

PART-1 BODY OF 2004 ASFA ADVISORY BOARD MEETING REPORT

**PART-2 DECISIONS/ACTIONS AGREED BY PARTICIPANTS AT 2004 MEETING
(Annex 48 of 2004 Meeting Report)**

.....

**(PART-1) BODY OF
2004 ASFA ADVISORY BOARD MEETING REPORT
Instituto Nacional de Investigación y Desarrollo Pesquero (INIDEP)
Mar del Plata, Argentina, 29 June - 2 July 2004
Final Report (body only)**

1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

The Annual Meeting of the Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Abstracts (ASFA) Advisory Board was hosted by **INIDEP, Instituto Nacional de Investigación y Desarrollo Pesquero**, located in Mar del Plata, Argentina, from 29 June to 2 July 2004.

The Meeting was attended by 25 participants from: 19 National ASFA Partners, 2 UN Partners, the ASFA Publishing Partner, and 1 observer. The Agenda was adopted as presented in **Annex-1**. The names and addresses of the participants are listed in **Annex-2**. The Documents presented at the Meeting and the abbreviations used in the Report are listed in **Annexes 2a** and **2b**, respectively.

Mr Luis Miguel Barletta, Director of INIDEP, opened the meeting and welcomed the participants to INIDEP and Mar del Plata. He highlighted the important role played by the INIDEP Library, as the ASFA Partner of Argentina, in the field of international relationships. He also noted how INIDEP, through ASFA, was showing the rest of the world the important work that was being doing by their researchers in the field of aquatic sciences. Mr Barletta acknowledged the work of the INIDEP Library staff in trying to organize a pleasant and fruitful Meeting environment. He also mentioned the crisis that struck Argentina a few years ago, and the efforts of the whole country to overcome it. He wished everybody a good stay in Mar del Plata.

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) welcomed all the Participants to the Meeting on behalf of the INIDEP ASFA team, and expressed her pleasure that this was the first ASFA Board Meeting to be held in South America. Noting the high number of South American ASFA Partners in attendance, she thanked the FAO ASFA Secretariat for all its efforts in increasing South America's participation in ASFA. She gave a brief historical background to INIDEP's joining of ASFA in 1996, and noted that, although many information systems had started up during the 1960s and 1970s, ASFA was one of the few which has survived. She highlighted the unique cooperation between volunteer ASFA Partners and a commercial publisher.

Mr Grainger (FAO) conveyed the apologies of the FAO Representative to Argentina, Mr J. L. Garcia de Siles, who, although could not be present, gave his best wishes for a successful Meeting. Mr Grainger thanked the Director of INIDEP for the warm welcome given to the ASFA Board and noted the positive attitude that was shown by all at INIDEP, considering the difficult times that they have been facing following the crisis which hit the country a few years back. He mentioned his appreciation regarding the short tour given to the ASFA Board, which was a reminder to members of the importance of the work carried out at the Institute.

2. ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) presented this Agenda Item.

3. ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON AND RAPPORTEURS

Mr Montes (UNAM) was elected Chairperson of the Board Meeting and Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) co-Chairperson. Ms Wibley (FAO) was appointed Rapporteur and Mr Pepe (FAO) as assistant Rapporteur.

4. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

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

5. ADOPTION OF SUMMARY REPORT OF 2003 ASFA ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

The Board agreed to adopt the 2003 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting Report (Habana, Cuba) without any changes.

5.1 Matters Arising from the last (2003) ASFA Advisory Board Meeting

Follow-up by ASFA Partners on 2003 action items is reported under the appropriate Agenda items.

6. STATUS OF ASFA PARTNERSHIP

6.1 Report on Inter-Sessional Activities of the ASFA Partners

Each ASFA Partner briefly introduced themselves and presented a summary report of inter-sessional activities. The FAO ASFA Secretariat summarized major points/concerns contained in the Reports of Partners not in attendance. The full text of all the Reports are in the **Annexes 3-34**.

6.1.1 United Nations Co-sponsors

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

6.1.2 ASFA Partners

- **ADRIAMED** - Not present, Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex -5**)
- **ICCAT** - (Not present, No Report) The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that ICCAT had notified FAO that a contract had been stipulated with NIO (India) to produce their input.
- **ICES** - Not present, Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-6**).
- **ICLARM** - (Not present, No Report)
- **IOTC** - (Not present, No Report) NEW PARTNER
- **IUCN** - (Not present, No Report).
- **NACA** - (Not present, No Report) NEW PARTNER
- **PIMRIS** - Not present, Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-7**)
- **Argentina (INIDEP)** - Ms. Cosulich presented the INIDEP report (**Annex-8**)
- **Australia (CSIRO)** - Not present, Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat(**Annex-9**)
- **Belgium (VLIZ)** - Mr Haspelslagh presented the VLIZ Report (**Annex-10**)
- **Brazil (USP)** - (Not present, No Report)
- **Canada (NRC)** - (Not present, No Report) Ms Beattie reported that NRC had communicated their interest in remaining in ASFA and that a replacement was being made for H. Cameron.
- **Chile (IFOP)** - Ms Muñoz presented the IFOP report (**Annex-11**)
- **China (NMDIS)** - Not present, Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-12**)
- **Cote d'Ivoire (CRO)** - Not present, No Report)
- **Cuba (CIP)** - Ms. Hernandez Ceballos presented the CIP Report (**Annex-13**)
- **Ecuador (INP)** - Mr Gabor presented the INP Report (**Annex-14**)
- **Estonia (EMI)** - Ms Kalenchits presented the EMI Report (**Annex-15**)

- **France (IFREMER)** - Ms Prod'homme presented the IFREMER Report (**Annex-16**)
- **Germany (BF)** - Dr Kühnhold presented the BF Report (**Annex-17**)
- **Iceland (MRI)** - (Not present, No Report) NEW PARTNER
- **Greece (HCMR)** - Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-18**)
- **India (NIO/NICMAS)** - Mr Sainekar presented the NIO Report (**Annex-19**)
- **Indonesia (LIPI/PDII)** - (Not present, No Report) NEW PARTNER The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that LIPI/PDII had sent someone to FAO for training in the ASFA input methods in June.
- **Italy (SIBM)** – (Not present, No Report)
- **Japan (FRA)** - Not present, Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-20**)
- **Kenya (KMFRI)** - Mr Macharia presented the KMFRI Report (**Annex-21**)
- **Korea (KORDI)** - Mr Jong-Yup Han presented the KORDI Report (**Annex-22**)
- **Mexico (DGB)** - Mr. Montes (UNAM) presented the DGB Report (**Annex-23**)
- **Mauritania (IMROP)** - (Not present, No report) NEW PARTNER
- **Morocco (INRH)** (Not present, No Report)
- **Nigeria (NIFFR)** (Not present, No Report) NEW PARTNER
- **Norway (IMR)**- Ms Skotheim presented the IMR report (**Annex-24**)
- **Peru (IMARPE)** - Not present, Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-25**)
- **Poland (SFI)** - Not present, Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-26**)
- **Portugal (IPIMAR)** - (Not present, No Report)
- **Russia (VNIRO)** - Ms Levashova presented the VNIRO Report (**Annex-27**)
- **Spain (IEO)** - (Not present, No Report)
- **Sweden (IMR)** - Ms Frohlund presented the IMR Report (**Annex-28**)
- **Tunisia (INSTM)** - (Not present, No Report)
- **Ukraine (YugNIRO)** - Dr Romanov presented the YugNIRO Report (**Annex-29**)
- **United Kingdom (NMBL)** - Ms Noble presented the NMBL Report (**Annex-30**)
- **Uruguay (IIP)** - Ms Cristiani presented the IIP Report (**Annex-31**)
- **USA (NOAA)** - Ms Beattie presented the NOAA Report (**Annex-32**)
- **Vietnam (FICen)** - Not present, Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-33**)

6.1.3 ASFA PARTNER-PUBLISHER (CSA)

- **CSA** - Dr Emerson presented the CSA Report (**Annex-34**)

6.2 New and Potential ASFA Partners

6.2.1 Admission of New Partners

The FAO ASFA Secretariat informed the Board that during the intersessional period, the ASFA Partnership gained four new ASFA National Partners and two new ASFA International Partners:

- Iceland - *The Marine Research Institute (MRI)*
- Indonesia - *The Center for Scientific Documentation & Information, Indonesian Institute of Science (PDII-LIPI)*
- Nigeria - *The National Institute for Freshwater Fisheries Research (NIFFR)*
- Mauritania - *Institut Mauritanien de Recherches Océanographiques et des pêches (IMROP)*
- IOTC - *The Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC)*
- NACA - *The Network of Aquaculture Centres in Asia-Pacific (NACA)*

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

See the FAO Report Section 4.2.1 (**Annex-3**) for information regarding the new partners, and see (**Annex-35**) for their full addresses.

6.2.2 Potential Partners

Tanzania

Mr Pepe (FAO) mentioned the negotiations that were currently being carried out with the Institute of Marine Sciences, University of Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania.

[**Rapporteurs note:** IMS has now signed the ASFA Partnership Agreement].

Netherlands

Follow-up action item (3) from 2003 ASFA Board Meeting:

3. *Netherlands - the FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to follow up on a potential ASFA National Partner in the Netherlands suggested by VLIZ. Mr Haspesslagh (VLIZ) agreed to carry out eventual training should a Partner be successfully identified and recruited.*

Mr Haspesslagh (VLIZ) reported that despite various efforts (contacts) that he made during the past intersessional period, he was not successful in obtaining positive reactions to join ASFA from 2 different Dutch Institutes (SCHELDE Informatie Centrum (Netherlands Branch) and NIOO: Netherlands Institute of Aquatic Ecology).

Both Institutes cited budget restrictions as the major reason for not being able to participate in ASFA. Mr Haspesslagh (VLIZ) reported that, although he could not provide additional Dutch contacts, he was willing to assist, should any other Dutch contacts be identified by FAO. He mentioned that because the most important publishing companies (e.g. Elsevier) were based in the Netherlands, probably most Dutch research institutions felt that they did not need to participate in ASFA (i.e. Elsevier provided the necessary services).

It was suggested that knowing where Dutch institutes carried out their bibliographic searches and which Dutch institutes were subscribing to ASFA could be useful in identifying other potential ASFA Partners in the Netherlands. **CSA agreed** to try to provide such information.

Increasing coverage of freshwater and aquaculture literature

Mr Romanov (YugNIRO) suggested that there may be a need for ASFA to increase coverage of freshwater and aquaculture literature, thus potential Partners should be sought in countries with well-developed aquaculture industries (e.g. the Czech Republic, Hungary and Romania).

The FAO ASFA Secretariat noted that the Network of Aquaculture Centers in Asia (NACA) had recently joined ASFA and that this should increase the coverage of aquaculture related literature. Mr Pepe (FAO) also pointed out that there was an ASFA Collaborating Centre in Brazil that should eventually be submitting input to ASFA dealing with freshwater literature.

6.2.3 Strategy for future expansion of ASFA Partnership

Mr Pepe (FAO) referred to the two, still relevant, “strategy papers”: *Strategy for priority setting for future expansion of the ASFA Partnership (presented at the 2002 Meeting)*, and *Criteria for recruitment and approval of new Partners and removal of existing Partners (presented and approved at the 1998 Meeting)*, which are taken into consideration by FAO when recruiting new ASFA Partners.

Outsourcing from FAO the training of new ASFA Partners

The FAO ASFA Secretariat cited, as an obstacle to recruiting new Partners, the scarce amount of time it had available for training and follow-up of new (and sometimes existing) ASFA Partners.

There was some discussion regarding the outsourcing of training in the ASFA input methods. Mr Haspesslagh (VLIZ) enquired as to whether FAO had a standard “outline of assistance” that it provided to ASFA Partners who, on behalf of FAO, were prepared to carry out training and to assist in the follow-up of new ASFA Partners. Mr Pepe (FAO) reported that FAO does provide some guidelines covering what should be taught and how it should be taught, however “**how**” the training is carried out depends very much on the existing capabilities of the new ASFA Partner.

In order to reduce some of the work load of the FAO ASFA Secretariat, Mr Montes (UNAM) suggested that a small group of 3-4 persons, with expertise in ASFA training methods, could be established to assist FAO in training, when needed. He mentioned, in particular, Mr Romanov (YugNIRO) and Mr Macharia (KMFRI), both with recent training experience. Mr Macharia (KMFRI) pointed out that in Africa, sometimes language was a problem since English and French speaking countries existed.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat stated that it was well aware of the input/training capabilities of each ASFA Partner, and that it would request assistance from Partners in training and follow-up, on a case by case basis, considering the many variables involved.

6.2.4 Partners dropping out of the ASFA Partnership

No ASFA National Partners dropped out of ASFA during the intersessional period, however INIDEP, IFREMER, NIO and YugNIRO reported that some of their ASFA Collaborating Centres have dropped out.

Regarding the problem of ensuring the continuity of ASFA activities within ASFA Partner Institutes/Organizations, Mr Pepe (FAO) noted that sometimes it was a change in the Director or person in charge of ASFA, within the Institute, that resulted in problems concerning continuity. Often, the new person in charge has little knowledge of ASFA and needs “convincing” (i.e. a good explanation) as to “what is ASFA” and “why his/her institute should continue its participation.

Mr Jorgens (UN/DOALOS) described the situation that he recently faced following a change in Directors. He expressed his appreciation for the support provided by the FAO ASFA Secretariat which successfully convinced the new Director of the need to continue participation in ASFA.

Mr Pepe (FAO) stressed the importance of ensuring the continuity of ASFA activities within ASFA Partner institutes/organizations and reminded Partners that the FAO ASFA Homepage (especially the FAQ section) contained a wealth of information regarding the structure and function of ASFA.

6.2.5 Partners removed from the system

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported it was not necessary to remove any Partners during the intersessional period, although it had been necessary to contact a number of Partners who were not submitting ASFA input. See next section for details.

