



PROGRAMME OF
THE EUROPEAN UNION



Sentinel-6 MF : F08 Reprocessing Calval Assessment



Reference : SALP-RP-MAO-OP-17710-CN

Issue : 2/ 1

Date : September 29, 2023

EUMETSAT
Eumetsat-Allee 1, D-64295 Darmstadt, Germany
Tel: +49 6151 807-7
Fax: +49 6151 807 555
<http://www.eumetsat.int>

Document Reference:	SALP-RP-MAO-OP-17710-CN
Date:	September 29, 2023
Issue	2.1

Project:	PROJECT NAME	
Title:	Sentinel-6 MF : F08 Reprocessing Calval Assessment	
	Name	Company
Author(s):	B. Courcol	CLS
	E. Cadier	CLS
Approved by:	F. Bignalet-Cazalet	CNES
Application authorized by :	C. Martin-Puig	EUMETSAT

Change Log

Version	Date	Changes
1.0	17/07/2023	First Draft
1.1	24/07/2023	Eumetsat review taken into account
2.0	11/09/2023	Addition of tandem phase analysis, GMSL analysis and compliance status to system requirements.
2.1	29/09/2023	Eumetsat and MPWG reviews taken into account

Acronyms

AMR	Advanced Microwave Radiometer
CLS	Collecte Localisation Satellites
CMEMS	Copernicus Marine Service
CNES	Centre National d'Etudes Spatiales
DUACS	Data Unification and Altimeter Combination System
DV	Default Value
ECMWF	European Centre for Medium-range Weather Forecasting
EUMETSAT	European Organisation for the Exploitation of Meteorological Satellites
ESA	European Space Agency
GIM	Global Ionosphere Maps
GDR	Geophysical Data Record
GMSL	Global Mean Sea Level
HR	High Resolution Mode, also called Synthetic Aperture Radar (SAR) or Delay Doppler Altimetry (DDA)
HRMR	High Resolution Microwave Radiometer
LR	Low Resolution Mode (=LRM)
LUT	Look-Up Table
MLE	Maximum Likelihood Estimator
MQE	Mean Quadratic Error
MSS	Mean Sea Surface
NASA	National Aeronautics and Space Administration
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NTC	Non Time Critical
PB	Processing Baseline
RMC	Range Migration Correction
SSH	Sea Surface Height
SSHA	Sea Surface Height Anomaly(=SLA)
SLA	Sea Level Anomaly(=SSHA)
SSB	Sea State Bias
STD	Standard Deviation
SWH	Significant Wave Height
WTC	Wet troposphere Correction

Table of Content

1	Introduction	1
2	Data used and processing	2
2.1.	Sentinel-6 MF F08 reprocessed data	2
2.2.	Sentinel-6 MF operational data used for comparison	2
2.3.	Jason-3 data used for comparison	3
3	Data coverage and validity of measurements	4
3.1.	Missing measurements	4
3.2.	Wrong equator time in products	5
3.3.	Edited measurements	7
3.3.1.	Overview	7
3.3.2.	Rejection on ice detection	8
3.3.3.	Rejection on thresholds criteria	8
3.3.4.	Along-track SSHA consistency	10
3.3.5.	Comparison between LR MLE4 and LR NR	11
4	Geophysical parameters	13
4.1.	Altimeter parameters	13
4.1.1.	Significant Wave Height	13
4.1.2.	Range	18
4.1.3.	Backscatter coefficient	22
4.1.4.	Altimeter Wind Speed	27
4.1.5.	Sea State Bias	31
4.1.6.	Altimeter ionosphere correction	36
4.1.7.	Mispointing	39
4.2.	Wet tropospheric correction from radiometer	42
4.2.1.	Differences between operational and reprocessed WTC	42
4.2.2.	Differences between radiometer and model WTC	42
4.3.	Sea Level Performances	45
4.3.1.	Along-track analysis	45
4.3.2.	Crossover analysis	50
5	Analysis of the tandem flight with Jason-3	52
5.1.	Radiometer parameters	52
5.2.	Ku-band LR	54
5.2.1.	SWH	54
5.2.2.	Range	56
5.2.3.	Backscatter coefficient	58
5.2.4.	Altimeter Wind-Speed	60
5.2.5.	Ku-band Sea State Bias	62
5.2.6.	Mispointing	64
5.3.	Ku-band HR	66
5.3.1.	Backscatter coefficient	66
5.3.2.	Altimeter Wind-Speed	68
5.4.	C-band	70
5.4.1.	C-band SWH	70
5.4.2.	C-band Range	72
5.4.3.	C-band Backscatter coefficient	74
5.4.4.	C-band Sea State Bias	76
5.5.	Altimeter ionosphere correction	78
5.6.	SSHA	80

5.6.1.	LR SSHA	80
5.6.2.	HR SSHA	83
6	GMSL	85
6.1.	Uncertainty between Jason-3 and Sentinel-6MF	85
6.1.1.	Side A	85
6.1.2.	Side B	87
6.2.	Comparison between MLE4 and NR	88
7	System Requirements	90
7.1.	LR	90
7.1.1.	R-S-00260	90
7.1.2.	R-S-00270	90
7.1.3.	R-S-00280	92
7.1.4.	R-S-00290	93
7.1.5.	R-S-00300	94
7.1.6.	R-S-00310	96
7.1.7.	R-S-00320	97
7.1.8.	R-S-00330	98
7.1.9.	R-S-00340	99
7.1.10.	R-S-00350	100
7.1.11.	R-S-00355	100
7.1.12.	R-S-00360	101
7.1.13.	R-S-00370	103
7.2.	HR	104
7.2.1.	R-S-00680	104
7.2.2.	R-S-00690	104
7.2.3.	R-S-00700	105
7.2.4.	R-S-00710	106
7.2.5.	R-S-00720	107
7.2.6.	R-S-00730	107
7.2.7.	R-S-00740	108
7.2.8.	R-S-00750	108
7.2.9.	R-S-00760	109
7.2.10.	R-S-00765	110
7.2.11.	R-S-00770	111
7.2.12.	R-S-00780	112
8	Conclusion	113
9	References	115

List of Figures

1	Percentage of missing data for the operational and reprocessed datasets (left) and their difference (right) for both LR (top) and HR (bottom). On the difference plots, positive values represent a loss of data with the reprocessing and negative values a gain of data thanks to the reprocessing.	5
2	Percentage of valid measurement for the operational (blue) and reprocessed (red for MLE4 and SAMOSA, green for NR) datasets over ocean by day in LR (left) and HR (right).	7
3	Percentage of edited measurements on ice detection for the operational (blue) and reprocessed (red) datasets over ocean by day.	8
4	Percentage of edited measurements for the operational (blue) and reprocessed (red for MLE4 and green for NR) datasets over ocean by day based on parameters at default value (left) and out of bounds (right) in LR.	10
5	Percentage of edited measurements on SSHA pass statistics for the operational (blue) and reprocessed (red) datasets over ocean by day in LR	11
6	Percentage of edited reprocessed measurements per day in NR that are valid in MLE4 (left) and in MLE4 that are valid in NR (right).	11
7	Maps of edited reprocessed measurements in NR that are valid in MLE4 (left) and in MLE4 that are valid in NR (right). The color scales are set to different widths for visibility purposes.	12
8	Time monitoring of Sentinel-6 MF LR Ku-band Significant Wave Height in meters, before reprocessing (blue) and after reprocessing (red for MLE4, green for NR). Left: mean per day, Right: standard deviation per day.	13
9	Distributions of Sentinel-6 MF (blue for operational MLE4, red for reprocessed MLE4, green for NR) and Jason-3 (black) Ku-band Significant Wave Height. Left : entire distribution, right : zoom without Jason-3 in the 0-2m range.	14
10	Map (right) and monitoring (left) of the LR reprocessed NR - MLE4 SWH difference in m/s per day. Bottom : Mean differences as a function of ERA 5 model SWH.	15
11	1Hz noise for LR operational (blue) and reprocessed (red for MLE4, green for NR) SWH, as a function of time (left) and ERA 5 model SWH (right).	16
12	Monitoring (left) per day (red) and pass (blue) and map (right) of the reprocessed - operational HR SWH difference.	16
13	Time monitoring (left) and ERA 5 model SWH dependency (right) of Sentinel-6 MF Ku-band SWH difference : HR - LR, before reprocessing (blue) and after reprocessing (red)	17
14	Monitoring (left) per day (red) and pass (blue) and map (right) of the reprocessed - operational C-band SWH difference.	17
15	Monitoring of the LR MLE4 operational - reprocessed range difference per day (red) and per pass (blue) for Ku-band.	18
16	Time monitoring of Sentinel-6 MF F08 NR - MLE4 range difference per day, for the mean (left) and the standard deviation (right).	19
17	Distributions of Sentinel-6 MF F08 NR - MLE4 range difference for side A (left) and side B (right).	19
18	Map (left) and ERA 5 model SWH dependency (right) of the LR F08 NR - MLE4 range difference.	19
19	Map (right) and monitoring (left) of the HR operational - reprocessed range difference per day (red) and per pass (blue).	20
20	Time monitoring (left) and ERA 5 model SWH dependency (right) of Sentinel-6 MF Ku-band Range difference : HR - LR, before reprocessing (blue) and after reprocessing (red with LR MLE4 and green for LR NR)	20
21	Maps of Ascending versus Descending tracks maps of HR versus LR MLE4 range bias. Left panel: for operational data. Right panel: for reprocessed data.	21
22	Monitoring (left) per day (red) and pass (blue) and map (right) of the reprocessed - operational C-band range difference.	21

23	Time monitoring of Sentinel-6 MF LR Ku-band Backscatter coefficient in dB, before reprocessing (blue) and after reprocessing (red for MLE4 and green for NR). Left: mean per day, Right: standard deviation per day.	22
24	Histogram of Sentinel-6 MF LR Ku-band Backscatter coefficient in dB, before reprocessing (blue) and after reprocessing (red for MLE4 and green for NR) and Jason-3 (black), for side A (left) and side B (right).	22
25	Map (right) and monitoring (left) of the LR MLE4 operational - reprocessed sigma0 difference per day (red) and per pass (blue).	23
26	Map (right) and monitoring (left) of the LR reprocessed NR - MLE4 sigma0 difference per day.	24
27	Map (right) and monitoring (left) of the HR operational - reprocessed sigma0 difference per day (red) and per pass (blue).	25
28	Time monitoring (left) and ERA 5 model SWH dependency (right) of Sentinel-6 MF Ku-band sigma0 difference : HR - LR MLE4, before reprocessing (blue) and after reprocessing (red with LR MLE4)	25
29	Monitoring (left) per day (red) and pass (blue) and map (right) of the reprocessed - operational C-band sigma0 difference.	26
30	Time monitoring of Sentinel-6 MF altimeter wind-speed in m/s, before reprocessing (blue) and after reprocessing (red for MLE4, green for NR). Left : mean per day, Right : standard deviation per day.	27
31	Histogram of altimeter wind-speed for Jason-3 (black), reprocessed S6 MF LR (blue) and reprocessed S6 MF HR (red). Computed over the completed reprocessed period.	27
32	Map (right) and monitoring (left) of the LR MLE4 operational - reprocessed wind speed difference per day (red) and per pass (blue).	28
33	Map (right) and monitoring (left) of the LR reprocessed NR - MLE4 wind speed difference in m/s per day. Bottom : Mean differences as a function of ERA 5 model SWH.	28
34	Time monitoring of Sentinel-6 MF altimeter - ECMWF model wind speed difference in m/s, before reprocessing (blue) and after reprocessing (red for MLE4, green for NR). Left : mean per day, Right : standard deviation per day.	29
35	Map (right) and monitoring (left) of the HR operational - reprocessed wind speed difference per day (red) and per pass (blue).	29
36	Time monitoring of Sentinel-6 MF wind speed difference : HR - LR MLE4, before reprocessing (blue) and after reprocessing (red with LR MLE4) per day.	30
37	Time monitoring of Sentinel-6 MF LR SSB in meters, before reprocessing (blue) and after reprocessing (red for MLE4 and green for NR). Left: mean per day, Right: standard deviation per day.	31
38	Histogram of Sentinel-6 MF LR SSB in meters, before reprocessing (blue) and after reprocessing (red for MLE4 and green for NR) and Jason-3 (black).	31
39	Map (right) and monitoring (left) of the LR MLE4 operational - reprocessed SSB difference per day (red) and per pass (blue).	32
40	Map (right) and monitoring (left) of the LR reprocessed NR - MLE4 SSB difference per day in cm. Bottom : Mean differences in meters as a function of ERA 5 model SWH.	32
41	Map (right) and monitoring (left) of the HR operational - reprocessed SSB difference per day (red) and per pass (blue).	33
42	Time monitoring of Sentinel-6 MF SSB difference : HR - LR MLE4, before reprocessing (blue) and after reprocessing (red with LR MLE4) per day.	34
43	Monitoring (left) per day (red) and pass (blue) and map (right) of the reprocessed - operational C-band SSB difference.	35
44	Time monitoring of Sentinel-6 MF LR Altimeter filtered ionosphere correction in meters, before reprocessing (blue) and after reprocessing (red for MLE4, green for NR). Left : mean per day, Right : standard deviation per day.	36
45	Histogram of altimeter filtered ionosphere correction for Jason-3 (black) and reprocessed Sentinel-6 MF LR (blue for operation MLE4, red for reprocessed MLE4, green for reprocessed NR). Computed over the completed reprocessed period.	36

46	Time monitoring of the NR - MLE4 filtered ionospheric correction difference per day in cm. . .	37
47	Time monitoring of the ionosphere correction difference : Altimeter Filtered minus GIM model (m), for Jason-3 (black) and Sentinel-6 MF LR reprocessed data (red for MLE4, green for NR). Left : mean per day, right : standard deviation per day.	37
48	Map of ionosphere correction difference : Altimeter filtered minus GIM model (m). For Sentinel-6 MF LR reprocessed MLE4 (left), NR (right) and Jason-3 (bottom). Computed over the completed reprocessed period.	38
49	Time monitoring of square of the off-nadir mispointing angle in deg ² , before reprocessing (blue) and after reprocessing (red). Left: mean per cycle, Right: standard deviation per cycle	39
50	Histogram of square of the off-nadir mispointing angle for Jason-3 (black) and reprocessed S6 MF LR. Computed over the completed reprocessed period.	39
51	Sentinel-6 MF LR reprocessed MLE4 - NR square off-nadir angle differences as a function of the reprocessed MLE4 square off-nadir angle. Left : mean, right : standard deviation. . . .	40
52	Sentinel-6 MF LR reprocessed MLE4 - NR range (left), sigma0 (right) and SSHA (bottom) mean differences as a function of the reprocessed MLE4 - NR square off-nadir angle differences.	40
53	Sentinel-6 MF along-track reprocessed MLE4 (blue) and NR (red) square off-nadir angle (top left) and reprocessed NR - MLE4 sigma0 (top right), range (bottom left) and SSHA (bottom right) for cycle 44 pass 4.	41
54	Monitoring (left) per day (red) and pass (blue) and map (right) of the reprocessed - operational LR WTC difference	42
55	Time monitoring of wet tropospheric correction difference (m): WTC from radiometer minus WTC from ECMWF model. Before reprocessing (blue), after reprocessing (red) and for Jason-3 (black). Left : mean per day, Right : standard deviation per day	43
56	Histogram of radiometer WTC for Jason-3 (black) and reprocessed Sentinel-6 MF. Computed over the completed reprocessed period.	43
57	Map of WTC difference : Radiometer minus ECMWF model (m). For Sentinel-6 MF operational dataset (left), reprocessed dataset (right) and Jason-3 (bottom). Computed over the completed reprocessed period.	44
58	Time monitoring of Sentinel-6 MF SSHA in meters, without the Caspian Sea, before reprocessing (blue) and after reprocessing (red for MLE4, green for NR). Left : mean per day, Right : standard deviation per day.	45
59	Maps of Sentinel-6 MF LR SSHA in meters for operational MLE4 (left), reprocessed MLE4 (right) and NR (bottom).	46
60	Map (right) and time monitoring (left) of Sentinel-6 MF LR MLE4 operational - reprocessed SSHA in meters per day (red) and per pass (blue).	46
61	Time monitoring of Sentinel-6 MF reprocessed NR - MLE4 SSHA in meters, without the Caspian Sea, before reprocessing (blue) and after reprocessing (red for MLE4, green for NR). Left : mean per day, Right : standard deviation per day.	47
62	Maps of mean (left) and standard deviation (right) of Sentinel-6 MF LR reprocessed NR - MLE4 SSHA in meters, and its mean as a function of ERA 5 model SWH (bottom).	47
63	Distributions of Sentinel-6 MF F08 NR - MLE4 SSHA difference for side A (left) and side B (right).	48
64	Map (right) and time monitoring (left) of Sentinel-6 MF HR operational - reprocessed SSHA in meters per day (red) and per pass (blue).	48
65	Time monitoring (left) and ERA 5 model SWH dependency (right) of Sentinel-6 MF SSHA difference : HR - LR MLE4, before reprocessing (blue) and after reprocessing (red)	49
66	Monitoring of the mean of SSH difference at mono-mission crossover for each cycle in meters. Left : LR and Jason-3. Right : HR.	50
67	Monitoring of the standard deviation of SSH difference at mono-mission crossover for each cycle in meters. Left : LR and Jason-3. Right : HR.	51

68	Mean SSH difference at crossovers for Sentinel-6 MF LR operational MLE4 (top left), reprocessed MLE4 (top right) and NR (bottom). Computed over the complete reprocessing period.	51
69	Mean SSH difference at crossovers for Sentinel-6 MF HR operational data (left) and reprocessed data (right). Computed over the complete reprocessing period.	51
70	Radiometer WTC difference : Sentinel-6 MF AMR-C/HRMR minus Jason-3 AMR. Histogram (left) and gridded map (right) computed over the complete tandem period.	52
71	Time monitoring of Radiometer WTC difference : Sentinel-6 MF AMR-C minus Jason-3 AMR. Mean per day for the operational (blue) and reprocessed (red) datasets, computed over the complete tandem period.	53
72	Histogram of Ku-band SWH difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Computed over the complete tandem period.	54
73	Time monitoring of Ku-band SWH difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Mean per day (left) and standard deviation per day (right) computed over the complete tandem period.	54
74	Ku-band SWH difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3 computed over the complete tandem period. Gridded maps for S6 MF MLE4 (left) and NR (right), and differences function of ERA 5 model SWH (bottom).	55
75	Histogram of Orbit - Ku-band range - MSS difference : Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Computed over the complete tandem period.	56
76	Time monitoring of Orbit - Ku-band range - MSS difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Mean per day (left) and standard deviation per day (right) computed over the complete tandem period.	56
77	Orbit - Ku-band range - MSS difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3 computed over the complete tandem period. Gridded maps for reprocessed MLE4 (left) and NR (right) and difference function of ERA 5 model SWH (bottom).	57
78	Histogram of Ku-band backscatter coefficient difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Computed over POS-4 side A (left) and side B (right) periods, for operational MLE4 (blue), reprocessed MLE4 (red) and NR (green).	58
79	Time monitoring of Ku-band backscatter coefficient difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Mean per day (left) and standard deviation per day (right) computed over the complete tandem period for operation MLE4 (blue), reprocessed MLE4 (red) and NR (green).	58
80	Ku-band backscatter coefficient difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3 computed over the complete tandem period. Gridded map for reprocessed MLE4 (left) and NR (right) and difference function of ERA 5 model SWH (bottom).	59
81	Histogram of altimeter wind speed difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Computed over the complete tandem period for operational MLE4 (blue), reprocessed MLE4 (red) and NR (green).	60
82	Time monitoring of Ku-band wind speed difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Mean per day (left) and standard deviation per day (right) computed over the complete tandem period for operational MLE4 (blue), reprocessed MLE4 (red) and NR (green).	61
83	Altimeter wind speed difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3 computed over the complete tandem period in m/s. Gridded map for reprocessed MLE4 (left) and NR (right) and difference function of ERA 5 model SWH (bottom).	61
84	Histogram of Ku-band SSB difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Computed over the complete tandem period for operational MLE4 (blue), reprocessed MLE4 (red) and NR (green).	62
85	Time monitoring of Ku-band SSB difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Mean per day (left) and standard deviation per day (right) computed over the complete tandem period for operational MLE4 (blue), reprocessed MLE4 (red) and NR (green). Means have been centred on 0 for better visibility.	62
86	Ku-band SSB difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3 computed over the complete tandem period. Gridded map for reprocessed MLE4 (left) and NR (right) and difference function of ERA 5 model SWH (bottom).	63

