Validation and intercomparison of satellite-based rainfall products over Africa using TAHMO in-situ rainfall observations

Denis Macharia¹, Katie Fankhauser², John Selker³, Jason Neff⁴, and Evan Thomas⁴

¹Regional Centre for Mapping of Resources for Development
²University of Colorado Boulder
³Oregon State University
⁴University of Colorado at Boulder

November 24, 2022

Abstract

Sparse rain gauge networks and declining observations in Africa limit climate research in the region. However, the proliferation of satellite-rainfall products (SRPs) and the growth of citizen-science-driven in-situ observations driven by cheaper data collection technologies have provided a pathway to overcoming the data scarcity problem. In this paper, we used rain gauge data from 596 stations operated by the Trans-African Hydro-Meteorological Observatory (TAHMO) across Africa to evaluate the performance of two widely-utilized satellite-based rainfall products: the Climate Hazards InfraRed Precipitation with Stations (CHIRPS) and the Tropical Applications of Meteorology using Satellite data (TAMSAT), and two under-validated and underutilized products: the satellite-only Global Satellite Mapping of Precipitation (GSMaP) and the gauge-corrected GSMaP version (GSMaP_Gauge). We also inter-compared the performance of the four products over Africa, East Africa, Southern Africa and West Africa at daily, pentadal, and monthly timescales. Our findings indicated that the GSMaP products had better performances at daily timescales whereas CHIRPS and TAMSAT matched or outperformed the GSMaP products at pentadal and monthly timescales. GSMaP_-Gauge daily rainfall detection was almost 1.5 times the CHIRPS detection scores at the same temporal scale. The Pearson correlation coefficient increased with temporal aggregation but the volumetric errors increased for all products. Additionally, all the products overestimated (underestimated) low (high) intensity rainfall events. Our analysis adds to a growing number of validation studies in Africa and presents an opportunity for developers of satellite-rainfall products to integrate the new TAHMO observations in bias-correction algorithms to improve the accuracy of SRPs in the region.

Validation of Satellite-based Rainfall Products over Africa using TAHMO in-situ station data

Denis Muthike^{*}, Katie Fankhauser, John Selker, Jason Neff, Evan Thomas University of Colorado Boulder

AGU Fall Meeting 2021-New Orleans, 13-17th December, 2021







Why do we need accurate climate data?

 The changing climate will lead to changes in the frequency, intensity, spatial extent, duration, and timing of extreme weather and climate events



• To better deal with the impacts of a changing climate there is need to;

- understand emerging risks
- have seamless access to monitoring and early warning information
- enhance preparedness and response capacity
- invest in anticipatory approaches
- enabling DRM policy environment and sustainable funding



Why do we need accurate climate data?





 As climate change increases the frequency and intensity of extreme events and hence impacts on the most vulnerable, Early Warning Systems have become a critical component of disaster risk reduction (DRR) efforts

SERVIR BEASTER A South

Using early warning information to anticipate disasters, implement anticipatory actions, prevent impacts, if possible, and reduce human suffering and losses.





Good forecasts are available many months in advance for the short rains



Skill is higher for extreme event (esp wet)



50 70

Hit rate: % events successfully anticipated Based on acting if P(event)> 30%

years

ONAL CENTREFOR 20191120/2100 Products ydrologic Models CREST Maximum Unit Streamflow CREST O Return Period CREST Maximum Soil Saturation OPE for Hydrologic Models OPF for Hydrologic Models

Funk et al. 2021: https://doi.org/10.3389/fclim.2021.716568

Challenge with climate data in Africa



- **Sparse** in-situ rainfall observations in Africa
- Persistent data gaps in available in-situ records
- Satellite-rainfall products (SRPs) as alternative sources of data

SERVIR AFRIC

- Concerns on systematic biases/errors in satellite rainfall products
- Need to evaluate the performance of various SR products



What are we doing?

Objective: Evaluate the performance of CHIRPS, TAMSAT, GSMaP-MVK and GSMaP_Gauge

RQ: How do these SRPs compare with TAHMO at different timescales in Africa, East Africa, Southern Africa and West Africa?

- TAHMO- Network of over 600 stations across Africa, with plans to expand to 20,000 stations- 2015- present; every 5 min, Van de Giessen 2014;
- CHIRPS- quasi global gauge corrected gridded rainfall at daily, pentadal and monthly timescales, 5km spatial res.; 1981-present- University of California St. Barbara- Funk et al. 2015; <u>https://data.chc.ucsb.edu/products/CHIRPS-2.0/</u>
- TAMSAT- quasi global gauge corrected gridded rainfall at daily, pentadal and monthly timescales, 4km spatial res.; 1983-present-University of Reading-UK; Maidment 2014; <u>http://gwsaccess.jasmin.ac.uk/public/tamsat/rfe/data_zipped/v3.1/</u>
- GSMaP-MVK- Global satellite only gridded rainfall available at daily and can be accumulated to pentadal and monthly scales, 10km spatial res.; 2000- present; Kubota et al 2007
- GSMaP-Gauge: Gauge corrected GSMaP available for the same period
 as above; <u>https://sharaku.eorc.jaxa.jp/GSMaP/</u>