6.2.6 Partners in danger of being removed

Follow-up action items (7, 8, 9, 10) from 2003 ASFA Board Meeting:

- "7. *Portugal (IPIMAR) - No ASFA input received from IPIMAR since 2001.*"
- "8. *Spain (IEO) – No input received from IEO since 2000.*"
- "9. *ICCAT – No input received from ICCAT since 2002. "*
- "10. *Morocco - INRH- No input received from INRH since joining "*

Mr Pepe (FAO) reported on each of the ASFA Partners who had been cited at the last ASFA Board Meeting as being in danger of being removed from the ASFA Partnership for the non-submittal of ASFA input for a prolonged period. He reported that they ALL have provided explanations regarding the delays in input production, and since they have re-confirmed their desire to continue participation in ASFA, for the time being, they are **no longer** in danger of being removed from the Partnership.

- **Portugal – National Institute of Agronomic and Fisheries Research (IPIMAR)**, has resumed input, which it has successfully prepared with the new software www-ISIS-ASFA.
- **Spain - Instituto Español de Oceanografía (IEO)** has not submitted input since 2002, however they have confirmed (21 May 2004) their intention to submit ASFA input (in June). Just before the Board Meeting, they had communicated with the FAO ASFA Secretariat asking for an extension of a few months. [**Rapporteurs note:** IEO has submitted a batch of input to FAO for checking]

- **ICCAT - International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT), Spain**, has not submitted input since 2002, however they notified the FAO ASFA Secretariat (21 May 2004) that they have stipulated a contract with another ASFA Partner (NIO/NICMAS) to produce their input. Mr Sainekar (NIO) mentioned that they had a target of some 500 records, which they hoped to finish by March/April next year.
- **Morocco - Institut National de Recherche Halieutique (INRH)** joined ASFA in April 1999, and received training in the ASFA input methodology in November 1999. Staff changes and re-organizing hindered input preparation. INRH will be sending a person to FAO for training 20 -24 September 2004.
- **Cote d'Ivoire - Centre de Recherches Océanologiques (CRO)** has not submitted input since 2001. CRO was trained in ASFA Input methods in November 1999 and did submit input during 2000 and 2001. Some input was sent to FAO for checking in 2002, but after FAO returned it to CRO with corrections to be made, CRO did not submit this input to CSA. CRO has notified the FAO ASFA Secretariat (27 May 2004) that it intends to submit input within 2004. It has cited problems with staff and equipment

Mr Sainekar (NIO) asked if a Collaborating Centre that has been removed from ASFA could, a few years later, request to re-join ASFA. Mr Pepe (FAO) reported that any ASFA Partner who drops out of the Partnership, either of their own will or due to removal by the Board can re-join should they wish.

Mr Pepe (FAO) reminded the Board that criteria existed for removing Partners not fulfilling their responsibilities as an ASFA Partner, BUT that efforts were always made so as not to arrive at such a drastic conclusion.

6.3 ASFA Partnership Agreement

As of 9 June 2004, the ASFA Partnership Agreement (official title: Partnership Agreement Providing for Co-Operation in the Preparation and Publication of the Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Abstracts (ASFA) and the Reconstitution of the Advisory Board) has been signed by 51 Partners*:

4 UN, Co-sponsoring ASFA Partners	38* National ASFA Partners
8 International ASFA Partners	1 Publishing ASFA Partner.

*[**Rapporteurs note**: since the Meeting one new Partner has joined ASFA (Institute of Marine Sciences, University of Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania) bringing the number of National ASFA Partners to **39**, and the total number of Partners to **52**]. See (**Annex-35**) for a list of all Partners/addresses.

6.4 ASFA Publishing Agreement

Renewal for the period 2004-2007

The ASFA Publishing Agreement between FAO and the ASFA Publisher (CSA) was renewed during the intersessional period. The Agreement covers the period 1 January 2004 to 31 December 2007. See (**Annex-41**) for excerpts of the Agreement which are relevant to ASFA Partners and section 3 of the FAO Report (**Annex-3**).

Referring to Exhibit F, Item 5 of the Publishing Agreement (**Annex-41**) some Partners questioned the limited number (four) of additional ASFA entitlements that Partners may claim after a certain number of input sheets are submitted to CSA. Ms Noble (NMBL) pointed out that this was too few and could result in a problem in keeping Collaborating Centres participating in ASFA.

Ms Prod'homme (IFREMER) also noted the importance in giving IDS access as an "incentive" to Collaborating Centres who were prepared to increase their ASFA input, since this also helped the National Partner in carrying out its own input.

CSA replied that they are always open to discussion regarding this point, and should an increase in the number of Collaborating Partners considerably increase the amount of input from a participating ASFA country then an agreement could be reached.

CSA **agreed** to consider increasing the number of IDS subscriptions granted to Partners on a case-by-case basis.

6.5 Co-operation with WAICENT/AGRIS group

Mr Pepe (FAO) mentioned the cooperation with the GIL/WAICENT (AGRIS) group regarding exchange of records at the input stage, between ASFA and AGRIS.

They are also working on establishing full text links between the ASFA database (on the CSA IDS service) and the FAO documents in the FAO document repository.

The Ontology initiative is still being evaluated.

6.6 Theme Paper – “The Structure of the [ASFA] Meeting”

Mr Pepe (FAO) opened this Agenda item by presenting the paper: *ASFA Advisory Board Meeting - Structure of the Meeting (Annex-42)*.

The Board decided to proceed by discussing each of the specific “questions for discussion” included in Part 4 of the above mentioned paper (and any other questions that might arise):

Question 4.1: Is there still a need to exchange experiences and discuss problems/solutions among ASFA inputters at Staff Meetings?

Discussion Listserve for ASFA Input problems

Ms Skotheim (IMR) suggested the establishment of a “Discussion Listserv” or “Forum” to be used to discuss technical problems related to ASFA input. This idea was supported by Mr Jorgens (UN/DOALOS) and also Ms Noble (NMBL), who had suggested the same in the UK Report.

Ms Wibley (FAO) reported that FAO often received similar questions on the same topic, so using a Discussion List could help show people that others have the same problem.

Mr Montes (UNAM) suggested having a local E-mail forum, in Spanish, for the Latin American Partners, perhaps not as official and formal as the ASFA Board - L. Mr. Kühnhold (BF) said that although a good idea, such a local forum should be open to everyone and perhaps be both in Spanish and English. The FAO ASFA Secretariat recommended that the Spanish Partners should, in any case, set up their own Discussion List for the exchange of information and experiences among themselves. This suggestion appeared to be well received.

Mr Emerson (CSA) suggested, as a first step, to start up a List Serve and then consider setting up a Forum later. The **Board agreed** to this suggestion.

FAO agreed to set up the List Serve and to call it “ASFA-Input-L”, and to provide some guidelines regarding its use. Ms Beattie (NOAA) suggested that an evaluation of the usefulness of the ASFA Input-L could be prepared with a report for the next meeting.

Mr Emerson (CSA) pointed out that **all** questions submitted to the Listserv should be answered. If not answered, the originator should send an e-mail to FAO who would post the question plus answer. He suggested ASFA-Input-L function as an archive of ASFA input problems.

Mini ASFA Meetings (regional)

The possibility of funding a "mini" ASFA Meeting among Latin American Partners every 3-4 years was considered. Mr Montes (UNAM) said that such a meeting could be used to focus on special problems (e.g. input problems, monitoring, coverage) and also assist some Latin American Partners who are often subject to a lot of staff turnover. Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) noted that the same could be done for other regional groups, such as ODINAFRICA.

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to carry out a feasibility study as to how much such a meeting would cost and then approach IOC for assistance in funding such an initiative, since IOC does sponsor other projects in South America, such as ODINCARSA. The ASFA Trust Fund could be used to supplement the funding, if necessary.

[**Rapporteurs note:** At the recent IOC/IODE/GE-MIM Group Meeting (which Mr Richard Pepe, FAO, attended) he raised the point of IOC funding support, for regional ASFA Staff Meetings. *“The GE-MIM Group supported this initiative and called on IOC to provide assistance”*.

Question 4.2: *Can the Secretary’s organization of the Meeting be improved? Is the Secretary’s progress-chasing sufficient/effective?*

Ms Beattie (NOAA) suggested that each ASFA Partner should evaluate the feasibility of carrying out their tasks and report back to the Board should they have any problems. She reminded ASFA Partners that they should be accountable for their own actions and take the first responsibility.

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to send out the “List of Action Items” agreed at the Meeting every 3 months so as to remind Partners of their responsibilities.

Question 4.3: *Comments and/or suggestions regarding the Invitations*

The **Board agreed** that the Invitations, as currently issued, were adequate.

Question 4.4: *The Board may consider discussing the possibility of increasing the length of the ASFA meeting - perhaps dedicating the extra day to special workshop topics or thematic discussions.*

The **Board agreed** to extend the Meeting to 5 days with the extra day dedicated to special workshops/ seminars/theme papers.

Question 4.5: *Is the current arrangement for deciding the venue adequate?*

The **Board agreed** on the current arrangement for deciding the venue [i.e. at each Meeting under the appropriate Agenda item, Partners are free to offer to host the subsequent Meeting]. For planning reasons, the Board would like to know the next two year’s Meeting venue in advance.

Question 4.6: *Are the Board Meetings being Chaired adequately?*

The **Board agreed** that the Meetings were being Chaired adequately, although some Partners suggested that the Chairperson should be: less “polite”, assist in the Meeting follow-up, and help in the planning of the next Meeting and Agenda, however there was no official agreement on any of these suggestions.

Question 4.7: *Is the documentation sufficient?*

The **Board agreed**, documentation, as currently prepared by the ASFA Secretariat, was sufficient.

Question 4.8: *Is the Agenda satisfactory? Are there items that too much time is being dedicated to and others not enough?*

The **Board agreed** that the Agenda was satisfactory. The item “Scope, Coverage and Monitoring and Timeliness” was considered a particularly essential Agenda item.

Nonetheless, it was suggested that some Agenda items could be “discussed” by special working groups on the extra day (5th day) that may/will be added to the ASFA Meetings.

The **Board agreed** that in order to have more time available for discussions on the last day of the Meeting, it would review for approval only the “List of Decisions” and “Actions” and not the full minutes of the Meeting.

Regarding the “full” minutes of the Meeting, the **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to circulate a draft of the full minutes via E-mail to the ASFA Partners who participated in the Meeting for their review. Afterwards the final version would be circulated to all Partners via ASFA-Board-L.

Question 4.9: *Is the Report adequate in form, content, presentation?*

The **Board agreed** the Report, as currently prepared by the ASFA Secretariat, was sufficient.

Question 4.10: *Does the Reporting need to be modified/improved*

The **Board agreed** the Reporting, as currently carried out by the ASFA Secretariat, was sufficient.

Questions 4.11:

- Is there sufficient intersessional follow up by Partners?

Some Board Members stated that Partners did not provide sufficient follow-up.

- Does/should the ASFA Secretariat provide continual reminders to Partner regarding the action items that they agreed to follow up?

See remarks under question item 4.2 above.

- Should there be economic incentives for every action item?

The Board said “No” to this question.

- Suggestions for getting intersessional follow-up actions carried out.

See remarks under question item 4.2 above.

7. ASFA SCOPE, COVERAGE, MONITORING AND TIMELINESS

7.1 Subject Scope

Mr Pepe (FAO) briefly defined: subject scope, coverage, and monitoring as it applies to ASFA.

Identifying and inputting articles within the subject scope of ASFA but appearing in non-aquatic science publications

In reply to observations by some ASFA Partners that there was less than optimal coverage in ASFA for certain fields within the subject scope of ASFA (e.g. fishery economics), Mr Emerson (CSA) noted that many ASFA subject areas were also relevant to some of the non-aquatic journals that are being monitored/included in CSA’s other non-aquatic databases, and that CSA was regularly scanning these other databases for the ASFA–related records for inclusion in ASFA.

Mr Pepe (FAO) reminded Partners of a paper prepared by Joan Baron some year’s ago, in which she reported that ASFA’s coverage of aquatic science related journals was good, however articles within the ASFA scope, appearing in non aquatic science journals, were often missed. The paper listed some journals, not on the ASFA Monitoring List, that often contained ASFA related papers.

Ms Noble (NMBL) requested that this list of journals be circulated to Partners via ASFA-Board-L.

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to circulate the list of journals contained in the Baron paper.

Considerable discussion followed on this subject. Mr Pepe (FAO) was of the opinion that CSA (because of the extensive monitoring for its other databases and because of its vicinity to many different libraries in the Washington DC area) would be in the best position to seek out and add to the ASFA database those papers relevant to ASFA that were appearing in non-aquatic science journals.

Mr Emerson (CSA) agreed that CSA had a prime role in this task, but also suggested that all ASFA Partners, time and manpower permitting, could try to identify such non-aquatic science journals in their libraries and add some of these non-core journals to their monitoring lists.

In this regard, ASFA Partners were reminded that they should notify FAO regarding any eventual additions to their Monitoring Lists, and also CSA, who could modify their own “unofficial” monitoring list.

7.2 Coverage

Coverage of Grey literature

Ms Noble (NMBL) enquired as to whether the coverage of grey literature and monographs should be given priority with respect to retrospective indexing. Mr Emerson (CSA) pointed out that **uniqueness** is one of the most important (positive) points of ASFA, and stressed the need for the inclusion of grey literature.

Electronic publishing

Ms Beattie (NOAA) mentioned that often scientists published their works only electronically and sometimes they do not inform the library that the literature was published. Much of the library's time may be spent searching for this literature, and often the URLs change. Ms Beattie added that NOAA generally downloads the documents and saves them on their server.

Mr Pepe (FAO) noted that CSIRO also mentioned the problem of non persistent URL's in their Annual Report. Mr Montes (UNAM) asked if some rules could be established on "how to monitor Web published literature" and on "how to follow them up" because of constantly changing servers.

Ms Noble (NMBL) and Ms Skotheim (IMR) mentioned the importance of archiving such literature electronically on a website.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) suggested this could be a topic for a Highlight Paper: "*Tracking online material and how to do*".

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to help identify a person (perhaps within the IAMSLIC membership) in the position to write such a paper.

