Past posting: A salmonid has only one ventral fin, more correctly called the anal fin

Author: **Ron Josephson**  
Friday, March 26, 2004 - 10:46 am

I note that the description in Chapter 11, Mark Coding, refers to the pelvic fins as ventral.

I recommend that we call them by their correct name, pelvic; i.e. Right Pelvic and Left Pelvic.

The anal fin is correctly named.

(This naming is consistent with Pacific Fishes of Canada by J.L Hart)

Author: **Dick O'Connor / WDFW**  
Monday, March 29, 2004 - 08:59 am

All the anatomical references I reviewed agree with Ron. Yet the terms "left ventral" and "right ventral" have been around since the earliest days of fin-clipping in the Columbia Basin (early 1960's). I suspect it was to allow unambiguous abbreviations, as the standard abbreviation for Left Pectoral clip would duplicate the abbreviation for Left Pelvic clip, both of which were used frequently. This then becomes a question of what we do with historical usage, which though technically flawed, was done for a good purpose.

Personally, I'm in no hurry to change, though I would support documenting Ron's note in our metadata somewhere so people don't think we just spell very badly. After all, it's not anatomically unthinkable to have a pair of fins on the ventral side of a fish and call them "ventral fins". Perhaps this is yet another case of lab-meets-field. 😊
RMIS / RMPC Interactive Forum: Action Plan / Priorities for the DSWG to Address:
Past posting: Reporting requirements of CDFO electronically sampled ad-intact CWT recoveries which...

Author: Kathryn Fraser /CDFO
Wednesday, June 16, 2004 - 11:32 am

Background:
CDFO is only interested in cwt occurrence in the marked (ad-clipped) population of the catch. For 2004, as a cost saving measure, we have ceased taking heads of adipose-intact (recorded mark 0000 or 0009) double index tagged fish in commercial chinook fisheries. Because of mass marking, of course, we will continue to electronically sample all commercial chinook fisheries. The major change this year is that “CWT positive beep” chinook that have an intact adipose fin will not have the head removed for lab recovery of the CWT. Our plans for directed commercial coho sampling for DIT are still under review, commercial coho usually being later in the season.

In electronically sampled commercial chinook fisheries, only heads from ad-clipped “CWT beep positive” fish will be processed in the lab. For ad-intact “CWT positive beep” fish, no head will be taken. The “recovery” event will be recorded, but there will be no tag status ‘1’ for ad-intact (mark ‘0000’ or ‘0009’) fish.

Due to the nature of our sampled freezer troll fisheries, we will continue to intercept some cwt data points from the ad-intact population. Freezer boats dress fish at sea and freeze them with heads off, making visual sampling impossible. Since heads are separated from bodies at sea, the vessel master is required to retain all heads. The heads are electronically checked for CWT when the catch is sampled and the bodies are visually sampled for mark rate. All “CWT positive beep” heads will continue to go through the lab and we will continue to report cwt’s from the heads-off fish as tag status ‘1’ (tag read ok), mark ‘9009’ (Adipose clip unknown + totally unknown other external marks).

Because we aggregate all troll samples in a stratum, whole fish and heads only, it is only after the tube that we can eliminate the processing of ad-intact fish. We must maintain strict electronic sampling. We can not introduce bias by doing a pre-screen on whole ad-intact fish. The whole catch must get the same sampling treatment.

Reporting Requirements:
We believe it may be of interest to analysts to differentiate these "head not taken" DITS from other recoveries. While this is not of interest to CDFO, some analysts may wish to associate them with known status 1’s DITS that might have been recovered in the freezer troll fishery within a stratum.

