

**ASFA ADVISORY BOARD MEETING**  
National Institute of Oceanography (NIO), Goa, India  
7-11 September 2009

**SUMMARY REPORT**  
(including ASFA Partners' Reports)





**ASFA ADVISORY BOARD MEETING**  
**National Institute of Oceanography (NIO), Goa, India**  
**7-11 September 2009**

**SUMMARY REPORT**  
(including ASFA Partners' Reports)

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of FAO.

All rights reserved. FAO encourages reproduction and dissemination of material in this information product. Non-commercial uses will be authorized free of charge. Reproduction for resale or other commercial purposes, including educational purposes, may incur fees. Applications for permission to reproduce or disseminate FAO copyright materials and all other queries on rights and licences, should be addressed by e-mail to:

[copyright@fao.org](mailto:copyright@fao.org)

or to the

Chief, Publishing Policy and Support Branch  
Office of Knowledge Exchange, Research and Extension  
FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy

© FAO 2010

## PREFACE

The **ASFA Advisory Board** is described under **Article VIII** of the **ASFA Partnership Agreement** which all ASFA Partners have signed. The full Partnership Agreement can be seen on the ASFA homepage (<ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/006/ad644e/ad644e00.pdf>).

The three paragraphs, from Article VIII, containing the **key functions** of the Board are:

**paragraph 8.1** – *The functions of the ASFA Advisory Board (the "Board") shall be to decide upon, and oversee the implementation of policy matters with respect to the ASFA service.*

**paragraph 8.2** – *Each ASFA Partner shall be entitled to nominate one member of the Board, who should be a person invested with authority to commit the expenditure of the resources of the ASFA Partner concerned.*

**paragraph 8.4** – *Members of the Board shall be adequately prepared to discuss and evaluate the issues raised at each meeting of the Board.*

The Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Abstracts (ASFA) Advisory Board has been meeting annually since the beginning of the ASFA service/system in 1970.

Besides providing an opportunity to establish contacts and to provide a forum for discussing the ongoing maintenance and the future development of the ASFA system, the Meeting also serves as a moment of “accountability” for all the ASFA Partners. This is because all the Partners must, both during the Meeting and in their Reports to the Meeting, render public what they have (or have not) accomplished during the intersessional period.

There is little doubt that the annual ASFA Board Meetings are an important factor in keeping the “momentum” going in a system which may be easily subject to stasis because of its highly decentralized nature and the lack of direct monetary subsidies as an incentive for input production.

Note regarding this document: In the printed version of the Meeting Report, you will find the minutes of the Meeting and only a few selected Annexes (e.g. the Agenda, the List of Participants, Trust Fund Status and Action Items). However, the CD-ROM included with this document contains all of the documents (Annexes) and PowerPoint presentations that were submitted to or presented at the Meeting (note: these documents have been reproduced as submitted and have not undergone editorial control by the FAO ASFA Secretariat).

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The body of this Report represents the minutes of the Meeting as recorded by the Rapporteur Ms Helen Wibley (FAO).

For bibliographic purposes, this document should be cited as follows:

FAO.  
ASFA Advisory Board Meeting. National Institute of Oceanography (NIO), Goa, India. 7-11 September 2009. Summary Report (including ASFA Partners' Reports). Rome, FAO. 2010. 70p. Includes a CD-ROM.



# CONTENTS

<b>1 OPENING OF THE MEETING.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2 ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>3 ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSONS AND RAPPORTEURS.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>4 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>5 ADOPTION OF THE SUMMARY REPORT OF THE 2008 MEETING.....</b>	<b>2</b>
5.1 Matters arising (from 2008 Meeting).....	2
<b>6 STATUS OF ASFA PARTNERSHIP.....</b>	<b>2</b>
6.1 Report on the intersessional Activities of ASFA Partners.....	2
6.2 New and potential ASFA Partners and those risking removal.....	4
6.3 ASFA Partnership Agreement.....	6
6.4 ASFA Publishing Agreement between FAO and ProQuest.....	7
6.5 ASFA cooperation with other groups/initiatives/systems/meetings outside or related to ASFA.....	7
<b>7 ASFA SCOPE, COVERAGE, MONITORING and TIMELINESS.....</b>	<b>7</b>
7.1 Subject Scope.....	7
7.2 Coverage.....	8
7.3 Monitoring.....	8
7.4 Timeliness.....	10
7.5 ASFA input procedures.....	14
7.6 ASFA input production.....	16
7.7 ASFA Theme(s).....	17
<b>8 ASFA PRODUCTS AND SERVICES.....</b>	<b>17</b>
8.1 ASFA journals.....	17
8.2 CD/DVD-ROM.....	17
8.3 Internet Service.....	18
8.4 New outputs and services (by ProQuest).....	19
8.5 Public relations activities, marketing (by ProQuest and Partners).....	19
8.6 Document delivery.....	20
8.7 Entitlements (Partner entitlements to ASFA products and services).....	20
8.8 Increasing distribution of ASFA information products and services.....	21
<b>9 PROGRESS WITH MACHINE-READABLE INPUT.....</b>	<b>21</b>
9.1 www-ISIS-ASFA.....	21
<b>10 REPORT ON ASFA TRAINING ACTIVITIES.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>11 STATUS OF ASFIS REFERENCE SERIES PUBLICATIONS.....</b>	<b>22</b>
11.1 ASFIS-1, Serials Monitored for the ASFIS Bibliographic Database.....	22
11.2 ASFIS-2, Subject Categories and Scope Descriptions.....	22
11.3 ASFIS-3, Guidelines for Bibliographic Description.....	22
11.4 ASFIS-4, Guidelines for Abstracting.....	23
11.5 ASFIS-5, Guidelines for Indexing.....	23
11.6 ASFIS-6, Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Thesaurus.....	23
11.7 ASFIS-7, Geographic Authority List.....	23

11.8 ASFIS-15, ASFIS List of Species for Fishery Statistical Purposes (ex-ASFIS-8, Taxonomic Authority List).....	25
11.9 ASFIS-10, Authority List for Corporate Names.....	25
11.10 ASFIS-16, Help Notes contained in the www-ISIS-ASFA software (used for bibliographic description).....	25
<b>12 EXPANDED LANGUAGE CAPABILITY IN ASFA.....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>13 ASFA TRUST FUND.....</b>	<b>26</b>
13.1 Status of the ASFA Trust Fund.....	26
13.2 Proposals in progress, completed or pending further discussion.....	26
13.3 New and/or ongoing proposals.....	28
<b>14 OTHER BUSINESS.....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>15 PLACE AND DATE OF NEXT MEETING.....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>16 SPECIAL TOPICS, DEMONSTRATIONS, WORKSHOPS (4<sup>th</sup> DAY).....</b>	<b>32</b>
16.1 Comments on ASFA Input.....	32
16.2 ProQuest tips on searching/using the ASFA database.....	32
16.3 Valuation (demonstrating the worth of libraries/information centers).....	32
16.4 Ontologies.....	33
<b>17 REVIEW/APPROVAL OF DRAFT REPORT OF MEETING.....</b>	<b>33</b>

**Annexes** (only the following are included in the printed document - see next page for full list of Annexes)

<b>Annex-1</b> Agenda.....	<b>35</b>
<b>Annex-1b</b> List of participants.....	<b>37</b>
<b>Annex-1c</b> List of abbreviations.....	<b>41</b>
Annex-2 to Annex-45 contained in the attached CD-ROM	
<b>Annex-46</b> Trust Fund status.....	<b>45</b>
Annex-47 to Annex-60 contained in the attached CD-ROM	
<b>Annex- 61</b> Action Items and decisions agreed by participants.....	<b>65</b>
Annex-62 to Annex-69 contained in the attached CD-ROM	



## ANNEXES

**Note.** The printed version of this Report contains only a few of the many Annexes: (i.e. Agenda, List of Documents, List of Participants, List of Abbreviations, ASFA Trust Fund Status, and Action Items Agreed) so as to limit its size. However, on the CD-ROM that accompanies the Report, you will find **all** of the Annexes (Meeting documents) listed below.

**Document numbering.** Document numbers (e.g. ASFA/2009/... etc.) were reserved for each ASFA Partner prior to the Meeting. However, some Partners did not (or were not required to) submit a Report, therefore you will find “gaps” in the sequential numbering of the Reports.

Annex-1	ASFA/2009/1	Agenda
Annex-1a	ASFA/2009/1a	List of Documents
Annex-1b	ASFA/2009/1b	List of Participants
Annex-1c		List of Abbreviations
Annex-2	ASFA/2009/2	Actions Agreed by Participants (at 2008 Meeting)
Annex-2a	ASFA/2009/2a	List of “Extra” or “Potential” Action Items contained in the 2008 ASFA Board Meeting Report
Annex-3	ASFA/2009/3	FAO Report
Annex-3a	ASFA/2009/3a	FAO Trust Fund Proposal: Staff support to FAO ASFA Secretariat in 2010
Annex-4	ASFA/2009/5	UN/DOALOS Report
Annex-5	ASFA/2009/7	ADRIAMED Report
Annex-6	ASFA/2009/9	ICES Report
Annex-7	ASFA/2009/14	NAFO Report
Annex-7a	ASFA/2009/14a	NAFO Follow-up report on 2008 Meeting Actions
Annex-8	ASFA/2009/15	PIMRIS Report
Annex-9	ASFA/2009/16	SPC Report
Annex-10	ASFA/2009/17	WCPFC Report
Annex-11	ASFA/2009/18	Argentina (INIDEP) Report
Annex-12	ASFA/2009/20	Belgium (VLIZ) Report
Annex-13	ASFA/2009/21	Brazil (USP) Report
Annex-14	ASFA/2009/23	Chile (IFOP) Report
Annex-15	ASFA/2009/24	China, People’s Republic (NMDIS) Report
Annex-16	ASFA/2009/27	Ecuador (INP) Report
Annex-17	ASFA/2009/28	Egypt (NIOF) Report
Annex-17a	ASFA/2009/28a	Egypt (NIOF) Trust Fund Proposal: Filling the missing gap
Annex-18	ASFA/2009/29	Estonia (EMI) Report
Annex-19	ASFA/2009/30	France (IFREMER) Report
Annex-20	ASFA/2009/31	Germany (BF) Report
Annex-21	ASFA/2009/33	Greece (HCMR) Report
Annex-22	ASFA/2009/34	Guinea (CNSHB) Report
Annex-22a	ASFA/2009/34a	Guinea (CNSHB) Trust Fund Proposal: Acquisition of computer equipment
Annex-23	ASFA/2009/36	India (NIO/NICMAS) Report
Annex-24	ASFA/2009/39	Iran, Islamic Republic of (IFRO) Report
Annex-25	ASFA/2009/40	Japan (FRA) Report

Annex-26	ASFA/2009/41	Kenya (KMFRI) Report
Annex-26a	ASFA/2009/41a	Kenya (KMFRI) Trust Fund Proposal: Elimination of gaps
Annex-26b	ASFA/2009/41b	Kenya (KMFRI): Identifying and listing grey literature published in Kenya not in ASFA
Annex-27	ASFA/2009/42	Korea, Republic of (KORDI) Report
Annex-28	ASFA/2009/ 43	Lao People's Democratic Republic (LARRec) Report
Annex-29	ASFA/2009/45	Mexico (DGB) Report
Annex-30	ASFA/2009/48	Nigeria (NIFFR) Report
Annex-31	ASFA/2009/51	Poland (SFI) Report
Annex-32	ASFA/2009/53	Russian Federation (VNIRO) Report
Annex-33	ASFA/2009/54	Senegal (DPM) Report
Annex-34	ASFA/2009/57	Tanzania (IMS) Report
Annex-34a	ASFA/2009/57a	Tanzania (IMS) Trust Fund Proposal: Scanning of fish catch and scientific results 1999-2009
Annex-35	ASFA/2009/58	Tunisia (INSTM) Report
Annex-36	ASFA/2009/59	Uganda (NaFIRRI) Report
Annex-37	ASFA/2009/60	Ukraine (YugNIRO) Report
Annex-38	ASFA/2009/61	United Kingdom (NMBL) Report
Annex-38a	ASFA/2009/61a	Geographic Authority List Trust Fund Report (FBA)
Annex-38b	ASFA/2009/61b	African Water Bodies Duplicate Materials Trust Fund Report (FBA)
Annex-39	ASFA/2009/62	Uruguay (IIP) Report
Annex-40	ASFA/2009/63	United States of America (NOAA) Report
Annex-41	ASFA/2009/64	Viet Nam (CIS) Report
Annex-41a	ASFA/2009/64a	Viet Nam (CIS) Trust Fund Proposal: Scanning of Viet Nam Fisheries Technology and Scientific Results 2000-2008
Annex-42	ASFA/2009/65	ProQuest Report
Annex-43	ASFA/2009/66	List of ASFA Partners
Annex-44	ASFA/2009/66a	ASFA Participating Organizations by Geographical Regions
Annex-45	ASFA/2009/67	ProQuest Calculation of Royalty Payment to Trust Fund
Annex-46	ASFA/2009/68	ASFA Trust Fund Status
Annex-47	ASFA/2009/69	Eleventh Report to ASFA Board Meeting (2009) on Project to Distribute ASFA CD-ROM to LIFDCs
Annex-48	ASFA/2009/70	FAO Trust Fund proposal: Financial support to attend 2010 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting
Annex-49	ASFA/2009/71	Contributions (input) to ASFA Database by Partners and ASFA Partner's Entitlements
Annex-49a	ASFA/2009/71a	List of Partner Entitlements (updated)
Annex-50	ASFA/2009/72	List of ASFA Information Products and Services
Annex-51	ASFA/2009/73	List of all ASFA Advisory Board Meetings and Editorial Staff Meetings to date
Annex-52	ASFA/2009/74	Utilization of ASFA Trust Fund to pay IAMSLIC Member fees for ASFA Partners

Annex-53	ASFA/2009/75	Supply of Scanners (for ASFA related use) to ASFA Partners lacking funds to buy such equipment (status report and document for the record, as it is a Trust Fund project proposal already agreed during intersessional period 2007-2009)
Annex-54	ASFA/2009/76	History of SPECIAL ASFA Projects: Input of historical materials (or other gaps)
Annex-55	ASFA/2009/77	Admission of One new member to the ASFA Partnership
Annex-56	ASFA/2009/78	www-ISIS-ASFA 1.1 Development Report (ICIE)
Annex-57	ASFA/2009/79	Solutions to improve/increase timeliness of ASFA input
Annex-58	ASFA/2009/80	FAO Trust Fund Proposal: Small financial incentive to ASFA Partner Institute hosting ASFA Board Meeting
Annex-59	ASFA/2009/81	Comments on ASFA Input (PowerPoint) by Ms Soto and Ms Wibley
Annex-60	ASFA/2009/82	ASFA Database on CSA Illumina (PowerPoint) by Ms Soto
Annex-61	ASFA/2009/83	Action Items and Decisions Agreed by Participants
Annex-62	ASFA/2009/Info-1	Revised Geographic Authority List GAL (FBA)
Annex-63	ASFA/2009/Info-1a	GAL Thesaurus output (20090814) (FBA)
Annex-64	ASFA/2009/Info-2	Turning Data into Information (Mr Kaske)
Annex-65	ASFA/2009/Info-3	What is Return on Investment for your Library (Mr Kaske)
Annex-66	ASFA/2009/Info-4	"Themes" of Past ASFA Board Meetings
Annex-67	ASFA/2009/Info-5	Reserved ASFA FTP site (FAO)
Annex-68	ASFA/2009/Info-6	Ontologies (Mr Pettman)
Annex-69	ASFA/2009/Info-7	List of ASFA Trust Project Proposals for discussion at this Meeting (FAO)



## 1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

The Annual Meeting of the Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Abstracts (ASFA) Advisory Board was hosted by the **National Institute of Oceanography (NIO)**, located in Goa, India, from 7 to 11 September 2009.

The Meeting was attended by 25 participants from: 17 National ASFA Partners, 1 UN Partner, 1 International ASFA Partners, the ASFA Publishing Partner, and 4 observers. The Agenda is in **Annex-1**. The names and addresses of the participants are listed in **Annex-1b**. The documents presented at the Meeting and the abbreviations used in the Report are listed in **Annex-1a** and **1c**, respectively.

Dr Shetye, the Director of the National Institute of Oceanography, delivered the opening speech. He expressed his pleasure in welcoming the participants to the meeting, noting that this was the second time that an ASFA Board Meeting had been hosted by NIO, the first one being in 2000. He referred to the long association that NIO had with ASFA, commenting that when NIO joined the ASFA Partnership in 1990 there were 27 ASFA Partners and that now in 2009 the figure was 64. He said that it was good to see the sustained progress in the ASFA programme over the past 2 decades. He wished the participants all the best for the meeting and hoped that they would enjoy Goa and its surroundings.

Mr Hall, the FAO Representative India, New Delhi, on behalf of the FAO, welcomed the participants to the ASFA Advisory Board Meeting, to the National Institute of Oceanography and to Goa. He thanked Dr Shetye for agreeing to host the 38<sup>th</sup> ASFA Advisory Board Meeting and acknowledged the hard work conducted by Mr Sainekar and his staff at NIO in organizing the meeting. He mentioned the long-standing participation by NIO in ASFA and its recognition world-wide as India's leading research institute for oceanographic studies. When NIO joined the ASFA Partnership, it was Mr Tapaswi, in charge of the NIO library, who was the driving force behind NIO's early participation in ASFA and in 2002 most of the ASFA inputting and operating responsibilities were transferred over to Mr Sainekar. Mr Hall also referred to NIO's mission statement, which was "to continuously improve our understanding of the seas around us and to translate this knowledge to benefit all", noting that in order to do this NIO relies on information gathering and information transfer in order to disseminate its research findings. He said that the participants were present at this meeting to ensure that some of the information required by NIO, and other research institutes, would be found in the ASFA database in a timely, comprehensive and relevant format. The continuous increase in the number of ASFA participating institutes and the longevity of the Partnership were testimony to the importance of the system and to the information that it captured and disseminated. He commented that the merit for ASFA's long and successful history went to the ASFA Partners, who were the backbone of the ASFA Partnership. It was their cooperative efforts in monitoring the world's aquatic science literature and the resulting collective input submitted to the database which had established the ASFA database as one of the main sources of aquatic science information in the world. He wished the participants a successful meeting and a pleasant stay in Goa.

Mr Grainger (Chief of FIES, FAO, Rome) said that it was a pleasure to return to Goa for the second time. He added that he had great memories of the ASFA Board Meeting that had been held at NIO in 2000. He mentioned how pleasurable and successful that meeting had been and was sure that this meeting would be just as successful. He noted the important role that NIO played in research and also its contribution to ASFA. Mr Grainger referred to the FAO ASFA Secretariat, which was composed of a small, dedicated team which was continually in contact with the ASFA Partners. He said that the ASFA Partnership was guided by what happened at the ASFA Board Meetings and he commented that there was some serious work to do and looked forward to a productive meeting. He urged the ASFA Partners to enjoy the district of Goa, and thanked NIO for hosting the meeting and for having provided such good preparation and organization.

Mr Tapaswi (NIO) addressed the Board, saying that it was a pleasure to see again many of the participants. He noted the increase in number of countries participating in ASFA and said that it was good to see the ASFA Partnership increasing. He thanked Dr Shetye (NIO) for having allowed the ASFA Board Meeting to be held again in Goa.

## 2. ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS

Mr Sainekar (NIO) presented this Agenda Item.

## 3. ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSONS AND RAPPORTEURS

Mr Sainekar (NIO) was elected Chairperson of the Board Meeting. Ms Wibley (FAO) was appointed Rapporteur and Mr Pepe (FAO) as assistant Rapporteur.

## 4. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The Agenda, as it appears in **Annex-1**, was adopted by the Board.

## 5. ADOPTION OF THE SUMMARY REPORT OF THE 2008 MEETING

The ASFA Board agreed to adopt the Summary Report of the 2008 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (Bergen, Norway).

### 5.1. Matters Arising (from 2008 Meeting)

The follow-up taken by Partners on last year's "action items" is reported under the appropriate Agenda items.

## 6. STATUS OF ASFA PARTNERSHIP

### 6.1. Report on the Intersessional Activities of ASFA Partners

Each ASFA Partner presented a summary Report of its own intersessional activities. The FAO ASFA Secretariat summarized the major points contained in the Reports of Partners not in attendance. The full text of all the Reports is in **Annexes 3-42**.

#### 6.1.1 United Nations Co-sponsors

- **FAO** - Mr Grainger presented the FAO Report (**Annex-3**)
- **IOC** - (Not present, No Report )
- **UN/DOALOS** - (Not present, **Annex-4**) - Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat
- **UNEP** - (Not present, No Report)

#### 6.1.2 ASFA Partners

- **ADRIAMED** - (Not present, **Annex-5**) - Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat
- **ICCAT** - (Not present, No Report)
- **ICES** - (Not present, **Annex-6**) - Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat
- **IOTC** - (Not present, No Report)
- **IUCN** - (Not present, No Report).
- **NACA** - (Not present, No Report)
- **NAFO** - (Not present, **Annex-7**) - Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat
- **PIMRIS** - Ms Kalenchits presented the PIMRIS Report (**Annex-8**)
- **SPC** - (Not present) - Report highlighted by Ms Kalenchits (**Annex-9**)
- **WCPFC** - (Not present, **Annex-10**) - Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat
- **WorldFish Center**- (Not present, No Report)
- **Argentina (INIDEP)** - Ms. Cosulich presented the INIDEP report (**Annex-11**)
- **Australia (CSIRO)** - (Not present - No Report)
- **Belgium (VLIZ)** - Ms Chisala presented the VLIZ Report (**Annex-12**)
- **Brazil (USP)** - Ms Corbisier presented the USP Report (**Annex-13**)
- **Canada (NRC)** - (Not present - No Report)
- **Chile (IFOP)** - (Not present, **Annex-14**) Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat
- **China (NMDIS)** - Ms Fangfang Wan presented the NMDIS report (**Annex-15**)
- **Côte d'Ivoire (CRO)** - (Not present, No Report)
- **Cuba (CIP)** - (Not present, No Report)
- **Ecuador (INP)** - (Not present) - Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-16**)

- **Egypt (NIOF)** - (Not present) - Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-17**)
- **Estonia (EMI)** - (Not present) - Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-18**)
- **France (IFREMER)** - Ms Prod'homme presented the IFREMER Report (**Annex-19**)
- **Germany (BF)** - Mr Ruetze presented the BF Report (**Annex-20**)
- **Ghana (CSIR)** - (Not present, No Report)
- **Greece (HCMR)** - (Not present) Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-21**)
- **Guinea (CNSHB)** - (Not present) Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-22**)
- **Iceland (MRI)** - (Not present, No Report)
- **India (NIO/NICMAS)** - Mr Sainekar presented the NIO/NICMAS Report (**Annex-23**)
- **Indonesia (LIPI/PDII)** - (Not present, No Report)
- **Iran, Islamic Rep. of (IFRO)** - (Not present) - Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-24**)
- **Italy (SIBM)** - (not present, No Report)
- **Japan (JFRCA)** - (Not present) - Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-25**)
- **Kenya (KMFRI)** - Mr Macharia presented the KMFRI Report (**Annex-26**)
- **Korea, Republic of (KORDI)** - Mr Han presented the KORDI Report (**Annex-27**)
- **LAO People's Democratic Republic (LARRec)** - (Not present) - Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-28**)
- **Mauritania (IMROP)** - (Not present, No Report)
- **Mexico (DGB)** – Mr Montes presented the DGB Report (**Annex-29**)
- **Morocco (INRH)** - (Not present, No Report)
- **Mozambique (INAHINA)** - (Not present, No Report)
- **Nigeria (NIFFR)** - Mr Ibeun presented the NIFFR Report (**Annex-30**)
- **Norway (IMR)** - (Not present, No Report)
- **Peru (IMARPE)** - (Not present, No Report)
- **Poland (SFI)** - (Not present) - Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-31**)
- **Portugal (IPIMAR)** - (Not present, No Report)
- **Russian Federation (VNIRO)** - Ms Levashova presented the VNIRO Report (**Annex-32**)
- **Senegal (DPM)** - (Not present) - Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-33**)
- **Spain (IEO)** - (Not present, No report)
- **Tanzania (IMS)** - Ms Nyike presented the IMS Report (**Annex-34**)
- **Thailand (PMBC)** - (Not present, No report)
- **Tunisia (INSTM)** - (Not present) - Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-35**)
- **Uganda (NaFFIRI)** - Ms Endra presented the NaFFIRI Report (**Annex-36**)
- **Ukraine (YugNIRO)** - (Not present) - Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-37**)
- **United Kingdom (NMBL)** - Ms Noble presented the NMBL Report (**Annex-38**)
- **Uruguay (IIP)** - (Not present) - Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-39**)
- **United States of America (NOAA)** - Mr Kaske presented the NOAA Report (**Annex-40**)
- **Viet Nam (CIS)** - Ms Vu Thuy Hau presented the CIS Report (**Annex-41**)

During the presentation of the Summary Reports, a number of the ASFA Partners raised issues regarding various different Agenda Items. The related discussions are reported under the appropriate Agenda Item in this report.

### 6.1.3 ASFA Publisher (ProQuest) - Mr Emerson presented the ProQuest Report (Annex-42)

## 6.2. New and Potential ASFA Partners and those risking removal

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that one Institute had signed the ASFA Partnership Agreement during the intersessional period 2008-2009 to become an ASFA National Partner: **Marine Institute, Galway, Ireland**. He expressed his thanks to Ms Linda Noble, NMBL (UK National ASFA Partner) for making the initial contacts on behalf of the FAO ASFA Secretariat and also for carrying out the training. Ms Noble (NMBL) commented that the training had been successful and that MI had already produced its first batch of ASFA input.

See the FAO Report Section 4.2.1 (Annex-3) for information regarding the new Partner, and see document ASFA/2009/77 (Annex-55) for further information and full address of the institute.

### 6.2.1. Admission of new partners

As is the custom, the Chairperson, Mr Sainekar (NIO), requested the Board to give a ceremonial welcome to the new Partner with a round of applause.

### 6.2.2. Partners dropping out of ASFA

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that one ASFA Partner, the Institute of Marine Research (IMR), Sweden, had dropped out of the ASFA Partnership during the intersessional period. See the FAO Report Section 4.2.2 (Annex-3) for further details. Mr Gajanan (NIO) asked who would be taking over the Swedish monitoring responsibilities. Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) replied that the reserved ASFA FTP site had been used to post the titles included on the Swedish Monitoring List for other ASFA Partners to consider monitoring. To date, one of the journals previously monitored by IMR has been taken over.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat also reported that during the intersessional period, one Japanese Collaborating Centre (Japan Agency for Marine-Earth Science and Technology) dropped out of the ASFA Partnership.

### 6.2.3. Strategy for future expansion of ASFA Partnership

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that the “strategy” guiding the FAO ASFA Secretariat in the recruitment of new ASFA Partners had not changed over the last few years. See the FAO Report Section 4.5.1 (Annex-3). Mr Pepe noted that of the top 20 fishing nations, 19 were ASFA Partners. He added that the Philippines still remained a recruitment priority, not only because it is listed among the priority countries, but also because according to recent studies, the Philippines would appear to be a major centre of marine biodiversity. See the FAO Report Section 4.5.1 (Annex-3).

### 6.2.4. Potential partners

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that a request to join ASFA had been received from the Institute of Oceanology of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences (IO-BAS) during the intersessional period. He also mentioned that an initial sign of interest in joining ASFA had been received from Instituto de Investigaciones Marinas y Costeras (**INVEMAR**), Colombia, although they had not yet sent any official requests.

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to** follow-up on the above mentioned “requests to join ASFA”. However, Mr Pepe (FAO) stressed that only when the FAO ASFA Secretariat was able to outsource the training and input checking would it proceed any further.

[**Rapporteurs note:** at this writing, IO-BAS/Bulgaria has signed the ASFA Partnership Agreement and is now a National ASFA Partner. The FAO ASFA Secretariat is in the process of finding a solution to carrying out the ASFA training necessary for IO-BAS to begin submitting ASFA input].

Mr Macharia (KMFRI) reported that, during the AFRIAMSLIC Meeting in July 2009, the University of Botswana/*Harry Oppenheimer Okavango Research Centre* library (HOORC) had expressed interest in joining the ASFA Partnership.

[**Rapporteur’s note:** HOORC/Botswana contacted FAO ASFA Secretariat in August 2009 expressing interest in becoming a member of ASFA. At this writing, HOORC/Botswana has signed the ASFA Partnership Agreement and is now a National ASFA Partner]

*Follow-up action item 1 from the 2007 ASFA Board Meeting:*

1. **Mr Kaviphone (Laos) agreed to** contact the Inland Fisheries Research and Development Institute of Cambodia regarding the possibility of their becoming part of the ASFA Partnership. [**Rapporteur’s note:** This was actually done before the meeting finished and Mr Kaviphone reported that he had already received a positive reply from the Director, Mr Srun Limsong, and had informed the Director to contact Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat).] **The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to follow up regarding this issue.**

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that Mr Prum Somany (Deputy Director of IFRDI) had contacted the FAO ASFA Secretariat regarding joining of the ASFA Partnership in March 2009 but no further action had been taken.



### 6.2.5. Partners in danger of being removed

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) referred to the Warning List included under Item 4.3 of the FAO Report (**Annex-3**) which listed those ASFA Partners who were in danger of being removed from the ASFA Partnership for not submitting ASFA input for 2 years or more. He added that, of the 13 ASFA Partners listed, some had submitted input since the time of preparing the list.

Included in the list were:

Iceland (MRI) - No input has been submitted since December 2006. Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that an e-mail had been sent to MRI requesting reconfirmation of their interest in remaining an ASFA Partner. They replied that they would communicate their decision in September. Therefore the FAO ASFA Secretariat would delay removing Iceland from the ASFA Partnership until September.

Mozambique (INAHINA) - No input has been submitted since 2007. In 2009, INAHINA reported that the serials they were supposed to monitor were discontinued, but would soon be resumed. The FAO ASFA Secretariat said that this Partner would not be dropped from the ASFA Partnership, but added that serious consideration should be taken.

Ms Soto (ProQuest) commented that INAHINA could take over the monitoring of other material so as to maintain ASFA input production.

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to** follow-up with Mozambique with respect to the fact that the serial titles included on their monitoring list had been discontinued. It would be suggested to INAHINA that they could take over responsibility of other serial titles, or other material, in their own country, should they have access to them in their library.

Côte d'Ivoire (CRO) - No input has been submitted since 2005. During the 2008-2009 intersession, Mr Odido (IOC/ODINAfrica project office) contacted CRO on behalf of the FAO ASFA Secretariat and CRO replied that they were restructuring and in the process of identifying someone for the ASFA duties. An E-mail was sent by the FAO ASFA Secretariat to CRO in June 2009 asking for re-confirmation of their interest in remaining an ASFA Partner. The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported receiving confirmation from CRO that they were in the process of hiring a person who would also be responsible for ASFA input. Therefore, this Partner will not be dropped from the ASFA Partnership.

IOTC (Indian Ocean Tuna Commission) - ASFA input, prepared by the ASFA Partner in India (NIO/NICMAS) under contract, was submitted in 2005. Nothing has been prepared or submitted since. The FAO ASFA Secretariat sent an E-mail to IOTC in July 2009 asking for re-confirmation regarding their interest in remaining an ASFA Partner. IOTC replied that ASFA input had been sent to ProQuest. These records are currently being processed by ProQuest for downloading onto the database. This Partner is no longer in danger of being dropped from the ASFA Partnership.

**[Rapporteur's note:** At this writing, the IOTC records are on the database.]

Greece (HCMR) - ASFA input ceased in 2006 due to staff leaving the Hellenic Centre for Marine Research (HCMR) and the retirement of the main ASFA contact (S. Goulala) a year earlier than anticipated. However, in August 2009 HCMR resumed submitting ASFA input and the staffing problems are on their way to being solved. This Partner is NOT in danger of being dropped from the ASFA Partnership.

**[Rapporteur's note:** in November 2009, HCMR notified the FAO ASFA Secretariat that Popi Panagiotoglou was taking over the responsibilities of the retired Ms Sofia Goulala. At this writing, HCMR has sent some batches of ASFA input to ProQuest.]

Guinea (CNSHB) - Following ASFA input training in mid-2008, computer problems, electricity and other problems have interrupted the work. However, CNSHB has recently submitted two batches of ASFA input to ProQuest. Therefore, this ASFA Partner is NOT in danger of being dropped from the ASFA Partnership.

