_____

ASFA ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
VLIZ, Oostende, Belgium, 4-8 September 2006

SUMMARY REPORT
(including ASFA Partners' Reports)

ASFA ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
VLIZ, Oostende, Belgium, 4-8 September 2006

SUMMARY REPORT
(including ASFA Partners' Reports)

**FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS
Rome, 2007**

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 portion of the Meeting Report, you will find the actual minutes of the Meeting, and only a few selected Annexes (e.g. the Agenda, the List of Participants, Trust Fund Status, and Action Items). While on the CD-ROM that is included with this document, you will find all of the documents (Annexes) and PowerPoint presentations that were submitted to or presented at the Meeting (note: these documents 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).

CONTENTS

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

ANNEXES

Note. The <u>printed</u> 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 contain its size. However, on the CD-ROM that accompanies the Report, you will find **all** of the Annexes (Meeting documents) listed below.

Document numbering. Documents numbers (e.g. ASFA/2006/... 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/2006/1   Agenda

Annex-1a: ASFA/2006/1a   List of Documents

Annex-1b: ASFA/2006/1b   List of Participants

Annex-1c: List of Abbreviations

Annex-2:   ASFA/2006/2   Actions Agreed by Participants (at 2005 Meeting)

Annex-3:   ASFA/2006/3   FAO Report

Annex-3a: ASFA/2006/3a   FAO Trust Fund Proposal (Staff Support to ASFA Secretariat in 2007)

Annex-4:   ASFA/2006/4   IOC Report

Annex-5:   ASFA/2006/5   UN/DOALOS Report

Annex-5a: ASFA/2006/5a   NAFO Training Report (UN-DOALOS)

Annex-6:   ASFA/2006/6   UNEP Report

Annex-7:   ASFA/2006/7   ADRIAMED Report

Annex-8:   ASFA/2006/9   ICES Report

Annex-9:   ASFA/2006/15   PIMRIS Report

Annex-10:   ASFA/2006/16   SPC Report

Annex-11:   ASFA/2006/17   Argentina (INIDEP) Report

Annex-11a: ASFA/2006/17a   Argentina Poster

Annex-12:   ASFA/2006/18   Australia (Input Centre) Report

Annex-13:   ASFA/2006/19   Belgium (VLIZ) Report

Annex-14:   ASFA/2006/21   Canada (Fisheries and Oceans) Report

Annex-15:   ASFA/2006/22   Chile (IFOP) Report

Annex-16:   ASFA/2006/23   China, People's Republic (NMDIS) Report

Annex-17:   ASFA/2006/25   Cuba (CIP) Report

Annex-18:   ASFA/2006/26   Ecuador (INP) Report

Annex-18a: ASFA/2006/26a   Ecuador (INP) Trust Fund Proposal

Annex-19:   ASFA/2006/27   Estonia (EMI) Report

Annex-19a: ASFA/2006/27a   Estonia Trust Fund Report

Annex-20:   ASFA/2006/28   France (IFREMER) Report

Annex-21:   ASFA/2006/29   Germany (BF) Report

Annex-22:   ASFA/2006/30   Greece (HCMR) Report

Annex-23:   ASFA/2006/32   India (NIO/NICMAS) Report

Annex-24:   ASFA/2006/33   Indonesia (PDII-LIPI) Report

Annex-24a: ASFA/2006/33a   Indonesia (PDII-LIPI) Trust Fund Proposal

Annex-25:   ASFA/2006/35   Iran (IFRO) Report

Annex-26:   ASFA/2006/36   Japan (FRA) Report

Annex-27:   ASFA/2006/37   Kenya (KMFRI) Report

Annex-28:   ASFA/2006/38   Korea (KORDI) Report

Annex-29:   ASFA/2006/39   Mauritania (IMROP) Report

Annex-30:   ASFA/2006/40   Mexico (DGB) Report

Annex-31:   ASFA/2006/41   Morocco (INRH) Report

1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

The Annual Meeting of the Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Abstracts (ASFA) Advisory Board was hosted by the Flanders Marine Institute (VLIZ), located in Oostende, Belgium, during 4 to 8 September 2006.

The Meeting was attended by 38 participants from 25 National ASFA Partners, 3 UN Partners, 1 International ASFA Partner, the ASFA Publishing Partner, and 3 observers. The Agenda is in **Annex-1**. The Documents presented at the Meeting and the abbreviations used in the Report are listed in **Annex-1a** and **Annex-1c**, respectively. The names and addresses of the participants are listed in **Annex-1b**.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) welcomed the participants to VLIZ and introduced Mr Mees, the Director of VLIZ, who officially opened the meeting.

Mr Mees welcomed participants to Flanders and to Oostende, on behalf of the Flemish Government, who were the main sponsors of VLIZ. He gave a description of the Institute, which became operational in 2000 and mentioned that its main objective was to assist Flemish marine scientists in their work by providing coordination and information services. VLIZ is a focal point for marine and coastal-related research and serves as an international contact point. It also provides logistic support to researchers by taking care of the management, maintenance and manipulation of research infrastructure and equipment. Mr Mees mentioned the collaboration with the IOC Project Office for IODE, and he noted how proud VLIZ was to be part of the important, strategic ASFA Partnership. He wished all the participants a happy stay in Oostende.

Mr Pissierssens (IOC) provided an introduction to the IOC Project Office for IODE, which was the actual premises of the ASFA Meeting, and explained the collaboration with VLIZ. He briefly described IODE's mission, structure, priorities, activities and projects - both global and regional. He mentioned the various ODIN projects, the IODE services and products, and the training tool Ocean Teacher. Since its opening in April 2005, the Project Office has received some 300 students from 70 countries and 60 expert visits. In 2006 there were a total of 28 events.

2. ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) presented this Agenda Item.

3. ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON AND RAPPORTEURS

Ms Beattie (NOAA) was elected Chairperson of the Meeting and Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) co-Chairperson. 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 SUMMARY REPORT OF 2005 ASFA ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

The following corrections to the Summary Report of the 2005 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (Rome, Italy) were noted:

1) Under *Agenda Item* 6.6. FIGIS-ASFA relations/cooperation (p6) the full name of FIGIS should read '*Fisheries Global Information Service'* (not Fisheries Information Global Service); and

2) Under *Agenda Item* 6.7. ASFA-IAMSLIC group(s) cooperation (p8) the line reading 'Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) explained to ASFA Partners that it was not necessary to not put their entire catalogue on Z 39.50' should be changed to *'Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) explained to ASFA Partners that it was not necessary to put their entire catalogue on Z 39.50'*

The ASFA Board thanked the ASFA Secretariat for the work involved and **agreed** to adopt the Summary Report of the 2005 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (Rome, Italy) with the above-mentioned corrections noted.

5.1.Matters arising from the last (2005) ASFA Advisory Board Meeting

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

6. STATUS OF ASFA PARTNERSHIP

6.1. Report on intersessional activities of the ASFA Partners

Each ASFA Partner presented a summary Report of its own intersessional activities. The ASFA Secretariat summarized the major points/concerns contained in the Reports of Partners not in attendance. The full text of all the Reports is in **Annexes 3-43**.

6.1.1. United Nations Co-sponsors

FAO - Mr Grainger presented the FAO Report **(Annex-3)**

IOC – Mr Pissierssens presented the IOC Report **(Annex-4)**

UN/DOALOS - Mr Jorgens presented the UN/DOALOS Report **(Annex-5)**

UNEP - Not present - Report highlighted by the ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-6**)

6.1.2. ASFA Partners

ADRIAMED - Not present - Report highlighted by the ASFA Secretariat **(Annex-7)**

ICCAT - (Not present, No Report)

ICES - Ms Ovens presented the ICES Report **(Annex-8)**

IOTC - (Not present, No Report)

IUCN - (Not present, No Report

NACA - (Not present, No Report)

PIMRIS - Not present - Report highlighted by the ASFA Secretariat **(Annex-9)**

SPC - Not present - Report highlighted by the ASFA Secretariat **(Annex-10)**

WorldFish Center - (Not present, No Report)

Argentina (INIDEP) - Ms Cosulich presented the INIDEP report **(Annex-11)**

Australia (CSIRO) - Not present - Report of Indexing contractor highlighted by ASFA Secretariat **(Annex-12)**

Belgium (VLIZ) - Mr Haspeslagh presented the VLIZ report **(Annex-13)**

Brazil (USP) - (Not present, No Report)

Canada (FOC) - Not present - Report highlighted by the ASFA Secretariat **(Annex-14)**

Chile (IFOP) - Ms Munoz presented the IFOP report **(Annex-15)**

China (NMDIS) - Mr Luo Xuye presented the NMDIS report **(Annex-16)**

Cote d'Ivoire (CRO) - (Not present, No Report)

Cuba (CIP) - Ms Hernandez Ceballos presented the CIP Report **(Annex-17)**

Ecuador (INP) - Mr Gaibor presented the INP report **(Annex-18)**

Estonia (EMI) - Ms Kalenchits presented the EMI Report **(Annex-19)**

France (IFREMER) - Ms Prod'homme presented the IFREMER Report **(Annex-20)**

Germany (BF) - Dr Kühnhold presented the BF Report **(Annex-21)**

Greece (HCMR) - Ms Goulala presented the HCMR Report **(Annex-22)**

Iceland (MRI) - (Not present, No Report)

India (NIO/NICMAS) - Mr Sainekar presented the NIO/NICMAS Report **(Annex-23)**

Indonesia (PDII/LIPI) - Not present - Report highlighted by the ASFA Secretariat **(Annex-24)**

Iran (IFRO) - Not present - Report highlighted by the ASFA Secretariat **(Annex-25)**

Italy (SIBM) - (Not present, No Report)

Japan (FRA) - Mr Satoshi presented the FRA Report **(Annex-26)**

Kenya (KMFRI) - Mr Macharia presented the KMFRI Report **(Annex-27)**

Korea (KORDI) - Mr Han presented the KORDI Report **(Annex-28)**

Mauritania (IMROP) - Mr Sow presented the IMROP Report **(Annex-29)**

Mexico (DGB) – Mr Montes presented the DGB Report **(Annex-30)**

Morocco (INRH) - Ms Bazi presented the INRH Report **(Annex-31)**

Nigeria (NIFFR) - Not present - Report highlighted by the ASFA Secretariat **(Annex-32)**

Norway (IMR) - Not present - Report highlighted by the ASFA Secretariat **(Annex-33)**

Peru (IMARPE) (Not present, No Report)

Poland (SFI) - Ms Fey presented the SFI report **(Annex-34)**

Portugal (IPIMAR) - (Not present, No Report)

Russian (VNIRO) - Ms Levashova presented the VNIRO Report **(Annex-35)**

Senegal (DPM) - Not present - Report highlighted by the ASFA Secretariat **(Annex-36)**

Spain (IEO) – (Not present, No report)

Sweden (IMR) - Ms K Frohlund presented the IMR Report **(Annex-37)**

Tanzania (IMS) - Ms Nyika presented the IMS Report **(Annex-38)**

Tunisia (INSTM) – (Not present - No Report)

Ukraine (YugNIRO) – (Not present - No Report)

United Kingdom (NMBL) - Ms Noble presented the NBML Report **(Annex-39)**

Uruguay (IIP) - Ms Cristiani presented the IIP Report **(Annex-40)**

USA (NOAA) - Ms Beattie presented the NOAA Report **(Annex-41)**

Viet Nam (FICen) - Mr Thain Thanh Dhuong presented the FICen Report **(Annex-42)**

6.1.3. ASFA PARTNER-PUBLISHER (CSA)

CSA - Mr Emerson presented the CSA Report (**Annex-43)**

6.2. New and potential ASFA Partners

The following four Organizations/Institutes signed the ASFA Partnership Agreement during the intersessional period 2005-2006 to become ASFA Partners.

1. Instituto Nacional de Hidrografia e Navegacao (INAHINA) , Mozambique

2. Living Aquatic Resources Research Center (LARReC), Lao People's Democratic Republic

3. Phuket Marine Biological Center (PMBC), Thailand

4. Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO), Canada.

See the FAO Report Section 4.2 **(Annex-3)** for information regarding the new Partners, and see **Annex-44** for further information and full addresses of the Organizations/Institutes.

6.2.1. Admission of new Partners

As is the custom, the Board gave a ceremonial welcome to each new Partner with a round of applause.

6.2.2. Potential Partners

Mr Pepe (FAO) gave a brief account of the strategy guiding the recruitment of new ASFA Partners. He referred to the 'strategy' papers currently guiding the FAO ASFA Secretariat. See the FAO Report, Section 4.5.1 (**Annex 3**) for more details. He also noted that several new ASFA Partners had been recruited thanks to the LIFDC project (see **Annex 48)** and the IOC/ODIN training courses.

Current recruitment activities involve: 1) **Guinea** (**Centre National des Sciences Halieutiques de Boussoura, CNSHB)* –** the ASFA Secretariat received a specific request for detailed information on joining ASFA, which was dispatched for them to study; 2) **Colombia** (**Centro de Documentación, INVEMAR, Santa Marta)** - the ASFA Secretariat has received signs of initial interests in joining ASFA, but has not been able to follow-up; 3) **Ireland** (**Marine Institute, MI) -** both Ms Noble (NMBL) and Mr Grainger (FAO) have been in contact with MI regarding eventual participation in ASFA. Mr Grainger reported that the latest contact with MI indicates that they are still interested in participating in ASFA. He also added that MI produces many publications in the field of marine sciences.

 *[**ASFA Secretariat note**: at this writing Guinea has joined ASFA]

6.2.3. Strategy for future expansion of ASFA Partnership

Mr Pepe (FAO) stressed that the recruitment of new ASFA Partners was a very onerous task which has currently overextended the capacity of the FAO ASFA Secretariat as regards training, follow-up etc. He

commented that the rate of future recruitment will be conditioned to the extent that the Secretariat is able to **outsource** some of its training and follow-up responsibilities (for example: the Secretariat used some of the money that was allocated to it under the ongoing ASFA Trust Fund project 'Staff support to ASFA Secretariat' (**Annex-3a**) to outsource the training of the new ASFA Partner NAFO (located in Canada) to the UN Co-sponsoring ASFA Partner, UN/DOALOS).

6.2.4. Partners dropping out of ASFA Partnership

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported no ASFA Partners **dropping out** of ASFA during the intersession.

6.2.5. Partners removed from the ASFA Partnership

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that no ASFA Partners had been **removed** from the ASFA Partnership during the intersession.

6.2.6. Partners in danger of being removed from Partnership (for not fulfilling inputting responsibility)

The FAO ASFA Secretariat referred to Iceland (Marine Research Institute)* and NACA (Network of Aquaculture Centres in Asia-Pacific) who both signed the ASFA Partnership agreement to join ASFA in 2003, but as yet had not produced any ASFA input. Both Partners had contacted the ASFA Secretariat to express their interest in continuing participation in ASFA and foresaw submission of input in the near future.

Mr Pepe (FAO) reminded all Partners that the primary task of the FAO ASFA Secretariat was: to attract, recruit, train, and support the ASFA Partners - not to remove them. Therefore, any Partner having problems in fulfilling their ASFA inputting responsibility should let the Secretariat know, and it would do its best to help.

 *[**ASFA Secretariat note**: the Marine Research Institute, Iceland, has started to submit ASFA input]

6.3. ASFA Partnership Agreement

As of 1 September 2006, 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) was signed by **60*** Partners (6 more than last year):

4	UN Co-sponsoring ASFA Partners	45	National ASFA Partners
10	International ASFA Partners	1	Publishing ASFA Partner

*[**ASFA Secretariat note:** during the finalization of this Report, a new National ASFA Partner joined the Partnership bring the total number of Partners to 60. The new National ASFA Partner is **Centre National des Sciences Halieutiques de Boussoura (CNSHB), Guinea.**]

6.4. ASFA Publishing Agreement

The ASFA Publishing Agreement between FAO and the ASFA Publisher (CSA) covers the period 1 January 2004 to 31 December 2007.

The parts of the Publishing Agreement of direct interest to ASFA Partners include: the allocation, number and use of the complimentary ASFA products which CSA distributes to the ASFA Partners, and the amount of 'royalties' that CSA 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

The FAO ASFA Secretariat informed the Board that FAO and CSA will start the initial negotiations regarding the 2008-2011 renewal of the Publishing Agreement early next year. Mr Pepe (FAO) requested that ASFA Partners should let the Secretariat know if they had any suggestions/comments concerning the renewal.

6.5. Cooperation with WAICENT/AGRIS group

The FAO ASFA Secretariat mentioned the cooperation with the FAO GIL/WAICENT (AGRIS) group regarding the ontology project and utilization of the software for the maintenance of the ASFA Thesaurus. See *Agenda Item 11.6* for further discussion.

6.6.FIGIS-ASFA relations/cooperation

The status of the Trust Fund project is presented in **Annex-51**.

Mr Pepe (FAO) gave a brief introduction/background to the Trust Fund Project which deals with the geo-referencing of ASFA geographical terms for use in searching geographically the ASFA database, and the direct access to the ASFA online records from the web pages generated by FIGIS*, and he called on Mr Emerson (CSA) to provide further details as CSA is involved in the implementation of this project. Mr Emerson (CSA) mentioned that most of the work had been conducted behind the scenes. It was now possible to connect to CSA ILLUMINA whilst using FIGIS, but they were still working on the CSA ILLUMINA interface so as to be able to search with a geographic map.

*(Mr Grainger (FAO) explained that FIGIS is no longer an FAO project. It is now under the FAO's Regular Programme and is an integral part of the FAO Fisheries Web Site.)

6.7.ASFA-IAMSLIC group(s) cooperation

Mr Pepe (FAO) reminded ASFA Partners of the ASFA Trust Fund project, approved and in operation (see 2005 ASFA Annual Meeting Report, p8) which will pay the IAMSLIC membership fees for ASFA Partners, and their collaborating centres, so that they could use the IAMSLIC information services. He commented that, to date, only 15 ASFA Partners had requested the ASFA Secretariat to pay for their IAMSLIC membership fees.

Mr Jorgens (UN-DOALOS) mentioned an E-mail from IAMSLIC regarding an increase in membership fees and asked how that would affect the Trust Fund Project Proposal. Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) confirmed that there is a proposal to increase the membership fees of IAMSLIC, which is to be discussed at their next meeting, but there would be an exception for developing countries. He added that ASFA Partners should become members, since IAMSLIC is a great information asset.

The Chair, Ms Beattie (NOAA) also urged the ASFA Partners who were not yet IAMSLIC members to join.

Mr Pissierssens (IOC) mentioned the Aquatic Commons Initiative and noted that the Summary Report of the Implementation Task Force was now with the IAMSLIC Executive Board for a final decision. For further information regarding the status of the Aquatic Commons Initiative, see **Annex-60**.

More discussion was held regarding Institutional Archives and Repositories on the fifth day of the Board Meeting (see Fifth Day Meeting *Agenda Item 1*). The **ASFA Board agreed** that all discussions held during the fifth day of the Meeting would be recorded and added as a part of the Meeting Report.

6.8.Other Information Systems

The Chair, Ms Beattie (NOAA) clarified that by 'other information systems' this Agenda Item intended to include systems not only used to obtain the same or related information contained in ASFA, i.e. competitors, but also other information systems such as ODINAFRICA, which were collaborators with ASFA.

Mr Emerson (CSA) noted that it was important for CSA to take into consideration what the customers say, since they are paying high subscriptions to obtain the information. He added that the major competitors were the Web of Science and Scopus (Elsevier).

Ms Beattie (NOAA) said that NOAA uses Web of Science, but their ASFA database searches are very high, due to the fact that their scientists need a more 'specific' database. Web of Science was good for obtaining citations or making evaluations, but ASFA was always used for obtaining the information.

Ms Noble (NMBL) asked whether NOAA subscribed to Scopus. Ms Beattie replied that NOAA had subscribed for a trial period to Scopus, but could not afford both Web of Science and Scopus. It was basically a monetary issue, since NOAA had already invested a lot of money in Web of Science.

Ms Noble, whilst agreeing that many other databases cover a wider scope of data, commented that ASFA's strength could be its weakness, i.e. it is 'too subject specific'. She mentioned that the UK was very dependent upon Web of Science, but that Scopus was becoming more competitive. It was now advertising more grey literature, which used to be ASFA's uniqueness.

Mr Emerson (CSA) suggested a Trust Fund Proposal to make a comparison between what can be obtained with ASFA and what may be obtained with Web of Science or Scopus. It was important that an objective reviewer made the analysis.

Mr Pepe (FAO) noted that such a comparison would be very useful, and probably could be carried out, without too much difficulty. He said that, although CSA might be in difficulty should users no longer wish to subscribe to ASFA and use other systems instead, FAO would still have to continue with ASFA, since it is part of their mandate.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) linked this discussion with the Fifth Day *Agenda Item 1* (Institutional archives and topical repositories of grey literature) by mentioning that open archives are successful because of their balance between workload (i.e. inputting of records/information) and result, whereas ASFA was rather cumbersome in its management (i.e. input processing). He referred to current projects to link ASFA to open repositories, using the metadata already available – the reference is already there, basic, but available.

Ms Noble (NMBL) commented how this also links with the current exercise to simplify ASFA rules, since open archives will vary in their structure. Mr Haspeslagh mentioned that many open archives use a standard protocol – OAI. Ms Beattie remarked that these standards would be considered later under the Fifth Day *Agenda Item 1*, but added that it was important to bear in mind future expansion to open archives.

Mr Pissierssens (IOC) mentioned the relationship between ASFA and the Odin projects/systems. He noted how 3 different systems are used for bibliographic description: 1) the local InMagic system which has different modules for description, acquisition and loans; 2) e-repositories; and, 3) www-ISIS-ASFA. He commented that this was not a very effective way of using resources, and that perhaps the systems used in 1 and 3, i.e. InMagic and www-ISIS-ASFA could be merged, despite some complexity with respect to different field structures. Mr Pissierssens emphasized that, at the end of the day, it was important to retrieve the abstract and the information. Since it is possible to go to a less complex from a more complex (but not vice versa), he suggested that the ASFA records were created first and then merged into an e-repository. The URLs in the ASFA records could give full text linking to the e-repositories. See *Agenda Item 1* of the Fifth day for more discussion regarding this matter.

Mr Sainekar (NIO/NICMAS) mentioned the importance of having links in the ASFA database to open archives, and that there was a need to adjust the structure of the www-ISIS-ASFA software so as to add extra fields to allow full text linking.

Ms Beattie (NOAA) queried the Latin American partners as to the extent of their full text linking to e-repositories. Ms Cristiani (IIP) replied that Uruguay was doing so. Ms Beattie added that linking e-repositories with ASFA was an important aspect that should be taken into account in future developments.

Considering the ASFA Partners different levels of usage, development, expertise etc. regarding e-repositories, a survey of Partners' existing e-repositories was suggested as perhaps being necessary.

Mr Pissierssens (IOC) suggested using a Trust Fund Project Proposal for such a survey.

7. ASFA SCOPE, COVERAGE, MONITORING AND TIMELINESS

The Chair, Ms Beattie (NOAA), introduced this item by reminding ASFA Partners that the issues discussed under this Agenda Item all reflect the quality of the ASFA Database and therefore were very important.

7.1. Subject Scope

Mr Pepe (FAO) introduced the document '*Amendment to subject scope of ASFA to explicitly exclude offensive warfare*' (**Annex-56**). He explained that this document aims to officially record that the topic of 'offensive warfare' is not within the Subject Scope of the ASFA bibliographic database, in line with the principles of Section 2 of the United Nations Charter which prohibits the use of force except for legitimate defense. This would mean that ASFA Partners would not **intentionally** prepare, for inclusion in ASFA, references to documents that **explicitly** deal with 'offensive warfare'.

Some discussion followed regarding this issue. Mr Emerson (CSA) mentioned that a working definition of 'offensive warfare', for Partners to follow while preparing input, would be rather difficult to formulate and requested that it be written in more detail. Ms Beattie (NOAA) commented that the wording '*explicitly deal with offensive warfare*' appeared to offer sufficient explanation as regards a 'working definition'.

