

## In Situ TAC multiparameter products:

INSITU\_GLO\_PHYBGCWAV\_DISCRETE\_MYNRT\_013\_030

INSITU\_ARC\_PHYBGCWAV\_DISCRETE\_MYNRT\_013\_031

INSITU\_BAL\_PHYBGCWAV\_DISCRETE\_MYNRT\_013\_032

INSITU\_IBI\_PHYBGCWAV\_DISCRETE\_MYNRT\_013\_033

INSITU\_BLK\_PHYBGCWAV\_DISCRETE\_MYNRT\_013\_034

INSITU\_MED\_PHYBGCWAV\_DISCRETE\_MYNRT\_013\_035

INSITU\_NWS\_PHYBGCWAV\_DISCRETE\_MYNRT\_013\_036

**Issue:** 2.4

**Contributors:** H. Wehde, K. V. Schuckmann, S. Pouliquen, A. Grouazel, T. Bartolome, J. Tintore, M. De Alfonso Alonso-Munoyerro, T. Carval, V. Racapé and the In Situ TAC team

**Approval date by the CMEMS product quality coordination team:** 15/10/2024

<p>QUID for In Situ Products</p> <p>INSITU_GLO_PHYBGCWAV_DISCRETE_MYNRT_013_030/  _ARC_013_031/_BAL_013_032/_IBI_013_033/_BLK_013_034/  _MED_013_035/_NWS_013_036</p>	<p>Ref: CMEMS-INS-QUID-013-030-036</p> <p>Date: 15 June 2024</p> <p>Issue: 2.4</p>
---	--

## CHANGE RECORD

When the quality of the products changes, the Quid is updated and a row is added to this table. The third column specifies which sections or sub-sections have been updated. The fourth column should mention the version of the product to which the change applies.

Issue	Date	§	Description of Change	Author	Validated By
0.1	25/01/2012	all	First version of document	H. Wehde, K. V. Schuckmann, S. Pouliquen, A. Grouazel, T. Bartolome, J. Tintore	
1.0	24/02/2012	all	Document for V2	H. Wehde, K. V. Schuckmann, S. Pouliquen, A. Grouazel, T. Bartolome, J. Tintore	
1.1	30/10/2012	Page 4	Merge NRT products	S. Pouliquen	
1.2	28/02/2013	all	Move to MyO2 template. The Quid describes the Near Real time products of Version 3	S. Pouliquen	
1.3	02/05/2013	all	Update of the document	H. Wehde	
1.4	May 1 2015	all	Change format to fit CMEMS graphical rules		L. Crosnier
1.5	Dec 9 2015	all	Change MyOcean in CMEMS	S. Pouliquen	S. Pouliquen
1.6	Nov 15 2016	all	Update with NRT Wave product	M. de Alfonso	L. Petit de la Villéon
1.7	09/04/2019	all	Generalrevisionfor NetCDF4 transition	T. Carval	L. Petit de la Villéon
2.0	04/09/2020	all	References for Biogeochemical data. New metrics for spatial and vertical coverage, minor updates and typo corrections	V. Racapé T. Carval M. de Alfonso	
2.1	07/01/2021	2.1	Add data sources chapter	V. Racapé T. Carval	S. Tarot
2.1	07/01/2021	2.2	Add data sources references, including EMODnet Chemistry	V. Racapé	S. Tarot
2.1	07/01/2021	3	Add flag 6 for EMODnet chemistry	V. Racapé	S. Tarot
2.2	25/08/2022	all	New names of products/datasets Use new template	In Situ TAC Partners	S. Tarot
2.3	30/08/2023	all	Update document for Nov. 2023 release (update charts, text)	In Situ TAC Partners	S. Tarot
2.4	15/06/2024	all	Update document for Nov. 2024 release (update charts, text)	In Situ TAC Partners	S. Tarot

<p>QUID for In Situ Products  INSITU_GLO_PHYBGCWAV_DISCRETE_MYNRT_013_030/  _ARC_013_031/_BAL_013_032/_IBI_013_033/_BLK_013_034/  _MED_013_035/_NWS_013_036</p>	<p>Ref:  Date:  Issue:</p>	<p>CMEMS-INS-QUID-013-030-036  15 June 2024  2.4</p>
---	------------------------------------	--

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b><i>I.</i></b>	<b><i>Executive summary</i></b>	<b>4</b>
<b>I.1</b>	<b>Products covered by this document</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>I.2</b>	<b>Summary of the results</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>I.3</b>	<b>Estimated Accuracy Numbers</b>	<b>5</b>
<b><i>II.</i></b>	<b><i>Production system description</i></b>	<b>8</b>
<b><i>III.</i></b>	<b><i>Validation Framework</i></b>	<b>11</b>
<b><i>IV.</i></b>	<b><i>Validation results</i></b>	<b>13</b>
<b>IV.1</b>	<b>Temperature and Salinity observations</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>IV.2</b>	<b>Biogeochemical (BGC) observations</b>	<b>17</b>
IV.2.1	Dissolved oxygen	17
IV.2.2	Nutrients	19
IV.2.3	Chlorophyll concentration	20
<b>IV.3</b>	<b>Wave observations</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>IV.4</b>	<b>Sea-level observations</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>IV.5</b>	<b>Ocean currents</b>	<b>25</b>
IV.5.1	A focus on HF radars	26
<b>IV.6</b>	<b>Meteorological and miscellaneous observations</b>	<b>27</b>
<b><i>V.</i></b>	<b><i>System’s Noticeable events, outages or changes</i></b>	<b>30</b>
<b><i>VI.</i></b>	<b><i>Quality changes since previous version</i></b>	<b>31</b>
<b><i>VII.</i></b>	<b><i>References</i></b>	<b>32</b>

<p>QUID for In Situ Products</p> <p>INSITU_GLO_PHYBGCWAV_DISCRETE_MYNRT_013_030/ _ARC_013_031/_BAL_013_032/_IBI_013_033/_BLK_013_034/ _MED_013_035/_NWS_013_036</p>	<p>Ref: CMEMS-INS-QUID-013-030-036</p> <p>Date: 15 June 2024</p> <p>Issue: 2.4</p>
---	--

## I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### I.1 Products covered by this document

This document applies to the following list of Copernicus Marine In Situ Thematic Assembly Centre (In Situ TAC) products described in the Copernicus Marine Service Catalogue and presented in Table 1.

