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**DRAFT MEETING MINUTES**

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Partner** | **Phone** | **Email** |
| Melissa Albino-Hegeman | NMFS | (228) 872-3831 | melissa.albino@dec.ny.gov |
| Renee St. Amand | CT DEEP | (860) 447-4325 | renee.st.amand@ct.gov |
| Kristen Anstead | ASMFC | (703) 842-0740 | kanstead@asmfc.org  |
| Nichole Ares | RI DMF | (401) 423-1926 | nichole.ares@dem.ri.gov  |
| Donna Bellais | GSMFC | (228) 875-5912 | dbellais@gsmfc.org  |
| Alan Bianchi | NC DMF | (252) 808- 8092 | alan.bianchi@ncdenr.gov |
| Chris Bradshaw (Chair) | FL FWCC | (727) 896-8626 x4717 | chris.bradshaw@myfwc.com |
| Julie Califf | GA DNR | (912) 264-7218 | julie.califf@dnr.ga.gov  |
| Barry Clifford | GARFO/NEFSC | (978) 281-9148 | barry.clifford@noaa.gov |
| Julie Dingle | SC DNR | (843) 953-5136 | dinglej@dnr.sc.gov  |
| Gary Glanden | DE DFW |  | garry.glanden@delaware.gov |
| Matthew Heyl | NJ DFW | (609) 748-4334 | matthew.heyl@dep.nj.gov |
| Eric Hiltz | SC DNR | (843) 953-9012 | hiltze@dnr.sc.gov  |
| Stephanie Iverson-Cason | VMRC | (757) 247-2061 | stephanie.iverson@mrc.virginia.gov  |
| Michael Larkin | SERO | (727) 209-5957 | michael.larkin@noaa.gov |
| Connie Lewis | MD DNR | (410) 260-8296 | connie.lewis@maryland.gov  |
| Mike Lewis  | NOAA | (301) 427-8146 | michael.t.lewis@noaa.gov  |
| Alan Lowther | NOAA |  | alan.lowther@noaa.gov |
| Holly McBride | NEFSC | (508) 495-2301 | holly.mcbride@noaa.gov  |
| Stephanie Mclnerny  | NC DMF |  | stephanie.mcinerny@ncdenr.gov |
| Conor O’Donnell | NH FGD | (603) 868-1095 | conor.odonnell@wildlife.nh.gov |
| Rob Watts | ME DMR | (207) 633-9412 | rob.watts@maine.gov  |
| Anna Webb (Vice Chair) | MA DMF | (978) 282-0308 | anna.webb@state.ma.us  |
| Jackie Wilson | NOAA HMS | (240) 338-3936 | jackie.wilson@noaa.gov  |

Committee Members Not in Attendance: G. Fanelli (NYS DEC), D. Gloeckner (SEFSC), S. Newlin (DE DFW), J. Stephen (SERO)

Others in Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Partner** | **Phone**  | **Email** |
| Brett Alger  | NOAA |  | Brett.alger@noaa.gov |
| Nicholas Buchan | MA DMF |  | Nick.buchan@mass.gov |
| Meredith Whitten | NC DMF |  | Meredith.whitten@ncdenr.gov |
| Chad Power  | NJ DEP |  | chad.power@dep.nj.gov |
| Bill DeVoe  | ME DMR |  | William.devoe@maine.gov |

Staff Members in Attendance: Anna-Mai Christmas-Svajdlenka (Data Coordinator), Julie Defilippi Simpson (Deputy Director), Alex DiJohnson (Recreational Team Lead), Adam Lee (Data Coordinator), Karen Holmes (Software Team Leader), Ed Martino (IT Manager & Programmer), Joe Myers (Senior Data Coordinator), Jennifer Ni (Data Analyst), Marisa Powell (Program Assistant), Mike Rinaldi (Data Team Lead), Heather Power (Senior Data Coordinator), Geoff White (Director)

**Welcome and Introductions**

Chair Bradshaw welcomed the group.

**Review and Approve Agenda**

Chair Bradshaw moved to approve the agenda. N. Ares made a motion to approve the agenda. J. Wilson seconded the motion.

**Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**Review and Approve Past Meeting Minutes**

Chair Bradshaw moved to approve the previous meeting minutes. N.Ares made a motion to approve the pass meeting minutes. J. Wilson seconded the motion.

**2021 Action Items**

C. Bradshaw went over the 2021 Action items. Three action items from last year are still in progress.

* J. Myers will update the Standard Codes gear definition to include Gears Fishing
* The updated gear definitions table will be shared with the committee for review
* The committee will send further action items to ComTech/ACCSP staff concerning aquaculture data.

**SAFIS Redesign Prioritization**

J. DeFilippi Simpson went over the list of potential projects for consideration. The projects to be evaluated for redesign are eDR redesign, registration tracking, and species tree. J. DeFilippi Simpson noted the ongoing work that is also taking up staff time including maintenance on eTRIPS, SMS message of the day, mapping functionality, universal trip ID, RAS/VPD, the VMS project, and SciFish.

J. DeFilippi Simpson went over the potential functionality updates in species QC/Tree, registration tracking and eDR. J. DeFilippi Simpson went over the timing which includes background, development, testing and production.

* Species tree
	+ 9-12 months
	+ 3,000 staff hours
* Registration tracking
	+ 15-18 months
	+ 4,500 staff hours
* eDR
	+ 15-18 months
	+ 4,500 staff hours

However, timing could be flexible. J. DeFilippi Simpson went over resources which includes staff time, developer time and HL contract. A resource time is time dedicated to do the project not a calendar period. ACCSP has specific constraints for registration tracking and eDR. However, for all three applications they have requirements. J. DeFilippi Simpson noted for all for the applications, ACCSP will need to meet with partners to determine the specific requirements. For registration tracking one constraint is the history of individual/ entity relationships. Another constraint is would data be managed by partners only or can permit holders create an account. eDR constraints relate to APEX programing bandwidth and inverse functionality of e1-ticket. A. Webb noted for eTRIPS updates were rolled out for eTRIPS online, eTRIPS mobile, eTRIPS upload, and then data access. For eDR, because of quota monitoring, a lot of partners are impacted. A. Webb suggested because of this all updates should be rolled out at the same time. J. DeFilippi Simpson went over the functionality changes for eTRIPS, eDR and e1-ticket that would occur if species QC/tree changed contributors. Under registration tracking SMS, SAFIS participant/ vessel database, and participant data would change. For eDR, the switchboard, API, data warehouse, registration tracking and species tree would change. J. DeFilippi Simpson went over the dependencies and noted species QC/tree, registration tracking, and eDR would have to have redesigned structures.

A.Webb suggested the way participant information is inserted should be reviewed in the registration tracking module a different API may be needed.

Staff Thoughts

J. DeFilippi Simpson went over the ACCSP perspective on the timeline. In 2022, the species tree would be worked along with Lobster tracking. In 2023, registration tracking would be worked on. eDR work would begin in 2024, and be ready for a January 2025 rollout.

Discussion

J. Wilson noted she agrees with the list of priorities and the species QC/ tree being the first on the list because the application affects other applications. B. Clifford followed up with J. Wilson and agreed with the list of priorities. B. Clifford asked if eTRIPS and OSR will be worked on as an ongoing project. J. DeFilippi Simpson noted that is correct. A. Webb noted for Massachusetts the species tree is not a priority.

**Data Warehouse Trip Redesign**

M. Rinaldi went over the new features for the Data Warehouse. SAFIS redesign data has been collected since January 2021. This data includes partner-specific data elements. The new structures and query methods allow uses to return one, or all, of the individual partner elements in a single report. The new query interface allows for better functionality, flexible design, and better security.

New Features:

* Shows attributes option
* New tab within additional parameters that shows available and used partner attributes. The attributes are bundled into trip, effort and catch.

