ASFA Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Abstracts

ASFA ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

Kenya Marine and Fisheries Research Institute (KMFRI), Mombasa, Kenya
3-7 September 2007

SUMMARY REPORT
(including ASFA Partners' Reports)

ASFA ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

Kenya Marine and Fisheries Research Institute (KMFRI), Mombasa, Kenya
3-7 September 2007

SUMMARY REPORT
(including ASFA Partners' Reports)

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS
Rome, 2008

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

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

All rights reserved. Reproduction and dissemination of material in this information product for educational or other non-commercial purposes are authorized without any prior written permission from the copyright holders provided the source is fully acknowledged. Reproduction of material in this information product for resale or other commercial purposes is prohibited without written permission of the copyright holders. Applications for such permission should be addressed to:
Chief
Electronic Publishing Policy and Support Branch
Communication Division
FAO
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy
or by e-mail to:
copyright@fao.org

© FAO 2008

PREFACE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

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

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

FAO.
ASFA Advisory Board Meeting. Kenya Marine and Fisheries Research Institute (KMFRI), Mombasa, Kenya, 3–7 September 2007. Summary Report (including ASFA Partners' Reports).
Rome, FAO. 2008. 67p. Includes a CD-ROM.

In memory of MAURICE JORGENS

Maurice Jorgens, Law of the Sea Officer, *United Nations Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea (UN-DOALOS)* and *Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Abstracts* (ASFA) Board Member suffered a heart failure and died on September 25, 2007. This was a tragedy for his family, for his friends and for the ASFA Partners who knew him.

Maurice was very well liked among the ASFA Partners, all of whom were both shocked and saddened upon learning of his death. He was liked for his wisdom, humour and the happy feeling that he generated when he was around. His interventions at the annual ASFA Advisory Board Meeting were always timely and to the point and, of course, often spiced with just the right amount of humour.

Maurice was employed by the United Nations, Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea, (New York) and its predecessor offices since 1977, but he also served as the ASFA Board Member representing the Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea since 2002. In recent years, in addition to being an ASFA Board Member, he also began to assist the FAO ASFA Secretariat by carrying out ASFA training courses for new ASFA partners in the ASFA input procedures.

We in ASFA shall miss Maurice as no doubt will his colleagues in UN-DOALOS.

I would like to share a few fragments from some of the e-mails that arrived here in the FAO ASFA Secretariat after his death.

From ASFA Partner in France: *I am very sad to hear of the passing of Maurice. He was a wonderful ASFA partner but also a good friend, always a good humour, friendship, kindness; Maurice liked the good things of the life and we will miss Maurice. We had with Maurice many beautiful memories of Cuba, Oostende!!!!!! Please pass my condolences to his family.*

From ASFA Partner in Russian Federation: *I mourn over Maurice together with all. I placed much value on his friendship with me. He was very interesting and versatile man ...*

From ASFA Partner in Canada: *Last year, Maurice Jorgens came to the NAFO Secretariat to provide us with ASFA training. We came to know Maurice as a kind person who enjoyed the good sides of life. I speak for all colleagues in the NAFO Secretariat in saying that we are very sad to hear of his passing (so premature) and that our thoughts are with his family and friends!... .*

From ASFA Partner in Morocco: *I was deeply touched by the passing away of our colleague and friend Maurice. I can't find the words to express my feelings of sorrow. I will keep of him forever an image of a man of an extreme kindness and devoted to his entourage. I present my sincere condolences at all of the team of ASFA and the family of Maurice on behalf of all the personnel of the INRH and my name..*

From ASFA Partner in Kenya: *It's sad to hear of the passing of Maurice... .*

From ASFA Publisher: *I am so sad to hear of the passing of Maurice. He was a wonderful ASFA partner but more, he was a good friend - we will miss him....*

From the FAO ASFA Secretariat: *Like you [UN-DOALOS], we (the FAO ASFA Secretariat and the ASFA Partners) shall also miss Maurice - both his jolly friendly manner and his pointed and professional contributions to the ASFA Advisory Board Meetings. In fact, the minutes of this year's ASFA Board Meeting were shorter than usual - definitely one of the reasons was because Maurice was not there to stir up the debate! ... ASFA is now recognized as the premier bibliographic database in the world dealing with the aquatic science literature. Certainly, the world-wide success of ASFA can be attributed to the efforts of all the individuals, like Maurice, who are working and have worked on ASFA over the years.*

Richard Pepe (Editor-in-Chief ASFA)

CONTENTS

1. OPENING OF THE MEETING **1**
2. ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS **1**
3. ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON AND RAPPORTEURS **2**
4. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA **2**
5. ADOPTION OF SUMMARY REPORT OF 2006 ASFA ADVISORY BOARD MEETING **2**
5.1 Matters arising from the last (2006) ASFA Advisory Board Meeting **2**
6. STATUS OF ASFA PARTNERSHIP **2**
6.1 Report on intersessional activities of the ASFA Partners **2**
6.2 New and potential ASFA Partners **4**
6.3 ASFA Partnership Agreement **5**
6.4 ASFA Publishing Agreement **6**
6.5 ASFA Cooperation with other Groups/Initiatives/Meetings outside or related to ASFA **6**
6.6 Other Information Systems **6**
6.7 Report of mini ASFA Regional Meeting (tentative) **7**
7. ASFA SCOPE, COVERAGE, MONITORING AND TIMELINESS **8**
7.1 Subject Scope **8**
7.2 Coverage **8**
7.3 Monitoring **9**
7.4 Timeliness **10**
7.5 ASFA input procedures **11**
7.6 ASFA input production **12**
8. ASFA PRODUCTS AND SERVICES **12**
8.1 ASFA journals **12**
8.2 CD-ROM **12**
8.3 Internet service **13**
8.4 Document delivery **13**
8.5 New outputs and services (by ProQuest) **13**
8.6 Public relation activities, marketing (by ProQuest and Partners) **15**
8.7 Entitlements **15**
8.8 Increasing distribution of ASFA information products and services **16**
9. PROGRESS WITH MACHINE-READABLE INPUT **16**
9.1 www-ISIS-ASFA **16**
10. REPORT ON ASFA TRAINING ACTIVITIES **17**
11. STATUS OF ASFIS REFERENCE SERIES PUBLICATIONS **18**
11.1 ASFIS-1, Serials Monitored for the ASFIS Bibliographic Database **18**
11.2 ASFIS-2, Subject Categories and Scope Descriptions **18**
11.3 ASFIS-3, Guidelines for Bibliographic Description **18**
11.4 ASFIS-4, Guidelines for Abstracting **19**
11.5 ASFIS-5, Guidelines for Indexing **19**
11.6 ASFIS-6, Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Thesaurus **19**
11.7 ASFIS-7, Geographic Authority List **21**
11.8 ASFIS-15, ASFIS List of Species for Fishery Statistical Purposes (ex-ASFIS-8, Tax. Auth. List) **23**
11.9 ASFIS-10, Authority List for Corporate Names **24**
11.10 ASFIS-14, ASFISIS (Release-3 User Manual) **24**
11.11 ASFIS-16, Help Notes in the www-ISIS-ASFA software (used for bibliographic description) **24**
12. EXPANDED LANGUAGE CAPABILITY IN ASFA **24**
13. ASFA TRUST FUND **25**
13.1 Status of the ASFA Trust Fund **25**
13.2 Proposals in progress, completed or pending further discussion **27**
13.3 New and/or ongoing proposals **29**
14. OTHER BUSINESS **34**
15. PLACE AND DATE OF NEXT MEETING **34**
16. REVIEW/APPROVAL OF DRAFT REPORT OF MEETING **34**

17. FIFTH DAY OF ASFA BOARD MEETING **34**
17.1 Comments on ASFA Input..... **34**
17.2 ProQuest tips on using/searching CSA Illumina **34**

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

Annex-1 Agenda **35**
Annex-1b List of Participants **37**
Annex-1c List of Abbreviations **43**
Annex-2 to Annex-46 contained in the attached CD-ROM
Annex-45 ASFA Trust Fund Status **47**
Annex-46 to Annex-56 contained in the attached CD-ROM
Annex-57 Action Items Agreed by Participants **63**
Annex-58 contained in the attached CD-ROM

ANNEXES

Note. The printed version of this Report contains only a few of the many Annexes: (i.e. Agenda, List of Documents, List of Participants, List of Abbreviations, ASFA Trust Fund Status, and Action Items Agreed) so as to 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/2007/... 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/2007/1	Agenda
Annex-1a	ASFA/2007/1a	List of Documents
Annex -1b	ASFA/2007/1b	List of Participants
Annex-1c	List of Abbreviations	
Annex -2	ASFA/2007/2	Actions Agreed by Participants (at 2006 Meeting)
Annex -3	ASFA/2007/3	FAO Report
Annex -3a	ASFA/2007/3a	(FAO) Trust Fund project proposal (Staff Support to ASFA Secretariat in 2008) - (reviewed and renewable each year)
Annex -4	ASFA/2007/4	IOC Report
Annex -5	ASFA/2007/5	UN/DOALOS Report
Annex -6	ASFA/2007/6	UNEP Report
Annex -7	ASFA/2007/7	ADRIAMED Report
Annex -8	ASFA/2007/14	NAFO Report
Annex-9	ASFA/2007/15	PIMRIS Report
Annex-10	ASFA/2007/17	WCPFC Report
Annex-11	ASFA/2007/18	Argentina (INIDEP) Report
Annex-11a	ASFA/2007/18	Argentina Poster
Annex-12	ASFA/2007/19	Australia (CSIRO) Report
Annex-13	ASFA/2007/20	Belgium (VLIZ) Report [not submitted]
Annex-14	ASFA/2007/23	Chile (IFOP) Report
Annex-15	ASFA/2007/24	China, People's Republic (NMDIS) Report
Annex-16	ASFA/2007/26	Cuba (CIP) Report
Annex-17	ASFA/2007/27	Ecuador (INP) Report
Annex-18	ASFA/2007/28	Estonia (EMI) Report
Annex-19	ASFA/2007/29	France (IFREMER) Report
Annex-20	ASFA/2007/30	Germany (BF) Report
Annex-21	ASFA/2007/31	Greece (HCMR) Report
Annex-22	ASFA/2007/32	Iceland (MRI) Report
Annex-23	ASFA/2007/33	India (NIO/NICMAS) Report
Annex-24	ASFA/2007/34	Indonesia (LIPI/PDII) Report
Annex-25	ASFA/2007/37	Japan (FRA) Report
Annex-26	ASFA/2007/38	Kenya (KMFRI) Report
Annex-26a	ASFA/2007/38a	Kenya (KMFRI) Trust Fund Proposal
Annex-27	ASFA/2007/39	Korea (KORDI) Report
Annex-28	ASFA/2007/41	Mauritania (IMROP) Report
Annex-29	ASFA/2007/44	Mozambique (INAHINA) Report
Annex-30	ASFA/2007/45	Nigeria (NIFFR) Report
Annex-30a	ASFA/2007/45a	Nigeria Trust Fund Proposal
Annex-31	ASFA/2007/46	Norway (IMR) Report

Annex-32	ASFA/2007/48	Poland (SFI) Report
Annex-33	ASFA/2007/50	Russia (VNIRO) Report
Annex-34	ASFA/2007/51	Senegal (DPM) Report
Annex-35	ASFA/2007/53	Sweden (IMR) Report
Annex-36	ASFA/2007/54	Tanzania (IMS) Report
Annex-37	ASFA/2007/56	Tunisia (INSTM) Report
Annex-38	ASFA/2007/58	United Kingdom (NMBL) Report
Annex-38a	ASFA/2007/58a	ASFA Thesaurus Maintenance Report (FBA)
Annex-39	ASFA/2007/59	Uruguay (IIP) Report
Annex-40	ASFA/2007/60	USA (NOAA) Report
Annex-41	ASFA/2007/61	Vietnam (FICen) Report
Annex-42	ASFA/2007/62	ProQuest Report
Annex-43	ASFA/2007/63	List of ASFA Partners
Annex-44	ASFA/2007/64	ProQuest Calculation of Royalty Payment to Trust Fund
Annex-45	ASFA/2007/65	ASFA Trust Fund Status
Annex-46	ASFA/2007/66	Ninth Report to ASFA Board Meeting (2007) on Project to Distribute ASFA CD-ROM to LIFDCs
Annex-47	ASFA/2007/67	ASFA Trust Fund project proposal – Financial support to attend 2008 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (reviewed and renewable each year)
Annex-48	ASFA/2007/69	Admission of TWO new members to the ASFA Partnership
Annex-49	ASFA/2007/71	(FAO) ASFA Trust Fund project proposal – To strengthen ASFA Partner in Kenya (KMFRI) in order to provide ASFA Training Support for other ASFA Partners in Africa and so as to assist FAO ASFA Secretariat (provision of computer equipment)
Annex-50	ASFA/2007/72	***(rediscussion of)*** IAMSLIC Aquatic Commons "Digitization" project proposal (which was circulated/voted during Intersessional period for voting but no quorum was reached)
Annex-51	ASFA/2007/73	WAIVER to policy regarding use of ASFA Trust Fund (which would allow the IAMSLIC Executive Board to submit project proposals) "A yearly allocation to support project proposals from IAMSLIC of mutual benefit to ASFA"
Annex-52	ASFA/2007/74	Theme for discussion – The ASFA Trust Fund "*beneficial ways of spending the ASFA Trust Fund*"
Annex-53	ASFA/2007/75	Utilization of ASFA Trust Fund to pay IAMSLIC Member fees for ASFA Partners
Annex-54	ASFA/2007/76	Training Session in ASFA Input Procedures (once a year)
Annex-55	ASFA/2007/77	Comments on ASFA Input (PowerPoint) by V.Soto, H.Wibley
Annex-56	ASFA/2007/78	ASFA Database on CSA Illumina (PowerPoint) by V.Soto
Annex-57	ASFA/2007/79	Action Items Agreed by Participants
Annex-58	ASFA/2007/80	Report of the African ASFA Partners' Meeting

1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

The Annual Meeting of the **Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Abstracts (ASFA)** Advisory Board was hosted by the **Kenya Marine and Fisheries Research Institute (KMFRI)**, located in Mombasa, Kenya, from 3 to 7 September 2007.

The Meeting was attended by 33 participants from: 19 National ASFA Partners, 2 UN Partners, 1 International ASFA Partner, the ASFA Publishing Partner, and 6 observers. The Agenda is in **Annex-1**. The names and addresses of the participants are listed in **Annex-1b**. The Documents presented at the Meeting and the abbreviations used in the Report are listed in **Annex-1a** and **1c**, respectively.

The Opening of the Meeting was moderated by Mr Harrison Ong'anda (KMFRI) and the Welcome Address was delivered by Mr Johnson Kazungu, Director of KMFRI.

Mr Kazungu, on behalf of KMFRI, welcomed the participants to Mombasa for the 2007 Annual Meeting of the ASFA Advisory Board. He mentioned the involvement of KMFRI in a number of fisheries related research activities both nationally and regionally and emphasized that KMFRI's focus, over the last 15 years, has been concentrating on manpower development. He called attention to the KMFRI staff who are occasionally asked by the FAO ASFA Secretariat to assist in the training of new ASFA Partners and in the preparation of ASFA input on behalf of other ASFA Partners (e.g. UNEP). He also referred to KMFRI's leading role in the database and information network within the Southwest Indian Ocean Fisheries (SWIOF) Project. He expressed his appreciation to FAO not only for all of the assistance received over the years but also for identifying in KMFRI the capacity to assist FAO in carrying out some of the ASFA training activities in Africa. He confirmed that KMFRI would continue to support all ASFA activities. He welcomed all the participants to Mombasa and wished the ASFA Board a fruitful meeting.

Mr Grainger, Chief of the FAO Fishery and Aquaculture Information and Statistics Service, on behalf of the FAO ASFA Secretariat, addressed the participants and the organizers of the Meeting, stating that it was a great honour for the ASFA Board to have such distinguished guests present for the opening of the Meeting and thanked the Hon Joseph Munyao, Minister for Livestock and Fisheries Development, for his presence. Mr Grainger mentioned the sustained efforts by the FAO ASFA Secretariat to include grey literature in ASFA, concentrating firstly in Latin America and now in Africa, noting that this was the first ASFA Annual Board Meeting to be held in Africa. He referred to the very important ASFA-related activities carried out by KMFRI and said how much they were appreciated by the FAO ASFA Secretariat.

Mr Shaukat Abdulrazak, Chairman of KMFRI Board of Management, also welcomed the ASFA Partners to Mombasa and to Kenya, acknowledging that this meeting was a gathering for "information sharing", which is a very important and powerful activity that not only assists in making aquatic and marine scientific information accessible in developing countries, but also is vital in making decisions. He introduced the Hon Joseph Munyao, Minister for Livestock and Fisheries Development, mentioning that his presence highlighted the importance of this meeting.

On behalf of the Government of the Republic of Kenya, the Hon Joseph Munyao, Minister for Livestock and Fisheries Development, opened the Annual Meeting of the ASFA Advisory Board. He welcomed all to Mombasa. He pointed to the attendance of participants from more than 20 countries as proof that ASFA was an international cooperative system covering the world's literature on marine and freshwater fisheries. He referred to the overall goal of the ASFA partnership which was to disseminate information on aquatic sciences and fisheries to the global environment, bearing in mind the special interests of different developing countries. He said that Kenya as a country and her partners in the region, recognized the contribution of the ASFA database towards the understanding and sustainable management of fisheries resources and added that in 1995 Kenya was honoured to be one of the few ASFA input centres with a mandate to cover the Western Indian Ocean. The Minister commended the FAO ASFA Secretariat for its dedicated work, which has seen the growth of the ASFA Partnership to 61 Partners. He expressed his gratitude to the Board for giving Kenya the honour of hosting this meeting and also commended KMFRI for its role in the organization of the meeting. He wished the ASFA Board a fruitful and successful meeting and welcomed the participants to sample and to enjoy the historical heritage of the Kenyan coast, and to visit the country's national parks.

2. ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS

Mr James Macharia (KMFRI) presented this Agenda Item.

3. ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON AND RAPPORTEURS

Mr Mika Odido (IOC) was elected Chairperson of the Board Meeting and Mr James Macharia (KMFRI) co-Chairperson. Ms Helen Wibley (FAO) was appointed Rapporteur and Mr Richard 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 2006 ASFA ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

The ASFA Board agreed to adopt the Summary Report of the 2006 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (Ostend, Belgium).

5.1. Matters Arising from the last (2006) ASFA Advisory Board Meeting

The follow-up carried out (or not) by Partners on last year's agreed "Action Items" is usually reported under the appropriate Agenda items, and sometimes highlighted by the phrase: "Follow-up action 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 FAO ASFA Secretariat attempted to summarize the major points/concerns contained in the Reports of Partners not in attendance. The full texts of all the Reports appear in **Annexes 3-42**.

6.1.1. United Nations Co-sponsors

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

In addition to the issues covered in the FAO Report, Mr Grainger (FAO) brought to the attention of the ASFA Board the recent "restructuring" that FAO, as a UN agency, has been undergoing. He mentioned the declining budget for Regular Programme activities, but stressed that the FAO ASFA Secretariat activities would be protected, since they were considered a priority activity. He told the ASFA Partners that he very much appreciated the ASFA Trust Fund Money, which enabled the FAO ASFA Secretariat to carry out other activities that were not considered "core" responsibilities. Mr Grainger referred to the Independent External Evaluation (IEE) of FAO that was currently being carried out, whereby FAO was the first UN agency to be evaluated from top-to-bottom. He added that the FAO Fishery and Aquaculture Information and Statistics Service (FIES), within which the FAO ASFA Secretariat was located, had received positive comments. However, there were still many constraints and uncertainties in FAO at the moment. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) asked when the effects of the IEE would start to be felt. Mr Grainger (FAO) replied that the FAO Conference, to be held in November 2007, would consider the recommendations of the IEE. He added that there was now a major trend for major donors to switch from regular programme funding to extra-budgetary funding. This reduction in regular programme funding results in the ear-marking of particular activities. He said that this was considered a controversial matter, especially for developing countries, since it could appear that the developed countries are deciding upon which activities should be carried out. He also referred to the fact that the FAO ASFA Secretariat was a very small secretariat, and that following the retirement of Ms Lombardi, some ad-hoc arrangements would be made until the budgetary situation was finalized.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) asked the ASFA Board to give a round of applause for the FAO ASFA Secretariat as a sign of appreciation. The Chair congratulated and thanked the FAO ASFA Secretariat for all its work.

- **IOC -** Mr Mika Odido presented the IOC Report (**Annex-4**)
- **UN/DOALOS** - (Not present) Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-5**)
- **UNEP -** Mr James Macharia presented the UNEP Report (**Annex-6**)

6.1.2. ASFA Partners

- **ADRIAMED** - (Not present) Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-7**)
- **ICCAT -** (Not present, No Report)
- **ICES** - (Not present, No Report)
- **IOTC -** (Not present, No Report)
- **IUCN -** (Not present, No Report)
- **NACA -** (Not present, No Report)
- **NAFO** - Mr Anthony Thompson presented the NAFO Report **(Annex-8)**
- **PIMRIS -** (Not present) Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat **(Annex-9)**
- **SPC -** (Not present, No Report)
- **WCPFC** - (Not present) Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-10**)
- **Argentina (INIDEP)** - Ms Guillermina Cosulich presented the INIDEP report **(Annex-11)**
- **Australia (CSIRO)** - (Not present) Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat **(Annex-12)**
- **Belgium (VLIZ)** - Mr Jan Haspeslagh presented the VLIZ report **(Annex-13)**
- **Brazil (USP)** - (Not present, No Report)
- **Canada (NRC)** - (Not present, No Report)
- **Chile (IFOP)** - (Not present) Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-14**)
- **China (NMDIS)** - Mr Yang Ying presented the NMDIS report **(Annex-15)**
- **Cote d'Ivoire (CRO)** - (Not present, No Report)
- **Cuba (CIP)** - (Not present) Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-16**)
- **Ecuador (INP)** - (Not present) (**Annex-17**)
- **Estonia (EMI)** - (Not present) Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-18**)
- **France (IFREMER)** - Ms Jacqueline Prod'homme presented the IFREMER Report **(Annex-19)**
- **Germany (BF)** - Mr Walther Kühnhold presented the BF Report **(Annex-20)**
- **Greece (HCMR)** - Ms Sofia Goulala presented the HCMR Report **(Annex-21)**
- **Iceland (MRI)** - (Not present) Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-22**)
- **India (NIO/NICMAS)** - Mr Gajanan Sainekar presented the NIO/NICMAS Report **(Annex-23)**
- **Indonesia (PDII/LIPI)** - (Not present) Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat **(Annex-24)**
- **Iran (IFRO)** - (Not present, No Report)
- **Italy (SIBM)** - (Not present, No Report)
- **Japan (JFRCA)** - Mr. Keiichi Hamada presented the JFRCA Report **(Annex-25)**
- **Kenya (KMFRI)** - Mr James Macharia presented the KMFRI Report **(Annex-26)**
- **Korea (KORDI)** - (Not present**)** Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat **(Annex-27**)
- **LAO (LARRec)** - (Not present, No Report)
- **Mauritania (IMROP)** - Mr Amady Sow presented the IMROP Report **(Annex-28)**
- **Mexico (DGB)** – (Not present, No Report)
- **Morocco (INRH)** - (Not present, No Report)
- **Mozambique (INAHINA)** - Ms AnaMaria Alfredo presented the INAHINA Report (**Annex-29**)
- **Nigeria (NIFFR)** - Mr Moses Ibeun presented the NIFFR Report **(Annex-30)**
- **Norway (IMR)** - Ms Brit Skotheim presented the IMR Report **(Annex-31)**
- **Peru (IMARPE)** (Not present, No Report)

- **Poland (SFI)** - (Not present) Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-32**)
- **Portugal (IPIMAR)** - (Not present, No Report)
- **Russia (VNIRO)** - Ms Sofia Levashova presented the VNIRO Report **(Annex-33)**
- **Senegal (DPM)** - Ms Arame Ndiaye Keita presented the DPM Report **(Annex-34)**
- **Spain (IEO)** – (Not present, No report)
- **Sweden (IMR)** (Not present) Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat **(Annex-35)**
- **Tanzania (IMS)** - Ms Edna Nyika presented the IMS Report **(Annex-36)**
- **Thailand (PMBC)** - (Not present, No Report)
- **Tunisia (INSTM)** - (Not present) Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat) **(Annex-37)**
- **Ukraine (YugNIRO)** - (Not present, No Report)
- **United Kingdom (NMBL)** - Ms Linda Noble presented the NBML Report **(Annex-38)**
- **Uruguay (IIP)** - (Not present) Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-39**)
- **USA (NOAA)** - Mr Neal Kaske presented the NOAA Report **(Annex-40)**
- **Vietnam (FICen)** - (Not present) Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-41**)

6.1.3. ASFA PARTNER-PUBLISHER (ProQuest)

- **ProQuest -** Mr Emerson presented the ProQuest Report **(Annex-42)**

6.2. New and Potential ASFA Partners

The following two organizations/institutes signed the ASFA Partnership Agreement during the intersessional period 2006-2007 to become ASFA Partners.