We see three options for reporting:

1) The only current option is to report these “head not taken” as tag status '8' (head not processed) with recorded mark '0000' (No adclip + no other external marks) or '0009'(No adclip + unknown or unspecified other marks).
CDFO usage of tag status 8’s has been for sampled fish which were not processed in the lab due to accident (i.e., they were lost in transit between sampling and the head lab) or on purpose (they were from escapement samples that were subsampled so were not all sent to the lab for processing). In both of these situations, the "head not processed" results in the assumption that there was a cwt which is distributed against known pins in the algorithm to calculate estimates.

These new “head not taken” status 8’s will be differentiated internally in our system so will not be distributed against known pins, however, for exchange purposes, they would look just like the other status 8’s and be counted together in the Catch Sample file in field 33 – Number Recovered Not Processed.

2) A second option is to introduce another tag status code for “head not taken”. '5' and '6' currently appear to be available. This would allow analysts to easily differentiate between the current usage of tag status '8's and new “head not taken” tags, if there is a desire to do so.

If we introduce a new code, there are implications to the Catch Sample file. There are two options:

a) Catch Sample field 33 – Number Recovered Not Processed would need to have the description modified to include status '5' or '6', whichever is decided, and status '8's. This is probably preferable in that there would be no major format change, but it is not consistent with other fields within the CS file.

b) A new field would have to be created, "Number Recovered Not Taken" to carry the tag status code '5' or '6' count.

Option 1 is adequate for CDFO reporting purposes but does not provide an easy way for analysts to recognize which of the 'Head not Processed' tags were or were not distributed against known pins to calculate estimates. If there is a desire to differentiate these tags, option 2 would require a change to the specifications.

We are looking to the data standards group to resolve this question - how to report 'head not taken' tags within the v4.0 specifications.

Author: Ken Phillipson /NWIFC
Wednesday, June 16, 2004 - 05:17 pm

Dear Forum Members,

Although I appreciate the situation that Kathryn is attempting to address for determining a process and reporting methodology for tag status “head not taken”, this is a departure from currently accepted CWT sampling methodology. This change has implications to the integrity of the CWT database. An act of knowingly not taking CWT's that are “in hand” would specifically target many of our evaluation studies on rebuilding stocks. The double index groups would also be seriously impacted, possibly leaving that analysis unusable. The impacts of this action need to be evaluated.

My suggestion is that this sampling issue should first be addressed at a higher PSC level,
and certainly be reviewed by Data Sharing. I would feel more comfortable with finding a reporting solution through Data Standards after receiving directions from our parent committee.

I understand that this issue surfaced at the Annual Mark Meeting last month. What official action was taken? I hope that it was referred to the Selective Fisheries Evaluation Committee or the Chinook Technical Committee. However, I haven't heard anything from either group (or anyone else) on this until now.

I agree with Ken P. that Data Sharing is an appropriate venue for review, but unless the potential impacts to the database have already been assessed and agreed to at a higher level, working out HOW we handle the new data situation may be a wasted effort.
We have a Data Sharing Committee meeting scheduled for Vancouver, B.C., during the PSC Annual Meeting. See our 2006 Work Plan under another topic within our Forum.

Items for consideration include:
1) Review the Expert Panel report on CWT (it is now available on the PSC Web Site).
2) Review status of Catch&Effort/Regulations Database.
3) Follow up on the Nov 2004 Portland meeting with SFEC (i.e. status of database for estimated impacts on un-marked salmon in selective fisheries or unsampled fisheries).
4) Discussion of direction of Data Sharing and issues to be addressed by this committee.

Can we address these issues in one day or do we need a 2 day meeting. Should we meet Monday afternoon and Tuesday of that week. There may be conflicts with other meetings for some of us.

Options: start early on Monday (would require Sunday travel for some) or meet the week before or after the PSC meeting (would require additional travel for some folks going to both meetings).

I have no other conflicts so far with Feb. 13-14. I'd prefer Monday afternoon through Tuesday-as-needed, but could come up on Sunday night if we need to limit the meeting to a single day.
Here is the tentative agenda. Please feel free to comment and add to it.

