

Review of Action Items and Discussion at 2011 Data Sharing Meeting in Victoria

1. Use of agency/blank wire

Agency only not a pseudo-tag.


- a. **ACTION** to Data Standards – remove the term “pseudo-tags”

Tag codes are entered/reported as coordinator code which is not the same as agency code. They should be bang records, since they are not unique, with tag type 16. Data sharing doesn't want to treat these tags as CWT but we do need to be able to manage historical data and find these tag 'not-codes' (marks) in the database using normal query tool. Could create a standard for bang records (report number on the tag not the coordinator code), or create a new blank wire file.

- b. **ACTION:** Data Standards to review and recommend a solution. Blue book needs to specify how these are to be reported. 4.1 specs chapter 16 describe how to report blank wire tags. All agency only wire releases must be reported, however reporting of recoveries is optional (Ken Phillipson to confirm)

2. Current Status of RMIS Database

Everyone at 4.1. See Data status page at RMIS site.

- c. **ACTION:** Update http://www.psc.org/publications_tech_techcommitteereport.htm#TCDS
TCDS (89)-1  - *Joint Technical Committee on Data Sharing Joint Working Group on Mark Recovery Databases. Information Content and Data Standards for a Coastwide Coded-Wire Tag Database. July 12, 1989.*
Data Standards will lead the update of original 1989 technical report and identify authors to update each section. Including each agencies use of 19 char recovery location code. Data Standards to define requirements for the 17 user-defined characters in the 19 char code (including use of spaces). CTC and CoTc have mapping tables which could be used to cross reference recovery location codes with CTC fishery names (appendix). Agencies review how they use records where no catch/sample ratio and general rule then take to Data Standards. How are expansion factors determined, different between agencies – specs in blue book PSC tech report have agency-specific calculations (1984-ish). Agencies should review these calculations, and update document (and original 19 character location code strip interpretation) if required. Reference on RMIS website to this document. Do agencies always correct historical data when codes or methods change, not always with older data at CDFO (ongoing updates), yes in AK.

3. Issue 18: Validation is Inadequate for Current Uses of CWT Data (p. 100)

Lots of progress. Analysts need to forward any requirements to RMIS to bring up to Data Sharing. Communication of changes to validation will go through Data Standards. Submitters may need to know how data is validated, what the steps are, so agencies understand why records are being rejected. Jim has an application that an agency can run to validate their data.

4. Issue 17: Updating CWT Data is Difficult and the Updates Cannot Be Tracked (p. 99)

- **Description Files** – presentation on desc files by George

If data is corrected, old data is deleted and replaced. If tag code changes, agencies must do a full submit and replace with delete first. System can now do this? RMIS could program a compare routine when data is submitted to report what has changed. RMIS could save each request pull, to compare against later.

For the time being, we are not including estimates of unmarked tagged recoveries that would have been taken (encounters) if fishery were/is not selective in the database or with visual sampling. Data Sharing is waiting advice from SFEC if this is wanted. Estimate of mortalities of unmarked DIT (EMUD), not raw data. Still under discussion.

- d. **ACTION:** need CTC, coho TC, SFEC, CWTIT, DS to get together to agree. Regulations make it impossible to use standard algorithms. Need regulations files completed. Sampling also not always aligned with regs. 7-8 yrs ago non-recoveries was discussed. Agencies responsible for making estimates, how to decide which lambda to use? Some clipped releases may not be associated with a marked group.

5. Catch/Effort File

- e. **ACTION:** do we still need it? Yes, but may be lower priority than other requirements. DS recommends that this file be archived, as incomplete it is not useful.
- f. **ACTION:** DS recommends that this file be archived, as incomplete it is not useful. Notify chairs of committees, provide some background.

6. Catch/Sample File

- g. **ACTION:** Add to multi-committee meeting agenda. SFEC needs estimates of encounters by mark status, legal/sublegal under regs, retained/released – has requested agencies to provide this data.

All coho and Chinook catch events (comprehensive catch) regardless of CWT sampling are required in this file. The catch/sample file should also include all catches whether sampled or not, but this is not done by all agencies yet. The catch/effort file gives more detail than the catch/sample file on the catch, including catch of all species.

- h. **ACTION** – Data standards to communicate this gap to agencies. Ask TC's if it is being implemented as needed.

Comprehensive catch reporting, a new requirement for reporting all catch. DS to review by region and agency comparing with tech committee reports is needed to evaluate comprehensiveness of data in database and likelihood of populating this. CWTIT should be interested in knowing gaps and current data status, similar to expert panel report (section 4).

- i. **ACTION:** Communication between DS cochairs and CWTIT cochairs. Briefing note around sections 13-19 pf expert panel report.

7. Fishery Regulations File (Proposed)

Analysts need to know applicable fishery regulations to define sampling strata around data. They need distinct reporting for each regulatory stratum. A table with time periods, areas and regs for each regulation could be shared between agencies informally until RMIS standard developed. Analysts need to know area, time period, C&R, bag limit, mixed bag e.g. jack/adult or marked/unmarked, slot limit / size limits, gear restrictions, things which may change catchability from regulations.

- j. **ACTION:** TCDS to communicate with Technical Committees (core set of attributes) and Technical Committees to determine needs and priority for regulations data. Data Standards working group needs to know attributes (as listed here?).
- k. **ACTION:** include in multi-committee meeting. CFDO and WDFW both are working on regs database concept models.

8. CWT Workgroup Response to Expert Panel Recommendations : Data Coordination and Reporting Issue 13: Timeliness of Reporting (p. 97)

Review the schedule in the Version 4.1 specs, - Specs say Jan 31 of the following year for all species. Reviewed planned schedule for each agency by pre-terminal fishery, terminal fishery, and escapement.

