

Table of Contents

Agency deadlines for publishing data to RMPC.....	1
Addition of Release Stock Origin	8
Addition of Unresolved Reason.....	11
Catch/Sample Period Ranges	13
Report Unsampled Catch.....	18
Update Location Code Format	21
Define Maximum Species Age	26
Remove Redundant Fields.....	29
Extend Max-Length of Recovery ID	31
Unknown Fishery Regulation.....	35
Update Dataset Transfer Method	37

Agency deadlines for publishing data to RMPC

Proposal ID: 2

Affected Version: 4.1

Affected Chapters: 1

Proposed Version: 5.0

Significance: Minor

WG-Status: Approved

PSC-Status: Not Applicable

TC-Status: Approved

Type: Exchange Specification

Created: 20120212 17:00:00

Description

“Timeliness of Reporting” is issue #13 identified in the [PSC Report 25 “An Action Plan in Response to Coded Wire Tag Expert Panel Recommendations”](#)

Proposal

Proposal to modify the *Specifications and Definitions for the Exchange of Coded Wire Tag Data for the North American Pacific Coast, PSC Format V 4.1* according to date requirements identified in the 22 January 2001 letter from the US Section of the PSC to the Director, WDFW and the table created by Gil Lensegrav on the RMPC DSWG Discussion Forum.

Format and Document Impact(s)

Chapter 1 - Introduction, Definitions and Rules

Once TCDS identifies the required dates, they will be documented in Chapter 1, Section 2b and 2c.

Data Migration Method

No data migration is required.

Discussion and Action Items

Feb 2014 Data Standards Work Group - Vancouver BC

Minutes Item	Discussion
Discussion	DSWG cannot define what deadlines are required (e.g., CTC requirements) from the dated US Commissioner letter of 2001.
Action Item	DSWG will ask TCDS to identify these dates, by fishery event (e.g., ocean troll), and by data type (e.g., escapement)

November 2014 Technical Committee on Data Sharing - Seattle, WA

Minutes Item	Discussion
Discussion 3.1	2016 TCDS Work Plan - High Priority, Short Term Chinook ocean/mixed stock fisheries for Chinook Year (prior to Oct. 1) - all recoveries with CWT estimates by Jan. 31; if catch estimates are not available, all raw data is required by Jan. 31. Chinook Escapement - CTC Chinook exploitation indicators with CWT estimates by Jan. 31.
Action Item 3.1	George and Kathy to send email to CTC to confirm preliminary info provided at meeting and to CoTC to identify their requirements.

October 2015 Data Standards Work Group - Seattle, WA

CDFO and RMPC (US) will create table of dates for reporting files.

Agencies need to look at this further and add to the above ref. table. They should consider any mitigating factors.

Chinook escapement estimates by Jan 31st is earlier than we had expected.

Interim Actions: 1. CTC has updates for table [in existing work plan] 2. CoTC should be asked to generate their own table of preferred dates 3. The data tables [by data type, etc.] will be assembled [by RMPC] and provided to DSWG.

October 2015 Work Group on Data Standards, Seattle, WA

TCDS chairs will create table of dates for reporting files for final review by CTC and input by CoTC.

Agencies need to look at this further and provide feedback on any mitigating factors.

May 23, 2023, meeting TCDS meeting, Vancouver, BC

Engage with all TC during 2023-2024 to obtain specific data deadlines to support analysis and plan to include deadlines in 5.0

- Recovery/escapement data most critical for analysis and how to have it informed (currently have Jan 31st deadline but frequently missed). Catch sample also has Jan 31st deadline.
- Releases are not as problematic
 - Prelim release Aug 15
 - Smolt monitoring
 - SFEC was to be used to help plan but the mass marking proposals may meet this need

 - Why can't have actual release instead of prelim?
 - Propose to write a proposal to remove and circulate for input to TC and RCMT

 - Note: Part of the issue of preliminary data is to reduce the code 8's in the database. It is unclear if those code 8's are resolved to tag status 1 when final releases are reported
 - Used to have hatchery production report—PSC funding it was a requirement to provide broodstock take and egg take, and releases but as this information was provided online (broodstock) and releases in RMIS. It became unnecessary to produce report. WDFW enhancement report has the sources, rearing location, release mass marking. Mass marking proposal handled by SFEC

Could have TC co-chair remind other TC of existence of the deadlines and they can inform/remind commissioners of the importance of these deadlines

Need to explore the need for the preliminary mid-season data - not as critical for Treaty but needed for domestic needs

Could explore having commissioners formally approve the dates

Could add to the workplan that a limitation is not having the commissioners' approval of the dates which may help put more weight to the deadlines (Check with John Field if a valid approach

Add to commissioner update concern of missed deadlines

June 20+, 2023 Data Standards Working Group - Virtual

DSWG reviewed (provided by Gil L. /WDFW):

- January 2001 letter from US section of Pacific Salmon Commission to the director of Washington Fish and Wildlife;
- A table of reporting data submission timelines is re-provided in current form.

DSWG on reporting data submission timelines (RC, CS data):

The agency reporting dates are primarily requirements that CTC has & are critical to both the estimates of exploitation rate and model calibration. The CTC & other groups usually meet in January, including at the Pacific Salmon Commission meetings. The CoTC group often meets in January and February.

Gil /WDFW: generally, to include spawning ground escapement, the reporting completion could be expected to be: November 30th of Run Year plus one (1). DSWG now considers this draft table (based on the above WDFW table) with Reporting Agency column added, so that other agencies (notably ODFW, NWIFC) can be added in with WDFW in the current rows, or can add new rows for their fishery /species groups that aren't currently in the table. This table, once completed, can be reviewed by TCDS and CTC. So, some version of the table can go into the specification for version 5.0.

DSWG Recommendation: Approved; pending further additions to the *PSC Reporting Timelines* table. (See RMPC for a current copy of the table.)

DSWG on 'Preliminary' RL data:

Do we need to have preliminary releases even defined or can we just go to saying that all fields are required—at the time the release group is ready for reporting to the RMPC? Some years ago the issue had come about because there were cases where we were starting to see recoveries of fish that hadn't had the tag code released yet – so the Recoveries file could not be validated. It was held up. There were RL groups that had been transferred between agencies during the rearing process, etc. The problem has pretty much gone away – or is very rare these days.

NWIFC may have been the only agency that was reporting preliminary data recently and they don't intend to do that anymore.

DSWG Recommendation: Approved. Group is ok with not having preliminary data for release data. The 'Preliminary' data reporting will be discontinued for version 5.0.

DSTC June 4-6 2024 Nanaimo, BC meeting

Confirmed that we remove the preliminary release due dates from the data specification document.

RMPC staff will continue with pre RCMT meeting check with the USA data providers in advance of the deadline for data submittal to remind them as well as other topics related to RCMT tasks.

CTC meetings already remind everyone about the data deadline

January 31 data dealing doesn't mean the data are complete for that year but communicates the date by which those data are needed for the PSC Analysis in February PSC Annual Meeting. Add a specific note that describes the reason for this January 31 due data i.e., that it's to support the specific analysis for the PSC Annual Meeting.

ACTION: Jim will draft the language that explains the need behind the Jan 31st: that is currently in the data specification document to be included in the 5.0 version of the data specifications:

- To inform the analysis that occurs during the PSC February annual meeting the data must be submitted and validated into the RMIS system by January 31st.

Side notes about the detailed table of expected data submitted dates from the WGDS:

- Canada January 31 is the Canada deadline
- The detailed table from the WGDS example would be a more informative table for USA data users. We could discuss if of use for USA data users and, if yes
- The table is a guideline for when the analysts expect the data to be in RMIS

TCDS September 4-5, 2024 Portland, OR - Hybrid Meeting

Jim shared rewrite for 'from data providers to RMPC' section during TCDS Sept 4-5 2024 meeting.

- This was in response to Nanaimo meeting requests to include the date for PSC annual analysis.
- January of first year after release is too soon for PSC use. PSC doesn't require such a short timeline for turnaround - suggested rewording it.
 - Suggested including both domestic and bi-lateral.
 - The word "complete" means that all the required fields are in - not all releases.
 - Suggested updating to "all available releases" and orgs can interpret what that means to their agency
- Outmigrant sampling in the river (anything under year 2) is not going to be used.
- Nick wants a chance to clean up their recoveries before they are forced to submit this data.