87	Histogram of mispointing difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Computed over the complete tandem period for operational MLE4 (blue), reprocessed MLE4 (red) and NR (green).	64
88	Time monitoring of mispointing difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Mean per day (left) and standard deviation per day (right) computed over the complete tandem period for operational MLE4 (blue), reprocessed MLE4 (red) and NR (green).	64
89	Mispointing difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3 computed over the complete tandem period. Gridded map for reprocessed MLE4 (left) and NR (right).	65
90	Histogram of Ku-band backscatter coefficient difference: Sentinel-6 MF HR minus Jason-3. Computed over POS-4 side A (left) and side B (right) periods, for operational (blue) and reprocessed (red) datasets.	66
91	Time monitoring of Ku-band backscatter coefficient difference: Sentinel-6 MF HR minus Jason-3. Mean per day (left) and standard deviation per day (right) computed over the complete tandem period for operational (blue) and reprocessed (red) datasets.	66
92	Ku-band backscatter coefficient difference: Sentinel-6 MF HR minus Jason-3 computed over the complete tandem period. Gridded map for reprocessed dataset (left) and difference function of ERA 5 model SWH (right).	67
93	Histogram of altimeter wind speed difference: Sentinel-6 MF HR minus Jason-3. Computed over the complete tandem period for operational (blue) and reprocessed (red) datasets.	68
94	Time monitoring of Ku-band wind speed difference: Sentinel-6 MF HR minus Jason-3. Mean per day (left) and standard deviation per day (right) computed over the complete tandem period for operational (blue) and reprocessed (red) datasets.	69
95	Altimeter wind speed difference: Sentinel-6 MF HR minus Jason-3 computed over the complete tandem period in m/s. Gridded map for operational (left) and reprocessed (right) datasets and difference function of ERA 5 model SWH (bottom).	69
96	Histogram of C-band SWH difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Computed over the complete tandem period, for the operational (blue) and reprocessed (red) datasets.	70
97	Time monitoring of C-band SWH difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Mean per day (left) and standard deviation per day (right) computed over the complete tandem period, for the operational (blue) and reprocessed (red) datasets.	70
98	C-band SWH difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3 computed over the complete tandem period. Gridded map for the reprocessed dataset (left) and difference function of ERA5 SWH (right).	71
99	Histogram of Orbit - C-band Range - MSS difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Computed over the complete tandem period, for the operational (blue) and reprocessed (red) datasets.	72
100	Time monitoring of Orbit - C-band Range - MSS difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Mean per day (left) and standard deviation per day (right) computed over the complete tandem period, for the operational (blue) and reprocessed (red) datasets.	72
101	Orbit - C-band Range - MSS difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3 computed over the complete tandem period. Gridded map (left panel) and difference function of ERA 5 model SWH (right panel).	73
102	Histogram of C-band backscatter coefficient difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Computed over the complete tandem period, for the operational (blue) and reprocessed (red) datasets.	74
103	Time monitoring of C-band backscatter coefficient difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Mean per day (left) and standard deviation per day (right) computed over the complete tandem period, for the operational (blue) and reprocessed (red) datasets.	74
104	C-band backscatter coefficient difference: Sentinel-6 MF reprocessed LR minus Jason-3 computed over the complete tandem period. Gridded map (left) and difference function of ERA 5 model SWH (right).	75
105	Histogram of C-band SSB difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Computed over the complete tandem period for operational MLE4 (blue), reprocessed MLE4 (red) and NR (green).	76

106	Time monitoring of C-band SSB difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Mean per day (left) and standard deviation per day (right) computed over the complete tandem period for operational MLE4 (blue), reprocessed MLE4 (red) and NR (green).	76
107	C-band SSB difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3 computed over the complete tandem period. Gridded map for reprocessed MLE4 (left) and NR (right) and difference function of ERA 5 model SWH (bottom).	77
108	Histogram of Filtered Altimeter Ionosphere correction difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Computed over the complete tandem period for operational MLE4 (blue), reprocessed MLE4 (red) and NR (green).	78
109	Time monitoring of Filtered Altimeter Ionosphere correction difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Mean per day (left) and standard deviation per day (right) computed over the complete tandem period for operational MLE4 (blue), reprocessed MLE4 (red) and NR (green).	78
110	Filtered Altimeter Ionosphere correction difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3 computed over the complete tandem period. Gridded map for reprocessed MLE4 (left) and NR (right) and difference function of ERA 5 model SWH (bottom).	79
111	Histogram of product SSHA difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Computed over the complete tandem period for operational MLE4 (blue), reprocessed MLE4 (red) and NR (green).	80
112	Time monitoring of product SSHA difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Mean (left) and standard deviation (right) per day computed over the complete tandem period for operational MLE4 (blue), reprocessed MLE4 (red) and NR (green).	81
113	Time monitoring of product SSHA with model WTC difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Mean per day computed over the complete tandem period for operational MLE4 (blue), reprocessed MLE4 (red) and NR (green).	81
114	SSHA difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3 computed over the complete tandem period. Gridded map for reprocessed MLE4 (left) and NR (right) and difference function of ERA 5 model SWH (bottom).	82
115	Histogram of product SSHA difference: Sentinel-6 MF HR minus Jason-3. Computed over the complete tandem period for operational (blue) and reprocessed (red) datasets.	83
116	Time monitoring of product SSHA difference: Sentinel-6 MF HR minus Jason-3. Mean (left) and standard deviation (right) per day computed over the complete tandem period for operational and reprocessed (red) datasets.	83
117	SSHA difference: Sentinel-6 MF HR minus Jason-3 computed over the complete tandem period. Gridded map for operational (left) and reprocessed (right) datasets and difference function of ERA 5 model SWH (bottom).	84
118	Jason-3 (black) and Sentinel-6 MF (green) GMSL over the side A (top panel), the tandem phase (middle panel) and their differences over the side A tandem phase (bottom panel), for Sentinel-6 MF reprocessed dataset, LR MLE4 on the left and LR NR on the right.	85
119	Time series of GMSL difference between Jason-3 and Sentinel-6 MF over the side A tandem phase (left) and relative GMSL offset and its uncertainty between Jason-3 and Sentinel-6 MF as a function of the number of cycle used for the computation (right). Top: Sentinel-6MF LR MLE4; Bottom: Sentinel-6MF LR MLE4	86
120	Jason-3 (black) and Sentinel-6 MF (green) GMSL over the side B (top panel), the tandem phase (middle panel) and their differences over the side B tandem phase (bottom panel), for Sentinel-6 MF reprocessed dataset, LR MLE4 on the left and LR NR on the right.	87
121	Time series of GMSL difference between Jason-3 and Sentinel-6 MF over the side B tandem phase (left) and relative GMSL offset and its uncertainty between Jason-3 and Sentinel-6MF as a function of the number of cycle used for the computation (right). Top: Sentinel-6 MF LR MLE4; Bottom: Sentinel-6 MF LR MLE4	88
122	GMSL difference MLE4 - NR SLAs over the reprocessed period. Slope errors are given at 90 % C.L.	89

123	1 Hz noise of LR Ku-band altimeter range. Left panel: noise function of SWH for Sentinel-6 MF LR MLE4 (blue for MLE4, green for NR) and Jason-3 (black); the purple line represents the requirement thresholds. Right panel : noise level computed for each cycle and at 1, 2, 5 and 8 m-wave (solid lines for MLE4, dashed lines for NR) and the corresponding requirement levels (dotted lines).	91
124	1 Hz noise of LR C-band altimeter range. Left panel: noise function of SWH for Sentinel-6 MF LR and Jason-3; the purple line represents the requirement thresholds. Right panel : noise level computed for each cycle and at 1, 2, 5 and 8 m-wave (solid lines) and the corresponding requirement levels (dashed lines).	92
125	Absolute value of consecutive filtered ionosphere correction measurement for MLE4 (left) and NR (right). Mean per pass (blue), mean per day (orange) and mean per cycle (green).	93
126	Standard deviation gridded map of Altimeter Filtered Ionosphere correction Sentinel-6 MF-Jason-3 difference (cm) for MLE4 (left) and NR (right). Computed over the tandem phase.	94
127	Standard deviation gridded map of the difference between Altimeter Filtered Ionosphere correction and GIM model (cm) for MLE4 (left) and NR (right). Computed over the entire reprocessing period.	94
128	Absolute value of consecutive LR sea state bias measurement for LR MLE4 (left) and NR (right). Mean per pass (blue), mean per day (orange) and mean per cycle (green).	95
129	Standard deviation gridded map of Ku-band SSB difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3 computed over the complete tandem period for MLE4 (left) and NR (right).	95
130	Mean gridded map of dry tropospheric correction difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Computed over cycles 4 to 51.	97
131	Absolute value of consecutive AMR-C WTC measurement in mm. Mean per pass (blue), mean per day (orange) and mean per cycle (green).	98
132	STD gridded map of AMR WTC difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3, in m. Computed over cycles 4 to 51.	98
133	Corrected LR SSH error derived from crossover analysis with a selection over Pacific patch (latitude in [-24.5°N; -3°N] and longitude in [220°E; 246°E]), in cm for MLE4 (left) and for NR (right). The error equals to the standard deviation of the SSH difference divided by $\sqrt{2}$. Computed on a cyclic basis.	99
134	SWH difference between Sentinel-6 MF LR data and ERA-5 SWH, plotted function of ERA-5 SWH for MLE4 (red) and NR (green). Computed over Sentinel-6 MF cycle 40. Purple lines represent requirement limits. Results are identical for all cycles.	100
135	Maximum value of Sentinel-6 MF LR SWH per cycle for MLE4 (left) and NR (right).	101
136	Difference between Altimeter LR wind speed and model wind speed function of model wind speed, in m/s for MLE4 (left) and NR (right). Computed for all cycles (right, darker curves correspond to more recent cycles). Green lines represent requirement limits.	102
137	1 Hz noise of HR Ku-band altimeter range, in cm. Left panel: noise function of SWH in m for Sentinel-6 MF HR and Jason-3; the purple line represents the requirement thresholds. Right panel : noise level computed for each cycle and at 1, 2, 5 and 8 m-wave (solid lines) and the corresponding requirement levels (dashed lines).	105
138	Absolute value of consecutive HR sea state bias measurement. Mean per pass (blue), mean per day (orange) and mean per cycle (green).	106
139	Standard deviation gridded map of Ku-band SSB difference: Sentinel-6 MF HR minus Jason-3 computed over the complete tandem period.	107
140	Corrected HR SSH error derived from crossover analysis with a selection over Pacific patch (latitude in [-24.5°N; -3°N] and longitude in [220°E; 246°E]), in cm. The error equals to the standard deviation of the SSH difference divided by $\sqrt{(2)}$. Computed on a cyclic basis.	109
141	SWH difference between Sentinel-6 MF HR data and ERA-5 SWH, plotted function of ERA-5 SWH. Computed over Sentinel-6 MF cycle 70. Green lines represent requirement limits. Results are identical for all cycles.	109
142	Maximum value of Sentinel-6 MF HR SWH per cycle.	110

143 *Difference between Altimeter HR wind speed and model wind speed function of model wind speed, in m/s. Computed over Sentinel-6 MF cycle 70 (left) and for all cycles (right, darker curves correspond to more recent cycles). Green lines represent requirement limits. 111*

List of Tables

1	<i>Number of passes with a different number of missing points in reprocessed wrt operational. This includes passes that are entirely missing.</i>	4
2	<i>LR products with erroneous equator time in attributes</i>	5
3	<i>HR products with erroneous equator time in attributes</i>	6
4	<i>Table of parameters used for editing and the corresponding percentages of edited measurements for each parameter for Sentinel-6 MF LR and HR. In LR MLE4 and HR, first values correspond to operational data, second values to reprocessed data.</i>	9
5	<i>Table of parameters used for the editing on the SSHA pass statistics. These parameters are identical in HR and LR.</i>	10
6	<i>Mean and standard deviation of SSH difference at crossovers</i>	50
7	<i>Calibration bias applied on sigma0 for LR wind speed computation in PB F08</i>	60
8	<i>Calibration bias applied on sigma0 for HR wind speed computation in PB F08</i>	68
9	<i>Summary of the Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3 biases for the parameters used in the SSHA computation. Computed over the complete tandem flight. The sum is performed as [bias on orbit-range-mss] minus [the sum of the bias on the geophysical correction], as in the SSHA computation.</i>	80
10	<i>Summary of the Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3 correlation to ERA 5 model SWH biases for the parameters used in the SSHA computation. Computed over the complete tandem flight. The sum is performed as [bias on orbit-range-mss] minus [the sum of the bias on the geophysical correction], as in the SSHA computation.</i>	82
11	<i>R-S-00260</i>	90
12	<i>R-S-00270</i>	90
13	<i>1 Hz noise of LR Ku-band altimeter range at 1, 2, 5 and 8 m-wave.</i>	91
14	<i>R-S-00280</i>	92
15	<i>1 Hz noise of LR C-band altimeter range at 1, 2, 5 and 8 m-wave.</i>	92
16	<i>R-S-00290</i>	93
17	<i>R-S-00300</i>	94
18	<i>R-S-00310</i>	96
19	<i>R-S-00320</i>	97
20	<i>R-S-00330</i>	98
21	<i>R-S-00340</i>	99
22	<i>R-S-00350</i>	100
23	<i>R-S-00355</i>	100
24	<i>R-S-00360</i>	101
25	<i>R-S-00370</i>	103
26	<i>R-S-00680</i>	104
27	<i>R-S-00690</i>	104
28	<i>1 Hz noise of HR Ku-band altimeter range at 1, 2, 5 and 8 m-wave.</i>	105
29	<i>R-S-00700</i>	105
30	<i>R-S-00710</i>	106
31	<i>R-S-00720</i>	107
32	<i>R-S-00730</i>	107
33	<i>R-S-00740</i>	108
34	<i>R-S-00750</i>	108
35	<i>R-S-00760</i>	109
36	<i>R-S-00765</i>	110
37	<i>R-S-00770</i>	111
38	<i>R-S-00780</i>	112

1 Introduction

Sentinel-6 is a collaborative Copernicus mission, implemented and co-funded by the European Commission, ESA, EUMETSAT and the USA through NASA and NOAA.

EUMETSAT is responsible for the Sentinel-6 operations as part of the Copernicus component of the EU Space Program. The Sentinel-6 Quality Assessment reports are generated by CNES as per EUMETSAT-CNES agreement in the context of Copernicus.

Since the launch of the Sentinel-6 MF satellite on 21st of November 2020, PDAP Processing Baseline (PB) has been updated several times following the satellite commissioning activities. This document presents the synthesis report concerning validation activities of Sentinel-6 MF PDAP 2023 reprocessing with PB F08. Sentinel-6 MF NTC products have been reprocessed using PB F08 until cycle 83 track 8. From cycle 83 track 9, PB F08 is used to compute operational data.

The present global report deals with the complete reprocessed period of the Sentinel-6 MF mission, thanks to comparison with operational dataset. This reprocessing includes the addition of the numerical retracker in LR mode. A special focus on LR data is therefore presented in this report. The analysis is performed over ocean and using 1 Hz data.

This report is split into 6 main sections after this introduction describing the keys of the reprocessing campaign:

- First, the **data used** are presented.
- The **data coverage** and measurement validity issues are then presented.
- A synthesis of the **geophysical parameter derived from altimeter and radiometer** is exposed.
- The analysis of the differences between Jason-3 and Sentinel-6 MF over the **tandem phase** is detailed.
- The impact of the reprocessing on the **GMSL** is presented.
- Finally, compliance with **system requirements** is checked.

2 Data used and processing

2.1. Sentinel-6 MF F08 reprocessed data

Sentinel-6 MF data has been reprocessed with Processing Baseline F08 (PB) for Non-Time Critical (NTC) timeliness, for both LR (Low Resolution) and HR (High Resolution) modes.

The main change to this new F08 baseline is the **addition of numerical retracker (NR) retrievals in LR products for Ku band**. Numerical retracking allows accounting for the PTR shape evolution thanks to the use of in-flight PTRs. Please note that this new set of parameters does not replace but complement MLE4-derived parameters: NR and MLE4 retrievals are both included in LR products.

Other changes in PB F08 include :

- The update of the antenna aperture angle from 1.33° to $1.34^{\circ 1}$.
- The update of the total electron content (TEC) computation with a more appropriate scaling factor (0.881 instead of 0.925) to align the altimeter-derived TEC with the GPS-derived JPL GIM model.

Please note that an anomaly on NR SWH has been raised following the pre-operational validation of F08 data (AR 2620). Due to an implementation error, LR NR SWH 1Hz compression is done using sigma-composite whereas it should be done by direct averaging. The main impact of this error is that negative measurements of SWH are mapped to their absolute value at 20Hz and mixed to actual positive SWH during compression. 1 Hz NR SWH can be impacted up to 1 meter and has repercussions on some diagnostics detailed in this report. A patched version of PB F08 will be deployed at the end of summer 2023 and the anomaly will be retroactively corrected during the next reprocessing campaign.

A detailed description of the products can be found in the Sentinel-6 MF user handbook [2] and in the product notice [3].

The reprocessed data spans from 2020-12-17 at 22:17 to 2023-02-09 at 01:40, corresponding to the period from cycle 4 track number 14 to cycle 83 track number 8.

The analysis is performed over ocean and using 1 Hz data. For LR, both "ocean" retrackers were used, being MLE4 and NR, as well as the SAMOSA retracker in HR.

In the following assessment, the reprocessed dataset is referred as "REP" on the figures.

2.2. Sentinel-6 MF operational data used for comparison

From the beginning of the mission to 2022-08-15 (corresponding to cycle 65 pass 21), Sentinel-6 MF data were processed with the PB F06. No data with PB anterior to F06 is present in this study thanks to the 2022 F06 reprocessing campaign [1]. Data after 2022-08-15 were processed with PB F07.

The main changes brought by the PB F07 are :

- The availability of High Resolution Microwave Radiometer (HRMR) data in all radiometer products. All variables within the Level 2 altimeter products derived from the radiometer result from the combination

¹In-flight operations have been conducted to better characterize the antenna aperture.

of AMR-C and HRMR data (ex: Wet Tropospheric Correction).

- The usage of ECHO CAL as main source of CAL1.
- An update of the ionospheric correction filtering method. With this update, the filtered ionospheric correction became available over the Caspian Sea in the products, enabling SLA computation in this region.

Mode details on the PB F07 can be found in the associated product notice [4].

In the following assessment, the operational dataset is referred as "OPE" on the figures.

2.3. Jason-3 data used for comparison

Between 2020/12/17 to 2022/04/07 (cycle 4 to 51 for Sentinel-6 MF), Sentinel-6 MF and Jason-3 are flying in tandem formation on the same ground track with only 30 seconds apart, Jason-3 ahead of Sentinel-6 MF.

In this current report, Jason-3 GDR-F standard with MLE4 retracking was used to compare to Sentinel-6 MF reprocessed data. A detailed description of the products can be found in the Jason-3 product handbook [5].

Sentinel-6 MF PB F06 to F08 and Jason-3 GDR-F share the same standards in terms of geophysical corrections: same tide models, same mean surface height, etc. In particular :

- for the wind speed, Collard algorithm is used on both mission
- for the sea state bias, Sentinel-6 MF uses the same Sea State Bias parametrization as Jason-3 GDR-F, both in LR and in HR.