Chile (IFOP) - No ASFA input has been submitted since 2006 and IFOP was in danger of being dropped from the Partnership until it strongly reiterated its desire to participate in ASFA. A new Librarian was hired to replace Ms Muñoz (who left IFOP in 2007) and was given the ASFA responsibility. She received ASFA training in July 2009 from Uruguayan ASFA Partner. At this writing, a batch of ASFA input has been submitted to ProQuest. Therefore, IFOP is no longer in danger of being dropped from the ASFA Partnership.

Peru (IMARPE) - No ASFA input has been submitted since 2004, after which the FAO ASFA Secretariat lost direct contact with its ASFA contact at IMARPE due to staff changes. In November 2005, FAO re-established contact with IMARPE and the submission of records seemed to slowly being re-established through the provision of feedback and distant training by FAO. In August 2007, Mr Montes (UNAM), trained new IMARPE staff in ASFA input procedures. There had been some initial contact with Ms Portal (IMARPE) but as yet no records have been sent to Mr Montes for checking, and there has been difficulty in further communication.

**Mr Montes agreed** to follow-up with Peru with respect to their failure to submit ASFA records following the training they received in Ecuador in August 2007. This was to be considered the first deadline given to Peru regarding the submission of ASFA records for checking.

Spain (IEO) - No ASFA input had been submitted since 2006 until September 2008, when a very large batch of input was sent by the company responsible for IEO's input to FAO for checking. Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that approximately 400 of these records had been checked so far and had been sent back for correction, but as yet these records have not been submitted to ProQuest. The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to** follow-up with IEO regarding the delay in submission to ProQuest of their ASFA records already seen and corrected by FAO. IEO is NOT in danger of being dropped from the ASFA Partnership.

NACA - No input had been submitted since training in 2004 until August 2008. A further batch of records was submitted to ProQuest just before this meeting. NACA will not be dropped from ASFA Partnership.

Ecuador (INP) - Following the first training in 2003, staff changes hampered submission of input. Retraining was carried out in 2007 by UNAM. There was for a time some communication problems between INP and UNAM, and the FAO ASFA Secretariat carried out some checking of the INP input. Despite such problems INP has submitted several batches of ASFA input to ProQuest this year. INP will not be dropped from the ASFA Partnership.

Mauritania (IMROP) - No input has been submitted since 2005. IMROP requested a re-training, which is to be carried out by IFREMER in October 2009. IMROP is NOT in danger of being removed from ASFA Partnership.

Indonesia (PDII-LIPI) - No input has been submitted since 2006. There have been problems of staff changes and PDII-LIPI has requested re-training. PDII-LIPI is NOT in danger of being removed from the Partnership, the onus of organizing a training session for PDII-LIPI is on the FAO ASFA Secretariat, which is not yet possible.

IOC and UNEP - (although not listed on the "warning list") Ms Soto (ProQuest) noted that neither IOC nor UNEP had submitted records since 2007 and asked if there had been any follow-up regarding these two ASFA Partners. Mr Macharia (KMFRI) reported that up until now he had been responsible for carrying out ASFA input for IOC and UNEP, but there were some bureaucratic/administrative problems regarding his contract. The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to** follow-up with both IOC and UNEP regarding their inactivity during 2008/2009.

**[Rapporteur's note:** In June 2009, UNEP (Mr Manyara) had notified Mr Macharia (KMFRI) that they had material on CD-ROM (publications) for KMFRI to input into ASFA on their behalf. As of 22 October, KMFRI reported not having received the CD-ROM.

In October 2009, IOC (Mr Odido) notified the FAO ASFA Secretariat that arrangements had been made with Mr Macharia (KMFRI) for the preparation of IOC records.]

#### 6.2.6. Partners removed from the system

No ASFA Partners were removed during the intersessional period.

*Follow-up action item 3 from the 2008 ASFA Board Meeting:*

*3. FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to circulate the new "Criteria for removing ASFA Partners not fulfilling their input responsibilities" agreed at the Board Meeting to all ASFA Partners via ASFA Board-L. A majority vote would render the new criteria as an Amendment to the Partnership Agreement.*

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that the proposed new criteria had been circulated to all Partners during the intersessional period for voting, via ASFA-Board-L listserv, on 22 October 2008. **The proposed new Criteria were agreed.** The voting results were communicated to ASFA Partners by E-mail dated 14 November 2008.

#### 6.3. ASFA Partnership Agreement

As of 1 September 2009, the ASFA Partnership Agreement (official title: Partnership Agreement Providing for Co-Operation in the Preparation and Publication of the Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Abstracts (ASFA) and the Reconstitution of the Advisory Board) has been signed by 64 Partners.

4 UN, Co-sponsoring ASFA Partners 11 International ASFA Partners	48* National ASFA Partners 1 Publishing ASFA Partner.
---	--

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported the total number of ASFA Partners unchanged from the previous year, despite the joining, during the intersession, of one new Institute (MI, Ireland). The reason being that one existing National ASFA Partner (IMR, Sweden) dropped out of ASFA during the same period (see Item 6.2.2).

\* **[Rapporteurs note:** since the Board Meeting, IO-BAS/Bulgaria and HOORC/Botswana have joined ASFA now bringing the total number of National ASFA Partners to 50]

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) referred to the above mentioned “new criteria for removing from the ASFA Partnership those ASFA Partners not fulfilling their ASFA inputting responsibilities” (Item 6.2.6) stating that the new criteria were now a part of (i.e. an amendment to) the Partnership Agreement.

#### **6.4. ASFA Publishing Agreement between FAO and ProQuest**

The current ASFA Publishing Agreement between FAO and the ASFA Publisher (ProQuest) covers the period 1 January 2008 to 31 December 2011.

The parts of the Publishing Agreement of direct interest to ASFA Partners include: the allocation, number and use of the complimentary ASFA products which ProQuest distributes to the ASFA Partners, and the amount of “royalties” that ProQuest should pay into the ASFA Trust Fund for using/marketing the Partners ASFA records in its information products. These parts of the Agreement are visible on the FAO ASFA Homepage at <ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/006/ad644e/ad644e00.pdf>.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reminded ASFA Partners that the renewed Agreement contained a number of improvements regarding Partners entitlements to the ASFA information products. See Agenda Item 8.7 for further discussion regarding ASFA Partners' entitlements to ASFA products and services.

#### **6.5. ASFA Co-operation with other Groups/Initiatives/Systems/Meetings outside or related to ASFA (IAMSLIC group(s), IOC/ODIN projects etc.)**

##### ASFA-IAMSLIC group cooperation

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reminded ASFA Partners of the ASFA Trust Project providing funds to pay the IAMSLIC membership fees for those ASFA Partners who are unable to do so themselves. See **Annex-52** for further details. He added that Partners should report on the utility of their IAMSLIC memberships (e.g. their use of and contributions to the IAMSLIC Distributed Library).

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP), referring to the 31 ASFA Partners whose IAMSLIC membership fees were currently being paid using money from the ASFA Trust Fund, asked whether any of these were Collaborating Centres. Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) replied that currently no Collaborating Centres were involved, although the initiative was open to them.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) mentioned the ASFA Trust Fund Project whereby US \$28 000 was allocated to digitize materials for inclusion in the Aquatic Commons repository, noting that as yet no ASFA Partner had come forward with any digitization proposal (See Agenda Item 13.2.12). He said that the FAO Fisheries Branch Library had identified some grey literature to be scanned and deposited in the Aquatic Commons repository. Ms Noble (NMBL) asked whether the literature was retrospective and whether links would be added to those ASFA records already on CSA Illumina. Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that she would be meeting with the contact person at the Library in order to view the list and decide what was needed to be done, so as to be able to go forward with the Trust Fund Project. She clarified that should the literature not be on the database, ASFA records would be prepared containing links to the Aquatic Commons repository and if the literature was already cited in the database, links to the Aquatic Commons repository for those records would be provided to ProQuest.

Ms Kalenchits (PIMRIS) referred to an ODIN/PIMRIS project whereby PDF versions of the documents contained in the individual repositories at the Solomon Islands, Samoa, Fiji, Kiribati and the Cook Islands would be sent to PIMRIS for depositing in a regional repository. PIMRIS would prepare ASFA records with links to this regional repository.

##### ASFA-FAO OEK/WAICENT group cooperation

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that cooperation with the FAO OEK/WAICENT (AGRIS) group continued through assistance to the ASFA Group by their Information Systems Analyst. Current activities involved in particular an examination of integrated library management systems (ABCD, WebLis, or other).

### **7. ASFA SCOPE, COVERAGE, MONITORING and TIMELINESS**

#### **7.1. Subject Scope**

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that there were no changes to the subject scope of ASFA. Therefore, the present version of ASFIS-2, Subject Categories and Scope Descriptions (Rev.-2) still remains the most current version.

*Follow-up action item 18 from the 2008 ASFA Board Meeting:*

*18. Regarding the Amendment to the Subject Scope of ASFA pending from last year (i.e. subject areas considered outside the scope of ASFA)....*

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to circulate an updated list of the subject areas considered outside the scope of ASFA via ASFA Board-L.**

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that the list of subject areas that were to be considered “outside” the scope of ASFA had been updated and circulated to all ASFA Partners via ASFA Board-L on 10 March 2009. See the FAO Report Section 5.2 (**Annex-3**) for the updated table.

Ms Noble (NMBL) called attention to the note at the bottom of the table, which stressed the need to examine the context of some of the excluded areas, as they could (depending on the context) be relevant for inclusion in ASFA.

## 7.2. Coverage

Ms Noble (NMBL) mentioned that many ASFA Partners were facing a problem, whereby, due to financial constraints, journal subscriptions had to be cancelled, resulting in a reduction in coverage.

Ms Noble (NMBL) raised the issue of coverage of grey literature that was freely available online and the preparation of ASFA records for literature with non-persistent URLs/handles. She questioned the utility of having ASFA records on CSA Illumina which had URL addresses that were no longer valid, i.e. the links were valid while the ASFA record had been prepared, but during the time taken to make it available on the database, the URL had disappeared. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) commented that even if the original link to the full-text was broken/no longer valid, the full text could be available somewhere else and therefore it was important that the literature be entered in ASFA. He added that this was just the same as preparing ASFA records for publications that were out of print. Mr Kaske (NOAA) commented that, should the link no longer work, researchers would be able to use the citation information contained in the record (such as Title, or author name) to carry out a search, for example on Google, to see if they could obtain the full text elsewhere. Mr Sahu (NIO) commented that documents are archived in their institutional repositories with individual handles for the chapters of the documents (PDF links), rather than an entire document link.

The **ASFA Board recommended** that ASFA Partners prepare ASFA records for grey literature that was freely available on-line and include the URL address, irrespective of the guarantee that the URL was persistent.

## 7.3. Monitoring

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that it was important for ASFA Partners to report on publication frequency, i.e. how many issues were to be expected within a year, whether it was bimonthly, quarterly etc. Such information was necessary to ProQuest. He suggested adding a note such as “irregular”.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) stated that it was not always possible to know beforehand if a publication was “irregular”. He referred to the comments made by Ms Cochrane in the LIFDC report (**Annex-47**) regarding the difficulty that African institutions have in publishing their journals regularly due to financial reasons. An African publication may cease for a while and then start up again after a few years. However, despite such problems, some African ASFA partners are succeeding in covering and incorporating research material from Africa into ASFA in a timely way.

Mr Ibeun (NIFFR) noted that irregular publishing frequency was a big problem in developing countries, especially in Africa. He concurred that ASFA Partners should inform ProQuest and the FAO ASFA Secretariat regarding volumes/issues that were never published. However, he believed that the term “irregular” could be misleading, since some journals may have an “irregular” number of issues produced within a year, but were still regularly published. For example, a quarterly journal could sometimes encounter difficulties in publishing one particular issue during the year.

Mr Sainekar (NIO) described a case whereby his institute had covered the first volume of a publication, and when requesting information after a gap of 3-4 years regarding volume 2, they were told that the next volume was number 3, i.e. there had been no volume 1 (2) or volume 2.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) commented on the use of the word “irregular”, saying that it depended on what was intended by the Publisher as an “irregular schedule”. He added that a clear expectation was necessary for the users of the database. Mr Ibeun (NIFFR) concurred that it was important to have such background information so that the users of the database understood the situation

Mr Kaske (NOAA) said that 2 elements were involved in the issue of irregularity – the Publishers’ intentions and their actual performance, i.e. the recorded frequency as opposed to the actual frequency.

Mr Sainekar (NIO) said that although all the journals included on their monitoring list were not subscribed to by his institute, most of them were covered via reprints. Great efforts were made by his institute to cover all the journal titles on their list so that all issues were entered within the current year, in order to avoid creating a backlog. He added that this increases the efficiency of the database and recommended that all ASFA Partners to do the same and ensure that all the journal titles on their monitoring lists were covered. This was supported by Ms Silaja (CIFT), who said that CIFT, the Indian Collaborating Centre, did have a backlog but were making great efforts to get rid of it and hoped to reduce it within 6 months. Mr Sainekar urged all ASFA

Partners to strive to prepare ASFA records from the serial titles on their monitoring list as soon as possible after publication.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that this was a good model shown by NIO and recommended that all ASFA Partners did the same. He suggested that ASFA Partners examined their Monitoring List on a regular basis, looking out for gaps in titles or issues, endeavoring to keep it up-to-date. In this way, by keeping their Monitoring Lists under surveillance, ASFA Partners would ensure regular coverage of their journals.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) mentioned that there was an increasing trend for e-journals not to be published as volumes or issues, but just “when ready”. These were “irregular” publications, although articles were appearing on a daily basis, having DOIs instead of volume or issue numbers. He also cited BioMed Central and Bentham Open as examples of open access publishers. This was a trend away from the “artificial print” environment. Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) suggested that some information could be added in the Notes field of the ASFA record, indicating that the publication was an e-journal, i.e. available only electronically. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) questioned the utility of this information, saying that there was a need for a balance regarding how much work would be necessary. He suggested the possibility of using a general term to describe this type of publication.

Mr Pettman (FBA) said that his institute produced a publication, “Freshwater reviews”, in this way. He explained that since his institute was both the publisher of this journal and an ASFA input centre, FBA could enter the articles into the ASFA database as soon as they were published. However, he asked how ProQuest did this, perhaps via crawling. He also questioned how other ASFA Partners could do this and whether they were notified by publishers regarding such e-articles.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) suggested that if an ASFA Partner covered an e-journal, they should look at the site once a month and check for new articles to download/prepare ASFA records. He stressed the importance of checking such sites frequently. Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that this might raise problems when preparing ASFA records for those journals that were available online and also in print. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) clarified that he was referring only to those journals that were published solely online. He added that, for journals available both in print and online, ASFA Partners should wait to harvest the content until the issue/volume is published.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) referred to the comments made by Ms Cochrane in the LIFDC report **(Annex-47)** regarding LIFDCs and the “digital divide”. Difficulties regarding Internet connectivity/access, particular in Africa, have implications for the way in which countries participating in the ASFA are able to respond to the challenges of moving into the digital age. The report also states that many African academic institutions continually face a battle for funding, a situation made even more difficult in the current economic climate. Publications that are locally produced, even with external funding, are often not profitable and it is possible that journals cannot be published regularly due to financial reasons. Mr Pepe commented that the economic situation worldwide was affecting ASFA Partners and the ASFA database.

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) suggested that ASFA Partners could provide information regarding the frequency of publications to the FAO ASFA Secretariat, who could perhaps update the Master Monitoring List with this information. She said that it was also important for ASFA Partners to record all those issues that were missing due to temporary cessation of publication.

*Follow-up action item 9 from the 2008 ASFA Board Meeting:*

**9. Mr Thompson agreed** to investigate with Regional Fisheries Bodies regarding their grey literature and its availability.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) referred to the document ASFA/2009/14a **(Annex-7a)** prepared by Mr Thompson (NAFO), which included a draft letter that was to be sent to Regional Fisheries Bodies regarding their grey literature and its availability together with a table of the Regional Fisheries Bodies. He noted that several of the RFBs were already ASFA Partners and/or their grey literature was already being covered by other ASFA Partners.

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to follow-up this issue with Mr Thompson and to provide him with some information on how he should proceed with the Action Item.

*Follow-up action item 10 from the 2008 ASFA Board Meeting:*

**10. Regarding the collection of information concerning new areas of grey literature/new journals that ASFA Partners know are not being covered and entered into ASFA ....** ProQuest asked whether it would be possible for FAO to set up a “share-point” site, which could be modified externally by ASFA Partners, whereby they could add such information, e.g. lists of serial titles, books/monographs ..... so as to have some sort of “repository” of literature that needs to be covered, i.e. entered in ASFA by one of the ASFA Partners.

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to investigate the possibility of setting up such a site for this purpose.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that it had not been possible to immediately set up a true Wiki-like site because of all the formal FAO requirements/procedures that were required. However, he said that, in the meantime, an **FTP site reserved for ASFA** has been established for ASFA Partners to use and share information. See the Information Document “ASFA Reserved FTP Site” (**Annex-67**) for further details.

#### **7.4. Timeliness**

The FAO ASFA Secretariat opened the Agenda item, tabling the document ASFA/2009/79 “solutions to improve/increase the timeliness of the ASFA input”. (**Annex-57**)

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that the document was the outcome of a 2-day Meeting between the FAO ASFA Secretariat and the Publisher of ASFA (ProQuest), including the participation of a representative from 1 National ASFA Partner and 1 Collaborating Centre. The purpose of the Meeting was to investigate the ways and means of enhancing ASFA’s comparative advantage (i.e. the coverage of the grey literature) including some solutions or options to increase the timeliness of ASFA. Mr Grainger (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that such meetings between the FAO ASFA Secretariat and ProQuest could become a frequent routine. He believed them to be a good idea and that they would assist the FAO ASFA Secretariat and ProQuest in strategic thinking to meet various challenges. He clarified that these meetings should not be considered as by-passing ASFA Board Meetings. The aim would be to come up with some concrete suggestions and ideas to bring to the ASFA Board for discussion.

To begin with, the document suggests introducing into the ASFA input process a “submission deadline of 4 weeks”. Regarding this suggestion, **the ASFA Board “recommended”** that ASFA Partners should strive to send at least one file per month of ASFA records to the Publisher and that they should try to include in this file material received within the past month.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that some sort of follow-up would be necessary to check-up on this. Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that if ProQuest was receiving more files, more frequently after this Board Meeting, then that would be a good sign.

Ms Soto (ProQuest) clarified that it was preferable for ASFA Partners to frequently send small batches of ASFA records, rather than large files once/twice a year. Mr Ibeun (NIFFR) questioned splitting large conference procedures, asking whether it would be acceptable to “split” the input into several batches. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that there was no reason to wait until ASFA records had been prepared for all the individual papers. As soon as some records were ready (even 10-12) they should be sent to ProQuest.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) clarified that ProQuest defined “timeliness” in terms of date of publication and appearance on the database. From a production point of view, timeliness could be considered the time taken by an ASFA Partner, from receipt of the document, to prepare an ASFA record and send it to ProQuest.

In addition to the idea of introducing “a submission deadline”, the paper also listed 5 options to increase timeliness.

Discussions regarding each option are recorded individually below.

##### **Option 1. Submission of ASFA Records to ProQuest in tagged text format**

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that text-tagging would require some work and assistance from ProQuest to prepare the necessary format. Ms Noble (NMBL) commented that while it was time-consuming to prepare ASFA records using the www-ISIS-ASFA software, this was mainly because the system helped the inputter/indexer to enter the data correctly. She said that preparing ASFA records in a tagged-text format would allow for errors and would lead to low quality records. Mr Sainekar (NIO) concurred, saying that the www-ISIS-ASFA software contained pick-lists/authority lists and that without these many mistakes/inconsistencies would go through.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that unidentified descriptors could be flagged and checked, but ProQuest did not have the resources to spell check the titles/abstracts. Receiving ASFA records in a tagged-text format would be very problematic and a heavy burden for ProQuest, although the intent of this option was to provide various possibilities to other ASFA Partners regarding input submission.

Mr Montes (UNAM) said that during his experience in training new Partners on how to prepare an ASFA bibliographic citation, he has noted that most of the trainees did not have any problems regarding data entry of the citation information. This was because most of the ASFA inputters were librarians. Likewise, since most of the ASFA inputters were not necessarily biologists or experts in the subject area, they did have difficulty in selecting the subject descriptors and the subject category codes. Therefore, he believed that since the indexing part was the bottleneck in ASFA data entry, preparing records in tagged-text format would not be a real solution to increasing timeliness.

The majority of ASFA Partners were of the opinion that preparing ASFA records in a tagged-text format was not a suitable option for increasing timeliness.

During the above discussions, the mention of the “ASFA *subject category codes*” brought up the long-standing question as to their utility.

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP), in addition to agreeing with Mr Montes’ comments above regarding the difficulty for ASFA inputters to assign/allocate the subject category codes during the preparation of an ASFA record also said that the scientists at her institute did not use the subject categories for searching the database. On the other hand, she did feel that the descriptors were an important search tool.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that according to their user statistics the subject category codes were not being used much by the database searchers. However, he added that the subject categories were very much needed to separate/organize into chapters the records appearing in the printed ASFA journals. In any case regardless of their perceived value and actual usage, the subject categories do/can provide a good entry point for browsing at a general level, and can help to navigate through different databases. He concluded that that the users of ASFA did not take advantage of the codes, unless they were looking at the printed journals.

### **Option 2. Submission of ASFA Records to ProQuest without: the journal allocation codes, the subject category codes and the indexing terms**

This option would mean that the Partners could submit their ASFA records to ProQuest without having to include the journal allocation codes, the subject category codes or the indexing terms. Therefore, such records would be submitted to ProQuest with only the citation plus abstract. On receipt of these base-records, ProQuest would assign the indexing information via their automated indexing system. There was general consensus within the ASFA Board that this option would assist those ASFA Partners who encountered difficulties when having to select journal/subject category codes and/or indexing terms. However there was considerable discussion regarding the implications of applying the automated indexing system to the base-records provided by ASFA Partners.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) mentioned one implication saying that the quality of the ASFA records would be compromised, to a certain degree, in order to increase the number of records getting on the database in a timely manner. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) clarified that most of the options under consideration assumed that ProQuest would carry out the indexing, i.e. put it through their automated indexing system, with some degree of quality control. Mr Emerson said that ProQuest were surveying user searches carried out on different types of data, for example “title + abstract” or “title + abstract + indexing” on the same databases. The impact was looking at the results of the search, not at the quality of the indexing. The retrieval of records showed a 15-20% increase in content when searches included the indexing. No difference was found when searches were limited to manually indexed versus auto-indexed. However, there was a great deal of variation with respect to the number of records retrieved and relevancy. ProQuest was continuing investigating the results, endeavouring to determine whether the errors do make a difference. Most probably, they would have an effect only on the “experienced” user and not the usual user.

Ms Noble (NMBL) stressed the importance of referring to full text when carrying out indexing. She said that the full text often had valuable information that was not contained in the title or the abstract, such as the geographic location. She also commented that there were 2 types of documents to be considered in particular, those that were available on-line and grey literature. If ASFA Partners sent records of grey literature to ProQuest for automated indexing, the implications regarding the quality of the indexing should be considered. One advantage of ASFA was the geographic indexing, whereas automated indexed could not deal with geographic indexing, unless that information was contained in the abstract. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) clarified that automated indexing followed rules to elicit concepts. However, he concurred that unless the information was contained in the title and/or abstract, then it would not be found. Ms Noble said that while subject indexing could vary, depending on the concepts, geographic indexing was not subjective, i.e. there would be only one term/string. She asked whether ProQuest could run a survey regarding the success of automated indexing with respect to geographic terms. Mr Emerson said that ProQuest were currently doing a study, but it was not focused on single, particular areas, although it could be refined to look at specific instances. Ms Noble expressed her concern that the ASFA records were being geographically indexed too generally, for example if an abstract mentioned 3 different estuaries, only 1 was entered as a geographic descriptor. Mr Emerson said that perhaps only 1 of the estuaries was mentioned in the title, and the others were not the primary focus of the article.

Mr Pettman (FBA) commented that it was good to know that ProQuest were carrying out studies regarding the success of automated indexing. He said that the general conclusions appeared to be that free-text searching together with controlled vocabulary searching was necessary to get good results. He asked whether the ASFA Board could provide some tools to ProQuest in order to assist them in improving the quality of the automated indexing.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that it was important to know the methodology of ProQuest’s studies. He said that automated indexing could not index the “intent”, but only the content. In order to compare manual and automated indexing, he suggested that FAO sent some 100 records that had been indexed manually to ProQuest to be put through their automated indexing system. Ms Noble (NMBL) also

asked whether it was possible to do a comparative study between auto-indexed and manually indexed records.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) replied that any of the ASFA Partners themselves could carry out a comparison by downloading some records from CSA Illumina that had been indexed by ProQuest, and then re-indexing them manually. He also suggested that Partners could carry out searches on CSA Illumina using all fields except the descriptors and also all fields including the descriptors, in order to see what difference the addition of descriptors made to the results of the search. He added that while manual indexing was always the preferred way, automated indexing worked well in most cases, however he did admit that sometimes it did not. He commented that it was important to bring the picture into focus, with respect to quality and quantity, looking at the overall effect on the database.

Several ASFA Partners stated that they wished to continue indexing their own records. Ms Prod'homme (IFREMER) said that IFREMER would prefer to index all their records themselves, since it was their responsibility. She suggested that there were other areas where the time taken to prepare records could be improved. See further discussion regarding this issue under Agenda Item 7.5.

Mr Ibeun (NIFFR) stressed that ASFA Partners should show some effort in their activities. He asked what the professional gain would be to the ASFA Partners should they cease to index their own records. He believed that carrying out ASFA input was a good training experience for librarians, and also that it was part of the essence of being an ASFA Partner - preparing their own records and submitting them in a timely manner.

Mr Sainekar (NIO) asked what would be the professional role of an ASFA Partner who was sending "base records" to ProQuest for indexing. He believed that if ASFA Partners had regular staff, and no particular problems, they should do their own indexing. If, however, an ASFA Partner was facing difficulties under particular circumstances, such as lack of time or staff, then perhaps this option could be a suitable solution for them.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that some ASFA Partners have continually stressed that they have difficulties in assigning the classification codes and indexing terms. Although the preferred procedure would be for the ASFA Partner to carry out their full responsibility, he added that this option would assist those ASFA Partners having difficulties (whether permanent or temporary). Ms Noble (NMBL) commented on some of the implications of handing over the indexing responsibility to ProQuest on a temporary basis. For example, re-training in indexing could be required, if the ASFA Partner decided to start doing their own indexing again.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) clarified that sending "base records" (i.e. citation + abstracts) would not affect the ASFA Partner's entitlements. When Mr Sainekar (NIO) asked how long would it take for ProQuest to process the records and get them on the database, Mr Emerson replied that it would take approximately 2 weeks; the records would be quickly put through the automated indexing process and made available for the next cycle to be downloaded onto the database.

Ms Noble (NMBL) asked whether the "base records" could be sent to ProQuest with some partial indexing, e.g. no journal/subject category codes, but with descriptors. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that it would be possible to accept different combinations, although it would be very important to define the parameters and be consistent. It would not be a problem for ProQuest to develop a process to deal with the varying types of "base records", but the records would have to be the same type in the one batch. ASFA Partners could take advantage of this option on a temporary or permanent basis. Ms Soto (ProQuest) added that it would be no problem if ASFA Partners wished to go ahead and do their own indexing, but it could be seen as a temporary solution to some particular occasions, e.g. to avoid large backlogs building up.

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) mentioned that there could be a technical problem regarding the www-ISIS-ASFA software, since some of the indexing fields were mandatory, i.e. the ASFA record could not be saved in the www-ISIS-ASFA software unless the subject descriptor field and the classification codes field were completed. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that some "dummy" or "fake" terms could be entered in these fields during the preparation of the ASFA record so as to enable the record to be saved and exported/submitted to ProQuest. The "dummy" or "fake" information in these fields would be replaced by the automated indexing process at ProQuest.

The following paragraphs summarize the general consensus regarding Option 2:

The ASFA Board recognized that the ideal situation as regards indexing was for each ASFA Partner, itself, to prepare and to include in the ASFA record the indexing elements. This is because the indexing provided by local, experienced indexers working on their own countries' publications has always been one of the factors which has earned the ASFA database recognition as being one of the world's premier databases in the field of aquatic sciences.

However, for those ASFA Partners who could not, for various reasons, submit their ASFA records to ProQuest in a timely manner, they could now consider submitting their ASFA records to ProQuest without some or all of the indexing information (e.g. the journal allocation codes, the subject category codes and the descriptors). In this case, ProQuest would add the missing information using an "automated indexing" software followed by a varying degree of manual control. ProQuest clarified that it would also be in a position



to receive records with only partial implementation of the above option. For example, a Partner could submit their records with all of the above mentioned indexing information missing, except for the Geographic descriptors. In this case, the Partner would have to be very clear in describing to ProQuest exactly which indexing fields it has decided to include.

The effects of automated indexing on the quality of the database and retrieval of records would be the subject of ongoing evaluation and review by the ASFA Partners.

### **Option 3. Transfer of Journal (Serial) Monitoring Responsibility to ProQuest**

In this option, should an ASFA Partner not be able to process all of their journals in a timely manner, at the ASFA Partner's request, ProQuest would be willing to assume the monitoring responsibility for a portion of the journals monitored by that Partner.

Regarding this option, Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reminded Partners that in principle each ASFA Partner was responsible for the journals included on their monitoring list. However, if for any particular reason, an ASFA Partner should come across difficulties in keeping up with their monitoring responsibilities in a timely manner, this option could then be considered. By transferring some journals to ProQuest, the ASFA Partner should then, in theory, be able to dedicate that time to do other material, such as grey literature in their country.

Mr Sainekar (NIO) commented that many of the core journals that are currently on NIO's monitoring list were originally under the responsibility of the publisher, then CSA. Gradually over the years, NIO has taken them back over. He felt strongly that each ASFA Partner should be responsible for monitoring the literature in their country.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that the best scenario would be for each ASFA Partner to cover all the aquatic science literature published in their country, but was aware of the fact that this was not always possible.

Ms Noble (NMBL) pointed out that the "transferring of journals to ProQuest" could represent a stumbling block for some ASFA Partners who were struggling to keep their input figures high, so as to maintain their right to extra ASFA product entitlements. She explained that preparing input from serial title/core journals, could be considered a fairly "easy" way of producing higher numbers of records, as opposed to preparing input from grey literature. Therefore, these ASFA Partners would be reluctant to "give up" such journals. Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that ASFA Partners in such a position could consider Option 2 to increase their production figures, i.e. send the base records to ProQuest for automated indexing.

Ms Soto (ProQuest) clarified that should ASFA Partners transfer some journal monitoring responsibilities to ProQuest, they would not lose their entitlements, since the ASFA Partners would then be concentrating on doing grey literature.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) mentioned that there was a growing tendency worldwide regarding staff reductions, and ASFA Partners were experiencing/suffering from this same problem, with backlogs building up in their work due to staff losses. He stressed that should any input responsibilities be given to ProQuest, whether by sending base records for automated indexing, or by transferring journal monitoring responsibilities, they should be replaced with grey literature input. He clarified that the options under discussion were not mandatory, but were solely to give ASFA Partners the possibility of some alternative options both to increase the timeliness and the coverage of grey literature.

### **Option 4. Transfer of Non-journal Monitoring Responsibility to ProQuest:**

This option refers to non-serial publications, such as monographs, books, conference proceedings. If an ASFA Partner can identify and process in a timely manner such documents published in their country, then they should do so. However, if they cannot they should try to provide the publication to ProQuest for processing, either in hard copy or scanned files. This would be to the benefit of the ASFA Partner, since the literature in their country was being made available worldwide on the ASFA database.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) assured ASFA Partners that this option, as well as the ones above, would not affect the entitlements of the ASFA Partner. He said that in no way were ProQuest trying to take over the responsibilities of the ASFA Partners; instead, they were only trying to help out those ASFA Partners having difficulty in fulfilling their responsibilities.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented on how these options were examples of "give and take", i.e. the ASFA Partners would "give up" their journal/monograph to ProQuest for processing in order to have the time to "take on" the processing of grey literature.

### **Option 5. Submission of Open Access Publications to ProQuest**

This option was for an ASFA Partner who was not able to deposit the publications in a repository. The publications could be sent to ProQuest who would then host the full-text and/or upload the content to the repositories.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) stressed that ProQuest did not want to assume the responsibility of an ASFA Partner, but were willing to provide some temporary support to those partners in difficulty, in order to ensure that content was getting onto the database. He added that all ASFA Partners should be aware of their responsibilities when signing the ASFA Partnership.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) clarified that ProQuest was not by this expressing its wish to host all the ASFA content, but that the literature should be deposited in a repository - be it their own institutional repository or the Aquatic Commons or OceanDocs etc.. He reminded ASFA Partners to be careful regarding copyright, when providing the full text of documents in repositories. Permission was necessary to deposit the documents in open access repositories. Also, he said that permission was required for taking a full-text document from one repository and placing it in another.