1. Centre National des Sciences Halieutiques de Boussoura (CNSHB), Guinea
2. Federated States of Micronesia-Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC)

See the FAO Report Section 4.2 **(Annex-3)** for information regarding the new Partners, and see **Annex-48** 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) briefly described the strategy currently guiding the FAO ASFA Secretariat in recruiting new ASFA Partners. See the FAO Report Section 4.5.1 (**Annex**-3) for more details. He referred to the priority countries that were listed in the paper "Strategy for priority setting for future expansion of the ASFA Partnership" by YongJa Cho, presented at the 2002 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting and noted that of these, Nigeria, Indonesia, Tanzania and Thailand are now ASFA Partners.

Mr Grainger (FAO) mentioned the current recruitment activities carried out jointly by the ASFA Secretariat and NMBL concerning the possible participation of the Marine Institute (MI) in Eire. He remarked that there was a very low figure of Irish material in ASFA, which very much stressed the need for the participation of MI. Ms Noble (NMBL) said that, due to staff reduction at NMBL, she did not know whether her institute could eventually provide training, should MI join the ASFA Partnership. However, she added that a member of staff from MI would be visiting NMBL, so she would be able to discuss further the situation then.

Mr Pepe (FAO) said that the FAO ASFA Secretariat had plans to identify an institute in Egypt, perhaps through the offices of the new FAO project (MEDFISIS), but no action had been taken thus far.

Mr Odido (IOC) mentioned the National Institute of Oceanography and Fisheries (NIOF) in Alexandria, Egypt as a potential ASFA Partner, and **Mr Odido (IOC) agreed** to investigate the possibility of NIOF becoming a new National ASFA Partner.

[**Rapporteur's note**: since the Meeting, Mr Odido (IOC) did contact NIOF and then NIOF contacted the FAO ASFA Secretariat. Mr Pepe (FAO) visited NIOF and NIOF is now an ASFA Partner]

Mr Pepe (FAO) reported that the representatives from the **National Fisheries Resources Research Institute (**Uganda) and the **Water Research Institute** (Ghana), who were present at the meeting, had been invited as observers, but also as potential new ASFA Partners. Should they eventually become ASFA Partners, the idea would be to have KMFRI assist in their eventual training and follow-up.

[**Rapporteur's note**: at this writing, both the National Fisheries Resources Research Institute (NaFIRRI), Uganda, and the Water Research Institute, Ghana, have formally joined the ASFA Partnership]

Ms Marian Jiagge (CSIR, Ghana) asked about the standard procedure for becoming as ASFA Partner. Mr Pepe (FAO) replied that this issue would be covered in more detail during the Sixth Day meeting for the African representatives, and he referred to Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) on the ASFA Website (see http://www.fao.org/fi/website/FIRetrieveAction.do?dom=org&xml=asfa_prog.xml&xp_nav=2), which contains a wealth of information not only on "what" is ASFA and its objectives, but also on the "why and how" to become an ASFA Partner. He added that the FAQ "Why and How to become an ASFA Partner" also described the "responsibilities" of an ASFA Partner as well as the "entitlements" (see ftp://ftp.fao.org/FI/asfa/faq/faq2_e.pdf).

Mr Kühnhold (BF) asked the FAO ASFA Secretariat the situation regarding a potential new ASFA Partner in Turkey, referring to a contact that he had previously given to FAO. Mr Pepe (FAO) reported that the ASFA Secretariat had not been able to successfully follow-up on that contact.

Mr Kühnhold (BF) mentioned that he had a good working relationship with 2 institutes in Turkey and **agreed** to follow-up with these institutes regarding the possibility of them becoming an ASFA Partner and would inform the FAO ASFA Secretariat regarding the outcome.

6.2.3. Strategy for future expansion of ASFA Partnership

Mr Pepe (FAO) explained to the ASFA Partners that since the ASFA Secretariat was understaffed, it was not currently on a campaign to actively solicit new ASFA Partners. However, he added that recruitment of new partners would proceed as regards some pending commitments and/or priority areas as well as for those organizations/institutes that specifically contact the FAO ASFA Secretariat requesting membership. The ASFA Secretariat plans to continue to outsource some of its training and follow-up responsibilities regarding new ASFA Partners (e.g. the most recent: the training of SPC, Ecuador and Peru).

6.2.4. Partners dropping out of ASFA

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 ASFA during the intersessional period.

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

The FAO ASFA Secretariat referred to those ASFA Partners included on the "Warning List", i.e. those in danger of being removed from the ASFA Partnership, since no input has been submitted for 2 years or more. They are: the Network of Aquaculture Centres in Asia-Pacific (NACA), the Direction des Pêches Maritimes (DPM), Senegal, and the Centre de Recherches Océanologiques (CRO), Côte d'Ivoire.

NACA - No input has been submitted since joining ASFA in 2003. However, NACA has continued to express its desire to participate in ASFA. An e-mail was sent to the FAO ASFA Secretariat in April 2007 stating their continued interest in ASFA, and Mr Grainger (FAO), who recently travelled to the region (June 2007), spoke with NACA representatives who reconfirmed their desire to participate in ASFA.

DPM (Senegal) - No input has been submitted since joining ASFA in 2005. Ms Keita (DPM) informed the ASFA Partners that some input had been prepared during 2006, but the institute had encountered problems following theft of some computers and the records were lost. She said that 35 ASFA records were now ready for sending to the FAO ASFA Secretariat for checking.

CRO (Côte d'Ivoire) - No input has been submitted since January 2005. The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported now having lost contact with CRO.

Given that IOC has contacts with CRO, **Mr Odido (IOC) agreed** to contact the Director of CRO for follow-up with respect to submission of ASFA input and inform the FAO ASFA Secretariat accordingly.

6.3. ASFA Partnership Agreement

As of 1 September 2007, the ASFA Partnership Agreement (the official title is: Partnership Agreement Providing for Co-Operation in the Preparation and Publication of the Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Abstracts (ASFA) and the Reconstitution of the Advisory Board) has been signed by 61 (at this writing 64)* Partners:

4 UN Co-sponsoring ASFA Partners	45 (at this writing 48)* National ASFA Partners
11 International ASFA Partners	1 Publishing ASFA Partner

*[**Rapporteur's note**: since the Board Meeting, there is now a total of 64 ASFA Partners (48 National Partners) thanks to the recently joined Partners from Uganda (National Fisheries Resources Research Institute (NaFIRRI) in October 2007), Egypt (National Institute of Oceanography and Fisheries (NIOF) in November 2007 and Ghana (Water Research Institute for the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) in January 2008)].

See **Annex-43** for the full list of the names and addresses of the ASFA Partners and Collaborating Centres.

Mr Pepe (FAO) stated that there were no suggested changes to the ASFA Partnership Agreement on the part of the FAO ASFA Secretariat. He noted that minor amendments to the Agreement could be agreed during the Meeting, recorded in the Board Report and enforced as such. Such eventual amendments would not be recorded in the Agreement itself, only in the Board Report.

6.4. ASFA Publishing Agreement

The current ASFA Publishing Agreement (the official title is: Publishing Agreement between Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and Cambridge Scientific Abstracts) is between FAO and the ASFA Publisher CSA (now called ProQuest) and it 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 ProQuest distributes to the ASFA Partners, and the amount of 'royalties' that ProQuest should pay into the ASFA Trust Fund for using/marketing the Partners ASFA records in its information products. These parts of the Agreement are visible on the FAO ASFA Homepage at ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/006/ad644e/ad644e00.pdf

FAO and ProQuest will start the negotiations regarding the 2008-2011 renewal of the Publishing Agreement this year. Mr Pepe (FAO) said that those items that had been submitted by some ASFA Partners regarding the Publishing Agreement had been recorded and would be included for discussion during the negotiations. He added that any ASFA Partner having suggestions/comments regarding the renewal should contact the FAO ASFA Secretariat.

6.5. ASFA Cooperation with Groups/Initiatives/Meetings outside or related to ASFA

6.5.1. WAICENT (AGRIS) group cooperation

Mr Pepe (FAO) reported that cooperation with the FAO WAICENT/Knowledge Exchange Facilitation Branch (Knowledge Exchange & Capacity Building Division) continues, through occasional assistance to the ASFA Group by their Information Systems Analyst, in particular as regards the development of an XML export format for the www-ISIS-ASFA software and more recently the testing/compatibility of the full copy of the ASFA database sent to FAO by ProQuest as a back-up.

6.5.2. ASFA-FIGIS cooperation

Mr Pepe (FAO) mentioned that the ASFA-FIGIS cooperation was a Trust Fund Project that involved the geo-referencing of ASFA geographic descriptors, for use in searching CSA Illumina. This Trust Fund Project was now complete and there was a test version working which enabled a search to be conducted on CSA Illumina though FIGIS, using a geographical interface. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) added that the system needed some further work as regards the issue of password recognition.

6.5.3. ASFA-IAMSLIC group(s) cooperation

Mr Pepe (FAO) referred to the ASFA Trust Fund Project which would pay the IAMSLIC membership fees for ASFA Partners and their collaborating centres. He urged the ASFA Partners, who have not yet done so, to make use of this Trust Fund Project so that they could become members and thereby benefit from the many IAMSLIC information services, which included document delivery and full-text linking.

Mr Pepe (FAO) added that two ASFA Trust Fund Proposals related to IAMSLIC would be brought forward for discussion under Agenda Item 13.3 ASFA Trust Fund - New Proposals.

6.6. Other Information systems [i.e. ASFA collaborating systems (e.g. Odin-Africa) and competing systems]

Mr Pepe (FAO) introduced this Agenda Item mentioning the growing instances whereby ASFA Partners, in addition to records they prepare using the www-ISIS-ASFA software, must also maintain an existing local database with another software.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) raised the issue of mapping records from local databases and/or repositories into or out of the www-ISIS-ASFA software, referring in particular to Dublin Core and XML formats.

Mr Pepe (FAO) said that ASFA records could currently be exported from the www-ISIS-ASFA software in the XML format that had been developed by the FAO-WAICENT (AGRIS) group and used as meta data in repositories (however it would now be up to the repositories to be able to import these records). Mr Pettman

(FBA) confirmed that the ASFA export format (in the www-ISIS-ASFA) software was almost perfect and required just a few technical modifications. He added that Dublin Core created problems with mapping, since it was too general, whereas the www-ISIS-ASFA record was “wonderfully” specific.

Mr Pepe (FAO) agreed to follow-up with Mr Rybinski (ICIE) for eventual ASFA Trust Fund projects: 1) regarding the export of ASFA records from the www-ISIS-ASFA software in XML format, as to ensuring its utility as a metadata input to repositories (fine tuning of the www-ISIS-ASFA XML export facility), and 2) to develop conversion programs for those ASFA Partners who already had their own ‘local’ databases/library catalogues so as to enable them to download/convert these local records into a format compatible with the www-ISIS-ASFA software.

See further discussions regarding compatibility of www-ISIS-ASFA with other systems under Agenda Item 9.1.www-ISIS-ASFA.

Some discussion followed regarding the maintenance of the ASFA records in local repositories.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) enquired whether it would constitute a problem for the ASFA publisher if the ASFA Partners used/hosted their ASFA records on their own server. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) replied that any of the ASFA Partners were free to use the records they submit to ProQuest as ASFA input as they choose, since those records belong to that ASFA Partner.

Further to the above enquiry, Ms Noble (NMBL) asked for some additional explanation regarding the source and intended use of the records on the VLIZ server. Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) said that the records would refer to the institute’s own publications and also to some documents of their researchers, and they would contain links to the full text in the VLIZ repository. Such records could be posted on the server so that they could then be harvested by the Aquatic Commons harvester (Avano).

Mr Pettman (FBA) questioned whether any IAMSLIC member could subscribe to the Aquatic Commons Repository and submit text. Mr Kaske (NOAA) clarified that the IAMSLIC Aquatic Commons repository was an “open” web resource, but the input was by subscribers only.

Ms Skotheim (MRI) said that their repository contained not only their own documents but also articles from commercial journals. This could perhaps create some copyright problems when exporting onto another database, although she added that it could be possible to select what was exported.

Mr Thompson (NAFO) commented that the copyright for papers produced by his institute was held by the author, and asked if this could cause problems for full-text linking to articles cited on the ASFA database.

Regarding copyright, Mr Emerson (ProQuest) stated that it was important to be careful when digitizing and submitting full-text to repositories, although it was the repository-holder’s final responsibility. He added that as regards the ASFA database, it did not contain full-text, but only pointed to it, which is not against copyright.

Ms Noble (NMBL) queried if there would be any problems in importing ASFA records to local repositories. Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) said that this should not be a problem since local repositories are branded with their own name. He commented that the Aquatic Commons was a very important repository, since currently there were no existing portals or search engines that could do specific searches of the aquatic science repositories. He mentioned that Google Scholar could do searches and pick up some of the open access aquatic science information, but Aquatic Commons was more specific in picking up the information and pointing to the full-text using the Avano Harvester.

Ms Noble (NMBL) stressed the importance of a repository as an archive for "long-term preservation". She reiterated that it should be possible to prepare a record just once for ASFA and then export it to a local repository or the Aquatic Commons.

Ms Crampton (NISC) mentioned that a DOI could be fixed to the document to ensure that it is retrievable, although this could be costly.

More discussion on full-text linking is reported under Agenda Item 8.5 New Outputs and Services.

6.7. Report of mini ASFA Regional Meeting (tentative)

Mr Pepe (FAO) reported that the mini ASFA Regional Meeting for Latin America had been postponed to probably sometime next year. He added that discussions would be held between the FAO ASFA Secretariat and Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) during the meeting to examine the various possibilities.

7. ASFA SCOPE, COVERAGE, MONITORING AND TIMELINESS

7.1. Subject Scope

Mr Pepe (FAO) introduced this Agenda Item, noting how broad the subject scope of ASFA was - “all aquatic sciences”!! No additions to the subject scope of ASFA were suggested. However, discussions further on below, do touch on how well is the “coverage” of this broad subject scope.

Mr Pepe (FAO) provided a brief historical background on how the subject scope of the ASFA database developed from its FAO origins that were the World Fisheries Abstracts (WFA) and Current Bibliography for Fisheries (CBF) journals, which began in 1950 and 1957 respectively. The scope of WFA and CBF was mission oriented (fisheries). In 1971 WFA ceased publication and the FAO publication CBF merged with an existing commercial abstracts journal called Aquatic Biology Abstracts (ABA) produced by IRL of London to create what is now known as ASFA. IRL sold ASFA to the US current publisher of ASFA, CSA, now called ProQuest. With this merger, the scope of ASFA now included a significant number of discipline-oriented (biology) records. Other missions were added to the scope of ASFA over the years. The participation of IOC and UNEP added to the subject and mission scope of ASFA to include oceanography and pollution and the joining of ASFA by UN-DOALOS brought in references to the Law-of-the Sea.

The complete subject scope of ASFA is described and defined in detail in the publication *ASFIS-2, Rev. 2, ASFIS Subject Categories and Scope Descriptions* (see section 11.2).

> *Follow-up action item 4 from the 2006 ASFA Board Meeting:*
>
> *4. 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.*

Follow-up: The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported no action done regarding this Action Item.

7.2. Coverage

> *Follow-up action item 1 from the 2006 ASFA Board Meeting:*
>
> ***1. 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.*

Follow-up: An E-mail from Ms Beattie (NOAA) was circulated via ASFA Board-L on 28.8.2007 containing standards developed by the NOAA library for digital video and still images.

Ms Noble (NMBL) referred to a previous Trust Fund Project conducted in 1999 which surveyed the ASFA coverage of fishery economics (A study of the coverage of fishery economics and related subjects by the International Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Abstracts (ASFA) database, by Joan Baron). Mr Emerson (ProQuest) suggested that a follow-up study could be conducted to see if any progress had been made regarding ASFA coverage of that subject area.

Mr Pepe (FAO) gave a brief summary of the 1999 coverage survey. The results had shown that although the major part of 'traditional' world literature is covered by ASFA, some areas were not covered, such as the literature appearing in non-fisheries journals. As examples, he cited aquaculture articles appearing in agriculture journals, and seafood articles appearing in food technology journals. He added that ProQuest played an important role in the coverage (i.e. monitoring) of these types of journals.

Mr Kaske (NOAA) mentioned that the examination of term-usage by searchers could provide some useful information. He said that if users searched the ASFA database and did not find what they wanted, the reason could be one of two possibilities: one, because they did not search properly (i.e. they need training) or two, because the references to the literature were not there (i.e. indicating that the subject area was not being covered in ASFA). He added that analyzing the user statistics regarding term usage should be a continual activity, not just a one-off exercise.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) commented that ProQuest had produced a log file of term usage, but that the analysis of the file was quite challenging and in no way straightforward or conclusive. However, he concurred that it would be very useful to analyze such data, since it was important to know where searches came from, i.e. who is doing the searches. He said that in their 2006 Summary Report there was a short listing of some of the most-frequently-used search terms.

Mr Pettman (FBA) commented that there were many papers on food technology related to fisheries on the oneFish website (e.g. Fish Technology Knowledge Base) and that it might be possible to use this site to obtain the papers. Mr Kühnhold (BF) asked whether it was really necessary to have these records in ASFA, since they were already on another database. Mr Pepe (FAO) confirmed the importance of 'harvesting' the

occasional papers appearing in non-core journals, and remarked that the oneFish website also hosts the TorLib Fish Technology Database, previously maintained at the Torry Research Station, Scotland (UK).

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) mentioned the MarBEF project (Marine Biodiversity and Ecosystem Functioning EU Network of Excellence), which carries out much work on taxonomy, and referred to comments that he had received saying that ASFA was not 'complete', which implied that taxonomy could be an area not covered well in ASFA.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) agreed that although there were a lot of taxonomy records in the ASFA database, this could be an area lacking in ASFA. Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) said that a large amount of taxonomy literature existed, and added that this could be something to bear in mind when surveying the literature.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) raised the issue of just how much of the aquatic science literature was being covered by ASFA. He said that if all the literature was being covered then there should be a gradual but steady increase each year in input by the ASFA Partners, reflective of the increasing volume of publications produced each year; this does not appear to be the case.

Mr Pepe (FAO) commented that as long as he can remember comparisons have been made between ASFA and other aquatic science databases, regarding comprehensiveness, which always concluded saying that no one database was all inclusive. Therefore, it is usually necessary to carrying out a search on a number of different databases to ensure maximum coverage of the aquatic literature. Ms Crampton (NISC) concurred with Mr Pepe, saying that every database has a large amount of unique information and added that no database could be totally comprehensive. She referred to how NISC integrated the ASFA database with others to form the ABAFR (Aquatic Biology, Aquaculture & Fisheries Resources) database.

7.3. Monitoring

Mr Thompson (NAFO) asked about the target area of literature that should be monitored, whether it was 'primary' journals or those journals which cannot be easily obtained, i.e. grey literature, reports and publications belonging to institutes.

Mr Pepe (FAO) replied that as a general rule ASFA does not exclude any type of publication within the subject scope of ASFA. He mentioned that one of the FAQs on the ASFA Homepage explained monitoring and coverage in detail (ftp://ftp.fao.org/FI/asfa/faq/faq5_e.pdf).

Mr Thompson (NAFO) remarked that ProQuest was concentrating on 'primary literature' sources, whereas institutes and organizations like WorldFish, NACA, etc, are a source of very good information of great importance to ASFA. He commented on the various problems affecting data input that were mentioned by some ASFA Input Centres in their summary reports (e.g. staff reductions/limitations, lack of computer equipment, funding restrictions) and suggested that emphasis be given to improving elements that affect this, providing assistance where possible.

Mr Pepe (FAO) appealed to all ASFA Partners to make efforts to cover grey literature, including theses, for entry in ASFA. He added that one of the advantages of a decentralization system, like ASFA, should be that it facilitates the capturing of the grey literature.

Ms Noble (NMBL) referred to the offer made by ProQuest in their Summary Report (**Annex-42**) to take over the indexing of some core journals currently under the monitoring responsibility of the ASFA Partners [i.e. the idea of ProQuest being that this would give the ASFA Partners more time to dedicate to the identification and processing of more complex documents, such as grey literature]. She was concerned that reducing the number of journals monitored by a partner (i.e. the number of records submitted) could cause problems to collaborating centres regarding their earning of entitlements for additional ASFA information products.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) clarified that, although ProQuest was willing to take over the responsibility of the monitoring of some journals from other ASFA Partners, it did not intend that this should have a negative impact on the Partners' entitlements. He stressed that ProQuest's major concern was in making the database as good as possible with respect to timeliness, since the reputation of ASFA will suffer if publications are entered one to two years late.

Mr Pepe (FAO) commented that the issue of ProQuest taking over the monitoring of some Partners journals had been raised several times in the past and asked ProQuest if a positive solution could be reached during this meeting.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) replied that a table listing some serial titles that ProQuest would be willing to take over was contained in ProQuest's Summary Report. He explained that there are many journals available electronically, either as an electronic feed to ProQuest directly from the primary publisher, or as online content that can be acquired through various automated processes (i.e. 'web crawlers'). ProQuest was in a very good position to gather much of this content, and therefore could take over the responsibility of some primary literature journals from some ASFA Partners with no problem. He again stressed that users wanted timeliness and that there was great concern that major titles are not getting onto the database, or are being put in with a large time delay.

Mr Thompson (NAFO) remarked that ASFA should not be judged simply in merit of its coverage or not of the primary literature, and said that emphasis should be given to the fact all efforts are made to cover grey literature and include it in ASFA.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) said that he would be prepared to transfer some titles on VLIZ's monitoring list over to ProQuest, so that he could concentrate on grey literature.

ProQuest agreed to send out to individual ASFA Partners a list of those serial titles for which it could take over the monitoring, with copy to FAO. An agreement could be reached by which Partners would not receive fewer entitlements because of their total input possibly decreasing as a result of ProQuest taking over responsibility of some titles. ASFA Partners should also contact ProQuest individually should they wish to transfer some titles under their responsibility to ProQuest.

Mr Pepe (FAO) reminded the ASFA Partners to inform the FAO ASFA Secretariat of any such changes to their monitoring lists (Helen.Wibley@fao.org)

FAO agreed to assist ProQuest in contacting some of the ASFA Partners, should ProQuest come across any difficulties.

Ms Noble (NMBL) raised the issue of recruiting new collaborating centres and having additional entitlements, referring to the fact that SEAFISH had expressed interest in joining the ASFA Partnership.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) replied that entitlements for collaborating centres could be discussed on an individual basis in order to work out an arrangement.

Ms Levashova (VNIRO) asked for clarification regarding the definition of grey literature. Mr Pepe (FAO) explained that there was more than one definition, saying that some scientists considered all research that was not peer reviewed as grey literature. Also considered as grey literature were those publications (reports, institutional reports, theses, conference proceedings or other documents) which were not readily available through commercial channels. Mr Kühnhold (BF) commented that references to such grey literature, pertaining to the field of aquatic sciences and of interest to ASFA, should however, only be submitted as input to ASFA if the full text document was potentially retrievable/available. Mr Thompson (NAFO) added that it was then very important that this type of literature should go onto public domain and be made available to everybody.

Mr Pettman (FBA) mentioned that in the UK much research was now "contract-research" and the reports produced by this type of research were released to the public. He said that these types of reports were a valuable source of information, and added that there would appear to be a trend towards this type of literature.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) commented that there was a trend to attach supplementary information to research articles, such as audio or video files. In the future, the possibility of indexing these supplementary files should be considered for inclusion in ASFA.

7.4. Timeliness

> *Follow-up action item 5 from the 2006 ASFA Board Meeting:*
>
> ***5. 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.*

Follow-up: ProQuest reported this done. An e-mail was sent via ASFA Board L on 3.11.2006 reminding ASFA Partners that ProQuest loads the Input Centre files into the production system on 25th of each month. Another e-mail was sent via ASFA Board L on 23.8.2007 informing ASFA Partners that there were now bi-weekly updates to the ASFA database.

Mr Ibeun (NIFFR) asked for a definition of timeliness. Mr Pepe (FAO) replied that it was the time that it took for a document to be cited on the ASFA database measured from the time of its publishing. He reminded ASFA Partners that to ensure timeliness, they should send ASFA records to ProQuest frequently, and in small batches.

Mr Ibeun (NIFFR), referring to conference proceedings or other documents which may contain a large number of individual record to prepare, asked whether it was acceptable to send ProQuest a few records at a time, or whether one should wait until all the ASFA records have been completed for the entire document.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) confirmed that there was no need to submit all the records pertaining to a large document at the same time. It would not be a problem for ProQuest to receive a few records at a time from one particular document, for example half the records in one batch and the other half at a later date.

7.5. ASFA input procedures

Follow-up action items 6 and 7 from the 2006 ASFA Board Meeting:

6. 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 members.

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 **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*.

Follow-up: The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that the list was circulated to all ASFA Partners via ASFA Board-L on 31.11.2006.