Mr Jorgens (UN/DOALOS) asked 'why' this issue had become of concern to the FAO ASFA Secretariat. Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat and the person who drafted the amendment) explained that if one were to search now on the ASFA database using the term 'warfare', approximately 300 records would be retrieved. Fortunately, most or all of these records deal with the monitoring or mitigation of the effects of war and weapons on the aquatic environment and its organisms, and therefore these records would neither be considered outside the subject scope of ASFA nor would they be in contrast to the Section 2 of the UN Charter. However, as more and more records are (and will be) automatically downloaded and input into the ASFA database, it is possible that some records explicitly dealing with offensive warfare could enter the database, and therefore the FAO ASFA Secretariat would like to have it on record that the ASFA Partners have agreed and have been alerted to avoid intentionally including such records on the database.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) disagreed with any sort of censuring regarding the inclusion of ASFA records in the database. Mr Pepe (FAO) pointed out that limiting the subject scope of a database was common practice among database producers and that there were already various other areas/topics officially designated or listed as being outside the subject scope of ASFA in the publications: *ASFIS-2, Subject Categories and Scope Description* and *ASFIS-5, Guidelines for Indexing.* Therefore, 'Offensive warfare' would become one more topic outside the subject scope of ASFA.

Referring in general to some of the topics currently excluded from ASFA, Mr Emerson (CSA) mentioned the paragraph in *ASFIS-2, Subject Categories and Scope Description* which lists the topics specifically excluded from the subject scope of ASFA. He questioned the inclusion of surface water and energy from the sea as topics not relevant to ASFA (i.e. these topics were definitely to be considered within the scope of ASFA).

The **ASFA Board agreed** that 'offensive warfare' was outside the subject scope of ASFA (i.e. not for inclusion in ASFA), and that 'surface water' and 'energy from the sea' were within the subject scope of ASFA.

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to review and update the list of topics specifically excluded from the subject scope of ASFA and to circulate it to Partners, via ASFA-Board-L. The updated/amended list will be included in the next revision of the publications: *ASFIS-5, Guidelines for Indexing* when it is next revised, and will also be incorporated in the publication *ASFIS-2, Subject Categories and Scope Description.*

Ms Wibley (FAO) reminded the ASFA Partners that on the Fifth Day of the Meeting there would be a short PowerPoint Presentation, prepared by CSA and FAO, concerning ASFA input, which included a short section on subject scope, indicating some areas of non-coverage and overlap.

7.2. Coverage

Ms Beattie (NOAA) mentioned that NOAA is producing data in the form of videos, e.g. digital videos from underwater surveys, and asked whether other ASFA Partners were documenting such videos in their ASFA input. Ms Soto (CSA) commented that they included videos as ASFA input.

ASFA Partners were reminded that the www-ISIS-ASFA software does currently contain a field (the Physical Medium Field) where a code may be selected to indicate films, slides or videos (F).

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) noted that there were also other media types, such as photos. Regarding photos, Mr Sainekar (NIO/NICMAS) mentioned that to celebrate the 40th anniversary of the establishment of his institute, NIO, old photos were being prepared for archives of the institute input and that there was some difficulty in carrying out the indexing.

Ms Beattie (NOAA) agreed as to the difficulty in indexing such media, since it depended very much upon what they were done for. She added that the scientists should provide the metadata, especially for the digital videos. NOAA provided a set of fields to be filled in by the scientists when carrying out the research, documenting also the cruise report.

Ms Beattie (NOAA) agreed to share the NOAA standards for digital videos and photos, and also their digital video management system, with the ASFA Partners via ASFA Board-L.

Ms Soto (CSA) referred to the request made by Norway (in their report) for the inclusion of references to Posters (which is very common at Conferences) in ASFA and establishing a new Document Type category. She added that CSA, who carries out the indexing of the Norwegian ASFA input, normally catalogue such records as Monographs (B).

In reply to the question as to whether Posters could be considered as 'one-page' monographs, Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) said that that Posters were not really monographs, but were in between an abstract and a monograph. He added that Posters were becoming more and more common, and perhaps should be defined as a new Type of Document.

Ms Lombardi (FAO) noted that there were other types of documents becoming more commonly available, such as Datasets/Databases, which needed to be catalogued differently (not as monographs) and CSA mentioned also PowerPoint Presentations.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) commented that should new codes be added for these different types of documents, the scientists/researchers would like these new definitions and find it useful that the document was actually specified as a presentation or a poster. Ms Beattie (NOAA) added that, in conference proceedings, some of the contents are actually designated as Posters.

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to request a change to the www-ISIS-ASFA software, so as to add more codes in the Type of Document field, including one to indicate 'Posters'.

7.3. Monitoring

The Chair, Ms Beattie (NOAA) introduced the document ASFA/2006/77 'Declaration of Coverage' which was prepared by Mr Pepe (FAO) for eventual distribution at one of the workshops to be held at the UNEP sponsored *Second Intergovernmental Review Meeting of the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities (GPA) (IGR-2) 16 - 20 October 2006, Beijing,* to which the FAO ASFA Secretariat had been invited to give a short overview of ASFA and its coverage of marine pollution.

Various comments were made regarding the wording of the document.

In reply to Mr Jorgens' (UN-DOALOS) question as to the need of the 'Declaration', Mr Pepe (FAO) explained that the 'Declaration' was not intended to address some existing contentious issue, but that the ASFA Secretariat believed it was necessary, from time to time, not only to reconfirm the ASFA partners commitment to carrying out their monitoring responsibilities, but also to highlight the point that ASFA Partners are more than just ASFA Input Centres. They also have an important role in exchanging information and should always bear this in mind when carrying out their other activities.

Mr Jorgens (UN-DOALOS) proposed changing the word 'Declaration' (in the title) to '*Statement*'.

Mr Pissierssens (IOC) suggested listing all the current ASFA Partners in the document, rather than leaving just those who originally founded ASFA. He also mentioned that there could be some confusion as to the exact purpose of the statement as although it was intended to be presented at the UNEP Meeting, it was also *urging* ASFA Partners to continue carrying out their activities regarding the preparation of bibliographic references in ASFA and the dissemination of information on aquatic sciences. He suggested the word '*urged'* should be changed to *'committed'.*

Mr Emerson (CSA) warned against giving disproportionate emphasis on one subject area (e.g. Pollution) as ASFA Partners are obliged to dedicate the same attention to the coverage of all subject areas within the scope of ASFA.

Mr Sow (IMROP) suggested that the 'Statement' should include in the title that it was '*adopted*' by the ASFA Partners at the 2006 Annual ASFA Advisory Board Meeting.

In accordance with the above mentioned comments/suggestions, Mr Pepe (FAO) presented a modified 'Statement of Coverage'' which the **ASFA Board agreed** to adopt (see **Annex-61**)**.**

7.4. Timeliness

Mr Emerson (CSA) noted the importance of timeliness, and that it took, on average, between 3-8 months for an article to appear on the database after publishing. He added that the users of ASFA want the publications to be available on the database the next day, stressing the need for the contents to go on the database immediately.

Regarding timeliness, Ms Soto (CSA) reminded ASFA Partners that they should send their files containing ASFA records to CSA on at least a monthly basis (preferably before the 20th of the month - see next paragraph) rather than only once or twice a year in large batches.

In reply to Ms Frohlund's (IMR) question as to when the records submitted by Partners were actually loaded onto the ASFA database, Ms Soto (CSA) stated that the loading of records was carried out once a month. She explained that records were checked around the 20-25th of the month, and then loaded. She pointed out that any files arriving after the 20th of the current month would be loaded after the 25th of the following month.

CSA agreed to remind ASFA Partners, via ASFA-Board-L, of the dates by which ASFA Partners should send their ASFA records to CSA, so as to ensure their inclusion in the current month's uploading of records into the ASFA database on ILLUMINA.

Mr Jorgens (UN-DOALOS) asked whether CSA could load records more frequently, e.g. twice a month, so as to give a more rapid access to the data. Mr Emerson (CSA) replied that they were working on this and **CSA agreed** to inform ASFA Partners when they change the uploading frequency from monthly to once every two weeks.

Mr Pissierssens (IOC), whilst noting that ASFA has been working as such for the past 35 years, asked whether there was a need for a change in the production model, i.e. put in some information and then add further information, such as the abstracting and indexing, at a later date. (See next section for continuation of this discussion.)

Ms Wibley (FAO), commenting that one of the points of uniqueness of ASFA was the inclusion of abstracts, mentioned that it took time to do the abstracting and indexing of the ASFA records and that the preparation of ASFA input was not just downloading citations from websites.

7.5. ASFA input procedures

Mr Emerson (CSA) re-iterated the fact that their users want the information as soon as possible. It was important to first analyze how ASFA best serves the user, and then decide the best way to do it. He referred to CSA's 'Recent References' and explained how CSA purchases citations from the British Library and adds them to CSA ILLUMINA within a few days of the full text being published (whether or not the abstract record was indexed, the record is available for searching). These 'Recent References' undergo quality checks and include an 'Indexing in process' tag to distinguish them from 'completed' records. Once indexed, the completed abstract record will replace the Recent Reference. In this way, several thousand records are available to ASFA users, weeks or months before they would normally see them.

Mr Emerson (CSA) said that CSA receives, directly from the publishers, citation information for numerous journals (some of which are under the monitoring responsibility of other ASFA Partners). Therefore, CSA would consider taking over, from a Partner, the monitoring responsibility of some of these journals, so as to speed up data entry - if the Partner so wished. He also suggested the possibility for the ASFA Partner to receive from CSA the citation information, of such journals, and then build upon this information to complete the ASFA records, i.e. carry out the abstracting and/or indexing.

Ms Noble (NMBL) asked if the un-indexed Recent References affect the Alert service of ILLUMINA. Mr Emerson (CSA) replied that very few Alert profiles included a descriptor field, however he added that the descriptors are covered in general Alerts. Ms Noble commented that most publishers nowadays offer a free current awareness service, but was ASFA offering anything extra in this sense? Mr Emerson replied that it was a question of ease, ASFA provides all the publishers together in one place.

Ms Wibley (FAO), referring to timeliness, asked whether it would be possible for ASFA Partners to send CSA 'Recent References - type records' (records without indexing) so that the records could be included on the 'Recent References' database, and then later be replaced by the fully indexed records once completed by the ASFA Partner. Mr Emerson (CSA) replied that this could be possible, but it would create a large management task for CSA, creating a heavier work load.

Mr Emerson (CSA) said that most users did free-text searching as a starting point, and often did not use the indexing terms (descriptors) to do the searching. Ms Beattie (NOAA) requested further clarification on this statement, and Ms Wibley (FAO) questioned, then, the need for indexing, if this was the case. Mr Emerson (CSA) clarified that actually all fields were used in the searches, but only a small percentage of their users searched exclusively on the 'descriptor' field.

Ms Noble (NMBL) suggested that the reason for the underutilization of 'descriptors' in searching could possible be due to undergraduates not having been trained on 'how to search' the database. In fact, Mr Emerson (CSA) stated that trained searchers do use the descriptor field, and that these included graduate students followed by researchers.

Ms Wibley (FAO) questioned the importance of the ASFA descriptors in searching. Mr Emerson pointed out that the descriptors were important in describing the concepts contained in a document, and that the indexer (in his/her use of the ASFA Thesaurus to describe concepts) should also focus on describing the concepts contained in the text of the document and not only those contained in the title or the abstract.

Regarding free-text searching and indexing or non-indexing, Mr Pepe (FAO) referred to the historic FAO AGROVOC trilingual (English, French and Spanish) thesaurus which has become a central element in the new FAO Ontology project and which has received substantial funding from the EU. The ontology concept has become very important with respect to integrating databases/information resources that have been indexed using different thesauri/vocabularies, i.e. so as to be able to carry out searching across the different databases. (See *Agenda Item 11.6* for further discussion regarding the Ontology project). Mr Pepe insisted on the importance of the indexing, and reminded Partners that indexing offers a 'truer' reflection of the content of a document than is sometimes reflected in the title and/or abstract.

See *Agenda Item 7.6* for related discussions regarding the input of ASFA records without indexing.

Machine-assisted indexing

Mr Emerson (CSA) informed the ASFA Partners that all records produced at CSA went through an automated indexing and then the indexing was cleaned up by the editors.

Simplification of some ASFA inputting procedures

The **ASFA Board agreed** to establish a 'Simplification' Working Group (SWG) to discuss the 'simplification' of some of the ASFA input procedures. Those who agreed to take part in the Group were FAO, CSA, India, UK (Chair), France, Sweden.

The Working Group examined document **Annex-53** (List of some ASFA rules contained in the Guidelines for Bibliographic Description and Data Entry which could be simplified or eliminated) and presented the ASFA Board with their decisions as follows:

1.1 Capitalization in English Title field – The SWG **agreed** that the English title could be left as it is in the original document, whether it is all in capitals, title case or not. This would not be mandatory. ASFA Partners could ignore this and follow the original rule should they wish. There should not be a full stop at the end of the title.

1.2 Separating titles in the non-English title field - The SWG **agreed** to leave the original rule as it is, i.e. separate 2 or more non-English titles by a full stop, dash and a space and do not end the last title with a full stop. However, should only a full stop, or only a dash be used, this would be accepted by CSA (it would not create any problems). There should not be a full stop at the end of the last title.

1.3 No action

1.4 Roman numerals - The SWG **agreed** to abolish the current rule. It was not necessary to change Roman numerals into Arabic. However, ASFA Partners could do so if they wish.

1.5 Italics - The SWG **agreed** to abolish the current rule regarding the use of italics coding for Latin expressions. BUT, the italics coding should still be used for Latin Genus + species names, although this was not necessary for DBO records or non-English abstracts.

1.6 Transliteration of non-Roman alphabets - The SWG **agreed** to use the revised table (Annex 1) for transliterating Ukraine Cyrillic characters.

2 Author name subfield - The SWG **agreed** that ASFA Partners could, should they wish, enter the first names in full as provided in the document, or just as initials.

2.1 Suffixes as part of the author's name - The SWG **agreed** that the suffix should go at the end of the name, but there was no need for a comma or space.

3 Author's address field - The SWG **agreed** to abolish the current rule and that ASFA Partners could type the address as indicated in the document, should they wish.

4.1 Corporate Author in a language other than English - The SWG **agreed** to change the current rule and allow the city to be entered as in the document i.e. in original language.

4.2 Abbreviations in the Corporate Author name - The SWG **agreed** to abolish the current rule and not abbreviate generic words i.e. type in full as in the document.

5.1 Conference name field - The SWG **agreed:** 1) to apply the same rules regarding capitalization in the English title field and that it should not end in a full stop; 2) to abolish the current rule and enter the conference number as it appears in the document; and, 3) to abolish the current rule regarding abbreviation of generic words.

6 Conference date field - The SWG **agreed** in principle to abolish the rule to abbreviate months (FAO will check with www-isis-asfa software regarding field length).

7 Language field - The SWG **agreed** to abolish current rule regarding alphabetical order. ASFA Partners can enter the codes in any order.

8 Document/Report/Patent number field - The SWG **agreed** to abolish the current rule. ASFA Partners can enter Document/Report/Patent number with the punctuation as it appears in the document.

9 Publisher field - The SWG **agreed** to keep the current rule, i.e. not put a full stop at the end of the publisher name, unless the last word is an abbreviation.

10 Date of publication – pending.

11 Notes field - The SWG **agreed** to maintain the current rule, i.e. each note should end with a full stop.

The Chair thanked the SWG for the time spent to discuss the topic and prepare their decisions.

The **ASFA Board agreed** to endorse the decisions made by the 'Simplification' Working Group members.

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to compile a complete and detailed list of the rules that were simplified and/or changed (together with explanations, where necessary) and circulate the list via ASFA-Board-L to all ASFA Partners. [**ASFA Secretariat note**: The list was sent to ASFA-Board-L on 31.10.06]

Environmental Regime field

Ms Noble (NMBL) noted that the 'Environmental Regime' field was often left blank in the ASFA records, and that most of the records in question were prepared by CSA. Most ASFA Partners felt that this field was an important filter for searching and should not be left blank.

CSA agreed that they would check these records and add, where relevant, the missing Environmental Regime code (M, B, F).

Corporate Author Names

Ms Levashova (VNIRO): 1) questioned the procedure for data input when there was no Corporate Author or Personal Author, since it was mandatory to have data entered in one of the 2 fields and therefore the ASFA record could not be saved with both fields empty; and 2) mentioned that, when preparing input using the www-ISIS-ASFA software, if a new Corporate Name was entered manually, the software gave a 'message' notifying the inputter that the name was not included in the pick-list. Regarding the first question, Ms Lombardi (FAO) informed Ms Levashova that 'Anon' should be entered in the Personal Author field, should the document not have a Personal or Corporate Author. As regards the second point, Ms Lombardi explained that the 'message' displayed by the software was simply a 'warning' to inform the inputter that the name was not on the Corporate author list. She said that the record could still be saved, and mentioned that this type of message was different from an 'error' message, which notified the inputter that some mandatory information was missing and that the record could not be saved until the missing information was included.

7.6. ASFA input production

Mr Pepe (FAO) introduced this Agenda Item by referring to the document ASFA/2006/68 *Contributions (input) to the ASFA Database by Partners,* (**Annex-52**) which shows the statistics of ASFA input by the ASFA Partners during the period 1989-2006. ASFA Partners were requested to review the statistics and should they note any discrepancies they should let CSA know (Attn: Mr Emerson). Mr Pepe pointed out that the latest figures were those of last year, since the ASFA Secretariat only received updated figures from CSA the week before the Board Meeting.

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to circulate an updated version of this table to ASFA Partners via ASFA Board L.

Mr Pepe (FAO) mentioned that there were now approximately 1 million 117 thousand ASFA records on the ASFA database as hosted by CSA ILLUMINA. Mr Emerson (CSA) noted that, despite the increase in number of ASFA Partners and also the increase in the amount of publications available, the total number of ASFA records input by the ASFA Partners had not increased significantly. He asked the ASFA Partners to make greater efforts in producing more ASFA records, since there was definitely more information available.

Ms Beattie (NOAA) commented that some ASFA Partners were having serious problems within their institutes, for example staff reduction, and that some publications were now only available on-line. She said that ASFA Partners should consider various possibilities as to how to keep up with the new journals.

Mr Pepe (FAO) explained that although the ASFA Partnership had increased over the past few years, an immediate increase in production of ASFA input will not be immediately visible for several reasons: 1) some recently joined Partners have not yet been trained in the ASFA input procedures, 2) after receiving training, new ASFA Partners do not always start producing regular ASFA input immediately, and 3) there is always a period, more or less extended, for input checking and feedback before the Partner becomes self-sufficient.

Conference proceedings (without indexing)

Regarding the amount of information published in the area of aquatic sciences, Ms Beattie (NOAA) asked CSA exactly in what area ASFA was lacking. Mr Emerson (CSA) replied that most of the core journals were covered adequately by ASFA, but there were many selective journals that were not looked at by any ASFA Partner. Also monographs and conference proceedings were often not covered, mainly due to their size, i.e. the large amount of analytics they contained.

As regards monographs, Ms Noble (NMBL) suggested Partners to contact the publishers for complimentary copies, as many publishers would be very happy to provide such copies for indexing in ASFA.

Mr Emerson (CSA) raised for discussion the idea that ASFA Partners consider 'different' inputting procedures, depending on the type of document being processed. For example, he suggested that the individual papers contained in a 'conference proceedings' could be prepared with abstracts, but without

any indexing. In this way, it would take less time to prepare the ASFA input for a conference proceedings, which often contained a very large number of papers.

Mr Pepe (FAO) questioned the validity of this idea, stressing the fact that one of the features contributing to the 'uniqueness' of ASFA was its indexing, i.e. the quality of the database.

Ms Noble (NMBL) remarked that including records on the database without any indexing whatsoever could discriminate against those who use subject descriptor structured searching.

With respect to the coverage of journals with a non-aquatic related title, but containing ASFA relevant articles (e.g. journal of sociology with the occasional articles on fishing communities, or an economics journal with an article on fishery economics etc.), Mr Pepe (FAO) asked CSA how difficult was it to obtain these journals. Mr Emerson (CSA) replied that there was no difficulty in obtaining the publications; the problem was in the time that it would take to index them (even using machine-assisted indexing).

Mr Jorgens (UN-DOALOS) asked whether CSA could extract ASFA related records from their other databases. Ms Noble (NMBL) suggested that it would then be a case of simply adding ASFA Thesaurus terms to records that were already available to CSA.

Mr Emerson (CSA) commented that time was the important factor. The hard part of preparing the ASFA record was the indexing, which requires much time and effort.

Contracting other ASFA Partners to do your input

Mr Pissierssens (IOC) said that IOC contracted another ASFA Partner to do their ASFA input for them, since there were few IOC publications. He suggested that ASFA Partners that carried out little input, due to a limited number of publications, could consider increasing the number of records they produced by taking on extra publications from another Partner.

Mr Pepe (FAO) explained that in some cases, there were logistic problems with the ASFA Partners. Some have just a few publications and consequently a limited type of input to prepare, so their ASFA Scope is very narrow. However, he added that perhaps some ASFA Partners could be paid to do extra work. He asked whether CSA had a list of those journals/monographs which they could supply.

Mr Emerson (CSA) said that this could be possible, but it had to be structured in the right way to allow countability, i.e. the number of records sent out. A tagged flat file could be sent out, with the base record, i.e. citation and abstract, but no full-text would be possible.

Mr Emerson commented that it was fairly easy to collect aquatic sciences articles so as to obtain a 'pool of records', but that it could be difficult to monitor their progress.

Mr Pissierssens (IOC) suggested taking a random 1000 records and identify those ASFA Partners who do less than 100 records/year or those who would be willing to participate in such a trial project.

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) said that at INIDEP there were several marine biologists who would be willing to do indexing for a nominal fee.

The possibility of using the ASFA Trust Fund for a pilot project with 1000 un-indexed records for completion was examined, considering also which ASFA Partners would/could participate.

Some discussion followed regarding the feasibility of this method of carrying out ASFA input and the most effective way of doing so.

Mr Emerson (CSA) pointed out that the records would be prepared by CSA in a 'structured' format. Mr Jorgens (UN-DOALOS) added that if the fields were structured and tagged then a conversion programme might be necessary.

Another question was how the indexing would be done, that is 'would it be possible to use the 'flat' file to add the indexing terms and then send the 'flat' file back to CSA'?

Mr Pissierssens (IOC) suggested a Trust Fund Proposal which would identify how this work could be done and who could/would participate. He added that CSA should participate in setting up the Proposal, determining what needs to be done and how it should be done.

Mr Montes (UNAM) supported the idea of a Trust Fund Proposal to obtain a 'pool' of ASFA Partners to carry out the completion of un-indexed records.

CSA/FAO/IOC agreed to prepare a Trust Fund Proposal, defining what would be required and what would be provided, for a pilot project whereby Input Centres could volunteer to participate. This proposal would be circulated via ASFA Board L.

Indexing using the Subject Categories

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP), commenting on the time required for indexing, noted particular difficulties in selecting/assigning the highly specific 'Subject Categories Codes'. This meant that it took considerable time and effort to carry out the indexing for very large Conference Proceedings. Another Partner commented that assigning the 'Subject Categories Codes' was the least difficult aspect of the indexing.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) said that it was important to maintain the integrity of the database, including the indexing terms which were needed by the users. However, he added his concern regarding the increased number of publications available. He said that the Board needed to consider how to make it easier for the ASFA Partners to keep up with this increased amount of information, thereby providing as much as possible to the users of the ASFA database. He agreed that one of the major problems were Conference Proceedings and the amount of time that it took to complete full ASFA records for them. Mr Haspeslagh suggested that one possible solution to be considered was to do the complete indexing for the Conference monograph record only, and drop the Subject Category Codes for the analytical records (i.e. the individual records presented at the Conference) but enter indexing terms (i.e. the descriptors). Mr Haspeslagh asked CSA if the Subject Category Codes were mandatory for CSA ILLUMINA, i.e. were they used in searching. He added that we should bear in mind that the ASFA print product (i.e. where the Codes are used as section headings) could be out cancelled one day soon.

Mr Emerson (CSA) replied that the Subject Category Code field was a very good field for searching and was very important for the print product, which is still being requested by customers. He added that this field was used to split/divide the ASFA records and referred to the *ASFA Aquaculture Database* which was obtained simply by taking the relevant categories from the *ASFA 1 Biological Sciences & Living Resources Database*.

Ms Soto (CSA) remarked that with practice, and more inputting, ASFA Partners should eventually become familiar with the Subject Category Codes. Ms Wibley (FAO) added that there would be a PowerPoint Presentation on the Fifth Day of the Meeting giving some tips on how to use the CSA ILLUMINA to help identify the Subject Category Codes, and agreed that those Partners, who carried out only a small amount ASFA input infrequently during the year, could find difficulty in becoming familiar with the codes.

The Chair, Ms Beattie (NOAA), noted that no immediate decision was taken as regards dropping the subject category codes, therefore the ASFA input for Conference Proceedings should be continued in the traditional manner, until further decision is taken.

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to consult with Dr Rybinski regarding the feasibility of any eventual modification to the software regarding this field.

