Modeling quality objectives in the framework of the FAIRMODE project: working document.

Authors: D. Pernigotti, P. Thunis and M. Gerboles

Table of contents

Summary of previous papers and scope of this work

Thunis et al. (2012) (here referred as **T2012**) proposed to use as Model Quality Objective (**MQO**) an indicator based on the Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) between measured and modeled concentrations divided by the Root Mean Square of the measurement Uncertainty (RMSU). This methodology is based on a simplified formulation of the measurement uncertainty as a function of the measured concentration. The best fit coefficients for the NO2 and PM10 uncertainties were estimated in Pernigotti et al. (2013, here referred as **P2013**).

In the first section we first describe the errata found in the calculations for NO2 uncertainty in P2013 (calculation based on year 2009 data). Corrected fitting coefficients are calculated for 2009 and kept as reference. We then assess the robustness of this corrected coefficients by repeating the same calculation on two independent dataset (i.e. other years).
In the derivation of the yearly NO2 and PM10 MQO, the formulation is simplified by assuming a linear relationship between the averaged concentration and the standard deviation of the

measurements. In the second section we discuss the validity of this assumption (see P2013 for more details).

In the third section we extend the methodology to PM2.5 and NOx while in the last section a first and preliminary attempt to extend the methodology to wind and temperature is presented

Review of the MQO formulation for NO2

Errata Corrige

Unfortunately an error was found in the scripts used for the statistical calculations of the NO2 model quality objective. A consequence of this error is that some uncertainty terms have been neglected (see Annex for details), i.e. the PAN (only for non-traffic stations) and HNO2 related uncertainty terms. Neglecting these terms results in an underestimation of the non-proportional terms by about 6 ug/m3 (importnat at the lowest range of concentrations) but this is for the worst case considered, i.e. non-traffic stations. The overall NO2 uncertainty is however underestimated only by about 3 ug/m3 as part of the error was mitigated by the fact that the rpan term was set to the lowest value of 0.41ppb for more than 50% of the stations (traffic stations) and by the combination of NO and NOx uncertainty in the NO2 uncertainty calculation (see P2013 annex).

For non traffic stations (the worst case) the non-proportional term is underestimated by 39.2 $(\square g/m^3)^2$. From the comparison of the statistics in the Table 1 we find that the underestimation for the NO2 uncertainty was $\Delta q = 9(\square g/m^3)^2$, as part of the error was mitigated by the fact that the rpan term was set to the lowest value of 0.41ppb for more than 50% of the stations (traffic stations) and by the combination of NO and NOx uncertainty in the NO2 uncertainty calculation (see P2013 annex).

A comparison of the fitting parameters before and after correction is presented in the table below.

	2009 (corrected)	P2013
m	0.01	0.01
q	22	13
DQO	0.12	0.12
alpha	0.04	0.02
(yearly data) Np	5	5
(yearly data) Nnp	12	7

Table 1: Corrected (P2013) and old fitting parameters for hourly and yearly NO2 uncertainties

After correction, the relative uncertainty generally increases (Fig 2), by about 20% for concentrations around $5 \mu g/m^3$, 10% around $5 \mu g/m^3$, 4% at $20 \mu g/m^3$, 2% at $40 \mu g/m^{3,}$, and 1% around $75 \mu g/m^3$.

For the yearly uncertainty the correction leads to an increase of the non proportional component. In P2013 we arbitrarily chose $2(\mu g/m^3)^2$ as a minimum fixed level of uncertainty to make sure that our approximate simplified uncertainty function always overestimate the measured uncertainties in the low range of NO2 concentrations (conservative approach). Following the same reasoning with the corrected values we now increased this value to $4(\mu g/m^3)^2$, see following figure (purple line in Fig1).However the two lines (see Fig 3) obtained with the corrected and P2013 formulations do not differ significantly.

In the following the corrected numbers (referred to as P2013C) will be kept as reference, i.e. the left column in the above table.


Fig1:

Robustness of the formulation

The P2013 and P2013C uncertainty estimates have been obtained with the Airbase data for the year 2009 (994 stations for a total of 7421864 hourly data). We apply here the same methodology for years 2008 (849 stations, 6388781 data) and 2006 (615 stations, 4433322 data) to test the robustness of the fitting parameters.

