Record of Changes

I have recorded changes that I have made in each chapter in response to reviewer's comments. Tracked changes has been used. As reviewed documents are read, a green spot is added to the name to indicate they are completed.

Chapter Comments

000 Title Page:
1. Etienne correctly notes that JCOMM does not operate data systems as implied by the brief title. His suggested title is too long for my taste, so I have chosen a slightly longer title that removes (I hope) the possession implication that he objected to.

100 Work Descriptions
1. Added some words to explain what edits were made in response to reviewers comments about new or changed capabilities on web sites.

100 Work Descriptions Ech
1. Etienne provided words that expanded lists and clarified some statements. These were incorporated.

100 Work Descriptions SDW
1. Scott pointed out that ICOADS and WOD consolidate data and I felt this was worthwhile mentioning.
2. He suggested adding chapters about these consolidating data sets, but I believe this is outside of the scope of the contract and so do not support this. However, it might be something that JCOMM or IODE may wish to consider.

210 An Analysis by Observing System
210 – Ech:
1. Etienne makes some valid points about WIS being more than data distribution. He also suggests mentioning potential other systems that could increase data volumes for WIS and ODP. He does not suggest more. Also I think this is beyond the scope of this report.

210 – JCOMMOPS
1. Mathieu offers a number of qualifications of types of buoys. The general designations I have used are inclusive of these and I see no particular reason to be so particular here.
2. He also speaks of miscellaneous other programmes that are not now formally part of JCOMM. These, such as gliders, mammals and so on are mentioned in appropriate sections, but dealing with these in depth are outside of the scope of this report (as he notes).
3. The suggested additional text about JCOMMOPS is not really needed here. JCOMMOPS gets plenty of attention in the monitoring sections of the different observing system chapters. I did note that JCOMMOPS provides monitoring as well as activities undertaken within each observing programme.

210 – Reed
1. Suggested addition to mention Associate Data Units in IODE. These are new entities created by IODE 2013 session (Mexico).

220 SOT
220 – Ech
1. A Number of good wording suggestions accepted.

220 – JCOMMOPS
1. Mathieu says there are 2 sub groups to SOT with ASAP being part of VOS. That is not how it appears on the SOT home page with tabs for VOS and ASAP being separate. I prefer treating these as separate, even though they may be formally together.

221 SOOP XBT and XCTD
221 -Ech
1. Rejected his explanation of how XBTs operate. The probe records time since deployment and this is converted to depth. The probe does not measure rate of fall as he states.
2. He is correct that the figure of 290 XCTDs are those reported on the GTS not actually collected (there
could be many more).
3. He suggests moving other types of data providers to a new section, but I want this section to include everything, not just XBT.
4. Accepted changed words about the GTS as suggested.
5. Accepted info about TDCs and TACs.
6. Etienne's reference to survey reports and others caused me to check my reference. I could no longer find the reports which I once could so I guess there have been some changes. I included these references, but it caused me to add another recommendation asking for links to all types of reports to be found at least on SOOP pages.
7. Etienne suggests changes to recommendation 6 to get the survey reports reinstated. I did not include this. My point was that what reporting is done should be readily available. Whether or not the survey he speaks about is important is a decision for SOOP to make. The point is as an outside viewer, I can see (if I can find them) that certain reports have started or stopped, but this presumably is something that SOOP has decided.

221 - Reed
1. Greg suggests the IMOS reference [8] does not provide information about XCTD and XBT. I checked and I think it does, whereas the reference he provided was not obviously a good one. I left the text as I wrote it.
2. Added text and reference to SSXBTs.
3. Added Quoll text.
4. Suggested changes to WOD and WODB. But these two acronyms seem to be used almost interchangeably by NODC so I left this alone in my text.
5. Added changes to WOD formatting I reported.
6. Added text and reference to AODN