1. Review report from PSC CWT expert panel. This is available on the PSC Web site. Please review this before coming to the meeting.

2. Review status of Catch&Effort/Regulations Database.

3. Follow up on Portland meeting with SFEC in November 2004 (at this meeting we developed a format for creating a database for estimated impacts on un-marked salmon in selective fisheries or unsampled fisheries).

4. Discussion of direction of Data Sharing and issues to be addressed by this committee. Helping to ensure quality control of CWT database has been emphasized by many of you.

5. Should submittal of unrolled releases be allowed?

6. Other

I don't think item 5 (submission of unrolled release records) is a Yes/No issue. I think Data Sharing should examine the needs for the proposed change in data exchange rules, discuss the costs and impacts, and either flatly declare this proposed change in violation of the Treaty or prescribe conditions under which such exchange would be considered legitimate.

And I would promote the issue on the agenda so that the current item 4 (current needs, future directions) is our last topic.
New agenda item

RMIS / RMPC Interactive Forum: Data Sharing Committee Meeting; February 2006:
New agenda item

Author: Norma Jean Sands /NMFS
Tuesday, January 31, 2006 - 03:42 pm

The RMIS database currently has a field to indicate the type of release (production, experimental, mixed, etc,) that a given tag code represents, but contains no information on whether or not the fish bearing that code are listed, or are representative of listed fish. Now that hatcheries are included in listed ESUs, and with Canada's increasing focus on SARA listed stocks, it seems that it would make sense to include this information in the RMIS database.
New Agenda Item - How to identify mas...

RMIS / RMPC Interactive Forum: Data Sharing Committee Meeting; February 2006:
New Agenda Item - How to identify mass mark releases

Author: Kathryn Fraser /CDFO
Monday, February 06, 2006 - 10:01 am

With the move to v4.0 specs, it has become very difficult for users to recognize mass marked releases without having to examine and sum over each v4.0 mark/count field where the mark begins with 5 or 0. I would like to request some discussion regarding whether the Data Standards Working Group should be directed to improve this through perhaps a new field - mass marked=y/n.

Also, If we decide to do this, we should ensure we reach some consensus of definition of mass marked. Is a 'traditional' tagged release record where the cwt'd fish were adclipped and there were no associated fish considered mass marked?
This week Dan Webb wrote me:

"It would be nice to nail down the requirements for establishing a set of releases as a DIT group. The Spec clearly does not address these types of releases adequately. From a programming point of view the only requirement I have identified for a DIT group is: at least two release records with the same related_group_type must exist. (The reporting_agencies don't even have to match). Following your previous EMail it is becoming apparent that a unified definition and set of requirements need to be developed. Perhaps this is what you have been trying to convey all along. I also would suspect that Ken has a much greater understanding of the requirements than myself. My suggestion would be to approach Data Standards and/or Data Sharing to initiate the process. In the mean time we can still work with you to help identify DIT groups that are improperly set up. Do you have a list of what constitutes a valid DIT group in which we can work off of."

My response was:

DIT groups are supposed to be two groups of tagged fish that are identical in every attribute (related to the fish survival) except that one group is adipose clipped and the other is not. So they should have the same brood year, species, hatchery, stock, average size, release site, and release stage (at a minimum). I cannot imagine why there would ever be a different agency or coordinator although those in theory would not relate to the analysis. The original intent was that the release sizes would be the same but I do not see that as an essential element of a DIT.

I do not think RMIS should reject a release record that does not meet the DIT rules, when it validates for normal release information. The data types will have better ideas on how to deal with this; my approach would be to test the data after submission, if records that are designated as related group type 'D' did not meet the agreed upon rule the related group type would be changed to 'F' 'failed double index group standards'.

Add Your Message Here
Post:
Data Sharing Committee Meeting Minutes
February 13-14, 2006
Vancouver, B.C.

