

DMSWG November 8, 2007 Telephone & WebEx Conference Minutes (1:30-3:30 PM Eastern)

Members in attendance: Bruce Joule, Chad Hanson, Dennis O'Hern, Gregg Bray, Gretchen Jennings, Kathy Knowlton, Mike Quach, Patty Zielinski, Scott Sauri, Tina Chang, Vivian Matter

Members not in attendance: Albert Jones, Carlos Rivero, Fred Golofaro, Geoff White, Lauren Dolinger Few, Ricky Gease

- Chair reviewed draft 10/29/07 conference call minutes. Highlights: G. White's offer to add language clarifying the WG's intent in Project #2 related to scope of the "full requirements document." S. Sauri had inquired about scope since, from a database structure point of view, a true full requirements document could not be completed until many of the decisions related to later projects were handled. P. Pate instructed the WG to provide him the updated project plan prior to the OT's 11/28/07 meeting and he would present the update. WG agreed that the revised plan did not need their review and approval prior to submission. **Action Item: G. White will provide a revised Project #2 to the Chair by 11/16/07. DONE (added after conference call with OT on 11/15/07, V. Matter will supply P. Pate with addendum description on budget request – DONE).**
- Chair update: Expect to hear result from OT on project funding in early January.
- S. Sauri update: progress of the collaboration tool for authorized members to share electronic files. **Action Item: S. Sauri will work within IT at S/T to establish and test the site prior to opening to the WG, with expected completion by 11/16/07. DONE**
- T. Chang update: progress within FIS on regional reports expected to include information on current recreational data collection methods and assist with Project #1. These will not be available prior to January, but she does not expect them to contain much recreational information anyway, so the issue is essentially moot now. **Action Item: V. Matter requested T. Chang to please contact those individuals drafting the regional reports and inquire whether they have information related to recreational fisheries.** They may already have collected some, even though the emphasis was not on recreational fisheries. T. Chang will need confirmation that non-FIS personnel have permission to read draft FIS reports. **DONE: T. Chang did not feel there was anything more of content to add (via email to chair 12/3/07).**
- Via updated spreadsheet, S. Sauri suggested edits to the projects spreadsheet, primarily to Projects #1-3. His Project #1 comments related to focusing on large programs first, followed by archiving less detailed information on small or historical data collection programs, will be deleted. Though this was the consensus on the previous WG conference call, the WG decided it was better to collect too much information than not enough. We will need as much data as possible once the review and discussion of common data elements begins. WG agreed that each regional coordinator should populate the template first with the larger programs in case it requires a great deal of work. By prioritizing the larger programs first, adherence to

the timeline may be more likely. S. Sauri's suggestion to include example data sets in the template was not approved by the WG. **Action Item: Comments from WG on S. Sauri's suggested edits to the project spreadsheet should be emailed to him by COB Friday, November 16th. DONE**

- S. Sauri presented idea of using InPort in Project #1. Information from the regional coordinators could be uploaded to InPort and provide a basis for the metadata project. InPort can identify document locations, click link, and download the document. This could help as repository for large documents. However, any use of and/or content posted to InPort related to our WG projects would have to be approved by D. Van Voorhees (as FIS Program Manager). **Action Item: S. Sauri will investigate the utility of InPort for our needs and present his findings to the WG prior to advancing to D. Van Voorhees, if approved by WG.**
- Discussion on template format: Should we start with Word or Excel document and later transfer to database, or start with data entry by regional coordinators directly into database forms/tables? T. Chang: It might be possible to migrate Excel documents directly into InPort. Several coordinators expressed preference for Word, primarily due to current Word format of documents that will provide basis for their portion. **Action Item: S. Sauri offered to attempt to create an Excel form that resembles Word for review by the WG in December, after which WG will make final decision on format.** However, general support for template was in Word format.
- T. Chang suggestion: In general (not limited to Project #1) how will the WG deal with points of discussion/issues that are either not within the immediate timeframe (save for later date, perhaps depend on completion of a project) or beyond the scope of the WG? Parking lot format? General comments document? Can we create some way to archive, in a central repository, discussion/issues for review by the WG later or outside our WG by the OT? Since this was not directly related to Project #1, the Chair got clarification from T. Chang at the end of the call. T. Chang's suggestion stems from her experience with FIS. During design and implementation, they often had discussions that would be important later, but could not get solved at that moment. Those ideas were not archived ("parked"), but later someone wanted to reference but no one could provide details. Along the way, as a WG, if we determine there is something that we can not resolve at the time, but is critical to the MRIP, can we make a record of it somewhere? Chair noted that this is accomplished, at least in part, by meeting minutes. But it is cumbersome to search through multiple documents, and a more central repository would be helpful. **Action Item: In December, Chair will update WG via email specifically dedicated to this suggestion, and request suggestions for implementing.**
- V. Matter made extensive changes to the template draft during the conference call. **Action Item: Additional comments on template elements should be emailed to V. Matter by COB Friday, November 16th - DONE.** V. Matter's expected timeline:
 - She and S. Sauri will continue to discuss ideas for format over next few weeks
 - Beginning December – provide updated draft for final review of template format and elements. (note: after the call P. Zielinski suggested using one program from one region as a test case prior to final release to coordinators for populating.)

- January 1 – provide final template to regional coordinators
- **Action Item: Chair will ask P. Pate when and how funds will likely be dispersed following the OT funding decisions. DONE**
- With above plans and due dates, WG agreed another conference call date did NOT need to set at this time.

Email from S. Sauri directly following WG conference call, related to his recent meetings with Gordon Colvin:

When Gordon, Tina and I met yesterday, one of the issues we discussed was expectations for the January 2009 deadline. Gordon indicated that it is his understanding that it is expected that by January 2009 we will be able to:

- a. Begin registering anglers
- b. Begin accepting data from exempted states

I indicated that item b is very much in contrast with perceptions in the DMSWG and with previous input I had received from Rob. I spoke with Rob today and he clarified that although we should be ready to begin accepting data from the states by January 2009, that this does not mean that we will have a completed MRIP system ready to accommodate the data. It is expected that we will have identified and documented the required minimum data elements and standards for data submission so that states can be exempted from nationally based registration and/or surveying through compliance with those standards (or through participation in a regional program that is compliant with those standards).

To be clear:

- * It is not expected that the new MRIP system will be completed by January 2009
- * It is expected that the angler registry component of the MRIP system will be ready to accept registration data by January 2009
- * It is not expected that the angler registry component of the MRIP system will be fully implemented by January 2009
- * It is expected that the required minimum data elements and standards for survey data submission will be identified and documented by January 2009
- * It is not expected that the survey data component of the MRIP system will be completed and/or ready to accept survey data by January 2009