

## Table of Contents

Expand Release Comments .....	1
Additional Count Method.....	2
Recovery Weight Upper Limit.....	3
Update CWT Estimate Name .....	6
Retire Catch and Effort Specification.....	8
Retire PSC Indicator Study Type .....	9
Increase Location Coordinate Precision .....	11
Upgrade Methods of PSC Data Exchange & Processing.....	13
Expand the Catch/Sample PsuedoTags Field.....	15

## Expand Release Comments

**Proposal ID:** 6

**Affected Version:** 4.1

**Affected Chapters:** 2.41

**Proposed Version:** 4.2

**Significance:** Minor

**WG-Status:** Recommended

**TC-Status:** Approved

**Type:** Exchange Specification

**Created:** 20151002 15:00:00

## Background

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

## Proposal

Expand Field 41 of Chapter 2 - Release Data to 200 characters.

## Format and Document Impact(s)

### Chapter 2 - Release Data

Field #	Max Cols
41	200

## Discussion and Action Items

### October 2015 Data Standards Work Group - Seattle, WA

Accepted for implementation in next version of the specifications.

### 2021 Coho Technical Committee Feedback

No specific feedback with this proposal.

### May 2022 Chinook Technical Committee - Virtual

No specific concerns with this proposal.

### October 12, 2022 Technical Committee on Data Sharing - Virtual

Implement this change as part of version 4.2 of the data standard.

## Recommendation

DSWG recommends implementation in next version of the specifications. TCDS approved this proposal for implementation in version 4.2.

---

## Additional Count Method

**Proposal ID:** 10

**Affected Version:** 4.1

**Affected Chapters:** 2.36

**Proposed Version:** 4.2

**Significance:** Minor

**WG-Status:** Recommended

**TC-Status:** Approved

**Type:** Exchange Specification

**Created:** 20151001

**Subsequent Proposal ID(s):**

## Description

Members of the DSWG identified that it may be helpful to identify release group totals that were counted using electronic methods.

## Proposal

Add a new counting method code to the release record that identifies when the release total is derived using an electronic counter.

## Format and Document Impact(s)

### Chapter 2 - Release Data

Field #	Description & Validation Rules
36	Add new count method value: 'E' = Electronic counter derived estimate

### Data Migration Method

No data migration is expected with this proposal.

### Discussion and Action Items

#### October 2015 Data Standards Work Group - Seattle, WA

Agreed to at this meeting.

#### 2021 Coho Technical Committee Feedback

No specific feedback with this proposal.

#### May 2022 Chinook Technical Committee - Virtual

No concerns with the additional code.

#### August 10, 2022 Technical Committee on Data Sharing - Virtual

No concerns with the additional code.

#### October 12, 2022 Technical Committee on Data Sharing - Virtual

Implement this change as part of version 4.2 of the data standard.

### Recommendation

DSWG recommends implementation in next version of the specifications. TCDS approved this proposal for implementation in version 4.2.

---

## Recovery Weight Upper Limit

**Proposal ID:** 13

**Affected Version:** 4.1

**Affected Chapters:** 3.21

**Proposed Version:** 4.2

**Significance:** Minor

**WG-Status:** Recommended

**TC-Status:** Approved  
**Type:** Exchange Specification  
**Created:** 20151001  
**Subsequent Proposal ID(s):** 35

## Description

An upper limit on weight similar to the existing limit on length was agreed to.

## Proposal

Add an upper limit on the recovery weight field.

## Format and Document Impact(s)

### Chapter 3 - Recovery Data

Field

#	Description & Validation Rules
21	Add the following criteria text: <i>If a weight is provided, it must be less than or equal to 59.99 kg for Chinook and 27.49 all other species</i>

**Weight references are based on 2022 information found at:**

<https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/species-directory>

## Data Migration Method

RMPC to identify recoveries that have a weight over the criteria and report those records to the reporting agencies.

If records have weights larger than valid, the value and associated weight type values will be removed from the record.

