



# ESA Climate Change Initiative River Discharge Precursor (RD\_cci+)

## D3. Water Surface Elevation (WSE) Algorithm Theoretical Basis Document (ATBD)

Contract number: 4000139952/22/I-NB

Reference

Issue 1 – 21/02/2024



## CHRONOLOGY ISSUES

Issue	Date	Object	Written by
1.0	28/07/23	Initial version	Sylvain Biancamaria et al.
1.1	29/11/23	Data format and architecture sections moved to WSE CRDP release note; added information about differences btw CCI lakes and rivers WSE	Sylvain Biancamaria
1.2	21/02/24	Added in section 4.1 that only one observation per day for merged time series, and in section 3.2 that dates are in UTC time	Sylvain Biancamaria

<b>Checked by</b>	S. Biancamaria - LEGOS	<i>Sylvain Biancamaria</i>
<b>Approved by</b>	Alice Andral - CLS	<i>A. Andral</i>
<b>Authorized by</b>	Clément Albergel - ESA	<i>Clement Albergel</i>

## DISTRIBUTION

Company	Names	Email
ESA	Clément Albergel	<a href="mailto:clement.albergel@esa.int">clement.albergel@esa.int</a>
CLS	Alice Andral	<a href="mailto:aandral@groupcls.com">aandral@groupcls.com</a>
CLS	Yann Bernard	<a href="mailto:ybernard@groupcls.com">ybernard@groupcls.com</a>
CLS	Beatriz Calmettes	<a href="mailto:bcalmettes@groupcls.com">bcalmettes@groupcls.com</a>
CLS	Daya Ceccone	<a href="mailto:dceccone@groupcls.com">dceccone@groupcls.com</a>
CLS	Nicolas Taburet	<a href="mailto:ntaburet@groupcls.com">ntaburet@groupcls.com</a>
CNRM	Simon Munier	<a href="mailto:simon.munier@meteo.fr">simon.munier@meteo.fr</a>
EOLA	Elena Zakharova	<a href="mailto:zavocado@gmail.com">zavocado@gmail.com</a>
Hydromatters	Malik Boussaroque	<a href="mailto:malik.boussaroque@hydro-matters.fr">malik.boussaroque@hydro-matters.fr</a>
Hydromatters	Laetitia Gal	<a href="mailto:laetitia.gal@hydro-matters.fr">laetitia.gal@hydro-matters.fr</a>
Hydromatters	Adrien Paris	<a href="mailto:adrien.paris@hydro-matters.fr">adrien.paris@hydro-matters.fr</a>
IRPI	Silvia Barbetta	<a href="mailto:silvia.barbetta@irpi.cnr.it">silvia.barbetta@irpi.cnr.it</a>



IRPI	Debi Prasad Sahoo	<a href="mailto:debi.prasad.sahoo@irpi.cnr.it">debi.prasad.sahoo@irpi.cnr.it</a>
IRPI	Angelica Tarpanelli	<a href="mailto:angelica.tarpanelli@irpi.cnr.it">angelica.tarpanelli@irpi.cnr.it</a>
LEGOS-CNRS	Sylvain Biancamaria	<a href="mailto:sylvain.biancamaria@univ-tlse3.fr">sylvain.biancamaria@univ-tlse3.fr</a>
LEGOS-CNRS-CTOH	Fabien Blarel	<a href="mailto:fabien.blarel@univ-tlse3.fr">fabien.blarel@univ-tlse3.fr</a>
LEGOS-CNRS	Benjamin Kitambo	<a href="mailto:benjamin.kitambo@univ-tlse3.fr">benjamin.kitambo@univ-tlse3.fr</a>
LEGOS-CNES	Julien Lefebve	<a href="mailto:julien.lefebve@univ-tlse3.fr">julien.lefebve@univ-tlse3.fr</a>
LEGOS-IRD	Fabrice Papa	<a href="mailto:fabrice.papa@ird.fr">fabrice.papa@ird.fr</a>
Magellium	Gilles Larnicol	<a href="mailto:gilles.larnicol@magellium.fr">gilles.larnicol@magellium.fr</a>
Magellium	Vanessa Pedinotti	<a href="mailto:vanessa.pedinotti@magellium.fr">vanessa.pedinotti@magellium.fr</a>