In a row level report page return data for selected attributes will be displayed. In a standard report data for an aggregated data type will be displayed. M. Rinaldi went over the confidentiality enhancements. In the future, users will only view attributes from partners that have granted them SAFIS confidential access approval. ACCSP staff can work with state administrators to make sure SAFIS approvals are updated. A. Webb asked what does the current SAFIS approval let administrators do. M. Rinaldi noted as an administrator a user of the warehouse reports can see other states data. The new enhancement would restrict that. A. Webb asked what happens if you do not grant someone SAFIS access currently for core attributes. M. Rinaldi noted it requires one SAFIS user access and then core reports will show up for that user. A. Webb asked if the user has confidential access, but not SAFIS access what does the user view. J. Myers noted without the SAFIS access authorization the view will be blocked. A. Webb asked will there be row level data available in the data warehouse. M. Rinaldi noted the data warehouse redesign will be built to enhance the current core reports. The user can query and receive reports without attributes. J. Wilson asked is the Data Warehouse attributes specific to eTRIPS. M. Rinaldi stated yes. J. Wilson asked when NDAs are renewed is that interface changing in the data warehouse. M. Rinaldi noted currently, there is an option to approve confidentiality access in general. As well as options to choose participant information, and SAFIS access. A. Webb asked could that be specified in the instructions. M. Rinaldi noted they can update the NDA form.

M. Rinaldi noted the 2022 timeline. ACCSP is working with K. Cannell on internal development; this work show be done by April. Beta testing should be available for partners by May. Production rollout is expected in June.

A. Webb asked about the data that was collected during the first 6 months of eTRIPS that was formatted incorrectly. Would that be included? M. Rinaldi noted ACCSP is working on that. M. Rinaldi went over the companion project for structural redesign for data warehouse trips. The primary focus of the project is to synchronize database structures in the warehouse to allow better ingestion of SAFIS data. They are creating a new database schema and parallel processing. After testing, data will be moved into the structures to create the redesign system. The data team began scoping in 2021, and work is still ongoing.

J. Wilson asked if ACCSP is also considering ways to identify landings with the companion project. M. Rinaldi replied and noted scoping was done for the current system to review what additional aspects are needed to be added to the data source for parts of records.

**Data Standards: 2022 Update and Electronic Monitoring**

Data Standards: 2022 Update

J. Defilippi Simpson went over the Atlantic Coast Data Standards on the ACCSP website. The process to update the coastal standards usually takes about a year for the document to get reviewed by all the technical committees. The document is then presented to the Advisors and Operations Committee for final approval, and then posted to the website. This review is usually done every 5 years. Currently, the Atlantic Coast Data Standards is from 2012 and has not been updated due to the amount of work it would take. J. Defilippi Simpson noted in 2022, the plan is to update the Atlantic Coast Data Standards by changing the way they are presented and organized. The idea is to identify dynamic text – text that is frequently changing, and separate it from text that is static – text that does not change as frequently and has to be review as often. By identifying dynamic text this will allow more response to changes in the industry, the standards and the technical committees’ level. This change will also reduce the yearlong review process.

J. Defilippi Simpson demonstrated to the group the difference between dynamic content and static content. J. Defilippi Simpson first went over Appendix D – the maps of areas fished. J. Defilippi Simpson noted an alternative is the interactive map that can be found via the eTRIPS help page. J. Defilippi Simpson went over Appendix J- Marine Mammal Stranding Form, and noted an alternative on the NOAA site. J. Defilippi Simpson noted within the document the data elements are continuously changing and suggested as an alternative an interface where the biological data elements change.

J. Defilippi Simpson noted this year the Committees will work on establishing which fields are static vs. dynamic and preferred the Committee to be done with review by early to mid-summer. Staff may need time to plan and create the interface.

J. Wilson noted ACCSP should link resources on the Atlantic Coast Standards page. J. DeFilippi Simpson noted all static information would be on the new Atlantic Coast Standards page, while dynamic information would be linked. A. Webb asked if the static and dynamic pages would include a change log. J. DeFilippi Simpson noted a change log would be a good idea.

Electronic Monitoring

M. Rinaldi went over the electronic monitoring working group and what they identified. In 2020, the Commercial Technical Committee had a task to investigate standards for EM and create a workgroup. The group met monthly to design draft standards compatible with VTR.

A small group was made up of representatives for federal electronic monitoring and pilot programs in the region. Electronic monitoring is use of cameras on board vessels to capture fishing activity. The purpose of the working group was to review the EM data standards related to videos that had data collected and analyzed. The working group identified variation in electronic monitoring data by data types, fishing effort and EM program goals. The biggest variation is the EM program goals including validating logbooks, compliance with discarding rules, catch retention, and full catch accounting. The data structures are designed to be compatible with federal vessel trip reports, at-sea monitoring, and ACCSP Bycatch standards.

The four components the group agreed upon are trip, haul, discard, and other events.

R. Watts noted the VTR on the spreadsheet is not long enough. The eVTR starts at 14 numerical numbers. A. Webb noted format comments. A federal permit can be on a state registered boat. If it is a state registered boat they have 2 to 3 numbers on them. The permit number issue could come up with a state model because most numbers are alpha numeric, and longer than 12 numbers. In other events section A. Webb suggested if a comments field could be included. J. Wilson followed up with R. Watts with the eVTR field and noted if eTRIPS is going to include SE logbooks fields in the future a lot of vessels are HMS pelagic logline permitted vessel may have to be expanded to be a 16 numerical values to accommodate eVTRs coming from eTRIPS. J. DeFilippi Simpson noted ACCSP will have to work on that field.

**The committee conditionally approved the draft Electronic Monitoring standards. Next, the draft Electronic Monitoring standards will be reviewed by the Operations Committee.**

**Vessel Tracking**

A. Webb presented a Status Update: Cellular vessel monitoring systems data collection and ACCSP storage.

Background

A. Webb went over the issues in the Northeast specific to Lobster traps. There is an increase in requests for spatial data. Spatial data is influenced by protected species, wind, ocean planning, and offshore enforcement.

Large Statistical Areas

A. Webb displayed large statistical areas that they are currently collecting data from. A lot of the lobster fleet does not report on VTRs currently. In 2021, 10 min square data started to be collected. The gap in spatial data led the ASMFC to recommend pilot investigations into vessel tracking for the Lobster industry with draft addendum 26. In December 2021, draft addendum 29 was released for public hearing. If approved this would require tracking in the federal fleet.

Problems using Traditional Satellite VMS

The pin rates needed to successfully identify efforts are very high costs. This causes issues in using traditional satellites. The faster the pin rate the higher the cost. Cell based vessel tracking works well for inshore areas. Offshore data does not need to be seen in real time.

Solution: Cell-based Vessel Tracking

A. Webb noted cell based tracking works both in and out of cell range. The cost of the cell based vessel tracking is low compared to satellite options. Data plans are either monthly or annual costs. Pin rates are adjustable for cell based vessel tracking. Power draws of the cell based vessel tracking devices are low. There are solar options available for the cell based vessel tracking. The market seems to be expanding rapidly for cell based vessel tracking devices.

Funding and Project Summaries

There are three projects in the Northeast reviewing the cell based vessel tracking devices and functionality. Two of the projects have been funded and completed.

Project 1: (MA and ME) met lobster FMP addendum 26 requirements

* Cell based vessel trackers were place on boats to see if they worked
* Completed in 2020

Project 2: (MA and RI)

* Attempted to integrate tracking with commercial trip reporting using the eTRIPS platform
* Tested features that can be added on to data collection programs
* Completed cost comparisons
* Completed in 2021

Project 3: (MA and RI) Phase:

* Expected to be funded in July 2022
* Testing of additional devices on the market
* Focusing on the administrative tool

Ping Rates and Data Storage

A. Webb noted they have determined the data should be stored at ACCSP.

Preliminary Pings to tracks work

Project 1: Conclusions

* Cell based trackers are a good alternative to traditional satellite options
* Cell based trackers offer higher pin rates than most satellite VMS
* Are offering higher pin rates than traditional. Traditional has an hour to an hour and half pin rate.
* There is a data availability delay when vessels are out of cell range
* ‘Rock 7’ device was the easiest to use, but the most expensive
* ‘Pelagic’ device had issues in ME getting enough light to charge, MA did not have issues
* Installation of devices may need a technician
* Identifying trap hauls from track data needs more data

Project 2: Integration of VMS and E- Reporting in SAFIS through API developing and field testing of multiple hardware options- Conclusions

* 5 different devices were tested including the GPS within the tablet
* Developed API to get trip and track data into ACCSP
* Tested functionality of Geofencing
* Developed a viewing interface within the application for harvesters and administrators

eTRIPS Mobile: Where it all comes together

A. Webb noted currently eTRIPS/ mobile is for trip report submissions by state and federal agencies. The tracking version of this application uses the device API to gather track data to matched trip submissions. This application works offline. A new map view feature was added to allow users to view the tracked trip on the tablet. If using the tablet as a tracker it can be used in real time.

