Ocean Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/os-2016-21-RC1, 2016 © Author(s) 2016. CC-BY 3.0 License.



OSD

Interactive comment

Interactive comment on "Bridging the Gap between Observational Oceanography and Users" by Christiane A. Eschenbach

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 18 August 2016

Does the paper address relevant scientific questions within the scope of OS? Especially the question of applicaton-oriented marine science and marine monitoring is a question of main interest for OS. "Bridging the Gap between Observational Oceanography and Users" tries to figure out the development process of COSYNA, the Coastal Observing System for Northern and Arctic Seas. The abstract states, that the analysis of data download has proved impact beyond academia. And this study should contribute to the emerging knowledge on integration of science and end-users. Does the paper present novel concepts, ideas, tools, or data and are substantial conclusions reached? The paper doesn't show an ex ante prepared scientific investigation process. But the author tries to bridge this gap by borrowing theoretical approaches from other disciplines, such as the iterative management method PDCA (plan–do–check– act or plan–do–check–adjust) and using approaches of transdisciplinary research and

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



stakeholder interaction. A critical reading comes to the conclusion, that a requirements analysis for the dataportal COSYNA - and the described activities are not more or less such a requirement analysis - is declared in the article as a "stakeholder interaction process". But stakeholder interaction would mean, that the stakeholder itself would directly influence the system and the kind of data, provided by the portal. But there is no indication, that such a real interaction process has taken place. Furthermore stakeholder interaction within a transdisciplinary process would mean, that different groups of stakeholders, e.g. NGO's, public administration, citizen, tourism, fishermen would have been involved into a problem-centered investigation process, to come to a common solution. In the discussion (p. 10) is stated, that stakeholder interaction and transdisciplinary orientations would have been established, during the planning process. The same abstract defines the objective of transdisciplinarity: "The core idea of transdisciplinarity is that different academic disciplines work jointly with practitioners to solve a real-world problem (Häberli et al. 2001)". At least these objectives cannot be gained, just by involving the offshore wind energy into the consultation process as the paper shows in the Case Study. If there have been additional activities to work into broader scope towards transdisciplinarity, these activities have to be pointed out. Otherwise the used concept of transdisciplinary research would not be adequate for the described activities. The given reference to the process of product life cycle respectively PDCA just shows, that needs a continuing improvement, has to run through such an process. But where is the scientific value of this procedure? The scientific methods and assumptions are on different levels and do not always support the interpretations and conclusions. Reading the article I steadily wondered, what could be the news from a scientific point of view. The Workflow process just led to a requirement analysis for data products. The following stakeholder interaction process has just been evaluating the provided data. And no wonder - business and science like to have good pre-processed no-cost data. At least the article contains no new findings or knowledgments, that are worth to be published in a high-ranking scientific journal. All the activities to develop the COSYNA dataportal are described in a well-structured

OSD

Interactive comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



and well readable form. The used literature is comprehensive and up-to-date. The objective of the paper – driving the ocean-monitoring more into a transdisciplinary and application-orientated direction – is creditable. But the scientific basis of the paper is weak. So I recommend to reject the paper.

Interactive comment on Ocean Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/os-2016-21, 2016.

Interactive comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

