



FIRMS Steering Committee Meeting
Twelfth Session
Online, 18-21 October 2021
FIRMS RELEVANT ACTIVITIES CARRIED OUT BY IRD DURING THE INTERSESSIONAL PERIOD (May 2019 – September 2021)
Author: Julien Barde

I. Summary of Activities

IRD contributes with its scripts legacy (R, SQL) and runs the yearly update for all Tuna Atlas products (current FIRMS product / old IRD Level 0 as well as IRD Levels 1 and 2):

- Summary for the workflow and data outputs:
 - **Workflow, technical part**
 - + : workflow is more reproducible & robust (but still requires some work though)
 - + : better practices for data management with following priorities: DOI assignment, metadata, data formats, access protocols,
 - - : no DOI (pre-requisite) and lack of documentation (just open source code and metadata)
 - **Data:**
 - + : FIRMS generates global catch at Level 0, only IRD generates Level 1 and 2 for catch
 - - : Level 0 is a very first elaborated product and is a good step forward but is still useless for scientists
 - + : Levels 1 and 2 required by scientists (“ready to go” products with harmonized *uom* and spatial data raised to total catch)
 - - : strong need for other data types (efforts, size class, conversion factors..)
- Summary for the partners coordination under FIRMS umbrella:
 - + : data calls work for catch data
 - + : review and validation of **metadata**. Only IOTC reported its **data** review by sharing a dynamic document (R codes from E. Chassot)
 - - : lower collaboration for **workflow execution** over the years, IRD expects

common periods of work (as long as it takes, eg first update during spring 2020)

- - : slow process with a definition of roles and goals which seems ambiguous. Different tasks should be kept separated (data calls, workflow execution, scripts and data review, CWP data structure...) to ensure the yearly update
 - - : mixing workflow execution and data structure definition (CWP standards), generating conflicts of schedules
- - : need to agree on a schedule to plan yearly updates: deadlines needed for data providers, for workflow managers, for data review...

II. Contribution to strategic directions for the FIRMS Partnership

(Please elaborate on perceived benefits to your organization and any suggested areas of improvements)

IRD contributes with its scripts legacy (R, SQL) and runs the yearly update for all Tuna Atlas products (current FIRMS product / old IRD Level 0 as well as IRD Levels 1 and 2):

- Summary for the workflow and data outputs:
 - **Workflow, technical part**
 - + : workflow is more reproducible & robust (but still requires some work though)
 - + : better practices for data management with following priorities: DOI assignment, metadata, data formats, access protocols,
 - - : no DOI (prerequisite) and lack of documentation (just open source code and metadata)
 - **Data:**
 - + : FIRMS generates global catch at Level 0, only IRD generates Level 1 and 2 for catch
 - - : Level 0 is a very first elaborated product and is a good step forward but is still useless for scientists
 - + : Levels 1 and 2 required by scientists (“ready to go” products with harmonized *uom* and spatial data raised to total catch)
 - - : strong need for other data types (efforts, size class, conversion factors..)
- Summary for the partners coordination under FIRMS umbrella:
 - + : data calls work for catch data
 - + : review and validation of **metadata**. Only IOTC reported its **data** review by sharing a dynamic document (R codes from E. Chassot)
 - - : lower collaboration for **workflow execution** over the years, IRD expects common periods of work (as long as it takes, eg first update during spring 2020)
 - - : slow process with a definition of roles and goals which still seems ambiguous for IRD. Different tasks should be kept separated (data calls, workflow execution, scripts and data review, CWP data structure...) to ensure the yearly update

-
- - : mixing workflow execution and data structure definition (CWP standards), generating conflicts of schedules
 - - : need to agree on a schedule to plan yearly updates: deadlines needed for data providers, for workflow managers, for data review...

III. Revised annex 2 (if applicable)