7.3 Monitoring

Gaps in monitoring

Referring to complaints that some documents did not appear on the ASFA database (i.e. incomplete monitoring of journals on the ASFA Monitoring list), Mr Kühnhold (BF) asked whether it would be feasible for authors to provide or **to input their own work** (i.e. articles may be input individually from particular issues should there be difficulty in obtaining them). Several ASFA Partners noted that this would create considerable confusion regarding the registering of journal issues that had been covered.

Ms Soto (CSA) noted that the matter of "gaps" should be brought to the attention of that particular ASFA Partner, since it should be the ASFA Partner under whose responsibility the journal falls who should prepare the input for missing articles/issues.

The **Board agreed** that when a missing article (or issue) is brought to the attention of an ASFA Partner, that ASFA Partner should contact and inform the ASFA Partner who is responsible for the monitoring of the publication involved. Should the ASFA Partner not have the publication in question or not be able to get hold of it, then it should ask other ASFA Partners via ASFA-Board-L if anyone could prepare the input for them on their behalf.

The ASFA Partners were reminded that a text file containing the complete list of the journals monitored by the ASFA Partners (the Monitoring List) is posted on the FAO-ASFA FTP site (ftp://ftp.fao.org/fi/asfa/Monitoring_List/). It may be downloaded and consulted to see under whose responsibility a particular journal falls.

7.4 Timeliness

Mr Emerson (CSA) started the discussion on **timeliness**, by stating that this was CSA's **number 1 priority** (as it was users' number 1 priority). He noted that it previously took an average of 8 months before an article appeared on the ASFA database, and now some take only 2 months. However, CSA still gets many complaints, as users want the ASFA records to appear on the database straightaway. To speed up the process, CSA is using electronic input. That is they buy "raw" citations from the British Library (without indexing or abstracting) and put them temporarily in their Recent References Database until they have the time to index them.

Mr Jorgens (UN/DOALOS) asked how much input (and how frequently) should an ASFA Partner send input to CSA. Mr Emerson (CSA) replied that it was better to send fewer records (maybe even 15-20 records) every month in order to ensure good timeliness.

Ms Prod'homme (IFREMER) mentioned numerous complaints received from her scientists regarding slow coverage whereby only some articles from a particular issue get onto the database at the same time. Then, several months later the other articles appear. CSA explained that articles are not necessarily indexed on an issue-by-issue basis.

Mr Sainekar (NIO) pointed out that the promotion of ASFA depended very much on the publication of the work on the database.

7.5 Input Procedures

Follow-up action items (26, 27, 28) from the 2003 ASFA Board Meeting:

English title capitalization - "26. *Since the capitalization in titles does not affect searching, the Board agreed to enter the titles as they are shown in the publication, and FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to effect this change in the relevant Guidelines, and the Help notes contained in the www-ISIS-ASFA software, regarding capitalization.*"

Entering the Author's first name in full - "27. *The Board agreed to enter the author name in full under the following 2 conditions: 1) if provided as such in the original document, and 2) manpower permitting. It was pointed out that the author field, in the www-ISIS-ASFA software, contained an open pick-list which was "added to" during data input (i.e. when you add new term which is not in the list, it remains in the list for future use).*"

"28. *The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to follow up on the possibility of changing the structure of the Author's name field to be sub-fielded to allow for surname and first names.*"

Review of the ASFA input rules (with view of increasing timeliness and coverage)

The **Board agreed** that in order to simplify and to speed up data entry during the preparation of ASFA bibliographic records, and therefore to increase the timeliness and the coverage of the ASFA database, that it would evaluate the relative importance of the numerous "rules"/"conventions"/ "special codes" etc. used in preparing ASFA input, and to make changes to these "rules" etc., even though such changes might not be concordant or consistent with standard bibliographic rules/procedures. HOWEVER, all such changes shall take into consideration, as much as possible, the intermediate and end users comments as to the effects of such changes on the various uses of the database (above all the effects on retrieval of records in response to a query). In any case, the **Board reserves** the right to reverse any eventual decisions regarding alterations to the input procedures which might later (after use and more in-depth study) reveal themselves to be counterproductive or inappropriate.

Mr Pepe (FAO) referred to some of the rules and regulations contained in the Guidelines for Abstracting that perhaps now are "redundant". He also mentioned the cooperation that FAO had initiated with an IAMSLIC working group regarding the use of standard cataloguing rules and whether they were important in the preparation of ASFA input, i.e. is standardization and aesthetics (e.g. upper case/lower case, italics, super/subscripts) as important, more important, or less important than timeliness?

Ms Beattie (NOAA) acknowledged IAMSLIC's high degree of expertise, but suggested proceeding with caution in consulting outside groups for such particular and specific information. Mr Emerson (CSA) mentioned that communicating with outside groups regarding ASFA input procedures could have some negative repercussions.

[Rapporteurs note to readers: the above paragraph may not convey the actual spirit of the discussions as it could appear that the speakers do not want outside groups to review the ASFA input techniques or that they do not want ASFA to be reviewed at all – which is in **no** way the case. The point of the interventions was that there is a danger in going outside of the ASFA Partnership with complex issues and publicizing eventual possible shortcomings, because if these issues are taken out of context (or perhaps because we, ourselves, do not describe fully and correctly the issues) there is the danger of creating unnecessary and unwarranted negative feedback with possible repercussions on the image and/or sales of the ASFA products].

CSA suggested that IAMSLIC could be asked to take a look at the database as a whole and provide some suggestions as to what could be done to improve it and make it better for them.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) suggested that it would also be advantageous to ask for comments from the "end users", i.e. the research scientists. Ms Prod'homme (IFREMER), referring to marine protected areas, mentioned that it was the scientists, i.e. the end users, who were more and more querying the database for the information.

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** (in principle) to revise the publication “Guidelines for abstracting” in order to eliminate some of the ASFA house rules no longer deemed important/necessary, in order to facilitate input procedures.

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat also agreed** to send to CSA a list of the rules, conventions, and ‘editing’/special character coding rules included in the all of various inputting guidelines. CSA will examine them and notify FAO of those not deemed necessary, even though they may not be concordant with standard bibliographic rules/procedures, again, with a view to streamlining/facilitating input procedures.

7.5.1 Automatic Data Entry

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) mentioned the IMIS system used by VLIZ to avoid keying data while preparing ASFA input and started up discussion regarding the use of software to download raw material into the www-ISIS-ASFA software, where the indexing would be carried out to complete the ASFA records.

Mr Emerson (CSA) referred to the system that CSA uses to download those abstracts and citations that are freely available on the Web, citing in particular Elsevier's ScienceDirect (an electronic collection of science, technology and medicine full text and bibliographic information).

He mentioned CSA's handling of copyright matters, and pointed out that CSA must write a Visual Basic program to convert each journal into a suitable format for CSA's processing. CSA receives alerts from ScienceDirect when new issues of journals, monitored by CSA, are available and then downloads the abstracts and citations into an XML file. Mr Emerson explained the software (spider + visual basic) used to download individual articles and convert them into a compatible format for importing into the CSA system. CSA uses this system for some 15 publishers.

Some discussion followed regarding the checking (and standarization) of such downloaded work and the modifying of abstracts. Mr Emerson (CSA) mentioned that CSA checked the titles and abstracts for errors, and that there is no problem in modifying author abstracts to conform to ASFA regulations provided that the text is modified without changing the meaning.

Mr Pepe (FAO) mentioned that if scientists wished to download such records from the ASFA database to create, for example, a bibliography, the records would be inconsistent in format (e.g. some titles all in uppercase etc.). Most ASFA Partners did not feel this (the aesthetical appearance) was of great importance, since often different publishers used different formats anyway.

Ms Noble (NMBL) noted that ScienceDirect contains journals without standard style and these records are downloaded to bibliographic software, such as EndNote, along with ASFA records.

Mr Jorgens (UN/DOALOS) requested CSA to provide the spider software to ASFA Partners. Mr Emerson (CSA) said that this was possible, but that the software system needed to be modified by Partners so as to be compatible with their system used to prepare ASFA input.

CSA agreed to send FAO details of the software (spider and Visual Basic programs) used to download and process citations from one Publisher (and how/where to get it and provide a text file with the Visual Basic program).

7.5.2 Diacritics

Follow-up action items (29, 30) from the 2003 ASFA Board Meeting:

"29. *The Board agreed that the Diacritic and Transliteration Committee would prepare a preliminary table, using the table in the Bibliographic Guidelines as a starting point, which would be circulated to ASFA Partners within 2-3 months.*"

"30. *In order to determine whether searching with/without diacritics would make any difference to results, the Board agreed to carry out searches to investigate different databases and to send results to the Committee for analysis, so that eventually a second table could be prepared.*"

Mr Kühnhold (BF) presented the Report of the ASFA “Diacritics and Transliteration Committee”. See Annex-A contained in the German (BF) Report (**Annex-17**). The major factors considered were whether searching for information is affected by the way the data is input and also the feasibility of entering all diacritical marks.

Current ASFA input rules request that diacritical characters are stripped of their diacritical marks and reduced to the basic characters or split to non-diacritical character combinations. Note, should ASFA Partners wish to keep inputting diacritical marks for use in their internal databases, they can, as when the records are exported to CSA, the Publisher will strip the letters of their diacritical marks before inclusion on the database.

Multiple variations will still have to be used when carrying out searches for authors' names which have diacritical marks split to non-diacritical character combinations

It was suggested that the current ASFA input rules be maintained until there is the possibility of incorporating UNICODE as a default character set in the www-ISIS-ASFA software.

Based on the deliberations of the ASFA “Diacritics Committee”, the ASFA Board agreed that the current treatment of diacritics should remain as at present, but that the table in the Bibliographic Guidelines should be replaced by the more comprehensive Table prepared by the ASFA “Diacritics and Transliteration Committee”, and that this item will continue to be reviewed, by the Board, in the future. Again, the Board reserves the right to block or modify any eventual decisions, which after a more detailed analysis, might later reveal themselves as inappropriate, for some previously unforeseen reason.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to circulate to all Partners the more comprehensive Table prepared by the ASFA “Diacritics and Transliteration Committee”.

With respect to non-Latin languages, the **Board agreed** that all new transliterations be based on the ISO transliteration system in order to avoid misinterpretation and errors.

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to contact/refer to ‘ISO’ standards regarding individual tables for the different languages.

In the case of the Ukraine, if no such ISO table is found to exist, the Board agreed to eventually consider some transliteration schemes that are being developed within the Ukraine.

7.5.3 Machine-assisted indexing

Follow-up action item (17) from 2003 ASFA Board Meeting:

"17. Dr Emerson (CSA) agreed to provide more detailed information regarding automatic machine indexing, and to circulate it via ASFA Board L. Dr Emerson (CSA) agreed also to carry out a test to compare machine-assisted indexing with personal indexing and prepare the trial for Partners to test by next spring."

Mr Emerson (CSA) explained that CSA is currently testing a machine-assisted indexing software package, which allows indexing rules to be created and thereby carry out automatic indexing. He pointed out that this automatic indexing still needs to be checked by human editors. CSA believes that this machine-assisted indexing will assist in increasing the number of records processed by indexers, and has good potential in the future in improving input efficiency. CSA does not use 100% machine assisted indexing in the preparation of its input.

CSA agreed to provide FAO with a selected list of records from all ASFA Partners (e.g. 100) to be posted via FTP, so that one can see the same records indexed both manually and by machine. Should Partners also wish to receive individual lists of records, they should E-mail their request to CSA.

7.5.4 Multiple author affiliations

Follow-up action items (36, 37, 38, 39) from the 2003 ASFA Board Meeting:

"36. Regarding the possibility that this extra information (i.e. multiple author affiliations) will cause records to exceed the maximum record length of the www-ISIS-ASFA software (approx. 7800 characters). The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to do some testing regarding this problem."

"37. Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) agreed to obtain some information from their own system (which already includes multiple author affiliations) to see how they have solved the problem of linking the various authors to their respective affiliations."

"38. The FAO ASFA Secretariat and Dr Emerson (CSA) agreed to investigate the possibility of including multiple affiliation fields, and FAO agreed to request Dr. Rybinski to modify the software so as to incorporate the multiple affiliation feature (including also multiple e-mail addresses) in the next release of the software."

"39. The Board agreed that the inclusion of multiple author affiliations would NOT be mandatory and only those Partners, who wished to do so, would enter multiple affiliations."

Mr Emerson (CSA) started the discussion on this Agenda item, mentioning that although the inclusion of multiple author affiliations in the ASFA database could be of use in demographic surveys, it would mean a lot of extra work, not only by ASFA Partners during input procedures but also by CSA. Many Partners said that they would not include multiple author affiliations in their input. Mr Kühnhold (BF) mentioned that keeping track of national scientific information is not really part of ASFA's mandate. Mr Romanov (YugNIRO) stated that the author affiliation is included in the record only to assist in obtaining the document. Mr Sainekar (NIO) mentioned that the Indian Input Centre often adds extra information in the record for internal use only, and suggested that more than one address could be entered in one of the local fields at the end of the ASFA Worksheet in the www-ISIS-ASFA software.

The **ASFA Board agreed** to leave the Author Address field as it is, i.e. have just one address.

Ms Prod'homme (IFREMER) wanted recorded in the Report that the headquarters and scientific committee of IFREMER regret such a decision by the Board.

8. ASFA PRODUCTS AND SERVICES

8.1 ASFA Journals

Mr Pepe (FAO) mentioned that there were now only 3 printed ASFA abstracts journals (*ASFA-1*, *ASFA-2* and *ASFA-3*), since publication of the printed versions of *ASFA Aquaculture Abstracts* and *ASFA Marine Biotechnology Abstracts* has ceased.

Follow-up action item (18) from the 2003 ASFA Board Meeting:

"18. The FAO ASFA Secretariat requested further time to consider the potential consequences of cancelling the two journals: *Aquaculture Abstracts* and *Marine Biotechnology printed journals*, and pointed out that such a change would require a legal amendment to the Publishing Agreement. FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to circulate via ASFA Board-L the CSA proposal (to cancel the printed versions of the two above mentioned journals) in order to have feedback also from Partners not present at the Meeting."

