Atmo Correction

- **work on a common protocol for using the aeronet data, since its the only reliable world wide source of indirect(!) validation**

-

- B. if we can agree on RTM intercomparison, **RTMs are the means of generic validation**

-

- C. NF: Issue. RTM codes are self consistent, how do we parametrize aerosol is of much more impact than the rest, what is the impact of not using aeronet aerosol.

-

- D. AB What is a starting point / sub group of such a activity ?

-

- E. Characterization of instruments on ground is issue (but for different)

-

- F. What are the quantities we need from Aeronet

-

- G. We should include other potential useful ground truth (not only Aeronet, but <-- Protocol!), actually we have to start with quantities that are needed and identify that Aeronet (among others ! can serve)

-

- H. NF: Is the uncertainty quantification of Aeronet appropriate,

-

- I. --> **Common protocol for uncertainty estimation**

-

- J. What about Ocean: if we aim for a protocol the **same philosophy should be the basis**

Cloud detection

-

- **A common means of understanding the differences between the cloudmasks**, give the scientific teams the possibility of their baby, Further this quantifies the uncertainty (variance!)

- AB: collect the needs of the user (who are they?)

- VIRS as an example for ONE common cloud mask, there is a team consisting of downstream algorithm experts. **'Cloud mask user working group'** CMUWG

- What is the least common denominator of a cloud for the members of 'so**mething that is disturbing my downstreaming algorithm**?', What is disturbing (not usable, or still correctable) (Example 1.38 µm band Landsat)