In Situ TAC NRT products are not fully homogeneous indeed:

- The observations aggregated are discrete in space and time and therefore the files cannot have the same spatial and temporal resolution (except for Radar HF files which are gridded)
- The instruments are not equipped with the same sensors, therefore the measured parameters are not the same in all files,
- The format of the files is adapted with respect to the original data of the instruments: vertical profiles, time series, spectra ... and therefore may differ from one type of data to another.

*Table 1: List of In Situ TAC products for which this document applies*

Short Description	Product code	Area	Delivery Time
Global region	INSITU_GLO_PHYBGCWAV_DISCRETE_MYNRT_013_030	Global	daily
Arctic region	INSITU_ARC_PHYBGCWAV_DISCRETE_MYNRT_013_031	Arctic	daily
BAL region	INSITU_BAL_PHYBGCWAV_DISCRETE_MYNRT_013_032	Baltic	daily
IBI region	INSITU_IBI_PHYBGCWAV_DISCRETE_MYNRT_013_033	Iberian-Biscay-Ireland	daily
Black Sea region	INSITU_BS_PHYBGCWAV_DISCRETE_MYNRT_013_034	Black Sea	daily
Med region	INSITU_MED_PHYBGCWAV_DISCRETE_MYNRT_013_035	Mediterranean	daily
NWS region	INSITU_NWS_PHYBGCWAV_DISCRETE_MYNRT_013_036	North West Shelf	daily

These products integrate observations aggregated from the Regional EuroGOOS (European Global Ocean Observing System) consortium (Arctic-ROOS<sup>1</sup>, BOOS<sup>2</sup>, NOOS<sup>3</sup>, IBI-ROOS<sup>4</sup>, MONGOOS<sup>5</sup>) and Black Sea GOOS<sup>6</sup> as well as from SeaDataNet<sup>7</sup> National Data Centers (NODCs), EMODnet chemistry<sup>8</sup> and JCOMM<sup>9</sup> global systems (Argo<sup>10</sup>, GOSUD<sup>11</sup>, OceanSITES<sup>12</sup>, GTSP<sup>13</sup>, DBCP<sup>14</sup>) and the Global telecommunication system (GTS<sup>15</sup>) used by the Met Offices.

<sup>1</sup> Arctic Regional Ocean Observing System: <https://arctic.eurogoos.eu/>

<sup>2</sup> Baltic Operational Oceanographic System: <http://www.boos.org/>

<sup>3</sup> North West European Shelf Operational Oceanographic System: <https://noos.eurogoos.eu/>

<sup>4</sup> Iberia-Biscay-Ireland Operational Oceanographic System <https://ibiroos.eurogoos.eu/>

<sup>5</sup> The Mediterranean Oceanographic Network <https://mongoos.eurogoos.eu/>

<sup>6</sup> Black Sea Global Ocean Observing System [http://old.ims.metu.edu.tr/black\\_sea\\_goos/](http://old.ims.metu.edu.tr/black_sea_goos/)

<sup>7</sup> SeaDataNet : <https://www.seadatanet.org/>

<sup>8</sup> EMODnet Chemistry : <https://emodnet.ec.europa.eu/en/chemistry>

<sup>9</sup> Joint WMO/IOC Technical Commission for Oceanography and Marine Meteorology: <https://community.wmo.int/en/activity-areas/Marine/JCOMM/Overview>

<sup>10</sup> Argo : <https://argo.ucsd.edu/>

<sup>11</sup> GOSUD : <https://www.gosud.org/>

<sup>12</sup> OceanSITES : <http://www.oceansites.org/>

<sup>13</sup> Global Temperature Salinity Profile Program : [https://www.iode.org/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=19:global-temperature-and-salinity-profile-program-gtspp&catid=14&Itemid=58](https://www.iode.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=19:global-temperature-and-salinity-profile-program-gtspp&catid=14&Itemid=58)

<sup>14</sup> Data Buoy Cooperation Panel : <https://www.ocean-ops.org/dbcp/>

<sup>15</sup> Global Telecommunication System : <https://community.wmo.int/en/activity-areas/global-telecommunication-system-gts>

<p style="text-align: center;">           QUID for In Situ Products  <b>INSITU_GLO_PHYBGCWAV_DISCRETE_MYNRT_013_030/            _ARC_013_031/_BAL_013_032/_IBI_013_033/_BLK_013_034/            _MED_013_035/_NWS_013_036</b> </p>	<p>           Ref:            Date:            Issue:         </p>	<p>           CMEMS-INS-QUID-013-030-036            15 June 2024            2.4         </p>
--	--	--

## I.2 Summary of the results

The accuracy of the In Situ observation depends on the platforms and sensors that have been used to acquire them (see next §1.3). All observations are aggregated by the In Situ TAC and provided to users together with metadata information on the platforms that were used to perform the observations. In Near Real Time NRT (within a few hours, maximum one week from acquisition) the quality of the observations is tested using automatic procedures and flags are positioned to inform the users of the level of confidence attached to the observations.

The In Situ TAC relies on observing systems maintained by institutes that are not part of the In Situ TAC, and Copernicus Marine Service project is not contributing to the maintenance and setting up of the observing systems it uses. That means that:

- The variety of platforms available to monitor the status of the ocean is very diverse within the different regions.
- Key performance indicators (KPIs) were developed to provide an overview of the system status.
- In some regions the number of available platforms is at a critically low level to be able to provide an adequate representative overall view of the state of the ocean. In particular:
  - Although the coverage of the underway instruments is rather homogeneous, for fixed platforms the coverage is variable, with most of the stations concentrated in the Northern Hemisphere and more specifically along the coasts of Europe and North America. The Black Sea observing network lacks platforms (both underway instruments and fixed platforms) that monitor the region.
  - Within the Arctic most of the data are obtained by regular vessel cruises or dedicated scientific expeditions. The availability of data from these scientific expeditions is often delayed, so they are not available for the NRT data stream. As a result, these data are not available for assimilation in the operational models.
  - There is also a lack of observations on the deep areas within the Mediterranean Sea.
  - In all the regions biogeochemical data are relatively scarcely available.
- The percentage of data flagged as ‘good data’ differs from region to region.

The sustainability of the Global Ocean network is still not guaranteed and highly relies on project funds.