- Work on the release language a bit. Recoveries need to be given more time to be reported.

TCDS September 4-5, 2024 Portland, OR - Hybrid Meeting (GitLab Summary)

Jim shared rewrite for 'from data providers to RMPC' section in response to Nanaimo meeting requests to include the date for PSC annual analysis.

January of first year after release is too soon for PSC use. Group suggested extending turnaround timeline to give recoveries more time to be reported. Also suggested including both domestic and bi-lateral and updating "complete" to "all available".

Recommendation from Sept 2024 Replaced by May 2025 recommendation below

Update language to provide context in the data standard reporting timeline. See Jim Longwill's proposed language change below {chapter 1, Section B: Scheduled Frequency of Reporting}:

[RMIS LC Translation Request Demo \(link\)](#)

Proposed re-writing of Specification, Ch.1, Sn. B. for Ver 5.0

NOTES:

* B.1. and B.2 have been switched to have reporting to the RMPC first.. for improved context for exchanging data and to reflect that reporting to Canada takes place generally after reporting to the RMPC.

* Information on Preliminary releases is removed since that is being discontinued

B. Scheduled Frequency of Data Exchange

Data should be provided to the RMPC and PSC in order to be as current as possible for the Annual PSC Analysis. This warrants that the current datasets should be provided by the **January 31st** due date.

The minimal schedule in which data needs to be exchanged is as follows:

1. From Reporting Agencies to the RMPC:
 - a. Release: All data records for the current calendar year should be reported no later than January 31 of the following year.
 - b. Recovery: All available data records should be reported no later than **January 31** for inclusion in annual PSC analyses.
 - c. Catch/Sample: All available data records should be reported no later than **January 31** for inclusion in annual PSC analyses.

- d. Location: ...
- e. Description: ...
- 2. From the RMPC to Canada:
 - a. Release and Location datasets will be sent to Canada:
 - i. when specifically requested by Canada, or
 - ii. within two weeks of validation and processing at the RMPC
 - b. Recovery and Catch/Sample datasets will be sent to Canada:
 - i. when specifically requested by Canada, or
 - ii. immediately upon validation and processing at the RMPC

TCDS May 27-28 2025 Portland, OR - Hybrid Meeting

Update language to provide context in the data standard reporting timeline. See Jim Longwill's proposed language change below {chapter 1, Section B: Scheduled Frequency of Reporting}:

[RMIS LC Translation Request Demo \(link\)](#)

[Proposed re-writing of Specification, Ch.1, Sn. B. for Ver 5.0](#)

NOTES:

* B.1. and B.2 have been switched to have reporting to. the RMPC first.. for improved context for exchanging data and to reflect that reporting to Canada takes place generally after reporting to the RMPC.

* Information on Preliminary releases is removed since that is being discontinued

B. Scheduled Frequency of Data Exchange

Data should be provided to the RMPC and PSC in order to be as current as possible for the Annual PSC Analysis. This warrants that the current datasets should be provided by the **January 31st** due date.

The minimal schedule in which data needs to be exchanged is as follows:

- 3. From US Reporting Agencies to the RMPC and from Canadian Reporting Agencies to DFO:
 - a. Release: All data records for the current calendar year should be reported no later than January 31 of the following year.
 - b. Recovery: All available data records should be reported no later than **January 31** for inclusion in annual PSC analyses.
 - c. Catch/Sample: All available data records should be reported no later than **January 31** for inclusion in annual PSC analyses.
- 4. To/ From the RMPC to/ from Canada DFO:
 - a. Release and Location datasets will be sent to Canada:
 - i. within two weeks of validation and processing at the RMPC or,

- ii. when specifically requested
- b. Recovery and Catch/Sample datasets will be sent to Canada:
 - i. within two weeks of validation and processing at the RMPC or,
 - ii. when specifically requested

Recommendation from May 2025

B. Scheduled Frequency of Data Exchange

Data should be provided to the RMPC and PSC in order to be as current as possible for the Annual PSC Analysis. This warrants that the current datasets should be provided by the **January 31st** due date.

The minimal schedule in which data needs to be exchanged is as follows:

- 5. From US Reporting Agencies to the RMPC and from Canadian Reporting Agencies to DFO:
 - a. Release: All data records for the current calendar year should be reported no later than January 31 of the following year.
 - b. Recovery: All available data records should be reported no later than **January 31** for inclusion in annual PSC analyses.
 - c. Catch/Sample: All available data records should be reported no later than **January 31** for inclusion in annual PSC analyses.
- 6. To/ From the RMPC to/ from Canada DFO:
 - a. Release and Location datasets will be sent to Canada:
 - i. within two weeks of validation and processing at the RMPC or,
 - ii. when specifically requested
 - b. Recovery and Catch/Sample datasets will be sent to Canada:
 - i. within two weeks of validation and processing at the RMPC or,
 - ii. when specifically requested

Addition of Release Stock Origin

Proposal ID: 9

Affected Version: 4.1

Affected Chapters: 2.22

Proposed Version: 5.0

Significance: Minor

WG-Status: Recommended

PSC-Status: Not Applicable

TC-Status: Approved
Type: Exchange Specification
Created: 20151001
Subsequent Proposal ID(s):

Background

From the minutes of the DSWG meeting held February 2014 in Vancouver BC.

Description

There was a request for a method of identifying the **parental stock origin** of a release group.

Proposal

Add a field to Chapter 2 - Release Data to identify "Stock Origin Type". Make the field required to raise the profile of the new field.

Format and Document Impact(s)

Chapter 2 - Release Data

Field #	Max Cols	Reqd	Format /Use	Description & Validation Rules\
22	1	Yes	'U' 'H' 'M' 'N' 'C' 'W' 'O'	Code indicating parental stock origin =Unknown =Hatchery Origin Parents =Mixed Parents (H and N or W) =Natural Origin Parents =Captive Brood Parents =Wild Origin Parents =Other stock origin 'See comments for details' If 'O' then a comment is required.

Data Migration Method

Automatically populate the new field with a 'U' value for unknown stock origin type.

Discussion and Action Items

October 2015 Data Standards Work Group - Seattle, WA

What is the definition of "Wild"? Is it spawned "in the ground"? It is an important [legal/political] question. Some lawyers say that there is the need to have multi-

generational spawning in order to be considered “Wild”. How is this different from Rearing Type? Rearing Type (field 22) has to do with the environment, not the [origin] of the fish.

The defn. of “Wild” should be clarified in the Blue Book.

Agreed - Add a new code ‘W’ for ‘wild origin parents’. Agencies are encouraged to define Natural/Wild origin salmon with a future release document.

CDFO Modification (April 2016)

Change the description of “Mixed Parents (H and N)” to “Mixed Parents (H and N or W)” to reflect the potential for Wild or Natural Origin parents within the Mixed Parents stock origin field.

2021 Coho Technical Committee Feedback

No specific feedback with this proposal.

May 2022 Chinook Technical Committee - Virtual

Possibly have clearer definitions around Natural and Wild parents. Suggested adding “O”ther to the list with a need for a comment. Suggest that the blue book have definitions of natural versus wild stocks by agency.

August 10, 2022 Technical Committee on Data Sharing - Virtual

- need edit under description from a ‘paternal’ to ‘parental’ to ‘
- need data management principles developed (and communicated) to guide when we required an ‘unknown’ versus leaving blank. For analysis need to know if a ‘u’ is the same as ‘blank’, so need to know if we go back and clean up the data system that we document what is meant by a blank or an unknown so the usage is clear from the data consumer. We need to developed a guidance for data management so clear that when data providers submit a ‘blank’ it means what we expect it to mean.
- Should add the data mgmt. principles to the Blue Book TCDS 89-1 when we revise it.
- Need to provide a guide to data management, so we can provide a common language
- requires adding a new field

June 20+, 2023 Data Standards Working Group - Virtual

Reviewed.. Ok for Version 5.0.

TCDS September 4-5, 2024 Portland, OR - Hybrid Meeting (GitLab Summary)

Suggested adding an unknown field for agencies to use. TCDS approves for 5.0.

TCDS May 27-28 2025 Portland, OR - Hybrid Meeting

Change name of the field to “Brood Stock Origin Type”

Remember RMIS will automatically fill with 'u' unknown if the information is unavailable but this could be useful when available for stock assessment analysis.

Name field 'Brood stock origin type'?