Recovery data can be reported as preliminary, without expansions, so analysts know if they should wait for expansions or not for a brood year e.g. with catch as 0 or as select recoveries? No estimated numbers e.g. partial reporting.

i.

- I. **ACTION:** Data Sharing to request reporting of recoveries for a recovery year by agency by year, by species, gear.

CWTIT call for proposals July. Data Sharing members could help with proposals.

- m. **ACTION:** Agencies to meet with partners to discuss data availability by Jan 31, if possible to get data 6 months sooner (2 months won't do it). Partial reporting to be considered.

9. Issue 14: Incomplete/No Exchange of CWT Data (p. 98)

Catch/sample file records are not mandatory and spawning escapement 'recoveries' (? or samples?) also not mandatory. Related to another item Discussion of CWT Estimation for Portions of the Escapement Without Complete Counts or Without CWT Sampling – CDFO presentation – tag type code, Documentation of agency algorithms historically done in "blue book" to be updated .

Currently TC get escapement data from agency contacts for their work. Escapement CWT sample data not being consistently reported in RMIS, across all agencies. Opportunity to standardize and centralize reporting in central repositories of these data exists but hasn't been a priority.

Pooling, temporal and/or spatial, strata used are up to the agency.

- n. **ACTION:** Data Standards to discuss use of period type by agencies and how pooled periods are reported. Currently ADFG uses period type 7 for user defined periods which vary by year. CDFO uses period first and last to pool samples over catch for those weeks to derive estimates for each week in the pool (multiple records needed to see the entire sample calculation).

ACTION: Data Standards to discuss variance could be a new field to provide estimates of variance on each catch and escapement estimate to help determine precision of estimated CWT recoveries and subsequent estimates of ER and survival rate.

10. Issue 16: Unclear Authority to Establish and Enforce Standards (p. 99)

RMIS / Data standards can control data issues. Two solutions proposed by CWT working group – forums and... **Roles of MUC, Data Standards and Data Sharing** – to be functional – deliverables e.g. annual report of data and procedures status by agency. Go back to terms of reference. Get requirements from analysts, tell Data Standards what to implement.

Related to **Data Sharing Committee Reporting to Commissioners**

See 2001 report on PSC website: <http://www.psc.org/pubs/TCDS01-1.pdf>

Data sharing provides annual workplan. Feedback this year to continue work on CWTs. Asked about GSI data. Catch and effort not supported. Annual briefing document sufficient. Post minutes at a minimum e.g FTP site.

- o. **ACTION:** Update blue book as per below.
- p. **ACTION:** Solicit input from CoTC, CTC, SFEC, CWTIT and MUC for Data Sharing via formal process.

11. Data Standards Working Group Data Quality Issues (from last meeting's minutes June 3-4, 2008)

- There is a need by analysts for bad clip rate (poor mark).

- q. **ACTION** – direct this to Data Standards. Data Sharing to determine if it matters. Does anyone ask for this? People just use marked and unmarked. This could affect visual sampling estimates. In recoveries we know it is a poor clip, may be tracked by agencies. Releases may be poor clips, and are tracked. Unknown clip also a possibility, code 9009 for recoveries.
- What is “associated” – no standard definition – release of unfed fry when hatchery needs to get rid of them, production fish, etc. User needs to check all releases for a given location/site in order to get potential associated fish recorded separately. What forum should be used to communicate/consult standards such as “associated” hatchery releases? **A CWT symposium was planned to address data quality issues which are procedural in nature.** There may be multiple locations e.g. watersheds in one record. Mass marked groups which is intended to be associated to a tag group should be reported in same record of that release. Never been stated or defined. Analysts may like to have it all on one record. Data providers tend to submit more than one record, so need to look at release dates and locations.
- r. **ACTION:** Table for multi committee meeting to gather requirements. Agencies to document how they associate groups to Data Standards for summarization. May want to rewrite spec for related group ID, used for agencies to group, not for analysts to pull groups. “Other” related? Can RMIS interface make it more explicit to user? Could use K to flag for analysts, not used consistently.
- Catch/sample ID: should be present and match with recovery file. Catch/sample ID in recovery file may be null or 0 (applies to some historical data, but if data is re submitted it must be populated, 0 works??),
- s. **ACTION: Data Standards working group to investigate extent of catch ID data nulls**, and look for options e.g. query other fields. Does every estimate need to reference a sample? Whenever an expansion factor is calculated, it must have come from some sampling. RMIS automation not an option, it is the agency responsibility.
- PSMFC is geo-referencing locations in the locations file to basins and areas, so they can be mapped or aggregated into these location types. Agencies will need to validate this work. Progress is being made.
- t. **ACTION:** CDFO will review draft version of maps in 2011. Data Sharing would like RMPC to remove draft versions of Canadian basins from their website.
- u. **ACTION** – Review domain maps at Data Standards – e.g. mapping to HUC (hydrological unit code) Domains and basins are not an internal coding standard.
- How does the user know which tagcodes are indicator stocks? Optional field Study Type = K.
 - Also is there a need for an additional field for integrated or segregated hatchery programs? Mixed or wild tagging e.g. bring wild into hatchery and mix with hatchery, become mixed. Segregated vs integrated hatchery programs. Do we need another field then brood origin in the release file?
- v. **ACTION:** Data Standards to discuss with agencies about requirements.
- Monitoring adequacy of recovery data
- w. **ACTION:** Follow up with CWTIT, CTC & CoTC cochairs regarding need for regular reporting of CWT statistics e.g. update table from catch/sample file and red/green table from CAS (cohort analysis system).