

SOP 4: Protocol Revision (FQ_A Creation)

Version 1

Revision History Log:

Prev. Version #	Revision Date	Updated By	Changes Made	New Version #
-	Aug 2011	Chris Sergeant	Initial version	1

1.0 Summary

The freshwater water quality monitoring protocol (Deliverable FQ_A) may be revised as new knowledge, technology, and methods become available. Revisions will balance the advantages of new techniques with the possible disadvantage of disrupting data continuity. Changes may also be made to correct significant errors in the document or to refine and update the data reports. Every effort will be made to ensure that complete, certified protocol revisions are applied before the start of a new continuous monitoring period on May 1. Exceptions to this deadline include revisions that would remedy identified safety deficiencies, significant data quality issues, or continuity of operations.

All revisions will require a review for clarity and technical soundness. Small changes to the existing protocol documents—for example, formatting, simple clarifications of existing content, small changes in the task schedule or project budget, or general updates to information management handling—may be reviewed internally by project cooperators and SEAN staff. Changes to data collection, analysis techniques, or sampling design may trigger peer review depending upon the significance of the changes. Formal external peer reviews will be coordinated by the Alaska Region Inventory and Monitoring Coordinator.

The SEAN Program Manager will periodically poll the Project Leader and Data Manager on the need to initiate a protocol revision cycle. If initiated, the process will be cooperatively managed by the Project Leader, SEAN Program Manager, and SEAN Data Manager. During a revision cycle, proposed revisions may originate from any of those three individuals. One of these three people, typically the Project Leader, shall agree to be “Revision Coordinator” and take responsibility for drafting the document. Proposed contributions and internally tracked-changes will be resolved by the Revision Coordinator until consensus is reached on a final draft document. If an external peer review is required, the coordinator will resolve external comments in consultation with the other two internal participants.

A revised protocol must be given a new protocol identifier, using the form detailed in the SEAN data management plan (Johnson and Moynahan 2008). The new protocol will be disseminated and archived through standard SEAN practices and will be submitted to appropriate NPS repositories outside SEAN.

2.0 Detailed Chronological Steps

1. Program Manager (PM)

1. *Periodically poll Project Leader (PL) and Data Manager (DM) on the need for a protocol revision cycle*
2. *Schedule a revision cycle when called for by consensus*
3. *Obtain a new formal protocol ID number from DM*
 1. Method for assigning a protocol ID is formally set in SEAN's Data Management Plan SOP-602 Version Control (Johnson and Moynahan 2008)
 2. A new ID is required for each revision because most data collected are tagged with the specific protocol under which they were created
4. *Solicit agenda of issues to address*
5. *Initiate kick-off meeting*

2. Program Manager, Project Leader, and Data Manager Tasks

1. *Prepare issues lists*
2. *Agree on overall scope of revision*
 1. "Minor" will have internal review
 2. "Major" will have internal and peer review
3. *Agree on a "Review Coordinator" who is responsible for managing assembly of the revised document*
4. *Obtain the most recent Word version of the current protocol from the DM to serve as the basis for the new document*
 1. The original DOCX file is copied to an editable destination file
 2. The document is set for Track Changes
 1. *A global search and replace is done to change all existing references to the protocol ID to the new designator*
 2. *The DM provides a link allowing access to the DOCX file by the three team members through a browser*
 3. *The actual final product will be made available on the web as only a read-only PDF in order to minimize the change of multiple conflicting documents being built*
5. *Draft possible revisions*
 1. Each team member should take responsibility for sections within their realm of expertise
 2. If a particular section needs to be addressed by multiple disciplines, it should be edited in sequence
 3. Agree on editing sequence
 4. Assign first editor
 5. Obtain consensus on the first revision
 6. Assign second editor, and so forth