Second Draft - 3/3/06

Attendance: Chuck Parken (CDFO), Kathy Fraser (CDFO), Norma Jean Sands (NMFS), Mike Matylewich (CRITFC), Ken Johnson (PSMFC), Marianna Alexandersdottir (NWIFC, for Amy Seider), Dick O'Connor (WDFW), Ron Josephson (ADFG): guest Christine Mallette (ODFW)

The meeting was chaired by Chuck Parken, with Norma Jean Sands taking minutes.

1. Unrolled Releases ' Dick O'Connor

WDFW has proposed establishing a second option to submit release data as unrolled entries, with more than one line per CWT in order to report differences in release site, additional marks, etc. within one CWT release. There would also be an aggregate line summing over the releases for one CWT; this would not need to fill all fields in the line.

Discussion by the committee concluded that the need for multiple entries for one CWT to clarify critical fields such as hatchery, stock, or release location was the result of 'bad' experimental design, whether done on purpose or by mistake and should not be encouraged by letting the agency enter the data that way. Multiple releases within one CWT can compromise the usefulness of the tag, depending on which attributes change, since upon recovery, one does not know which attributes apply. The fact that multiple releases occurred could be flagged in the comments. The current specification does NOT require this of reporting agencies. There is no requirement to state anything in comments once releases have been rolled up to one record per CWT code. However, one purpose of the comments field is to report any abnormalities in the data out of courtesy to the users.

To the knowledge of the Data Sharing Committee, there has been no demand for the detailed information in multiple entries by PSC technical committees.

CONCLUSION: The Data Sharing Committee, at this time, rejects submission of multiple entries per CWT.

2. What is a DIT?

SFEC, in its use of the Regional Mark Information System (RMIS) to analyze DIT releases and recoveries, has found inconsistencies in the way DITs were reported. SFEC has notified agencies and reporting has improved.

Members of CoTC and CTC have been reporting some DIT errors to the RMPC. More recently, Ron Josephson reported a number of irregularities to the RMPC. This included DIT
releases with different release locations and release stages, releases without two groups identified, releases with both groups reported as adipose clipped, release groups with different fin clips, and even different stocks in one case.

Thus, additional validation rules are needed to reduce the reporting discrepancies. The validation should be standardized and explicitly stated in the Data Standards format manual.

**CONCLUSION:** The Data Sharing Committee tasks Data Standards with development of additional validation checks based on needs from SFEC. Data Sharing is to be advised if any of the new rules cause data integrity problems.

3. Pseudo recoveries (follow up of Nov 2004 discussion with SFEC)
At the November 2004 Data Sharing/Data Standards meeting SFEC proposed that a new data table be formatted that would record information needed to estimate certain impacts of selective fisheries on wild stocks. The data table would include lambda values and provide an estimate of how many recoveries would have been made if the fishery were not mark selective.

This request is now on hold, as the SFEC is not unanimous on whether this data/information is appropriate or whether it is actually analysis that should be the responsibility of SFEC.

**CONCLUSION:** This request is on hold for now until Data Sharing hears more from SFEC.

This topic also raised the issue of whom Data Standards takes order from, the PSC technical committees or from Data Sharing. Since the Data Sharing Committee is the parent committee for the Data Sharing Workgroup, assignments should come through Data Sharing. See item 6 for a more complete discussion of this topic.

4. What is a mass mark?
Mass marking by clipping the adipose fin is used to identify hatchery fish for mark selective fisheries; it was referred to as mass marking as all or most of the hatchery fish were meant to be ad-clipped. Not all hatchery fish were, or are, ad-clipped and some ad-clipped releases may be for purposes other than identifying hatchery fish for selective fisheries. However, with the advent of selective fisheries, all ad-clipped fish are vulnerable to selective fisheries, if the fishery occurs where the fish are found. Therefore, to quantify releases that were available to mark selective fisheries, one must look at all ad-clipped releases, regardless of the original intent of the clip.