## LIST OF CONTENTS

1	Introduction.....	5
2	WSE computation from nadir altimeters.....	5
2.1	Basic principle of WSE measurements from nadir altimeter .....	5
2.2	Computing the range R from altimeter waveform and its complexity .....	6
2.2.1	Tracking window .....	6
2.2.2	Retracker.....	6
3	Deriving WSE time series from a single mission and virtual station.....	7
3.1	Radar nadir Altimeter missions used and concept of virtual stations.....	7
3.2	Algorithm used to compute WSE time series at one virtual station and from one mission.....	8
4	Merged multi-missions altimetry WSE time series .....	10
4.1	Overall methodology .....	10
4.2	Multi-missions on similar orbit and same track (i.e., same VS).....	10
4.3	Multi-missions not on the same orbit or not on the same track (i.e., on different VS).....	11
4.4	Merging time series without time overlap .....	12
5	References.....	13

## LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

Figure 1.	Conceptual view of nadir altimeter and WSE measurements .....	6
Figure 2.	Timeline of the altimetry missions considered in this precursor project .....	8
Figure 3.	TP/J1/J2/J3/S6 time series without bias correction at VS near Dilkusha on the Indus River .	11
Figure 4.	J3 time series and unbiased TP/J1/J2/S6 time series at VS near Dilkusha on Indus River ....	11

## REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

[1] D.2 Selection of river basins. CCI River Discharge precursor project Document (CCI-Discharge-0004-RP\_WP2, Issue 1.0)



[2] D.1 User Requirements Document for CCI River Discharge precursor project (CCI-Discharge-0003-URD, Issue 1.0)

[3] D2.2: Algorithm Theoretical Basis Document (ATBD). CCI Lake project (CCI-LAKES-0024-ATBD, Issue 3.1, 6 July 2022). Available at [https://climate.esa.int/media/documents/CCI-LAKES-0024-ATBD\\_v3.1.pdf](https://climate.esa.int/media/documents/CCI-LAKES-0024-ATBD_v3.1.pdf)

## LIST OF ACRONYMS

ATBD	Algorithm Theoretical Basis Document
CCI	Climate Change Initiative
CNES	Centre National d'Etudes Spatiales
DEM	Digital Elevation Model
ESA	European Space Agency
GDR	Geophysical Data Records
J1	Jason-1
J2	Jason-2
J3	Jason-3
LRM	Low Resolution Mode
OCOg	Offset Centre of Gravity
OLTC	Open-Loop Tracking Command
SAR	Synthetic Aperture Radar
Saral	Satellite with ARGOS and ALtika
S3A	Sentinel-3A
S3B	Sentinel-3B
S6	Sentinel-6 Michael Freilich
TP	Topex-Poseidon
UTC	Coordinated Universal Time
VS	Virtual Station
WSE	Water Surface Elevation



# 1 Introduction

This document describes the theoretical basis for the algorithm used to compute Water Surface Elevation (WSE) from nadir altimeters within the CCI River Discharge precursor project (deliverable D3 from the Work Package 3.1). First, the principles and issue concerning the use of altimeter data over inland waterbodies are presented in section 2. Then, the computation of WSE time series at a single virtual station (VS; i.e., intersection between the satellite ground track and the studied water body/river reach) and from a single altimeter mission is described in section 3. Section 4 presents the method defined to merge time series from different missions and locations.

## 2 WSE computation from nadir altimeters

### 2.1 Basic principle of WSE measurements from nadir altimeter

Radar altimeter measurements are used to compute the range ( $R$  on Figure 1), i.e. the distance between the satellite and the surface of the observed river reach. The altimeter sends a radar pulse at the vertical of the satellite (nadir). Then, it records the radar echo (or waveform) backscattered toward the antenna by the water body below the satellite. This radar waveform is downlinked on the ground and  $R$  is estimated by post-processing this waveform. If the radar pulse sent by the instrument was a pure Dirac function with a propagation speed equal to the speed of light in vacuum (noted  $c$  in Eq. 1), then  $R$  would be easily computed by recording the radar pulse two-way travel time (noted  $dt$ ) and using Eq. 1.

$$R = \frac{1}{2} \cdot c \cdot dt \quad \text{Eq. 1}$$

Satellite altitude ( $H$  on Figure 1) is computed thanks to the on-board instruments.  $H$  is known quite precisely with recent satellite altimeters (below 2 cm; e.g. Couhert et al., 2015). The WSE ( $h$  on Figure 1) can be computed using Eq. 2.

$$h = H - (R - \Delta R_{\text{propagation}} - \Delta R_{\text{geophysical}}) \quad \text{Eq. 2}$$

The term  $\Delta R_{\text{propagation}}$  corrects the range  $R$  from propagation delay occurring when the radar signal propagates through the atmosphere (its speed is smaller than  $c$  in this environment).  $\Delta R_{\text{geophysical}}$  corrects  $R$  from geophysical signal affecting the measurements (i.e. crustal vertical motions due to the solid Earth and pole tides).