3 Data coverage and validity of measurements

This section consists in analysing the availability of data for level 2 NTC products before and after the reprocessing. Furthermore, the edited (invalidated) measurements are monitored and analysed.

3.1. Missing measurements

Sentinel-6 MF data availability is improved thanks to F08 reprocessing. In LR, 7 tracks are recovered (cycle 4 passes 13, 15, 26 and 232 ; cycle 11 pass 1 and cycle 74 passes 35 and 68) and no new missing track is detected. Please note that cycle 74 pass 68 was recovered after the main reprocessed products generation and is not included in this report. In HR, 5 passes are recovered with the reprocessing (cycle 4 passes 13, 15 and 26, cycle 11 pass 1 and cycle 50 pass 251) and one pass is lost with the reprocessing (cycle 10 pass 254). However, this loss is minimal as this pass only contains 16 points in operational dataset.

Table 1 lists the total number of passes in the reprocessed data, and the number of passes with a different number of points with respect to the operational dataset, with thresholds of 1 and 500 (i.e. 8min and 20s). A few number of passes have less available points in the reprocessed dataset than in the operational dataset, respectively 28 in LR and 33 in HR. However, this data loss is marginal as the number of data points lost is of exactly 1 in all case except two : 16 points for cycle 10 pass 254 (already mentioned above), and 6 points cycle 25 pass 153 in LR. On the other hand, about three quarters of all passes in LR and HR have at least 1 more point in reprocessed than in operational. The reason is still under investigation. Once again, the number of points recovered per pass is in average low, typically 1 or 2. 24 passes in LR have more than 500 recovered points, as well as 11 passes in HR.

Parameter	LR	HR
Total number of passes in reprocessing	20066	20066
Number of passes with at least 1 more missing point wrt to operational dataset	28	33
Number of passes with at least 1 less missing point wrt to operational dataset	15297	14356
Number of passes with at least 500 more missing points wrt to operational dataset	0	0
Number of passes with at least 500 less missing points wrt to operational dataset	24	11

Table 1 – Number of passes with a different number of missing points in reprocessed wrt operational. This includes passes that are entirely missing.

The cyclic monitoring of available data for both dataset is presented in figure 1.




Figure 1 – Percentage of missing data for the operational and reprocessed datasets (left) and their difference (right) for both LR (top) and HR (bottom). On the difference plots, positive values represent a loss of data with the reprocessing and negative values a gain of data thanks to the reprocessing.

3.2. Wrong equator time in products

Products with erroneous equator time in their attributes are listed in tables 2 and 3. There are 4 products impacted in LR and 16 products impacted in HR. Impacted products are passes with significant missing segments that include the equator. In these cases, the equator times in the product attributes correspond to that of the previous pass. Please note that this issue was already present in PB F06 and F07 products.

Cycle	Pass	File name
4	82	S6A_P4_2__LR_STD__NT_004_082_20201220T140017_20201220T140200_F08.nc
16	120	S6A_P4_2__LR_STD__NT_016_120_20210420T011844_20210420T013649_F08.nc
17	82	S6A_P4_2__LR_STD__NT_017_082_20210428T114111_20210428T114302_F08.nc
35	8	S6A_P4_2__LR_STD__NT_035_008_20211021T015440_20211021T020322_F08.nc

Table 2 – LR products with erroneous equator time in attributes

Cycle	Pass	File name
5	31	S6A_P4_2__HR_STD__NT_005_031_20201228T121152_20201228T121613_F08.nc
7	228	S6A_P4_2__HR_STD__NT_007_228_20210125T004312_20210125T005322_F08.nc
10	225	6A_P4_2__HR_STD__NT_010_225_20210223T155007_20210223T161648_F08.nc
12	47	S6A_P4_2__HR_STD__NT_012_047_20210308T130058_20210308T132754_F08.nc
16	103	S6A_P4_2__HR_STD__NT_016_103_20210419T092305_20210419T093746_F08.nc
19	106	S6A_P4_2__HR_STD__NT_019_106_20210519T061140_20210519T061321_F08.nc
31	97	S6A_P4_2__HR_STD__NT_031_097_20210914T212341_20210914T214706_F08.nc
32	223	S6A_P4_2__HR_STD__NT_032_223_20210929T172516_20210929T173333_F08.nc
35	8	S6A_P4_2__HR_STD__NT_035_008_20211021T015440_20211021T020322_F08.nc
42	161	S6A_P4_2__HR_STD__NT_042_161_20220104T110513_20220104T113049_F08.nc
61	35	S6A_P4_2__HR_STD__NT_061_035_20220706T223407_20220706T225134_F08.nc
62	159	S6A_P4_2__HR_STD__NT_062_159_20220721T164316_20220721T170252_F08.nc
74	153	S6A_P4_2__HR_STD__NT_074_153_20221117T104819_20221117T105257_F08.nc
74	196	S6A_P4_2__HR_STD__NT_074_196_20221119T030533_20221119T032931_F08.nc
77	147	S6A_P4_2__HR_STD__NT_077_147_20221216T230637_20221216T232830_F08.nc

Table 3 – HR products with erroneous equator time in attributes

3.3. Edited measurements

3.3.1. Overview

The outlier detection or editing step of the Cal/Val process is applied to remove any measurement that is considered erroneous. Thus, it helps to refine the various metrics which are provided in the specific sections dedicated to the performance over the ocean. The definition of an erroneous measurement, and of the accepted error level on the final sea level anomaly is of course a trade-off between accuracy and data coverage. The monitoring of the percentage of valid and edited measurements also provides relevant information about the mission performances.

A series of editing criteria are used to detect outliers over ocean. This process is divided into 3 main parts:

- Removal of all measurements affected by sea-ice.
- Removal of all measurements which exceed defined thresholds on different parameters.
- Further checks on along-track SLA consistency.

For each step of the process, the number of outliers is routinely monitored at Cal/Val level. The number of removed data is used to detect processing anomalies which could be due to instrumental, geophysical or algorithmic changes. The process performed here is dedicated to ocean applications. Data over land are removed using a land/water mask prior to the analysis described in this section. The editing criteria have not been changed with the reprocessing.

The percentage of edited data per day for the operational and reprocessed dataset over ocean is monitored on figure 2. The overall percentage of edited data is very similar between operational and reprocessed datasets both in LR (11.86 % and 11.84 % respectively for MLE4) and HR (10.39 % and 10.41 %). The NR dataset shows slightly lower levels of edited data at 11.6 % (further details in section 3.3.5.).




Figure 2 – Percentage of valid measurement for the operational (blue) and reprocessed (red for MLE4 and SAMOSA, green for NR) datasets over ocean by day in LR (left) and HR (right).

The main difference between operational and reprocessed datasets is a spike at cycle 5 in the operational data only (HR and LR). From passes 121 to 126 (included) of this cycle (i.e. from 01-01-2021 00:31:12.0 to 06:08:28.0), the dry tropospheric correction is set to default value in the operational products. This was caused by a missing meteo file, which has been recovered during the reprocessing. Another notable spike that appear in all datasets in March 2021 is due to an AMR-C 24h warm calibration that impacted the ice flag, cf section 3.3.2.. Other spikes are statistical artefacts due to variations in the number of available measurements.

3.3.2. Rejection on ice detection

The first step of the editing process includes the removal of points with ice detection. The radiometer-derived ice flag (*rad_sea_ice_flag* in the products) is used to remove measurements affected by sea ice within the altimeter footprint.

The percentage of measurements edited on the ice flag criterion over ocean is monitored on the figure 3. There is no significant difference between operational and reprocessed datasets.

An AMR-C 24h warm target calibration conducted on the 17-18/03/2021 (on cycle 13 passes 20 to 45) caused the unavailability of ice flag over this period, resulting a spike in edited data.




Figure 3 – Percentage of edited measurements on ice detection for the operational (blue) and reprocessed (red) datasets over ocean by day.

3.3.3. Rejection on thresholds criteria

Once the measurements corrupted by sea ice surfaces are identified, the quality of the parameters retrieved by the altimeter, as well as that of the geophysical corrections are checked with respect to defined thresholds. These thresholds and the corresponding percentage of corrupted measurements are detailed in table 4. For each of the listed parameters, the percentage of detected outliers is closely monitored cycle by cycle, day by day and pass by pass, by CLS Cal/Val routines.

Parameters	Min	Max	Unit	% rejected		
				LR MLE4	LR NR	HR
Sea surface height anomaly	-2	2	m	3.73/3.66	3.10	3.52/3.45
Sea surface height	-130	100	m	2.52/2.55	1.97	0.01/0.01
Nb measurements of range	10	N/A		0.14/0.16	0.00	0.1/0.01
Std. deviation of range	0	See (*)	m	2.72/2.82	0.58	0.62/0.91
Backscatter coefficient	LR: 7 HR: 10	LR: 30 HR: 35	dB	2.21/2.26	0.12	0.05/0.12
Nb measurements of sigma0	10	N/A		0.13/0.15	0.00	0.01/0.01
Std. deviation of sigma0	0	1	dB	3.87/4.13	2.32	0.70/0.85
Significant wave height	0	11	m	2.58/2.66	0.26	0.11/0.11
Altimeter wind speed	0	30	m.s-1	2.90/2.46	1.01	1.91/1.42
Sea State Bias	-0.5	0	m	2.23/2.25	0.02	0.04/0.04
Ionospheric correction filtered	-0.4	0.04	m	3.08/3.02	2.87	3.07/3.01
Square off nadir angle	-0.2	0.64	deg2	0.70/0.82	1.34	N/A
Equilibrium tide	-0.5	0.5	m	0.01/0.01	0.01	0.01/0.01
Combined atmospheric correction	-2	2	m	0.00/0.00	0.00	0.00/0.00
Dry tropospheric correction	-2.5	-1.9	m	0.07/0.04	0.04	0.07/0.04
Internal tide	-5	5	m	0.00/0.00	0.00	0.00/0.00
Ocean tide	-5	5	m	0.04/0.04	0.04	0.04/0.04
Pole tide	-15	15	m	0.00/0.00	0.00	0.00/0.00
Earth tide	-1	1	m	0.00/0.00	0.00	0.00/0.00
AMR wet tropospheric correction	-0.5	-0.001	m	0.19/0.19	0.20	0.19/0.19
Global statistics of edited measurements by thresholds				6.61/6.57	6.33	5.13/5.16

Table 4 – Table of parameters used for editing and the corresponding percentages of edited measurements for each parameter for Sentinel-6 MF LR and HR. In LR MLE4 and HR, first values correspond to operational data, second values to reprocessed data.

(*) The maximum threshold for range standard deviation is set as function of significant wave height as follows:

- In LR:
 - for $SWH \leq 2m$: 0.192
 - for $SWH > 2m$: $0.018 * SWH + 0.156$
- In HR:
 - for $SWH \leq 2m$: 0.087
 - for $SWH > 2m$: $0.033 * SWH + 0.121$

As table 4 shows, the percentage of edited points at this step is similar in LR MLE4 (6.6%) in the operational and reprocessed datasets. The percentage of edited points in LR NR is slightly lower at 6.3%. Note that these figures include parameters at default values as well as out of bounds. Additionally, the majority of all edited points come from these default values rather than actual out of bound values, as can be seen in the daily monitoring of figure 4. On this monitoring, slightly different behaviours are observed between datasets. There are fewer criteria at default value in LR NR than in LR MLE4 reprocessed and in turn LR MLE4 operational. However, the opposite is true for criteria out of bounds. This indicates that more data are retrieved in NR (and in MLE4 reprocessed compared to MLE4 operational), but most of this additional data is of poor quality and then edited on threshold criteria.




Figure 4 – Percentage of edited measurements for the operational (blue) and reprocessed (red for MLE4 and green for NR) datasets over ocean by day based on parameters at default value (left) and out of bounds (right) in LR.

3.3.4. Along-track SSHA consistency

Once the thresholds editing is applied, the consistency of the along-track sea surface height anomaly (SSHA) is checked. The statistics of the SSHA by pass are computed, with a selection that excludes zones of high geophysical variability. If the mean or the standard deviation is higher than a given threshold, the entire pass is edited. This process is repeated for a stricter set of selection and thresholds. The details are listed in table 5.

Parameters	Set 1	Set 2
Selection		
Bathymetry	<-1000m	<-1000m
Coastal distance	>100km	>100km
Oceanic variability	<0.3m	<0.1m
Min number of measurements	3	200
Thresholds		
Mean (absolute value)	0.3m	0.15m
STD	0.4m	0.2m

Table 5 – Table of parameters used for the editing on the SSHA pass statistics. These parameters are identical in HR and LR.

The percentage of edited points based on SSHA pass statistic is presented in figure 5. There is only one occurrence of this happening, at the cycle 20, passes 182 and 183 (01-06-2021 03:18:11.0 to 05:10:35.0), for all datasets. An issue have been found in the corresponding PTFA file, and new corrected products have been generated with PB F08 for both LR and HR. These new files have not been included in the present analysis.




Figure 5 – Percentage of edited measurements on SSHA pass statistics for the operational (blue) and reprocessed (red) datasets over ocean by day in LR

3.3.5. Comparison between LR MLE4 and LR NR

This section focuses on the difference between LR reprocessed MLE4 and LR NR retrievals in terms of editing. The daily monitoring of data valid in MLE4 and not in NR is presented on the left panel of figure 6, while the monitoring of data valid in NR and invalid in MLE4 is presented on the right panel. The MLE4/NR differences are stable in time:

- 0.1 % of ocean data is edited in NR and not in MLE4, and is mostly located in high rain areas as seen on figure 7 (left panel).
- 0.4 % of ocean data is edited in MLE4 and not in NR, and is mostly located in low SWH areas as seen on figure 7 (right panel). This is linked to the anomaly on NR SWH (AR 2620) resulting in the absence of negative waves in NR. This negative waves are edited on a threshold criterion in MLE4 and thus not in NR (cf table 4).




Figure 6 – Percentage of edited reprocessed measurements per day in NR that are valid in MLE4 (left) and in MLE4 that are valid in NR (right).




Figure 7 – Maps of edited reprocessed measurements in NR that are valid in MLE4 (left) and in MLE4 that are valid in NR (right). The color scales are set to different widths for visibility purposes.

4 Geophysical parameters

4.1. Altimeter parameters

Parameters derived from POS-4 altimeter are monitored in this section.

4.1.1. Significant Wave Height

4.1.1.1. LR

The time monitoring of LR Ku-band Significant Wave Height (SWH) over the complete reprocessing period is presented in figure 8, for operational (blue) and reprocessed (red for MLE4 and green for NR) datasets. As expected, no differences are observed on MLE4 with the reprocessing. Similar temporal evolutions are observed for SWH NR and MLE4. The standard deviation of NR SWH is slightly lower than for MLE4 datasets (1.378m versus 1.391m).




Figure 8 – Time monitoring of Sentinel-6 MF LR Ku-band Significant Wave Height in meters, before reprocessing (blue) and after reprocessing (red for MLE4, green for NR).
Left: mean per day, Right: standard deviation per day.

The distributions of Sentinel-6 MF and Jason-3 SWH datasets are presented on figure 9. Distributions for both Sentinel-6 MF MLE4 SWH are identical and centred around 2.688m evolutions brought by PB F07 and F08 do not impact MLE4 SWH. NR SWH is centred around a value 2.2cm higher, at 2.710m. This is in part a consequence of the anomaly in the negative NR wave management (AR 2620, see section 2.1.), which can also be seen at the low end of the distributions (right panel), where NR and MLE4 curves are not aligned up to 1.2m. Furthermore, there is no valid NR SWH below 17cm, while MLE4 SWH extend all the way to 0. Note that negative waves are edited and not considered in this analysis. The peak in Jason-3 distribution is due to its management of low SWH. In Jason-3 processing, all 20 Hz SWH below 25 cm are set to 25 cm.




Figure 9 – Distributions of Sentinel-6 MF (blue for operational MLE4, red for reprocessed MLE4, green for NR) and Jason-3 (black) Ku-band Significant Wave Height. **Left** : entire distribution, **right** : zoom without Jason-3 in the 0-2m range.

The impact of NR SWH anomaly is also visible in figure 10, which presents the NR - MLE4 SWH difference monitoring (left panel) map (right panel), and dependency to ERA5 model SWH (bottom panel). Most differences are located in small SWH areas. The bias at very low SWH is up to 28cm, and is still about 7cm at 1m-SWH. At higher SWH, a residual bias of about 2cm remains, which can not be attributed to negative wave management, as it is unlikely to have an impact beyond the 2-3m-wave range. On the daily monitoring, a seasonal cycle is visible, as well as what could be a small drift on side B with a decrease of about 8mm in total. Such a drift would be in line with Sentinel-6 PTR ageing and would indicate an improvement brought by the numerical retracking.

This assessment will be repeated on data produced with F08 patched version (see section 2.1.) in order to truly quantify the residual differences between LR MLE4 and LR NR waves.




Figure 10 – Map (right) and monitoring (left) of the LR reprocessed NR - MLE4 SWH difference in m/s per day. **Bottom** : Mean differences as a function of ERA 5 model SWH.

To estimate the noise of 1-second along-track average of the LR Ku-band altimeter SWH, we analyse "data_01/ku/swh_ocean_rms" variable from LR products. It contains the standard deviation of 20 Hz measurements used for the compression to 1hz. To approximate 1 Hz level of noise, this value is divided by $\sqrt{20}$. Figure 11 presents the mean 1Hz SWH noise, as a function of time (left panel) and ERA 5 model SWH (right panel). The NR 1Hz SWH noise is lower than for MLE4 (which are both in line) by about 0.5cm. However, all this improvement comes from low SWH, and therefore is not representative of nominal NR performance. Beyond 3m-SWH, NR and MLE4 level of noise are in line.

4.1.1.2. HR

HR SWH monitoring highlight a small (5.6 mm) and stable difference between operational and reprocessed data (figure 12), correlated to SWH with up to 1cm bias at high SWH. This is expected and is linked to the antenna aperture update in PB F08.




Figure 11 – 1Hz noise for LR operational (blue) and reprocessed (red for MLE4, green for NR) SWH, as a function of time (**left**) and ERA 5 model SWH (**right**).




Figure 12 – Monitoring (**left**) per day (red) and pass (blue) and map (**right**) of the reprocessed - operational HR SWH difference.

4.1.1.3. HR-LR

The monitoring of SWH difference between HR and LR MLE4 data (figure 13) shows a small (about 5mm) reduction of the bias between the two retrievals thanks to PB F08 on the antenna aperture update impact on HR data (see previous paragraph). It is now centred around 22.7 cm with no drift between LR and HR SWH. The dependency to ERA 5 model SWH is also marginally reduced (figure 13, right panel). This bias and dependency with SWH come from the impact of the orbital wave effect which is not yet compensated on HR side.




Figure 13 – Time monitoring (left) and ERA 5 model SWH dependency (right) of Sentinel-6 MF Ku-band SWH difference : HR - LR, before reprocessing (blue) and after reprocessing (red)

4.1.1.4. LR C-band

Figure 14 presents the time series of the reprocessed - operational LR C-band SWH and the corresponding map. No significant difference is visible.




Figure 14 – Monitoring (left) per day (red) and pass (blue) and map (right) of the reprocessed - operational C-band SWH difference.

4.1.2. Range

4.1.2.1. LR

MLE4 operational versus reprocessed

The daily monitoring of LR MLE4 operational - reprocessed range difference is presented on figure 15 for Ku-band. Differences are submillimetric, with a small (about 0.2mm) jump at the POS4 side B switch on 2021-09-14, and a change of behaviour from F07 update on 2022-08-15, with only negligible differences afterward. This last change might be linked to the ECHO CAL update implemented in PB F07.




Figure 15 – Monitoring of the LR MLE4 operational - reprocessed range difference per day (red) and per pass (blue) for Ku-band.