RMPC (Sep 2022): It is noted that this validation will require 177 records to be edited. Some agencies may need to modify and re-submit some datasets. The affected rows are:

- For Chinook (1 row) Reporting Agency: ODFW
- For Coho (125 rows) 123 from Reporting Agency WDFW, 1 from Reporting Agency CDFO, 1 from Reporting Agency NMFS
- For Steelhead (51 rows) 38 from Reporting Agency NMFS, 13 from Reporting Agency WDFW

## 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 10% to the weight to allow for some variability. Also, a subsequent proposal should be created to update the maximum lengths based on the same Wikipedia values.

Species	Maximum Weight
Chinook	67.54 kg (61.4 kg + 10%)
All other salmon	17.49 kg (15.9 kg + 10%)

### 2021 Coho Technical Committee Feedback

No specific feedback with this proposal.

### May 2022 Chinook Technical Committee - Virtual

No concerns with this constraint.

### August 10, 2022 Technical Committee on Data Sharing - Virtual

No concerns with the additional constraint.

### September 2022 Regional Mark Processing Center Feedback

RMPC recommends: Changes to the following specific caps (instead of those from the Oct 2015 proposal), and add a reference to the external source(s). Table of values is as follows:

Species	Maximum Weight
Chinook	59.99 kg (54.4 kg + ~10%)
All other salmon	27.49 kg (24.9 kg + ~10%)

An alternative weight reference would be: <https://www.fishbase.se/search.php>

### October 12, 2022 Technical Committee on Data Sharing - Virtual

Implement this change as part of version 4.2 of the data standard. The only modification is that RMIS will remove invalid weights from existing recovery records and reject future files that have invalid weights.

## Recommendation

DSWG recommends implementation in next version of the specifications. TCDS approved this proposal for implementation in version 4.2.

---

## Update CWT Estimate Name

**Proposal ID:** 15

**Affected Version:** 4.1

**Affected Chapters:** 3.41, 4.27

**Proposed Version:** 4.2

**Significance:** Minor

**WG-Status:** Recommended

**TC-Status:** Approved

**Type:** Exchange Specification

**Created:** 20151001

**Subsequent Proposal ID(s):**

### Description

The name of Field 41 (Estimated Number) in Chapter 3 - Recovery Data is inconsistent with Field 27 (Number Estimated) in Chapter 4 - Catch/Sample Data

### Proposal

Modify the field name to "Number CWT Estimated".

### Format and Document Impact(s)

#### Chapter 3 - Recovery Data

Field #	Description & Validation Rules
41	Rename the PSC Common Name to "Number CWT Estimated" and the Data Field Name to "number_cwt_estimated".

RMPC (Sep 2022): no change to text except slightly re-arrange order of rules.

#### Chapter 4 - Catch/Sample Data

Field #	Description & Validation Rules
27	Rename the PSC Common Name to "Number CWT Estimated" and the Data Field Name to "number_cwt_estimated".

### RMPC (Sep 2022): actual columnar text as follows:

Field #	Description & Validation Rules
27	Estimated number of tagged fish in the catch with the same coded wire tag represented by the corresponding tag recovery \ or recoveries, as estimated by the reporting agency.\

Field #	Description & Validation Rules
	<p>If greater than zero, then catch_sample_id should be present and match the existing catch_sample_id(s) in the \</p> <p>Recovery file.\</p> <p>If present, must be numeric in the range: '0' through '99999.99' \</p> <p>No implied decimal. Decimal optional with up to 2 digits after the decimal point.\</p>

## Data Migration Method

No data migration is expected for this change.

## Discussion and Action Items

### October 2015 Data Standards Work Group - Seattle, WA

Agreed to at this meeting.

### 2021 Coho Technical Committee Feedback

This would be very helpful to have standardized if they do indeed represent the same data field but have been labeled differently in various tables/areas of the RMIS system. This would require updates to post-processing merge functions, but would be quick to implement and would simplify/clarify the data.

### May 2022 Chinook Technical Committee - Virtual

No concerns with renaming of the columns.

### August 10, 2022 Technical Committee on Data Sharing - Virtual

No concern with simple field name change.

