SOIL Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/soil-2019-65-AC2, 2019 © Author(s) 2019. This work is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.



SOILD

Interactive comment

Interactive comment on "A new model for intraand inter-institutional soil data sharing" *by* José Padarian and Alex B. McBratney

José Padarian and Alex B. McBratney

jose.padarian@sydney.edu.au

Received and published: 30 November 2019

Thanks for your comments Yusuf.

Sadly, we couldn't open the link that you provided. There might be some extra dashes inserted by the SOIL system. We tried all the combinations but it did not work.

Regarding your comment:

GloSIS is being built in exactly the opposite manner. GLOSIS is envisioned as a federation of soil information systems, which share interoperable soil data sets via web services. The soil information systems that host and publish the soil data of the data providers are referred to as "nodes" in the federation. These nodes could be national(country) systems, regional systems (e.g. the Latin



Discussion paper



American Soil Information System, SISLAC) or a soil information system of an (inter)national research organization or NGO that wishes to share its soil data. GLOSIS will connect users with providers through a single access point: the discovery hub...

We think that providing a system like the one you mention, a federation of nodes what are exposed through a single access point, is a great advancement considering what we have at the moment. That system fits very well when the participants do not form a consortium. In terms of concept and design, it is different to what we propose. In your case, for instance, if a node goes off-line for any reason, their data becomes inaccessible. If a node decides to change their data or remove it, that can be done without leaving traces. Of course, all that could be prevented to some degree, but then the system would be closer to either a centralised database or the solution that we propose.

Another point to consider is the independence of the nodes that you mention, that in reality could be limited. For instance, SISLAC has almost 50,000 profile information from Latin America but SISLAC also depends on FAO-GSP. From our experience in Chile, we know SISLAC approaches different groups to request their data to add it to their system and not to promote the development of national soil information systems, which is logical given the nature of the system. Considering the reality in Latin America and other regions, where developing national SIS is not easy, offering regional nodes is a good solution to help data dissemination but, despite the good intentions, it is a centralised (or top-bottom) solution. We prefer to envision a bottom-up solution.

Interactive comment on SOIL Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/soil-2019-65, 2019.

SOILD

Interactive comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