Reprocessed MLE4 versus NR

The daily monitoring of LR reprocessed NR - MLE4 range difference is presented on figure 16. A -1mm jump on the mean (left panel) is visible at the side B switch on 2021-09-14. The main hypothesis for this jump is this instrumental LUT applied on MLE4 range, which is for the moment identical for both POS4-A and POS4-B. The standard deviation monitoring (right panel) presents a yearly variation with higher values from June to September and lower values from December to May, and can be linked with seasonal SWH variations (cf below). Note that NR range improves the comparison to Jason-3, see section 5.2.2.. The NR - MLE4 range distributions are presented on figure 17 for side A (left panel) and side B (right panel). Ranges are consistent between both retrackings, with only a 6.7mm bias on side A and 5.7mm on side B.

On figure 18 is presented the map of the F08 NR - MLE4 range difference (left panel) and its dependency to ERA 5 model SWH (right panel). The differences are correlated to SWH, with a decrease of about -6mm between 0 and 0.5m-SWH and then about +7.5mm increase between 0.5 and 7m SWH. This bias increase is expected and caused by the MLE4 LUT.




Figure 16 – Time monitoring of Sentinel-6 MF F08 NR - MLE4 range difference per day, for the mean (*left*) and the standard deviation (*right*).




Figure 17 – Distributions of Sentinel-6 MF F08 NR - MLE4 range difference for side A (*left*) and side B (*right*).




Figure 18 – Map (*left*) and ERA 5 model SWH dependency (*right*) of the LR F08 NR - MLE4 range difference.

4.1.2.2. HR

The daily monitoring of HR operational - reprocessed range difference is presented on figure 19, left panel. Differences are submillimetric, with a bias of about 0.5mm stable in time after a small (about 0.2mm) jump at the POS4 side B switch on 2021-09-14. The map of these differences (right panel) shows SWH-dependent regional differences. This is expected and linked to the antenna aperture update.




Figure 19 – Map (right) and monitoring (left) of the HR operational - reprocessed range difference per day (red) and per pass (blue).

4.1.2.3. HR - LR

HR versus LR MLE4 range bias is monitored in figure 20. Using MLE4 range, the bias is reduced by about 0.5mm with the reprocessing thanks to HR as seen in the previous paragraph (1.87cm versus 1.92cm in operational data). A drift of -1mm/year is seen in both MLE4 datasets, and can be linked to the PTR deformation. Using LR NR, the bias reduction is much more significant, at only 1.26cm, and the use of the in-flight LR PTR shape reduces the drift between LR and HR to -0.3mm/year. A marginal decrease in SWH correlation (right panel) is observed with the reprocessing in MLE4. This SWH dependency comes from the usage of a skewness coefficient of 0 on HR side whereas the it is set to 0.1 on LR side.




Figure 20 – Time monitoring (left) and ERA 5 model SWH dependency (right) of Sentinel-6 MF Ku-band Range difference : HR - LR, before reprocessing (blue) and after reprocessing (red with LR MLE4 and green for LR NR)

Along track wind has a known impact on HR data and more particularly on HR range [8]. To highlight this impact, two gridded maps of HR versus LR range difference are drawn, one for ascending tracks and the other one for descending tracks. Next, the difference between these two maps is computed (ascending minus descending). Such process allows to remove all systematic error on the bias (such as waves) and to only highlight HR variations with respect to LR that depend on track orientation. Figure 21 shows the resulting maps for both operational and reprocessed data. No significant difference can be seen between the two datasets.




Figure 21 – Maps of Ascending versus Descending tracks maps of HR versus LR MLE4 range bias. Left panel: for operational data. Right panel: for reprocessed data.

4.1.2.4. LR C-band

Figure 22 presents the time series of the reprocessed - operational LR C-band range and the corresponding map. No significant difference is visible.




Figure 22 – Monitoring (left) per day (red) and pass (blue) and map (right) of the reprocessed - operational C-band range difference.

4.1.3. Backscatter coefficient

4.1.3.1. LR

Ku-band backscatter coefficient (sigma0) time series are presented on figure 23 and their distributions, on figure 24. On side B, the bias between reprocessed and operational MLE4 sigma0 is of -0.09dB, and the bias between reprocessed NR and MLE4 is 0.89dB. The standard deviation shows negligible increase in NR (1.61dB) compared to MLE4 (1.59dB for both operational and reprocessed).




Figure 23 – Time monitoring of Sentinel-6 MF LR Ku-band Backscatter coefficient in dB, before reprocessing (blue) and after reprocessing (red for MLE4 and green for NR). Left: mean per day, Right: standard deviation per day.




Figure 24 – Histogram of Sentinel-6 MF LR Ku-band Backscatter coefficient in dB, before reprocessing (blue) and after reprocessing (red for MLE4 and green for NR) and Jason-3 (black), for side A (left) and side B (right).

MLE4 operational versus reprocessed

Looking more closely at the differences between operational and reprocessed MLE4 sigma0 (figure 25), two jumps are visible :

- 0.02dB on 2021-09-14 at the POS-4 side B switch.
- 0.06dB on 2022-08-15 at the PB F07 update. This is linked to the ECHO CAL becoming the main source for CAL 1.

After this last jump, the remaining bias is close to -0.06dB and is linked to the PB F08 antenna aperture update. Note that the radiometer calibration anomaly from October to December 2022 (see section 4.2.) is also visible with a very small amplitude. It is due to use of the atmospheric attenuation, derived for the radiometer, in the computation of the sigma0.

On the corresponding map on the right panel of figure 25, we note the existence of low amplitude regional patches and much lower differences in the Caspian Sea. This Caspian Sea discrepancy is explained by the fact that only data simultaneously valid in both datasets were kept. Indeed, before the PB F07 update, no filtered ionospheric correction was available on the Caspian Sea and the data was edited. Therefore, this area only contains data from the 0.06dB F07/F08 bias distribution.




Figure 25 – Map (right) and monitoring (left) of the LR MLE4 operational - reprocessed sigma0 difference per day (red) and per pass (blue).

Reprocessed MLE4 versus NR

Figure 26 presents the sigma0 differences between reprocessed NR and MLE4. On the time series, a drift of very small amplitude can be observed (+0.003dB on the entire side B). This drift is still monitored and is under investigation.

In the corresponding map (right panel), the sigma0 difference is slightly correlated with high Mean Sea Surface (MSS) gradients, which corresponds to sudden changes in bathymetry. This indicates that both retrackers have different sensitivities to sea surface slopes, however the exact explanation is not yet understood. Additionally, the bias on the Caspian Sea is significantly lower than on ocean. LR NR is not affected by the sampling ratio anomaly in the computation of the total power since it uses the peak power of the PTR.




Figure 26 – Map (**right**) and monitoring (**left**) of the LR reprocessed NR - MLE4 sigma0 difference per day.

4.1.3.2. HR

The HR reprocessed - operational Ku-band backscatter coefficient difference present the same features as in LR MLE4 (figure 27). While jumps at the side B switch and PB F07 update have amplitudes identical to LR, the remaining F07/F08 bias due to the antenna aperture update is of only -0.01dB.




Figure 27 – Map (right) and monitoring (left) of the HR operational - reprocessed sigma0 difference per day (red) and per pass (blue).

4.1.3.3. HR - LR

HR versus LR MLE4 sigma0 bias is monitored in figure 28. The bias increased from 5.46 to 5.63dB with the reprocessing. This was expected because of the antenna aperture update impacting differently LR and HR (see previous paragraphs). Otherwise, there is no significant evolution.




Figure 28 – Time monitoring (left) and ERA 5 model SWH dependency (right) of Sentinel-6 MF Ku-band sigma0 difference : HR - LR MLE4, before reprocessing (blue) and after reprocessing (red with LR MLE4)

4.1.3.4. LR C-band

Figure 29 presents the time series of the reprocessed - operational LR C-band sigma0 and the corresponding map. As in Ku-band, the corrected WTC drift from October to December 2021, due to use of the atmospheric attenuation in the computation of the sigma0, is visible. No other significant difference is visible.




Figure 29 – Monitoring (*left*) per day (red) and pass (blue) and map (*right*) of the reprocessed - operational C-band sigma0 difference.

4.1.4. Altimeter Wind Speed

4.1.4.1. LR

As for the backscatter coefficient, operational and reprocessed LR altimeter wind speeds are in line from PB F07 (figure 30, left panel). The standard deviation average across the entire time series (right panel) slightly increased after the reprocessing (3.76m/s for MLE4 and 3.78m/s for NR) compared to operational data (3.72 m/s). After reprocessing, LR wind-speed is centred around 8.32m/s for MLE4 and 8.31m/s for NR, which is higher than for operational data (8.17m/s) and Jason-3 (8.14m/s).




Figure 30 – Time monitoring of Sentinel-6 MF altimeter wind-speed in m/s, before reprocessing (blue) and after reprocessing (red for MLE4, green for NR). **Left:** mean per day, **Right:** standard deviation per day.




Figure 31 – Histogram of altimeter wind-speed for Jason-3 (black), reprocessed S6 MF LR (blue) and reprocessed S6 MF HR (red). Computed over the completed reprocessed period.

MLE4 operational versus reprocessed

Looking more closely to the reprocessed - operational differences (figure 32), a small jump is visible at the side B switch (2021-09-14), as well as a 20cm/s jump at the PB F07 update. This behaviour is consistent with what is seen on the backscatter coefficient (see section 4.1.3.) and was therefore expected. The map (right panel) shows a correlation with wind speed, with regional differences ranging from about 7 to 20 cm/s.




Figure 32 – Map (**right**) and monitoring (**left**) of the LR MLE4 operational - reprocessed wind speed difference per day (red) and per pass (blue).

Reprocessed MLE4 versus NR

Figure 33 presents the wind speed differences between reprocessed NR and MLE4. On the time series, as for the sigma0, a drift of very small amplitude can be observed (-1cm/s on the entire side B). This drift is still monitored and is under investigation.

Unsurprisingly, the corresponding map (right panel) presents similar features to the NR - MLE4 sigma0 differences map presented on figure 26, with a correlation with high Mean Sea Surface (MSS) gradients and a different bias on the Caspian Sea.

The differences are correlated to the SWH (bottom panel), with a +5cm/s increase between 0.5 and 8m-SWH.




Figure 33 – Map (**right**) and monitoring (**left**) of the LR reprocessed NR - MLE4 wind speed difference in m/s per day. **Bottom** : Mean differences as a function of ERA 5 model SWH.

Comparison to ECMWF model

The daily monitoring of the comparison of altimeter-derived wind speed to ECMWF model is presented on figure 34. Both reprocessed datasets are aligned, with a mean bias of 35.1cm/s in MLE4 and 35.6cm/s in NR, stable on side B and slightly decreasing on side A starting from April 2021 with peaks above 60cm/s. As expected from previous paragraphs, the mean of the operational dataset is almost aligned with the reprocessed datasets after the PB F07 update. Standard deviation is slightly higher for NR (1.47m/s) compared to MLE4 (1.45m/s and 1.46m/s for operational and reprocessed respectively), and presents small seasonal variations.




Figure 34 – Time monitoring of Sentinel-6 MF altimeter - ECMWF model wind speed difference in m/s, before reprocessing (blue) and after reprocessing (red for MLE4, green for NR). **Left:** mean per day, **Right:** standard deviation per day.

4.1.4.2. HR

The HR reprocessed - operational wind speed difference present the same features as in LR MLE4 (figure 35). There is no significant difference after the PB F07 update except for the corrected impact of the radiometer drift from October to December 2021.




Figure 35 – Map (**right**) and monitoring (**left**) of the HR operational - reprocessed wind speed difference per day (red) and per pass (blue).

4.1.4.3. HR - LR

HR versus LR MLE4 wind speed bias is monitored in figure 36. An unexpected jump of about 10cm/s is visible at the side B switch on the reprocessed dataset. Analysis of the Sentinel-6 MF minus Jason-3 wind speed differences during the tandem phase in LR (section 5.2.4.) and HR (section 5.3.2.) show that this jump originates from LR mode and is likely caused by unoptimized sigma0 calibration biases.




Figure 36 – Time monitoring of Sentinel-6 MF wind speed difference : HR - LR MLE4, before reprocessing (blue) and after reprocessing (red with LR MLE4) per day.

4.1.5. Sea State Bias

4.1.5.1. LR

SSB time series are presented on figure 37 and their distributions, on figure 38. Biases are submillimetric and all datasets follow identical variations.




Figure 37 – Time monitoring of Sentinel-6 MF LR SSB in meters, before reprocessing (blue) and after reprocessing (red for MLE4 and green for NR). Left: mean per day, Right: standard deviation per day.




Figure 38 – Histogram of Sentinel-6 MF LR SSB in meters, before reprocessing (blue) and after reprocessing (red for MLE4 and green for NR) and Jason-3 (black).

MLE4 operational versus reprocessed

Looking more closely to the reprocessed - operational differences (figure 39), a small 0.4mm jump is visible at the PB F07 update. It is due to the wind speed evolution at the same date. The map (right panel) shows a correlation with SWH, with submillimetric regional variations.

Reprocessed MLE4 versus NR

Figure 40 presents the SSB differences between reprocessed NR and MLE4. No clear jump or drift is visible in the daily monitoring, although yearly variations with amplitudes reaching up to 0.5mm can be seen. These variations are the result of the significant SWH correlation that is visible on the corresponding map (right panel) and in the mean difference as a function of ERA 5 model SWH (bottom panel), with an almost +6mm increase between 0 an 8m-SWH.




Figure 39 – Map (**right**) and monitoring (**left**) of the LR MLE4 operational - reprocessed SSB difference per day (red) and per pass (blue).




Figure 40 – Map (**right**) and monitoring (**left**) of the LR reprocessed NR - MLE4 SSB difference per day in cm. **Bottom** : Mean differences in meters as a function of ERA 5 model SWH.

4.1.5.2. HR

As in LR, the HR reprocessed - operational SSB difference presents a small jump at the PB F07 update of about +0.5mm (figure 41). Additionally, a change in behaviour is visible between sides A and B, with a slightly more significant negative bias on side B. As in LR, the map (right panel) shows a correlation with SWH, with submillimetric regional variations.




Figure 41 – Map (**right**) and monitoring (**left**) of the HR operational - reprocessed SSB difference per day (red) and per pass (blue).

4.1.5.3. HR - LR

HR versus LR MLE4 SSB bias is monitored in figure 42. As with the wind speed, an unexpected jump of about 0.5mm is visible at the side B switch on the reprocessed dataset. Tandem phase with Jason-3 analysis (see section 5.2.5.) shows that this mainly originates from LR mode.




Figure 42 – Time monitoring of Sentinel-6 MF SSB difference : HR - LR MLE4, before reprocessing (blue) and after reprocessing (red with LR MLE4) per day.

4.1.5.4. LR C-band

Figure 43 presents the time series of the reprocessed - operational LR C-band SSB and the corresponding map. As in Ku-band, a small jump is visible at the PB F07 update, with an amplitude of about 0.75mm. Also similarly to Ku-band, the corresponding maps highlights a correlation to SWH with an amplitude of about 1mm.




Figure 43 – Monitoring (*left*) per day (red) and pass (blue) and map (*right*) of the reprocessed - operational C-band SSB difference.

4.1.6. Altimeter ionosphere correction

Sentinel-6 MF altimeter ionosphere correction is derived from LR data, in Ku and C-band. The ionosphere correction in HR products is copied from LR products and thus identical. Filtered ionosphere correction from altimeter is analysed in this section.

Operational and reprocessed ionosphere corrections are in line for all datasets, both in mean and in standard deviation (figure 44). On this monitoring, a decrease of the ionosphere correction is visible. This expected behaviour is due to the current increase in activity along the solar cycle.




Figure 44 – Time monitoring of Sentinel-6 MF LR Altimeter filtered ionosphere correction in meters, before reprocessing (blue) and after reprocessing (red for MLE4, green for NR). **Left:** mean per day, **Right:** standard deviation per day.

On the histogram of the distributions (figure 45), NR ionosphere correction (-3.12cm) shows a small 1.2mm bias with respect to MLE4 (-3.24 cm in both MLE4 datasets).




Figure 45 – Histogram of altimeter filtered ionosphere correction for Jason-3 (black) and reprocessed Sentinel-6 MF LR (blue for operation MLE4, red for reprocessed MLE4, green for reprocessed NR). Computed over the completed reprocessed period.

Figure 46 presents the daily monitoring of the NR - MLE4 filtered ionospheric correction difference. An about -0.25mm jump is visible at the side B switch.




Figure 46 – Time monitoring of the NR - MLE4 filtered ionospheric correction difference per day in cm.

Reprocessed Sentinel-6 MF altimeter ionosphere corrections show in average a better consistency to GIM model than Jason-3 (figure 47, left panel), with a 9mm bias in MLE4, a 10mm bias in NR and a 13mm bias for Jason-3. However, looking at the corresponding maps of altimeter versus GIM difference (figure 48), the amplitude of the difference is stronger for Sentinel-6 MF than Jason-3. This behaviour can be linked to correlations of Sentinel-6 MF Ku and C ranges to SWH (see sections 5.2.2., 5.4.2. and 5.5.). The NR standard deviation is slightly lower (7.9mm) than in MLE4 (8.0mm), as shown on the right panel of figure 47.




Figure 47 – Time monitoring of the ionosphere correction difference : Altimeter Filtered minus GIM model (m), for Jason-3 (black) and Sentinel-6 MF LR reprocessed data (red for MLE4, green for NR). **Left** : mean per day, **right** : standard deviation per day.




Figure 48 – Map of ionosphere correction difference : Altimeter filtered minus GIM model (m). For Sentinel-6 MF LR reprocessed MLE4 (left), NR (right) and Jason-3 (bottom). Computed over the completed reprocessed period.

4.1.7. Mispointing

In this section is analysed the square of the off-nadir angle derived from LR waveform using MLE4 and NR retrackings. The time series are presented on figure 49 and the distributions, on figure 50. The reprocessing improves the estimation of the mispointing from waveform in MLE4 thanks to the PB F08 antenna aperture update, decreasing from 0.012deg² to 0.008deg². NR square off-nadir angle is even closer to zero, with a distribution centred on 0.004deg². Spikes in the time series are related to cross-manoevres.




Figure 49 – Time monitoring of square of the off-nadir mispointing angle in deg², before reprocessing (blue) and after reprocessing (red). Left: mean per cycle, Right: standard deviation per cycle




Figure 50 – Histogram of square of the off-nadir mispointing angle for Jason-3 (black) and reprocessed S6 MF LR. Computed over the completed reprocessed period.

While the square off-nadir angle follow similar variations in all datasets, a difference in behaviour has been identified between NR and MLE4 retrackings. Figure 51 shows the mean (left panel) and standard deviation (right panel) MLE4 - NR mispointing difference as a function of MLE4 mispointing. The differences are insignificant at low mispointing but increase rapidly beyond 0.2deg². At very high mispointing, the differences are beyond 50%. The standard deviation of the differences also increases with the mispointing.




Figure 51 – Sentinel-6 MF LR reprocessed MLE4 - NR square off-nadir angle differences as a function of the reprocessed MLE4 square off-nadir angle. Left : mean, right : standard deviation.

The high differences in mispointing impact other retracking outputs, namely backscatter coefficient and the range (figure 52). The sea surface height anomaly (SSHA) is also impacted. These impacts are far from negligible and go up to -0.75dB for the sigma0, 12cm for the range and 9cm on the SSHA.




Figure 52 – Sentinel-6 MF LR reprocessed MLE4 - NR range (**left**), sigma0 (**right**) and SSHA (**bottom**) mean differences as a function of the reprocessed MLE4 - NR square off-nadir angle differences.

While this difference in behaviour is insignificant during normal operations, it has a noticeable impact during

satellite manoeuvres with high mispointing. Figure 53 presents an example on cycle 44 pass 4 (2022-01-18), which contains two yaw slew manoeuvres (-90 and +90 degrees respectively). In this instance, NR - MLE4 difference reaches -0.24deg² in mispointing, 20cm in range and SSHA, and 1.5dB in sigma0. This unexpected difference in behaviour is under investigation.