8. ASFA PRODUCTS AND SERVICES

8.1. ASFA Journals

Mr Emerson (CSA) affirmed that the ASFA print products are still alive and are very important products, adding that there had actually been an increase in number of requests for them.

8.2. CD-ROM

Mr Emerson (CSA) reported that CSA had carried out much development work on the ASFA CD, taking into account the various suggestions made by ASFA Partners for its improvement. During the intersessional period, a new software was developed which addressed many of the past issues. Mr Emerson informed the Board that the first CD generated from this new software would be available in the fall of 2006. He added that now both DVD and CD-ROM versions were available according to ASFA Partners requirements.

Mr Sainekar (NIO/NICMAS) mentioned that some institutes did not have the software to support DVDs, and asked about simultaneous searching with multiple CDs. Mr Emerson replied that the new software now supported simultaneous searching. See the CSA Report (**Annex-43)** for a full list of the new features.

Mr Pepe (FAO) welcomed this new development regarding the ASFA CD-ROMs and DVDs, and stressed the importance of this product, particularly as regards the LIFDC Project which is an initiative to increase the availability and distribution of the ASFA information products to LIFDCs (Low Income Food Deficit Countries). See *Agenda Item 8.8* for further discussion regarding the LIFDC initiative and also **Annex-48** for more information regarding this project.

8.3. Internet Service

Mr Sainekar (NIO/NICMAS) expressed his appreciation for the excellent job done by CSA in quickly loading onto the ASFA database the batches of ASFA input that are sent to them. However, referring to the last batch of NIO input he sent to CSA, he mentioned that some of the geographic descriptors appearing in the records (when viewed in the ASFA database via CSA ILLUMINA) differed from the descriptors contained in the originally submitted NIO input, and he asked why these terms had been

modified. Ms Soto (CSA) replied that all the geographic descriptors go through an authority checking so as to maintain a certain consistency in the terms, since there are many different ways of entering the same term. She said that CSA were aware that some terms had been incorrectly replaced, by mistake, and **CSA agreed** to correct them.

Mr Pissierssens (IOC) mentioned that some ASFA Partners had difficulties in using CSA ILLUMINA due to fixed IP addresses (e.g. Norway, Tanzania). Ms Soto (CSA) reminded ASFA Partners to send an E-mail to Mr Emerson (cemerson@csa.com) should they have any connection problems.

Ms Prod'homme (IFREMER) reported that the new CSA ILLUMINA interface was appreciated very much by the majority of the French users. However, she highlighted some other functionalities that had been requested by the French ASFA users: 1) addition of other 'sort by' options, such as the TR field which is very important for verifying the input by the ASFA Partners; 2) simultaneous searching by author/editor; 3) the viewing format, e.g, showing the original non-English title; 4) URL address and full-text linking; and 5) provision of examples regarding use of the 'not' operator when combining searches in the 'Search Tips'. For more detailed comments see the IFREMER Report (**Annex-20**).

Ms Lombardi (FAO) informed the Board that the ASFA Secretariat had requested Dr Rybinski to add some additional URL Address fields for the new version of the www-ISIS-ASFA software. This could possibly improve the current problems regarding full text linking mentioned by Ms Prod'homme.

Mr Emerson (CSA) said that IFREMER's suggestions would be passed on to the head of CSA's electronic publishing services, adding that the most requested and/or important functionalities would be dealt with first.

8.4. Document delivery

See Fifth Day *Agenda Item* 1 for discussions related to this topic.

Ms Beattie (NOAA) mentioned Ariel, stating that NOAA were having problems using Ariel, caused by security issues (firewalls), but that their IT people were dealing with it.

8.5. New outputs and services (by CSA)

Mr Emerson (CSA) briefly described the new 'Deep Indexing Project' which is underway at CSA (http://info.csa.com/csaillustrata). The project aims to **index the data appearing in the individual tables and figures that are contained in scientific/academic publications**. He explained that CSA had developed a new process to extract and index the contents of these tables and figures. This new Tables & Figures Index would be ready some time next year (Jan 2007) and would show the figure or table caption with a thumbnail image, and also include descriptors specific to the information given in the figure or table. For further details see the CSA Report (**Annex-43**). Many ASFA Partners showed great interest in this new feature.

Mr Emerson (CSA) added that most publishers were enthusiastic about this new development and noted that it provided a value enhancement for subscribers. He also mentioned that CSA is spending a considerable amount of development money on this.

Mr Kuhnhold (BF) questioned the difference between this new system and linking to full text. Mr Emerson pointed out that this system made the tables and figures searchable and that from these the full text could still be linked.

Mr Kuhnhold (BF) asked if this new service would affect entitlements of ASFA Partners. Mr Emerson (CSA) replied that they would have to consider including this new service in the FAO-CSA Publishing Agreement.

8.6. Public relations activities, marketing (by CSA and Partners)

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) mentioned a marketing letter that scientists at INIDEP had received from CSA, saying that it was much appreciated. Mr Emerson (CSA) explained that this was part of the marketing activities carried out by CSA, whereby a letter was sent to the authors of articles appearing on CSA ILLUMINA saying that they could contact their library for access to their articles on the database. Ms Noble (NMBL) reported that the Director of her Institute had received such an E-mail, but that no particular mention had been given to ASFA. Ms Soto (CSA) explained that these marketing letters were sent regarding one particular database at a time and that the next one would refer to ASFA.

Mr Pepe (FAO) reminded CSA that any marketing material regarding ASFA should always be sent to the ASFA Secretariat as well, for clearing as stated in the Publishing Agreement.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) asked whether it would be possible for authors to be notified as soon as their article goes online. Ms Soto (CSA) replied that this could be quite simply done by setting up an E-mail Alert.

Mr Sainekar (NIO/NICMAS) described his ASFA public relation activities, whereby Research fellows or newly recruited scientists were always given a demonstration of the ASFA database. Such demonstrations are also given at Seminars or Workshops organized in the Institute, as a means of popularizing ASFA amongst the visiting students or professors.

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) mentioned her unsuccessful attempts regarding the promotion of ASFA in Latin America through the Regional FAO Representatives web site and requested the FAO ASFA Secretariat to contact the Regional FAO Office regarding this matter. Mr Pepe (FAO) reported on the Secretariat's action on this, and noted that it could not propose contact names without prior permission.

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) agreed to provide FAO with a list of contact names of the Latin American ASFA Partners who wished to be included in a letter to be sent by the FAO ASFA Secretariat to the FAO Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean. The letter would be a request to FAO Representative's office to include, on their Web site, information regarding the Latin American ASFA Partners.

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to assist in drafting a letter and in sending it to the FAO Representative at the Regional Office.

Mr Pepe (FAO) mentioned that ASFA was promoted within and outside FAO through the ASFA Home Page and reminded ASFA Partners that they could use all the information available there for their individual promotional activities, e.g. to assist in promoting the continuity of ASFA. He also mentioned that within the FAO Fisheries Department, two or three times a year, he sent a reminder to staff on where and how to access and search the ASFA database. In addition, the back-to-office report of ASFA Meetings and Action items were always circulated within the Department as were mention of key events (e.g. the reaching of 1 million records etc.). The project to distribute ASFA to LIFDC countries (see *Agenda Item 8.8*) was also mentioned as an important means of promoting ASFA.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) acknowledged that CSA was making good efforts to promote ASFA, but perhaps the activities were lacking in some aspects. He said that CSA promotes one specific database at a time, concentrating on just the financial/commercial aspects. He asked whether it would be possible to organize promotional activities actually on the premises of an ASFA Partner, covering aspects such as content and searching. The audience would be the users of the database, who could then make pressure on the Directors of their Institutes regarding the importance of participating in ASFA. He continued saying that this could be some sort of 'team-work' dividing the tasks between the 'commercial' aspects and the 'content and value'.

Mr Emerson (CSA) said that using the ASFA Partners premises could be beneficial and mentioned that generally he, or Ms Soto (CSA), went along to promotional activities, although it was not always possible. He mentioned that the sales person from CSA normally dealt directly with the Library manager, rather than the end user, but added that now there is a shift towards the user.

8.7. Entitlements

Ms Goulala (HCMR) questioned the minimum number of records that ASFA Partners have to produce to receive their entitlements. Mr Emerson (CSA) replied that in the last Publishing Agreement the minimum requirement had been removed.

Mr Pepe (FAO) explained that some ASFA Partners have very few publications and these are the only ones for which the Partners prepare input for ASFA. Therefore, their ASFA input is low **not** because they do not wish to do more, but simply because that is all they have to do.

Ms Goulala (HCMR) asked when a new Collaborating Centre joined the ASFA Partnership, how much input was required before they received any entitlements. Mr Pepe (FAO) said theoretically 1 record was sufficient, but stressed the fact that it was important to show **good will** and to monitor **to the best of one's ability and resources**, following the ASFA Guidelines. He referred to the discussions held at the 2005 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting and quoted 'access to CSA ILLUMINA is given even if just 1 ASFA record is produced'.

[Rapporteur's note: the following are clarifications/historical notes, for the record, provided by Mr Pepe (FAO) regarding the issue of the 'free' ASFA entitlements: 1) First, although we sometimes call or refer to the ASFA entitlements as 'free' this is not the correct term. The ASFA Partners are not receiving the products 'free', they are doing ASFA input and the ASFA products are the 'entitlement'; 2) Second, while most of society is based on a 'production-reward based model' (i.e. the more you produce - the more you earn), this model is only partially true for ASFA. While it is true that a Partner, to be eligible to receive the ASFA entitlements, MUST be producing/submitting ASFA records to the Publisher, it is also true that the number of entitlements is NOT in merit or directly proportional to the amount of records produced (i.e. every ASFA Partner receives the same basic ASFA entitlement regardless of the number of input produced and now the collaborating centres are also eligible to receive entitlements without having to reach 250 records – yes, theoretically even for 1 record). The current system of 'same basic entitlements

for all' is based on the assumption that each Partner is operating in good faith (i.e. doing as much input as he/she can). It also assumes that the information needs of all the ASFA Partners are equally important regardless of the Partners ability to pay (i.e. in this case 'to pay' refers to the ability to produce records). Therefore, the present system asserts that a Partner should not be denied access to a product because he/she does not have enough publications to produce a high number of records inputs or does not have sufficient manpower to produce a high number of records. Is this unfair? (I, personally, do not think so). Will Partners take advantage of this arrangement? (We hope not). In any case, there is a mechanism to remove Partners who do NO input at all. Also, it is fairly easy for the FAO ASFA Secretariat, during correspondence and follow-up, to identify those Partners who may be 'taking advantage' of the system. The above is NOT to say that there is no merit in the 'production-reward based model'. Certainly, conditions and circumstances permitting, incentives may/do work, as appears may be the case in the example pointed out in the next paragraph by Mr Sainekar.]

Mr Sainekar (NIO/NICMAS) mentioned the case where one of the Indian Collaborating Centres created a backlog over a period of 2 years due to a continual decrease in their input, 100 records instead of 200. When NIO warned the Centre that if they continued to produce so few records, they would cease receiving the CDs or not have access to CSA ILLUMINA, the following year the Collaborating Centre produced some 350 records.

Mr Emerson (CSA) said that CSA could not, at the moment, provide CDs for **all** active Collaborating Centres, but he added that there was no problem in supplying CDs to those participating in the LIFDC project.

Mr Emerson (CSA) said that CSA made evaluations on a case-by-case basis regarding additional entitlements, and that he could provide support in opening up access to CSA ILLUMINA to those that were in difficult circumstances. Mr Emerson pointed out that there were some limits regarding the number of CDs produced by CSA due to the software license with the CD producer. Mr Pepe (FAO) asked CSA to request more CDs when re-negotiating the software license with the CD producer.

ASFA Partners were reminded to contact Mr Emerson at CSA (cemerson@csa.com) regarding any problems or queries relating to entitlements.

8.8.Increasing distribution of ASFA information products and services

Mr Pepe (FAO) referred to the Eighth Report of the LIFDC Project by Ms Cochrane (FAO consultant) (**Annex-48)** which included details of the various participating institutes, now totalling 58, a 19% increase over last years figures. He noted that INAHINA (Mozambique) joins the 7 other institutions from Ecuador, Indonesia, Morocco, Mauritania, Nigeria, Senegal and Tanzania as previously participating in the project, but who are now ASFA partners. Mr Grainger (FAO) noted that the recruitment of new ASFA Partners is where the success of this project lies.

Mr Pissierssens (IOC) asked about the criteria for adding new institutions to the LIFDC Project, referring in particular to extending coverage to the South American and the Caribbean Region. Mr Pepe (FAO) replied that should any ASFA Partner wish to provide information regarding any institutes that they believe should take part in this initiative, they should contact the FAO ASFA Secretariat (attn. R. Pepe).

Mr Pepe (FAO) noted the difficult Internet connectivity of many of the institutions participating in the project, and again stressed the importance of the CD-ROM medium for ASFA. He re-iterated that **any** information, which ASFA Partners believed to be of relevance to the LIFDC project, should be sent to the FAO ASFA Secretariat, who would then pass it on to Ms Cochrane (FAO), the consultant in charge of the project.

9. PROGRESS WITH MACHINE READABLE INPUT

9.1.DOS-ASFISIS

The DOS-ASFISIS version of the ASFA input software is still being used by only one or two ASFA Partners. The DOS-ASFISIS software is not being updated and it is recommended that **all** ASFA Partners, if they haven't already done so, should update to the latest www-ISIS-ASFA version. The www-ISIS-ASFA software contains improvements/features which improve the quality of input and is under continual development/updating. The FAO ASFA Secretariat informed ASFA Partners to contact the Secretariat should they have any problems regarding change-over to the www-ISIS-ASFA software.

9.2.www-ISIS-ASFA

Mr Pepe (FAO) outlined some of the new features of release 1.1 of the www-ISIS-ASFA software and thanked the ASFA team at the ASFA Secretariat (Luciana Lombardi, Helen Wibley, AnnaMaria

RossiTaddei, and Richard Pepe) and Dr Rybinski for all the work dedicated to this release. He mentioned the new Export utility programme, the new Validation routine (also available in Spanish, and soon in French) and the up-dated Help notes (which also are available in Spanish and French).

Mr Pepe also referred to the Help Desk provided by Dr Rybinski at ICIE (http://www.icie.com,pl/asfa), and the support/assistance provided directly by the ASFA Secretariat (especially Ms Lombardi) regarding various trouble-shooting situations. He reminded ASFA Partners of the www-ISIS-ASFA list of Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) which has now been very much enlarged, revised and edited (and for some items translated into French and/or Spanish). The new FAQ list is on the FAO ASFA Homepage at: ftp://ftp.fao.org/FI/asfa/faq/www-ISIS-ASFA/FAQ.pdf   (and will also be on the ICIE ASFA support homepage http://www.icie.com.pl/asfa/).

Mr Emerson (CSA) while noting that there had been much improvements made to the software remarked that further work should look towards the future. He suggested considering the possibility of using a centralized web server with Partners submitting their ASFA input directly, as this would also facilitate updating frequency. In this way, many different ASFA Partners could also work together. Mr Emerson realized that this would be a big job to carry out but recommended that it should be considered for the future.

Mr Pissierssens (IOC) commented that when considering the future of www-ISIS-ASFA software and the possible use of a centrally-based web software, it would be important to check first with **all** ASFA Partners regarding their Internet connectivity and stability. Also, the maintenance of such a centrally-based server would have to be carefully planned.

Ms Beattie (NOAA) supported the idea of a centralized server and web access, and suggested that since IT support is costly, perhaps the ASFA Trust Fund could be used for maintenance costs.

Mr Grainger (FAO) commented that some appropriate System Developments could already be available at FAO. He referred to FIRMS (Fishery Resources Monitoring System) which was modelled on the ASFA Partnership, whereby there was remote updating by Partners on the state of fish stocks, and suggested that perhaps this technology could be applicable.

Mr Pepe (FAO) noted that the www-ISIS-ASFA software, itself, was already a web based 'inputting platform' (server and clients), although it was not used to feed all the input to one centrally located server. He agreed with Mr Emerson that the development and coordination of a centralized system for submitting input would be big job, but should be investigated.

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to further investigate the possibility of using the www-ISIS-ASFA software on a centralized server for ASFA input and the potentiality of ASFA Partners to take advantage of this (i.e. their broad-band capacity), and also to investigate the utility and feasibility of utilizing the FAO FIRMS technology in the longer term.

Mr Pepe (FAO) mentioned that a new 'Version 2' of the www-ISIS-ASFA software was the next step, and referred to **Annex-58,** which included further changes to ASFA input procedures that required modification to the software. He added that this development would be some time away, and that discussions regarding Version 2 would be held with Dr Rybinski during the Fifth Day of the Meeting. (See **Annex-64** for details of the discussions held).

Mr Pepe (FAO) also reminded ASFA Partners that should they have any feedback and/or suggestions for improvement regarding of the software, any problems encountered or any solutions to problems encountered they should always inform the ASFA Secretariat.

10. REPORT ON ASFA TRAINING ACTIVITIES

Mr Pepe (FAO) reported that the FAO ASFA Secretariat carried out two training sessions at FAO during the intersession (INAHINA and WorldFish Center) and outsourced one training session to UN/DOALOS (NAFO). He referred to the ASFA Trust Fund project proposal that was going to be put forward later on, by the FAO ASFA Secretariat, regarding the 'Training of Trainers' (**Annex- 59**).

Mr Jorgens (NOAA) referred to his report on the training carried out at NAFO (**Annex-5a**). He commented that, initially the trainees had thought that understanding and carrying out the procedures of ASFA input could be possible without the assistance of a trainer. However, during the training they realized that it was not feasible to learn the procedures by just following the various manuals provided, and that a trainer was required. Mr Jorgens believed that the training was successful and congratulated the ASFA Secretariat on the manual for installing the new 'www-ISIS-ASFA 1.1 software release, which in his opinion was excellent and provided simple, step-by-step instructions which were very easy to follow. He also added that a 'Training of Trainers', as proposed by the ASFA Secretariat, would be a very good idea. Mr Pepe (FAO) officially thanked Mr Jorgens for having successfully carried out the training and mentioned that he had received E-mail from the trainees saying how well the training had gone.

Ms Beattie (NOAA) commented on the 'Training of Trainers' ASFA Trust Fund project proposal, saying that she too thought it a very good idea as a means of Capacity Building.

Mr Pissierssens (IOC) asked whether the ASFA Secretariat had some sort of training package that they provided when necessary. Mr Pepe (FAO) replied that the FAO ASFA Secretariat supplied: 1) a very detailed and annotated course Agenda-outline (by R. Pepe); and, 2) a set of input examples (chosen by L. Lombardi) with the ASFA bibliographic data completed (by L. Lombardi and H. Wibley) all to be used during the training.

Ms Lombardi (FAO) explained in some detail the process by which the FAO ASFA Secretariat prepared the input examples/materials for the training courses (e.g. using worksheets containing the different combination of bibliographic levels, and using publications from the country and/or Partner institute). As regards the indexing training, Ms Wibley (FAO) commented that during the training course itself, the trainees were given some theory and shown which tools to use to assist them in the indexing process (i.e. the relevant guidelines, searching on the ASFA database) and how to enter the data in the appropriate fields. Then later, during the feedback provided by the ASFA Secretariat, further detailed editorial comments and explanations were provided regarding the indexing (and abstracting) for each record submitted for checking.

Mr Jorgens (UN-DOALOS) confirmed that the Agenda outline was fine. He thanked the ASFA Secretariat for all assistance given regarding the training, including the well-prepared examples and expressed his appreciation that some of these were prepared from NAFO journals.

11. STATUS OF ASFIS REFERENCE SERIES PUBLICATIONS

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

This publication (or rather the database and/or pick-list contained in the www-ISIS-ASFA software) is commonly referred to as simply 'the Monitoring List'. It lists the **serials** publications (journals, monographic series, report series etc.) which each ASFA Partner has agreed to monitor as input to the ASFA bibliographic database.

Ms Lombardi (FAO) briefly described the 'Monitoring List' and her maintenance of it. She reminded the ASFA Partners that a few years ago 5 new fields were added to the record structure that defined or described each serial title in the database containing the Monitoring List (note: you don't see these 5 new fields in the www-ISIS-ASFA pick-list as they relate to when coverage began, ceased etc.). In any case, the ASFA Secretariat has practically completed the exercise of retroactively entering data in these new fields (a few ASFA Partners had yet to send the required information).

Ms Lombardi (FAO) reminded Partners of the necessity of notifying the FAO ASFA Secretariat (attn: Ms Lombardi) of any changes to the list of serial titles under their monitoring responsibility (e.g. deletion/addition of titles and any changes to title names). On receiving changes from Partners, Ms Lombardi modifies the Master file of the 'Monitoring List' held in FAO. An updated Monitoring List is included in each new release of the www-ISIS-ASFA software, and also from, time to time, Ms Lombardi sends to Partners an updated version of the Monitoring List to replace the outdated list contained in the software. She pointed out that, if a Partner does not notify the ASFA Secretariat as to changes in their Serial titles, they will not find the changes in the updated pick-list, and they will then have the time consuming and error prone task of physically typing in the new/modified titles (and related fields) each time they prepare a record for that serial. She also reminded ASFA Partners that a monthly updated copy of the Monitoring List is made available as a text file on the FAO ASFA FTP site (ftp://ftp.fao.org/FI/asfa/Monitoring_List/

11.2. ASFIS-2, Subject Categories and Scope Descriptions

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to update this publication and/or issue an addendum to incorporate the changes in the topics to be excluded from the scope of ASFA to reflect the discussions held under *Agenda Item 7.1 Subject Scope.*

11.3. ASFIS-3, Guidelines for Bibliographic Description

The FAO ASFA Secretariat mentioned that the simplification rules agreed by the ASFA Board under *Agenda Item 7.5 ASFA Input procedures* would mean a substantial review of this publication. Ms Lombardi (FAO) commented that it would be a fairly complex job, since the document is divided in to 2 parts, the first covering Data input and the second covering Technical aspects. Mr Jorgens (UN-DOALOS) suggested that, after the review was completed, the publication could be first made available on the FAO ASFA web site and then printed at a later date.

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to** revise the publication ASFIS-3, Guidelines for Bibliographic Description to include the modifications to some of the Bibliographic Data Entry rules agreed by the ASFA Board during discussions under *Agenda Item 7.5 ASFA Input procedures,* and also the modifications made in the updated software version 1.1.

11.4.ASFIS-4, Guidelines for Abstracting

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to** revise the publication ASFIS-4, Guidelines for Abstracting, and/or issue an addendum, to include the modifications to use of italics, as agreed by the ASFA Board during discussions under *Agenda Item 7.5 ASFA Input procedures.* The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to circulate via ASFA Board-L a paper regarding the changes to Abstracting procedures.

11.5.ASFIS-5, Guidelines for Indexing

The **ASFA Secretariat agreed to** modify the publication ASFIS-5, Guidelines for Indexing, and/or issue an addendum, with respect to the list of subject areas/topics that Partners should consider outside the subject scope of ASFA, in accordance with the discussions held under *Agenda Item 7.1 Subject Scope.*

11.6.ASFIS-6, Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Thesaurus

Mr Pepe (FAO) recalled the discussion held at the last ASFA Board Meeting regarding the possibility of the UK ASFA Collaborating Centre, Freshwater Biological Association (FBA) maintaining the ASFA Thesaurus, instead of preparing ASFA input as its ASFA responsibility to qualify for an ASFA entitlement. He referred to the FAO AGRIS/AGROVOC Ontology project, and the current status of its activities. He mentioned that they had received EU funding to support the project. See FAO report (**Annex-3**) for more details regarding this project. He informed the ASFA Partners that the full 'Terminology Workbench' tool for maintaining the vocabularies (e.g. the ASFA Thesaurus) within the ontology was not yet ready; however, the FAO ASFA Secretariat had been advised to load the ASFA Thesaurus into the 'Protégé' software and use that for updating the terms.

Mr Pepe referred to the report prepared by FBA concerning ASFA Thesaurus maintenance (**Annex-39a**), which included comments for discussion regarding future procedures and areas of work. FBA reports that they are willing to assist the ASFA Board and ASFA Secretariat to move forward on the maintenance and further development of the ASFA Thesaurus and related tools. They propose that the ASFA Secretariat gathers, screens and sends the terms to the ASFA Thesaurus Committee, who would then make the final decisions and send them to FBA.

The ASFA Board agreed to form a Thesaurus Working Group, composed of FAO, CSA, France, and UK (including FBA).

