In February 2013, SeaDataNet provided an in-situ dataset
- Area: IBI-ROOS (Ireland – Biscay – Iberia)
- Period: 1990 to 2012
- Parameters: temperature and salinity only
- 284,073 vertical profiles

Profiles as distinct local_cdi_id
IBI-Roos tasks on SeaDataNet data

The IBI-ROOS TAC performed the following tasks:

- Creation of 1700 pseudo platform codes from SeaDataNet cruise IDs
- A total of 9,889 CTDs and 127,211 bottles where identified as new data. We ignored the SHOM data as a direct integration is underway.
- A first visual quality control was performed on the new profiles with Scoop QC tool on the 1990-1999 period
- A first QC feedback to SeaDataNet is available
IBI-Roos remaining tasks

- Perform a visual QC on 2000-2012 period and provide feedback

- Investigate the SeaDataNet profiles reporting the same platform-date-position-instrument (13 961 : about 5% of the profiles)

- Perform analysis on 1990-2012 period before addition into CORA dataset and provide additional feedback to SeaDataNet
New profiles: CTDs and bottles

ibi-roos area: seadatanet and myocean data
New profiles by provider (edmo)

ibi-roos area: seadatanet and myocean data
New CTDs by provider (edmo)
IBI-Roos existing profiles (no bottles)

ibi-roos area: seadatanet and myocean data
Height issues

1: Many profiles have salinity but no temperature
   Many profiles have no temperature and no salinity

2: In the ODV file the vertical reference is immersion.
   We need the original measurement: pressure for CTDs.
   This is crucial for MyOcean users.

3: For XBTs we need the WMO instrument type and the
   fall rate equation. This is crucial for MyOcean users.

4: In addition to the cruise ID, we need a platform code for
   each profile. This is crucial for MyOcean data managers.
Height issues

5: We need to know whether CTDs are calibrated. *What is the error on measurement?* Modelers want to know the error on any data, particularly on calibrated data.

6: A fair number of QC 0 (no control) are mixed with QC 1 (good). Should we change 0 into 1?

7: some immersions are duplicated
Height issues

8: The great majority of profiles is well quality controlled. However, a visual inspection is still needed. QC flags changed on 0.5% of the profiles on period 1990-1999 (452/96,263 profiles).

Objective analysis may raise further inspections.
Mixed profiles and spike

ibi-roos area: seadatanet and myocean data
Dubious salinities

ibi-roos area: seadatanet and myocean data
Suspicious profile

ibi-roos area: seadatanet and myocean data
Salinity but no temperature

ibi-roos area: seadatanet and myocean data
Atypical density

ibi-roos area: seadatanet and myocean data
Dubious immersion

ibi-roos area: seadatanet and myocean data
ibi-roos area: seadatanet and myocean data
Bottom errors

ibi-roos area : seadatanet and myocean data
Instrument failure

ibi-roos area: seadatanet and myocean data
Noisy data
Good and uncontrolled data
Good and uncontrolled data