Comments for the stock upload template, considering the [SDG2GRSF metadata mapping](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1jFpUJq4x9Xz1W9ior9r_iLUXfIaBYsqAWaM2B6J_vwA/edit?usp=sharing) :

* it would be easier to set up a spreadsheet to upload if the import template column names did not include spaces. An underscore "\_" or no space at all would be fine
* there are no fact sheets already prepared for new stocks, but this is a mandatory field. I put NA. AG: I think can be left empty and that woudl be the source not strictly only a fact sheet
* in the sdg-2-grsf mapping of fields, the owner of SDG questionnaires is the country. Do you prefer the country name or iso code? AG: Country official name
* is "Creation Date" the date that the record is created on GRSF ? So in my case, the day that I submit the stock import spreadsheet (today)? Or is it the year of that the questionnaire was dispatched? i.e. 2019? I don't find this in the metadata mapping AG: I think we can set the date we upload the data in the GRSF
* I'm not sure if it matters at this stage, but the template gives the colnames as "Reference Year**s**" and "Reporting Year**s**", but the documentation is singular. [having now gone through the whole process, I don't think it matters much] AG: I also believe reporting years and reference years for the identiy are not needed. While the fields "State and Trend, Methods, Scientific Advices" could go in time series as well. Yannis, what do you think, is it possible?
* For the species names: is the SYSTEM for WoRMS "APHIAID"? AG: it is "aphiaid:" see for example <https://data.d4science.org/ctlg/GRSF_Admin/02671397-50f6-33f0-8712-1153c02a1701>
* Should the species and area SYSTEMS be entered as caps or as lower case? AG: I do not know, I suggest lower case as the semantic identifier but Yannis to confirm
* the records don't always come with an area name, but the convention for entering the assessment area is SYSTEM:CODE:NAME. Do I put an "NA" instead of name where there isn't one? AG: at worst it the EEZ of the country, so you may put somethign like Togo waters or equivalent
* there are 3 ways to note stock status in the SDG questionnaire "sustainable" (relative to SDG 14.4.1 criteria), "overfished" (abundance-based), and "overfishing" (fishing mortality-based). I put together a short narrative that incorporates each of the three answers into one paragraph. This may be a question for the larger group as well... AG: this can go under fao stock status category in the time series worksheet. Yannis I think we need to include the list of all possible time dependent data
* "Methods" is new since the metadata mapping between SDG and GRSF, and I'm using the SDG field "Method approach", with the controlled terms "classical", "data-limited", or "undefined" and combining it with "Assessment method/software" field in the questionnaire, noting that many countries haven't filled out this field.
* How do I note when a record is exactly- or partially-matched or new to GRSF? I have this information from my mapping exercises, but there's not a field in the template. AG:  we need to verify with Yannis if the action approve and/or merge can be indicated in the input file or must come aftwards.

Comments on the assessment area Competency Queries;

* I would match the variable names with the stockImport fields - e.g. area code type should be area system AG: it woudl be "CodeSystem" and "Code"
* it would be cool to be able to download the tables as csv AG: Yannis to assess the feasibility. In any case you open in html, select all, and copy-paste in excel/csv file.

Comments on merging

* AE: Is a stock exactly matched when the areas are exactly overlapping, but the area SYSTEM is different? for example, ukrainian stocks in the Black Sea. Their FAO major area/subarea is 37.4.2, and they are not specified as managed under GFCM.  I'm wondering if even though the gfcm:29 area is the same as fao:37.4.2, are they exactly matched ? same for gfcm 30, Azov Sea. same for many of the Italian stocks. AG: I think this is a content related matter to discuss with data owners rather than at application level
* AG: can we have a field in the inport template to indicate the uuid to which this new record shoudl be merged? (what about the notion of dominant, do we need here? or maybe you can merge only with approved records only)