

D.B.

**U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION  
OCEAN PRODUCTS CENTER**

**TECHNICAL NOTE**

**A PRELIMINARY EVALUATION OF SCATTEROMETER  
WIND TRANSFER FUNCTIONS FOR ERS-1 DATA**

**W. Gemmill, P. Woiceshyn<sup>(\*)</sup>, C. Peters<sup>(\*\*)</sup> and V. Gerald**

**NATIONAL METEOROLOGICAL CENTER  
WASHINGTON, D. C.  
NOVEMBER 1994**

**THIS IS AN UNREVIEWED MANUSCRIPT, PRIMARILY INTENDED FOR  
INTERNAL EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION**

---

**(\*) Present Affiliation  
Jet Propulsion Laboratory  
4800 Oak Drive  
Pasadena, CA, 91109**

---

**(\*\*) Present Affiliation  
General Science Corp.  
Laurel, MD., 20707**

**OPC Contribution No. 97**

## OPC CONTRIBUTIONS

- No. 1. Burroughs, L. D., 1987: Development of Forecast Guidance for Santa Ana Conditions. National Weather Digest, Vol. 12 No. 1, 7pp.
- No. 2. Richardson, W. S., D. J. Schwab, Y. Y. Chao, and D. M. Wright, 1986: Lake Erie Wave Height Forecasts Generated by Empirical and Dynamical Methods -- Comparison and Verification. Technical Note, 23pp.
- No. 3. Auer, S. J., 1986: Determination of Errors in LFM Forecasts Surface Lows Over the Northwest Atlantic Ocean. Technical Note/NMC Office Note No. 313, 17pp.
- No. 4. Rao, D. B., S. D. Steenrod, and B. V. Sanchez, 1987: A Method of Calculating the Total Flow from A Given Sea Surface Topography. NASA Technical Memorandum 87799, 19pp.
- No. 5. Feit, D. M., 1986: Compendium of Marine Meteorological and Oceanographic Products of the Ocean Products Center. NOAA Technical Memorandum NWS NMC 68, 93pp.
- No. 6. Auer, S. J., 1986: A Comparison of the LFM, Spectral, and ECMWF Numerical Model Forecasts of Deepening Oceanic Cyclones During One Cool Season. Technical Note/NMC Office Note No. 312, 20pp.
- No. 7. Burroughs, L. D., 1987: Development of Open Fog Forecasting Regions. Technical Note/NMC Office Note. No. 323, 36pp.
- No. 8. Yu, T. W., 1987: A Technique of Deducing Wind Direction from Satellite Measurements of Wind Speed. Monthly Weather Review, 115, 1929-1939.
- No. 9. Auer, S. J., 1987: Five-Year Climatological Survey of the Gulf Stream System and Its Associated Rings. Journal of Geophysical Research, 92, 11,709-11,726.
- No. 10. Chao, Y. Y., 1987: Forecasting Wave Conditions Affected by Currents and Bottom Topography. Technical Note, 11pp.
- No. 11. Esteva, D. C., 1987: The Editing and Averaging of Altimeter Wave and Wind Data. Technical Note, 4pp.
- No. 12. Feit, D. M., 1987: Forecasting Superstructure Icing for Alaskan Waters. National Weather Digest, 12, 5-10.
- No. 13. Sanchez, B. V., D. B. Rao, S. D. Steenrod, 1987: Tidal Estimation in the Atlantic and Indian Oceans. Marine Geodesy, 10, 309-350.
- No. 14. Gemmill, W.H., T.W. Yu, and D.M. Feit 1988: Performance of Techniques Used to Derive Ocean Surface Winds. Technical Note/NMC Office Note No. 330, 34pp.
- No. 15. Gemmill, W.H., T.W. Yu, and D.M. Feit 1987: Performance Statistics of Techniques Used to Determine Ocean Surface Winds. Conference Preprint, Workshop Proceedings AES/CMOS 2nd Workshop of Operational Meteorology, Halifax, Nova Scotia, 234-243.
- No. 16. Yu, T.W., 1988: A Method for Determining Equivalent Depths of the Atmospheric Boundary Layer Over the Oceans. Journal of Geophysical Research, 93, 3655-3661.
- No. 17. Yu, T.W., 1987: Analysis of the Atmospheric Mixed Layer Heights Over the Oceans. Conference Preprint, Workshop Proceedings AES/CMOS 2nd Workshop of Operational Meteorology, Halifax, Nova Scotia, 2, 425-432.
- No. 18. Feit, D. M., 1987: An Operational Forecast System for Superstructure Icing. Proceedings Fourth Conference Meteorology and Oceanography of the Coastal Zone, 4pp.
- No. 19. Esteva, D.C., 1988: Evaluation of Preliminary Experiments Assimilating Seasat Significant Wave Height into a Spectral Wave Model. Journal of Geophysical Research, 93, 14,099-14,105.
- No. 20. Chao, Y.Y., 1988: Evaluation of Wave Forecast for the Gulf of Mexico. Proceedings Fourth Conference Meteorology and Oceanography of the Coastal Zone, 42-49.