### September 2022 Regional Mark Processing Center Feedback

RMPC recommends: Given that these fields are in effect 'the same', and that we are rendering the field names identical, then the two definitions should be similar. I.e. RC, Field #41 and CS, Field #27 should be edited to have as similar 'Description & Validation Rules..' as possible. This warrants an edit, primarily in the Catch/Sample validation.

See RMPC suggested text above.

## Recommendation

DSWG recommends implementation in next version of the specifications. TCDS approved this proposal for implementation in version 4.2.

---

## Retire Catch and Effort Specification

**Proposal ID:** 17

**Affected Version:** 4.1

**Affected Chapters:** 1, 5, 6.6, 7.6, 7.8, 7.9, 10

**Proposed Version:** 4.2

**Significance:** Moderate

**WG-Status:** Approved

**TC-Status:** Completed

**Type:** Exchange Specification

**Created:** 20151002

**Subsequent Proposal ID(s):** 18, 26

### Description

The Catch and Effort file formats within the specification is reported by a small set of agencies and generally not used by the PSC technical committees. TCDS has agreed that this portion of the specification is not needed and that the emphasis should be on reporting total catch within the existing catch/sample files.

### Format and Document Impact(s)

#### Chapter 1 - Introduction, Definitions and Rules

Chapter 1 should be updated to remove numerous references to Catch and Effort in the text.

#### Chapter 5 - Catch & Effort Data

This chapter should be completely removed from the specification.

#### Chapter 6 - Location Data

Field #	Description & Validation Rules
6	Modify the description for location type '2' from = <i>Catch area or Effort area...</i> to = <i>Catch area...</i>

#### Chapter 7 - Description Data

Field #	Description & Validation Rules
6	Remove the following file type: 'CE'=Catch & Effort
8-9	Remove references to the 'CE' file type.



## Chapter 10 - Catch Effort Gear Codes

This chapter should be completely removed from the specification.

## Data Migration Method

No migration is expected for this change, other than to drop the existing files.

## Discussion and Action Items

### November 2014 Technical Committee on Data Sharing - Seattle, WA

Identified as Agenda Item 3.6

Minutes Item	Discussion
Discussion 3.4	Agreed to retire and archive the Catch and Effort database.
Action Item 3.4	Request for status report from each agency on progress towards including all catch for Chinook and Coho into catch sample field, whether or not it is sampled for CWTs

### October 12, 2022 Technical Committee on Data Sharing - Virtual

This proposal should be implemented in version 4.2 of the data specification.

## Recommendation

TCDS approved this proposal for implementation in version 4.2.

---

## Retire PSC Indicator Study Type

**Proposal ID:** 25

**Affected Version:** 4.1

**Affected Chapters:** 2.23

**Proposed Version:** 4.2

**Significance:** Minor

**WG-Status:** Recommended

**TC-Status:** Approved

**Type:** Exchange Specification

**Created:** 20151013

**Subsequent Proposal ID(s):**

## Description

The Technical Committee on Data Sharing has identified that reports produced by other technical committees, such as the Chinook Technical Committee, is the appropriate place to reference PSC indicator CWTs.

## Proposal

Remove the PSC indicator study type value to reduce confusion.

## Format and Document Impact(s)

### Chapter 2 - Release Data

Field #	Description & Validation Rules
23	Remove the following study type value: 'K' = PSC key indicator stocks

## Data Migration Method

As the PSC key indicator study type field is not required, convert all the 'K' values into 'P' values. Remove 'K' in the table.

## Discussion and Action Items

### October 2015 Data Standards Work Group - Seattle, WA

Agreed to at this meeting.

### 2021 Coho Technical Committee Feedback

No specific feedback with this proposal.

### May 2022 Chinook Technical Committee - Virtual

Suggest changing existing "K" values to "P" in the data migration.

### August 10, 2022 Technical Committee on Data Sharing - Virtual

Retire PSC Indicator Study Type Approve \* 'K' is rarely populated. Indicator stocks need to be obtained directly from the TCs reports.

## Recommendation

DSWG recommends implementation in next version of the specifications. TCDS approved this proposal for implementation in version 4.2.

