

DMSWG September 11, 2008 Telephone Conference Summary (2:00-3:45 PM Eastern)

Work Group members in attendance: Albert Jones, Carlos Rivero, Chad Hanson, Geoff White, Gregg Bray, Gretchen Jennings, Kathy Knowlton, Lauren Dolinger Few, Mike Quach, Patty Zielinski, Ricky Gease, Scott Sauri, Tina Chang, Tom Si, Vivian Matter, Wade Van Buskirk.

Work Group members not in attendance: Anjel Lewis, Bruce Joule, Dennis O'Hern, Risa Oram.

This conference call was paired with a WebEx session. Meeting materials included updated July 9th call summary, list of potential future MRIP project ideas (from Rob Andrews) and DMSWG project update submitted to R. Andrews in early August.

- K. Knowlton reviewed July 9th conference call summary, pointing out outstanding action items and clarification of information management/Task 4 section of the proposed Project #2.
 - o B. Joule (via earlier phone conversation with Chair) is having technical issues accessing the MDMS website. Once resolved, he intends to complete the Maine program entry and program notes on other states assigned to him.
 - o C. Hanson still intends to wrap up entry on two Everglades programs.
- S. Sauri provided an update and WebEx demonstration of new MDMS functionality. He plans to finish testing upgraded functionality and roll out middle of next week.
 - o In addition to the "Manage Programs" option we have been using, two new options have been added (thank you Tom Si).
 - o "Manage accounts" for administrators in which users can be added/deleted, and assigned as "reviewers" to various programs. Thus, when a designated reviewer signs on they see only those programs assigned to them. A "reviewer notes" field was added to the Program Tab such that when a reviewer is signed in this is the only field in which they can make changes, while the rest is read-only. Once finished, they can check the box for "reviewed" and complete that status. Multiple people can also be assigned to a program for review.
 - o "Inspect Programs" relates to the automated reports. Multiple fields can be selected. At this point, this functionality is limited to producing only character counts within each selected field (Phase 1). Eventually, the report will include the actual data from that field as well (Phase 2). The initial report will help identify gaps as a starting point for follow-up prior to more in-depth review.
 - o An additional function added was the ability to allow guests to view the MDMS, which can be defaulted such that all programs are viewed with read-only access for all fields. There was discussion on whether to publish this in the deliverable for Project 1, or limit access to folks within the MRIP process like other WG members, and staff such as R. Andrews, P. Pate, J. Boreman, etc. At this point, the WG chose the latter since we need to limit confusion

between this metadata project created for our WG's immediate needs and that of InPort. S. Sauri felt the majority of the info in MDMS could be transferred to InPort within about one month of program verification.

W. Van Buskirk provided a brief update on the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission's web upgrade project. The scope of the project, and resulting updated project plan, will be revised following review of available contractors with the necessary skills and knowledge of available funds (e.g., review list of vendors, cost options). Basically, the scope is very wide at this point, and the immediate goals and limited funding need to be more efficiently matched with available contractors' programmers and developers. Members of the RecFIN database subcommittee will assist in the review of contractors and revised scope. **Action Item: Wade will produce an updated project plan (including timeline) by 10/1/08. DONE** sent to WG team members as well as Pacific RecFIN Data Subcommittee. Also, the RecFIN Technical Committee will be getting a status report on October 22 at the RecFIN meeting.

- V. Matter – Project #1 update – Progress to date is primarily Scott and Tom's work on increased functionality of the MDMS, including several project team calls to review options for automated report fields. Once Scott has completed QA/QC on the automated reports functionality, they will move into production and more critical review of program content. The larger question remains what to do with incomplete programs. Several WG members felt the answer lies with focusing on the national system needs and that we cannot delay progress.

- Deliverable for Project #1 – **Action Item: V. Matter still hoping to complete Project #1 Project Report by the 10/1/08 deadline. DONE 11/4/08.** What programs do we want listed in the deliverable – all those that we know about, even if they have not all been entered/completed in the MDMS? WG settled on two lists 1) those that have been entered in the MDMS (even if not complete) and 2) others that we know about, but are not yet entered. This document is intended to primarily report what was needed, how the WG completed this need (i.e., developed the MDMS) and describe the main functionality and content of the MDMS. The intention is to avoid producing a “living” document that would continually need to be updated as more programs are added to/completed in the MDMS.