221 – Gustavo
1. Didn't use track changes so this was harder to review. I have highlighted the changes in blue where I detected them.
2. Changes in wording that improves the text are generally adopted.
3. The suggested text about TSGs was added to the chapter (222) on underway measurements.
4. He supplied a number of links that go to very good pages. However, I suspect these have been added since I generated my report (or after I looked at the XBT pages. Using the SOOP pages as a starting point, and even the AOML home pages, I did not see a link that took me to these new pages. - email send 25 Apr.
5. The comment about the relative numbers of XCTDs was moved from where I had it to the Introduction. I choose to leave this information where I had it.
6. He quotes data getting off ships in 24 hours, but I doubt that this is generally true,; perhaps true for AOML. My text suggests more quickly but I added the 24 hour number.
7. Added the additional information about SIO, but removed reference to SIO and stated “some”.
8. Adopted all of the description of US operations.
9. Added reference to new XBT web pages (subject of email I sent to Gustavo).
10. Added additional information about SIO and AOML as he suggested.

221 – JCOMMOPS
1. This is the same as received directly from Gustavo.

222 SOOP Underway
222 - Reed
1. a number of changes re IMOS, all accepted.

222 – Ech
1. Modifications to description of the WMO and GTS. Identical word changes as made in the SOOP chapter were inserted here.

222- JCOMMOPS
1. track changes was not used. I highlighted noted differences in this document in blue.
2. Accepted changes about GOSUD and metadata, but moved them around from the suggested locations.
3. Note that a Version 3 of the netCDF format is available, but I could find to reference to it at GOSUD pages.
4. Added information about MyOcean.
5. Added info about final archive for FerryBox.
6. Mod to rec 12 to suggest JCOMMOPS and OSMC need to figure out who does what monitoring. GOSUD seems poorly represented at both.
7. A Rec 14 was rejected. I agree with the sentiment, but my report is not intended to tell network systems how to work. I reflect on what I see and what improvements are suggested based on that. That GOSUD could use active partners is generally true for all JCOMM systems. That GOSUD should enhance governance is a general statement, whereas the recommendations I want to include suggests what I think are ways to improve. Rec 2 does speak partially to these sentiments.

223 VOS
223 – North
1. Removed precip from table as suggested.
2. Accepted all changes suggested in the sections.

223 – ECh
1. He suggests a recommendation that encourages more visual observations be collected. While I agree with that, my report is not about observing practices, it is about the state of data systems. I did not include this additional recommendation although I did include the comment that these additional observations are valuable.
2. Moved the text about ESURFMAR and suggested text about UKMO and monitoring into the monitoring section. This means a renumbering of references.
3. Accepted changes of “unclear” sentence.
5. Accepted word changes re ship masking.
6. Accepted changes re CMOC and data rescue.
7. Accepted word changes re WIS.
8. Accepted any word changes in recommendations.

223 – JCOMMOPS
1. There was no track changes on this file so it was hard to find the changes. The changes looked to be those suggested by Sarah North in the separate file I got from her.

230 DBCP
230 – ECh
1. Accepted all suggested changes

231 Surface Drifters
231 – ECh
1. I don't understand the changes regarding “most of the DBCP Action groups ...”. I ignored these.
2. Accommodated his reference 55. The other [54] does not appear to be available through a web page. I did take his words about evolving design into account.
3. I took his point about pressure tendency.
4. I did not include his ref 56 since I have described how to get to it.
5. I adjusted text to explain surface drifter data is only part of the data on the GTS. The comment about how the data are used is more appropriate in the User Community section.
6. I included his refs 60 and 61 here. The other text is more about monitoring that comes later. This inclusion requires a renumbering of references.
7. Accepted inclusion of FM designators and text re abandoning TACs.
8. I did not agree with Etienne's comments regarding annual reports. I left my text and recommendation.

231 – Mayra et al
1. Accepted all suggestions in Data Providers, Data Assembly sections.
2. The information provided about QC procedures was included, but I could not find the appropriate link to the Training CD mentioned. This, too, was noted.
3. Accepted suggestions in Data Dissemination, Differences ..., User Communities sections.
4. Links to annual reports are indeed available as noted and text is added to reflect this. I don't believe this link was available when I originally looked at these pages.