Recommendation

DSWG recommends implementation in next version (4.2) of the specifications.

Field Name to be changed to "Brood Stock Origin Type"

TCDS approved this proposal for implementation in version 5.0.

Addition of Unresolved Reason

Proposal ID: 12

Affected Version: 4.1

Affected Chapters: 3.29

Proposed Version: 5.0

Significance: Minor

WG-Status: Recommended

PSC-Status: Not Applicable

TC-Status: Approved

Type: Exchange Specification

Created: 20151001

Subsequent Proposal ID(s): 23

Description

There is a desire by some agencies that the reporting agency identify the reason for an unresolved recovery (Tag Status = 7). This allows the releasing agency to possibly take corrective action.

Proposal

Add a new field to Chapter 3 - Recovery Data to identify "Unresolved Reason". Make the field required if "Tag Status = 7".

Format and Document Impact(s)

Chapter 3 - Recovery Data

Add the following field:

Field #	Max Cols	Reqd	Format Use	Description & Validation Rules\
29	1	No		Code indicating the reason for identifying the recovery as unresolved
			'0'	=Not Specified
			'1'	=Unresolved Tagcode (i.e. no release exists)
			'2'	=Mismatched Species (i.e. difference between release and
			'3'	recovery)
			'4'	=Unreasonable Age: Recovery Year - Brood Year
			'5'	(e.g. negative age)
			'9'	=Multiple Uses of Tagcode (reused tagcode) =Destroyed Tag Release =Multiple reasons
				Field is required if Tag Status (Field 28) = '7'
				Field must be blank if Tag Status (Field 28) <> '7'

Data Migration Method

Automatically populate the new field "Unresolved Reason" with value '0' when Tag Status is '7'.

Discussion and Action Items

TCDS needs to provide input on maximum ages by species for identifying "Unreasonable Ages".

October 2015 Data Standards Work Group - Seattle, WA

Add a qualifier that age is recovery year minus brood year. Further discussion, do we need the '5' = Destroyed Tag Release value? [When would it be used?]

2021 Coho Technical Committee Feedback

The "Unreasonable Age" could also be a too large a value (not just negatives), but this would require additional clarification of criteria.

In addition, additional clarification of criteria for “Unreasonable Location” would need to be defined, as CWT recoveries can occur in very unexpected locations.

May 2022 Chinook Technical Committee - Virtual

No concerns with the additional value. This would be a helpful field in communicating data quality concerns between agencies.

August 10, 2022 Technical Committee on Data Sharing - Virtual

No concerns with the additional value.

October 12, 2022 Technical Committee on Data Sharing - Virtual

There was concerns if the original proposed value for “Unreasonable Location” was unneeded, so it was removed. Furthermore, an additional value was specified if multiple reasons for the unresolved recovery was identified. This proposal should be implemented in version 5.0 of the data specification.

June 20+, 2023 Data Standards Working Group - Virtual

Reviewed.. Ok for Version 5.0.

TCDS September 4-5, 2024 Portland, OR - Hybrid Meeting (GitLab Summary)

Reviewed and approved for 5.0.

TCDS May 27-28 Portland, OR - Hybrid Meeting

No change

Recommendation

DSWG recommends implementation in next version (4.2) of the specifications.

TCDS approved this proposal for implementation in version 5.0.

Catch/Sample Period Ranges

Proposal ID: 16

Affected Version: 4.1

Affected Chapters:

Proposed Version: 5.0

Significance: Moderate

WG-Status: Recommended

PSC-Status: Not Applicable

TC-Status: Approved

Type: Exchange Specification

Created: 20151002

Subsequent Proposal ID(s):

Description

Two methods are currently in use to identify pooling periods in Catch/Sample files. For each pool period, Canada reports individual records for each period in the pool but field 27 - "Number Estimated" cannot be directly calculated without summing the set of records. For each pool period, Alaska reports a single record with summary results for all periods in the pool using a custom value in Field 10 - "Period ID". Both methods are difficult to interpret.

The use of a custom value on Alaskan catch/sample records may also be prone to interpretation error because it is not consistent with the Period ID format identified by Field 9 - "Period Type".

Proposal

As period pooling is common practice for both Canada and Alaska, references in the specification to it being "...non-standard estimated number calculations..." should be removed.

Add a field to Chapter 4 - Catch/Sample Data to identify an optional "Pool ID".

Format and Document Impact(s)

Chapter 4 - Catch/Sample Data

Field

Description & Validation Rules

10 Make this field *Not Required*

11 Modify the following rule:

If present, must define a valid period

to:

*If present, must define a valid period represented by the **Period Type***

Field

Description & Validation Rules

Add the following rule:

If Period is absent, first period must have a value less than or equal to last period

Remove the phrase *Applies to non-standard estimated number calculations only* as the method of using period ranges is standard practice for both Canada and Alaska.

12 Modify the following rule:

If present, must define a valid period

to:

*If present, must define a valid period represented by the **Period Type***

Add the following rule:

If Period is absent, last period must have a value greater than or equal to first period

Remove the phrase *Applies to non-standard estimated number calculations only* as the method of using period ranges is standard practice for both Canada and Alaska.

Add the following field:

PSC Fld #	PSC Common Data Field Name	Max Cols	Reqd	Format /Use	Description & Validation Rules
13	Pool ID	6	No	Text	Agency-specific pooling code that identifies a temporal pool

Data Migration Method

Canada and Alaska must re-publish catch/sample files based on the new period range reporting format.

Discussion and Action Items

November 2014 Technical Committee on Data Sharing - Seattle, WA

Minutes Item	Discussion
Discussion 3.4	Agreed there are pros and cons of both methods are acceptable. Agencies can decide which method they prefer to use. Suggestion to resolve Alaskan issues - add new code to Field 9 - "Period Type" for agency-defined pool and new

Minutes Item	Discussion
	field "Pool Period Type". Suggestion to improved interpretation of records for Canadian method - create new field "Pool ID".
Action Item 3.4	Assigned to DSWG to develop requirements for both methods and to develop documentation to support agencies for data exchange and interpretation.

Canadian Proposal (October 2015)

To reduce confusion, the catch/sample record should clearly represent a range of periods and not appear to represent a single period as defined by the period type. To do this, it is recommended that Field 10 - "Period ID" be optional if both Fields 11 and 12 - "First Period" and "Last Period" are provided.

Proposed Change (Chapter 4 - Catch/Sample Data)

Field #	Description & Validation Rules
10	Make this field <i>Not Required</i>
11,1	Modify the following rule:
2	<i>If present, must define a valid period</i> to: *If present, must define a valid period represented by the Period Type

October 2015 Data Standards Work Group - Seattle, WA

If period is absent, First and Last must be present. If First present, Last must be present. New field Pool ID - 6 character alpha.

CDFO Comments (April 2016)

If Period ID is provided on a catch/sample records, it may not be between the first and last period IDs. Canada calculates CWT estimates based on data from time periods outside of the record's time period in some circumstances.

2021 Coho Technical Committee Feedback

No specific feedback with this proposal.

May 2022 Chinook Technical Committee - Virtual

No concerns with this change to the period reporting of catch/sample records. This change may require some modifications of analysis tools to importing this data.

August 10, 2022 Technical Committee on Data Sharing - Virtual

Proposal approved.

- Proposal is to change the validation rule so that when entered PERIOD TYPE then we only require to fill PERIOD ID or First/Last PERIOD fields and not require both
- Troll fishery can span multiple weeks, which causes an issues for Canada and Alaska. Pooling type of sampled couldn't fit so went unreported.
 - Period Type '6' stats week; then Period is required as well as First Period and Last Period is required. Request that you make one or the other required not both. So allows to pool the 3 week range .
- In Alaska 'period' means a period to time, such as 1 week.
- In Canada: statistical weeks but we have 3 weeks so it doesn't fit
- Gary: converting stats week back to accounting periods and aging protocols makes it challenging. Get into an expansion issue. Nick – perhaps the recovery dates are useful for this.
- Unclear what the spec defines as a 'week' since if the month starts on a Saturday is that week 1 of new month or last week of previous month?
- In RMIS statistical week is very specific and based on an algorithm for recovery for statistical week based on DSTC guidance
- Gary, chinook, Canada and Alaska use accounting year that ends Sept 30. Aging we use for modeling is also Sept 30 for Canada and Alaska. And the others use end of December/January. Nick: no standard across PSC/PST regarding dates

October 12, 2022 Technical Committee on Data Sharing - Virtual

This proposal should be implemented in version 5.0 of the data specification.

