



SC14 Meeting Report
Annex 10: Data Working Group Questionnaire

How to Complete This Questionnaire	
Purpose	This questionnaire is part of the SPRFMO Data Working Group (DWG) data systems inventory. Its aim is to understand in detail what data each scientific working group uses, at what level of aggregation, and where the critical gaps lie.
Who should complete it	The Chairperson of the working group, ideally in consultation with WG members. If different members use different data types, please complete a row for each.
Sheet structure	Sheet 0 (Identification): complete first with your WG name and contact. Sheet 1 (Data Types Used): core section, complete for all data types your WG uses. Sheets 2–3 (Spatial, Temporal): complete for each data type flagged as used in Sheet 1. Sheet 4 (Templates & Database): indicate needs for standardised data-sharing templates and a shared database. Sheet 5 (Data Gaps): list your most critical gaps, ranked by priority. Sheet 6 (Additional Comments): free text for anything not captured above.
Green cells	All green cells are for your responses. Cells with pre-filled grey/italic text (data type names, CMM references) are for reference only — do not overwrite them.
Dropdowns	Where a dropdown is available, click the cell and select from the list. If none of the options fits, select 'Other' and add detail in the Notes column.
Spatial resolution terms	Individual fish/record = finest level (one row per fish or sample). Haul/set level = one record per fishing operation. Trip/vessel level = one record per vessel trip. Grid cell = spatial grid (please specify resolution, e.g. 1°x1°, in the Notes column). Statistical area = SPRFMO statistical areas. Stock area = the geographic extent of the assessed stock. SPRFMO convention area = the entire SPRFMO area.
Temporal resolution terms	Per haul/set = finest level, one record per fishing operation. Per trip = one record per vessel trip. Monthly / Quarterly / Annual = aggregated by calendar period.
Importance grades	Critical = the assessment cannot proceed without this data type. High = substantially affects results if absent or of poor quality. Medium = improves precision but the analysis can proceed without it. Low = minor or supplementary use. Not currently used = WG does not use this data type at present.
Deadline and return	Please return the completed file to the Secretariat Science Manager (jfuller@sprfmo.int) by 9 October 2026 . Save as: SPRFMO_DWG_DataQuestionnaire_[WG name]_[date].xlsx
Data form terms	Raw as reported per CMM = data used in the form CCMs submit them under CMM 02 / CMM 18 (e.g. logbook catches by haul, observer length records). Estimate (derived product) = data that have been processed, expanded or modelled before use (e.g. length composition by stratum, age composition from age-length keys, CPUE index, mean weight-at-age, swept-area biomass index). Both = the WG uses raw and derived versions of the same data type.
Examples of estimates	Length composition (proportions or numbers-at-length by stratum); age composition (numbers-at-age, derived from ALK or direct ageing); CPUE index (standardised by GLM / GAM); weight-at-age, maturity-at-age, selectivity ogives; biomass / abundance indices; discard rates; effort estimates raised from sampled trips.
Current vs required aggregation	Sheets 2 and 3 ask for both the spatial / temporal aggregation your WG CURRENTLY uses (what is actually in your input files) and the MINIMUM and PREFERRED resolution your analyses require. The gap between current and required is what the DWG most needs to capture.

SPRFMO Scientific Working Group: Data Requirements Questionnaire

This questionnaire is being compiled by the SPRFMO Data Working Group (DWG) to understand what data the scientific working groups use, at what level of aggregation, and where the critical gaps are. Your responses will inform the DWG workplan and the review of CMM 02. Please complete one sheet per section. Use green cells for free-text responses; use dropdowns where provided. Return the completed file to the DWG Chair by [DATE]. Save as: SPRFMO_DWG_DataQuestionnaire_[WG name]_[date].xlsx

Working Group name:	
Chairperson / contact person:	
Date of completion:	
Members who contributed to this response:	

Section 1: Data Types Used

For each data type listed, indicate whether your working group uses it, its importance to your analyses, and the model or analysis type it feeds into. Add rows at the bottom for any data types not listed. Green cells = your response. Dropdowns available where indicated.

Pre-filled data types are provided as a starting point. For each, complete columns C–H. Add additional data types in the blank rows at the bottom.