## ABSTRACT

Transfer functions for ERS-1 scatterometer wind data have been evaluated at NMC along with the "fast-delivery" wind vectors from The European Space Agency (ESA) to provide improved wind vectors for use in numerical weather prediction models. The "fast-delivery" wind vector data from ESA were often found to be incorrectly de-aliased. Fortunately, the data received from ESA also contain the raw sigma-0 values which make it possible to process the vector retrievals directly using specified empirical transfer functions. This study was carried out using quality control (QC) procedures developed at the National Meteorological Center (NMC) to eliminate bad data points and duplicate reports. The directional selection algorithms were adapted from the U.K. Meteorological Office. Since several wind vector solutions may result from each transfer function, the direction is determined by a minimization method, using the NMC global surface wind analysis as background guidance during the procedure.

The selected wind vectors were then evaluated using one year's data from the NOAA fixed buoy network covering the northern hemisphere mid-latitudes and the TOGA buoy network covering the tropics. Of the five functions that were evaluated, two performed consistently better. The transfer function finally selected for operational processing was identical to the transfer function used by the "fast-delivery" product at ESA, however, the NMC winds are derived using different minimization and ambiguity removal procedures. The statistical comparisons show that there was a distinct improvement in the wind directions processed by NMC (RMS of 31 degrees), when compared to those processed by ESA (RMS of 57 degrees).

## INTRODUCTION.

The European Space Agency (ESA) launched the ERS-1 spacecraft in July of 1991. The spacecraft data include measurements from a radar (scatterometer) that are used to estimate wind vectors at the sea surface. ESA made these data available daily to a few selected operational Meteorological Centers for their evaluation of the data for operational use.

The ERS-1 scatterometer is an active, five cm microwave instrument that measures the radar backscatter from gravity-capillary waves at the ocean surface. This backscatter is then related to wind stress (and wind) through the use of a radar backscatter-to-wind transfer function. Since more than two measurements of backscattered power are necessary to resolve directional ambiguity in the wind data, this scatterometer was designed with three antennae to measure the backscatter from the ocean surface. The satellite follows a polar-orbit of 98 degrees of inclination and the time it takes to complete an orbit is about 102 minutes. This provides about three and one-half orbits per six hour period (about 14 orbits per day). The data coverage of backscatter measurements is across a swath of about 500km wide, with 19 cells across the swath at about 25 km apart. The spatial resolution is about 50 km for the measurement of each cell. The characteristics of the ERS-1 scatterometer wind data are presented in Table 1. The satellite coverage for a typical 6 hour period is shown in figure 1. The geometry of the satellite and its scatterometer wind cell distribution over the ocean surface is shown in figure 2.

NMC began receiving the fast delivery (FD) scatterometer wind data taken by the ERS-1 satellite from ESA during the spring of 1992. But, an evaluation of the ESA FD wind vectors showed that there were several deficiencies (mainly wrong directions) that made the wind data unacceptable for use in analysis and forecast models. Fortunately, the FD data include not only the wind vector (speed and direction) data as processed by ESA, but also the raw sigma-0 radar backscatter parameters, incident angles and pointing angle with related noise and quality parameters for each of the three antennae of the scatterometer. Since the raw data were available, it was decided that NMC should develop its own processing system in an attempt to improve the retrieved satellite ocean surface winds.