June 20+, 2023 Data Standards Working Group - Virtual

Reviewed.. Ok for Version 5.0.

TCDS September 4-5, 2024 - Portland, OR - Hybrid Meeting (GitLab Summary)

Data migration warrants that Canda and Alaska will have to republish upon implementation of 5.0. Don't put periods anymore if they are pooled.

TCDS May 27-28 Portland, OR - Hybrid Meeting

no changes

Recommendation

DSWG recommends implementation in next version (4.2) of the specifications.

TCDS approved this proposal for implementation in version 5.0.

- Proposal is to change the validation rule so that when entered PERIOD TYPE then we only require to fill PERIOD ID or First/Last PERIOD fields and not require both

Report Unsamplerd Catch

Proposal ID: 18

Affected Version: 4.1

Affected Chapters: 4.18

Proposed Version: 5.0

Significance: Moderate

WG-Status: Draft

PSC-Status: Not Applicable

TC-Status: Approved

Type: Exchange Specification

Created: 20151002

Subsequent Proposal ID(s): 26

Description

The TCDS identified that the Data Standards committee should remove the Catch and Effort file specification and focus on reporting total catch in the existing Catch/Sample file format. However, the current Catch/Sample file does not allow for sample types associated with unsampled fisheries.

Proposal

DSWG to develop proposal.

Format and Document Impact(s)

Chapter 4 - Catch/Sample Data

File

Id

Description & Validation Rules

18 Add sample types '3' and '5' as defined in Chapter 3 - Recovery Data to the set of valid values for the Catch/Sample Data.

Add a new sample type '8' = Known catch from a fishery with no sampling. Number CWT Estimated must be zero and there are no known recoveries.

Data Migration Method

Agencies should begin populating this file format with catch from all fisheries, even those that may not have been sampled for CWTs.

Discussion and Action Items

October 2015 Data Standards Work Group - Seattle, WA

Given C&E data now retired, consider allowing unsampled catch as added to Catch/Sample file. Discussion: could add new Sample Type (8); however, [it may be better to clarify meaning & situation of “unsampled catch” in definition of Sample Type ‘1’]. see specification, look at punctuation, etc.

Addressed as sample type 1 in existing specification.

Canadian Proposed Changes (October 2015)

Add more options to Field 18 - *Sample Type* in the Catch/Sample file, to allow reporting of catch from unsampled fisheries.

Format and Document Impact(s) (Chapter 4 - Catch/Sample Data)

Field #	Description & Validation Rules
18	Add sample types ‘3’ as defined in Chapter 3 - Recovery Data to the set of valid values for the Catch/Sample Data.

Add a new sample type ‘8’ = Known catch from a fishery with no sampling. Number CWT Estimated must be zero and there are no known recoveries.

2021 Coho Technical Committee Feedback

Are the known catches from a fishery with no sampling currently being entered with sample type = 1? If so, how do we delineate data from a fishery with no sampling and a fishery with sampling but zero recoveries collected? We definitely need this type of information entered and a clear way to delineate this situation versus a fishery that had known catch and was sampled but had zero recoveries. These data types are often handled differently in terms of analysis. Thus, the proposal to add a new sample type “8” would be supported, but it would require an understanding of how to analyze prior years representing this same situation, along with data records of the new sample type value.

May 2022 Chinook Technical Committee - Virtual

Propose add this and suggest to the CYER workgroup to have agencies report unsampled catch through this mechanism. Look at having a sunset clause to drop if it is not adopted in

a meaningful way. Explore using this data to inform the Catch and Escapement automated report of the CTC.

August 10, 2022 Technical Committee on Data Sharing - Virtual

- Will TCs actual use it?
- Concern with timeliness and ability to get those data collected to exchange
- Leave active until we have more understanding on how it can be used and

May 23-24, 2023 meeting Vancouver, B.C.

Combine this proposal (or supersede one with the other) with

Combine Report Unsampld Catch (ID 26) and Total Catch (ID 7) - action: Nick to consider combining or superseding these 2 proposals together

June 20+, 2023 Data Standards Working Group - Virtual

Proposal #18: Report Unsampld Catch, and #26: Reporting Total Catch, appear to be largely 'the same' proposal and ought to be combined.

It has been standard practice for WDFW to report unsampld catch for, for example, Puget Sound, fresh water sport; also, quite a few commercial, fisheries with unsampld catch that get reported. CDFW and ODFW confirm that they also have this type of situation. These are catch sample records that don't have corresponding recoveries.

For example, WDFW uses: in Catch Sample field #18, Sample Type '1' equals in-sample recoveries from a sampled fishery with known catch, and number estimated of 0. This is also used to report unsampld catch. So, known & unsampld catch is generally reported – in this way or other ways.

We may want to consider other agencies that aren't part of this discussion. They may not be reporting their unsampld catch.

DSWG: We seek clarification on what they want in cases where Number Sampled is zero. There are several different situations, and some many involve Sample Type '1', and /or may have no recoveries associated with the C/S record.

DSTC June 4-6, 2024 Nanaimo, BC meeting

Sample type 1 definition in current 4.2 spec: "In-sample recoveries from a sampled fishery with known catch; number_cwt_estimated is non-zero. Also used to report unsampld catch"

Add the sample type 8 , and do not allow populating the other fields such as no tags, and sample size is 0. Response sample type 8 would only apply to catch sample status (not apply to recovery). There's nothing else to provide, so it's just a catch sample record to say 8000 fish were caught in this fishery type 8. We could use 3 as in the RECOVERY table: 3= voluntary recoveries from an unsampld fishery and put that 3 also in the CATCH SAMPLE table.

ACTION: add sample type 8; build validation rules to prevent populating other fields that would not be logical with a sample type 8, so required sample size = 0 and all CWT totals must be blank. And if another sample type value is selected then require the sample size to be >0. Could add a footnote that explains the validation rules associated with a sample type=8 versus other sample type

ACTION: bring value 3 from RECOVERY TABLE To CATCH/SAMPLE Table... it is an optional no hard rules around 3 in the CATCH/SAMPLE size

TCDS May 27-28 Portland 2025, OR - Hybrid Meeting

Need to check why sample type 5 may have been dropped from this proposal

If the group goes with including '5' then

- Add a validation rule to prevent use of 5 to avoid duplicating the catch [validation must match recovery], Jim and Dan will explore the best validation rule for this need.
- In a few years check whether anyone is using the '5' in this field.

Mike will check GITLAB to view the 2 proposals that were merged to create the current proposal to check that '5' was intentionally removed from the final proposed recommendation.

Recommendation

Add sample types 3 and 8 to the catch/sample format.

Update Location Code Format

Proposal ID: 19

Affected Version: 4.1

Affected Chapters: 2.18, 2.19, 2.20, 3.17, 4.16, 6.5

Proposed Version: 5.0

Significance: Major
WG-Status: Recommended
PSC-Status: Not Applicable
TC-Status: Approved
Type: Exchange Specification
Created: 20151002
Subsequent Proposal ID(s):

Description

This proposal addresses several improvements identified for the location code format.

Proposal

Location codes should no longer allow embedded spaces in the code and should be padded with the caret (^) character. Trailing spaces should be trimmed to the minimum length needed for a location code. If the location code does not require lower levels of the code, then the code should be shorter and **not** be padded out with unnecessary characters.

In addition to changing the padding character, level 6 (sub-location) should be expanded from 3 characters to 7. This will expand the overall code length from 19 characters to 23 characters.

Format and Document Impact(s)

Chapter 2 - Release Data

Field #	Description & Validation Rules
18-20	Expand the Release, Hatchery, and Stock Location Code fields from 19 to 23 characters.

Add the following validation rule:

Location codes must not contain spaces and must be padded with “^”

Modify the validation constraint:

Trailing blanks should not be included

to

Trailing periods should not be included

Chapter 3 - Recovery Data

File

Id

Description & Validation Rules

- 17 Expand the Recovery Location Code field from 19 to 23 characters.
Add the following validation rule:
Location codes must not contain spaces and must be padded with “^”

Modify the validation constraint:
Trailing blanks should not be included
to
Trailing periods should not be included

Chapter 4 - Catch/Sample Data

File

Id

Description & Validation Rules

- 16 Expand the Catch Location Code field from 19 to 23 characters.
Add the following validation rule:
Location codes must not contain spaces and must be padded with “^”

Modify the validation constraint:
Trailing blanks should not be included
to
Trailing periods should not be included

Chapter 6 - Location Data

File

Id

Description & Validation Rules

- 5 Expand the Catch Location Code field from 19 to 23 characters.