232 Tropical Moorings
232 – ECh
1. Accepted minor edits.
2. Wording of uses of mooring data inserted into User Community section.
3. The references to QC documents held at WMO is noted. But references to draft versions are found on the DBCP web site, so I suggest these be updated.
4. Comments about UKMO monitoring products and other monitoring are incorporated in to the monitoring section.
5. Wording about phasing out of BUOY was accepted.
6. The inclusion of a link to annual reports as noted by Ech was either not present or missed when I prepared the draft. I have left the comments I made and the recommendation, even though it appears now to be fulfilled. - a hazard of the delay between draft completion and comments received.
7. I cleared up the confusion about “GTS code” as appears in rec 17.

232 – hpf...
1. Suggestions to list the many groups is not accepted. ECh and this review provide a name that is different that what is presented on the DBCP web site which is what I used. If this is not correct, it should be fixed on the web site.
2. I included a listing the countries supporting this but without references. All of these should be appropriately linked through DBCP/mooring web pages.
3. The wording that BTMBA contributes to OceanSITES sounds backwards to me. Surely OceanSITES contributes to the action group (as the web pages seem to imply). I left my wording intact. My reasoning is that the words provided here are at odds with the web page presentation. I am reporting on what is apparent from the web site, and if this does not present the correct view the site needs changing. The mooring pages are difficult to navigate – things appear fragmented, though they may not be.
4. I did include the point about mooring cruises providing ocean observation/deployment opportunities.
5. The comment about "sponsorship" without financial contribution is perhaps correct. I have changed the word to "endorsement" hoping this has non-financial connotations.
6. The TAO refresh reference provided is not linked to the DBCP pages. If this is the better site for information, the link should be updated.
7. The words about handles BUO and stores BUFR I think are already correctly reflected in my text.
8. Accepted paragraph of text on TAO processing.
9. Accepted addition to ISDM para re sending data to GTSP.
10. Suggested link to NDBC page describing QC works okay, but I could not find a link to it through a starting point at DBCP or PMEL or NOAA links that are connected to DBCP. I noted this, but did include the link.
11. I also included comments about data fragmentation and a link to a POS document.
12. The extra references for data display at PMEL were pointed out as a link of the referenced page.
13. Comments about ICOADS plans are welcome but not presently available.
15. Changed wording of PSD offerings and NCAR registration.
16. Changed wording of information about ISDM access.
17. Modified ISDM offerings in “differences...” section.
18. Corrected who mirrors who statements.
19. Added longer list of products at PMEL and a reference to RAMA publications.
20. Included project status link but I could not find this page linked to PMEL pages linked to DBCP.
21. Removed mirroring statement in Rec 15. That was cleared up earlier.

Overall: This review in particular seems to contain pointers to information that has changed since I looked at the pages. It also seems to present information that does not connect with what appears from links originating at DBCP but going to PMEL or other sites. This is quite confusing, but I have tried to reflect these updated comments. This is partially a reflection of the time delay between draft completion and review. But the fact is that a number of the new links provided in the review paper do not connect up to the home pages. I think this just reinforces the need for better coordination between the Panel web page developers.

233 OceanSITES
233 – kjs
1. “Objectives” information and wording has changed. This is acknowledged.
2. A number of comments indicate that changes have been made on the web site since I produced the draft report. This is noted, as well as any impacts these may have on the recommendations.
3. A comment notes that new documents are forth coming. That is good, but I have left my original wording
since I think the comments still apply.

4. Recording value of long time series as these sites continue to operate and the sampling of extreme events as noted by reviewers.
5. Rec 4 was augmented to acknowledge the change made to see information about different sites.
6. Rec 10 was altered to say that if OceanSITES has its own policy that should appear on the web site.
7. Changed link 8 as suggested.

240 GLOSS
240 – sdw  
1. Track changes were lost so I have highlighted the changes I have found in blue. There are very few.
2. Woodruff comments about national responsibilities in the US are sensible. I inserted a reference to ICES guidelines and modified Rec 6 to reflect these concerns.

