

What do we need to accomplish

1. Take note of response received for the ECV Inventory, including balance of past/current and future datasets
 - What are the lessons-learned for improving the process
2. Define a “validation” procedure for the datasets submitted
 - Decide on whether to initiate a new iteration this year
3. Define an agreed approach for analysis of the data and a timeline for undertaking this analysis (SIT, CGMS-41, CEOS Plenary)
4. Investigate relation of CEOS-CGMS-WMO Inventory to other Inventory initiatives (e.g. WCRP/WDAC)
5. Discuss other parallel Architecture activities (identified in Strategy report)
 - Case Studies
 - Macroscale space system requirements

ECV Inventory

response received so far

- ~220 entries so far good representation across domains
- Much more response on past/current than on planned/future
- Potential for gap analysis to distinguish what is being observed but not used
- Need to underline need for both long-term climate data records and routine monitoring (JS: interim CDRs)
- Timelines should be done at the level of ECV products rather than whole ECV

ECV Inventory from Day 1

position to take CEOS & CGMS agencies

- Accomplishment with respect to GCOS-WCRP letter to SA – direct response. Encourages openness, transparency
- Grateful for contributions, however it is a continuous process, open for additional contributions
- May consider different tone for CGMS (less contributions), could be raised at intercessional WG meetings – especially WG2 (SB & MG)
- Important to identify the “how” of/following gap analyses
- Also further thought needed on traceability (implications) of gaps to specific users interested in inventory – how to integrate this

Links to WCRP/GCOS inventory initiatives

- There is an opportunity to consider a central “database” of ECV product metadata
- CEOS-CGMS-WMO maybe the the best “resourced” opportunity for this – **BUT** this should not negate the potential for multiple interfaces to this database
- CEOS-CGMS-WMO Inventory needs to (by WDAC):
 - Verify consistency of GCOS/WCRP questionnaire with ECV Inventory
 - Evaluate feasibility of extending to in-situ data – This would then have to be vetted by CEOS and CGMS plenaries
 - Ultimately CEOS-CGMS-WMO could provide the infrastructure/database but GCOS/WCRP Panels & WMO would be responsible for soliciting insitu contributions (i.e. handholding)

ECV Inventory

quality control of submissions

1. Completeness tests – bar-chart of answers/question (SS)
2. Consistency checks e.g. units (JB)
3. Validation with respect to MIM (SS – longer time delay)
4. Team “expert” reviews
 - Atmosphere (JB, RE, SM, AS, AV)
 - Ocean (MD, PL, MR)
 - Land (JD, JS, MD)

Website update

- ECV Inventory Wiki for our comments during QC analysis period (SS)
- “Version control” of entries date stamp
- Simplify entry page, instructions (RH, SS)

- Webinar, screencasts of datasets entry for CGMS agencies (CMA, KMA, JMA)
 - SB to check reason for lack of entries from these agencies

ECV Inventory

data analysis - Mark's categories

- Missed opportunities
- Myth buster
- Stewardship
- Match maker
- Justify our existence

ECV Inventory

data analysis - ideas

- Spatial temporal resolution vs. GCOS requirements check - - **justify our existence**
- Comparative gap analysis for ECV products and sensors - **missed opportunities**
- Histograms comparison of length of ECV timeseries for “operational” and “research” agencies - **myth buster**
- Shared responsibilities pre-launch cal, post-launch cal, validation – **stewardship**
- Cluster climate application field on GFCS Priorities & WCRP grand challenges - **justify our existence**

ECV Inventory

data analysis - ideas contd.

- Identify number of agencies per ECV, comparison existing VCs – **missed opportunities**
- Number of citations of product references provided - **stewardship**
- Coverage analysis global vs. regional – **match making**
- Combining polar and geostationary missions: possible examples SST, precipitation, clouds, LST, albedo – **missed opportunities**
- Take two ECV products COVE analysis for intercalibration – **match making**

Discussion on Assessments

- Recognition that ultimately assessment information should be available in the inventory but for now we are keeping this distinct
- Need to also be clear in differences between metrics (e.g. maturity matrix) and assessments.
- Desirable roles/responsibility:
 - Someone to provide “blueprint”/protocol for assessments, i.e. WCRP-WDAC (benefitting from experience with GEWEX, SPARC)
 - Domain specific competence/scientific bodies (e.g. GHRSSST, IOCCG, OST-ST, OSVW-ST) together with CEOS VCs undertake individual assessments
 - CEOS WGClimate to ensure assessment have resources, where appropriate thorough CEOS member agencies
 - GCOS/WCRP Panels to provide overall review of assessments