Expand the definition of Level 6; Sub-Location from 3 characters to 7.
Change the description to “...Characters 17 through 23...”

Add the following validation rule:
Location codes must not contain spaces and must be padded with “^”

Modify the validation constraint:
Trailing blanks should not be included
to

File
Id
Description & Validation Rules

Trailing periods should not be included

Data Migration Method

To migrate existing location codes, the embedded spaces must be replaced with the carat character.

Discussion and Action Items

October 2015 Data Standards Work Group - Seattle, WA

Approved at this meeting.

2021 Coho Technical Committee Feedback

[As described: Location codes should no longer allow embedded spaces in the code and should be padded with the period (.) character.] I do NOT support this formatting change, as it would require an extensive amount of re-coding the post-processing mechanisms that have been built to analyze CWT data. I do not see a “functional” or logical reason why this would be needed for the cost of time/energy to re-write programs.

[As described: Trailing spaces should be trimmed to the minimum length needed for a location code. If the location code does not require lower levels of the code, then the code should be shorter and not be padded out with unnecessary characters.] I agree that this would be helpful. Currently many data analysts use functions to do this post-processing step regardless.

[As described: In addition to changing the padding character, level 6 (sub-location) should be expanded from 3 characters to 7. This will expand the overall code length from 19 characters to 23 characters.] Because the level 6 (sub-location) falls at the end of the CWT hierarchy of string characters in location codes, the current post-processing mechanisms could be utilized to accommodate this proposal. Additional definitions of how to post-process the longer character string in level 6 would need to be added, but the overall mechanism would remain the same.

May 2022 Chinook Technical Committee - Virtual

No concerns with modifying the location format. This modification would require modification to analytical tools to, primarily the fishery lookup table in CAMP.

August 10, 2022 Technical Committee on Data Sharing - Virtual

Approved. The implementation will likely affect other technical committee analytical tools.

- Removing spaces can cause an issue as may not know if the value belongs to one part or another part.
- Approved just need to adjust implementation time-line and which character to use before we implement. Discuss implementation plan with technical committees

September 2022 Regional Mark Processing Center Feedback

RMPC recommends: Per discussions by TCDS, August 10, 2022, there is an intent to re-evaluate the character that is to replace the embedded space (' '). The RMPC still recommends use of the dot ('.') character; however, acceptable alternatives might be: tilde ('~'), or carat ('^').

October 12, 2022 Technical Committee on Data Sharing - Virtual

There was concerns that the dot is not visually distinct and may conflict with other code values (e.g. coding latitude/longitude into the code). We modified the proposal to use the carat character ('^') to avoid conflict with other values and visually distinct. This proposal should be implemented in version 5.0 of the data specification.

June 20+, 2023 Data Standards Working Group - Virtual

Reviewed.. Ok for Version 5.0.

TCDS September 4-5, 2024 Portland, OR - Hybrid Meeting

The last 2 codes 'level 6: sub-location' aspect of the CWT Location Code is what is affected by this proposal.

Agencies may end up regrouping these 'levels' as part of the change made when we implement this proposal in 5.0

Note: The other Levels (level 0, 1,2,3,4 are not affected). How each agency use the CWT location code as they defined it within the TCDS 89-1 document. May want to review the TCDS 89-1 agency location code before 6.0 , move it ahead of the other elements of the controlled vocabulary document, to see if any updates are needed and make available sooner with the RMIS data tools.

Note, NMFS/high seas are using lat/longs. Suggestion in the future we could have 2 formats for location codes (1) coordination codes based location codes and (2) special sector code for lat longs

Note, FRAM , CTC, and some other analysis uses the CWT Location code to aggregate data by prefix

TCDS September 4-5, 2024 Portland, OR - Hybrid Meeting (GitLab Summary)

The proposal affects only the last 2 'level 6: sub-location' codes of the CWT Location Code.

Each agency's use of the CWT location code is defined within the TCDS 89-1 document. Agencies may restructure their location codes as part of the change made when we implement this proposal in 5.0.

Suggested prioritizing review of the TCDS 89-1 agency location code over other controlled vocabulary elements before 6.0 and assess if updates are needed - make available sooner with the RMIS data tools.

Suggested future use of 2 location code formats (1) coordination codes-based location codes and (2) special sector code for lat longs due to NMFS/high seas use of lat/longs.

Note, FRAM , CTC, and some other analysis uses the CWT Location code to aggregate data by prefix.

TCDS May 27-28 2025 Portland, OR - Hybrid Meeting

Recommendation

DSWG recommends implementation in next version of the specifications. The recommendation is to use the caret '^' and implement with version 5.0.

TCDS recommends implemented for 5.0 and beyond. If code changes beyond carrots occur, Jim Longwill will request location code translation table to help map old to new codes as a part of the 5.0 migration.

Note that the rough draft of 5.0 shared with the co-chairs mentioned trailing characters and this needs to be corrected when generating the good draft 5.0 since we are not including trailing characters

Define Maximum Species Age

Proposal ID: 23

Affected Version: 4.1

Affected Chapters: 3.29

Proposed Version: 5.0

Significance: Minor

WG-Status: Recommended

PSC-Status: Not Applicable

TC-Status: Approved

Type: Exchange Specification

Created: 20151009

Subsequent Proposal ID(s):

Description

To allow agencies to more clearly define the relationship between releases and recoveries, it is beneficial to define a maximum species age.

Proposal

TCDS must determine species-specific maximum ages to help identify tag code recoveries that are **unresolved** against release records.

Format and Document Impact(s)

Chapter 3 - Recovery Data

When defining constraints on the *Unreasonable Age* (3) value of the Proposed 12 - *Unresolved Reason*, the upper age limit for each species should be stipulated in the specification. This upper age limit should only be used to enforce use of unreasonable ages above the age limit. Submitting recoveries with ages above the limit should be rejected unless the tag status is unresolved. Unreasonable ages less than the maximum are still appropriate based on other information about the indicator release group (e.g. life history).

Data Migration Method

The issue of data migration has not been discussed

Discussion and Action Items

October 2015 Data Standards Work Group - Seattle, WA

A table from Wikipedia accepted by DSWG and will be delivered to CTC for acceptance, then TCDS. Add 1 year to each age to allow for some variability.

Species	Maximum Age
Chinook	10 (9 + 1)
Chum	8 (7 + 1)
Coho	6 (5 + 1)
Pink	4 (3 + 1)
Sockeye	9 (8 + 1)
Steelhead	11 (10 + 1)
Masu	4 (3 + 1)

2021 Coho Technical Committee Feedback

This would assist in quality control of CWT data, as these types of data records are regularly encountered and often excluded from analysis. It would be helpful to identify them to the reporting agencies for quality control.

May 2022 Chinook Technical Committee - Virtual

No concerns with this validation field.

August 10, 2022 Technical Committee on Data Sharing - Virtual

Approved.

- Want to improve data quality. These are validation rules to avoid negative ages and max ages
- Some validation rule already in place to restrict negative age
- Example of a tag accidentally used in a year before it should have been used provided by Eric Keller

Sep 2022 Regional Mark Processing Center Feedback

RMPC recommends: Re-locating the Wikipedia page reference for this, documenting it, and documenting the criteria that establishes this maximum age reference. Also, document: what is the basic formula? Is it Recovery Year minus Brood Year? Or Run Year minus Brood Year? Or Run Year minus Release Year? Plus or minus 1 year? Etc. Which is it?. TCDS should visit this and verify that all equations related to it are in the specification.

RMPC suspects Wikipedia source is <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Salmon> that references FishBase, FAO, and ITIS. However this Wikipedia source doesn't have maximum age for steelhead, so another source must have been consulted such as FishBase that cites maximum reported steelhead age of 11

<https://www.fishbase.se/summary/SpeciesSummary.php?ID=239&AT=steelhead>

NOTE: possible alternatives to the Wikipedia reference might be:

<https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/species-directory> or <https://www.fishbase.se/search.php>

. See the related discussion on Proposal #12.