## I.3 Estimated Accuracy Numbers

The following tables summarise the accuracy of the measurements that can be expected depending on the platforms and sensors. These five tables represent accuracy for:

- Table 2: Temperature & Salinity
- Table 3: Current
- Table 4: Sea-level
- Table 5: Biogeochemical (BGC) parameter
- Table 6: Waves

<p>QUID for In Situ Products</p> <p>INSITU_GLO_PHYBGCWAV_DISCRETE_MYNRT_013_030/  _ARC_013_031/_BAL_013_032/_IBI_013_033/_BLK_013_034/  _MED_013_035/_NWS_013_036</p>	<p>Ref: CMEMS-INS-QUID-013-030-036</p> <p>Date: 15 June 2024</p> <p>Issue: 2.4</p>
---	--

This is the best accuracy that a user can expect for the in situ data to which a quality flag “Good data” (see Table 4) has been applied after the validation process.

The definition of the reference values is obtained from different sources. The specific reference is given in Tables 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6. The values are given for the different parameters. Platform specific references that differ from the common ones are given for the specific value.

Table 2: Accuracy numbers for temperature and salinity observations in the different platforms of the In Situ TAC.

Data-type	Temperature[°C]	Salinity [‰]
CTD (Conductivity Temperature Depth)	0.005 - 0.001	0.02-0.003
XBT (Expendable Bathythermograph)	0.1	
XCTD (Expendable Conductivity Temperature Depth)	0.02	0.003
PF (profiling floats) - Argo Buoys	0.01	0.01
Moored buoy data: Tropical Moored Buoy (TRITON/TAO PIRATA/RAM Tropical Moored Buoy Array <a href="https://www.pmel.noaa.gov/gtmba/">https://www.pmel.noaa.gov/gtmba/</a> ) Surface Subsurface	0.002 0.01 - 0.3 0.01 - 0.09	0.003
Drifting buoy data	0.01	0.01
Marine mammals	0.005	0.01
Glider	0.005	0.02
Underway (Ferrybox, Research vessel TSG) (Depending on sensor type)	0.001 – 0.1	0.003-0.2

Table 3: Accuracy numbers for Current observations in the different platforms of the In Situ TAC.

Data-type	Current [cms <sup>-1</sup> ] Aquadopp (see References)
Moored instruments Depending on the resolution of the data bins	0.5-1
Drifter Hansen and Poulain (1996)	1
Underway data	1

Table 4: Accuracy numbers for Sea level observations in the different platforms of the In Situ TAC.

Data-type	Sea level [cm] IOC 1997, IOC, 2006
Tide gauges	1
Barometers	1

<p>QUID for In Situ Products</p> <p>INSITU_GLO_PHYBGCWAV_DISCRETE_MYNRT_013_030/ _ARC_013_031/_BAL_013_032/_IBI_013_033/_BLK_013_034/ _MED_013_035/_NWS_013_036</p>	<p>Ref: CMEMS-INS-QUID-013-030-036</p> <p>Date: 15 June 2024</p> <p>Issue: 2.4</p>
---	--

Table 5: Accuracy numbers for biogeochemical parameter observations in the different platforms of the In Situ TAC.

Data-type	Chlorophyll fluorescence Exemplary TriOS Microflu sensor. There is quite a range of sensors with quite a variety of accuracy available.	Oxygen Values given by a number of sensor providers, Aanderaa Instruments, Endress and Hauser.	Nutrients[ $\mu\text{mol kg}^{-1}$ ] Exemplary Syssta MicroMac sensor. There is a limited number of different sensors available.
CTD (Conductivity Temperature Depth)	0.05	8 $\text{myMol}/5\%$ 0.2 %	Discrete samples
PF (profiling floats)	0.05	2% of saturation or 2mbar Thierry et al., 2021. Argo Quality control manual for dissolved oxygen concentration. <a href="http://dx.doi.org/10.13155/46542">http://dx.doi.org/10.13155/46542</a>	1 Johnson et al., 2023. BGC-Argo quality control manual for nitrate concentration. <a href="http://dx.doi.org/10.13155/84370">http://dx.doi.org/10.13155/84370</a>
Moored buoy data: TRITON/TAO PIRATA/RAMA surface Subsurface	0.05	< 8 mM or 5% Of concentration (Whichever is greater)	Not available
Drifting buoy data	0.05		Not available
Glider	0.05	2% of saturation	1 Krahmann et al., OceanGlider Nitrate Standard Operating Procedure. <a href="https://oceangliderscommunity.github.io/Nitrate_SOP/README.html">https://oceangliderscommunity.github.io/Nitrate_SOP/README.html</a>
Ferrybox	0.05	8 $\text{myMol}/5\%$ 0.2 %	Typically better than 2% of the full scale. Repeatability: better than 2%

Table 6: Accuracy numbers for measured time series and wave estimated parameters for different wave sensors.

Wave sensor	Measured time series		
	Vertical displacement (heave)	Period	Direction
Waverider (Datawell)	0.5% of the measured value	0.5% of the measured value	0.4 - 2 deg (depending on latitude)
Wavesense (Oceanor)	0.1 m	0.15 s	1 deg
Triaxys (Axyx)	1% of the measured value	1%	3 deg
<b>Estimated parameters (due to the statistical variability)</b>			
Based on numerical time series simulation and intercomparing tests. The uncertainty in estimated parameters is inherent to the stochastic process and it is due to the statistical variability.	<b>Wave heights</b>	<b>Wave periods</b>	<b>Wave directions</b>
All wave sensors	< 5% of the estimated value	< 5% of the estimated value	< 10 deg

<p>QUID for In Situ Products  INSITU_GLO_PHYBGCWAV_DISCRETE_MYNRT_013_030/  _ARC_013_031/_BAL_013_032/_IBI_013_033/_BLK_013_034/  _MED_013_035/_NWS_013_036</p>	<p>Ref:  Date:  Issue:</p>	<p>CMEMS-INS-QUID-013-030-036  15 June 2024  2.4</p>
---	------------------------------------	--

## II. PRODUCTION SYSTEM DESCRIPTION

The In Situ TAC is a distributed system built on the existing activities and services developed previously within the European Commission supported projects and the activities carried out in the EuroGOOS Regional alliances (ROOSes). The In Situ TAC aims to provide a research and operational framework to develop and deliver in situ observations and derived products based on such observations and to address progressively global but also regional needs either for monitoring, modelling or downstream service development.

The In Situ TAC provides the interface between centres, distributing in situ measurements from national and international observing systems. The MERSEA<sup>16</sup> project established the global component of the In Situ TAC for the physical parameters needed by the Marine Forecasting Centres (MFC). These centres use the data for assimilation and validation of their forecasting systems. The goal within Copernicus Marine Service has been to consolidate and integrate the regional components, based on the expertise developed within the ROOSes, and to initiate the setup of the biogeochemical part of the In Situ TAC. In addition, experience has been gained in terms of in situ product choice, service, timeliness, quality, robustness and accuracy. As an operational infrastructure, the In Situ TAC sets the necessary production capacities and quality control procedures to answer Europe's request for service level agreements with the external users as defined in the Copernicus Marine Service.