Mr Pepe added that, during the intersessional period, the ASFA Secretariat prepared 2 draft lists of amended terms/new terms, the first compiled from suggestions sent by ASFA Partners and the second compiled by the ASFA Secretariat by carrying out a review of the FAO Fisheries Glossary. These lists, which include some 200 terms to be incorporated, have been sent to FBA for preliminary analysis. Partners were reminded that any suggestions for new terms to be added to the ASFA Thesaurus should be sent, via E-mail, to the ASFA Secretariat.

Some assessment work has been done and FBA is now ready to tackle the actual maintenance, subject to the ASFA Board's approval, and under their guidance. Ms Noble (NMBL) noted that Mr Pepe had presented all the topics mentioned in the FBA report very well, but that he did not mention Mr Pettman's remarks regarding involvement with the Geographic Authority List, but added that since a Geographic Working Group had been formed to tackle the problem, there was no immediate need for FBA to become involved.

The ASFA Board agreed that FBA could proceed on work regarding maintenance of the ASFA Thesaurus.

Mr Pepe (ASFA Secretariat) pointed out that FBA, although not producing any ASFA input, would still be eligible to receive ASFA entitlements.

Regarding the future of the ontology project at FAO, as also questioned by Mr Pettman in the FBA Report, Mr Pepe (ASFA Secretariat) said that it would eventually involve all vocabularies at FAO. Therefore, once the ASFA Thesaurus is ready, it could be incorporated within the full ontology. He added that the ontology would be useful as a tool for searching the ASFA database and that, it would also be possible to separate the ASFA terms from the full ontology, so as to create a separate 'ASFA-only' ontology. This would probably not be much of an improvement over the existing ASFA Thesaurus for indexing purposes, but retrieval would benefit from some improved relations with respect to the Related Terms. However, Mr Pepe added, this was more 'thinking towards the future' and the immediate task for the Thesaurus Committee was maintaining the ASFA Thesaurus.

Ms Beattie (NOAA) suggested that the Board might consider using the ASFA Trust Fund to hire a consultant, to work together with the Thesaurus Committee.

11.7. ASFIS-7, Geographic Authority List

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) introduced Mr Appeltans (VLIZ), currently involved in the MarBEF (Marine Biodiversity and Ecosystem Functioning) EU Network of Excellence. Mr Appeltans gave a presentation on the VLIZ Marine Gazetteer (VLIMAR), whose main purpose is to provide a visual interface of different geographic, but mainly marine, names.

Currently, the gazetteer lists and provides geographical relations on more than 8000 marine geographic place names. The higher classification of oceans and seas in the gazetteer is based on the chart 'Limits of Oceans and Seas', published by the IHO. VLIMAR integrates all the different place names used in MarBEF. Mr Appeltans (VLIZ) demonstrated how it was possible to search and browse the various datasets of the MarBEF Data System. He mentioned some of the applications of VLIMAR, whereby different datasets, species distributions or sampling campaigns may be linked with geographic entities from the gazetteer. He added that it was also possible to download shapefiles (created at VLIZ) such as those from the IHO Sea Areas and from the FAO fishing Areas and also EEZs.

Mr Appeltans (VLIZ) explained that this system is linked to IMIS (the Integrated Marine Information System used at VLIZ). IMIS is a set of separate, but closely interlinked modules, and aims to provide information on all topics relevant to marine sciences in Flanders (people with their expertise, institutions and their mandate, publications or other literature, research projects, conferences, ...). The literature module is an SQL implementation of the ASFIS format, the format used for preparation of ASFA records, and two of the ASFA authority lists are implemented: the thesaurus and geographic descriptors. (For further information regarding VLIMAR see the homepage on the VLIZ website: http://www.vliz.be/vmdcdata/vlimar/).

Some discussion followed regarding how the VLIMAR interface, or the information it contains, may be applied to ASFA, especially with regards to the Geographic Authority List.

Mr Jorgens (UN-DOALOS) enquired as to which authority was used for the EEZs, mentioning that not everybody has officially declared EEZs. Mr Appeltans replied that the sources were cited from the Official Treaties found on the United Nations web site.

Mr Pepe (FAO) asked whether the VLIMAR interface was similar to that used by FAO/FIGIS, and mentioned that the current problem with the ASFA Geographic Authority List was not so much the eventual GIS software to present it, but rather the authority list behind the terms and the person/structure to maintain it.

Mr Emerson (CSA), having some familiarity with the FAO/FIGIS interface, commented that VLIMAR was more sophisticated with respect to the FIGIS interface, but that it covered only the marine environment. He added that, once the ASFA Geographic Authority List is cleaned up, maintained and controlled, then this sort of implementation would be very useful in the future. He suggested that funds could be allocated for the maintenance of the Geographic Authority List, either at VLIZ or by an external consultant.

Mr Pepe (FAO) asked Mr Emerson whether CSA could develop a Trust Fund proposal regarding maintenance of the Geographic Authority List. Mr Emerson stressed that it was important to separate display issues from the correction of the terms in the list and its maintenance. When asked about what sort of costs would be involved, Mr Emerson said it could be in the region of US $30 000/40 000. He added that various options should be considered, together with some minimum requirements of what the ASFA Partners want.

Mr Kuhnhold (BF) suggested defining what is required, for example how a term would fit into the hierarchy of the Geographic Authority List, making a catalogue of the needs. Mr Appeltans commented that various systems have been developed and already exist, but there is a need for a person to carry out the work.

Mr Pepe (FAO) pointed out that there already was a hierarchy in the ASFA Geographic Authority List, but that not all ASFA Partners conformed to it. He said that there were various aspects to be analysed: the cleaning-up of the geographic descriptor pick-list in the www-ISIS-ASFA software; the use of an external database; use of the Times Atlas; and, use of the Sea Codes.

Mr Kuhnhold (BF) pointed out that an authority was necessary to be able to determine how to enter a geographic term in the correct manner, especially for those in remote areas. Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) commented that just one authority would not be sufficient for all geographic names in order to build a system as coherent and efficient as possible. He suggested that ASFA could build such a system, using the ASFA Trust Fund, and that ASFA could then become an Authority on geographic terms.

Mr Jorgens (UN-DOALOS) commented that during the NAFO training conducted in Canada, many errors had been noted and suggested that perhaps the terms could be cleaned-up by doing sections at a time. Ms Beattie (NOAA) said that perhaps each ASFA Partner could do a small section.

Mr Emerson (CSA) said that there was much variation within the terms contained in the list and stressed that external assistance was necessary, whereby somebody would be paid to maintain the list, with input from ASFA Partners. Mr Haspeslagh and Ms Beattie also stressed the need for one Central Place to carry out such work.

Ms Frohlund (IMR) asked whether the Geographic Descriptor field could be subdivided so that one field would be the Authority File for the general, broader terms and the second would be open, allowing the entry of very specific terms, such as the names of small creeks.

The **ASFA Board agreed** that the most constructive way to proceed would be to form a Geographic Working Group (GWG). The following **ASFA Partners agreed** to be part of the GWG: FAO, CSA, Belgium, IOC, UN/DOALOS, India, Germany, Morocco, Mexico, Tanzania, France, UK, China, with Mr Kuhnhold (BF) being Chairperson. The GWG's discussions would be carried out via E-mail.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) suggested that the GWG should work towards describing a Project Proposal covering the following: 1) cleaning up the current Geographic term pick-list in the www-ISIS-ASFA software; 2) defining a structure for and the management of that list, and how to work with it; 3) having a workable list that is simple and pragmatic; 4) propose a Tender for either an ASFA Partner and/or an external body/institute to implement technical solutions to enable the addition of a Geographic Interface in the future which could be used both to assist in data entry and in searching the database.

The **ASFA Board agreed** that the items suggested by Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) could be used as a 'terms of reference' for the GWG.

11.8. ASFIS-10, Authority List for Corporate Names

This list is contained as a pick-list in the www-ISIS-ASFA software. ASFA Partners should send the names of new Corporate Authors (i.e. those not found in the pick-list) to CSA (vsoto@csa.com) so that they may keep the master Corporate Author list updated. (An updated list was included in the version 1.1 of the www-ISIS-ASFA software.)

11.9. ASFIS-14, ASFISIS (Release-3 User Manual)

This manual is intended for use with the previous **DOS** ASFISIS software. The last version or release of this software was in 1998. The manual is still available on the ASFA Homepage FTP site (ftp://ftp.fao.org/fi/asfa/).

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

This contains the Taxonomic descriptors (i.e. Latin scientific names) that may be used during indexing. The list (approx 10,000 terms) is contained as a pick-list in the www-ISIS-ASFA software to facilitate data entry.

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

This reproduces in printed format the 'Help Notes' for all the fields contained in the www-ISIS-ASFA software. The document constitutes a 'mini input manual' in easy to use printed format which ASFA Partners might find convenient to consult. They are available in English, French and Spanish.

12. EXPANDED LANGUAGE CAPABILITY IN ASFA

Mr Pepe (FAO) referred to the various initiatives taken by the ASFA Secretariat to expand the language capability of ASFA, as listed in the FAO report (**Annex-3,** Section 11). Regarding the www-ISIS-ASFA software version 1.1, he mentioned in particular the inclusion of a Spanish version (in addition to the English version) of the now enlarged 'Validation routine', adding that a French version was to be soon forthcoming. He also mentioned that both the French and Spanish versions of the Help Notes, which are linked to each field in the data entry worksheets, were included with the www-ISIS-ASFA 1.1 upgrade, and that either version could replace the default English version.

13. ASFA TRUST FUND

13.1. Status of the ASFA Trust Fund

The **Balance** of the Trust Fund is **US$ 666 727.** CSA deposited US$ 245 411.00 in royalties for the year 2005. See **Annex-46** for the CSA calculation of the year 2005 royalty payment. **Annex-47** provides a detailed account of the financial status of the ASFA Trust Fund.

Mr Pepe (FAO) mentioned that the royalties were deposited/held in the FAO account on behalf of ASFA Board and that such funds were used for the various Trust Fund Proposals agreed upon by the ASFA Board.

Mr Kuhnhold (BF) noted that the balance has been increasing since the ASFA Trust Fund was initiated, but that there were no records of any accrued interest. Mr Pepe (FAO) explained that this fund, since being held by FAO, did not accrue interest and that this fact was known when the fund was originally established. In compensation, it was noted that there were NO overhead/operating costs charged by FAO (usually 13%) for administering this fund.

Mr Kuhnhold (BF), referring to the fact that there was an increased amount of money available in the Trust Fund, suggested that the Board should intensively think about how to use more of this money to enhance input and quality of ASFA.

Ms Beattie (NOAA) reminded the ASFA Partners that the money in the Trust Fund could and should be used for putting forward Trust Fund Proposals to increase the value of the ASFA database. (see *Agenda Item 13.3.3*).

13.2. Proposals in progress, completed or pending further discussion

13.2.1. Financial support to attend the 2006 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (VLIZ, Belgium, 2006)

*(in progress)*This project refers to **this** year's (2006) Meeting, so the project must be 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 16 ASFA Partners to attend this year's ASFA Board Meeting: CIP, FICen, IFOP, IIP, IMROP, IMS, INIDEP, INP, KMFRI, KORDI, MEI, NIO/NICMAS, NMDIS, SFI, UNAM, and VNIRO.

This is an on-going proposal, and the renewal of this proposal for 2007 is contained in **Annex-50** and discussed and reported under *Agenda Item 13.3.1* (see below).

13.2.2. Staff Support to the ASFA Secretariat (for year Jan-Dec 2006) ($40 000)

*(in progress)*This project is to assist the ASFA Secretariat with its work/initiatives/formation for the collective benefit of the ASFA Partnership. See the document ASFA/2006/63 ASFA Trust Fund Status, Section 2.1.2. **(Annex-47)** for a partial listing of the activities funded under this Trust Fund project.

This is an on-going project proposal. The request for re-confirmation of this proposal for 2007 is contained in **Annex-3a** and discussed under *Agenda Item 13.3.21* (see below).

Ms Beattie thanked the ASFA Secretariat on behalf of the ASFA Board for the outstanding work they carry out and also for all the support received by the ASFA Partners.

13.2.3. Utilization of the ASFA Trust Fund to pay the IAMSLIC Membership fees for ASFA Partners

*(in progress)*Mr Pepe (FAO) reminded ASFA Partners that at the last ASFA Board Meeting (see section 6.7 of the 2005 Board Meeting Report), the initiative had been extended for a further two years and modified to include the ASFA Collaborating Centres. He reported that, to date, this initiative has cost only $480, and urged all the ASFA National Partners to contact their Collaborating Centres to remind them about this initiative.

The Chair, Ms Beattie (NOAA), also emphasized the need for National ASFA Partners to encourage their ASFA Collaborating Centres to join IAMSLIC (or one of the regional bodies) in order to make full use of this resource, especially with regard to document delivery.

13.2.4.(China-NMDIS) Compilation of www-ISIS-ASFA Manuals and Guidelines in Chinese ($10 000)

*(in progress)*This project was agreed by the Board at the 2005 ASFA Board Meeting (see section 13.3.3 and Annex-16a of the 2005 ASFA Board Meeting Report). Mr Pepe (FAO) reported that the project was underway and that the 1st payment had been made. Mr Yang Ying (NMDIS) added that China hoped to complete the project by March 2007.

13.2.5.(Kenya-KMFRI) Elimination of Gaps ($18 200)

*(in progress)*This project was agreed by the Board at the 2005 ASFA Board Meeting (see section 13.3.5 and Annex-26a of the 2005 ASFA Board Meeting Report). Mr Pepe (FAO) reported that the project was underway and that the 1st payment had been made. Mr Macharia (KMFRI) reported that there were 3000 records at various stages of input and that a small batch would be sent to FAO for quality control. The total number was expected to be around 4000. KMFRI hoped to complete the project by the end of the year (2006).

13.2.6.(Russia-VNIRO) Input of Caspian Literature II ($10 270)

*(in progress)*This project was agreed by the Board at the 2005 ASFA Board Meeting (see section 13.3.6 and Annex-32a of the 2005 ASFA Board Meeting Report). Mr Pepe reported that the project was underway and that the 1st payment had been made. Ms Levashova added that a first batch of records from this project had been sent to CSA. The total number of records to be completed for this project would be approximately 700.

13.2.7.(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)*This project was originally put forward/approved during the 2002-2003 intersessional period via ASFA-Board-L. 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.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) reported that the records were ready and fully indexed, but there had been delays due to a compatibility problem between the www-ISIS-ASFA software and the software used at VLIZ. Following discussions with Ms Soto (CSA) the problem appears to have been resolved. Mr Haspeslagh said that VLIZ would now be able to focus on their regular ASFA input and then, by the end of the year they should be able to finalize the project.

13.2.8.ASFA-FIGIS Interaction (development of a map based query facility (GIS) to ASFA) ($20 000)

*(completed)*This project was put forward at the 2001 Meeting and agreed in principle. The status of this Trust Fund proposal is presented at each ASFA Board Meeting (see Annex-47 of 2005 Board Meeting Report and **Annex-51** of this year's Report). Mr Pepe (FAO) added that some technical issues were being worked upon but that the project could now be considered completed.

13.2.9.www-ISIS-ASFA Maintenance Release

(completed) **Released on 11 May 2006.** The ICIE final Report on the work carried out under this proposal was presented at the 2005 Board Meeting and is contained in Annex-50 of the 2005 Board Meeting Report. See also this year's FAO Secretariat Report, **Annex-3**, Section 8.2.1.

Mr Jorgens (UN-DOALOS) thanked the ASFA Secretariat for the magnificent work that had been done in preparing the clear, precise and easily understandable manuals for the updated www-ISIS-ASFA version 1.1.

13.2.10.(EMI, Estonia) Latvian and Lithuanian Aquatic Serials processed for ASFA by ($4 800)

(completed) This project (see Annex-19a of 2005 Board Meeting Report) was submitted by EMI (Estonia) and approved by the Board during the 2004-2005 intersessional period (see E-mail of 07 July 2005). The 555 records are on the ASFA database.

13.2.11. (BF, Germany) Draft Concept for a project Correcting the ASFA Database Descriptor Fields

(cancelled) Mr Kuhnhold (BF) reported that this was the second phase to a previous project, but that due to various technical and personnel problems at BF it should be considered **as cancelled**. He mentioned that some technical problems had delayed the loading of the results from the first phase of the project by CSA. Mr Emerson reported that there had been some IT problems: they had received a file that was corrupted and now required a new one.

Mr Kuhnhold said that should it be possible, and thought appropriate, another Trust Fund Proposal would be forwarded in the future.

13.2.12. (YugNIRO- Ukraine) Translation of ASFA Thesaurus into Russian and development of Russian-English Thesaurus

(pending) This project was 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). FAO administrative problems have rendered the proposal as **pending**. Mr Pepe (FAO) reported that staff changes at YugNIRO's have made it difficult to contact YugNIRO to discuss whether there is still continued interest in carrying out this proposal.

13.2.13. (YugNIRO- Ukraine) Translation of www-ISIS-ASFA 'Help Notes' and front end into Russian

(pending) This project 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 revisions to the various Guidelines for Bibliographic Data Entry, Abstracting, and Indexing.

13.2.14. (YugNIRO- Ukraine) Translation of www-ISIS-ASFA Guidelines into Russian

(pending) This project 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 revisions to the various Guidelines for Bibliographic Data Entry, Abstracting, and Indexing.

13.2.15. (IAMSLIC-ASFA) Aquatic Commons Initiative

(approved in principle) The **ASFA Board approved in principle** this Trust Fund project proposal, pending further clarification and finalization of the project. See **Annex-60** to view the original proposal and the ASFA Partners comments regarding the proposal.

In May 2006, IAMSLIC notified the ASFA Secretariat that the IAMSLIC Executive Board had created an Implementation Task Force, and that they were looking at three proposals for creating the repository: one from Woods Hole, one from IOC, and the original one from FCLA with slight modifications. They said that they would keep the ASFA Secretariat informed.

Mr Pepe (FAO) commented that the original proposal, which had been circulated via ASFA Board-L, had now changed and that further discussion regarding this was to be held on the Fifth Day of the Meeting. (See discussion under *Agenda Item 17*).

13.3. New and/or ongoing Proposals

13.3.1. Financial support to attend ASFA Advisory Board Meetings ($40 000)

(approved) Ongoing project proposal **(Annex-50)**. This proposal is reviewed each year by the Board to update the amount of allocated funds. The FAO ASFA Secretariat proposed an increase to $40 000, and that the Board might consider this as a ceiling for at least the next 2 years, with the hope that should additional funds be required in the future, the other UN Co-sponsoring ASFA Partners could contribute.

Mr Jorgens (UN/DOALOS) pointed out that, although he would try his very best, the UN could not be compelled to commit funds for ASFA.

The **ASFA Board approved** the proposal.

13.3.2. Staff Support to the ASFA Secretariat (for year Jan-Dec 2007) ($50 000)

(approved) Ongoing project proposal **(Annex-3a)**. This proposal is reviewed each year by the Board to update the amount of allocated funds. It aims to assist the ASFA Secretariat in carrying out

work/initiatives that are for the collective benefit of the ever-increasing number of ASFA Partners, as listed in **Annex-3a**.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat proposed an increase in the sum from $40 000 to $50 000, because of overall decreased budget allocations within FAO together with an expanding ASFA Partnership (60 Partners).

The **ASFA Board approved** the proposal.

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

Mr Pepe (FAO) reported that the major part of the funds was used for Items 1, 2 and 3 listed under the activities to be considered within the Terms of Reference of the proposal (**Annex-3a**).

Mr Pissierssens (IOC) requested some clarification regarding Item 5, also listed as one of these activities (Participation in activities/meetings aimed at increasing the Secretariat's expertise and/or experience in areas/issues related to ASFA maintenance and development). Mr Pepe (FAO) explained that the ASFA Secretariat's attendance at some conferences/meetings of relevance and/or important to ASFA was partially in response the 1999 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting recommendation that the ASFA Secretariat: 'monitor trends', and 'keep up to date' on the developments in the information field etc. However, the attendance at such Meetings is often totally or partially funded by the organizers of the Meeting.

Mr Pissierssens (IOC) suggested that the wording in Item 5 be changed to add: 'and also to promote ASFA'. The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to incorporate this modification to Item 5 in the proposal.

13.3.3.(FAO) Setting aside a small part of the ASFA Trust Fund to finance Micro-Projects in ASFA Partner countries related to aquatic information (US $10 000)

(not approved – for reconsideration next year)

Mr Pepe (FAO) introduced this Trust Fund project proposal (see **Annex-55)**. The project proposes that on an experimental basis, a small portion of the ASFA Trust Fund (e.g. $10 000/year) be set aside in order to fund eventual micro-projects ($2000-$5000 each). These projects would preferably involve some information aspect related to the aquatic sector/environment, and would be identified by ASFA Partners. In other words, they would be to the benefit of persons, projects, communities, co-operatives **outside** the ASFA Partner institute, but **within** the Partner's country. Fundamental to this proposal, said Mr Pepe, was the premise that the ASFA Trust Fund was now, and for some time, being underutilized, and this was not acceptable/justifiable for numerous reasons.

Mr Emerson (CSA) commented that this kind of proposal could, instead, be addressed globally through an overall clarification and or adjustment regarding the use and scope of the ASFA Trust Fund.

Mr Pepe (FAO) further explained the idea behind this proposal (again with the premise that the Trust Fund was being underutilized) was both to accomplish 'some good' and, at the same time, to provide a way of promoting and giving visibility to ASFA and to an ASFA Partner within their own institute/country. He commented that ASFA, by 'sponsoring' the dissemination of fishery information to fishing communities, would be promoting itself within the local community or the country in which the micro-project was being conducted. He added that such micro-projects were not a novel idea, but were becoming more common in various international organizations. He re-iterated that this could be done for an experimental 2-year period. Mr Pepe said that this proposal should not be interpreted as intending to change the entire scope of the ASFA Trust Fund spending, but rather as just one small, additional means of utilizing the ASFA Trust Fund.

Mr Pissierssens (IOC) said that perhaps the ASFA Board should dedicate itself to using the Trust Fund money for ASFA and its products. He also expressed the opinion that the Proposal might prove extremely difficult and time consuming to administer as regards the current staffing level of the ASFA Secretariat. He added that the Trust Fund could be used to promote ASFA at a local level, suggesting that ASFA Partners could organize 'ASFA Days', make posters, invite people, or go to fishermen, to demonstrate the information that is available in ASFA. Ms Frohlund (IMR) replied to Mr Pissierssens' last statement saying that the 'spreading of information on fisheries' appeared to be the idea of the micro-projects suggested by this Trust Fund Proposal, and that 'spreading of information on fisheries' was also one of the main objectives of ASFA. She added that such a micro-project could be experimented for a period of 2 years and then perhaps the ASFA Board could review the Trust Fund Proposal criteria.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) suggested changing the criteria for putting forward ASFA Trust Fund Proposals, expanding the current system to enable non-ASFA Partners to be involved, such as IAMSLIC or the ODIN networks. He added that the ASFA Board would still have control in deciding whether to proceed with the proposal, but stressed that it should be directly related to the ASFA database.

Ms Beattie (NOAA) noted that, with this procedure, the ASFA Board would have to do more 'reviewing' of such Trust Fund Proposals and therefore thought it better that an outside body should work together with an ASFA Partner before putting forward an ASFA Trust Fund Proposal.

Mr Jorgens (UN-DOALOS) suggested that the Trust Fund money could be spent wisely by buying some software packages that could assist ASFA in some way, and that it would be best to spend the money in areas in which ASFA has more knowledge.

Ms Beattie (NOAA) suggested the possible use of the Trust Fund money with respect to the creation and/or maintenance of e-repositories.

Ms Noble (PML) commented that there should not be a problem in spending the ASFA money and that the ASFA Board could and should spend the money to help and invest in ASFA.

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) mentioned the difficulty that some ASFA Partners would have within their Institutes regarding spending the money that would be received from an ASFA Trust Fund Proposal. She pointed out that the money would go to the Institute and not necessarily to the ASFA input staff carrying out the work involved. She supported the idea that external associations or NGOs could work together with an ASFA Partner on a Trust Fund Proposal that would be related to ASFA input or promotion activities. This could be experimented for a trial period.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) noted that such local problems within National ASFA Partners' Institutes could be stopping them from making some valid ASFA Trust Fund Proposals. He also added that there may be other types of general management problems for some ASFA Partners, with respect to the fact that there was a limit to the time available to carry out such activities.

Mr Kuhnhold (BF) said that if there was no 'minimum' limit regarding the amount to be spent for an ASFA Trust Fund Proposal, then there was no real need for this particular Trust Fund Proposal, since the money is available and a micro-project could be put forward by any ASFA Partner.

