Summary and overview of workshop - 1

Lara Ferrighi, METNO

Ocean Data Dojo - Workshop 2, Virtual Meeting 2022-12-15/16

Ocean mooring data INTAROS/IMR Oceanographic measurements IOPAN

- Lots of data to manage
- Different instrumentations
- Overview of metadata standardization
- (Meta)data harmonization effort
- CTD/Moorings/Argo Floats/Ocean profilers/Biology samples
- Data standardization can be difficult
- Finding the more appropriate standard/convention/vocabulary



Oceanographic measurements IOPAN

Ocean mooring data INTAROS/IMR Arctic Ocean Observation System NERSC

- Deploying instrumentation is a big effort, human and logistics
- Long term perspective for infrastructure is crucial
- New generations need to know about Data Management
- A more clear definition of roles and responsibilities is needed



Oceanographic measurements IOPAN

Ocean mooring data

- Systems for Arctic conditions
- Cover a large area of the sea
- Navigation support, Search & Rescue
- Sea-ice classification with deep learning
- Low-cost drifters with high resolution
- Time series of Ocean waves

Arctic Ocean Observation
System
NERSC

Unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) Maritime Robotics



Drifters METNO

Ocean mooring data INTAROS/IMR

Core Data Ocean SIOS

Oceanographic measurements IOPAN

Arctic Ocean Observation

- In situ live observation of ice
- Difficult to train people, lack of boats participating
- Lack of standardization
- Commitment for long monitoring
- Not enough coverage & biological data
- Lack of FAIR training and data harmonization



IceWatch METNO

Drifters METNO

Breakout sessions

Discussion on:

- Gaps in data delivery chains
- Gaps between data collection and publication requirements
- Gaps in knowledge and FAIR implementations
- Clarification of roles and responsibilities
- Opportunities to improve and create a network



Main points (1)

- Lack of preparation in Data Management/FAIR
 - Data management project inviting data collectors
 - Fulfilling requirements is difficult without guidance
 - Senior/Experienced scientist must instruct next generation of scientists with practical filling of metadata templates (excel or paper) during a field experiment (research school)
 - regular science course or as part of PhD program
- Recognition
 - Data should count more when people are evaluated for projects/fundings
 - Lobbying at the Research Council
- Funding is often underestimated
 - Too many hours are spent due to lack of preparation and/or misunderstanding of roles
 - Dedicated Curation Calls
 - Influence funding agencies to increase funding for research projects: more funding for extensive data collection



Main points (2)

Level of requirements

 Finding an appropriate level of requirements for metadata publication to keep them interoperable but not too challenging to achieve.

Uncertainties on how to prepare data

- Good netCDF example for common data types: filled attributes, controlled vocabularies etc...
- Promoting better existing templates (Nansen Legacy, INTAROS, CMEMS) and sample software (Rosetta, Python scripts)

Toolings

- Can be difficult to find relevant tools, e.g. new tools that are not part of big organisations or projects that can promote them widely
 - Catalogue of tools (with links to software)



Main points (3)

- Data collector
 - Gather use/site metadata during field experiment, processing data, quality control
- Data manager
 - Provide support for discovery metadata
 - Specifying what metadata are needed, what vocabs to use
 - Clear information for data type & have a good netCDF example of datasets
 - Good feedback and guidelines for creating netCDF files
- Data center
 - Expect dissemination & citation tracking
 - Ensure visibility of datasets.
 - Ideally requiring / quality controlling sufficient metadata for compliance
 - Long-term data preservation & DOI provision
- Data consumer
 - Proper attribution and following the licence
 - Suggest future collaboration