Comparison of temperature data collected by XBT and CTD instruments in a mesoscale eddy dominated environment

Morris T.¹, Ternon J-F.² and Roberts M.J.^{1,3}

¹Bayworld Centre for Research and Education, Cape Town, South Africa ²Institut de Recherché pour le Développement, La Réunion ³Department of Environmental Affairs, Cape Town, South Africa



Background

- *Flow discontinuous
- *Forcing Rossby waves?
- *Southward (poleward) propagation of 4-5 anti-cyclones per year (8.6 Sv; std dev – 14.1 Sv)
- *Less consistent and weaker cyclones



(Tew-Kai and Marsac, 2010)

*Northward undercurrent ~1500-2500 m (1.5 Sv)

*Thermohaline circulation contribution

Harlander et al (2009), Lutjeharms (2006), Schouten et al (2003)

XBT Bias and Fall-rate Workshop, Hamburg, Germany - 25-27 August 2010

Background

First evidence of biological coupling to mesoscale eddies – frigate bird foraging

MESOBIO – Study the influence of MESOscale dynamics on BIOlogical productivity at multiple trophic levels in the Mozambique Channel



(Weimerskirch et al., 2004 Photo credit: Trevor Hardaker)

*spatial and temporal scale research
*multi-disciplinary teams
*limited ships time – hence the use of XBT's to compliment
CTD deployments

Drop separation: CTD and XBT stations



XBT Bias and Fall-rate Workshop, Hamburg, **Drop distance (km)** Germany - 25-27 August 2010

Cruise data (SSH imagery)

Nansen 2008 Cruise

•December (summer); North - central channel •CTD specifications:

> •Standard SBE 3+ temperature sensor •Calibrated: 25 July 2007 (~16 months) No calibrations sampled

•XBT specifications:

•Sippican T-7 (760 m depth rating) •H95 (IGOSS) drop rate equation





Antéa 2010 Cruise

•April / May (Autumn); North - central channel •CTD specifications:

•Standard SBE 3+ temperature sensor

- Calibrated: 27 Feb 2009 (~14 months)
- No calibrations sampled

•XBT specifications:

•Sippican Deep Blue (900 m depth rating) •H95 (IGOSS) drop rate equation (re-

XBT Bias and Fall-rate Workshop, Hamburg, processed after cruise) Germany - 25-27 August 2010

Methods for temperature comparison

*Data handling – processing

*Data plotting and representation – MatLab

*Data interpolation – MatLab scripts (interp); CTD pressure to depth

*Statistics (basic) calculations

*Comparisons: 1) 0-100 m 2) 100 m – max. depth 3) Entire water column

*Vertical sections – Ocean Data View





Methods for temperature comparison cont...



Methods for temperature comparison cont...



Nansen 2008 temperature comparison

°C	Average (total)	Std. Dev (total)	Average (<100 m)	Std. Dev (<100 m)	Average (>100 m)	Std. Dev (>100 m)
All data	-0.26	± 0.37	-0.33	± 0.56	-0.22	±0.21
0-5 km	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
5-10 km	-0.22	± 0.09	-0.22	± 0.57	-0.25	± 0.06
10-15 km	-0.13	± 0.41	-0.04	± 0.42	-0.27	±0.16
15-20 km	-0.34	± 0.42	-0.52	± 0.59	-0.18	±0.28
*XBT warm b	ias for all cate	egories	Highest std. deviation			

Nansen 2008 temperature comparison



Antéa 2010 temperature comparison

°C	Average (total)	Std. Dev (total)	Average (<100 m)	Std. Dev (<100 m)	Average (>100 m)	Std. Dev (>100 m)
All data	-0.25	± 0.27	-0.09	± 0.63	-0.27	±0.29
0-5 km	-0.14	± 0.27	-0.19	± 0.89	-0.05	± 0.17
5-10 km	-0.21	± 0.25	-0.32	± 0.64	-0.21	±0.20
10-15 km	-0.26	± 0.30	0.03	± 0.59	-0.30	±0.28
15-20 km	-0.32	± 0.30	0.04	± 0.59	-0.38	± 0.34
*XBT warm b except <100 m for 1 (not signific	ias for most o 10-15 and 15- cant)	ategories, 20 km catego	Highest std. deviation			

Antéa 2010 temperature comparison



XBT Bias and Fall-rate Workshop, Hamburg,



Data correction

Antéa 2010 Cruise N-S transect (interpolation same)



Conclusions

*Current data sets ill-suited for this type of comparison (distances)

- *Overall XBT bias (0.25 °C) for both cruises
- *Greatest std. dev. in upper 100m
- *CTD warm bias in upper 100 m coastal upwelling
- *Complete CTD bias eddy frontal regions (high variability)
- *Correction by average warming no real change

*For meso-scale work, bias perhaps not as critical as for micro-scale research

Acknowledgements

Our thanks to the following groups and individuals:

- 1)Dr. Viktor Gouretski and the CliSAP-Office at the KlimaCampus, University of Hamburg for travel arrangements to participate in this workshop.
- 2)Bayworld Centre for Research and Education for additional funding support to attend the workshop.
- 3)Funders on the various cruises include: GEF, ASCLME Project, UNDP, FAO-Nansen Project, IRD, WIOMSA, Genavir, SWIOFP, Bayworld Centre for Research and Education, DEA, the NRF and ACEP II Project.
- 4)The officers and crew of the *Dr. Fridtjof Nansen* and the *N/O Antéa* for the help and support during data collection.
- 5)Scientific and technical teams onboard the cruises for their assistance in data collection and processing.
- 6)Dr. Molly Baringer from NOAA, Mr. Tim Boyer from the NODC and Grant Johnson and Wolfgang Schlegel from Lockheed Martin Sippican for their help in terms of XBT fall rate equations and temperature data interpolation.

XBT Bias and Fall-rate Workshop, Hamburg, Germany - 25-27 August 2010









References

Harlander, U., H. Ridderinkhof, M. W. Schouten and W. P. M. de Ruijter (2009). Long-term observations of transport, eddies and Rossby waves in the Mozambique Channel. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 114, C02003, doi:10.1029/2008JC004846.

Lutjeharms, J. R. E. (2006). The Agulhas Current. Springer.

Schlitzer, R. (2009). Ocean Data View, <u>http://odv.awi.de</u>.

Shouten, M. W., de Ruitjer, W. P. M., van Leeuwen, P. J., and Ridderinkhof, H. (2003). Eddies and variability in the Mozambique Channel. *Deep-Sea Research II*, 50:1987–2003.

Tew Kai, E. and F. Marsac (2010). Influence of mesoscale eddies on spatial structuring of top predators' communities in the Mozambique Channel. *Progress in Oceanography*, 86, 214-223.

Weimerskirch, H., M. Le Corre, S. Jaquemet, M. Potier, F. Marsac (2004). Foraging strategy of a top predator in tropical waters: great frigatebirds in the Mozambique Channel. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 275, 297-308.

XBT Bias and Fall-rate Workshop, Hamburg, Germany - 25-27 August 2010