The ESA FD wind vector data were objectively evaluated using data from buoys and also subjectively compared with surface weather maps. These efforts clearly showed that, although the satellite derived wind speeds appear to meet specifications, the ESA selected directions do not. A sample of wind vectors obtained from ESA are shown in Figure 3. It is evident that the winds do not depict a consistent meteorological flow pattern. In addition, figure 4 shows that there are often duplicate vectors which may differ slightly in position and selected direction in the fast delivery product of ESA.

A major concern for operational weather centers, such as NMC, is that the data must arrive in a timely manner (near real-time) in order to be ingested into analysis and forecast models at the synoptic cycle times. The data must be received and be available no more than 3 hours after observation time, if it is to be used by the forecast model. An examination of the timeliness of the data received from ESA shows that most of the data meet the required time constraint. A sample recording of satellite observation times to receipt time at NMC computers are presented in figure 5. Occasionally, there are longer delays which prevents the use of the data for global forecast model, but as long as they are received at NMC with 8 hours they are still useful to the NMC Global Data Assimilation System (GDAS) which runs last in the operational cycle in order to ingest as much late data as possible into the final analysis. The analysis procedure (GDAS) is described in detail by Parrish & Derber(1992) and Derber, Parrish & Lord (1993) .

The NMC/JPL processing system consists of four steps: 1) quality control (QC) procedures, 2) a transfer function which converts the raw sigma-0 values to wind vectors (unfortunately with multiple solutions), 3) a least squares minimization algorithm to determine each of the multiple vector solutions and 4) the directional selection procedure to select the most likely wind vector. Some of the details on these steps were presented by Woiceshyn (1993).

A brief description of the evaluation of the transfer functions has been presented by Peters et al (1994a). At that time seven months of data had been collected. This paper will present some general statistics which were used to justify the selection of the transfer function which was implemented as part of NMC operations. The details concerning the processed ERS-1 winds vector data now available within NMC are described by Peters et al (1994b).

## QUALITY CONTROL

Automated quality control procedures are required when processing large quantities of satellite data in real-time. It is necessary to remove erroneous data from entering into the analysis system, which may be due to any number of problems which are encountered in the flow of data between the satellite and the operational center. The data initially received from ESA are decoded from BUFR messages and collocated with the NMC Global Model wind, humidity, air temperature and sea surface temperature (SST) fields, either from the GDAS or from a six hour forecast. Since several ground stations may be processing data blocks along the satellite orbit, the data may not arrive at a particular meteorological center in a consistent time and position sequence. The result is data blocks that are out of order, missing or even duplicated. Duplicate blocks can occur when the data are received from more than one ground processing station and can even result not quite at identical positions. Thus, the data are sorted into an ordered time/location sequence along the orbit and duplicates are removed. Other QC checks include using the global SST analysis to identify and discard observations assumed to be over ice (i.e., where the SST is less

than zero degrees centigrade) or discard those over land, ensuring that all three beams were functioning properly (resulting in three sigma naught measurements) and that the backscatter noise to signal ratio was less than 10%.

## SCATTEROMETER WIND TRANSFER FUNCTION MODELS

An empirically based transfer function converts the radar backscatter parameters: sigma-0, look angle, and incident angle from three antennae into wind vectors: wind speed and direction at height of 10m over the ocean. It is necessary to use empirical transfer functions because the properties of backscatter radar signal from the ocean surface are yet too complex for direct theoretical conversion to wind vectors. In this study, five transfer functions were selected to compute wind vectors. These wind vectors as well as the wind vector data from ESA were then evaluated. The CMOD4 transfer function (developed at ECMWF) has gone through post-launch refinements and retuning, is generally accepted as the operational processing algorithm and it is now used by some meteorological centers. ESA uses the CMOD4 transfer function in its processing of the FD wind vector data. Offiler (1994) reviewed the developments of CMOD4 and shows that those scatterometer winds, when compared to special measurements and wind analyses over the North Sea, meet the ERS-1 user requirements for accuracy of 2 m/s RMS (or 10%, whichever is higher) and 20 degrees for direction. The transfer functions are identified in Table 2 and their functional forms are presented in the Appendix.