Ms Beattie (NOAA) noted that the only thing that was different with this particular Trust Fund Proposal, was that it broadened the scope to which the ASFA Trust Fund could be applied, and that it was not really necessary for a proposal to set aside money for other proposals, since they could be put forward at any time.

Mr Grainger (FAO) remarked on how many different ideas had been raised as to how the money could be spent and suggested setting this Trust Fund Proposal aside and reconsidering it next year.

The Chair, Ms Beattie (NOAA), summed up the discussions under this item by noting the considerable discussion and debate that this project proposal had generated among the ASFA Partners as regards 'how to spend' the ASFA Trust Fund and 'what it should be spent on'. She recommended that, during the intersessional period, ASFA Partners should reflect on these issues and how to address them, while keeping in mind the dissemination of information and the importance of ASFA. She commended the ASFA Secretariat for putting forward this Trust Fund Proposal which will 'force' partners to think about beneficial ways of spending the Trust Fund money.

The **ASFA Board did not approve** the proposal, but **agreed** to re-consider it at next year's Meeting, in the context of a more general review of the use of the ASFA Trust Fund.

Mr Pepe (FAO) reminded ASFA Partners that there was a 2-page explanation on the FAQ section of the FAO ASFA Home Page regarding ASFA Trust Funds Proposal (www.fao.org/fi/asfa/asfa.asp) - FAQ 6.

13.3.4.(FAO) Mini ASFA Meeting (Regional) (US$ 20 000)

(approved) Mr Pepe (FAO) introduced this Trust Fund project proposal (see **Annex-57)** which would commit $20 000 from the ASFA Trust Fund for the ASFA Secretariat to organize and carry out a mini (regional) ASFA Meeting.

Mr Pepe (FAO) said that the first such Meeting would be in Latin America (as previously proposed at the 2004 and 2005 ASFA Meetings). Subsequent Meetings (and relevant Trust Fund proposals) would be considered for Asia and for Africa if successful. He explained that it was not possible to present an accurate budget for this meeting as the exact location and agenda had not yet been decided. He added that some additional funds would come from FAO and IOC also would contribute.

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

Mr Pissierssens (IOC) mentioned that there would be a problem to commit funding by IOC, unless the dates for the meeting would be after May/June (IOC administrative reasons). He said that IOC could contribute US $5 000, if the proposal could be redefined, including specific financing details.

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) said that this Meeting could be held at INIDEP (Mar del Plata, Argentina) proposing June/July 2007 as tentative dates. She mentioned that the Latin American ASFA Partners had all met to discuss this, and all were of the opinion that it would be very useful for them to have a Mini ASFA Meeting in Latin America.

Ms Beattie (NOAA) commented that it was a good idea and would be a good experiment to do things on a regional basis.

Mr Sow (IMROP) remarked that, although the proposal mentioned 10-12 people, there was no itemizing of the funds. Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) added that there was only a general figure regarding travel, but with no details as to the costs of the logistics.

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) agreed to provide a more detailed cost estimate and agenda for the Meeting, according to the suggestions agreed by the Latin America ASFA Partners, which would also include the tentative list of participants (including the trainees for ODINCARSA Repositories) and the suggested resource persons (M. Montes and L. Lombardi).

 [**Rapporteur's note**: Ms Cosulich submitted a paper to the ASFA Secretariat before the end of the meeting, providing an outline for the Mini ASFA Latin American Staff Meeting. See **Annex-57a**]

Mr Pissierssens (IOC) agreed to consider the provision of some IOC funding, taking into consideration synergies within the ODINCARSA Project.

The **ASFA Board approved** the proposal.

13.3.5. (FAO) Training of Trainers (US $10 000)

 (approved) Mr Pepe (FAO) introduced this Trust Fund project proposal. It proposed that $10 000 be set aside from the ASFA Trust Fund for the 'training of trainers' in ASFA input procedures. The trainers would assist the FAO ASFA Secretariat in the training of ASFA Partners. (See **Annex-59**)

Mr Emerson asked whether this 'training' could not be incorporated into existing money in other on-going FAO Trust Fund Proposals.

Ms Beattie commented that this Trust Fund Proposal was specifically designated for training, and added that this was a very important aspect of Capacity Building.

Mr Peter Pissierssens (IOC) suggested increasing the amount to $20,000 to enable the development of a training package, which would include a video and other training materials that could be given to the trainees to take back with them, as a learning tool.

IOC agreed to provide FAO with some examples of the videos that they have produced.

The **ASFA Board agreed** to increase the amount to $20,000 (so that a video training package could be prepared) and **approved** the proposal.

13.3.6.(FAO) www-ISIS-ASFA - Towards Release-2 (initial study/work/development) $8 750

 (approved) Mr Pepe (FAO) introduced this Trust Fund project proposal. It proposes to set aside $8 750 from the ASFA Trust Fund to continue with the development of the www-ISIS-ASFA software. The 'Release-2' would include some changes that were too big to incorporate into the 1.1 upgrade and some new elements that would be identified by the ASFA Board, CSA, FAO, ICIE. (**See Annex-58**)

Following Mr Jorgen's (UN-DOLAOS) question regarding the amount of money to set aside, Mr Pepe explained that the sum proposed was an estimate calculated according Dr Rybinski's consultancy fees. Mr Jorgens suggested that the Board could agree upon a flexible sum.

The **ASFA Board approved** the proposal in principle and **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to circulate the final cost of the proposal via ASFA Board-L.

13.3.7.(NIGERIA - NIFFR) ASFA Trust Fund proposal filling the missing gap ($8 060)

 (approved in principle) This proposal is to fill some of the missing gaps in the ASFA Database for Nigerian literature and intends to prepare about 700 records. See **Annex-32a.**

Mr Pepe (FAO) reminded ASFA Partners of the criteria that were required before a new ASFA Partner could put forward a Trust Fund project proposal: 1) they should be up-to-date with their current input; and, 2) they should be autonomous/self-sufficient in their input preparation (i.e. sending their ASFA input directly to CSA)

Mr Pepe (FAO) reported that currently the Nigerian input is still being checked by the FAO ASFA Secretariat and/or KMFRI.

Ms Beattie (NOAA) suggested that the ASFA Board approve this Proposal, but that it would only become operative once NIFFR was up to date with its input and was actually sending their ASFA records directly to CSA without any quality control.

Mr Kuhnhold (BF) queried the inclusion of paying for equipment, and Mr Pepe (FAO) said that this was accepted in certain cases, referring to the Ecuador Trust Fund project proposal that was proposed last year and re-formulated this year. Mr Jorgens (UN-DOALOS) questioned the need for a second PC for the carrying out of ASFA input. Ms Lombardi (FAO) explained that often ASFA Partners only had access to 1 PC to carry out their input, which sometimes was shared with other people and often crashed. She added

that many countries had difficulties regarding equipment, and often they required a second PC to be able carry out ASFA input, or extra work, in an efficient manner.

Ms Ovens (ICES) asked whether there was a maximum amount set for the records. Mr Pepe (FAO) replied that the average price per record was US $5. Mr Emerson (CSA) pointed out that when calculating the cost per record, various aspects should be taken into account (such as whether it is necessary to write an abstract, translate one or edit one) and the costs should be specified.

Following Mr Jorgens' (UN-DOALOS) query regarding the records that were involved in the 'missing gaps' of input, Mr Pepe (FAO) explained that the 'missing gaps' existed <u>before</u> NIFFR became members of the ASFA Partnership, and were not due to lack of monitoring on their behalf.

Mr Sow (IMROP) remarked that it was difficult to evaluate the situation if the person putting forward the Trust Fund Proposal was absent and Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) commented that perhaps the person should be present when putting forward a Trust Fund Proposal to be able to judge any contentious aspects. Mr Pepe noted that Mr Ibeun (NIFFR), although he would have fulfilled requirements to receive financial support, had not, to his knowledge, made a request to attend this year's meeting.

Ms Beattie (NOAA) suggested the proposal be approved in principle and that the ASFA Secretariat could renegotiate certain aspects (e.g. the costs and total number of records involved) with NIFFR.

The **ASFA Board approved in principle** the project proposal, which would become operative as soon as NIFFR becomes autonomous regarding ASFA input. The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to contact NIFFR to clarify some points regarding the costs and the number of records. The Trust Fund Proposal would then be circulated to ASFA Partners via ASFA Board-L.

13.3.8.(Russia - PINRO) ASFA Trust Fund Proposal - Input of Barents and Norwegian Seas Literature (US$3 960)

(approved) Ms Levashova (VNIRO) introduced this Trust Fund project proposal (**Annex-35a)**, which aims to fill gaps in the ASFA database, concerning the Russian language literature on Barents and Norwegian Seas for the period 1938-1971, including also some missing literature from the period 1970-2000. A total of 310 records would be added to ASFA database during one year.

She mentioned that by arrangement with the Norwegian ASFA Partner (IMR) the parts of the IMR database ('Russian literature') available in Procite, would be analyzed and put in the ASFA database by PINRO's staff member.

Ms Merkina (PINRO) gave a short PowerPoint Presentation providing some background information to this proposal, referring also to the activities of the 2 Murmansk research institutes involved - PINRO (Institute of Marine Fisheries and Oceanography) and MMBI (Murmansk Marine Biological Institute).

Following Ms Frohlund's (IMR) query regarding the hiring of staff, Ms Levashova explained that the person involved was a staff member already working in PINRO.

The **ASFA Board approved** the proposal.

13.3.9.(INP - Ecuador) Elaboration of the Ecuador database at INP and INOCAR (US$6 000)

Mr Gaibor (INP) introduced this Trust Fund project proposal which requests funds for 2 PCs plus 2 printers to carry out training of staff and also to assist the 2 Ecuador ASFA input centres (INP and INOCAR) in preparing their ASFA records (which includes both current input and any backlog). See **Annex-18a.**

The **ASFA Board approved** the proposal.

13.3.10.(PDII-LIPI - Indonesia) Trust Fund Proposal US $11 000

Mr Pepe (FAO) introduced this Trust Fund project proposal, which dealt with the production of ASFA input and training. He mentioned that certain aspects in the proposal needed to be further clarified, however the fact that the proposal arrived during the Board Meeting had prevented this.

Mr Pepe (FAO) informed the ASFA Board that the ASFA Secretariat was having some difficulty in communicating with the Indonesian ASFA Partner via E-mail. He mentioned the difficulty that the ASFA Secretariat had gone through to get this institute as an ASFA Partner, and added that PDII-LIPI always showed good intentions and that the situation looked promising. Mr Pepe stated that the ASFA Secretariat would like to have the Indonesian ASFA Partner come back to FAO for a second training. In this way, on his return to Indonesia, the PDII-LIPI ASFA inputter himself could carry out the training for the other Indonesian ASFA input centres.

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to discuss the situation further with the Indonesian ASFA Partner.

The **ASFA Board did not approve** the proposal, but was sympathetic towards the idea and **agreed** that it could be re-considered following further training of the Indonesian Partner.

<u>Other discussions regarding use of the ASFA Trust Fund</u>

Mr Ying Yang (NMDIS) asked for information purposes only (i.e. not to be interpreted as a Trust Fund proposal) whether the Trust Fund could be used to fund the carrying out of a Partner's regular ASFA input, under exceptional circumstances. He explained that China produces a vast amount of literature relevant to ASFA, which approximates 4000 records per year. However, the Chinese ASFA Input Centre, NMDIS, can now only cover about half this number. Mr Ying Yang mentioned that NMDIS used to hire retired personnel to carry out ASFA input but this was no longer possible, due to financial problems. It cost around US$ 2-3000 to produce 1000 records. As a consequence, a large backlog of records was building up.

Ms Beattie (NOAA) commented that in principle this could be a valid proposal, since the Chinese ASFA Partner knows that they cannot cover all the literature being produced in their country. Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ), although in agreement, pointed out that some caution should be taken regarding this type of proposal with respect to salary, since other ASFA Partners would perhaps also consider hiring other staff to prepare more input using the Trust Fund. Mr Grainger (FAO) added that this type of proposal could be counterproductive and that it would have to demonstrate that something 'extra' (besides regular input) was being done. Ms Beattie stated that the 2000 records to be submitted in one year constituted, in her opinion, a substantial addition to the database.

As on other occasions, Mr Emerson (CSA) reminded ASFA Partners that should they be having problems covering their serial publications, they should always let CSA know, since CSA could possibly take on the responsibility for some of the publications.

14. OTHER BUSINESS

<u>Regarding continuity in ASFA</u>

Mr Montes (UNAM) brought up the always topical issue of 'the continuity in ASFA' mentioning that many ASFA Partners have, or have had in the past, problems regarding the continuity of the personnel producing input for ASFA. He commented that often there was lack of support or understanding from the Directors of the Partners' institutes as regards ASFA. In order to request, or to obtain support within their institutes with respect to ASFA, he said it was necessary for some sort of official statement from the ASFA Secretariat.

Mr Montes (UNAM) requested the FAO ASFA Secretariat to send a letter, once or twice a year (if required by a Partner) to the Directors of the ASFA Partner institutes thanking them for their Institute's support for ASFA and at the same time reminding the Directors of the ASFA entitlements and of the responsibilities linked to ASFA participation. The idea behind this initiative is to keep interest high in the institute, as regards ASFA Participation, especially when changes in high level staff are foreseen or have occurred.

Mr Sainekar (NIO/NICMAS), agreeing with Mr Montes, added that often when there is a change in Directors within an Institute, they may not be aware of all previous responsibilities. Therefore, he suggested that ASFA Partners should always inform the ASFA Secretariat when they have such a change in higher management.

Mr Pepe (FAO) reported that whenever the ASFA Secretariat had a Duty Travel to, or near to, a country where there was an ASFA Partner, they would always try to pay a courtesy visit in order to promote ASFA. This was appreciated by Partners.

Ms Beattie (NOAA), confirming that this was quite a common problem among the ASFA Partners, suggested that those ASFA Partners requiring some sort of official statement from the ASFA Secretariat should inform the ASFA Secretariat (attention Mr Pepe) of their Director's name and address.

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to provide such a letter when requested.

[**Rapporteur's note:** Ms Cosulich submitted a paper to the ASFA Secretariat before the end of the meeting, providing a brief report of a meeting held between the Latin American ASFA Partners present, in which a request for such a letter was made. See **Annex-78**]

Regarding the announcement by Mr Grainger (FAO) of the retirement, during the next year, of Ms Lombardi (FAO), the Board gave a standing ovation to show their appreciation to Ms Luciana Lombardi (FAO) for her longstanding service in ASFA, her enthusiasm, professionalism and friendship.

Ms Lombardi (FAO) thanked all the ASFA Partners. She mentioned how, during the past many years, the daily contact that she has had with the ASFA Partners in helping them solve their inputting and software problems had made her work extremely interesting, gratifying and pleasant.

15. PLACE AND DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Mr Macharia offered to host the upcoming 2007 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting at KMFRI, Mombassa, Kenya, pending confirmation from his Director and with the dates to be established (probably September 2007).

The ASFA Board agreed to hold the next Meeting at KMFRI and thanked Mr Macharia for KMFRI's offer.

The Board thanked Mr Gaibor (INP) and Ms Ovens (ICES) also for their offers to hold the Meeting.

[**Note from FAO ASFA Secretariat**: the final dates of the 2007 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting are 3-7 September 2007 (5 days)]

16. REVIEW/APPROVAL OF DRAFT REPORT OF MEETING

The Board reviewed and approved the Draft of the 'Items and Actions Agreed' during the Meeting.

The **ASFA Secretariat agreed** to circulate for comments, via ASFA Board-L, the Draft Report of the Meeting, first to the ASFA Partners present at the Meeting and then to the full ASFA Partnership. A draft version of the 'List of action items agreed at the Meeting' would be circulated to all Partners as soon as possible after the close of the Meeting (no later than one or two weeks after the Meeting).

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

17. FIFTH DAY OF ASFA BOARD MEETING

17.1. Institutional archives and topical repositories of grey literature

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) introduced this Agenda Item, using the **topics suggested by the Belgian ASFA-Partner and by the IOC International ASFA Partner** in the E-mail of 2 March 2006, prepared by Mr Haspeslagh and Mr Pissierssens **(Annex-64).**

This document stresses the need for coordination of institutional archives and topical repositories of grey literature, with respect to compliance of supporting technology with OAI protocols, searchability of the metadata and access to the full-text documents. It is proposed that the ASFA records on CSA ILLUMINA for grey-literature references point to the full-text, which would be housed in one repository. Many ASFA Partners actually hold the full-text of the grey-literature documents for which they enter records into the ASFA Database, and they also have online repositories/archives where these documents are accessible. Two methods for linking grey literature documents on CSA ILLUMINA to the full-text, proposed in the document, were put forward to the ASFA Board for discussion. A study would be necessary to map OAI protocol and database requirements to the current ASFA database structure and also to examine the compliance between the 2 systems. At a later stage, work would be required to enable **all** ASFA Partners to build repositories of their grey literature, linked to the ASFA records on CSA ILLUMINA. An ASFA Trust Fund Project could be proposed for some ASFA Partners to receive training in setting up a repository.

Mr Pissierssens (IOC) gave a brief description of the ODINAFRICA Project and mentioned how many of the Marine Libraries involved who were part of the ASFA Partnership, had their own library catalogues and were also involved in developing e-repositories, such as ODIN*Pub*AFRICA and ODINCARSA. He noted how this often meant carrying out the same or similar record processing 3 times, since different methodologies were used for each system/application, and stressed the need for simplification of this work by developing a way to do it all in one go.

Mr Marc Goovaerts (Universiteit Hasselt) demonstrated the ODIN*Pub*AFRICA repository (http://iodeweb1.vliz.be/odin/), which was composed of scientific text documents from the different African partners of the network, put together in a digital format using DSpace, a digital repository system which captures, stores, indexes, preserves, and distributes digital research material. He said that the system was fairly easy to set up, but mentioned some of the difficulties regarding copyright rules. He added that most publishers accepted the fact that versions of the document may eventually go on a repository, but many authors needed convincing regarding copyright, since they could lose the right to publish the document.

Mr Goovaerts (Universiteit Hasselt) referred to the important support given by IOC regarding the training of information managers, giving them some background knowledge of copyright policy which they could take back to their institute and which would assist them in understanding how to set up a repository and why it was so important.

He showed how it was possible to search the documents of the different communities participating in the network. He explained some of the technology and OAI protocols behind the searching, mentioning Dublin Core, which was used to import the document, and 'harvesters' which were used to access the document. He referred to the marine and aquatic science harvester Avano, developed by IFREMER,

which was used to browse archives such as ODIN*Pub*AFRICA, search for information and access the document on the local e-repository of the institute. Metadata was available to assist in the searching and retrieval.

He added that more standards were needed if different e-repositories are to be created, saying that Dublin Core was not sufficient The information was available in different forms, and a rich export function was required in order to be able to put the records from the e-repository onto ASFA or on a Library Catalogue, i.e. to make less work for ASFA Partners.

Following Ms Lombardi's (FAO) question regarding English and non-English titles for Trilingual publications, Mr Goovaerts explained that it would be a simple technical adaptation to make the Title field a repeatable one. He added that according to International Cataloguing Rules, English was always the First title, and the other languages were secondary.

Ms Levashova (VNIRO) asked whether access to the full text involved just grey literature and also queried copyright rules. Mr Goovaerts said that there was more than just grey literature in the repositories and explained that copyright was not so much of a problem if in the full text document there was no reference to the journal, i.e. it was the author's copy of the document.

Mr Pepe (FAO) questioned whether the starting point for the bibliographic record should be ODIN*Pub*AFRICA or ASFA, and asked about compatibility between the www-ISIS-ASFA software (currently being used to prepare ASFA records), e-repositories and library catalogues.

Some discussion followed regarding the various possibilities regarding this topic.

Dr Rybinski (ICIE) referred to the WebAgris system which could integrate Library Modules with www-ISIS-ASFA, so that data did not have to be entered twice. He mentioned use of API software and automatic harvesting, adding that currently XML downloading was not very useful. He suggested the possibility of putting www-ISIS-ASFA on the Internet so that other people could automatically harvest the data. One central data entry point would not be a very good idea, but it could be possible to do 'distributed' data entry using local authority files. However, it was important to take into consideration the fact that not all Input Centres could expose on the web and not all Input Centres had access to Internet.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) welcomed the idea that libraries or Input Centres could put their www-ISIS-ASFA records on the Internet so that they could be harvested.

Dr Rybinski (ICIE) referred to FAOLEX, a www-ISIS application for spreading information on natural resource legislation, and said that the technology was there but needed modification; it was not UNICODE based.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) commented that, if the technology permitted, perhaps it would be possible to link the CSA ILLUMINA record to the ASFA record on the local repositories.

Mr Gajanan (NIO/NICMAS) also asked about linking records on CSA ILLUMINA to local repositories. Mr Emerson (CSA) said that this could be done by using a file containing TRN and AN numbers. Mr Gajanan welcomed this news.

Mr Goovaerts (Universiteit Hasselt) said that it was important to look at different approaches for other software, not just www-ISIS-ASFA, for example how an electronic print could be put into ASFA.

Mr Jorgens (UN-DOALOS) commented that it was important to decide which database would be the major one to use as a starting point, and that this would depend upon the simple or more complex structure involved.

Mr Pissierssens (IOC) referred to how to organize the work so as to make it easier. He suggested that www-ISIS-ASFA was used, integrating a Library Management System, and the records could be flagged and then harvested to ASFA. D-space could be used to manually download the records in XML format. He asked whether this type of solution could be useful.

Mr Macharia (KMFRI) and Ms Nyika (IMS) both said that this would make the work easier, i.e. it would eliminate the double work of processing the same record twice for 2 different systems.

Mr Pissierssens (IOC) suggested that a Working Group be set up to examine the technical feasibilities for such a system and then put forward a Trust Fund Proposal for a pilot project to test it.

Dr Rybinski (ICIE) said that the technical possibilities existed in the software and suggested keeping data entry with www-ISIS-ASFA, and changing or adding interfaces. It would be fairly easy to develop other www-ISIS applications.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) agreed with the idea of starting with an ASFA record which could be exported to other systems, using D-space, but stressed that this simplification of work procedures did not necessarily mean inputting a 'simpler' record, in fact it could result in the need for more complex records to allow for compatibility between different systems.

Mr Goovaerts (Universiteit Hasselt) commented that repositories are being developed more and more and therefore standards are necessary since not all go through the www-ISIS system.

Mr Pepe (FAO) pointed out that, since the ASFA record format is the more complex, it would be more logical to use www-ISIS-ASFA as the starting point, adding that this system should already be OAI compliant, with respect to XML format, or at least very near to being so.

Dr Rybinski (ICIE) confirmed this, saying that OAI did not need so many details and therefore it was possible to go from more complex to simpler.

Mr Goovaerts (Universiteit Hasselt) pointed out that OAI was not only Dublin Core and that there were other metadata formats to be considered.

Dr Rybinski (ICIE) said that www-ISIS-ASFA was not completely compliant with MARC format. However, it is possible to export in AGRIS API XML format.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) remarked that there appeared to be a clear wish to enhance work within the ASFA Partnership to enable ASFA to be used to give access to the full text document of the record. He commented that the current www-ISIS-ASFA software used to create ASFA records would appear to be almost ready to export records to institutional repositories/archives. Dr Rybinski (ICIE) agreed with this, but stressed that some additional XML layout needed to be defined.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) suggested the formation of a working group to define a policy, i.e. come up with a working solution whereby the ASFA Partners/Input centres could produce ASFA records which could then be linked to repositories without creating any conflict. An ASFA Trust Fund proposal could be proposed during the coming intersessional period.

Mr Pepe suggested the Working Group consisted of people with the technical expertise - Dr Rybinski, Mr Goovaerts, CSA, FAO, IOC and AGRIS. Mr Pissierssens (IOC) added that some ASFA Partners should also be involved so as to ensure that functionality aspects were covered, not just technical.

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) stressed the importance of this topic, saying that it was an urgent matter, not just for developing countries, and welcomed the idea of a Trust Fund proposal. Mr Jorgens (UN-DOALOS) also voiced his support for a Working Group which could decide upon a Trust Fund proposal and send it out intersessionally.

Mr Pissierssens (IOC) asked whether the technical issues could be defined by the end of 2006, stressing that time was a very important factor.

Mr Pepe (FAO) remarked that most of the technical issues had already been identified, and therefore it should not be too difficult to put the pieces together. Dr Rybinski (ICIE) and Mr Goovaerts (Universiteit Hasselt) agreed that it would be feasible for them to come up with a solution by the end of the year.