The following table compares the P2013C 2009 results with the results obtained with the 2006 and 2008 data.

	2009 (P2013C)	2006	2008
m	0.01	0.01	0.01
q	22	31	19
DQO	0.12	0.12	0.12
alpha	0.04	0.05	0.03
(yearly data) Np	5	6	5
(yearly data) Nnp	11	16	9

Table 2: comparison of fitting parameters obtained for 3 independant years datasets


Fig 2: Hourly relative uncertainties for NO2 obtained after correction and with two other independent datasets, compared with the reference values (P2013 - in red).

As seen from the Table above differences in the uncertainty estimation arise especially for the non-proportional part (i.e. Nnp) and mostly for year 2006. When the relative uncertainty is plotted against concentration (figure 2) these differences are around 10% up to 10□g/m3, over 4% up to 35□g/m3 and 1% up to 60□g/m3 with negligible values for higher hourly concentrations.

Fig 3: Yearly relative uncertainties for NO2 obtained after correction and with two other independent datasets, compared with the reference values (P2013 - in red).

For yearly data the 3 curves of fitted relative uncertainty do overlay almost perfectly .

Given the little changes in terms of parameters across years the parameters obtained in P2013C discussed above have been inserted in the current version of the Delta tool.

Assumption on the degree of randomness of the linear fit uncertainty term

To be completed (input from Michel Gerboles)

Assumption on the standard deviation term in the MQO formulation for yearly uncertainties

In P2013 the assumption is made that the standard deviation (σ) term in the yearly average uncertainty formulation can be expressed as a linear function of the mean observed value, concentration, i.e. $\sigma = \underline{l}\underline{x}$ in which x is the averaged concentration value and l the proportionality coefficient, or in other words:

$$u = u_r \sqrt{\frac{1-\alpha}{N_p}\frac{\overline{x}^2+\sigma^2}{N_p} + \frac{\alpha RV^2}{N_{np}}} \approx u_r \sqrt{\frac{1-\alpha}{N_{np}^*}\frac{\overline{x}^2}{N_{np}^*} + \frac{\alpha RV^2}{N_{np}}} \text{ with } N_{np}^* = \frac{N_{np}}{1+l^2}$$

where u_r is a reference uncertainty, α is the non-proportional component of the uncertainty, RV is a reference value (generally equivalent to the limit value), $\underline{x}$ and σ are the observation mean and standard deviation, respectively and N_{np} and N_p are fitting coefficients introduced to account for the reduction of the uncertainty when yearly averages are considered (see P2013 for more details). In this section we evaluate this assumption between the concentration mean and the standard deviation. To do so we will check the quality of the linear fit between x^2 and σ^2+x^2.

NO2

Out of the 994 stations considered for 2009, 600 had at least 90% of valid data over the whole year. The linear fit of σ^2+x^2 as a function of x^2 for these stations' average data gave a slope of 1.28 (the intercept was forced through zero) and a correlation coefficient of 0.98. Note that in this section x is equivalent to NO2.
The graph below reports u^2 (u_NO2^2) as a function of x^2 (NO2^2) which are the data (intercept and slope) that have been used in P2013 to retrieve the formulation of the yearly uncertainty.


Fig4: Scatter plot of squared uncertainties against squared concentrations

We can see that this graph is equivalent to the next (within the factor of scale 1.28), in which we substituted the abscissa by the σ^2+x^2 values.

Fig5: *Scatter plot of squared uncertainties against scaled (x 1.28) squared concentrations*

While the data which should be used in theory ("true data") for the fitting are given in the next graph, with no approximation for $\sigma^2 + x^2$.


Fig6: *Scatter plot of squared uncertainties against squared concentrations plus squared standard deviation*

In the next plot we compare the uncertainty fitting obtained with the last two dataset ("original" and "fitted")

Fig7:Comparison of the NO2 yearly uncertainty functions with and without the standard deviation linearisation assumption

From the above graph it can be seen that using a fitting approximation for $\sigma^2 + x^2$ in terms of x^2 leads to some slight differences in terms of relative uncertainty for small values while differences become negligible at the higher range of concentrations. We also note that the approximated curve always over-estimate the uncertainty values (conservative approach).

Given that the fitting of u^2 versus x^2 is equivalent to the fitting of u^2 versus $1.28x^2$ we therefore demonstrated here that the approximation made in P2013 can be considered as valid.