Identification	Originator
CMOD 4	ECMWF
CMOD 5I	IFREMER
CMOD 5L	ESA
CMOD 6	University of Hamburg
CMOD 7	NASA-JPL/Oregon State University
ESA CMOD4	ESA "fast delivery"

Table 2

Unfortunately, the transfer functions do not provide unique solutions for the wind vectors. There may be as many as six solutions, (but more likely four) depending on the wind direction relative to the direction of the satellite scatterometer antennae. A combination of two look-up tables generated "off-line" from the specific transfer function, a quadratic function, and derivatives of that function are used during the minimization process to determine the multiple wind vector solutions at each measurement cell node.

A statistical ranking procedure is employed to determine the probabilities of each vector solution as being "correct", using a cost function. Finally, the selection of the most likely wind vector is modified by the indirect use of an ocean surface wind

analysis. For this study, the winds were obtained from the NMC global surface wind analysis provided by the GDAS. These "background" winds are used to modify the probabilities of the valid scatterometer wind vectors, taking into account the likely error of both the analysis and scatterometer wind vector solution.

An important difference to note on the selection of wind direction between ESA processing and NMC processing in this study is that the ESA wind product uses the ECMWF 18 to 36 hour wind forecast fields, whereas the NMC wind product uses the current analysis.

To check the local consistency of the wind vectors, a 5X5 node array "modal" filter is passed through the two-dimensional wind vector field in the scatterometer data swath. This filter is similar to a buddy check for vector to vector consistency, which is referred to as a Sequential Local Iterative Consistency Estimator (SLICE), and was developed at the UK Meteorological Office by Offiler (1992). He states, "SLICE should be considered as being an algorithm which 'tidies up' the scatterometer swath to be self-consistent, particularly in cases where the background wind is locally incorrect (e. g. location of low pressure centres)." Each scatterometer measurement location is sequentially processed in an across- and along-track spacecraft direction. If a local inconsistency is determined by SLICE, the probabilities are modified according to the fit of each wind solution to the local wind field. The wind vector solutions are then re-ranked. SLICE is iteratively repeated in alternative directions until fewer than a threshold number of locations had their ranking changed. No probability and re-ranking modifications are made if inconsistency is not detected by the SLICE algorithm. SLICE in this operation can be considered as a two-dimensional "filter" to provide a quality controlled field of consistent wind vectors along the satellite track.

The total processing package developed at NMC combines software to unpack from BUFR, match the individual scatterometer measurements with model values, and quality control the data, with minimization and wind vector selection algorithms adapted from the UK Met. Office (Offiler, 1992). The final result is a data set containing unique wind vectors at each scatterometer measurement node, which we will henceforth refer to as the "NMC/JPL Processed Product".

## DATA MATCH-UPS

The data collected for this study covers a one year period, from September 9, 1993 through September 9, 1994. A program was executed four times a day to collocate the NMC Processed ERS-1 scatterometer satellite data (time, position, ESA wind speed and direction, and the radar backscatter information for the three antennae), with NMC wind analyses and with wind data from the NOAA's National Data Buoy Center (NDBC) fixed buoy network and the Tropical Ocean Global Atmosphere (TOGA) moored buoys. The NDBC buoys provided data that meet the speed and direction accuracy specification of +/- 1.0 m/s and 10 degrees, respectively, based on

8.5 minute averages (Gilhousen, 1987). The NDBC buoys take wind measurements at heights ranging from 5m to 15m. The wind data received from the TOGA buoys have been averaged for one hour taken at a height of 3.8m (Hayes et al, 1991).

Buoy data were matched up with satellite data four times per day at 00, 06, 12, 18 UTC for data within a +/- 3 hour window and within 1.5 degrees radius of the buoy location. The wind analysis was taken from the surface wind analysis of GDAS, by interpolating to the location of the satellite cell node. Unfortunately, the height of the wind measurements is not the same: the GDAS winds are provided at a height of about 45m, the buoy wind observations are measured at heights ranging from 3.8m for the TOGA buoys and from 5m to 15m for the NDBC buoys whereas the scatterometer winds are specified at 10m (all heights are above sea level). It was necessary to adjust all wind speed data to the height of the satellite estimate (10m), which was done using the simple neutral log wind profile relation. The location of buoy data used in this study are identified in figures 6a,b,c.

