

ASFA ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
Institute of Marine Research (IMR), Bergen, Norway
1-5 September 2008

SUMMARY REPORT
(including ASFA Partners' Reports)



ASFA ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
Institute of Marine Research (IMR), Bergen, Norway
1-5 September 2008

SUMMARY REPORT
(including ASFA Partners' Reports)

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

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

All rights reserved. Reproduction and dissemination of material in this information product for educational or other non-commercial purposes are authorized without any prior written permission from the copyright holders provided the source is fully acknowledged. Reproduction of material in this information product for resale or other commercial purposes is prohibited without written permission of the copyright holders. Applications for such permission should be addressed to:

Chief
Electronic Publishing Policy and Support Branch
Communication Division
FAO
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy
or by e-mail to:
copyright@fao.org

© FAO 2009

PREFACE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

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

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

FAO.
ASFA Advisory Board Meeting. Institute of Marine Research (IMR), Bergen, Norway,
1-5 September 2008. Summary Report (including ASFA Partners' Reports).
Rome, FAO. 2009. 69p. Includes a CD-ROM.

CONTENTS

1. OPENING OF THE MEETING	1
2. ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS	1
3. ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON AND RAPORTEURS	1
4. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA	1
5. ADOPTION OF SUMMARY REPORT OF 2007 ASFA ADVISORY BOARD MEETING	1
5.1 Matters arising from the last (2007) ASFA Advisory Board Meeting	1
6. STATUS OF ASFA PARTNERSHIP	2
6.1 Report on intersessional activities of the ASFA Partners	2
6.2 New and potential ASFA Partners and Partners risking removal.....	4
6.3 ASFA Partnership Agreement	9
6.4 ASFA Publishing Agreement	9
6.5 ASFA Cooperation with other Groups/Initiatives/Meetings outside or related to ASFA.....	9
7. ASFA SCOPE, COVERAGE, MONITORING AND TIMELINESS	10
7.1 Subject Scope	10
7.2 Coverage.....	10
7.3 Monitoring	10
7.4 Timeliness	11
7.5 ASFA input procedures	12
7.6 ASFA input production.....	15
7.7 ASFA Theme Paper.....	15
8. ASFA PRODUCTS AND SERVICES	15
8.1 ASFA journals	15
8.2 CD-ROM	16
8.3 Internet service	16
8.4 Document delivery	16
8.5 New outputs and services (by ProQuest).....	16
8.6 Public relation activities, marketing (by ProQuest and Partners)	17
8.7 Entitlements	17
8.8 Increasing distribution of ASFA information products and services	17
9. PROGRESS WITH MACHINE-READABLE INPUT	17
9.1 www-ISIS-ASFA	17
10. REPORT ON ASFA TRAINING ACTIVITIES	21
11. STATUS OF ASFIS REFERENCE SERIES PUBLICATIONS	21
11.1 ASFIS-1, Serials Monitored for the ASFIS Bibliographic Database	21
11.2 ASFIS-2, Subject Categories and Scope Descriptions	22
11.3 ASFIS-3, Guidelines for Bibliographic Description	22
11.4 ASFIS-4, Guidelines for Abstracting	22
11.5 ASFIS-5, Guidelines for Indexing	22
11.6 ASFIS-6, Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Thesaurus.....	22
11.7 ASFIS-7, Geographic Authority List	23
11.8 ASFIS-15, ASFIS List of Species for Fishery Statistical Purposes (ex-ASFIS-8, Tax. Auth. List).....	23
11.9 ASFIS-10, Authority List for Corporate Names	24
11.10 ASFIS-14, ASFISIS (Release-3 User Manual).....	24
11.11 ASFIS-16, Help Notes contained in the www-ISIS-ASFA software (used for bibliogr. description)...	24
12. EXPANDED LANGUAGE CAPABILITY IN ASFA	24
13. ASFA TRUST FUND	25
13.1 Status of the ASFA Trust Fund	25
13.2 Proposals in progress, completed or pending further discussion	25
13.3 New and/or ongoing proposals	29
14. OTHER BUSINESS	32
15. FOURTH DAY OF ASFA BOARD MEETING	32
15.1 Demonstration of digitizing documents for repositories.....	32
15.2 Sampling literature - repeatability of searches.....	33

15.3 Comments on ASFA Input.....	33
15.4 ProQuest tips on using/searching CSA Illumina.....	33
15.5 Demonstration of CSA Illustrata.....	33
16. PLACE AND DATE OF NEXT MEETING	34
17. REVIEW/APPROVAL OF DRAFT REPORT OF MEETING	34

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

Annex-1 Agenda	35
Annex-1b List of Participants	37
Annex-1c List of Abbreviations	43
Annex-2 to Annex-46 contained in the attached CD-ROM	
Annex-47 Trust Fund Status	47
Annex-48 to Annex-63 contained in the attached CD-ROM	
Annex- 64 Action Items and Decisions Agreed by Participants	65
Annex-65 to Annex-68 contained in the attached CD-ROM	

ANNEXES

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

Document numbering. Documents numbers (e.g. ASFA/2008/... etc.) were reserved for each ASFA Partner prior to the Meeting. However, some Partners did not (or were not required to) submit a Report, therefore you will find “gaps” in the sequential numbering of the Reports.

Annex-1	ASFA/2008/1	Agenda
Annex-1a	ASFA/2008/1a	List of Documents
Annex-1b	ASFA/2008/1b	List of Participants
Annex-1c		List of Abbreviations
Annex-2	ASFA/2008/2	Actions Agreed by Participants (at 2007 Meeting)
Annex-3	ASFA/2008/3	FAO Report
Annex-4	ASFA/2008/4	IOC Report
Annex-5	ASFA/2008/5	UN/DOALOS Report
Annex-6	ASFA/2008/6	UNEP Report
Annex-7	ASFA/2008/7	ADRIAMED Report
Annex-8	ASFA/2008/9	ICES Report
Annex-9	ASFA/2008/14	NAFO Report
Annex-10	ASFA/2008/15	PIMRIS Report
Annex-11	ASFA/2008/17	WCPFC Report
Annex-12	ASFA/2008/18	Argentina (INIDEP) Report
Annex-13	ASFA/2008/20	Belgium (VLIZ) Report
Annex-14	ASFA/2008/21	Brazil (USP) Report
Annex-15	ASFA/2008/22	Canada (Fisheries and Oceans) Report
Annex-16	ASFA/2008/24	China (NMDIS) Report
Annex-17	ASFA/2008/26	Cuba (CIP) Report
Annex-18	ASFA/2008/29	Estonia (EMI) Report
Annex-19	ASFA/2008/30	France (IFREMER) Report
Annex-20	ASFA/2008/31	Germany (BF) Report
Annex-21	ASFA/2008/34	Guinea (CNSHB) Report
Annex-22	ASFA/2008/34a	Guinea (CNSHB) Trust Fund Proposal
Annex-22a	ASFA/2008/36	India (NIO/NICMAS) Report
Annex-23	ASFA/2008/39	Iran, Islamic Republic of (IFRO) Report
Annex-24	ASFA/2008/40	Japan (FRA) Report
Annex-25	ASFA/2008/41	Kenya (KMFRI) Report
Annex-26	ASFA/2008/41a	Kenya (KMFRI) Trust Fund Proposal
Annex-26a	ASFA/2008/41b	Report of the African ASFA Partners meeting (KMFRI, Sept 2007)
Annex-26b	ASFA/2998/41c	Report of the ASFA Input Methodologies Training course held at KMFRI
Annex-26c	ASFA/2008/42	Korea, Republic of (KORDI) Report
Annex-27	ASFA/2008/ 43	Lao People's Democratic Republic (LARRec) Report
Annex-28	ASFA/2008/45	Mexico (DGB) Report
Annex-29	ASFA/2008/46	Morocco (INRH) Report [not submitted]
Annex-30	ASFA/2008/48	Nigeria (NIFFR) Report

Annex-31	ASFA/2008/49	Norway (IMR) Report
Annex-32	ASFA/2008/50	Peru (IMARPE) Report
Annex-32a	ASFA/2008/50a	Peru (IMARPE) Trust Fund Proposal
Annex-33	ASFA/2008/51	Poland (SFI) Report
Annex-34	ASFA/2008/53	Russian Federation (VNIRO) Report
Annex-35	ASFA/2008/54	Senegal (DPM) Report
Annex-36	ASFA/2008/57	Tanzania (IMS) Report
Annex-37	ASFA/2008/59	Tunisia (INSTM) Report
Annex-38	ASFA/2008/60	Uganda (NaFIRRI) Report
Annex-39	ASFA/2008/61	Ukraine (YugNIRO) Report
Annex-40	ASFA/2008/62	United Kingdom (NMBL) Report
Annex-40a	ASFA/2008/62a	ASFA Thesaurus Maintenance Report (FBA)
Annex-40b	ASFA/2008/62b	ASFA Trust Fund Proposal: Geographic Authority List proposal by FBA to: Update The Authority List; Transform it to a Thesaurus Format; Clean up the Pick List in Thesaurus version of authority list
Annex-40c	ASFA/2008/62c	ASFA Trust Fund Project Proposal: African Water Bodies – Duplicate Materials
Annex-41	ASFA/2008/63	Uruguay (IIP) Report
Annex-42	ASFA/2008/64	USA (NOAA) Report
Annex-43	ASFA/2008/66	ProQuest Report
Annex-44	ASFA/2008/67	List of ASFA Partners
Annex-45	ASFA/2008/67a	ASFA Participating Organizations by Geographical Regions
Annex-46	ASFA/2008/68	ProQuest Calculation of Royalty Payment to Trust Fund
Annex-47	ASFA/2008/69	ASFA Trust Fund Status
Annex-48	ASFA/2008/70	Tenth Report to ASFA Board Meet (2008) on Project to Distribute ASFA CD-ROM to LIFDCs
Annex-49	ASFA/2008/71	ASFA Trust Fund project proposal – Financial support to attend 2009 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (reviewed and renewable each year)
Annex-50	ASFA/2008/72	Contributions (input) to ASFA Database by Partners and ASFA Partner’s Entitlements
Annex-51	ASFA/2008/73	Admission of Three new members to the ASFA Partnership
Annex-52	ASFA/2008/74	List of ASFA Information Products and Services
Annex-53	ASFA/2008/75	Renewed ASFA Publishing Agreement between FAO and ProQuest (2008-2011) – abbreviated version
Annex-54	ASFA/2008/76	Themes submitted by Partners on topic – What does it mean to be an ASFA Partner
Annex-55	ASFA/2008/77	ASFA Trust Fund Proposal – Identifying and listing the grey literature in your country not in ASFA
Annex-56	ASFA/2008/78	List of all ASFA Advisory Board Meetings and Editorial Staff Meetings to date
Annex-57	ASFA/2008/79	Utilization of ASFA Trust Fund to pay IAMSLIC Member fees for ASFA Partners
Annex-58	ASFA/2008/80	New Criteria for removing ASFA Partners not fulfilling responsibilities

Annex-59	ASFA/2008/81	Supply of Scanners (for ASFA related use) to ASFA Partners lacking funds to buy such equipment (status report and document for the record, as it is a Trust Fund project proposal already agreed during intersessional period 2007-2008)
Annex-60	ASFA/2008/82	Further development of www-ISIS-ASFA software as regards interoperability, additional URL fields, and updating picklists (status report and document for the record, as it is a Trust Fund project proposal already agreed during intersessional period 2007-2008)
Annex-61	ASFA/2008/83	History to-date of SPECIAL ASFA Projects-input of historical materials (or other gaps)
Annex-62	ASFA/2008/84	List of New Terms to ASFA Thesaurus
Annex-63	ASFA/2008/85	WEBLIS - Integrated Library System. A possibility to integrate with WWW-ISIS-ASFA (PowerPoint) by H. Rybinski
Annex-64	ASFA/2008/86	Action Items and Decisions agreed by Participants
Annex-65	ASFA/2008/87	Scanning and preparation of documents for repositories using Adobe Acrobat 8 (PowerPoint) by K. Seteraas
Annex-66	ASFA/2008/88	Sampling literature-repeatability of searches (abstract) by H. Folkestad
Annex-67	ASFA/2008/89	Comments on ASFA Input (PowerPoint) by V. Soto, H. Wibley
Annex-68	ASFA/2008/90	ASFA Database on CSA Illumina (PowerPoint) by V. Soto

ASFA ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
Institute of Marine Research (IMR), Bergen, Norway, 1-5 September 2008

1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

The Annual Meeting of the Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Abstracts (ASFA) Advisory Board was hosted by the **Institute of Marine Research (IMR)**, located in Bergen, Norway, from 1 to 5 September 2008.

The Meeting was attended by 35 participants from: 23 National ASFA Partners, 1 UN Partner, 2 International ASFA Partners, the ASFA Publishing Partner, and 3 observers. The Agenda is in **Annex-1**. The names and addresses of the participants are listed in **Annex-1b**. The Documents presented at the Meeting and the abbreviations used in the Report are listed in **Annex-1a** and **1c**, respectively.

Mr Tore Nepstad, Managing Director of the Institute of Marine Research (IMR), delivered the opening speech. He expressed his pleasure in welcoming the participants to Bergen and to IMR. He referred to the role that IMR played in scientific management in marine biology, noting how important the sharing of knowledge was in marketing activities and also in promoting the activities of schools, colleges and universities. He said that IMR was very proud of being an ASFA Partner; this was of great value to IMR and brought them many benefits. He gave some examples of knowledge sharing, referring in particular to cooperation between NORAD (the Norwegian Agency of Development Cooperation) and the Directorate of Fisheries in various project activities conducted in Southern Africa, South America and Asia to assist in scientific development management. He also mentioned Dr F. Nansen and the international recognition of the work that he had conducted at IMR by being awarded the NUWA award. IMR also carried out activities regarding sustainable fisheries, which together with the work carried out by ICES in the North Atlantic was very important in scientific development. IMR, together with the Directorate of Fisheries, worked towards making marine literature available, and Mr Nepstad stressed the important role that libraries and networks play in this field, noting in particular that international networks such as ASFA were a key to success. He added that Bergen was a city that was founded on international trading, with the first Hanseatic offices built there. He wished the participants a pleasant stay and a successful meeting.

Mr Richard Grainger (FAO) said that it was an honour to have Mr Nepstad open the meeting and thanked him for his presence and warm welcome. The FAO ASFA Secretariat valued Norway as an important ASFA Partner since their joining the partnership in 1983. He added that FAO was very familiar with the work carried out in developing countries by Dr Nansen and noted how important it was to mention the important role played by libraries in promoting scientific knowledge, they acted as a window on the world for science. He thanked IMR for hosting the meeting and Ms Skotheim for the organization.

Ms Liv Holmefjord, Director General of the Directorate of Fisheries, addressed the ASFA Board, welcoming the participants to Bergen.

2. ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS

Ms Brit Skotheim (IMR) presented this Agenda Item.

3. ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON AND RAPPORTEURS

Ms Linda Noble (NMBL) was elected Chairperson of the Board Meeting and Ms Skotheim (IMR) co-Chairperson. Ms Wibley (FAO) was appointed Rapporteur and Mr Pepe (FAO) as assistant Rapporteur. Ms Noble mentioned the passing away of Mr Maurice Jorgens (UN/DOALOS) in October 2007, referring to the Eulogy in the Summary Report of the 2007 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting. A Minute of Silence was held as a sign of respect prior to the start of the meeting.

4. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

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

5. ADOPTION OF SUMMARY REPORT OF 2007 ASFA ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

The ASFA Board agreed to adopt the Summary Report of the 2007 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (Mombasa, Kenya).

5.1. Matters arising from the last (2007) ASFA Advisory Board Meeting

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

6. STATUS OF ASFA PARTNERSHIP

6.1. Report on Intersessional activities of the ASFA Partners

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

6.1.1. United Nations Co-sponsors

- **FAO** - Mr Grainger presented the FAO Report (**Annex-3**)
- **IOC** - (Not present, **Annex-4**) - Report highlighted by Mr James Macharia (KMFRI)
- **UN/DOALOS** - (Not present, **Annex-5**) Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat
- **UNEP** - (Not present, **Annex-6**) - Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat

6.1.2. ASFA Partners

- **ADRIAMED** - (Not present, **Annex-7**) - Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat
- **ICCAT** - (Not present, No Report)
- **ICES** - Ms Lund presented the ICES Report (**Annex-8**)
- **IOTC** - (Not present, No Report)
- **IUCN** - (Not present, No Report)
- **NACA** - (Not present, No Report)
- **NAFO** - Mr Thompson presented the NAFO Report (**Annex-9**)
- **PIMRIS** - (Not present - Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat) (**Annex-10**)
- **SPC** - (Not present - No Report)
- **WCPFC** - (Not present, **Annex-11**) - Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat
- **Argentina (INIDEP)** - Ms. Cosulich presented the INIDEP report (**Annex-12**)
- **Australia (CSIRO)** - (Not present, No Report)
- **Belgium (VLIZ)** - Ms Chisala presented the VLIZ Report (**Annex-13**)
- **Brazil (USP)** - Ms Corbisier presented the USP Report (**Annex-14**)
- **Canada (NRC)** - (Not present - Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-15**))
- **Chile (IFOP)** - (Not present, No Report)
- **China (NMDIS)** - Mr Yang Ying presented the NMDIS report (**Annex-16**)
- **Côte d'Ivoire (CRO)** - (Not present, No Report)
- **Cuba (CIP)** - Mr Tizol presented the CIP Report, (**Annex-17**)
- **Ecuador (INP)** - (Not present, No Report)
- **Egypt (NIOF)** - Mr El Nemr presented the NIOF Report (No written Report)
- **Estonia (EMI)** - (Not present) - Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-18**)
- **France (IFREMER)** - Ms Prod'homme presented the IFREMER Report (**Annex-19**)
- **Germany (BF)** - Mr Kühnhold presented the BF Report (**Annex-20**)
- **Greece (HCMR)** - Ms Goulala presented the HCMR Report (No written report)
- **Guinea (CNSHB)** - (Not present) Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-21**)
- **Iceland (MRI)** - (Not present, No Report)
- **India (NIO/NICMAS)** - Mr Sainekar presented the NIO/NICMAS Report (**Annex-22**)
- **Indonesia (LIPI/PDII)** - (Not present, No Report)

- **Iran (IFRO)** - (Not present) - Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-23**)
- **Italy (SIBM)** - (not present, No Report)
- **Japan (JFRCA)** - Mr. Hamada presented the JFRCA Report (**Annex-24**)
- **Kenya (KMFRI)** - Mr Macharia presented the KMFRI Report (**Annex-25**)
- **Korea, Republic of (KORDI)** - Mr Han presented the KORDI Report (**Annex-26**)
- **Lao (LARRec)** - Mr Phouthavongs presented the LARRec Report (**Annex-27**)
- **Mauritania (IMROP)** - (Not present, No Report)
- **Mexico (DGB)** – Mr Montes presented the DGB Report (**Annex-28**)
- **Morocco (INRH)** - Ms Bazi presented the INRH Report (**Annex-29**)
- **Nigeria (NIFFR)** - (Not present) Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-30**)
- **Norway (IMR)** - Ms Skotheim presented the IMR Report (**Annex-31**)
- **Peru (IMARPE)** - (Not present) Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-32**)
- **Poland (SFI)** - Ms Fey presented the SFI Report (**Annex-33**)
- **Portugal (IPIMAR)** - (Not present, No Report)
- **Russian Federation (VNIRO)** - Ms Levashova presented the VNIRO Report (**Annex-34**)
- **Senegal (DPM)** - (Not present) - Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-35**)
- **Spain (IEO)** – (Not present, No report)
- **Sweden (IMR)** - (Not present, No report)
- **Tanzania (IMS)** - (Not present) - Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-36**)
- **Thailand (PMBC)** - (Not present) - Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-37**)
- **Tunisia (INSTM)** - (Not present) - Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-38**)
- **Ukraine (YugNIRO)** - Ms Kulakova presented the YugNIRO Report (**Annex-39**)
- **United Kingdom (NMBL)** - Ms Noble presented the NMBL Report (**Annex-40**)
- **Uruguay (IIP)** - Ms Cristiani presented the IIP Report (**Annex-41**)
- **USA (NOAA)** - Mr Kaske presented the NOAA Report (**Annex-42**)

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

6.1.3. ASFA PARTNER-PUBLISHER (PROQUEST)

- **ProQuest** - Mr Emerson presented the ProQuest Report (**Annex-43**).

6.1.4. Report of 2007 Meeting of ASFA African Partners

Mr Macharia (KMFRI) presented a report of the meeting of ASFA African Partners that was held after the 2007 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting in September, 2007 at KMFRI, Mombasa, Kenya (**Annex-25b**).

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented on some of the challenges listed in the report. He said that some Trust Fund Proposals were being put forward to help address some of the problems faced by lack of equipment. See Agenda Item 13.3 ASFA Trust Fund New Proposals. He mentioned the ASFA Home Page with its large amount of written material about ASFA which could be used to provide information for management to understand the importance of ASFA. Mr Pepe referred to the Integrated Library Management Software, WEBLIS, which would be presented by Mr Rybinski later under Agenda Item 9. 1 Progress with Machine-Readable Input, www-ISIS-ASFA. This package could be integrated with the www-ISIS-ASFA software, and this could possibly resolve the problematic issue reported by the African ASFA Partners regarding the use of 3 different softwares for data entry.

6.2. New and Potential ASFA Partners and Partners risking removal

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that the following three Institutes signed the ASFA Partnership Agreement during the intersessional period 2007-2008 to become ASFA National Partners:

1. National Institute of Oceanography and Fisheries (NIOF), Egypt
2. National Fisheries Resources Research Institute (NaFIRRI), Uganda
3. Water Research Institute of the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR), Ghana

See the FAO Report Section 4.2 (**Annex-3**) for information regarding the new Partners, and see document ASFA/2008/73 (**Annex-51**) for further information and full addresses of the organizations/institutes.

6.2.1. Admission of New Partners

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

6.2.2. Potential Partners

Ms Noble (NMBL) referred to the countries listed in the FAO Report Section 4.5.5 (**Annex-3**) as priority for eventual recruitment as ASFA Partners.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) explained that these "priority" countries were the same as those listed in the paper "Strategy for priority setting for future expansion of the ASFA Partnership" by YongJa Cho (presented at the 2002 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting). He noted that of the countries listed in YongJa Cho's report - Thailand, Nigeria, Egypt, Indonesia and Tanzania have subsequently become ASFA Partners.

Regarding a request to join ASFA from the Institute of Oceanology of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences (IO-BAS), **Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) agreed** to follow-up regarding this potential new ASFA Partner when the ASFA Secretariat had the resources (i.e. manpower, time).

Although the FAO ASFA Secretariat has never succeeded in getting NIWA/New Zealand to participate in ASFA (NIWA cannot participate due to administrative reasons), it was pleased to report that NIWA were from time to time supplying records from their databases to ProQuest for inclusion in the ASFA database.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) stated that an ASFA Partner in the Philippines would be an important addition to the ASFA partnership. Not only is the Philippines listed among the priority countries in the previously mentioned report, but also recent studies have indicated that this area would appear to be the centre of marine biodiversity.

Regarding contacts with the Marine Institute of Eire (MI), Ms Noble (NMBL) reported that she was still in contact with the Institute, and that there had been a meeting planned regarding their joining the ASFA Partnership, but unfortunately it had to be postponed and was still pending.

[Rapporteur's note: at this writing, MI has formally joined the ASFA Partnership]

Mr Phouthavongs (LaRReC) reported that the Inland Fisheries Research and Development Institute of Cambodia (IFREDI) could be interested in joining ASFA. **Mr Phouthavongs (LaRReC) agreed** to contact the Institute regarding the possibility of their becoming a member of the ASFA Partnership.

[Rapporteur's note: This action was carried out during the meeting by Mr Phouthavongs who reported that he had received a positive reply from the Director of IFREDI, Mr Srun Limsong. Mr Phouthavongs said that he informed the Director of IFREDI to contact Mr Pepe at the FAO ASFA Secretariat for further information.]

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to follow up when the request for further information was received.

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

1. **Mr Kühnhold (BF) agreed** to follow-up with 2 institutes in Turkey regarding the possibility of them becoming an ASFA Partner and would inform the FAO ASFA Secretariat regarding the outcome.

Mr Kühnhold (BF) reported that they would be having a meeting later on during the year regarding this issue.

Follow-up action item 2 from the 2007 ASFA Board Meeting:

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

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that this contact had resulted in Egypt/NIOF becoming an ASFA Partner.

6.2.3. Strategy for future expansion of ASFA Partnership

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) stated that for the most part the future expansion of the ASFA Partnership would continue to be guided by the above mentioned strategy paper by YongJa Cho. However, Mr Pepe noted that the joining of more than 14 new ASFA Partners over the last 4.5 years had overextended the capacity of the FAO ASFA Secretariat for recruiting, training and following up on future partners, and therefore, future recruitment would be conditioned to the extent that the FAO ASFA Secretariat would be able to outsource the training and follow-up activities (as done to some extent in the past).

Mr Thompson (NAFO) raised the issue of regional collaboration, citing the Mediterranean region as an example, where there were several FAO projects. He suggested that project managers could assist regarding expansion since many projects were set up to develop networking systems. Such projects could facilitate national bodies of countries within the projects becoming an ASFA Partner.

Mr Pepe replied to Mr Thompson stating that what he had suggested had already been undertaken in some regions. For example, the AdriaMed project became an ASFA International partner and now has 2 Collaborating Centres (Croatia and Montenegro) under it, which one day hopefully will evolve into becoming National ASFA Partners. Other ASFA Partners with a regional connotation are ICCAT, ICES, Worldfish, NACA, NAFO, IOTC, IUCN, SPC, PIMRIS, and WCPFC.

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) reported that she was investigating the possibility of the University of La Plata Library becoming a Collaborating ASFA Centre. This was currently pending the signing of an agreement between the two institutes and eventual training.

Mr Macharia (KMFRI) reported on the recruitment of a new Collaborating ASFA Centre at Kisumu, Kenya.

Ms Levashova (VNIRO) reported a new Collaborating ASFA Centre at Sakhalin, Russian Federation.

6.2.4. Partners dropping out of ASFA

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that no ASFA Partners had dropped out of the ASFA Partnership during the intersessional period, although a few ASFA Partners reported the dropping out of some Collaborating ASFA Centres from within their national networks. IFREMER/France and NMBL/UK both had one Collaborating ASFA Centre drop out during this intersessional period.

[**Rapporteur's note:** subsequent to the Meeting the ASFA National Partner in Sweden (Institute of Marine Research, IMR) dropped out of ASFA]

6.2.5. Partners removed from the ASFA Partnership

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) introduced the document ASFA/2008/80 (**Annex-58**) "Proposed New Criteria and Procedure for Removing ASFA Partners Not Fulfilling Input Responsibilities". He explained that this document (the criteria) was important to the FAO ASFA Secretariat in order to assist it in making quicker decisions regarding the removal of "dormant" ASFA Partners from the partnership, i.e. those ASFA Partners not submitting ASFA input for a long period of time. He mentioned that the new criteria had a much shorter deadline: for the first submission of ASFA input by a new ASFA Partner after receiving training and for the dealing with and resolving of problems. Regarding the first submission of ASFA input by a Partner, experience has shown that where the input was not submitted by the new ASFA Partner within a few weeks after of receiving training, the inputters no longer remembered the complicated rules and procedures for data input which had been explained to them during the training. And as a consequence, they often required long-term training via e-mail, which was very difficult and very time-consuming. Mr Pepe explained that changes to the ASFA Partnership Agreement required a majority vote by all ASFA Partners. Therefore if the proposed new "criteria and procedure" were accepted by the participants at the meeting, they would then be circulated to all ASFA Partners for vote via ASFA Board-L. If agreed by the majority vote of all ASFA Partners, the new "criteria and procedure" would become an official amendment to the ASFA Partnership Agreement.

Whilst discussing the new "criteria and procedure" for removal of dormant Partners, the discussions also touched upon some of the obstacles that hindered the preparation and submission of ASFA records by both the new and "old" ASFA Partners:

Several ASFA Partners were of the opinion that, although it was important to have such a "criteria for removal ...", it was also or more important to make sure that a clear picture was presented to potential ASFA Partners (i.e. before they join ASFA) regarding exactly what the ASFA inputting responsibilities are and what is be required to fulfill these responsibilities. Ms Noble (NMBL) commented that several ASFA Partners had said in their reports that they had difficulty in submitting input due to insufficient hardware. Therefore she suggested that potential ASFA Partners should be made well aware of the hardware and equipment requirements that were necessary before they signed the Agreement. Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that sometimes hardware was shared with other departments, which explained why often ASFA Partners made requests later on regarding the need for equipment.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) concurred that the requirements/responsibilities expected of potential ASFA Partners should be made more visible to the potential ASFA Partners before they sign the partnership

Agreement, as this could save the FAO ASFA Secretariat considerable time and effort later on. He suggested the drawing up of a check-list of required resources, which could be discussed before signing the Partnership Agreement. He also suggested that the individual Monitoring List of the ASFA Partner should be included in the agreement before signing.

Mr Thompson (NAFO) was in agreement and suggested that the expectations of ASFA Partners should be better-defined.

Mr Kaske (NOAA) suggested also highlighting what is better about ASFA, rather than searching with Google, for example, and emphasizing the importance of grey literature.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) stated that the responsibilities and entitlements of being an ASFA Partners were explained to institutes wanting to join ASFA (but obviously there is room for improvement) via correspondence and with reference to the detailed ASFA Homepage. In some cases where possible, the potential ASFA Partner is also instructed to directly contact an existing ASFA Partner in a nearby country (same mother tongue) so as to have a direct hands-on explanation as to the realities (requirements and responsibilities) of being an ASFA Partner. Admittedly, for budgetary reasons, the FAO ASFA Secretariat only rarely visits, in person, a potential ASFA Partner before they join ASFA, so the staff and the input facilities are not seen first hand. Recalling ASFA practices many years ago, Mr Pepe said that FAO used to provide a small amount of “start-up” money (US\$5 000) to the new partners and suggested that perhaps this could again be re-instated to help new ASFA Partners in meeting their responsibilities (e.g. acquiring equipment etc.).

Mr Kühnhold (BF) commenting generally on Partners who received hardware through ASFA Trust Fund money, suggested that perhaps these Partners should return the hardware if they cease to produce input.

Ms Goulala (HCMR) said that often there was a problem (delay) in preparing ASFA input due to the complexity of input preparation.

Another reason cited for reduced input or delays in submission of input was that sometimes in an institute the preparation of ASFA input was considered and carried out as “extra work” for the inputter. That is the inputter did the work “in-addition” to his/her regular duties rather than as a part of it. Ms Noble (NMBL) suggested that the ASFA input work should be included in the job description of the person who does the input. Ms Goulala (HCMR) commented that this would not help lessen the work load of the person.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) concurred that the person doing the ASFA input should have that task officially specified in his/her job description, and that the work of ASFA should have an official budget line within in the Institute’s work plan. Having said this, he realized that it was not always easy for an institute joining ASFA to include the ASFA work into an existing job description or create a new post or include the work in the Institute’s budget.

Ms Noble (NMBL) said that it was not always the case that the ASFA Partners’ Institute expects the inputter to do the work as extra, citing the UK situation where the institute provides funds for 50% of a person’s time to do ASFA input.

Mr Sainekar (NIO) commented that his institute had a 5-year plan in which the ASFA work was included and therefore there was no need for addition manpower. He added that when an ASFA Partner signs the ASFA Partnership Agreement, they should consider it as an obligation to themselves to prepare input. He insisted on the fact that management should keep ASFA responsibilities as part of their mission in their mandate.

Mr Pettman (FBA) said that generally the Director of an Institute would be concerned with the issue of losing the complimentary subscription of ASFA and re-iterated that the expectations of an ASFA Partner should be better defined during recruitment.

Mr Kaske (NOAA) also concurred that the expectations of an ASFA Partner should be made clearer, perhaps included in the Partnership Agreement itself, for example, it should be mentioned in the agreement that after receiving training, some ASFA records should be produced within a short period of time.

The deadline or time-frame contained in the new Criteria for the submission, by a newly trained Partner, of the first batch of records was discussed.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that only a few records were required in the first batch, even only 5 or 10, but stressed that this was critical because the ASFA input rules were complicated, which necessitated the preparation of records as soon as possible after the training, in order to avoid forgetting the procedures.

Mr Sainekar (NIO) concurred on the importance of preparing input straightaway and the need to practice.

Mr Thompson (NAFO) reported his experience, on the contrary, whereby 6/8 months after training NAFO started submitting ASFA input. He said the written documentation (guidelines and manuals) were very good and should be sufficient to assist the inputter in remembering the rules even after considerable time.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) while appreciating the compliment on the quality of the FAO guidelines pointed out that the majority of the manuals and guidelines were in English, and therefore they were not such a good recall tool for the non-mother tongue English inputters.

Mr Sainekar (NIO) suggested that the trainer visit the new ASFA Partner's institute, in order to understand where the difficulties. Ms Noble (NMBL) concurred that knowing the situation would lead a better resolution of the problem. Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) acknowledged the desirability of visiting potential ASFA Partners, but mentioned that this was not always feasible for budgetary reasons.

Still on the subject of Partners not submitting input on a regular basis. Mr Kühnhold (BF) said that there appeared to be 2 categories of ASFA Partners: 1) Those with no financial problems, having their own repositories and able to pay for the ASFA database subscription, and therefore the complimentary ASFA subscription is not an incentive for them to prepare ASFA input, and 2) Those ASFA Partners who cannot afford the ASFA subscription and therefore the complimentary subscription to the ASFA database is an incentive to prepare ASFA input, but they cannot because they have problems in the preparation of the input.

Mr Sainekar (NIO) described the case of one of NIO's Collaborating Centres which was having a problem in allocating time to ASFA input preparation. NIO recommended they prepare just one ASFA record a day. This resulted in 25/30 records being prepared in one month, from just very little dedicated time each day.

Ms Noble (NMBL) stated that one particular problem hindering regular ASFA input, was when people leave their institute and the ASFA memory is lost, i.e. continuity. Mr Kühnhold (BF) commented that the ASFA input person should not be the sole focal point in an ASFA Partner institute.

Mr Sainekar (NIO) said that management at the institute should always be contacted so they know what is going on. He suggested that e-mails regarding problems in ASFA input submission should not only go to the ASFA inputter, but also to the Director of the Institute, and perhaps, in such cases, also as an official letter should be sent to the Director. Mr Phouthavongs (LaRReC) concurred with sending official letters to the Director of the institute rather than sending e-mails. Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) replied that e-mails and sometimes letters were sent to or copied to Directors depending on the circumstances.

Ms Noble (NMBL) raised the issue of coverage of the serial titles that were on the Monitoring List of the "dormant" ASFA Partner. Mr Kaske (NOAA) asked who else could do the ASFA input in such cases. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) noted that the titles on the Monitoring List were identifiable. Further discussion regarding monitoring responsibilities is included under Agenda Item 7.3 Monitoring.

Ms Goulala (HCMR) suggested that providing ASFA Partners with funds to attend ASFA Board Meetings could help in their regular submission of ASFA input. Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) replied that criteria existed and were being used to bring those ASFA Partners who regularly produce input to Board Meetings.

