Please provide the following information, and submit to the NOAA DM Plan Repository.

Reference to Master DM Plan (if applicable)

As stated in Section IV, Requirement 1.3, DM Plans may be hierarchical. If this DM Plan inherits provisions from a higher-level DM Plan already submitted to the Repository, then this more-specific Plan only needs to provide information that differs from what was provided in the Master DM Plan.

URL of higher-level DM Plan (if any) as submitted to DM Plan Repository:

1. General Description of Data to be Managed

1.1. Name of the Data, data collection Project, or data-producing Program:
AFSC/NMML: Shore-based counts of the Eastern North Pacific gray whale stock from central California, 1967 - 2007

1.2. Summary description of the data:
The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) has conducted shore-based counts of the Eastern North Pacific stock of gray whales (Eschrichtius robustus) 26 years from 1967 to 2008 at Granite Canyon (or nearby at Yankee Point), 13 km south of Carmel, in central California. Convenient access to the Granite Canyon research station (owned by NOAA but operated by the State of California Department of Fish and Game) and the narrowness of the whales' migratory corridor in this area permitted an efficient counting process at this site. All counts were conducted during the 2-month southbound migration (mid-December to late February) rather than the protracted 3-month northbound migration. The routine nature of these counts and the consistency in research protocol lend themselves to inter-annual trend analyses. Research protocol has been based on single observers independently searching for whales and recording data on environmental conditions and the time, location, count, and direction of travel for each sighting. The counting system and observer performance has been tested through paired, independent observational effort; aerial surveys; thermal imagery; radio-tagging of whales; systematic observations through high-powered (25x) binoculars; and teams of observers tracking specific whale pods through the viewing area.

1.3. Is this a one-time data collection, or an ongoing series of measurements?
One-time data collection

1.4. Actual or planned temporal coverage of the data:
1967 to 2007

1.5. Actual or planned geographic coverage of the data:
W: -121.94, E: -121.91, N: 36.5, S: 36.4
Granite Canyon and Yankee Point, California

1.6. Type(s) of data:
(e.g., digital numeric data, imagery, photographs, video, audio, database, tabular data, etc.)

Table (digital)

1.7. Data collection method(s):
(e.g., satellite, airplane, unmanned aerial system, radar, weather station, moored buoy, research vessel, autonomous underwater vehicle, animal tagging, manual surveys, enforcement activities, numerical model, etc.)

1.8. If data are from a NOAA Observing System of Record, indicate name of system:

1.8.1. If data are from another observing system, please specify:

2. Point of Contact for this Data Management Plan (author or maintainer)

2.1. Name:

2.2. Title:
Metadata Contact

2.3. Affiliation or facility:

2.4. E-mail address:

2.5. Phone number:

3. Responsible Party for Data Management
Program Managers, or their designee, shall be responsible for assuring the proper management of the data produced by their Program. Please indicate the responsible party below.

3.1. Name:
Rod Hobbs

3.2. Title:
Data Steward

4. Resources
Programs must identify resources within their own budget for managing the data they produce.

4.1. Have resources for management of these data been identified?
No

4.2. Approximate percentage of the budget for these data devoted to data management (specify percentage or "unknown"):
0

5. Data Lineage and Quality
NOAA has issued Information Quality Guidelines for ensuring and maximizing the quality, objectivity, utility, and integrity of information which it disseminates.

5.1. Processing workflow of the data from collection or acquisition to making it publicly accessible
(describe or provide URL of description):
Process Steps:
- For years since 1987, observers checked their hand-written data sheets the day of collection, filling in redundant information (such as the header on the data form) and corrected obvious errors (such as misspellings in comments). Each observer then entered their data into a computer database (ERAbund). The database entry program had built-in boundaries for each data field (e.g., a logical date, a list of possible observer initials, and a range of possible entries for visibility, Beaufort state, etc.) to eliminate common data-entry errors.
- Preferably within a day or two of the original data entry, NMML observers worked in pairs to compare all of the handwritten data sheets to printouts of the corresponding records in the database. This provided a check of the accuracy of data transfer from handwritten logs to the database, and gave two more people a chance to review the data, watching for possible illogical errors (e.g., only gray whale sightings have data in columns for location and pod size; keeping environmental condition records in chronological order; starting and ending watches with the appropriate codes).