PM10

In P2013 a holistic approach was used to determine the uncertainty related to PM10 daily measurements and the uncertainty coefficients were estimated via an inter-comparison campaign data where parallel measurements using gravimetric technique were available.

In order to estimate yearly uncertainty the coefficients found for the gravimetric method were used in stations where gravimetric and beta-ray techniques were both available (AirBase database, 5 stations for 2009 having data coverage over 80% for both gravimetric and beta, located in Austria). The assumption was made here that Np and Nnp were approximately equal for gravimetric and beta-ray. An interactive process led to the final result of Np=40 whereas Nnp was difficult to estimate and was assumed equal to 1 (conservative estimate).

The linear fit of $\sigma2+x2$ as a function of $x2$ on all available gravimetric daily data averaged over the whole year (3009 stations) gives a slope of 1.39 and a correlation of 0.98. We make the assumption that this fitting coefficient is also valid for beta ray stations. Indeed almost the same

fitting coefficients were found with both the beta and gravimetric data for the limited dataset of 5 stations.

In all three approaches, u2 vs. x2, u2 vs. (1.39x)2 and the "true" fitting line, the uncertainty-concentration slope is approaching zero (of the order 10-3) meaning that the proportional part of the absolute uncertainty disappears and the absolute uncertainty is practically constant for the whole range of concentrations with Np ranging between 20 to 40. The absolute uncertainty is then fixed by the non-proportional term. As the assumption on the standard deviation is made on the proportional term and given that this part of the uncertainty disappears for yearly data the three different methodologies lead to the same result. In the next picture an arbitrary value of 0.8□g/m^3 was set for the fixed uncertainty, while we would have two straight horizontal lines 1% apart in the case of the fixed uncertainty set to zero.


Fig8: *Comparison of the PM10 yearly uncertainty functions with and without the standard deviation linearisation assumption*

Extension of the MQO formulation to NOx and PM2.5

PM2.5

For PM2.5 a similar to the PM10 approach (see P2013) is used, namely the holistic or direct approach based on the guide for demonstration of equivalence (ECWG, 2010, hereon GDE). With this methodology parallel measurements are used to estimate the uncertainties related to the various PM2.5 measurements technique. Field gravimetric, TEOM and BETA instrument uncertainties are estimated based on measurements collected in the frame of the European PM QA/QC Programme (Lagler et al., 2011) in which a JRC (Joint Research Centre e European

Commission) gravimetric reference sampler was co-located with monitoring network instruments in 18 European countries between 2006 and 2009 (15 days campaigns).

The first step was to apply the methodology on the gravimetric data from the European PM2.5 QA/QC Programme. The concentrations have been monitored with 19 other gravimetric instruments but the requirement of 10 days of data reduced the dataset to 140 days for 14 stations (actually 139 since 1% of extreme values are excluded from the analysis). Two measurements obtained with the same method (gravimetric) are compared,. According to the results discussed in Lagler et al. (2011), a value of 5% has been used for the uncertainty of the JRC reference data (see P2013 for details on the methodology). The fitting coefficients obtained from the analysis described above are listed in the table below and compared to those obtained for PM10.

	RV	urRV	α	m	q
PM10	50	0.14	0.018	0.02	0.9
PM2.5	25	0.18	0.018	0.03	0.4

Table 3:

For TEOM (30 day data for 3 stations) and Beta-ray (50 day data for 5 stations) the results give extremely high uncertainties (urRV respectively 0.524 and 0.400) with a relative uncertainty increasing with the measured concentration (negative values for α). The following plots depict the analysis results. In conclusion more data are certainly needed to assess the robustness of the formulation for other techniques than gravimetric.


Fig9:

NOx

For NOx a similar approach to the one used for O3 in T2012 has been applied, namely a GUM approach where all uncertainty components for NOx were estimated from literature and experience. We refer to the appendix of P2013 for the table of the various uncertainty terms used and for details on how these terms were added in order to estimate the proportional and non-proportional part of u^2 for this pollutant. In the following table and graph the results found are presented with a reference value: RV=200 g m^{-3}.

	min	**max**
m	0.0020	**0.0061**
q	16.4594	**95.1100**
α	0.1707	**0.2815**
urRV	0.0491	**0.0919**
(yearly data) Np	4	**3**
(yearly data) Nnp	3	**7**

Table 4: Fitting parameters obtained for the minimum and maximum uncertainty formulations.