The In Situ TAC Version 0 is the result of all the work performed during previous projects. The operational products proposed for this version are near real time and re-analyzed data for the global ocean via the Coriolis data centre. Version 1 of the In Situ TAC complements the previous version by delivering suitable products for all European regions, new lines of products (real time, biogeochemistry) and implementing improved validation procedures for the products and services. Versions 2 and 3 of the In Situ TAC provide re-analysed datasets for reanalysis activities performed by the Copernicus Marine Service MFCs and external users in collaboration with the SeaDataNet infrastructure.

In Situ TAC products provided within the Copernicus Marine Service include:

- Temperature & salinity: global and regional, produced in Real Time and Delayed Mode
- Currents: global and regional, produced in Real Time
- Sea level: only regional, produced in Real Time
- Biogeochemical: global and regional, produced in Real Time
- Waves: global and regional, produced in Real Time

The In Situ TAC is a distributed centre organized around seven oceanographic regions: the global ocean and the six EUROGOOS regional alliances (see Figure 1). It involves 17 partners from 11 countries in Europe. It does not deploy any observing system and relies on data that are obtained by sources other than Copernicus Marine Service.

<sup>16</sup> MERSEA: Marine Environment and Security for the European Area (<https://www.copernicus.eu/en/documentation/research-projects/marine-environment-and-security-european-area> )



<p>QUID for In Situ Products  INSITU_GLO_PHYBGCWAV_DISCRETE_MYNRT_013_030/  _ARC_013_031/_BAL_013_032/_IBI_013_033/_BLK_013_034/  _MED_013_035/_NWS_013_036</p>	<p>Ref:  Date:  Issue:</p>	<p>CMEMS-INS-QUID-013-030-036  15 June 2024  2.4</p>
---	------------------------------------	--

Copernicus Marine Service In Situ TAC portfolio

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <p><b>NRT products</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Global:</b> Ifremer-Pokapok</li> <li><b>Arctic Ocean:</b> IMR</li> <li><b>Baltic Sea:</b> SMHI</li> <li><b>North West Shelf:</b> BSH</li> <li><b>Iberia-Biscay-Ireland:</b> PdE-Nologin</li> <li><b>Mediterranean Sea:</b> HCMR</li> <li><b>Black Sea:</b> IOBAS</li> <li><b>T &amp; S:</b> OceanScope</li> <li><b>Currents (UV):</b> CLS-AZTI-Ifremer-CNR</li> </ul> | <p><b>Multi Year products</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>T &amp; S:</b> OceanScope</li> <li><b>Currents (UV):</b> CLS-AZTI-Ifremer-CNR-SOCIB</li> <li><b>Waves:</b> PdE-Nologin</li> <li><b>BGC:</b> IMR-Pokapok-HCMR-SYKE</li> <li><b>Sea level:</b> PdE-Nologin</li> <li><b>Carbon:</b> IMR</li> <li><b>OMI:</b> PdE-Nologin</li> </ul> |
|--|--|




Figure 1: The Copernicus In Situ TAC organization and components – Leader: Ifremer/France.

The In Situ TAC architecture is decentralized. However, harmonisation procedures ensure that the quality of the products delivered to users is equivalent wherever the data are processed. The different functions implemented by the global and regional components of the In Situ TAC to this scope are summarized in Figure 2.

<p>QUID for In Situ Products  INSITU_GLO_PHYBGCWAV_DISCRETE_MYNRT_013_030/  _ARC_013_031/_BAL_013_032/_IBI_013_033/_BLK_013_034/  _MED_013_035/_NWS_013_036</p>	<p>Ref:  Date:  Issue:</p>	<p>CMEMS-INS-QUID-013-030-036  15 June 2024  2.4</p>
---	------------------------------------	--




Figure 2: Functions implemented by the In Situ TAC components.

Each region implements four core functions:

- Data Acquisition: Gather data available on international networks or through collaboration with regional partners.
- Data Quality Control (QC): Apply automatic quality controls that have been agreed at the In Situ TAC level. These procedures are defined by parameter, elaborated in coherence with international agreements, in particular SeaDataNet<sup>17</sup>, and documented in the Copernicus Marine Service Catalogue<sup>18</sup>.
- Product validation: Assess the consistency of the data over a period of time and an area to detect data that are not coherent with their neighbours although they could pass the automatic Data Quality Control (QC).
- Product distribution: Upload the data available to Marine Data Store (MDS). The MDS is responsible for data distribution to end users.

In any case, the Global component of the In Situ TAC collects the data from the regional components and integrates them into the global product acting as a backup of the regional centres.

<sup>17</sup> <https://www.seadatanet.org/>

<sup>18</sup> <https://data.marine.copernicus.eu/products>

QUID for In Situ Products INSITU_GLO_PHYBGCWAV_DISCRETE_MYNRT_013_030/ _ARC_013_031/_BAL_013_032/_IBI_013_033/_BLK_013_034/ _MED_013_035/_NWS_013_036	Ref: CMEMS-INS-QUID-013-030-036 Date: 15 June 2024 Issue: 2.4
--	---

### III. VALIDATION FRAMEWORK

As fully described above, the In Situ TAC aggregates operational oceanography data and metadata from various sources. At the time of ingestion, In Situ TAC maintains the original quality control (QC) results as much as possible. Data originally flagged as bad in these QC are kept and an additional quality control resulting from a QC flag degradation is then performed. This additional Near Real Time QC procedure approved by the In Situ TAC follows the recommendations endorsed in 2010 by EuroGOOS that are available at <https://eurogoos.eu/data-management-exchange-quality-working-group-data-meq/> completed by the regional expertise of the In Situ TAC data scientist.

This quality control is mainly made by means of a first validation method supplemented by a second one for temperature and salinity parameters.

These two methods consist of the Real Time Quality Control (RTQC) of the in situ observations and product evaluation based on quality-controlled data sets. For the first method a set of metrics were developed for temperature, salinity, ocean current, sea level, biogeochemical and wave parametric families to guarantee the accuracy of the in situ observations. These metrics are described in detail in the following documents for the real time QC:

1. Temperature and salinity data (von Schuckmann et al., 2010a; Gourrion, Leroy 2023).
2. Current measurements (Hammarklint et al., 2010).
3. Current measurements inferred from drifter data (Notarstefano et al., 2010).
4. Sea level in Situ data (Perez et al., 2010).
5. Copernicus Marine In Situ TAC BGC quality control group (2023).
6. Wave data (Copernicus Marine In Situ TAC Data Management Team, 2020).