Mr Pepe (FAO) said that the publication Guidelines for Bibliographic Description and Data Entry using www-ISIS-ASFA software, version 1.1, had been revised by Ms Lombardi (FAO) to incorporate the changes endorsed by the ASFA Board and would be sent to the ASFA Partners shortly, together with the revised electronic Help Notes contained in the software. See discussion under Agenda Item 11.3 for further information regarding this issue.

[**Rapporteur's note**: the above mentioned revised Guidelines were mailed to ASFA Partners on 26.10.2007 and the Help Notes sent via e-mail on 7.11.2007]

Mr Thompson (NAFO) raised the issue of the "descriptors" that indexers must assign to records during ASFA input preparation. He emphasized that this was a very time consuming part of the data entry process. Much discussion followed and this is reported together with other discussions concerning subject descriptors and the ASFA Thesaurus under Agenda Item 11. 6. ASFIS-6, Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Thesaurus.

<u>Environmental Regime field</u>

Mr Gajanan (NIO/NICMAS) expressed his views as to the importance of always entering data in the Environmental Regime Field and suggested that when a code was selected for this field, it should be mandatory to enter also a geographic descriptor in the appropriate field.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) stated that there will always be some records not requiring an environmental regime, and therefore it could not be made into a mandatory field. Mr Sainekar (NIO/NICMAS) said that since all records in ASFA should be within the scope of the aquatic sciences/environment, he thought it seemed logical that it should be possible to assign every record to one or more of the aquatic environmental regimes. Mr Ibeun (NIFFR) concurred, saying that the data being described in an ASFA record were collected from an aquatic environment, for example a fish species being studied must have come from somewhere.

Ms Wibley (FAO) said, however, that purely laboratory/experimental studies often need not have an aquatic environment mentioned. Also a document could refer to a "freshwater" or "marine" species without necessarily specifying to where it came from. Therefore, it would not be feasible to make it compulsory to enter a geographic descriptor every time a code has been entered in the Environmental Regime Field.

Mr Pepe (FAO) reminded the ASFA Partners that the instructions for data entry in the Environmental Regime Field recommended selecting an appropriate code "when applicable" and quoted several cases of purely scientific studies, where it would not be applicable to enter a code in this field. For example: a laboratory study of the eye of a cephalopod could be considered purely experimental and therefore an environmental regime code would not be applicable; the administrative annual report of a research institution could be considered not applicable.

In any case, Ms Wibley (FAO) explained that because ASFA Partners could forget to enter the Environmental Regime code, even when it is relevant, the www-ISIS-ASFA v1.1 software now has a verification to check the Environmental Regime Field and it gives a "warning" message each time the field is left empty (remember a "warning message" is an alert to a potential error not to an absolute error).

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that how people search should be taken into account and mentioned that users rarely searched on only the Environmental Regime code, but that it was occasionally used in combination with other fields. Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) commented that some fields, such as the Environmental Regime Field, are used to make a "selection" for other purposes. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) mentioned that how the searcher uses the field could be problematic and suggested that it was more of a training issue. He added that this field could be used to filter out information from the database in the searches.

Mr Sainekar (NIO/NICMAS) said that the ASFA database was not only used for literature searches, but also for management purposes. Publications could be searched in association with the Environmental Regime Field.

Follow-up action item 8 from the 2006 ASFA Board Meeting:

8. Regarding the Environmental Regime field in the ASFA record..... many records did not contain data in this field, and 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).*

Follow-up: ProQuest reported this done in their Summary Report (See **Annex**-**42**)

Follow-up action item 9 from the 2006 ASFA Board Meeting:

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

Follow-up: ProQuest reported no action regarding this item in their Summary Report (See **Annex**-**42**)

Non-English abstracts

Ms Skotheim (IMR), in the IMR Summary Report, mentioned language problems due to lack of staff at her institute. She explained that it was now no longer possible to translate the Norwegian abstracts into English. She questioned whether the records would still be useful to ASFA if they were only in Norwegian. Ms Soto (ProQuest) replied that these Norwegian records, and other such records in a non-English language, are important to ASFA, and therefore should be included. Mr Pepe (FAO) reminded the ASFA Partners that it was possible to submit ASFA records with only the non-English language abstract, but that it was preferable to have both the original language abstract and the English translation, if possible. In any case, a title in English is always mandatory for all ASFA records regardless of the original language of text.

7.6. ASFA input production

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that there were now over 1,178,931 records on the ASFA database as of September 2007. He noted that although there has been a significant increase in input since 2004, this has been mainly due to an increase in ProQuest's contribution, which showed an increase of 74% in 2006.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that many more primary journals are now providing their information online, backdated, and this makes the information easily available for inputting, i.e. retrospective indexing.

Mr Pepe (FAO) referred to the input statistics provided in the ProQuest summary report and noted that ProQuest stated that eleven ASFA Partners were responsible for 95% of the ASFA input.

Mr Pepe (FAO) commented that these input statistics did not accurately reflect the reality of the complex situation regarding the new ASFA Partners, many of which had still not started preparing input.

8. ASFA PRODUCTS AND SERVICES

8.1. ASFA Journals

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that there had been no changes regarding the printed ASFA journals during the intersessional period.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that, although the publisher would like to eliminate the 3 printed journals, some users still wanted them. He reminded the Board that the monthly or bi-monthly content of the printed journals only reflected a part of the total number of updates actually added to the online version of the ASFA database each month, and therefore the printed journals could not really be considered as a full paper archive of the electronic database. The addition of older content or low-priority content, such as that from large conference proceedings, is only available in electronic formats and is excluded from the print products.

Regarding the printed vs the electronic formats of the ASFA databases, Mr Pepe (FAO) commented that he had encountered one ASFA user of the printed journal (at the moment, one of Italy's oldest and most renowned marine biologists) who stated clearly his reason for his preference for the print, which was that he just "*preferred reading from paper as opposed to reading on the screen of a computer*".

8.2. ASFA CD-ROM

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) informed the ASFA Board that the ASFA CD-ROMs and DVDs have a new, improved software, similar in functionality to that of the previous SilverPlatter version, which has taken into account some of the requests for improvements made by ASFA Partners regarding the previous version of CD-ROM produced by the ASFA Publisher. He added that both the CD and DVD ASFA products are produced by CSA (i.e. ProQuest), but that they are not for sale to the general public and are only distributed to the ASFA Partners and those Institutes participating in the LIFDC project.

Mr Pepe (FAO) thanked ProQuest and expressed the FAO ASFA Secretariat's appreciation for incorporating, where possible, the concerns of the ASFA Partners and the LIFDC participants in producing the enhanced product.

Mr Ibeun (NIFFR) expressed his appreciation of ProQuest's activities in helping developing countries. He said that the CD-ROM was very important, especially for the developing countries in Africa. He added that although many people used the printed journals, there were always long queues for using the CD-ROM.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) commented that producing the ASFA database in print and on CD-ROM was part of the terms of the Publishing Agreement between FAO and ProQuest.

8.3. Internet Service

Mr Pepe (FAO) mentioned that access to the full ASFA Database was one of the entitlements of all ASFA National Partners (including the collaborating centres in developing countries). Regarding the collaborating centres in developed countries and their access to the ASFA entitlements, he acknowledged the ongoing complaint of some ASFA National Partners in developed countries, which like the developing countries would like it to be easier (lower input requirements) to qualify for additional ASFA entitlements - if not they maintain that their efforts to recruit new collaborating centres were being hampered. The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to take this into consideration during the discussions regarding entitlements, when renewing the Publishing Agreement with ProQuest.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) referred to the new developments regarding the ASFA database as hosted by ProQuest and mentioned in the ProQuest Summary Report, such as: bi-weekly updates, the possibility to set up personal interface preferences and the “expanded full-text linking” service. See Agenda Item 8.5 for discussions regarding full-text linking.

Mr Sainekar (NIO/NICMAS) congratulated ProQuest regarding the biweekly updates, complimenting in particular both Mr Emerson and Ms Soto (ProQuest) for their contribution to improving the services of the ASFA database.

[**Rapporteur’s note**: Ms Soto (ProQuest) gave a presentation on the CSA Illumina platform on the Fifth Day of the meeting, demonstrating in particular the new features mentioned above.]

8.4. Document Delivery

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reminded ASFA Partners that the provision of documents (document delivery) was not officially part of their ASFA Partner responsibilities. Therefore they were not obliged to do so. However the ASFA record should give the user enough information so as to be able to obtain/retrieve the document.

Mr Pepe (FAO) said that the ASFA Board-L could be used to make requests for documents amongst Partners, as has been done by several ASFA Partners, and that the list could be used more for information/document sharing. He added that the ASFA Partnership was not just “data entry” and sending ASFA records to the ASFA publisher.

Mr Sainekar (NIO/NICMAS) commented that he had often used the ASFA Board-L for this purpose and had always been able to receive the documents he requested.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) reminded ASFA Partners of the IAMSLIC Z39.50 catalogue and said that they should use this for document requests/delivery, and only use the ASFA Board-L if everything else failed. Mr Pepe (FAO) concurred with the fact that the first step for document requests/delivery should be the IAMSLIC Z39.50 catalogue.

8.5. New Outputs and Services (by ProQuest)

Full-text linking

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) explained the new “expanded full-text linking” service in the ASFA database, whereby it was possible to link an ASFA record to the full text of the document, if the ASFA Partner had access (i.e. subscribed) to the publication/journal.

Ms Noble (NMBL) raised the issue of “clickable” links from the ASFA record to the full text, referring to the fact that many of the ASFA records on the ASFA database have the URLs in the Notes field which are not active (“clickable”) links, and so it was only possible to link to the full text by copying and pasting the URL address into an internet browser software. This was also mentioned in the IFREMER Summary Report (See **Annex**-**19**)

Ms Soto (ProQuest) reminded the ASFA Partners of the demonstration she gave at the previous year’s Board Meeting regarding full-text linking. She explained that there was some difficulty in mapping the URL addresses due to the fact that there were different types of URL addresses i.e. a URL not pointing to the full-text but only to the abstract, or to the publisher URL. CSA Illumina had different fields for the various URL addresses, whereas the current version of the www-ISIS-ASFA 1.1 only had one field. Ms Soto (ProQuest)

said that it would be possible to map the URL address field in the www-ISIS-ASFA software to the full-text link in CSA Illumina, if the URL address that pointed to the full text only was entered in that field.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that URL address in the Notes field could be moved to a URL field, although it would not be possible to know whether it was a proper full-text URL, a publisher URL or a journal URL. Ms Noble (NMBL) asked whether ProQuest could move only the clickable full-text link if the ASFA Partner, who had submitted the record with a clickable link, informed ProQuest. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) replied that it was not feasible to do this on a case-by-case basis, with currently available resources.

Ms Wibley (FAO) said that there were plans to add extra URL fields in the eventual release 2 of the www-ISIS-ASFA software, as this had been discussed by the www-ISIS-ASFA Working Group on the Fifth Day of last years ASFA Board Meeting at VLIZ, in Belgium. (See Annex-67 of the 2006 ASFA Board Meeting Report)

FAO agreed to send out via ASFA Board-L a reminder to all ASFA Partners on exactly what information should be entered in the URL address field of the ASFA worksheet contained in the www-ISIS-ASFA software, i.e. specifying that ONLY the URL address pointing to the full-text of the article for which the ASFA record is being prepared should be entered in this field. Any other URL addresses, such as that of the publisher or that of the journal, should be entered in the Notes field of the www-ISIS-ASFA software.

ProQuest agreed to change its conversion programme so as to map the URL Address field in www-ISIS-ASFA to the URL field in CSA Illumina and not the Notes field.

Ms Skotheim (IMR), referring to the future addition of URL Address fields to the www-ISIS-ASFA software, asked when Release 2 of the software would be ready. Mr Pepe (FAO) replied that Release-2 was not planned for the near future.

FAO agreed to investigate with Mr Rybinski (ICIE) as to whether a patch could be prepared to make all of the necessary modifications to www-ISIS-ASFA v1.1 regarding the additional URL Address fields, so that it could be sent out to ASFA Partners via ASFA Board-L fairly soon, without having to wait for Release 2 of the software.

[**Rapporteur's note:** since the Board Meeting, Mr. Pepe (FAO) has met with Mr Rybinski regarding the above issue. Mr Rybinski reports that the preparation of a patch is feasible.]

Ms Soto (ProQuest) commented that URLs change all the time, so it was very important to ensure that it was the correct URL address that is entered into the record. Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) remarked that DOI addresses were stable and URL compliant, so there should not be any problem in using this number to identify/retrieve a document.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that there were various ways to link to documents. DOIs were an industry standard for primary literature, but quite expensive so most grey literature does not have a DOI. A “stable” code from a document repository was necessary to ensure correct linking; however, some programming would be necessary to check and see if the link was working.

Ms Skotheim (IMR) said that Norway used a URN (Uniform Resource Name) to identify and link a document and that this was a numbering system which was internationally recognized. She expressed her concern that the Norwegian input, which was done by ProQuest on behalf of IMR, was linked correctly. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that if the documents had a DOI, then it would go in the appropriate field, but any other type of numbering system could not be managed, since there may not be an appropriate corresponding field in CSA Illumina. Ms Skotheim (IMR) said that URNs were unique identifiers and recognized as document “handles”.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) said that there were not that many different types of URIs (Uniform Resource Identifiers) and that it should be possible to make the field compatible to receive any type of document identifier. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) replied that there was a need for consistency. He said that ProQuest did not have details regarding all the particular types of URI but added that if ASFA Partners so wished, other “document identifier” fields could be added to the CSA Illumina platform, if the appropriate specifications were supplied.

Mr Thompson (NAFO) stressed the fact that URLs are temporary and will change, so this would always lead to problems for ProQuest. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) concurred with this, but added that there were many documents where the URL was the only link, and so it was important to keep this option open for the time being.

Ms Skotheim (IMR) and **Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ**) **agreed** to prepare a list of the specifications related to the various document links and send it to ProQuest. The list could then be circulated to ASFA Partners intersessionally for agreement.

ProQuest agreed to investigate the possibility of adding some different “document identifier” links to the ASFA database.

Use of the ASFA database

Mr Sainekar (NIO/NICMAS) raised the issue of the ‘’use of the database” and how it had changed over the years since its availability on-line. He noted that now many different people are using the database in different ways. Scientists, researchers and technical officers use the database to search for scientific information. However, he said that top/upper level management people were also using the database in an attempt to obtain qualitative and quantitative information. At the moment the database only provided bibliographic information on a particular subject area, but he asked whether ProQuest had any plans to provide “management information”.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that journal impact factors were used internally for prioritizing document production, but ProQuest was not allowed to use them within a customer interface. He added that ISI-Thompson Scientific had the rights, but perhaps if they were to be contacted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat they might consider giving ProQuest permission to use this information and give it to the ASFA Partners. Currently it was not possible to identify material coming from a particular institute. The author affiliations could not be used, since they were not necessarily permanent addresses, in some occasions they could be only sabbatical addresses.

Mr Sainekar (NIO/NICMAS) expressed his regret that it was not possible to enter the affiliations of all author cited in the record.

Mr Ibeun (NIFFR) mentioned that the ASFA database was used to measure the productivity of the scientists at his institute. Whilst carrying out searches, it had been noted that some of the scientists, instead of appearing as editors, were cited as co-authors. Ms Soto (ProQuest) said that there were two different fields for authors and editors, so such cases were most probably errors. She asked Mr Ibeun (NIFFR) to give details of the records to ProQuest and they would be corrected.

Ms Noble (NMBL) asked about remote access to the ASFA database and Ms Soto (ProQuest) replied that she would be giving a demonstration regarding this issue on Day Five of the Meeting.

Illustrata

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) mentioned the new initiative, CSA Illustrata: Natural Sciences - an index to the data presented in figures and tables of academic journal articles, indexed and linked to the article abstract or full-text. This tool helps refine search terms for more precise results. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) asked ASFA Partners to consider the possibility of contributing to this database in the future.

Mr Pepe (FAO) mentioned that CSA Illustrata had been demonstrated by the FAO ASFA Secretariat to scientists at FAO and they were all very enthusiastic.

8.6. Public Relations Activities, Marketing (by ProQuest and Partners)

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) reported that the new company (ProQuest) carried out a considerable amount of marketing and sales activities. It had more staff and therefore had much better coverage for public relation activities. There would be an increase in trainers around the world to conduct seminars on how to use the database.

Ms Prod’homme (IFREMER) referred to some of the ASFA public relations activities carried out by IFREMER, mentioned in the IFREMER Summary Report (See **Annex-19**). These included the preparation and demonstration of a PowerPoint Presentation on ASFA, its history and uses, for their Annual Workshops; regular training courses regarding use of the database; and, demonstrations of the CSA Illumina and Illustrata search interfaces. Ms Prod’homme added that during the Annual Workshops, IFREMER would liaise with the visiting scientists to promote ASFA, and provide details of the ASFA National Partner in their country or region. Should there not be an ASFA National Partner in their country, IFREMER would recommend contacting ProQuest and/or the FAO ASFA Secretariat for more information should they wish to join the ASFA Partnership.

8.7. Entitlements (of ASFA Partners to ASFA information products)

Mr Pepe (FAO) reminded the ASFA Partners to contact ProQuest for any queries regarding their entitlements to the ASFA information products (Internet access to the ASFA database, ASFA CD-ROM, etc.) or should they have any problems regarding Internet connectivity. He mentioned that ASFA Collaborating Partners in developing countries were also entitled to have access to the ASFA database via Internet. He reminded ASFA Partners that the entitlements they received were a form of compensation for the ASFA input they produced, and therefore each ASFA Partner should respect their monitoring responsibility and produce ASFA input in a timely and complete manner.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) informed the ASFA Partners that it was now Ms Soto (ProQuest) who was in charge of the ASFA entitlements. He explained that ProQuest had very strict rules regarding entitlements. In the past, CSA had been very flexible and Mr Emerson said that ProQuest would continue to be so when possible. When ProQuest receives a request from a new Collaborating Centre, even though it may not be entitled as in the Publishing Agreement, it would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. However, he added,

there were some restrictions, so the request would have to go through the Sales Department before Ms Soto would be able to grant extra access.

8.8. Increasing Distribution of ASFA Information Products and Services

The FAO ASFA Secretariat briefly reviewed the historical background of this ASFA Trust Fund project dealing with the distribution of ASFA on CD-ROM to LIFDCs in Africa and via Internet to LIFDCs worldwide (see **Annex-46**).

This project started in 1999 and is now in its ninth year. Ms Hilary Cochrane (FAO) administers the project with limited supervision from Mr Pepe (FAO). Mr Pepe said that an account of the objectives of the project and how to participate could be found as one of the FAQs on the ASFA Homepage (see ftp://ftp.fao.org/FI/asfa/faq/faq9_e.pdf). He mentioned that the number of African countries receiving either the DVD or CD-ROM was 34 and the number of participating institutions in the rest of the world was 23, making the total number of participating institutions 57 - one less than the previous year. During the time the initiative has been underway, a total of 9 institutions have become ASFA National Partners. The FAO ASFA Secretariat thanked Ms Cochrane (FAO) for all her dedicated work in this project and expressed appreciation to ProQuest for their continued efforts to keep this project going.

9. PROGRESS WITH MACHINE READABLE INPUT

9.1. www-ISIS-ASFA

The FAO ASFA Secretariat urged all ASFA Partners who had not yet installed the latest version of the www-ISIS-ASFA software, version 1.1, to do so. Any ASFA Partner having problems in making the changeover to version 1.1 should request assistance from the FAO ASFA Secretariat. Mr Pepe (FAO) explained that version 1.1 facilitates the processing of the ASFA records by ProQuest, due to the new export wizard, and it also contains a larger validation routine and other features which assist the inputter in identifying potential errors during input preparation. In addition, it gives the input centre the possibility of changing the language version of the help notes contained in the software from English to either French or Spanish.

> *Follow-up action item from the Fifth Day of the 2006 ASFA Board Meeting:*
>
> ***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 Mr Rybinski.*

Follow-up: Mr Pepe (FAO) reported that the www-ISIS-ASFA Working Group met during the 2006 Board Meeting to discuss the development of Release 2 of the software (see Section 17.5 and Annex 67 of the 2006 ASFA Meeting Report). He added that the FAO ASFA Secretariat had compiled a draft list of changes based on this meeting and some further changes after consultation with ProQuest and ICIE. He said that a contract would eventually be drawn up with ICIE and Mr Rybinski (ICIE) would visit FAO for more detailed discussions with the FAO ASFA Secretariat regarding the changes to be made. However, this would be done time/staff permitting in the FAO ASFA Secretariat considering, said Mr Pepe (FAO), that the www-ISIS-ASFA software was functioning reasonably well.

Compatibility of www-ISIS-ASFA with Linux

Mr Sainekar (NIO/NICMAS), in the NIO/NICMAS Summary Report, raised the issue of using the www-ISIS-ASFA software under the Linux operating system. He pointed out that he has raised this issue repeatedly over the past couple of years. He stressed that this was a very important issue, especially for developing countries, since the Linux operating system was free. Mr Pepe (FAO) replied that the FAO ASFA Secretariat had sent an e-mail regarding this issue to Mr Rybinski (ICIE) and was now waiting for a cost estimate.

[**Rapporteur's note:** since the Board Meeting, Mr Pepe (FAO) has been in contact with Mr Rybinski regarding this and other issues. Transferring www-ISIS-ASFA to Linux by Mr Rybinski (ICIE) would cost the ASFA Trust Fund EU 30.000. However, there is now also a chance that there will be an externally (i.e. external to FAO/ASFA/ASFA Partners) financed project that will benefit www-ISIS-ASFA in as much as the end result will be an Integrated Library Management software incorporating a Linux compliant www-ISIS-ASFA software. At the most, the ASFA Trust Fund might be asked to contribute $10-$15,000]

Compatibility of www-ISIS-ASFA with other data entry/cataloguing systems

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) raised the issue of data management problems related to the use of the www-ISIS-ASFA software to prepare ASFA records by ASFA Partners who used other local databases and/or information systems for their library catalogues or document repositories. His library uses IMIS. He said that, rather than having to prepare input for the same record 2 or 3 times for these different systems, it would be more efficient to use just one system that could offer all software possibilities. He commented that www-ISIS-

ASFA was not designed as a library catalogue and asked the other ASFA Partners whether this was a problem for them.

Mr Pepe (FAO) replied that although the www-ISIS-ASFA software was not an Integrated Library Management software, it did contain some local fields that were created for Library Cataloguing use. Mr Ibeun (NIFFR) confirmed that the www-ISIS-ASFA system could be used for data management and library catalogues, using the last page of the worksheets, i.e. the local fields, to enter the cataloguing data. He added that his institute found the www-ISIS-ASFA software very useful for library management.

Ms Keita (DPM) said that she was having the same problem as Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) at her institute which was using InMagic to catalogue documents. She commented that the same record had to be entered in 3 different systems (OceanDocs, www-ISIS-ASFA and InMagic) and suggested that the www-ISIS-ASFA system was used as the data entry interface and then the records could be exported to the other systems, in the appropriate format. She referred to the discussions held during the Fifth Day of the 2006 Board Meeting regarding an integrated solution to library cataloguing, ASFA input and e-repositories and the decision agreed for a Working Group to work on this solution. (See Section 17.1 of the 2006 ASFA Board Meeting)

Ms Keita (DPM) noted that there were many countries participating in ODINAfrica who used InMagic as a cataloguing system.

Several ASFA Partners expressed their wishes for the use of just one system, which would enable them to export the same record in different formats compatible with the different information systems they used locally. This would save time and effort, allowing the ASFA Partners to prepare a larger number of ASFA records and/or concentrate more on grey literature.

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) suggested that Mr Rybinski (ICIE, Poland) and Mr Goovaerts (Library, University Hasselt, Belgium) worked together to provide a solution for everybody. She added that both ASFA input and document repositories were very important, but time-consuming.

Mr Pepe (FAO) said that Mr Rybinski (ICIE) could be contracted through the ASFA Trust Fund to prepare export conversions programs for local databases (e.g. IMIS, InMagic) and to insure the ASFA XML export format was satisfactory for repositories.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) endorsed this solution, adding that he believed that it was the ASFA Board's responsibility to help those ASFA Partners, who were using local systems, to export records in a format compatible with ASFA from their local systems into www-ISIS-ASFA for further modifications or, if possible, directly to the ASFA Publisher.

FAO agreed to prepare a Trust Fund Proposal for Mr Rybinski (ICIE) to develop some export/conversion programmes for those ASFA Partners using different systems for their library catalogues/repositories (e.g. InMagic, OceanDocs and IMIS). This Trust Fund proposal would also involve Mr Rybinski travelling to the IOC Project Office for IODE, in Ostend, Belgium, to have discussions with Mr Goovaerts.

[**Rapporteur's note:** since the Board Meeting, Mr Pepe (FAO) organized a meeting between Mr Rybinski, Mr Goovaerts, Mr Pissierssens and himself at the IOC/IODE office in November 2007. The problem of exporting records from the Belgium, VLIZ, local database directly to the ASFA publisher has been solved, and the problem of upgrading the www-ISIS-ASFA software to export (and import) records from various systems is on the way to being resolved/addressed.]

> *Follow-up action item from the Fifth Day of the 2006 ASFA Board Meeting:*
>
> ***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, Mr Rybinski and Mr Goovaerts.*

Follow-up: The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that the Working Group did not work during the intersession, however, Mr Pepe (FAO) did meet with Mr Goovaerts (University Hasselt) while he was visiting FAO regarding the www-ISIS-ASFA software and its ability to export metadata to the OceanDocs DSpace repository. Mr Goovaerts reiterated that he thought the problem was not on the ASFA side but rather with the repositories, regarding who should be making the modifications so as to be able to import the ASFA XML record.

[**Rapporteur's note:** since the Board Meeting (and again referring to the meeting organized by Mr Pepe (FAO) between Mr Rybinski, Mr Goovaerts, Mr Pissierssens and himself at the IOC/IODE office), many of the interoperability questions are underway to being resolved or addressed.]

10. REPORT ON ASFA TRAINING ACTIVITIES

Mr Pepe (FAO) reported that the FAO ASFA Secretariat asked for Trust Fund money each year to assist the FAO ASFA Secretariat in carrying out work/initiatives for the collective benefit of the ASFA Partners. This

year, some of this Trust Fund money was used to fund a training course held at FAO, 21-25 May 2007 for 2 new ASFA Partners, LARRec (Lao) and PMBC (Thailand).

Mr Pepe (FAO) said the FAO ASFA Secretariat was experimenting with outsourcing some of the ASFA Training, so as to relieve some of the work pressure on the FAO ASFA Secretariat. One such training was carried out last year in Canada, 12-14 March 2007, whereby the FAO ASFA Secretariat outsourced the training of SPC to Ms Oriente (ex-SPC librarian and ASFA inputter). Further details as to these training courses, their funding and the people/institutes involved may be found in the FAO Summary Report, Section 7.2.2.2. (See **Annex -3**)

The FAO ASFA Secretariat referred to a second training course carried out at FAO, 14-25 May 2007, which was a "Training of Trainers". This was funded by an ASFA Trust Fund project agreed at the 2006 Board Meeting (see 2006 Board Report, Annex-59). The 2 persons trained to become ASFA trainers were Mr Macharia (KMFRI), who would bear some of the responsibility for training/supporting some of the ASFA Partners in Africa and Mr Montes (UNAM), who would bear some of the responsibility for training/supporting some of the ASFA Partners in South America and the Caribbean. Mr Pepe (FAO) explained that the course involved 2 phases: the first week was an "informal" training whereby the FAO ASFA Secretariat explained the standard procedures it followed when carrying out a training course, and the second week involved the 2 trainees acting as observers during the Training Course that the FAO ASFA Secretariat carried out for Lao and Thailand the following week.

Mr Pepe (FAO) mentioned that another ASFA training had been outsourced during the intersession by Mr Montes (UNAM). This was the re-training of the ASFA Partners in Ecuador (INP) and Peru (IMARPE) that was rendered necessary due to staff changes at both institutes. Mr Pepe (FAO) added that the training of the new ASFA Partner in Guinea (CNSHB) was pending, but there were plans to outsource this training to IFREMER. The re-training of the ASFA Partner in Indonesia was still pending.

11. STATUS OF ASFIS REFERENCE SERIES PUBLICATIONS

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

Mr Pepe (FAO) explained that the Monitoring List is contained as a pick-list in the www-ISIS-ASFA software and that, from time-to-time, updated versions of this list were sent to ASFA Partners, and made available on the ASFA Homepage, for uploading into the software. He said that the most recent updated version of the monitoring list is available only as a text file and may be downloaded for consultation only, from the FTP site of the FAO ASFA Homepage (ftp://ftp.fao.org/FI/asfa/Monitoring_List/MASTER.txt).

Mr Pepe (FAO) said that a printed version of the Monitoring List had been sent to the ASFA Partners in March 2007. Although vulnerable to becoming soon outdated, a printed copy was deemed necessary, at least from time to time. In fact, the FAO ASFA Secretariat has received several compliments.

The ASFA Partners were reminded to alert the ASFA Secretariat of any changes or additions/deletions to their monitoring lists and that, for the time, being any communication regarding the serial publications included in the Monitoring List should be sent to Ms Wibley (Helen.Wibley@fao.org).

Mr Pepe (FAO), referring to the discussions held under Agenda Item 7.3 Monitoring, regarding the possible taking over of some titles on the individual monitoring lists of ASFA Partners by ProQuest, said that the FAO ASFA Secretariat must be informed of any such eventual changes (attention: Ms Wibley Helen.Wibley@fao.org)

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

> *Follow-up action item 14 from the 2006 ASFA Board Meeting:*
>
> *14. The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to update this publication (ASFIS-2, Rev. 2, ASFIS Subject Categories and Scope Descriptions) and to incorporate the changes in the topics to be excluded from the scope of ASFA.*

Follow-up: Mr Pepe (FAO) reported no action during the intersessional period, but said that the **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to make the modification to topics to be excluded from the scope of ASFA when carrying out the next revision of the publication.

See section 7.1 for other discussions regarding subject scope.

11.3. ASFIS-3, Guidelines for Bibliographic Description and Data Entry

The FAO ASFA Secretariat informed the ASFA Partners that a revised edition of the Guidelines for Bibliographic Description and Data Entry (using www-ISIS-ASFA software) had been published and would be sent to ASFA Partners shortly. The revision contains: 1) changes presented and accepted at the 2006 ASFA Board Meeting to speed up data entry; 2) some technical changes related to the new version of the software www-ISIS-ASFA v.1.1; and 3) additions of rules that the ASFA Secretariat deemed necessary following

acquired familiarity with the software and taking into account problems that some ASFA partners have encountered during data input. Part 2 of these guidelines has been re-compiled so as to include useful procedures for efficient management of the ASFA database and also the FAQs related to the software.

Mr Pepe (FAO) also reported that the on-line Help Notes included in the www-ISIS-ASFA software had been revised to as to incorporate the changes included in the above mentioned guidelines.

[**Rapporteur's note:** The revised edition of these Guidelines was mailed to ASFA Partners on 26.10.2007 and the Help Notes were sent to ASFA Partners via e-mail on 7.11.2007]

11.4. ASFIS-4, Guidelines for Abstracting

Mr Pepe (FAO) reported that there was no change to this publication. The publication is available on the FAO ASFA Homepage FTP site ftp://ftp.fao.org/fi/asfa/ .

11.5. ASFIS-5, Guidelines for Indexing

Mr Pepe (FAO) reported that there was no change to this publication. The publication is available on the FAO ASFA Homepage FTP site ftp://ftp.fao.org/fi/asfa/ .

11.6. ASFIS-6, Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Thesaurus

Mr Pepe (FAO) explained that the ASFA thesaurus contained the “subject descriptors” used during the indexing of the ASFA records. He said that it is contained as a pick-list within the www-ISIS-ASFA software to facilitate data entry, and is also included in the ASFA CD-ROM and on the CSA Illumina platform to facilitate searching of the ASFA database.

Use of descriptors

Mr Thompson (NAFO) questioned the use of descriptors, both subject and geographic, saying that they were very time-consuming to assign to records while indexing.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that perhaps emphasis should be given to entering those descriptors that are not mentioned in the abstract.

Mr Pepe (FAO) commented that many organizations have discussed the value of subject descriptors and/or thesauri. He referred in particular to the AGROVOC Thesaurus, developed by FAO, which is used by AGRIS and CARIS information systems of FAO for indexing and retrieval. He said that with the advent of Internet, an initial reduced importance was given to controlled vocabularies/thesauri (e.g. AGROVOC), as most people thought that they could simply search free text to get the information they needed. However, there is now a new trend, again recognizing the importance of and use of controlled vocabularies, since it has been realized that free text searching does not necessarily retrieve the correct information and that it was important to use a correct searching language. Mr Pepe (FAO) added that, in this respect, librarians are very important in assisting researchers finding the exact information they want. He said that this new trend has led to the development of the FAO "Ontology" project, which aims to be a "reference tool that structures and standardizes agricultural terminology in multiple languages for use by any number of different systems". At the heart of this ontology is the AGROVOC Thesaurus. Mr Pepe (FAO) stressed that a controlled vocabulary is very important, as sometimes the words in the title and/or abstract of a document do not accurately reflect the concept being covered and emphasized the important of the human-factor with respect to machine-assisted indexing. He said that the German ASFA Partner, BF, assigns such importance to the indexing that they send their ASFA records to external scientists for indexing. Ms Crampton (NISC) said that when NISC build their databases, they always used scientists to do the indexing, mainly because it was the scientists that were doing the searching. She commented that the taxonomic descriptors were especially important.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) commented that many end users are satisfied with a "preview" content, i.e. records on CSA Illumina without indexing; many users are more interested in full-text searching and do not necessarily use the descriptors for searching. However, the descriptors are very useful for relevancy ranking in search results. Moreover, once trained, searchers understand the full value of the index terms added to ASFA records. Note that librarians have always understood the value that indexed records are to the search process.

Mr Thompson (NAFO) said that many scientists (being one himself) will use their own keywords when searching, rather that the thesaurus descriptors.

Ms Noble (NMBL), speaking from a librarians point view and as a seasoned searcher, commented that one of the values of using descriptors is that they are standardized - the thesaurus should be used as a guideline. The descriptors are used to filter down so as to get the specific information required and exclude peripheral information. She posed the question that perhaps people were not using the descriptors “simply due to lack of training on how to search”. She added that many scientists at her institute use library staff to do the searching for them.

Mr Thompson (NAFO) said that this could very well be the case and that "training for searching" was a valid point.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) commented that the author keywords could often be used to refine the descriptors, when carrying out searches. He added that training in searching was always a difficult issue. He explained that 50% of the searches on CSA Illumina were carried out by students and it was a challenge for librarians (and for ProQuest) to train them. He said that ProQuest, as a database provider, needed to know how to help a user find results and that the descriptors were very useful, albeit indirectly.

Mr Ibeun (NIFFR) commented that "descriptors" and "keywords" were different - descriptors were very useful and resulted in precision, i.e. good retrieval.

Mr Kaske (NOAA) remarked that often scientists used other means for obtaining articles (e.g. friends who were also scientists) rather than searches. He added that today there are some extremely useful tools available for searching and they should be used. He recommended using "evidence-based management" techniques to think more about searching and how to improve results.

Ms Skotheim (IMR) asked whether ProQuest could provide some information on how users searched ASFA. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) replied that analyses had been made, but they were always difficult to interpret. He referred to the previous year's summary report of CSA which had a section on ASFA Usage (see Annex-43 of the 2006 ASFA Board Report), and said that the data had to be examined in detail in the right context. It would be possible to reply to specific questions, such as "How many terms (descriptors) are also mentioned in the title".

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) said that a survey had been carried out at his institute to examine how their database was used. It was found that users searched much more on authors' names rather than the literature; the users were more interested in looking for citations. Ms Wibley (FAO) commented that the type of search carried out depended on the type of database that was being used. On a bibliographic scientific database such as ASFA, searchers were looking for information on a particular subject area. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that when carrying out a ranking of the searches, authors' names are third on the list, but usually always in combination with subject term(s). He added that the most common combination was "subject+publication year+author".

Mr Pettman (FBA) commented that, taking it from the users' point of view, they want extra content, but good, accurate retrieval. He said that the expertise of the ASFA inputters would help the user in obtaining a good quality search result, i.e. good indexing gives good results. He concurred that some people were of the opinion that they do not need to use the indexing terms for searching and simple do free-text searching. But, when they were unable to get the information they want, they realized that a controlled vocabulary was necessary.

Updating the Thesaurus

Mr Pepe (FAO) reminded the ASFA Partners that at the 2005 Board Meeting it was agreed that the UK Collaborating ASFA Centre, Freshwater Biological Association (FBA) could carrying out the work relating to the ASFA Thesaurus updating and regular maintenance, instead of preparation of ASFA input.

Two lists (approx. 200 terms), which had been prepared during the previous intersessional period (one compiled from suggestions sent by ASFA Partners and the second compiled by the ASFA Secretariat) were sent to NMBL and FBA for preliminary analysis. Ms Noble (NMBL/UK) compiled, circulated and coordinated the terms in these lists for discussion (and eventual voting) by the ASFA Thesaurus Working Group. The FAO ASFA Secretariat expressed their appreciation to Ms Noble for her valuable work on this matter. Mr Pepe (FAO) said that the final list of terms was ready and that Mr Pettman (FBA) was working on the actual updating of the Thesaurus file.

Mr Pettman (FBA) thanked both the FAO ASFA Secretariat and the Thesaurus Working Group for all the hard work conducted during the intersessional period and said that it had been a very fruitful exercise. He informed the ASFA Partners that the Thesaurus Working Group had met during the Board Meeting to clarify the very few pending issues. The Thesaurus was now ready to be produced in various different outputs:

- a printed Word version in 2 possible formats: a flat format, like the current printed version, and/or a hierarchical display format, showing the various narrower/broader term levels;

- a file for Mr Rybinski (ICIE) which would be used to replace the current thesaurus pick-list in the www-ISIS-ASFA software;

- an XML file of just the new and/or modified terms for ProQuest, so that it could be incorporated into the ASFA Thesaurus appearing on the CSA Illumina Platform.

Mr Pettman (FBA) reported that the FAO ASFA Secretariat had channelled 4 requests for the Thesaurus outputs to FBA, details of which may be found in the ASFA Thesaurus Maintenance Report (**Annex-38a**).

He mentioned the OWL format, which was the standard Web Ontology Language, and said that it needed further testing. He added that some experimental work had been carried out on modelling the ASFA

Thesaurus to produce output files compliant with the 2 standards, OWL and SKOS (Simple Knowledge Object Standard). The 2 output files were available, if anyone wanted to have a look at them.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat thanked Mr Pettman (FBA) for his work on the Thesaurus and asked him to provide some written details regarding these output formats and what they would/could be used for.

Mr Pettman (FBA) commented that the list of new/modified terms could be sent to those ASFA Partners who have translations of the current Thesaurus (e.g. French, Spanish), so that the new/modified terms could be translated and incorporated into their existing lists.

Translation of the ASFA Thesaurus

Some discussion was held as to the translation of the ASFA Thesaurus and whether it was feasible and/or necessary.

Mr Thompson (NAFO) asked about the possibility of a multi-language version of the ASFA Thesaurus and whether it could be put on the CSA Illumina platform that hosts the ASFA database. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that it was possible, although it would require a detailed mapping. He added that Beta French and Spanish versions were currently available with the ASFA database via the CSA Illumina interface, although the translations were not always accurate.

Mr Pepe (FAO) said that once the thesaurus was updated it would be possible to consider hiring a consultant to prepare translated versions in French and Spanish. Mr Pettman (FBA) said that FBA could take the other language equivalents and integrate them into the ASFA Thesaurus and then perhaps liaise with ProQuest. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) replied that that there were some mapping problems with their current system, which would have to be replaced.

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) questioned the need for a Spanish version of the ASFA Thesaurus and mentioned the difficulties that would be involved, having to take into account the various South American variations of the Spanish language. She said that INIDEP did have a list of the terms most often used for their local database and would provide it, if requested.

Mr Pettman (FBA) said that this would be the way forward, looking towards having a multi-lingual ASFA Thesaurus. Some experimental work could be done, taking the French and Spanish versions as they stand. This work would be carried out as part of the ASFA contribution of FBA and a report would be provided at the next years ASFA Board Meeting.

11.7. ASFIS-7, Geographic Authority List

Mr Pepe (FAO) said that the Geographic Authority List contains the geographic descriptors for use during the indexing of ASFA records. He explained that the geographic descriptor pick-list contained in the www-ISIS-ASFA software is compiled by ProQuest by downloading from the ASFA database all the ASFA Partners' geographic indexing taken over a 3-year period. The ASFA Board has recognized that this pick-list is no longer an Authority List and contains errors. Mr Pepe gave a brief summary of the decisions taken at the 2006 Board Meeting regarding the most constructive way to proceed in order to update/clean-up the pick-list.

> Follow-up on Action item 15 from the 2006 ASFA Board Meeting:
>
> 15. The **ASFA Board agreed** that the most constructive way to proceed would be to form a Geographic Working Group (GWG). .... The **ASFA Board agreed** that the items suggested by Jan Haspeslagh could be used as a 'terms of reference' for the GWG.

Follow-up: The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that no action had been taken on this item for lack of manpower and time.

Mr Kühnhold (BF), the chairperson of the GWG, went through the 4 items listed as terms of reference for the GWG individually, explaining some of the possible actions that could be taken to proceed.

1) cleaning up the current Geographic term pick-list in the www-ISIS-ASFA software:

This would be a relatively simple exercise, although rather time-consuming. Mr Kühnhold said that many of the errors were just typographical ones, but added that some of the terms were incorrect, with the hierarchy not being compliant with the rules given in appropriate section in the Indexing Guidelines regarding geographic descriptors. He urged the ASFA inputters to consult with the relevant section of the Guidelines when having to enter or construct a geographic descriptor.

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:

Mr Kühnhold said that the possibility of subfielding the geographic descriptor field in the www-ISIS-ASFA software could be considered to assist the ASFA inputter enter the data in a correct sequence. The first subfield(s) (broader/general term) could be a pick-list and the last subfield (narrower/specific term) would be for manual data entry.

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 discussions that followed regarding the Geographic Authority List are summarized below.

Using non-ASFA databases

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that it would be very difficult, if not impossible, for the ASFA Board to maintain its own ASFA Geographic Authority List. He added that there were several geographic databases available and suggested the ASFA Board considered buying or leasing one. Mr Pettman (FBA) asked whether the commercial geographic databases had enough marine/sea features. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) replied that some did, but remarked that no "one" particular database would suit all the ASFA needs. He also said that when thinking about buying a geographic database(s), the future use of the list should be taken into consideration, for example examining the possibility of incorporating the use of longitude and latitude, and including variants of names. He stressed the importance of developing the Authority File into something more adaptable to the future.

Mr Kühnhold (BF) remarked that if a "usable" geographic database existed, perhaps one could be bought and then adapted, but the question remained as to which one to buy. He mentioned the Getty Geographic Thesaurus, which was not complete regarding sea features, and the Times Atlas, which perhaps was more appropriate, but said that the problem would be how to adapt such a database into the software.

Mr Kaske (NOAA) expressed his agreement regarding the future development of the pick-list. He referred to Google Maps and NOAA experts who were using longitude and latitude, although names were still needed for inland water areas such as lakes. He also raised the issue of language problems, saying that different names were used for geographic places, and they often changed.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) asked how "buying" a geographic database would work. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) explained that the Getty Thesaurus had a license fee, which was very expensive (in the region of tens of thousands of US $) plus an annual maintenance fee, approximately US$ 8,000. He also mentioned Map Quest, who could sell longitudes and latitudes (there were about 3 million entries). He added that web access was necessary, and perhaps this was not very feasible for the www-ISIS-ASFA software.

Cleaning-up the existing list

Mr Sainekar (NIO/NICMAS) commented that the printed version of the Geographic Authority List should still be considered the "Authority" and should always be used to assist in constructing geographic descriptors. Mr Kühnhold (BF) expressed his agreement and added that the Indexing Guidelines should also be consulted and the rules described in the appropriate section should be followed when constructing geographic descriptors.

Mr Sainekar (NIO/NICMAS), referring to the incorrect terms present in the pick-list, said that he could clean-up the Indian geographic terms. Ms Noble (NMBL) reminded the ASFA Partners that a "cleaning-up" exercise had been carried out several years ago. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that in the late 1990s CSA did send a text file of geographic terms to individual ASFA Partners. The corrected terms that were received from the ASFA Partners were then incorporated into the current pick-list.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) suggested that, for the Geographic Working Group to work efficiently, it should be fewer in number.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) commented that, rather than each individual ASFA Partner cleaning up sections of the pick-list, it would be better if the cleaning-up was carried out by just a few individuals. He was in agreement that the Geographic Working Group should be reduced in number, and suggested reducing it to just 2 or 3 individuals, who could then work on cleaning up the list. He supported the hiring of a consultant via a Trust Fund proposal to assist in the future development and maintenance of the Geographic Authority List, adding that the ASFA Board lacked expertise in this field.

Mr Pettman (FBA) asked whether there were any specialists in the FAO Fishery Department, or other departments, who could be of any assistance. Mr Grainger (FAO) replied that there were various UN Working Groups that were currently carrying out activities regarding geographic interfaces. He added that many of the ASFA Partners came from institutes who could possibly have experts in the field, and suggested that they could search for a person from within their institute.

Use of the geographic descriptors

Mr Thompson (NAFO), referring to the hierarchy of the geographic descriptors, asked how people searched the database and whether it was that important to use the geographic descriptors in the searches. Mr Ibeun (NIFFR) replied that in the developing countries in Africa, the librarians used the geographic descriptors in their searches. The geographic index was very important, especially for countries with many water bodies.

Mr Odido (IOC) commented that cleaning-up the geographic descriptor pick-list may not solve all problems, since there were other features that were becoming important for searching that should be taken into account when carrying out geographic indexing, such as longitude and latitude.

Mr Kühnhold (BF) concurred that it was important to look towards the future and investigate other options, but stressed that in the meantime it was still important to clean-up the list to avoid errors continuing to be made.

The ASFA Board agreed that the Geographic Working Group should be streamlined to no more than 5 ASFA Partners. This would be done by e-mail, given that some members of the working group were not present at this meeting.

The ASFA Board agreed that the members of the Geographic Working Group would clean up the list of geographic descriptors, by correcting the typographical and obvious errors.

ASFA Partners were requested to investigate within their institutes regarding any contacts for a possible 'geographic term' expert, and provide the Geographic Working Group with details. This expert could work as a consultant on a Trust Fund Proposal to assist the Geographic Working Group in their activities.

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

Mr Pepe (FAO) mentioned that ASFIS-15, the ASFIS List of Species for Fishery Statistical Purposes, was compiled/computerized by the Statistics Section of FAO/FIES. The list contains "taxonomic descriptors" and is contained as a pick-list in the www-ISIS-ASFA software to facilitate data entry.

Mr Sow (IMROP) asked for some further clarification regarding the list. Ms Wibley (FAO) explained that the list was prepared by experts in the FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Information and Statistics Service (FIES) and was updated once a year and posted on the FAO/FIES web site. For each new version of the www-ISIS-ASFA software the latest update of this list would be included.

[**Rapporteur's note:** the following information regarding ASFIS-15 is taken from the FAO/FIES web page http://www.fao.org/fi/website/FIRetrieveAction.do?dom=collection&xml=asfis.xml&xp_nav=1.

FIES collates world capture and aquaculture production statistics at the species, genus, family or higher taxonomic levels in 1,728 statistical categories referred to as species items.

The 10,685 species items contained in the list are selected according to their interest or relation to fisheries and aquaculture. Recent taxonomic revisions are consulted to use the correct scientific names and taxonomic classification. This allows the identification of some scientific names and taxonomic codes used in the FAO fishery statistics databases that were no longer correct.

The species of importance to fisheries have been mainly selected consulting the FAO Species Identification and Data Programme (SIDP) publications, such as species catalogues, identification sheets and field guides. FishBase (1998) has been the main source of information on newly included fish species. For fishes, the Eschmeyer's (1998) higher classification was adopted (as in FishBase), for crustaceans the classification by Bowman and Abele (1982) and that of Luning, Yarish and Kirkman (1990) for algae. For the other groups, more than one source is consulted for the higher classification.]

Mr Thompson (NAFO) commented that there should be some other lists available which could be used to supplement the current pick-list in the www-ISIS-ASFA software.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that there were several comprehensive taxonomic lists currently available that could be downloaded with no charge. Most of them had the common names, showed multiple hierarchies and some also included different language names. He recommended that the ASFA Partners take advantage of these lists (e.g. http://www.itis.gov).

Ms Wambiji (KMFRI) mentioned OBIS (Ocean Biogeographic Information System) which included information on synonyms, distribution lists and enables searching by longitude and latitude.

Mr Kühnhold (BF) said that there were many good external services, and mentioned ITIS, the Integrated Taxonomic Information System (which provides taxonomic information on plants, animals, fungi, and microbes of North America and the world). He said that input of the data should be easy and simple to do, there and then.

Mr Pettman (FBA) expressed his agreement regarding using other lists and referred in particular to uBio, prepared by the Marine Biological Laboratory, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, which contained some 10 million records. He added, however, that it would be very difficult, if not impossible, to include such large lists as a pick-list in the www-ISIS-ASFA software, since so much information was included. He added that not all ASFA Partners had Internet access and therefore would not be able to take advantage of using such lists that were only available online. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) commented that this particular list could not be downloaded for free; it would be necessary to buy or license it. He asked if there was a limit to the size of the pick-lists that could be included in the software.

FAO agreed to ask Mr Rybinski (ICIE) regarding the maximum number of terms that www-ISIS-ASFA could contain in the various pick-lists included in the software.

Taxonomic Synonyms

Ms Levashova (VNIRO), referring to the taxonomic pick-list in the www-ISIS-ASFA software, said that often it was necessary to consult a biologist in her institute regarding taxonomic names, since the list was not comprehensive and did not contain synonyms. She raised the issue of synonyms and/or mistakes in Latin names appearing in the document, saying that taxonomic names often changed, creating problems when having to enter the taxonomic descriptor.

Mr Kühnhold (BF) commented that synonyms did create problems. It was difficult for the inputter to know which one was the correct taxonomic name to use and enter in the ASFA record.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) expressed his agreement regarding the problems that taxonomic names and their synonyms caused during data entry. He added that the ASFA inputter was not, and could not be expected to be, a taxonomic expert and therefore would have to rely on external databases.

Mr Thompson (NAFO) suggested that the taxonomic name should be entered as appearing in the document, but the search engine could include the various synonyms or common errors when carrying out the search.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) confirmed that including such information could be done at the search interface.

Mr Pepe (FAO) provided some background regarding taxonomic indexing and ASFA. He said that before the machine-readable pick-list in the www-ISIS-ASFA software, the taxonomic indexing was always taken from that mentioned in the document. Up-posting was considered (i.e. entering the full taxonomic hierarchies) but this would have meant too much work at the indexing stage. He explained that the FAO List of Species was chosen as the pick-list for inclusion in the first version of the ASFISIS software to be used simply as an aid to facilitate data entry and ensure correct spelling of taxonomic names. He also suggested that taxonomic up-posting could be done by ProQuest at the search stage.

The Chairperson, in summarizing the above discussions, reminded the ASFA Partners that they should input the taxonomic name as given in the document.

11.9. ASFIS-10, Authority List for Corporate Names

This list is contained as a pick-list in the www-ISIS-ASFA software. An updated version of this list was included in the release 1.1 of www-ISIS-ASFA. The FAO ASFA Secretariat reminded ASFA Partners that they should send ProQuest (attention Ms Soto: Vicki.Soto@proquest.com) the names of new corporate authors, not included in the current pick-list, so that ProQuest can keep the master Corporate Author list updated.

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

This manual is only for use with the old DOS-ASFISIS software and the most recent version remains that issued in 1998. It is available on the ASFA Homepage FTP site (ftp://ftp.fao.org/fi/asfa/)

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

This publication reproduces in printed format the "Help Notes" contained in the www-ISIS-ASFA software. This printed version of the Help Notes needs to be revised in light of the recent revisions made to the Guidelines for Bibliographic Description using www-ISIS-ASFA software.

[**Rapporteur's note**: since the Meeting, the updated electronic version of the Help Notes (English version only) was sent to the ASFA Partners via e-mail for loading into the www-ISIS-ASFA software]

12. EXPANDED LANGUAGE CAPABILITY IN ASFA

Mr Pepe (FAO) gave a brief summary of the various initiatives taken by the FAO ASFA Secretariat over the years to increase or incorporate the use of other languages within the ASFA system, as listed in the FAO report (See **Annex-3**). He referred to some of the ASFA documentation that had been translated thanks to the assistance and/or efforts of some ASFA Partners.

Some of the future activities envisaged by the FAO ASFA Secretariat include a continuation of selected translations of the ASFA input manuals or part of them, such as the Thesaurus, Subject Categories, Bibliographic, Indexing and Abstracting Guidelines.

There was some discussion regarding the eventual translation of the ASFA Thesaurus. These discussions are reported under Agenda Item 11.6 Thesaurus.

13. ASFA TRUST FUND

13.1. Status of the ASFA Trust Fund

The **Balance** of the Trust Fund is **US$ 794 118.** CSA (ProQuest) deposited US$ 251,290.75 in royalties for the year 2006. See **Annex-44** for the CSA (ProQuest) calculation of the year 2006 royalty payment. **Annex-45** provides a detailed account of the financial status of the ASFA Trust Fund.

Mr Pepe (FAO) introduced this Agenda Item, referring to the document ASFA/2007/ 74 (**Annex-52**) "*The ASFA Trust Fund - beneficial ways of spending the ASFA Trust Fund*", which was prepared by the FAO ASFA Secretariat as a "theme paper" for discussion by the ASFA Board.

Mr Pepe (FAO) reminded the ASFA Partners that at the previous year's Board Meeting, Partners had been requested to think about the Trust Fund and ways in which the money could be spent for the benefit of the ASFA Partnership.

He gave a brief summary/background to the ASFA Trust Fund, outlining what is the money, where it comes from, and how it may be used. He said that the ASFA Partners should consider their Institute's participation in ASFA as part of a larger project (prospective), which is not limited to only inputting records. Efforts should be made to provide and disseminate the information to local user communities.

The Chair asked the ASFA Partners to examine this document and opened the floor for discussion.

Capacity building

Ms Noble (NMBL) expressed her concern that institutes lacked the funding to buy equipment which would assist them in disseminating the information that they held. She suggested that some of the ASFA Trust fund money could be used for assisting those institutions which lack equipment. She said that many libraries do not have scanners, thus making it impossible for them to include documents in repositories or to send copies of documents electronically when requested by users. She suggested that a questionnaire could be sent via ASFA Board-L to ask which ASFA Partners needed such equipment, to assist/to strengthen their capacity to provide information services to their user community.

Mr Pepe (FAO) asked if any particular type of scanner would be required, or whether a standard model would be sufficient. Ms Noble (NMBL) replied that libraries were lacking simple, inexpensive equipment.

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) said that she thought this was an excellent idea, but stressed that the scanners be of a professional type, with good quality OCR. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) commented that the OCR quality of simple, inexpensive scanners was just as good; he added that the highly expensive, professional scanners had very high maintenance costs.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ), although in agreement about using the Trust Fund money to supply scanners to those institutes who lacked them, reminded the ASFA Partners that IAMSLIC could also participate in providing funds to those ASFA Partners who were IAMSLIC members.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to send out a questionnaire via ASFA Board L to survey the need for scanners amongst the ASFA Partners, to carry out a cost analysis and then prepare a Trust Fund Proposal, which would be circulated intersessionally.

Mr Kühnhold (BF) raised the issue of which format should be used to save scanned historical literature. He referred to some very old ICES material available in his institute, some of which was in very bad condition making it practically impossible to do an OCR and save it in a searchable format. He questioned whether such material would still be of use in a graphic PDF format.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that "image only" information is useful, commenting that it was necessary to evaluate the time and effort that would be necessary to try and make the material searchable (i.e. scanning and OCR'ing to create a digital text). He suggested contacting Google who could perhaps do such work under a fee. Mr Kühnhold replied that the good quality material did not take much time and effort, but it was very difficult for the very old, poor-quality material which came out with many errors. Ms Skotheim (IMR) said that she believed it was not necessary to carry out OCR processing on the very old documents and that it would be sufficient to make such material readable and not necessarily searchable.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) referred to the suggestion by the FAO ASFA Secretariat that ASFA Partners used the Trust Fund money to assist them in promoting ASFA in their country, "not only in providing and disseminating information to its local user community, but also sharing resources with others within and outside its local user community". He said that some ASFA Partners could be lacking the technological aspects to be able to distribute their input within their region. Perhaps ASFA Trust Fund Money could be used to help set up local networks and to help convince the local authorities of the importance of such networks. He added that ProQuest should be willing to support better networking, i.e. to assist universities in developing countries to improve their technical capabilities.

The Geographic Authority List as an area for spending Trust Fund

Ms Noble (NMBL) referred to the maintenance of the Geographic Authority List, saying that it has been included in trust fund proposal discussions several times, and urged the ASFA Board and the Geographic Working Group to come up with a concrete proposal this year.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) expressed his agreement with Ms Noble (NMBL) and stressed the importance of resolving the current problems regarding the Geographic Authority List, as discussed in Agenda Item 11.7. ASFIS-7, Geographic Authority List. He said that the Trust Fund money could be used to help speed up the process, by hiring consultants from outside the ASFA Partnership.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) referred to the theme paper (**Annex**-**52**) which, in Section 2.1 Principles and Priorities, agreed for using the ASFA Trust Fund Money, stated that priority should be given to development of tools and capacity building. He noted in Section 4.3 Percentage of all money spent or committed to date, that there was a lack of money spent regarding tools. Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) said that he would like to see a shift in the ASFA Trust Fund Proposals towards tool development, using expertise outside of ASFA if necessary.

ASFA User Survey as an area for spending Trust Fund

Mr Odido (IOC) mentioned how an ASFA User Survey could provide some very useful information, which if examined in depth could provide insights to improving the system.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) mentioned that bibliometric information was very important (e.g. author affiliations) and could be used to produce scientific output data. He suggested that some tools could be developed so as to enable the software (www-ISIS-ASFA) to provide such scientific output data, which would assist the ASFA Partner in keeping track of the scientific information produced in their country.

Ms Prod'homme (IFREMER) commented that such bibliometric information is used to prove that the marine scientific community is doing work in their country.

Exchange/delivery of duplicate documents as an area for spending Trust Fund

Mr Pettman (FBA) raised the issue as to whether the ASFA Trust Fund money could be used to cover mailing costs for sending duplicate documents to those ASFA Partners who could benefit from them. He explained that his institute, FBA, had a great deal of old 'colonial' African literature that it would like to send to institutes in Africa where they could be made available for requests. Unfortunately, his institute lacks the funds necessary to send the material in printed form.

Mr Pepe (FAO) said that conserving the printed format of documents is very important, since not everything can or will be digitized. Many ASFA Partners are now inputting historical data as Trust Fund proposals. He added that this material should be analyzed in order to decide where/to whom it should be sent.

Ms Noble (NMBL) asked whether countries beyond Africa could also be considered. She commented that her institute also had much literature that could be send to other institutes. She said that the ASFA Board-L could be used to circulate lists of available material.

Mr Pepe (FAO) supported the possibility of using the ASFA Trust Fund to cover mailing costs of sending duplicate material to ASFA Partners (an official Trust Fund Proposal would probably be necessary). Mr Pettman (FBA) could mail the African literature at his institute to an African ASFA Partner for historical input.

Ms Noble (NMBL) said that she could send duplicate material to ASFA Partners in other countries. Her institute had long runs of publications available.

Ms Crampton (NISC) commented that the African reprint material could be sent to the library at SAIAB (South African Institute of Aquatic Biodiversity) in Grahamstown, South Africa, who would make good use of it. However, this institute was not an ASFA Partner.

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) believed that the first choice for sending such material should be an ASFA Partner in the region, and then, if no-one was interested, it could be sent to SAIAB.

Ms Nyika (IMS) recommended that the historic material be sent to KMFRI, who could then make the publications more accessible to the African countries participating in ODINAfrica.

Mr Macharia (KMFRI) asked the ASFA Board if KMFRI, once having digitized these “historic material” documents, could prepare records for inclusion in the ASFA database. Mr Pepe (FAO) said that this could be done, but it required clarification and itemization and a Trust Fund Project Proposal would have to be prepared and sent intersessionally. Mr Thompson (NAFO), whilst supporting the idea of preparing ASFA input for these “historic” documents, said that it was not clear as what would happen to the documents after digitization by KMFRI. Mr Ibeun (NIFFR) said that he supported KMFRI handling these documents, but suggested that KMFRI should then distribute them to the originating countries. Mr Odido (IOC) suggested that should NIFFR, or any other of the African ASFA Partners wish to have these documents, they could make a request to KMFRI.

Mr Pettman (FBA) suggested that KMFRI prepare a Trust Fund Project Proposal in collaboration with the relevant African ASFA Partners, and then sent it to the FAO ASFA Secretariat for finalization.

13.2. Proposals in Progress, Completed or Pending Further Discussion

13.2.1. Financial support to attend 2007 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (KMFRI, Kenya, 2007)

(in progress) This project refers to **this** year's (2007) Meeting, so the project should 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 9 ASFA Partners to attend this year's ASFA Board Meeting: DPM, IMROP, IMS, INAHINA, INIDEP, NIFFR, NIO/NICMAS, NMDIS, and VNIRO.

This is an on-going proposal, and the renewal of this proposal for 2008 is contained in **Annex-47** and is discussed and reported under Agenda Item 13.3.1 (see below).

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

(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/2007/65 ASFA Trust Fund Status, Section 3 Item 2 (**Annex-45)** 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 2008 is contained in **Annex-3a** and is discussed under Agenda Item 13.3.2 (see below).

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

(in progress) This proposal was approved 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 first payment was made and a part of the records have been submitted to ProQuest. Mr Macharia (KMFRI) reported that 4000 records were abstracted and indexed, but some were awaiting a final quality control before being sent to ProQuest.

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

(in progress) This project was approved 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 (FAO) reported that the project was underway and that the first payment had been made. Ms Levashova (VNIRO) added that several batches of records from this project had been sent to ProQuest during the intersessional period. In total, 195 records are now on CSA Illumina. The total number of records to be completed for this project is approximately 700.

13.2.5. 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.

This project proposal expires this year. The request for the extension of this proposal, at an estimated cost of $840, is contained in **Annex-55** and is discussed under Agenda Item 13.3. (See below).

13.2.6. (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 approximately 10, 000 and increasing the time frame.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) reported that there had been delays in sending the completed records to ProQuest due to a compatibility problem between the www-ISIS-ASFA software and the software used at VLIZ. However, following discussions held with Ms Soto (ProQuest) during this meeting, the problem appears to have been resolved and Mr Haspeslagh said that by the end of the year VLIZ would be able to complete the project.

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

(completed) The following 16 ASFA Partners received full or partial assistance to attend the 2006 ASFA Board Meeting: CIP, FICen, IFOP, IIP, IMROP, IMS, INIDEP, INP, KMFRI, KORDI, MEI, NIO/NICMAS, NMDIS, SFI, UNAM, and VNIRO.

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

(completed) This proposal was to assist the FAO ASFA Secretariat with work/initiatives/formation activities for the collective benefit of the ASFA Partnership.

For the period January - December 2006, $28 545 was spent; the unspent money was carried forward to the 2007 allotment See the document ASFA/2007/65 ASFA Trust Fund Status, Section 3 Item 9 (**Annex-45)** for a listing of how the FAO ASFA Secretariat utilized the funds.

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

(completed) This proposal was approved 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 files of the Chinese Guidelines would be put on the FAO ASFA FTP site.

13.2.10. Training of Trainers $10 000

(completed) This proposal for the "training of trainers" in the ASFA input procedures was agreed at the 2006 ASFA Board Meeting (see 2006 Report, section 13.3.5 and Annex 59). Marco Montes (UNAM, Mexico) and James Macharia (KMFRI, Kenya) came to FAO, 14-25 May 2007. Mr Montes carried out a training of the ASFA Partners in Peru and Ecuador in August 2007.

13.2.11. ASFA-FIGIS Interaction (re: a map-based query facility (GIS) for ASFA) ($20,000)

(completed) 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 tool is functional, but it is not operational (i.e. available to the general public user) on either the ProQuest or FAO sites. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) reported that it was a case of authorization, i.e. passwords, that needed to be sorted out.

13.2.12. (FAO) MINI ASFA MEETING (REGIONAL)

(postponed) This proposal was approved at the 2006 ASFA Board Meeting (see 2006 Report, section 13.3.4 and Annex 57). Initially, the first of such Meetings was to be held in Latin America, and if successful, subsequent Meetings would be considered for Asia and for Africa.

The time available at FAO and INIDEP (where the Meeting was to be hosted) was not sufficient to organize this Meeting during the intersessional period. Therefore, the Meeting is postponed probably until next year.

13.2.13. IAMSLIC-ASFA, Aquatic Commons Initiative/repository Trust Fund proposal

(superceded) The Trust Fund project proposal (IAMSLIC-ASFA, Aquatic Commons Initiative) was approved, in principle, by the Board during the 2005-2006 intersessional period via ASFA-Board-L.

This proposal should be considered superceded/cancelled, because IAMSLIC no longer requires funding from ASFA to start up the Repository. For further explanation see ASFA/2007/72 (**Annex-50**). See next item and 13.3.5.

13.2.14. Initiative to support the digitization of grey literature for inclusion in the IAMSLIC *Aquatic Commons Digital Document Repository,* and advice as to what should be digitized

(pending) This proposal was circulated to the ASFA Board during the 2006-2007 intersessional period for approval in principle, **but a quorum was not** reached.

The Board was requested to reconsider this proposal, and was discussed for approval under Agenda Item 13.3.5. See ASFA/2007/72 (**Annex-52**) for further details.

13.2.15. (FAO) www-ISIS-ASFA – towards Release-2

(pending) This proposal to continue with the development of the www-ISIS-ASFA software ($8 750) was approved at the 2006 ASFA Board Meeting (see section 13.3.6 and Annex 58 of 2006 Meeting Report). The "Release-2" would include some changes that could not be, at the time, incorporated into the 1.1 upgrade and new elements to be discussed by the Board, CSA, FAO, and ICIE.

Mr Pepe reported that the FAO ASFA Secretariat had compiled a draft list of changes, on consultation with ProQuest and ICIE. He said that the next step would be to draw up a contract with ICIE and have Mr Rybinski come to FAO for more detailed discussions with the FAO ASFA Secretariat. Mr Pepe added that this proposal was not considered top priority, since the www-ISIS-ASFA v1.1 of the software was working satisfactorily, and therefore would be done time/staff permitting.

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

(pending) This proposal was approved, in principle, at the 2006 ASFA Board Meeting (see 2006 Report, section 13.3.7 and Annex 32a), but is pending until NIFFR records no longer require checking/editing.

The proposal was put forward again this year by NIFFR and was discussed for approval under Agenda Item 13.3, where it was approved.

13.2.17. (Russia-VNIRO/PINRO) - Input of Barents and Norwegian Seas Literature ($3 960)

(pending) This proposal was approved at the 2006 ASFA Board Meeting (see section 13.3.8 and Annex 35a of the 2006 Meeting Report). Mr Pepe (FAO) reported that the contractual details for carrying it out have not yet been worked out between the FAO ASFA Secretariat and VNIRO and PINRO.

13.2.18. (PDII/LIPI- Indonesia) - ASFA Trust Fund Proposal ($11 000) relating to ASFA input preparation and training

(pending) This proposal was not approved at the 2006 ASFA Board Meeting (see section 13.3.10 and Annex 24a of the 2006 Meeting Report) and was designated for further discussion between the FAO ASFA Secretariat and PDII/LIPI. Mr Pepe (FAO) reported difficulties in communicating with PDII/LIPI, but an agreement had been reached whereby a training of one or two PDII/LIPI staff at FAO would take place some time in the future. FAO will pay the travel and per-diem of one trainee and PDII/LIPI for the other.

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

(pending) This proposal was approved by the Board at the 2004 ASFA Board Meeting (see section 13.3.5 and Annex-29c of the 2004 Board Meeting Report). This proposal is pending due to the transfer of the main ASFA contact regarding this project.

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

(pending) This proposal was approved by the Board at the 2004 ASFA Board Meeting (see section 13.3.6 and Annex-29a of the 2004 ASFA Board Meeting Report). This proposal is pending due to the transfer of the main ASFA contact regarding this project.

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

(pending) This proposal was approved by the Board at the 2004 ASFA Board Meeting (see section 13.3.7 and Annex-29b of the 2004 ASFA Board Meeting Report). This proposal is pending due to the transfer of the main ASFA contact regarding this project.

13.2.22. (FAO) - Setting Aside a Small Part of the ASFA Trust Fund to Finance Micro-Projects in ASFA Partner Countries Related To Aquatic Information

(pending) The FAO ASFA Secretariat proposed this Trust Fund project on an experimental basis at the last Board Meeting see Board Report (section 13.3.3, Annex-55, of the 2006 Meeting Report).

This proposal was not discussed.

13.3. New and/or Ongoing Proposals

13.3.1. Financial support to attend the ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (for year 2008)

(approved) This is an ongoing project proposal **(Annex-47)**.It is reviewed each year by the Board to update the amount of allocated funds. At the last 2006 Meeting, the FAO ASFA Secretariat proposed that the sum for 2008 Meeting would also be $40 000.

The **ASFA Board approved** the proposal.

13.3.2. Staff Support to the ASFA Secretariat (for year Jan-Dec 2008) ($60 000)

(approved) This is an ongoing project proposal **(Annex-3a)**. It is reviewed each year by the Board to update the amount of allocated funds. It aims to assist the FAO ASFA Secretariat in carrying out work/initiatives that are for the collective benefit of the ever-increasing number of ASFA Partners.

Mr Grainger (FAO) referred to the decrease in budget allocations within FAO which continued to create financial difficulties for the Department within which the FAO ASFA Secretariat is located. He said that this trust fund proposal would provide a valuable source of financial resources for the FAO ASFA Secretariat to carry out additional activities for the benefit of ASFA.

The **ASFA Board approved** the proposal for the next two years for a total of $120 000.

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

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) suggested that the Board allocated a "fixed percentage" of the Trust Fund money, which would safeguard the money for the FAO ASFA Secretariat.

Several ASFA Partners commented that it could be dangerous to fix an amount of money to be spent, as it could bias decisions made by the FAO ASFA Secretariat.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) clarified that he was suggesting the setting-up of a certain amount of money as a table, so as not to spend all the money in the ASFA Trust Fund. This fixed amount could be set aside and kept for regular projects.

Mr Thompson (NAFO) suggested that the proposal be re-written mentioning specific activities rather than just asking for funding.

Mr Pepe (FAO) replied that the specific activities were listed in the Terms of Reference of the project proposal.

Mr Pettman (FBA) suggested matching the 2-year horizon with the FAO biennial budget period. Mr Grainger (FAO) said that the next FAO biennium was 2008/2009, so a 2-year horizon for this project proposal would match perfectly.

13.3.3. (FAO) ASFA Trust Fund project proposal – To strengthen ASFA Partner in Kenya (KMFRI) in order to provide ASFA Training Support for other ASFA Partners in Africa and so as to assist FAO ASFA Secretariat (provision of computer equipment) $5 000

(approved) Mr Pepe (FAO) said that the FAO ASFA Secretariat cannot continue, alone, to train and provide follow-up to the ever increasing number of new ASFA Partners, or those who change staff and require re-training). He explained that Mr Macharia (KMFRI) participated in a "Training for Trainers" course on ASFA input procedures at FAO during the intersessional period, in order to prepare KMFRI to be able to provide training and follow-up to other African ASFA Partners.

This project proposal (**Annex**-**49**) is for the purchase of one computer+monitor+external hard disk (for back-ups), one printer and one scanner for KMFRI, who would use this equipment not only for carrying out ASFA training activities but also for follow-up procedures, i.e. KMFRI would download (import) ASFA records prepared by the newly trained ASFA Partner, print them for checking and then provide instructions and/or explanations regarding any corrections/inconsistencies.

The ASFA Board approved the proposal.

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

Mr Thompson (NAFO) commented on the difficulty to monitor the use of this equipment for ASFA work and asked whether it would be possible to know the number of records checked. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) also said that accountability is important.

Mr Pepe (FAO) replied that accountability would be fairly easy, since the follow-up and feed-back provided by KMFRI would be monitored by FAO.

Mr Kaske (NOAA) said that cost/benefit analyses were important, but the evaluation of training is very difficult. Training was vital for the continuation of activities, and the success of the training (i.e. accountability) would be demonstrated by the records produced. He mentioned that the sociological interactions during the training, although not accountable, were very important.

Mr Sow (IMROP) commented that an ASFA Partner having just one PC at its institute often created problems/difficulties in preparing ASFA input. He also raised the issue that KMFRI would only be able to cover training for English-speaking African countries, which would create difficulties for those French-speaking African countries requiring training and/or assistance in ASFA input.

Mr Odido (IOC) said that it could be possible for an ASFA Partner in one of the French-speaking African countries to assist in training activities once it became proficient and autonomous in ASFA input.

13.3.4. WAIVER to policy regarding use of ASFA Trust Fund (which would allow the IAMSLIC Executive Board to submit project proposals)

(approved) At the 2002 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (pg. 18, item-13.3), the Board agreed to the policy whereby Trust Fund projects proposals coming from non-ASFA Partners would **not** be accepted.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat proposes a “waiver” be made to the above stated policy (See **Annex-51)**. The “waiver” would allow the IAMSLIC Executive Board to submit project proposals (of **mutual** benefit to ASFA) to the ASFA Board for its approval. The “waiver” includes the setting aside $14 000 a year from the ASFA Trust Fund for the project proposals submitted by the IAMSLIC Executive Board. Such Trust Fund project proposals would be subject to voting approval by the ASFA Partners and this would be for a period of two years.

The ASFA Board approved the proposal.

Although ASFA Partners were favourable towards the "waiver", there was considerable discussion on the need to "fix" a sum of money for this type of proposal. The major points raised are reported below:

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that setting aside a "fixed" amount of money would not be reasonable, because a valid trust fund proposal, which exceeded this amount, would then be considered not eligible for submission. Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) agreed and added that the criteria "mutual benefit" was too vague. He suggested that these Trust Fund Proposals should be judged under the same criteria as if coming from ASFA Partners.