October 12, 2022 Technical Committee on Data Sharing - Virtual

This proposal should be implemented in version 5.0 of the data specification.

June 20+, 2023 Data Standards Working Group - Virtual

Reviewed.. Ok for Version 5.0.

TCDS September 4-5, 2024 Portland, OR - Hybrid Meeting

Use the 2015 table of species-specific maximum ages provide by the WGDS (include the reference) to help identify tag code recoveries that are **unresolved** against release records.

- If the age exceeds the max age in the table it is reported as unresolved
- And if exceed the max age then have a validation rule that it is tagged status 7
- And all the unresolved records will be addressed/track as part of an integrity report to have people review these records and determine if need to correct or confirm it is a true exception, as appropriate
- Past data will not be migrated.

TCDS September 4-5, 2024 Portland, OR - Hybrid Meeting (GitLab Summary)

The 2015 table of species-specific maximum ages provide by the WGDS will be used to help identify tag code recoveries that are unresolved against release records. If the age exceeds the maximum age in the table, it is reported as unresolved, and a validation rule tags it as status 7.

Integrity reporting will address/track unresolved records for review and correction or confirmation that it is a true exception, as appropriate.

Past data will not be migrated.

TCDS May 27-28 Portland, OR - Hybrid Meeting

No changes from Sept 2024

Recommendation

DSWG recommends implementation in next version of the specifications.

TCDS approved this proposal for implementation in version 5.0.

Remove Code Coordinator

Proposal ID: 34

Affected Version: 4.2

Affected Chapters: 2

Proposed Version: 5.0

Significance: Moderate

WG-Status: Active

PSC-Status: Not Applicable

TC-Status: Approved

Type: Exchange Specification

Created: 20240905

Subsequent Proposal ID(s): 60

Description

The inclusion of Code Coordinator Field 6 is redundant given that this information is currently captured in the release code prefix.

Proposal

Remove Code Coordinator Field 6 for 5.0 implementation.

Format and Document Impact(s)

Chapter 2 - Release Data

Remove the Coordinator Code #6 field.

Data Migration Method

No migration needed, as field data will be removed.

Discussion and Action Items

May 2023 TCDS meeting

RELEASES: COORDINATOR separate field (Currently #6) as it could be part of FIELD 7 tag. Coordinator code use only for untagged release (no tag prefix code) so the coordinator code is used for that ID. Misleading to have coordinator as a standalone field since only used for untagged fish and instead use if as example of Field 7 Case number 2 under tag code or release ID so clear to only be used for untagged (no CWT).

- RMPC will submit proposal that says we remove field #6 and instead require use of code coordinator for non-cwt tagged fish in Field 7 (bang record - And move the coordinator code list from Field 6 to Field 7 - Value of Coordinator Code should align with Tag Prefix
- RMPC will generate proposal for house cleaning to have coordinator code match prefix code (or one of the prefix code if agency has more than one)

June 20+, 2023 Data Standards Working Group - Virtual

DSWG: Regarding: RL / Coordinator

DSWG Recommendation: Approved. It is OK to remove Coordinator from RL as field #6 given that it is being placed under Case 2 of Tag Code or Release Id field, & renamed to Untagged-Group Prefix. (see separate proposal). See new proposal: 53].

TCDS September 4-5, 2024 - Portland, OR - Hybrid Meeting

- Code Coordinator Field 6: remove for 5.0 implementation.
 - o Develop a new Proposal that only focuses on the discussion resulting to the removal of the code coordinator.
 - o Bring in the discussion and rational of how this Field 6 is redundant since the content is also in the prefix to the release code

TCDS September 4-5, 2024 - Portland, OR - Hybrid Meeting (GitLab Summary)

Discussed removal of Code Coordinator Field 6 for 5.0 implementation - Field 6 is redundant given that content is in release code prefix. All fields suggested in proposal 60 not accepted to be removed for version 5.0.

TCDS May 27-28 2025 Portland, OR - Hybrid Meeting

Remember to look for other redundant fields for 5.1 and 6.0

Recommendation

TCDS approved the removal of this field for 5.0 implementation.

Extend Max-Length of Recovery ID

Proposal ID: 42

Affected Version: 4.1

Affected Chapters: 3

Proposed Version: 5.0

Significance: moderate

WG-Status: Approved

PSC-Status: Not Applicable

TC-Status: Approved

Type: Exchange Specification

Created: August 1, 2022

Subsequent Proposal ID(s):

Description

With the integration of scan bar technology incorporated with sampling and recovery identification, we are currently constrained by the 10-character limit of the field as currently described. In order to maintain unique permanent recoveries, we are requesting an additional 2 or more characters.

- Historically WDFW and NWIFC have populated this field by concatenating sample bag numbers + head numbers. This way we “tie” the individual recovery to a sample stratum.

- NWIFC has strengthened the process for assign unique recovery identifications to each fish by using a scan bar. The existing specifications for this field limits NWIFC from using the bar scan identification number, and instead requires NWIFC to create a second recovery identification number in advance of fish sampling. Furthermore, to guarantee this second number's uniqueness while being processed through the WDFW CWT Recovery Lab, head numbers must be 6 or more characters and an alpha separator needs to be incorporated between the sample bag number and the head number.
- WDFW Data stewards have expressed support for expanding this field.

Option 1: Basic Extension (to around 12+ characters): Increasing the field length to at least 12 characters to support the longer unique recovery number (sample bag - alpha separator - head numbers) while being processed in the WDFW CWT Recovery Lab.

Option 2: Further Extension (to 36 characters): Increasing the field length fully to 36 characters would allow the use of the randomly generated UUID (universally unique identifier) and scan bar, currently used by the Tribes as the primary unique identification number. Adoption of this option would enhance the uniqueness of RMIS recovery records in perpetuity and could provide a permanently unique Recovery ID, independent of Reporting Agency and Run Year. WDFW has already adopted 36-character UUIDs as an internal standard for new database development.

Format and Document Impact(s)

Increase Recovery Data Field # 6 size to 12 or more characters. The field is currently Alpha-Numeric.

Data Migration Method

None required

Discussion and Action Items

August 10, 2022 Technical Committee on Data Sharing - Virtual

Leave the status as is, and follow up on traceability. Amy Seiders to confirm traceability

May 2023 meeting

- NWIFC wants 12 or 36 characters and WDFW wants 36
- Important that old recoveries do not change their IDs
- Currently we used agency and year with the rec id for uniqueness
- Maybe add a rule to validation where older years cannot be longer than 10 characters
- Will we require agencies be make a universally unique id and a permanent id? This is likely a different proposal and likely something that we cannot enforce without enforcing how agencies do their field sampling

- approve up to 36 characters for new run years only
- Need to add old recovery id length validation rule

TCDS Meeting (May 23 to 25, 2023)

- NWIFC can apply unique IDs forever if we expand to 12
- RMPC enforces uniqueness by reporting agency and run year. The permanence suggested by NWIFC would be preferred to no resubmitting of IDs in the DB. This proposal ID 30 (in the closed file) From 2015 included request for permanence ID for the DB – we could bring back that 2015 proposal so that we would required agencies not to regenerate / reuse IDs. Unsure if all agencies can provide a GUID.
 - are recovery IDs provided along with the CWT that is returned to the owner agency?
 - The scan bars used by NWIFC would be associated at the head lab with the CWT
 - DFO assigns bar code to the fish that has a positive detection in the field
- NWIFC want the permanent recovery unique recovery ID put on fish when killed so when they take all fish samples (Scales etc.) would have same ID assigned to all fish
 - WDFW wanted to have 36 (to have GUID), WDFW is expected
 - already required to be unique
- Would be good if it included the year within the field similar to the related group ID (agency coordinator, year, group). But there may be some difficulties in using the year for this field
- NWIFC is fine with either 12 or 36 characters
- This characters should be tied to the actual physical specimens
- Need to discuss how handle existing shorter IDs, we don't want to lose the permanence of the existing IDs
- Analytical tools use recovery ID, run year, agency
- DO not have agencies resubmit to replace their existing ID, so would need a validation to prevent changing their old IDs to updated 36 character
- Need WDFW clarification -WDFW wants 36 for more flexibility. The code links to the tag that is sent back to the agency
- DFO concern with traceability, 36 character may be hard to verbally communicate to get update on the fish from the agency