The ASFA Board agreed that a *'Working Group to provide an integrated solution for library cataloguing, ASFA input and e-repositories'* be established. The Working Group would be composed of FAO ASFA Secretariat, AGRIS, CSA, IOC, VLIZ, UN/DOALOS, IFREMER, Tanzania, Chile, Mauritania, Dr Rybinski, and Mr Goovaerts. The Trust Fund Proposal would be circulated via ASFA Board-L intersessionally for voting.

17.2. Comments on ASFA input

Ms Soto (CSA) and Ms Wibley (FAO) gave a PowerPoint Presentation on ASFA input, which identified some persistent problems encountered by CSA and FAO in the input prepared by ASFA Partners and which also gave some tips on how to avoid making them. Some of the new features of the new release of the software, www-ISIS-ASFA v1.1, were highlighted, in particular the new verification checks. These, amongst others, include warning messages regarding the Taxonomic descriptor field, and error messages regarding the Primary and Secondary Classification Codes fields. ASFA Partners were informed that further verification messages were being developed for the next version of the software, Release 2. These would include an error message regarding Abstract length which, when exceeded, creates problems in saving a record. [***Note from FAO ASFA Secretariat****: this problem, and how to solve it, is covered in detail in the paper regarding the changes to Abstracting procedures to be circulated by the FAO ASFA Secretariat via ASFA Board-L. See Agenda Item 11.4. The solution to this problem is also included in the FAQs (Q20) which are available at the following FAO FTP site: ftp://ftp.fao.org/FI/asfa/faq/www-ISIS-ASFA/FAQ.pdf*].

See **Annex-65** for a copy of the PowerPoint Presentation. A copy of this presentation is also viewable on the CSA ASFA Summary Page (www.csa.com/asfa/summary.htm).

17.3. CSA tips on searching/using the ILLUMINA interface

Ms Soto (CSA) gave a presentation on how to use the CSA ILLUMINA interface, explaining the various options available to the users regarding changes to the interface structure/display format. She reminded ASFA Partners of the ASFA Summary Page, which gave details of the contributions by ASFA Partners to

the ASFA Database, both regular input and Trust Fund input. She requested that ASFA Partners periodically checked this page for details as to the status of the latest files that they had sent to CSA.

Some of the questions made by ASFA Partners regarding the CSA ILLUMINA interface are included below.

Mr Gajanan (NIO/NICMAS) questioned the need for the zero in the 5 number code for the Subject Category Code in CSA ILLUMINA (e.g. 01581), since in the www-ISIS-ASFA software it was a 4 number code (without the zero). Ms Soto (CSA) replied that she would pass on this question to the CSA development department to see if the zero was really necessary.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) commented that linking was not always possible, since the URL addresses were often in different fields and he said that E-mail addresses were not always usable. Ms Soto (CSA) said that CSA would investigate, and added that the linking depended upon the data entered in the URL field in www-ISIS-ASFA.

Ms Soto (CSA) told the ASFA Partners that should they come across any problems whilst searching on ILLUMINA, they should click on the 'Support' button and send an E-mail explaining the problem.

Following Mr Gajanan's (NIO/NICMAS) question regarding the addition of URL addresses to 'old' ASFA records already on ILLUMINA, Ms Soto (CSA) said that it would be sufficient to send CSA a table listing the Accession Numbers of the records together with the URL address to be added.

With respect to changes to the ILLUMINA interface, Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) asked whether creating a new, personalized interface could be easily done on anyone's PC, or would they need to have Administrator authority. Ms Soto (CSA) replied that in order to change the account, such changes would have to be done through the Administrator.

See **Annex-66** for a copy of the PowerPoint Presentation. A copy of this presentation is also viewable on the CSA ASFA Summary Page (www.csa.com/asfa/summary.htm).

17.4. Demonstration of www-ISIS-ASFA v1.1

Ms Lombardi (FAO) gave a demonstration of the 'Set Defaults' feature of the www-ISIS-ASFA software, a function which greatly facilitates the preparation of ASFA input for a large number of records containing repetitive data in some fields.

She explained the utility of this feature in <u>automatically</u> entering repetitive data in various fields for a large number of ASFA records, thus saving considering time and effort.

The demonstration was well accepted by the ASFA Partners and Mr Thain Thanh Dhuong (FICen) asked whether description of this 'Set defaults' function could be included in the FAQs on the ASFA Home Page.

Mr Pepe (FAO) replied that this feature was always included as part of the training procedures carried out at FAO. Instructions regarding the Set defaults were also included in the *Guidelines for Bibliographic Description and Data Entry.* He added that the ASFA Secretariat could send out reminders from time to time concerning some key inputting techniques, such as the 'Set defaults'.

Mr Gajanan (NIO/NICMAS) commented that a 'Do's and Don'ts' regarding ASFA inputting procedures could be useful for ASFA Partners. Mr Pepe (FAO) suggested that, in the future, during the Fifth Day of the ASFA Meetings, perhaps some refresher workshops on inputting and/or searching procedures could be organized.

In an aside, Dr Rybinski (ICIE) informed the ASFA Partners that should they use an Internet Browser such as Mozilla Firefox, there is an in-built spell-checker which works well with the www-ISIS-ASFA software.

Mr Jorgens asked about the next version of the www-ISIS-ASFA software, whether it was going to be called version 1.2 or version 2. Mr Pepe (FAO) replied that it would probably be called Version 2, since some structural changes would be made to the software.

The ASFA Board agreed that a Working Group be established to discuss development of the new version 2 of the www-ISIS-ASFA software, taking the document '*Some suggested changes to the ASFA input procedures (and consequential changes to www-ISIS-ASFA software and rules contained in the guidelines for bibliographic description and data entry*' (**Annex-54)** as a preliminary basis upon which to start discussions. The immediate volunteers for the Working Group were: FAO ASFA Secretariat, CSA, IOC, VLIZ, UN/DOALOS, IFREMER, Dr Rybinski, and Mr Goovaerts (who briefly met afterwards, see *Agenda Item 17.5)*

Further members of the www-ISIS-ASFA Working Group would be decided upon via ASFA Board-L, to give the opportunity of those ASFA Partners not present at the Board Meeting to take part if they so wished.

17.5. Report of www-ISIS-ASFA Working Group

A brief summary is given here of the report of the www-ISIS-ASFA Working Group, who met after termination of discussions held during the Fifth Day. See **Annex-67** for the full report of the working group.

Mr Pepe (FAO) introduced the document 'Some suggested changes to the ASFA input procedures (and consequential changes to www-ISIS-ASFA software and rules contained in the guidelines for bibliographic description and data entry' (See **Annex-54**). This document had been previously circulated to CSA and Dr Rybinski and included their comments.

The Working Group examined the suggested changes listed in the document and the decisions made are given below.

Proposal to eliminate the TRN field

The Working Group agreed to this proposal and Dr Rybinski agreed to make the necessary changes to the software, saying that technically there would be no problem.

Addition of further URL address fields

The Working Group agreed to this proposal, and Dr Rybinski agreed to make the necessary changes to the worksheet structure, various formats and any other function related to this issue. The software would include fields for the Article URL, Journal URL, Publisher URL, and a supplementary Information URL, which would link to either data or graphs not included in the publication.

With respect to the automatic data entry following selection of a serial title from the Serial Titles pick-list contained in the software, Ms Lombardi pointed out to Dr Rybinski that the e-ISSN should also be included. Dr Rybinski agreed to rectify this. **[Note from ASFA Secretariat**: This amendment was incorporated in the updated Monitoring List sent to ASFA Partners 16.1.07]

Modify the Imprint field by adding subfields for the Publishers' website (URL address) and E-mail address

The Working Group agreed to this proposal and Dr Rybinski agreed to make the necessary changes to the software so that a Publishers pick-list would be included in the Imprint field, which would be modified so as to contain 2 additional subfields, for the Publisher URL address (website) and Publisher E-mail address.

Addition of codes to the Physical Medium Field

The Working Group agreed that this proposal should be considered pending, since further information/discussion is necessary.

Addition of a new Worksheet - Serial (Bibliographic Level <S>)

CSA said that the present way of cataloguing these types of journals/monographic series should be left as is using the current worksheets, and that there was no need for a new S worksheet.

The Working Group did not agree to this proposal.

The Collective worksheet

The Working Group agreed that the ASFA Partners should be asked via ASFA Board L if they actually needed/used the Collective level worksheet and then a decision would be made regarding the next steps to take concerning any changes to the Collective worksheet with respect to the possibility of describing publications which belong to a 'collection', by adding 2 more bibliographic levels. The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to send an E-mail to ASFA Partners via ASFA Board-L regarding the use of the Collective worksheet.

UNICODE

CSA reported that there were still technical problems concerning this issue.

The Working Group agreed that the ASFA Board should continue working towards the use of Unicode.

Authority Lists (Monitoring List and Corporate Author List)

Dr Rybinski suggested that the ASFA Partners should be able to work with limited parts of the various authority lists, such as the Corporate Author list and Monitoring List, according to country/region. An extraction process would be carried out during the installation procedure of the www-ISIS-ASFA software, i.e. a type of filter, which would leave ONLY each individual ASFA Partner's list in the software.

Ms Lombardi said that this was not feasible for the Corporate Author list. She explained that the 'complete' Corporate Author list was necessary because the ASFA Partners could come across documents having Corporate Authors not just from their countries.

The Working Group agreed that any further discussion regarding the maintenance of the Monitoring List should be continued between FAO ASFA Secretariat and Dr. Rybinski.

The possibility of having a centralized server to maintain these authority files was considered, however the Working Group agreed that, although this could be feasible, it required more thought, and should be considered pending further discussion.

AGENDA

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 2005 MEETING**

   5.1 Matters Arising (from 2005 Meeting

6. **STATUS OF ASFA PARTNERSHIP**

   6.1 Report on the Iintersessional Activities of ASFA Partners

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

   6.1.2 ASFA Partner

   6.1.3 ASFA Publisher (CSA*)*

   6.2 New and Potential ASFA Partners

   6.2.1 Admission of new partner

   6.2.2 Potential partners

   6.2.3 Strategy for future expansion of ASFA Partnership

   6.2.4 Partners dropping out of ASFA

   6.2.5 Partners removed from the system

   6.2.6 Partners in danger of being removed

   6.3 ASFA Partnership Agreement

   6.4 ASFA Publishing Agreement between FAO and CSA

   6.5 Co-operation with WAICENT/AGRIS group

   6.6 FIGIS-ASFA Co-operation

   6.7 ASFA-IAMSLIC group(s) cooperation

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

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

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

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

   7.4 Timeliness... (the time period between when a document is published and its reference appears in ASFA)

   7.5   ASFA Input procedures

8. **ASFA PRODUCTS AND SERVICES**

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

   8.2 CD-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 Document Delivery (include discussion of Ariel and Prospero)

   8.5 New Outputs and Services (by CSA)

   8.6 Public Relations Activities, Marketing (by CSA and Partners)

   8.7 Entitlements (Partner entitlements to ASFA products and services) for info.

   8.8 Increasing Distribution of ASFA Info. Products and Services .f*or info/discussion.*

9. **PROGRESS WITH MACHINE READABLE INPUT**

   9.1 DOS-ASFISIS

   9.2 www-ASFA-ISIS

10. **REPORT ON ASFA TRAIN. ACTIVITIES**

11. **STATUS OF ASFIS REF. SERIES PUB.**

12. **EXPANDED LANGUAGE CAPABILITY IN ASFA**

13. **ASFA TRUST FUND**

   13.1 Status of the Trust Fund

14. OTHER BUSINESS

15. PLACE AND DATE OF NEXT MEETING

16. REVIEW/APPROVAL OF DRAFT REPORT OF MEETING

17. FIFTH DAY .... Special topics, Demonstrations, etc

••

5th DAY MEETING AGENDA (draft)

1. Institutional archives and topical repositories of (mainly) grey literature

- compliance of the supporting technology with OAI-protocols

- searchability of the metadata

- access to the fulltext documents

(discussions to be led by J. Haspeslagh – VLIZ, Belgium ASFA Partner and Peter Pissierssens – IOC, ASFA UN-co-sponsoring Partner)

2. Comments on ASFA Input (persistent problems encountered in Partners input and advice). (Helen Wibley, FAO, and Luciana Lombardi. FAO, and Vicki Soto, CSA)

3. CSA tips on searching/using the ASFA database via the Illumina Internet web interface and efforts to link records from ASFA database to full text in

Partners Repositories. (Craig Emerson, CSA, and Vicki Soto, CSA)

4. Comments/demo/further explanation of new www-ISIS-ASFA release 1.1

(Luciana Lombardi, FAO, and Helen Wibley, FAO, and Richard Pepe, FAO)

5. Miscl.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

UN CO-SPONSORING ASFA PARTNERS

FAO
Dr Richard Grainger
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)
Fishery Information, Data and Statistics Unit (FIDI)
Fisheries Department
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00100, Rome, Italy
Tel: (39) 06 570 54828 / Fax: (39) 06 570 52476
E-mail: richard.grainger@fao.org / URL: http://www.fao.org/fi

Mr Richard Pepe
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)
Fishery Information, Data and Statistics Unit (FIDI)
Fisheries Department
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00100, Rome, Italy
Tel: (39) 06 570 56380 / Fax: (39) 06 570 52476
E-mail: richard.pepe@fao.org / URL: http://www.fao.org/fi

Ms Helen Wibley
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)
Fishery Information, Data and Statistics Unit (FIDI)
Fisheries Department
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00100, Rome, Italy
Tel: (39) 06 570 56331 Fax: (39) 06 570 52476
E-mail: helen.wibley@fao.org / URL: http://www.fao.org/fi

Ms Luciana Lombardi
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)
Fishery Information, Data and Statistics Unit (FIDI)
Fisheries Department
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00100, Rome, Italy
Tel: (39) 06 570 56472 Fax: (39) 06 570 52476
E-mail: luciana.lombardi@fao.org / URL: http://www.fao.org/fi

IOC
Mr Peter Pissierssens
Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission of UNESCO (IOC)
1 rue Miollis
75732 Paris Cedex 15
France
Tel: +33 1 45 68 40 46
Fax: +33 1 45 68 58 12
E-mail: p.pissierssens@unesco.org

UN/DOALOS
Mr Maurice Jorgens
Division for Ocean Affairs and
The Law of The Sea (UN/DOALOS)
Office of Legal Affairs, Room DC2-0428
United Nations
New York, NY 10017, USA
Tel: (1) (212) 963 3968 / Fax: (1) (212) 963 5847
E-mail: jorgens@un.org / doalos-ASFA@un.org
URL: http://www.un.org/Depts/los

INTERNATIONAL ASFA PARTNERS

ICES
Ms Michala Ovens
International Council for the Exploration
of the Sea (ICES)
H. C. Andersens Boulevard 44-46
1553 Copenhagen V, Denmark
Tel. (+45)33 38 67 00/(38 direct) / Fax: (+45) 33 93 42 15
E-mail: michala@ices.dk
URL: http://www.ices.dk

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
URL: http://www.inidep.edu.ar

BELGIUM
Mr Jan Haspeslagh
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 : janh@vliz.be
URL: http://www.vliz.be

Mr Bart Goossens
Research Institute for Nature and Forest (INBO)
Gaverstraat 4
9500 Geraardsbergen
Belgium
Tel. +32 54 43 71 27
info@inbo.be
http://www.inbo.be

CHINA, PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC
Mr Luo Xuye / Mr. Yang Ying
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: lxy@mail.nmdis.gov.ch / yangy@mail.nmdis.gov.cn / asfa@mail.nmdis.gov.cn
URL: http://www.coi.gov.cn

CHILE
 Ms Patricia Muñoz
Instituto de Fomento Pesquero
Sistema de Biblioteca IFOP
Blanco 839, P.O. 8-V
Valparaíso, Chile
Tel: +56 32 2322357 / Fax: +56 32 2322345
E-mail: pmunoz@ifop.cl

CUBA
Ms Marisela Hernandez Ceballos
Centro de Investigaciones Pesqueras (CIP)
Ministerio de la Industria Pesquera (MIP)
5TA, Avenida y 246 Barlovento, Santa Fe'
Cuidada de la Habana, Cuba
Tel: (537) 2098966 / (537) 2097875 / Fax: (537) 20 498 27
E-mail: marisela@cip.telemar.cu
URL: http://www.cubamar.cu/cip/cip.htm

ECUADOR

Mr Nikita Gaibor
Instituto Nacional de Pesca (INP)
Letamendi 102 y La Ria
Guayaquil, Ecuador
Tel. (593-4) 2401773 - 76 - 79 ext 130 / Fax: (593-4) 240 2304
E-mail: ngabor@inp.gov.ec
URL: http://www.inp.gov.ec

ESTONIA

Ms Maria Kalentsits
Estonian Marine Institute of the University of Tartu (MEI)
Library
Maealuse 10A
12618 Tallinn, Estonia
Tel.: +37 26718914 / Fax: +37 26718900
E-mail: maria@phys.sea.ee
URL: http://www.sea.ee

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 /   jacqueline.prodhomme@ifremer.fr
URL: http://www.ifremer.fr / http://www.ifremer,fr/blp

GERMANY

Dr Walther Kühnhold
Bundesforschungsanstalt für Fischerei (BF)
Informations- und Dokumentationsstelle
Palmaille 9
22767 Hamburg, Germany
Tel: +49 40 38905-113 / Fax: +49 40 38905-261
E-mail: walther.kuehnhold@iud.bfa-fisch.de
URL: http://www.bfa-fisch.de

GREECE

Ms Sofia Goulala
Hellenic Centre for Marine Research (HCMR)
Library, Documentation and Information Centre
PO Box 172
19013 AnavyssosAttikis, Greece
Tel: +30 2291076320 / Fax: +30 2291076321
E-mail: sgoulala@ath.hcmr.gr
 URL: http://www.hcmr.gr

INDIA

Mr Gajanan H. Sainekar
National Institute of Oceanography (NIO)
National Information Centre for Marine Sciences (NICMAS)
Library
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
URL: http://www.nio.org

JAPAN

Mr Tabuchi Makoto/ Dr Watanabe Satoshi
Fisheries Research Agency (FRA)
2-12-4 Fukuura, Kanazawa-ku,
Yokohama-shi, Kanagawa 236-8648, Japan
Tel: (81) 45-788-7609 / Fax (81) 45-788-5001
E-mail: tabuchim@affrc.go.jp /
URL http://www.nrifs.affrc.go.jp

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 / asfa@kmfri.co.ke
URL: http://www.kmfn.co.ke

KOREA (Republic of)
Mr Jong-Yup Han
Korea Ocean Research and Development Institute (KORDI)
Ansan P.O. Box 29
Seoul 425-600, Rep. of Korea
Tel: 82 31 4006465 / Fax: 82 31 4090325
E-mail: jyhan@kordi.re.kr
URL: http//library.kordi.re.kr

MAURITANIA
Mr Amady Sow
Institut Mauritanien de Recherches Océanographiques et des pêches (IMROP)
Ministére des Pêches et de l'Economie maritime
BP 22, Nouadhibou
République Islamique de Mauritanie
Tel: 00(222) 574 90 35 / Tel: 00(222) 6 36 06 39 / Tel : 00(222)6411364 / Fax: 00 (222) 574 5081
E-mail tijouceddo@yahoo.fr

MEXICO
Mr Marco Montes
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM)
Edificio Anexo de la Dirección General de Bibliotecas (DGB)
Subdirección de Servicios de Información Especializada
Ciudad Universitaria
Apartado Postal 70-392
México City 04510, México
Tel: (52) 55 5622-3958 ext 107 / 5622-3959 ext 107 / Fax: (52) 55 5616 1436 / (52) 55 5622 4001
E-mail: marco@dgb.unam.mx
URL: http://dgb.unam.mx

MOROCCO
Ms Bouchra Bazi
Centre de Documentation Halieutique
INRH
2,Rue de Tiznit, Casablanca
Morocco
Tél : +212 22 22 02 49/44
Fax : + 212 22 26 69 67
E-mail: bazi@inrh.org.ma / bouchra_79@hotmail.com

POLAND
Ms. Iwona Fey
Sea Fisheries Institute (SFI)
Kollataja Street 1
81-332 Gdynia, Poland
Tel. +48 (0)58 7356 278 (Library) / + 48 (0)58 7356232 (Director)
Fax: +48 (0)58 7356110
E-mail: asfa@mir.gdynia.pl
URL : http://www.mir.gdynia.pl

RUSSIAN FEDERATION
Ms. Sofia Levashova
Russian Federal Research Institute of Fisheries
and Oceanography (VNIRO), Head of ASFA Center
V. Krasnoselskaya17
Moscow, 107140, Russian Federation
Tel: +7 (495) 2640089
E-mail: asfa@vniro.ru
URL: http://www.vniro.ru

Ms Irina Merkina
Polar Research Institute of Marine Fisheries and Oceanography (PINRO)
Head of Library PINRO
6, Knipovich St.,
Murmansk, 183038, Russian Federation
Tel: +7 (8152) 473563
E-mail: merkina@pinro.ru

SWEDEN
Ms Karin Frohlund
Swedish Board of Fisheries
Institute of Marine Research (IMR)
P.O. Box 4
45321 Lysekil, Sweden
Tel: +46 523-187 14 / Fax: +46 523-139 77
E-mail: karin.frohlund@fiskeriverket.se / vidar.oresland@fiskeriverket.se
URL: http://www.fiskeriverket.se

TANZANIA (United Republic of)
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
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
URL: http://www.mba.ac.uk/nmbl

URUGUAY
Ms Andrea Cristiani
Universidad de la Republica, Fac. Vet.
Instituto de Investigaciones Pesqueras
1160 Tomas Basañez St
11300, Montevideo, Uruguay
E-mail: acris@fvet.edu.uy
URL: http://www.pes.fvet.edu.uy

USA
Ms Janice Beattie
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Admin. (NOAA)
Library and Information Services Division
NOAA Central Library (SSMC3, 2nd floor),
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910, USA
E-mail:Janice.Beattie@NOAA.gov
URL:http://www.lib.noaa.gov

VIET NAM
Thai Thanh Duong
Ministry of Fisheries of Viet Nam
Fisheries Informatics Center (FICen)
10 Nguyen Cong Hoan str., Ba Dinh Dist.
Hanoi, Viet Nam
Tel: (84.4) 8343182 / Fax: (84.4) 7.716578
E:Mail: ttam.bts@hn.vnn.vn / duonglongtri@mofi.gov.vn
 URL: http://www.fistenet.gov.vn / http://www.ficen.org.vn

PUBLISHING ASFA PARTNER

CSA

Mr Craig Emerson / Ms Vicki Soto
CSA
7200 Wisconsin Ave.
Bethesda, Maryland 20814, USA
Tel: 1-800-843-7751 / Fax: 1-301 961 6740
E-mail: CEmerson@csa.com / vsoto@csa.com
URL: http://www.csa.com

OBSERVERS

Mr Ward Appeltans
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 : wardappeltans@vliz.be
URL: http://www.vliz.be

Mr Marc Goovaerts
Staff member Information Technology
Universiteit Hasselt
Agoralaan gebouw D
3590 Diepenbeek
Belgium
Tel: + 32 11 26 81 24
E-mail: marc.goovaerts@uhasselt.be

Mr. Henryk Rybinski
Institute for Computer and Information Engineering (ICIE)
ul. Mazowiecka 14,
Warsaw, Poland
E-mail: rybinski@mimuw.edu.pl

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

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

AGRIS/GIL - International Information System for Agricultural Sciences and Technology, General Information and Library

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 fur Fischerei (Germany)

CICH - Centro de Información Científica y Humanística (Mexico)

CIP - Centro di Investigaciones Pesqueras (Cuba)

CNSHB - Centre National des Sciences Halieutiques de Boussoura (Guinea)

CRO - Centre de recherches océanologiques (Côte d'Ivoire)

CSA - Cambridge Scientific Abstracts (ASFA Publisher)

CSIRO - Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization (Australia)

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

DPM - Direction de 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)

FICen - Fisheries Information Center (Viet Nam)

FIDI - Fishery Information, Data and Statistics Unit, 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

IATTC - Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission

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)

IMR - Institute of Marine Research (Sweden)

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)

IOC - Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (Unesco)

IOTC - Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (Seychelles)

IPIMAR - Instituto Portugues de Investigacão 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

MOFR - Marine Oceanographic and Freshwater Resources

MRI - Marine Research Institute (Iceland)

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

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)

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 in 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 Progamme

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

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 2006)

PART-1: RECORD OF DEPOSITS AND BALANCE

1.1 CSA and BF (Germany) Royalty Payments

CSA   **BF (Germany)**

Year	US$	(deposit date)		(deposit date)
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 from BF because BF no longer makes
the ASFA database available commercially to external users).