By performing the QC tests, new QC flags are allocated to the obtained observational data. The QC flags follow the definitions of the Copernicus Marine In Situ reference Table 1 in the Copernicus Marine In Situ NetCDF Format Manual and are presented in Table 7.

*Table 7: Quality control flags (Currently, QC flag 6 qualifies BGC data from the EMODnet chemistry aggregated products only).*

Code	Meaning	Comment
0	No QC was performed	-
1	Good data	All real-time QC tests passed
2	Probably good data	These data should be used with caution
3	Bad data that are potentially correctable	These data are not to be used without scientific correction
4	Bad data	Data have failed one or more of the tests.
5	Value changed	Data may be recovered after transmission error.
6	Value below detection/quantification	The level of the measured phenomenon was too small to be quantified/detected by the technique employed to measure it. The accompanying value is the quantification/detection limit for the technique or zero if that value is unknown
7	Nominal value	Data were not observed but reported. Example: an instrument target depth.
8	Interpolated value	Missing data may be interpolated from neighbouring data in space or time.
9	Missing value	The value is missing, is not reported, is not applicable.

<p style="text-align: center;"> <b>QUID for In Situ Products</b>  <b>INSITU_GLO_PHYBGCWAV_DISCRETE_MYNRT_013_030/</b>  <b>_ARC_013_031/_BAL_013_032/_IBI_013_033/_BLK_013_034/</b>  <b>_MED_013_035/_NWS_013_036</b> </p>	<p> <b>Ref:</b>  <b>Date:</b>  <b>Issue:</b> </p>	<p> <b>CMEMS-INS-QUID-013-030-036</b>  <b>15 June 2024</b>  <b>2.4</b> </p>
---	---	---

The second validation method setting up for temperature and salinity consists of metrics that are area-dependent and which are described in detail in von Schuckmann and Cabanes (2010b). The main features of this plan are as followed:

For the Global data the following set of metrics is applied:

1. Comparison to a baseline climatology to detect gross errors and deviations.
  - a. Objective analyses and residual analyses.
  - b. Anomaly method.
2. Comparison with altimetry.
3. Argo floats inter-comparison to complement existing Delayed Mode Quality Control.
4. Visual quality control by an operator in the Global region TAC.

For the Regional data we provide the set of metrics which is applied below:

1. Visual quality control by an operator.
2. Comparison to a baseline climatology to detect gross errors and deviations.
3. Objective analysis and residual analysis.
4. Assessment of drifter data.

<p style="text-align: center;">           QUID for In Situ Products  <b>INSITU_GLO_PHYBGCWAV_DISCRETE_MYNRT_013_030/            _ARC_013_031/ _BAL_013_032/ _IBI_013_033/ _BLK_013_034/            _MED_013_035/ _NWS_013_036</b> </p>	<p>           Ref:            Date:            Issue:         </p>	<p>           CMEMS-INS-QUID-013-030-036            15 June 2024            2.4         </p>
--	--	--

## IV. VALIDATION RESULTS

The overall quality and its representativeness for the specific region of a product is severely dependent on the amount of good data available, i.e. the number of platforms that are providing data for the region.

The variety of platforms available to monitor the status of the ocean is very diverse within the different regions.

The actual performance of the near real time data delivery system can be highlighted by the provision of so called Key Performance Indicators (KPI). KPIs are quantifiable performance indicators used to define success factors and measure progress toward the achievement of the organisation/system goals. They can be defined as an item of information collected on a regular interval to track the performance of a system. Hence, KPIs are important pointers to the functioning of a system and keeping track of them is one aspect of Quality Control (QC). KPIs should be seen as:

- Key: of fundamental importance indicating the success or failure of the system
- Performance: can be clearly measured, quantified and easily influenced the system providers
- Indicator: providing leading information on future performance.

A central theme of the definition of KPIs is the need to adapt performance indicators to the particular circumstances of the systems and procedures involved. Quality indicators need to be robust, i.e. show continuity in time. They need to be easy to implement and to automate and need to permit a delivery on a regular basis. They need to allow easy access for the user, and hence to be characterized by clarity and readability. The main criteria for KPI definition within the In Situ TAC include:

- Criteria I: Is the control information key to the success of the system?
- Criteria II: Can we measure it and influence it?
- Criteria III: Does it provide leading edge indications of future developments?

The aim is to provide the user information on the three different validation steps, i.e. RTQC, quarterly assessment and delayed mode assessment.

Four indicators were developed providing information on

- Data availability
- Monitoring continuity
- Metadata quality
- Output data quality

The detailed description of the definition of the KPIs can be found in von Schuckmann et al., 2011. The actual performance of the near real time data delivery system can be found at:

- <http://www.marineinsitu.eu/monitoring/> (see Figure 3)

In addition to the KPIs, specific assessment metrics have been developed to assess the products, depending on the variable, to show the spatial (horizontal and vertical) and temporal coverage.




Figure 3: Copernicus Marine Service In Situ TAC KPIs dashboard (screenshot taken on 18/09/2023).

#### IV.1 Temperature and Salinity observations

Temperature and Salinity (T&S) observations are reported as vertical profiles, underway data and time series. Compared to 2022, the total number of vertical profiles increased by 3% in 2023 (see Table 8). and the total number of underway data increased by 7.5% in 2023 (see Table 9).

During the 1970-1999 period, fixed buoys and vessels were the main observation platform types (see Figure 4 and Figure 6). In the 2000-2023 period, drifting buoys and Argo floats significantly complemented the T&S observation networks (see Figure 6). Although small in absolute number, sea-mammal profiles significantly increased the spatial coverage in Northern and Southern latitudes (see pink dots in Figure 5).

Table 8: Number of T&S vertical profiles.

Vertical profiles (temperature, Salinity, Oxygen, others)			
Description	No. measures 2023	No. measures 2022	Increase in No. (2022-2023) %
Argo profiling floats	4168956	3877682	6.99%
Buoys, moorings	880291	878212	0.24%
Vessels (XBT, CTD)	10532752	10509050	0.23%
<b>Total</b>	<b>20445375</b>	<b>19760148</b>	<b>3.35%</b>

Table 9: Number of T&S underway data.

