

COADS Bridge Data Quality Control Report

Jesse Enloe and Shawn R. Smith

World Ocean Circulation Experiment (WOCE)

Surface Meteorological Data Assembly Center
Center for Ocean-Atmospheric Prediction Studies
Florida State University

December 21, 2000

Report WOCEMET 99-13

Version 2.0

Addendum:

Member's of the WOCE Hydrographic Project Office (WHPO) and WOCEMET met at the 13th Data Products Committee (DPC) meeting in College Station, TX to discuss reconciliation of the WOCE cruise line designators. This was done in anticipation of the future release of version 3 of the WOCE global data set, and resulted in changes to several WOCE cruise line designations.

On December 21, 2000, WOCEMET changed the WOCE designators for the Hudson (Identifier: CGDG) cruise AR_05_/01, A__04_/01, AR_20C/01, AR_22_/01 to the updated form, AR_05_/01, AR_20_/01, and AR_22_/01.

The cruise designator, AR_14_/02 should be added to the CGDG's cruise AR_07W/05; AR_13_/03.

The cruise designators AR_05_/02 and AR_13_/06 should be added to the CGDG's cruise A__01W/00.

The designator AR_04_/05 for the Le Noroit (Identifier: FITA) was split into two different designators, AR_04E/05 and AR_04W/05.

The WOCE designator for the VJJF's cruise IR_02_/01, was updated to S__05_/00.

Introduction:

The data referenced in this report are bridge observations obtained from the Comprehensive Ocean Atmosphere Data Set (COADS) (Slutz et. al.). The data originated on research vessels Takuyo (identifier: 7JWN), Hudson (identifier: CGDG), Sonne (identifier: DFCG), Le Noroit (identifier: FITA), Charles Darwin (identifier: GDLS), Chofu Maru (identifier: JCCX), Shumpu Maru (identifier: JFDG), Kaiyo (identifier: JRPG), T. Washington (identifier: KGWU), Tyro (identifier: PIBQ), Akademic A. Nesmeyanov (identifier: UBYK), Akademic Lavrentyev (identifier: UJFY), Franklin (identifier: VJJF), New Horizon (identifier: WKWB), Discoverer (identifier: WTEA), Vickers (identifier: WTEC), Malcom Baldrige (identifier: WTER), Oceanus (identifier: WXAQ), James Clarke Ross (identifier: ZDLP), and Agulhas (identifier: ZSAF). The data were provided to the Florida State University Data Assembly Center (DAC) in electronic format by and were converted to standard DAC netCDF format. The data were then processed using an automated screening program, which adds quality control flags to the data, highlighting potential problems. Finally, the Data Quality Evaluator (DQE) reviewed the data and current flags, whereby flags were added, removed, or modified according to the judgement of the DQE and other DAC personnel. Details of the WOCE quality control procedures can be found in Smith et al. (1996). The data quality control report summarizes the flags for the Comprehensive Ocean Atmospheric Data Set, including those added by both the preprocessor and the DQE.

Statistical Information:

	AR_07E/01		X					
	AR_07E/02		X					
UBYK								
	P_01W/00	X	X					
UJFY								
	PR_13N/03	X	X					
WXAQ								
	AR_11_/02		X		X		X	X
ZSAF								
	ISS01_/01		X					

Details of the cruises are listed in Table 2 and include cruise dates, number of records, number of values, number of flags, and total percentage of data flagged. A total of 70,354 values were evaluated with 1,132 flags added by the preprocessor and the DQE for a total of 1.61% of the values being flagged. The coded data (WX, TCA, LMCA, ZCL, LCT, MCT, HCT) were not included in these statistics.

Table 2: Statistical Cruise Information

RV/CTC	Dates	Number of Records	Number of Values	Number of Flags	Percentage Flagged
CGDG					
AR_05_/01;A_04_/01; AR_20C/01;AR_22_/01	04/25/91 - 05/23/91	88	792	12	1.52
AR_07W/02	05/27/91 - 06/04/91	20	180	0	0.00
AR_07W/03	05/28/92 - 06/13/92	40	360	0	0.00
AR_10_/07	04/07/93 - 05/12/93	72	720	6	0.83
AR_07W/04	06/19/93 - 06/28/93	32	320	8	2.50
AR_13_/02;AR_19_/02; AR_22_/02	11/05/93 - 12/16/93	79	790	0	0.00
AR_07W/05;AR_13_/03; AR_14_/02	05/25/94 -06/12/94	45	450	1	0.22
AR_13_/04	10/13/94 - 11/09/94	60	600	2	0.33
AR_13_/05	04/20/95 - 05/16/95	63	630	1	0.16
A_01W/00;AR_05_/02; AR_13_/06	06/09/95 - 07/04/95				
DFCG					
IR_04_/01	12/23/90 - 01/19/91	95	950	17	1.79
FITA					

	PR_15_/17	02/01/91 - 03/03/91	139	1,390	10	0.72
	PR_15_/18	03/11/91 - 04/06/91	83	747	6	0.80
	PR_15_/19	07/18/91 - 08/13/91	70	630	7	1.11
	PR_15_/20	01/02/92 - 02/16/92	224	2,240	7	0.31
	PR_15_/21	02/21/92 - 03/17/92	185	1,850	7	0.38
	PR_15_/22	08/06/92 - 08/31/92	177	1,770	10	0.56
	PR_15_/23	09/05/92 - 10/02/92	173	1,730	13	0.75
	AR_04_/05;AR_15_/16	09/09/95 - 10/11/95	239	2,390	21	1.51
GDLS						
	AR_10_/03	05/09/92 - 06/07/92	113	1,130	9	0.80
	AR_11_/08	10/01/92 - 10/20/92	59	590	3	0.51
	AR_10_/08	04/23/93 - 05/24/93	125	1,250	24	1.92
JCCX						
	PR_19_/01	11/13/90 - 11/16/90	25	250	3	1.20
	PR_19_/02	11/18/90 - 11/21/90	29	290	0	0.00
	PR_19_/03	11/07/91 - 11/08/91	12	108	0	0.00
	PR_19_/05	11/08/92 - 11/18/92	75	750	14	1.87
JFDG						
	PR_17_/04	10/14/91 - 10/16/91	22	198	0	0.00
	PR_17_/17	10/01/94 - 10/05/94	37	370	0	0.00
	PR_17_/19	07/01/95 - 07/05/95	34	340	0	0.00
JRPG						
	PR_24_/02	10/06/92 - 10/19/92	15	150	0	0.00
	PR_23_/03	12/13/92 - 12/23/92	56	560	9	1.61
KGWU						
	P__17C/00	06/03/91 - 07/11/91	132	1,320	1	0.08
	P__17S/00	07/17/91 - 08/25/91	120	1,200	10	0.83
	P__16C/00	09/01/91 - 10/01/91	85	850	10	1.18
PIBQ						
	AR_07E/01	07/03/90 - 08/02/90	64	576	5	0.87
	AR_07E/02	04/13/91 - 04/30/91	31	279	3	1.08
UBYK						
	P__01W/00	08/31/93 - 09/03/93	11	88	3	3.41
UJFY						
	PR_13N/03	05/13/93 - 06/08/93	75	600	0	0.00
VJFF						
	IR_04_/03	08/28/94 - 09/03/94	23	230	0	0.00
	IR_02_/01	11/20/94 - 12/01/94	22	220	7	3.18
	ISSO3_/01	04/01/95 - 04/22/95	66	660	3	0.45
	IR_06_/04	09/20/95 - 10/09/95	66	660	2	0.30
WKWB						
	PRS03_/04	11/17/94 - 12/04/94	29	290	1	0.34
WTEA						
	PR_16_/01	11/28/90 - 12/06/90	74	740	19	2.57
	P__16N/01	02/28/91 - 02/28/91	8	80	0	0.00
	P__16N/02	03/07/91 - 04/06/91	241	2,410	28	1.16