Figure 1. Conceptual view of nadir altimeter and WSE measurements

## 2.2 Computing the range R from altimeter waveform and its complexity

### 2.2.1 Tracking window

Due to instrument design, the altimeter can record the backscattered radar signal from only a small portion (labelled “tracking window”) of the vertical axis below the satellite. For comparison, the tracking window size of Poseidon-class altimeters (TP, J1 to J3 altimeters) is 60m wide, whereas the satellite orbit altitude is around 1336 km. It is needed to set this vertical tracking window correctly to observe the water body surface. For past missions, the position of this window is computed automatically, based on previously measured waveforms. This tracking method is called “autonomous” or “Closed-Loop” mode. It is conceived to track ocean surface topography, but could fail over continents, which have more important and abrupt topography variations than oceans (e.g. Biancamaria et al., 2018). When the tracking window is not correctly set, then the waveform does not contain any backscattered signal from the targeted water body and data over this water body is lost. To overcome this issue, CNES and then ESA conceived another tracking mode, called “Open-Loop” or “Diode/DEM” mode. Rather than updating automatically the tracking window positions, they are set using elevations stored on-board. These elevations come from OLTC tables that are derived from global DEMs and water masks. This mode has been used operationally on J3, S3A/B and S6. For more information on this mode, see for example Desjonquères et al. (2010), Taburet et al. (2020), Le Gac et al. (2021) and the websites: <https://sentinels.copernicus.eu/web/sentinel/user-guides/sentinel-3-altimetry/overview/oltc> and <https://www.altimetry-hydro.eu/>.

### 2.2.2 Retracker

Once the radar waveform backscattered by the continent within the tracking window is recorded by the instrument, it is needed to process it to estimate R for the targeted water body below the satellite nadir. The instrument cannot emit Dirac radar pulses and the instrument “footprint” (defined as the 3-dB antenna beam) is multiple km wide (8km, 18km and 30km diameter for Saral, Envisat and Jason series altimeters, respectively). Therefore, the radar waveform (i.e. the returned power to the instrument as a function of time or, equivalently, of the distance between the satellite and the ground) is not a “simple” pulse but is spread in time (or distance/range). This is due to all the targets on the soil within the instrument footprint, which are located at different distance from the satellite and have different backscatter coefficient. Due to the potentially important heterogeneity of the observed scene below the satellite, contrarily to oceans, retracking the radar waveform to compute accurately R within all the



potential targets that backscattered power to the satellite is very difficult over continents. Surface waters are mainly quasi-specular, they are backscattering much more energy to the satellite than most other soil targets. However, in a few km wide footprint, multiple water bodies might be backscattering energy to the satellite. Besides, some other targets, like wet sand (for example wet river banks or ephemeral sand islands that have just been uncovered by water) could also be quite specular. Finally, the recorded waveform is digitalized using a fixed number of bins. These bins cover usually 0.5 m distance span (except for Saral/AltiKa for which it is 0.3m and for some mode of Envisat which could then be equal to 0.5m, 2m or 8m).

Radar waveforms over continents are very heterogenous and there is currently no theoretical waveform retracker for continents (which is not the case for open ocean), that can be used to retrack waveforms and retrieve unambiguously the range  $R$  for a specific water body overflowed by a nadir altimeter. For more information and discussion on this topic, see for example Crétaux et al. (2017). A common empirical retracker algorithm used over continental waters, and available in most nadir altimeters, GDR files is the so-called “Ice-1” or “OCOG” retracker (Wingham et al., 1986; Bamber, 1994). This retracker is not described in this document, nor the reasons why it is commonly used at least over rivers. For more information, the reader is referred to Wingham et al. (1986), Bamber (1994) and, for example, Crétaux et al. (2017).