5.1.1. If data at different stages of the workflow, or products derived from these data, are subject to a separate data management plan, provide reference to other plan:

5.2. Quality control procedures employed (describe or provide URL of description):
See descriptions of methods at http://www.afsc.noaa.gov/nmml/software/eranalysis.php

6. Data Documentation
The EDMC Data Documentation Procedural Directive requires that NOAA data be well documented, specifies the use of ISO 19115 and related standards for documentation of new data, and provides links to resources and tools for metadata creation and validation.

6.1. Does metadata comply with EDMC Data Documentation directive?
No

6.1.1. If metadata are non-existent or non-compliant, please explain:
Missing/invalid information:
- 1.7. Data collection method(s)
- 2.1. Point of Contact Name
- 2.4. Point of Contact Email

6.2. Name of organization or facility providing metadata hosting:
NMFS Office of Science and Technology

6.2.1. If service is needed for metadata hosting, please indicate:

6.3. URL of metadata folder or data catalog, if known:
https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/inport/item/25525

6.4. Process for producing and maintaining metadata
(describe or provide URL of description):
Metadata produced and maintained in accordance with the NOAA Data Documentation
Procedural Directive:
https://nosc.noaa.gov/EDMC/DAARWG/docs/EDMC_PD-Data_Documentation_v1.pdf

7. Data Access

NAO 212-15 states that access to environmental data may only be restricted when distribution is explicitly limited by law, regulation, policy (such as those applicable to personally identifiable information or protected critical infrastructure information or proprietary trade information) or by security requirements. The EDMC Data Access Procedural Directive contains specific guidance, recommends the use of open-standard, interoperable, non-proprietary web services, provides information about resources and tools to enable data access, and includes a Waiver to be submitted to justify any approach other than full, unrestricted public access.

7.1. Do these data comply with the Data Access directive?
No

7.1.1. If the data are not to be made available to the public at all, or with limitations, has a Waiver (Appendix A of Data Access directive) been filed?
No

7.1.2. If there are limitations to public data access, describe how data are protected from unauthorized access or disclosure:
There are no legal restrictions on access to the data. They reside in public domain and can be freely distributed.

7.2. Name of organization of facility providing data access:
NOAA National Centers for Environmental Information (NCEI)

7.2.1. If data hosting service is needed, please indicate:

7.2.2. URL of data access service, if known:
https://www.afsc.noaa.gov/nmml/software/eranalysis.php

7.3. Data access methods or services offered:
At this time data can be downloaded from the Alaska Fisheries Science Center website:
http://www.afsc.noaa.gov/nmml/software/eranalysis.php

7.4. Approximate delay between data collection and dissemination:

Unknown

7.4.1. If delay is longer than latency of automated processing, indicate under what authority data access is delayed:

8. Data Preservation and Protection

The NOAA Procedure for Scientific Records Appraisal and Archive Approval describes how to identify, appraise and decide what scientific records are to be preserved in a NOAA archive.

8.1. Actual or planned long-term data archive location:
(Specify NCEI-MD, NCEI-CO, NCEI-NC, NCEI-MS, World Data Center (WDC) facility, Other, To Be Determined, Unable to Archive, or No Archiving Intended)
NCEI_MD

8.1.1. If World Data Center or Other, specify:

8.1.2. If To Be Determined, Unable to Archive or No Archiving Intended, explain:

8.2. Data storage facility prior to being sent to an archive facility (if any):
National Marine Mammal Laboratory - Seattle, WA

8.3. Approximate delay between data collection and submission to an archive facility:
Unknown

8.4. How will the data be protected from accidental or malicious modification or deletion prior to receipt by the archive?
Discuss data back-up, disaster recovery/contingency planning, and off-site data storage relevant to the data collection
IT Security and Contingency Plan for the system establishes procedures and applies to the functions, operations, and resources necessary to recover and restore data as hosted in the Western Regional Support Center in Seattle, Washington, following a disruption.

9. Additional Line Office or Staff Office Questions

Line and Staff Offices may extend this template by inserting additional questions in this section.