Mr Sainekar (NIO) commented that open-access links were included in the ASFA records prepared by NIO. Mr Sahu (NIO) said that some institutional repositories contained grey literature such as theses and dissertations and that copyright was generally with the institute.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) suggested that ASFA Partners could browse such open-access repositories to look for documents not on the ASFA database. They could prepare ASFA records for these documents and include the link to the full text on the repository.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat), referring to the discussions under this Agenda item, said that ASFA Partners had now been made aware of the importance of timeliness and were being provided with some options to help them improve the situation.

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to circulate details of Option 2\* to submit ASFA records to ProQuest without indexing information to all ASFA Partners via ASFA Board-L, indicating under which particular circumstances this option could be taken and also providing precise criteria to follow.

\* **[Rapporteur's note:** since the Board Meeting, the FAO ASFA Secretariat has identified 3 ASFA Partners willing to start experimenting with the submission of records for automated indexing (UK/NMBL, NAFO, and INIDEP/Argentina), and has provided them with the instructions on how to submit the records. At this writing, some records have been submitted by NMBL and NAFO to ProQuest for automated indexing.]

## 7.5. ASFA Input procedures

Some aspects of ASFA data inputting procedures that could be simplified or eliminated were examined. The discussions are reported below.

### Formatting and special character codes

Ms Prod'homme raised the issue of the use of italics coding for taxonomic names, saying that it was very time consuming when entering multiple taxonomic names in the abstract. She asked whether it would be possible to eliminate the use of such coding, including also the sub- and superscript coding.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) commented that the italics, sub- and superscripts coding was primarily for the printed products. There were ASFA records on CSA Illumina where sub- and superscripts coding had not been used. All the diacritic characters/special formatting codes had no impact on the search results and could be omitted. He added that chemical formulae were not that important to users of the database and therefore could be eliminated from the text in the abstract, thereby saving time during data entry.

Mr Ibeun (NIFFR) commented that omission of some sub- or superscripts could make the text misleading (for example, 2m<sup>2</sup> instead of 2m<sup>2</sup> or 5 x 10<sup>6</sup> instead of 5 x 10<sup>6</sup>). Ms Soto (ProQuest) while agreeing that it did not "look" good, said that this did not affect the searching results. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) added that, although there could be some confusion when reading the text, this did not affect the users' decision to go to the full text of the document.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) clarified that the use of such coding was optional, ASFA Partners could decide themselves whether they wished to enter text with or without italics, sub- or superscript coding.

Ms Soto (ProQuest) said that some particular special character codes would be necessary and suggested reviewing the Table of special character codes.

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat and ProQuest agreed** to prepare a table of those special character codes that would have to be used during ASFA data entry, including some examples of what could be done.

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to notify ASFA Partners via ASFA Board-L regarding this change to ASFA data entry procedures and send them copies of the new special character codes table.

### Records without abstracts

Ms Kalenchits (PIMRIS) raised the issue of grey literature material which, although existing as full-text in institutional repositories, did not have any abstracts. She explained that PIMRIS would be receiving many PDFs of grey literature from their collaborators for processing into ASFA and it would take considerable time to process all the material in a timely matter, since abstracts would have to be written. She asked whether such material could be entered into ASFA without abstracts since the full text was available.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that if the full text of the material was not hosted by ProQuest, the fact that such material existed as full-text in other repositories did not assist in searching, especially if no abstract was present. Mr Pettman (FBA) asked whether ProQuest could host the full text of such material. Mr Emerson replied that ProQuest as yet, was not equipped to host the full text of records for the ASFA database. Ms Kalenchits (PIMRIS) said that many of the Pacific countries would not be prepared to deposit their documents somewhere else. She added that there were 14 countries in the region that were providing material, but there was only 1 person doing the ASFA input. Therefore there were many records to process, approximately 1000, which would require considerable time and effort if abstracts had to be prepared for all of them.

Ms Noble (NMBL) asked why these documents had no abstracts. Ms Kalenchits (PIMRIS) replied that much of this grey literature was annual reports or survey reports, which generally do not have summaries. Mr Ibeun (NIFFR) asked why it was that grey literature did not have abstracts. He said that recommendations should be made to the publishers to include abstracts. He suggested that perhaps a trust fund proposal could be put forward to prepare the abstracts for such a large amount of material. Ms Noble asked whether Ms Kalenchits could request that future publications be provided with abstracts. Ms Kalenchits replied that she would take into consideration these possibilities.

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reminded the ASFA Partners that the "Guidelines for Abstracting (using www-ISIS-ASFA software)" explained the exceptional situations whereby ASFA records could be submitted without abstracts, and that this included material such as Annual Reports, Statistical Reports etc. She said that if the title was clear and the indexing was in depth then these records could be submitted without abstracts.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that, even though under some particular circumstances, abstracts were not necessary, it was always highly recommended that an ASFA record should contain at least one abstract, if not in English then at least one in another language (e.g. Spanish, French etc.). Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) commented that in those cases where there was only a non-English abstract, the depth and the accuracy of the indexing became even more important. Mr Pepe said that abstracts were very useful for searching, whereas searching the full text was not very useful. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) noted that much irrelevant "noise" would be obtained if searching only on full text, and an abstract would help the search results. Mr Pepe said that as full texts became more widespread, abstracts were becoming more important to help narrow down the search. Mr Sahu (NIO) also commented that abstracts were very important to researchers when searching databases. Mr Pepe reminded the Partners that, in the past, one of the reasons that gained ASFA its good name and reputation as a bibliographic database, was its inclusion of abstracts.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) summed up the above discussion, saying that the large amount of grey literature referred to by Ms Kalenchits (PIMRIS) could be submitted without abstracts, but only as per the exceptions mentioned by Ms Wibley (FAO) in the above paragraph (i.e. only the records referring to annual reports, statistical reports, cruise reports etc. could be entered without abstracts and in these records the indexing should be in-depth).

Mr Ruetze (BF) reported that he was in a similar situation with ICES papers, i.e. they were available as full text, but did not have abstracts. He asked whether the full-text documents could be submitted to ProQuest to be put through the automated indexing system. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that this was possible, but there would be a lot of inaccuracies/ noise if done only using the full text.

#### Abbreviated serial titles

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) questioned the importance of including the abbreviated serial titles in ASFA records. He noted that at present the abbreviated serial titles appear as well as the full serial title in the ASFA record (i.e. the abbreviated serial titles and the full serial title were both included in the Serial titles pick-list contained in the www-ISIS-ASFA software used for data entry; when the full serial title is selected from the pick-list during data entry the abbreviated serial title is also entered in the record).

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that users of the database did not search frequently using the abbreviated serial titles; they searched on the full title rather than the abbreviated. He believed that the abbreviated serial title could be omitted during data entry. Mr Sainekar (NIO) insisted that the abbreviated serial titles should not be eliminated, adding that they were very important for the printed product. He said that there had been consensus at the Simplification Working Group Meeting, held during the 2006 ASFA Board Meeting in Belgium, to maintain the abbreviated serial titles. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) explained that the abbreviated serial titles already existing on the database were not going to be removed; they would remain on the CSA Illumina platform. The proposal to eliminate abbreviated serial titles was for new serial titles. Ms Wibley (FAO) said that the pick-list in the www-ISIS-ASFA software would still keep the abbreviated titles for all those serials already included. Therefore, by selecting the full title from the list, the abbreviated serial title would still automatically be entered in the record. However, when a new title was to be added to the Master Monitoring List, an abbreviated version of the serial title would no longer be included. She said that this would also be the case when carrying out retrospective indexing, i.e. when preparing records from old publications not on the Master Monitoring List there would be no need to create an abbreviated version of the title.

Mr Sainekar (NIO) stressed that document citations always used the abbreviated form of the title. He said that NIO converted their ASFA records onto their in-house databases and that consistency in the title format was very important. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) commented that there was not much consistency nowadays regarding abbreviated serial titles, given that publishers use different standards, not necessarily the International ISO Standards used by ASFA. Originally, only the abbreviated serial title was entered during data entry in order to save space on the printed journal; this problem no longer existed regarding the CSA Illumina platform.

Ms Noble (NMBL) asked whether ProQuest could add the full serial title to the old records on the database which only had the abbreviated serial title. Ms Soto (ProQuest) replied that some had been done and that they were being done a few at a time. Mr Pettman (FBA) asked whether the work could be done behind the scenes, i.e. mapping with the search interface. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) pointed out that some of the older abbreviated titles were incorrect since they had been done before machine-readable input. He added human resources would be needed to do the mapping.

**Ms Noble (PMBL) agreed** to send a list of serial titles to ProQuest for which it would like ProQuest to retroactively add the full serial titles to those older ASFA records appearing on the database which (in accordance with past inputting procedures) contained only the abbreviated serial title.

**Ms Soto (ProQuest) agreed** to add the full serial titles, but stressed that ProQuest would prioritise and carry out the work as and when the resources are available.

#### Modifying/enriching authors' abstracts

Ms Noble (NMBL) raised the issue of "enriching" the abstracts provided by the document/publication with information such as geographic location, taxonomic names in the context of automated indexing. This information was often contained in the text of the document, rather than the abstract. Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that for those ASFA Partners who would be sending "base records" to ProQuest for automated indexing, as discussed previously under Agenda Item 7.4 (Option 2), it would be necessary to add geographic names to the abstract. He stressed that the procedure to be followed by ASFA Partners choosing this option regarding timeliness would be fully explained in a cover letter sent by the FAO ASFA Secretariat to all ASFA Partners.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) mentioned that author-assigned keywords were often very useful and that the possibility of including them in the ASFA records should be considered. He explained that ProQuest captured these keywords as text to be processed through their automated indexing system. Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that if the "author-assigned keywords" were considered as being useful for automated indexing, then perhaps ASFA Partners should be entering them during data entry using www-ISIS-ASFA.

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to investigate with Dr Rybinski (ICIE) regarding the addition of a new field for "author keywords" in the www-ISIS-ASFA software.

\* **[Rapporteur's note:** since the Board Meeting, the FAO ASFA Secretariat has contracted (ICIE) to include this extra field in the soon to be released www-ISIS-ASFA 1.2 software update]

*Follow-up action item 12 from the 2008 ASFA Board Meeting:*

*Regarding the digitization of the full text of ASFA records that already exist on the CSA Illumina database and the inclusion of this literature in institutional repositories..... **the FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to send an e-mail via ASFA Board-L to remind all ASFA Partners that URL links could be added to ASFA records already existing on the database.***

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that the e-mail had been sent to all ASFA Partners via ASFA Board-L on 19.02.09.

## **7.6. ASFA input production**

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) referred to statistics regarding ASFA Partner contributions to the database contained in the FAO Report, Section 8.5 (**Annex-3**) and the document ASFA/2009/71 (**Annex-49**). He mentioned that these statistics showed regular input by the ASFA Partners and also input prepared during Trust Fund Projects. He also questioned the input statistics provided by ProQuest in their report (**Annex-42**), saying that they did not correspond with those compiled by the FAO ASFA Secretariat.

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) questioned the wording in the statement by ProQuest in their Summary Report "The number of active partners has also been decreasing from a high of 49 in 2005 to 41 in 2008." (See **Annex-42**). Mr Emerson (ProQuest) clarified that the word "active" should be taken as meaning "actively submitting". Ms Wibley pointed out that 4 ASFA Partners, who had not submitted input during the year 2008, had already submitted ASFA records for 2009 (at the time of the Board Meeting) and stated that the FAO ASFA Secretariat had input pending for submission to ProQuest from 4 other ASFA Partners. She said that these ASFA Partners should be considered as being active. This would bring the total of "active partners" to 49 (equal to the all time high in 2005).

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) commented that there was lot of valuable input from Partners not getting into the database, or being submitted in a slow and tardy manner. While accepting the fact that some ASFA Partners faced staffing problems and could be lacking in human resources, he noted that 20 ASFA Partners had not submitted Interseasonal Reports, and that could be seen as an indicator of how important ASFA was to them, i.e. a sign of lack of commitment or responsibility. Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that some ASFA Partners could be facing administrative problems when it came to writing and submitting reports.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) stressed the importance of actively submitting ASFA records to ProQuest in a timely manner. He said that ProQuest's customers did not like delays in current literature; they wanted the latest records appearing on the database as soon as possible. Ms Noble (NMBL), while understanding the importance of timeliness, pointed out that some of the countries' literature would not appear anywhere else in any other database and surely some issues, even though late, were better than none. Mr Emerson replied that this was not a key point in purchasing the database.

Mr Sainekar (NIO) said that it was important to know why there was a decrease in input by the ASFA Partners, and suggested that one of the reasons could be a decrease in publications. He added that for many of the ASFA Partners who were librarians, ASFA input was only one of their many activities, some of which could have higher priority than ASFA. He suggested that ASFA Partners set themselves a target regarding the number of ASFA records to prepare and that they made every effort to reach it. Mr Ibeun (NIFFR) concurred, saying that it was necessary to find out what the problem is in order to solve it. He asked whether the FAO ASFA Secretariat could formulate some questions regarding input production and circulate it to ASFA Partners via ASFA Board-L. Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) replied that the FAO ASFA Secretariat did contact ASFA Partners not sending reports or input, asking for some explanations. He mentioned the staff turnover in various ASFA Partners, noting that this affected the regularity of ASFA input submission and said that, in some cases, this required re-training.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) asked ASFA Partners to examine their vision of ASFA and whether they believed it to be economically viable/sustainable.

## **7.7. ASFA Theme(s)**

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) introduced this Agenda Item, referring to the document "Themes of past ASFA Board Meetings" (**Annex-66**). He explained that "timeliness" was to be considered the underlying theme of this meeting, in light of the discussions held regarding the document "solutions to improve/increase timeliness of ASFA" (**Annex-57**).

## **8. ASFA PRODUCTS AND SERVICES**

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) referred to the document "List of ASFA information products and services" (**Annex-50**) which described the various formats and media in which the ASFA database is available, providing also price details.

### **8.1. ASFA journals**

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) reported that it was unlikely that the printed ASFA Journals would survive much longer, due to the high production costs. He said that the printed journal was only a small part of the database, with approximately 100,000 records per year. The ASFA database was therefore not well reflected in the journals, showing an increasing disparity with the CSA Illumina database. He explained that this also meant that the printed journals were no longer important for pure archival purposes.

### **8.2. CD-ROM/DVD**

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) explained that the ASFA database on CD-ROM/DVD was a product available only to the ASFA Partners and those institutions involved in the LIFDC project. He said that this was a very important product for the LIFDCs (some 53 countries), and that it was very important for the CDs/DVDs to arrive on time, given that the LIFDCs depended on them. Mr Pepe mentioned that there had been some problems regarding the correct content of the CDs/DVDs and there had also been some delays in their arrival. He solicited ProQuest not to forget this very important product, since it was one of the requirements included in the Publishing Agreement.

Ms Soto (ProQuest) said that ProQuest was striving hard to produce this product. The June update went out on time with the correct records, and the September update would be distributed within the next few weeks.

Mr Ibeun (NIFFR) asked about the cost of the ASFA Database on CD-ROM. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) explained that the CD-ROM was not commercially available, i.e. it was not sold but only produced by ProQuest for distribution exclusively to the ASFA Partners. He said that the direct cost for production was approximately US \$ 40 000/year, whereas the total cost of production, including indirect costs was US \$80 000-90 000/year. Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) asked why the costs were so excessive. Mr Emerson replied that there were licensing costs for the search software and also continuing development costs (i.e. human resources) that had to be taken into account in the production of the CD-ROM.

### 8.3. Internet Service

Ms Noble (NMBL) reported that several batches of UK-indexed records that had been submitted to ProQuest during the intersessional period erroneously appeared in ASFA Illumina with “indexing in process” instead of showing the indexing. She said that ProQuest had dealt with the problem quickly after the error had been noted and reported. However, she asked whether the records would have remained that way had ProQuest not have been informed. Ms Soto (ProQuest) said that there had been a problem with the overlap time, and the records may not have been checked. She explained that this error would have been noted, given that there was an occasional re-loading of the records (once a year). However, the re-loading could be done upon request, should there be a need. Ms Soto reminded ASFA Partners that should they notice any discrepancies in their records, they should notify ProQuest immediately.

Mr Pettman (FBA), referring to the Internet Service interface and the new user platform being developed, asked if there had been any discussion between ProQuest and the FAO ASFA Secretariat regarding input to the interface. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) replied that there had been no direct discussion between the interface team and FAO ASFA Secretariat, only indirectly through Ms Soto and himself. He explained that there were many external advisors involved and that it was not just an internal effort. The new platform would contain all the CSA Illumina databases and the ProQuest databases, with ASFA just being one of the components. Mr Pettman asked whether the FAO ASFA Secretariat would have a preview of the new platform before it went live, in order to be able to see if and how it could affect data entry. Mr Emerson clarified that there were no “structural” changes, i.e. there would be no changes to metadata. The changes concerned the searching interface, i.e. to allow cross-searching across different databases. However, he added that this request was noted.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that if ProQuest were changing their tools for cross-searching, with the possibility of incorporating the ASFA Thesaurus and an eventual Geographic Thesaurus, then perhaps Mr Pettman (FBA) should be kept up-to-date regarding these tools. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) replied that much of the information regarding the new platform was restricted, but he added that they were focussing on a geographic tool for map integration which would be in a structure compatible with the Geographic Thesaurus. He explained that the geographic pick-list and/or thesaurus would require a numeric tagging to reflect a GIS oriented system so as to be able to use a map system. Mr Pettman expressed his willingness to contribute, if ProQuest thought it to be useful to the development of their new tools. Mr Emerson said that 6/7 geographic vocabularies were used for location and that since more work was now being planned on the ASFA Geographic Thesaurus, it would become more valuable.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that it was important for the FAO ASFA Secretariat to be informed by ProQuest as to whether what was being done regarding software development and data entry procedures was useful or not. This information would assist the ASFA Partners in deciding which way to go forwards for the future (e.g. future uses of ontologies, geographic coordinates) and whether to continue with future projects or not. Mr Pepe stressed the importance of collaboration between ProQuest and the FAO ASFA Secretariat.

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) referred to the request made in the INIDEP Report (See **Annex-11**) for the linking options of full text handles (to Ocean Docs and Scielo) to be made more visible. She said that they should appear in the first search display format (short format) and also be highlighted. Ms Soto (ProQuest) explained that this was a dilemma involving software mapping to the Notes field rather than the Full-text field. However, she added that since the www-ISIS-ASFA 1.2 update would have a new field exclusively for URL full-text addresses, the links could then be mapped in order to be clickable from that field. She said that INIDEP’s request to change the Browse Interface would be put forward to ProQuest’s interface team. She reminded ASFA Partners that the CSA Illumina display views could be customized to show fields as required by the user by using the administrative features option of the interface. Ms Soto added that she would be giving a presentation regarding this feature on Day 4 of the Board Meeting. Ms Kalenchits (PIMRIS) questioned the need for the visibility of the URLs on the short display format. She said that it would be necessary first to read the abstract before deciding whether to go to the full text, i.e. see the record in the full display format.

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that once version 1.2 of the www-ISIS-ASFA software was release, it would only allow “clickable” live links to the full text handles for records prepared in the future. She added that it would be desirable if ProQuest could go back to the old links entered in the Notes field and also make them “clickable”.

Ms Prod’homme (IFREMER) referred to some of the requests made in the IFREMER Report (See Annex-19) concerning some of the CSA Illumina search functions. She stressed the importance of being able to search simultaneously for authors and editors. While appreciating the use of the Boolean operator “not” in searches, she said that it would be very useful if more specific examples were provided in the Search Tips.

Ms Noble (NMBL) concurred with the need for more examples regarding the searchable fields and how they should be searched. She asked whether ProQuest could make more visible what could be searched, e.g. the Geographic descriptors. Ms Soto (ProQuest) said that this type of information was included in the ASFA Fact Sheets. Ms Noble commented that nobody used these fact sheets, but perhaps if they were made more

visible on the search interface then users would see them and consult them more. **Ms Soto (ProQuest)** agreed that she would pass this request on to their interface development team.

Regarding the ASFA database and its more or less user friendliness, Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) noted that the ASFA system has evolved over many, many years and has changed over time. Consequently, he said the database had perhaps tended towards becoming a bit “esoteric”, i.e. if you knew the system (and its secrets) you would be able to use (search) it without any problem. However, for those users who did not know the system and its history, it was important to have good user manuals, providing examples and descriptions of the various tools available. He stressed that these should be visible, and not hidden, in order to help the searcher correctly use the database.

Mr Kaske (NOAA) commented on the complexity of searching. He said that the future trend was for libraries to become more complex, yet more simple. He said that manuals were provided online to help the user do what he/she wanted to do wherever he/she was in the system. He mentioned some of the features that were appreciated by students using the CSA Illumina search interface, such as the division of documents into books/journals/websites and also the “save and print” feature.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that “how to search the database” was a serious problem and asked whether ProQuest could provide some sort of manual online. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that most information providers did not develop online manuals, but rather used algorithms behind the scenes so that the system can understand what the user is trying to get and help him/she in getting the information. Mr Pepe said that this was good, since the current trend in “searching” is: “Find out what I mean and not what I say”.

#### **8.4. New outputs and services (by ProQuest)**

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) reported that all ASFA Partners would be granted access, at no cost, to the records contained in the new Illustrata database (i.e. indexed tables, figures etc.) a few weeks after the Board Meeting. That is, when carrying out a search on the ASFA database, records retrieved from the Illustrata database would also turn up in the ASFA search results and could be viewed.

Mr Emerson mentioned that ProQuest had a new agreement with Cambridge University Press, Oxford Press and Elsevier. He also reported that the previous NISC CD-ROM/DVD, which combined ASFA together with other files, was no longer available, since NISC had been purchased by EBSCO. He explained that EBSCO was a primary competitor, being a distributor like ProQuest with many databases and full-text agreements with primary publishers. As a consequence ProQuest were not providing ASFA records to them.

#### **8.5. Public relations activities and marketing (by ProQuest and Partners)**

Ms Soto (ProQuest) referred to some of ProQuest's Marketing activities for ASFA that were carried out in 2008, which are listed in Annex 4 of the ProQuest Report (see **Annex-42**).

Mr Sainekar (NIO) gave a brief summary of some of NIO's public relations activities. He said that a great attempt was made by NIO to make ASFA visible. He explained that most NIO scientists could access CSA Illumina from the NIO Intranet. Mr Sainekar added that NIO received many search requests and that now this service was becoming easier via Internet/e-mails.

Ms Silaja (CIFT) said that ASFA was very much appreciated by the CIFT scientists, visiting scientists and students, when searching the database to obtain information.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that this was very encouraging and showed the good spirit of NIO and its Collaborating Centre in promoting ASFA not only within the institutes but also within the country. He reported that the FAO ASFA Secretariat frequently reminded staff in the FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Department about ASFA and how to use the database. Twice a year e-mails were sent to the staff with detailed instructions on how to access CSA Illumina from the FAO Intranet service. Mr Pepe also reported that at the 2008 IAMSLIC meeting he had chaired a Panel discussion entitled “What does it mean to be an ASFA Partner?” Some of the ASFA Partners present at the Meeting including Ms Soto (ProQuest) were amongst the people who participated in the Panel discussion. Several people who thought they understood what ASFA was before the Panel discussion came up to Mr Pepe afterwards expressing their satisfaction in having learned more about ASFA and the way it functions.

Mr Sainekar (NIO) said that in the field of aquatic sciences there was no substitute for ASFA, and if all ASFA Partners paid great attention to coverage, monitoring and timeliness, people would keep subscribing to the database.

Mr Pettman (FBA) reported that at his institute each new staff member was provided with a PC with a direct link to ASFA on the desktop.

Regarding access to CSA Illumina, Mr Sainekar (NIO) asked whether institutes could request ProQuest for trial periods of access and, if so, how they should go about it. He added that sometimes, after an institute has finished its trial period, it may be interested in buying subscription. Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) mentioned that FAO had received a request from someone who wished to subscribe to CSA Illumina, but

could not find the appropriate information on the ProQuest website. He said that such information was important and should be easy to find, rather than “hidden” somewhere within the website interface. He asked ProQuest to make this information more visible.

**ProQuest agreed** to send out an e-mail via ASFA Board-L containing information on how to subscribe to CSA Illumina and also on how to obtain a free trial period of access.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reminded the ASFA Partners that they should share their Institute/library information resources by sending e-mails via ASFA-Board-L to notify everybody regarding any new ASFA relevant activities, resources, features or networks that are launched on or through their institutional web site. The idea, he said, was that if you are doing something good – let us all know, let us all benefit.

Mr Ibeun (NIFFR) commented that publicizing ASFA activities was a good way of making the ASFA records sent to ProQuest visible internationally. He described various activities conducted within his institute to acquaint people with ASFA. He said that people working in the area of aquatic sciences were identified, giving FISON (Fisheries Society of Nigeria) as an example, and then a visit would be made to that institute/organization to give a seminar to the scientists regarding ASFA. Demonstrations were given on how to search the ASFA database, and sometimes, in return, free publications were obtained for putting on the database.

Ms Kalenchits (PIMRIS) reported that promoting ASFA was very important in their programme, especially to students in marine sciences. Searching strategies were described and she added that ASFA was the major resource of research information.

Mr Kaske (NOAA) said that new employees at NOAA, during their orientation, were shown ASFA amongst the different databases available.

## **8.6. Document delivery**

Mr Sainekar (NIO) reported that document delivery was a very important service provided by NIO, and added that the ultimate goal when using the ASFA database was “to get the document in hand”. He explained that on the NIO website, from their publications database it was possible to use the search and request reprint option to have a next-day delivery. He said that NIO often supplied publications/articles to IAMSILIC members and also replied to requests for documents by ASFA Partners, via ASFA Board-L. However, he mentioned that sometimes it was difficult to verify the identity of the ASFA Partner, since personal e-mail addresses were used to make the requests. He asked that the ASFA Partner’s requesting documents send the request from their officially recognized ASFA contact address, and he also stressed the importance of providing a correct bibliographic citation. He expressed his appreciation to all ASFA Partners who had helped him in document delivery.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that, for many ASFA Partners, their institute’s official ASFA contact e-mail address did not work consistently and therefore they often had to resort to using personal e-mail addresses to send messages. He reminded ASFA Partners that should they use a personal e-mail address when posting to another ASFA Partner or to ASFA Board-L, they should sign the e-mail with their full name and full address of their institute. In this way, the other ASFA Partner receiving the request is certain that the request is a legitimate request coming from another ASFA partner.

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) insisted that the IAMSILIC Z39.50 Distribution library should be used for document delivery, saying that ASFA Board-L should not really be used for this purpose. She expressed appreciation for her IAMSILIC membership being paid by the ASFA Trust Fund.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reminded Partners that the IAMSILIC Z39.50 distributed library should always be consulted (searched first) before making requests for document delivery via ASFA-Board-L. ASFA Board-L should be used as a last resort.

Ms Nyika (IMS) reminded ASFA Partners that even if they could not make their library catalogues searchable through the IAMSILIC Z39.50 distributed library initiative, they could still provide a list of their serials to IAMSILIC, in order to make them visible.

Mr Ibeun (NIFFR) acknowledged the efforts made by the FAO Fisheries Branch Library in strengthening the inter-library collaboration among some libraries in the Africa including document delivery for the LIFDC countries. He said that the connections and contacts established were being used for document delivery via e-mail, mentioning in particular South African Institute for Aquatic Biodiversity (SAIAB) library, Grahamstown.

## **8.7. Entitlements (Partner entitlements to ASFA products and services)**

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reminded ASFA Partners of their entitlements to the ASFA products and services, referring to the Table of ASFA Partners’ Entitlements (**Annex-49a**). He mentioned that CSA Illustrata was now included as part of the ASFA Partner entitlements. He asked all ASFA Partners to check with the data provided in the table and confirm that they were actually receiving the products to which they were entitled. Should an ASFA Partner no longer wish to receive one of the entitlements, they should send an e-mail to inform Ms Soto (ProQuest), copying it to Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat).



Regarding the statistics included in the Table of ASFA Partners' Entitlements, several ASFA Partners observed that their entitlements were not correctly reflected. Ms Soto (ProQuest) said that she would check with the ProQuest marketing department, who provided the data.

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to remind ASFA Partners of their ASFA entitlements and to individually contact each ASFA Partner to ask for information regarding their current entitlements, i.e. exactly which products/services they were receiving, and also if they wished to change them.

[**Rapporteur's note:** since the Board Meeting, the FAO ASFA Secretariat has contacted all Partners regarding their entitlements and ProQuest is taking action.]

## 8.8. Increasing distribution of ASFA information products and services

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) noted that this was the 11<sup>th</sup> year of the "*Project to Distribute ASFA on CD-ROM to LIFDCs in Africa and via Internet to LIFDCs worldwide*" and referred to the full report of the project's activities prepared by Ms Hilary Cochrane (FAO consultant) (**Annex-47**). He reported that the number of currently active institutions, i.e. receiving ASFA free-of-charge under this project, had increased this year to 49 members; replies from four others were still outstanding, which would make a total of 53. The number of institutions that have become ASFA partners after participating in the LIFDC initiative remained at 12. Mr Pepe added that, given the present worldwide economical difficulties, some countries may be reluctant to commit themselves to increased responsibilities and so it was even more important to continue to encourage new participants to join this project.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest), referring to the questionnaires that were sent out to the institutes which were receiving CD-ROMs/DVDs under the LIFDC project, asked whether any usage statistics had been compiled. Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that each time a CD-ROM/DVD was sent out to an institute, a request was made for acknowledgement; the survey responses varied from year to year. Mr Emerson asked how the success of the project could be evaluated without any information from the institute receiving the CD-ROM/DVD regarding their usage of the ASFA database. In order to be able to promote continuation of this project at ProQuest, Mr Emerson said that it was important to have important tools such as statistical information; he suggested that ASFA Partners could also quantify usage of the CD-ROM/DVDs in their Intersessional Reports.

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to ask Ms Cochrane (FAO) to solicit the institutes regarding answers to the questionnaires and to also obtain some statistics regarding usage of the database. ProQuest would be sent copies of the returned questionnaires.

Mr Ibeun (NIFFR) commented that although his institute made great use of the CD-ROM, for example when training students or research officers, no statistics were recorded. Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) clarified that NIFFR were no longer part of the LIFDC project, but could present information regarding usage of the CD-ROM in training or search requests in their intersessional reports.

Regarding the questionnaires, Ms Kalenchits (PIMRIS) requested that, when the questionnaires were sent to LIFDCs in the Pacific Island region regarding their interest in the project, PIMRIS would also be informed of the replies so as to assist them in coordinating their activities.

## 9. PROGRESS WITH MACHINE READABLE INPUT

### 9.1. www-ISIS-ASFA

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that the Release 1.2 upgrade was complete and extensive testing had been carried out by the FAO ASFA Secretariat. The work carried out by Mr Rybinski (ICIE) regarding the development of the 1.2 upgrade is described in the ICIE report (see **Annex-56**). Sample records had been prepared by the FAO ASFA Secretariat and sent to ProQuest. The FAO ASFA Secretariat was waiting for the go ahead from ProQuest after their final testing on the records, before the upgrade could be distributed, but up until the time of the Board Meeting, no reply from ProQuest had been received.

**ProQuest agreed** to investigate the status of this testing and inform the FAO ASFA Secretariat if all was OK or if they required more sample records.

[**Rapporteur's note:** at this Board Meeting, it was agreed to add an additional field to the www-ISIS-ASFA 1.2 upgrade ("Author assigned keywords"), therefore the preparation of test records by the FAO ASFA Secretariat and the sending to ProQuest for final testing/loading would have to be repeated.]

## 10. REPORT ON ASFA TRAINING ACTIVITIES

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that 3 ASFA training sessions had been carried out during the intersessional period, and that one was to be held shortly after this meeting: 1) "Training of trainers" course, carried out 11-15 May 2009 at FAO, Rome, where Ms Cristiani (IIP, Uruguay) was trained to become an ASFA trainer (her first assignment was to train the new staff at IFOP, Chile); 2) Training session for ASFA

Partner IFOP, Chile, carried out 30 June-4 July 2009 by Ms Cristiani (IIP) with some technical support from the FAO ASFA Secretariat; 3) Training session for ASFA Partner MI, Ireland, carried out 10-11 June 2009 at NMBL, UK by Ms Noble with some technical support from the FAO ASFA Secretariat; 4) Training session for ASFA Partner IMROP, Mauritania, 5-9 October 2009 by Ms Prod'homme at IFREMER, France

The FAO ASFA Secretariat believed that Ms Cristiani (IIP) and Mr Montes (UNAM) would now be able to deal with the Latin American ASFA Partners in that they would take over responsibility (from FAO) for input control, troubleshooting software problems etc.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that a training session was planned to be held at PIMRIS headquarters for SPC. Ms Kalenchits (PIMRIS) reported that this training session was postponed, given that there were plans for merging it with another library (that of the Pacific Islands Applied Geoscience Commission, SOPAC). An eventual training would be held for both centres together.

Another ASFA training/refresher session had been provisionally planned to be held by Mr Macharia (KMFRI) after the AFRIAMSLIC Meeting in Tanzania, 23-24 July 2009 for participating African ASFA Partners. However, Mr Macharia reported that, aside from IMS (Tanzania) and KMFRI (Kenya) no other ASFA Partners had attended. Mr Macharia asked whether it would be possible to have some language training regarding French, so that he could provide ASFA training and assistance to Francophone African countries. Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat), while expressing appreciation regarding Mr Macharia's offer to learn French in order to be able to train/assist the French speaking ASFA partners, said that it would probably be better if one of the existing French speaking ASFA partners (e.g. DPM/Senegal) took on this responsibility.

See FAO Report (**Annex-3**, Section 7.2.3) for further details of possible future ASFA training/refresher courses.

## **11. STATUS OF ASFIS REFERENCE SERIES PUBLICATIONS**

### **11.1. ASFIS-1, Serials Monitored for the ASFIS Bibliographic Database**

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) explained that the Serials Monitoring List was contained as a pick-list in the www-ISIS-ASFA software and that, from time-to-time, updated versions of this list were sent to ASFA Partners, and also made available on the ASFA Homepage, for uploading into the software. The most recent updated version of the Monitoring List had been distributed to ASFA Partners in June 2008. The Monitoring List is also available for downloading from the FTP site of the FAO ASFA Homepage at [ftp://ftp.fao.org/FI/asfa/Monitoring\\_List/Monlis.zip](ftp://ftp.fao.org/FI/asfa/Monitoring_List/Monlis.zip).

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) stressed the importance of keeping the Serials Monitoring List up-to-date, and reminded ASFA Partners that they should notify the FAO ASFA Secretariat (attention Ms Wibley, [Helen.Wibley@fao.org](mailto:Helen.Wibley@fao.org)) of any changes, additions or deletions to serial titles on their monitoring lists. He mentioned that transfer of the maintenance of the Serial Monitoring List to ProQuest was under consideration.

Mr Sainekar (NIO) asked how frequently the ASFA Partners should inform the FAO ASFA Secretariat regarding changes to serial titles. Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) told ASFA Partners that they should notify immediately the changes to the FAO ASFA Secretariat. She explained that maintenance of the Master File was an ongoing process and that titles were continually being updated.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) mentioned that a text file containing the fully updated Serials Monitoring List was periodically made available for downloading from the FTP site of the FAO ASFA Homepage at: [ftp://ftp.fao.org/FI/asfa/Monitoring\\_List/MASTER.txt](ftp://ftp.fao.org/FI/asfa/Monitoring_List/MASTER.txt). He stressed that this file was for consultation only, and not for loading into the www-ISIS-ASFA software. At this time of writing, the most recent version of the text file was dated 9.08.09.

### **11.2. ASFIS-2, Subject Categories and Scope Descriptions**

The present version of ASFIS-2, Subject Categories and Scope Descriptions (rev.2) is the most current version and is available on the FTP site of the FAO ASFA Homepage at: <ftp://ftp.fao.org/fi/asfa/>.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that although there were no modifications to the subject categories, there was an up-dated list of subject areas that were considered to be outside of the subject scope of ASFA. This list had been circulated by ASFA Board-L on 10 March 2009. See discussion reported under Agenda Item 7.1 and see FAO Report, Section 5.2 (**Annex-3**) for the updated list.

### **11.3. ASFIS-3, Guidelines for Bibliographic Description**

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that a revision (Rev.4) of the Guidelines for Bibliographic Description and Data Entry (using www-ISIS-ASFA software v1.1) had been issued and distributed to ASFA Partners in October 2007. The English version of the Help Notes in the software had also been updated to incorporate the revised rules and sent to ASFA Partners at the same time.

The publication is available for downloading at: <ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/010/k0446e/k0446e.pdf>.

#### 11.4. ASFIS-4, Guidelines for Abstracting

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that there had been no change to this publication during the intersessional period. It is available on the FTP site of the FAO ASFA Homepage at: <http://ftp.fao.org/fi/asfa/>.

#### 11.5. ASFIS-5, Guidelines for Indexing

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that there had been no change to this publication during the intersessional period. It is available on the FTP site of the FAO ASFA Homepage at: <http://ftp.fao.org/fi/asfa/>. Mr Pepe commented that these guidelines most probably would have to be modified in the future, to incorporate the changes in ASFA data entry procedures with respect to automated indexing and the revised Geographic Authority List.

#### 11.6. ASFIS-6, Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Thesaurus

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that both the printed version of the updated ASFA Thesaurus (Rev. 3) and the updated ASFA Thesaurus pick-list were available on the FTP site of the FAO ASFA Homepage at <http://ftp.fao.org/fi/asfa/>. A printed version of the ASFA Thesaurus was sent to all ASFA Partners in June 2009. Mr Pepe mentioned that a "form" for suggesting new terms had been circulated via ASFA Board-L during the intersessional period. This same form is also included as the last page in the printed version of the Thesaurus, and is also available on the "reserved FAO ASFA ftp site" at <http://ASFA:2go2ASFA@ext-ftp.fao.org/FI/Reserved/ASFA> in the folder called ASFA\_Reference\_Series-Guidelines.

Mr Pepe expressed his thanks to the Thesaurus Working Group for all their efforts involved in the updating of the ASFA Thesaurus. In particular, he mentioned the hard work carried out by Mr Pettman (FBA) to get the terms into the new Thesaurus maintenance software, so that it would be ontology friendly and he also reported that FBA would be responsible for the maintenance of the ASFA Thesaurus. Mr Pepe reported that the ASFA Thesaurus was one of the vocabularies being used in the EU project "NeOn: Lifecycle for Networked Ontologies" to develop and test the technology for creating and disseminating ontologies. He said that other information systems had requested the ASFA Thesaurus in different formats, such as SKOS, EXCEL etc. See the FAO Report, section 5.6 (**Annex-3**) for more information regarding the ASFA Thesaurus and ontology applications. Mr Pettman (FBA) told ASFA Partners that he would give a presentation on "Ontology" on the Fourth day of the Meeting. See Agenda Item 16.4.

Mr Pettman (FBA) clarified that the ASFA Thesaurus and the GAL Thesaurus were 2 different publications/issues and should not be confused. (See Agenda Item 11.7 for discussions regarding geographic descriptors and the GAL Thesaurus.) He requested ASFA Partners to look at the printed version of the revised ASFA Thesaurus and to inform the FAO ASFA Secretariat and himself should any discrepancies be noticed. Regarding the maintenance of the ASFA Thesaurus, Mr Pettman referred to the "new terms" form and recommended that ASFA Partners used this form to suggest any particular terms they believed should be added. He requested that ASFA Partners sent him this form, copying also to the FAO ASFA Secretariat.

Ms Kalenchits (PIMRIS) referred to the request made by SPC in their report for better subject descriptors to describe the idea of traditional knowledge in fisheries. Mr Pettman (FBA) commented that SPC could use the "new terms" form to suggest the additional terms themselves, or they could request him to suggest terms for that particular subject area. He said once a total of approximately 200/250 new terms had been collected, a new thesaurus update could be produced. He suggested a time interval of 2/3 years between updates.

**Mr Pettman and Ms Kalenchits agreed** to liaise regarding terms to be added to cover the field of "traditional knowledge".

#### 11.7. ASFIS-7, Geographic Authority List

Mr Pettman (FBA) gave a brief outline of the trust fund project to "Update the ASFA Geographical Authority List (GAL) and produce a geographic Thesaurus and revised Pick List from the revised GAL", referring to his report of the activities involved (See **Annex-38a**). He informed the ASFA Partners that the Geographic Working Group had met to discuss various aspects and present recommendations regarding ways forward.

##### Updating the GAL

Mr Pettman (FBA) said that, given the 17 years since the last update, there had been many changes in country names, regional groupings, water body names etc. The revised GAL was now 25% larger than the last 1992 update. He explained that changes had been made not only to entry names but also to layout which can be seen on page 2 of his report (**Annex-38a**).

He told the ASFA Partners that, in July 2009, the FAO ASFA Secretariat had put on the FAO FTP site for review - a copy of the draft revised GAL ("**INFO-1\_revised-Geographic Authority List**") (see <http://ASFA:2go2ASFA@ext-ftp.fao.org/FI/Reserved/ASFA> under the folder called ASFA\_Reference\_Series-Guidelines) (see **Annex-62**).

**The ASFA Board recommended** that ASFA Partners review the draft updated Geographic Authority List and sent their comments to Mr Pettman (FBA) by the end of September 2009.

Incorporation of updated GAL as pick-list in www-ISIS-ASFA software

Mr Pettman (FBA) explained that he had not used the current geographic pick-list in the www-ISIS-ASFA software, given the exceedingly large number of errors. Instead, he had produced a new pick-list from the updated GAL. Mr Pettman raised the issue of the use of abbreviations for words such as Lake, River etc in the pick-list. He mentioned that these abbreviations had originally been used mainly for the printed geographic index and asked whether the ASFA Partners wanted to keep the abbreviations or use the words in full.

**The ASFA Board recommended** replacement of abbreviations such as L. and R. with the words in full, e.g. Lake, River.

Mr Pettman referred to the word order of geographic terms in the pick-list which included the names of rivers, lakes, bays etc. He asked whether the ASFA Partners wished to change the current structure so that the name would come last, for example, Bay of Biscay instead of Biscay Bay, River Don instead of Don River.

**The ASFA Board recommended** changing the word order of the names of rivers, lakes, bays etc so that these names would reflect common use of the terms.

The new pick-list produced by FBA was much shorter than the previous, since it had been produced from the GAL, and Mr Pettman (FBA) explained that it was now necessary to rebuild it. He said that there were 2 options to consider: 1) FBA rebuild the entire list and then send an extracted file of the strings to individual ASFA Partners for their comment; or 2) FBA send an extract of the new, short pick-list for each ASFA Partner, who would review, modify and add strings to it and then return it to FBA for incorporation into the revised pick-list.

Some discussion followed as to the logistics and time-scale of the work involved in the above suggested options.

Mr Pettman said that the "British Isles, England" entries and related coastal strings had been extracted and used as a test sample for revision, carried out by FBA. This exercise proved that it was feasible to extract lists of existing strings for each of the ASFA Partner countries, so that the ASFA Partner could eventually review their own lists. He explained that revision of the individual lists could involve a great deal of extra work for the ASFA Partners. Mr Pettman commented that it would be important to know which ASFA Partner could/would be willing to carry out this work, so that he could liaise with them and provide deadlines, so that the work could be completed by mid-2010. He stressed the importance of keeping to deadlines so that the work could be completed on time.

Mr Montes (UNAM) said that he would be willing to cover the Central American region, as his institute had a geographic expert who could contribute to the revision work. Mr Sainekar (NIO) said that he would be willing to do the terms from his geographic area.

Mr Kaske (NOAA) commented that it would be important for the individual ASFA Partners to know how many terms would be involved, before they could commit themselves to doing the work within a given timeframe.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that it was important to take advantage of the expertise of ASFA Partners in their geographic areas. He suggested use of the ASFA Trust Fund to cover this work. Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that it would be administratively very difficult to have many different contracts for individual persons. Mr Pettman (FBA) said that perhaps a regional approach be considered, i.e. one contract per region. He added that FBA would have to do an extensive part of the work, since there were many geographic areas where there was no ASFA Partner. In order to facilitate production of the pick-list by mid-2010, Mr Pettman suggested that FBA constructed the new, cleaned-up pick-list, including corrected individual country terms/strings that were originally contained in the original pick-list of the www-ISIS-ASFA software.

**The ASFA Board recommended** that Mr Pettman (FBA) prepare a new, revised and updated pick-list and then send individual extractions to all ASFA Partners so that individual partners could check the terms/strings for their particular area/region and add any terms they believed to be missing.

Mr Ibeun (NIFFR) asked for some clarification regarding the updating of the pick-list, as to whether once constructed it would be, as before, be built up upon as the years went by. Mr Pettman (FBA) confirmed that the pick-list would be reviewed and updated in future years, but stressed that it was important to have a good starting point now.

Mr Kaske (NOAA) asked if the pick-list, once built, would be available electronically, so that perhaps people could change/add to it, like a wiki, or an administrator could modify it. Mr Pettman (FBA) said that it would be necessary to address the maintenance of the pick-list in the near future, considering also how to make it available electronically.

Ms Levashova (VNIRO) asked whether there would be a maximum number of terms, when including names of water bodies, rivers, streams etc. Mr Pettman (FBA) replied that there would be no limit to the number of terms, but they would have to be used terms.

#### Geographic Thesaurus (GAL Thesaurus)

Mr Pettman (FBA) said that a geographic thesaurus (GAL Thesaurus) was needed to take steps forward to assist indexing and retrieval. It could eventually replace the pick-list in the future, but this would depend on how the www-ISIS-ASFA software and ProQuest could handle the tool. He informed the ASFA Partners that he had introduced the GAL Thesaurus to the Geographic Working Group, so that they could discuss and examine possible ways to go ahead in the future and present their recommendations at the next ASFA Board Meeting in 2010. (See **Annex-63**)

**The ASFA Board recommended** that the Geographic Working Group should investigate the possibility of moving from a pick-list to a thesaurus.

Mr Pettman mentioned the current use of sea-code areas, which was specific to ASFA, and commented that the possibility of working together with other systems should be considered.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) suggested that the use of sea-codes should be re-assessed, as it appeared that users were currently attributing little value to them as evidenced by their small usage of them during search.

**The ASFA Board recommended** that the Geographic Working Group should reassess the use of sea codes in the geographic terms and examine possible alternatives.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) thanked Mr Pettman (FBA) for all the hard work he had done regarding the 3 items included in the GAL Trust Fund Project.

### **11.8. ASFIS-15, ASFIS List of Species for Fishery Statistical Purposes (ex ASFIS-8, Taxonomic Authority List)**

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) explained that ASFIS-15, the ASFIS List of Species for Fishery Statistical Purposes, was contained as a "taxonomic descriptor" pick-list in the www-ISIS-ASFA software to assist in data entry. He said that the list was compiled/computerized by the Statistics Section of FAO/FIES and that it was updated once-a-year. The list may be downloaded from the FAO Fisheries Web site (<http://www.fao.org/fi/statist/fisoft/asfis/asfis.asp>) as a text file and converted into Excel or Access software, but it could not be imported in this format into the www-ISIS-ASFA software. Mr Pepe mentioned that the latest version of the list would be included in the next upgrade to the www-ISIS-ASFA software.

*Follow-up action item 20 from the 2008 ASFA Board Meeting:*

*20. Regarding taxonomic names and synonyms, up-posting and the use of a Taxonomic Authority...*

**Mr Pettman (FBA) and Mr Thompson (NAFO) agreed to assist the FAO ASFA Secretariat regarding this issue.**

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) referred to the document prepared by Mr Thompson (NAFO) describing some follow-up and conclusions regarding this issue (See **Annex-7a**). Mr Pettman (FBA) commented that ASFA could not develop its own taxonomic list and therefore would have to use those existing taxonomic authority lists which were updated. He asked whether ProQuest could use such taxonomic lists in their new platform and, if not, asked whether the FAO ASFA Secretariat could perhaps approach uBio to see if ASFA could use it for indexing. He explained that the taxonomic name given in an article/document could be looked up on uBio, which would display all the names of synonyms and also provide up-posting possibilities. Mr Pettman added that it would be best if the up-posting was done at the search engine interface, rather than during data entry.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) replied that they could not use uBio, but said that ITIS was very easy to download and update. This taxonomic authority had a good level of review and was quite comprehensive. He said that ProQuest's new platform would have taxonomic terms in their search engine. Ms Noble (NMBL) commented that ITIS covered mainly North American species. Mr Ibeun (NIFFR) also questioned the comprehensiveness, asking whether fish species in developing countries were included. Mr Emerson said that ITIS had a global coverage. Mr Pettman (FBA) asked whether ITIS allowed accredited people to add terms to their list. Mr Emerson believed that this was possible, adding that ITIS had a vigorous system for reviewing the list.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) expressed his enthusiasm regarding the possibility of taxonomic up-posting in ASFA, saying that such up-posting was very important in an aquatic sciences database.

### **11.9. ASFIS-10, Authority List for Corporate Names**

This list is contained as a pick-list in the www-ISIS-ASFA software. An updated version of this list would be included in the eventual new version (1.2) of www-ISIS-ASFA. The FAO ASFA Secretariat reminded ASFA Partners that they should send ProQuest (attention Ms Soto: [Vicki.Soto@proquest.com](mailto:Vicki.Soto@proquest.com)) the names of new

corporate authors, not included in the current pick-list, so that ProQuest can keep the master Corporate Author list updated.

### **11.10. ASFIS-16, Help Notes contained in the www-ISIS-ASFA Software (used for bibliographic description and data entry)**

This publication reproduces in printed format the "Help Notes" contained in the www-ISIS-ASFA software. The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that the electronic version of the English "Help Notes" (i.e. for inclusion in the www-ISIS-ASFA software) had been updated so as to correspond with the revised and updated edition of ASFIS-3, Guidelines for Bibliographic Description and Data Entry (using www-ISIS-ASFA software v1.1) which was distributed to ASFA Partner in October 2007. The updated Help Notes would be incorporated in the new version 1.2 of the www-ISIS-ASFA software. A revision of the printed version of the "Help Notes" has not been produced.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that the electronic version of the Spanish "Help Notes" (i.e. for inclusion in the www-ISIS-ASFA software) had been updated by Ms Cristiani (IIP) and that, following review by the FAO ASFA Secretariat, they would be issued together with the new update of the www-ISIS-ASFA v1.2 software. There were still plans to update the French version of the "Help Notes", but the FAO ASFA Secretariat could not give a deadline.

## **12. EXPANDED LANGUAGE CAPABILITY IN ASFA**

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported on some of the steps taken to increase/incorporate the use of other languages within the ASFA system. See FAO Report, Section 10 (**Annex-3**).

He referred to the translation into Spanish of the "Help Notes" contained in the www-ISIS-ASFA software, saying that this had been done by Ms Cristiani (IIP/Uruguay) on a voluntary basis. The FAO ASFA Secretariat thanked Ms Cristiani for the translation.

## **13. ASFA TRUST FUND**

### **13.1. Status of the Trust Fund**

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) introduced this Agenda Item, referring to the document "ASFA Trust Fund Status" (**Annex-46**).

The **Balance** of the Trust Fund was **US\$969 177**. ProQuest deposited US\$249 826.62 in royalties for the year 2008. See ASFA/2009/67revised (**Annex-45**) for the ProQuest calculation of the 2008 royalty payment. **Annex-46** provides a detailed account of the financial status of the ASFA Trust Fund.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) commented that this was a very large balance and asked whether there were any issues in holding such a large sum of money. Mr Grainger (FAO ASFA Secretariat) replied that there were no administrative problems in holding the ASFA Trust Money at FAO, and there were no tax issues or charges. The money was under the control of the ASFA Board and, he added, the ASFA Board should be spending it.

### **13.2. Proposals completed, in progress, or pending further discussion and status of some proposals**

#### **13.2.1. Financial support to attend the 2009 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (NIO, India, 2009)**

(in progress) This project refers to **this** year's (2009) Meeting, so the project is considered as being "in-progress" until the meeting is finished and the last expense claim is filed (this sometime takes months). Funds were used for the following 11 ASFA Partners to attend this year's ASFA Board Meeting: CIS (Viet Nam), IMS (Tanzania), INIDEP (Argentina), KMFRI (Kenya), KORDI (Korea), NIFFR (Nigeria), NMDIS (China), PIMRIS (Fiji), NAFIRRI (Uganda), UNAM (Mexico), USP (Brazil).

This is an on-going proposal, and the renewal of this proposal for 2010 is contained in **Annex-48** and is discussed and reported under Agenda Item 13.3.1 ASFA Trust Fund New Proposals (see below).

#### **13.2.2. Financial support to attend last year's 2008 ASFA Board Meeting (IMR, Norway, 2008) (US\$40 000)**

(completed) This refers to last year's (2008) Meeting. The sum of US\$40 000 was allocated at the 2007 Meeting to support attendance at the 2008 Board Meeting in Norway. The allocated sum plus US\$12 684 unspent from the previous year's allocation plus US\$2 765 donated by NIFES, Norway for VNIRO travel brought the total available sum to US\$55 449. The final total amount disbursed was US\$45 119. The unspent funds US\$10 330 were added to the 2009 Meeting allocation.



The following 15 ASFA Partners received full or partial assistance to attend the 2008 ASFA Board Meeting: CIP, IIP, INIDEP, INRH, KMFRI, KORDI, LaReC, NIO/NICMAS, NIOF, NMDIS, SFI, YugNIRO, UNAM, USP, VNIRO\*. \*(VNIRO funding donated by Nasjonalt Institutt For Ernaerings- og Sjoematforskning / National Institute of Nutrition and Seafood Research (NIFES) thanks to Brit Skotheim's efforts.

### **13.2.3. Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for 2 years: Jan/2008 to Dec/2009) (US\$60 000 per year)**

(in progress) This ongoing proposal is to assist the FAO ASFA Secretariat with works/initiatives which are for the collective benefit of the ASFA Partnership. The project remains classified "in progress" until end of 2009.

For a listing of the spending made/planned for **2008-2009**, see **Annex-46** (Part-3, items-2 and 10).

This is an ongoing proposal which the Board usually exams/reconfirms each year. The request for re-confirmation of this proposal for 2010 is contained in **Annex-3a** and is discussed below under Agenda Item 13.3.2 ASFA Trust Fund Proposals - new and/or ongoing.

Note: this ongoing proposal is usually reconfirmed by the Board each year. However, at the 2007 Board Meeting this proposal was reconfirmed for the two year period (2008 and 2009). The Board will be asked at this Meeting to reconfirm the project proposal for the usual one year period (2010).

### **13.2.4. Further development of www-ISIS-ASFA software as regards interoperability, additional URL fields, and updating picklists (EUR 13 553)**

(completed) This project was completed during the intersession (see contractors work report **Annex-56**). However, the software has not yet been released. It is still being tested by the ASFA Publisher. This update to the software (to be called release 1.2) addresses the need to increase the interoperability of the www-ISIS-ASFA version 1.1 of the software. This was requested by the Board at the 2007 Meeting. The actual project proposal was circulated to the ASFA Partners for voting during the 2007-2008 intersession via ASFA-Board-L (18 April 2008) - it was "approved" (see Annex-60 of the 2008 Meeting Report for details and a record of this proposal). The update to the software contains, besides the export/import programs that will enable Partners to import and export their records to and from other systems/repositories, also some additional URL fields and the updating of the pick-lists contained in the software. The update will include a function to import records from INMAGIC into www-ISIS-ASFA.

### **13.2.5. (FAO) www-ISIS-ASFA – towards Release-2 (i.e. after release 1.2) (US\$8 750)**

(pending) The current www-ISIS-ASFA 1.1 software is still viable and the small upgrade (1.2) to the www-ISIS-ASFA software that is underway will increase the interoperability of www-ISIS-ASFA and further delay the need for a full Release-2 of the software.

### **13.2.6. (FAO) ASFA Trust Fund project proposal – (provision of computer equipment) Further strengthening of the ASFA Partner in Kenya (KMFRI) in order to provide ASFA Training Support for other ASFA Partners in Africa and so as to assist FAO ASFA Secretariat (approx. US\$3 700)**

(in progress) This proposal was put forward by KMFRI and agreed in principle by the Board at the 2008 ASFA Board Meeting (see 2008 Report, Annex-25a). The Board requested more details/specifications regarding the equipment and that the proposal to be circulated via ASFA-Board-L for final approval. This was done and the project was approved for two desktop computers, one portable computer and one dehumidifier. FAO is awaiting the final cost statement from the FAO representative office in Kenya, which will carry out the purchase locally. It appears that the final cost of the equipment will amount to around US\$3 700.

[Rapporteur's note: at this writing the final cost amounted to US\$3 971.31]

### **13.2.7. (Russian Federation - VNIRO) - Inputs of Barents and Norwegian Seas Literature (US\$3 960)**

(completed) This proposal had been agreed by the Board at the 2006 Meeting (see 2006 Report, Annex 35a and section 13.3.8). The Russian Collaborating Centre was originally envisaged to carry-out the work, but instead VNIRO carried out the work. The contract between FAO and VNIRO to carry out this work was finalized in May 2008 and VNIRO send the first batch of records in June 2008. The project is now complete and all 310 records are now on the ASFA database. For a list of all ASFA Trust fund project proposals to input historical literature and filling of gaps, see **Annex-54**.

### **13.2.8. (VLIZ, Belgium) - Collect, sort out, and prepare approx. 15 000 complete bibliographic references dealing with the aquatic environment (from the North Sea, in particular the Southern Bight area (US\$18 000)**

(in progress) This proposal was put forward/approved during the 2002-2003 intersessional period via ASFA-Board-L (see 2003 Meeting Report: section 13.3.1.5 and Annexes 14, 14a for full details of project). At the

2004 Meeting (see 2004 Meeting Report: section 13.2.1.3) VLIZ revisited the project proposal redefining the number of records to be processed to approx. 10 000 and increasing the time frame.

The project has been hampered by difficulties in developing a program to automatically transfer VLIZ records to the ASFA Publisher in the accepted ASFA format. VLIZ even provided some funds to Dr Rybinski to assist in working out the problems. There are also a large number of VLIZ records, besides the above mentioned project records, waiting to go to the Publisher. Finally, it appears the problems have been resolved and the records are starting to flow to the Publisher, according to news we have received from the ASFA Publisher. For a list of all ASFA Trust fund project proposals to input historical literature and filling of gaps, see **Annex-54**.

#### **13.2.9. Utilization of the ASFA Trust Fund to pay the IAMSLIC Membership fees for ASFA Partners and ASFA Collaborating Centers who do not have the funds, or are not able for administrative reasons to pay for membership to IAMSLIC.**

(completed) This is an “ongoing” proposal presented every two years to the Board for review and re-approval.

See **Annex-52** for a detailed status report regarding the project. The request for renewal of this project is discussed below under Agenda Item 13.3.9.

#### **13.2.10. (NIGERIA – NIFFR) ASFA Trust Fund proposal filling the missing gap (US\$8 060)**

(completed) This proposal was agreed by the Board in principle at the 2006 Meeting (see 2006 Report, section 13.3.7 and Annex 32a) and finally approved at the 2007 ASFA Board Meeting (see 2007 Report, section 13.2.16). Various administrative issues delayed the finalizing of this Letter of Agreement until 2008. The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that the project is now completed and the records are on the ASFA database. For a list of all ASFA Trust fund project proposals to input historical literature and filling of gaps, see **Annex-54**.

#### **13.2.11. Supply of scanners (for ASFA related use) to those ASFA Partner Institutes which lack the funding to buy equipment (continuation of project)**

(in progress) See **Annex-53** for a summary/status of this project to date.

The ASFA Board agreed at the 2008 ASFA Board meeting (see item 13.3.9 of the 2008 Meeting Report) to continue this project initiative (“round-two”).

The “round-two” of the project will supply scanners to the following six ASFA Partners who requested one: IMS, Zanzibar; CSIR, Ghana; NIO/NICMAS, India; IMROP, Mauritania; UNAM/DGB, Mexico; and IMARPE, Peru. The total cost should be approx. US\$3 600.

The first “round-one” of this project was approved during the 2007-2008 intersessional period (see Annex-59 of the 2008 ASFA Board Report for details). The first round cost approx. **US\$6 107** and supplied scanners and scanning software to the following nine Partners: IIP, Uruguay; NIFFR, Nigeria; NaFIRRI, Uganda; VNIRO, Russian Fed.; YugNIRO, Ukraine; NIOF, Egypt; IFOP, Chile; FICen, Viet Nam; INSTM, Tunisia.

#### **13.2.12. Initiative to support the digitization of grey literature and advice as to what should be digitized (proposal put forward by IAMSLIC) US\$28 000**

(pending) This proposal has been pending since 2007. The FAO ASFA Secretariat has contacted the ASFA Partners on numerous occasions requesting suggestions for digitization with reference to this project, but as yet there has not been any positive response from Partners regarding suggestions or lists of materials to scan. However, Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that the FAO Fisheries Branch Library had carried out some preliminary analysis and has identified some grey literature for scanning. A Trust Fund Proposal was in the process of being prepared and would be put forward during the intersessional period.

#### **13.2.13. (FAO) Mini ASFA Meeting (Regional)**

(postponed) The Meeting was again postponed. The venue will now be INIDEP, Argentina so as to run back-to-back with the International IAMSLIC Meeting and the Latin American Regional IAMSLIC Meeting.

#### **13.2.14. (PDII-LIPI- Indonesia) - ASFA Trust Fund Proposal (\$11 000) relating to ASFA input preparation and training**

(pending) This proposal is still pending action by the FAO ASFA Secretariat which must organize training for PDII-LIPI. Unfortunately, this has not been possible to date.

#### **13.2.15. (YugNIRO- Ukraine) Translation of ASFA Thesaurus into Russian and development of Russian-English Thesaurus**

(pending) See comments below under item-13.2.17.



### **13.2.16. (YugNIRO- Ukraine) Translation of www-ISIS-ASFA “Help Notes” and front end into Russian**

(pending) See comments below under item-13.2.17.

### **13.2.17. (YugNIRO- Ukraine) Translation of www-ISIS-ASFA Guidelines into Russian**

(pending) The above 3 proposals were agreed by the Board at the 2004 ASFA Board Meeting (see section 13.3.5 and Annex-29c of the 2005 ASFA Board Meeting Report). Difficulties, on FAO's part, in the initial administrative phases of the project blocked the project, as did subsequent staff changes at YugNIRO.

These proposals are pending YugNIRO's continued interest in carrying them out.

## **13.3. New proposals**

### **13.3.1. Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year Jan -Dec 2010)**

This is an ongoing Trust Fund project proposal (see **Annex-3a**). It is reviewed each year by the Board to maintain or update the amount of allocated funds. The FAO ASFA Secretariat proposed maintaining the sum of US\$60,000 for this project proposal for the year 2010. However, Mr Grainger (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that at the 2011 ASFA Board Meeting, the FAO ASFA Secretariat would be asking for an increased sum, taking into consideration the retirement of Mr Pepe (FAO Editor-in-Chief of ASFA) and the need to hire additional temporary staff to support the FAO ASFA Secretariat in their ASFA related activities.

**The ASFA Board recommended approval** of this Proposal.

Some discussion followed regarding the retirement of Mr Pepe at the FAO ASFA Secretariat, and a brief summary is given below.

Mr Pettman (FBA) asked whether there would be an overlap period, so that the successor to Mr Pepe would receive some insight/training/briefing into the ASFA Partnership and the activities/work involved. Mr Grainger (FAO ASFA Secretariat) replied that such an overlap period would not be possible, due to FAO rules and regulations. However he assured the ASFA Partners that he would try his best to ensure that a successor would be selected as quickly as possible following Mr Pepe's retirement.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that over the past years he had been trying to make the many facets of the ASFA system visible and easy-to-follow (e.g. the ASFA webpage and its FAQs, various guidelines with their fine detail etc.). He said that he has been trying to document everything in order to facilitate continuity.

Mr Sainekar (NIO) commented that Mr Pepe had been very successful in creating confidence within the ASFA Partners so that they could carry out their work efficiently.

### **13.3.2. Egypt (NIOF) - Filling the missing gap (US\$ 14 160)**

This proposal aims to fill in some of the missing gaps regarding Egyptian literature in the ASFA database (See **Annex-17a**). NIOF intended to prepare about 2360 complete bibliographic records based on the www-ISIS-ASFA software methodology for ASFA data entry. Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that NIOF had only recently started submitting ASFA input to ProQuest and clarified that the general rule was that ASFA Partners should be autonomous and regularly submitting records to ProQuest before undertaking such projects. Ms Noble (NMBL) concurred, saying that it was very important that the ASFA Partner became familiar with ASFA inputting procedures before carrying out such trust fund projects.

Mr Sainekar (NIO) commented that this proposal involved important literature which would be a good addition to the ASFA database.

**The ASFA Board recommended approval in principle** of the proposal, which would be pending until NIOF were autonomous and regularly submitting ASFA input.

### **13.3.3. Guinea- Acquisition of computer equipment for Guinean Input Center (US\$3 575)**

This proposal requests funding for the acquisition of computer equipment and Internet access fees for CNSHB, both of which are fundamental for the preparation of ASFA input and the sending of records to the FAO ASFA Secretariat and ProQuest (See **Annex-22a**). CNSHB referred to problems encountered within their institute related to technical breakdowns and electricity black-outs. Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that, when recruiting a new ASFA Partner, everything is made clear upfront regarding the essential requirements necessary for the preparation of machine-readable input. He commented that there was no way of knowing the actual facilities at the ASFA Partner's institute, unless a visit was made there. He added that after CNSHB had signed the ASFA Partnership, their country had faced some serious difficulties and there had been numerous problems regarding infrastructure, electricity, etc.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) commented that it was extremely important that everything was explained clearly up-front, especially with regard to equipment required, and should there be any extenuating circumstances, they should be clarified. He noted that there were some discrepancies in the listed budget costs.

**The ASFA Board recommended approval in principle** of the proposal, which would be pending some clarification by CNSHB regarding the extenuating circumstances and also a review of the costs.

#### **13.3.4. Kenya - Elimination of Gaps**

This proposal (see **Annex-26a**) has been pending since 2007, when ProQuest had informed KMFRI that there was the possibility of the “Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom” being converted/processed by ProQuest. Ms Noble (NMBL) said that Cambridge University Press had now digitized their archive. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) reported that ProQuest now had a publishing agreement with CUP, and would be able to process the electronic information using their automated indexing system.

**The ASFA Board did not recommend approval** of this proposal, since it was no longer considered valid given that the situation had changed.

#### **13.3.5. Kenya - Identifying and listing grey literature published in Kenya not in ASFA US\$7 320 (maximum)**

This proposal aims to identify, collate and list grey literature published in Kenya, with a view to entering the references into the ASFA database, digitizing the full-text and depositing them in OCEANDOCS repository (See **Annex-26b**).

Some of the comments/discussions regarding this proposal are reported below.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) questioned the costs that were listed, saying that they assumed a certain number of documents, although this figure was not listed anywhere. Mr Macharia (KMFRI) replied that the costs listed for the photocopying were a maximum figure and would not be exceeded.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) asked whether this proposal actually included the preparation of the ASFA records. Mr Macharia (KMFRI) clarified that this was to be done at a second phase. Mr Emerson questioned the need to photocopy the documents, asking whether it would be possible to scan at the place where the material is located. Ms Noble (NMBL) commented that scanning would also have costs and asked whether permission had been obtained to scan and digitize the documents. Mr Emerson said that it was important to have copyright permission before proceeding. Mr Macharia replied that he had already contacted the institutes and informed them of the activities involved in this proposal.

Ms Kalenchits (PIMRIS) commented that a timeframe of 20 days perhaps was not sufficient to identify, and photocopy (or scan) the documents.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that this proposal could be a pilot study for the identification and collection of grey literature, and if successful could be considered as precedence for other ASFA Partners to follow suit. He requested Mr Macharia to take note of the comments made regarding the number of documents involved.

**The ASFA Board recommended approval** of the proposal.

#### **13.3.6. Viet Nam - Scanning of Viet Nam Fisheries Technology and Scientific Results from 2000-2008 (US\$14 690)**

This proposal aims to collect and scan Vietnamese scientific reports within the scope of ASFA and link the full-text to relevant records for ASFA input (See **Annex-41a**).

Some of the comments/discussions regarding this proposal are reported below.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that he appreciated that Viet Nam had presented such an important proposal for scanning their literature. However, he again clarified that an ASFA Partner should be autonomous and regularly submitting records to ProQuest before undertaking such projects.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) commented that, although this was a valuable proposal, some clarification was needed as to whether the full-texts would be deposited in a repository, since there was no mention of this in the proposal. Also, it was not clear whether the links would be to ASFA records already existing on the CSA Illumina ASFA database or whether new ASFA records would be prepared.

**The ASFA Board recommended approval in principle** of the proposal, pending further clarification as to whether the documents to be scanned already had ASFA records on the database and therefore only the full-text links would be sent to ProQuest or whether new ASFA records were to be prepared. The proposal would be given the go-ahead once a revised version was presented and also once CIS were autonomous and regularly submitting ASFA input.

#### **13.3.7. Financial support to attend the ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (for year 2010) (US\$40 000)**

This is an ongoing Trust Fund project proposal (See **Annex-48**). It is reviewed each year by the Board to maintain or to update the amount of allocated funds. The sum has been at \$40 000 for the last few years and this appears for the moment to be sufficient.

**The ASFA Board recommended approval** of the proposal for the sum to remain at US\$40 000 for the 2010 Meeting.

### **13.3.8. Small Financial Incentive to ASFA Partner Institute hosting ASFA Board Meeting (US\$2 500)**

This proposal aims to eliminate any small financial obstacles which might prevent an ASFA Partner from offering to host the ASFA Board Meeting (See **Annex-58**). It would provide the ASFA Partner Institute hosting the Meeting with a sum of US\$1 000 (the proposal is not intended to be retroactive). Mr Emerson (ProQuest) suggested raising the sum to US\$ 2 500.

**The ASFA Board recommended approval** of the proposal, for the sum of US\$2 500.

### **13.3.9. Utilization of ASFA Trust Fund to Pay IAMSLIC Membership (US\$1 240)**

This is an “ongoing” proposal presented every 2 years for review and re-approval (See **Annex-52**). The past amount spent on this project and the proposed future spending is minimal with respect to the advantages that can be obtained from the free document delivery services for members.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat requested that this proposal be extended for a further two years, which would mean a potential spending over the next 2 years of about US\$1 240\*.

\*(The sum of US\$1 240 refers to renew all 31 of the currently sponsored IAMSLIC membership fees which will expire in either 2009 or 2010 (see Table-1 in **Annex-52**)

To date (from 2004), this initiative has cost the ASFA Trust Fund a total of less than US\$2 000.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reminded ASFA Partners and Collaborating ASFA Centres again, that if they were not a member of IAMSLIC then they should consider the benefits of joining and that it would be useful if ASFA Partners would report on the utility of their IAMSLIC membership (e.g. their use of the Z39.50 distributed library and IAMSLIC Listserv).

**The ASFA Board recommended approval** of the proposal, for the sum of US\$1 240.

### **13.3.10. Tanzania - Scanning of Fisheries Catch and Scientific Results from 1999-2009 (US\$10 625)**

This proposal aims at making widely available, in full text format, fisheries catch and scientific reports (grey literature) deposited at the Division of Fisheries and the Tanzania Fisheries Research Institute of the Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries Development (See **Annex-34a**). Ms Nyika (IMS) explained that the documents falling within the scope of ASFA would be collected, scanned and then bibliographic records (approximately 500) would be prepared both for ASFA and the IMS/Aquatic Commons repositories.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) asked about the time-scale for this proposal. Ms Nyika replied that she estimated the work to be completed within 6 months.

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) commented that fish catch statistics were very important and this proposal would result in some valuable information going into ASFA. She asked whether summaries/abstracts would be provided or whether it would be just the statistics being deposited in the repositories. Ms Nyika said that some of the reports had abstracts and added that those written in Kiswahili would be translated.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) asked whether the reports would be just scanned or also digitized, saying that for non-English characters there could be some problems. Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that the scanner provided to IMS under the ASFA Trust Fund Proposal came with OCR software. Ms Kalenchits (PIMRIS) commented that some editing was necessary for the OCR recognized text. Ms Nyika clarified that the reports would be digitized, but she was not sure about those in Kiswahili.

**The ASFA Board recommended approval** of the proposal.

## **14. OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

## **15. PLACE AND DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) referred to a document which listed all the past ASFA Board Meetings and their venues (**Annex-51**). At the 2008 ASFA Board Meeting, Ms Bazi, INRH/Morocco (not present at this meeting) expressed interest in hosting the 2010 meeting in Casablanca, Morocco. Mr Pepe reported that the FAO ASFA Secretariat had contacted Ms Bazi and that she confirmed that INRH was still willing to host the 2010 meeting, although official confirmation of the dates had not been received as yet.

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) reported that INP/Ecuador had also offered to host the 2010 ASFA Board meeting.

Mr Grainger (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that several ASFA Board Meetings have been held fairly recently in South America (See **Annex-51**). Given the interest in spreading the meetings around the world and in view of the fact that an ASFA Board Meeting has never been held in the North African/Near East region, preference would be given to Morocco for 2010 and then Ecuador for 2011. The FAO ASFA Secretariat thanked INP/Ecuador for its offer hoping it would be still valid in 2011.

Mr Ibeun (NIFFR) mentioned that depending on the venue there could sometimes be problems and/or delays in getting visas. He thought that this was an important factor to consider when deciding upon a venue.

Ms Soto (ProQuest), commenting on the possible dates for the 2010 meeting, requested that the meeting be held some time towards the end of June/beginning of July, rather than in September.

**The ASFA Board agreed in principal** that the 2010 ASFA Board Meeting would be held at INRH, Casablanca, Morocco. The exact dates, however, would be confirmed by INRH and circulated to all ASFA Partners via ASFA Board-L.

**[Rapporteur's note:** The FAO ASFA Secretariat communicated the exact dates of the Meeting (5-9 July 2010) by E-mail to all Partners on 5 November 2009]

## **16. SPECIAL TOPICS, DEMONSTRATIONS, WORKSHOPS (4th DAY)**

### **16.1. Comments on ASFA Input**

Ms Soto (ProQuest) and Ms Wibley (FAO) gave a PowerPoint presentation on ASFA input (see **Annex-59**). Various aspects relating to submission of ASFA records to ProQuest and also to ASFA input preparation using www-ISIS-ASFA software were covered, highlighting areas where ASFA partners should pay particular attention, so as to avoid errors and inconsistencies.

### **16.2. ProQuest tips on searching/using the ASFA database via the CSA Illumina interface**

Ms Soto (ProQuest) gave a demonstration on the ASFA database using the CSA Illumina platform (see **Annex-60**). She explained some of the Administrative functions that can be set and/or modified on the CSA Illumina interface and also how to set up a personalized interface using the My Research log-in option. Some searching tips and tools were demonstrated and an overview given of the search display including some of the searchable tables and figures.

### **16.3. Valuation (demonstrating the worth of libraries/information centers)**

Mr Kaske (NOAA) gave a talk on the value and performances of libraries and the ways of demonstrating their worth. He referred to logic models, cost-benefit analysis, return-on-investment and social return-on-investment and their applications, taking as an example the "value" and "valuation" of electronic resources and databases offered by libraries (see **Annexes-64** and **65**).

Some discussion followed regarding ways of "valuing" databases.

Mr Emerson (PQ) commented that "usage" of a database was an important factor to take into account when considering buying or renewing a subscription to a database. Mr Grainger (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that taking into account repeat usage would give an indication as to the level of satisfaction of a user. Mr Kaske (NOAA) commented that if usage by a unique IP address was examined over a few months, it could be a bad assumption to say that a figure of 3-4 meant less satisfaction than one of 7-8.

Mr Ibeun (NIFFR) commented that sometimes libraries faced budgetary restraints and so did not have what was needed to meet the requirements of the scientists. Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) said that not all great libraries had great funding, but rather great librarians. She believed that collaboration with other networks and participation at various meetings (such as IAMSILIC) brought benefits to the institutions and would have an impact on their services. She mentioned the importance of keeping "thank you letters" as a positive impact. Mr Kaske (NOAA) concurred that it was important to keep qualitative and quantitative items, such as "thank you letters", which provided support for keeping the library going. Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) mentioned that he sometimes received letters of gratitude from scientists obtaining information using ASFA whilst working in the field and that this was testimony of the usefulness of the ASFA database.

Mr Grainger (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that the FAO Fisheries Branch Library had been keeping an activity report over the past few years, containing useful information such as number of visitors (staff, consultants, students), requests made, documents delivered, information resources etc. He commented that over the years, there had been a drop in the number of visitors, but an increase in document delivery. Mr Grainger said that, using the "logic model" referred to in the paper presented by Mr Kaske (**Annex-64**), it had been possible to analyse the final impact that the FAO Services have had within member countries.

## 16.4. Ontologies

Mr Pettman (FBA) gave a PowerPoint Presentation on Ontologies and their relevance to ASFA (**Annex-68**). He provided an outline of how he believed ontologies could be beneficial to improve the existing retrieval tools of ASFA, such as the Subject Thesaurus and the Geographic Tools. He felt that it was important for ASFA to be ontology-ready so that other projects could use the ASFA tools and also to enable ASFA to take advantage of future ontology-based search engines.

The presentation was well received by the ASFA Partners and some discussion followed.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) commented that there were very few search ontologies. Mr Pettman (FBA) referred to studies being carried out at Manchester University (UK) on data mining tools and how ontologies can help them. Although it was rather early to say how useful ontologies will be, and in what way, he said that current work was on an integrated approach, i.e. data mining tools together with ontologies, to assist in obtaining information. He mentioned GoPubMed, which is an ontology based search engine, based on GO (Genetics Ontology).

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that there was an ever-increasing mention and use of the word ontology, even though many of the so-called ontologies were really nothing more than a standard thesaurus (and even sometimes less). Although it was necessary to wait until things move ahead in the field of ontology, he said that it was good to be aware of such developments.

## 17. REVIEW/APPROVAL OF DRAFT REPORT OF MEETING

The Board reviewed and approved the Draft of the "Items and Actions Agreed" during the Meeting. See **Annex-61**.

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to circulate the Draft Report of the Meeting to ASFA Partners via ASFA Board-L for comments.

As is the practice, the Final Report of the Meeting will be approved at the next ASFA Board Meeting in 2010.



**AGENDA**  
**ASFA Advisory Board Meeting**  
**NIO, Goa, India, 7-11 September 2009**

**1. OPENING OF THE MEETING**

**2. ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS**

**3. ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSONS AND RAPPORTEURS**

**4. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

**5. ADOPTION OF THE SUMMARY REPORT OF THE 2008 MEETING**

5.1 Matters Arising (from 2008 Meeting)

**6. STATUS OF ASFA PARTNERSHIP**

6.1 Report on the Intersessional Activities of ASFA Partners

6.1.1 United Nations Co-sponsors (FAO, UN, IOC, UNEP)

6.1.2 ASFA Partners

6.1.3 ASFA Publisher (ProQuest)

6.2 New and potential ASFA Partners and those risking removal

6.2.1 Admission of new partners

6.2.2 Partners dropping out of ASFA

6.2.3 Strategy for future expansion of ASFA Partnership

6.2.4 Potential partners

6.2.5 Partners in danger of being removed

6.2.6 Partners removed from the system

6.3 ASFA Partnership Agreement

6.4 ASFA Publishing Agreement between FAO and ProQuest

6.5 ASFA Co-operation with other Groups/Initiatives/Systems/Meetings outside or related to ASFA

**7. ASFA SCOPE, COVERAGE, MONITORING and TIMELINESS**

7.1 Subject Scope (includes all literature dealing with aquatic environment)

7.2 Coverage (extent, or completeness, to which documents falling under ASFA subject scope are monitored by Partners in terms of: geographic, language, time span, document type, and media coverage)

7.3 Monitoring (the systematic scanning/input of literature relevant to the subject scope of ASFA which is published in Partner's own country, e.g. serials, monographs & other documents)

7.4 Timeliness (the time period between when a document is published and it's cited in ASFA)

7.5 ASFA input procedures

7.6 ASFA input (i.e. records produced)

7.7 ASFA Theme(s)

**8. ASFA PRODUCTS AND SERVICES**

8.1 ASFA journals (includes discussion on: accuracy of records, timely receipt of updates, presentation etc.)

8.2 CD/DVD-ROM (includes discussion on: accuracy of records, timely receipt of updates, presentation etc.)

8.3 Internet Service (includes discussion on: accuracy of records, timeliness, presentation, features etc. )

8.4 New Outputs and Services (by ProQuest)

8.5 Public Relations Activities, Marketing (by ProQuest and Partners)

8.6 Document Delivery

8.7 Entitlements (Partner entitlements to ASFA products & services)

8.8 Increasing Distribution of ASFA Information Products and Services

## 9. PROGRESS WITH MACHINE READABLE INPUT

9.1 www-ISIS-ASFA

## 10. REPORT ON ASFA TRAINING ACTIVITIES

## 11. STATUS OF ASFIS REFERENCE SERIES PUBLICATIONS

## 12. EXPANDED LANGUAGE CAPABILITY IN ASFA

## 13. ASFA TRUST FUND

13.1 Status of the Trust Fund

13.2 Proposals completed in progress, or pending further discussion and status of some proposals

13.3 New Proposals

## 14. OTHER BUSINESS

## 15. PLACE AND DATE OF NEXT MEETING

## 16. SPECIAL TOPICS, DEMONSTRATIONS, WORKSHOPS (4<sup>th</sup> DAY)

## 17. REVIEW/APPROVAL OF DRAFT REPORT OF MEETING

.....

### AGENDA FOR 4<sup>th</sup> DAY OF MEETING (SPECIAL TOPICS, DEMONSTRATIONS, WORKSHOPS)

1. **Comments on ASFA Input (records) (persistent problems encountered in Partners input and advice)** by FAO (Helen Wibley) and ProQuest (Vicki Soto)
2. **ProQuest tips on searching/using the ASFA database via the Illumina Internet web interface** by ProQuest (Vicki Soto)
3. **Valuation (demonstrating the worth of libraries/information centers)** by Neal Kaske
4. **Ontologies** by Ian Pettman

.....

### **Working Group Sessions to be held OUTSIDE of regular Meeting**

1. **Meeting of "Geographic Authority List Working Group"** (members of GAL Working Group is: UK, L. Noble (Chair) and I. Pettman (GAL reviser) / FAO Secretariat / ProQuest / NIO, G. Sianekar / Ifremer (J. Prod'homme). Observers welcome.

**(draft) AGENDA/items for discussion**

1. Agree order and structure of meeting
  2. Brief background as to why the meeting is being held - Linda Noble and/or Richard Pepe
  3. Problems with (and possible solutions to) present ASFA geographic indexing/searching system
    - 3.1 the immediate priority ( and a longstanding Action Item) - to clean up the existing geographic pick list. Options and timetable
    - 3.2 building a bigger, more useful pick list i.e making it more representative of the geographic terms in use today
    - 3.3 replacing the pick list with the thesaurus – pros and cons.
    - 3.4 Pick List errors and legacy data – is correction required?
  4. Problems with (and possible solutions to) present ASFA geographic indexing/searching system
    - 4.1 Abbreviations (**L., I., R., Terr., St.** etc)
    - 4.2 Adding words to terms e.g. Rivers, Inhabited Place, etc.
    - 4.3 Sea Codes (sea areas, ocean bed features, coastal features) – present GAL map, etc.
    - 4.4 Hierarchies – representation in ASFA printed indexes (long strings) and searching online
  5. Future options and possible developments
    - 5.1 ProQuest's new platform – implications and timetable
    - 5.1 ProQuest's Map interface project – implications and timetable
    - 5.2 Getty Thesaurus
  6. Any other problems and solutions
  7. Possible proposals to put to the Board Meeting
2. **Meeting of Latin American ASFA Partners** (members: Argentina, Brazil, Ecuador, Uruguay, Mexico)
  3. **Meeting of African ASFA Partners** (members Kenya, Nigeria, Tanzania, Uganda)



## **DRAFT LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

### **UN CO-SPONSORING ASFA PARTNERS**

#### **FAO**

**Dr Richard Grainger**  
**Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)**  
Statistics and Information Service (FIPS)  
Fisheries and Aquaculture Department  
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla  
00153, Rome, Italy  
Tel: (39) 06 570 54828 / Fax: (39) 06 570 52476  
E-mail: [richard.grainger@fao.org](mailto:richard.grainger@fao.org) / URL: <http://www.fao.org/fi>

**Mr Richard Pepe**  
**Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)**  
Statistics and Information Service (FIPS)  
Fisheries and Aquaculture Department  
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla  
00153, Rome, Italy  
Tel: (39) 06 570 56380 / Fax: (39) 06 570 52476  
E-mail: [richard.pepe@fao.org](mailto:richard.pepe@fao.org) / URL: <http://www.fao.org/fi>

**Ms Helen Wibley**  
**Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)**  
Statistics and Information Service (FIPS)  
Fisheries and Aquaculture Department  
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla  
00153, Rome, Italy  
Tel: (39) 06 570 56331 Fax: (39) 06 570 52476  
E-mail: [helen.wibley@fao.org](mailto:helen.wibley@fao.org) / URL: <http://www.fao.org/fi>

### **INTERNATIONAL ASFA PARTNERS**

#### **PIMRIS**

**Ms Maria Kalentchits**  
**Pacific Islands Marine Resources Information System (PIMRIS)**  
Division of Marine Studies, FSTE  
The University of the South Pacific  
Laucala Bay Rd., Private Bag Mail  
Suva, FIJI Islands  
Tel. (+679) 323 2934 / Fax (+679) 330 1490  
E-mail: [pimris@usp.ac.fj](mailto:pimris@usp.ac.fj) // URL: <http://www.usp.ac.fj>

### **NATIONAL ASFA PARTNERS**

#### **ARGENTINA**

**Ms. Guillermina Cosulich**  
**Instituto Nacional de Investigación y Desarrollo Pesquero (INIDEP)**  
Biblioteca y Servicio de Documentación  
Casilla de Correo 175  
7600 Mar del Plata, Argentina  
Tel: +54 (23) 86 0963 / 2404 / Fax: +54 (23) 86 1830 / 1831  
E-mail: [biblio@inidep.edu.ar](mailto:biblio@inidep.edu.ar)  
URL: <http://www.inidep.edu.ar>

#### **BELGIUM**

**Ms Chilekwa Chisala**  
**VLIZ Vlaams Instituut voor de Zee vzw / Flanders Marine Institute**  
Wandelaarkaai 7  
B-8400 Oostende  
Belgium  
Tel. +32-(0)59-34 21 30 / Fax +32-(0)59-34 21 31  
E-mail: [chilekwa.chisala@vliz.be](mailto:chilekwa.chisala@vliz.be)  
URL: <http://www.vliz.be>

## **BRAZIL**

**Ms Thais Corbisier**

**Universidade de São Paulo**

Instituto Oceanografico (IO/USP)

Praca do Oceanografico, 191

Cidade Universitaria-Butanta

CEP 05508-900, São Paulo, SP, Brazil

E-mail: [asfa-br@io.usp.br](mailto:asfa-br@io.usp.br)

URL: <http://www.io.usp.br>

## **CHINA**

**Mr Dongxu Li/ Ms Fangfang Wan**

**National Marine Data and Information Service (NMDIS)**

State Oceanic Administration of China (SOA)

93 Liuwei Road, Hedong District

Tianjin 300171, People's Republic of China

Tel. (86) (22) 2401 0827 / Fax: (86) (22) 2401 0926

E-mail: [ldx@mail.nmdis.gov.cn](mailto:ldx@mail.nmdis.gov.cn) / [fangfw@yaho.com.cn](mailto:fangfw@yaho.com.cn) / [asfa@mail.nmdis.gov.cn](mailto:asfa@mail.nmdis.gov.cn)

URL: <http://www.coi.gov.cn>

## **FRANCE**

**Ms Jacqueline Prod'homme**

**Institut français de recherche pour l'exploitation de la mer (IFREMER)**

Bibliothèque La Pérouse/Centre de documentation sur la mer

15 rue Dumont d'Urville

B.P. 70

29280 Plouzane, France

Tel: +33 2 98 49 8871 / Fax: +33 2 98 498884

E-mail: [jprodhom@ifremer.fr](mailto:jprodhom@ifremer.fr) / [jacqueline.prodhomme@ifremer.fr](mailto:jacqueline.prodhomme@ifremer.fr)

URL: <http://www.ifremer.fr> / <http://www.ifremer.fr/blp>

## **GERMANY**

**Mr Matthias Ruetze**

**Scientific Information Centre**

Johann Heinrich von Thünen Institute

Federal Research Institute for Rural Areas, Forestry and Fisheries

Leuschnerstr. 91

21031 Hamburg, Germany

Tel: +49 40 73962-247 / Fax: +49 40 73962-299

E-mail: [matthias.ruetze@vti.bund.de](mailto:matthias.ruetze@vti.bund.de)

URL: <http://www.vti.bund.de>

## **INDIA**

**Mr Gajanan H. Sainekar**

**National Institute of Oceanography (NIO) (CSIR)**

National Information Centre for Marine Sciences (NICMAS)

Library CSIR

Dona Paula, 403 004, Goa, India

Tel: +91 (0)832 2450 450/370 / Fax: +91 (0)832 2450 602/603

E-mail: [saine@nio.org](mailto:saine@nio.org)

URL: <http://www.nio.org>

## **KENYA**

**Mr James Macharia**

**Kenya Marine and Fisheries Research Institute (KMFRI)**

ODINAFRICA

P.O. Box 81651

Mombasa, Kenya

Tel: 254 41 471129 / 254 41 475151-4 / Fax: 254 41 475157

E-mail: [jmacharia@kmfri.co.ke](mailto:jmacharia@kmfri.co.ke) / [jmacharia@gmail.com](mailto:jmacharia@gmail.com)

URL: <http://www.kmfri.co.ke>

## **KOREA, Republic of**

**Mr Jong-Yup HAN**

**Korea Ocean Research and Development Institute (KORDI)**

Library and Information Section

Ansan P.O. Box 29

Seoul 425-600, Rep. of Korea

Tel. (+82-31) 400-6465 / Fax: (+82-31) 409-0325

E-mail: [jyhan@kordi.re.kr](mailto:jyhan@kordi.re.kr)

URL: <http://www.kordi.re.kr> / <http://library.kordi.re.kr>

## **MEXICO**

**Mr Marco Montes**

**Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM)**

Edificio Anexo de la Dirección General de Bibliotecas (DGB)

Subdirección de Servicios Especializados

Departamento de Bibliografía Latinoamericana

Apartado Postal 70-392

México, D.F., 04510, México

Tel. (52) 55 5622-3958 / 5622-3959 / Fax: (52) 55 5616 1436 / (52) 55 5622 4001

E-mail: [marco@dgb.unam.mx](mailto:marco@dgb.unam.mx) / [URL:dgb.unam.mx](http://URL:dgb.unam.mx)

## **NIGERIA**

**Dr Moses Ibeun**

**National Institute for Freshwater Fisheries Research (NIFFR)**

Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development

PMP 6006

New-Bussa

Niger State, Nigeria

Tel: 031-670444 / Telegram : NIFFISH

E-mail : [moibeun@yahoo.com](mailto:moibeun@yahoo.com)

## **RUSSIAN FEDERATION**

**Ms Sofia Levashova**

**Russian Federal Research Institute of Fisheries and Oceanography (VNIRO)**

Head of ASFA Center

V. Krasnoselskaya 17

Moscow, 107140, Russia

Tel: +7 (499) 2649421

E-mail: [asfa@vniro.ru](mailto:asfa@vniro.ru)

URL: <http://www.vniro.ru>

## **TANZANIA**

**Ms Edna Nyika**

**Institute of Marine Sciences (IMS)**

University of Dar es Salaam

P.O. Box 668

Zanzibar, Tanzania

Tel: +255 24 2230741 / +255 24 2232128/ Fax: +255 24 2233050

E-mail: [nyika@ims.udsm.ac.tz](mailto:nyika@ims.udsm.ac.tz)

URL: <http://www.ims.udsm.ac.tz>

## **UNITED KINGDOM**

**Ms Linda Noble**

**Marine Biological Association**

National Marine Biological Library

Library and Information Services

Citadel Hill

Plymouth PL1 2PB, United Kingdom

Tel: (44) (1752) 633 266 / Fax: (44) (1752) 633 102

E-mail: [LNO@MBA.AC.UK](mailto:LNO@MBA.AC.UK)

URL: <http://www.mba.ac.uk/nmbi>

**Mr Ian Pettman**

**Freshwater Biological Association (FBA)**

The Ferry Landing

AMBLESIDE

Cumbria LA22 0LP, UK

Tel: +44 (0) 15394 42468 / Fax: +44 (0) 15394 46914

Email: [ipettman@fba.org.uk](mailto:ipettman@fba.org.uk)

## **UGANDA**

**Ms Alice Endra**

**National Fisheries Resources Research Institute**

P.O. Box 343

Jinja, Uganda

Tel: 256-0434120484 / Fax: 256-0434120192

E-mail: [aendra2000@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:aendra2000@yahoo.co.uk)

## **UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

**Dr Neal Kaske**

**National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)**

Library and Information Services Division

NOAA Central Library (SSMC3, 2nd floor)

1315 East-West Highway

Silver Spring, Maryland 20910, USA

Tel: 301 713 2600 x131 / Fax: 301 713 4599

E-mail: [Neal.Kaske@NOAA.gov](mailto:Neal.Kaske@NOAA.gov)

URL: <http://www.lib.noaa.gov>

## **VIET NAM**

**Hau Vu Thuy**

**Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development of Viet Nam**

**Centre for Informatics and Statistics (CIS)**

10 Nguyen Cong Hoan str., Ba Dinh Dist.

Hanoi, Viet Nam

Tel: (84.4) 44591239 / Fax: (84.4) 38230381

E-Mail: [duonglongtri@mof.gov.vn](mailto:duonglongtri@mof.gov.vn) / [vuthuyhau@mard.gov.vn](mailto:vuthuyhau@mard.gov.vn) / [vuthuyhau@yahoo.com](mailto:vuthuyhau@yahoo.com)

URL: <http://www.mard.gov.vn>

## **PUBLISHING ASFA PARTNER**

### **ProQuest**

**Dr Craig Emerson / Ms Vicki Soto**

**ProQuest**

7200 Wisconsin Ave.

Bethesda, Maryland 20814, USA

Tel: 1-800-843-7751 / Fax: 1-301 961 6740

E-mail: [Craig.Emerson@proquest.com](mailto:Craig.Emerson@proquest.com) / [Vicki.Soto@proquest.com](mailto:Vicki.Soto@proquest.com)

URL: <http://www.csa.com>

## **OBSERVERS**

### **INDIA**

**MrSatya Ranjan Sahu**

**National Information Centre for Marine Sciences (Library)**

**National Institute of Oceanography (NIO) (CSIR)**

Dona Paula, Goa,

India 403 004

Tel: +91 (0) 832 2450 370 / Fax: +91 (0) 832 2450 601/602/603

E-mail: [satya@nio.org](mailto:satya@nio.org)

URL: <http://www.nio.org>

**Mr Atmaram K.Gawas**

**National Institute of Oceanography (NIO) (CSIR)**

Dona Paula, Goa,

India 403 004

Tel: 091 832 2450 379

E-mail: [akgawas@nio.org](mailto:akgawas@nio.org)

**Dr Murari Tapaswi**

**Documentation Officer**

**National Institute of Oceanography (NIO) (CSIR)**

Dona Paula, Goa,

India 403 004

Tel: 091 832 2450 275

E-mail: [murari@nio.org](mailto:murari@nio.org)

**MsThottathil Silaja**

**Technical Officer**

**Central Institute of Fisheries Technology**

CIFT Junction

Matsyapuri P.O.

Cochin

India 682029

Tel: 091 949 628 1406

E-mail: [silajat@gmail.com](mailto:silajat@gmail.com)

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

**ADRIAMED** - Scientific Cooperation to Support Responsible Fisheries in the Adriatic Sea (Italy)

**AGRIS/OEK** - International Information System for Agricultural Sciences and Technology, Knowledge Management and Library Services

**ASFA** - Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Abstracts

**ASFIS** - Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Information System

**ASFISIS** - Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Integrated Set of Information Systems (Micro CDS/ISIS package for preparing ASFA input and for retrieval)

**BF** - Informations- und Dokumentstionsstelle, Bundesforschungsanstalt für Fischerei (Germany)

**CIP** - Centro di Investigaciones Pesqueras (Cuba)

**CIS** - Centre of Information and Statistics (Vietnam)

**CNSHB** - Centre national des sciences halieutiques de Boussoura (Guinea)

**CRO** - Centre des recherches océanologiques (Côte d'Ivoire)

**CSA** - Cambridge Scientific Abstracts (ASFA Publisher)

**CSIR** - Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (Ghana)

**CSIRO** - Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization (Australia)

**DGB** - Dirección General de Bibliotecas (Mexico), part of CICH

**DPM** - Direction des pêches maritimes (Senegal)

**DFO** - Department of Fisheries and Oceans (Canada)

**EMI** - Estonian Marine Institute

**FAO** - Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (Italy)

**FBA** - Freshwater Biological Association (UK)

**FIPS** - Fisheries and Aquaculture Department, Information and Statistics Service, FAO

**FIGIS** - Fisheries Global Information System, FAO

**FRA** - Fisheries Resource Agency (Japan)

**FTP** - File Transfer Protocol

**GAL** - Geographic Authority List

**GIS** - Geographic Information System

**HTML** - Hypertext Markup Language

**IAMSLIC** - International Association of Aquatic and Marine Science Libraries and Information Centers

**ICCAT** - International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (Spain)

**ICES** - International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (Denmark)

**ICIE** - Institute for Computer Information and Engineering (Poland)

**IDS** - Internet Database Service

**IEO** - Instituto Español de Oceanografía (Spain)

**IFOP** - Instituto de Fomento Pesquero (Chile)

**IFREMER** - Institut français de recherche pour l'exploitation de la mer (France)

**IFRO** - Iranian Fisheries Research Organization

**IIP** - Instituto de Investigaciones Pesqueras (Uruguay)

**IMARPE** - Instituto del Mar del Perú

**IMR** - Institute of Marine Research (Norway)

**IMROP** - Institut Mauritanien de Recherches Océanographiques et des pêches (Mauritania)

**IMS** - Institute of Marine Sciences (Tanzania)

**INAHINA** - Instituto Nacional de Hidrografia e Navegacao (Mozambique)

**INIDEP** - Instituto Nacional de Investigación y Desarrollo Pesquero (Argentina)

**INP** - Instituto Nacional de Pesca (Ecuador)

**INRH** - Institut national de recherche halieutique (Morocco)

**INSTM** - Institut national des sciences et technologies de la mer (Tunisia)

**IO-BAS** - Institute of Oceanology of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences (Bulgaria)

**IOC** - Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (UNESCO)

**IOTC** - Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (Seychelles)

**IPIMAR** - Instituto Portugues de Investigação Maritima (Portugal)

**IUCN** - The World Conservation Union (Switzerland)

**JFRCA** - Japan Fisheries Resource Conservation Association

**KMFRI** - Kenya Marine and Fisheries Research Institute

**KORDI** - Korea Ocean Research and Development Institute

**LARReC** - Living Aquatic Resources Research Center (Lao People's Democratic Republic)

**LIFDC** - Low Income Food Deficit Countries

**MEI** - Estonian Marine Institute

**MI** - Marine Institute (Eire)

**MRI** - Marine Research Institute (Iceland)

**NACA** - Network of Aquaculture Centres in Asia-Pacific (Thailand)

**NaFIRRI** - National Fisheries Resources Research Institute (Uganda)

**NAFO** - Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (Canada)

**NCMR** - National Centre for Marine Research (Greece)

**NICMAS** - National Information Centre for Marine Sciences (India)

**NIFFR** - National Institute for Freshwater Fisheries Research (Nigeria)

**NIO** - National Institute of Oceanography (India)

**NIOF** - National Institute of Oceanography and Fisheries (Egypt)

**NISC** - National Information Services Centre (South Africa)

**NMBL** - National Marine Biological Library (UK)

**NMDIS** - National Marine Data and Information Service, State Oceanic Administration (People's Republic of China)

**NOAA** - National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (USA)

**NRC** - National Research Council (Canada)

**OAI** - Open Archive Initiative

**ODINAFRICA** - Ocean Data and Information Network in Africa

**ODINCARSA** - Ocean Data and Information Network for the Caribbean and South America

**PIMRIS** - Pacific Islands Marine Resources Information System (Fiji)

**PINRO** - Polar Research Institute of Fisheries and Oceanography (Russia)

**PMBC** - Phuket Marine Biological Centre (Thailand)

**SFI** - Sea Fisheries Institute (Poland)

**SIBM** - Società Italiana di Biologia Marina (Italy)

**SIPAM** - Information System for the Promotion of Aquaculture in the Mediterranean (Tunisia)

**SPC** - South Pacific Commission (New Caledonia)

**UNAM** - Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México

**UN/DOALOS** - United Nations Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea (UN-Secretariat, NY, USA)

**UNEP** - United Nations Environment Programme

**URI** - Uniform Resource Identifier

**URL** - Uniform Resource Locator

**USP** – Universidade de São Paulo (Brazil)

**VLIZ** – Vlaams instituut voor de Zee vzw Flanders Marine Institute (Belgium)

**VNIRO** - All-Russia Research Institute of Marine Fisheries and Oceanography

**WRI** - Water Research Institute (Ghana)

**WCPFC** - Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (Federated States of Micronesia)

**www-ISIS-ASFA** - (Web-based Micro CDS/ISIS package for preparing ASFA input and for retrieval)

**YugNIRO** - Southern Science Research Institute of Marine Fisheries and Oceanography (Ukraine)





## ASFA TRUST FUND STATUS (as of August 2009)

### CONTENTS

#### **PART- 1: Record of Deposits and Balance**

1.1 Yearly Deposits made into Trust Fund by ProQuest .....	1
1.2 BALANCE.....	1
1.3 What is the ASFA Trust Fund & ASFA Trust Fund Project Proposals .....	2

#### **PART- 2: Trust Fund Project Proposals**

2.1 Projects <b>IN PROGRESS</b> .....	3
2.1.1 Financial support to attend (THIS) 2009 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (Goa, India, 2009)	
2.1.2 Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for 2 years Jan 2008 -Dec 2009)	
2.1.3 (continuation of project) Supply of scanners (for ASFA related use) to those ASFA Partner Institutes which lack the funding to buy equipment	
2.1.4 (KMFRI) ASFA Trust Fund project proposal – (provision of computer equipment) Further strengthening of the ASFA Partner in Kenya (KMFRI) in order to provide ASFA Training Support for other ASFA Partners in Africa and so as to assist FAO ASFA Secretariat	
2.1.5 (VLIZ, Belgium) - Collect, sort out, and prepare approximately 15,000 complete bibliographic references dealing with aquatic environment (from North Sea, in particular the Southern Bight area)	
2.2 Projects <b>COMPLETED</b> (in Intersessional period 2007- 2008).....	4
2.2.1 Financial support to attend the 2008 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (Bergen, Norway, 2008)	
2.2.2 Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year Jan -Dec 2008)	
2.2.3 Further development of www-ISIS-ASFA software as regards interoperability, additional URL fields, and updating picklists	
2.2.4 (Russia-VNIRO) Input of Barents and Norwegian Seas Literature	
2.2.5 Utilization of the ASFA Trust Fund to pay the IAMSILIC Membership fees for ASFA Partners	
2.2.6 (NIGERIA – NIFFR) ASFA Trust Fund proposal filling the missing gap	
2.3 Projects <b>PENDING</b> (further discussion and/or action).....	6
2.3.1 Initiative to support the “Digitization” of grey literature & advice as to what should be digitized	
2.3.2 (KMFRI) Elimination of Gaps Phase II ( <i>requires further information from KMFRI and final approval Board</i> )	
2.3.3 (FAO) MINI ASFA MEETING (REGIONAL) ( <i>postponed</i> )	
2.3.4 (FAO) www-ISIS-ASFA –towards Release-2 ( <i>postponed</i> )	
2.3.5 (PDII-LIPI- Indonesia) - ASFA Trust Fund Proposal relating to ASFA input preparation and training ( <i>postponed</i> )	
2.3.6 ASFA Training Session ( <i>postponed</i> )	
2.3.7 (YugNIRO- Ukraine) Translation of ASFA Thesaurus into Russian and development of Russian-English Thesaurus ( <i>postponed</i> )	
2.3.8 (YugNIRO- Ukraine) Translation of www-ISIS-ASFA “Help Notes” and front end into Russian( <i>postponed</i> )	
2.3.9 (YugNIRO- Ukraine) Translation of www-ISIS-ASFA Guidelines into Russian ( <i>postponed</i> )	
2.4 <b>NEW PROJECT PROPOSALS AND ONGOING UP FOR RE-APPROVAL 2008-2009</b> .....	8
(ASFA/2009/70) 2.4.1 Financial support to attend the ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (for year 2010)	
(ASFA/2009/3a) 2.4.2 (FAO) - Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year Jan -Dec 2010)	
(ASFA/2009/74) 2.4.3 (FAO) – utilization of Trust Fund to pay IAMSILIC membership fees (2 year continuation)	
(ASFA/2009/34a) 2.4.4 (Guinea/CNSHB) – Computer Equipment for CNSHB	
(ASFA/2009/64a) 2.4.5 (Viet nam/CIS) – Scanning of Viet Nam Fisheries technology and Scientific Results from 2000-2008	
(ASFA/2009/80) 2.4.6 (FAO) Small Financial Incentive to ASFA Partner Institute hosting ASFA Board Meeting	

#### **PART- 3: Summary List of ALL Proposals.....9**

## PART-1: RECORD OF DEPOSITS AND BALANCE

### 1.1 YEARLY DEPOSITS MADE INTO TRUST FUND

<u>ProQuest deposits</u>			<u>BF (Germany) deposits**</u>	
Year	US\$	(deposit date)		(deposit date)
<b>2008</b>	<b>\$242 325.52</b>	<b>8/2009</b>		
2007	\$254 593.54	5/2008	**	
2006	\$251 290.75	5/2007	**	
2005	\$245 411.42	5/2006	**	
2004	\$212 998.00	5/2005	**	
2003	\$199 188.66	5/2004	**	
2002	\$185 913.49	5/2003	€ 32,65 / \$30.03*	2002
2001	\$155 668.79	6/2002	DM 110.83+€ 8,30* / = \$59.87	2001
2000	\$127 846.27	5/2001	DM 134 05 / \$63.00	2000
1999	\$ 85 412.46	5/2000	DM 151 23 / \$71.08	1999
1998	\$ 80 003.75	4/1999	DM 190 65 / \$89.73	1998
1997	\$ 70 315.76	4/1998	DM 204 43 / \$96.22	1998
1996	\$ 64 596.00	4/1997	DM 122 21 / \$57.52	1996
1995	\$ 61 543.51	5/1996	DM 241 72 / \$113.77	1995
1994	\$ 34 473.77	4/1995	*1Euro=.92US\$ * 1\$=2.12452 DM	

\*\* (there are no Trust Fund payments for 2003-2009 from BF, because BF no longer makes the ASFA database available commercially to external users).

### 1.2 BALANCE

• <b>ALL Funds</b> deposited in Trust Fund to date (sum of entries in section 1.1 above)	(+) <b>\$2 272 161</b>	(\$2 029 836) (last year)
• <b>COMMITTED funds</b> (sum of all committed funds listed under Part 3) .....	(-) <b>\$1 355 130.</b>	(\$1 223 064) (last year)
• <b>Funds returned to balance unspent</b> (see items 58, 58a, and 90 in Part 3)..... (note: Not all unspent funds are returned to balance. In the case of ongoing proposals, that are renewed each year such as: "Financial support to Attend Board Meeting" and "Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat", the funds are carried over to the next year's allotment. In other cases, the funds have been spent on similar or follow-up activities to the original proposal)	(+) \$ 47 135.	
• <b>Overspent</b> (see item 49 and 83 in Part 3) .....	(-) \$2 490.	
<b>BALANCE</b> .....(+)	<b>US\$ 961 676</b>	(\$851 417) (last year)

### **1.3 WHAT IS THE ASFA TRUST FUND & ASFA TRUST FUND PROJECT PROPOSALS?**

This section describes briefly "What is the ASFA Trust Fund"

The ASFA Trust Fund is the collective property of the ASFA Partners. It was created and is maintained through the accumulation of royalties made from the sale of the ASFA products. FAO holds the funds (deposited in FAO) on behalf of the ASFA Partners.

The commercial Publisher of ASFA, CSA (now called ProQuest) is the major and now only financial contributor to the ASFA Trust Fund (approx. US\$250,000+ /year).

- The deposits, balance, and projects underway etc. are reported as accurately (and as transparently as possible) at each ASFA Advisory Board Meeting by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (i.e. this document)
- The amount of money (or Royalties) paid into the ASFA Trust Fund for commercial use of the ASFA information products and services is negotiated between FAO and ProQuest (the details are contained in the Publishing Agreement between FAO and ProQuest).

#### **WHAT IS AN ASFA TRUST FUND PROJECT PROPOSAL?**

ASFA Trust Fund proposals are small projects suggested by ASFA Partners dealing with the development and maintenance of the ASFA system.

At the 1993 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (pg7 and annex III), the Board agreed that the Trust Fund should be used to support project/activities dealing with:

- Development of Tools\*,
- Capacity Building\*,
- Training, and
- Special Projects

**\*(with priority being given to development of tools and capacity building)**

At the 1997 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (pg.17 and Annex 32), the Board agreed also to use the Trust Fund:

- To support the participation of ASFA Partners at the ASFA Board Meetings by participants from economically developing countries or from countries in transition to a market economy [the allocated sum was to be adjusted at each year's Meeting].

At the 2002 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (pg. 18, item-13.3), the Board agreed:

- that requests for Trust Fund proposals from non-ASFA Partners\* would not be accepted and
- that requests to attend Meetings (other than the ASFA Board Meeting) would not be supported.

***\*(At the 2007 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting, an exception or waiver to this rule was agreed for a 2 year trial period by the Board with regard to project proposals put forward by the IAMSILIC Executive Board for projects of mutual benefit to ASFA and IAMSILIC up to a total of \$28 000)***

***All ASFA Trust Fund proposals are discussed/agreed at Board meetings or circulated to the ASFA Board for approval.***

**When and if approved**, the ASFA Secretariat contracts the work using FAO's official financial instruments (e.g. contracts, Letters of Agreements etc.).

**Note**, money from the Trust Fund for projects such as "filling gaps" etc. is not paid to individual persons, but rather it is paid to their institute.

## PART-2: TRUST FUND PROJECT PROPOSALS

### PART-2:

- 2.1 Projects IN PROGRESS
- 2.2 Projects COMPLETED in Interessional Period
- 2.3 Projects PENDING
- 2.4 Projects NEW and ONGOING (in need of review)

### 2.1 Projects IN PROGRESS

#### (in progress) 2.1.1 Financial support to attend (THIS) 2009 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (NIO, India, 2009)

This proposal remains classified as “in progress” until the participants have returned home from the Meeting and have presented any eventual Travel Expense Claims (TECs).

At this writing, the following 15 ASFA Partners are to receive full or partial assistance to attend this year's ASFA Board Meeting: CIS(Viet Nam), IIP (Uruguay), IMS (Tanzania), INIDEP (Argentina), INP (Ecuador), KMFRI (Kenya), KORDI (Korea), NIFFR (Nigeria), NIOF (Egypt), NMDIS (China), PIMRIS (Fiji), YugNIRO (Ukraine)\*, NAFIRRI (Uganda), UNAM (Mexico), USP (Brazil). \*(YugNIRO cannot attend)

The Funds available for this Meeting at NIO, India are US\$50 330 thusly derived: US\$ 40 000 allocated (agreed) by ASFA Board at 2008 Board Meeting, plus \$10 330 unspent from last year's (2007) Meeting.

The total amount disbursed is not available at this writing as all tickets and itineraries have not been determined or finalized. As usual, any eventual overspending or under spending will be subtracted from or added to next year's allocation.

***This is an ongoing proposal - so EACH year it requires "updating" with regard to the cost for the next year's (2010) allocation. The "Updating" of this proposal is presented as ASFA/2009/70 and is mentioned under the "New Proposals" section 2.4.1 below. It will be discussed under Agenda item 13.3.)***

#### (in progress) 2.1.2 Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for 2 years 2008-2009) (2x\$60,000/yr = \$120 000)

This proposal covering the 2 years, 2008-2009, remains classified as “in progress” until the end of 2009.

This proposal is to assist the FAO ASFA Secretariat by funding some of the work/initiatives that it carries out for the collective benefit of the ASFA Partnership.

Note, the allotment for the 2 year period Jan 2008 – Dec. 2009 was \$60,000 per year. For the year 2008, the \$60 000 allotment was fully spent, except for \$627, which was carried over to the 2009 allocation to make it \$60 627.

To date for 2009, (January - July 2009) **\$59 647** has been spent/committed. See Part-3, item-2 for FAO Secretariat utilization of allotment (and item 10 for 2008).

Under spending (\$980) will be carried forward to the 2010 allotment.

***This is an ongoing proposal which the Board suggested be reconfirmed each year. The "Updating" of this proposal for 2010 is presented as ASFA/2009/3a and is mentioned under the "New Proposals" section 2.4.1 below. It will be discussed under Agenda item 13.3.)***

#### (in progress) 2.1.3 (continuation of project) Supply of scanners (for ASFA related use) to those ASFA Partner Institutes which lack the funding to buy equipment

The ASFA Board agreed at the 2008 ASFA Board meeting (see item 13.3.9 of the 2008 Meeting Report) **to continue** this project initiative (let's call it: “round-two”).

The “round-two” of the project will supply scanners to the following six ASFA Partners who requested one: IMS, Zanzibar; CSIR, Ghana; NIO/NICMAS, India; IMROP, Mauritania; UNAM/DGB, Mexico; and IMARPE, Perú. The total cost should be approx. US\$3 600.

See **ASFA/2009/75** for a resume/status of the project to date.

For your convenience/reminder, the first “round-one” of this project was approved during the 2007-2008 interessional period (see ASFA/2008/81 for details). The first round cost approx. US\$6107.00 and supplied scanners and scanning software to the following nine Partners: IIP, Uruguay; NIFFR, Nigeria; NaFIRRI, Uganda; VNIRO, Russian Federation; YugNIRO, Ukraine; NIOF, Egypt; IFOP, Chile; FICen, Viet Nam; INSTM, Tunisia.

(in progress) **2.1.4 (KMFRI) ASFA Trust Fund project proposal – (provision of computer equipment) Further strengthening of the ASFA Partner in Kenya (KMFRI) in order to provide ASFA Training Support for other ASFA Partners in Africa and so as to assist FAO ASFA Secretariat**

This proposal was put forward by KMFRI and agreed in principle by the Board at the 2008 ASFA Board Meeting (2008 Board Report, item, 13.3.8). The Board requested more details/specifications regarding the equipment and that the proposal to be circulated via ASFA-Board-L for final approval. This was done (14 May 2009) and the project was approved (10 June 2009) for two desktop computers, one portable computer and one dehumidifier.

FAO is awaiting the final cost statement from the FAO representative office in Kenya, which will carry out the purchase locally. It appears that the final cost of the equipment will amount to around \$3 700.

(in progress) **2.1.5 (VLIZ, Belgium) - Collect, sort out, and prepare approximately 15,000 complete bibliographic references dealing with the aquatic environment (from the North Sea, in particular the Southern Bight area. \$18,000. In progress**

The project has been hampered by difficulties in developing a program to automatically transfer VLIZ records to the ASFA Publisher in the accepted ASFA format. VLIZ even provided some funds to Dr Rybinski to assist in working out the problems. There are also a large number of VLIZ records, besides the above mentioned project records, waiting to go to the Publisher. **Finally, it appears the problems have been resolved and the records are starting to flow to the Publisher**, according to news we have received from the ASFA Publisher.

History of project: this proposal (\$18 000) was put forward/approved during the 2002-2003 intersessional period via ASFA-Board-L (2003 Meeting Report: section 13.3.1.5 & Annexes 14,14a for full details of project). At the 2004 Meeting (2004 Meeting Report: section 13.2.1.3) VLIZ revisited the project proposal redefining the number of records for processing to approx. 10, 000 and increasing the time frame.

For a list of all ASFA Trust fund projects to input historical literature/fill gaps, see **ASFA/2009/76**)

## **2.2 Projects COMPLETED (during Intersessional period 2008-2009)**

(completed) **2.2.1 Financial support to attend the 2008 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (IMR, Norway, 2008)**

The following 15 ASFA Partners receive full or partial assistance to attend the 2008 ASFA Board Meeting: CIP, IIP, INIDEP, INRH, KMFRI, KORDI, NIFFR, NIO/NICMAS, NIOF, NMDIS, SFI, YugNIRO, UNAM, USP, VNIRO\*.

\*(VNIRO funding contributed by Nasjonalt Institutt For Ernærings- og Sjømatforskning / National Institute of Nutrition and Seafood Research (NIFES) thanks to Brit Skotheim's efforts (NIFES link [http://www.nifes.no/index.php?page\\_id=126&lang\\_id=2](http://www.nifes.no/index.php?page_id=126&lang_id=2) )

The Funds available for this Meeting at IMR, Norway were US\$55 638 thusly derived: US\$ 40 000 allocated (agreed) by ASFA Board at 2007 Board Meeting, plus \$12 684 unspent from last year's allotment and \$2 954 contributed by the *National Institute of Nutrition and Seafood Research*, Norway.

The total amount disbursed was \$45 119. As usual, the under spending (remaining balance of \$10 330) was added to the 2009 year's allocation, bringing that allocation to \$59 330.

(completed) **2.2.2 Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year Jan -Dec 2008) (\$60 000)\***

This proposal is to assist the FAO ASFA Secretariat by funding some of the work/initiatives that it carries out for the collective benefit of the ASFA Partnership.

\* Note, the allotment for 2008 was \$60 000, but there was an overspending of **\$7 836** from the previous year's (2007) allocation. Therefore, the actual sum available during 2008 was **\$52 164**.

For the period January - December 2008, **\$51 537** was been spent. See Part-3, item-10 for a list of how the FAO Secretariat utilized the funds.

The under spending of \$627 was be brought forward and added to the 2009 allotment of \$60 000.

(completed) **2.2.3 Further development of www-ISIS-ASFA software as regards interoperability, additional URL fields, and updating picklists) (\$21 195)**

This project was completed during the intersession (see the contractors work report **ASFA/2009/78**). However, the software has still not been released as it is still being tested by the ASFA Publisher for compatibility etc..

This update to the software (to be called release 1.2) mainly addresses the need to increase the interoperability of the www-ISIS-ASFA version 1.1 of the software (increased export and import functionality, including a function to import INMAGIC records). This was requested by the Board at the 2007 Meeting. The actual project proposal was circulated to the ASFA Partners for voting during the 2007-2008 intersession via the ASFA-Board-L listserv (18 April 2008) - it was "approved" (see ASFA/2008/ 82, in the 2008 Meeting Report for details and a record of this proposal).

The update to the software contains, besides the export/import programmes that will enable Partners to import and export their records to and from other systems/repositories, also some additional URL fields and the updating of the pick-lists contained in the software.

(completed) **2.2.4 (Russia–VNIRO) – Inputs of Barents and Norwegian Seas Literature (US\$3960)**

Agreed by the Board at the 2006 Meeting (see 2006 Report, Annex 35a and section 13.3.8). The Russian Collaborating center was originally envisaged to carry-out the work, but instead VNIRO carried out the work.

The contract between FAO and VNIRO to carry out this work was finalized in May 2008 and VNIRO send the first batch of records in June 2008. The project is now complete and all 310 records are now on the ASFA database.

For a list of all ASFA Trust fund projects to input historical literature/fill gaps, see **ASFA/2009/76)**

(completed) **2.2.5 Utilization of the ASFA Trust Fund to pay the IAMSLIC Membership fees for ASFA Partners**

See **ASFA/2009/74** for the **renewal request** and for the status report regarding this project

The projects renewal calls for the sum of **US\$ 1 240** - necessary to renew all 31 of the currently sponsored IAMSLIC membership fees which will expire in either 2009 or 2010 (see table-1 in the document ASFA/2009/74).

History of project: This project refers "to paying the IAMSLIC Membership fees for both ASFA Partners and ASFA Collaborating Centers who do not have the funds, or are not able for administrative reasons to pay for membership to IAMSLIC". The project was discussed and agreed by the Board at 2004 Meeting and renewed for 2 additional 2 year periods at the 2005 and 2007 ASFA Board Meetings (see section 8.4 of the 2004 Meeting Report, section 6.7 of the 2005 Report, and section 13.3.6 of 2007 Report).

We remind ASFA Partners and Collaborating ASFA Centers again. If you are not a member of IAMSLIC please consider the benefits of joining.

In addition, it would be useful if ASFA Partners would report on the utility of their IAMSLIC membership (e.g. their use of the Z39.50 distributed library and IAMSLIC Listserv).

(completed) **2.2.6 (NIGERIA – NIFFR) ASFA Trust Fund proposal filling the missing gap (\$8 060)**

Agreed by the Board in principle at the 2006 Meeting (see 2006 Report, section 13.3.7 and Annex 32a) and finally approval at the 2007 ASFA Board Meeting (see 2007 Report, section 13.2.16). Various administrative issues delayed the finalizing of this Letter of Agreement until 2008.

In any case, we are happy now to report that the project is completed and the records are on the ASFA database. For a list of all ASFA Trust fund project proposals to input historical literature and filling of gaps, see **ASFA/2009/76)**

## **2.3 Projects PENDING** (further discussion and/or action)

(pending) **2.3.1 Initiative to support the digitization of grey literature and advice as to what should be digitized**  
(proposal put forward by IAMSLIC) \$28 000

**It would appear clear**, that the identification of grey literature for ASFA inputting and scanning is not an easy task for the ASFA Partners, as is evidenced by our inability to utilize the available funding as described above. **Perhaps a solution can be found at this meeting.**

History of project - At the 2007 Board Meeting, see section 13.3.4 of 2007 Report, the Board agree to modify its policy which prevented it from considering for financing from the ASFA Trust Fund project proposals coming from outside the ASFA Partnership (now project proposals coming from the IAMSLIC Executive Board will be considered for a trial period of 2 years and up to a one time total of \$28 000). Following the change of policy, the above mentioned project proposal on digitization was tabled at the 2007 Meeting by the FAO ASFA Secretariat on behalf of IAMSLIC for discussion and approval. The Board approved the proposal, in principle (see section 13.3.5 of 2007 Report). R. Pepe (FAO) met at the last IAMSLIC Meeting with some key IAMSLIC members (present and incoming Presidents of IAMSLIC and the Chair of the Aquatic Commons Implementation taskforce) where it was concurred that: the digitization of material for inclusion in the Aquatic Commons repository was of primary importance to IAMSLIC, and therefore, instead of the \$10,000 mentioned in the original IAMSLIC Trust Fund digitization proposal, the entire \$28 000 allocated by the ASFA Board to IAMSLIC for the 2 year trial period should go towards the

digitization. The ASFA Partners can suggest specific titles to be digitized and can do the digitization of the items as well. A newly created IAMSILIC "Digital Collection Development" taskforce within the Aquatic Commons Board will also identify collection development priorities for the repository, and these recommendations will point to many other documents. It was agreed that the FAO ASFA Secretariat would implement (disburse) this \$28 000 project through its offices by contacting the ASFA Partners and soliciting their specific nominations of materials to scan etc.. The FAO ASFA Secretariat would also identify which ASFA Partners are willing/wanting to do the scanning and work out/negotiate with the ASFA partner(s) a "contract" to do the work, and a procedure to follow.

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat has contacted the ASFA Partners on numerous occasions requesting suggestions for digitization with reference to the above project.** In addition, some ASFA Partners have been supplied with scanners (although not specifically to serve this project). There has not yet been any positive response from Partners regarding suggestions or lists of materials to scan.

**In addition,** at the 2008 ASFA Board Meeting, the FAO ASFA Secretariat put forth an ASFA Trust Fund Project proposal (ASFA/2008/77) whereby ASFA Partners (who want to participate) will be paid a sum to identify and list the grey literature in their institute/country that they could enter into ASFA including digitization. Such a list could include grey literature already with records in ASFA, but not yet digitized. Partners were asked for an indication on how to coordinate such a project and as to how much funds should be allocated.

### (pending) **2.3.2 (KMFRI) Elimination of Gaps - Phase two**

The project proposal is pending revision by KMFRI regarding the journals, the time span, number of records and costs etc., and then final approval of the revision by the Board with authorization to proceed. KMFRI was to circulate the revision via ASFA –Board-L during 2008-2009 intersessional period.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat contacted KMFRI regarding the status of this proposal. KMFRI replied that they were working on the proposal and were thinking about separating the records with abstracts and those without, thereby possibly splitting the proposal into two phases, because of the time required for the abstracting. The proposal will likely be re-submitted at the Board meeting.

History of project proposal: This Trust Fund project proposal (approx. \$21 459) was presented at the 2007 Meeting and approved in principle (see 2007 Report, section 13.3.8). It is a continuation of the retrospective indexing activities conducted by KMFRI. This *Phase two* intends to prepare 2000 records for the following 2 titles: Journal of the Fisheries Research Board of Canada (1934-1972) and Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom (vols. 1-62). Following discussion/comments from Partners, the project proposal required revision by KMFRI and resubmitting for approval.

### (postponed) **2.3.3 (FAO) Mini ASFA Meeting (Regional)**

The Meeting was postponed to 2010 and venue has been changed. The venue will be INIDEP, Argentina, so as to run back-to-back with the 2010 International IAMSILIC Meeting and the Latin American Regional IAMSILIC Meeting.

History of project: Agreed at the 2006 ASFA Board Meeting (see 2006 Report, section 13.3.4 and Annex 57) - Initially, the first of such Meetings was to be held in Latin America and if successful, subsequent Meetings would be considered for Asia and for Africa. The idea is that such Meetings would provide a forum to exchange ideas before the Board Meetings and to discuss practical experiences and problems/solutions related to the ASFA input and its special problems. During 2007 the time available at FAO and INIDEP (the Meeting venue) was not sufficient to organize this Meeting during the intersessional period. Therefore, the Meeting was postponed.

### (pending) **2.3.4 (FAO) www-ISIS-ASFA –towards Release-2**

The current www-ISIS-ASFA 1.1 software is still viable and the small upgrade (1.2) to the www-ISIS-ASFA software that is underway will increase the interoperability of www-ISIS-ASFA and further delay the need for a full Release-2 of the software.

Background - This proposal, to continue with the development of the www-ISIS-ASFA software, was agreed at the 2006 ASFA Board Meeting (see section 13.3.6 and Annex 58 of 2006 Meeting Report). The purpose was to include some changes that could not be, at the time, incorporated into the 1.1 upgrade and perhaps new elements to be discussed by the Board, CSA, FAO, ICIE. The next step is to draw up a contract with ICIE and have Dr Rybinski come to FAO (time permitting) for more detailed discussions with the FAO Secretariat regarding the changes to be made.

**However the contract and further discussions have not yet been carried-out due to lack of staff resources in the FAO ASFA Secretariat and, as stated above, the non-urgency of developing Release-2.**

*(pending)* **2.3.5 (PDII-LIPI- Indonesia) - ASFA Trust Fund Proposal (\$11 000) relating to ASFA input preparation and training**

Pending Action FAO. Hopefully, the training can be carried out sometime in the near future.

History of project: This proposal, from 2006, was not approved at the 2006 Meeting (see 2006 Report, Annex 24a and section 13.3.10) but rather designated for further discussion between the FAO ASFA Secretariat and PDII-LIPI. The ASFA Secretariat informed PDII-LIPI that rather than its going to Indonesia to carry out a training of PDII-LIPI's many potential collaborating or sub-centers, it preferred to train someone from PDII-LIPI to do the training. It was agreed that a training of one or two PDII-LIPI staff at FAO would take place some time in the future, probably at FAO, with FAO paying the travel and per-diem of one trainee and PDII-LIPI paying for the other.

The training was delayed for a number of reasons on the part of both FAO and PDII-LIPI. FAO had earmarked the first PDII-LIPI trainee for a second minor training, but because of his being in Japan until mid 2007 and later his being occupied by Masters Degree the training was postponed and never carried out. PDII-LIPI informed FAO that they had a new trainee, but the FAO ASFA Secretariat (not having planned for a full training of a new person) was neither in a position to carry out the training nor to organize an outsourced training.

*(pending)* **2.3.6 ASFA Training Session (\$14 000)**

This proposal was agreed by the Board at the 2007 Meeting (see section 13.3.7 of the 2007 Report) and it authorized the ASFA Secretariat to organize and carry out, once a year, a Training session, up to 5 participants, in the ASFA Input procedures for those Partners in need (both new ASFA partners and existing ASFA Partners who may need re-training). The training was envisaged most likely be at FAO, Rome. No action to date.

*(pending)* **2.3.7 (YugNIRO- Ukraine) Translation of ASFA Thesaurus into Russian and development of Russian-English Thesaurus**

This proposal was agreed by the Board at the 2004 ASFA Board Meeting (see section 13.3.5 and Annex-29c of the 2005 Board Meeting Report). Difficulties, on FAO's part, in the initial administrative organization of project has rendered the proposal as "pending". The proposal is still pending.

*(pending)* **2.3.8 (YugNIRO- Ukraine) Translation of www-ISIS-ASFA "Help Notes" and front end into Russian**

This proposal was agreed by the Board at the 2004 ASFA Board Meeting (see section 13.3.6 and Annex-29a of the 2005 ASFA Board Meeting Report). The proposal is pending for reason given in 2.3.6.