<b>Underway data (Temperature, Salinity, Oxygen, others)</b>			
Description	No. measures 2023	No. measures 2022	Increase in No. (2022-2023) %
Argo profiling float	23450252	22987900	1.97%
Drifting Buoys, Moorings, Tide-gauges, ...	856830448	812281440	5.20%
Vessels (TSG, Ferryboxes)	138161956	131601053	4.75%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2254691129</b>	<b>2085525508</b>	<b>7.50%</b>




Figure 4: Evolution in the availability of the different platform types since 1970.




Figure 5: Profiles in year 2023. Yellow: Argo, Cyan: vessels, Blue: gliders, Pink: sea mammals.




Figure 6: Time series for 2023. Red: moorings, Yellow: drifting buoys, Blue: vessels.



<p>QUID for In Situ Products</p> <p>INSITU_GLO_PHYBGCWAV_DISCRETE_MYNRT_013_030/  _ARC_013_031/_BAL_013_032/_IBI_013_033/_BLK_013_034/  _MED_013_035/_NWS_013_036</p>	<p>Ref: CMEMS-INS-QUID-013-030-036</p> <p>Date: 15 June 2024</p> <p>Issue: 2.4</p>
---	--

## IV.2 Biogeochemical (BGC) observations

In Situ TAC aggregates and provides to users a large panel of BGC variables together with useful metadata information on the platforms. The main parameters available in the NRT In Situ TAC products are:

- Dissolved oxygen concentration
- Nutrients (nitrate, silicate and phosphate)
- Chlorophyll-*a* (including chlorophyll-*a* fluorescence) and
- pH

Figure 7 shows the evolution of the platform number for each BGC variable available in the NRT In Situ TAC products since the entry into service in 2022. One file contains all the observations from the platform (so the number of files corresponds to the number of platforms).

BGC variables are stored and made available within their original unit only (original units means unit in which observations were delivered). BGC variable unit depends either on the kind of sensor, the chemical method used for measurement and on the data provider.




Figure 7: Number of platforms measuring oxygen, phosphate, silicate, nitrate, chlorophyll-*a*, pH, turbidity, inorganic carbon, alkalinity, coloured dissolved organic matter (cdom), particle backscattering (bbp) and irradiance and other minor BGC variables available in the NRT In Situ TAC product from its Entry Into service (EIS) between 2022 and 2024 (EIS22 => EIS in 2022; EIS23 => EIS in 2023; EIS24 => EIS in 2024).

### IV.2.1 Dissolved oxygen

This section is focused on the quality control procedure for the dissolved oxygen concentration, named “oxygen” hereafter. Oxygen observations are alternatively provided in (i) ml/l (volume fraction of oxygen), (ii) in mmol/m<sup>3</sup>, equivalent to μmol/l (the mole concentration of dissolved molecular oxygen), (iii) in μmol/kg (moles of oxygen per unit mass) or (iv) in % (fractional saturation of oxygen in sea water). It is easy to move from one unit to another one using the conversion factor -44.6596 μmol/mL-, the corresponding potential temperature and salinity to get the potential density of seawater referenced to a hydrostatic pressure of zero dbar, or the solubility of oxygen in seawater as recommended by the SCOR

<p>QUID for In Situ Products  INSITU_GLO_PHYBGCWAV_DISCRETE_MYNRT_013_030/  _ARC_013_031/_BAL_013_032/_IBI_013_033/_BLK_013_034/  _MED_013_035/_NWS_013_036</p>	<p>Ref:  Date:  Issue:</p>	<p>CMEMS-INS-QUID-013-030-036  15 June 2024  2.4</p>
---	------------------------------------	--

WG 142 (Bittig et al., 2016). Unit standardization is a part of the reprocessing tools available in the In Situ TAC REP product.

Figure 8 represents the spatial distribution of the oxygen observations and Figure 9 the oxygen profiles yearly distribution. Both figures show that most of the dissolved oxygen profiles included in the MYNRT products have been measured by bottle (BO) and CTD-O2 (CT) during the 20th century and covered the global Ocean. This has progressively evolved over the last two decades with the implementation of the Argo-O2 profiling float network (PF). The spatial coverage of the profiling floats remains nevertheless insufficient.




Figure 8: Spatial distribution of the good oxygen profiles (i.e., those with a QC flag of 1,2,5,6,8) per instrument type (BO for bottle, CT for CTD sensors, XX for unknown instrument type, MO for mooring, XB for XBT sensor, GL for gliders, ML for mini-log, PF for profiling floats, SM for sea mammals, FB for ferry boxes and SD for saildrones).




Figure 9: Number of good oxygen profiles (i.e., those with a QC flag 1, 2, 5, 6, 8) collected per year (1950 – 2024) per instrument type; log scale (BO for bottle, CT for CTD sensors, XX for unknown instrument type, MO for mooring, XB for XBT sensor, GL for gliders, ML for mini-log, PF for profiling floats, SM for sea mammals, FB for ferry boxes and SD for saildrones).

## IV.2.2 Nutrients

This section is focused on the quality control procedure for the nutrients. Nitrate, Phosphate and Silicate are the three nutrients quality controlled in real time by the In Situ TAC. Nutrient observations are available either in (i) mmol/m<sup>3</sup>, equivalent to μmol/l, the mole concentration of dissolved molecules) or (ii) in μmol/kg with NTAW (Nitrate), PHOW (Phosphate) and SLCW (Silicate) (moles of nutrient per unit mass). However, except for Argo nutrient data, most of the observations are provided in mmol/m<sup>3</sup>.

Figure 12 represents the spatial distribution of nutrient observations and Figure 13 the yearly distribution of nutrient stations. Nutrient measurements are essentially (if not exclusively) chemical (BO), but it is possible to find them in CTD (CT) instrument files to keep information with CTD-O<sub>2</sub> (CT) observations. BGC-Argo profiling floats (PF) and GLIDER (GL) networks measure nitrate only.




Figure 10: Spatial distribution of good nutrient observations (i.e., those with a QC flag 1, 2, 5, 6, 8) per instrument file type (BO for bottle, CT for CTD sensors, XX for unknown instrument type, MO for mooring, XB for XBT sensor, GL for gliders, ML for mini-log, PF for profiling floats, SM for sea mammals, FB for ferry boxes and SD for saildrones).




Figure 11: Nutrient station yearly distribution per instrument file type (log scale) of (BO for bottle, CT for CTD sensors, XX for unknown instrument type, MO for mooring, XB for XBT sensor, GL for gliders, ML for mini-log, PF for profiling floats, SM for sea mammals, FB for ferry boxes and SD for saildrones).