3. Review Coordinator Tasks

1. *Assemble revisions into a coherent document*
2. *Maintain a document change table in the SOP document to track internal versioning*
3. *Distribute to other internal staff for review*
4. *Update document to satisfy internal review*
5. *Format the document (if available, this may instead be done by an assigned copy editor)*
6. *If scope is major, coordinate an external review*
 1. Submit document to Alaska Region Inventory and Monitoring Coordinator for consideration
 2. Distribute external peer review comments to internal staff
 3. Revise protocol in light of review comments
 4. Coordinate revisions among internal staff
7. *Assemble document*
8. *Obtain final internal staff approval*
9. *Format document as a Natural Resource Report (NRR)*
 1. Coordinate technical and formatting review for NRR
 2. Obtain a “TIC” document number from NRSS
 3. Make final technical revisions
10. *Notify team of completion*

4. Program Manager Tasks

1. *Generate a PDF file from the original Word Document*
2. *Submit both the PDF and DOCX files via email attachment to the Data Manager for validation*
 1. Specify in the message body it is deliverable FQ_A, as defined in protocol FQ-2013.1

5. Data Manager Tasks

1. *On receipt of the submission, assign the next formal Submission Number to this file, as found in the master Submission_Log table*
 1. Use the “Update Submission Log” web tool at the data management site:
http://165.83.57.239/0_submission_update.aspx
 2. Complete Submission_Log details up through the Submission_Date column
2. *Save the attached file into the staging area for validation at:*
\\inpglbafs03\data\SEAN_Data\Staging\FQ\FQ_A\nnnn where “nnnn” is the assigned submission number
3. *Validate the two files according to current criteria*
4. *Record validation summary data in the Submission_Log using the web tool*
5. *If submission fails mandatory criteria, reply with a “failure email” that includes:*
 1. The submission number assigned
 2. The deliverable ID
 3. The protocol ID
 4. Documentation listing all the specific mandatory criteria failed

6. *If submission passes mandatory criteria, reply with a “success email” that includes:*

1. The submission number assigned
2. The deliverable ID
3. The protocol ID
4. Documentation listing any specific optional criteria failed
5. Request to certify deliverable as complete

6. Program Manager Tasks

1. *On receipt of a failure email:*

1. Make corrections so the deliverable meets mandatory criteria
2. Make another submission with corrected deliverable candidate

2. *On receipt of a success email, review any failed optional criteria:*

1. If there are acceptable to PM, PL, and DM:
 1. *Reply with a “certification email” stating the deliverable is certified and may be disseminated*
2. If these are unacceptable:
 1. *Reply with a “withdrawal email,” stating the deliverable is withdrawn*
 2. *Take remedial action to obtain a corrected deliverable*
 3. *Restart the process from the beginning*

7. Data Manager Tasks

1. *On receipt of a withdrawal email:*

1. Mark the withdrawal in the Submission_Log’s Status column using the web tool
2. Terminate the process

2. *On receipt of a certification email:*

1. Due to the nature of these data, NO sensitive information is in the deliverable
2. Copy the two submitted files to test environment at:
[\\inpglbafs03\data\SEAN_Data_Mgmt\Web_Sites\SEAN-Test\AuxRep\FQ\FQ_A\](#)
 1. *Name them <protocol_ID>PDF and <protocol_ID>DOCX*
3. Create web page link to the new PDF, but not the DOCX
4. Retire the old protocol so it becomes accessible from the Historical Protocol Link
5. Mark the certification in the Status column in Submission_Log using the web tool
6. Propagate from test to production environment
7. Update the annual deliverable tracking spreadsheet showing date of completion for FQ_A
 1. *Record in the tracking spreadsheet for the year reflected in the Protocol_ID, which may not be the current year*
 2. *An entirely new row will need to be added to the sheet, as this is not a scheduled deliverable already accounted for*

3. *Submit the final document to NPS IRMA Data Store*

4. *Update the Inventory and Monitoring protocol database to reference the new protocol*

5. *Revise web sites to accommodate any altered information structure set in the new protocol*
6. *Update the scope of the formal metadata so it includes the new date and versioning information*

3.0 Literature Cited

Johnson, W. F., and B. J. Moynahan. 2008, Data management plan: Southeast Alaska network. Natural Resource Report NPS/SEAN/NRR—2008/058. National Park Service, Fort Collins, Colorado.