*(pending)* **2.3.9 (YugNIRO- Ukraine) Translation of www-ISIS-ASFA Guidelines into Russian**

This proposal was agreed by the Board at the 2004 ASFA Board Meeting (see section 13.3.7 and Annex-29b of the 2005 ASFA Board Meeting Report). The proposal is pending for reason given in 2.3.6.

**2.4 NEW PROJECT PROPOSALS AND ONGOING UP FOR RE-APPROVAL 2009-2010**  
***(For discussion/approval by Board - Agenda item 13.3)***

*(for re-approval)* **2.4.1 Financial support to attend the ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (for year 2010)**

This proposal (**ASFA/2009/ 70**) is reviewed each year by the Board to eventually update the amount of allocated funds. At the last three ASFA Meetings (2006, 2007 and 2008) the sum allocated has been held at \$40 000. The sum appears to be sufficient for the time being.

**THEREFORE, the renewal of this Trust Fund project proposal for the 2010 meeting is for discussion at US\$40 000.**

*(for Re-approval)* **2.4.2 (FAO) - Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year Jan -Dec 2010) (\$60,000)**

This is an ongoing proposal (**ASFA/2009/3a**) that is reviewed and renewed each year by the Board to update the amount of funds allocated to the FAO ASFA Secretariat. At the 2007 Board Meeting the proposal was approved for a two year period (2008 and 2009) at \$60 000 per year. The 2 year period is completed, so the proposal now again appears for review/approval. Preferably for the two year period 2010 and 2011.

The listing of the spending for this project is visible in Part - 3 of this paper in the table item-2.

**THEREFORE, the renewal of this Trust Fund project proposal for the 2010 is US\$60 000 unless the Board decides on a two year approval (i.e. \$120 000 for 2010 and 2011).**



(for Re-approval) **2.4.3 (FAO) Utilization of ASFA Trust Fund to Pay IAMSLIC Membership Fees (*request for further 2 year continuation*)**

This is an “ongoing” proposal presented every two years to the Board for review and re-approval. See **ASFA/2009/74** for the re-newal request and for a detailed status report regarding the project.

**The sum of US\$ 1 240** is required to renew all 31 of the currently sponsored IAMSLIC membership fees which will expire in either 2009 or 2010 (see table-1 in the document ASFA/2009/74)

**THEREFORE, the FAO ASFA Secretariat requests that this proposal be extended for a further two years, which means a potential spending over the next 2 years of US\$1 240\*.**

\*(The sum, US\$ 1 240, corresponds to the cost of renewing all 31 of the currently sponsored IAMSLIC membership fees (see table-1 below) since these memberships will expire in either 2009 or 2010. Each membership would be renewed for a further 2 years. *For your information, the membership fee is US\$20.00 per year for prospective members from low and middle income countries, therefore (\$20x2 years= \$40, and \$40x31 renewals= total \$1 240).*

(NEW) **2.4.4 (Guinea, CNSHB) Computer Equipment for CNSHB**

**See ASFA/2009/ 34a**, The objective of this Trust Fund Proposal is to contribute to the resolution of constraints and problems due to lack of computer equipment and difficulties with access to Internet because of weak debit, technical breakdown.

(NEW) **2.4.5 (Viet Nam, CIS) Scanning of Viet Nam Fisheries Technology and Scientific results from 2000-2008**

**See ASFA/2009/ 64a**, The objective of this Trust Fund Proposal is to scan and to create ASFA records with corresponding full-text.

(NEW) **2.4.6 (FAO ASFA Secretariat ) Small Financial Incentive to ASFA Partner Institute hosting ASFA Board Meeting**

**See ASFA/2009/ 80**, This proposal is to offset some of the cost that might deter a Partner from offering to host the Meeting.

## PART-3: SUMMARY LISTING (all project proposals in-progress and completed, 1995-to date)

The purpose of this listing is to keep a detailed and transparent record of ALL ASFA Trust Fund proposals and the funds disbursed.

**2008-2009 Intersessional Project Proposals** (proposals put forward and approved during intersession via ASFA-Board-L)

none

**2008 Project Proposals** (project proposals put forward and approved at the **2008** Board Meeting, IMR, Norway)

	COMMITTED	DISBURSED	NOTES
<b>1. Financial Support to attend annual (2009) Board Meeting</b> * [\$ 40 000 was allocated by Board at 2008 Meeting for the 2009 Meeting. However, the \$10 330 carry-over of unspent funds from the 2008 meeting makes the <b>TOTAL funds available for the 2009 Meeting = \$50 330</b> (Note, the additional \$10 330 is not shown in the "Committed" column, but is calculated as part of balance available to be spent.)	\$40 000*	40 000**	<b>**Underway.</b> Final sum disbursed not available at writing. Eventual under/over spending will be balanced against next year's allotment, as done each year.
<b>2. Staff Support to FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year 2009)</b> [\$ 60 000 was allocated by Board for 2009, (actually \$120 000 for the 2 year period 2008-2009). There was an under- spending of \$ 627 for the previous (2008) year's allocation, see item-10 below] <b>Therefore, the TOTAL funds available for 2009 = \$60 627</b> * (Note, the \$ 627 advanced from 2008 is not shown in the "Committed" column, but it is/will be calculated as part of total balance to be spent) <b>** The Spending or committed so far for 2009 has been \$59 647</b> <b>(\$60 627 – 59 647 = \$980</b> (i.e. \$980 unspent balance which be added to the 2010 allotment. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- \$2 000* - assistance to FAO ASFA input preparation 2009 - sub-contracto AdriaMed. Estimates cost (underway)</li> <li>- \$ 4 025 – secondment (S. Kalayanova) to ASFA from FAO WAICENT-AGRIS group for 10 days in 2009.</li> <li>- \$6 800 for ASFA information products to LIFDC countries (underway)</li> <li>- \$2 500 (estimate) 1 FAO ASFA Staff member to attend IAMSILIC Meeting Sept. 2009, Belgium (to be undertaken)</li> <li>- \$ 8 250 hiring of consultant (L. Lombardi) to assist FAO ASFA Secretariat (50 days) (underway)</li> <li>- \$2 800 attendance FAO Secretariat at 2009 Online conference (estimate)</li> <li>- \$2 000 Board Report 2008 (print and distribution) *(estimated cost)</li> <li>- \$12 699 meeting with ProQuest in Bethesda (USA) regarding strategic planning present(R.Grainger, R.Pepe, A.Thompson, I.Pettman) (completed)</li> <li>- \$3 725 training of trainers course (A. Cristiani ) to FAO, Rome</li> <li>- \$4 200* training of A. Sow (Mauritania) at IFREMER by J. prod'homme includes honorarium *(approximate cost - training not yet carried out)</li> <li>- \$2 297 Training (in Chile) &amp; follow-up of Chile/IFOP input by A. Cristiani (travel/per diem \$1 677 + contract \$1000)</li> <li>- \$1 897 laptop for ASFA Partner (IIP/Uruguay) for utilization in ASFA training and follow-up activities in Latin America</li> <li>- \$1 514 attendance FAO Secretariat (J. Garnica) at International Conference for Digital Libraries and the Semantic Web, Trento, Italy</li> <li>- \$1 297 J. Macharia (KMFRI) to AFRAMSLIC, Tanzania, to carry out ASFA Training *(travel/per diem))</li> <li>- \$3643 (approx.) Printing and mailing ASFA Thesaurus</li> </ul>	\$60 000*	\$59 647 **	all items in progress, underway, completed, or to be undertaken.
<b>3. FBA Geographic Authority List – update of List FBA African Water Bodies – duplicate Material organized for eventual scanning and ASFA input</b>	\$24 000	\$10 000	
<b>4. Continuation of project – To Supply of scanners (for ASFA related use) to those ASFA Partner Institutes which lack the funding to buy equipment</b> *estimated cost to date of (6 Scanners \$2400 and 6 copies of Adobe Acrobat software \$1266 = <b>\$3666</b>	\$3 666*	\$0*	in progress

<b>5. Further Strengthening KMFRI (Kenya) ASFA Training Centre –</b> computer equipment: Kenya 2 PCs, 1 portable, 1 dehumidifier	\$3 700*	\$0	approved during intercession by vote. *(approx.price)
<b>6. Utilization of the ASFA Trust Fund to pay the IAMSLIC Membership fees for ASFA Partners (project extended for a further two years 2009-2010)</b>	\$750	\$750	in progress 18 renewals to date
<b>sub-total</b>	<b>\$132 116</b>	<b>\$110 397</b>	

**2007-2008 Intersessional Project Proposals** (proposals put forward and approved during intersession via ASFA-Board-L)

	<u>COMMITTED</u>	<u>DISBURSED</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
<b>7. Development of Export/Conversion programs for www-ISIS-ASFA software</b> (Euro 13 553) (USD 21 195.54) (1 Euro=USD 1.5639, European Central Bank Exchange rate 20 May 2008)	\$21 195.	\$21 195	LOA In progress of being signed by ICIE (originally Euro 11975, some additional tasks added raised figure to Euro 13 553)
<b>8. Supply of scanners (for ASFA related use) to those ASFA Partner Institutes which lack the funding to buy equipment</b> (9 Scanners \$4 208 + 9 Adobe Acrobat software \$1 899 = <b>\$6 107</b> (still not final cost as problems acquiring delivering scanner for USSR)	\$7 270	\$6 107*	completed except for 1 institutes without FAO office in country
<b>sub-total</b>	<b>\$28 465</b>	<b>\$27 302</b>	

**2007 Project Proposals** (project proposals put forward and approved at the 2007 Board Meeting, KMFRI, Kenya)

	<u>COMMITTED</u>	<u>DISBURSED</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
<b>9. Financial Support to attend annual (2008)Board Meeting</b> * [\$40 000 was allocated by Board at 2007 Meeting for the 2008 Meeting. However, there was a <b>\$12 684</b> carry-over from the 2007 Meeting plus and there was \$2765 donated by NIFES, Norway - making the <b>TOTAL funds available for the 2008 Meeting = \$55 449</b> ] (Note, the additional \$15 449 is not shown in the "Committed" column, but is calculated as part of balance available to be spent.) <b>The final amount spent was \$45 119.</b> The unspent <b>\$10 330</b> is carried over to the allotment for 2009 meeting.	\$40 000*	\$45 119	<b>Completed.</b> The unspent funds will be added to next year's allotment as has been the case in the past
<b>10. Staff Support to FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year 2008)</b> [\$ 60 000 was allocated by Board for 2008, however there was an over-spending of \$7836 from the previous (2007) year's allocation] <b>Therefore, the TOTAL funds available for 2008 = \$52 164</b> * (Note, the \$7 836 overspent funds is not shown in the "Committed" column, but it is/will be calculated as part of total balance to be spent) <b>** The Spending during 2008 was \$ 51 537</b> ( <b>\$52 164 - \$51 537 = \$ 627</b> (i.e. \$ 627 advanced will be added to the 2009 allotment of \$60 000) - \$2 007 spent (\$18 700 allocated) - assistance to FAO ASFA input preparation/follow-up/training 2008 - sub-contract to ADRIAMED. - \$6 800 for ASFA information products to LIFDC countries (completed) - \$2 440 training YugNiro in Ukraine by E. Romanov (completed) - \$5 812 training in Kenya by KMFRI staff of two new ASFA National Partners (Ghana, Uganda) and the Kenya collaborating center plus per diem for Ghana and Uganda participants to attend AFRIAMSLIC/ASFA Africa group meeting and IOC-Odin meeting that was held back-to-back with training. (completed) - \$1 300 honorarium for KMFRI to carry out above training and feedback for Ghana and Uganda Nationals ASFA Partners (completed) - \$1 597 training of NIOF in Egypt by N. Milone (completed) - \$1 526 training of ICCAT in Spain by M. Montes and H. Wibley (Montes cost covered by ICCAT) (completed) - \$3 423 training of ASFA Partner Guinea, in France, by J. Prod'homme (sum is for Mr Kaba's travel to/perdiem in France, IFREMER) (completed) - \$11 083 FAO ASFA Staff member (R.P) to attend IAMSLIC Meeting 2008	\$60 000*	\$ 51 537**	all items <b>completed</b>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- \$1 019 FAO ASFA Secretariat mission to National Institute of Fisheries in Egypt and recruitment as ASFA National Partner</li> <li>- \$3 300 hiring of consultant (L. Lombardi) to assist FAO ASFA Secretariat for 20 days (completed)</li> <li>- \$1 674.00 FAO ASFA Secretariat (R. Pepe) to IOC/IODE Project Office and VLIZ (Belgium) to discuss ASFA continuity</li> <li>- \$700 conversion Monitoring list by ICIE from master database FAO format to format of www-ISIS-ASFA</li> <li>- \$1004 for H.Rybinski to attend 2008 ASFA Board Meeting</li> <li>- \$2 905 attendance FAO Secretariat (R. Pepe) at Online conference</li> <li>- \$2 000 Board Report 2007 (print and distribution)</li> <li>- \$2 947 FAO Secretariat (R. Grainger) visit to China with side visit to ASFA Partner in Tianjin</li> </ul>			
<b>11. To strengthen ASFA Partner in Kenya (KMFRI) in order to provide ASFA Training Support for other ASFA Partners in Africa and so as to assist FAO ASFA Secretariat (provision of computer equipment) \$5 000 budgeted (but actual cost was \$1930.60)</b>	\$5 000	\$1 931	<b>completed</b>
<b>12. Digitization of Grey Literature from Economically Developing Countries for Inclusion in the IAMSILIC Aquatic Commons Digital Document Repository</b> (including guidance and assistance from the ASFA Board in identifying and contributing the literature to be digitized). <b>Note</b> – This is the first Project proposal approved by the ASFA Board after the Board granted a WAIVER to the policy regarding use of ASFA Trust Fund (i.e. now the IAMSILIC Executive Board is allowed to submit project proposals for a 2 year trial period up to total of \$28 000). This project was originally put forward by IAMSILIC for \$10 000 (of the total \$28 000 allocated to them). But after a Meeting between FAO ASFA Secretariat and members of IAMSILIC Aquatic Commons Board and IAMSILIC President, it was concurred that all \$28 000 of the IAMSILIC allotment could be allocated to this project considering its importance and priority for IAMSILIC.	\$28 000*	\$0	slow to progress
<b>13. Utilization of the ASFA Trust Fund to pay the IAMSILIC Membership fees for ASFA Partners</b>	\$790	\$790	This cycle completed - for continuation 2008-2009, see 2008 Table of Project proposals
<b>14. ASFA Training Session (\$14 000) (ASFA/2007/76)</b>	\$14 000	\$0	not yet carried-out
<b>15. (KMFRI) Trust Fund Proposal Elimination of Gaps - Phase II</b> *Approved in principle. To be revised with respect to the journals, number of records and costs, and circulated via ASFA Board L by KMFRI during the intersessional period	\$21 459 estimated	-	Approved in principle*
<b>sub-total</b>	<b>\$169 249</b>	<b>\$99 377</b>	

**2006 - 2007 Intersessional Project Proposals** (proposals put forward and approved\* during intersession via ASFA-Board-L)

	<u>COMMITTED</u>	<u>DISBURSED</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
<b>16. Digitizing Grey Literature and helping to identify it for inclusion in IAMSILIC Repository - \$10 000.</b>  *(Eventually agreed at 2007 ASFA Board Meeting (for \$28 000) – see above item-13)	\$ -	\$ -	<b>No quorum*</b> *(Eventually agreed at 2007 ASFA Board Meeting (for \$28 000) – see above item -13 )
<b>sub-total</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	

**2006 Project Proposals** (project proposals put forward and approved at the **2006** Board Meeting, VLIZ, Belgium)

	<u>COMMITTED</u>	<u>DISBURSED</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
<b>17. Financial Support to attend (2007) Board Meeting</b> * \$ 40 000 allocated by the Board for 2007 Meeting, but there was a MINUS carry-over of \$ 2 252 from 2006 Meeting to subtract from 2007 allocation. <b>Therefore, the TOTAL funds available for the 2007 Meeting = \$37 748</b> * Note, the minus \$2 252 is not shown in the "Committed" column, but is calculated as part of balance available to be spent. ** US\$25 064 was spent (the under-spending of \$12 684 will be added to next year's allotment as has been the case in the past).	\$40 000*	\$25 064**	<b>Completed</b>

<p><b>18. Staff Support to FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year 2007)</b></p> <p>* (\$ 50 000 was allocated by Board for 2007, however there was a carry-over of \$14 586 unspent from the previous (2006) year's allocation (see item-19).  <b>Therefore, the TOTAL funds available for 2007 = \$64 586</b></p> <p>* Note, the \$14 586 carry-over unspent funds is not shown in the "Committed" column, but it is/will be calculated as part of total balance to be spent</p> <p>** Spending for 2007 (period Jan - Aug 2007) was <b>\$72 422</b> as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- \$6 020- assistance to FAO ASFA input prep. 2007-sub-contract to AdriaMed</li> <li>- \$6 800 for ASFA information products to LIFDC countries</li> <li>- \$7 738 www-ISIS-ASFA training at FAO for new ASFA Partners in Lao and Thailand (sum refers to their travel to Rome &amp; per-diem in Rome)</li> <li>- \$9 865 Training of trainers course M. Montes and J. Macharia at FAO Rome (sum refers to their travel to Rome &amp; per-diem in Rome)</li> <li>- \$350. to use FAO training room/facilities for training courses (\$70/day)</li> <li>- \$ no cost - one FAO staff member invited to participate in UNEP/GPA meeting in China expensed paid by UNEP</li> <li>\$1 594 (while in China for above GPA meeting, one day visit to ASFA Partner in Tianjin and Seoul – R. Pepe )</li> <li>- \$500 www-ISIS-ASFA training of 1 SPC staff member outsourced to R. Oriente (sum refers to her honorarium)</li> <li>- \$718 (while in Kenya for Board Meeting one day visit to ASFA Partner (UNEP) in Nairobi - R. Pepe, travel and per-diem cost)</li> <li>- \$7 000 ASFA Staff member attendance at 2007 IAMSILIC Meeting in US</li> <li>- \$700 conversion Monitoring list by ICIE from master database FAO format to format of www-ISIS-ASFA</li> <li>- \$4 174 funding to attend 2007 ASFA Board meeting for potential new ASFA partners Ghana, Uganda, and 1 day per diem for I. Pettman (thes.)</li> <li>- \$4 142 (\$6 802 = total cost of of Peru &amp; Ecuador training by M. Montes in Ecuador (\$4 142 of total was paid from funds allocated to ASFA Secretariat and \$ 2 660 from funds left over from \$6000 allocated to INP- Ecuador Trust fund project for equipment) - see item directly following this one</li> <li>- \$1382* travel (H. Rybinski) to Unesco/ IOC/IODE project office in Oostende, Belgium, 19 and 20 November for Meeting regarding ASFA Interoperability, follow-up to 2007 Board meeting, Meeting.  *(actual cost \$1 800, but \$418 was contributed by VLIZ for work done on its behalf = \$1382) by H. Rybinski)</li> <li>- \$1 609 travel (R. Pepe) to Unesco/ IOC/IODE project office in Oostende, Belgium, 19 and 20 November for Meeting regarding ASFA Interoperability, follow-up to 2007 Board meeting, Meeting.</li> <li>- \$2 830 ASFA Secretariat attendance Online Info. Conf. 2007 (R. Pepe)</li> <li>- \$9 000 printing distribution 2 ASFIS Ref Series pubs (Mon list, Bib. Guide)</li> <li>- \$2 000 Board Report 2006 (print and distribution)</li> <li>- \$6 000 print/distrib. www-ISIS-ASFA installation manuals&amp; Board Reports (2004-2006 (should have been calculated under previous year's expenses)</li> </ul> <p>Overspending (- \$7836) is deducted from the 2008 allotment.</p>	\$50 000 *	\$72 422**	all items are <b>completed</b>
<p><b>19. INP-Ecuador Trust Fund project proposal (Elaboration of the Ecuador database...</b> . This was a request for 2 PC's and printers, plus training. Only \$3 340 spent on equipment. Funds remaining used for training of Ecuador &amp; Peru staff by M. Montes. See item-12</p>	\$ 6 000	\$3 340	<b>Completed \$3 340 spent on equipment. Remaining \$2 660 for Ecuador and Peru training by M. Montes</b>
<p><b>20. (FAO) ASFA Trust Fund project proposal Mini-ASFA-Meeting (regional)</b> plus eventual \$5 000 from IOC</p>	\$ 20 000	\$0	postponed till 2010, to run with IAMSILIC Meet.
<p><b>21. (FAO) ASFA Trust Fund project proposal Training of Trainers.</b> \$10 000 for training and \$10 000 for video.</p>	\$20 000	\$ 9 782.00	½ <b>completed</b> (video not yet produced)
<p><b>22. (NIFFR –Nigeria) Trust Fund proposal –Filling Gaps</b></p>	\$6 990	\$6 990	<b>completed</b> LOA operative in 2008. completed June 09
<p><b>23. (Russia - VNIRO) ASFA Trust Fund project proposal, Input of Barents and Norwegian Seas Literature</b></p>	\$ 3960	\$3960	<b>completed</b> LOA sent to VNIRO for signature
<p><b>sub-total</b></p>	<b>\$146 950</b>	<b>\$121 558</b>	

**2005 Project Proposals** (project proposals put forward and approved at the 2005 Board Meeting, FAO, Rome)

	<u>COMMITTED</u>	<u>DISBURSED</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
<p><b>24. Financial Support to attend (2006) Board Meeting</b></p> <p>* (\$ 38 500 was allocated by the Board for the 2006 Meeting, however there was a carry-over of \$2 289 unspent from the previous year's allocation.</p>	\$38 500*	43 041**	<b>completed</b>

<p><b>Therefore, the TOTAL funds available for the 2006 Meeting = \$40 789.</b></p> <p>* Note, the \$2 289 carry-over is not shown in the "Committed" column but that is the total sum used to calculate the available funds for the Meeting.</p> <p>** US\$43 041 was spent. Overspending (\$40 789 – \$43 041= - \$ 2 252) will be subtracted from 2007 allotment, as has been the case in the past).</p>			
<p><b>25. Staff Support to FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year 2006)</b></p> <p>* (\$ 40 000 was allocated by Board for 2006, however there is a carry-over of \$3 131 unspent from the previous (2005) year's allocation.</p> <p><b>Therefore, the TOTAL funds available for 2006 = \$43 131</b></p> <p>* Note, the \$3 313 carry-over of unspent funds from previous years is not shown in "Committed" column, but is calculated as part of balance to be spent</p> <p>** Spending for 2006 (period January - December. 2006) <b>\$28 545</b> has been spent as listed below. The unspent funds <b>\$14 586</b> was carried forward to 2007 allotment. (\$43 131- \$28 545 = \$14 586) (see item-12)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- \$ 2 530 (instead of budgeted 18 700) - assistance in FAO ASFA input preparation 2006 - sub-contract to AdriaMed,</li> <li>- \$ 2 200 Admin assistance for ASFA Board Meet. (1month when employed)</li> <li>- \$ 7 484 for ASFA info. products to LIFDC countries- admin, contacts, etc.</li> <li>- \$ 3 047 one extra FAO staff to attend ASFA Board Meeting VLIZ, Belgium)</li> <li>- \$ 816 www-ISIS-ASFA training for NAFO (per-diem UN-DOALOS staff)</li> <li>- \$ 3 478 www-ISIS-ASFA training at FAO for INAHINA (Mozambique)</li> <li>- \$ 350. to use FAO training room/facilities for training courses (\$70/day)</li> <li>- \$ 780 Coffee breaks at 2005 ASFA Board Meetings (completed)</li> <li>- \$ 6 582 1 FAO ASFA Staff member to attend IAMSLIC Meeting, USA, Oct. 2006 and meeting with UN-DOALOS chief</li> <li>- \$ 1 278 H. Rybinski to attend ASFA Meeting Oct. 2006</li> </ul>	\$40 000 *	\$28 545**	all items are <b>completed</b>
<b>26. (China) Compilation of www-ISIS-ASFA Manuals and Guidelines in Chinese</b>	\$ 10 000	\$10 000	<b>completed</b>
<b>27. (Kenya-KMFRI) Elimination of Gaps</b>	\$18 200	\$18 200	<b>completed during 2007-08 intersession</b>
<b>28. (Russia-VNIRO) Input of Caspian Literature II</b>	\$10 270	\$ 10 270	<b>completed during 2007-08 intersession</b>
<b>sub-total</b>	<b>\$116 970</b>	<b>\$110 056</b>	

### **2004 - 2005 Intersessional Project Proposals**

(proposals put forward and approved during intersession via ASFA-Board-L)

	<u>COMMITTED</u>	<u>DISBURSED</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
<b>29. Estonia –EMI – Latvian and Lithuanian Aquatic Serials processed for ASFA Database</b>	\$ 4 800	\$ 4 800	<b>Completed</b>
<b>sub-total</b>	<b>\$4 800</b>	<b>\$4 800</b>	

### **2004 Project Proposals** (project proposals put forward & approved at the **2004** Board Meeting, INIDEP, Argentina)

	<u>COMMITTED</u>	<u>DISBURSED</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
<p><b>30. Financial Support to attend annual (2005) Board Meeting</b></p> <p>*( \$ 35 000 was allocated by Board for 2005 Meeting) (with carry-over of \$ 8 716 unspent from previous year. The total funds available 2005 Meeting = <b>\$43 716</b></p> <p>The Balance in the "Committed" column does not include the carry-over of \$8,716 unspent for previous 2004 Meeting)</p>	\$35 000*	\$41 385	<p><b>Completed.</b></p> <p>Unspent \$2 331 carried over to 2006 Meeting. (43716 - 41385 = \$2 331)</p>

<b>31. Staff Support to FAO ASFA Secretariat (for 2005)</b> *(\$ 40 000 was allocated by Board for 2005) (with carry-over of \$2 165 from previous year (see below). The total funds available for 2005= <b>\$42 165</b> * The Balance in the "Committed" column does not include the carry-over of \$2 165 from unspent Jan-Dec 2004 allocation. ** Spending: - \$ 4 474. assistance in ASFA input preparation 2005 - sub-contract to AdriaMed (originally budgeted at \$8 800, but only \$4 474 was spent) , - \$10 710. for ASFA information products to LIFDC countries - admin, contacts, including comparative study of new CSA CD-ROM. – (underway) - \$14 115. ASFA CD-ROMS for LIFDC project: NISC subscription - 15 CD's, - \$ 3 700. for additional features added to terms of reference for www-ISIS-ASFA upgrade (not in original T.F proposal - \$1 500. www-ISIS-ASFA training for Senegal-DPM (week preceding Board Meeting) - \$ 795. www-ISIS-ASFA training for Iran-IFRO (only air ticket) - \$1 500. use FAO training room/facilities for training courses (\$70/day) - \$ 240. nominal fee paid for FAO attendance (R. Pepe) at Marine Metadata Workshop (all expenses paid by organizers - except \$240) - \$2 000 per diem for 4 IAMSILIC speakers attending ASFA Board Meeting (Resource sharing and repositories)	\$40 000 *	\$39 034**	<b>Completed.</b> Unspent \$3 131 carried over to 2006. \$42 165 - \$39 034 = \$3 131
<b>32.(FAO) www-ISIS-ASFA Maintenance Release</b> (upgrade 1.1)	\$7 900	\$7 900	<b>completed</b>
<b>33. (FAO) Utilization of ASFA Trust Fund to pay for ASFA Partners membership fees in IAMSILIC</b>	\$1 060	\$1 060	<b>on-going 2 years</b>
<b>34. (YugNIRO- Ukraine) Translation of ASFA Thesaurus into Russian and development of Russian-English Thesaurus</b>	\$15 000		pending release of version 1.1
<b>35. (YugNIRO- Ukraine) Translation of www-ISIS-ASFA "Help Notes" and front end into Russian</b>	\$2000		pending release of version 1.1
<b>36. (YugNIRO- Ukraine) Translation of www-ISIS-ASFA Guidelines into Russian</b>	\$5 000		pending results of exercise to simplify input rules/procedures
<b>37. (INIDEP - Argentina) Marine Bibliogr. Information from Latin America and Caribb. Region ... (1955-1980) 1<sup>st</sup> Stage: S.A. Chile</b>	\$0*		* withdrawn by INIDEP
<b>sub-total</b>	<b>\$105 960</b>	<b>\$89 379</b>	

### 2003- 2004 Intersessional Project Proposals

(i.e. proposals put forward and approved during intersession via ASFA-Board-L) ..... **NONE**

### 2003 Project Proposals (project proposals put forward and approved at the **2003** Board Meeting, CIP,Cuba)

	<u>COMMITTED</u>	<u>DISBURSED</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
<b>38. Financial Support to attend annual (2004) Board Meeting</b> (US\$ 30 000 was allocated by Board for 2004) ( carry over of \$3 642 from previous years (see below). The total funds available for 2004 = <b>\$33 642</b> * Balance in Committed column does not include the following carry-over : a) extra \$1 941 unspent for 2003 Meeting) b) extra \$1 030 unspent for 2002 Meeting) c) extra \$ 671 unspent for 2001 Meeting)	\$30 000*	\$24 926	<b>completed</b> , unspent \$8,716 (\$33,642-\$24,926=\$8716) is moved to 2005 Meeting, allocation
<b>39. Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for 2004)</b> *(US\$ 30 000 was allocated by Board for 2004) (with carry-over of \$33 685 from previous years (see below). The total available funds for 2004 = <b>\$63 685</b> * Balance in "Committed" column does not include the following carry-over : a) unspent \$852 from unspent Jan-Dec 2003 allocation b) unspent \$22,200 from unspent Jan-Dec 2002 allocation c) unspent \$9,833 from unspent Jan-Dec 2001 allocation d) unspent \$800 from unspent Jan-Dec 2000 allocation ** Spending: - \$ 6 484 assistance in ASFA input preparation - sub-contract to AdriaMed, - \$ 2 500 Input of missed IOTC documents by NIO (completed Nov. 2005)	\$30 000*	\$65 850**	<b>completed</b> , unspent \$2,165 (\$65,850 - \$63,685=\$2165) is moved to Year 2005 allocation, see item-25).