250 Argo
Freeland (email):
1. "Needs word smithing": Without comments, I am doing a read over for these final changes but beyond that there will be no additional edits.
2. "Array of 3600 floats not 3000": The specific number is only mentioned in GCOS 2010 Performance Indicators, so I have added text to say that Argo has altered this target to 3600.
3. "GDACs to provide highest quality data": I have added words to this effect in the section on Processing and Archiving.
4. "NODC to provide citable snapshots of Argo data": Sylvie replied that monthly snapshots with DOIs are available at the GDAC. These were not present when I looked when composing the report. Charles reports that snapshots are available in the NODC data input archiving system, but that no DOIs are attached and that finding these snapshots is not straightforward.

250 Argo Responses all:
1. A number of small wording changes to clarify or to expand facts have been accepted.
2. Comments about metadata availability found under the Monitoring section have been placed under the Data Dissemination section with a pointer to the Monitoring section as well. I view metadata availability as a data dissemination whereas monitoring are products used to gauge performance.
3. There are many additional monitoring items listed, but I am not inclined to include them all. I infer that there are more than those discussed by using the word "including" and I do not think there is a lot of useful information.
4. Suggested text changes in the GCOS-IP section have been rejected since the text in the report was taken directly from that report.
5. Mathieu B talks about extensions into WBC – email 22 April asks him to say what this is.
6. I have ignored responses to the recommendations. I am glad they are taking them seriously, but they are not part of my report.
7. There is a change to the meaning of JCOMMOPS, but I took the name from the logo of JCOMMOPS and it is as in my original report.
8. Mathieu added a bunch of links to AIC monthly maps and monthly metadata export files. These should be obvious from the links I have provided.

250 Argo SEW MB MK:  
1. This is an almost identical document to the above (Argo responses all):

260 GO-SHIP
260 – JCOMMOPS
The review of this document included references to new material generated at a recent GO-SHIP meeting. I could not find a meeting report – just meeting documents. These are new developments that took place after my draft was prepared. I have taken some of these things into consideration, but unless there is new material on web sites I did not incorporate the suggestions. They are all positive developments, some evident, some still behind the scenes. But I am not doing a significant revision of my report, though some of my comments are now dated by the changes the reviewer noted. It just means GO-SHIP can point to these changes when they are asked (if they are) what they have been doing to address comments of my review.

1. The changes are not tracked so I have noted them in blue.
2. A note about GO-SHP-4 was introduced, but there is no meeting report yet. I did note later on that the most recent report available from the GO-SHIP site is from 2010.
3. There was a lot of text relating to variables (from the Feb 2014 meeting) and information about GO-SHIP
at JCOMMOPS. I included that because it is valuable to know, but it illustrates a lack of getting information up in a timely way. Also, I found nothing about GO-SHIP at the present JCOMMOPS pages.

4. Deletion of text about there not being information on GO-SHIP pages about data delivery targets is still true and so I left this text in place.

5. The reviewer also noted changes to GO-SHIP data delivery tracking. I welcome this, but it is action after the report was prepared. In essence, they are addressing some of the deficiencies noted when I first compiled my report. I did not add this text.

6. The change to wording states that data go to NODC. I am sure this is true, but those words do not appear on the GO-SHIP web pages and they should. My text was left unchanged.

7. Statements I made about data restrictions are still true. I agree that GO-SHIP should, and I guess does have policies, but these are not clearly stated on GO-SHIP pages. My text stands.

8. The stated relationship to JCOMMOPS is good, but it took place after my report was prepared and I still see no evidence at JCOMMOPS. So, this is still a work in progress and is “revising the history” that I saw when first compiling my report. My text stands.

9. I am glad to learn that more monitoring is under development, but a user going to GO-SHIP pages does not know this. At this point it is still “virtual monitoring”. I stand by my text.