From this section, it is important to recall that, from a single waveform, there is no certainty that the targeted water body is observed within the tracking window, even if the “Open-Loop” tracking mode helps a lot compared to the former “Closed-Loop” tracking mode, nor that the targeted water body range  $R$  will be correctly estimated by the retracker algorithm, especially if there are more specular targets nearby. That’s why, Biancamaria et al. (2018) highlighted that: “The ability of an altimeter to observe a river is dependent on river width but is determined to an even greater extent by the “surrounding topography, the observation configuration, previous measurements and the instrument design” (Baup et al., 2014; Biancamaria et al., 2017)”. It is therefore very difficult, maybe impossible, to assess beforehand where and when an altimeter provided/will provide usable data at global scale.

## 3 Deriving WSE time series from a single mission and virtual station

### 3.1 Radar nadir Altimeter missions used and concept of virtual stations

The timeline and repeat cycle of all nadir radar altimeter missions used in this study are provided in Figure 2. This figure gathers, through the same color code, missions that were on the same orbit tracks. This means they observe the same locations with the same time repetitiveness. If the TP/J1/J2/J3/S6A observe the same VS every 10 days from 1992 to now, with some time overlaps between consecutive missions, this is not the case for other orbits. The ERS-1/ERS-2/Envisat/Saral 35-days orbit tracks are not sampled since 2016, once Saral satellite is drifting and not maintained on a repeat orbit. Another issue is the absence of time overlap between Envisat on its nominal orbit and Saral launch, leading to a few years’ observation gap. S3A and S3B missions are on another orbit, with a better time sampling (27 days), but have been launched quite recently (2016 and 2018, respectively).






Figure 2. Timeline of the altimetry missions considered in this precursor project. Colors correspond to missions' orbits repeat periods. After June 1996, ERS-1 is in back-up mode and no measurements are recorded and from Mid-2003, altimeter onboard ERS-2 stopped working. That's why the boxplot patterns for these two missions after these dates are changed to show the absence of measurements

The satellite orbit defines both the spatial and temporal sampling of the nadir altimeter mission. They change in opposite directions: the greater the number of tracks in an orbit, the finer its spatial sampling, but the greater its repeat period (i.e. the time taken for the satellite to fly over the same point again), and therefore the coarser its temporal sampling. Therefore, Jason series allows a much better time sampling than other orbits, but the counter part is the scarcity of its spatial sampling (nadir altimeter observing only within the footprint of the instrument at the nadir of the satellite). It means that for some locations chosen [1], only observations from altimeters on Envisat orbit could be used, leading to observation gaps (at least between Envisat change of orbit and launch of Saral). Furthermore, due to some technical limitations, satellite ground tracks are controlled to within  $\pm 1$  km around their nominal positions for most altimeter missions (for more details, see product handbook for all missions listed on Figure 1).

It should also be noted that the oldest missions are the least accurate. The most important issue arises for J1, which was finer tuned to observe the ocean than TP, resulting in less data acquisition over continental water bodies.

The intersection of the satellite ground track with a targeted water body (e.g. a river reach) is usually referred to as “virtual station” (VS) in scientific literature. Its definition is therefore intrinsically linked with the orbit of the radar nadir altimeter mission considered. The VSs from all available missions tracks near the locations defined in [1] have been processed to compute WSE time series.

### 3.2 Algorithm used to compute WSE time series at one virtual station and from one mission

WSE is defined as the distance between the surface of water and a reference surface (ellipsoid or geoid). The chosen reference surface is the WGS84 ellipsoid. The geoid is more meaningful from a hydraulic point of view. However, as WSE is not used to compute river slopes in this project and many global to national geoids are available (and multiple versions of a specific geoid might exist), it is better suited to use a mathematically defined reference, i.e. an ellipsoid.

The purpose of this section is to describe the methodology used to compute WSE time series from a single radar nadir altimeter. As much as possible, this precursor project will use WSE time series already computed and available on the Hydroweb database (<https://hydroweb.theia-land.fr>). This database contains mainly time series from S3A/B, J3 and S6 missions' VSs. These time series will be provided by





CLS around the specific locations selected (see [1]). However, it is needed to extend this database for past missions and VS with current missions not available on Hydroweb.

