

## ***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: 11 May 2016

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.

The decision is based on the integrative aspect of COSYNA. There are specialised data portals to access time-series data, survey data, data of FerryBoxes on ships going on fixed routes and remote sensing data. These data portals should be used preferable if the platform is the first criterion. The main scope of CODM is the integrative aspect of

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



---

Interactive comment

presenting data from different platforms together.

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

Data metadata describing a stationary time-series are related to this time-series as a whole. Start time is the first value of the time-series. The end time lies in future. All other data metadata describe the whole measurement series e.g. a transect.

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

This will be corrected.

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.).

To be honest the SOS version is the pre-version 0.7 because the development of pySOS was stopped then. The conditions to be able to migrate to SensorML are described in the revised paper now. We are working on a SOS V2 solution as well. But it is not clear that such a solution can be integrated into CODM as it is described in the paper.

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.

We are not using any licenses up to now but we are considering to do it in the future.

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.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



Main reason are performance and usability. A WFS could be configured just for discovery. A catalogue should contain all necessary information.

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).

This will be corrected.

---

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

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