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- \$10 497 for ASFA information products to LIFDC countries (administration, contacts etc.)</li> <li>- \$ 4 000 ASFA CD-ROMS for LIFDC project: subscription - Ovid for 40 CD's</li> <li>- \$12 045 ASFA CD-ROMS for LIFDC project: subscription- NISC for 15 CDs,</li> <li>- \$ 3 587 www-ISIS-ASFA training for Mauritania (in September),</li> <li>- \$ 2 701 www-ISIS-ASFA training for Indonesia (in June),</li> <li>- \$ 2 787 www-ISIS-ASFA training &amp; follow-up for Nigeria by KMFRI at KMFRI (in June 2004) (completed)</li> <li>- \$ 2 746 www-ISIS-ASFA training &amp; follow-up for Ecuador by Montes (training completed, follow-up completed 1<sup>st</sup> 100 records),</li> <li>- \$ 3 388 FAO recruitment of Indonesian ASFA Partner - visit to Institute while in region by R.Grainger ,</li> <li>- \$ 2 854 FAO attendance at IAMS LIC by R.Pepe (in September).</li> <li>- \$ 2 250 travel-perdiem Ms Nyika-Tanzania to www-ISIS-ASFA training at KMFRI &amp; follow-up by KMFRI (12/2004), (follow-up underway)</li> <li>- \$ 3 531 www-ISIS-ASFA training of SPC, and PIMRIS at PIMRIS (by G. Rao, ex-PIMRIS co-ordinator). Costs include his honorarium, travel and per diem and SPC participants travel and per diem (Dec. 2004),</li> <li>- \$ 6 480 assistance in ASFA input preparation - sub-contract to Ms Milone for 700 records (ex-AdriaMed)</li> </ul>			
<b>40. (VNIRO – Russia) Input of old unique literature Caspian Sea from 1770-1970</b>	\$6 000	\$6 000	<b>completed</b>
<b>41. UNAM, Mexico – Translate into Spanish the ASFIS Reference Series</b> (No. 2, ASFIS Subject Categories and Scope Descriptions and No. 3, Guidelines for Bibliographic Description and Data Entry	\$7 000	\$7 000	<b>completed</b> , available on FAO, ASFA FTP site
<b>sub-total</b>	<b>\$73 000</b>	<b>\$103 776</b>	

**2002 - 2003 Intersessional Project Proposals** (proposals put forward and approved via ASFA-Board-L)

	COMMITTED	DISBURSED	NOTES
<b>42. Collect, sort, input of "historical" bibl. Records (KMFRI)</b>	\$15 000	\$15 000	<b>completed</b>
<b>43. Collect, sort, input of "historical" bibl. Records (VLIZ)</b>	\$18 000	\$11 000	<b>underway</b> 2 payments made
<b>sub-total</b>	<b>\$33 000</b>	<b>\$26 000</b>	

**2002-2003 Intersessional Initiatives taken by the FAO ASFA Secretariat using funds “left over” from completed proposals where there was under spending** (therefore these are not “proposals” in the strict sense of the word. However FAO did, at previous Meetings, declare its intentions regarding the deployment of these “left over” funds, and received no objections to such use)

<b>44. www-ISIS-ASFA training for VNIRO Partner</b> *(using funds (\$8 002) unspent from ASFA training workshops, see item-43)		\$2 900*	<b>completed</b>
<b>45. Translation www-ISIS-ASFA Help Notes into Spanish</b> *(using funds (\$8 002) unspent from ASFA training workshops, see item-43)		\$1 500*	<b>completed</b>
<b>46. Translation www-ISIS-ASFA Help Notes into French</b> *(using funds (\$8 002) unspent from ASFA training workshops, see item-54)		\$1 500*	<b>completed</b>
<b>47. Translation of Bibliographic Guidelines into Portuguese</b> *(using funds (\$8 002) unspent from ASFA training workshops, see item-54)	\$2 700		<b>(lost contact)</b>
<b>sub-total</b>	<b>\$2 700</b>	<b>\$5 900</b>	



**2002 Project Proposals** (proposals put forward and approved at **2002** Board Meeting, FAO, Rome)

	<u>COMMITTED</u>	<u>DISBURSED</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
<b>48. Funding to attend Oct.2002 IAMSLIC Meeting (1 person)</b>	\$2 500	\$2 790	<b>completed</b> , overspent \$290.
<b>49. Conversion of 1971 ASFA Journals (NIO)</b>	\$8 500	\$8 500	<b>completed</b>
<b>50. Financial Support to attend annual (2003) Board Meeting</b>	\$30 000	\$28 059	<b>completed</b> (unspent \$1 941, moved to 2004 Meeting,
<b>51. Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year 2003)</b> \$8,800 for assistance in ASFA input preparation (sub-contract to AdriaMed); \$10,497 for ASFA information products to LIFDC countries; \$2000 to identify gaps in FAO monitoring list; \$2500 to attend www-ISIS, training at ICIE; \$2674 - FAO attendance at Online Conference 2003 (R.P); \$1744 FAO attendance at Thesaurus maintenance seminar (R.P); \$933 to print 2003 Board Report.	\$30 000	\$29 148	<b>completed</b> (unspent \$852 moved to 2004 year allocation
<b>sub-total</b>	<b>\$71 000</b>	<b>\$68 497</b>	

**2001 Project Proposals** (proposals put forward and approved at **2001** Board Meeting, IFREMER, Brest)

	<u>COMMITTED</u>	<u>DISBURSED</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
<b>52. Financial Support to attend annual (2002) Board Meeting</b>	\$25,000	\$23,969.	<b>completed</b> (unspent \$1030, moved to 2004 Meeting, allotment
<b>53. Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for 2002)</b> (\$8,800 for assistance in ASFA input preparation(sub-contract to AdriaMed)	\$30,000	\$8,800	<b>completed</b> (unspent \$22 200 moved 2004 allocation,
<b>54. Support to implementation of www-ISIS-ASFA interface</b> (start when software was issued – 10/2002) *(plus additional funds to attend 2002 Board Meeting (see next item)	\$10,000*	10,000	<b>completed</b>
<b>55. Funds to attend 2002 Board Meeting for Dr Rybinski</b>	\$1,500	\$1,688	<b>completed</b>
<b>56. ASFA-FIGIS Interaction</b>	\$20,000	\$20 000	<b>completed but not yet operational to public</b>
<b>57. Correction of the ASFA Descriptors fields</b> *(subject to negotiation - this project includes possible extension \$5000 – see next item)	\$19,800*	0	cancelled funds returned to balance
<b>51a Extension of project to other Partners</b>	\$5 000	0	cancelled funds returned to balance
<b>sub-total</b>	<b>\$111 300</b>	<b>\$64 457</b>	

**2000 Project Proposals** (proposals put forward and approved at **2000** Board Meeting, NIO, India)

	<u>COMMITTED</u>	<u>DISBURSED</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
<b>58. Financial Support to attend annual (2001) Board Meeting</b> *(extra \$4,629 disbursed from unspent 2000 allocation, item-59	\$15,000	\$18,958*	<b>completed</b> (unspent \$671, moved to 2003 Meeting allocation
<b>59. Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year 2001)</b> (expenditure for Rybinski to 2001 Meet.\$1688, Cort to L.America\$6039, Input support\$3900, CDs to LIFDC\$7000, Transl. Help notes\$3000)	\$31,460	\$21,627	<b>completed</b> (unspent \$9833 moved to 2004 allocation
<b>60. Workshops for familiarization(training) in ASFA input preparation</b>	\$28,800	\$20,798	<b>completed</b> (unspent \$8002 to be spent on future training related to www-ISIS-ASFA
<b>61. Support to the Dev. of Web based interface to ASFISIS</b>	\$10,000	\$10,000	<b>completed</b> 10/2002
<b>62. Provision of ASFA Centres in former USSR with translation</b> (ASFIS-2, Subject Categories and Scope Descriptions)	\$1,500	\$1,500	<b>completed</b>
<b>63. Conversion of ASFA Printed Journals into machine readable format (1971-1974). 1973 Conversion</b>	\$15,000	\$15,000	<b>completed</b>
<b>64. Conversion of ASFA Printed Journals into machine readable format (1971-1974). 1972 Conversion</b>	\$15,000	\$15,000	<b>completed</b>
<b>sub-total</b>	<b>\$116 760</b>	<b>\$102 883</b>	

**1999 Project Proposals** (proposals put forward and approved at 1999 Board Meeting, NOAA, USA)

	COMMITTED	DISBURSED	NOTES
<b>65. Financial Support to attend annual (2000) Board Meeting</b> *(unspent \$4,629 moved to support attendance at 2001 Meeting, item-52)	\$15,000	\$10,371*	<b>completed</b>
<b>66. Staff support to ASFA Secretariat (Ms Wibley)</b> (for the period January 2000 -December 2000)	\$31,460	\$30,660*	<b>completed</b> *(unspent \$800 transferred to 2004year allocation)
<b>67. Improvement of ASFA Database by Germany (BF)</b>	\$15,000	\$15,000	<b>completed</b>
<b>68. Request for training from Kenya (RECOSCIX-WIO)</b>	\$3,000	\$2,825	<b>completed</b>
<b>69. Conversion of ASFA printed journals into machine readable format (1974 volume) by India (NIO)</b>	\$15,000	\$15,000	<b>completed</b>
<b>70. Addition of 45,000 abstracts to 1975-77ASFA database-China</b>	\$17,000	\$17,000	<b>completed</b>
<b>71. Formatting ASFA Thesaurus by Julia Hudson</b>	\$2,000	\$2,000	<b>completed</b>
<b>sub-total</b>	<b>\$98 460</b>	<b>\$92 856</b>	

**1998 Project Proposals** (proposals put forward and approved at 1998 Board Meeting, FAO, Rome)

	COMMITTED	DISBURSED	NOTES
<b>72. Financial Support to attend annual Board Meeting</b>	\$10,000	\$12,500*	<b>completed</b> *(extra \$2500 from unspent 1997 allocation)
<b>73. Staff support to ASFA Secretariat (Ms Wibley)</b> (for the period January 1999 -December 1999)	\$25,200	\$25,200	<b>completed</b>
<b>74. A systems analysis specification for a Windows-based data entry software (ASFISIS/Win) (Dr. DeSmet)</b>	0	0	<b>cancelled</b>
<b>75. Extension of ASFA Potential in Lithuania</b>	\$2,500	\$2,500	<b>completed</b>
<b>76. Coverage of Fishery Economics &amp; Related Subjects in ASFA.</b>	\$5,000	\$5,000	<b>completed</b>
<b>sub-total</b>	<b>\$42 700</b>	<b>\$45 200</b>	

**1997 Project Proposals** (proposals put forward and approved at 1997 Board Meeting, SFI, Poland)

	COMMITTED	DISBURSED	NOTES
<b>77. Financial Support to attend annual Board Meeting</b>	\$6,000	\$3,500*	<b>completed</b> *(\$2,500 moved to 1998 allocation,
<b>78. Staff support to ASFA Secretariat (Ms Wibley)</b> (for the period January 1998 -December 1998)	\$25,200	\$25,200	<b>completed</b>
<b>79. Extension of ASFA potential in Ukraine (YugNIRO)</b>	\$3,000	\$3,000	<b>completed</b>
<b>80. Provision of ASFA Centres in former USSR with reference material for input (translations) (YugNIRO)</b>	\$3,500	\$3,500	<b>completed</b>
<b>81. ASFISIS Maintenance (Dr. DeSmet)</b>	\$2,000	\$1,400*	<b>completed</b> *(\$600 returned to balance due to over budgeting)
<b>82. Training for PIMRIS (travel Mr. Rao)</b> *(disbursed exceeds committed, because for administrative reasons, FAO could not issue the most economic ticket as per original estimate)	\$3,000	\$5,200*	<b>completed,</b> overspent \$2200.
<b>83. Convert 500 Records (from PIMRIS database into ASFISIS formatting) *</b> (New contract stipulated in 2004 with Ganeshan Rao)	\$3,500	\$ 3 500	<b>completed*</b>
<b>84. Analysis of ASFA for Scope and Coverage with eventual recommendations for improvement</b>	\$6,500	\$6,500	<b>completed</b>
<b>sub-total</b>	<b>\$52 700</b>	<b>\$51 800</b>	

**1996 Project Proposals** (proposals put forward and approved at 1996 Board Meeting, FAO, Rome)

	<u>COMMITTED</u>	<u>DISBURSED</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
<b>85. Manual on ASFISIS software and Data Entry</b> *(funds credited to FAO FIDI budget (because FAO carried out the work))	\$6,000	\$6,000*	<b>completed</b>
<b>86. Logo for ASFA competition</b>	0	0	costed at \$2500, but later <b>cancelled</b>
<b>87. Statistical Analysis of ASFA Database</b>	0	0	<b>completed</b> costed at \$7000, no charge by CSA
<b>88. ASFA User Survey</b>	0	0	<b>cancelled-never budgeted</b>
<b><i>sub-total</i></b>	<b>\$6 000</b>	<b>\$6 000</b>	

**1995 Project Proposals** (proposals put forward and approved at 1995 Board Meeting, BF, Germany)

	<u>COMMITTED</u>	<u>DISBURSED</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
<b>89. Workshops for familiarization with the ASFA input methodology (ASFA Training Session, 3-7 June 1996, FAO)</b>	\$34,000	\$11,645*	<b>completed</b> *(unspent \$22,335 returned to Balance)
<b>90. Review of the ASFA Partners Monitoring of Serials for ASFA</b> (follow-up to 1994 review)	\$5,000	\$5,000	<b>completed</b>
<b>91. IOC Study Grant.. (\$8,000)</b>	0	0	<b>cancelled</b>
<b>92. Chinese proposal sub-project 1, Identification of ASFA information users and suppliers in China</b>	\$4,000	\$4,000	<b>completed</b>
<b><i>sub-total</i></b>	<b>\$43 000</b>	<b>\$20 645</b>	

**GRAND TOTAL****\$1 355 130**COMMITTED

.....

**The Full text** of most of the Trust Fund Project Proposals cited in the above tables is contained in the corresponding year's ASFA Advisory Board Meeting Report: (Hamburg, 30 May-2 June 95) (FAO, Rome, 28-31 May 96) (Gdynia, 22-25 April 97) (FAO, Rome, 9-12 June 98) (NOAA, 25-28 May 99), (NIO/NICMAS 19-22 September 2000) (IFREMER, Brest 19-22 June 2001) (FAO, Rome, 18-21 June 02) (Cuba, 15-18 July 2003) (INIDEP, Argentina 29 June-2 July 2004) (FAO, Rome, 4-8 October 05) (VLIZ, Belgium 4-8 September 2006) (KMFRI, Kenya, 3-7 September 2007) (IMR, Norway, 1-5 September 2008).

(R. Pepe, 7 August 2009)



**Draft Minutes of Action Items and Decisions Agreed  
at  
ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (NIO, Dona Paula, India, 7-11 September 2009)**

*[Note: some discussion is included for a few of the Action Items/Decisions in order to put them into perspective. The full discussions will be reflected in the Minutes of the Report, which will be completed and circulated to the participants in this meeting within 4-6 weeks ]*

The 38<sup>th</sup> annual Meeting of the **Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Abstracts (ASFA) Advisory Board** took place from **7 to 11 September 2009** (five days) at the **National Information Centre for Marine Sciences (NICMAS), National Institute of Oceanography, NIO (CSIR)** located in Dona Paula, Goa, India.

Mr. Gajanan Sainekar (NIO) chaired the Meeting and completed the Agenda on time. The main reporter was Ms H. Wibley (FAO).

The Meeting was opened by Dr Shetye, Director of NIO; Mr Wall, FAO Country Representative for India and Bhutan, and Dr Grainger, Chief of the FAO service which is responsible for ASFA.

The number of ASFA Partners attending this year's Meeting was smaller than usual because of a series of circumstances (e.g. last minute problems with visa, health issues, and personal reasons).

**Agenda Item 6.2.3 (Strategy for future expansion of ASFA Partnership)**

*Regarding recruitment initiatives ....*

1. The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to** follow-up regarding the interest shown by the Institute of Oceanology of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences (IO-BAS) and the Instituto de Investigaciones Marinas y Costeras (INVEMAR), Colombia. However, only when the FAO ASFA Secretariat is able to outsource the training and input checking will it proceed any further.

**Agenda Item 6.2.5 (Partners in danger of being removed)**

*Regarding the "Warning List" included in the FAO Report, listing ASFA Partners not submitting ASFA records*

2. The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to** follow-up with Mozambique with respect to the fact that the serial titles included on their monitoring list had been discontinued. It would be suggested to Mozambique that they could take over responsibility of other serial titles, or other material, in their own country, should they have access to them in their libraries.

3. **Mr Montes agreed to** follow-up with Peru with respect to their failure to submit ASFA records following the training they received in Ecuador in August 2007. This was to be considered the first deadline given to Peru regarding the submission of ASFA records for checking.

4. The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to** follow-up with IEO (Spain) regarding the delay in submission to ProQuest of their ASFA records already seen and corrected by FAO.

5. The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to** follow-up with IOC regarding their inactivity during 2008/2009.

6. The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to** follow-up with UNEP regarding their inactivity during 2008/2009.

**Agenda Item 6.4 (ASFA Publishing Agreement between FAO and ProQuest)**

7. The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to** send a reminder to ASFA Partners via ASFA Board-L regarding their entitlements and also to follow-up with those ASFA Partners without access to Illumina to see if they require access.

**Agenda Item 7.2 (Coverage)**

*Regarding the coverage of grey literature freely available online and the preparation of ASFA records with non-persistent URLs/handles .....Ms Noble raised the issue of whether it was useful to have ASFA records on CSA Illumina which had URL addresses that were no longer valid, i.e. the links were valid while the ASFA record had been prepared, but during the time it was made available on the database, the URL had disappeared..... Mr Emerson commented that even if the original link to the full-text was broken/no longer valid the full text could be available somewhere else..... Mr Kaske (NOAA) commented that, should the link*

no longer work, researchers would be able to use the citation information contained in the record, e.g. Title, author name, to carry out a search on Google to see if they could obtain the full text elsewhere.

8. The **ASFA Board recommended** that ASFA Partners prepare ASFA records for grey literature that was freely available on-line and include the URL address, irrespective of the guarantee that it was persistent.

#### **Agenda Item 7.3 (Monitoring)**

*Regarding the Action Item 8 of the 2008 ASFA Board Meeting “Mr Thompson agreed to investigate with Regional Fisheries Bodies regarding their grey literature and its availability” .....Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) referred to the document ASFA/2009/14a prepared by Mr Thompson (NAFO), which included a draft letter that was to be sent to Regional Fisheries Bodies and a table of the Regional Fisheries Bodies. He noted that several of the RFBs were already ASFA Partners and/or their grey literature was already being covered by other ASFA Partners.*

9. The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to follow-up this issue with Mr Thompson and to provide him with some information on how he should proceed with the Action Item.

#### **Agenda Item 7.4 (Timeliness)**

The FAO ASFA Secretariat opened the Agenda item tabling the document ASFA/2009/79 “Solutions to improve/increase the timeliness of the ASFA input”.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that the document was the outcome of a 2-day Meeting between the FAO ASFA Secretariat and the Publisher of ASFA (ProQuest), including the participation of a representative from 1 National ASFA Partner and 1 Collaborating Centre. The purpose of the Meeting was to investigate the ways and means of enhancing ASFA’s comparative advantage (i.e. the coverage of the grey literature) including some solutions or options to increase the timeliness of ASFA.

To begin with the document suggests introducing into the ASFA input process a “submission deadline of 4 weeks”. Regarding this suggestion, **the ASFA Board “recommended”** that ASFA Partners should strive to send at least one file per month of ASFA records to the Publisher and that this file should try to include material received within the past month.

In addition to the idea of introducing “a submission deadline”, the paper also listed 5 options to increase timeliness as follows:

1) *Submission of ASFA Records to ProQuest in tagged text format .....*

**2) Submission of ASFA Records to ProQuest without: the journal allocation codes, the subject category codes and the indexing terms**

*This option would mean that the Partners could submit their ASFA records to ProQuest without having to include the journal allocation codes, the subject category codes or the indexing terms. Therefore, such records would be submitted to ProQuest with only the citation plus abstract. On receipt of these records, ProQuest would assign the indexing information via their automated indexing system. .... There was general consensus within the ASFA Board that this option would assist those ASFA Partners who encountered difficulties when having to select journal/subject category codes and/or indexing terms....However, several ASFA Partners expressed their concern regarding the implications of this option. Some ASFA Partners stated that they wished to continue indexing their own records ..... Other ASFA Partners stressed that it was the responsibility of the ASFA Partner to index their own records..... ProQuest said that they would be prepared to assist those ASFA Partners in difficulty regarding the indexing of ASFA records by accepting records without journal/subject category codes and/or subject/taxonomic/geographic indexing terms for a test period .*

*[CONSIDERING THE IMPORTANCE OF THIS OPTION AND ITS POTENTIAL IMPLICATIONS, THE BOARD REQUESTED TO SEE HOW THIS AGENDA ITEM WOULD BE REPORTED (WORDED) IN THE FULL MEETING REPORT. BELOW IS A DRAFT OF HOW THIS ITEM WILL APPEAR IN THE FINAL REPORT]:*

**The ASFA Board recognized that the ideal situation as regards indexing was for each ASFA Partner itself to prepare and to include in the ASFA record the indexing elements. This is because the indexing provided by local, experienced indexers working on their own countries’ publications has been one of the factors which has earned the ASFA database recognition as being one of the world’s premier databases in the field of aquatic sciences.**

However, for those ASFA Partners who cannot, for various reasons, submit their ASFA records to ProQuest in a timely manner, they may now consider submitting their ASFA records to ProQuest without the: journal allocation codes, the subject category codes and the descriptors. In this case, ProQuest would add the missing information using an “automated indexing” software followed by a varying degree of manual control. ProQuest clarified that it would also be in a position to receive records with only partial implementation of the above option. For example, a Partner could submit their records with all of the above mentioned indexing information missing, except for the Geographic descriptors. In this case, the Partner would have to be very clear in describing to ProQuest exactly which indexing fields it has decided to include.

3) *Transfer of Journal (Serial) Monitoring Responsibility to ProQuest .....*

4) *Transfer of non-journal Monitoring Responsibility to ProQuest .....*

5) *Submission of Open Access Publications to ProQuest ....*

10. The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to circulate details of the option to submit ASFA records to ProQuest without indexing information to all ASFA Partners via ASFA Board-L, indicating under which particular circumstances this option could be taken and also providing precise criteria to follow.

#### **Agenda Item 7.5 (ASFA Input procedures)**

*Regarding procedures to simplify ASFA data entry..... Ms Prod'homme raised the issue of the use of italics coding for taxonomic names, saying that it was very time consuming when entering multiple taxonomic names in the abstract. She asked whether it would be possible to eliminate the use of such coding, including also the sub- and superscript coding.....Mr Emerson (ProQuest) commented that the italics coding was primarily for the printed products.....there were ASFA records on CSA Illumina where sub- and superscripts coding had not been used ..... the omission of such formatting codes had no impact on search results.....However, some particular special character codes would be necessary.*

11. The **FAO ASFA Secretariat and ProQuest agreed** to prepare a table of those special character codes that would have to be used during ASFA data entry, including some examples of what could be done.

12. The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to notify ASFA Partners via ASFA Board-L regarding this change to ASFA data entry procedures and send them copies of the new special character codes table.

#### **Agenda Item 8.3 (Internet Service)**

*Regarding access to CSA Illumina, Mr Sainekar (NIO) asked whether institutes could request ProQuest for trial periods of access. He added that sometimes, after an institute has finished its trial period, it may be interested in buying subscription. ...Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) mentioned that FAO had received a request from someone who wished to subscribe to CSA Illumina, but could not find the appropriate information on the ProQuest website ..... the information was 'hidden' within the website interface and should be made more visible (easy to find)*

13. **ProQuest agreed** to send out an e-mail via ASFA Board-L containing information on how to subscribe to CSA Illumina and also on how to obtain a free trial period of access.

14. **Ms Noble (PMBL) agreed** to send a list of serial titles to ProQuest for which it would like ProQuest to retroactively add the full serial titles (i.e. this action item refers to the situation whereby all of the older ASFA records appearing on the database(in accordance with past inputting procedures) contain only the abbreviated serial title)

15. **Ms Soto (ProQuest) agreed** to add the full serial titles, but would prioritise and carry out the work as the resources are available.

#### **Agenda Item 8.7 Entitlements (Partner entitlements to ASFA products & services)**

*Regarding the statistics included in the Table of ASFA Partners' Entitlements (ASFA/2009/71), several ASFA Partners observed that their entitlements were not correctly reflected.*

16. The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to individually contact each ASFA Partner to ask for information regarding their current entitlements, i.e. exactly which products/services they were receiving, and also if they wished to change them.

#### **Agenda Item 8.8 (Increasing Distribution of ASFA Information Products and Services)**

*Regarding the questionnaires that were sent out to the institutes which were receiving CD-ROMs/DVDs under the LIFDC project, Mr Emerson (ProQuest) asked whether any usage statistics had been compiled ....*

17. **The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to ask Ms Cochrane to solicit the institutes regarding answers to the questionnaires and to also obtain some statistics regarding usage of the database. ProQuest would like to receive copies of the returned questionnaires.

#### **Agenda Item 9.1 (www-ASFA-ISIS)**

*Regarding the new release 1.2 of the www-ISIS-ASFA software ..... the FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that it had sent some sample records prepared with this release to ProQuest for testing but as yet had not received any reply.*

18. **ProQuest agreed** to investigate the status of this testing and inform the FAO ASFA Secretariat if all was OK or if they required more sample records.

#### **Agenda Item 11.4 (Abstracting guidelines)**

*With respect to enriching abstracts that were to be put through the ProQuest automated indexing programme with extra information regarding geographic names ..... Mr Emerson (ProQuest) commented that the "author-assigned keywords" were captured as part of the text so that they would also be processed during the automated indexing ..... Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that if the "author-assigned keywords" were considered useful for the automated indexing, then perhaps ASFA Partners should also be entering them during data entry using www-ISIS-ASFA.*

19. **The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to investigate with Dr Rybinski regarding the addition of a new field for 'author keywords' in the www-ISIS-ASFA software.

#### **Agenda Item 11.6 (ASFA Thesaurus)**

*Regarding the request made by SPC in their intersessional report for the addition of subject descriptors to describe the idea of traditional knowledge in fisheries .....*

20. **Mr Pettman and Ms Kalenchits agreed** to liaise regarding terms to be added to cover the field of 'traditional knowledge'.

#### **Agenda Item 11.7 (Geographic Authority List)**

*Regarding the draft updated Geographic Authority List, which had been produced by Mr Pettman as part of the UK-FBA ASFA Trust Fund Project approved at the 2008 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting ..... a copy of which had been placed on the FAO ftp reserved ASFA site in July 2009 ...*

21. **The ASFA Board recommended** that ASFA Partners review the draft updated Geographic Authority List and send comments to Mr Pettman (FBA) by the end of September 2009.

*Regarding the exercise to incorporate the revised GAL as a pick-list for use in the www-ISIS-ASFA software..... Mr Pettman raised the issue of the use in the pick-list of abbreviations for words such as Lake, River etc..... He asked whether the ASFA Partners wanted to keep the abbreviations or use the words in full.*

22. **The ASFA Board recommended** replacement of abbreviations such as L. and R. with the words in full, e.g. Lake, River.

*Regarding the word order of geographic terms in the pick-list which included the names of rivers, lakes, bays etc, Mr Pettman asked whether the ASFA Partners wished to change the current structure so that the name would come last ..... for example, Bay of Biscay instead of Biscay Bay, River Don instead of Don River.*

23. **The ASFA Board recommended** changing the word order of the names of rivers, lakes, bays etc so that these names would reflect common use of the terms.

*Regarding the building-up of the new cleaned-up pick-list, i.e. the inclusion of the corrected individual country terms/strings that were originally contained in the original pick-list of the www-ISIS-ASFA software ....*

24. **The ASFA Board recommended** that Mr Pettman prepared a new, revised and updated pick-list and then send individual extractions to all ASFA Partners so that individual partners could check the terms/strings for their particular area/region and add any terms they believed to be missing.



*Regarding the GAL Thesaurus produced by Mr Pettman and future development possibilities.....Mr Pettman suggested that the Geographic Working Group should discuss/examine possible ways to go ahead for the future and present their recommendations to the ASFA Board next year ....*

**25. The ASFA Board recommended** that the GWG should reassess the use of sea codes in the geographic terms and examine possible alternatives.

**26. The ASFA Board recommended** that the GWG should investigate the possibility of moving from a pick-list to a thesaurus.

### **Agenda Item 13. (ASFA TRUST FUND)**

#### **13.3 New Proposals**

*Regarding the Trust Fund Proposal Staff Support To ASFA Secretariat (For January - December 2010) (ASFA/2009/3a) US\$ 60,000*

*The FAO ASFA Secretariat proposed maintaining the sum of US \$ 60,000 for this project proposal for the year 2010. However, Mr Grainger (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that at the 2011 ASFA Board Meeting, the FAO ASFA Secretariat would be asking for an increased sum, taking into consideration the retirement of Mr Pepe and the need to hire additional temporary staff to support the FAO ASFA Secretariat in their ASFA related activities.*

**27. The ASFA Board recommended approval** of this Proposal.

*Regarding the Trust Fund Proposal "Egypt - Filling the missing gap" (ASFA/2009/28a) US\$ 14,160*

*This proposal aims to fill in some of the missing gaps regarding Egyptian literature in the ASFA database. NIOF intends to prepare about 2360 complete bibliographic records based on the www-ISIS-ASFA software methodology for ASFA data entry..... Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that NIOF had only recently started submitting ASFA input to ProQuest and that the general rule was that ASFA Partners should be autonomous and regularly submitting records to ProQuest before undertaking such projects.*

**28. The ASFA Board recommended approval in principle** of the proposal, which would be pending until NIOF were autonomous and regularly submitting ASFA input.

*Regarding the Trust Fund Proposal "Guinea- Acquisition of computer equipment for Guinean Input Center" (ASFA/2009/34a) US\$ 3,575*

*This proposal requests funding for the acquisition of computer equipment and Internet access fees, both of which are fundamental for preparation of ASFA input and the sending of the records to FAO ASFA Secretariat and ProQuest.....CNSHB referred to problems encountered within their institute related to technical breakdowns and electricity black-outs..... Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that, when recruiting a new ASFA Partner, everything is made clear upfront regarding the essential requirements necessary for the preparation of machine-readable input. He commented that there was no way of knowing the actual facilities at the ASFA Partner's institute, unless a visit was made there. He added that after CNSHB had signed the ASFA Partnership, the country had had numerous problems regarding infrastructure, electricity, etc.*

**29. The ASFA Board recommended approval in principle** of the proposal, which would be pending until some clarification was received regarding the extenuating circumstances and a review made of the costs.

*Regarding the Trust Fund Proposal "Kenya - Elimination of Gaps" (ASFA/2009/41a)*

*This proposal has been pending since 2007, since ProQuest had informed KMFRI that there was the possibility of the "Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom" being converted/processed by ProQuest..... Ms Noble (NMBL) reported that Cambridge University Press had now digitized their archive ..... ProQuest would now be able to process the electronic information using their automated indexing system.*

**30. The ASFA Board did not recommend approval** of this proposal, since it was no longer considered valid given that the situation had changed.

*Regarding the Trust Fund Proposal "Kenya - Identifying and listing grey literature published in Kenya not in ASFA" (ASFA/2009/41b) US\$ 7,320 (maximum)*

*This proposal aims to identify, collate and list grey literature published in Kenya, with a view to entering the references into the ASFA database, digitizing the full-text and depositing them in OCEANDocs repository..... Mr Emerson (ProQuest) asked whether this proposal actually included the preparation of the ASFA records. Mr Macharia (KMFRI) clarified that this was to be done at a second phase.*

**31. The ASFA Board recommended approval** of the proposal.

*Regarding the Trust Fund Proposal "Viet Nam - Scanning of Viet Nam Fisheries Technology and Scientific Results from 2000-2008" (ASFA/2009/64a) US\$ 14,690*

*This proposal aims to collect and scan scientific reports within the scope of ASFA and link the full-text to relevant records for ASFA-input. .... A few ASFA Partners commented that it was not clear whether the links would be to ASFA records already existing on CSA Illumina or whether new ASFA records would be prepared..... No mention was made of depositing the full-text documents in a repository....*

**32. The ASFA Board recommended approval in principle** of the proposal, pending further clarification as to whether the documents to be scanned already had ASFA records on the database and therefore only the full-text links would be sent to ProQuest or whether new ASFA records were to be prepared. The proposal would be given the go-ahead once a revised version was presented and also once CIS were autonomous and regularly submitting ASFA input.

*Regarding the proposal "Financial support to attend the ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (for year 2010)" (ASFA/2009/70) US\$ 40,000*

**33. The ASFA Board recommended approval** of the proposal.

*Regarding the proposal "Small Financial Incentive to ASFA Partner Institute hosting ASFA Board Meeting" (ASFA/2009/80) US\$ 2,500*

*This proposal aims to eliminate any small financial obstacles which might prevent an ASFA Partner from offering to host the ASFA Board Meeting. It would provide the ASFA Partner Institute hosting the Meeting with a sum of \$1000 (the proposal is not intended to be retroactive). Mr Emerson (ProQuest) suggested raising the sum to US\$ 2,500.*

**34. The ASFA Board recommended approval** of the proposal, for the sum of US\$ 2,500.

*Regarding the proposal "Utilization of ASFA Trust Fund to Pay IAMSILIC Membership US\$ 1,240*

*FAO ASFA Secretariat requests that this proposal be extended for a further two years, which means a potential spending over the next 2 years of US\$1 240\*.*

**34. The ASFA Board recommended approval** of the proposal, for the sum of US\$ 1,240.

*Regarding the proposal "Tanzania - Scanning of Fisheries Catch and Scientific Results from 1999-2009" (ASFA/2009/56a) US\$ 10, 625*

*This proposal aims at making widely available, in full text format, fisheries catch and scientific reports which are in grey literature deposited at the Division of Fisheries and Tanzania Fisheries Research Institute of the Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries Development. The documents would be scanned and then some 500 ASFA records would be prepared and sent to ProQuest.*

**36. The ASFA Board recommended approval** of the proposal.

#### **Agenda Item 15 (Place and date of next meeting)\***

*Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that at the previous ASFA Board Meeting, Ms Bazi (INRH) had expressed interest in hosting the meeting for 2010. Mr Pepe had contacted Ms Bazi last month and she confirmed that her institute was still willing to host the 2010 meeting. The offer also made by INP (Ecuador) to host the 2010 meeting was noted.*

**37. The ASFA Board agreed in principal** that the 2010 ASFA Board Meeting would be held at INRH, Casablanca, Morocco

**\*(Note: Next year's meeting will mark the 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary of ASFA, which was first published in 1971)**

**This CD-ROM does not start automatically.  
To start, select the drive designation of your CD-ROM device (e.g. D:\) and double click.**