Mr Pepe (FAO) reported that all ASFA Partners (and a small IAMSLIC working group) were consulted during the intersessional period via ASFA Board-L regarding cancellation of the 2 journals. The general opinion was that it was "OK" to cancel the journals as long as the same information remained available in the other ASFA printed products and/or CD-Rom/IDS service.

8.2 CD-ROM

Mr Emerson (CSA) provided the ASFA Board with a brief background to the problems which had developed over the past few years between CSA and SilverPlatter-Ovid Technologies and which resulted in the non-renewal of the contract (which expired in April 2004) between CSA and Ovid to produce the ASFA CD-ROM.

Consequently, CSA now produces the ASFA CD-ROM themselves. The new CSA, ASFA CD-ROM was sent out to all ASFA Partners in May 2004 for review/comments. Mr Emerson mentioned that the new CSA, ASFA CD-ROM does not match the search interface/options of the SilverPlatter ASFA CD-ROM that it replaces. Instead, it resembles the CSA, ASFA IDS interface.

Mr Emerson reported that the new CSA CD-ROM contains 74,000 more records than the previous SilverPlatter version, because CSA carried out a previously delayed re-load of the entire database.

Mr. Emerson (CSA) requested that ASFA Partners test the new CSA, ASFA CD-ROM and let CSA know what their views were, and also what they would like to be modified/added, listing the options in priority.

The **ASFA Board agreed** that they would test the new CD-ROM and send their comments to FAO, who would then notify CSA.

CSA agreed to provide ASFA Partners with instructions on the setting up of the new CD-ROM on LAN, following a request by Mr Sainekar (NICMAS). (**Rapporteurs note:** this has been done)

Mr Sainekar (NIO/NICMAS) raised the question of using the new ASFA CD-ROM on a Linux system, and the importance of being able to search simultaneously the two ASFA CD-ROMs which make up the set.

Mr Romanov (YugNIRO) noted that although not many ASFA Partners are currently using Linux, there were problems concerning the use of illegal copies of Windows and pointed out that there now was a greater tendency towards using free software such as Linux.

CSA agreed to investigate the possibility of making the CD-ROM Linux-compatible and also the possibility of simultaneously searching the CD-ROMs

Mr Grainger, on behalf of the FAO ASFA Secretariat, expressed his concern regarding the cessation of the SilverPlatter-Ovid CD-ROM, especially with respect to the possible consequences for developing countries and mentioned in particular those countries involved in the LIFDC project. He hoped that the cessation of this product would not affect those countries that depend upon the CD-ROM.

He noted that the cancellation and replacement of a longstanding well-established ASFA information product like the ASFA database on the SilverPlatter-Ovid CD-ROM is a major change and requested that the following statement by the FAO Secretariat be recorded in the Report.

Regarding the suspended publication and distribution of the ASFA database on the SilverPlatter-Ovid CD-ROM platform, and its replacement by a CSA ASFA CD-ROM, FAO would like to note that it regrets the loss of some of the advantages and functionalities that the SilverPlatter-Ovid CD-ROM provided and hopes that the CSA CD-ROM replacement will be sufficient to satisfy users' requirements. FAO, whilst noting CSA's fine job in producing and marketing the ASFA database and in developing the ASFA products and user interface, reserves the right to review CSA's decision on the matter in the light of the ASFA Publishing Agreement should it be deemed necessary.

8.3 Internet Service

Follow-up action item from 2003 ASFA Board Meeting:

"23. Both VLIZ (Belgium) and IFREMER (France) requested that combining search strategies should be made available on the IDS. CSA noted that they were always trying to improve the IDS service and that it was one of the improvements already included on their list, and that CSA would try to make it a priority."

Ms Prod'homme (IFREMER) mentioned some of IFREMER's requests regarding search options on the CSA, ASFA IDS interface. Mr Emerson (CSA) noted that some of the items, such as the possibility to combine search strategies with the "not" operator, were already included in the new IDS Interface to be released shortly, and said that he would check regarding the possibility to sort records according to other fields, such as author. Ms Prod'homme also mentioned the problems in searching for authors who were editors of documents, and therefore appeared in different fields. Mr Emerson said that he would also check if the new Interface would have the possibility to search simultaneously for author and/or editor, but suggested that it would be better to search for an author in both the fields "author" and 'editor'.

CSA agreed to provide the Partners with a list of further improvements/changes that will be made to the IDS in the future, and noted that some improvements are already listed in the CSA Report.

Ms Skotheim (IMR) mentioned the need for good and comparable statistics in order to be able to survey the usage of the database. Mr Emerson (CSA) noted that the utility of the user report statistics is rather limited in some cases.

Regarding the correction of records on the IDS, CSA reloads the entire database every 6 months (early January and late June/July). The data are first loaded into a test database to ensure the corrections have been made and then are re-loaded. Ms Soto (CSA) mentioned that records with missing data are taken out, but some data, such as abbreviated Serial Title, may be automatically entered before re-loading.

8.4 Document Delivery

Follow-up action items (31, 32) from 2003 ASFA Board Meeting:

"31. Ms Goulala (NCMR) agreed to send ASFA Partners a paper on copyright laws that NCMR had compiled. "

"32. The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to prepare a questionnaire regarding Partners problems concerning document delivery, and circulate it to Partners via ASFA-Board-L"

ASFA – IAMSLIC cooperation

Mr Pepe (FAO) introduced the topic of document delivery (or resource sharing) by referring to the InterLibrary Loan (ILL) system used by IAMSLIC (i.e. the Z39.50 Distributed Library and the IAMSLIC listserv), which are available to members of IAMSLIC.

He mentioned that many ASFA Partners were also IAMSLIC members and therefore already had access to this document delivery system. He suggested that all ASFA Partners become members of IAMSLIC, and if necessary, the ASFA Trust Fund could be used to pay the annual membership costs. In this way, all of the ASFA Partners would have access to the IAMSLIC listserv and to the document delivery system, which could be of great use in the exchange/retrieval of grey literature.

Some discussion followed, explaining the advantages of being an IAMSLIC member. It was suggested that an ASFA Partner, as well as preparing ASFA input and sending it to CSA, could put up (on a voluntary basis) its Catalogue (or part of its catalogue) on their Server and make it available to other IAMSLIC members through the Z39.50 Distributed library initiative.

Mr Pepe (FAO) noted that ASFA Partners already members of IAMSLIC are aware of the IAMSLIC system and how to use it, but that perhaps a Liaison Officer would be necessary to help explain the system to those ASFA Partners who had no knowledge regarding the Z39.50 Library.

The **ASFA Board agreed** that the ASFA Trust Fund could be used to pay for those Partners who do not have the funds, or are not able for administrative reasons to pay for membership to IAMSLIC, but would like to become IAMSLIC members.

Ms Goulala (HCMR) suggested that membership costs could be negotiated with IAMSLIC for all the ASFA Board Members.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) agreed to be the "Liaison person" between ASFA and IAMSLIC dealing with technical matters regarding the eventual joining by ASFA Partners into the IAMSLIC Z.39 initiative, which allows for the distributed searching of library catalogues or selected parts of them.

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed**, as the next step, to contact the IAMSLIC president to work out the details. After which the ASFA Partners will be informed by ASFA-Board-L as to the outcome, and how to proceed.

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) mentioned that although some Partners were already members of IAMSLIC, they were not able to participate in document delivery for other reasons such as lack of equipment (e.g. no scanning equipment). As a point of information, Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) informed the Board that IAMSLIC had budgets for members regarding equipment.

Areil and Prospero software

Follow-up action item (33) from 2003 ASFA Board Meeting

"33. Regarding compatibility between Ariel and Prospero. Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) agreed to continue the testing, and agreed to circulate a written paper on Prospero via ASFA Board-L"

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) mentioned that, as regards the testing of Prospero, no further developments were made during the intersessional period. Work was underway on a new version of the software, and it is still recommended as being a good software as an alternative to Ariel.

Ms Beattie (NOAA) suggested the buying of the Ariel software be negotiated as a group (i.e. the ASFA Board).

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to investigate a negotiated price.

Web site depository for grey literature

Mr Emerson (CSA) brought up the topic of setting up a Web Site as a depository for electronic documents, in particular for grey literature documents, which are often difficult to obtain.

He suggested that the ASFA Trust Fund could be used for establishing, maintaining such a site, should it be necessary. Ms Noble (NMBL) supported the idea, mentioning that in this way there could be a live link from the ASFA database to the full text on the Web Site. Mr Emerson (CSA) mentioned the Scopus database, a new abstract and indexing (A&I) database being developed by Elsevier which links to libraries' full text.

Some discussion followed as to who should host and maintain the Web Site of grey literature (CSA, FAO, other).

Ms Beattie (NOAA) suggested that some Partners might already be doing something similar, i.e. have their own depository, so perhaps links could be made to the individual Web Sites. She also pointed out that the continuity of the hosting is a problem. Ms Noble (NMBL) also agreed that long-term access would be a problem. Mr Emerson (CSA) suggested that besides the individual Partners sites, in order, to facilitate continuity (and the eventual linking from the ASFA IDS database) it would be best to have a copy of everyone's depository on one Web Server.

Mr Macharia (KMFRI) noted that ODINAFRICA has an electronic depository for grey literature hosted on the Web Site to help document delivery.

Ms Beattie (NOAA) enquired as to whether ODINCARSA maintained a similar depository as ODINAFRICA; Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) reported that there was none. Ms Muñoz said she would ask other Latin American colleagues at the next IAMSLIC meeting whether setting up one could be possible.

Ms Beattie (NOAA) reminded the ASFA Partners that setting up an archive and/or calling oneself an archive, in some countries, carries with it certain obligations or requirements to be fulfilled and that meeting these requirements could involved considerable cost and effort.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) suggested the possibility of broadening the "Virtual Library" to involve other networks, such as EUROCEAN and EURASLIC, however Mr Emerson (CSA) disagreed saying that the Board should concentrate, as a first step, on setting up the ASFA Virtual Library, but could perhaps ask the above networks for some information/experience regarding the matter (considering the possibility of involving such networks later on in the future).

Mr Emerson(CSA) noted that some ASFA Partners had hard copies of documents, but no facilities to scan them. CSA mentioned that it might consider scanning such documents for Partners.

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to further consider/study the matter including the possibility of using its Web Server to set up a Web Site for electronic documents, where all the grey literature contained in the various individual ASFA Partners repositories could be kept together and linked to the ASFA database.

CSA agreed to provide FAO with the technical details of what is involved in setting up a Web server.

8.5 New Outputs and Services

Mr Emerson (CSA) mentioned that information regarding the new CSA, ASFA CD-ROM and the new release IDS 7 was included in the CSA Report.

8.6 Public Relations Activities, Marketing

Mr Romanov (YugNIRO) referred to the Argentina Report where Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) mentions the lack of information regarding ASFA in the FAO Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean. He recognized that the FAO Secretariat did its best regarding the promotion of ASFA world-wide via the FAO Web Site, however he asked whether it was possible for the FAO Fisheries Department to provide more publicity regarding ASFA, especially at the various meetings attended by the Department.

Mr Pepe (FAO) replied, saying that since ASFA was not a 100% FAO initiative (being a joint venture with a private company) it was sometimes problematic to advertise/promote ASFA, since FAO could then be expected to provide unlimited free copies of the database. Nonetheless, he mentioned that the FAO Secretariat did promote ASFA. For example at the biennial COFI Meetings held at FAO, delegates from all over the world were always presented with an ASFA display stand where searches on the ASFA database were demonstrated. Within FAO, a circular is distributed 2-3 times a year to all the FAO Fisheries Department staff regarding ASFA explaining what it is, giving details of the FAO ASFA Home Page and also mentioning the recent developments during the past year. In addition, the FAO Fisheries Library occasionally gives small presentations regarding searching the ASFA database.

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) stressed the importance of making the FAO Representatives aware of ASFA and asked whether the FAO Representatives could provide some funds to assist in the promotion of ASFA in their countries.

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to communicate with the Latin American Regional Office in order to facilitate the promotion of ASFA in the respective countries.

Ms Wibley (FAO) suggested that the ASFA Trust Fund be used to prepare some ASFA promotional materials, that could then be used by all Partners.

Considerable discussion followed regarding the promotion of ASFA. Both Ms Beattie (NOAA) and Mr Emerson (CSA) mentioned that ASFA promotion is carried out at large international meetings that are directly related to ASFA. Mr Romanov (YugNIRO) mentioned that the Ukraine has published ASFA information in several information-related conference proceedings and local fisheries journals to attract users.

Mr Emerson (CSA) noted that some publications use the ASFA database as a tool for Bibliometric and Scientometric studies.

Mr Sainekar (NIO) suggested that ASFA Partners write short articles to be published in local newspapers to assist promoting ASFA. He mentioned how the promotion of ASFA at a local aquaculture fair in India helped in bringing people to use the ASFA database.

Mr Pepe (FAO) drew attention to the FAQs on the FAO ASFA Home Page (now also available in Spanish) which could be used by ASFA Partners to write papers and to promote ASFA.

8.7 Entitlements

Mr Pepe (FAO) explained ASFA Partners' basic "Product Entitlements" referring to **Annex-47**.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reminded ASFA Partners to contact CSA (Craig Emerson) should they wish not to receive the ASFA printed journals as part of their basic entitlements or should they have any queries regarding missing entitlements. It was stressed that only the National Partner should contact CSA - not Collaborating Centres.

8.8 Increasing Distribution of ASFA Information Products and Services

Mr Pepe (FAO) presented the Report of the LIFDC Project (**Annex-38**). He briefly reviewed the project for the benefit of new Partners. He highlighted the fact that a number of institutions that were once part of the project have now moved on to become ASFA Partners: Ecuador, Indonesia, Morocco, Mauritania and Nigeria. This was certainly a sign of the success of the project.