---

## Increase Location Coordinate Precision

**Proposal ID:** 33

**Affected Version:** 4.1

**Affected Chapters:** 5

**Proposed Version:** 4.2

**Significance:** Minor

**WG-Status:** Recommended

**TC-Status:** Approved

**Type:** Exchange Specification

**Created:** 20151014

**Subsequent Proposal ID(s):**

### Description

There is a request to expand the allowed precision of latitude and longitude coordinates reported in the location file.

### Proposal

Increase the number of allowed decimal places on both the latitude and longitude from 4 to 6 digits. This would increase coordinate precision to sub-meter accuracy.

### Format and Document Impact(s)

#### Chapter 6 - Location Data

Field #	Description & Validation Rules
8	Increase "Max Cols" size from 8 to 10. Added note: <i>Recommended that coordinates be based on WGS-84</i> Modify the following code definition: <i>Decimal optional with up to 4 digits after the decimal point</i> to: <i>Decimal optional with up to 6 digits after the decimal point</i>
9	Increase "Max Cols" size from 9 to 11. Added note: <i>Recommended that coordinates be based on WGS-84</i> Modify the following code definition: <i>Decimal optional with up to 4 digits after the decimal point</i> to: <i>Decimal optional with up to 6 digits after the decimal point</i>

## Data Migration Method

No data migration is expected for this proposal other than the option for agencies to report locations with greater precision. *Provide specific approaches to how data can be migrated from the **Affected Version** provided above to the **Proposed and Implemented Versions**.*

## Discussion and Action Items

*Provide any relevant discussion pertaining to the proposal in this section. Create separate subsection headers for capturing discussion from a particular meeting or forum (e.g., RMIS forum or email chain).*

### October 2015 Data Standards Work Group - Seattle, WA

Agreed to at this meeting.

### 2021 Coho Technical Committee Feedback

This would assist in improving spatial analysis of CWT data, and the proposal would be supported.

### May 2022 Chinook Technical Committee - Virtual

Suggest adding recommendation around coordinate system, such as WGS 84.

### August 10, 2022 Technical Committee on Data Sharing - Virtual

Approved with the addition of referencing WGS 84.

- Use Datum WGS 84 is recommended (used by google maps/google earth) (or do we use nad?)
- Many might not even know what projection is being used
- Would be good to know sooner than later since PSMFC RMPC is about to update their RMPC grouping maps
- Location codes, if doing a spatial analysis information in RMIS in relation to location codes, that has better metadata and notation on how spatial coordinates were assigned.
- Do we need to have agency review and update their location codes and provide missing ones?

## Recommendation

DSWG recommends implementation in next version of the specifications. TCDS approved this proposal for implementation in version 4.2.

---

## Upgrade Methods of PSC Data Exchange & Processing

**Proposal ID:** 43

**Affected Version:**

**Affected Chapters:** Chapter 1

**Proposed Version:** 4.2

**Significance:** Major

**WG-Status:** Active

**TC-Status:** Approved

**Type:** Exchange Specification & Process

**Created:** August 1, 2022

**Subsequent Proposal ID(s):**

### Description

*Section that describes the issue or situation and possible background review.*

Modern internet security requirements have compelled the need to introduce new (modern) method(s) of data file exchange between the RMPC, Canada (Fisheries & Oceans, Canada), and all data Reporting Agencies. The use of Internet FTP protocol is being discontinued and will no longer be available for PSC data exchange. All references to FTP protocols will be removed.

### Proposal

Proposal to: 1. Eliminate Internet File Transfer Protocol (FTP) as a method for PSC data exchange; 2. Eliminate "CD-ROM" as a method for PSC data exchange; 3. Eliminate all file compression (e.g. "PKZip", "gzip") format options; 4. Modify the Specifications and Definitions for the Exchange of Coded Wire Tag Data for the North American Pacific Coast, PSC Format, § F.; 5. Implement new methods of PSC data exchange between all agencies and the RMPC.

These changes will involve building and testing a new API at the RMPC's data center: ([www.rmpec.org](http://www.rmpec.org)), and will involve re-writing the outdated text of the PSC Data Exchange specification (see below). The new APIs and updated text are described -- in general terms -- in this proposal. The RMPC plans to implement data file uploads through both an HTML data submission form (web page form) as well as through the use of an API /Web Service.

