

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:**

Obsolete - AFSC/RACE/GAP/Orr: NPRB_1016 An annotated checklist of the marine macroinvertebrates of Alaska and a retrospective analysis of the groundfish trawl database.

1.2. Summary description of the data:

A comprehensive species list of marine invertebrates of Alaska has been lacking. The checklist of Austin (1985) treated the marine invertebrates of the southern coast of Alaska to California and since then many new species have been described, many range extensions have been discovered, and considerable changes in higher-level systematics have been made. The checklist we compiled lists over 3,500 species and includes the currently accepted scientific name and its significant synonyms, common names, type localities, geographic and depth distributions, a general statement of abundance in Alaska when known (e.g., rare, uncommon, common, abundant), and general remarks. This checklist will serve as a foundation for future species-specific research. Updated species lists are necessary to reflect the current state of biodiversity knowledge and are thus essential for conservation planning and management. To monitor and predict future changes to marine life, the distribution and abundance of marine species need to be better understood, and this can only be achieved with reliable identifications based on a sound taxonomy. The current status and future directions of Alaskan marine invertebrate biodiversity are briefly discussed.

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:

1980 to 2011

1.5. Actual or planned geographic coverage of the data:

W: 161.91167, E: -117.4167, N: 72.07583, S: 32.36567
All of Alaska

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:

Metadata Coordinators MC

2.2. Title:

Metadata Contact

2.3. Affiliation or facility:

2.4. E-mail address:

afsc.metadata@noaa.gov

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:

James Orr

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"):

Unknown

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:

- 2011-01-01 00:00:00 - An identification confidence index was established for each taxon for each survey and survey year separately for both fishes and invertebrates following Stevenson and Hoff (2009) for the Bering Sea continental shelf. Tables refer only to data collected during the annual surveys of the Bering Sea upper continental slope or GOA or AI continental shelf and upper slope conducted by the AFSC from 1980 through 2011 during May-August. The index is unavoidably subjective but was influenced by several factors, including relevant taxonomic literature, available field identification tools, interannual reporting trends, and examination of collected specimens. The identification confidence index codes used in this table are defined as follows: 1 ¿ High confidence and consistency. Taxonomy is stable and reliable at this level, and field identification characteristics are well known and reliable, or survey records have been verified from vouchers returned to the laboratory or from photos of specimens in the field. 2 ¿ Moderate confidence. Taxonomy may be questionable at this level, or field identification characteristics may be variable and difficult to assess consistently. 3 ¿ Low confidence. Taxonomy is incompletely known, or reliable field identification characteristics are unknown, or the occurrence of this taxon in the region is doubtful and survey records have not been verified. Included at this level are problematic species pairs, for which the identification to the pair may not be problematic, but identifying the species is.

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):
unknown

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)
- 7.2. Name of organization of facility providing data access

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/25689>

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:

Data will be available as manuscripts

7.2. Name of organization of facility providing data access:**7.2.1. If data hosting service is needed, please indicate:**

no

7.2.2. URL of data access service, if known:

<https://www.ncei.noaa.gov>

7.3. Data access methods or services offered:

unknown

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:

no delay

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)

OTHER

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):**

Alaska Fisheries Science Center - 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.