In the table "min" and "max" refer to the minimum and maximum uncertainty estimation while in the figure below the maximum and minimum values are differentiated for the hourly data (minh and maxh) and yearly data (maxy and miny). Only the maximum estimates are considered in the MQO formulation.

Fig 10: Minimum and maximum uncertainty (u) functions for hourly (minh and maxh) and yearly NOx.

Overview of currently available Air quality MQO

In this section we summarize the MQO available for air quality variables. The table summarizes the current parameter fitting values while the two figures below provide the uncertainty curves for daily/hourly and yearly data respectively.

Pollutant	k	α	u_r^{RV}	RV	N_p	N_{np}
NO2	2.00	0.040	0.12	200	5	12
NOx	2.00	0.280	0.09	200	3	7
PM10	2.00	0.018	0.14	50	40	1
PM25	2.00	0.018	0.18	25	40	1
O3	1.40	0.62	0.09	120	N/A	N/A

*Table 5:Fitting parameters for the simplified uncertainty formulations*

*Fig 11: Overview of the combined relative hourly/daily uncertainties (u) for different pollutants*

Fig 12: Overview of the combined relative yearly uncertainties (u) for different pollutants

Extension of the MQO formulation to temperature and wind

NOTE: THE CONTENT OF THIS SECTION IS STILL VERY PRELIMINARY!!!!!

In this report an attempt is made to extend the technique adopted for PM10 and PM2.5 to meteorological data from inter-comparison measuring campaign data.

Temperature

The dataset considered here was provided by the Croatian Meteorological institute and consist of two meteorological stations located in the same site from 2012-05-29 16:15 to 2012-06-13 17:30 for a total of 1447 data with a time resolution of 15'. In particular it consists of two PT1000 air temperature measurement inside actively ventilated radiation shield and two average wind speed (measured by sonic anemometer : WindSonic).


Fig 13: Scatter plot of measured (1) vs. measured (2) temperature (left) and wind speed (right) measurements

The scatter plot for temperature and wind speed shows that the two sources of data are very well correlated, in particular temperature data from the two stations are practically indistinguishable (RMSE ~ 0.02 °C). Similar results are found with the different instruments located in ventilated radiation shields (RMSE 0.03 – 0.06 °C).

The methodology used for PM10 was applied to temperature using a trial and error procedure in order to give the same uncertainty to both the stations. As expected the result of the fitting of u^2 as a function of the t^2 shows practically null coefficients m=1.4e-05 q=3.9e-05.

In this case it is probably necessary to use a different approach and/or to test different dataset. Given the lack of data for deriving robust estimates, we temporarily opted for a simplified approach based on the conclusions contained in Leroy (2002). The source of uncertainty is not so much the temperature measurement in itself but rather the quality of the shielding structure and the location where the measurement is made. In a regular temperature shield, many effects

can influence the precision of temperature measurement: ventilation within the shield, wind speed, radiative effects...As a result of all these uncertainty sources Leroy states that the error on temperature measurement might be around 1 degree (in case of high radiation and low wind). In the case of badly designed shields this error might be doubled or tripled. In the current MQO version, we opted for a constant and equiprobable (i.e. rectangular distribution) uncertainty (i.e. u) over the whole range of temperature values. This results in a constant value for the combined uncertainty (u) of 0.6 (=1/$\overline{3}$). This choice results in the following fitting parameters. Note that this choice of u=0.6 K leads to U=1.2K and an MQO tolerance margin about 2.4 K

	k	α	u_r^{RV}	RV
TEMP	2.00	1.00	0.025	25

Table 6: list of parameters used to define the simplified uncertainty formulation for temperature

Wind speed

When the PM10 methodology is applied to wind speed more reasonable but still small values of uncertainty are found, i.e. m=2.4e-03 q=8.1e-05. Above 0.5m/s the relative uncertainty is around 5%.


Fig 14:

Also in this case it seems that these values of uncertainty are very low and may refer to sonic anemometers only but not to routine anemometers normally used for meteorological applications.

