

Review Form Response

Review FOSS4G Academic Track Submission

This form is for reviewing a FOSS4G Academic Track Submission.

Remarks to the editors *

the paper needs strong revision to be considered as strong accept, especially if it shall be recommended for inclusion in Transactions in GIS.

Remarks to the author

Interesting paper, well-structured with only minor spelling errors.

Feedback:

1. The title ("OSM-GB: Using Open Source Geospatial Tools to Create OSM Web Services for Great Britain") does not match well with the main question presented in section 2: "Can OSM become an authoritative map source in GB?" In my opinion these are two independent and different questions which require different approaches to answer them
2. The main question is answered mainly from a technical perspective. In Chapter 2 requirements are listed but these lack of a subchapter that talks about an authoritative instance that approves whether a dataset is an authoritative map source. This is crucial.
3. I think the claim to be an authoritative map source is not related to its application / use but rather to its origin and the body that stands behind the data-source; especially with open-source – compared to proprietary software – this is one of the main/core issues: who is responsible for software bugs or failures? With proprietary software this is clear because when you buy a license you enter into a contract, but with open-source software this is not the case so it raises the question of responsibility – so it does with open data. This point is not discussed at all
4. OSM is NOT a map but a dataset. When you ask the question "Can OSM become an authoritative map source in GB?" you should not answer the question whether OSM is available as WMS/WMTS/WMSC/WFS etc. This is irrelevant. If OSM can be handled similar to any other spatial dataset that can be deployed through a webservice OSM also will (it's another question whether someone is willing to do that!).
5. Chapter 5: I cannot make out in Figures 4 and 5 what the waste collection points are. A legend is missing or an explanation like "the green (? Or the blue? Or the yellow? Or any other features???) circles represent waste collection points"
6. The mentioned case study does not refer to / answer the raised requirements in Chapter 2. Does the case study provide OSM data in BNG? What about its quality assessment process? Etc.

Recommendation *

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

Close

* Denotes required field

