

## EM data review protocol sub-committee meeting notes

Meeting date: Jan 13, 2015

**Attendees included:** Farron Wallace, Chris Rilling, Howard McElderry, Dave Colpo, Dan Falvey, Adam Batty, David Polushkin, Malcolm Milne, Heather Gilroy, Jennifer Mondragon, Sam Cunningham, Bill Tweit

On the phone: Alia Al-Humaidhi, Courtney Donovan

---

### I. Revisions to Data Review Protocols

We reviewed the data review protocols that were used in 2014 (as summarized on page 7 of the PMFC report: [http://www.npfmc.org/wp-content/PDFdocuments/conservation\\_issues/Observer/EM/PSMFC\\_EM2014\\_Alaska\\_DraftReport\\_2015-01-07.pdf](http://www.npfmc.org/wp-content/PDFdocuments/conservation_issues/Observer/EM/PSMFC_EM2014_Alaska_DraftReport_2015-01-07.pdf)) to identify any changes for 2015.

For 2015 there will be 4 levels of video review and the following information to be identified at each level:

#### 1. Metadata

- a. ADFG permit #
- b. Date drive retrieved
- c. Field assessment notes (Saltwater/Archipelago notes when drive was picked up)
- d. Logbook: Y/N

#### 2. Initial review to answer the following:

- a. Is sensor data complete? Y/N
- b. Is imagery/video complete? Y/N
- c. Was there dockside monitoring? Y/N

#### 3. Trip data

- a. Port code
- b. Date/time/location start of trip
- c. Date/time/location end of trip
- d. Number of hauls
  - i. Date/time/location start of each haul
  - ii. Date/time/location end of each haul

#### 4. Complete video review

- a. Time to review
- b. All fish species IDs to lowest level
- c. All fish counts
- d. All fish disposition (discarded at rail; retained at rail)
- e. All other species
  - i. Birds, inverts, mammals
- f. ~~Hook counts (including empty hooks)~~ stop doing this in 2015
- g. ~~Skate/segment counts~~ stop doing this in 2015

- h. For halibut: - do we need to keep doing this? For now the answer is yes, unless IPHC says it is not useful
  - i. Injury key/Release condition
  - ii. Release method
- i. Confidence in species ID. EM reviewers will provide a data confidence rating (high, medium, low).
- j. Image quality: EM reviewers will provide an image quality assessment (high, medium, low). - this is new for 2015
  - i. For low image quality, they will assign a reason for the low image quality. Note that AMR will provide field assessment notes that might provide more information about why there was low quality.

#### Rules of Review:

- For all trips: Do review level 1-3 (metadata, initial review, trip data).
- If there is complete video for whole trip & there was full retention of rockfish & there was dockside monitoring: Conduct full review through level 4.
  - Note: Might need to sub-sample and randomly review a sub-sample of *trips* if we end up with more dockside trips than the budget can handle.
- For the rest of the trips (complete video or not): identify the trips based on operational characteristics, and randomly select *hauls* to full level review level 4.
  - Howard will come up with the list of operation attributes that will be used. For example:
    - vessel configuration (side haul, stern haul)
    - day vs night
  - The number of hauls that will be reviewed will be based on the budget.

## II. Special data review projects for 2015

- a. Cost of reviewing all catch vs only discards: PSMFC will do a special project to evaluate EM review time to only monitor discards only vs time to count all fish (retained & discard). They will use the same trips where they already did the hook counts. That way we will have an comparison of: time to review hook counts & all catch; time to review all catch; time to review only discards.
- b. EM duplicate reviewers: PSMFC already does this, but they will write up the protocol and formalize it.
- c. Random sub-sampling within hauls: the group discussed this idea and decided to stick with random sampling of hauls and trips. For now, PSMFC will continue to review the entire haul and not try and sub-sample within the haul.

## III. Effort data collection

- In 2015 all vessels will complete data sheets with effort information (see example data sheet on page 22 of PSMFC report: [http://www.npfmc.org/wp-content/PDFdocuments/conservation\\_issues/Observer/EM/PSMFC\\_EM2014\\_Alaska\\_DraftReport\\_2015-01-07.pdf](http://www.npfmc.org/wp-content/PDFdocuments/conservation_issues/Observer/EM/PSMFC_EM2014_Alaska_DraftReport_2015-01-07.pdf) )
- The group discussed ways that we could verify the self-reported effort and agreed that one solution would be for IPHC port samplers to verify the EM data sheet during their normal interview process.

- For 2015, the vessels will provide:
  - A copy of the IPHC logbook that has been verified.
  - Or use the EM datasheet and have IPHC port samplers verify that self-reported data through their usual interview process.
- Heather will review the datasheet and provide feedback if there are additional data elements that will enable the port samplers to complete the verification. For example, the data sheets are currently missing gear type (e.g. fixed hook, autholine, snap)

#### **IV. Try out Data Turnaround Models**

- For particular ports, have a port coordinator pull hard drives for each trip.
  - Can NMFS make the PNOL data available to port samplers so that they would have advance notice of deliveries? Jennifer will look into this.
  - How should the data be sent to PSMFC? Fedex? Chris will look into this.
- Have skipper mail in hard drives from remote ports.
- Third level would be to have first level of EM review at the port. Look at the logistics of it in 2015.