The corrections to be used to compute WSE (see section 2.1 and Eq. 2) are the usual ones considered over continents (Crétau et al., 2017): ionospheric correction, dry and wet atmospheric corrections, solid Earth correction, and pole tides correction (usual corrections used for inland water bodies) from GDR products from space agencies or from reanalysis products. For TP data available in the PISTACH reanalysis done by CLS, atmospheric corrections are missing at multiple locations. For this mission and at such locations, a climatology produced by LEGOS (S. Calmant, not published yet) from the corrections at same locations during the Jason-1 to Jason-3 period will be used. For Envisat, when they will be available, GDR data from the FDR4ALT from CLS could be used.

To compute time series not available on the Hydroweb database, a “manual” approach to select measurements from GDR files will be used. This approach is the same than the one used for “research mode” VS time series on Hydroweb (see Hydroweb User Manual, [https://www.theia-land.fr/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/Handbook\\_Hydroweb-V2.1-1.pdf](https://www.theia-land.fr/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/Handbook_Hydroweb-V2.1-1.pdf), and Santos da Silva et al., 2010). For example, this is done using the AITiS software, developed at LEGOS/CTOH (<https://gitlab.com/ctoh/altis>) at LEGOS and Hydro Matters. The main steps of such selection are the followings: 1- define a polygon at the intersection between the satellite ground track and the observed river reach, 2- compute and visualize the WSE (and eventually the backscatter coefficient) for all cycles and measurements within this polygon, 3- remove WSE outliers, 4- for each cycle, compute the median of all selected WSE, and 5- finally export the WSE time series. Concerning step 1, the polygon should cover at least plus or minus 1 km perpendicularly to the ground track (to take into account the orbit drift) and few hundreds of meters along track to completely cover the extent of the river reach along the track and contains at least 3 measurement points along the track. Concerning step 3, evident outliers should be removed, for example based on local topography, potential upstream/downstream WSE time series inconsistency, unrealistic WSE amplitude, and presence of other water bodies. However, this "expert judgement" should not be used too frequently and parsimoniously, to avoid removal of extreme events. ENVISAT and ERS-2 L2 (GDR) and L3 (timeseries) around these locations will be computed by CLS from the FDR4ALT project and will be provided to the consortium. TP GDR files will come from the PISTACH project. For other missions, GDR files are the ones provided by the space agencies and formatted by the CTOH (<http://ctoh.legos.obs-mip.fr>).

Differences between the CCI Lake WSE and the precursor CCI River Discharge WSE are the same than differences between “research” Hydroweb WSE on lakes and rivers, as described in the Hydroweb User Manual and in the CCI lake ATBD [3]. The main differences between CCI river WSE and CCI lake WSE are the following: as river WSE are referenced to an ellipsoid and located on a river reach, the geoid slope correction crucial for lake is not applied for rivers WSE; bias between missions (see section 4) is computed differently as there are usually less time series overlaps.

It should be noted that no slope values will be used to correct (the plus or minus 1km) satellite drifts around the theoretical track. There is currently no global river slope product accurate enough to correct this source of errors. When validated SWOT river slope product over at least one year will be available, such type of correction could be considered (i.e., not before August 2024).

Dates in the time series are provided as UTC time.



## 4 Merged multi-missions altimetry WSE time series

In this precursor project, combined WSEs must be evaluated at least over some few basins with in situ WSE. Some users indicated in [2] that they would be interested to have combined WSE time series. For WP3.2 (i.e. river discharge computation from WSE time series and ancillary discharge data), it will be evaluated if merged WSE at a specific SV could have some benefits compared to the use of multiple WSE time series at different SV. Indeed, a merged WSE might not be needed to derive a continuous discharge time series, as the rating curve could be computed separately for each mission (as long as there is time overlap between at least one mission and in situ discharge and then between mission with a rating curve and others).

### 4.1 Overall methodology

It is proposed rather to compute a merged WSE at a specific VS, called reference VS. VSs are tied to a mission ground track. So, the reference VS is intrinsically linked to a specific mission orbit. Besides, the intermission bias is dependent, among other, to the considered sensor. That's why, it might be better to give the priority to the longest mission with valid measurements and with the highest time sampling, but also recent enough to be as accurate as possible. So, **the reference VS should be a Jason-3 VS** (the Jason series is the longest continuous series of altimetry missions, with the highest repeat period, and Jason-3 is the recent enough, as it has been launched in January 2016). However, Jason series ground tracks are sparser than other altimetry missions (the drawback of the higher repeat period). Therefore, **if there is no Jason-3 VS near the location defined in [1] to evaluate discharge, then the reference VS should be an Envisat VS** (ERS-2/Envisat and Saral used the same orbit, but as there is no time overlap between Saral and Envisat, which is not the case between Envisat and ERS-2, thus the choice to consider Envisat). **If there is no Jason-3 and Envisat VS available, then a S3A VS should be the reference VS** (however, for this last case, it is doubtful that a 20 years WSE time series could be computed).

