

NOTES

Information Management Meeting - “Regional Information Management Strategy-RIMS”

Date/Time: 2007-01-22

Location: Bonneville Power Administration
905 11th Avenue
Portland, Oregon

Meeting Facilitators: Jen Bayer, Stewart Toshach

Participants: Jim Geiselman, Mike Beaty, Bruce Schmidt, Tom Pansky, Tom O’Neill, Peter Paquet, Phil Roger, Steve Rentmeester, Dave Ward, Tom Rien, Danny Burgett, Rick Mogren, John Piccininni, Paul Ocker, Jill Leary, Bill Kaiser, Michael Newsom, Tom Iverson, Jacque Schei; Phone: Richard Kang, Jeff Cowen,

Note: There was a technical problem with the phone connection. The phone bridge was not established until around 10:15 which limited participation and information for those who depended on the phone bridge.

Agenda

1.0 Introductions (Jen Bayer)

2.0 Purpose of Meeting (Jim Geiselman)

The federal government is currently working with states and tribes in a court mandated Regional Collaboration Process that includes development and coordination of Federal FCRPS BiOp actions, Recovery Plans, and state and tribal actions in the areas of Hydro, Habitat, Harvest, Hatcheries and Research, Monitoring and Evaluations (RM&E) within the Columbia Basin. In the RM&E area we have a significant data management component that needs to be developed for this collaboration process. This need has been discussed within the Collaboration Process RM&E workgroup, the Federal Caucus, NED, and PNAMP. There are several pieces of a potential strategy that have been referenced and developed in various regional forums and coordination efforts, but a clear conceptual diagram and strategy description that is agreed to by all parties is yet to be communicated to many of the executives and participating parties within the Regional Collaboration Process. Development of such a Strategy communicated through the Collaboration Process, FCRPS BiOp, and Recovery Plans is an opportunity to raise awareness of regional coordination efforts in data management and advance agency level agreements and funding that are needed to implement it.

3.0 Background Information from Jim Geiselman and Some Discussion

What is the topical and geographic scope of needed information?

- Topical: Status and Trend, action effectiveness, focused on ESA listed fish and habitat, but not constrained to that. Sees NED and PNAMP extending it later to regionwide environmental data; salmon life cycle (Pacific)
- Geographic: Main focus on Columbia River Basin, but also fits with broader PNW region.

Who is the lead and who are essential partners?

- Should be all those signed on to PNAMP and NED who see the objectives of advancing information management in the region. A specific lead was not identified.
- Partners - NED, PNAMP, Federal Caucus, CBFWA, NPCC, Action Agencies
- Decision makers (Regional Executive networks of the partners)

Who is the audience?

- Executives, decision makers, monitoring/data program leaders, program staff

What are desired deliverables and when are they needed?

- Initial draft by end of February, with final product in June or July 2007
- As of now, no clear textual description of how we think data should be managed, starting from collection that we would all buy into as a region. Envision a fairly succinct textual description along with several schematics that communicates it – need to be understood not only by data personnel, but also the decision makers. Describe how various products fit together – current state and desired state.
- There are existing strategies (Paquet and Roger)
- Diagram of who does what relative to data management upfront (do this later)

Is there a sign off/review process?

- Not discussed at meeting: Note from Jim Gieselman -This needs further discussion. Product would go for review by all the executive networks of participating partners including the FCRPS BiOp Collaboration Process (Columbia Basin federal, state and tribes)

What budget, in-kind or other resources and etc are available for these deliverables/products?

- Only that existing currently within the partner groups since this is within the scope of their existing efforts and objectives. This product would help facilitate identification, communication, and securing of future funding needed to implement the strategy..

What is the relationship to previous related products e.g. FCRPS RME/Data Management Plan?

- Should be built upon past and current efforts related to this topic

4.0 Discussion: How does this effort relate to existing efforts, e.g. StreamNet, NWHL, FPC, PNAMP, Council F&W Program, NED, ISEMP, Biop and Recovery Plans and etc.

- *No real discussion on this topic*

5.0 Discussion: What are the needed components of the strategy? (40 min)

- Reference made to previous work product the 2003 Federal RME plan – (pp. 246-247) specifically, Data Management RME plan that identified needed components, use this as a resource (Note: this excerpt was provided as prep material on the [PNAMP website](#))
- Data collection protocols
- Goal and objectives
 - Analytical framework to answer questions – information management, not just data management
- Commitment to collaborate
- Identify the common goal
- List of partners
 - Data source agencies
 - Engage all in process of development of strategy
- Define questions that we want answered and the information needs we need to answer the questions (Web links will be provided to BPA PNAMP and other question and information lists)
- Resources needed
- Binding commitments
- Common language
- Deadlines and deliverables
- Define deliverable of the strategy
- Data management components
 - Data sharing agreements
 - Additional details

- How to understand different responsibilities (manage complexity; not all overlap)?
- Keep product high level, simple to start
- How to manage fragmentation?
- What about Project Tracking information? (Needs to be added to list of essential questions.)

