

Feedback summary table - third review round

Agenda Item	Issues	Sub-issues	Comments	Partner	FIGIS comments				
1	4. Review of FIRMS web site	FIRMS website structure	general considerations on menu items	various proposals made by...	CCSBT NAFO IATTC	FIGIS has generally responded positively to suggestions. We have maintained for the General public the "Information resources" menu item including Meetings, Publications and Related links since we do think these are relevant to the general public. We also think that it is important to present "Contacts" up-front.			
2			menu button for LOGIN - members area			Need for an area visible to Partners only	we propose to have a "members area" top level menu item which will contain all information relevant to FIRMS partners only, and will be visible to FIRMS partners only after login:the "members area" menu item is visible to all but sub-levels remain invisible, and the login (user name and password) button is triggered when user clicks on this menu item. User registers and then has access to "members area" sub-levels menu items		
3			Members area / mock-ups			Misunderstandings on the concepts of mock-ups	IATTC	Mock-ups are static pages highlighting typical scenarios. Please click on red buttons to follow query/results scenarios. Red buttons will not remain in the live application, Red is just used in the mock-ups to facilitate your exploration of the scenarios.	
4						The Management Descriptors has the management unit as "No", but the fact sheet clearly has this as yes. There is clearly a problem here. Maybe these problems are just due to the mockup nature of the search results list. However, if you are using made-up data you should say so to prevent people like me from becoming concerned and to save us time from producing unnecessary comments	CCSBT	As far as possible, we try to construct our mock-up from real data , but we may be led to "create" data for the sake of some scenarii .	
5			powered by FIGIS			remove "powered by FIGIS". If "Powered by FIGIS" is maintained on the bottom of the home page, I don't thing we need "FIRMS system is part of the Fisheries Global Information System (FIGIS)" in the text for "The system".	IATTC CCSBT	the "powered by FIGIS technology" button is maintained in minimal fonts at the bottom of each FIRMS page. There are various reasons for it: first in a world of distributed information system, it's becoming part of our FI policy to provide Credit to the system powering a site/page ; second this reference to FIGIS should constitute a benchmark , the stamp of an information management concept ensuring highest possible quality, compliance to standards, and streamlining; from this clickable label, it is proposed to link to the FIGIS framework description web-site , instead of the FIGIS web-site which as such will disappear to become part of the broadened FI web-site.	
6			Information Resources, News, Meetings, Publications			The right column is quite redundant with the bullet in left button , e.g. Publications - same as Publications in "Information Resources". News and Events - same as Meetings in "Information Resources" plus News - probably standardization of word "events" or "meetings" is required. And if "News" is moved to be under "Information Resources" all information in the right column may not be necessary anymore.	SEAFDEC	The right columns in the home page are intended to present latest news and publications. It' s the "newsy" element of the web-site, hence headers that are rather " newsy" oriented. This menu element is only accessible from the home page. What you find under the Information resources menu item is 1) accessible from any page, and 2) is directly naming a CAT a "cat". This however could be easily modified after live discussion during the technical workshop	
7			4.1 Organizations summary sheets			About us	We have two problems with the link to "Fact Sheets" for each partner (1) The words "Fact Sheets" are already used in the context of the FIRMS information on stocks and this alternative use of the same term on the same site can be very confusing. (2) At the last Steering Committee FIRMS Partners agreed that links would be only provided to the original websites of the partner organizations and not to the FAO summary descriptions. Instead, it was proposed that the short descriptions on the page itself be just a little bit more comprehensive.	NAFO	FIRMS FSC2 report says that the proposed links to summary descriptions of institutions should be maintained only if there are mechanisms assuring that information contained in these fact sheetes reflect the up-to-date RFB situation. FAO/FIPL, the current data owner of these summary descriptions believes in the value of RFBs summary descriptions for users willing to grasp an overview of worldwide Regional Fishery Bodies. FIPL wants the RFB web-site within the FI web-site, as visible as possible, and as updated as possible. This site should provide summary descriptions for all RFBs, together with direct links to the existing RFB web-sites. Understanding that the FIPL RFB portal exists within the FAO web-site, what are the possible alternatives in the framework of the FIRMS development?
8									1. No link is drawn to these summary descriptions, and FIPL's RFB portal lives its own life
9							issue discussed during the FSC meeting was primarily one of validation and, secondarily, of avoiding duplication of work	ICCAT	2.1 Maintain the link: and restrict as far as possible these summary descriptions to very static type of information , such as Legal foundations, Main functions, Objectives, Area of competence (+map), Institutional structure, language used.

10			This has been a point we have consistently raised with FAO as something we desired to control . By validation of the website, we will see that the FAO "summary" on the site is in fact not a summary but our language	IATTC	2.2 ensure validation of the content by RFBs themselves before publication , and have FIPL agreeing with them on mechanisms for updating content. A mechanism may ultimately be that of assigning direct responsibility for updating the information by the RFB itself, through on-line editing tools made available by FIGIS
11			I think it is a bit confusing to see the fish-logo that gives you FI's structure next to the individual partners name.	ICES	Fish logo linked to Regional Fishery Bodies General site.
12		Access to FIRMS data base			
13	4.2 Components and layout of a fact sheet:	Fact sheet structure			
14	4.2.1 citation, ownership;				
15	4.2.2 identity, including map for geo-location;	Map, and georeferencing standards	we continue to request and would like to see a Pacific-centered map for Pacific resources . We are concerned that this point remains unaddressed and a potential for delay in implementation.	IATTC	this requirement is taken into account, as reflected in the CCSBT "Southern Bluefin Tuna" example fact sheet
16			My attention was drawn to proposed area definitions for the pacific and the maps of them on the FAO site . in comparing them to the historical, i do not see that they are much improved, or i miss the reason for them in the first place, i guess. Must be for government reporting purposes, only. Or to satisfy some other particular immediate policy need, e.g. WCPO reporting of particular/immediate interest. Stock considerations must have very little to do with it at all, particularly as we are finding out that they disregard all that the new map (not to mention the old) has to offer. The reality is that we really need a huge disclaimer on these maps that says that they bear no relationship to anything - not association with participation in regional fisheries bodies (they cross the boundaries), not stock structure of economically important stocks (individuals we include in them can't read), nothing except regional economic alliances (ephemeral as they are, maybe) and convenience of reporting (is this it? but we have to regenerate the stats - the supposed major impedance to change in these in the first place!).	IATTC	As part of FIRMS development, we are currently working on the dynamic mapping tool used for the [as accurate as possible] georeferencing of marine resources and fisheries, and we distinguish the following classes of areas : 1) Statistical areas (typically FAO fishing statistical areas, or the areal grid systems for Tuna spatial catches); 2) Jurisdiction areas (including national EEZs and RFB competence areas); 3) Management areas (SMU) areas, a typical example of which is ICCAT SMUs; 4) Environment areas (eg Large Marine Ecosystems). We understand from your last point that we may want to add a " Reporting areas " category under which would include the Pacific wide Tuna areas for reporting Tuna and tuna like statistics and to georeference Tuna and tuna like stocks.
17			In addition, for Pacific Tunas, as a result of the discussions we had in 2004 with you and Tim Lawson: 5. the use of the name "Pacific Ocean" and not "Pacific" 6. EPO and WCPO, as well as NPO and SPO represent reference areas	IATTC	The proposal we can make from these inputs is for the creation of 6 Georeferencing systems for Pacific Tuna and tuna like fisheries, understanding that each Geosystem corresponds to a single GIS layer . 1) IATTC convention area; 2) WCPFC convention area; 3) SPC convention area; 4) Pacific Tuna East-West reporting areas (composed of WCPO and EPO); 5) Pacific Tuna North-South reporting areas (composed of NPO and SPO); 6) Pacific Tuna Major reporting areas (composed of NEPO, SEPO, SWPO and NWPO)
18	4.2.3 body content:	Fact sheet formatting	Graphics - tables some of the graphics were very difficult to read	FAO Asia&Pacific reg. off.	Concerning graphics, the size of images is limited on purpose to fasten the display, which may affect the quality, but a link to a full size view is available by clicking on the magnifying glass icon .
19		Table formatting	The table entitled "ATLANTIC AND MEDITERRANEAN ALBACORE SUMMARY" has several formatting errors (cell spaces, footnote placements, alignment). You should be able to see the correct layout in the original Word document.	ICCAT	The table has been pasted as an image file so that it is identical to the source file. With the on-line editor, it is possible to copy the table from word and paste it into the "rich text box editor", thus preserving the original formatting .
20	Maintenance	External Links	General issue of broken links		In order to avoid broken links on FIRMS web site, we recommend to use "robust" links (e.g. gateway pages, dynamic URLs)

21	4.2.3 standard and local topics	standard and local topics,	<p>There were some cases where the titles of FIGIS superseded the titles we normally use. Is there any way to address this? (ie FIGIS Geographical Distribution = NAFO Background. FIGIS Exploitation = NAFO Fishery and Catches FIGIS Assessment Indicator, FIGIS Projection = NAFO Medium and Long Term Considerations, FIGIS Management Advice = NAFO Recommendation, FIGIS Biological State and Trend = NAFO State of Stock. Also we have an extra paragraph called Special Comments)</p>	NAFO	<p>FIRMS proposes one harmonized topic structure which means that a choice has to be made for each topic on the harmonized labelling. For a given element of the topic tree, once all partners agree on labelling it the same way, then it becomes de facto a standard (in the mock-up, all labels presented over blue background, or in blue, are proposed to be the harmonized labels). Where a partner wants to maintain his own labelling, then he can opt for it as a "local" non harmonised (or standard) title presented differently (in the mock-up, all local titles are presented in black font). This is true at any level of the topic tree.</p> <p>Indeed being successful in presenting harmonised status reports is one of the justification for FIRMS (as argued in row 5) but will be a process. It is naturally expected that agreement on standard labels is reached first on high level topics, then progressively reaches lower levels.</p>
22			<p>The assessment part very technical (reference to VPAs etc). These fact sheets may work for temperate stocks. How are we going to report on multi-species tropical fisheries (Over 50% of the world's production)?</p>	FAO Asia&Pacific reg. off.	<p>The fisheries domain (which development follows - see progress with Fisheries results list) is mainly destined to host multi-species fisheries</p>
23		References	<p>It would be good if there could be some informal arrangement between those organizations to allow reports to be provided. Eventually, the Pacific owners for most highly migratory stocks will be the IATTC and WCPFC. I did not intend to suggest that ISC should be included as an owner, but I wanted to be clear that of the IATTC information uses ISC references. I think that can be handled with appropriate links.</p>	IATTC	<p>We do differentiate two concepts: Bibliography, and Source. I guess where IATTC uses ISC references, this should be treated under bibliography. Source should really be used when the fact sheet directly evolves from a IATTC report. IATTC should specify whether each should be treated as part of source or bibliography</p>
24	4.2.4 Metadata semantic,	Metadata semantic,	<p>Stock structure</p> <p>In "main descriptors" and "resource structure", the following appears: "Considered as a stock: No". I think that it would be much more precise to have the following: "Considered as a <u>single stock</u>: No"</p>	ICCAT	<p>The label "Considered as stock" is a label common to all Marine resource fact sheets that the application shows every time this kind of data is inserted (see xml: <fi:AqResStruct BiologicalStock="true" />). This kind of discussion should be addressed by FIRMS WG/FSC before any change. If a new label (in this case "Considered as a single stock") is accepted it will be immediately updated. Generally speaking, there is also a need to be concise concerning labels and titles. The width of the page, its architecture and design, the huge quantity of text and data force us to be as much as predictable and visually explicit as possible, trying the best to avoid redundancies or refinements that adds few in matter of real content but that reduces so much in matter of usability.</p>
25			<p>We disagree with the change that you have implemented from "Stock or Resource" to "Stock Structure". If I were to enter something about stock structure, for BFT for example, it would read (I don't think that this is what you want): " [Present fisheries for Atlantic bluefin tuna are distributed from the Gulf of Mexico to Newfoundland in the West Atlantic, from roughly the Canary Islands to south of Iceland in the East Atlantic, and throughout the Mediterranean Sea. Historically, catches of bluefin were made from a broad geographic range in the Atlantic and Mediterranean]"</p>	ICCAT	<p>The Metadata semantic is a matter for discussion at the December FIRMS technical working group. Whatever name we give to this element, we distinguish (in the fact sheet) within that element the attribute Boolean type ("stock yes/not" coming from the excel file), and the text describing the structure (which could be added later on in the Fact Sheet). This text would contain the type of description you provided above</p>
26			<p>All IOTC Tuna stock have an "Uncertain" Stock structure</p>	IOTC	<p>In the current design, the "Stock structure" attribute is Boolean (Yes/No); FIRMS Technical working group should advise whether this attribute should instead be referring to various values including "Yes", "No", "Uncertain"</p>

27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

4.2.5 Reference [controlled] terms,

Assessment Method	The subtitle " Indirect Assessment Methods " should be removed in the ICCAT case study	ICCAT	This can be discussed at FIRMS WG/FSC level and eventually applied; for example a rule could be if only one class of methods is available ("direct", or "indirect") there is no needs to display this header . Another option to avoid these "automatic standard headers" would be to treat all the content of the assessment method topic as simple text (i.e. the topic currently displayed with the "Indirect Assessment Method" header), in which case only the "Overall Assessment Results" header within the "Assessment" paragraph will be displayed (e.g.: see CCSBT case study). In this case, the source document paragraph structure will be presented with the headers shown with black fonts (as is currently the case for the header "Mediterranean" just above the overall assessment results header). As you can understand, blue headers means adoption of FIRMS standard topic architecture, while black headers mean partners local standards . Each partner should decide adopting either solution at each level of the topic architecture based on its own information dissemination policy, consideration on work load, and political willingness to drive towards more harmonization of reports within FIRMS.
Management Unit, Spatial scale	A minor comment regarding two of the Main Descriptors (Management unit and Spatial scale) is that these do not seem particularly intuitive. For example, what would a person not involved with the FIRMS process understand by the statements "Management unit: yes" and "Spatial scale: regional"?	CCSBT	The way " Management unit " and " Spatial scale " are presented to users can be fine tuned during the technical workshop
Spatial scale	My question has to do with the levels of Spatial Scale that you have developed in a file containing "reference terms". I have considered that "Global" means all oceans, "Regional" means the Atlantic Ocean, and "Sub-regional" means part of the Atlantic.	ICCAT	Your understanding is the right one
Stock State and trends terms	The site is looking good. What is the difference between exhausted and depleted , if any?	ICCAT	Definitions will be provided
	The ICCAT contribution conforms to the pre-defined exploitation status terms . However (and this is of course a subject to bring up for all partners), these pre-defined terms are not completely satisfactory because they do not allow for a complete description of stock status . Most of the pre-defined terms (with some exceptions) refer implicitly to the biomass or abundance of the stock. What is missing is something about the intensity of fishing . For example, you could have a stock that is in an overfished state ($B[t] < B_{msy}$) but that is not BEING overfished ($F[t] < F_{msy}$).	ICCAT	We have added FAO definitions to the original list of terms . For the rest, this is a matter for discussion at the December FIRMS technical working group
	NAFO does not use status descriptions based on the FAO terms . If these are absolutely required, Scientific Council will have to advise. Therefore NAFO has used the column Status trends description to fill in terms such as "low level", or "positive trend"	NAFO	Your understanding is correct. The Status trends description is made for anything else than the list of controlled terms
	IOTC State values includes values such as " uncertain, probably moderately exploited "	IOTC	Three options are envisaged: i) for these compounds state terms, two values could be entered , eg "Uncertain" and "moderately exploited", together with in the accompanying comment the full statement "Uncertain, probably moderately exploited"; ii) adding additional controlled terms to the list , eg "Uncertain, probably moderately exploited"; iv) the previous, while building filtered lists for each partner ; iii) restricting the list of standard terms and preventing the use of standard terms in the cases highlighted here .
	The regional review on the state of world fishery resources includes for highly aggregated resources terms like " Moderately to Fully exploited "	FAO	
Stock status summaries - Reporting to UNGA in FIRMS	Access from the home page change in Stock Status Summaries and eventually add "Exploitation summaries" for non assessment information		other summaries such as "Exploitation summaries" may effectively be added later

