

## ET-DDS SMM-CD DATASET ASSESSMENT EVALUATION

**SMM-CD Assessed Dataset Title:** ERA5

**ET-DDS Evaluator Name:** Ge Peng and José A. Guijarro; Reviewed by the team

**Date of Evaluation:** 11/01/2019 – 11/15/2019

**Dataset POC Contacted (if applicable):** Robert Dunn and Paul Berrisford

**Date of Updated Evaluation (including POC comments if applicable):** 12/11/2019

SMM-CD ASPECT	SMM-CD RATING  (Robert Dunn/Paul Berrisford)	RATING EVALUATION  (‘Agree’/ ‘Higher Score Reconsideration’/ ‘Lower Score Reconsideration’ with justification comments)	EVALUATION FOLLOW-UP WITH POC (No follow up needed/Minor or Major issue(s))
<b>Data Access</b>			
<i>Discoverability</i>	5/5	Agree.  The dataset is searchable. The link to an international catalogue (Copernicus Data Store - CDS) is provided and is workable.	No follow-up is needed.
<i>Accessibility</i>	5/4	Agree with Level 5.  Justifications are provided.	No follow-up is needed.
<b>Usability &amp; Usage</b>			
<i>Data Portability</i>	4/3.5	Agree with Level 4.  Justification is provided.	No follow-up is needed.
<i>Documentation</i>	5/4	Recommend to be changed to Level 4.5.  As pointed out by the SMM-CD assessment POC (Robert Dunn), it is unlikely to be reproducible. Therefore, it should not be assessed at Level 5, which represents all criteria are satisfied.	No follow-up is need but the team review: agree to change the rating to Level 4.5.
<i>Usage</i>	4/4	Agree.	No follow-up is needed.
<b>Quality Management</b>			
<i>Quality Assurance &amp; Control</i>	4/4	Agree.	No follow-up is needed.
<i>Quality Assessment</i>	2/1	Agree with Level 2.  Dataset POC: We have done some ad hoc quality assessments, some of which are available online. In the near future, the ERA5 paper will be published, so at that point I would change the score to 3. Over time, the	Follow-up is needed.  Feedback from dataset POCs:

		community will probably publish much more on ERA5, so then the score could go even higher.	Agree with Level 2.
<i>Uncertainty Analysis</i>	3/3	<p>Agree.</p> <p>Additional clarification is needed on whether ERA5 should be considered as a new product.</p>	<p>Follow-up is needed.</p> <p>Feedback from dataset POC: ERA5 should be considered as a new product. Agree with Level 3.</p>
<i>Data Integrity</i>	3/1	<p>Change to Level 2 based on the feedback from dataset POC.</p> <p>Dataset POC: Data integrity is not systematically verified for all parameters at all locations.</p>	<p>Follow-up is needed.</p> <p>Feedback from Paul Berrisford: Change to Level 2.</p>
<b>Data Management</b>			
<i>Preservation</i>	4/4	Agree.	No follow-up is needed.
<i>Metadata</i>	5/3	<p>Agree with Level 3</p> <p>Dataset url (<a href="https://confluence.ecmwf.int/display/CKB/ERA5+data+documentation">https://confluence.ecmwf.int/display/CKB/ERA5+data+documentation</a>) resolves to a product page that contains some product information. The metadata may also be captured by files, either in GRIB or NetCDF.</p> <p>Does not appear to support dataset provenance.</p> <p>Sufficient attributes in NetCDF files to use the data.</p>	<p>No follow-up is needed but the team review: Agree with Level 3.</p>
<i>Governance</i>	3/4	Agree with Level 4	No follow-up is needed.

(V3R1 3/22/2019)