9. PROGRESS WITH MACHINE READABLE INPUT

9.1 DOS- ASFISIS (release-3)

Mr Pepe (FAO) pointed out that although the last version of this software is still being used by some Partners there would be no further maintenance. CSA can still receive ASFA input prepared with this software, but the FAO ASFA Secretariat strongly recommended that ASFA Partners change to the new web version of the software, www-ISIS-ASFA, especially in view of the fact that the web version has a slightly different worksheet structure (i.e. new fields such as Serial Title-extended, URL address).

CSA agreed to inform FAO as to who was still preparing input using the ASFISIS software, and the **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to contact those ASFA Partners to investigate “why” (if there was a technical problem) and to try to get them to change to the new www-ISIS-ASFA software.

9.2 WWW-ASFA-ISIS

Mr Pepe (FAO) reported that most ASFA Partners were now using www-ISIS-ASFA software to prepare input. He referred the ASFA Partners to the Report prepared by ICIE (**Annex-44**) giving details of the main Help Desk activities performed under a Trust Fund project during the 12 month period following distribution of the software. Although the contract expired in October 2003, ICIE has continued to reply to the occasional enquiries received from ASFA Partners.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat proposed extending the Help Desk and including it as part of another Trust Fund Proposal dealing with the development of an upgrade/maintenance software release.

Most ASFA Partners agreed in continuing the Help Desk and this topic is discussed further under the Agenda Item 13.3 New Proposals (see **Annex-46**)

Following request by Mr Sainekar (NIO), the **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to investigate with Dr Rybinski regarding the development of the www-ISIS-ASFA software under the Linux operating system.

Follow-up action item (22) from the 2003 ASFA Board Meeting:

"22. FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to send a reminder via ASFA-Board-L to all Partners regarding usage of the environmental codes, and agreed to request modification of the www-ISIS-ASFA input software to incorporate a warning message when the field was missing data during the data input."

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that a reminder regarding usage of the environmental codes had been to Partners via ASFA Board-L on 14.04.04, and that the updated version of the www-ISIS-ASFA software would incorporate a warning message in the verification should the field be missing data.

10. REPORT ON ASFA TRAINING ACTIVITIES

Mr Pepe (FAO) reported that five Training Courses on ASFA input methods were held during the intersessional period.

Three Training Courses were held at FAO headquarters in Rome. They were: 1) Iceland - *Marine Research Institute (MRI)*, 9-13 February 2004; 2) NACA - *Network of Aquaculture Centres in Asia-Pacific (NACA)*, 17-21 May 2004; and 3) Indonesia - *Center for Scientific Documentation and Information, Indonesian Institute of Science (PDII-LIPI)*, 7-11 June 2004.

Two Training Courses were held outside of FAO. They were: 1) Ecuador - *Instituto Nacional de Pesca (INP)*, 20-24 October 2003, carried out by Mr. M. Montes (UNAM, Mexico), and 2) Nigeria - *National Institute for Freshwater Fisheries Research (NIFFR)*, 31 May-4 June 2004, carried out by James Macharia (KMFRI, Kenya).

Another Training Course is planned at FAO in Rome, 20-24 September 2004 for Mauritania - *Institut Mauritanien de Recherches Oceanographiques et des peches (IMROP)* and Morocco - *Institut National de Recherche Halieutique (IHRH)*.

11. STATUS OF ASFIS REFERENCE SERIES PUBLICATIONS

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

The Monitoring List is available as a text file on the FAO ASFA Homepage FTP site (<ftp://ftp.fao.org/fi/asfa/>).

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reminded the ASFA Partners of the necessity of notifying FAO (attention: Ms Lombardi) of any changes or additions/deletions to their monitoring lists, and to reply as quickly as possible to any FAO queries regarding the List.

With respect to the ongoing exercise requested by the Board at the 2000 ASFA Board Meeting, involving the addition of 5 new fields to the Monitoring List Master File, the FAO ASFA Secretariat again reminded the ASFA Partners that, if and when they are requested by FAO (Ms Lombardi) to provide information regarding these fields, they should supply the information as soon as possible, so that their lists will be complete with the updated information.

CSA agreed to send FAO a list of publications with some information regarding publication dates (i.e. when records from a particular journal first start appearing in ASFA).

11.2 ASFIS-2, Subject Categories and Scope Descriptions

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that no modifications were made to this publication during the intersessional period. The publication is available in English, Russian and Spanish on the FAO ASFA Homepage FTP site (<ftp://ftp.fao.org/fi/asfa/>).

11.3 ASFIS-3, Guidelines for Bibliographic Description

The publication *ASFIS-3 (Rev.3) Guidelines for Bibliographic Description using www-ISIS-ASFA software* is available in English and Spanish on the FAO ASFA Homepage FTP site (<ftp://ftp.fao.org/fi/asfa/>).

For ASFA Partners still using the DOS ASFISIS software, *ASFIS-3 (Rev.2) Guidelines for Bibliographic Description using ASFISIS software*, issued in 1998, is also available on the FAO ASFA Homepage FTP site (<ftp://ftp.fao.org/fi/asfa/>).

11.4 ASFIS-4, Guidelines for Abstracting

The publication is available on the FAO ASFA Homepage FTP site (<ftp://ftp.fao.org/fi/asfa/>).

For ASFA Partners still using the DOS ASFISIS software, *ASFIS-4 (Rev.1), Abstracting Guidelines*, issued in 1998 and revised in 2001, is also available on the FAO ASFA Homepage FTP site (<ftp://ftp.fao.org/fi/asfa/>).

11.5 ASFIS-5, Guidelines for Indexing

The publication is available on the FAO ASFA Homepage FTP site (<ftp://ftp.fao.org/fi/asfa/>).

For ASFA Partners still using the DOS ASFISIS software, *ASFIS-5 (Rev.1), Indexing Guidelines*, issued in 1998, is also available on the FAO ASFA Homepage FTP site (<ftp://ftp.fao.org/fi/asfa/>).

11.6 ASFIS-6, Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Thesaurus

The ASFA Thesaurus is currently available in 3 formats: 1) Printed publication - *ASFIS-6, (Rev.2) Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Thesaurus*; 2) Online Internet version - available on the FAO ASFA Homepage at http://www4.fao.org/asfa/nons_en.htm; and 3) Text file in English - available on the FAO ASFA Homepage FTP site (<ftp://ftp.fao.org/fi/asfa/>).

Follow-up action item (43) from 2003 ASFA Board Meeting:

"43. Regarding the Fishery Ontology Service Project, FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to keep the Board informed of progress."

The FAO ASFA Secretariat informed the Board as to the status of the FAO Ontogeny Project and mentioned that the project is still under evaluation and therefore could not be used to update other systems. Mr Pepe (FAO) said that the "mapping" of the terms (which is covered in the Ontogeny project) would help in the addition of terms and also in the translation of the Thesaurus.

CSA suggested that the ASFA Thesaurus could be used as it is now as a base to start translation into Spanish and French (or any other language).

Ms Beattie (NOAA) mentioned that the Thesaurus was important and widely used by many different agencies. Mr Emerson (CSA) said that the Thesaurus, which is available on CSA's IDS, is well-used. CSA uses a software to gather statistical details as to how the Thesaurus is used.

Mr Sainekar (NIO) observed that chemical terms/toxins were not included in the Thesaurus pick-list. Mr Emerson (CSA) replied that this was correctly so and suggested that perhaps another list for chemical compounds could be added.

Ms Frohland (IMR) mentioned the usefulness of having more forbidden terms/synonyms included in the Thesaurus.

Mr Pepe (FAO) suggested that the ASFA Board might consider identifying some important terms for addition to the ASFA Thesaurus for immediate use in indexing, so that the pick-list in the www-ISIS-ASFA software could be updated.

The **Board agreed** to prepare a short list of terms (up to 10 terms) which they believed should be added to the ASFA Thesaurus and send it to FAO. The list may include synonyms of existing thesaurus terms – such synonyms would be included in the thesaurus as cross-reference of “forbidden” terms pointing to the “accepted” term.

The **Board agreed** that the ASFA Thesaurus Committee should be re-instated to guide the future development of the Thesaurus and to review the above mentioned terms that Partners will be submitting to FAO.

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to send an E-mail via ASFA Board-L to invite ASFA Partners should they wish to be part of the Committee. **FAO and CSA agreed** to be part of the Committee.

11.7 ASFIS-7, Geographic Authority List

Follow-up action items (44, 45, 46, 47) from the 2003 ASFA Board Meeting:

"44. *Dr Emerson (CSA) reported that they had recently sent the list (approximately 25,000) to Partners for analysis. CSA pointed out that it was of great importance to give a clean list to FIGIS before it starts mapping the terms to its GIS interface. Dr Emerson (CSA) agreed to try to identify a consultant to clean up the current geographic descriptor list. (Partners were also requested by CSA to inform them of any experts they may know in the field.)*

"45. *Regarding whether the GAL list could be made to appear as an ‘accruable’ pick-list in the www-ISIS-ASFA software (i.e. when you add new term which is not in the list, it remains in the list for future use). FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to ask Dr. Rybinski if this would be possible.*

"46. *Regarding the navigational charts compiled by the National Information Mapping Agency (NIMA) Mr Jorgens (UN/DOALOS) agreed to investigate and to follow-up on NIMA, with the assistance of NOAA.*

"47. *FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to consult the UN programme for further information.*

Ms Noble (NMBL) referred the numerous incorrect terms present in the Geographic Descriptor pick-list (which is included in the www-ISIS-ASFA software). She noted that this was creating problems during ASFA input by less-experienced staff. She suggested that, in order to avoid the addition of poorly indexed records to the database, that indexers consult the printed version of the Geographic Authority List.

Mr Emerson (CSA) explained that the pick-list contained in the www-ISIS-ASFA software was not an actual Authority List, but rather a download of all Partners’ geographic indexing as taken from 3 years of ASFA input (i.e. from the annual ASFA geographic indexes). And that it does contain many inconsistencies which require cleaning-up. He suggested two possibilities to consider in order to have a good Geographic Descriptor list: 1) hire a consultant to clean-up the current list, or 2) adopt and use an already existing Geographic Thesaurus/List. Mr Emerson stated that, in his opinion, a “quick checking” of the current pick-list for spelling and incorrect entries would not be sufficient to provide a valid authority list, and that a thorough cleaning/revising and future maintenance of the list by a consultant would be very expensive (prohibitive).

Some discussion followed regarding costs involved and whether more than one list could be used. Ms Frohland (IMR) brought up the importance of being able to add local names, which may not be included in an “already existing list”. Mr Emerson (CSA) noted that most of the lists were fairly comprehensive and did contain many local names. He referred in particular to the Getty Thesaurus. Ms Beattie (NOAA) suggested that ASFA Partners take a look at the Getty Thesaurus and make an evaluation of the inclusion of local names. The findings could be communicated via ASFA Input-L.

The Board recognized that the Geographic pick-list in www-ISIS-ASFA contained many errors and that it was not an Authority List. The **Board agreed** that the pick-list should be used with care, to assist in data entry, and that the FAO Secretariat should remind Partners of this.

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to send an E-mail via ASFA-Board-L reminding Partners of the limitations present in the current www-ISIS-ASFA geographic terms picklist and hints to follow regarding its use.

CSA suggested that ASFA Partners review the Getty Thesaurus as a possible replacement to the geographic pick-list and **agreed** to give the URL address to interested ASFA Partners.

The **Board agreed** to evaluate the Getty Thesaurus, and any other On-line Geographic Thesaurus they found, and communicate their views to the other ASFA Partners via ASFA-Board-L.

Brief mention was made of the FIGIS-ASFA cooperation regarding geo-referencing of ASFA geographical terms for use in searching the ASFA database. Mr Emerson (CSA) said that work had proceeded on the Search Interface Tools and Sea Codes. See (**Annex-43**) for a Report regarding the FIGIS-ASFA cooperation.

11.8 ASFIS-8, Taxonomic Authority List

This list is included as a pick-list in the www-ISIS-ASFA software to assist data entry, and it is available on the FAO Fisheries Web page site (<http://www.fao.org/fi/statist/fisoft/asfis/asfis.asp>) as a text file for easy importing into Excel or Access Software.

Follow-up action item (49) from 2003 ASFA Board Meeting:

"49. A request was made to make this list become an 'accruable' pick-list in the www-ISIS-ASFA software (i.e. when you add new term which is not in the list, it remains in the list for future use). Dr. Romanov (YugNIRO) said that this was already possible and agreed to follow up with instructions to all partners on how to do it - via ASFA Board-L

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that this had been done and referred to the E-mails of Dr Romanov and Dr Rybinski's dated 24 and 25 July 2003 sent to ASFA Board-L"

11.9 ASFIS-9, Database User Guide – no action to report

11.10 ASFIS-10, Authority List for Corporate Names

Follow-up action item (50) from the 2003 ASFA Board Meeting:

"50. The FAO ASFA Secretariat requested that CSA to send it the updated Corporate Author Master File, so that it could be incorporated into the www-ISIS-ASFA software. Dr Emerson (CSA) agreed."

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that CSA had sent the list, and that it was currently with Dr Rybinski for incorporation into the www-ISIS-ASFA software.

Mr Pepe (FAO) reported that the updated version of the Corporate Author List will be included in the planned updated version of www-ISIS-ASFA.

11.11 ASFIS-11, Magnetic Tape Specifications and Record Format

Nothing to report

11.12 ASFIS-12, Intern. Dir. of Ser. Published in Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries

Nothing to report.

11.13 ASFIS-13, ASFIS Database Indexing And User Guide (Chinese)

Nothing to report

11.14 ASFIS-14, ASFISIS (Release-3 User Manual)

This publication, issued in 1998, is only for use with the DOS ASFISIS software and is available on the ASFA Homepage FTP site (<ftp://ftp.fao.org/fi/asfa>)

12. EXPANDED LANGUAGE CAPABILITY IN ASFA

Mr Pepe (FAO) reported on the various ASFA Documents that had been translated into other languages during the intersessional period, which included:

- 1) translation of the www-ISIS-ASFA "*Help Notes*" into **Spanish & French** (special credit goes to M. Montes, UNAM, Mexico; J. Prod'homme, IFREMER, France; and L. Lombardi, FAO);
- 2) translation into **Spanish** of *Guidelines for Bibliographic Description and Data Input using www-ISIS-ASFA* and *ASFIS Subject Categories and Scope Notes* (M.Montes, UNAM);
- 3) translation into **Russian** of: *Guidelines for Bibliographic Description and Data Input using ASFISIS*, the *Guidelines for Abstracting using ASFISIS*, *Guidelines for Indexing using ASFISIS*, *ASFISIS User Manual*, and *ASFIS Sub. Categories and Scope Notes* (E. Romanov, YugNIRO);
- 4) translation into **Spanish** of: *ASFA information fact sheet*, *IAMSLIC letter*, and *FAQ's* which appear on the FAO ASFA Homepage. Special thanks to G. Cosulich (INIDEP) for volunteering to do these jobs), and
- 5) translation into **Chinese** of *ASFA Thesaurus* (NMDIS).

(Rapporteurs note: Ms J. Prod'homme (IFREMER) has also translated into **French** the *Guidelines for Bibliographic Description and Data Input using www-ISIS-ASFA*, together with parts of the *Indexing* and *Abstracting* Guidelines)

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) suggested translating the "lead terms" of the ASFA Thesaurus into Spanish. Mr Montes (UNAM) agreed with the suggestion, but added that the terms would have to be reviewed by the Latin American Regional Group in order to decide upon some standardization regarding the terms.

13. ASFA TRUST FUND

13.1 Status of the ASFA Trust Fund

The balance in the Trust Fund account is **US\$ 438,069.00**. CSA deposited **US\$199,188.66** in royalties for 2003. **Annex-36** and **Annex-37** give a slight breakdown of the calculation of CSA Royalty payment, and details on the status of the Trust Fund.

13.2 Proposals in Progress, Completed or Pending Further Discussion

13.2.1 Proposals in Progress

13.2.1.1 Supporting Attendance to Annual ASFA Board Meeting (INIDEP, Argentina, 2004)

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

At the 2003 Meeting, the Board allocated \$30,000 to support attendance at this year's Meeting in Argentina. The total amount disbursed was [US\$24,926.47]

Eleven ASFA Partners received full or partial assistance to attend this year's Meeting: 1) Chile, 2) Cuba, 3) Ecuador, 4) Estonia, 5) India, 6) Kenya, 7) Korea, 8) Mexico, 9) Russia, 10) Ukraine, 11) Uruguay.

(This is an ongoing proposal, so EACH year it requires "updating" with regard to the cost. The "updating" of this proposal is presented as (Annex-41) and is reported below in section 13.3)

13.2.1.2 Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year Jan -Dec 2004) (\$30,000)

This proposal is in progress and ends December 2004. It is to assist the FAO ASFA Secretariat with work/initiatives that are for the collective benefit of the ASFA Partnership

So far for the period Jan.-Dec. 2004, \$54,317 has been spent/committed as follows: - \$8,800 assistance in ASFA input preparation - sub-contract to AdriaMed (underway); \$2500 Input of missed IOTC documents; \$26,542 for work/subscription costs related to the project to distribute ASFA information products to LIFDC countries; \$10,233 for www-ISIS-ASFA training for Mauritania, Indonesia, Nigeria, and Ecuador; \$3388 FAO recruitment of Indonesian ASFA Partner - visit to Institute while in region by R.Grainger; and \$2854 for FAO attendance at IAMSLIC by R.Pepe (in September 2004).

In addition to the \$30,000 allotment for 2004, there was also \$33,665 of unspent funds allocated in the previous years, therefore the actual sum available during 2004 is \$63,665. Any unspent funds will be carried forward and added to 2005 allotment.

(This is an ongoing proposal which the Board suggested be reconfirmed each year. Reconfirmation of this proposal is presented as (Annex-3a) and is reported below in section 13.3)

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

This proposal was put forward/approved during the 2002-2003 intersessional period via ASFA-Board-L (see 2003 Meeting Report: section 13.3.1.5, Annex-14, and 14a for full details of project). During this intersession period, there was some discussion between VLIZ, CSA, and FAO regarding the exact nature of the documents to be input under this project, so as not to include duplicates or other Partners journals.

Mr Haspesslagh (VLIZ) pointed out some of the technical discrepancies encountered during the project, which are detailed in the Belgian Report (**Annex-10a**). He explained the misunderstanding regarding the selection of references to be included in the project, some of which belonged to serial titles under the responsibility of other ASFA Partners. Therefore the records which have currently been prepared under the project will need to be reviewed to eliminate possible duplicates.

Mr Haspesslagh (VLIZ) pointed out that, due to the extra required review activities, more time will be needed (approximately 6 months) to complete the work, and most probably the target figure of 15,000 records will be reduced to 10,000. He asked the Board for their approval to the proposed way of continuing the project. He also requested that a second advance sum, of the budget, be made to VLIZ to cover the costs that have already been advanced by the VLIZ Treasury to pay for the temporary staff member contracted to do the bulk of the work.

The **Board agreed** to the proposed way of continuing with the Project and gave its approval for payment of the 2nd advance sum of the budget to VLIZ.

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat** will carry out the second payment.

13.2.1.4(VNIRO, Russia) - Input of "old" unique literature (approx 1000 records) on Caspian Sea from 1770 -1970 (\$6,000)

This proposal was put forward and agreed at the 2003 Meeting (see 2003 Meeting Report, section 13.4.3 and Annex-31a). Ms Levashova (VNIRO) gave a brief report as to the current status of the Trust Fund Project (see **Annex-27**)

The **Board agreed** that FAO could proceed with the 2nd payment to VNIRO in September 2004.

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

Mr Pepe (FAO) explained the current status of the Trust Fund Project referring the ASFA Board to the Progress Report by FIGIS (**Annex-43**). 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). Mr Emerson (CSA) mentioned the technical programming that was required to connect to the ASFA Database and check for subscription, so as to allow searching. He also mentioned the UN Statistical Codes that were used to map FIGIS.

13.2.1.6 (PIMRIS) - Convert 500 Records from PIMRIS database into ASFISIS format.

This proposal was originally approved in 1997 (see 1997 Meeting Report, section 4.15 and Annex 31), but was never carried out for various reasons. A small contract equal to the original Trust Fund project (US\$3,500) has been given to Mr. Ganeshan Rao (ex-PIMRIS co-ordinator) to resume the conversion. Several batches of input prepared with ASFISIS3 have already been received by FAO for checking.

13.2.2 Proposals Completed

13.2.2.1 Financial support to attend the ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (CIP, Cuba, 2003)

At the 2002 Meeting, the Board allocated \$30,000 to support attendance to the Meeting in Cuba (see 2002 Meeting Report, section 13.3.1). Seven ASFA Partners received full or partial assistance to attend the Cuba Meeting: Argentina, China, Estonia, Kenya, Mexico, Poland, Ukraine.

13.2.2.2 (FAO) - Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year Jan -Dec 2003) \$30,000)

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

13.2.2.3 Support to implementation of www-ISIS-ASFA interface by ICIE (Help Desk) (\$10,000)

This proposal was first approved at the 2001 Meeting and it became operative when the new www-ISIS-ASFA software was issued in October 2002. The purpose of the proposal was to assist Partners with the implementation and installation of the new www-ISIS-ASFA software, and to maintain the software (updates to internal pick-lists and debugging) for a period of one year. A Report by ICIE on the functioning of the "Help Desk" was presented at the 2003 Meeting (see 2003 Meeting Report, Annex-48). A **final** Report by ICIE on the functioning of the "Help Desk" is presented as (**Annex-44**).

13.2.2.4 KMFRI, (Kenya) - Collect, sort out, and prepare approximately 6000 complete bibliographic references dealing with the aquatic environment (in machine readable format using www-ISIS-ASFA or ASFISIS) for inclusion in the ASFA Database (\$15,000)

This proposal was put forward and approved during the 2002-2003 intersessional period via ASFA-Board-L (see e-mails to the ASFA-Board-L list dated 30 September 2002 and 15 October 2002 and 2003 Meeting Report, section 13.3.1.3). The project is completed and the records (5991) were reported by CSA in April 2004 as being loaded in the ASFA database.

13.2.2.5 UNAM, (Mexico) translate into Spanish the ASFIS Reference Series, No. 2 (ASFIS Subject Categories and Scope Descriptions) and ASFIS Reference Series, No. 3 (Guidelines for Bibliographic Description and Data Entry) (\$7,000)

This proposal was put forward and agreed at the 2003 Meeting (see 2003 Meeting Report, section 13.4.4 and Annex-28a). Both Documents have been translated into Spanish and are available on the FAO ASFA Homepage FTP site (<ftp://ftp.fao.org/fi/asfa>)

13.2.3 Proposals pending further discussion

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

At the 2003 Meeting (see 2003 Meeting Report, section 13.3.3.1) the Board Agreed in principle to this proposal at €30,000, however its implementation was **pending** the successful outcome of the completed first “cleaning” project which meant the merging of the “cleaned” BF records into a master CSA file.

Mr Kühnhold (BF) provided a brief background to the project. Mr Emerson (CSA) explained that there had been many technical problems and that it had taken a lot of time to carry out the conversion. The ASFA descriptors have now been separated and are ready for mapping. Mr Kühnhold (BF) said that they were waiting for the completion of the mapping in order to complete the second phase of the project to cover the rest of the descriptors.

Mr Emerson (CSA) mentioned that CSA were investigating the possibility of splitting the ASFA descriptors into their respective fields (i.e. subject, taxonomic, geographic) and that this would carry out some cleaning up of the descriptor field, although it would not necessarily clean up all of the incorrectly spelt words. Mr Kühnhold (BF) stressed the importance of correcting the mis-spelt words, since they were of no use and could not be used for searching.

Discussion followed regarding whether it was worth waiting (keeping the project pending) or whether the project should be cancelled. Mr Jorgens (UN/DOALOS) pointed out that most probably the costs would be higher than originally stated, should the project be kept pending and eventually started at a later date.

The **ASFA Board agreed** to keep the project pending until a new price quotation would be circulated by Mr Kühnhold (BF) via ASFA Board-L. The Board would then be asked to confirm the project via ASFA Board-L.

13.2.3.2 (INIDEP, Argentina and IFOP, Chile) - Marine Bibliographic Information from the Latin American and Caribbean Region Processed for the ASFA Database, Twenty Five Years of Scientific Research (1955-1980). First Stage: South America: Argentina and Chile.

This proposal was put forward at the 2002 Meeting (see Annex-12a of 2002 Report), but not approved because the Partners submitting the proposals had a backlog of input from their own current Monitoring list (see 2002 Meeting Report, section 13.3.4). The Board agreed that the proposals could be presented again at the 2003 Meeting. At the 2003 Meeting, the Board Agreed in principle to both proposals (US\$10,000 each), however **providing** that both Partners were up-to-date with their own monitoring and that their records were no longer being checked by FAO (see 2003 Meeting Report 13.3.3.3).

Mr Pepe (FAO) informed the ASFA Board that as of April 2004, INIDEP (Argentina) input was no longer being checked by FAO, Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) confirmed that they were up to date in their current monitoring responsibilities.

The **Board agreed** that INIDEP may proceed with this Trust Fund Proposal, and the **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to initiate the administrative measures.

Mr Pepe (FAO) explained that ASFA input from IFOP (Chile) was still being checked and so the Chile Trust Fund Proposal is still pending.

13.3 New and/or Ongoing Proposals

13.3.1 (FAO)-Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year Jan-Dec 2005) (\$30,000)

Ongoing proposal (see **Annex-3a**) - This proposal is to assist the FAO ASFA Secretariat in carrying out work/initiatives that are for the collective benefit of the ASFA Partnership. FAO proposed this as an ongoing proposal, and which the Board requested be discussed each year before renewal.

The **ASFA Board agreed** to this FAO Trust Fund Proposal.

13.3.2 Supporting attendance to ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (for year 2004)

Ongoing proposal (**Annex-40**) - This proposal is reviewed each year, by the Board, in order to update the funds for allocation for the subsequent Meeting. The original proposal (by NOAA) was agreed at the 1997 ASFA Board Meeting, where \$6000 was allocated to support attendance at the 1998 Meeting. The Board subsequently updated/increased the allocation as follows: year 1998 (\$10,000), year 1999 (\$15,000), year 2000 (\$15,000), year 2001 (\$25,000), year 2002 (\$30,000), and year 2003 (\$30,000).

Some discussion followed regarding increasing the sum allocated to this Trust Fund Proposal. It was noted that the number of ASFA Partners has increased considerably over the past 2 years.

Mr Grainger (FAO) suggested increasing the sum from the present \$30,000 to \$35 000.

The **Board agreed** to renew the Trust Fund Proposal and to increase the sum to \$35 000 for the 2005 Board Meeting.

Mr Romanov (YugNIRO) questioned the eligibility of some Eastern European States regarding the funding of their attendance at the ASFA Board Meetings, since they were now becoming members of the EU, i.e., for how long should they be considered as “developing and/or economies in transition” after membership to the EU?.

He suggested that the Board consider reviewing the criteria for funding attendance and decide: 1) are new EU members to be considered still eligible for funding, and if so, for how long?; or 2) new EU members are no longer to be considered eligible for funding, since they no longer fit the mandatory requirement 'economically-developing countries and/or countries in transition to a market economy'.

No discussion followed on the matter. Whereupon, Mr Pepe (FAO) reminded the Board that there is a criteria for funding taken into consideration by the FAO Secretariat when funding ASFA Partners to attend the Board Meetings (it is sent out as part of the invitation to the Meeting). He also noted that the FAO Secretariat does make the final decision on funding, and this could now also include deciding whether the institute should still be considered a “developing and/or economies in transition” country regardless of its “official classification”.

The possibility of using the ASFA Trust Fund to pay for observers to attend ASFA Board Meeting was raised by Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ). He mentioned that observers from countries neighbouring the Host country could be invited to attend the 5th Day of the Board Meeting as a means of promoting ASFA or as a means of identifying new ASFA Partners. Mr Sainekar (NIO) felt that should observers wish to attend the ASFA Board Meeting, they should be able to fund themselves.

