

DMSWG April 28, 2009 Telephone Conference Summary (2:00-3:00 PM Eastern)

<b>WG Member</b>	<b>In Attendance</b>	<b>Not In Attendance</b>
Albert Jones	X	
Anjel Lewis	X	
Bruce Joule		X
Carlos Rivero		X
Dennis O'Hern		X
Geoff White		X
Gregg Bray	X	
Gretchen Jennings		X
Henny Winarsoo		X
Kathy Knowlton	X	
Lauren Dolinger Few		X
Mike Quach	X	
Patty Zielinski	X	
Ricky Gease		X
Risa Oram		X
Scott Sauri		X
Tina Chang		X
Tom Si		X
Vivian Matter		X
Wade Van Buskirk	X	

Also in attendance: Tom Sminkey (NOAA S/T, project leader for FY09 QA/QC project)

This conference call was paired with a WebEx session. Documents reviewed during the call included (in order during call):

1. FY09 QA/QC Proposal
2. 1/7/09 WG conference call summary
3. 3/24/09 WG Chairs conference call summary
4. January 13-14 IA Subteam Workshop summary
5. FY09 Project 2 Proposal

Call started with an update on the progress of developing the FY09 QA/QC project (uploaded to collaboration tool: Projects folder, DMSWG-4 subfolder, file "QA/QC proposal"). In February, project lead was switched from Patty Zielinski to Tom Sminkey due to the former's expected workload on another FY09 MRIP project and the latter's previous work on QC. Gordon Colvin also volunteered to join the project team due to his experience both as a former state director and recent listening sessions/constituent comments related primarily to MRFSS QA concerns. An updated team membership list has already been uploaded to the collaboration tool (Projects folder, file "Task Teams"). K Knowlton thanked T. Sminkey for his willingness to step in as project lead under a tight timeline for proposal submission, as well as subsequent requested revisions in mid-March to include more on the QA portion. T. Sminkey reviewed the basics of the proposal, noting that, in particular, he will rely on project team members to lead the QA

portion while he handles much of the work associated with the QC portion. Proposal comments from the OT were limited, generally supportive and recommended funding to the ESC. Final approval from the ESC is expected within two weeks, at which point the project team will convene by conference call to initiate work.

There were no questions from attendees about either the 1/7/09 WG or 3/24/09 WG Chairs conference call summaries. The former is uploaded to the collab tool (Conference Calls, DMSWG, 2009 conf call sum subfolder), while the latter will be available on the MRIP website under the OT (meetings tab).

In the absence of S. Sauri (he was on a different MRIP conf call along with many of the other WG members from S&T), K. Knowlton provided an update on the ever-evolving Project 2. Due to delays caused by increase in work on Project 1, Project 2 basically never started during FY08. Prior to the February FY09 proposal deadline, the Information Architecture Subteam (IA Subteam) held a workshop on January 13-14 (see summary for details, loaded to collab tool: Projects, DMSWG-2, Task 1: Information Architecture subfolder, file "IA Workshop Objectives"). In addition to listing expected deliverables from the new and improved Project 2, this document also lists the following components:

- Development will take place in phases (including examples of potential future phases)
- First phase will focus on a national system to store/report participate, catch and effort for 2006-2007 (remember, this just first step so the time frame was limited during application development)
- Current regional programs will be evaluated and compared to a list of criteria for inclusion in the national system (criteria list included in summary)
- Various users/consumers need to be consulted to determine what their data needs are and how this project can fill current data need gaps

The resulting FY09 Project 2 Proposal was then reviewed (loaded to collab tool: Projects, DMSWG-2 subfolder, file "DMSWG-2 Project Plan"), including the following review of OT proposal comments ("responses" added by K. Knowlton during the call):

- How does this proposal integrate with FIS since it was originally envisioned as including recreational fisheries, though no significant work to date has occurred  
Response: Rob Andrews and Lauren Dolinger Few are pursuing getting clarification from Dave Van Voorhees on issues of FIS this week. We had already planned investigate ways to combine with existing FIS database and query tools, when possible and appropriate.
- NMFS already has the data and just needs to upload it. Response: were it this easy, NMFS would have already done it. NMFS efforts such as Fisheries of the US (FUS) do currently compile data from disparate regional data collection sources, but they are not uniform in their survey design, codes or electronic delivery format, so a great deal of work still goes into getting them prepped for FUS.
- High price tag. Response: S. Sauri and R. Andrews have already met and tentatively reduced the budget to ~\$300K.

- Can this project be delayed until more critical design issues are completed?  
Response: We will always have to provide historical data, as well as whatever data are the result of MRIP redesign efforts. Also, with expected significant increase in staff time next year as Angler Registry comes fully on-line, there is more staff availability this year to expend toward initial database design and access to summary data at national level. Plus, our WG was *specifically tasked* in the December 2008 OT FY09 Priorities spreadsheet to develop a proposal that addressed “Continuation/expansion of current DMSWG project. Will include recommended information architecture for MRIP, recommendation for standard codes, database structure, data elements and data types.”

The OT’s recommendation was to request additional information from the project team to clarify the above issues prior to their making a final funding recommendation for the project. In addition to issues noted above, the regional program evaluation criteria list developed during the workshop will be added since it was overlooked in the initial proposal version.

**Action Item: Within the next two to three weeks, the IA Subteam will update the Project 2 Proposal and resubmitted to the OT.**

Comments from WG members:

A. Jones: It is important to keep the communication loop open with constituents as we develop these data queries. They have spoken out via listening sessions and other venues about their needs. We should, as the query systems develop, continue that dialogue with at least key users (Regions, Centers, fishers, conservationists) to inform of progress and to solicit comments and any newly identified data needs.

M. Quach: The West Pacific region does not provide information for the recreational portion of FUS; S&T must do that. West Pacific only forwards the commercial statistics portion and they have requested more funds for Oracle (or something similar) to support those requests, but have not yet heard a response, particularly from FIS.

W. Van Buskirk provided a brief update on the Pacific States web redesign effort (Project 3). He is working to complete extensive background documentation in the form of a design statement and regional structure document (similar to FIS architecture documents) such that they are in a better position to request work from area vendors. Documentation includes how they currently handle data, data conversion and what hardware/software used. Russel Porter has requested the updated web redesign RFP be released within the next two weeks.

Related comment from Wade: As we work to design a format for summary national data, as well as better querying tools at regional level, we still need to maintain the regional expertise to handle complex queries. We need to keep the folks heavily involved that run the surveys, understand the details, and whose primary responsibilities include querying the data. In other words, you cannot expect to write queries that cover 100% of the possible requests.