**CONCLUSION:** No action is needed by Data Standards or Data Sharing. But users need to be aware of this.

5. Status of Catch/Effort data table
The format for the Catch/Effort data base was completed several years ago. So far only WDFW has submitted data to RMIS for this table. At the Nov 2004 meeting of Data Sharing/Data Standards it was decided to add a new field for the identification of ad-clip selective fisheries.

It has been suggested that this data table be used to enter regulation information needed
by the PSC technical committees. Data Sharing should reiterate its request to the PSC technical committees for a summary of the regulation information that they need for their analyses.

CONCLUSION: Data Sharing cochairs should meet with or communicate with cochairs of other PSC technical committees on database needs not currently being met by the database. In particular, should selective fishery regulations be added to the Catch/Effort database?

6. Role of Data Sharing
The role of Data Sharing (addressed in the 1985 Treaty MOU) is to facilitate the sharing of data between the two parties. Data Sharing has a limit of no more than 7 members per party. Data Sharing has had several workgroups under it to address specific tasks such as formation of a specific database format. Most of these workgroups have had sunset dates and no longer are in existence. The Data Standards workgroup has been extended indefinitely for the purpose of maintaining and enhancing the exchange database formats.

Data Sharing responds to the needs of PSC members for their data analyses supporting the treaty process. PSC technical committees should approach Data Sharing, not Data Standards, for changes in the database content. However, if the request from the PSC technical committees is of minor impact to Data Standards workload, they may take it directly to Data Standards; Data Standards still has the ability to push the request up to Data Sharing if they believe it is controversial or requires a lot of work. Data Sharing can prioritize tasks sent to Data Standards.

RMIS has been used as the repository of the PSC exchange databases. However, RMIS also responds to the needs of the Mark Committee (a coastwide PSFMC committee comprised of U.S. and Canadian members). The Regional Mark Center staff does a good job of providing groupings and reports to satisfy the various needs of users. However, the WDFW representative raised the question of whether RMIS currently has clear guidance in balancing Treaty-based needs with other needs, such as those brought up by the Mark Committee. There is an overlap in membership of Data Standards and the Mark committee, so any concerns raised by the later can be brought to Data Standards and/or Data Sharing.

CONCLUSION: Suggested changes in the database format and content that results in changes in the way agencies submit the data should go through Data Sharing.

7. Data Standard issues brought to Data Sharing
a. The 9000 mark-code was meant as unknown/unobserved marks on recovered fish. 'It should not be used for releases' was Norma's recollection of the discussion. Ken remembers differently:
'I don't remember this discussion as stated (i.e. 9xxx series mark codes only meant for recoveries). My understanding was that the 9xxx codes should be used for releases in limited situations at most. Tagging programs should know with few exceptions what marks are on their given release groups, but there might be some cases in which the mark might not be known for certain.' I do recall pointing out in the discussion that the release database has a significant number of records prior to mass marking where the mark code is identified as 9000 or 9009. Those codes have to be in error as the adipose clip was still sequestered for CWT marked fish only. Hence if there were no tags, the fish weren't adipose clipped, and thus should be coded '0000'. And my guess is that most if not all of
those particular errors were introduced at the time that we ported over from PSC Format 3.2 to 4.0. We will work with the given release agency to convert the problem mark codes back to ‘0000’.

b. Blank wire continues to be discouraged, but has been on the rise recently. Does making the blank wire agency recognizable affect the effectiveness of PSC sampling efforts? Is blank wire demagnetized? This issue should go to the Mark Committee.

c. Canadian sampling has a procedure where electronically sampled Chinook fish with an intact adipose fin register positive for CWT (i.e., likely to be from a DIT release group) but the head is not taken for processing. How can this be recognized in the database? This issue should go to Data Standards.

CONCLUSION: Data Standards should implement a validation rule that flags the use of the 9000 mark-code in the release database as it should be seldom used when reporting release groups. Data Standards should look for a way to incorporate the Canadian sampling procedure in the catch sample and possibly recovery database(s).