Data Type	CMM / Source	Used by this WG? (Yes / No / Partial)	Importance to analyses	Model / analysis type	Data form used (Raw as reported per CMM / Estimate / Both)	If estimate: type of estimate (e.g. length comp, age comp, CPUE index, weight-at-age)	Estimate produced by (CCM / Secretariat / WG / External)	Notes
Catch by species, area, gear	CMM 02-2025							
Fishing effort by vessel, area, gear	CMM 02-2025							
Length samples	CMM 02-2025							
Weight samples	CMM 02-2025							
Age samples (otoliths)	CMM 02-2025							
Maturity data	CMM 02-2025							
At-sea observer reports	CMM 18-2025							
Electronic monitoring data	CMM 18-2025							
Bycatch and discards	CMM 02-2025							
VME encounter reports	CMM 03a							
Survey indices (acoustic / trawl)	Non-CMM / voluntary							
CPUE standardisation data	Non-CMM / voluntary							
Tagging / mark-recapture data	Non-CMM / voluntary							
Genetic / otolith samples	Non-CMM / voluntary							
Oceanographic / environmental data	Non-CMM / external							

Section 2: Spatial Aggregation Requirements								
For each data type your WG uses, specify the spatial resolution required for your analyses. If a finer resolution than currently available would improve your analyses, please indicate this. Refer to the Instructions sheet for definitions of spatial resolution terms.								
List only the data types your WG actually uses (from Section 1). Spatial resolution terms: Individual fish/record > Haul/set > Trip/vessel > Grid cell > Statistical area > Stock area > Convention area.								
Data Type	Current spatial aggregation used by WG	Minimum spatial resolution required	Preferred spatial resolution	Is current resolution sufficient?	If not, what resolution is needed and why?	Spatial stratification needed? (e.g. by depth, habitat, fleet)	Impact on analyses if resolution is insufficient	Notes

Section 3: Temporal Aggregation Requirements								
Specify the temporal resolution your WG requires for each data type it uses. Indicate whether the current reporting frequency is adequate and flag historical data gaps.								
List only the data types your WG actually uses (from Section 1). Temporal resolution terms: Per haul/set > Per trip > Monthly > Quarterly > Annual.								
Data Type	Current temporal aggregation used by WG	Minimum temporal resolution required	Preferred temporal resolution	Is current frequency sufficient?	If not, what frequency is needed?	Time series length required (years)	Are historical data gaps a significant problem?	Notes

Section 4: Standardised Templates and Database Needs

This section captures your working group's need for standardised data-sharing templates for common data types, and for a shared SPRFMO database. Your responses will help the DWG prioritise template development and assess the case for a central database. Green cells = your response. Dropdowns available where indicated.

Part A asks about standardised templates for each common data type. Part B asks about the need for, and desired features of, a shared database. Complete the parts relevant to your WG.

Part A: Standardised templates for common data types

Data type	Standardised template needed?	Priority for a template	What the template should standardise (fields, units, codes, format)	Preferred file format (CSV / Excel / XML / other)	Notes
Catch by species, area, gear					
Fishing effort by vessel, area, gear					
Length composition / length samples					
Age composition / age samples					
Biological data (weight, maturity)					
Observer / at-sea sampling data					
Bycatch and discards					
CPUE / standardisation input data					
Survey indices (acoustic / trawl)					
Other (specify)					

Part B: Need for a shared SPRFMO Scientific database

Does your WG need a shared/central database for data storage and access?	
Priority of a shared database for your WG	
Which data types should the database hold? (list the most important)	
What access or query features would your WG need? (e.g. download by species/area/year, API, versioning)	
What problems would a database solve that current arrangements do not? (e.g. version control, reproducibility, access delays)	
Would a database reduce your reliance on ad-hoc data requests to the Secretariat or CCMS?	
Any concerns about a shared database? (e.g. confidentiality, data ownership, resourcing)	

Section 5: Known Data Gaps and Limitations							
List the most critical data gaps your WG faces. Rank by priority and describe the impact on your ability to provide scientific advice to the Commission.							
Be as specific as possible. Distinguish between gaps that are addressable through better data collection versus those that require analytical solutions or Commission-level decisions.							
Data gap / limitation (describe specifically)	Priority	Data type(s) affected	Impact on scientific advice (what advice cannot be given or is less reliable?)	Addressable through improved data collection?	If yes, what would be required?	Addressable through improved analytical methods?	Notes

Section 6: Additional Comments

Please use this sheet to provide any additional context, flag issues not captured in the sections above, or make suggestions for the DWG workplan and the CMM 02 review.

Are there data types not listed in Section 1 that your WG uses or needs?

Are there data submission formats or standards that would significantly improve your work?

Are there coordination issues with other WGs around shared data needs?

Are there data types collected under CMMs that your WG does not use and considers of low scientific value?

What single data improvement would have the greatest positive impact on your WG's scientific advice?

Any other comments for the Data Working Group: