ECV uncertainty: project progress, best practices & user uptake

- Many users prefer L3 data but often these lack correlation length scales accompanying the products, and conveying this information to the users can be challenging:
  - Where more detailed information is available many users are ignoring the off-diagonals, instead only using the diagonals
  - Some users interpret uncertainties as data quality
  - How are we conveying information on bias vs. uncertainty
  - There is a general lack of understanding amongst the user communities how to implement the uncertainties from the CCI products:
    - Do we have the correlation length scales or understand them
    - Is there sufficient information from L1
      - Needs to be a priority for upcoming missions
      - Recommendation through the MAGs to highlight this
- It appears much of the meaning of the uncertainties xECV are not consistent, and in some cases not consistent within ECVs
- There is recognition that a strategy to come to some common terminology is needed
- GCOS uncertainty requirements are not necessarily consistent or necessarily meaningful across ECVs
- The xECV characterisation and harmonisation of uncertainties needs to be expanded to all ECVs

ECV uncertainty: project progress, best practices & user uptake

- Some possible actions:
  - High level inventory of how ECVs communicate uncertainties
  - Template document / table per CCI:
    - Some overlaps between the ways we do uncertainties
    - Would be good to know how each CCI is doing uncertainties
    - Why are their gaps in our respective implementations
    - Are we all following a strict metrological approach
  - Each CCI requested to fill in their respective information in the template