8. Identification of listed fish in the release tables of the CWT database.
This is similar to the problem of identifying indicator stocks in the database. One stock may be an indicator for a variety of analyses. However the designation as an indicator stock or stock of concern is fluid and can change with time. The best way to reflect this is to have separate tables of CWT and indicator or listed status. This perceived need should be brought to the attention of the Coho and Chinook Technical committees.

CONCLUSION: Include this issue in letter to the PSC technical committees asking if they need or would use this information.

9. Error Criteria
A number of errors crept into the database under conversion from Format Version 3.2 to Version 4.0. When found, they have been drawn to the attention of RMIS staff and most subsequently have been corrected by either the Mark Center or the reporting agency. However there continues to be some errors that the reporting agencies have not yet corrected. Mark Center efforts to get the errors resolved will continue.

Anyone finding errors should report them to the RMIS staff and to the agencies supplying the data. RMIS staff produces a discrepancy report that gets sent to the agencies and encourage the agencies to make the corrections.

CONCLUSION: Data quality is important; historical data is important and used. Fixable errors, including those in early year submittals, should be fixed as soon as possible and not shelved. Agencies needing financial assistance to complete historical QA review and corrections should notify Data Sharing Committee. It may be possible to use PSC endowment funds to assist here.

10. CWT symposium
PSMFC has volunteered to host a CWT symposium to address some of the concerns and problems with the current CWT program. This is in response to the PSC Expert Panel report on the PSC CWT program and alternative methods.

CONCLUSION: Data Sharing supports this effort and suggested that Ken Johnson provide a letter to the PSC Commissioners with this proposal. While Data Sharing is not endorsing the Expert Panel Report findings per se, Data Sharing supports addressing any bilaterally-agreed concerns in the symposium format.
Feb. 15, 2006 follow up: As suggested, Ken Johnson provided the PSC Commissioners with a letter outlining PSMFC’s offer to host a CWT symposium. This offer was discussed but deemed not necessary. Rather, it was decided that a PSC Ad Hoc Work Group of 8-10 members would be established to initially address the deficiencies of the current CWT system. The Work Group is expected to transmit its initial report and recommendations to the PSC Commissioners by August 1, 2006.

The Panel Report addressed issues of data quality for the CWT program as well as looked at alternative methods of estimating stock composition, abundance, and harvest rates. If alternative methods, such as GSI, are used by the PSC, should there be a common PSC database (format for exchange)? While agencies doing the work may want to keep their data (e.g., GSI standards for stocks) in their own propriety data bases, samples from catches will need a home easily accessible by the PSC technical committees. Given this discussion is premature, Data Sharing will wait for data needs to be identified by the PSC users.

A current need for the CWT database has been identified by the report, and that is improvement in data quality. Data Sharing is willing to work on improving data quality and responding to needs of PSC users of the database. We support a CWT symposium that will address issues of release and sampling rates.

One issue of the Version 4 format came up in these discussions: that of the 4 double fields that report releases by mark (i.e., CWT 1st Mark; CWT 1st Mark Count; CWT 2nd Mark; CWT 2nd Mark Count; Non CWT 1st Mark; Non CWT 1st Mark Count; Non CWT 2nd Mark, Non CWT 2nd Mark Count). These eight fields were introduced to accommodate double index tagging.

Are these fields providing the data needed by the users? They aren’t easy to work with and can be quite confusing at times to those experienced with the data. In terms of selective fisheries, users must look at all four mark columns (equivalent to ‘Ad+CWT, Ad Only, CWT only, and Unclipped/NonCWT) and figure how to combine them for their purposes.

CONCLUSION: Data Sharing tasks Data Standards to review the reasoning behind the pattern of the four mark release fields and their four associated count fields. Data Sharing will wait for assignments from the PSC as a result of the Expert Panel Report.