13.3.3 www-ISIS-ASFA Maintenance Release-1 (\$7 900)

This proposal (**Annex-46**) intends to continue the development of the www-ISIS-ASFA software by means of a "minor upgrade", which includes improvements and corrections for most of the errors or bugs that have been uncovered so far by FAO and ASFA Partners during data input, and also incorporate updates to some of the pick-lists included in the software.

The **Board agreed** to this the Trust Fund Proposal, and FAO will initiate the contract with ICIE to proceed with the work.

ASFA Partners were reminded that should they have any additional "minor" changes they wished to be made to the software they should send them to FAO via E-mail as soon as possible.

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to evaluate the possibility of incorporating additional changes into the Trust Fund Proposal to upgrade www-ISIS-ASFA.

Mr Kühnhold (BF) suggested calling this upgrade www-ISIS-ASFA Version 1.1, rather than a “maintenance release”, and for short - perhaps “Henry 1.1”.

13.3.4 KMFRI (Kenya) - Elimination of gaps and incomplete coverage (\$15 000)

Mr Macharia (KMFRI) introduced this Trust Fund Proposal (**Annex-21**) with respect to a comparative study that KMFRI had conducted to establish the completeness of coverage of core journals/series i.e. identify gaps. He proposed that KMFRI cover the gaps for the journals which they held in their library. The survey had identified some 5000 records for which ASFA input was required. A list of the journals/series titles showing incomplete coverage was included.

Mr Emerson (CSA) noted that some series titles included in this list were on the Monitoring Lists of other ASFA Partners, and therefore under their responsibility. He also noted that some issue numbers may already be under preparation by some ASFA Partners, i.e. ASFA input could already have been prepared but not yet sent to CSA and included in the ASFA database. Mr Emerson (CSA) suggested that Mr Macharia first check with ASFA Partners before preparing ASFA input for the gaps on their behalf, and to decide upon a publication year as a starting date.

The **Board agreed** in principle to this proposal, pending revision of the list of journals identified as having incomplete coverage (i.e. KMFRI needs to check first with other ASFA Partners should they wish to cover the gaps of the journals falling under their responsibility). Mr Macharia (KMFRI) would then circulate a new list via ASFA Board-L, with a revised cost per record, in order to get the go ahead from the ASFA Board.

13.3.5 YugNIRO (Ukraine)–Translation of ASFA Thesaurus into Russian and development of an English-Russian and Russian-English Thesaurus (\$15 000)

Mr Romanov (YugNIRO) introduced this Trust Fund Proposal (**Annex-29c**), noting how useful the translation would be, not only to the Russian and Ukraine ASFA Partners during preparation of ASFA input, but also as a reference publication regarding Russian terminology in fisheries/aquatic sciences.

The **Board agreed** to this Trust Fund Proposal.

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to investigate the use of the Multites software for this project and eventually to send a copy to YugNIRO

13.3.6 YugNIRO (Ukraine)–Translation of the www-ISIS-ASFA Help Notes and front interface into Russian (\$2 000)

Mr Romanov (YugNIRO) introduced this Trust Fund Proposal (**Annex-29a**), mentioning that a Russian user interface and “help notes” in Russian would greatly facilitate input procedures for the Russian and Ukraine centres.

He proposed that YugNIRO translate the “help notes” and software front interface pages for distribution upon request among the Russian-speaking ASFA input centres. However, he referred to the ASFA Board decision to evaluate the possible modifications to some input procedures which were going to be evaluated by ASFA Partners during the next intersessional period and so requested that the proposal be approved in principle, pending eventual modifications to the www-ISIS-ASFA software.

The **Board agreed** to this Trust Fund Proposal in principle, pending release of www-ISIS-ASFA 1.1 and eventual revisions to the *Guidelines for Bibliographic Data Entry, Abstracting, and Indexing*.

13.3.7 YugNIRO (Ukraine)– Translation of www-ISIS-ASFA guidelines into Russian (\$5000)

Mr Romanov (YugNIRO) introduced this Trust Fund Proposal (**Annex-29b**), noting that translation of the various guidelines for ASFA input using the www-ISIS-ASFA software would be useful for both the Ukrainian centres and also for other centres of the former USSR preparing ASFA input.

However, he again requested that the proposal be approved in principle, pending eventual modifications to ASFA input procedures or to the www-ISIS-ASFA software.

The **Board agreed** to this Trust Fund Proposal in principle, however pending the foreseen changes to the *Guidelines for Bibliographic Data Entry using the www-ISIS-ASFA* and the *Guidelines for Abstracting and Indexing Guidelines* as a result of the exercise to simplify the input procedures.

13.3.8 (Estonia) – Review missing publications from Latvian and Lithuania literature

Ms Kalenchits (EMI) mentioned that EMI would like to carry out a review of publications from the Latvian and Lithuania literature to identify missing publications and carry out ASFA input to fill in the gaps. EMI will prepare a written Trust Fund Proposal and send it to ASFA Board-L for approval.

The **Board agreed** in principle, pending circulation by EMI, via ASFA-Board-L, of a written Proposal.

14. OTHER BUSINESS

Nothing to report

15. PLACE AND DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Mr Pepe (FAO) suggested the next ASFA Board Meeting be held in Rome (Italy) in October 2005, so as to be “back-to-back” with the 2005 IAMSLIC Meeting to be held in Rome 10-14 October 2005, as this could produce a number of mutual benefits. One of the main benefits would be cost savings for those ASFA Partners who usually attend (or would want to attend) both Meetings.

Some discussion followed as to the usefulness of having the two Meetings "back-to-back". Mr Jorgens (UN/DOALOS) suggested inviting some IAMSLIC members to attend the ASFA Board Meeting as observers. Mr Pepe (FAO) suggested that IAMSLIC could be asked to dedicate some time to talk about ASFA within their meeting and perhaps also have some guest speakers/lecturers from IAMSLIC to talk to the ASFA Board on the “5th” day of the Board Meeting.

Mr Emerson (CSA) noted that feedback from IAMSLIC provides information of great importance to abstract databases like ASFA, and that the presence of ASFA at the IAMSLIC meeting would be very beneficial.

The **Board agreed** in principle to hold the 2005 ASFA Board Meeting in Rome (Italy). However the dates, cost effectiveness and modality of creating spaces in both Meetings for the sharing of expertise still need to be studied/decided.

Two Board Members (CSA, VLIZ) agreed to assist the FAO ASFA Secretariat in establishing the best dates for the ASFA Meeting (before or after the IAMSLIC Meeting, number of days etc.)

(Rapporteurs note: based on further discussions regarding this matter, the best dates for the next ASFA Advisory Board Meeting seem to be Tuesday 4 to Saturday 8 October 2005 (5 day inclusive) and they have been communicated to the ASFA Partners.

Should the idea of holding the Board Meeting adjacent to the IAMSLIC result not be feasible for some reason, **VLIZ (Belgium) re-confirmed** its offer to host the Meeting in late June or July. **HCMR (Greece) also offered** to host the Meeting if necessary.

16. REVIEW/APPROVAL OF MINUTES (ITEMS AGREED AT MEETING)

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

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to send an E-mail to ASFA Board-L, explaining the new procedure regarding review of the Minutes of the Report and informing ASFA Partners that there would be a delay in sending out the Rough Draft.

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

The Chairperson thanked Ms Cosulich and all of the INIDEP staff involved in the organization of the Meeting. Ms Cosulich also thanked Mr Montes for acting as Chairperson during the Meeting.

(PART-2)

DECISIONS AND ACTIONS AGREED BY PARTICIPANTS AT 2004 MEETING

(this is Annex-48 from the 2004 Board Meeting Report, INIDEP, Argentina)

.....

(the **section numbers** in this section refer to the Body of the Report)

1. 2003 ASFA Board Meeting Report

The **Board agreed** to adopt the 2003 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting Report (Habana, Cuba) without any changes. (section 5)

2. Regarding the recruitment of an ASFA Partner in the Netherlands

It was suggested that knowing where Dutch institutes carried out their bibliographic searches and which Dutch institutes were subscribing to ASFA could be useful in identifying other potential ASFA Partners in the Netherlands.

CSA agreed to try to provide such information. (section 6.2.2)

3. Renewed (2004-2007) ASFA Publishing Agreement between FAO and the ASFA Publisher (CSA)

Referring to Exhibit F, Item 5 of the Publishing Agreement (Annex-42) some Partners questioned the limited number (four) of additional ASFA entitlements that Partners may claim after a certain number of input sheets are submitted to CSA.

CSA agreed to consider increasing the number of IDS subscriptions granted to Partners on a case-by-Action CSA case basis. (section 6.4)

4. Theme Paper: *ASFA Advisory Board Meeting - Structure of the Meeting*

4.1 The need to exchange experiences & discuss problems among ASFA inputters at Staff Meetings

Listserv - As a means to discuss ASFA Input problems - Mr Emerson (CSA) suggested, as a first step, to start up a Listserv and then to consider setting up a Forum later.

The **Board agreed** to this suggestion. (section 6.6)

FAO agreed to set up the Listserv and to call it "ASFA-Input-L", and to provide some guidelines regarding its use. A report of its usefulness will be presented at the next meeting.(section 6.6)

Mini ASFA Meetings (regional) – Again as a means to discuss ASFA Input problems, the **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to carry out a feasibility study as to how much such a meeting would cost and then approach IOC for assistance in funding such an initiative, since IOC does sponsor other projects in South America, such as ODINCARSA. The ASFA Trust Fund could be used to supplement the funding, if necessary. (section 6.6)

4.2 Secretary's organization of the Meeting progress-chasing

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to send out the "List of Action Items" agreed at the Meeting every 3 months so as to remind Partners of their responsibilities. (section 6.6)

4.3 Meeting Invitations

The **Board agreed** that the Invitations as currently issued were adequate. (section 6.6)

4.4 Increasing the length of the ASFA meeting

The **Board agreed** to extend the Meeting to 5 days with the extra day dedicated to special workshops/ seminars/theme papers. (section 6.6)

4.5 The venue

The **Board agreed** on the current arrangement for deciding the venue [i.e. at each Meeting under the appropriate Agenda item, Partners are free to offer to host the subsequent Meeting]. To facilitate planning, the Board requested to know/establish the next two year's venue in advance.(section 6.6)

4.6 The Chairperson

The Board agreed that the Meetings were being Chaired adequately, although some Partners suggested that the Chairperson should be: less "polite", assist in the Meeting follow-up, and help in the planning of the next Meeting and Agenda, however there was no official agreement on any of these suggestions. (section 6.6)

4.7 Documentation

The **Board agreed** that the documentation, as currently prepared by the ASFA Secretariat, was sufficient. (section 6.6)

4.8 The Agenda

The **Board agreed** that the Agenda was satisfactory. The item "Scope, Coverage and Monitoring and timeliness" was considered a particularly essential item. Nonetheless it was suggested that some Agenda items could be discussed by special working groups on the extra day (5th day) of the meeting. (section 6.6)

The **Board agreed** that in order to have more time available for discussions on the last day of the Meeting, that it would review for approval only the "List of Decisions" and "Actions" and not the full minutes of the Meeting. (section 6.6)

Regarding the "full" minutes of the Meeting, the **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to circulate a draft of the full minutes via E-mail to the ASFA Partners who participated in the Meeting for their review. Afterwards the final version would be circulated to all Partners via ASFA-Board-L. (section 6.6)

4.9 The Report

*The **Board agreed** that the Report, as currently prepared by the ASFA Secretariat, was sufficient. (section 6.6)*

4.10 The Reporting

*The **Board agreed** that the Reporting, as currently carried out by the ASFA Secretariat, was sufficient. (section 6.6)*

4.11: Intersessional follow up by Partners and should there be economic incentives for every action item?

The Board said "No" to this question. (section 6.6)

ASFA Scope, Coverage, Monitoring And Timeliness

5.1 Identifying and inputting articles within the subject scope of ASFA but appearing in non-aquatic science publications

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to circulate the list of journals contained in the paper prepared by Joan Baron a few years ago. (section 7.1)

Mr Emerson (CSA) agreed that CSA had a prime role in identifying those ASFA relevant papers appearing in non aquatic science journals, but also suggested that all ASFA Partners, time and manpower permitting, could try to identify such "non-aquatic science journals in their libraries and add some of these non-core journals to their monitoring lists. (section 7.1)

In this regard, the ASFA Partners were reminded that they should notify FAO regarding any eventual additions to their Monitoring Lists, and also CSA, who could modify their own 'unofficial' list. (section 7.1)

5.2 Electronic documents on the Web

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to help identify a person (perhaps within the IAMSLIC membership) in the position to write such a paper on 'Tracking online material and how to do it'. (section 7.2)

5.3 Gaps in monitoring

The **Board agreed** that when a missing article (or issue) is brought to the attention of an ASFA Partner, that ASFA Partner should contact and inform the ASFA Partner who is responsible for the monitoring of the publication involved. Should the ASFA Partner not have the publication in question or not be able to get hold of it, then it should ask other ASFA Partners via ASFA-Board-L if anyone could prepare the input for them on their behalf. (section 7.3)

6. ASFA Input Procedures and Review of the ASFA input rules with the view of speeding up data entry and consequently timeliness

6.1 The **Board agreed** that in order to simplify and to speed up data entry during the preparation of ASFA bibliographic records, and therefore to increase the timeliness and the coverage of the ASFA database, that it would evaluate the relative importance of the numerous "rules", "conventions", "special codes" etc. used in the data input procedures, and to make changes to these "rules" etc., even though such changes might not be concordant or consistent with standard bibliographic rules/procedures. HOWEVER, all such changes shall take into consideration, as much as possible, the intermediate and end users comments as to the effects of such changes on the various uses of the database (above all the effects on retrieval of records in response to a query). In any case, the **Board reserves** the right to reverse any eventual decisions regarding alterations to the input procedures which might later (after use and more in-depth study) reveal themselves to be counterproductive or inappropriate. (section 7.5)

6.2 The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** (in principle) to revise the publication "Guidelines for abstracting" in order to eliminate some of the ASFA house rules no longer deemed important/necessary, in order to facilitate input procedures. (section 7.5)