It has been decided that merged time series should have only one measurement per day. If multiple observations are available from single mission time series for a day, the earliest one is kept in the merged time series.

Sections 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4 explain how to merge different time series, depending if they are on the same ground track or not.

### 4.2 Multi-missions on similar orbit and same track (i.e., same VS)

For these cases and if there is a time overlap between consecutive missions, then the mean bias over the common period between the consecutive time series in time is computing and it is removed to get a coherent WSE time series compared to the reference mission. For example, the Topex/Jason1/Jason2/Jason3/Sentinel6 intermission bias will be computed considering the Jason3 data as the reference. These biases will be computed considering the mean difference between each mission during the common period. The data in the merged time series during the common period, if the time difference between observation dates is below one hour, will be the WSE from the most recent altimeter. For example, when measurements from Jason-2 and Jason-3 are available at the same date, then the Jason-3 data should be provided. Similarly, when both Jason-1 and Topex-Poseidon measurements are available at the same date, then the Jason-1 data should be provided. Figures 3 and 4 show some examples of bias corrected time series using this methodology (Figure4) compared to initially biased time series (Figure 3) for a Jason VS on the Indus River. It should be noted that, for some VS, the first five Jason3 measurements have important errors. It may be needed to exclude them from the Jason2/Jason3 intermission bias computation.






Figure 3. TP/J1/J2/J3/S6 time series without bias correction at VS near Dilkusha on the Indus River




Figure 4. J3 time series and unbiased TP/J1/J2/S6 time series at VS near Dilkusha on the Indus River

### 4.3 Multi-missions not on the same orbit or not on the same track (i.e., on different VS)

Once time series from all missions within the same VS have been merged, then WSE time series from different VSs have to be merged together. A reference VS has to be identified (see section 4.1). In this case, not just a bias correction might be needed. A fit of the relationship between WSE time series at



each other VS and the reference VS has to be done. From the scatter plot, over the common period, between the other VS time series and the reference VS time series, will be used to select a linear fit or a Power law fit according to the topology, river characteristics and/or distance between both VSs. These fits have been chosen because, assuming steady and uniform flow, no main tributary between two locations, uniformly varying bathymetry and constant slope of the hydraulic gradient line at these locations, then, due to mass continuity, the relationship between WSE at these two locations is a power-law relationship.

Other VSs should be preferably less than 10km from the reference VS, with no major tributary between the VSs. If for any reason, a VS with a distance much higher than 10km from the reference VS, then using a time lag between the VS and the reference VS should be tested. It will be done using the methodology from Biancamaria et al. (2011): the lag that maximizes the correlation between the reference VS time series and the lagged VS time series.

To concatenate different time series, first data over common overlapping time period(s) between different time series should be considered. These data might not be acquired at the same dates between these different time series. It will be needed to interpolate observations at the same dates to compute the fit (or at least the bias). It will be done by interpolating time series with the highest time sampling to the dates from the time series with the coarsest time sampling, over the common time span. If the time series have the same time sampling, then time series from the other VS will be interpolated to the dates of the reference VS.

## 4.4 Merging time series without time overlap

In order to avoid this case, as much time series as possible should be gathered, rather from the same VSs or from different VS(s) from all altimetry missions considered in this project. Methodology from sections 3.1 to 3.3 should be applied, over consecutive and overlapping in time time series starting from the reference VS from the reference satellite mission.

However, the case of consecutive time series with no time overlap might occur (for example, this is the case between Envisat and Saral or Topex and Jason-2, if no Jason-1 data could be used). In this case, two methods to correct the bias between non-overlapping missions have been tested. The first is the "average long-term method" that consists of computing the average over the entire time series of the two consecutive missions. The difference between the two averages is used to compute the bias enables to get coherent WSE over the reference VS. The second approach is the "climatology method". A monthly climatology (i.e., all data acquired in January over the whole time series should be average and provided for the month of January in the climatology, similar for the other months) is computed for both consecutive time series. The mean difference (i.e., the average over twelve months of the two monthly climatology's subtraction) between these two climatologies is used to compute the bias and get coherent WSE over the reference VS. The comparison of both methods near Kinshasa station (Congo basin) revealed that they provide similar results (e.g., 0.158 m and 0.156 m from the average long-term and climatology methods respectively between Envisat and Saral missions). Therefore, the monthly climatology method has been chosen to compute the bias in this case. For cases with important extreme events or short high flow period (< 1 or 2 months), then 10% of the highest data in the time series will be removed, before computing the monthly climatology or remove the month with the highest value in the climatology.

