Copernicus FICE 2025

Training on
In situ Ocean Colour Above-Water Radiometry towards Satellite Validation

AAOT Shifts and Group Assignments

Juan Gossn
EUMETSAT
JuanIgnacio.Gossn@eumetsat.int

6-17 May 2024
Venice, Italy

Each of you is assigned to shifts and groups. Please remember **them!**

SHIFT 1

Name	Group
Carolina Mander	1A
Gemma Kerrisk	1A
Ivan Farace	1B
Anabel Gammaru	1B
Mengjie Zhao	1C
Eva Cullen	1C
Alejandro Roman Vazquez	1D
Jorge García Jiménez	1D
Ekaterina Koltsova	1E
Roy Armstrong	1E
Sorin Constantin	1F
Ceridwyn Hunter	1F

SHIFT 2

Name	Group
Vishnu Perumthuruthil Suseelan	2G
Tarasenko Anastasiia	2G
Remika S. Gupana	2H
Ana Inés Dogliotti	2H
Ileana Aracely Galdamez	2I
Wilhem Riom	2I
Natalie Hall	2J
Eduardo Negri de Oliveira	2J
Charlotte Begouen Demeaux	2K
Luis Gonzalez Vilas	2K
Deuk Jae, Hwang	2L
Sergio Mauricio Molano Cárdenas	2L

- Each shift will travel to AAOT in separate days.
- The other shift will stay at San Servolo taking the “Learn OLCI” and “Learn PACE” trainings.
- Vittorio and the rest of trainers will keep us informed about the AAOT dates via WhatsApp.

Group assignments

Each group will give a final presentation (15 min) at the end of the course – Saturday July 19th, addressing the following points:

1st part: Your experience during the field measurements in San Servolo and AAOT

1. What were the hardest particular things (instrumental, coordination, logistics, cables, weather, etc.) to achieve during the San Servolo field experiment?
   - What unexpected issues took place and how did you circumvent them?
2. What particular roles did each of you take individually during the measurements (e.g. who took pictures, who took field notes, who triggered the casts, etc.)?
3. What measurement protocol recommendations are harder/easier to follow in San Servolo when compared to other sites where you performed in situ radiometry measurements?
4. Was it easier or harder compared to the locations from where you typically measure?
5. What measurement protocol recommendations are harder/easier to follow with TriOS when compared to other instruments with which you performed in situ radiometry measurements?
6. Do you have specific suggestions as regarding measurement protocols/procedures that the OCR community should consider to include in revisits of the protocols and procedures?

Group assignments

Each group will give a final presentation (15 min) at the end of the course – Day July 19th, addressing the following points:

2nd part: Running HyperCP and/or ThoMaS with a precursor in situ dataset.

1. Select (in case accessible by any member of your group) a pre-existing data set of **raw measurements** performed with TriOS or SeaBird instruments that you wish to run using HyperCP… and give it a try in HyperCP!
   - Discuss preliminary results and challenges faced.
   - Added value (in case you have your own processing workflow): Compare the results obtained with HyperCP vs. your own processing workflow.
   - Please discuss in advance your selected dataset with the HyperCP instructors (Dirk, Aga, Juan and Hayley).
2. In case you have a specific of in situ radiometry dataset (+ Chlorophyll/TSM) set that you wish to use to perform matchups with ThoMaS, give it a try!
   - Discuss preliminary results and challenges faced.
   - Please don't select huge datasets!
   - Compare the results obtained with ThoMaS vs. your own matchup workflow.
   - Please discuss in advance your selected dataset with the ThoMaS instructors (Juan and Hayley).

If you don't find a suitable dataset for neither HyperCP nor ThoMaS, please talk yo us

Group assignments

Each group will give a final presentation (15 min) at the end of the course – Day 10, May 17th, addressing the following points:

3rd part: Achieving "FRM quality" over your future measurements

1. What are the overarching major challenges that each of you and your teams face today to acquire in situ optical measurements?
2. Do you consider that your (past/coming) in situ acquisitions are conforming to the FRM principles? If not:
   - Which are
     1. … the limitations in terms of your instrumental facilities …
     2. … the elements of your acquisition protocol or specific procedures in the field …
     3. … the Quality Control and Quality Assurance steps …

     …. that you think you can re-assess after the course?
   - Is there any specific procedure that you follow that you consider to be specific to your measurement conditions (site/instrumentation/other) and that should be accounted for in the current documentation?
   - How can the OC community (IOCCG, FRM4SOC-2, Consortium, space agencies) help you and your research teams to further achieve FRM standards?
3. Are you planning to use HyperCP and/or ThoMaS to process your in situ data? Regardless if yes or not,
   1. Which were the major challenges you faced when using them?
   2. Are there processing steps in HyperCP/ThoMaS that you would need to tweak for your particular case?
   3. What enhancements do you think that HyperCP and ThoMaS would benefit from?