**Current CA Work Plan (Phase VI)** runs from Jan 1, 2014 to March 31, 2015

**Goals/Activities/Deliverables**

**1) Continue Phased Approach to Facilitation Implementation of Coordinated Assessments Project:**

**Deliverable:** Maintain progress in developing consistent salmon and steelhead data sharing systems across agencies and tribes within the Columbia River Basin to the degree the data management Strategies can be implemented with existing funding; maintain communication between data providers and data users to make data sharing more efficient; and, enable discussion and communication among interested parties for salmon and steelhead data.

**2) Expand the initial DES to include hatchery indicators:**

**Deliverable:** Completed Data Exchange Standard (DES) for 3-5 hatchery indicators in 2014; expanded initial DES to include some standardization of measures and metrics where appropriate, and annual update of CA DES.

 Hatchery Work Group Additions/ Section B- Hatchery Origin Fishes:

Table 1- Hatchery Spawning

Table 2- Proportion Natural Influence

Table 3- Egg to Release

Table 4- Smolt to Adult Return Ratio

Table 5- Recruit per Spawner

**3) Implement EPA Grant to Create the Coordinated Assessments Exchange (CAX) as a node on the EPA exchange network:**

**Deliverable:** Functional Coordinated Assessments Data Exchange Network (CAX) for first four natural origin indicators by June 2015.

The goal for next year is to exchange data as described in the DES for the:

• NOSA Table,

• SAR Table, and

• RperS Table.

(Note: 4th indicator, “juvenile abundance”, is being finalized.)

**Managing expectations and setting quantitative objectives:** it is important to communicate what CA will accomplish and in what time frames.

1) That CA data DES is used as the basis to design data sharing systems and to send/ receive data electronically

2) Ensure alignment between data flow and need for information

3) First target is to provide data to NOAA- are we on track for that? It appears that there will be two paths for this coming year to share data with NOAA – the old way and through the CAX. In the future (2015 and beyond), data should flow through the CAX to NOAA. Data is currently due to NOAA by November 2014 for their upcoming Status Review. That data will flow to/from the CAX as it is posted to the NOAA SPS database.

**Status Reports from StreamNet Steering Committee Meeting (June 17, 2014)**

**IDFG**

* Data availability varies from indicator to indicator
* RperS and NOSA for spring and summer chinook are on one formatted excel worksheet, linked to metric data in IFWIS databases. Evan queries and produces these in DES form, which he then sends to Bill at StreamNet.
* Hard part to all of this is GETTING DATA IN in DES standard. Bios put their data into formatted Excel spreadsheet and check that it is complete, correct, and accessible. Adding new indicators is a huge workload because biologists do not collect and report data that way, need to build a system and then get them to put the data into it.

**Colville Tribe**

* Okanogan steelhead. In next 6 months the NOSA tables will be complete for this population. This will be updated annually thereafter. Update: NOSA table now has data! (7/1/2014)

**ODFW**

* Compiled indicator & metric data and metadata for 19 NOSA populations and 16 RperS populations, data has been QA/QC’ed.
* ODFW, obtained code from IDFG. Started to test data flow (July 1, 2014)
* Most time consuming part of this is getting data from the biologists who produce it.
* Will work on both data flow and field data stewardship to improve both areas

**WDFW**

* R-code along with Win-bugs was used to produce outputs to populate the NOSA and SAR tables.
* 17 populations have been entered into the NOSA table for years 2010-2012 to be used for testing purposes.
* SAR data for one population (Wind River Sthd) has been entered for outmigrant years 2003-2010.
* Processes to exchange data from regions (Region 5 Vancouver) to headquarters (Olympia) will take place this month. A test exchange will then take place with StreamNet.
* Hardest part is getting enough Research Scientist time to help create outputs in the necessary format (DES).
* NOSA table is the easiest to obtain metrics for. Projects are mostly not sufficiently funded to produce outputs to populate the SAR and RperS tables sufficiently.

**Steering Committee Discussion:**

Why is data collected in one format but reported in a different format?

* If you are trying to speed up the process, why wouldn’t you be working with the biologists to collect the data in the way that you need it?
* Working via the DES to be able to still allow biologists to collect the data however they want, and then automatically convert it for reporting purposes
* How to fix bottlenecks?
	+ Temporaries or technicians to take data from the biologists and put into DES format.
	+ Set up a pipeline to enhance data flow.
	+ Standardize data collection and reporting to reduce or eliminate the “conversion” step (have biologists report the indicators and metrics in DES format).

Is there a tie between the CA Work Plan and the StreamNet SOW? Should make sure the quantitative targets are noted? They are not in the SOW currently, and have not been included previously. Not having targets means they could be defined for us by others. Do we want to specify the quantitative targets? And how specific should it be?

Steering Committee Recommendation: Add language in the SOW that identifies the CA workplan as the place where quantitative targets by organization can be found. Ensure that the CA work plan has those targets, and specify in the SOW that modifying/ updating/ clarifying those quantitative targets through the CA work plan will occur as the year progresses.