12. Work Plan 2006
Our work plan, submitted to and accepted by the PSC Commissioners includes two additional meeting in 2006. The full Data Sharing meeting is a place marker, depending on issues; it may occur later or be met with exchanges over the forum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When</th>
<th>Who Location Purpose</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Data Standards</td>
<td>Review updates needed for CWT database. Complete upgrade to database Version 4.1 Address tasks identified at February Data Sharing meeting. Any new business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spring or early summer Data Sharing and Data Standards U.S. Address quality control and database needs not currently supported by CWT database.
Summary of tasks to:
Data Sharing
1) Data Sharing cochairs should meet with or communicate with cochairs of other PSC technical committees on database needs not currently being met by the database. This includes:
DIT: Find out if the database records DIT as 'related group-D' information in a useful manner for SFEC.
Regulations continue to be desired, but the exact need, other than identifying selective fisheries, has not been itemized
There is continued interest in identifying indicator stocks. DSC finds that the use of a separate table to capture tag code, species, Indicator stock name, and release year (at a minimum) is the preferred solution to documenting PSC Indicator stocks (both actual and 'developing'). DSC will direct the Technical Committees to draft the contents for such a table. A subsequent task will be generated for DSWG to create an exchange format for the table. TC members will populate the table when ready.
There is a new interest in identifying listed stocks? However, there is confusion over whether the (CTC) requestor wants to identify wild stocks, associated hatchery stocks, all hatchery releases inside an ESU boundary, etc.
Should the 8 code/numbers fields on the current release data record be replaced with four simpler fields containing numbers released with AD+CWT, AD-only, CWT-only, No AD/No CWT?

2) Regarding the question: should the 8 code/numbers fields on the current release data record be replaced with four simpler fields? Kathy Fraser will extract examples where it appears data submitters have used the 8 fields incorrectly and ask DSC members to review.

3) DSC will notify the Coast-wide Mark Committee that DSC and DSWG does not plan to make changes to the data exchange formats to accommodate blank wire (agency-only) tags.

4) Error fixing of database
   a. DSC directed Ken to send copies of all such reports to the reporting agencies (both data reporter and tag coordinator) in order to initiate the correction process.
   b. Ken raised the concern that some reporting agencies (e.g. IDFG) are drastically under-funded to provide data and may not be able to afford to research errors and make corrections.
   c. DSC will review the QC state of RMIS data and discuss pursuit of Southern Panel endowment funds to help address these cases if additional money is helpful for such agencies.

Data Standards Workgroup

1) Data Standards should implement a validation rule that does not allow the 9000 mark-code in the release database. But in addition,
   a. RMIS has been directed to extract all occurrences of mark code 9xxx in the release database, contact the reporting agencies for more appropriate mark codes, and report back to DSC any non-compliant instances.

2) Data Standards should look for a way to incorporate the Canadian sampling procedure
of recognizing a tag but not reading it.
a. Catch: sample can accommodate snouts-not-processed but not the subset of snouts-beeped-not-taken.
b. DSWG is directed to add this field.

3) The CWT Expert Panel report mentions two issues related to data quality that Data Sharing/Data Standards should handle.
a. Why did the question about lack of unique and perpetual recovery record IDs arise? It turns out that ADFG re-labels all recoveries at the time of each file submission. This will be addressed with ADFG (and others as needed). ADFG does not re-label recoveries and we never have done this. Each recovery id is unique to a year and never changes.
b. How does recovery happen prior to release? Discussion ensued. DSWG will be directed to change the release data spec to require a last date released, and will force non-blank first date released by using the contents of last date released for records that arrive with a blank first date. (I suggest that recovery happens prior to release when a tag is read wrong [this is not necessarily the readers fault as we have seen tags where the marks were not distinct])

Author: Norma Jean Sands / NMFS
Wednesday, April 12, 2006 - 11:00 am