|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Seed questions - Session 2 (Datasets)** | |
| 1. Would you favour the inclusion of SMOS L1 (TB) data in the Platform and, if so, in which frame (antenna/earth), at which level (TOA/BOA) and with which correction included (eg. atm/Gal/Ionosphere)? |  |
| 2. SMOS L2 SSS will only refer to SSS1 (roughness model #1). Do you consider adequate to retain only the last two reprocessed dataset (currently v622 and v662)? |  |
| 3. Are you aware of additional constraints that would prevent the regular update of the identified datasets? |  |
| 4. Could you spot any missing crucial dataset? |  |
| 5. Delayed Mode versus Near Real Time - how to cope with this? Preliminary idea is splitting the database for the matchup according to QC control. Any further insight? |  |
| 6. Any other crucial NWP or NOP data provider? Any suggestion for the most adequate products? |  |
| 7. Any suggested mechanism for transferring/including campaigns data (eg. SPURS-2) directly into the Platform? |  |
| **Seed questions - Session 3 (Analyses/Processing/Tools)** | |
| 8. Match-up criteria: suggested additional spatial or temporal scales? |  |
| 9. Match-up criteria: suggested collocation radii? |  |
| 10. Any missing data in the in situ datasets (see PIMEP\_DATASETS.xls table) as it is defined currently? |  |
| 11. Any clear limitation with the current official SMOS validation protocol? |  |
| 12. Any suggestion to agree on a common set of flags for the various products? |  |
| 13. Any other statistics/metrics/plot to be included/visualized? |  |
| 14. The Platform intends to “stratify” data according to selected geophysical regimes to favour an enhanced validation (Eg. wrt SST, or WS/SWH, or WS/MLD). Any suggestion for additional regimes to be considered? |  |
| 15. The platform aims at a full characterization/error budget of the actual SMOS performances; any suggested metric to characterize and discount errors due to h/v variability and representativeness? |  |
| 16. Any clear limitation of the described Tools? Any missing feature? |  |
| 17. Any additional tool recommended to implement? |  |
| 18. The platform intends to allow some capability of ingesting user codes (yet limited in complexity) – Any suggested constraint to the user? |  |
| 19. The platform intends to allow some capability of ingesting user datasets (yet limited in size and format) – Any suggested constraint to the user? |  |
| **Seed questions – Session 4 (process studies)** | |
| 20. Any missing info to attain the listed process studies? |  |
| 21. Could you rank your most valuable 3 case studies among those selected? |  |
| 22. Any additional process study users might like to address? |  |
| 23. Suggested metrics for the performance assessment of the platform in the pre-operational phase? |  |
| 24. Any insight to avoid overlapping with future CCI SSS activities, considering that merging SSS datasets is already beyond scope of this Platform? |  |