Macharia et al.AMS Journal of Hydrometeorology (accepted with revisions)



A: East Africa, B: Southern Africa, C: West Africa

Results

SERVIR BEASTERN & Souther

Categorical metrics

	Africa (N=441,768)			East Africa (N=194,364)				Southern Africa (N=49,50				
	POD	FAR	Eff	CSI	POD	FAR	Eff	CSI	POD	FAR	Eff	CS
CHIRPS	0.46	0.28	-0.12	0.39	0.42	0.21	-0.36	0.37	0.44	0.26	0.08	0.3
TAMSAT	0.54	0.29	-0.02	0.45	0.47	0.22	-0.17	0.42	0.45	0.22	0.1	0.4
GSMaP	0.67	0.3	-0.07	0.53	0.67	0.25	-0.1	0.55	0.62	0.29	0.18	0.4
GSMaP_wGauge	0.72	0.31	0.11	0.54	0.75	0.3	0.07	0.57	0.63	0.29	0.18	0.5

Daily time scale

Volumetric metrics

Daily timescale

	1	Africa (N	i=441,7	768)	East Africa (N=194,364)				
	CC	MAE	Bias	RMSE	CC	MAE	Bias	RMSE	
CHIRPS	0.36	3.82	1.15	10.45	0.35	4.39	1.26	11.5	
TAMSAT	0.32	3.81	1.1	10.01	0.29	4.21	1.14	10.68	
GSMaP	0.44	3.29	1.1	10.25	0.4	3.49	0.99	10.36	
GSMaP wGauge	0.44	3.15	1	9.31	0.42	3.48	1.05	9.51	

	Sout	hern Afr	ica (N=	=49,509)	West Africa (N=197,895)				
	CC	MAE	Bias	RMSE	CC	MAE	Bias	RMSE	
CHIRPS	0.38	3.12	0.93	10.24	0.39	3.45	1.09	9.36	
TAMSAT	0.36	3.08	0.84	10.17	0.37	3.61	1.13	9.27	
GSMaP	0.51	2.6	0.89	9.71	0.46	3.27	1.23	10.27	
GSMaP_wGauge	0.48	2.67	0.86	9.67	0.46	2.94	0.97	9.03	

Pentad timescale

0.38

0.48

		Africa (l	N=87,6	22)	East Africa (N=38,447)				
	CC	MAE	Bias	RMSE	CC	MAE	Bias	RMSE	
CHIRPS	0.52	13.05	1.17	24.95	0.53	12.02	1.28	26.53	
TAMSAT	0.45	13.73	1.1	26.6	0.41	14.55	1.13	29.76	
GSMaP	0.5	13.15	1.07	27.54	0.47	15.41	0.97	28.89	
GSMaP_wGauge	0.53	12.01	0.99	24.77	0.52	13.19	1.05	25.78	

West Africa (N=197,895)

0.07

0.09

-0.12 0.51

CSI

0.43

0.48

CSI POD FAR Eff

0.3

0.35

0.35

0.71 0.34 -0.14 **0.52**

0.53

0.65

0.7

	Southern Africa (N=9,836)				West Africa (N=39,339)				
	CC	MAE	Bias	RMSE	CC	MAE	Bias	RMSE	
CHIRPS	0.58	10.5	0.95	25.01	0.51	12.22	1.1	23.3	
TAMSAT	0.52	11.09	0.84	26.2	0.5	12.76	1.13	23.23	
GSMaP	0.61	9.55	0.88	25.12	0.5	13.23	1.23	26.75	
GSMaP_wGauge	0.6	9.66	0.85	24.86	0.51	11.47	0.96	23.71	

Evaluation metrics: A, B, C, S & G represent hits, false alarms, misses, satellite estimate and gauge measurement, respectively

Evaluation metric	Formula	Unit	Best Value
Probability of Detection	$POD = \frac{A}{A+C}$	None	1
False Alarm Ratio	$FAR = \frac{B}{A+B}$	None	0
Correlation Coefficient	$\mathrm{CC} = \frac{\sum (G - \bar{G}) \left(S - \bar{S}\right)}{\sqrt{\sum (G - \bar{G})^2 \left(S - \bar{S}\right)^2}}$	None	1
Mean Absolute Error	$MAE = \left(\frac{1}{N}\right) \sum S - G $	mm	0
Root Mean Square Error	$\text{RMSE}=\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{N}\right)\sum(S-G)^2}$	mm	0
Efficiency	Eff=1 - $\frac{\sum (S-G)^2}{\sum (G-\overline{G})^2}$	None	1
Multiplicative Bias	Bias = $\frac{\sum S}{\sum G}$	None	1
Critical Success Index	$CSI = \frac{A}{A+B+C}$	None	1