The raw sigma-0 measurements are QC'ed by the methods described above. Using an empirical transfer function, solutions for up to six directions (ambiguities) may be obtained. The minimization, ranking, wind field background fit and SLICE techniques are applied to obtain a set of consistent satellite wind vectors. This process is repeated five times, once for each transfer function. The ESA data are QC'ed only by virtue of collocation to the QC'ed NMC processed data. The remaining ESA wind vectors are accepted as they are delivered. The data are then ready to be evaluated.

## STATISTICAL EVALUATION

Ocean surface winds obtained 1) from utilizing through the five transfer functions and scatterometer measurements from the ERS1 satellite, 2) from NMC analyses and 3) from buoys can now be compared by calculating various statistical measures. For this study, only the high-seas buoys will be used to avoid land contamination on the satellite data and/or to land induced local circulations. The satellite derived wind vectors were collocated within a 0.5 degree latitude, longitude box with the buoy at the center (a subset of the original data), and within +/- 3 hour of the observation. This time and space specification of collocation was chosen to be similar to the scales used by GDAS (for the AVN & MRF models) to make super-obs of high density data. This specification for the co-location of match-ups is coarser than what is required for algorithm development and validation which is usually specified to be +/- 30 minutes and 25 km. The statistics from these data match-ups will then be poorer than those presented from validation reports, because of the difference in time and space, but also, because only superficial QC has been applied to the buoy data. To determine the impact of time and space scales on averaging in the comparisons, the satellite data can be assigned to other time and space windows. It is also important to observe that although these winds are all at a common reference height (10m), there are differences in time and space scales of the wind measurement made by buoys, satellites and analyses. The buoy makes a "spot" measurement averaged for 8.5



minutes (NDBC) or 1 hour (TOGA), the satellite measurement is spatially averaged (50km) and takes 2 to 7 minutes for collocation of the three antennae, and the model is a spatially averaged and smoothed estimate at a given time. The NDBC and TOGA buoys will be used as the "sea-truth" for this study.

Table 3 shows some composite statistics for the evaluation based on all the data. The sample size is the total number of satellite data points that were matched to buoys; calm winds were included in the speed but not the direction statistics. The left side of the table presents the mean speed and standard deviation for each data source (satellite, model, buoy), whereas, the right side presents comparison statistics between the data sources: for the bias, RMS, speed correlation, an average Figure of Merit (FoM) and a vector correlation which is defined by Crosby et al (1993). The Figure of Merit is a composite type of statistic which measures how close the satellite derived wind speeds and directions meet specifications. It includes the bias, standard deviation, RMS and the vector RMS for comparisons with buoys and analyses. A FoM greater than one indicates the derived wind data are meeting the specified requirements. The average Figure of Merit is defined as:

$$FoM = (F1 + F2 + F3)/3$$

where  $F1 = 40 / (SPD(bias) + 10SPD(sd) + DIR(bias) + DIR(sd))$   
 $F2 = (2/SPD(rms) + 20/DIR(rms)) / 2$   
 $F3 = 4 / Vector(rms)$

In order to determine more easily which wind transfer function performed best when compared to the buoys, each of the transfer functions was ranked in order of performance (1 is best and 6 is worst) by each of the statistical categories.

TABLE 3a  
 BUOY VS TRANSFER FUNCTION WIND STATISTICS

NDBC and TOGA buoys, High Seas, All Data  
 Space Box: 0.5 degree, Time Window: +/- 3 hours  
 Dates 93 09 09 - 94 09 09

--- CMOD 4            Number: 9371

	SAT	MOD	BUOY		SAT - MOD	SAT - BUOY	MOD - BUOY
MEAN SPD	6.3	6.7	6.9	SPD BIAS	-0.3	-0.5	-0.2
SD SPD	2.8	2.8	2.7	SPD RMS	1.7	1.8	1.9
				SPD CORR	0.82	0.80	0.77
				DIR RMS	23	31	29
				VECT CORR	0.92	0.87	0.89
				FOM	1.15	0.93	0.97
SPD MAX	20.7	21.7	20.1				
NUM CALM	0	0	107				