36	Query page			This scenario of “Stock status summary” leads to Pre-cooked report dealing with a sensitive matter whereby integrity of Status and trends statements must be maintained, and that due to lack of homogeneity between institutions it may be misleading to mix-up within a user defined list state and trends statements across different institutions. Therefore the scenario proposes only a possibility to display lists of statements by institution
37	Query page Organizations reporting to UNGA in FIRMS	However, the drop down menu includes more than the current FIRMS partners. I think the only exception to the current partners should be (if they wish) the other organizations that have participated in the Partnership meetings (CCAMLR, IWC and SPC)	IATTC	We do share this understanding
38	Query page Shared partners	I am happy with the way the owner and resource name is presented in the mock up.	IATTC	
39		I suppose you will find the instances of shared partners under both organizations in the drop down menu.	IATTC	Until now, we thought that it would be simpler for final users to access information through partner organizations, and not strictly speaking through ownership (within one ownership, one may find more than one organization). In other words we would have in the pop-up list acronyms of single organizations, but no concatenation of acronyms. If user selects IATTC, he will get a list of stocks status report owned by IATTC be it the single or co-owner of these stocks. But the stock status report makes it clear that there are eg IATTC and WCPFC co-owning the status statement.
40	Status – trends presentation	I understand the status and trend section of the mock up will be taken from the spreadsheet column Status Trends description	IATTC	You understand correctly
41		Perhaps a more web-like feel and appearance would be achieved with a drill-down approach that emphasizes lists with single level topics on screen at one time, versus multi-level topics/subject displays mixed. An example of the mixed is given in the layout of the ICES mock-up of State of Exploitation Summary, which could be laid out in the suggested approach in what we think a more visually oriented manner suitable for the web as compared to text media.	IATTC	With regard comments made with reference to the “ICES mock-up of State of Exploitation summary”, we must again stress the fact that i) integrity of Status and trends statements must be maintained (you can notice that we propose to cut the text after a certain number of characters which we can reduce or increase, and associate it with an expand button), and ii) that this list is meant to be a final (printable) product (with no collapse of text for the print format) and not at all a search list.
42		I doubt there would be general agreement to providing a link to the spreadsheet column for exploitation status using the limited set of terms. I think there has been a lot of discussion about only reporting the Partners comments most of which do not use the terms for state of exploitation.	IATTC	As you can see from this mock-up, the report as per this proposal would only be generated partner by partner. This would allow to stick to each partners' information management policy. In this case, this list would include or not the standard term for state of exploitation depending on this partner's information policy. We could also generate a comprehensive report "all partners included", in which case only partners comments would be shown.
43	Traceability	There should be a link to the bibliographic references	IATTC	Good point for the status report, understanding that this is already part of the fact sheets standards. There may be some complications given the differentiated concepts of sources and bibliography.
44	4.3 Marine resource tree browser	In relation to the “Browse Resources Inventory”, I discovered that browsing via the tree does not enable the “Southern Bluefin tuna – Global” resource to be detected. The only thing that can be detected by the tree is “Southern Bluefin tuna – Indian Ocean” which is presumably supplied by IOTC. If I was a casual user of the FIRMS web site, I would expect Southern Bluefin tuna to appear within the Marine Resources of each of the 3 main oceans rather than ONLY outside these oceans in Tuna and tuna-like species – Global. Similarly, I think a casual user would expect to see other tuna species (in addition to southern bluefin) in Tuna and tuna-like species – Global.	CCSBT	Your proposal is fine, and we have implemented the positioning of Southern Bluefin Tuna - Global within various branches of the hierarchy. The cohabitation, within the Indian Ocean branch, of the “Southern Bluefin tuna – Global”, and of “Southern Bluefin tuna – Indian Ocean” may however look weird. We are also working to have other tuna species in Tuna and tuna-like species global
45	4.3.1 search page / search results page (layout, ranking)			

46 4.3.2 Dynamic embedding of statistics

47 5. Publishing workflow:

Workflow for FIRMS editing Various formats for contribution

The summary sheets are presently in a word document but I believe it had been discussed to convert them to an access file. Is there a specific format you would prefer?

NAFO

We have been working to offer the possibility to FIRMS partner to provide their reports with one of the following solutions: 1) **for simple text fields, inputs into Excel then conversion to XML**; this is the fast track solution followed for the status of stocks contributions required as part of the report to UNGA on progress on straddling and highly migratory fish Stocks. 2) **for inputs based on word documents**: 2.a) **direct editing in XML Spy** or 2.b) **conversion from word to XML (using Upcast)**: a functional prototype has been developed for ICES which will be presented during the December working group; this prototype is potentially applicable to other partners provided standard templates and fixed conventions can be applied in the word source documents. 3) **On-line editing: this fulfills a range of needs, from editing simple text fields, to editing of more complex structures**. At this moment you can choose between option 1 and 2a, 2.b and 3 should be demonstrated during the December FIRMS working group.