Project 1 Results

A.Webb noted there were successful pulls of tracks from all devices. Validating geofencing with eTRIPS mobile was successful. This allows vessel locations and patterns to be viewed.

Project 2 Results

The application has information available within the test environment.

Project 3: Integration of VMS and E- Rep

A. Webb noted the purpose of this project is to test two more devices ‘Particle’ and ‘Skymate’. Maine has done a lot of work with ‘Particle’. ‘Skymate’ will come out with a cell based option this spring. Enhancement will be investigated specifically more with geofencing and post dock analysis. Needs to establish protocol for adding enhancements. They want to enhance existing administrative application to accommodate needs. This is expected to launch this summer.

ASMFC American Lobster FMP Draft Addendum XXIX, Jonah Crab FMP draft Addendum IV

A.Webb noted the planned development team was initiated in September 2021. B. DeVoe in Maine did a lot of work to support the draft addendum with pin rate research in Maine. Draft addendums were released in December 2021. Public hearings were January 2022. On February 22 the American Lobster Board met to discuss. A. Webb noted the Lobster Addendum 29 would require vessel tracking in the federal Lobster fleet. Likely beginning in fishing year 2023 if this passes. ACCSP is creating a platform to integrate VTRs with VMS tracks for compliance monitoring data validation and data review.

February 2022 Meeting

The decision on the draft Lobster Addendum 29 has been delayed for another month. The board members, technical committee members, and plan development team are attempting to answer outstanding questions about the program use and implementation. May 1, 2023 is the implementation goal date.

ACCSP and Partner Implications

A. Webb noted if the draft Lobster Addendum 29 passes partners will be impacted from VA-ME. State partners will be responsible for fishing waivers, device failures, investigating track data and compliance monitoring. ACCSP will create software to assist with identifying missing VTR or track data. All data will be housed at ACCSP via API and then sent to NOAA OLE. Federal eVTR data will need to be in SAFIS. Federal assistance will be needed for corrections with VTR. Partners will coordinate with ACCSP over the next year to develop and test requirements for data access and interfaces.

Summary

A. Webb noted the pilot projects have set the stage for the VMS requirements to be implemented. They have the ability to link trips upon the submission of data. ACCSP is working on a way to pos-hoc trips not using eTRIPS mobile. A. Webb noted if the draft Lobster Addendum 29 does not pass it may in the future. An administrative interface is necessary if the draft Lobster Addendum 29 passes.

A. Webb asked if there were any questions. B. Alger asked if ACCSP would build some software to review data separate from vtrack system currently used to monitor VMS users. J. DeFilippi Simpson noted ACCSP would be providing the data to NOAA OLE. A.Webb noted this helps to solve the issue of state partner access to vtracks. B. Alger asked is there a way to track the tracks rather than the vessel location using a camera based system. A. Webb noted they have not yet tested a camera based system, but have reviewed Bluetooth tags on the tracks that could communicate with a tracking device. B. DeVoe noted they tested Bluetooth track tags in Maine with the ‘Succorfish’ devices and the ‘Particle’ devices. The Bluetooth devices vary in price and can be cheaper. The Bluetooth device does not have a rechargeable battery.

B. Clifford noted the plan development team had a discussion about making the program federal. However, if the program was federal, it would only be the satellite VMS units available. The plan development team was concerned about the cost, so it became a state program.

**Accountability Update**

J. DeFilippi Simpson acknowledged the data accountability work group.

J. DeFilippi Simpson noted the charge from the Coordinating Council to assess:

* Data validation and accountability issues that can compromise data quality
* -Review the standards and update as needed
* Reflect current best practices for data validation and provision

Objectives

* To define accountability
* Inventory current particles and procedures
* Define the gaps between provided data and data needed for science and management
* Evaluate best practices and procedures
* Documents and develop best practices

J. DeFilippi Simpson noted for the developing best practices objective the group developed and provided recommendations for improvements. J. DeFilippi Simpson went over the definition for accountability. For the purpose of the project the definition applies to agencies that collect audit data as well as users, stakeholders, and the public.

Approach

J. DeFilippi Simpson noted the data accountability workgroup formed in 2020. 3 surveys were conducted: data accountability, data managers, and a data consumer survey. The small group used the survey to develop recommendations.

Data Accountability Survey

The partner data contacts and Commercial Technical members were participants. A total of 19 respondents completed the survey. 4 respondents represented NOAA fisheries. 15 respondents represented state partners. The purpose of this survey was to establish a baseline information on accountability.

Data Accountability Conclusions

Top 3 methods of accountability:

1. Audits of some form are used by all respondents and to the knowledge of the group, all state and federal partners on the Atlantic coast.
2. Comparison of fishermen reports and dealer reports
3. Negative Reports

Options 2 and 3 are inversely coordinated. In the case where the availability of dealer/fishermen were not timely or comprehensive, negative reports are then relied upon.

Data Manager Survey

The data manager participants include agency workers that process and collect the data and dissimulate it out for data requests and other science and management actives. This survey was sent to 52 data managers. There were 25 responses broken down by sector and jurisdiction.

Data Manager Survey Conclusion

Generally the data managers are aware of the issues affecting data quality. The issues vary by jurisdiction and sector. The accountability working group recommended to improve the communication of data limitations so people understand why data are collected, and to expand the process.

Data Consumer Survey

This survey was collected in May 2021. This survey was sent to participants who are data consumers. People using data for science or management activities this survey was sent to 300 participants. The survey was sent to 17 agencies. There were 47 respondents to the survey.

Data Consumer Survey Conclusion

The results showed most data consumer issues are not issues with the data. The issue is communication. The accountability small group recommended increased communication so there is awareness.

All Recommendations

* Have a multiple jurisdiction effort for metadata and caveats.
* Have best practices workshops and share information to improve data quality
* Expanding and simplifying language on the ACCSP website
* To continue communication between ASMFC and ACCSP on timing with stock assessments and management of reports

**The accountability working group requested the Commercial Technical Committee to review the recommendations and use track changes and submit comments via email to** **julie.simpson@accsp.org** **no later than March 18, 2022.**

**New Business**

There was no new business.

**Other Business**

A. Webb discussed the significant change to data collection and data entry user experience for eTRIPS that started in January 2021. A. Webb noted they are thinking of a way to analyze patterns in data entry before and after changes are made. A. Webb asked partners if they feel data quality was lost or changed. What are some examples for data quality changing for the better or worse? A. Webb asked the group who would want to help determine and analyze data quality changes on eTRIPS online. N. Ares, B. Clifford, and J. Dingle volunteered.

**Commercial Technical Committee members who are interested in helping determine and analyze data quality changes on eTRIPS online can reach put to A. Webb to formulate a working group.**

**M. Rinaldi noted A. Christmas-Svajdlenka will become the new staff member for the Commercial Technical Committee. M. Rinaldi noted to please copy A. Christmas-Svajdlenka on all Commercial Technical correspondence.**

M. Rinaldi noted if anyone has any specific feedback on the ACCSP Committee Newsletter to please reach out to J. DeFilippi Simpson or M. Powell via email.

**Adjourn**

Chair Bradshaw moved to adjourn the meeting. M. Lewis second that motion.

**Action Items**

1. **The draft Electronic Monitoring standards will be sent to be reviewed by the Operations Committee.**
2. **The accountability working group requested the Commercial Technical Committee to review the recommendations and use track changes and submit comments via email to** **julie.simpson@accsp.org** **no later than March 18, 2022.**
3. **Commercial Technical Committee members who are interested in helping determine and analyze data quality changes on eTRIPS online can reach out to A. Webb to formulate a working group.**
4. **ACCSP will schedule discussions with the committee in order to update the coastal standards**