Computing monthly discharge time series is a goal in [2], but there is no similar requirement on WSE product. Therefore, no monthly WSE time series will be computed.



## 5 References

- Bamber J. (1994). Ice sheet altimeter processing scheme. *International Journal of Remote Sensing*, 15, 925-938.
- Baup F., F. Frappart, and J. Maubant (2014). Combining high-resolution satellite images and altimetry to estimate the volume of small lakes. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 18, 2007–2020, <http://dx.doi.org/10.5194/hess-18-2007-2014>
- Biancamaria S., F. Hossain, and D. P. Lettenmaier (2011). Forecasting transboundary flood with satellites. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 38, L11401, doi:10.1029/2011GL047290
- Biancamaria S., F. Frappart, A.-S. Leleu, V. Marieu, D. Blumstein, J.-D. Desjonquères, F. Boy, A. Sottolichio, and A. Valle-Levinson (2017). Satellite radar altimetry water elevations performance over a 200 m wide river: evaluation over the Garonne River. *Advances in Space Research*, 59(1), 128-146, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.asr.2016.10.008>
- Biancamaria S., T. Schaedele, D. Blumstein, F. Frappart, F. Boy, J.-D. Desjonquères, C. Pottier, F. Blarel and F. Niño (2018). Validation of Jason-3 tracking modes over French rivers. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 209, 77-89, doi :10.1016/j.rse.2018.02.037
- Couhert A., L. Cerri, J.-F. Legeais, M. Ablain, N.P. Zelensky, B.J. Haines, F.G. Lemoine, W.I. Bertiger, S.D. Desai, M. Otten (2015). Towards the 1 mm/y stability of the radial orbit error at regional scales. *Advances in Space Research*, 55 (1), 2-23, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.asr.2014.06.041>
- Crétaux J.-F., K. Nielsen, F. Frappart, F. Papa, S. Calmant & J. Benveniste (2017). Hydrological applications of satellite altimetry: rivers, lakes, man-made reservoirs, inundated areas in *Satellite Altimetry Over Oceans and Land Surfaces, Earth Observation of Global Changes* (éd. Stammer, D. & A. Cazenave) 459-504 (CRC Press, Boca Raton, USA). isbn: 978-1-4987-4345-7.
- Desjonquères J.D., G. Carayon, N. Steunou, J. Lambin (2010). Poseidon-3 radar altimeter: new modes and in-flight performances. *Marine Geodesy*, 33(S1), 53-79, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01490419.2010.488970>
- Le Gac S., F. Boy, D. Blumstein, L. Lasson and N. Picot (2021). Benefits of the Open-Loop Tracking Command (OLTC): Extending conventional nadir altimetry to inland waters monitoring. *Advances in Space Research*, 68:2, 843-852, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asr.2019.10.031>
- Santos da Silva J., S. Calmant, O. Rotuono Filho, F. Seyler, G. Cochonneau, E. Roux and J. W. Mansour (2010). Water Levels in the Amazon basin derived from the ERS-2 and ENVISAT Radar Altimetry Missions. *Remote Sensing of the Environment*, 114, 2160-2181, doi:10.1016/j.rse.2010.04.020
- Taburet N., L. Zawadzki, M. Vayre, D. Blumstein, S. Le Gac, F. Boy, M. Raynal, S. Labroue, J.-F. Crétaux and P. Femenias (2020). S3MPC: Improvement on Inland Water Tracking and Water Level Monitoring from the OLTC Onboard Sentinel-3 Altimeters. *Remote Sensing* 12(18), 3055, <https://doi.org/10.3390/rs12183055>
- Wingham, D.J., Rapley, C.G., Griffiths, H., 1986. New techniques in satellite altimeter tracking systems. In: ESA (Ed.), *Proceedings of IGARSS'86 Symposium, Zürich, 8–11 September 1986*, SP-254, pp. 1339-1344