10. Reviewers deleted a paragraph where I made a suggestion about monitoring. These are my words and I stand by them. They need not pay them any mind, but I still want them included in my report.

11. I included the comments in the section on GCOS-IP as reviewer comments. - with some further comments of my own.

12. Suggested wording changes to Rec 4 are awkward. I think they are saying there are interim targets. Good, but they are not evident enough. I stand by my text.

13. Rec 6: I did not accept the reference to GO-SHIP-4. Again, I applaud this, but that occurred after my report was prepared.

14. I did not incorporate the statement about no restrictions to data in Rec 10 as suggested. I agree with the statement, but that is a value statement for the Project to make, not me.

15. Rec 13 suggested a reference to new maps and metadata. This is new material and that it currently exists means they have already address this recommendation (that is now dated).

16. Rec 15 suggests pointing to the new coordinator. This happened after my draft was prepared and there is still work to do to make things evident on appropriate web pages.

17. Some words from Rec 16 were deleter. These are my words and I left them in.

270 IOCCP – no comments were received
300 An Analysis by ECV – no comments were received

301 Air Pressure – Notes that new tools are under development. Until these appear on web pages a user knows nothing about them. I did not incorporate this text.

302 Air Temperature – Same comment as for 301
303 CDOM – no comments received
304 Clouds – Same comment as for 301
305 DIC – no comments received
306 Humidity – Same comment as for 301
307 Irradiance – no comments received
308 Surface and Subsurface Ocean Velocity
   1. I did not include the statements relating to real-time transmission. This section of the report is only talking about instrumentation not data delivery.
   2. I included text that says ADCPs often are used in conjunction with CTD.
   3. Included wording about parking depth cycling.
   4. Small word changes re SOFAR.
   5. Included comments about surface radars.
   6. Included reference to assessment of ocean velocity measurements

309 pCO2
   1. Comment about monitoring is not yet a reality. No changes made to my text.

310 Salinity – no comments received
311 Sea Level – no comments received
312 Sea Surface Salinity – Same comment as for 301
313 Sea Surface Temperature – Same comment as for 301
314 Water Temperature – Same comment as for 301
315 Waves – no comments received
316 Winds – Same comment as for 301

400 Concluding Remarks and Recommendations
400 – JCOMMOPS

1. A comment on how to count GTS versus JCOMMOPS is accepted, the point on Rec 21 is to make clear if there are differences, why there are. This is particularly important since to a casual user, there may be no evident reason for the differences. The last sentence of Rec 21 seeks an explanation and so I stand by my text.

Comments from OOPC meeting

1. Added another recommendation that whenever web services are available on a web site, these should be well publicized and described.

OSMC Comments

1. Dissemination and Consideration – The comment is fair. In fact I added a new recommendation about explaining web services where they are available, and added some text to emphasize the importance of explaining content.
2. Rec 1b – I understand the point made. I still think that individual networks need to do this monitoring at least for their own purposes and that is part of what 1b is about. OSMC is a “unifying” way to count, and this may be counting different “units” (see comment from JCOMMOPS). I would not suggest there is only one solution. I added a small wording change that I hope captures this duality.
3. Rec 8 – no changes needed
4. Rec 9b – I agree with the comments and again this goes back to the differences in what is counted. I think both JCOMMOPS and OSMC need to be clear on their web pages what it is they are counting in contrast to what the other counts. Moreover, I think JCOMM and OOPC need to figure out what are the counts most relevant to them.
5. Rec 15 - I agree the original suggestion made is limited. I modified Rec 15 to include a suggestion of a deeper consideration of how to manage and preserve metadata.
6. Rec 16 – I agree that OSMC has an important role. To the extent that OSMC operations are driven by or supporting JCOMM, they are included in the very high level partners I mention.
7. Rec 21 – (now Rec22) See comments on Rec 1b.
8. Rec 23 – (now Rec 24) - I take no stand on this. The Rec is to discuss, and at the end, the point made here may well be the final result.
9. Rec 24 – (now Rec 25) – No comment and no changes result,