

Interactive comment on “An introduction to the Australian and New Zealand flux tower network – OzFlux” by Jason Beringer et al.

D. Papale (Referee)

darpap@unitus.it

Received and published: 20 May 2016

Beringer and co-authors submitted a nice overview and synthesis of the OzFlux network where its importance is well documented and explained. For the nature and content of the paper however I think that it should be submitted as “Review and synthesis” and not “Research article”. The main limitation in the paper that I think must be addressed is that OzFlux includes both Australia and New Zealand (as also cited by the authors) but the paper is only on Australian sites. This is an important limitation. I can understand that there could be data policy limitations and issues however at least in the general part of the description the New Zealand sites could be added and described. Clearly it would be better if the sites can be added also to the analysis.

Other comments:

C1

- Affiliation 23, the word “Australia” is missing
- Affiliation 25 is not an affiliation
- It would be important to stress the unique characteristics (in general) of the Australian sites respect to the rest of FLUXNET and why their contribution is crucial globally.
- Line 100: other more recent examples exist respect to Running 1999, I suggest to add them also to better highlight the role of eddy covariance measurements in recent activities.
- Line 110: you forgot Europe, that is an historical network that together with AmeriFlux were the start of the FLUXNET. . .
- Lines 167-168: it refers to standard protocols that however should be better explained at least with references. The same is valid for the list of common measurements present at all the sites: it would be an important info to add.
- Lines 174-178: it is not clear which are the tasks specific of the central hub respect to the site managers. Who is doing the quality control and processing – postprocessing?
- In the Section 5.2 it could be added the importance of the OzFlux sites also in the empirical upscaling models since they are covering unique climate and vegetation.
- I suggest to add the significance of the correlation in figure 5. In addition the use of MODIS LAI should be better evaluated. It is not a measurement and has uncertainty: why not using measured LAI? Or if satellite data are needed why not Vegetation Indexes (direct measurements)?
- Still on Figure 5, there are mixed the interannual variability and spatial variability. This makes the analysis difficult to interpret because in the network there are sites with long time series and sites with only few years of data. A possible solution could be to redo (or add) the figure using only average multi-year data (analyzing only spatial variability).
- The table 1 is quite large and difficult to read and use. I suggest a more condensed

C2

version and the rest probably as supplementary data, better if directly as csv file. I suggest also to report the coordinates of the sites with at least 4 decimal digits: these data will be used by people working in remote sensing and it is important to give the best information available.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., doi:10.5194/bg-2016-152, 2016.