Figure 53 – Sentinel-6 MF along-track reprocessed MLE4 (blue) and NR (red) square off-nadir angle (**top left**) and reprocessed NR - MLE4 sigma0 (**top right**), range (**bottom left**) and SSHA (**bottom right**) for cycle 44 pass 4.

4.2. Wet tropospheric correction from radiometer

4.2.1. Differences between operational and reprocessed WTC

The mean difference between operational and reprocessed WTC is presented on figure 54, left panel. Differences are mostly stable, with two main drifts :

- Between 2021-04-22 and 2021-05-04, with a maximum amplitude of about -1.5mm, directly following a POS-4 restart and ending with a +1.5mm jump back to previous levels. The cause of this drift is unknown at the time of writing.
- Between 2022-10-01 and 2022-12-14. This drift has been identified as resulting from a calibration error in the microwave radiometer in operational data. On 2022-12-14, the error was fixed, causing a jump of about +5.5mm back to previous levels. This drift has been completely corrected in reprocessed data.




Figure 54 – Monitoring (**left**) per day (red) and pass (blue) and map (**right**) of the reprocessed - operational LR WTC difference

The map of these differences is presented on the right panel of figure 54. The most significant differences are located in coastal areas. This is due to the inclusion of HRMR in addition of AMR-C in the WTC computation which improved coastal performances in the PB F07 update.

4.2.2. Differences between radiometer and model WTC

Monitoring of the differences between radiometer and model WTC allows to highlight any jump or drift between the two retrievals and is presented on figure 55. The mean differences curves follow similar variations for operational and reprocessed datasets, except for the two drifts described in the previous section. Three phases are visible, induced by two events (figure 55 left panel):

- On 27-28 April 2021, a jump of -4 mm is observed in the bias preceded by a progressive increase of the bias (from beginning of March 2021) by the same amplitude. The jump visible on 27-28 April 2021 is concomitant with a satellite restart and is not observed in Jason-3 time series. The amplitude of the jump is higher by about 1mm in the reprocessed dataset. The potential link between the satellite restart and this jump is under investigation.
- On 13 October 2021, a jump of +2 mm is observed on both Sentinel-6 MF and Jason-3 monitoring. It is linked to an update in the ECMWF model (see [6] for more details).




Figure 55 – Time monitoring of wet tropospheric correction difference (m): WTC from radiometer minus WTC from ECMWF model. Before reprocessing (blue), after reprocessing (red) and for Jason-3 (black). **Left:** mean per day, **Right:** standard deviation per day

After reprocessing, Sentinel-6 MF radiometer WTC is slightly closer to the ECMWF model with an average bias of -0.16mm (from -0.34mm) see figure 56. The bias is also smaller than that of Jason-3 (0.97mm).




Figure 56 – Histogram of radiometer WTC for Jason-3 (black) and reprocessed Sentinel-6 MF. Computed over the completed reprocessed period.

The corresponding maps (figure 57) do not highlight strong discrepancies between Sentinel-6 MF and Jason-3 retrievals.




Figure 57 – Map of WTC difference : Radiometer minus ECMWF model (m). For Sentinel-6 MF operational dataset (**left**), reprocessed dataset (**right**) and Jason-3 (**bottom**). Computed over the completed reprocessed period.

4.3. Sea Level Performances

The Sea Surface Height Anomaly (SSHA) is the most well-known parameter estimated from altimetry. It corresponds to the elevation of sea surface, with respect to a reference called Mean Sea Surface (MSS), generated by oceanic variability and climatic phenomena (such as Gulf Stream current, El Nino, ...). It is computed as follows:

$$SSHA = Orbit - AltimeterRange - \sum(GeophysicalCorrections) - MeanSeaSurface$$

The details of the geophysical corrections can be found in Sentinel ALT Level 2 Product Generation Specification [7].

4.3.1. Along-track analysis

4.3.1.1. LR

The monitoring of Sentinel-6 MF LR SSHA is presented on figure 58. As the filtered ionosphere correction and therefore the SSHA became available on the Caspian Sea only after the PB F07 update, the Caspian Sea was removed in this figure for a better comparison with the PB F06 segment of operational data. Besides the correction of the WTC drift from October to December 2021 (see section 4.2.), no significant difference in variations is visible between operational and reprocessed MLE4 SSHA. Corresponding maps on figure 59 do not highlight any significant regional difference.




Figure 58 – Time monitoring of Sentinel-6 MF SSHA in meters, without the Caspian Sea, before reprocessing (blue) and after reprocessing (red for MLE4, green for NR).
Left: mean per day, Right: standard deviation per day.




Figure 59 – Maps of Sentinel-6 MF LR SSHA in meters for operational MLE4 (*left*), reprocessed MLE4 (*right*) and NR (*bottom*).

MLE4 operational vs reprocessed

The MLE4 reprocessed - operational differences (figure 60) are mostly stable in time, except for the two drifts related to the WTC and described in section 4.2.. After the last jump on 2022-12-14, differences are negligible. The corresponding map (right panel) show significant coastal differences due to the inclusion of HRMR data in WTC with the PB F07 update (see section 4.2.).




Figure 60 – Map (*right*) and time monitoring (*left*) of Sentinel-6 MF LR MLE4 operational - reprocessed SSHA in meters per day (red) and per pass (blue).

Reprocessed MLE4 vs NR

The reprocessed NR - MLE4 SSHA differences monitoring on figure 61 shows an about 1.5mm jump at side B switch, resulting from range (section 4.1.2.1.) and ionosphere correction behaviours (section 4.1.6.). The corresponding map on figure 62 highlights a significant SWH correlation, with about -1.5cm decrease between 0.5 and 8m-SWH. This behaviour is expected and is part of the improvement brought by the numerical retracker. Indeed, contrary to MLE4, numerical retracker outputs are not corrected by instrumental LUTs, which are applied function of SWH values. Numerical retracker retrievals are then less sensitive to any approximation in the LUT estimation. Analysis performed in the frame of Sentinel-6 MF commissioning activities have shown that part of the residual bias between S6 MF LR MLE4 and J3 can be attributed to S6 MF instrumental LUT. Using numerical retracker strongly reduces the correlation to SWH in S6 MF LR/J3

SSHA bias. More details about this improvement can be found in the tandem phase analysis in section 5.6.1..

The standard deviation of the SSHA difference is degraded at low SWH which is probably linked to the anomaly in negative SWH management in LR NR (see section 2.1.).




Figure 61 – Time monitoring of Sentinel-6 MF reprocessed NR - MLE4 SSHA in meters, without the Caspian Sea, before reprocessing (blue) and after reprocessing (red for MLE4, green for NR). **Left:** mean per day, **Right:** standard deviation per day.




Figure 62 – Maps of mean (**left**) and standard deviation (**right**) of Sentinel-6 MF LR reprocessed NR - MLE4 SSHA in meters, and its mean as a function of ERA 5 model SWH (**bottom**).

The NR - MLE4 SSHA distributions are presented on figure 63 for side A (left panel) and side B (right panel). SSHA are consistent between both retrackings, with only a -7.0mm bias on side A and -5.8mm on side B.




Figure 63 – Distributions of Sentinel-6 MF F08 NR - MLE4 SSHA difference for side A (left) and side B (right).

4.3.1.2. HR

The HR reprocessed - operational differences (figure 64) are mostly stable in time, except for the two drifts related to the WTC and described in section 4.2.. The corresponding map (right panel) shows significant coastal differences due to the inclusion of HRMR data in WTC with the PB F07 update (see section 4.2.).




Figure 64 – Map (right) and time monitoring (left) of Sentinel-6 MF HR operational - reprocessed SSHA in meters per day (red) and per pass (blue).

4.3.1.3. HR - LR

HR versus LR MLE4 SSHA bias is monitored in figure 65. The bias is reduced by about 0.2mm with the reprocessing (-1.15cm vs -1.17cm). A drift of -1mm/year is seen in both datasets, and is related to the range walk correction not yet applied in HR mode. On side A, both curves are more in line than on side B, pointing to the existence of a small jump difficult to observe due to the day-to-day variations of SSHA measurements. A marginal decrease in SWH correlation (right panel) is observed with the reprocessing. This dependency with SWH comes from the skewness coefficient being set to 0 on HR side whereas is it set to 0.1 on LR.




Figure 65 – Time monitoring (**left**) and ERA 5 model SWH dependency (**right**) of Sentinel-6 MF SSHA difference : HR - LR MLE4, before reprocessing (blue) and after reprocessing (red)

4.3.2. Crossover analysis

Sea Surface Height crossover differences are the SSH differences between ascending and descending passes where they cross each other. Crossover differences are systematically analysed to estimate data quality and the Sea Surface Height (SSH) performances. SSH crossover differences are computed from the valid data set on a one cycle basis, with a maximum time lag of 10 days, in order to limit the effects of ocean variability which are a source of error in the performance estimation. The mean SSH crossover differences should ideally be close to zero and standard deviation should ideally be small.

Nevertheless, SLA varies also within 10 days, especially in high variability areas. Furthermore, due to lower data availability (due to seasonal sea ice coverage), models of several geophysical corrections are less precise in high latitude. Therefore, an additional geographical selection - removing shallow waters, areas of high oceanic variability and high latitudes ($> |50|$ deg) - is applied for cyclic monitoring.

Table 6 summarizes the mean and standard deviation of the SSH difference at crossovers across all datasets. The reprocessing had a negligible impact on mean SSH difference at crossover, as seen in the cyclic monitoring presented on figure 66 for all Sentinel-6 MF datasets and Jason-3. Looking at standard deviation of the SSH difference at crossovers (figure 67), operational and reprocessed LR datasets present similar performance. In HR, differences are also insignificant except for three spikes in the reprocessed dataset on cycles 32, 57 and 61. These spikes are of unknown origins and do not appear in the monitoring of the standard deviation of HR SSHA.

Dataset	Mean (cm)	STD (cm)
S6 MF LR MLE4 operational	-0.02	4.71
S6 MF LR MLE4 reprocessed	-0.02	4.71
S6 MF LR NR reprocessed	-0.02	4.68
S6 MF HR operational	0.08	4.48
S6 MF HR reprocessed	0.07	4.50
Jason-3	-0.03	4.65

Table 6 – Mean and standard deviation of SSH difference at crossovers




Figure 66 – Monitoring of the mean of SSH difference at mono-mission crossover for each cycle in meters. **Left** : LR and Jason-3. **Right** : HR.

Maps of LR SSH difference at crossovers are smooth and do not highlight any strong discrepancies between ascending and descending tracks in terms of SSH (figure 68).




Figure 67 – Monitoring of the standard deviation of SSH difference at mono-mission crossover for each cycle in meters. **Left** : LR and Jason-3. **Right** : HR.




Figure 68 – Mean SSH difference at crossovers for Sentinel-6 MF LR operational MLE4 (**top left**), reprocessed MLE4 (**top right**) and NR (**bottom**). Computed over the complete reprocessing period.

Maps of HR SSH difference at crossovers highlight patterns correlated to along-track wind (figure 69). It is linked to the residual impact of along-track wind on HR data and more particularly on HR range.




Figure 69 – Mean SSH difference at crossovers for Sentinel-6 MF HR operational data (**left**) and reprocessed data (**right**). Computed over the complete reprocessing period.

5 Analysis of the tandem flight with Jason-3

Between 2020-12-17 and 2022-04-07 (Sentinel-6 MF cycles 4 to 51), Sentinel-6 MF and Jason-3 were flying in tandem formation on the same ground track with only 30 seconds apart, Jason-3 ahead of Sentinel-6 MF. This section is dedicated to the precise comparison between Sentinel-6 MF and Jason-3 data over this tandem flight.

To perform such analysis, Sentinel-6 MF and Jason-3 data are co-located by interpolation onto their common theoretical ground-track. This allows to perform point to point differences over the complete tandem flight period and thus to provide precise comparison metrics.

In this section, we focus on parameters involved in the LR SSHA computation, as well as some key parameters for HR mode (backscatter coefficient, wind speed, SSHA). A particular attention is given to POS-4 switch to B-side (2021-09-14). For this analysis, only MLE4 Jason-3 data is considered.

5.1. Radiometer parameters

The WTC derived from radiometer are compared between Sentinel-6 MF (AMR-C and HRMR) and Jason-3 (AMR). In average, the bias between the two retrievals is well centred around 0 (below 1mm bias). Differences range between -3 and 1 mm with clear correlation to wet troposphere content itself (figure 70).




Figure 70 – Radiometer WTC difference : Sentinel-6 MF AMR-C/HRMR minus Jason-3 AMR. Histogram (**left**) and gridded map (**right**) computed over the complete tandem period.

Looking at time monitoring of Sentinel-6 MF versus Jason-3 bias, three distinct changes can be observed (figure 71):

- On 27-28 April 2021, a jump of -4 mm is observed in the bias, preceded by a progressive increase of the bias (from beginning of March 2021) by the same amplitude. The same behaviour was observed on Sentinel-6 MF radiometer WTC comparison to ECMWF model (see section 4.2.). The jump visible on 27-28 April 2021 is concomitant with a satellite restart. The potential link between the satellite restart and this jump is under investigation. The AMR-C jump is between two calibration sequences and will therefore be difficult to remove. Note that, while having the same amplitude, the jump on the reprocessed dataset is shifted by about 0.5mm compared to the operational dataset.
- The drift from 2021-04-22 to 2021-05-04 described in section 4.2.1. is also visible in the residuals in the reprocessed dataset, while it is absent from the operational dataset. This drift encompasses but

is distinct from the jump detailed above. It starts directly after a POS-4 restart, reaches a maximum amplitude of about -1.5mm, and ends with a +1.5mm jump back to previous levels. The cause is still under investigation.

- From the beginning of 2022, Sentinel-6 MF and Jason-3 radiometer WTC derived from one another to reach -3.3 mm bias around mid-February. The origin of this behaviour is for the moment unknown and cannot be affected to neither Sentinel-6 MF AMR-C nor to Jason-3 AMR.

Generally, Sentinel-6 MF and Jason-3 AMR are being calibrated completely independently of each other for operational processing, so such a bias is possible. Sentinel-6 MF AMR-C calibration shall be superior to the Jason-3 AMR since Sentinel-6 MF is calibrated using the SCS (Supplemental Calibration System), while Jason-3 AMR is calibrated using the historical vicarious references. For the Sentinel-6 MF AMR-C, each calibration brings the radiometer back to a nominal baseline with an uncertainty of about 2mm (1-sigma).




Figure 71 – Time monitoring of Radiometer WTC difference : Sentinel-6 MF AMR-C minus Jason-3 AMR. Mean per day for the operational (blue) and reprocessed (red) datasets, computed over the complete tandem period.

5.2. Ku-band LR

5.2.1. SWH

As expected, Ku-band MLE4 SWH bias between Sentinel-6 MF LR and Jason-3 is unchanged with the reprocessing. It is centred around -1.15cm with a standard deviation of 21.4cm (figure 72) and mean daily bias ranging between -2.1 and 0.1 cm (figure 73).

The mean bias between Sentinel-6A LR NR and Jason-3 MLE4 is centred around 1.75 cm with a standard deviation of 22.4 cm. The shift in bias with respect to MLE4's bias is of the same order as the difference between MLE4 and NR Ku-band SWH (section 4.1.1.1.).

A small difference is observed between POS4-A and POS4-B (about -0.4cm). It is hard to say here if it is due to the switch to POS-4 B-side or simply to sea state condition variations.




Figure 72 – Histogram of Ku-band SWH difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Computed over the complete tandem period.




Figure 73 – Time monitoring of Ku-band SWH difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Mean per day (left) and standard deviation per day (right) computed over the complete tandem period.

In LR MLE4, the map of SWH difference (figure 74 left panel) mainly shows a good consistency between the two missions, except in small waves areas where the bias is higher. The root cause of this higher bias is the improved handling of low wave heights in Sentinel-6 MF Level 2 processing, as already explained in section 4.1.1.: Sentinel-6 MF processing allows negative SWH values while it is not the case for Jason-3. It can lead to differences up to -9 cm for very low SWH (below 0.5m), see bottom panel. For SWH > 1m,

Sentinel-6 MF LR and Jason-3 SWH are in line, with differences within 2cm in absolute value. In LR NR (right panel), regional variations are more significant. At low SWH, the correlation is of opposite sign compared to MLE4 and the bias can reach up to 17cm below 0.5m-SWH. The reason is the NR small wave anomaly (AR2620) presented in section 2.1. and impacting data up to 1m-wave. This behaviour at low SWH will be corrected and aligned to MLE4 thanks to the PDAP v3.8 (PB F08 patch version) deployed in September 2023. Beyond 2m-SWH, Sentinel-6 MF LR NR and Jason-3 SWH bias is not correlated to SWH values, with differences within 2cm in absolute value compared to MLE4.




Figure 74 – Ku-band SWH difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3 computed over the complete tandem period. Gridded maps for S6 MF MLE4 (left) and NR (right), and differences function of ERA 5 model SWH (bottom).

5.2.2. Range

To compare ranges between the two missions, we do not compute a direct difference of the two ranges, because of their strong variation in time that would cause significant interpolation errors. Instead, we compare (orbit - range - MSS).

Figure 75 highlights the consistency between the two satellites with an average bias of 0.72cm in MLE4 and only 0.07cm in NR. The time monitoring of the difference depicts a small drift in time of +2 to 3mm over the entire tandem phase (figure 76) in MLE4 and in NR. A small difference in behaviour can also be spotted in the daily mean monitoring between sides A and B when comparing MLE4 and LR. On side A, the S6 MF LR NR - J3 green curve is slightly below the MLE4 curves (in red for the reprocessed and blue for operational datasets), while it is slightly above the MLE4 curves on side B. It is coherent with LR NR minus LR MLE4 range difference presented in figure 16. This suggests the existence of a jump at the switch from side A to side B of higher amplitude in NR than in MLE4. Although the value of the jump itself is hard to quantify due to other variations in the daily means.




Figure 75 – Histogram of Orbit - Ku-band range - MSS difference : Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Computed over the complete tandem period.




Figure 76 – Time monitoring of Orbit - Ku-band range - MSS difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Mean per day (left) and standard deviation per day (right) computed over the complete tandem period.

The maps of the difference presented on figure 77 show a clear correlation to SWH in MLE4, which is strongly reduced in NR. In MLE4, the bias increases of 1.1cm between 1 and 8m-SWH, as shown by the red curve on figure 77, bottom panel. This correlation is mainly caused by the instrumental LUT applied on Sentinel-6 MF range. In NR, the bias increase between 1 and 8m-SWH is significantly lower, at 0.4cm.

The residual correlation can be linked in part to pulse-to-pulse correlation effect, not taken into account in the processing yet.

An equatorial band of 5mm amplitude is also clearly visible on both maps. Investigations have shown that this behaviour is most likely coming from Jason-3. The root cause is still to be identified.




Figure 77 – Orbit - Ku-band range - MSS difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3 computed over the complete tandem period. Gridded maps for reprocessed MLE4 (**left**) and NR (**right**) and difference function of ERA 5 model SWH (**bottom**).

5.2.3. Backscatter coefficient

Figure 78 shows the distribution of the difference in sigma0 over sides A (left panel) and B (right panel). Values are not identical: -1.37dB and -0.49dB for side A and -1.33dB and -0.44dB for side B in reprocessed MLE4 and NR respectively. These differences between side A and B (+0.04dB and +0.05dB for reprocessed MLE4 and NR respectively) are higher than in operational MLE4 (+0.02dB). This can also be observed in the time monitoring (figure 79, left panel) with an increase of the bias at the switch to POS4-B higher in reprocessed datasets. Apart from this, the sigma0 bias between the two missions is stable in time with a standard deviation of 0.30dB in MLE4 and 0.31dB in NR (right panel).