### IV.2.3 Chlorophyll concentration

This section is focused on the quality control procedure for the chlorophyll concentration. Chlorophyll-a and chlorophyll-a fluorescence are the two types of chlorophyll concentration quality controlled in real time by the In Situ TAC. The units for the two data types are mg/m<sup>3</sup> (milligrams per cubic metre). Chlorophyll-a data are laboratory analyses using HPLC (High Performance Liquid Chromatography) and spectrophotometry as well as the fluorometric data from the BGC-Argo platforms. Chlorophyll-a fluorescence data comprise all other in situ fluorometric-based measurements from gliders, ferrybox, buoys and other platforms.

Figure 12 represents the spatial distribution of chlorophyll observations and Figure 13 the yearly distribution of chlorophyll stations. Chlorophyll measurements are essentially (if not exclusively) chemical (BO) in the first decades but are now dominated by in-situ fluorometric-based measurements essentially from autonomous instruments.




Figure 12: Spatial distribution of good chlorophyll observation (i.e., those with a QC flag 1, 2, 5, 6, 8) per instrument file type (BO for bottle, CT for CTD sensors, XX for unknown instrument type, MO for mooring, XB for XBT sensor, GL for gliders, ML for mini-log, PF for profiling floats, SM for sea mammals, FB for ferry boxes and SD for saildrones).




Figure 13: Chlorophyll station yearly distribution per instrument file type -log scale- (BO for bottle, CT for CTD sensors, XX for unknown instrument type, MO for mooring, XB for XBT sensor, GL for gliders, ML for mini-log, PF for profiling floats, SM for sea mammals, FB for ferry boxes and SD for saildrones).

### IV.3 Wave observations

Figure 14 shows the temporal coverage by region with the evolution over time in the number of platforms from 1970 to 2023, considering the type of data collected: wave height, period, direction, and wave spectra. The spatial coverage is presented through a map with the distribution of platforms (Figures 15 and 16), where the colour of the dots represents the number of years for which there was data coverage. For both scalar and directional waves the increase in the number of platforms over the period from 1970 to 2023 can be clearly seen, especially over the last two decades. For wave spectra there is no coverage until the 1990's and then it increases significantly in the last decade. Regarding the spatial coverage, most of the stations that provide wave information are concentrated in the Northern Hemisphere and close to the coast. In the European Seas there are differences between regions with high coverage in all of them except in the Southern Black Sea, the Arctic and the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean.

Product: INSITU\_GLO\_PHYBGCWAV\_DISCRETE\_MYNRT\_013\_030.






Figure 14: Evolution of the number of wave platforms from 1970 to 2023 at global and regional scales.



#### IV.4 Sea-level observations

Sea level observations are aggregated in real-time. The evolution of the number of platforms between 1840 and 2024 is shown in Figure 17. The number is increasing slowly in the first decades until 1990. In the two decades from 1990 to 2010, the number of platforms doubled from 200 to 400, and in the last

<p>QUID for In Situ Products  INSITU_GLO_PHYBGCWAV_DISCRETE_MYNRT_013_030/  _ARC_013_031/_BAL_013_032/_IBI_013_033/_BLK_013_034/  _MED_013_035/_NWS_013_036</p>	<p>Ref:  Date:  Issue:</p>	<p>CMEMS-INS-QUID-013-030-036  15 June 2024  2.4</p>
---	------------------------------------	--

decade (after 2010) the increase is even more marked. The spatial distribution maps (Figures 18 and 19) show that the coverage is high in European Seas except for the Southern Mediterranean, Black Sea and the Arctic, and very scarce beyond Europe due to the fact that we do not fully collect data outside Europe.

Product: INSITU\_GLO\_PHYBGCWAV\_DISCRETE\_MYNRT\_013\_030.






Figure 17: Evolution over time in the number of sea level platforms between 1840 and 2023 at global scale.





<p style="text-align: center;">           QUID for In Situ Products            INSITU_GLO_PHYBGCWAV_DISCRETE_MYNRT_013_030/            _ARC_013_031/_BAL_013_032/_IBI_013_033/_BLK_013_034/            _MED_013_035/_NWS_013_036         </p>	<p>           Ref:            Date:            Issue:         </p>	<p>           CMEMS-INS-QUID-013-030-036            15 June 2024            2.4         </p>
---	--	--

## IV.5 Ocean currents

Ocean currents data are aggregated from platforms such as HF-radars (HFRs), vessels or fixed sites. They are reported as seven variables (see Table 10). The number of platforms was quite low until the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (less than 200 platforms) and then substantially increased to more than 800 in 2020 (see Figure 20).

*Table 10: The seven variables reported in NetCDF files for ocean currents.*

name	long name
HCSP	Horizontal current speed
HCDT	Current to direction relative true north
EWCT	West-east current component
NSCT	South-north current component
VCSP	Bottom-top current component
RDVA	Radial sea water velocity away from instrument
DRVA	Direction of radial vector away from instrument

Product: INSITU\_GLO\_PHYBGCWAV\_DISCRETE\_MYNRT\_013\_030.




Figure 20: Evolution over time in the number of platforms providing current data between 1970 and 2023 at global scale.

#### IV.5.1 A focus on HF radars

The last inventory (June 2024) shows that there are 94 HFRs currently deployed and active in various coastal areas of the European seas (Figure 21). This number is growing with seven new HFRs installed per year. The EU HFR node delivers in near real-time and on an hourly basis, maps of surface current velocities from the HFRs that are active. The HFR node also collects and processes near real time HFR data for advanced QA/QC and aggregation of files to build the REP dataset of historical surface current velocity data from those operators connected to the node. In the European framework, the EU HFR Node is now managing data from 20 HFR networks (built by 53 radar sites) and from 2019 is also receiving data from 5 US HFR networks. From these 25 networks, 23 are sending data in NRT, and 2 have provided time series of historical data.

European HFRs are distributed amongst the different Regional Ocean Observing Systems (ROOS) areas coordinated by the European Global Ocean Observing System (EuroGOOS): 56% in MONGOOS (Mediterranean Operational Network for the Global Ocean Observing System), 32% in IBI-ROOS (Ireland-Biscay-Iberia Regional Operational Oceanographic System) and 5% in NOOS (north West European Shelf

<p>QUID for In Situ Products  INSITU_GLO_PHYBGCWAV_DISCRETE_MYNRT_013_030/  _ARC_013_031/_BAL_013_032/_IBI_013_033/_BLK_013_034/  _MED_013_035/_NWS_013_036</p>	<p>Ref:  Date:  Issue:</p>	<p>CMEMS-INS-QUID-013-030-036  15 June 2024  2.4</p>
---	------------------------------------	--

Operational Oceanographic System) according to the last update of the inventory, in June 2024, as shown in Figure 21.