- Perhaps split the proposal (1) need unique recovery ID across all time (proposal 30) & (2) expand length of character (proposal 42)
- DFO – hard to ensure IDs not being reused. CTC/CoTC tools rely on permanent IDs (permanent doesn't mean duplicate, we don't have duplicates in the system, we want to keep permanent)
- Leave it active for now - the request to go up to 36 characters (regardless of whether that is permanent across years – the permanency across years should we kept as separate proposal)
- WDFW moving from SQL to Postgres and Postgres will automatically generate UUID, confirm that GUID will trace back to recovery record that ties to physical sample (traceable to physical tag)
- Group ok with extending to 'up to' 36 characters but need validation rules to not allow updating existing records to a new recovery ID that has more characters to preserve permanency of these IDs

June 20+, 2023 Data Standards Working Group - Virtual

We have option one of this proposal –going to just 12 characters, option two is expanding to 36 characters. We observe at the Mark Center that the number of recoveries a few years ago actually did exceed 10 million rows, so it has become more pressing an issue with a mere 10-char Id dating back to 1987, etc.. We also emphasize the importance of permanence – so that recoveries don't change their ID's once submitted to RMIS (see separate, related proposals: #30, #37, #41). So, if we don't allow changes, it means that for all data to date, we're stuck with the old recovery ID. The RMPC does identify duplicates at validation, but the recovery ID is only unique within an agency Run Year.

We also understand that the Ids have to trace back to a physical sample, to an envelope with the tag in it or something similar.

Some other databases use the globally unique Id (36 characters). Some agencies may want to do that. For sure, we need to keep it as an alpha numeric.

DSWG Recommendation: Ok.. approved for 5.0, & option 2: extend to 36 characters for Recovery Id.

TCDS May 27-28 2025 Portland, OR - Hybrid Meeting

For 5.1 plan to discuss for catch sample ID being longer as well?

Remember to discuss the use of UUIDs for catch sample records

There will also need a discussion about the difficulty requiring it in all circumstances and agencies in some circumstances just put a zero in there to meet our validation requirements.

We might want to visit that issue when discussing future application of a UUID

Recommendation

- Change to be up to 36 characters, and add restriction that you can't change your older tags that have smaller than 36 characters (do not regenerate for old IDS) and stipulate these longer IDS must be tied to a physical fish. Put a validation rule that 36 characters only allowed from YYYY onwards – ask Technical Committees for their preference for when we can start allowing 36 characters.
- Assigned Proposal 30 to DSWG to explore any agency system concerns of moving towards UUID.GUID to support record by record validation in post 2025 and to facilitate data consumers tracking changes in records. For agency who can't manage UUID.GUID could stipulate all records continue to be deleted prior to resubmittal or some other approach that WGDS can suggest . Likely this would proposal would not be implemented until after 5.0
- DSWG for review of any concern of moving towards UUID/GUID

Unaligned Fishery Regulation

Proposal ID: 46

Affected Version: 4.1

Affected Chapters:

Proposed Version: 5.0

Significance: Moderate

WG-Status: Approved

PSC-Status: Not Applicable

TC-Status: Approved

Type: Exchange Specification

Created: 20221117

Subsequent Proposal ID(s):

Description

Currently there is no code to identify if an agency does not know if a recovery occurred under a strictly mark (i.e. adipose-clip) selective fishery (MSF) regulation (code “S”), a non-selective regulation (code “N”), or a partially selective regulation (code “M”; e.g. mixed bag with some retention of both adipose-clipped and unclipped fish). A code is needed to identify these recoveries.

Proposal

Add a “U” code for unknown regulation within the `adclip_selective_fishery` field.

As a minor formatting fix, the “**NOTE:...**” should be fixed to left align with the other validation rules and values of the `adclip selective fishery` field.

Format and Document Impact(s)

Chapter 3 - Recovery Data

File	
Id	
#	Description & Validation Rules
15	Add new Adclip Selective Fishery value: 'U' = Unaligned selective fishery

Fix the alignment of the “**NOTE:...**” that identifies the definition of mixed selective regulation.

Data Migration Method

No migration required

Discussion and Action Items

- Might have to add an example of what a ‘mixed bag’ is in the data specifications.
- Use ‘unaligned’ instead of unknown

TCDS Meeting (May 23 to 25, 2023)

This proposal was discussed and it was clear that the common situation for the unknown fishery regulations was that the recovery could not be resolved spatially or temporally to the regulation. It was decided that it was more appropriate to define the new “U” value as unaligned.

Required field, so when unknown people are using M which is misused when people don’t know the regulation

- For the spec could add an example for mixed bag term to also support proper use
- propose to add “Indeterminate” as an option

- Group decided to use 'U' for 'unaligned' for when regulations don't match catch strata

June 20+, 2023 Data Standards Working Group - Virtual

We understood that the common situation for the unknown fishery regulations was that the recovery could not be resolved spatially or temporally to the regulation.

Sometimes they (WDFW, etc..) run into situations where, both selective and non-selective fisheries are occurring. Also, it could be that the location where they were harvesting the fish did not match the regulation. Also, there were multiple locations where different regulations were being enacted, but people were allowed to fish in both of those locations and keep catch, so then that catch could not be associated directly with a particular regulation.

'Unaligned' was for when regulations don't match the sample strata, but we should have that clearly indicated /defined.

DSWG Recommendation: Approved, but add clear definitions of 'Unaligned' into spec for this field.

TCDS May 27-28 2025 Portland, OR - Hybrid Meeting

Canada would re-published misused M's as U's

In the future perhaps a more detailed review of U recoveries.

Recommendation

The addition of the new unaligned value is approved for version 5.

Update Dataset Transfer Method

Proposal ID: 55

Affected Version: 4.2

Affected Chapters: 1

Proposed Version: 5.0

Significance: Immediate

WG-Status: Draft

PSC-Status: Not Applicable

TC-Status: Approved

Type: Exchange Specification

Created: 20240410

Subsequent Proposal ID(s): 43

Description

The specification document needs updating to explain the current method(s) of transferring datasets to the RMPC for processing and validation. At this point, it has only “placeholder” text and no explanation on how to do this.

Proposal

In Chapter 1, Section F, Item #1, change to the following text:

F. Method of Data File (DataSet) Exchange and Validation

NOTE: Transferring data files to the RMPC is limited to authorized RMIS data providers. Please contact the RMPC at: rmpc.admin@psmfc.org in order to obtain credentials for data file exchange.

1. Transferring a dataset: use the RMPC Internet web-site at the following URL address: [RMPC WebForm](https://www.rmpc.org/submission/web-form/) [https://www.rmpc.org/submission/web-form/]. A registered *email* and *password* are required in order to use the RMPC WebForm. These will be established by contacting the RMPC.

Format and Document Impact(s)

Chapter 1 - Introduction, Definitions and Rules

Update text of Section F, Item #1 as described above.

Data Migration Method

No data migration required.

Discussion and Action Items

DSTC June 4-6 2024 Nanaimo, BC meeting

Discussed and approved this proposal for version 5.0.

TCDS September 4-5, 2024 Portland, OR - Hybrid Meeting (GitLab Summary)

Discussed, add to 5.0 approval list.

TCDS May 27-28 2025 Portland, OR - Hybrid Meeting

No change

Recommendation

Incorporate language into version 5.0 for review.

ADD TO 5.0 APPROVED LIST [per TCDS Sept 4/5 2024 meeting]

Additional Release Strategy codes: “Net Pen” and “Barge”

Proposal ID: 56

Affected Version: 4.2

Affected Chapters: 2

Proposed Version: 5.0 (potential deferral to 5.1)

Significance: Immediate

WG-Status: Draft

PSC-Status: Not Applicable

T-C Status: Active

Type: Exchange Specification

Created: 20170518

Subsequent Proposal ID(s):

Description

Regional Mark Committee Meeting 2017: California is releasing millions of fish using acclimation net pens and imprinting river water circulation barges.

“We would appreciate release strategies to capture these for easier data analysis.” - Jason Azat Environmental Scientist Anadromous Resources Assessment, Fisheries Branch California Department of Fish and Wildlife presentation to TCDS 9/4-5/2024

The specification document needs updating to account for net pen and barge release strategies. Currently it only has release strategies, forced, volitional, and mixed which leads to three releases with the same release location code and different release strategies in the case of net pen and barge releases accompanying traditional hatchery release methods.

