Ocean Science
Discussions

Open Access

EGU

Interactive comment on "Accessing Diverse Data Comprehensively – CODM the COSYNA Data Portal" *by* Gisbert Breitbach et al.

Gisbert Breitbach et al.

gisbert.breitbach@hzg.de

Received and published: 9 May 2016

Reply to: I am sure that the authors have done a great job in setting up the COSYNA data portal and getting the system running. What is missing is the localisation of CODM in the national and international landscape. I would like to ask the authors to give a better description on that. Please also note the supplement to this comment: http://www.ocean-sci-discuss.net/os-2016-6/os-2016-6-RC1-supplement.pdf

You asked for a localisation of CODM in the national and international landscape. As far as we know there is no review article about data portals so far. We think it is a good idea to write such a review about existing data portals. Only with such a review the national and international landscape of data portals can be defined. The authors of such an article should be either neutral or should represent a lot of different portals

from all over the earth. In our article we tried to locate CODM as far as we can do. 5 years ago we found that no existing portal was able to fulfil our requirements so started our new development. As far as we can see no other portal is still able to do what CODM is doing especially the inclusion of GetMap or GetObservation commands into the metadata. Another aspect that we don't know of any detailed description of other portals like it is done for CODM in this paper.

Comments to your 'in text comments':

Abstract line 8(Isn't that the aim of all data portals? Also, web services are standard for most other ocean data portals.): As worked out later in text the aim of CODM is not just making all gathered data available like most other portals. CODM is able to visualise data on an interrelated way by using web services. Most other portals uses the web service GetCapability-request CODM uses the GetMap- or the GetObservation-request.

Line 14 (Please, mention IMOS as well if you talk about Australian Data Centers.): This will be done.

Line 15 (PANGAEA is involved in a number of EC funded projects that focus on observing systems like FIXO3.): Nevertheless PANGAEA is not focused on observing systems with near-real-time data. PANGAEA is more interested on finalised data.

Page 2 line 10 (It is not just CODM that follows that approach.): This is not the assertion.

Line 18 (I am actually missing here a more throughout description of the ocean data portal landscape and the strategy to integrate them. A number of EC funded projects like seadatanet or ODIP shall be considered here.): This would be the task for a review paper about data portals. For this paper describing CODM in detail such a review is beyond the scope.

Page 3 line 8 (And at the same time a more rigid implementation that will probably lead

to extra efforts dealing with the diversity of data): There might be a disadvantage but for COSYNA data we can say that no extra effort is needed.

Line 14 (How do you resolve this conflict?): This is described later in the paper.

Line 17 (What is the intention of this section? It is neither a complete list of COSYNA observations nor is it clear how this influences the architecture of CODM.): It is a complete list of COSYNA observations included into CODM. All automatic COSYNA observation are included.

Page 6 line 10 (Isn't it a trivial statement? This entire paragraph needs to be revised.): We will revise this paragraph.

Page 7 line 17 (What does "highly standardised" mean?): In this case it means IN-SPIRE and ISO19115 compliant. The text will be adapted.

Line 20 (A few more words about the migration to SensorML would be vaulable here.): We are waiting for the results of ODIP2 before we could really decide to migrate to SensorML. In this paper we are not able to describe a migration which is not yet decided to do.

Page 9 line 30 (Is there a link between EMODnet and CODM?): The described connection is more than a link. It is an integration of COSYNA data into EMODnet.

Page 10 listing (Is this listing really needed?): We think that it is really hard to understand the emersed difference of CODM without this listing. Here it is shown that a mapservice is included as GetMap-request and how a portal could access the services in a syntactical correct way. We added more description in the figure caption.

Line 7 (This belongs into the user manual not in a publication): The passage will be removed.

Page 12 table (Is this an standardised scheme or just COSYNA specific? References?): As indicated in text this scheme is based on "data level definition used for

remote sensing data (Parkinson and King, 2006"). The definition were expanded to include in-situ data. The expansion is COSYNA specific but is adopted by MaNIDA for example. We reiterate the reference in the figure caption.

Page 14 table (Is there a reason to abstain from using the IOC quality flagging scheme? It is almost the same but at least a reference should be given here.): The IOC flagging scheme and the SeaDataNet scheme are different. The quality scheme is taken from SeaDataNet with slightly different definitions. This is indicated in text but will be included in the figure caption too.

Page 15 line 9 (Is this section really needed?): We think that examples are really needed for a data portal to make clear the advantages. Especially in a journal like Ocean Science where most readers are interested in the possibilities and accessible data of CODM and not so much in the technical methods. A data portal is not only a technical solution it is mainly a way to access data. Therefore examples how to access the data are needed from our point of view.

Some (Reiteration from above): We will try to avoid some reiterations but we think that some are useful.

Interactive comment on Ocean Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/os-2016-6, 2016.