Figure 78 – Histogram of Ku-band backscatter coefficient difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Computed over POS-4 side A (left) and side B (right) periods, for operational MLE4 (blue), reprocessed MLE4 (red) and NR (green).




Figure 79 – Time monitoring of Ku-band backscatter coefficient difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Mean per day (left) and standard deviation per day (right) computed over the complete tandem period for operation MLE4 (blue), reprocessed MLE4 (red) and NR (green).

The maps of the sigma0 difference for reprocessed MLE4 and NR are presented in figure 80, top panels. As confirmed with the difference plot as function of SWH on the bottom panel, we observe a small SWH dependency : +0.11dB between 1 and 8m-SWH. This correlation is slightly higher in the operational dataset (+0.12dB).




Figure 80 – Ku-band backscatter coefficient difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3 computed over the complete tandem period. Gridded map for reprocessed MLE4 (**left**) and NR (**right**) and difference function of ERA 5 model SWH (**bottom**).

5.2.4. Altimeter Wind-Speed

Sentinel-6 MF wind speed is computed with Collard algorithm, as for Jason-3. Sentinel-6 MF sigma0 in input of the computation should then be calibrated the same way as Jason-3. As seen in the previous section, Sentinel-6 MF sigma0 shows different mean bias with respect to Jason-3 whether operating on POS4-A or POS4-B. It is why, in PB F08, different calibration biases for wind speed computation are applied for POS4-A and POS4-B. These values are summarized in table 7.

	MLE4	NR
POS4-A	+ 1.39 dB	+ 0.46 dB
POS4-B	+ 1.35 dB	+ 0.47 dB

Table 7 – Calibration bias applied on sigma0 for LR wind speed computation in PB F08

As can be seen on the histogram in figure 81, the differences in wind speed for the reprocessed dataset are not perfectly centred around 0 (18cm/s in MLE4 and 19cm/s in NR), as opposed to operational MLE4. Additionally, the reprocessed distributions are slightly asymmetric. Looking more closely at the evolution in time (figure 82), the bias is not constant, with a jump of about 10cm/s at the switch to POS4-B. This result shows that the calibrations bias applied on sigma0 for the wind speed computation are not perfectly adjusted and can be improved.

For Jason-3, the sigma0 calibration bias equals to 0.06 dB. Sentinel-6 MF sigma0 calibration should be calculated as the sum of J3/Sentinel-6 MF sigma0 bias and Jason-3 sigma0 calibration bias (0.06 dB). For Sentinel-6 MF LR wind speed computation, the calibration bias applied on sigma0 should be :

- for POS4-A : + 1.42dB (= 1.37 + 0.06) for MLE4 and + 0.55dB (= -0.49 + 0.06) for NR
- for POS4-B : + 1.39dB (= 1.33 + 0.06) for MLE4 and + 0.50dB (= -0.44 + 0.06) for NR

We recommend using these values for the next Sentinel-6 MF reprocessing campaign.




Figure 81 – Histogram of altimeter wind speed difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Computed over the complete tandem period for operational MLE4 (blue), reprocessed MLE4 (red) and NR (green).




Figure 82 – Time monitoring of Ku-band wind speed difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Mean per day (**left**) and standard deviation per day (**right**) computed over the complete tandem period for operational MLE4 (blue), reprocessed MLE4 (red) and NR (green).

The maps of reprocessed altimeter wind speed difference are presented in figure 83, top panels. As confirmed with the difference plot as function of SWH on the bottom panel, we observe a SWH dependency : -30cm/s in reprocessed MLE4 and -26cm/s in NR between 1 and 8m-SWH. This is significantly reduced compared to the operational dataset (-44cm/s). This is consistent with Ku-band sigma0 analysis.




Figure 83 – Altimeter wind speed difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3 computed over the complete tandem period in m/s. Gridded map for reprocessed MLE4 (**left**) and NR (**right**) and difference function of ERA 5 model SWH (**bottom**).

5.2.5. Ku-band Sea State Bias

Figure 84 shows the distribution of the differences in SSB over the complete period, with a bias of less than -0.1mm in reprocessed MLE4 and -1.2mm in NR. The time monitoring of these differences is presented in figure 85. A jump of about +0.3mm is visible at the switch to POS4-B due to the change in wind speed. For each side, the SSB is otherwise stable in reprocessed MLE4. Small variations ± 1 mm are visible on side B in NR, of unknown origin.




Figure 84 – Histogram of Ku-band SSB difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Computed over the complete tandem period for operational MLE4 (blue), reprocessed MLE4 (red) and NR (green).




Figure 85 – Time monitoring of Ku-band SSB difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Mean per day (left) and standard deviation per day (right) computed over the complete tandem period for operational MLE4 (blue), reprocessed MLE4 (red) and NR (green). Means have been centred on 0 for better visibility.

The maps of the SSB difference are presented in figure 86, top panels. The differences are mostly located in low SWH areas. It is in line with what is observed for SWH differences in Figure 74 and is due to the difference in low SWH management between Sentinel-6 MF and Jason-3 processing. Due to the implementation error in low SWH management in the numerical retracking (AR 2620, see section 4.1.1.), the correlation of SWH is of opposite sign compared to MLE4.




Figure 86 – Ku-band SSB difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3 computed over the complete tandem period. Gridded map for reprocessed MLE4 (**left**) and NR (**right**) and difference function of ERA 5 model SWH (**bottom**).

5.2.6. Mispointing

In this paragraph, difference of the square of the off-nadir angles derived from the waveform retracking from LR datasets are compared between Jason-3 and Sentinel-6 MF. Biases of 0.009 and 0.005 degree² for reprocessed MLE4 and NR respectively are detected (figure 87). This is a significant improvement compared to the operational dataset (0.013 degree²), linked to the antenna aperture update in PB F08. Analysis presented in section 4.1.7. shows that this bias is coming from Sentinel-6 MF, as Jason-3 off-nadir angle is well centred around 0. These biases are stable in time (figure 88). Manoeuvres performed on Sentinel-6 MF during the commissioning activities are visible on both the time monitorings and the maps (figure 89).




Figure 87 – Histogram of mispointing difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Computed over the complete tandem period for operational MLE4 (blue), reprocessed MLE4 (red) and NR (green).




Figure 88 – Time monitoring of mispointing difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Mean per day (**left**) and standard deviation per day (**right**) computed over the complete tandem period for operational MLE4 (blue), reprocessed MLE4 (red) and NR (green).




Figure 89 – Mispointing difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3 computed over the complete tandem period. Gridded map for reprocessed MLE4 (**left**) and NR (**right**).

5.3. Ku-band HR

This section details key altimeter parameters for HR mode : the backscatter coefficient and the altimeter wind speed. For an analysis of the remaining HR parameters, results found in the calval assessment report of the F06 reprocessing campaign [1] are still relevant, as the impact of the F08 reprocessing is more limited in HR mode.

5.3.1. Backscatter coefficient

Figure 90 shows the distribution of the difference in sigma0 over sides A (left panel) and B (right panel). Values are not identical between both sides: 4.39dB and 4.31dB for side A and 4.43dB and 4.37dB for side B in operational and reprocessed dataset respectively. The difference is slightly higher in the reprocessed dataset (+0.05dB) compared to the operational (+0.04dB). This can also be observed in the time monitoring (figure 91, left panel) with an increase of the bias at the switch to POS4-B higher in the reprocessed dataset. Apart from this, the sigma0 bias between the two missions is stable in time with a standard deviation of 0.45dB for both datasets (right panel).




Figure 90 – Histogram of Ku-band backscatter coefficient difference: Sentinel-6 MF HR minus Jason-3. Computed over POS-4 side A (left) and side B (right) periods, for operational (blue) and reprocessed (red) datasets.




Figure 91 – Time monitoring of Ku-band backscatter coefficient difference: Sentinel-6 MF HR minus Jason-3. Mean per day (left) and standard deviation per day (right) computed over the complete tandem period for operational (blue) and reprocessed (red) datasets.

The map of the sigma0 difference for reprocessed HR dataset is presented in figure 92, left panel. As confirmed with the difference plot as function of SWH on the right panel, we observe a significant SWH

dependency : +0.26dB between 1 and 8m-SWH. This correlation is identical in the operational dataset.




Figure 92 – Ku-band backscatter coefficient difference: Sentinel-6 MF HR minus Jason-3 computed over the complete tandem period. Gridded map for reprocessed dataset (**left**) and difference function of ERA 5 model SWH (**right**).

5.3.2. Altimeter Wind-Speed

Sentinel-6 MF wind speed is computed with Collard algorithm, as for Jason-3. Sentinel-6 MF sigma0 in input of the computation should then be calibrated the same way as Jason-3. As seen in the previous section, Sentinel-6 MF sigma0 shows different mean bias with respect to Jason-3 whether operating on POS4-A or POS4-B. It is why, in PB F08, different calibration biases for wind speed computation are applied for POS4-A and POS4-B. These values are summarized in table 8.

POS4-A	-4.33 dB
POS4-B	-4.37 dB

Table 8 – Calibration bias applied on sigma0 for HR wind speed computation in PB F08

As can be seen on the histogram in figure 93, the differences in wind speed are not perfectly centred around 0 (8.0cm/s for the reprocessed dataset and -4.4cm for the operational dataset). This can also be seen in the evolution in time (figure 94). This result shows that the calibrations biases applied on sigma0 for the wind speed computation are not perfectly adjusted and can be improved. Note that the fact that the bias is constant between both sides of POS4 shows that the jump in HR - LR time monitoring at the side B switch presented in section 4.1.4. is caused by LR data only.

For Jason-3, the sigma0 calibration bias equals to 0.06 dB. Sentinel-6 MF sigma0 calibration should be calculated as the sum of J3/Sentinel-6 MF sigma0 bias and Jason-3 sigma0 calibration bias (0.06 dB). For Sentinel-6 MF HR wind speed computation, the calibration bias applied on sigma0 should be :

- for POS4-A : -4.25dB (= -4.31 + 0.06)
- for POS4-B : -4.31dB (= -4.37 + 0.06)

We recommend using these values for the next Sentinel-6 MF reprocessing campaign.




Figure 93 – Histogram of altimeter wind speed difference: Sentinel-6 MF HR minus Jason-3. Computed over the complete tandem period for operational (blue) and reprocessed (red) datasets.

The maps of reprocessed altimeter wind speed difference are presented in figure 95, top panels. As confirmed with the difference plot as function of SWH on the bottom panel, the SWH dependency is significantly




Figure 94 – Time monitoring of Ku-band wind speed difference: Sentinel-6 MF HR minus Jason-3. Mean per day (**left**) and standard deviation per day (**right**) computed over the complete tandem period for operational (blue) and reprocessed (red) datasets.

reduced compared to the operational dataset : -70cm/s instead of -81cm/s between 1 and 8m-SWH.




Figure 95 – Altimeter wind speed difference: Sentinel-6 MF HR minus Jason-3 computed over the complete tandem period in m/s. Gridded map for operational (**left**) and reprocessed (**right**) datasets and difference function of ERA 5 model SWH (**bottom**).

5.4. C-band

5.4.1. C-band SWH

Please note that the C-band SWH is not used in the SSHA computation process.

C-band SWH difference between Sentinel-6 MF LR and Jason-3 show a large bias of -19cm (figures 96 and 97), with a standard deviation of 1.2m. The larger standard deviation is due to POS4 design: the number of pulses in POS4 C-band is smaller compare to other altimeter (such as POS3). It leads to noisier C-band retrievals for Sentinel-6 MF.






Figure 96 – Histogram of C-band SWH difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Computed over the complete tandem period, for the operational (blue) and reprocessed (red) datasets.

Figure 97 – Time monitoring of C-band SWH difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Mean per day (left) and standard deviation per day (right) computed over the complete tandem period, for the operational (blue) and reprocessed (red) datasets.

The map of the C-band SWH differences for the reprocessed dataset is presented in figure 98, left panel. As for F06 data, we observe a strong correlation to SWH values, as confirmed on the difference plotted function of ERA-5 SWH (figure 98, right panel). The bias increases of about 70cm cm between 1 and 8m-SWH and reaches up to -130 cm for very low SWH.



*Figure 98 – C-band SWH difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3 computed over the complete tandem period. Gridded map for the reprocessed dataset (**left**) and difference function of ERA5 SWH (**right**).*

5.4.2. C-band Range

C-band range difference highlights the consistency between the two satellites with a bias of only 1.4 cm in average, which is of the same order as Ku-band range bias (0.72 cm). However, the standard deviation of the difference is higher for C-band: 21.9 cm versus 4.4 cm in Ku-band. This behaviour is expected and due to the reduced number of pulses in C-band.

The time monitoring of this difference is presented in figure 100. It shows the stability of the bias over POS4-A period. However, from the switch to the altimeter B-side, the bias seems to drift in time.




Figure 99 – Histogram of Orbit - C-band Range - MSS difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Computed over the complete tandem period, for the operational (blue) and reprocessed (red) datasets.

Figure 100 – Time monitoring of Orbit - C-band Range - MSS difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Mean per day (left) and standard deviation per day (right) computed over the complete tandem period, for the operational (blue) and reprocessed (red) datasets.

The map of C-band range differences is presented in figure 101, left panel. The main correlation is to the total electron content of the atmosphere, which can be explained by the C-band frequency difference between Sentinel-6 MF (5.41 GHz) and Jason-3 (5.3 GHz) (the ionosphere impact depends on band frequency). Additionally, these differences might also be correlated to the sea state bias.




Figure 101 – Orbit - C-band Range - MSS difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3 computed over the complete tandem period. Gridded map (left panel) and difference function of ERA 5 model SWH (right panel).

5.4.3. C-band Backscatter coefficient

Please note that the C-band sigma0 is not used in the SSHA computation process.

Figure 102 (left panel) shows the distribution of the differences in C-band sigma0 over the complete period, with a bias of -1.64 dB. The time monitoring of these differences is presented in figure 103, with a visible drift before the POS4 switch to B-side.




Figure 102 – Histogram of C-band backscatter coefficient difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Computed over the complete tandem period, for the operational (blue) and reprocessed (red) datasets.






Figure 103 – Time monitoring of C-band backscatter coefficient difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Mean per day (left) and standard deviation per day (right) computed over the complete tandem period, for the operational (blue) and reprocessed (red) datasets.

The map of C-band sigma0 difference is presented in figure 104, left panel. The differences are mostly located in low SWH areas.



*Figure 104 – C-band backscatter coefficient difference: Sentinel-6 MF reprocessed LR minus Jason-3 computed over the complete tandem period. Gridded map (**left**) and difference function of ERA 5 model SWH (**right**).*

5.4.4. C-band Sea State Bias

Sentinel-6 MF C-band SSB are computed using Jason-3 GDR-F C-band algorithm with Sentinel-6 MF LR Ku-band SWH and altimeter wind speed derived from LR Ku-band measurements as inputs. Sentinel-6 MF and Jason-3 C-band SSB are perfectly in line in reprocessed MLE4, with a bias below the mm (figure 105). As expected, the bias is slightly higher in NR (-1.4mm). The time monitoring of the SSB difference (figure 106) highlights a jump of 0.5mm at the POS4 B-side switch in all datasets. This is due to Ku-band sigma0 and its calibration bias applied for the wind speed computation. For each POS4 side, the SSB bias is otherwise stable in reprocessed MLE4. Similar to the Ku-band SSB (see section 5.2.5.), small variations $\pm 0.25\text{mm}$ are visible on side B in NR, of unknown origin.




Figure 106 – Time monitoring of C-band SSB difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Mean per day (left) and standard deviation per day (right) computed over the complete tandem period for operational MLE4 (blue), reprocessed MLE4 (red) and NR (green).

The corresponding maps (figure 107, top panels) show a small correlation to SWH. It is in line with what is observed for SWH differences in Figure 74 and is due to the difference in low SWH management between Sentinel-6 MF and Jason-3 processing. Due to the implementation error in low SWH management in the numerical retracking in Ku-band (AR 2620, see section 4.1.1.), the correlation of SWH is of opposite sign compared to MLE4.




Figure 107 – C-band SSB difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3 computed over the complete tandem period. Gridded map for reprocessed MLE4 (**left**) and NR (**right**) and difference function of ERA 5 model SWH (**bottom**).

5.5. Altimeter ionosphere correction

Sentinel-6 MF altimeter ionosphere correction is derived from LR data, in Ku and C band, and more precisely from ranges corrected from SSB.

In this section, the filtered altimeter ionosphere corrections from Sentinel-6 MF and Jason-3 are compared. Over the complete tandem phase, the bias between the two solutions is centred around -0.4cm in reprocessed MLE4 and -0.2cm in NR.

The time monitoring of this bias (figure 109) shows a clear jump of -0.7 mm at the POS4-B switch in all datasets. This value is small but the jump is clearly visible on the plot due to the stability of the bias over each POS4 side period, which is due to Sentinel-6 MF Ku-band sigma0 change at the switch to POS4-B (see Figure 79). Such jumps should have been corrected with PB F08, as sigma0 calibration biases were adapted for each altimeter side. However, as seen in section 5.2.4., the calibration biases need some adjustments in order to improve the transition from POS4-A and POS4-B.




Figure 108 – Histogram of Filtered Altimeter Ionosphere correction difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Computed over the complete tandem period for operational MLE4 (blue), reprocessed MLE4 (red) and NR (green).




Figure 109 – Time monitoring of Filtered Altimeter Ionosphere correction difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Mean per day (left) and standard deviation per day (right) computed over the complete tandem period for operational MLE4 (blue), reprocessed MLE4 (red) and NR (green).

The maps of the filtered ionosphere correction differences are presented in figure 110, top panels. We observe a correlation with ERA-5 model SWH (bottom panel) : -0.7 cm between 1 and 8m-SWH in MLE4.

In NR, the correlation is reduced to about -0.6cm on the same interval thanks to the reduced dependency of the NR range to SWH (see figure 77).




Figure 110 – Filtered Altimeter Ionosphere correction difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3 computed over the complete tandem period. Gridded map for reprocessed MLE4 (**left**) and NR (**right**) and difference function of ERA 5 model SWH (**bottom**).

5.6. SSHA

5.6.1. LR SSHA

In this section, Sentinel-6 MF LR and Jason-3 SSHA are compared over the complete tandem flight. The average bias is of 1.18cm in reprocessed MLE4. It is reduced to 0.53cm in NR. As summarized in table 9, the reduction of bias with NR retrievals is mainly due to a better alignment of the ranges between Sentinel-6A LR NR and Jason-3 MLE4.




Figure 111 – Histogram of product SSHA difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Computed over the complete tandem period for operational MLE4 (blue), reprocessed MLE4 (red) and NR (green).

Parameter	S6 MF LR - J3 bias	
	MLE4	NR
Orbit - Ku-band range - MSS	0.72cm	0.08cm
Ku-band SSB	-0.01cm	-0.12cm
Altimeter filtered ionosphere correction	-0.35cm	-0.23cm
AMR-C/HRMR WTC	-0.10cm	
Sum	1.18cm	0.52cm

Table 9 – Summary of the Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3 biases for the parameters used in the SSHA computation. Computed over the complete tandem flight. The sum is performed as [bias on orbit-range-mss] minus [the sum of the bias on the geophysical correction], as in the SSHA computation.

The time monitoring of this difference (figure 112, left panel) highlights two events:

- a jump of about +5 mm is visible after the satellite restart of 27-28 April 2021. This is partly caused by the jump in WTC (cf figure 71) of similar amplitude.
- a jump of about +2.5 mm is visible around the 20 January 2022. The origin is under investigation.

We cannot definitely conclude on the existence of a jump in the monitoring at POS4 switch to B-side on September 14th 2021. It is because the jumps visible on the SSB and the ionosphere correction are




Figure 112 – Time monitoring of product SSHA difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Mean (**left**) and standard deviation (**right**) per day computed over the complete tandem period for operational MLE4 (blue), reprocessed MLE4 (red) and NR (green).

partially cancelling themselves and because the SSHA difference has a standard deviation stronger than the jumps observed. This standard deviation is stable in time and is centred around 4.0cm in reprocessed MLE4 and 3.9cm in NR (figure 112, right panel).