1.2 BALANCE

• **ALL funds** deposited in Trust Fund to date (**sum** of **all** entries in section 1.1 above	(+)$**1 523 952**.	*($1 278 541)* (last year)
• **COMMITTED funds** (**sum** of **all** committed funds listed under Part 3)	(-)$ 877 670.	*($ 760 320)* (last year)
• **Funds returned to balance unspent** .... (see items 56 and 64 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 (see items: 1, 2, 7, 8 in Part 3). In other cases, the funds have been spent on similar or follow-up activities to the original proposal (see items: 21, 22, 23 23a in Part 3)	(+) $ 22 935.	
• **Overspent** .... (see item item 24 and 57 in Part 3)	(-) $2,490.	
BALANCE (not committed)………………………………….(+) **US$666 727.**		($538 666 (last year)

49

PART-2: TRUST FUND PROJECT PROPOSALS

```
PART-2:
    2.1 Projects IN PROGRESS
    2.2 Projects COMPLETED in Intersessional Period
    2.3 Projects PENDING
    2.4 Projects NEW and ONGOING (in need of review)
```

2.1 Project Proposals IN PROGRESS

2.1.1 Financial support to attend (THIS) 2006 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (VLIZ, Belgium, 2006)

At the 2005 Board Meeting in Rome, the Board allocated $38,500 to support attendance at this year's Meeting in Belgium. The $2 289 unspent from last year was carried over for a total available sum of $40 789.

This proposal remains classified as "in progress" until the participants have returned home from the Meeting and have presented any eventual travel expense claims.

The final total amount disbursed is not available at this writing, because all tickets have not yet been processed and un-expected travel expenses may occur. However, a rough estimate of costs would appear to equal or slightly exceed the allocated amount (as usual, if there is overspending it will be subtracted from the next year's allocation, and if there is underspending it will be carried over to the next year's allotment).

The following 16 ASFA Partners will receive full or partial assistance to attend this year's ASFA Board Meeting: CIP, FICen, IFOP, IIP, IMROP, IMS, INIDEP, INP, KMFRI, KORDI, MEI, NIO/NICMAS, NMDIS, SFI, UNAM, VNIRO.

This is an underline ongoing proposal - so EACH year it requires "updating" with regard to the cost for the following year's allocation. The "Updating" of this proposal for the 2007 Meeting is presented as ASFA/2006/66 and is mentioned under the "New Proposals" section 2.4.1 below. It will be discussed under Agenda item 13.3.)

2.1.2 Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year Jan -Dec 2006) ($40 000)*

This proposal is to assist the FAO ASFA Secretariat with its work/initiatives/formation that is for the collective benefit of the ASFA Partnership. FAO proposed this as an ongoing proposal, which the Board requested be discussed each year before renewal.

*Note, in addition to the $40 000 allotment for 2006, there was also $3 131 carry-over of unspent funds from the previous allocation year(s), therefore the actual sum available during 2006 is $43 131.

So far for the period January - August. 2006, $38 986 has been spent/committed as follow:

- $ 18 700 - assistance in FAO ASFA input preparation 2006 - sub-contract to AdriaMed (underway) ,
- $2 200 - Admin assistance for ASFA Board Meeting (1 month as when employed)
- $7 484. for ASFA information products to LIFDC countries - administration, contacts, (underway)
- $2 400 one extra FAO staff member to attend ASFA Board Meeting (underway)
- $ 816 www-ISIS-ASFA training for NAFO (per-diem for UN-DOALOS) (completed)
- $ 3 478 www-ISIS-ASFA training at FAO for INAHINA (Mozambique) (completed)
- $ 350. to use FAO training room/facilities for training courses ($70/day) (completed)
- $ 780 Coffee breaks at 2005 ASFA Board Meetings (completed)
- $1 500 (approx.) 1 FAO ASFA Staff member to attend IAMSLIC Meeting Oct. 2006 (to be undertaken)
- $1 278 H. Rybinski to attend ASFA Meeting Oct. 2006 (underway)

Unspent funds or overspending will be carried forward or deducted from 2007 allotment.

(This is an underline ongoing proposal which the Board suggested be reconfirmed each year. The reconfirmation of this proposal for 2007 is presented as ASFA/2006/3a and mentioned under the "New Proposals" section 2.4.2 and will be discussed under Agenda item 13.3)

2.1.3 Utilization of the ASFA Trust Fund to pay the IAMSLIC Membership fees for ASFA Partners

At the 2004 ASFA Board Meeting (see section 8.4 of the 2004 ASFA Board Meeting Report), the Board agreed that the ASFA Trust Fund could be utilized to pay the IAMSLIC membership fees for ASFA Partners. At the 2005 ASFA Board Meeting (see section 6.7 of the 2005 Board Meeting Report), the initiative was extended for a further two years and extended to the ASFA Collabortaing Centres. To date, this initiative has cost $380.

2.1.4 (China) Compilation of www-ISIS-ASFA Manuals and Guidelines in Chinese $ 10 000

This proposal was agreed by the Board at the 2005 ASFA Board Meeting (see section 13.3.3 and Annex-16a of the 2005 ASFA Board Meeting Report). The first payment has been made.

2.1.5 (Kenya-KMFRI) Elimination of Gaps $18 200

This proposal was agreed by the Board at the 2005 ASFA Board Meeting (see section 13.3.5 and Annex-26a of the 2005 ASFA Board Meeting Report). The first payment has been made.

2.1.6 (Russia-VNIRO) Input of Caspian Literature II $10 270

This proposal was agreed by the Board at the 2005 ASFA Board Meeting (see section 13.3.6 and Annex-32a of the 2005 ASFA Board Meeting Report). The first payment has been made.

2.1.7 (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

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.

2.1.8 ASFA-FIGIS Interaction (development of a map based query facility (GIS) to ASFA) $20,000

This proposal was put forward at the 2001 Meeting and agreed in principle. At the 2002 Meeting, final consent to proceed with this project was given by the Board (see 2002 Meeting Report, section 13.2.14).

The status of this Trust Fund proposal is presented at each ASFA Board Meeting (see Annex-47 of 2005 Board Meeting Report and ASFA/2006/67 of this year's Report). At the 2005 Meeting, GIS tool, in testing stage, was demonstrated and feed-back was requested on the need for additional GIS layers for the tool. Expenses incurred as of August 2006 amount to the total amount of $20,000 agreed initially.

2.2 Proposals COMPLETED (in Intersessional period 2003-2004)

2.2.1 www-ISIS-ASFA Maintenance Release

Completed and released on 11 May 2006! This project (US$7 900) was agreed by the Board at the 2004 Board Meeting (see Annex-46 of 2004 Board Meeting Report) and given to ICIE of Poland to carry out. FAO increased the funding by $3 700 to accommodate further change not in the original proposal (the extra funding was covered by FAO from funds diverted form its Trust Fund project ("Staff Support to FAO Secretariat"). The ICIE final Report on the work carried out under this proposal was presented at the 2005 Baord Meeting and is contained in Annex-50 of the 2005 Board Meeting Report. See also this year's FAO Secretariat Report ASFA/2006/3, section 8.2.1.

2.2.2 Financial support to attend the 2005 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (Rome, Italy, 2005)

The sum of $35,000 was allocated at the 2004 Meeting to support attendance at the 2005 Board Meeting in Rome. The allocated sum plus the $8 716 unspent from the previous year's allocation brought the total available sum to $43 716.

The final total amount disbursed was $43 674. The excess $2 289 was added to the 2006 allocation.

The following 15 ASFA Partners received full or partial assistance to attend the 2005 Meeting: IMROP, NIFFR, FICen, YugNIRO, NMDIS, NIO/NICMAS, PDII-LIPI, VNIRO, CIP, SFI, UNAM, INIDEP, KMFRI, IIP, and DPM.

2.2.3 Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year Jan -Dec 2005) ($40 000)*

This proposal is to assist the FAO ASFA Secretariat with its work/initiatives/formation that are for the collective benefit of the ASFA Partnership. FAO proposed this as an ongoing proposal, which the Board requested be discussed each year before renewal.

*Note, in addition to the $40 000 allotment for 2005, there was also $2 165 carry-over of unspent funds allocated for 2004 (and previous years), therefore the actual sum available during 2005 was $42 165.

For the period January - December 2005, $39 034 was spent. See item-8, in Part-3 for list of spending.

The unspent US$ 3 131 will be carried forward to the 2006 allotment.

2.2.4 Latvian and Lithuanian Aquatic Serials processed for ASFA by (EMI, Estonia) ($4 800)

This proposal (see Annex-19a of 2005 Board Meeting Report) was submitted by EMI and approved by the Board during the 2004-2005 intersessional period (see E-mail of 07 July 2005). The 555 records are on the ASFA database.

2.3 Project Proposals <u>PENDING</u> (pending further discussion and/or action)

2.3.1 (BF, Germany)-Draft Concept for a project Correcting the ASFA Database Descriptor Fields
(cleaning the identifier field (and further cleaning to a finer level the subject and geographic fields)

It would appear that this proposal should be considered as cancelled - Confirmation from BF.

(Historical background to this proposal) At the 2001 Meeting, this proposal was agreed in principle; the initial proposal sum was for $19,800 subject to further cost calculations. At the 2002 Meeting (see section 13.3.3 and Annex-20a of 2002 Meeting Report) BF re-proposed the project. CSA pointed out problems in replacing the incorrect or unwanted terms for records prior to 1998 with the desired terms, due to the different structure of these records (i.e. the correct terms had to be "appended" to the records – together with the unwanted terms). CSA suggested separating the types of errors and doing a trial run with 100 records. CSA and BF agreed to work together to clarify certain aspects/technical problems related to the exercise, and the proposal would be put forward again after clarification was made.
At the 2004 Meeting (see 2004 Meeting Report, 13.2.3.1), the Board agreed to keep the proposal (€ 30 000) pending until a new price quotation would be circulated by Dr. Kuhnhold (BF) via ASFA-Board-L. The Board was then to confirm the project via ASFA-Board-L.
At the 2003 Meeting (see 2003 Meeting Report, 13.3.3.1) the Board Agreed in principle to this proposal at €30,000, however its implementation is **pending** on the successful outcome of the completed first "cleaning" project which would mean the merging of the "cleaned" BF records into a master CSA database file (see next paragraph).

(For further discussion see under Agenda item 13.2)

2.3.2 (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 ASFA Board Meeting Report). Difficulties on FAO's part, in the initial administrative organization of project has blocked/rendered the proposal as "pending". To verify YugNIRO's continued interest in carrying out this proposal.

2.3.3 (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 release of new software.

2.3.4 (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 release of new software.

2.3.5 (IAMSLIC-ASFA) Aquatic Commons Initiative

The ASFA Board approved this Trust Fund proposal, in principle, pending further clarification and finalization of the project. See **ASFA/2006/76** to view the original proposal and the ASFA Partners comments regarding the proposal.

As to the status of the proposal, in May 2006, IAMSLIC notified the FAO ASFA Secretariat that the IAMSLIC Executive Board had created an Implementation Task Force, and that they were looking at three proposals for creating the repository: 1 from Woods Hole, 1 from IOC, and the original one from FCLA with slight modifications. They will keep us informed.

2.4 <u>NEW</u> PROJECT PROPOSALS AND ONGOING UP FOR RE-APPROVAL 2006-2007

2.4.1 Financial support to attend the ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (for year 2007)

This proposal **(ASFA/2006/66)** is reviewed each year by the Board to update the amount of allocated funds.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat proposes that the sum be increased to $40 000 and frozen at that level for at least the next 2 years. It is envisaged that should additional funds be required to support participation in ASFA Board Meetings, there could be a some contribution from the other UN ASFA co-sponsoring Partners.

(For discussion/approval by Board - Agenda item 13.3)

2.4.2 (FAO) - Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year Jan-Dec 2007) ($50,000)

This proposal **(ASFA/2006/ 3a)** is reviewed each year by the Board to update the amount of allocated funds. The proposal is meant to assist the FAO ASFA Secretariat in carrying out work/initiatives that are for the collective benefit of the ever increasing in number of ASFA Partners.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat proposes an increase of from $40,000 to $50 000

Decreased budget allocations within FAO continue to create a difficult financial situation for the Department/Unit within which the FAO ASFA Secretariat is located. Therefore, the FAO ASFA Secretariat will continue to rely on some of its funding from the ASFA Trust Fund.

(For discussion/approval by Board - Agenda item 13.3)

2.4.3 (FAO) - Setting aside a small part of the ASFA trust fund to finance micro-projects in ASFA partner countries related to aquatic information

The FAO ASFA Secretariat proposes on an experimental basis **(ASFA/2006/71)** that a small portion of the ASFA Trust Fund (e.g. $10 000 - per year) be set aside from the ASFA Trust Fund in order to fund eventual **micro-projects (between $2000 -$5000 each).**

The projects would preferably be related to aquatic information, and would be identified by ASFA Partners. In other words, these micro-projects would be to the benefit of persons, projects, communities, co-operatives **outside** the ASFA Partner institute, but within the Partner's country.

(For discussion/approval by Board - Agenda item 13.3)

2.4.4 (FAO) - Mini ASFA Meeting (Regional) see ASFA/2006/73

The FAO ASFA Secretariat proposes that $20 000 be set aside from the ASFA Trust Fund for the FAO ASFA Secretariat to organize and carry out a mini (regional) ASFA Meeting.

Initially, the first such Meeting would be in Latin America (as mentioned at the 2004 and 2005 ASFA Meetings). Subsequent Meetings (and relevant Trust Fund proposals) would be considered for Asia and for Africa if successful.

At the last few ASFA Board Meetings the idea of organizing mini ASFA (regional) Meetings every 3-4 years was raised/discussed (see Section 6.6 of 2004 ASFA Board Report, and Section 14 of 2005 Board Report) with the idea was that such Meetings would provide a forum to exchange practical experiences and to discuss problems/solutions related to the ASFA input and its special problems (e.g. input procedures, monitoring, coverage., indexing, abstracting etc.) and also to assist some Partners who are often subject to a great deal of staff turnover. The idea was also presented by R. Pepe (FAO) to the 2004 Meeting of IOC/IODE GE-MIM with the idea of obtaining some financial assistance. The GE-MIM group called on IOC to provide assistance.

(For discussion/approval by Board - Agenda item 13.3)

2.4.5 (FAO) - Training of Trainers - see ASFA/2006/75

The FAO ASFA Secretariat proposes that $10 000 be set aside from the ASFA Trust Fund for the "training of trainers" in the ASFA input procedures. The trainers would assist the FAO ASFA Secretariat in the training of ASFA Partners.

(For discussion/approval by Board - Agenda item 13.3)

2.4.6 (FAO) www-ISIS-ASFA –towards Release-2 - see ASFA/2006/74

The FAO ASFA Secretariat proposes to set aside $8 750 from the ASFA Trust Fund to continue with the development of the www-ISIS-ASFA software. The "Release-2 would include some changes that were too big to incorporate into the 1.1 upgrade and new elements that will be identified by the Board, CSA, FAO, ICIE.

(For discussion/approval by Board - Agenda item 13.3)

2.4.7 (NIGERIA – NIFFR) ASFA Trust Fund proposal filling the missing gap ($8 060)

See **ASFA/2006/43a.** The proposal is to fill some of the missing gaps in the ASFA Database for Nigerian literature. The proposal intends to prepare about 700 records.

(For discussion/approval by Board - Agenda item 13.3)

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

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

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

	COMMITTED	DISBURSED	NOTES
1. Financial Support to attend annual (2006) Board Meeting * ($ 38 500 was allocated by the Board for the 2006 Meeting, however there is a carry-over of $2 331 unspent from the previous year's allocation. **Therefore, the TOTAL funds available for the 2006 Meeting = $40 831.** * Note, the $2 331 carry-over is not shown in the "Committed" column ** approx. US$41 000 is being spent (eventual small under/overspending will be balanced against next year's allotment as has been the case in the past).	$38 500*	41 000**	**underway**, sum not available at writing
2. Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year 2006) * ($ 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. **Therefore, the TOTAL funds available for 2006 = $43 131** * Note, the $3 313 carry-over unspent funds is not shown in "Committed" column ** Spendings for 2006 (up to writing of this paper July 2006) : - $ 18 700. assistance in FAO ASFA input preparation 2006 - sub-contract to AdriaMed (underway), - $2 200 – Admin assistance for ASFA Board Meeting (1 month) - $7 484. for ASFA information products to LIFDC countries - administration, contacts, (underway) - $2 400 Lombardi to ASFA Board Meeting - $ 816 www-ISIS-ASFA training for NAFO (per-diem for UN-DOALOS) - $ 3 478 www-ISIS-ASFA training at FAO for INAHINA (Mozambique) - $ 350. to use FAO training room/facilities for training courses ($70/day) - $ 780 Coffee breaks at 2005 ASFA Board Meetings - $ 1 500approx) 1 FAO ASFA Staff member to attend IAMSLIC Meeting October 2006 - $ 1 278 H. Rybinski to attend ASFA Meeting Oct. 2006	$40 000 *	$38 986**	all items are **underway or completed**
3. (China) Compilation of www-ISIS-ASFA Manuals and Guidelines in Chinese	$ 10 000	$3 000	**1st payment made**
4. (Kenya-KMFRI) Elimination of Gaps	$18 200	$5 460	**1st payment made**
5. (Russia-VNIRO) Input of Caspian Literature II	$10 270	$ 3 080	**1st payment made**

2004 - 2005 Intersessional Project Proposals
(proposals put forward and approved during intersession via ASFA-Board-L)

	COMMITTED	DISBURSED	NOTES
6. Estonia –EMI – Latvian and Lithuanian Aquatic Serials processed for ASFA Database	$ 4 800	$ 4 800	**Completed**

2004 Project Proposals (project proposals put forward and approved <u>at the **2004** Board Meeting)</u>

	COMMITTED	DISBURSED	NOTES
7. Financial Support to attend annual (2005) Board Meeting *($ 35 000 was allocated by Board for 2005 Meeting) (with carry-over of $ 8 716 unspent from previous year. The total funds available for 2005 Meeting = **$43 71** * The Balance in the "Committed" column does not include the carry-over of $8,716 unspent for previous 2004 Meeting)	$35 000*	$41 385	**completed,** unspent $2 331 carried over to 2006 Meeting. (43716 - 41385 = $2 331)
8. Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year 2005) *($ 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= **$42 165** * 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 - administration, contacts, including comparative study of new CSA CD-ROM. – (underway) - $14 115. ASFA CD-ROMS for LIFDC project: NISC subscription for 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 preceeding 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 IAMSLIC speakers attending ASFA Board Meeting (Resource sharing and repositories)	$40 000 *	$39 034**	**completed,** unspent $3 131 carried over to 2006 . $42 165 - $39 034 = $3 131
9. (FAO) www-ISIS-ASFA Maintenance Release (upgrade 1.1)	$7 900	$7 900	**completed**
10. (FAO) Utilization of ASFA Trust Fund to pay for ASFA Partners membership fees in ASFA	$380	$380	**on-going**
11. (YugNIRO- Ukraine) Translation of ASFA Thesaurus into Russian and development of Russian-English Thesaurus	$15 000		pending release of version 1.1
(YugNIRO- Ukraine) Translation of www-ISIS-ASFA "Help Notes" and front end into Russian	$2 000		pending release of version 1.1
12. (YugNIRO- Ukraine) Translation of www-ISIS-ASFA Guidelines into Russian	$5 000		pending results of exercise to simplify input rules/procedures
13. (INIDEP - Argentina) Marine Bibliographic Information from Latin America and Caribb. Region ... (1955-1980) 1st Stage: S.A. Chile	$0*		* withdrawn by INIDEP

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)

	COMMITTED	DISBURSED	NOTES

14. Financial Support to attend annual (2004) Board Meeting
 (US$ 30 000 was allocated by Board for 2004) (with carry over of $3 642 from previous years (see below). The total funds available for 2004 = **$33 642**
 * Balance in Committed column does not include the following carry-over :
   a) extra $1 941 unspent for 2003 Meeting, see item-20)
   b) extra $1 030 unspent for 2002 Meeting, see item-22)
   c) extra $ 671 unspent for 2001 Meeting, see item-27)
	$30 000*	$24 926	**completed,** unspent $8,716 ($33,642-$24,926=$8716) is moved to 2005 Meeting allocation, see item-2)

15. Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year 2004)
 *(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 = **$63 685**
 * Balance in "Committed" column does not include the following carry-over :
   a) unspent $852 from unspent Jan-Dec 2003 allocation, see item- 21
   b) unspent $22,200 from unspent Jan-Dec 2002 allocation, see item-23
   c) unspent $9,833 from unspent Jan-Dec 2001 allocation, see item-28
	$30 000*	$65 850**	**completed**, unspent $2,165 ($65,850 - $63,685=$2165) is moved to Year 2005 allocation, see item-3).

d) unspent $800 from unspent Jan-Dec 2000 allocation, see item-35 ** Spending: - $ 6 484 assistance in ASFA input preparation - sub-contract to AdriaMed, - $ 2 500 Input of missed IOTC documents by NIO (completed Nov. 2005) - $10 497 for ASFA information products to LIFDC countries (administration, contacts etc.) - $ 4 000 ASFA CD-ROMS for LIFDC project: subscription - Ovid for 40 CD's - $12 045 ASFA CD-ROMS for LIFDC project: subscription - NISC for 15 CD's, - $ 3 587 www-ISIS-ASFA training for Mauritania (in September), - $ 2 701 www-ISIS-ASFA training for Indonesia (in June), - $ 2 787 www-ISIS-ASFA training & follow-up for Nigeria by KMFRI at KMFRI) (in June 2004) (completed) - $ 2 746 www-ISIS-ASFA training & follow-up for Ecuador by Montes (training completed, follow-up completed 1st 100 records), - $ 3 388 FAO recruitment of Indonesian ASFA Partner - visit to Institute while in region by R.Grainger , - $ 2 854 FAO attendance at IAMSLIC by R.Pepe (in September). **(above is up to June 2004 and reported at 2004 Meeting, below is June- Dec 2004)** - $ 2 250 travel-perdiem Ms Nyika-Tanzania to www-ISIS-ASFA training at KMFRI & follow-up by KMFRI) (12/2004), (follow-up underway) - $ 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), - $ 6 480 assistance in ASFA input preparation - sub-contract to Ms Milone for 700 records (ex-AdriaMed)			
16. (VNIRO – Russia) Input of old unique literature Caspian Sea from 1770-1970	$6 000	$6 000	**completed**
17. UNAM, Mexico – Translate into Spanish the ASFIS Reference (No. 2, ASFIS Subject Categories and Scope Descriptions and No. 3, Guidelines for Bibliographic Description and Data Entry	$7 000	$7 000	**completed**, available on FAO, ASFA FTP site

2002 - 2003 Intersessional Project Proposals (proposals put forward and approved via ASFA-Board-L)

	COMMITTED	DISBURSED	NOTES
18. Collect, sort, input of "historical" bibl. Records (KMFRI)	$15 000	$15 000	**completed**
19. Collect, sort, input of "historical" bibl. Records (VLIZI)	$18 000	$11 000	**underway** 2 payments made

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)

20. www-ISIS-ASFA training for VNIRO Partner		$2 900*	**completed**
21. Translation www-ISIS-ASFA Help Notes into Spanish		$1 500*	**completed**
22. Translation www-ISIS-ASFA Help Notes into French		$1 500*	**completed**
23a Translation of Bibliographic Guidelines into Portuguese	$2 700		in progress? **(lost contact)**

*(using funds ($8 002) unspent from ASFA training workshops, see item-29)

2002 Project Proposals (proposals put forward and approved at 2002 Board Meeting)

	COMMITTED	DISBURSED	NOTES
23. Funding to attend Oct.2002 IAMSLIC Meeting (1 person)	$2 500	$2 790	**completed**, overspent $290.
24. Conversion of 1971 ASFA Journals (NIO)	$8 500	$8 500	**completed**
25. Financial Support to attend annual (2003) Board Meeting	$30 000	$28 059	**completed** (unspent $1 941, moved to 2004 Meeting, see item-9)
26. Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year 2003) $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	**completed** (unspent $852 moved to 2004 year allocation, see item-10)

2001 Project Proposals

	COMMITTED	DISBURSED	NOTES
27. Financial Support to attend annual (2002) Board Meeting	$25,000	$23,969.	**completed** (unspent $1030, moved to 2004 Meeting, allotment
28. Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year 2002) ($8,800 for assistance in ASFA input preparation (sub-contract to AdriaMed)	$30,000	$8,800	**completed** (unspent $22 200 moved 2004 allocation, see item-10)
29. Support to implementation of www-ISIS-ASFA interface (start when software was issued – 10/2002) *(plus additional funds to attend 2002 Board Meeting (see next item 16a)	$10,000*	10,000	**completed**
24a Funds to attend 2002 Board Meeting for Dr Rybinski	$1,500	$1,688	**completed**
30. ASFA-FIGIS Interaction	$20,000	$11 715	**underway**
31. Correction of the ASFA Descriptors fields *(subject to negotiation - this project includes possible extension $5000 – see next item)	$19,800*		pending (subject to negotiation) – cancelled?
Extension of project to other Partners	$5000		pending – cancelled?

