

## Review

### Bridging the Gap between Observational Oceanography and Users

#### Summary:

The paper is a narrative in describing attempts for stakeholder involvement within the COSYMA project. As such it is not a typical scientific paper. There are weaknesses in the assessment which lacks a designed and quantitative component. This refers to a need for more structured data gathering as a precondition for a more structured analysis.

Also, there is a focus on what can be considered key stakeholders. This actual focus does not meet conditions described in the introduction basically seeking input from a diverse group of stakeholders. This should be addressed in a revision.

On the other hand, a summary of the stakeholder involvement process outside a preconceived scientific project is quite valuable and such a summary cannot scientifically cover all aspects of a PDCA assessment that may be should have but in fact has not accompanied the process. I would therefore recommend to retain the paper as a valuable summary of outreach activities within the COSYMA project, in spite of the fact that it is narrative and by itself clearly does not provide a scientific analysis of the stakeholder consultation process. In this context, I recommend the author to outline in some detail what could be a designed assessment for such a complex process such as COSYMA.

More detailed recommendations include:

#### 1. Introduction

Quite complete, provides a very good literature base

Omit page 3 lines 26-30 (redundant)

Omit page 4 reference to citizen science - does not seem to really fit the topic

page 4 lines 12 to 13 moderate statement "Consequently ..... et al, 2012) - standards and evaluation criteria may not be well developed for marine systems, specifically. But does this matter? How would such methods be different from the evaluation of participatory processes in general?

#### 2. The COSYMA product life-cycle

Consider elaboration of PDCA approaches - as is they are mentioned but no background is provided (basic information).

#### 3. Steps of the COSYMA life cycle

##### 3.1. Initial surveys

Appropriate description of the initial surveys

### 3.2. Mathematical-technological realisation

not the focus in this paper, relies on reference to previous publications

page 6, line 15: I presume resolution should be 1 km<sup>2</sup> (not one km)

### 3.3. Free access to data

not the focus in this paper, relies on reference to paper in the same volume

### 3.4. External evaluation

No NGOs participated in evaluation, missing a potentially important target group.

not the focus in this paper, summary sufficient except it would be nice to have an explanation for discrepancies between Science1 and Science2 and possible rankings below 4 in general

Table 1: Needs explanation of terms Science1 and Science2

### 3.5. Interviews and workshops with stakeholders

Purely descriptive, lacks attempts for prioritization.

## 4. Impact evaluation

was conducted via evaluation and feedback sheets. However, results of evaluations are not presented.

Figure 4 provides results from download. These should be described and possible patterns discussed (high proportion of science downloads, private enterprises and industry only in December 2014 and 2015 etc).

## 5. Discussion

Suggest to remove introductory paragraph or integrate with introduction

### 5.1. The usability of the products

page 10, line 20: How did you rank the questions in order to come to the most interesting questions for the offshore wind energy sector - should the deduction of interesting have a database in the results?

page 11, line 1: the use needs a description in the results section and an explanation in the discussion - is the download from those administrations that provide the services?

page 11, line 23: usefulness to potential users - what are the potential users beyond the administration - business nexus

## 5.2. The stakeholder process

page 11, lines 29 - 31: Not sure enough is provided in the preceding chapters to warrant the conclusion that the process was successful. Table 1 in particular does not support that conclusion. It is also not clear to me whether co-operation or collaboration was achieved or how it is supposed to be achieved. Is a statistics on data exchange (e.g. number of relevant events) feasible in this context?

page 12, lines 2-3 suggestion to rephrase;

"The "consultation" indicates ...." change to "The "consultation" encompasses ..."

"... and was fulfilled via ..." change to "...and was specifically addressed through ...."

## 5.3. Contribution to impact evaluation

page 12, line 16, suggestion to rephrase

"... or what might be the possible criteria for success."

Main concern is that stakeholder integration usually is restricted to government agencies, i.e. those funding the according research. This appears to be too narrow. In general this point of rather narrow stakeholder participation should be discussed. Proposals how to solve this may be helpful including approaches to broaden input, but also approaches to prioritize (identify key stake-holders).

As is the promise in the introduction to look for broad stakeholder participation is not really met. Stakeholder participation is very much targeted at industry.