

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

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 18 April 2016

This paper addresses a highly relevant topic: The interoperable access to coastal observation data. Especially the common approach to access very diverse data sets is very interesting. There are only a few aspects which should be addressed:

Page 2, lines 1 - 6: Here you describe that COSYNA offers a different way how to select data. It would be great if you could explain this decision a bit more. The approach to first select the observed property and then the spatio-temporal extend is useful. However, there may also be use cases in which the selected based on the platform as the first criterion might be useful. Would it make sense to support both approaches? The underlying SWE standards could allow to support both.

Page 7, line 10: Are the data metadata really related to single measurements (as you write) or to a time series as a whole?

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



Page 18, line 15: The reference to the listing seems to be broken.

All SWE standards that you are mentioning are used in their 1.0 versions. However, for some years, the SWE 2.0 specification are already available. It would be great if you could explain your plans if you want to upgrade to the SWE 2.0 standards which would offer some advantages (hierarchical structure of SensorML descriptions, more efficient SOS metadata, etc.).

You are explaining the COSYNA Open Data policy. It would be great if you could explain if you are using a specific license for publishing the data. Using such licenses gives users a higher level of security which constraints and conditions need to be considered.

The use of a WFS server for discovery functionality is interesting. It would be great if you could provide more explanations for the decision to use the WFS instead of the OGC Catalogue which is usually the typical interface for discovering resources.

Please have a general review of the spelling and grammar. For example the style of writing “NetCDF” should be harmonised (netcdf vs. netCDF). Also OGC standards should be written without a “-“ (e.g. OGC WMS instead of OGC-WMS).

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

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