	PR_16_/03	11/01/91 - 11/13/91	231	2,310	36	1.56
	PR_16_/05	10/14/92 - 11/18/92	209	2,090	43	2.06
	PR_16_/09	09/18/93 - 10/15/93	168	1,680	40	2.38
	PR_16_/10	01/27/94 - 01/29/94	19	190	0	0.00
	PR_16_/14	02/06/95 - 05/02/95	189	1,890	15	0.79
	PR_16_/16	08/05/95 - 08/26/95	156	1,560	6	0.38
WTER						
	PR_16_/02	03/23/91 - 04/19/91	205	2,050	13	0.63
	PR_16_/04	02/23/92 - 03/26/92	255	2,550	34	1.33
	PR_16_/06	02/21/93 - 03/18/93	208	2,080	74	3.56
	PR_16_/07	04/18/93 - 05/14/93	221	2,210	66	2.99
	AR_21_/02	08/22/93 - 10/03/93	259	2,590	14	0.54
	PR_16_/11	04/16/94 - 05/09/94	229	2,290	75	3.28
	PR_16_/15	05/17/94 - 06/17/94	284	2,840	106	3.73
	PR_16_/12	08/04/94 - 08/25/94	215	2,150	138	6.42
	PR_16_/13	08/30/94 - 09/25/94	247	2,470	91	3.68
	IR_04_/05	08/24/95 - 09/25/95	238	1,380	0	0.00
WXAQ						
	AR_11_/02	06/19/91 - 07/04/91	8	72	0	0.00
ZDLP						
	SR_01_/04	11/20/93 - 12/18/93	64	640	14	2.19
ZSAF						
	ISS01_/01	04/05/91 - 05/07/91	186	1,674	81	4.84

Summary:

The overall quality of the bridge data for the COADS proves to be excellent, though the quality varies by ship and by cruise. The distribution of flags for each variable is detailed in Table 3.

Table 3: Number of Flags and Percentage Flagged for Each Variable

Variable	B	D	F	G	L	S	T	Total Number of Flags	Percentage of Variable Flagged
TIME							497	497	6.99
LAT			57		1	166		225	3.16
LON			57		1	145		202	2.84
DIR	55					5		60	0.84
SPD				20		13		33	0.46
P				4		10		14	0.20
T		7		17		8		32	0.45
TS	6			16		16		38	0.53
TD		6				7		13	0.18

TW		13				5		18	0.25
WX								0	0.00
TCA								0	0.00
LMCA								0	0.00
ZCL								0	0.00
LCT								0	0.00
MCT								0	0.00
HCT								0	0.00
Total Number of Flags	61	26	114	57	2	375	497	1,132	
Percentage of All Values Flagged	0.09	0.04	0.16	0.08	0.00*	0.53	0.70	1.61	

*Percentage < 0.01

Time Duplicate Problem:

Almost seven percent of the time stamps were flagged with the T flag by the preprocessor, indicating time duplication. If there are two values for any given variables that share the same time stamp they will both be displayed at that time by the visual data assessment tool. In many cases, this problem caused spikes in the data. Often times if a spike occurred the DQE determined which value was real and flagged the other value as a spike (S). Though the time duplicate spike occurred throughout the data, it was most common in the position data. The user may wish to avoid using meteorological data at times flagged as duplicates.

Other Problems:

Latitude and Longitude received F flags indicating unrealistic platform velocity as determined by the position data. Both variables also received an L flag, denoting a position over land. Erroneous position reports are not uncommon to bridge data.

A total of 26 D flags were assigned by the preprocessor to T, TW, and TD for failing the $T \geq TW \geq TD$ test. In the free atmosphere, the value of the temperature is always greater than or equal to the wet-bulb temperature, which in turn is always greater than or equal to the dewpoint temperature (Smith et al. 1996).

The G flag designates data that are four standard deviations from the COADS climatological means (da Silva et al. 1994).

The B flag assigned by the preprocessor designates a wind direction outside the 0 to 360 degree bounds. A value of 362 degrees refers to variable wind and a value of 361 degrees refers to calm wind in COADS data. All of these values were flagged with the B flag by the preprocessor, but can be considered as reliable data values.

References:

- Smith, S.R., C. Harvey, and D.M. Legler, 1996: *Handbook of Quality Control Procedures and Methods for Surface Meteorology Data*. WOCE Report No. 141/96, Report WOCOMET 96-1, Center for Ocean-Atmospheric Prediction Studies, Florida State University, Tallahassee FL 32306-2840
- da Silva, A.M., C.C. Young and S. Levitus, 1994: *Atlas of Surface Marine Data 1994, Volume 1: Algorithms and Procedures*. NOAA Atlas Series.
- Slutz, R.J., S.J. Lubker, J.D. Hiscox, S.D. Woodruff, R.L. Jenne, D.H. Joseph, P.M. Seurer and J.D. Elms, 1985: COADS - Comprehensive Ocean Atmosphere Data Set, CIRES/ERL/NCAR/NCDC, Boulder, Colorado.