--- CMOD 5I Number: 9310

	SAT	MOD	BUOY		SAT - MOD	SAT - BUOY	MOD - BUOY
MEAN SPD	7.2	6.7	6.9	SPD BIAS	0.5	0.3	-0.2
SD SPD	3.1	2.8	2.7	SPD RMS	1.8	1.8	1.9
				SPD CORR	0.83	0.82	0.77
				DIR RMS	23	32	29
				VECT CORR	0.92	0.88	0.89
				FOM	1.10	0.92	0.97
SPD MAX	20.7	21.7	20.1				
NUM CALM	0	0	104				

--- CMOD 5L Number: 9224

	SAT	MOD	BUOY		SAT - MOD	SAT - BUOY	MOD - BUOY
MEAN SPD	5.5	6.7	6.9	SPD BIAS	-1.2	-1.4	-0.2
SD SPD	3.3	2.8	2.7	SPD RMS	2.2	2.4	1.9
				SPD CORR	0.83	0.81	0.76
				DIR RMS	24	32	28
				VECT CORR	0.90	0.85	0.89
				FOM	1.04	0.85	0.97
SPD MAX	21.8	21.7	20.1				
NUM CALM	0	0	88				

--- CMOD 6 Number: 9322

	SAT	MOD	BUOY		SAT - MOD	SAT - BUOY	MOD - BUOY
MEAN SPD	5.6	6.7	6.8	SPD BIAS	-1.1	-1.3	-0.2
SD SPD	2.9	2.8	2.7	SPD RMS	2.1	2.2	1.9
				SPD CORR	0.79	0.77	0.77
				DIR RMS	28	35	29
				VECT CORR	0.90	0.85	0.89
				FOM	0.99	0.84	0.97
SPD MAX	21.1	21.7	20.1				
NUM CALM	0	0	103				

--- CMOD 7 Number: 9025

	SAT	MOD	BUOY		SAT - MOD	SAT - BUOY	MOD - BUOY
MEAN SPD	6.1	6.8	7.0	SPD BIAS	-0.7	-0.9	-0.2
SD SPD	3.5	2.7	2.6	SPD RMS	2.2	2.3	1.9
				SPD CORR	0.80	0.80	0.76
				DIR RMS	28	37	27
				VECT CORR	0.90	0.85	0.90
				FOM	0.96	0.81	1.00
SPD MAX	26.3	21.7	20.1				
NUM CALM	0	0	70				

--- ESA                    Number: 8755

	SAT	MOD	BUOY		SAT - MOD	SAT - BUOY	MOD - BUOY
MEAN SPD	6.5	6.8	7.0	SPD BIAS	-0.3	-0.5	-0.2
SD SPD	2.7	2.8	2.6	SPD RMS	1.6	1.7	1.9
				SPD CORR	0.82	0.80	0.76
				DIR RMS	56	57	28
				VECT CORR	0.75	0.71	0.90
				FOM	0.75	0.71	0.99
SPD MAX	20.0	21.7	20.1				
NUM CALM	0	0	72				

Table 3b  
TRANSFER FUNCTION RANKINGS

NDBC and TOGA buoys, High Seas, All Data  
Space Box: 0.5 degree, Time Window: +/- 3 hours  
Dates 93 09 09 - 94 09 09

	CMOD4	CMOD5I	CMOD5L	CMOD6	CMOD7	ESA
SPD BIAS	2	1	6	5	4	2
SPD RMS	2	2	6	4	5	1
SPD COR	3	1	2	6	3	3
DIR RMS	1	2	3	4	5	6
VECT CORR	2	1	3	3	3	6
FOM	1	2	3	4	5	6

These data are further stratified by season, winter and summer and geographical location, mid-latitude and tropical to compute the error statistics. These are presented in the following tables.

Table 4 presents the statistics for the mid-latitude NDBC buoys for the winter months, November 1, 1993 through April 31, 1994.

Table 5 presents the NDBC buoys for the summer months September 9, through October 31, 1993 and May 1, through September 9, 1994.