- P. Zielinski received information on a new program a few weeks ago, thereby bringing up the need for the WG to discuss how to handle new programs. WG agreed they should be entered into MDMS, even if almost no info, so can serve as a placeholder. Scott mentioned that he could set it up such that only completed/verified programs are uploaded to InPort. Did other WG members want to be involved with the discussion of uploading programs from MDMS to InPort? **Action Item: Email or conference call needed to discuss efforts to address MDMS migration of data into InPort.**

- S. Sauri reviewed the delayed status of producing a deliverable for Project #2 by 10/1/08. The delay was caused primarily by the huge increase in scope for Project #1, time constraints on WG members due to primary job responsibilities, and the need to reorganize the order of tasks prior to starting Project #2 based on updated information as Project #1 developed and team members had more time with the issues beyond the initial planning workshop last summer. See 8/8/08 DMSWG update for details. He will produce an updated timeline, and outline plans for mapping existing and future systems, as well as recommending standard codes, and database structure/elements/types as a basis

for the partial requirements document. **Action Item: Deliverables needed from S. Sauri by 10/1/08 include the updated timeline for Project #2 (done 11/19/08) and short description of IT accomplishments by T. Si and him based, in part, on funding provided through the WG (done 10/3/08).**

- S. Sauri shared John Witzig's architecture mapping as an example of what is needed as part of Project #2 to map the various programs that will feed into MRIP. **Action Item: S. Sauri will post Witzig's example on collaboration tool. DONE** to MRIP root directory on collaboration tool website. M. Quach brought up issue of data confidentiality and data sharing being problematic for some partners. Those issues will have to be dealt with prior to an integrated system.

- S. Sauri discussed the overlap of MRIP development with FIS (Fisheries Information System). Scott recently began looking more in-depth at FIS documents/programs and where MRIP fits in. The original plan was to have some components of MRIP feed into FIS where possible/applicable as opposed to "reinventing the wheel." Examples may include the National Permit System (NPS), Commercial Landings Integration (CLI) and Data Reconciliation Tool (DRT). These programs are very closely tied to what we will/may need to do for MRIP. **Action Item: S. Sauri will plan for NMFS associate to demonstrate the CLI to WG members. DONE** via demo conference call with workgroup on October 22.

- Rob Andrews' updated list of potential projects for future funding was reviewed. As stated on the last call when a more preliminary version was presented, this initial list of project ideas is based on undeveloped OT priorities, ideas from regional listening sessions, additional pilot projects and feedback from the WG's. P. Pate and R. Andrews did not intend for this to be an exhaustive list but simply jotting down ideas to date. Of the projects listed, 5 appear to relate strongly to the DMSWG:

- o Standardize and document sampler training and monitoring protocols – informal discussions have occurred for C. Hanson, B. Joule and K. Knowlton to start this review
- o Develop standard protocols for updating and maintaining master site register (intercept survey sample frames) – lower priority for WG members
- o Improved access to data – part of Project #2 and the Pacific States Commission's pilot
- o More timely wave and final estimates – generated the most discussion, see below
- o Allow for regional control of phone surveys – Chair urged M. Quach to pursue since it is regionally specific to begin with, combined with their recent success in utilizing contractor support for specific projects.

- C. Hanson strongly supported pursuing the issue of more timely wave and final estimates given the Reauthorized Magnuson Act and upcoming Annual Catch Limits (ACL's) and Accountability Measures (AM's). He suggested a new project team made up of members from Design/Analysis WG (and other WG's, Team members or folks outside of existing members, if interested) since they have been reviewing potential changes to estimates procedures that may affect timeliness. At minimum, they could review the current methods and make recommendations for improved timeliness as an initial review. A. Jones referenced two reports on the DAWG's portion of the

collaboration tool outlining their work to date related to this issue. Bottom line, this is a critical issue and could benefit from cross-WG membership.

- **Action Item: A. Jones will forward link on the DAWG collaboration tool to two reports related to how to change estimates procedures to improve timeliness.**

DONE

- **Action Item: Once interested WG members (C. Hanson, G. Bray and L. Dolinger Few) have reviewed two DAWG reports, contact Rob Andrews with request for potential multi-WG project team to review issue of more timely wave and final estimates. DONE** and will be addressed in FY09 proposal list presented to Operations Team in late October.
- Chair presented overview of R. Andrews' basic question – what do WG members envision for the future of the WG's as the MRIP progresses? Is there too much work now? Would they prefer an advisory role in which they help guide the format, communicate about current data collection, address regional issues, etc? Generally, WG members were supportive of the latter
 - o stated that consultants are needed, since as individuals we cannot complete all the work
 - o they liked the idea of consultant, guide and help coordinate
 - o can't justify spending significantly more time due to primary job responsibilities
 - o it's not realistic to ask for more time from WG members, again, given primary jobs
 - o feel more people will be committed to staying involved over the years if the advisory capacity is pursued
 - o time constraints even higher burden if member of >1 WG
- Come January 1, 2009 the WG members need to know what has been done and how all the pieces will fit into the grant vision of the MRIP. During this first year, we have mostly been working as individual project teams and WG's without a lot of interaction with big picture and accomplishments of other WG's. Several members supported either a monster conference call with presentations on WebEx or another work shop to present findings thus far and detail the big picture.
- Several also supported being asked directly in an email what they think about the role of the WG's. They suggested R. Andrews/P. Pate send out a small list of very specific questions (~5??) rather than asking via the Chairs.