### Format and Document Impact(s)

#### Chapter 1 - Introduction, Definitions and Rules

Remove text:

Methods of Data File Exchange

1. Methods of file transfer may be any of the following:

- Internet File Transfer Protocol (FTP) using the RMPC Internet web-site at the following address: <http://www.rmpc.org>
  - Internet File Transfer Protocol (FTP) using an individual login account on the Mark Center computer; FTP to this address: <ftp.rmpc.org>
  - CD-ROM disc
2. For file-transfer purposes, files may be compressed using PKZip, or Unix “gzip” file compression software;

Insert /replace with the following text:

### **Methods of Data File (DataSet) Exchange and Validation**

1. Transferring a dataset: Methods are currently under development and are pending description later. Please contact the RMPC for details about how to transfer datasets
2. Processing a dataset may involve one of the following scenarios:
  - Test-validation: The dataset will be checked (only) – in which case an RMPC Status, Error & Message report will be made available to the data provider. In this case, even if some or all rows are found valid, the rows will not be inserted into the RMPC/RMIS database.
  - PartialSet Validation: The dataset will be checked, and – if rows found valid – will have the valid rows moved into the RMPC/RMIS database. An RMPC Status, Error & Message report will be made available to the data provider.
  - FullSet Validation: The dataset will be checked, and – if valid – will have the entire dataset moved into the RMPC/RMIS database. If any rows are found invalid then the entire dataset is rejected. An RMPC Status, Error & Message report will be made available to the data provider.

### **Data Migration Method**

No data migration required.

### **Discussion and Action Items**

#### **August 10, 2022 Technical Committee on Data Sharing - Virtual**

Upgrade Methods of PSC Data Exchange & Processing. At this time, insert in version 4.2 generic text informing data providers to contact RMPC to find out how to submit the data. Then in version 5.0 we can update the generic text to add all the details related to the API, webform and validation processes. In version 5.0 describe process for who to contact to get the authentication token to publish. When editing for version 5.0, also include text describing how data consumers can access the data using the API (if feasible to do by 5.0) as well from the queries and individual files accessible from the web-page.

- Reason for shifting away from FTP is that it is not secure exchange.
- File size will not be an issue with the upgrade to webform and move to API usage.
- Will still be able to download data files from <https://www.rmpc.org/data/> or similar web-based approach.

- Discussion about other potential improvements for the future: When data consumer or other individuals sees an error in the data records, currently the agency has to upload the entire data set again. With the changes in data exchange processes being considered, can we explore options to streamline the approach for data consumers to flag errors to RMPC and back to data providers to correct the records?
- Once we are using the API to submit data, can we have the API (machine to machine) return the validation results using the API response (e.g. JSON validation report).

## Recommendation

TCDS approved this proposal for implementation in version 4.2.

---

## Expand the Catch/Sample PsuedoTags Field

**Proposal ID:** 44

**Affected Version:** 4.1

**Affected Chapters:** 4

**Proposed Version:** 4.2

**Significance:** Minor

**WG-Status:** Active

**TC-Status:** Approved

**Type:** Exchange Specification

**Created:** 20220812

**Subsequent Proposal ID(s):**

## Description

Some agencies have to report values of agency-only/blank-wire recovery totals within the catch/sample record. Values have been encountered in the field that exceed the 3 column Max Cols.

## Proposal

Expand the number\_recovered\_pseudotags field to handle more digits.

## Format and Document Impact(s)

### Chapter 4 - Catch/Sample Data

Expand the number\_recovered\_pseudotags field from three digits to four digits

Field #	Description & Validation Rules
---------	--------------------------------

Field #	Description & Validation Rules
34	Expand <i>Max Cols</i> from 3 to 4

### Data Migration Method

No migration needed

### Discussion and Action Items

#### August 10, 2022 Technical Committee on Data Sharing - Virtual

This issue was identified by Jim Longwill during this meeting. The committee agrees that it is a straight forward modification to the data standard.

### Recommendation