Mr Pepe (FAO) explained that the amount of money included in this Trust Fund Proposal was an average figure of most ASFA Trust Fund Proposals, which ranged $ 5 000-30 000. He reminded the ASFA Board that there was a large balance of unspent money in the Trust Fund, and said that the main idea of this project was to inject a "new" body or group with some new ideas/projects, i.e. to open up the ASFA Trust Fund for other types of proposals.

Mr Kaske (NOAA) referring to the suggested "fixed" sum of money, re-iterated the fact that fixing a certain sum of money could create difficulties and suggested setting a "ceiling", whereby the ASFA Board could ensure that funding would not exceed a certain amount per project. He was favourable to the proposal being for no more than 2 years, with no more than $14 000 per project.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that there should be clarity as to where the idea is coming from and exactly what would be done. Mr Grainger (FAO) commented that in the proposal it was stated that the FAO ASFA Secretariat would screen any eventual project proposal from IAMSLIC, formulate it and then table the proposal to the ASFA Board.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) said that the ASFA Board could not act as sponsors for IAMSLIC. He referred to how some informal agreements between IOC and IAMSLIC had created some problems for the regional IAMSLIC groups, as some members began to depend too much on such agreements. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) commented that this would be a different situation because it would be "project-based". He stressed that the project should be clear and accountable.

Mr Sainekar (NIO/NICMAS) said that most ASFA Partners were IAMSLIC members and were benefiting from the organization, and therefore the ASFA Board should be favourable towards any activities that would enhance mutual benefit.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) commented that if the project proposal was for mutual benefit, then perhaps the ASFA Board should only sponsor the project for a certain percentage.

Mr Thompson (NAFO) commented that this was rather a complex issue, and said that if the project was of mutual benefit, then it should be done as a joint project. He suggested that the ASFA Board could contract IAMSLIC to do the work. He asked whether there could be an agreement or a Memorandum of Understanding with IAMSLIC. Mr Pepe (FAO) replied that there was already an MOU.

Mr Ibeun (NIFFR) said that the FAO, as the ASFA Secretariat, should be given the benefit of the doubt in formulating such project proposals, and recommended leaving the figure at $28 000 for 2 years.

13.3.5. Initiative to support the digitization of grey literature for inclusion in the IAMSLIC *Aquatic Commons Digital Document Repository,* and advice as to what should be digitized

(approved in principle) Mr Pepe (FAO) explained that this proposal was presented to the FAO ASFA Secretariat by IAMSLIC during the 2006-2007 intersessional period. Now that the ASFA Board has officially removed the ban on project proposals coming from outside the ASFA Partnership (at least as regards proposals coming from the IAMSLIC Executive Board) this proposal was tabled by the FAO ASFA Secretariat for discussion and approval, in principle, by the Board. (**Annex-50**)

Mr Pepe (FAO) summarized the 2 main points of the proposal, which were: 1) a contribution of $10 000 for the digitization of grey literature from economically developing countries for inclusion in the IAMSLIC Aquatic Commons digital document repository; and 2) some guidance/assistance from the ASFA Board in identifying the literature to be digitized.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat suggested that the Board's final approval should await IAMSLIC's clarification regarding concerns about a) the material itself - grey literature (who identifies it, which countries and the cost); and, b) the digitization (who does it and who gets paid for it?). Mr Pepe (FAO) suggested that a small working group could be nominated as a contact.

Most ASFA Partners shared the same concerns and requested further clarification by IAMSLIC. See below for an outline of the issues discussed by the ASFA Board regarding this Trust Fund Proposal.

The **ASFA Board approved** the proposal **in principle**, pending the elaboration of a more detailed proposal by the FAO ASFA Secretariat, which would clarify areas of concern expressed by the ASFA Partners. In particular, ASFA Partners requested that there be a guarantee that the digitized records would go on the ASFA Database/CSA Illumina, with full-text linking that would point to the document in the repository.

The FAO agreed to clarify with IAMSLIC the questions raised by the ASFA Partners during the discussion of this Trust Fund Proposal and then circulate a more detailed proposal via ASFA Board-L for approval.

[**Rapporteur's note**: Since the Board Meeting, Richard Pepe (FAO) met with some key IAMSLIC members and clarified some of the issues. *In brief: it was agreed that: the digitization of material for inclusion in the Aquatic Commons repository was of primary importance to IAMSLIC, and therefore, instead of the $10,000 mentioned in the above Trust Fund proposal, all the funds allocated to IAMSLIC from the ASFA Trust Fund for the next 2 years ($28,000) could go towards digitization. ASFA Partners will suggest specific titles and will digitize the items as well. A newly created digital collection development taskforce within the Aquatic Commons Board will also identify collection development priorities for the repository, and these recommendations will point to many other documents. Therefore, the FAO ASFA Secretariat should now contact the ASFA Partners and solicit their specific nominations of materials to scan; the FAO ASFA Secretariat should identify which ASFA Partners are willing/wanting to do the scanning and work out / negotiate with the ASFA partner(s) a "contract" to do the work, and a procedure to follow.*]

The major issues discussed with respect to this proposal are summarized as follows:

Identification of grey literature from ASFA database search records

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) clarified that ProQuest could not supply any statistics regarding the ranking of the most heavily used grey literature, as inferred in the letter sent by IAMSLIC to the FAO ASFA Secretariat in January 2007. Such information should be generated from comments and suggestions from IAMSLIC and/or ASFA members.

Extra work/duplication of records

Mr Kühnhold (BF) said that once the grey literature to be digitized has been identified and if it is not already included on the ASFA database, then it should be entered into ASFA.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) commented that this new material could be a technical issue, since it would involve more work, and not simply more ASFA input, as there would also be the need to check against the existing ASFA records on the ASFA databases. He said that, once the scanned grey literature had been entered into the Aquatic Commons repository, records would then have to be prepared for entry into the ASFA database, a duplication of work which he believed should be avoided.

Ms Keita (DPM) commented that the OceanDocs repository already contained fishery documents, some of which was grey literature, and therefore this would mean a duplication of information in the Aquatic Commons repository. Mr Ibeun (NIFFR) remarked that this IAMSLIC project would be filling a gap, concentrating on aquaculture and freshwater material, and not be duplicating information. Mr Macharia (KMFRI) clarified that the OceanDocs repository did not just cover material from the marine environment, but also freshwater, and had full-text linking. Nonetheless, Mr Ibeun (NIFFR) commented that the name, “OceanDocs”, implied coverage of the marine environment.

Ms Crampton (NISC) said that African Journals OnLine most probably also had duplicate information available on-line, so it would not appear to be a problem having the same information on different sources.

Full-text linking from repository to ASFA record

Mr Sainekar (NIO/NICMAS) commented that the ASFA Board should have access to these grey literature documents included in the Aquatic Commons repository. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that this was a very important point and added that when asking for clarification, since this was to be a Trust Fund Proposal of mutual benefit, it should be stressed that open access was fundamental and therefore a link to the ASFA record on the repository should be guaranteed.

Mr Pettman (FBA) said that the letter sent by IAMSLIC to the FAO ASFA Secretariat in January 2007, stated that “the Aquatic Commons repository would be free to all and that the digital items created would be linked to the ASFA records” but there was no mention as to how this would be done.

13.3.6. Utilization of the ASFA Trust Fund to pay the IAMSLIC Membership fees for ASFA Partners (extension of initiative for a further two years)

(approved) At the 2004 and 2005 ASFA Board Meeting, the Board agreed to pay the IAMSLIC Membership fees for both ASFA Partners and ASFA Collaborating Centres (i.e. for those Partners who do not have the funds, or are not able for administrative reasons to pay for membership to IAMSLIC).

The scope of this ASFA Trust Fund project proposal is to extend this initiative for another two years, at an estimated cost of $840. Mr Pepe (FAO) reminded ASFA Partners of the benefits of being a member of IAMSLIC, and strongly urged any ASFA Partner who was not a member to take the opportunity that this Trust Fund Proposal was giving them. See **Annex**-**53**.

The ASFA Board approved the proposal.

13.3.7. (FAO) Training session in the ASFA input procedures (once a year) $14 000

(approved) This proposal would authorize the ASFA Secretariat to utilize the ASFA Trust Fund to organize and carry out, once a year, a Training session, for up to 5 participants, in the ASFA Input procedures for those Partners in need (both new ASFA partners and existing ASFA Partners who may need re-training). The training would most likely be at FAO, Rome. See **Annex-54.**

The ASFA Board approved the proposal.

13.3.8. (KMFRI) Elimination of Gaps - Phase two $21 450

This Trust Fund project proposal is a continuation of the retrospective indexing activities conducted by KMFRI. Phase two intends to prepare 2000 records for the following 2 titles: Journal of the Fisheries Research Board of Canada (1934-1972) and Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom (vols. 1-62). See **Annex-26a.**

Mr Macharia (KMFRI) said that KMFRI had less than 20 journals on their Monitoring List. Therefore, by carrying out retrospective indexing activities, they are able to keep their skill and knowledge up-to-date, as regards the ASFA input procedures, rules and regulations.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) commented that the inclusion of older records in ASFA was of prime value for the ASFA database, and that Trust Fund project proposals for carrying out such retrospective indexing were very important. He asked KMFRI to refrain from preparing input from the Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom, since ProQuest was possibly in the process of processing this journal. Mr Emerson said that he would check and inform Mr Macharia (KMFRI) accordingly. He added that, since this journal was available in electronic format, instead of preparing records from the hard copies of the journals in the KMFRI library, time and money could be saved by using the electronic version to prepare ASFA records.

Mr Sainekar (NIO/NICMAS) commented that the Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom was a very important journal, containing many taxonomic studies and articles covering biodiversity. He said that this journal was an open access journal and that if KMFRI would provide links to each article, not only would it help users of the ASFA database to get the full-text content but also it would add to the beauty of the database.

Ms Keita (DPM) asked why KMFRI selected these 2 journals, if they were not under KMFRI's responsibility. Mr Macharia (KMFRI) confirmed that these 2 journals were not on KMFRI's monitoring list, but added that they were included in KMFRI's initiative to eliminate gaps on the ASFA database. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that these publications were high quality journals and a very important addition to the ASFA database. He added that such publications were requested by end-users and also enhanced the quality of the ASFA database.

Ms Skotheim (IMR) asked whether there would be full-text linking to these records. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that ProQuest would point to the full text, if it were responsible for the preparation of these ASFA records and Mr Macharia confirmed that KMFRI would also provide a link if it were to go ahead and prepare input from the journals, since these publications were already in KMFRI's repository.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) suggested that KMFRI investigated the possibility of preparing retrospective ASFA records from Nature and Science, journals which are also available online back to Volume 1. He added that good online access would be required, and suggested that the possibility of requesting extra funding could be considered, in case KMFRI would have to pay for a subscription or improve its connectivity.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) agreed to inform Mr Macharia as to whether KMFRI should proceed with the preparation of records from the Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom.

The **ASFA Board approved in principle** to this Trust Fund Proposal, which would be revised with respect to the journals, number of records and costs, and circulated via ASFA Board L by KMFRI during the intersessional period.

13.3.9. (NIFFR) - Filling the Missing Gap $6990

(approved) Mr Ibeun (NIFFR) introduced this Trust Fund project proposal, which intends to fill some of the missing gaps in the ASFA Database for Nigerian literature since 1971. This will involve the preparation of about 600 records (see Annex 32a of the 2006 ASFA Board Meeting Report for a full copy of the proposal)**.**

Mr Ibeun reminded the Board that this Trust Fund project proposal had been presented at the previous year's Board Meeting and was approved in principle, subject to the renegotiation of certain aspects (e.g. the costs and total number of records involved) and the autonomy of NIFFR with respect to preparation of ASFA input. He informed the Board that the schedule had been corrected and that NIFFR had produced several batches of ASFA input during the intersessional period that were now on the CSA Illumina ASFA database. He added that NIFFR had received feedback from both KMFRI and the FAO ASFA Secretariat, which had been very useful in assisting NIFFR to improve its ASFA input.

Mr Macharia (KMFRI) confirmed that since the training of NIFFR carried out by KMFRI in 2004, NIFFR had been regularly producing ASFA input and sending it to KMFRI for quality control and feedback and said that the input was good.

The ASFA Board approved the proposal.

14. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

15. PLACE AND DATE OF NEXT MEETING

There were no offers to host the 2008 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting from those ASFA Partners present at the Meeting, and the two Partners, who at the 2006 Meeting had expressed some interest in hosting the 2008 Meeting, did not renew their offers.

Mr Pepe (FAO) suggested that all ASFA Partners, including those not present at this meeting, should be given one more opportunity to offer to host next year's ASFA Board Meeting, before the FAO ASFA Secretariat offers to host the Meeting in Rome.

Therefore, **the FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to send an e-mail to all ASFA Partners via ASFA Board-L, asking if any ASFA Partner would like to offer to host the 2008 ASFA Board Meeting. An answer was received – see below*.

*[Rapporteur's note: The 2008 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting will be hosted by the **Institute of Marine Research (IMR) and the Directorate of Fisheries**, Bergen, Norway, 1-5 September 2008 (**http://www.imr.no/english/main** / **http://www.imr.no**) The FAO ASFA Secretariat extends its thanks to Ms Brit Skotheim and the direction of IMR and Directorate of Fisheries for offering to host the 2008 Meeting.]

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

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

The Chair thanked Mr Macharia and the KMFRI team for all their hard work in preparing and organizing the meeting.

Mr Macharia (KMFRI) thanked all the ASFA Partners for coming to the meeting. He also expressed his appreciation to the KMFRI meeting organizing committee for their work and the FAO ASFA Secretariat for all its assistance and support.

17. FIFTH DAY OF ASFA Board Meeting (Special topics, Demonstrations)

This year's Fifth Day of the ASFA Board Meeting (workshop/seminar) was dedicated to speaking about ASFA inputting problems from the point of view of the ASFA Publisher ProQuest and FAO ASFA input checking.

17.1. Comments on ASFA Input

A PowerPoint presentation was given by Ms Soto (ProQuest) and Ms Wibley (FAO) demonstrating some of the areas that ASFA inputters should pay particular attention to, so as to avoid errors/inconsistencies during the preparation of ASFA records, together with some live demonstrations on the www-ISIS-ASFA software. (See **Annex-55)**

17.2. ProQuest tips on using/searching CSA Illumina

Ms Soto (ProQuest) also gave a demonstration regarding the ASFA production cycle at ProQuest. She explained some of the new features and some of the Administrative functions that can be set and/or modified on the CSA Illumina interface. Searching the ASFA database was demonstrated as was the new CSA Illustrata database product. (See **Annex-56**).

Annex-1
(ASFA/2007/ 1)

AGENDA
ASFA Advisory Board Meeting
KMFRI, Mombasa, Kenya, 3-7 September 2007

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 2006 MEETING

5.1 Matters Arising (from 2006 Meeting

6. STATUS OF ASFA PARTNERSHIP

6.1 Report on the Intersessional Activities of ASFA Partners

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

6.1.2 ASFA Partners

6.1.3 ASFA Publisher (ProQuest)

6.2 New and Potential ASFA Partners

6.2.1 Admission of new partners

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 ProQuest

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

6.5.1 WAICENT/AGRIS group

6.5.2 ASFA-ex-FIGIS Co-operation

6.5.3 ASFA-IAMSLIC group(s) cooperation

6.6 Other Information systems (i.e. ASFA collaborating systems (e.g. Odin-Africa) and competing systems.

6.7 Report of mini ASFA Regional Meeting (tentative)

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

7.6 ASFA input (i.e. records produced)

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

8.5 New Outputs and Services (by ProQuest)

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

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

8.8 Increasing Distribution of ASFA Information Products and Services (f*or info/discussion).*

9. PROGRESS WITH MACHINE READABLE INPUT

9.1 www-ASFA-ISIS

10. REPORT ON ASFA TRAINING ACTIVITIES

11. STATUS OF ASFIS REFERENCE SERIES PUBLICATIONS

12. EXPANDED LANGUAGE CAPABILITY IN ASFA

13. ASFA TRUST FUND

13.1 Status of the Trust Fund

13.2 Proposals completed in progress, or pending further discussion

13.3 New Proposals (*for discussion/decision - **ASFA/2007/ 76, 75, 73, 72, 71, 67, 3a**)*

14. OTHER BUSINESS

15. PLACE AND DATE OF NEXT MEETING

16. REVIEW/APPROVAL OF DRAFT REPORT OF MEETING

17. FIFTH DAY - Special topics, Demonstrations - See draft agenda

.....

5th DAY MEETING AGENDA (draft)

1. Comments on ASFA Input - persistent problems encountered in Partners input and advice (Vicki Soto, ProQuest and Helen Wibley, FAO)

2. CSA tips on searching/using the ASFA database via the Illumina Internet web interface (Craig Emerson and Vicki Soto, ProQuest)

.....

6h DAY MEETING

(FOR AFRICAN ASFA PARTNERS ONLY)

Special session organized by James Macharia, KMFRI, for ASFA related discussions among African ASFA Partners and eventual African observers.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

UN CO-SPONSORING ASFA PARTNERS

FAO

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

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

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

IOC

Mr Mika Odido
Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission of UNESCO (IOC)
UNESCO Nairobi Office
UNON Complex Gigiri Block C
P.O. Box 30592
00100 Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: (254) 20 7623830 / Fax: (254) 20 7622750
E-mail: m.odido@unesco.org
URL: http://www.odinafrica.org / http://www.ioc.unesco.org

INTERNATIONAL ASFA PARTNERS

NAFO

Dr Anthony Thompson
Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO)
P.O. Box 638
Dartmouth, Nova Scotia
Canada B2Y 3Y9
Tel: (+1-902) 468 6582 / Fax: (+1-902) 468 5538
Email: athompson@nafo.int
URL: http://www.nafo.int

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

CHINA

Mr Yang Ying / Mr Luo Xuye
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.cn / yangy@mail.nmdis.gov.cn / asfa@mail.nmdis.gov.cn
URL: http://www.coi.gov.cn

FRANCE

Ms Jacqueline Prod'homme
Institut français de recherche pour l'exploitation de la mer (IFREMER)
Bibliothèque La Pérouse/Centre de documentation sur la mer
15 rue Dumont d'Urville
B.P. 70
29280 Plouzane, France
Tel: +33 2 98 49 8871 / Fax: +33 2 98 498884
E-mail: jprodhom@ifremer.fr / 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 Anavyssos Attikis, Greece
Tel: +30 2291076320 / Fax: +30 2291076321
E-mail: sgoulala@ath.hcmr.gr
URL: http://www.hcmr.gr

GUINEA

Mr Fode Karim Kaba
Centre national des sciences halieutiques de Boussoura (CNSHB)
Service d'information et de valorisation (SIVA)
814, rue MA500, Corniche Sud Madina
Boussoura-Port B.P. : 3738/39
Conakry (Guinée)
Te: (224) 60 34 21 58
E-mail: fkaba@cnshb.org
URL: http://www.cnshb.org.gn

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 Keiichi Hamada
Fisheries Research Agency (FRA)
2-12-4 Fukuura, Kanazawa-ku,
Yokohama-shi, Kanagawa 236-8648, Japan
Tel: (81) 45-788-7608 / Fax (81) 45-788-5001
E-mail: khamada@fra.affrc.go.jp
URL http://www.nrifs.fra.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.kmfri.co.ke

MAURITANIA

Mr Amady Sow
Institut mauritanien de recherches océanographiques et des pêches (IMROP)
Ministère des Pêches
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

MOZAMBIQUE

Ms Ana Maria Alfredo
Instituto Nacional de Hidrografia e Navegação (INAHINA)
Av. Karl Marx, nº 153, 5º/12º andar
Maputo, Mozambique
Tel: 258 21 430186/8 / Fax: 258 21 430185
E-mail: am.alfredo@odinafrica.net / am.alfredo@inahina.gov.mz

NIGERIA

Dr Moses Ibeun
National Institute for Freshwater Fisheries Research (NIFFR)
Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
PMP 6006
New-Bussa
Niger State, Nigeria
Tel: 031-670444 / Telegram : NIFFISH
E-mail : moibeun@yahoo.com

NORWAY

Ms Brit Skotheim
Institute of Marine Research (IMR)
Nordnesgaten 50
5817 Bergen, Norway
Tel: 0047 55238550
E-mail: brit.skotheim@imr.no
URL: http://biblioteket.imr.no

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Dr Sofia Levashova
Russian Federal Research Institute of Fisheries
and Oceanography (VNIRO), Head of ASFA Center
V. Krasnoselskaya 17
Moscow, 107140, Russian Federation
Tel: +7 (499) 2640089
E-mail: asfa@vniro.ru
URL: http://www.vniro.ru

SENEGAL

Ms Arame G. Ndiaye KEITA
Direction des pêches maritimes
Ministère de l'economie maritime
1, rue Joris
BP 289, Dakar, Senegal
Tel: (221) 8230137 / Fax: (221) 8214758
E-mail: a.keita@odinafrica.net / arame.keita@gmail.com / dopm@orange.sn
URL: http://www.ecomartime.gouv.sn

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

UNITED STATES

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

PUBLISHING ASFA PARTNER

ProQuest

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

OBSERVERS

Ghana

Ms Marian Jiagge
Water Research Institute (CSIR)
P.O Box M-32
Accra, Ghana
Tel: 233-21-779514 / 770396 / Fax: 233-21-777170 / 761080
E-mail: mjiagge@yahoo.com

Kenya

Ms Nina Wambiji / Mr Elijah Mokaya / Mr Michael Mosoti
Kenya Marine and Fisheries Research Institute (KMFRI)
P.O. Box 81651
Mombasa 80100, Kenya
Tel: 254 41 471129 / 254 41 475151-4 / Fax: 254 41 475157
E-mail: nwambiji@kmfri.co.ke / emokaya@kmfri.co.ke / mmosoti@kmfri/co.ke
URL: http://www.kmfri.co.ke

South Africa

Ms Margaret Crampton
NISC Pty Ltd & AJOL (African Journals OnLine)
19 Worcester St.,
P.O. Box 377
Grahamstown, 6140, South Africa
Tel: +24 46 6229690 / Fax: +24 46 6229550
E-mail: margaret@nisc.co.za
URL: http://www.nisc.co.za / www.ajol.info

Uganda

Ms Alice Endra
National Fisheries Resources Research Insitute
P.O. Box 343
Jinja, Uganda
Tel: 256-043120484 / Fax: 256-0434120192
E-mail: aendra2000@yahoo.co.uk

United Kingdom

Mr Ian Pettman
Freshwater Biological Association (FBA)
The Ferry Landing
AMBLESIDE
Cumbria LA22 0LP, UK
Tel: +44 (0) 15394 42468 / Fax: +44 (0) 15394 46914
Email: ipettman@fba.org.uk

Annex-1c

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)

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)

CSIR - Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (Ghana)

CSIRO - Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization (Australia)

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

DPM - Direction 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)

FIES - Fishery and Aquaculture Information and Statistics Service, FAO

FIGIS - Fisheries Global Information System, FAO

FRA - Fisheries Resource Agency (Japan)

FTP - File Transfer Protocol

GAL - Geographic Authority List

GIS - Geographic Information System

HTML - Hypertext Markup Language

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

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

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

ICIE - Institute for Computer Information and Engineering (Poland)

IDS - Internet Database Service

IEO - Instituto Español de Oceanografía (Spain)

IFOP - Instituto de Fomento Pesquero (Chile)

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

IFRO - Iranian Fisheries Research Organization

IIP - Instituto de Investigaciones Pesqueras (Uruguay)

IMARPE - Instituto del Mar del Perú

IMR - Institute of Marine Research (Norway)

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

MRI - Marine Research Institute (Iceland)

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

NaFIRRI - National Fisheries Resources Research Institute (Uganda)

NAFO - Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (Canada)

NCMR - National Centre for Marine Research (Greece)

NICMAS - National Information Centre for Marine Sciences (India)

NIFFR - National Institute for Freshwater Fisheries Research (Nigeria)

NIO - National Institute of Oceanography (India)

NIOF - National Institute of Oceanography and Fisheries (Egypt)

NISC - National Information Services Centre (South Africa)

NMBL - National Marine Biological Library (UK)

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

NOAA - National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (USA)

NRC - National Research Council (Canada)

OAI - Open Archive Initiative

ODINAFRICA - Ocean Data and Information Network in Africa

ODINCARSA - Ocean Data and Information Network 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

WRI - Water Research Institute (Ghana)

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

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

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

Annex-45
(ASFA/2007/ 65)

ASFA TRUST FUND STATUS

(as of July 2007)

CONTENTS

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

1.1 Yearly Deposits made into Trust Fund by ProQuest-CSA & BF (Germany).....1
1.2 BALANCE.....1
1.3 What is the ASFA Trust Fund?.....2

PART- 2: Trust Fund Project Proposals.

2.1 Projects IN PROGRESS 3

2.1.1 Financial support to attend (THIS) 2007 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (KMFRI, Kenya, 2007)
2.1.2 Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year Jan -Dec 2007)
2.1.3 (Kenya-KMFRI) Elimination of Gaps
2.1.4 (Russia-VNIRO) Input of Caspian Literature II
2.1.5 Utilization of the ASFA Trust Fund to pay the IAMSLIC Membership fees for ASFA Partners
2.1.6 (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.

2.2 Projects COMPLETED (in Intersessional period 2006-2007).....5

2.2.1 Financial support to attend the 2006 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (Vliz, Belgium, 2006)
2.2.2 Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year Jan -Dec 2006)
2.2.3 (China) Compilation of www-ISIS-ASFA Manuals and Guidelines in Chinese
2.2.4 Training of Trainers
2.2.5 ASFA-FIGIS Interaction (development of a map based query facility (GIS) to ASFA)

2.3 Projects PENDING (further discussion and/or action).....6

2.3.1 (FAO) MINI ASFA MEETING (REGIONAL) **(*postponed*)**
2.3.2 IAMSLIC-ASFA, Aquatic Commons Initiative/repository Trust Fund proposal **(*superseded*)**
(ASFA/2007/72) 2.3.3 Initiative to support "Digitization" of grey literature & advice as to what should be digitized **(*re-discuss*)**
2.3.4 (FAO) www-ISIS-ASFA –towards Release-2
2.3.5 (NIGERIA – NIFFR) ASFA Trust Fund proposal filling the missing gap
2.3.6 (Russia–VNIRO/PINRO) – Inputs of Barents and Norwegian Seas Literature
2.3.7 (PDII-LIPI- Indonesia) - ASFA Trust Fund Proposal relating to ASFA input preparation and training
2.3.8 (YugNIRO- Ukraine) Translation of ASFA Thesaurus into Russian and development of Russian-English Thesaurus
2.3.9 (YugNIRO- Ukraine) Translation of www-ISIS-ASFA "Help Notes" and front end into Russian
2.3.10 (YugNIRO- Ukraine) Translation of www-ISIS-ASFA Guidelines into Russian
2.3.11 (FAO) - Setting aside a small part of the ASFA Trust Fund to Finance Micro-Projects in ASFA Partner Countries related to Aquatic Information

2.4 NEW PROJECT PROPOSALS AND ONGOING UP FOR RE-APPROVAL 2007-2008.....8

(ASFA/2007/67) 2.4.1 Financial support to attend the ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (for year 2008) **(*$40 000*)**
(ASFA/2007/3a) 2.4.2 (FAO) - Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year Jan -Dec 2008) **(*$60 000*)**
(ASFA/2007/71) 2.4.3 (FAO) ASFA Trust Fund project proposal – To strengthen ASFA Partner in Kenya (KMFRI) in order to provide ASFA Training Support for other ASFA Partners in Africa and so as to assist FAO ASFA Secretariat (provision of computer equipment) **(*$5 000*)**
(ASFA/2007/73) 2.4.4 WAIVER to Policy regarding use of ASFA Trust Fund- which would allow IAMSLIC ExecutiveBoard to submit project proposals which are of mutual benefit to ASFA – up to a yearly allocation of ***$14 000***
(ASFA/2007/75) 2.4.5 Utilization of the ASFA Trust Fund to pay the IAMSLIC Membership fees for ASFA Partners **(*$840*)**
(ASFA/2007/76) 2.4.6 ASFA Training Session **(*$14 000*)**

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

PART-1: RECORD OF DEPOSITS AND BALANCE

1.1 YEARLY DEPOSITS MADE INTO TRUST FUND BY ProQuest-CSA and BF (Germany)

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

**** (**there are no Trust Fund payments for 2003-2006 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 entries in section 1.1 above)	(+)$1 775 243	*($1 523 952)* (last year)
• **COMMITTED funds** (**sum** of **all** committed funds listed under Part 3)	(-)$1 026 370	*($ 877 670)* (last year)
• **Funds returned to balance unspent** (see items 39, 40, 64 and 72 in Part 3)..... (**note:** Not all unspent funds are returned to balance. In the case of ongoing proposals, that are renewed each year such as: "Financial support to Attend Board Meeting" and "Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat", the funds are carried over to the next year's allotment. In other cases, the funds have been spent on similar or follow-up activities to the original proposal	(+) $ 47 735	
• **Overspent** (see item 31 and 65 in Part 3)	(-) $2,490	
! BALANCE .....(+)	**US$794 118**	($666 727) (last year)

1.3 WHAT IS THE ASFA TRUST FUND?

(see also ASFA/2007/74, theme paper *ASFA Trust Fund*)

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

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

The commercial Publisher of ASFA, CSA (now called ProQuest-CSA) is the major financial contributor to the ASFA Trust Fund (approx. US$200,000+ /year).

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

WHAT IS AN ASFA TRUST FUND PROJECT PROPOSAL?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

All *ASFA Trust Fund proposals are discussed/agreed at Board meetings or circulated to the ASFA Board for approval.* When and if approved, the ASFA Secretariat contracts the work using FAO's official financial instruments (e.g. contracts, Letters of Agreements etc.). Note, money from the Trust Fund for projects such as "filling gaps" etc. is not paid to individual persons but rather is paid to their institute.

****(an exception to this rule will be discussed see ASFA/2007/73 "A yearly allocation to support project proposals fromIAMSLIC of mutual bebefit to ASFA)***

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 Projects IN PROGRESS

2.1.1 Financial support to attend (THIS) 2007 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (KMFRI, Kenya, 2007)

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

At this writing, the following ASFA Partners will receive full or partial assistance to attend this year's ASFA Board Meeting: DPM, IMROP, IMS, INAHINA, INIDEP, NIFFR, NIO/NICMAS, NMDIS, VNIRO.

At the 2006 Board Meeting, VLIZ, Belgium, the Board allocated $40 000 to support attendance at this year's Meeting at KMFRI, Kenya. The $2 252 overspent from last year's allotment was subtracted from this year's allotment leaving a total available sum of $37 748.

The total amount disbursed is not available at this writing. As usual, any eventual overspending or underspending will be subtracted from or added to next year's allocation.

This is an ongoing proposal - so EACH year it requires "updating" with regard to the cost for the following year's allocation. The "Updating" of this proposal for the 2008 Meeting is presented as ASFA/2007/67 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 2007) ($50 000)*

This proposal remains classified as "in progress" until the end of 2007.

This proposal is to assist the FAO ASFA Secretariat with its work/initiatives/etc. that are for the collective benefit of the ASFA Partnership.

* Note, the allotment for 2007 was $50 000, but there was also a **$14 586** carry-over of unspent funds from the 2006 previous year's allocation. Therefore, the actual sum available during 2007 is **$64 586)**.

So far for the period January – December 2007, **$66 917** has been spent/committed. See Part-3, item-2 for a list of how the FAO Secretariat utilized the funds.

Under or over spending will be brought forward and calculated against the 2008 allotment.

This is an ongoing proposal which the Board suggested be reconfirmed each year. The reconfirmation of this proposal for 2008 is presented as ASFA/2007/3a and mentioned under the "New Proposals" section 2.4.2 and will be discussed under Agenda item 13.3

2.1.3 (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.

2.1.4 (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.

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

At the 2004 and 2005 ASFA Board Meeting, the Board agreed to pay the IAMSLIC Membership fees for both ASFA Partners and ASFA Collaborating Centers *(i.e. for those Partners who do not have the funds, or are not able for administrative reasons to pay for membership to IAMSLIC)* (see section 8.4 of the 2004 Meeting Report and section 6.7 of the 2005 Meeting Report, respectively). Note the proposal was not presented in the usual written ASFA Trust Fund project proposal format.

This project proposal expires this year.

*The "extension" of this proposal, at an estimated cost of $840, is presented as **ASFA/2007/75** and is mentioned under the "New Proposals" section 2.4.5 below. It will be discussed under Agenda item 13.3.)*

To date, this initiative has cost the ASFA Trust Fund $1 060 with the following membership fees paid:

(updated table of ASFA Partners as 5 June 2007)

Name	Institution	Country	Expiration Date
1 Guillermina Cosulich	INIDEP	Argentina	2008-12-31
2 Maria Kalenchits	PIMRIS	Fiji	2010-12-31
3 Gajanan Sainekar	NIO	India	2008-12-31
4 Patricia Munoz Palma	IFOP	Chile	2007-12-31
5 Yang Ying	NMDIS	China	2008-12-31
6 Amady Sow	IMROP	Mauritania	2008-12-31
7 Andrea Cristiani	IIP	Uruguay	2008-12-31
8 Nikita Gaibor	INP	Ecuador	2008-12-31
9 Evgeny Romanov	IDR/Ifremer	France	2008-12-31
10 Ali Farzanfari	IFRO	Iran	2008-12-31
11 Pham Tuyet Nhung	FICen	Viet Nam	2007-12-31
12 Jusni Djatin	PDII-LIPI	Indonesia	2007-12-31
13 Olga Akimova	IBSS	Ukraine	2007-12-31
14 Tipamat Upanoi	PMBC	Thailand	2008-7-31
15 Marco Montes	UNAM	Mexico	6/2007-6-2009
16 Thavone Phommavong	LARReC	Lao	6/2007-6-2009
17 Raphael Okeyo	KMFRI	Kenya	6/2007-6-2009
18 Lea Kull	MEI	Estonia	6/2007-6-2009
19 James Macharia	KMFRI	Kenya	2008-12-31
20 Moses Ibeun	NIFFR	Nigeria	2008-12-31
21 Bouchra Bazi	INRH	Morocco	2008-12-31

2.1.6 (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 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.

2.2 Projects COMPLETED (in Intersessional period 2006-2007)

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

The sum of $38,500 was allocated at the 2005 Meeting to support attendance at the 2006 Board Meeting in Belgium. The allocated sum plus the $2 289 unspent from the previous year's allocation brought the total available sum to $40 789.

The final total amount disbursed was $43 041. The overspent $2 252 was subtracted from the 2007 Meeting allocation.

The following 16 ASFA Partners received full or partial assistance to attend the 2006 ASFA Board Meeting: CIP, FICen, IFOP, IIP, IMROP, IMS, INIDEP, INP, KMFRI, KORDI, MEI, NIO/NICMAS, NMDIS, SFI, UNAM, VNIRO.

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

This proposal was to assist the FAO ASFA Secretariat with the work/initiatives/formation that are for the collective benefit of the ASFA Partnership.

*Note, in addition to the $40 000 allotment for 2006, there was also $3 313 carry-over of unspent funds allocated for 2005 (and previous years), therefore the actual sum available during 2006 was $43 131.

For the period January - December 2006, $28 545 was spent.

The unspent US$ 14 586 was carried forward to the 2007 allotment.

See Part-3, item-9 for list of how FAO Secretariat utilized funds.

2.2.3 (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).

2.2.4 Training of Trainers $10 000 (plus $10 000 for video)

This proposal for the "training of trainers" in the ASFA input procedures was agreed at the 2006 ASFA Board Meeting (see 2006 Report, section 13.3.5 and Annex 59). The trainers are to assist the FAO ASFA Secretariat in the training of ASFA Partners. Marco Montes (UNAM, Mexico) and James Macharia (KMFRI, Kenya) came to FAO from 14-25 May 2007. Cost $9 782. A video was not made for lack of time to prepare for it. Mr. Montes will be utilized in the training of the ASFA Partners in Peru and Ecuador in July or August 2007.

2.2.5 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 was presented at the 2005 and 2006 ASFA Board Meetings (see Annex-47 of 2005 Meeting Report and Annex-51of 2006 year's Report). During the 2005 Meeting, the 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. The tool is functional, but it is not operational (i.e. available to the general public user) on either the Proquest-CSA or FAO sites.

2.3 Projects PENDING (pending further discussion and/or action)

2.3.1 (FAO) MINI ASFA MEETING (REGIONAL)

Agreed at the 2006 ASFA Board Meeting (see 2006 Report, section 13.3.4 and Annex 57) - Initially, the first of such Meetings was to be held in Latin America. If successful, subsequent Meetings would be considered for Asia and for Africa. The idea is that such Meetings would provide a forum to exchange ideas before the Board Meetings and to discuss practical experiences and problems/solutions related to the ASFA input and its special problems.

The time available at FAO and INIDEP (where the Meeting was to be hosted) was not sufficient to organize this Meeting during the intersessional period. Therefore, the Meeting is postponed until further notice. The FAO ASFA Secretariat would like to clarify that "**all such Meetings, in the future, would need to be fully organized by the hosting organization with minimum input from FAO.**

2.3.2 IAMSLIC-ASFA, Aquatic Commons Initiative/repository Trust Fund proposal

(superceded by proposal below) The Trust Fund project proposal (IAMSLIC-ASFA, Aquatic Commons Initiative) was approved, in principle, by the Board during the 2005-2006 intersessional period via ASFA-Board-L. The proposal was never given "final" approval and no funds were disbursed, because the proposal required further clarification from IAMSLIC. **This proposal should be considered superceded/ cancelled**, because IAMSLIC no longer requires funding from ASFA to start up the Repository.

Further explanation see ASFA/2007/72,

2.3.3 Initiative to support the digitization of grey literature and advice as to what should be digitized

This proposal was circulated to the ASFA Board during the 2006-2007 intersessional period for approval in principle, **but a quorum was not** reached (**see note-2**).

THE BOARD IS REQUESTED TO RECONSIDER THIS PROPOSAL, see (ASFA/2007/ 72)

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

This proposal to continue with the development of the www-ISIS-ASFA software ($8 750) was agreed at the 2006 ASFA Board Meeting (see section 13.3.6 and Annex 58 of 2006 Meeting Report). The "Release-2" would include some considerable changes that could not be, at the time, incorporated into the 1.1 upgrade and new elements to be discussed by the Board, CSA, FAO, ICIE.

A www-ISIS-ASFA Working Group comprised of: Mr Emerson and Ms Soto (CSA), Mr Goovaerts (Universiteit Hasselt), Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ), Mr Jorgens (UN/DOALOS), Ms Lombardi, Mr Pepe, Ms Wibley (FAO), Mr Pissierssens (IOC), Ms Prod'homme (IFREMER) and Dr. Rybinski (ICIE) met at the 2006 Board Meeting (evening of 5th day). Mr Pepe opened the meeting by stating that the ASFA Board had agreed to proceed with development of Version 2 of the www-ISIS-ASFA software, and to initiate this development. He 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 of 2006 Board Report)**.** This document had been previously circulated to CSA and Dr Rybinski and included their comments.
The Working Group examined the initial list of suggested changes contained in the document and the discussions and decisions are recorded in the above mentioned Annex-54 and section 17.5 of the 2006 Meeting Report.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat (L.Lombardi, lead) compiled a draft list of changes based both on this meeting and further changes identified by FAO for which Ms Lombardi has consulted with CSA and ICIE on these changes.

The next step is to draw up a contract with ICIE and have Dr Rybinski come to FAO for more detailed discussions with the FAO Secretariat regarding the changes to be made.

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

This proposal was agreed, in principle, at the 2006 ASFA Board Meeting (see 2006 Report, section 13.3.7 and Annex 32a). 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. This proposal remains pending until NIFFR records no longer require checking/editing.

2.3.6 (Russia–VNIRO/PINRO) – Inputs of Barents and Norwegian Seas Literature (US3960)

This proposal (see 2006 Report, Annex 35a and section 13.3.8) was agreed by the Board. The contractual details for carrying it out have not yet been workied out between the FAO ASFA Secreatriat and VNIRO and PINRO.

2.3.7 (PDII-LIPI- Indonesia) - ASFA Trust Fund Proposal ($11 000) relating to ASFA input preparation and training

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

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

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

2.3.9 (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.

2.3.10 (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.

2.3.11 (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 proposed this Trust Fund project on an experimental basis at the last Board Meeting see Board Report (section 13.3.3, Annex-55) 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.

At the last Board Meeting it was suggested that this proposal be again reconsidered at this Meeting

2.4 NEW PROJECT PROPOSALS AND ONGOING UP FOR RE-APPROVAL 2007-2008

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

2.4.1 Financial support to attend the ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (for year 2008)

This proposal **(ASFA/2007/67)** is reviewed each year by the Board to update the amount of allocated funds. However at the last 2006 Meeting the FAO ASFA Secretariat proposed that the sum for 2008 Meeting also be $40 000.

THEREFORE, the renewal of this Trust Fund project proposal for 2008 meeting is for **US$40 000**..

2.4.2 (FAO) - Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year Jan -Dec 2008) ($60,000)

This proposal **(ASFA/2007/ 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 the figure of $60 000

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.

2.4.3 (FAO) ASFA Trust Fund project proposal – To strengthen ASFA Partner in Kenya (KMFRI) in order to provide ASFA Training Support for other ASFA Partners in Africa and so as to assist FAO ASFA Secretariat (provision of computer equipment) $5 000

(ASFA/2007/71) The FAO ASFA Secretariat cannot, alone, train and provide follow-up to the ever increasing number of new ASFA Partners (plus the "old" Partners who change staff and require re-training). This project proposal is for the purchase of one computer, printer and scanner.

2.4.4 WAIVER to policy regarding use of ASFA Trust Fund (which would allow the IAMSLIC Executive Board to submit project proposals) (ASFA/2007/ 73)

At the 2002 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (pg. 18, item-13.3), the Board agreed that Trust Fund projects proposals coming from non-ASFA Partners would **not** be accepted.

HOWEVER, this paper suggests that "waiver" or an exception to the above stated policy, be made which would allow or authorize the IAMSLIC Executive Board to submit project proposals (of **mutual** benefit to ASFA) to the ASFA Board for its approval and funding up to a total sum of $14 000 per year, for the next two intersessional periods (2 years).

The fact that many ASFA Partners are IAMSLIC members and vice-versa is testimony that many of the interests of both groups are in-common or overlap. Hence, a project proposal by IAMSLIC would likely benefit ASFA, just as most project proposals by ASFA Partners would benefit IAMSLIC.

Therefore this Trust Fund proposal calls for setting aside of $14 000 a year from the ASFA Trust Fund for proposals submitted by the IAMSLIC Executive Board. Such Trust Fund project proposals would be subject to voting approval by the ASFA Partners and this would be for a trial period of two years.

2.4.5 Utilization of the ASFA Trust Fund to pay the IAMSLIC Membership fees for ASFA Partners (extension of initiative for a further two years) (ASFA/2007/ 75)

At the 2004 and 2005 ASFA Board Meeting, the Board agreed to pay the IAMSLIC Membership fees for both ASFA Partners and ASFA Collaborating Centers *(i.e. for those Partners who do not have the funds, or are not able for administrative reasons to pay for membership to IAMSLIC)* (see section 8.4 of the 2004 Meeting Report and section 6.7 of the 2005 Meeting Report, respectively). Note the proposal was not presented in the usual written ASFA Trust Fund project proposal format.

This project proposal expires this year.

***The FAO ASFA Secretariat would like it to see this initiative extended for another two years (at an estimated cost of $840). see* (ASFA/2007/ 75)**

2.4.6 ASFA Training Session ($14 000) (ASFA/2007/76)

This proposal would authorize the ASFA Secretariat to organize and carry out, once a year, a Training session, up to 5 particpants, in the ASFA Input procedures for those Partners in need (both new ASFA partners and existing ASFA Partners who may need re-training). The training would most likely be at FAO, Rome

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.

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

	COMMITTED	DISBURSED	NOTES
Digitizing Grey Literature and helping to identify it for inclusion in IAMSLIC Repository - $10 000	**$**	$	* **Not Agreed No quorum**

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

	COMMITTED	DISBURSED	NOTES
1. Financial Support to attend annual (2007) Board Meeting * (**$ 40 000** allocated by the Board for the 2007 Meeting, however there is a MINUS carry-over of **$ 2 252** from last year to subtract from the 2007 allocation. **Therefore, the TOTAL funds available for the 2007 Meeting = $37 748.** * Note, the minus $2 252 is not shown in the "Committed" column, but is calculated as part of balance available to be spent. ** approx. US$??? is being spent (eventual small under/overspending will be balanced against next year's allotment as has been the case in the past).	$40 000*	??**	**underway**,final disbursed sum not available at writing
2. Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year 2007) * (**$ 50 000** was allocated by Board for 2007, however there was a carry-over of **$14 586** unspent from the previous (2006) year's allocation (see item-10). **Therefore, the TOTAL funds available for 2006 = $64 586** * Note, the $14 586 carry-over unspent funds is not shown in the "Committed" column, but it is/will be calculated as part of total balance to be spent ** Spending or committed so far for 2007 (period January - August. 2007) has been **$66 917** as follows: - $18 700 - assistance to FAO ASFA input preparation 2007 - sub-contract to AdriaMed (underway), - $ 6 800 for ASFA information products to LIFDC countries - $ 7 738 www-ISIS-ASFA training at FAO for new ASFA Partners in Lao and Thailand (completed) - $ 350 to use FAO training room/facilities for training courses ($70/day) - $ no cost - one FAO staff member invited to participate in UNEP/GPA meeting in China expensed paid by UNEP $ 1 594 (while in region 1- day visit to ASFA Partner in Tianjjin and Seoul) - $ 500 www-ISIS-ASFA training of 1 SPC staff member outsourced to R. Oriente (completed) - $ 5 000 (approx.) 1 FAO ASFA Staff member to attend IAMSLIC Meeting Oct. 2007 (to be undertaken) - $ 700 conversion Monitoring list by ICIE from master database FAO format to format of www-ISIS-ASFA (completed) - $ 4 289 travel to 2007 Board meeting - Ghana, Uganda, I. Pettman (thes.) - $ 1 746 training Peru and Ecuador by M.Montes (plus funds $ 2 660) left over from INP-Ecuador Trust fund project for equipment) - $2500 Online conference - $9 000 printing distribution 2 ASFIS Ref Series pubs (Mon list, Bib. Guide) - $2000 Board Report 2006 (print and distribution) - $6000 printing-distrib: www-ISIS-ASFA installation manuals & Board Reports 2004-2006 (should have been calculated under previous year's expenses Overspending will be deducted from the eventual 2008 allotment.	$50 000 *	$ 66 917**	all items are **underway or completed**
3. INP-Ecuador Trust Fund project proposal (Elaboration of the Ecuador database... .This was a request for 2 PC's and printers, plus training. Only $3 340 spent on equipment. Funds remaining used for training of Ecuador & Peru staff by M. Montes	$ 6 000	$ 6 000.	**Completed $ 3340 spent on equip. Remaining 2660** for Ecuador & Peru training by M. Montes
4. (FAO) ASFA Trust Fund project proposal Mini-ASFA-Meeting (regional) plus eventual $5 000 from IOC	$ 20 000	$	postponed
5. (FAO) ASFA Trust Fund project proposal Training of Trainers. $10 000 for training and $10 000 for video.	$20 000	$ 9 782.00	Half-**completed** (video not yet produced)
6. (NIFFR - Nigeria) filling missing gaps	$ 8 060		Pending until input not checked by FAO
7. (Russia - PINRO) ASFA Trust Fund project proposal, Input of Barents and Norwegian Seas Literature	$ 3960		Pending
Sub-total	(148 020)	82 699	

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

	COMMITTED	DISBURSED	NOTES
8. Financial Support to attend annual (2006) Board Meeting * (**$ 38 500** was allocated by the Board for the 2006 Meeting, however there was a carry-over of **$2 289** unspent from the previous year's allocation. **Therefore, the TOTAL funds available for the 2006 Meeting = $40 789.** * Note, the $2 289 carry-over is not shown in the "Committed" column, but that is the total sum used to calculate the available funds for the Meeting. ** US$43 041 was spent. Overspending ($40 789 – $43 041= **- $ 2 252**) will be subtracted from 2007 allotment, as has been the case in the past).	$38 500*	43 041**	**completed**
9. Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year 2006) * ($ 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 of unspent funds from previous years is not shown in "Committed" column, but is calculated as part of balance to be spent ** Spending for 2006 (period January - December. 2006) **$28 545** has been spent as listed below. The unspent funds **$14 586** was carried forward to 2007 allotment. ($43 131- $28 545 = $14 586) (see item-3) - $ 2 530 (instead of budgeted 18 700) - assistance in FAO ASFA input preparation 2006 - sub-contract to AdriaMed, - $ 2 200- Admin assistance for ASFA Board Meeting(1month when employed) - $ 7 484 for ASFA info. products to LIFDC countries- administration, contacts - $ 3 047 one extra FAO staff to attend ASFA Board Meeting VLIZ, Belgium) - $ 816 www-ISIS-ASFA training for NAFO (per-diem for UN-DOALOS staff) - $ 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 (completed) - $ 6 582 1 FAO ASFA Staff member to attend IAMSLIC Meeting, USA, Oct. 2006 and meeting with UN-DOALOS chief - $ 1 278 H. Rybinski to attend ASFA Meeting Oct. 2006	$40 000 *	$28 545**	all items are **completed**
10. (China) Compilation of www-ISIS-ASFA Manuals and Guidelines in Chinese	$ 10 000	$10 000	**completed**
11. (Kenya-KMFRI) Elimination of Gaps	$18 200	$5 460	**1st payment made**
12. (Russia-VNIRO) Input of Caspian Literature II	$10 270	$ 3 080	**1st payment made**
sub-total	(116 970)	(90 126)	

2004 - 2005 Intersessional Project Proposals

(proposals put forward and approved during intersession via ASFA-Board-L)

