

Review Form Response

Review FOSS4G Academic Track Submission

This form is for reviewing a FOSS4G Academic Track Submission.

Remarks to the editors *

Paper is an interesting and valuable contribution to FOSS4G 2013. Authors address automated metadata generation and present results of first investigations in the domain. Automation of metadata creation is still, after decades of spatial data infrastructures' existence, relevant research problem. The paper in its current form is too long, contains unnecessary detail and still needs editing. However, after revision, I suggest accepting the paper for the academic track of FOSS4G.

Remarks to the author

- Authors should review sub-section 1, which currently reads not too well, also because it contains not appropriate references (e.g. quotes without a page reference, full sentence quotes without connection to previous statements). In the last paragraph of sub-section 1 it is not very clear what 'issues' authors address in the paper – this should be made more specific.
- Throughout the document authors seem to confuse INSPIRE with a standard – as they correctly state at the beginning of Section 2, INSPIRE is an infrastructure that uses standards for (among other things) metadata, more specifically INSPIRE uses guidelines for metadata creation based on EN ISO 19115 and EN ISO 19119.
- Statement "As with any Spatial Data Infrastructure, metadata forms a core component of INSPIRE, and is based on ISO 19115 – this is not true: 1. Surely not any spatial data infrastructure is based on ISO 19115 (there are other metadata standards widely used in geocommunity – e.g. FGDC, Dublin Core)
- Sub-sub-sections 2.2.1 – 2.2.4 do not add much to the paper and in my view should be reduced to an overview table displaying existing GIS software, its metadata capability and its limitations. This reduction will reduce the paper, which is quite lengthy at the moment.
- Sub-section 3.2 – it seems that 'Identifier code' is simply an OID of the dataset as registered in the system, which is certainly different from URI as proposed by the INSPIRE guidelines authors seem to follow. In my view this is insufficient and requires more reflection in the discussion, especially because authors mention future use of their system in web environment (e.g. WFS and CSW). In the future, how will URI be assigned to a data+metadata resource?
- Sub-sub-section 4.2.1 – bullet 3. "resource ID" is called "Identifier code" in Table 1
- Section 5 – in the footnote on p.16 authors say: "The data itself is also FOSS" – what is meant here? How can data be free and open source software (FOSS)?
- What is the purpose of Figure 9 on p. 20?
- p. 20 - There is no sub-section 5.0 and neither sub-sub-section 5.0.1 so how can there be sub-sub-section 5.0.2? I think it is a good idea to explain automated metadata update, but 5.0.2 is very short and does not do the job.
- Figure 10 is not legible and should be enlarged.
- In section 6 authors state "...the functionality to maintain dataset and metadata synchronized is interoperable across multiple FOSS and non-FOSS GIS platforms" – this has not been tested and demonstrated; authors only show extension to the SPIT plugin in QGIS which takes shapefile format (non-FOSS GIS) and transforms it into a (FOSS) PostGIS/PostgreSQL table. It is useful, but it certainly does not demonstrate interoperability of the proposed solution across variety of platforms.
- It is not clear from the paper how do authors deal with shapefiles that have already metadata (e.g. as ISO 19139 compliant XML file). Is this ignored and new metadata is created?
- p. 23 – "Web Catalog Service" should be "Catalog Service for the Web"
- References section needs serious revision – it contains spelling errors in the names of authors (e.g. Burrough) and many incomplete references.

Recommendation *

- Strong Accept and recommendation for inclusion in Transactions in GIS
- Strong Accept

- Weak Accept
- Reject

Close

* Denotes required field