6.3 The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to send to CSA a list of the rules, conventions, and editing/special character coding rules included in the all of various inputting guidelines. CSA will examine them and notify FAO of those not deemed necessary, even though they may not be concordant with standard bibliographic rules/procedures, again, with a view to streamlining/facilitating input procedures. (section 7.5)

7. Regarding Automatic Data Entry

CSA agreed to send FAO details of the software (spider and Visual Basic programs) used to download and process citations from one Publisher (and how/where to get it and provide a text file with the Visual Basic program). (section 7.5.1)

8. Diacritics

8.1 Based on the deliberations of the ASFA "Diacritics Committee", the **ASFA Board agreed** that the current treatment of diacritics should remain as at present, but that the table in the Bibliographic Guidelines should be replaced by the more comprehensive Table prepared by the ASFA "Diacritics and Transliteration Committee", and that this item will continue to be reviewed, by the Board, in the future. Again, the Board reserves the right to block or modify any eventual decisions, which after a more detailed analysis, might later reveal themselves as inappropriate, for some previously unforeseen reason. (section 7.5.2)

8.2 The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to circulate to all Partners the more comprehensive Table prepared by the ASFA “Diacritics and Transliteration Committee”. (section 7.5.2)

8.3 With respect to non-Latin languages, the **Board agreed** that all new transliterations be based on the ISO transliteration system in order to avoid misinterpretation and errors. (section 7.5.2)

8.4 The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to contact/refer to ‘ISO’ standards regarding individual tables for the different languages. (section 7.5.2)

8.5 In the case of the Ukraine, if no such ISO table is found to exist, the **Board agreed** to consider some transliteration schemes that are being developed within the Ukraine. (section 7.5.2)

9. Machine-assisted indexing

CSA agreed to provide FAO with a selected list of records from all ASFA Partners (e.g. 100) which would be posted via FTP, so that one can see the same records indexed both manually and by machine. Should ASFA Partners also wish to receive individual lists of records, they should E-mail their request to CSA. (section 7.5.3)

10. Regarding the inclusion of Multiple author affiliations in ASFA Citations

The **ASFA Board agreed** to leave the Author Address field as it is currently, i.e. have just one address. (section 7.5.4)

11. Regarding the non-renewal of the contract between CSA and SilverPlatter/Ovid regarding the production of the ASFA CD-ROM

11.1 The **ASFA Board agreed** that they would test the new ASFA CD-ROM produced by CSA and send Action FAO their comments to FAO, who would then notify CSA. (section 8.2)

11.2 **CSA agreed** to provide ASFA Partners with instructions on the setting up of the new CD-ROM on LAN, following a request by Mr Sainekar (NICMAS). (**Rapporteurs note:** this had been done) (section 8.2)

11.3 **CSA agreed** to investigate the possibility of making the CD-ROM Linux-compatible. (section 8.2)

Regarding the suspended publication and distribution of the ASFA database on the SilverPlatter-Ovid CD-ROM platform, and its replacement by a CSA ASFA CD-ROM, FAO would like to note that it regrets the loss of some of the advantages and functionalities that the SilverPlatter-Ovid CD-ROM provided and hopes that the CSA CD-ROM replacement will be sufficient to satisfy users' requirements. FAO, whilst noting CSA's fine job in producing and marketing the ASFA database and in developing the ASFA products and user interface, reserves the right to review CSA's decision on the matter in the light of the ASFA Publishing Agreement should it be deemed necessary. (section 8.2)

12. Regarding the ASFA on the CSA Internet Service

CSA agreed to provide the Partners with a list of further improvements/changes that will be made to the IDS in the future, and mentioned that some improvements are already listed in the CSA Report.(section 8.3)

13. Document Delivery and ASFA – IAMSLIC cooperation

13.1 The **ASFA Board agreed** that the ASFA Trust Fund could be used to pay for those Partners who do not have the funds, or are not able for administrative reasons to pay for membership to IAMSLIC, but would like to become IAMSLIC members. (section 8.4)

13.2 **Mr Haspesslagh (VLIZ) agreed** to be the “Liaison person” between ASFA and IAMSLIC regarding technical matters regarding the eventual joining by ASFA Partners into the IAMSLIC Z.39 initiative, which allows for the distributed searching of library catalogues or selected parts of them. (section 8.4)

13.3 The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed**, as the next step, to contact the IAMS LIC president to work out the details. After which the ASFA Partners will be informed by ASFA-Board-L as to the outcome, and how we shall proceed. (section 8.4)

14. Regarding Areil and Prospero software

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to investigate a negotiated price. (section 8.4)

15. Regarding the of setting up a Web Site as a depository for electronic documents, in particular for grey literature documents

15.1 The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to further consider/study the matter including the possibility of using its Web Server to set up a Web Site for electronic documents, where all the grey literature contained in the various individual ASFA Partners repositories could be kept together and linked to the ASFA database. (section 8.4)

15.2 **CSA agreed** to provide FAO with the technical details of what would be involved in setting up a Web server. (section 8.4)

16. Regarding Public Relations Activities, Marketing and making the FAO Representatives aware of ASFA

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to communicate with the Latin American Regional Office in order to facilitate the promotion of ASFA in the respective countries. (section 8.6)

17. Regarding Entitlements

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reminded ASFA Partners to contact CSA (Craig Emerson) should they wish not to receive the printed journal as part of their basic entitlements or should they have any queries regarding missing entitlements. It was stressed that only the National Partner should contact CSA - not the Collaborating Centres. (section 8.7)

18. Regarding Partners still using the DOS- ASFISIS (release-3) software

CSA agreed to provide FAO information as to who was still preparing ASFA input using the ASFISIS software, and the **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to contact those ASFA Partners to investigate "why" (if there was a technical problem) and try to get them to change to the new www-ISIS-ASFA software. (section 9.1)

19. Regarding WWW-ASFA-ISIS

Following request by Mr Sainekar (NIO), the **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to investigate with Dr Rybinski regarding the development of the www-ISIS-ASFA software under the Linux operating system. (section 9.2)

20. Regarding the STATUS OF ASFIS REFERENCE SERIES PUBLICATIONS

20.1 ASFIS-1, Serials Monitored for the ASFIS Bibliographic Database

CSA agreed to send FAO a list of publications with some information regarding publication dates (i.e. when records from a particular journal first start appearing in ASFA). (section 11.1)

20.2 ASFIS-6, Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Thesaurus

The **Board agreed** to prepare a short list of terms (up to 10 terms) which they believed should be added to the ASFA Thesaurus and send it to FAO. The list may include synonyms of existing thesaurus terms – such synonyms would be included in the thesaurus as cross-reference of "forbidden" terms pointing to the "accepted" term. (section 11.6)

The **Board agreed** that the ASFA Thesaurus Committee should be re-instated to guide the future development of the Thesaurus and to review the above mentioned terms that Partners will be submitting to FAO. (section 11.6)

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to send an E-mail via ASFA Board-L to invite ASFA Partners should they wish to be part of the Committee. **FAO and CSA agreed** to be part of the Committee. (section 11.6)

20.3 ASFIS-7, Geographic Authority List

The Board recognized that the Geographic pick-list in www-ISIS-ASFA contained many errors and that it was not an Authority List. The **Board agreed** that the pick-list should be used with care, to assist in data entry, and that the FAO Secretariat should remind Partners of this. (section 11.7)

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to send an E-mail via ASFA-Board-L reminding Partners of the limitations present in the current www-ISIS-ASFA geographic terms picklist and hints to follow regarding its use. (section 11.7)

CSA suggested that ASFA Partners review the Getty Thesaurus as a possible replacement to the geographic pick-list and **agreed** to give the URL address to those ASFA Partners who would be interested. (section 11.7)

The **Board agreed** to evaluate the Getty Thesaurus, and any other On-line Geographic Thesaurus they found, and communicate their views to the other ASFA Partners via ASFA-Board-L. (section 11.7)

20.4 ASFIS-10, Authority List for Corporate Names

Mr Pepe (FAO) reported that the updated version of the Corporate Author List will be included in the planned updated version of www-ISIS-ASFA. (section 11.10)

21. ASFA TRUST FUND

The balance in the Trust Fund account is **US\$ 438,069.00**. CSA deposited **US\$199,188.66** in royalties for 2003. (section 13.1)

21.1 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) (VLIZ, Belgium)

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) pointed out that, due to the extra review activities, more time will be required (approximately 6 months) to complete the work, and most probably the target figure of 15,000 records will be reduced to 10,000. He asked the Board for their approval to the proposed way of continuing the project. He also requested that a second advance sum of the budget be made to VLIZ to cover the costs that have already been advanced by the VLIZ Treasury to pay for the temporary staff member contracted to do the bulk of the work.

The **Board agreed** to the proposed way of continuing with the Project (i.e. extra 6 months time, reduced target figure from 15,000 to 10,000 records, and payment of second advance sum) gave its approval to payment of a 2nd advance sum of the budget to VLIZ. (section 13.2.1.3)

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat** will carry out the second payment. (section 13.2.1.3)

21.2 (VNIRO, Russia) - Input of "old" unique literature (approx 1000 records) on Caspian Sea from 1770 -1970 (\$6,000)

The **Board agreed** that FAO could proceed with the 2nd payment to VNIRO in September 2004. (section 13.2.1.4)

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

The **ASFA Board agreed** to keep the project pending until a new price quotation would be circulated by Mr Kühnhold (BF) via ASFA Board-L. The Board would then be asked to confirm the project via ASFA Board-L. (section 13.2.3.1)

21.4 INIDEP (Argentina) and IFOP (Chile) - Marine Bibliographic Information from the Latin American and Caribbean Region Processed for ASFA Database, Twenty Five Years of Scientific Research (1955-1980). First Stage: South America: Argentina and Chile.

The **Board agreed** that INIDEP may proceed with this Trust Fund Proposal, and the **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to initiate the administrative measures. (section 13.2.3.2)

21.5 (FAO)-Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year Jan-Dec 2005) (\$30,000)

The **ASFA Board agreed** to this FAO Trust Fund Proposal. (section 13.3.1)

21.6 Supporting attendance to ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (for year 2004)

The **Board agreed** to renew the Trust Fund Proposal and to increase the sum to \$35 000 for the 2005 Board Meeting. (section 13.3.2)

21.7 www-ISIS-ASFA Maintenance Release-1 (\$7 900)

The **Board agreed** to this the Trust Fund Proposal, and FAO will then initiate the contract with ICIE to proceed with the work. (section 13.3.3)

ASFA Partners were reminded that should they have any additional "minor" changes they wished to be made to the software they should send them to FAO via E-mail as soon as possible.

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to evaluate the possibility of incorporating additional changes into the Trust Fund Proposal to upgrade www-ISIS-ASFA. (section 13.3.3)

Mr Kühnhold (BF) suggested calling this upgrade www-ISIS-ASFA Version 1.1, rather than a "maintenance release", and for short - perhaps (Henry 1.1).

21.8 KMFRI (Kenya) - Elimination of gaps and incomplete coverage (\$15 000)

The **Board agreed** in principle to this proposal, pending revision of the list of journals identified as having incomplete coverage (i.e. KMFRI needs to check first with other ASFA Partners should they wish to cover the gaps of the journals falling under their responsibility). Mr Macharia (KMFRI) would then circulate a new list via ASFA Board-L, with a revised cost per record, in order to get the go ahead from the ASFA Board. (section 13.3.4)

21.9 YugNIRO (Ukraine)-Translation of ASFA Thesaurus into Russian and development of an English-Russian and Russian-English Thesaurus (\$15 000)

The **Board agreed** to this Trust Fund Proposal. (section 13.3.5)

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to investigate the use of the Multites software for this project and eventually to send a copy to YugNIRO. (section 13.3.5)

21.10 YugNIRO (Ukraine)-Translation of the www-ISIS-ASFA Help Notes and front interface into Russian

The **Board agreed** to this Trust Fund Proposal in principle, pending release of www-ISIS-ASFA 1.1 and eventual revisions to the Guidelines for Bibliographic Data Entry, Abstracting, and Indexing. (section 13.3.6)

21.11 YugNIRO (Ukraine)– Translation of www-ISIS-ASFA guidelines into Russian (\$5 000)

The **Board agreed** to this Trust Fund Proposal in principle, however pending the foreseen changes to the Guidelines for Bibliographic Data Entry using the www-ISIS-ASFA and the Guidelines for Abstracting and Indexing Guidelines as a result of the exercise to simplify the input procedures. (section 13.3.7)

21.12 EMI (Estonia) – Review missing publications from Latvian and Lithuania literature

The **Board agreed** in principle, pending circulation by EMI, via ASFA-Board-L, of a written Proposal. (section 13.3.8)

22. Regarding PLACE AND DATE OF NEXT MEETING

22.1 The **Board agreed** in principle, to hold the next ASFA Board Meeting held in Rome (Italy) in October 2005, so as to be “back-to-back” with the 2005 IAMSLIC Meeting which is to be held in Rome 10-14 October 2005, However the dates, cost effectiveness and modality of creating spaces in both Meetings for the sharing of expertise still need to be studied/decided. (section 15)

22.2 Two Board Members (CSA, VLIZ) agreed to assist the FAO ASFA Secretariat in establishing the **CSA, VLIZ** best dates for the ASFA Meeting (i.e. before or after the IAMSLIC Meeting, number of days etc.) . (section 15)

22.3 Should the idea of holding the Board Meeting adjacent to the IAMSLIC result not be feasible for some reason, **VLIZ (Belgium) re-confirmed** its offer to host the Meeting in late June or July. **HCMR (Greece) also offered** to host the Meeting if necessary. (section 15)

23. Regarding the Review and Approval of Minutes (Items and Actions Agreed at Meeting)

23.1 The Board reviewed and approved the Draft of the Items and Actions Agreed during the Meeting. (section 16)

23.2 The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to send an E-mail to ASFA Board-L, explaining the new procedure regarding review of the Minutes of the Report and informing ASFA Partners that there would be a delay in sending out the Rough Draft. (section 16)