A SSHA recomputed with a model WTC (ECMWF) for both Sentinel-6 MF LR and Jason-3 is used for comparison in figure 113. The use of model WTC reduces the jump of April 2021 to about 1.5mm. However, this SSHA bias presents larger oscillations. It is hard to say here if the second jump of January 2022 is also linked to Sentinel-6 AMR-C WTC or to Jason-3 AMR or from another source.




Figure 113 – Time monitoring of product SSHA with model WTC difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Mean per day computed over the complete tandem period for operational MLE4 (blue), reprocessed MLE4 (red) and NR (green).

The maps of the SSHA differences (figure 114 top panels) highlight a clear correlation to SWH, as confirmed by the plot of the difference function of ERA-5 SWH (figure 114 left panel). The SSHA bias increases by 1.9 cm between 1 and 8m-SWH in MLE4. However, the correlation is strongly reduced with the numerical retracking, to only +0.8cm on the same interval. These behaviours are in line with what has been observed on separate SSHA components in previous sections, and synthesized on table 10. Most of the reduction in the SSHA correlation to SWH in NR comes from improvement on the range.

The equatorial band visible on the orbit-range-mss difference map (figure 77) is still observed on the SSHA difference map, with the same amplitude.




Figure 114 – SSHA difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3 computed over the complete tandem period. Gridded map for reprocessed MLE4 (**left**) and NR (**right**) and difference function of ERA 5 model SWH (**bottom**).

Parameter	S6 MF LR - J3 bias between 1 and 8m-SWH	
	MLE4	NR
Orbit - Ku-band range - MSS	1.1cm	0.4cm
Ku-band SSB	-0.1cm	0.2cm
Altimeter filtered ionosphere correction	-0.7cm	-0.6cm
Sum	1.9cm	0.8cm

Table 10 – Summary of the Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3 correlation to ERA 5 model SWH biases for the parameters used in the SSHA computation. Computed over the complete tandem flight. The sum is performed as [bias on orbit-range-mss] minus [the sum of the bias on the geophysical correction], as in the SSHA computation.

5.6.2. HR SSHA

In this section, Sentinel-6 MF HR and Jason-3 SSHA are compared over the complete tandem flight. The average bias is reduced from an already negligible value of -0.6mm in the operational dataset to 0.2mm in the reprocessed one (figure 115).




Figure 115 – Histogram of product SSHA difference: Sentinel-6 MF HR minus Jason-3. Computed over the complete tandem period for operational (blue) and reprocessed (red) datasets.

The time monitoring of this difference (figure 116, left panel) highlights the same two events as in LR mode in the previous section:

- a jump of about +5 mm is visible after the satellite restart of 27-28 April 2021. This is partly caused by the jump in WTC (cf figure 71) of similar amplitude.
- a jump of about +2.5 mm is visible around the 20 January 2022. The origin is under investigation.

Both curves follow identical evolution but with a +0.7mm shift for the reprocessed one. Standard deviations (right panel) are similar with 3.5cm for the operational dataset and 3.6cm for the reprocessed dataset.




Figure 116 – Time monitoring of product SSHA difference: Sentinel-6 MF HR minus Jason-3. Mean (**left**) and standard deviation (**right**) per day computed over the complete tandem period for operational and reprocessed (red) datasets.

The maps of the SSHA differences (figure 117 top panels) highlight a clear correlation to SWH, as confirmed by the plot of the difference function of ERA-5 SWH (figure 114 left panel). The SSHA bias decreases by 2.7 cm between 1 and 8m-SWH for both datasets. This is mainly due to skewness differences between Jason-3 and Sentinel-6 MF but also to the remaining impact of the ocean vertical velocity.

The equatorial band already observed in LR is also visible here, with a similar amplitude, as it is expected since this behaviour comes from Jason-3.




Figure 117 – SSHA difference: Sentinel-6 MF HR minus Jason-3 computed over the complete tandem period. Gridded map for operational (**left**) and reprocessed (**right**) datasets and difference function of ERA 5 model SWH (**bottom**).

Sentinel-6MF satellite is taking over the responsibility as the reference mission to continue the long-term record of sea-surface height measurements started in 1992 by the Topex-Poseidon satellite and then by the Jason series. The role of Copernicus Sentinel-6 MF is not only to extend the so-called Global Mean Sea Level (GMSL) climate record, but also to monitor the changing height of the sea surface with greater precision than before. At first, dedicated tandem phase with previous satellite Jason-3 ensure precise calibrations of the GMSL Sentinel-6 MF record.

6.1. Uncertainty between Jason-3 and Sentinel-6MF

In this section, we present the derivation of the GMSL offset and its uncertainty between Jason-3 and Sentinel-6MF for its LR mode only, over the tandem phase. We also discuss the behaviour of the GMSL difference time series between the two satellites to highlight potential residuals discrepancies.

For this analysis, Jason-3 GDR-F MLE4 data has been used with the AVISO L2P standards.

6.1.1. Side A

Figure 118 presents the GMSL over POS4-A period for the reprocessed dataset, for LR MLE4 (left panel) and LR NR (right panel) retrievals. The GMSL evolution is identical for the two retracking outputs over this period (green curves in the middle panels). The differences with respect to Jason-3 (bottom plots) also show the same evolution in time: it is stable in time, with a jump at cycle 17. It is concomitant with Sentinel-6MF restart occurring on the 27-28 April 2021. This jump is also visible on S6A SSHA comparison to J3 and might come from radiometer WTC (see sections 4.2., 5.1. and 5.6.1. for more details).




Figure 118 – Jason-3 (black) and Sentinel-6 MF (green) GMSL over the side A (top panel), the tandem phase (middle panel) and their differences over the side A tandem phase (bottom panel), for Sentinel-6 MF reprocessed dataset, LR MLE4 on the left and LR NR on the right.

The GMSL offset between Jason-3 and reprocessed Sentinel-6MF dataset is estimated to $10.4 \pm 0.8 \text{ mm}$ (68.2% C.L.) for LR MLE4. It is reduced to $3.9 \pm 0.8 \text{ mm}$ (68.2% C.L.) thanks to LR NR (see right panels of figure 119). The GMSL offset derivation and its uncertainty estimation is based on [9]. From figure 119 (left panel), we still observed a significant GMSL drift between Jason-3 and Sentinel-6MF ($4.5 \pm 2 \text{ mm.yr}^{-1}$ (90% C.L.) for LR MLE4 and LR NR) that is mostly due to the jump at cycle 17 mentioned above. This behaviour was already observed with PB F06 data (see [1]) and did not change with the reprocessing.




Figure 119 – Time series of GMSL difference between Jason-3 and Sentinel-6 MF over the side A tandem phase (left) and relative GMSL offset and its uncertainty between Jason-3 and Sentinel-6 MF as a function of the number of cycle used for the computation (right). Top: Sentinel-6MF LR MLE4; Bottom: Sentinel-6MF LR MLE4

6.1.2. Side B

Figures 120 and 121 present the GMSL over the side B for the reprocessed dataset, as well as the GMSL differences with respect to Jason-3 and their relative offset over the tandem phase. The stability between Jason-3 and Sentinel-6MF has been improved after the switch (from 4.5 +/- 2.0 mm/yr to 2.6 +/- 2.5 mm/yr in LR MLE4). No more significant drift is observed between Jason-3 and Sentinel-6MF side-B GMSL (despite the large uncertainty due to the short time period). The uncertainty on the GMSL offset has also been improved from 0.8 mm to 0.5 mm (68.2% C.L.). On the monitoring of the difference of GMSL with Jason-3, a change of behaviour can be seen during February 2022, which origin is under investigation. This behavior was also observed in the tandem phase analysis (see section 4.2., 5.1. and 5.6.1. for more details).

The metrics are of the same order for the two retracker outputs. The only difference can be observed on the GMSL offset between Jason-3 and reprocessed Sentinel-6MF dataset. As for POS4-A period, it is reduced from 11.7 ± 0.7 mm (68.2% C.L.) with LR MLE4 to 6.3 ± 0.5 mm (68.2% C.L.) with LR NR.




Figure 120 – Jason-3 (black) and Sentinel-6 MF (green) GMSL over the side B (top panel), the tandem phase (middle panel) and their differences over the side B tandem phase (bottom panel), for Sentinel-6 MF reprocessed dataset, LR MLE4 on the left and LR NR on the right.




Figure 121 – Time series of GMSL difference between Jason-3 and Sentinel-6 MF over the side B tandem phase (left) and relative GMSL offset and its uncertainty between Jason-3 and Sentinel-6MF as a function of the number of cycle used for the computation (right). Top: Sentinel-6 MF LR MLE4; Bottom: Sentinel-6 MF LR MLE4

6.2. Comparison between MLE4 and NR

To compare the LR MLE4 and LR NR retracker in terms of GMSL, two GMSL have been estimated over the complete Sentinel-6 MF lifetime. Figure 122 shows the resulting GMSL difference (MLE4 - NR). Over the two periods (POS4-A and POS4-B), no significant drift can be observed between MLE4 and NR (errors are higher than slopes value). We cannot conclude here on the improvement brought by the numerical retracker on the long term stability of the mission. It will be re-assessed on a longer time series for POS4-B.

The offset observed between side A and side B is linked to ranges. As seen in section 4.1.2.1., range difference between LR NR and LR MLE4 shows a jump of 1 mm at the switch to POS4-B. It results in a jump of 1.5 mm in the SSHA difference (figure 61), which is in line with the jump seen here.




Figure 122 – GMSL difference MLE4 - NR SLAs over the reprocessed period. Slope errors are given at 90 % C.L.

7 System Requirements

In this section, the system requirements are verified for reprocessed data, in LR MLE4 and NR and in HR.

7.1. LR

7.1.1. R-S-00260

Requirement	Status
For low-resolution ALT-NTC products, the standard deviation of the 1-second along-track averaged corrected low-resolution altimeter range measurements shall be less than 2.83 cm. Note: This requirement is based on the apportionment given in the table of the Sentinel-6 low-resolution altimetry error budget at the end of the document. Note: Like all performance requirements on the altimeter, unless specified otherwise, this specifies the maximum global RMS error over open ocean. Note: A goal is 1.73 cm.	Not addressed in this report

Table 11 – R-S-00260

7.1.2. R-S-00270

Requirement	Status
For low-resolution ALT-NTC products, the noise of the 1-second along-track average of the low-resolution Ku-band altimeter range measurements shall be less than 1.5 cm at 2 m significant wave height. Note: the requirement is applicable after ground re-tracking. Note: The upper limit depends on SWH: 1.2 cm at 1 m SWH, 1.5 cm at 2 m SWH, 2.4 cm at 5 m SWH, and 3.2 cm at 8 m SWH. Note: A goal is 1.0 cm at 2 m SWH	OK

Table 12 – R-S-00270

To estimate the noise of 1-second along-track average of the LR Ku-band altimeter range, we analyse "data_01/ku/range_ocean_rms" variable from LR products. It contains the standard deviation of 20 Hz measurements used for the compression to 1hz. To retrieve 1 Hz level of noise, this value is divided by $\sqrt{20}$.

The resulting 1 Hz level of noise averaged over the complete period is plotted function of SWH on figure 123, left panel. Noise levels are similar for MLE4 and NR except at very low SWH. As expected, Sentinel-6 MF LR noise level is well below Jason-3 level and below the system requirement (purple curve) over almost all the SWH spectrum. For 1 m wave, the level of noise is slightly above the note in the requirement with a value of 1.21 cm and an upper limit at 1.2 cm. Please note that the requirement itself, i.e. the 2m SWH limit, is met. Table 13 reports the level of noise for the stated SWH values.

This noise level is stable in time, as shown on the cyclic monitoring of figure 123, right panel.




Figure 123 – 1 Hz noise of LR Ku-band altimeter range. Left panel: noise function of SWH for Sentinel-6 MF LR MLE4 (blue for MLE4, green for NR) and Jason-3 (black); the purple line represents the requirement thresholds. Right panel : noise level computed for each cycle and at 1, 2, 5 and 8 m-wave (solid lines for MLE4, dashed lines for NR) and the corresponding requirement levels (dotted lines).

SWH	Requirement	Noise level MLE4	Noise level MLE4
1 m	1.2 cm	1.24 cm	1.24 cm
2 m	1.5 cm	1.44 cm	1.44 cm
5 m	2.4 cm	1.94 cm	1.94 cm
8 m	3.2 cm	2.41 cm	2.41 cm

Table 13 – 1 Hz noise of LR Ku-band altimeter range at 1, 2, 5 and 8 m-wave.

7.1.3. R-S-00280

Requirement	Status
For low-resolution ALT-NTC products, the noise of the 1-second along-track average of the C-band altimeter range measurements shall be less than 5.7 cm at 2 m significant wave height. Note: the requirement is applicable after ground re-tracking. Note: The upper limit depends on SWH: 4.5 cm at 1 m SWH, 5.7 cm at 2 m SWH, 9.1 cm at 5 m SWH, and 12.0 cm at 8 m SWH	OK

Table 14 – R-S-00280

Similarly to Ku-band, we analyse "data_01/c/range_ocean_rms" variable from LR products to estimate the noise of 1-second along-track average of the LR C-band altimeter range.

The resulting 1 Hz level of noise averaged over the complete period is plotted as a function of SWH on figure 124, left panel. Sentinel-6 MF LR noise level is and below the system requirement (purple curve) over all the SWH spectrum. Table 15 reports the level of noise for the stated SWH values.

This noise level is stable in time, as shown on the cyclic monitoring of figure 124, right panel.




Figure 124 – 1 Hz noise of LR C-band altimeter range. Left panel: noise function of SWH for Sentinel-6 MF LR and Jason-3; the purple line represents the requirement thresholds. Right panel : noise level computed for each cycle and at 1, 2, 5 and 8 m-wave (solid lines) and the corresponding requirement levels (dashed lines).

SWH	Requirement	Noise level
1 m	4.5 cm	4.48 cm
2 m	5.7 cm	5.22 cm
5 m	9.1 cm	7.87 cm
8 m	12 cm	10.04 cm

Table 15 – 1 Hz noise of LR C-band altimeter range at 1, 2, 5 and 8 m-wave.

7.1.4. R-S-00290

Requirement	Status
For low-resolution ALT-NTC products, the contribution of the ionosphere correction error to the standard deviation of the 1-second along-track averaged corrected low-resolution altimeter range measurements shall be less than 0.5 cm. Note: Derived from C and Ku band and averaged over 200 km. Note: Like all performance requirements on the altimeter, unless specified otherwise, this specifies the maximum global RMS error over open ocean. Note: A goal is 0.3 cm	OK

Table 16 – R-S-00290

To quantify the contribution of the ionosphere correction error to the standard deviation of 1 Hz corrected LR range, several metrics are checked.

A first estimation of filtered ionosphere correction error is performed by checking the noise between consecutive measurements. The results show a very low level of noise, way below the mm (figure ??), except for a single pass (cycle 15 pass 1), for which rapid ionosphere variations near the equator caused significant jumps between land masses around Indonesia. Even this extreme case is compliant with requirements.




Figure 125 – Absolute value of consecutive filtered ionosphere correction measurement for MLE4 (left) and NR (right). Mean per pass (blue), mean per day (orange) and mean per cycle (green).

Comparison to Jason-3 filtered ionosphere correction highlights a standard deviation ranging between 2 and 4.5 mm (figure 126) for both retrackings. And finally, comparison to ionosphere correction derived from GIM model shows a standard deviation ranging between 3 mm and 1.5 cm (figure 127) for both retrackings. These values are all within requirement.




Figure 126 – Standard deviation gridded map of Altimeter Filtered Ionosphere correction Sentinel-6 MF-Jason-3 difference (cm) for MLE4 (**left**) and NR (**right**). Computed over the tandem phase.




Figure 127 – Standard deviation gridded map of the difference between Altimeter Filtered Ionosphere correction and GIM model (cm) for MLE4 (**left**) and NR (**right**). Computed over the entire reprocessing period.

7.1.5. R-S-00300

Requirement	Status
For low-resolution ALT-NTC products, the contribution of the sea state bias error to the standard deviation of the 1-second along-track averaged corrected low-resolution altimeter range measurements shall be less than 2.0 cm. Note: Like all performance requirements on the altimeter, unless specified otherwise, this specifies the maximum global RMS error over open ocean. Note: A goal is 1.0 cm	OK

Table 17 – R-S-00300

As for ionosphere correction, a first estimation of the SSB error is performed by checking the noise between consecutive measurements. The results shows a low level of noise, below the cm (figure 128) for both LR retrakkings.




Figure 128 – Absolute value of consecutive LR sea state bias measurement for LR MLE4 (left) and NR (right). Mean per pass (blue), mean per day (orange) and mean per cycle (green).

Comparison to Jason-3 SSB highlights a standard deviation ranging between 4.5 mm and 1.5 cm (figure 129) for both retrackings. These values are within requirement.




Figure 129 – Standard deviation gridded map of Ku-band SSB difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3 computed over the complete tandem period for MLE4 (left) and NR (right).

7.1.6. R-S-00310

Requirement	Status
For low-resolution ALT-NTC products, the contribution of the dry tropospheric correction error to the standard deviation of the 1-second along-track averaged corrected low-resolution altimeter range measurements shall be less than 0.7 cm. Note: this requirement applies to the model to be used to calculate the dry troposphere model. Note: Like all performance requirements on the altimeter, unless specified otherwise, this specifies the maximum global RMS error over open ocean. Note: A goal is 0.5 cm	OK

Table 18 – R-S-00310

The dry troposphere correction model are identical between Jason-3 and Sentinel-6 MF products: same model and same estimation from model.

Analysis have shown that the two retrievals are indeed perfectly in line (see figure 130).

System requirement for Jason-3 dry troposphere correction is the same as Sentinel-6 MF present requirement, and it has been shown that Jason-3 dry troposphere correction is compliant.




Figure 130 – Mean gridded map of dry tropospheric correction difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3. Computed over cycles 4 to 51.

7.1.7. R-S-00320

Requirement	Status
For low-resolution ALT-NTC products, the contribution of the wet tropospheric correction error to the standard deviation of the 1-second along-track averaged corrected low-resolution altimeter range measurements shall be less than 1.0 cm. Note: Like all performance requirements on the altimeter, unless specified otherwise, this specifies the maximum global RMS error over open ocean. Note: A goal is 0.8 cm	OK

Table 19 – R-S-00320

A first estimation of AMR-C WTC error is performed by checking the noise between consecutive measurements. The results show a very low level of noise, below 2 mm (figure 131).

Comparison to Jason-3 AMR WTC highlights a standard deviation below 8 mm (figure 132). These values are within requirement.




Figure 131 – Absolute value of consecutive AMR-C WTC measurement in mm. Mean per pass (blue), mean per day (orange) and mean per cycle (green).




Figure 132 – STD gridded map of AMR WTC difference: Sentinel-6 MF LR minus Jason-3, in m. Computed over cycles 4 to 51.

7.1.8. R-S-00330

Requirement	Status
For low-resolution ALT-NTC products, the standard deviation of the determination of the radial component of the orbit shall be less than 1.5 cm. Note: This requirement is applicable to the orbital solution derived from the combined set of data from DORIS, GNSS-POD and LRA. Note: Orbit errors have a larger than 1000 km length scale, significantly different from the 1 Hz altimetry noise. Nevertheless, the orbit error is added in a RSS sense, presuming that the error is uncorrelated from cycle to cycle at the same location. Note: a goal is 1.0 cm	Not addressed in this report

Table 20 – R-S-00330

7.1.9. R-S-00340

Requirement	Status
For low-resolution ALT-NTC products, the standard deviation of the 1-second along-track averaged corrected low-resolution measurements of sea surface height shall be less than 3.20 cm. Note: This requirement is based on the apportionment given in the table of the Sentinel-6 low-resolution altimetry error budget at the end of the document. Note: Like all performance requirements on the altimeter, unless specified otherwise, this specifies the maximum global RMS error over open ocean. Note: A goal is 1.99 cm	OK

Table 21 – R-S-00340

To verify this requirement, the crossover analysis presented in section ?? is used. The standard deviation of corrected LR SSH difference is centred around 4.7 cm (see figure ??) in both MLE4 and NR. It means that the error is of 3.3cm (standard deviation divided by $\sqrt{2}$). This value is slightly above requirement. However, looking at a region with low variability, for example the pacific patch, the error is of 2.25 cm in average. On a cyclic basis, this error is always below the requirement limit of 3.2 cm as shown on figure 133. The only exception is cycle 25 in the NR dataset.




Figure 133 – Corrected LR SSH error derived from crossover analysis with a selection over Pacific patch (latitude in [-24.5°N; -3°N] and longitude in [220°E; 246°E]), in cm for MLE4 (left) and for NR (right). The error equals to the standard deviation of the SSH difference divided by $\sqrt{2}$. Computed on a cyclic basis.

7.1.10. R-S-00350

Requirement	Status
For low-resolution ALT-NTC products, the uncertainty of 1-second along-track averaged low-resolution measurements of significant wave height in the range 0.5 to 8 m shall be less than 15 cm plus 5% of significant wave height. Note: This is based on the combination of noise and systematic error. Note: A goal is 10 cm plus 5% of significant wave height	OK

Table 22 – R-S-00350

LR Ku-band SWH are compared to SWH derived from ERA-5 model on figure 134. It shows a good consistency between the two datasets, the difference being below requirement limit over the complete SWH spectrum.




Figure 134 – SWH difference between Sentinel-6 MF LR data and ERA-5 SWH, plotted function of ERA-5 SWH for MLE4 (red) and NR (green). Computed over Sentinel-6 MF cycle 40. Purple lines represent requirement limits. Results are identical for all cycles.

7.1.11. R-S-00355

Requirement	Status
For low-resolution ALT-NTC products, significant wave heights shall be provided up to at least 20 m. Note: The measurement performance under high sea state conditions will be determined during commissioning	OK

Table 23 – R-S-00355

Figure 135 shows the maximum value per cycle of Sentinel-6 MF LR SWH. As expected, the values are




Figure 135 – Maximum value of Sentinel-6 MF LR SWH per cycle for MLE4 (**left**) and NR (**right**).


above 20 m in MLE4, while they are at 20 m in NR.

7.1.12. R-S-00360

Requirement	Status
For low-resolution ALT-NTC products, the uncertainty of 1-second along-track averages of 10 meter wind speed over ocean surfaces, derived from low-resolution altimeter measurements, shall be better than 1.5 m/s for wind speeds in the range 3 m/s to 20 m/s. Note: Wind speed refers to the wind (not neutral wind) speed at a reference height of 10 meters above the sea surface. Note: This wind speed accuracy requirement translates to an accuracy requirement on the backscatter. Note: A goal is 1.0 m/s	OK

Table 24 – R-S-00360

To verify the uncertainty of Sentinel-6 MF LR altimeter wind-speed, a comparison to model is performed. The model wind speed used is derived from U and V components provided in L2 product ("data_01/wind_speed_mod_u" and "data_01/wind_speed_mod_v"). Difference between altimeter and model wind speed is plotted on figure 136 function of model wind speed. Values are within requirement.



*Figure 136 – Difference between Altimeter LR wind speed and model wind speed function of model wind speed, in m/s for MLE4 (**left**) and NR (**right**). Computed for all cycles (right, darker curves correspond to more recent cycles). Green lines represent requirement limits.*

7.1.13. R-S-00370

Requirement	Status
For low-resolution ALT-NTC products, the absolute accuracy of 1-second along-track averaged low-resolution measurements of normalized radar cross-section at Ku-band and vertical incidence, in the range 7 to 16 dB, shall be better than 0.3 dB. Note: This value (0.3 dB) is not the value at satellite level (1 dB), but it is achieved after external in-flight calibration to ensure coherence with other missions. In other words, 0.3 dB is the global value, what allows 1 dB at satellite level, to be compensated by the ground processing. Note: This requirement also sets limits on the accuracy of sigma0 attenuation correction to be supplied by the radiometer	Not addressed in this report

Table 25 – R-S-00370

The absolute accuracy of the LR sigma0 is not addressed in this report as there is currently no facility available to measure it.

7.2. HR

7.2.1. R-S-00680

Requirement	Status
For high-resolution ALT-NTC products, the standard deviation of the 1-second along-track averaged corrected high-resolution altimeter range measurements shall be less than 2.53 cm. Note: This requirement is based on the apportionment given in the table of the Sentinel-6 high-resolution altimetry error budget at the end of the document. Note: Note: Like all performance requirements on the altimeter, unless specified otherwise, this specifies the maximum global RMS error over open ocean. Note: Note: A goal is 1.49 cm.	Not addressed in this report

Table 26 – R-S-00680

7.2.2. R-S-00690

Requirement	Status
For high-resolution ALT-NTC products, the noise of the 1-second along-track average of the high-resolution Ku-band altimeter range measurements shall be less than 0.8 cm at 2 m significant wave height. Note: the requirement is applicable after ground re-tracking. Note: The upper limit depends on SWH: 0.7 cm at 1 m SWH, 0.8 cm at 2 m SWH, 1.3 cm at 5 m SWH, and 2.0 cm at 8 m SWH. Note: A goal is 0.5 cm at 2m SWH	OK

Table 27 – R-S-00690

Similarly to LR, we analyse "data_01/ku/range_ocean_rms" variable from HR products to estimate the noise of 1-second along-track average of the HR Ku-band altimeter range.

The resulting 1 Hz level of noise averaged over the complete period is plotted function of SWH on figure 137, left panel. As expected, Sentinel-6 MF HR noise level is well below Jason-3 and Sentinel-3A levels. However, Sentinel-6 MF HR noise level is above the additional note in the requirement (purple curve) for 5 m and 8 m wave upper limits. Please note that the requirement itself, i.e. the 2m SWH limit, is met. Table 28 reports the level of noise for the stated SWH values.

Please note that the use of a numerical retracking for HR will improve noise levels and will be implemented in the coming PB F09 update.

This noise level is stable in time, as shown on the cyclic monitoring of figure 137, right panel.




Figure 137 – 1 Hz noise of HR Ku-band altimeter range, in cm. Left panel: noise function of SWH in m for Sentinel-6 MF HR and Jason-3; the purple line represents the requirement thresholds. Right panel : noise level computed for each cycle and at 1, 2, 5 and 8 m-wave (solid lines) and the corresponding requirement levels (dashed lines).

SWH	Requirement	Noise level
1 m	0.7 cm	0.61 cm
2 m	0.8 cm	0.75 cm
5 m	1.3 cm	1.40 cm
8 m	2.0 cm	2.31 cm

Table 28 – 1 Hz noise of HR Ku-band altimeter range at 1, 2, 5 and 8 m-wave.

7.2.3. R-S-00700

Requirement	Status
For high-resolution ALT-NTC products, the contribution of the ionospheric correction error to the standard deviation of the 1-second along-track averaged corrected high-resolution altimeter range measurements shall be less than 0.5 cm. Note: Derived from C and Ku band and averaged over 200 km. Note: Like all performance requirements on the altimeter, unless specified otherwise, this specifies the maximum global RMS error over open ocean. Note: A goal is 0.3 cm	OK, see section 7.1.4.

Table 29 – R-S-00700

7.2.4. R-S-00710

Requirement	Status
For high-resolution ALT-NTC products, the contribution of the sea state bias error to the standard deviation of the 1-second along-track averaged corrected high-resolution altimeter range measurements shall be less than 2.0 cm. Note: Since the sea state bias model will have to be determined for the altimeter data itself, the error can only be evaluated based on day-2 processing. Note: Like all performance requirements on the altimeter, unless specified otherwise, this specifies the maximum global RMS error over open ocean. Note: A goal is 1.0 cm	OK

Table 30 – R-S-00710

As for LR data, a first estimation of HR SSB error is performed by checking the noise between consecutive measurements. The results show a low level of noise, below the cm (figure 138).

Comparison to Jason-3 SSB highlights a standard deviation ranging between 4.5 mm and 1.6 cm (figure 139). These values are within requirement.




Figure 138 – Absolute value of consecutive HR sea state bias measurement. Mean per pass (blue), mean per day (orange) and mean per cycle (green).




Figure 139 – Standard deviation gridded map of Ku-band SSB difference: Sentinel-6 MF HR minus Jason-3 computed over the complete tandem period.

7.2.5. R-S-00720

Requirement	Status
For high-resolution ALT-NTC products, the contribution of the dry tropospheric correction error to the standard deviation of the 1-second along-track averaged corrected high-resolution altimeter range measurements shall be less than 0.7 cm. Note: this requirement applies to the model to be used to calculate the dry troposphere model. Note: Like all performance requirements on the altimeter, unless specified otherwise, this specifies the maximum global RMS error over open ocean. Note: A goal is 0.5 cm	OK, see section 7.1.6.

Table 31 – R-S-00720

7.2.6. R-S-00730

Requirement	Status
For high-resolution ALT-NTC products, the contribution of the wet tropospheric correction error to the standard deviation of the 1-second along-track averaged corrected high-resolution altimeter range measurements shall be less than 1.0 cm. Note: Like all performance requirements on the altimeter, unless specified otherwise, this specifies the maximum global RMS error over open ocean. Note: A goal is 0.8 cm	OK, see section 7.1.7.

Table 32 – R-S-00730

7.2.7. R-S-00740

Requirement	Status
For high-resolution ALT-NTC products, the standard deviation of the determination of the radial component of the orbit shall be less than 1.5 cm. Note: This requirement is applicable to the orbital solution derived from the combined set of data from DORIS, GNSS-POD and LRA. Note: Orbit errors have a larger than 1000 km length scale, significantly different from the 1 Hz altimetry noise. Nevertheless, the orbit error is added in a RSS sense, presuming that the error is uncorrelated from cycle to cycle at the same location. Note: A goal is 1.0 cm	Not addressed in this report

Table 33 – R-S-00740

7.2.8. R-S-00750

Requirement	Status
For high-resolution ALT-NTC products, the standard deviation of the 1-second along-track averaged corrected high-resolution measurements of sea surface height shall be less than 2.94 cm. Note: This requirement is based on the apportionment given in the table of the Sentinel-6 high-resolution altimetry error budget at the end of the document. Note: Like all performance requirements on the altimeter, unless specified otherwise, this specifies the maximum global RMS error over open ocean. Note: A goal is 1.80 cm	OK

Table 34 – R-S-00750

To verify this requirement, the crossover analysis presented in section ?? is used. The standard deviation of corrected HR SSH difference is centred around 4.5 cm (see figure ??). It means that the error is of 3.2cm (standard deviation divided by $\sqrt{2}$). This value is slightly above requirement. However looking at a region with low variability, for example the pacific patch, the error is of 2.03 cm in average. On a cyclic basis, this error is always below the requirement limit of 3.2 cm as shown on figure 133, except for two cycles (19 and 24).




Figure 140 – Corrected HR SSH error derived from crossover analysis with a selection over Pacific patch (latitude in $[-24.5^{\circ}\text{N}; -3^{\circ}\text{N}]$ and longitude in $[220^{\circ}\text{E}; 246^{\circ}\text{E}]$), in cm. The error equals to the standard deviation of the SSH difference divided by $\sqrt{(2)}$. Computed on a cyclic basis.

7.2.9. R-S-00760

Requirement	Status
For high-resolution ALT-NTC products, the uncertainty of 1-second along-track averaged high-resolution measurements of significant wave height in the range 0.5 to 8 m shall be less than 15 cm plus 5% of significant wave height. Note: This is based on the combination of noise and systematic error. Note: A goal is 10 cm plus 5% of significant wave height	NOK

Table 35 – R-S-00760

HR Ku-band SWH are compared to SWH derived from ERA-5 model on figure 141. Sentinel-6 MF HR SWH are not compliant with requirement. Please note that the use of a numerical retracking for HR will improve the uncertainties and will be implemented in the coming PB F09 update.




Figure 141 – SWH difference between Sentinel-6 MF HR data and ERA-5 SWH, plotted function of ERA-5 SWH. Computed over Sentinel-6 MF cycle 70. Green lines represent requirement limits. Results are identical for all cycles.

7.2.10. R-S-00765

Requirement	Status
For high-resolution ALT-NTC products, significant wave heights shall be provided up to at least 20 m. Note: The measurement performance under high sea state conditions will be determined during commissioning	OK

Table 36 – R-S-00765

Figure 142 shows the maximum value per cycle of Sentinel-6 MF HR SWH. It equals to 20 m for all cycles, which is consistent with the requirement.




Figure 142 – Maximum value of Sentinel-6 MF HR SWH per cycle.

7.2.11. R-S-00770

Requirement	Status
For high-resolution ALT-NTC products, the uncertainty of 1-second along-track averages of 10 meter wind speed over ocean surfaces, derived from high-resolution altimeter measurements, shall be better than 1.5 m/s for wind speeds in the range 3 m/s to 20 m/s. Note: Wind speed refers to the wind (not neutral wind) speed at a reference height of 10 meters above the sea surface. Note: This wind speed accuracy requirement translates to an accuracy requirement on the backscatter Note: A goal is 1.0 m/s	OK

Table 37 – R-S-00770

As for LR, a comparison to model is performed to verify the uncertainty of Sentinel-6 MF HR altimeter wind-speed. Difference between altimeter and model wind speed is plotted on figure 143 function of model wind speed. Values are within requirement.




Figure 143 – Difference between Altimeter HR wind speed and model wind speed function of model wind speed, in m/s. Computed over Sentinel-6 MF cycle 70 (left) and for all cycles (right, darker curves correspond to more recent cycles). Green lines represent requirement limits.

7.2.12. R-S-00780

Requirement	Status
For high-resolution ALT-NTC products, the absolute accuracy of 1-second along-track averaged high-resolution measurements of normalized radar cross-section at Ku-band and vertical incidence, in the range 7 to 16 dB, shall be better than 0.3 dB. Note: This value (0.3 dB) is not the value at satellite level (1 dB), but it is achieved after external in-flight calibration to ensure coherence with other missions. In other words, 0.3 dB is the global value, what allows 1 dB at satellite level, to be compensated by the ground processing. Note: This requirement also sets limits on the accuracy of sigma0 attenuation correction to be supplied by the radiometer	Not addressed in this report

Table 38 – R-S-00780

The absolute accuracy of the HR sigma0 is not addressed in this report as there is currently no facility available to measure it.

8 Conclusion

An overview of the impact of Sentinel-6 MF F08 reprocessing over ocean has been presented in this report. The Processing Baseline F08 used for this reprocessing brought two major improvements:

- The update of POS4 antenna aperture from 1.33° to 1.34° , to improve mispointing estimation. In LR MLE4, mispointing value is reduced from 0.012deg^2 to 0.008deg^2 .
- The addition of LR Numerical Retracker retrievals, in order to better account for system ageing (PTR shape evolution).

This numerical retracker brings significant improvements on the range long term evolution, as seen the HR versus LR range evolution. This improvement should improve as well the long term stability of the GMSL, however the reprocessing period is too short for this to be measured. Also, the dependencies of LR range and ionospheric correction to SWH variations are strongly reduced thanks to numerical retracking. Contrary to MLE4, NR accounts for all instrumental behaviours in real time. Therefore, it does not require approximate instrument corrections (e.g. LUTs). It brings a strong improvement in the consistency between Jason-3 and Sentinel-6 MF in terms of range and thus SSHA, both in global bias and correlation with SWH.

An anomaly (AR 2620) has been raised on the handling of small waves with the numerical retracking which introduced biases at low SWH. This anomaly will be patched at the end of summer 2023 in operational data. Other unexpected differences with MLE4 are still being investigated, such as residual SWH bias at high SWH, sensitivity to sea surface slope and behaviour at high mispointing.

This reprocessing also includes improvements brought by PB F07 on data before 2022-08-15 :

- The availability of High Resolution Microwave Radiometer (HRMR) data in all radiometer products, improving WTC at the coast.
- The usage of ECHO CAL as main source of CAL1.
- An update of the ionospheric correction filtering method. With this update, the filtered ionospheric correction became available over the Caspian Sea in the products, enabling SSHA computation in this region.

POS4 switch between A and B side on 14/09/2021 has shown impact on the backscatter coefficient, mainly in LR. Its value slightly varies between altimeter sides, impacting the altimeter wind speed, sea state bias and ionosphere correction retrievals. In this report, we recommend new values for the sigma0 calibration bias used in the wind speed computation for next reprocessing, in order to improve the consistency between POS4-A and -B. POS4 switch to B-side also shows a small impact on LR NR range: -1 mm at the switch. It results in a jump of +1.5 mm in LR NR SSHA. Except from that, the transition between the two altimeters is perfectly smooth.

LR reprocessed data are in line with Jason-3 with a bias in SWH of only -1.2 cm in MLE4 and 1.8 cm in NR. In range, biases are of only 0.8cm in MLE4 and less than 0.1cm in NR. The total SSHA bias with respect to Jason-3 is also excellent, 1.18 cm in MLE4 and only 0.53 cm in NR. Mispointings derived from Sentinel-6 MF LR retracksings reduced mis-centring thanks to the reprocessing, with a value centred around 0.009degree^2 in MLE4 and 0.005degree^2 in NR.

The reprocessing has less effect on HR mode, which is still impacted by the remaining ocean vertical velocity and by the absence of skewness parameter in its processing. Future addition of skewness parameter in the HR processing along with numerical retracker and ocean vertical velocity correction in PB F09 update should improve these results in the future.

With this reprocessing, a significant -2mm/month drift impacting the wet tropospheric correction from October to December 2022 has also been corrected.

The impact of the reprocessing is small in other aspects, with submillimetric differences in geophysical parameters such as SWH, range, SSB, or SSHA, for both LR MLE4 and HR datasets. Performance of SSH difference at crossovers remain similar with operational data.

The compliance status to system requirements shows once again the excellent quality of Sentinel-6 MF data, especially for LR dataset for both MLE4 and NR retracers. In HR, only requirement R-S-00760 is not yet fulfilled: due to the remaining impact of ocean vertical velocity, HR SWH uncertainty is above requirement. Upcoming PB F09 will include significant improvement to HR data, including a HR numerical retracker with range walk, the addition of a skewness parameter and a correction for the impact of ocean vertical velocity.

References

- [1] Sentinel-6A F06 Reprocessing Calval Assesment available at : https://www-cdn.eumetsat.int/files/2022-10/S6A_F06_Reprocessing_Calval_Assesment_v2_draft4.pdf
- [2] Sentinel-6A user handbook available at <https://eumetsatspace.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/SEN6/overview>
- [3] Sentinel-6A product notice for Processing Baseline F08 at <https://www.eumetsat.int/media/50743>
- [4] Sentinel-6A product notice for Processing Baseline F07 at <https://www.eumetsat.int/media/50079>
- [5] Jason-3 product handbook available at https://www.aviso.altimetry.fr/fileadmin/documents/data/tools/hdbk_j3.pdf
- [6] Changes in ECMWF model, web page: <https://www.ecmwf.int/en/forecasts/documentation-and-support/changes-ecmwf-model>
- [7] Sentinel ALT Level 2 Product Generation Specification available at <https://www.eumetsat.int/media/48266>
- [8] Raynal et al, Lessons learned from Sentinel SARM missions in preparation of Jason-CS. Oral Presentation, Ocean Surface Topography Science Team Meeting 2019, Chicago
- [9] Guérou, A., Meyssignac, B., Prandi, P., Ablain, M., Ribes, A., and Bignalet-Cazalet, F.: Current observed global mean sea level rise and acceleration estimated from satellite altimetry and the associated uncertainty, EGU sphere [preprint], <https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2022-330>, 2022.