

Interactive comment on “How to improve your metocean datasets” by Erik Quaeghebeur and Michiel B. Zaaijer

Hans Verhoef (Referee)

hans.verhoef@tno.nl

Received and published: 15 October 2019

Summary

The authors successfully completed the tedious job of preparing for analysis met ocean datasets that came in different formats. As a result the article contains clear recommendations to the data set providers; the most important are to include metadata and to use netCDF. May netCDF be the standard in the geophysical and the meteorological worlds, and be common in the realms of universities and institutes, the reviewer doubts that is generally accepted in the commercial wind energy sector. Under developers there still may be a preference for plain rather than binary numbers. For the user of the data the article is on one hand of less interest; the main recommendation is to not

C1

trust what you got, as many things could be wrong. But is this not what a user already is doing? This recommendation therefore is a collection of reminders. From another point of view it is interesting for a user if a standard data format would be used for the data sets in the sense that it would save time and therefore effort.

The article is technical rather than scientific in nature as it deals with things made by men. More importantly, the article is descriptive in nature and lacks a research question. Since it focusses on data preparation, it does not contain any analysis whatsoever, and that's a pity because what one likes to know is whether the met ocean climate differs between the three sites. (There are many studies on the met ocean climate in single spots (MMIJ, OWEZ, or Fino1) but not many which compare the climates in one or more station.) I am aware that this is not the scope for the authors but something which could be addressed.

Recommendation: Accept, after resolving minor issues:
• There is a lot of statistics in the appendices A2.2 and A2.3. A reference (text book, own work, ...) must be given.
• The first three equations in line 28 on page 26 have the same right-hand sides.
• The colors in fig 2 must be explained in the caption or the legend of that figure. (The explanation is in the text now.)
• Think again about the use of uncommon words (non-onerous, relegate, gleaned, tuple).
• For wind direction the authors mention North. It is not clear whether they mean compass North or not?
• Figure 3 Missing labels
• Figure 4 Missing labels
• Figure 5 Missing labels
• Figure 6 Missing labels
• In the text it's mentioned that data can be downloaded. The urls are not clear where to retrieve the data and the site <http://www.WindOpZee.net> should be mentioned since that is the location where MMIJ data can be retrieved.
• The provided link in the article for Kouwenhoven is not valid anymore. It should be https://www.noordzeewind.nl/nl_nl/kennis/meteogegevens/_jcr_content/par/iconlist/iconlist-manual-data-files-meteo-mast-noordzeewind.pdf I understand that it's difficult to have working links if people change the address

In the article it's mentioned ECN (Energy research Centre of the Netherlands). Since

C2

April 1, 2018 we are called ECN part of TNO and later this afternoon we will get another name. Can imagine that the authors can't keep track of all the changes in naming but just for information.

Again compliments to the authors to try to standardize the data formats!

Interactive comment on Wind Energ. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/wes-2019-42>, 2019.