Review Form Response

Review FOSS4G Academic Track Submission

This form is for reviewing a FOSS4G Academic Track Submission.

Remarks to the editors *

I struggled to decide between a 'Weak Accept' and a 'Strong Accept' for this paper. While my review lists a few issues, I think all of them could easily be addressed in a revision of the paper. In the end I decided to recommend the paper for a 'Weak Accept' purely because the authors report on 'first investigations' and preliminary results. However, this is typical of conference papers and depending on the quality of other submissions, this paper could be rated as a 'Strong Accept'. (For example, if for argument sake all other papers report on preliminary results, this paper should be a 'Strong Accept'.)

Remarks to the author

Title: Using Free and Open Source GIS to Automatically Create Standards-Based Spatial Metadata in Academic – First Investigations

Length: 7 955 words, 26 pages

Stated objective of the article
The authors aim to present preliminary work done on an approach to metadata automation in an academic context, making use of QGIS and PostGIS. They describe how the creation of 18 of the 20 INSPIRE mandatory metadata elements can be automated in an approach where the data and metadata are tightly coupled, allowing GIS interoperability.

Title
The title accurately reflects the content of the paper, except that it is not clear why the title and this work are restricted to an academic context. Refer also to the comment under 'Review' below.

Abstract
Similar to the title, the abstract accurately reflects the content of the paper, except that it is not clear why this work is restricted to an academic context. Refer also to the comment under 'Review' below.

Keywords
I would suggest to add 'automation' and/or 'metadata automation' to the list of keywords.

Review
Metadata generation and maintenance remain a challenge for which solutions need to be sought. This paper presents first investigations into a novel approach for metadata automation. The authors provide a logical justification for the research that refers to relevant literature. The paper is interesting and relevant to the FOSS4G2013 target audience, because open source tools are used. The paper is equally relevant to the wider geospatial community.

The stated objective of the paper is mostly met. The authors describe how they automated the creation of 18 of the 20 INSPIRE mandatory metadata elements. The data and metadata are tightly coupled in that they are stored in the same database, but it is not clear whether the workflow is tightly coupled. The authors refer to the 'tightly coupled' characteristic in two ways: tightly coupled in terms of storage (is the data and metadata integrated?), as well as tightly coupled in terms of workflow (is the metadata updated as part of the spatial editing workflow?). The approach described in the paper is definitely tightly coupled in terms of storage, but there is not enough information to evaluate whether the workflow is also tightly coupled. For example, when will the keywords be updated?

Recommendation *

○ Strong Accept and recommendation for inclusion in Transactions in GIS
○ Strong Accept
◉ Weak Accept
○ Reject

Close

* Denotes required field