Another dataset was provided by the Croatian Meteorological institute consisting of a monitoring campaign for wind speed and direction on the island of Vis at 600m altitude. In this case 46716 data every 10' from 2009-01-05 09:10 to 2009-12-27 14:40.
In the scatter plot of the two stations it is evident that while the comparison is coherent for most data, different wind regimes are however measured under certain circumstances, .


Fig15: Scatter plot of measured (1) vs. measured (2) wind speed measurements for the site of Vis.

When the methodology used for PM10 is applied we find uncertainty coefficient of q=0.0006 and m=0.026. Above 0.5m/s the relative uncertainty remain stable around 16%.

Fig 16:

Similarly to temperature, given the lack of sufficient data, we also opted here for a simplified approach based on the WMO technical guidance document which report a fixed uncertainty of 0.5 m/s below 5 m/s and a proportional uncertainty equal to 10% of the wind speed value above 5 m/s. On top of this we also assumed an equi-probable uncertainty (+/- 0.5 m/s error) resulting from the frequent rounding of wind measurements to an integer value. These assumptions lead to the following fitting parameters and uncertainty function.

	k	α	u_r^{RV}	RV	N_p	N_{np}
WS	2.00	0.8	0.13	5	N/A	N/A

Table 7: *list of parameters used to define the simplified uncertainty formulation for temperature*

Fig 17: Overview of the combined relative hourly uncertainties (u) for wind speed

Extension of the MQO formulation to PM components

Estimation of the uncertainties for these PM components rely on expert judgment. They are here provided only for testing purposes and as a starting point for further discussion and before refinement. Values presented in the table below are valid for both their fine and coarse (if relevant) fractions. The same repartition between the proportional and non-proportional fractions of the uncertainty has been assumed similar for all PM components.

	k	α	u_r^{RV}	RV
PM10	2.00	0.018	0.140	50
PM25	2.00	0.018	0.180	25
SO4	2.00	0.018	0.150	7
NO3	2.00	0.018	0.150	8
NH4	2.00	0.018	0.225	4
EC	2.00	0.018	0.375	5
TOM	2.00	0.018	0.375	10

Table 8: *list of parameters used to define the simplified uncertainty formulation for PM components*

Fig 18: Overview of the combined relative hourly uncertainties (u) for wind speed

Bibliography

Thunis, P., Pernigotti, D., Gerboles, M., Belis, C., 2013. Model quality objectives based on measurement uncertainty. Part I: O3. Atmospheric Environment. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2013.05.018.

Thunis, P., Pederzoli, A., Pernigotti, D., 2012. Performance criteria to evaluate air quality modeling applications. Atmospheric Environment 59, 476e482.

Pernigotti, D., Gerboles, M., Belis, C.A., Thunis, P., 2013. Model quality objectives based on measurement uncertainty. Part II: NO2 and PM10, Atmospheric Environment, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2013.07.045

Leroy M., 2002. La mesure au sol de la température et des précipitations. La Meteorologie, 39, 52-56.

WMO Guide to meteorological instruments and methods of observation, 2006, WMO-No. 8.

Annex

A bug was found in the scripts used for the statistical calculations. Some lines were unappropriately commented (the "+" at the beginning of the line in R means a comment!) both for NO and NOx in the ***non variable part of the hourly and yearly uncertainty***

```
u2_nor<-uest["r_rep",wpar[ipar]]^2+
        u_fit^2
        +uest["r_press",wpar[ipar]]^2+
```

```
            uest["r_temp",wpar[ipar]]^2+uest["r_volt",wpar[ipar]]^2
→ max values 0.06^2+0.7^2+0.02^2=0.5ppb^2=0.8ug/m3^2
  u2_noxr<-uest["r_rep",wpar[ipar]]^2+
            u_fit^2
            +uest["r_press",wpar[ipar]]^2+
            uest["r_temp",wpar[ipar]]^2+uest["r_volt",wpar[ipar]]^2+
            rpan_station[ist]^2+   #<<-- minimum for traffic stations, maximum elsewhere
            uest["r_CO2",wpar[ipar]]^2+
            uest["r_NH3",wpar[ipar]]^2+uest["r_hno2",wpar[ipar]]^2+uest["r_nhno3",wpar[ipar]]^2
→ max values 0.06^2+0.7^2+0.02^2+2.86^2+0.35^2+0^2+1.4^2+0^2=10.8ppb^2=39.2ug/m3^2
```