

Aerosol type

- \neg ... is a categorial / qualitative variable
- → ... is input needed for (ill-posed) retrievals / affects accuracy (AOD ...)
- \neg ... is output from retrievals to some extent (AERONET, satellite)
- \neg ... is estimated from ground-based data (sampling!) and model climatologies

- → Different instruments
 - \neg ... need different definitions
 - → … have different / limited information content for aerosol type



Aerosol typing

Aerosol typing procedures differ in many aspects:

- approach
- nomenclature (e.g. same name for different definitions)
- assumed number of components (e.g. TOMS: 3 MISR: 74)
- parameters used for the classification
- Particle size / shape / absorbing properties
- ≻Aerosol load
- ➤Location
- ➤Seasonal behavior
- approach
- ➢by source (e.g. dust, sulfates)
- ➢by optical properties (e.g. aspherical, absorbing)



Questions?

What is needed?

- review of aerosol typing assumptions
- harmonization of the nomenclatures
- harmonization of the procedures

Long-term perspectives (WG2) Validation (WG3) Improved accuracy(WG4)

Can / we find one overarching nomenclature? Do we see a need / benefit in it?



Different concept examples

- → Aerosol_cci
 - \rightarrow 4 basic components; 3 external mixing mixing fractions
 - → Reflecting limited dual view information content
- → MISR
 - → 8 components
 - → 74 mixtures grouped by size, absorption, sphericity
- → CALIOP
 - Originally driven by need to define lidar ratio for extinction
 - Combination of depolarisation and geolocation criteria

@esa Discussion points (1)

- Information content is largely dependent on retrieval conditions
- Harmonize on nomenclature, but not on approaches
- → Nomenclature:
 - components/particles (unchanged input), mixtures (output)
- Overall qualitative categorization
 - → by size, absorption (spectral dependance?) and shape
- Unknown / partly unknown should be valid output
- Mixture pdfs can be provided instead of best mix
- Review table of aerosol typing schemes will be made
- Idea: multi-sensor level4 aerosol typing?

@esa Discussion points (2)

Clearly communicate

- → limitations of retrievals/derivation/interpretation for aerosol types
- → Quantitative definition of components
- → Avoid unnessasarily confusing nomenclature
- → Satellites "see" optical properties
- Different users need different aerosol types (climate / AQ)
- User needs mentioned direct/derived
 - → Fine mode, absorption, dust
 - → Smoke, dust, pollution
 - → Plume origin, height, …
 - → Anthropogenic, dust/salt, submicron dust
 - → Aerosol-cloud interaction proxys