2000 Project Proposals

	COMMITTED	DISBURSED	NOTES
32. Financial Support to attend annual (2001) Board Meeting *(extra $4,629 disbursed from unspent 2000 allocation, item-34	$15,000	$18,958*	**completed** (unspent $671, moved to 2003 Meeting allocation, see item-9)
33. Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year 2001) (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	**completed** (unspent $9833 moved to 2004 allocation, see item-10)
34. Workshops for familiarization (training) in ASFA input preparation	$28,800	$20,798	**completed** (unspent $8002 to be spent on future training related to www-ISIS-ASFA, see items 15-17a
35. Support to the Dev. of Web based interface to ASFISIS	$10,000	$10,000	**completed** 10/2002
36. Provision of ASFA Centres in former USSR with translation (ASFIS-2, Subject Categories and Scope Descriptions)	$1,500	$1,500	**completed**
37. Conversion of ASFA Printed Journals into machine readable format (1971-1974). 1973 Conversion	$15,000	$15,000	**completed**
38. Conversion of ASFA Printed Journals into machine readable format (1971-1974). 1972 Conversion	$15,000	$15,000	**completed**

1999 Project Proposals

	COMMITTED	DISBURSED	NOTES
39. Financial Support to attend annual (2000) Board Meeting *(unspent $4,629 moved to support attendance at 2001 Meeting, item-27)	$15,000	$10,371*	**completed**
40. Staff support to ASFA Secretariat (Ms Wibley) (for the period January 2000 -December 2000)	$31,460	$30,660*	**completed** *(unspent $800 transferred to 2004year allocation, see item-10)
41. Improvement of ASFA Database by Germany (BF)	$15,000	$15,000	**completed**
42. Request for training from Kenya (RECOSCIX-WIO)	$3,000	$2,825	**completed**
43. Conversion of ASFA printed journals into machine readable format (1974 volume) by India (NIO)	$15,000	$15,000	**completed**
44. Addition of 45,000 abstracts to 1975-77ASFA database-China	$17,000	$17,000	**completed**
45. Formatting ASFA Thesaurus by Julia Hudson	$2,000	$2,000	**completed**

1998 Project Proposals

	COMMITTED	DISBURSED	NOTES
46. Financial Support to attend annual Board Meeting	$10,000	$12,500*	**completed** *(extra $2500 from unspent 1997 allocation, item-46
47. Staff support to ASFA Secretariat (Ms Wibley) (for the period January 1999 -December 1999)	$25,200	$25,200	**completed**
48. A systems analysis specification for a Windows-based data entry software (ASFISIS/Win) (Dr. DeSmet)	0	0	**cancelled**
49. Extension of ASFA Potential in Lithuania	$2,500	$2,500	**completed**
50. Coverage of Fishery Economics and Related Subjects in ASFA.	$5,000	$5,000	**completed**

1997 Project Proposals

	COMMITTED	DISBURSED	NOTES
51. Financial Support to attend annual Board Meeting	$6,000	$3,500*	**completed** *($2,500 moved to 1998 allocation, item-41)
52. Staff support to ASFA Secretariat (Ms Wibley) (for the period January 1998 -December 1998)	$25,200	$25,200	**completed**
53. Extension of ASFA potential in Ukraine (YugNIRO)	$3,000	$3,000	**completed**
54. Provision of ASFA Centres in former USSR with reference material for input (translations) (YugNIRO)	$3,500	$3,500	**completed**
55. ASFISIS Maintenance (Dr. DeSmet)	$2,000	$1,400*	**completed** *($600 returned to balance due to over budgeting)
56. Training for PIMRIS (travel Mr. Rao) *(disbursed exceeds committed, because for administrative reasons, FAO could not issue the most economic ticket as per original estimate)	$3,000	$5,200*	**completed, overspent $2200.**
57. Convert 500 Records (from PIMRIS database into ASFISIS formatting * (New contract stipulated in 2004 with Ganeshan Rao)	$3,500	$ 3 500	**completed***
58. Analysis of ASFA for Scope and Coverage with eventual recommendations for improvement	$6,500	$6,500	**completed**

1996 Project Proposals

	COMMITTED	DISBURSED	NOTES
59. Manual on ASFISIS software and Data Entry *(funds credited to FAO FIDI budget (because FAO carried out the work)	$6,000	$6,000*	**completed**
60. Logo for ASFA competition	0	0	costed at $2500, but later **cancelled**
61. Statistical Analysis of ASFA Database	0	0	costed at $7000, done at no charge by CSA
62. ASFA User Survey	0	0	**cancelled-never budgeted**

1995 Project Proposals

	COMMITTED	DISBURSED	NOTES
63. Workshops for familiarization with the ASFA input 64. methodology (ASFA Training Session, 3-7 June 1996, FAO)	$34,000	$11,645*	**completed** *(unspent $22,335 returned to Balance)
65. Review of the ASFA Partners Monitoring of Serials for ASFA (follow-up to 1994 review)	$5,000	$5,000	**completed**
66. IOC Study Grant.. ($8,000)	0	0	**cancelled**
67. Chinese proposal sub-project 1, Identification of ASFA information users and suppliers in China	$4,000	$4,000	**completed**
TOTAL	**$877 670** COMMITTED	$764 754 DISBURSED	

(R. Pepe, Aug2006)

_____

The Full text of most of the Trust Fund Proposals cited above 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)

Minutes of Action Items and Decisions
Agreed at ASFA Advisory Board Meeting
(VLIZ, Oostende, Belgium, 4-8 September 2006)

1. **Regarding ASFA Scope, Coverage, Monitoring and Timeliness, Coverage - the inclusion of digital videos as ASFA input.**

NOAA agreed to share their standards for digital videos and photos and also their digital video management system with the ASFA Partners via ASFA Board-L.

2. **Regarding the inclusion of references to Posters (so common at Conferences) in ASFA and how to catalogue them.**

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to request a change to the www-ISIS-ASFA software, so as to add more codes in the Type of Document field, including one to indicate "Posters".

3. **Regarding document ASFA/2006/77 Statement of Coverage** (to be presented at the Ocean Library Workshop of the Second Intergovernmental Review Meeting of the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities (GPA) 16-20 October 2006, Beijing, China)

The **ASFA Board agreed** to adopt the "Statement of Coverage", following modification of the statement to incorporate the changes suggested by Partners (the statement will appear in the final Board Report as an Annex)

4. **Regarding document ASFA/2006/72 Amendment to Subject Scope of ASFA**

The **ASFA Board agreed** that "offensive warfare" was outside the subject scope of ASFA (i.e. not for inclusion in ASFA), and that "surface water" was within the subject scope of ASFA.

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to circulate to Partners, via ASFA-Board-L, an amended list of subject areas/topics that Partners should consider outside the subject scope of ASFA. This List will replace the current list that appears in the Indexing Guidelines when it is next revised.

5. **Regarding Timeliness, when and how ASFA Partners should send their records/files to CSA**

CSA agreed to remind ASFA Partners, via ASFA Board L, of the dates by which ASFA Partners should send their ASFA records to CSA, so as to ensure their inclusion in the current month's uploading of records into the ASFA database on ILLUMINA.
CSA also **agreed** to inform ASFA Partners when they change the uploading frequency from monthly to once every two weeks.

6. **Regarding ASFA Input Procedures**

The **ASFA Board agreed** to establish a "Simplification" Working Group (SWG) to discuss the "simplification" of some of the ASFA input procedures. Those who agreed to take part in the Group were FAO, CSA, India, UK (Chair), France, Sweden.

7. **Regarding document ASFA/2006/69 (List of some ASFA rules contained in the Guidelines for Bibliographic Description and Data Entry which could be simplified or eliminated)**

The **ASFA Board agreed** to endorse the decisions made by the "Simplification" Working Group.

[The following were the decisions recommended by the "Simplification" Working Group:

1.1 Capitalization in English Title field – The SWG **agreed** that the English title could be left as it is in the original document, whether it is all in capitals, title case or not. This would not be mandatory. An ASFA Partner could ignore this and follow the original rule should they wish. There should not be a full stop at the end of the title

1.2 Separating titles in the non-English title field - The SWG **agreed** to leave the original rule as it is, i.e. separate 2 or more non-English titles by a full stop, dash and a space and do not end the last title with a

full stop. However, should only a full stop, or only a dash be used, this would be accepted by CSA (it would not create any problems). There should not be a full stop at the end of the last title.

1.3 No action

1.4 Roman numerals - The SWG **agreed** to abolish the current rule. It was not necessary to change Roman numerals into Arabic. However, ASFA Partners could do so if they wish.

1.5 Italics - The SWG **agreed** to abolish the current rule regarding the use of italics coding for Latin expressions. BUT, the italics coding should still be used for Latin Genus + species names, although this was not necessary for DBO records or non-English abstracts.

1.6 Transliteration of non-Roman alphabets - The SWG **agreed** to use the revised table (Annex 1) for transliterating Ukraine Cyrillic characters.

2 Author name subfield - The SWG **agreed** that ASFA Partners could, should they wish, enter the first names in full as provided in the document, or just as initials.

2.1 Suffixes as part of the author's name - The SWG **agreed** that the suffix should go at the end of the name, but there was no need for a comma or space.

3 Author's address field - The SWG **agreed** to abolish the current rule and that ASFA Partners could type the address as indicated in the document, should they wish.

4.1 Corporate Author in a language other than English- The SWG **agreed** to change the current rule and allow the city to be entered as in the document i.e. in original language.

4.2 Abbreviations in the Corporate Author name - The SWG **agreed** to abolish the current rule and not abbreviate generic words i.e. type in full as in the document.

5.1 Conference name field - The SWG **agreed:** 1) to apply the same rules regarding capitalization in the English title field and that it should not end in a full stop; 2) to abolish the current rule and enter the conference number as it appears in the document; and, 3) to abolish the current rule regarding abbreviation of generic words.

6 Conference date field - The SWG **agreed** in principle to abolish the rule to abbreviate months (FAO will check with www-isis-asfa software regarding field length).

7 Language field - The SWG **agreed** to abolish current rule regarding alphabetical order. ASFA Partners can enter the codes in any order.

8 Document/Report/Patent number field - The SWG **agreed** to abolish the current rules. ASFA Partners can enter Document/Report/Patent number with the punctuation as it appears in the document.

9 Publisher field - The SWG **agreed** to keep the current rule, i.e. not put a full stop at the end of the publisher name, unless the last word is an abbreviation.

10 Date of publication field – pending.

11 Notes field - The SWG **agreed** to maintain the current rule, i.e. each note should end with a full stop

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to compile a complete and detailed list of the rules that were simplified and/or changed (together with explanations, where necessary) and circulate the list via ASFA-Board-L to all ASFA Partners.

8. Regarding the Environmental Regime field in the ASFA record.

It was pointed out that many records did not contain data in this field, and that most of the records in question were prepared by CSA.

CSA agreed that they would check these records and add, where relevant, the missing Environmental Regime code (M, B, F).

9. Regarding ASFA Input Production and the amount of time it takes to index records

CSA mentioned that that they had numerous <u>partially</u> completed ASFA citations in their production cycle (awaiting the indexing) and that they could supply these records to Partners who had the time and capability to carry out the indexing.

IOC suggested an ASFA Trust Fund Proposal (a pilot project of approx. 1000 records) be prepared whereby Partners could apply to complete these records with the required indexing behind a small payment per record.

CSA/FAO/IOC agreed to prepare a Trust Fund Proposal, defining what would be required and what would be provided, for a pilot project whereby Input Centres could volunteer to participate. This proposal would be circulated via ASFA Board L.

10. Regarding the possibility of preparing ASFA records without the inclusion of Subject Category Codes for certain types of publications (e.g. Conference Proceedings).

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to consult with Dr Rybinski regarding any necessary modification to the

software (i.e. changing the error message to a warning message in the verification format), and then ASFA Partners would discuss how to modify indexing procedures via ASFA Board L so that at the next ASFA Board Meeting the simplification of indexing procedures could be discussed.

11. Regarding ASFA Products and Services, Public Relations Activities and Marketing, and the promotion of ASFA in Latin America through the Regional FAO Representatives web site

Ms Cosulich agreed to provide FAO with a list of contact names of the Latin American ASFA Partners who wished to be included in a letter to be sent by the FAO ASFA Secretariat to the FAO Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean. The letter would be a request to FAO Representative's office to include, on their Web site, information regarding the Latin American ASFA Partners.

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to assist in drafting a letter and in sending it to the FAO Representative at the Regional Office.

12. Regarding Document ASFA/2006/68 (Contributions to the ASFA Database by Partners and ASFA Partners Entitlements)

FAO reported that the figures (regarding entitlements) were of last year, since they had only received the updated figures the week before the Meeting.

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to circulate an updated version of this table to ASFA Partners via ASFA Board L.

13. Regarding Progress with machine-readable input, www-ISIS-ASFA the preparation of ASFA input on a centrally-based server

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to further investigate the possibility of using the www-ISIS-ASFA software on a centralized server for ASFA input and the potentiality of the ASFA Partners to take advantage of this (i.e. their broad-band capacity) and also to investigate the possibility of utilizing the FAO FIRMS technology in the longer term.

14. ASFIS-2, Subject Scope Description

Regarding the discussions on the subject scope of ASFA

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to update this publication and to incorporate the changes in the topics to be excluded from the scope of ASFA as mentioned above in item-4.

15. ASFIS-7, Geographic Authority List

Regarding discussions on: how to clean up the terms in the current pick-list that is incorporated in the www-ISIS-ASFA software; how to provide ASFA Partners with a list of geographic names in a standardized hierarchical structure to assist them during ASFA input, and which Authority should be used to develop the list

The **ASFA Board agreed** that the most constructive way to proceed would be to form a Geographic Working Group (GWG). The following **ASFA Partners agreed** to be part of the GWG: FAO, CSA, Belgium, IOC, UN/DOALOS, India, Germany, Morocco, Mexico, Tanzania, France, UK, China, with Walther Kuhnhold being Chairperson. The GWG's discussions would be carried out via E-mail.

Jan Haspeslagh suggested that the GWG should work towards describing a Project Proposal covering the following: 1) cleaning up the current Geographic term pick-list in the www-ISIS-ASFA software; 2) defining a structure for and the management of that list, and how to work with it; 3) having a workable list that is simple and pragmatic; 4) propose a Tender for either an ASFA Partner and/or an external body/institute to implement technical solutions to enable the addition of a Geographic Interface in the future which could be used both to assist in data entry and in searching the database.

The **ASFA Board agreed** that the items suggested by Jan Haspeslagh could be used as a 'terms of reference' for the GWG.

16. Regarding the ASFA Thesaurus

The **ASFA Board agreed** to form a Thesaurus Working Group, composed of FAO, CSA, France, and UK (including FBA).

17. Regarding Document ASFA/2006/55a (ASFA Thesaurus Maintenance Report)

FBA reports that it is willing to assist the ASFA Board and ASFA Secretariat to move forward on the maintenance and further development of the ASFA Thesaurus and related tools. Some assessment work has been done and FBA is now ready to tackle the actual maintenance subject to the ASFA Board's approval.

The **ASFA Board agreed** that FBA could proceed on work regarding maintenance of the ASFA Thesaurus.

18. ASFA Trust Fund, New Project Proposals

Regarding the Trust Fund Proposal Financial support to attend ASFA Advisory Board Meetings (ASFA/2006/66)

The FAO ASFA Secretariat proposes an increase to $40 000**,** and that the Board might consider this as a ceiling for at least the next 2 years, with the hope that should additional funds be required in the future, the other UN Co-sponsoring ASFA Partners could contribute.

The **ASFA Board approved** the proposal.

19. Regarding the Trust Fund Proposal Staff Support To ASFA Secretariat (For January - December 2007) (ASFA/2006/3a)

The FAO ASFA Secretariat proposes an increase in this Trust Fund allocation from $40 000 to $50 000, because of overall decreased budget allocations within FAO together with an expanding ASFA Partnership (59 Partners).

The **ASFA Board approved** the proposal.

20. Regarding the Trust Fund Proposal Setting aside a small part of the ASFA Trust Fund to finance micro- projects in ASFA partner countries related to aquatic information (ASFA/2006/71)

The FAO ASFA Secretariat proposes (on a limited/experimental basis) that a small portion of the ASFA Trust Fund (e.g. $10 000 per year) be set aside from the ASFA Trust Fund to fund eventual micro-projects (between $2000 -$5000 each). The projects would preferably be related to aquatic information, and would be identified by ASFA Partners. In other words, these micro-projects would be to the benefit of persons, projects, communities, co-operatives outside the ASFA Partner institute, but within the Partner's country.

The **ASFA Board did not approve** the proposal, but **agreed** to re-consider it at next year's Meeting, in the context of a more general review of the use of the ASFA Trust Fund.

21. Regarding the Trust Fund Proposal Mini ASFA Meeting (Regional) (ASFA/2006/73)

The FAO ASFA Secretariat proposed $20 000 be set aside from the ASFA Trust Fund for the FAO ASFA Secretariat to organize and carry out a mini (regional) ASFA Meeting.

Initially, the first such Meeting would be in Latin America (as mentioned at the 2004 and 2005 ASFA Meetings). Subsequent Meetings (and relevant Trust Fund proposals) would be considered for Asia and for Africa if successful.

The **ASFA Board approved** the proposal.

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) agreed to provide a more detailed cost estimate and agenda for the Meeting, according to the suggestions agreed by the Latin America ASFA Partners, which would also include the tentative list of participants (including the trainees for ODINCARSA Repositories) and the suggested resource persons (M. Montes and L. Lombardi).

Mr Pissierssens (IOC) agreed to consider the provision of some IOC funding, taking into consideration synergies within the ODINCARSA Project.

22. Regarding the Trust Fund Proposal Training Of Trainers (to assist FAO ASFA Secretariat in training and backstopping ASFA Partners) $ 10 000 (ASFA/2006/75)

The FAO ASFA Secretariat proposes that $10 000 be set aside from the ASFA Trust Fund for the "training of trainers" in the ASFA input procedures. The trainers would assist the FAO ASFA Secretariat in the training of ASFA Partners.

Mr Peter Pissierssens suggested increasing the amount to $20,000 to enable the development of a training package, which would include a video and other training materials/tools that could be given to the trainees to take back with them.

The **ASFA Board agreed** to increase the amount to $20,000 (so that a video training package could be prepared) and **approved** the proposal.

23. Regarding the Trust Fund Proposal www-ISIS-ASFA - Towards Release -2 (initial study/work/development)(ASFA/2006/74)

The FAO ASFA Secretariat proposes to set aside $8 750 from the ASFA Trust Fund to continue with the development of the www-ISIS-ASFA software. The "Release-2 would include some changes that were too big to incorporate into the 1.1 upgrade and new elements that will be identified by the Board, CSA, FAO, and ICIE.

The **ASFA Board approved** the proposal in principle and **FAO agreed** to circulate the final cost of the proposal via ASFA Board-L.

24. Regarding the Trust Fund Proposal Nigeria – NIFFR ASFA trust fund proposal Filling the missing gap approx. 600 records (US $8 060) (ASFA/2006/43a)

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reminded ASFA Partners of the criteria that were required before a new ASFA Partner could put forward a Trust Fund Proposal: 1) they should be up-to-date with their current input; and, 2) they should be autonomous/self-sufficient in their input preparation (i.e. sending their ASFA input directly to CSA). Currently the Nigerian input is still being checked by the FAO ASFA Secretariat and/or KMFRI.

The **ASFA Board approved** the proposal in principle, which would become operative as soon as NIFFR is autonomous. The FAO ASFA Secretariat **agreed** to contact NIFFR to clarify some points regarding the costs and the number of records. The Trust Fund Proposal would then be circulated to ASFA Partners via ASFA Board-L.

25. Regarding the Trust Fund Proposal Input of Barents and Norwegian Seas Literature (US$3 960) (ASFA/2006/48a)

This proposal aims at filling in gap in the ASFA database, concerning the Russian language literature on Barents and Norwegian Seas for the period since 1938 till 1971. A total of 310 records could be added to ASFA database during one year.

The **ASFA Board approved** the proposal.

26. Regarding the Trust Fund Proposal Elaboration of the Ecuador database at INP and INOCAR (US$6 000) (ASFA/2006/26a)

This proposal requests funds for 2 PCs plus 2 printers to carry out training of staff and also to assist the 2 Ecuador ASFA input centres (INP and INOCAR) in preparing their ASFA records.

The **ASFA Board approved** the proposal.

27. Regarding the Indonesia ASFA Trust Fund Proposal ($11, 000) (ASFA/2006/33a)

This proposal deals with the production of ASFA input and training. The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported some difficulty in communicating with the Indonesian ASFA Partner via E-mail. The ASFA Secretariat stated that it would like to have the Indonesian ASFA Partner back to FAO for a second training, so that they would then be prepared to carry out, themselves, the training of other Indonesian ASFA input centres.

The **ASFA Secretariat agreed** to discuss the situation further with the Indonesian Partner.

The **ASFA Board did not approve** the proposal, but was sympathetic towards the idea and **agreed** that it could be re-considered following further training of the Indonesian Partner.

28. Regarding Other Business

Mr Montes (UNAM) requested the FAO ASFA Secretariat to send a letter, once or twice a year (if requested by a Partner) to the Directors of the ASFA Partner institutes thanking them for their Institute's support for ASFA and at the same time reminding the Directors of the ASFA entitlements and of the responsibilities

linked to ASFA participation. The idea behind this initiative is to keep interest high in the institute, as regards ASFA Participation, especially when changes in high level staff are foreseen or have occurred.

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to do this when requested.

29. Regarding Ms Lombardi's retirement

The Board gave a standing ovation to show their appreciation to Ms Luciana Lombardi (FAO) for her longstanding service in ASFA, her enthusiasm, professionalism and friendship, upon learning from Mr R Grainger (FAO) of her retirement next summer.

30. Place and Date of Next Meeting

Mr James Macharia offered to host the upcoming 2007 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting at KMFRI, Mombassa, Kenya, pending confirmation from his Director and with the dates to be established (probably September).

The **ASFA Board agreed** to hold the next Meeting at KMFRI and thanked Mr Macharia for KMFRI's offer.

The Board thanked Mr Gaibor (INP) and Ms Ovens (ICES) for their offers to hold the Meeting.

Decisions Agreed during the Fifth Day

Re: Agenda Item 1

During the discussion on institutional archives and topical repositories, reference was made to the fact that the same information was being entered in 3 different systems (Library Catalogues, ASFA and e-repositories) using 3 different methodologies. There was general consensus that the more logical, and less time consuming way to carry out this work, would be to use just one system, whereby the data would be entered just once, but with the possibility of harvesting and/or exporting in different formats. However, it was noted that such 'simplification' of work did not necessarily mean preparing a 'simpler' record.

Many aspects were covered, including the possible integration of Library modules/management systems within the www-ISIS-ASFA software........ this software has the technical possibilities - the data entry interface could be kept and other interfaces could be changed or added....... It was possible to keep the ASFA record format, which is the most complex, and use it as a starting point to export in other simpler formats. ..... The current software is almost ready to export records to institutional archives..... Some additional XML layout needs to be defined.

There was a clear wish amongst the ASFA Partners to enhance the ASFA input work to enable it to be used to give access to the full text document of the record.

The ASFA Board **agreed** to set up a Working Group to define what is needed to be done and put forward a Trust Fund Proposal for an integrated solution to library cataloguing, ASFA input and e-repositories. The proposal will be presented intersessionally for voting. The Repository Working Group is composed of FAO, AGRIS, CSA, IOC, Belgium, UN/DOALOS, France, Tanzania, Chile, Mauritania, Dr Rybinski and Mr Goovaerts.

Re: Agenda Item 5 Others

The ASFA Board **agreed** to set up a Working Group regarding the development of version 2 of the www-ISIS-ASFA software, taking the items mentioned in document ASFA/2006/70 as a preliminary basis. The members of the working group would by identified via ASFA Board-L, but provisionally include FAO, CSA, UN/DOALOS, India, Kenya, France, and Dr Rybinski.