6.0 Discussion: Who can help with the components?

- Peter Paquet – NPCC proposal
- ISEMP – Lessons learned from ongoing pilot subbasin project
- NWHI
- Salmonid Field Protocol Handbook – chapter on data management
- NED products
- CBFWA – Status of the Resource Project
 - Abundance
 - Analytical framework next
- CRITFC
- US Army Corps of Engineers
- US Bureau of Reclamation
- US Forest Service – maybe
- Federal Caucus – interested in this advancing and would participate-give staff to commit to it, signed the PNAMP charter; maybe
- States involved separately from CBFWA – Oregon
- Signatories to NED and PNAMP
- NOAA NWFSC SDM group is interested but needs sign off
- How to communicate across ongoing efforts and get convergence?
- Habitat as focal issues, other Hs underway (Paquet)
- Need to identify questions.(Paquet)
- Familiar discussion – NED/PNAMP have these identified.
 - Need better visualization of core elements, commitments
 - Go from general vision of what is needed then move to details of what is going to do what.
 - Need plan to get specifics
 - Define information needed first the give detailed information (not ‘who’s collecting what’ first). Need to manage scale, not question. Different information is needed at different levels (regional, local, etc.) and there are different ways to manage/present the information.
 - Need Master List of questions – PNAMP did survey and got responses from 18 entities, but not everyone. Completion of this effort may define this list.
- What do those involved have to put on the table? How involved will they be?
 - What are the pieces of the deliverables? What information is needed? What are the questions? What tools do they have to work with? Who does what?
 - This will be more detailed than the NED/PNAMP MOUs.
- Datasets needed
 - Recovery Monitoring in Columbia River Basin
 - Fish and Wildlife Program
 - Beyond Columbia River Basin – State level efforts
- How to do it?
 - Use products of existing groups? NED, PNAMP, etc.
- Ongoing reviews of needs? Describe process.
- Tiered

- Shared questions first
 - Separate process and partners
 - Baseline information
- String of management questions from each question identified.
 - Name of data elements/objects – agree upon a common name

7.0 Discussion: Next steps/action items/time line

Discussion about how to develop a strategy:

- Workshop with large group of participants – could use NED/PNAMP workshop, can still adjust planning at this point.
- This group can meet again to clarify key components and outline of strategy – are there pieces that NED, PNAMP, collaboration groups, ISEMP, CSMEP can contribute? Figure out where gaps are and identify subgroups to fill. A group structure was not defined.
- Options: Assign it to NED and PNAMP now and have them take over.
 - Most of the people in the room would still be involved.
 - Neither NED or PNAMP have workgroups set up to deal with RME needs – NED or PNAMP can set up workgroups to provide for a for the strategy development; PNAMP and NED are superset of Columbia Salmonid data, but not specifically set up to do RME needs as separate task
- Let RME collaboration group develop an information management strategy depending on their needs, then others follow. (& FWP also first)
 - One issue – no data management people part of this group.
- Envision multiple products:
 - Ten page document for executive audience, overview of strategy
 - Tier eventually to identified detailed technical documents
- Need a narrowly defined list of questions and information needed from the RME group
 - Give to NED/PNAMP – ask them to devise a strategy to get there.
 - Is this complete? See RME management question document
- If we complete ‘solution’, where does it go for implementation?
 - Programmatic: could go to NED, REMAND – multiple executives
 - Data collecton
- Collaboration process is opportunity to connect with some groups that are not in PNAMP or NED.
 - Dates, timeline?
- Can this group influence BIOP RME products?
 - BIOP RME is nested within broader picture
- Resources available?
 - Vision that strategy will help us find resources to implement.
 - Without product, will have a difficult discussion with funders.

Decisions about Next steps and Action Items

- **Agreed to draft an outline if strategy:** (2-5 pages, goal for product); started with ‘pieces of strategy’ identified in these notes;
 - When: 2 weeks
 - Who: Jim Geiselman, Peter Paquet, Tom Iverson, Michael Newsom, Stewart Toshach, Jen Bayer, Paul Ocker
 - How: Group will meet after PNAMP meeting on January 23 at 3pm
 - Flag pieces from other groups that will go into draft – share by February 5, include management questions short list and expanded list.
 - Subgroup will identify needed subproducts?

- **Review outline via email**– input from members at this meeting; NED can review at Feb. 7 meeting.
 - Solicit support to work on pieces
- **Draft Strategy document: (5-10 pages); high level, easy to read document.** Will identify needed component pieces.
 - When: February 23, 2007
 - Who: Will be determined as outline and review progress.
 - How: not determined
 - Who will get it? Goes to collaboration, PNAMP, NED to get input back.
 - Once it is complete, whose product is it and where does it go? Federal Caucus, PNAMP, NED, or joint effort? Not resolved
 - ??REMAND will go away when BIOP process is done, will need additional infrastructure. Also, very focused on the basin.
- RIMS name/acronym – concern with “Regional”? A longer term goal is regional, but this strategy is focused on subset of regional data. It’s not focusing on regional information, but selected subsets of information in the region.
 - Is it focused on Columbia River? Yes, the initial focus is on the Columbia River, but want it to be broader later.
 - Is it focused on anadromous fish? Not only, but the remand and FCRPS Biop are heavily focused on it.