	Africa (N=14,756)				East Africa (N=6,436)				
	CC	MAE	Bias	RMSE	CC	MAE	Bias	RMSE	
CHIRPS	0.66	50.92	1.18	85.85	0.64	58.45	1.29	94.36	
TAMSAT	0.6	53.79	1.12	89.8	0.53	63.23	1.16	102.84	
GSMaP	0.59	57.89	1.08	96.32	0.53	64.02	0.97	103.89	
GSMaP_wGauge	0.65	49.16	1	82.06	0.61	54.5	1.06	86.14	

	Southern Africa (N=1,678)				West Africa (N=6,642)				
	CC	MAE	Bias	RMSE	CC	MAE	Bias	RMSE	
CHIRPS	0.73	43.57	1	80.73	0.67	45.47	1.1	78.1	
TAMSAT	0.7	45.11	0.87	82.43	0.67	46.84	1.14	77.13	
GSMaP	0.72	42.13	0.9	81.25	0.63	55.93	1.23	92.11	
GSMaP_wGauge	0.71	42.4	0.89	82.02	0.66	45.7	0.98	77.92	

- Better rainfall events detection (POD, CSI) and skill (Bias, Eff) by GSMaP ٠ products
- Increasing RMSE and MAE with timescale aggregations ٠

Monthly timescale

SERVIR BEASTERN & Southerr

Results

Africa East Africa 1.0 0.9 0.8 0.7 Cumulative Frequency Southern Africa West Africa 0.8 0.7 0.6 0.5 100 75 25 50 75 50 100 Rainfall (mm)

Ability of SRPs to capture daily rainfall events







• Generally, all the SRPs overestimate (i.e. their CDF curves are below the TAHMO CDF) low intensity rainfall events (<20 mm/day) while all except GSMaP underestimate high intensity rainfall events (>20 mm/day)

GSMaP wGauge - TAHMO

• CHIRPS and TAMSAT CDFs show similar patterns; both have a higher overestimation of low rainfall events

TAMSAT - GSMaP

— CHIRPS

• CDFs of the two GSMaP products is closer to that of the TAHMO in-situ gauge data for the low intensity rainfall events

- Larger errors (RMSE) at higher elevations for all SRPs
- GSMaP products in general perform better for all metrics; GSMaP_Gauge shows better rainfall detection at higher elevation
- *GSMaP_Gauge shows a higher POD but also a higher FAR for all elevation categories

Results



← TAHMO ← CHIRPS ← TAMSAT ← GSMaP ← GSMaP_wGauge

- All the SRPs reproduce the annual rainfall cycle over each of the regions
- CHIRPS and TAMSAT overestimate (74% and 61%, respectively) the peak rain month in the long rains season in East Africa
- CHIRPS showed a wet bias (33%) for short rains peak month in East Africa while GSMaP_Gauge showed a dry bias (-21%)
- Small monthly biases in Southern Africa for all products compared with TAHMO station
 data



SERVIR BEASTER A South

- In West Africa, all the SRPs overestimate rainfall; CHIRPS and TAMSAT show larger over-estimations in the monsoon season (June – September) of around 36% over that period.
- GSMaP shows wet biases of between 10-80% in the months of March June in West Africa.
- Density of TAHMO stations with high correlations in West Africa and Southern Africa

Conclusions

Correlation between CHIRPS, TAMSAT, GSMaP, GSMaP_Gauge and in-situ data improves with temporal
aggregation. This improvement would be beneficial to general applications that require longer timescale (i.e.
monthly to annual scale) if the objective of such analyses is to detect long-term trends over large geographical
areas.

SERVIR Bastern & South

- Larger errors in CHIRPS and TAMSAT at daily timescale compared to the GSMaP rainfall products may be a limiting factor in water-balance modeling that requires higher rainfall detection capability at shorter timescales.
- Gauge-corrected products produced better correlations with reference gauge data but statistical errors increased with data aggregation over coarser timescales.
- The introduction of low-cost monitoring networks by TAHMO and the expansion of this network across Africa could provide a complementary and valuable new data resource for climate research in Africa.
- This research recommends the use of TAHMO data in validation of other satellite rainfall products over Africa and the integration of the TAHMO gauge data in gauge-satellite data integration algorithms.

SERVIR I AFRICA



REGIONAL CENTRE FOR MAPPING OF RESOURCES FOR DEVELOPMENT







SERVIR Focus Countries

Additional Countries Reached



RESOURCES FOR DEVELOPMENT Our Vision

Our Mission

To be a premier Centre of Excellence in provision of

Geo-Information services

To promote sustainable development through generation, application & dissemination of Geo-Information and allied ICT services and products in the Member States & beyond