Proposal

In Chapter 2, consider adding “Net Pen” and “Barge” or similar as transport forced release strategies: - ‘NP’ – net pen - ‘BG’ – barge (ex: imprinting river-water circulation barge). Leave unspecified forced release (truck/backpack releases) and leave mixed release.

Format and Document Impact(s)

Chapter 2 - Release Data

Release Strategy field is optional with 3 codes:

'FR' =Forced release

'MX' =Mixed release strategies

'VO' =Volitional release

Revised to:

'FR' =Forced release

'MX' =Mixed release strategies

'VO' =Volitional release

'NP' =Net pen

'BG' =Barge (ex: imprinting river-water circulation barge)

Discussion and Action Items

DSTC June 4-6 2024 Nanaimo, BC meeting

Specifically for this request: * Should the net pens be location if they are stable from year to year. Some net pen locations are coded as hatchery locations * Barge are more of a release site * Release strategy : transport versus not transported (barged or not-barged) field but not sure if we still have * "Rearing Container" or "Rearing Environment"

ACTION for this specific proposal * Ask California why they needed this addition, and see if this is the best way to address the need, if it is value added for bilateral level or limited to domestic RMIS or limited to California * Explore if we can add a new field [domestic RMIS] without impacting bilateral fields (e.g. can't add to the bilateral look up field if negative impacts to the data partners)

Ask a representative from CA to sit in on a meeting to discuss this, is there a need to support barges (might be only CA who needs this). ...as a guest

There is an increased interest in using RMIS as an agency database, which then brings up having a separate RMIS and a shared RMIS In general process for in-year minor changes Such as – for additions to codes in look up tables that can be used by others we can write a proposal to circulate for approval by email of the TCDS of proposed change . - Treat as a 'patch' by adding to the change log at the end of the specification. Gives opportunity to flag when a change is too impactful and needs more discussion or when the recommended change needs refinement

Consider adding to the Data Specification a note at the beginning that within year minor changes 'patches' to refine the existing version may occur and to check the Change Log (URL) so we don't need to resubmit multiple data specification documents within a year to PSC for a new technical report Start notifying users of new values without having to do a

major update. Being clear to the end user and amongst the user agencies, keeping timestamps of some changes. Better definitions for Net pens and Barge, make them clear. Keep proposal open for more discussion

TCDS Sept 4-5, 2024 – Portland, OR – Hybrid Meeting

Jason Azat Talk on Proposal 56:

- Current release strategies are volitional forced (trucked = forced) and mixed
- CA has been using barge and net pens as different methods of releasing the fish away from the hatchery.
 - Because of this there can be the same release location lat/long that has 3 different release strategies. They solved this by creating 3 different releases.
 - It is cleaner to have the one location and make it so that we can have 3 different release strategies.
- Barge
 - Holds 13 thousand gallons.
 - Fish are trucked to barge then moved down river in barge where river water is constantly pumped through barge so that fish can hopefully imprint on that waterway and pathway back to the river.
 - Because we can do this we can have different release locations every year that would require different location codes.
 - Thinks it is better described by release strategy.
- Net Pens
 - There are mobile net pens that can be towed behind a trailer/boat so it can be moved to many different locations.
 - This means that the location code doesn't exist because it is new every year and can change constantly
 - Makes location hard to get accurate in RMIS
 - Larger permanent in water net pen - still mobile so boats can take it to a different place for release - hold 700,000 fish
 - Fish can be held for hours to days depending on conditions that impact release.
 - Very solid structure but is still highly mobile
 - Requires new location codes less frequently but usually have one new location a year
- It would be helpful to change the release codes so that we can get better data to RMIS

Additional Notes: California uses net pens extensively and is using barges experimentally at this time. CDFW mentioned that currently interpret 'Forced' to include 'Trucking'. CDFW uses a different location code when releases from different location for unloading salmon into the barge. This may be better addressed in the data by having the 'barge' be a release strategy instead of a 'location'. The acclimation pens are also moved in location, which currently will require a new location code every year, and the challenge is that hatcheries cannot assign the release of fish to a 'location' since the pen's location are not

entered as a location code in RMIS which makes it difficult to enter their data into RMIS. Adding pen and barge as a release strategy would make it easier to provide better data.

Presentation Discussion:

- CDFO question can volitional be used?
 - CDFW defines Volitional: hatchery Raceway you open up the outflow and if the fish decided to swim downstream, they're allowed to and they volitionally decide to exit the Raceway to decide outmigration. CDFW input that volitional: can't be a truck, pen, barge since we moved the fish to the location, and they have to outmigrate.
- Gary: how does this address the problem of not having a location code? / Why is there no location code, and how do you address this issue?
 - Jason: there are location codes they can use but they are not specifically listed as net pen codes because no one knew they were doing it that year. Because of this we are getting duplicate or more location codes because we have the volitional release and net and barge at the same locations with no way to specify the difference.
 - CDFW: if this large net pen is taken to Tiburon and the Fisher released there, I already have a Tiburon, a location code and the hatchery knows about that, and they can easily give me that information. But if I don't have a Tiburon net location code and the hatchery would look and see. I'll just put Tiburon and they can't put in a location code net because I didn't know they were going to do a net there this year and it's not available in the dropdown list of when they how they give me their release data and they can't put into release strategy that it wasn't just some kind of a forced anything but volitional they can't put in. what I consider to be a duplicate location code so it'll be Tiburon, Tiburon, net and Tiburon Barge three location codes for the exact same latitude and longitude. We've jimmied this data into location code when it doesn't really fit very well the way that we are releasing it does not fit as well into location, if that makes sense.
- Michael: The other option is to add a new field "release structure" because these are new categories of structures for releases. / IS it better to overload the Release Strategy instead of overloading the Location?
 - Adding structure to the RELEASE Strategy may complicate the strategy. But now have many ways to release that didn't exist in the past, so now we are stretching the FORCE strategy to not just include pushed from raceway but by adding everything in it (truck etc.).
- Jason - don't want to force this change on people if they don't want to use it. Just make it available if they do.
- Michael: why do we care if the location is listed as a structure too? / Why specify if it was from a barge if from the same location?
 - Jason: we do paired releases at the same location with different release methods. So would have 2 different releases at the same location.

- Marianne: Can we define forced within the spec? net and barge - those two new methods are both forced, so maybe the that could be defined. Do we need to add ponds too?
 - Michael - don't want to force hatchery workers to implement this if they don't want to
- Is Release and Force still useful? Should we expand/ refine this term. Perhaps Release Process could clarify what is meant by Force. Force = Transport Force (hatchery force; Truck; Backpack); or FORCE = unspecified.
- Discussed Action: Leave forced as unspecified, add transport forced (add net pen forced/barge forced). Leave truck and backpacking as the old unspecified forced. Leave Mixed.
 - Will include in 5.0 and discuss with the committee in Jan/Feb and defer to 5.1 if there are issues.

TCDS September 4-5, 2024 Portland, OR - Hybrid Meeting (GitLab Summary)

Due to the increased use of movable Net Pens and Barges as hatchery release methods, organizations have had to create numerous release records with the same release location and lat/long to account for different release strategies that can change yearly. Jason Azat requested the ability to list multiple release strategies for one location and to create specific release strategies for Net Pens and Barges given that they do not fit cleanly in the current forced, volitional, mixed release categorizations.

Decided Action: Leave forced as unspecified (truck & backpacking are unspecified forced), add transport forced (net pen forced/barge forced). Leave Mixed as is. Jason will send suggested wording for Net Pen and Barge release strategies. Include in 5.0, discuss with the committee in Jan/Feb and defer to 5.1 if needed.

TCDS May 27-28 Portland, OR - Hybrid Meeting

Move with the below as recommended

Continue discussion in the future if there is a benefit to further refine/tighten up this field

- (1) Need to add 'transport forced' Leave forced as unspecified (truck & backpacking are unspecified forced), add transport forced (net pen forced/barge forced)
- (2) Separate the terms between 'strategy' 'facility'

Recommendation

TCDS recommends modifying the data specification for the RELEASE Strategy to:

- 'FR' =Forced release
- 'MX' =Mixed release strategies
- 'VO' =Volitional release

'NP' =Net pen

'BG' =Barge (ex: imprinting river-water circulation barge)

Will include in 5.0, and discuss with the committees in Jan/Feb and if there are any major issues raised defer to 5.1.