	COMMITTED	DISBURSED	NOTES
13. Estonia –EMI – Latvian and Lithuanian Aquatic Serials processed for ASFA Database	$ 4 800	$ 4 800	**Completed**
Sub-total	(4 800)	(4 800)	

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

	COMMITTED	DISBURSED	NOTES
14. 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 = **$43 716** * 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 = $2 331)
15. Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year 2005) *($ 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 preceding Board Meeting) - $ 795. www-ISIS-ASFA training for Iran-IFRO (only air ticket) -$1 500. use FAO training room/facilities for training courses ($70/day) - $ 240. nominal fee paid for FAO attendance (R. Pepe) at Marine Metadata Workshop (all expenses paid by organizers - except $240) - $2 000 per diem for 4 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
16. (FAO) www-ISIS-ASFA Maintenance Release (upgrade 1.1)	$7 900	$7 900	**completed**
17. (FAO) Utilization of ASFA Trust Fund to pay for ASFA Partners membership fees in IAMSLIC	$1 060	$1 060	**on-going 2 years**
18. (YugNIRO- Ukraine) Translation of ASFA Thesaurus into Russian and development of Russian-English Thesaurus	$15 000		pending release of version 1.1
19. (YugNIRO- Ukraine) Translation of www-ISIS-ASFA "Help Notes" and front end into Russian	$2000		pending release of version 1.1
20. (YugNIRO- Ukraine) Translation of www-ISIS-ASFA Guidelines into Russian	$5 000		pending results of exercise to simplify input rules/procedures
21. (INIDEP - Argentina) Marine Bibliogr. Information from Latin America and Caribb. Region ... (1955-1980) 1st Stage: S.A. Chile	$0*		* withdrawn by INIDEP
Sub-total	(105 960)	(89 379)	

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
22. Financial Support to attend annual (2004) Board Meeting (US$ 30 000 was allocated by Board for 2004) (with carry over of $3 642 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) b) extra $1 030 unspent for 2002 Meeting) c) extra $ 671 unspent for 2001 Meeting)	$30 000*	$24 926	**completed,** unspent $8,716 ($33,642-$24,926=$8716) is moved to 2005 Meeting, allocation
23. Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year 2004) *(US$ 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 b) unspent $22,200 from unspent Jan-Dec 2002 allocation c) unspent $9,833 from unspent Jan-Dec 2001 allocation d) unspent $800 from unspent Jan-Dec 2000 allocation ** Spending: - $ 6 484 assistance in ASFA input preparation - sub-contract to AdriaMed, - $ 2 500 Input of missed IOTC documents by NIO (completed Nov. 2005) - $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)	$30 000*	$65 850**	**completed** unspent $2,165 ($65,850 - $63,685=$2165) is moved to Year 2005 allocation, see item-3).
24. (VNIRO – Russia) Input of old unique literature Caspian Sea from 1770-1970	$6 000	$6 000	**completed**
25. 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
Sub-total	(73 000)	(103 776)	

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

	COMMITTED	DISBURSED	NOTES
26. Collect, sort, input of "historical" bibl. Records (KMFRI)	$15 000	$15 000	**completed**
27. Collect, sort, input of "historical" bibl. Records (VLIZI)	$18 000	$11 000	**underway** 2 payments made
Sub-total	(33 000)	(26 000)	

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)

28. www-ISIS-ASFA training for VNIRO Partner *(using funds ($8 002) unspent from ASFA training workshops, see item-43)		$2 900*	**completed**
29. Translation www-ISIS-ASFA Help Notes into Spanish *(using funds ($8 002) unspent from ASFA training workshops, see item-43)		$1 500*	**completed**
30. Translation www-ISIS-ASFA Help Notes into French *(using funds ($8 002) unspent from ASFA training workshops, see item-43)		$1 500*	**completed**
31. Translation of Bibliographic Guidelines into Portuguese *(using funds ($8 002) unspent from ASFA training workshops, see item-43)	$2 700		in progress? **(lost contact)**
sub-total	(2 700)	(5 900)	

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

	COMMITTED	DISBURSED	NOTES
32. Funding to attend Oct.2002 IAMSLIC Meeting (1 person)	$2 500	$2 790	**completed**, overspent $290.
33. Conversion of 1971 ASFA Journals (NIO)	$8 500	$8 500	**completed**
34. Financial Support to attend annual (2003) Board Meeting	$30 000	$28 059	**completed** (unspent $1 941, moved to 2004 Meeting,
35. 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
Sub-total	(71 000)	(68 497)	

2001 Project Proposals

	COMMITTED	DISBURSED	NOTES
36. Financial Support to attend annual (2002) Board Meeting	$25,000	$23,969.	**completed** (unspent $1030, moved to 2004 Meeting allotment
37. 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,
38. 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**
39. Funds to attend 2002 Board Meeting for Dr Rybinski	$1,500	$1,688	**completed**
40. ASFA-FIGIS Interaction	$20,000	$20 000	**completed but not yet operational to public**
41. Correction of the ASFA Descriptors fields *(subject to negotiation - this project includes possible extension $5000 – see next item)	$19,800*	0	cancelled funds returned to balance
40a Extension of project to other Partners	$5 000	0	cancelled funds returned to balance
Sub-total	(111 300)	(64 457)	

2000 Project Proposals

	COMMITTED	DISBURSED	NOTES
42. 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)
43. 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
44. 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)
45. Support to the Dev. of Web based interface to ASFISIS	$10,000	$10,000	**completed** 10/2002
46. Provision of ASFA Centres in former USSR with translation (ASFIS-2, Subject Categories and Scope Descriptions)	$1,500	$1,500	**completed**
47. Conversion of ASFA Printed Journals into machine readable format (1971-1974). 1973 Conversion	$15,000	$15,000	**completed**
48. Conversion of ASFA Printed Journals into machine readable format (1971-1974). 1972 Conversion	$15,000	$15,000	**completed**
Sub-total	(116 760)	(102 883)	

1999 Project Proposals

	COMMITTED	DISBURSED	NOTES
49. 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**
50. Staff support to ASFA Secretariat (Ms Wibley) (for the period January 2000 -December 2000)	$31,460	$30,660*	**completed** *(unspent $800 transferred to 2004 year allocation)
51. Improvement of ASFA Database by Germany (BF)	$15,000	$15,000	**completed**
52. Request for training from Kenya (RECOSCIX-WIO)	$3,000	$2,825	**completed**
53. Conversion of ASFA printed journals into machine readable format (1974 volume) by India (NIO)	$15,000	$15,000	**completed**
54. Addition of 45,000 abstracts to 1975-77ASFA database-China	$17,000	$17,000	**completed**
55. Formatting ASFA Thesaurus by Julia Hudson	$2,000	$2,000	**completed**
Sub-total	(98 460)	(92 856)	

1998 Project Proposals

	COMMITTED	DISBURSED	NOTES
56. Financial Support to attend annual Board Meeting	$10,000	$12,500*	**completed** *(extra $2500 from unspent 1997 allocation
57. Staff support to ASFA Secretariat (Ms Wibley) (for the period January 1999 -December 1999)	$25,200	$25,200	**completed**
58. A systems analysis specification for a Windows-based data entry software (ASFISIS/Win) (Dr. DeSmet)	0	0	**cancelled**
59. Extension of ASFA Potential in Lithuania	$2,500	$2,500	**completed**
60. Coverage of Fishery Economics and Related Subjects in ASFA.	$5,000	$5,000	**completed**
sub-total	(42 700)	(45 200)	

1997 Project Proposals

	COMMITTED	DISBURSED	NOTES
61. Financial Support to attend annual Board Meeting	$6,000	$3,500*	**completed** *($2,500 moved to 1998 allocation)
62. Staff support to ASFA Secretariat (Ms Wibley) (for the period January 1998 -December 1998)	$25,200	$25,200	**completed**
63. Extension of ASFA potential in Ukraine (YugNIRO)	$3,000	$3,000	**completed**
64. Provision of ASFA Centres in former USSR with reference material for input (translations) (YugNIRO)	$3,500	$3,500	**completed**
65. ASFISIS Maintenance (Dr. DeSmet)	$2,000	$1,400*	**completed** *($600 returned to balance due to over budgeting)
66. 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.
67. Convert 500 Records (from PIMRIS database into ASFISIS formatting) * (New contract stipulated in 2004 with Ganeshan Rao)	$3,500	$ 3 500	**completed***
68. Analysis of ASFA for Scope and Coverage with eventual recommendations for improvement	$6,500	$6,500	**completed**
Sub-total	(52 700)	(51 800)	

1996 Project Proposals

	COMMITTED	DISBURSED	NOTES
69. Manual on ASFISIS software and Data Entry *****(funds credited to FAO FIDI budget (because FAO carried out the work)	$6,000	$6,000*	**completed**
70. Logo for ASFA competition	0	0	costed at $2500, but later **cancelled**
71. Statistical Analysis of ASFA Database	0	0	**complete**d costed at $7000, no charge by CSA
72. ASFA User Survey	0	0	**cancelled- never budgeted**
Sub-total	(6000)	(6000)	

1995 Project Proposals

	COMMITTED	DISBURSED	NOTES
73. Workshops for familiarization with the ASFA input methodology (ASFA Training Session, 3-7 June 1996, FAO)	$34,000	$11,645*	**completed** *****(unspent $22,335 returned to Balance)
74. Review of the ASFA Partners Monitoring of Serials for ASFA (follow-up to 1994 review)	$5,000	$5,000	**completed**
75. IOC Study Grant.. ($8,000)	0	0	**cancelled**
76. Chinese proposal sub-project 1, Identification of ASFA information users and suppliers in China	$4,000	$4,000	**completed**
Sub-total	(43 000)	(20 645)	
GRAND TOTAL	**$1 026 370**	**$855 018**	
	COMMITTED	**DISBURSED**	

(R. Pepe, 3 July 2007)

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) (VLIZ, Belgium 4-8 September 2006)

Minutes of Action Items and Decisions Agreed at ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (KMFRI, Mombasa, Kenya, 3-7 September 2007)

Agenda Item 6. Status of ASFA Partnership

Re: Agenda Item 6.2.2 - *Regarding the discussion on the potential new ASFA Partners*

1. *Regarding Turkey* - Mr Kuhnhold (BF) asked the FAO ASFA Secretariat the situation regarding a potential new ASFA Partner in Turkey, referring to a contact that he had previously given to FAO.

Mr Pepe (FAO) reported that the ASFA Secretariat had received no follow-up on this contact.

Mr Kuhnold (BF) mentioned that he had a good working relationship with 2 institutes in Turkey and **he agreed** to follow-up with these institutes regarding the possibility of them becoming an ASFA Partner and would inform the FAO ASFA Secretariat regarding the outcome.

2. *Regarding Egypt* - **Mr Odido (IOC) agreed** to contact the National Institute of Oceanography and Fisheries in Alexandria, Egypt and investigate the possibility of them becoming a new ASFA Partner.

Re: Agenda Item 6.2.5- *regarding Partners in danger of being removed from ASFA Partnership*

3. *Regarding Cote d'Ivoire* - Mr Pepe (FAO) mentioned that CRO had not produced any ASFA input since 2005 and that FAO had lost contact with the institute.

Mr Odido (IOC) agreed to contact the Director of CRO for follow-up and inform the FAO regarding the outcome.

Agenda Item 6.6 Other Information systems

4. *Regarding the possibility of exporting records prepared with the www-ISIS-ASFA software into XML format .....*

Mr Pepe (FAO) agreed to follow-up with Dr Rybinski (ICIE) regarding the exportation of www-ISIS-ASFA records in XML format. He also mentioned the possibility of contracting Dr Rybinski under an ASFA Trust Fund Proposal to develop conversion programmes for those ASFA Partners who already had their own 'local' databases/library catalogues so as to enable them to download/convert these local records into a format compatible with the www-ISIS-ASFA software. See further discussions/decisions under Agenda Item 9.1.

Agenda Item 7. ASFA Scope, Coverage, Monitoring and Timeliness

5. Re: Agenda Item 7.3 Monitoring

There are many journals available electronically, either as an electronic feed to ProQuest directly from the primary publisher, or as online content that can be acquired through various automated processes (i.e. 'web crawlers'). Since ProQuest is in a very good position to gather much of this content, it proposed that some ASFA Partners consider having some of their journals transferred to the ProQuest monitoring list.... (This would free resources for the Partner, and allow them to spend more time on identifying and inputting other content which may require translation or require more effort in other respects, e.g. grey literature)
ProQuest agreed to send out to individual ASFA Partners a list of those serial titles for which it could take over the monitoring and input responsibilities, with copy to FAO. An agreement could be reached by which Partners would not receive fewer entitlements because the total input may decrease as a result of ProQuest taking over responsibility of some titles. ASFA Partners could also contact ProQuest individually should they wish to transfer some titles under their monitoring list to that of ProQuest.

FAO agreed to assist ProQuest in contacting some of the ASFA Partners, should ProQuest come across any difficulties.

Agenda Item 8. ASFA Products and Services

6. Re: Agenda Item 8.5 New Outputs and Services (by CSA)

Regarding full-text linking and URL addresses ....

FAO agreed to send out via ASFA Board-L a reminder to all ASFA Partners on exactly what information should be entered in the URL address field in the www-ISIS-ASFA software, i.e. ONLY the URL address pointing to the full-text of the article for which the ASFA record is being prepared should be entered in this field. Any other URL addresses, such as that of the publisher or that of the journal, should be entered in the Notes field of the software.

ProQuest agreed to change their conversion programme so as to map the URL Address field in www-ISIS-ASFA to the URL field in CSA Illumina and not the Notes field.

Regarding the Release 2 of the www-ISIS-ASFA software (which would have additional URL fields) and Norway's question as to when this new release would be available..... FAO replied that Release 2 of the software would probably not be for the immediate future....

FAO agreed to investigate with Dr Rybinski (ICIE) as to whether a patch could be prepared to make all of the necessary modifications to www-ISIS-ASFA v1.1 regarding the additional URL Address fields, so that it could be sent out to ASFA Partners via ASFA Board-L fairly soon, without having to wait for Release 2 of the software.

During the discussion on linking the ASFA record to the full text document, Brit Skotheim (IMR) referred to Noway's use of URN (Uniform Resource Name) as a document identifier ..... Craig Emerson said that there were many ways to link to the full text of a document ..... consistency was important and there was a need for detailed specifications .... other such fields could be added to CSA Illumina should the ASFA Partners wish ..... Brit Skotheim and Jan Haspeslagh agreed to prepare a list of the specifications related to the various types of document links and send it to ProQuest. The list could be circulated to ASFA Partners intersessionally.

Agenda Item 9. Progress with Machine-readable input

7. Re: Agenda Item 9.1 www-ISIS-ASFA

Regarding the discussions led by Jan Haspeslagh (VLIZ) concerning the preparation of ASFA records by those ASFA Partners who have several different information systems running at the same time, such as InMagic, OceanDocs and IMIS .....

Many of these ASFA Partners were concerned with the fact that they were having to key in the same record several times, so as to enter it in the different systems they use .... They expressed their wishes for the use of just one system, which would enable them to export the record in different formats compatible with the different information systems they used locally. ..... This would save them time and effort, allowing them to prepare a larger number of ASFA records and/or concentrate more on grey literature.
FAO agreed to prepare a Trust Fund project proposal for Dr Rybinski (ICIE) to develop some export/conversion programmes for those ASFA Partners using different systems for their library catalogues/repositories (e.g. InMagic, OceanDocs and IMIS). This Trust Fund project proposal might also involve Dr Rybinski (ICIE) travelling to VLIZ and the IOC Project Office for IODE, in Ostende, Belgium, to have discussions with the relevant staff and Marc Goovaerts

Agenda Item 11 ASFIS Reference Series

8. Re: Agenda Item 11.7 Geographic Authority List

The ASFA Board has recognized that the Geographic descriptor pick-list in www-ISIS-ASFA contains many errors and that it is no longer an Authority List. At the last Board Meeting in 2006 the ASFA Partners decided that the most constructive way to proceed would be to form a Geographic Working Group, which would work towards describing a Trust Fund Project Proposal..... The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that no action had been taken on this item due to lack of manpower and time.

The ASFA Board agreed that the Geographic Working Group should be streamlined to 5 ASFA Partners. This would be done by e-mail, given that some members of the working group were not present at this meeting.

The ASFA Board agreed that members of the Geographic Working Group would clean up the list of geographic descriptors, by correcting the typographical and obvious errors.

ASFA Partners were requested to investigate within their institutes regarding any contacts for a possible

'geographic term' expert, and provide the Geographic Working Group with details. This expert could work as a consultant on a Trust Fund Proposal to assist the Geographic Working Group in their activities.

9. Re: Agenda Item 11.15 ASFIS List of Species for Statistical Purposes

Some discussion was held regarding the use of the 'correct' taxonomic term and whether synonyms should be included in the Taxonomic descriptor pick-list..... it was stressed that it was more important to solve the problem of taxonomic names and their synonyms at the search stage rather than at the data entry stage.... ProQuest asked whether there was a limit to the terms that could be included in the www-ISIS-ASFA software as pick-lists.

FAO agreed to ask Dr Rybinski (ICIE) regarding the maximum number of terms that www-ISIS-ASFA could contain in the various pick-lists included in the software

Agenda Item 13. ASFA Trust Fund

10.Re: Agenda Item 13.1 Status of the Trust Fund

*At last year's Board Meeting there was considerable discussion and concern regarding the issue of the persisting **"unspent balance"** present in the ASFA Trust Fund, which is currently **US$794 118**.....It was suggested that the Board **reflect**, during the intersessional period, on the issue of **"beneficial ways of spending the ASFA Trust Fund"**.*

Richard Pepe (FAO) introduced the paper ASFA/2007/74, which provides some background and information in order to facilitate the Board's discussion of the issue of "beneficial ways of spending the ASFA Trust Fund".

Linda Noble suggested that some of the funds could be used for capacity building e.g. assist those institutions lacking in equipment. She said that many libraries do not have scanners, thus making it impossible for them to include documents in repositories or to send copies of documents when requested by users. She suggested that a questionnaire could be sent via ASFA Board-L to ask which ASFA Partners needed such equipment to assist them in disseminating the information that they held.

FAO agreed to send out a questionnaire via ASFA Board L to survey the need for scanners amongst the ASFA Partners, to carry out a cost analysis and then prepare a Trust Fund project Proposal, which would be circulated intersessionally.

Re: Agenda Item 13.3 New Project Proposals

11.Regarding the Trust Fund Proposal Financial support to attend the ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (ASFA/2007/67) (for year 2008)

This proposal is reviewed each year by the Board to update the amount of allocated funds. The renewal of this Trust Fund project proposal for 2008 meeting is for US$40 000.

The **ASFA Board approved** the proposal.

12. Regarding the Trust Fund Proposal Staff Support To ASFA Secretariat (For January - December 2008) (ASFA/2007/3a)

The FAO ASFA Secretariat proposes an increase in this Trust Fund allocation from $50 000 to $60 000, because of overall decreased budget allocations within FAO together with an expanding ASFA Partnership (61 Partners).

The **ASFA Board approved** the proposal for the next two years for a total of $120 000.

13. Regarding the Trust Fund Proposal (FAO) ASFA Trust Fund project proposal – To strengthen ASFA Partner in Kenya (KMFRI) in order to provide ASFA Training Support for other ASFA Partners in Africa and so as to assist FAO ASFA Secretariat (provision of computer equipment) $5 000 (ASFA/2007/71)

This project proposal is for the purchase of one computer, printer and scanner.

The **ASFA Board approved** the proposal.

14. Regarding the Trust Fund Proposal WAIVER to policy regarding use of ASFA Trust Fund (which would allow the IAMSLIC Executive Board to submit project proposals) (ASFA/2007/ 73)

At the 2002 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting the Board agreed that Trust Fund projects proposals coming from non-ASFA Partners would ***not*** *be accepted.*

This Trust Fund Proposal suggests that a "waiver" be granted to the above stated policy which would allow or authorize the IAMSLIC Executive Board to submit project proposals (of ***mutual*** *benefit to ASFA) to the ASFA Board for its approval. In particular, this Trust Fund proposal calls for the setting aside of $14 000 a year from the ASFA Trust Fund for proposals submitted by the IAMSLIC Executive Board. Such Trust Fund project proposals would be subject to voting approval by the ASFA Partners and this would be for a period of two years.*

The **ASFA Board approved** the proposal.

15. Regarding the Trust Fund Proposal: Digitization of Grey Literature from Economically Developing Countries for Inclusion in the IAMSLIC Aquatic Commons Digital Document Repository, (including guidance and assistance from the ASFA Board in identifying and contributing the literature to be digitized ($10 000))

This proposal was presented to the FAO ASFA Secretariat by IAMSLIC during the 2006-2007 intersessional period. Now that the Board has officially removed the ban on project proposals coming from outside the ASFA Partnership (i.e. as regards proposals coming from the IAMSLIC executive Board) this proposal was tabled by the FAO ASFA Secretariat for discussion and approval, in principle, by the Board.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat suggested that the Board's final approval should await IAMSLIC's clarification regarding concerns about a) the material itself - grey literature (who identifies it, which countries and the cost); and, b) the digitization (who does it and who gets paid for it?)

Many ASFA Partners shared the same concerns and requested further clarification by IAMSLIC.

The **ASFA Board approved** the proposal **in principle**, pending the elaboration of a more detailed proposal by the FAO ASFA Secretariat, which would clarify areas of concern expressed by the ASFA Partners. In particular, ASFA Partners requested that there be a guarantee that the digitized records would go on the ASFA Database/CSA Illumina, with full-text linking that would point to the document in the repository.

The FAO agreed to clarify with IAMSLIC the questions raised by the ASFA Partners during the discussion of this Trust Fund Proposal and then circulate a more detailed proposal via ASFA Board-L for approval.

16. Regarding the Trust Fund Proposal Utilization of the ASFA Trust Fund to pay the IAMSLIC Membership fees for ASFA Partners (extension of initiative for a further two years) (ASFA/2007/ 75)

At the 2004 and 2005 ASFA Board Meeting, the Board agreed to pay the IAMSLIC Membership fees for both ASFA Partners and ASFA Collaborating Centers (i.e. for those Partners who do not have the funds, or are not able for administrative reasons to pay for membership to IAMSLIC).

The FAO ASFA Secretariat would like this initiative extended for another two years (at an estimated cost of $840).

The **ASFA Board approved** the proposal.

17. Regarding the Trust Fund Proposal ASFA Training Session ($14 000) (ASFA/2007/76)

This proposal would authorize the ASFA Secretariat to organize and carry out, once a year, a Training session, up to 5 participants, in the ASFA Input procedures for those Partners in need (both new ASFA partners and existing ASFA Partners who may need re-training). The training would most likely be at FAO, Rome.

The **ASFA Board approved** the proposal.

18. Regarding the Trust Fund Proposal Elimination of Gaps - Phase two (KMFRI) $21 450 (See ASFA/2007/38a)

This Trust Fund Proposal is a continuation of the retrospective indexing activities conducted by KMFRI. Phase two intends to prepare 2000 records in www-ISIS-ASFA for the following 2 titles:
Journal of the Fisheries Research Board of Canada (1934-1972) and Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom (vols. 1-62).

Mr Craig Emerson (ProQuest) asked KMFRI to hold back from preparing input from the *Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom*, since they (ProQuest) were possibly in the process of converting this journal. Mr Emerson said that he would check and let Mr Macharia 9KMFRI) know. He added that, since this journal was available in electronic format, instead of preparing records from the hard copies of the journals in the KMFRI library, time and money could be saved by using the electronic version to prepare ASFA records.

Ms Skotheim (IMR) asked whether there would be full-text linking to these records. ProQuest said that they would point to the full text, if they were responsible for the preparation of these ASFA records and Mr Macharia confirmed that KMFRI would also provide a link were they to go ahead and prepare input from this journal, since it is already in their repository.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) suggested that KMFRI investigated the possibility of preparing retrospective ASFA records from Nature and Science, which are also available online back to Volume 1.

ProQuest agreed to inform Mr Macharia as to whether KMFRI should proceed with the preparation of records from the *Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom*.

The ASFA Board approved in principle to this Trust Fund Proposal, which would be revised with respect to the journals, number of records and costs, and circulated via ASFA Board L by KMFRI during the intersessional period.

19. Regarding the Trust Fund Proposal Filling the Missing Gap (NIFFR) $6990

This Trust Fund Proposal aims to fill some of the missing gaps in publications on Nigerian fisheries and aquatic sciences since 1971. It intends to prepare about 600 ASFA records using the www-ISIS-ASFA software

The ASFA Board approved the proposal.

20. Regarding the Place and Date of the next meeting

There were no offers to host the next (2008) ASFA Advisory Board meeting from the ASFA Partners present at the Meeting.

In order to give the ASFA Partners, who were not present at the Meeting, a chance to host the Meeting, **the FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to send an e-mail to all ASFA Partners via ASFA Board-L, asking if anyone would like to offer to host the 2008 ASFA Board Meeting.

This CD-ROM does not start automatically. To start, select the drive designation of your CD-ROM device (e.g. D:\) and double click.