Table 6 presents the statistics for the tropical TOGA buoys for the winter months, November 1993 through April, 1994.

Table 7 presents the TOGA buoys for summer months September 9, through October, 1993 and May through September 9, 1994.

TABLE 4a

## BUOYS VS TRANSFER FUNCTION WIND STATISTICS

NDBC Mid-latitude, High-Seas, Winter Data  
 Space Box: 0.5 degree, Time Window: +/- 3 hours  
 Date 93 11 01 - 94 04 31

--- CMOD 4            Number: 3114

	SAT	MOD	BUOY		SAT - MOD	SAT - BUOY	MOD - BUOY
MEAN SPD	7.3	7.8	7.6	SPD BIAS	-0.4	-0.3	0.1
SD SPD	3.2	3.4	3.1	SPD RMS	1.9	2.1	2.3
				SPD CORR	0.85	0.80	0.76
				DIR RMS	24	37	33
				VECT CORR	0.93	0.86	0.89
				FOM	1.07	0.78	0.80
SPD MAX	20.4	21.7	19.1				
NUM CALM	0	0	33				

--- CMOD 5I           Number: 3082

	SAT	MOD	BUOY		SAT - MOD	SAT - BUOY	MOD - BUOY
MEAN SPD	8.2	7.8	7.7	SPD BIAS	0.4	0.5	0.1
SD SPD	3.4	3.4	3.1	SPD RMS	1.9	2.1	2.3
				SPD CORR	0.86	0.81	0.76
				DIR RMS	23	36	27
				VECT CORR	0.73	0.87	0.89
				FOM	1.06	0.77	0.80
SPD MAX	20.0	21.7	19.1				
NUM CALM	0	0	33				

--- CMOD 5L           Number: 3090

	SAT	MOD	BUOY		SAT - MOD	SAT - BUOY	MOD - BUOY
MEAN SPD	6.7	7.8	7.7	SPD BIAS	-1.1	-1.0	-0.1
SD SPD	3.8	3.4	3.1	SPD RMS	2.3	2.5	2.3
				SPD CORR	0.85	0.80	0.76
				DIR RMS	23	36	33
				VECT CORR	0.92	0.86	0.89
				FOM	1.00	0.74	0.80
SPD MAX	21.8	21.7	19.1				
NUM CALM	0	0	29				

--- CMOD 6            Number:    3100

	SAT	MOD	BUOY		SAT - MOD	SAT - BUOY	MOD - BUOY
MEAN SPD	6.6	7.8	7.6	SPD BIAS	-1.1	-1.0	0.1
SD SPD	3.1	3.4	4.2	SPD RMS	2.3	2.4	2.3
				SPD CORR	0.82	0.76	0.76
				DIR RMS	29	40	33
				VECT CORR	0.92	0.85	0.88
				FOM	0.93	0.74	0.80
SPD MAX	21.1	21.7	19.1				
NUM CALM	0	0	33				

--- CMOD 7            Number:    3011

	SAT	MOD	BUOY		SAT - MOD	SAT - BUOY	MOD - BUOY
MEAN SPD	7.2	7.8	7.7	SPD BIAS	-0.6	-0.5	0.1
SD SPD	4.0	3.3	3.1	SPD RMS	2.3	2.5	2.2
				SPD CORR	0.84	0.79	0.76
				DIR RMS	27	41	31
				VECT CORR	0.92	0.86	0.89
				FOM	0.94	0.71	0.83
SPD MAX	26.3	21.7	19.1				
NUM CALM	0	0	26				

--- ESA                Number:    3026

	SAT	MOD	BUOY		SAT - MOD	SAT - BUOY	MOD - BUOY
MEAN SPD	7.4	7.8	7.7	SPD BIAS	-0.4	-0.3	0.1
SD SPD	3.1	3.3	3.1	SPD RMS	1.8	2.1	2.2
				SPD CORR	0.85	0.79	0.76
				DIR RMS	60	62	32
				VECT CORR	0.77	0.75	0.89
				FOM	0.66	0.62	0.82
SPD MAX	17.6	21.7	19.1				
NUM CALM	0	0	27				

---