Figure 21: Distribution of HFR systems in Europe. The operational systems are plotted in blue, future installations in grey, past deployments in yellow and temporally not working active stations (data recorded in June 13, 2024) in red colour. Left map: All HFR systems in Europe. Right Map: European HFR systems connected to Copernicus Marine Service Catalogue (In NRT and/or REP). Source: <https://www.hfrnode.eu/map/>

#### IV.6 Meteorological and miscellaneous observations

The In Situ TAC has no specific commitment to manage in situ meteorological and non-ocean observations. However, when such parameters are reported along with ocean in situ parameters, they are preserved in the NetCDF files, with no additional quality control.

Meteorological and miscellaneous observations include, among others, wind, air temperature, humidity, precipitation, atmospheric pressure and river flows.

As an example, Figure 22 shows the evolution of the number of platforms measuring atmospheric parameters between 1970 and 2024. It shows a clear increase from the middle 2000’s. Figure 23 shows the distribution of the platforms providing wind data at global scale and Figure 24 at European Seas scale.

Product: INSITU\_GLO\_PHYBGCWAV\_DISCRETE\_MYNRT\_013\_030.




Figure 22: Evolution over time in the number of meteorological platforms between 1970 and 2020 at global and regional scales.




Figure 23: Wind data geospatial coverage at global scale, coloured by time coverage.




Figure 24: Wind data geospatial coverage at European seas. Colour scale shows the extent of the temporal coverage.

<p>QUID for In Situ Products  INSITU_GLO_PHYBGCWAV_DISCRETE_MYNRT_013_030/  _ARC_013_031/_BAL_013_032/_IBI_013_033/_BLK_013_034/  _MED_013_035/_NWS_013_036</p>	<p>Ref:  Date:  Issue:</p>	<p>CMEMS-INS-QUID-013-030-036  15 June 2024  2.4</p>
---	------------------------------------	--

## V. SYSTEM'S NOTICEABLE EVENTS, OUTAGES OR CHANGES

---

No noticeable events, outages or changes to report for this version of the document.

<p>QUID for In Situ Products  INSITU_GLO_PHYBGCWAV_DISCRETE_MYNRT_013_030/  _ARC_013_031/_BAL_013_032/_IBI_013_033/_BLK_013_034/  _MED_013_035/_NWS_013_036</p>	<p>Ref:  Date:  Issue:</p>	<p>CMEMS-INS-QUID-013-030-036  15 June 2024  2.4</p>
---	------------------------------------	--

## VI. QUALITY CHANGES SINCE PREVIOUS VERSION

---

There is no quality change to report for this version

<p>QUID for In Situ Products  INSITU_GLO_PHYBGCWAV_DISCRETE_MYNRT_013_030/  _ARC_013_031/_BAL_013_032/_IBI_013_033/_BLK_013_034/  _MED_013_035/_NWS_013_036</p>	<p>Ref:  Date:  Issue:</p>	<p>CMEMS-INS-QUID-013-030-036  15 June 2024  2.4</p>
---	------------------------------------	--

## VII. REFERENCES

Aquadopp: Nortek AQUADOPP profiler: <https://www.nortekgroup.com/products>

Bittig, H. C., Körtzinger, A., Johnson, K. S., Claustre, H., Emerson, S., Fennel, K., et al. (2016). SCOR WG 142: Quality Control Procedures for Oxygen and Other Biogeochemical Sensors on Floats and Gliders. Recommendations on the Conversion between Oxygen Quantities for Bio-Argo Floats and Other Autonomous Sensor Platforms. <http://doi.org/10.13155/45915>.

Copernicus Marine In Situ Tac Data Management Team (2020). Copernicus In Situ TAC, Real Time Quality Control for WAVES. <http://doi.org/10.13155/46607>

Copernicus Marine In Situ TAC BGC quality control group (2023). Real time quality control of biogeochemical measurements within Copernicus Marine in situ TAC. <https://doi.org/10.13155/75704>

Gourrion Jérôme, Leroy Delphine (2023). MinMax Quality Check for NRT operations. Note. <https://doi.org/10.13155/88904>

Hammarklint, T., D. Kassis, H. Wehde, and L. Rickards, 2010: Real Time Quality Control of Current measurements. <https://doi.org/10.13155/74316>.

Hansen, D. V., Poulain, P.-M., 1996: Processing of WOCE/TOGA drifter data. J. Atmos. Oceanic Technol. 13, 900-909.

IOC, (1997): Global Sea Level Observing System (GLOSS) implementation plan -1997. Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission, Technical Series, No. 50, 91pp. & Annexes

IOC, (2006): Manual on Sea Level Measurement and Interpretation. Volume IV: An update to 2006. Paris, Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission of UNESCO. 78 pp. (IOC Manuals and Guides No. 14, vol IV; JCOMM Technical Report No. 31 WMO/TD. No. 1339.

NOAA (2009): NOAA Atlas NESDIS 66: World Ocean Database 2009

Notarstefano, G. et al., May 2010: MyOcean Real Time Quality Control and Validation of Current Measurements inferred from Drifter Data. <https://doi.org/10.13155/74299>.

Perez, B., M. De Alfonso, V. Huess, and L. Rickards, 2010: Recommended Quality Control on Sea level in Situ data within MyOcean. <https://doi.org/10.13155/74307>.

Von Schuckmann, K., B. Garau, H. Wehde, T. Gies, D. Durand and F. Reseghetti (2010a), Real Time Quality Control of temperature and salinity measurements. Real Time Quality Control of temperature and salinity measurements within MyOcean and Copernicus In Situ TAC. CMEMS-INS-CURRENT-RTQC. <https://doi.org/10.13155/74317>.

Von Schuckmann, K. and C. Cabanés, 2010b: Validation methods of temperature and salinity measurements: Application on global measurements performed at the Coriolis data centre, MyOcean project guidelines, WP15.

Von Schuckmann, K., H. Wehde, S. Pouliquen, M. de Alfonso and L. Perivoliotis, (2011) Key Performance Indicators: Synthetic information to users on the quality of the product and of the service. MyOcean document