Returning to the "criteria and procedure for removal of ASFA Partners, Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that within a given country the current ASFA practice was that there be only one National ASFA Partner, although sometimes there also existed one or more Collaborating ASFA Centres which could be recruited by the National Partner to assist it in the coverage and input of documents to ASFA. He noted that when a National ASFA Partner stops producing ASFA input, the FAO ASFA Secretariat (because there can be only one National ASFA Partner per country) cannot immediately recruit another Institute in the same country, at least not until the first Institute either voluntarily renounces its status as National Partner or is removed by the Secretariat, which is time consuming and unpleasant. Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reminded the Board that the "new criteria and procedure" would provide something concrete to hasten and simplify decisions in specific cases when an ASFA Partner was no longer submitting ASFA input.

There was some discussion regarding the wording of the new criteria, modifications to which were suggested during the meeting and accepted by the ASFA Board.

The **ASFA Board agreed** to the new criteria for removal of ASFA Partners not fulfilling their inputting responsibilities, (as modified under agreement during the Board Meeting (see **Annex-58**).

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to circulate the new criteria to all ASFA Partners via ASFA Board-L for vote. A majority vote would render the new criteria as an Amendment to the Partnership Agreement.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) re-iterated the fact that the new criteria would only be used with care. He added that the FAO ASFA Secretariat, in an effort to never have to apply the new criteria and procedure to remove Partners, would stress and underline the ASFA responsibilities and necessary requirements when approached by institutes potentially wanting to join ASFA.

[Rapporteur's note: the new "criteria" was circulated to Partners for vote, and the majority did vote in favour of its adoption, see E-mail from R. Pepe (FAO) to all Partners dated 14 Nov. 2008]

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

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) referred to the Warning List included under Item 4.3 of the FAO Report (**Annex-3**) which listed those ASFA Partners who were in danger of being removed from the ASFA

Partnership for not submitting ASFA input for 2 years or more. Notwithstanding the existence of such a list, he stressed that the primary goal of the FAO ASFA Secretariat was not to remove ASFA Partners, but rather to assist them and support them with their difficulties, when possible.

Included in the list were:

Iceland/MRI - No input was submitted since December 2006. The ASFA contact at MRI recently changed institutes and the FAO ASFA Secretariat is waiting for some action from his successor. Mr Pepe said that MRI originally was very enthusiastic when it joined ASFA and even paid for its own training.

Ms Skotheim (IMR) reported that she was in contact both with the previous ASFA contact and his replacement at MRI. **Ms Skotheim (IMR) agreed** to follow-up with the Iceland ASFA Partner and ask them what their problem was (i.e. why they are not producing any ASFA input) and also if they were still interested in being a member of the ASFA Partnership.

[Rapporteur's note: subsequent to the Meeting MRI has reiterated its interest in remaining an ASFA Partner, and a refresher training is being planned whereby Ms Noble (NMBL) will carry out the training]

Côte d'Ivoire/CRO- No input has been submitted since January 2005.

Follow-up action item 3 from the 2007 ASFA Board Meeting:

3. Mr Pepe (FAO) mentioned that CRO had not produced any ASFA input since 2005 and that FAO had lost contact with the institute. Mr Odido (IOC) agreed to contact the Director of CRO for follow-up and inform the FAO regarding the outcome.

Mr Odido (IOC) had contacted CRO on behalf of the FAO ASFA Secretariat during the intersessional period. CRO had replied saying that they were restructuring and that they were in the process of identifying someone for the ASFA duties.

IOTC - In 2005, ASFA input had been prepared under contract by NIO (India). Arrangements for subsequent input were still pending. The FAO ASFA Secretariat **agreed** to contact IOTC and ask them if they were still interested in being a member of the ASFA Partnership and, if so, who would be doing their ASFA input.

No action to report

Peru/IMARPE - Contact with IMARPE had been lost in May 2004, following staff changes, but was re-established in November 2005. New IMARPE staff received training in ASFA input procedures from Mr Montes (UNAM) in August 2007, but there was no ASFA input for sometime afterwards. Mr Montes reported that, prior to this meeting, he had received a batch of 16 records. He explained that IMARPE suffered various problems regarding computer availability and also structural damage caused by the earthquake in August 2007. However, the ASFA contact at IMARPE had reported having favourable discussion with the director of the institute, who was now more aware of ASFA and had agreed to provide a PC for ASFA input and other library tasks.

Ecuador/INP - Changes in staff have hindered input submission. New INP staff received training in ASFA input procedures from Mr Montes (UNAM) in August 2007, but there was no ASFA input for sometime afterwards. Mr Montes suggested that it could be useful if the FAO ASFA Secretariat sent a letter to the Director of the Institute, similar to the one sent 2 years ago which highlighted the importance of their institute being part of the ASFA Partnership.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to send the letter and follow up on this issue. It would also investigate the possibility of the Ecuador Collaborating Centre, INOCAR, becoming the Ecuador National Partner, should INP continue to have difficulties in carrying out its ASFA responsibilities.

[Rapporteur's note: subsequent to the Meeting very positive contact was re-established with INP, and input is being generated.]

Chile/IFOP - Mr Pepe (FAO) mentioned that the FAO ASFA Secretariat, prior to the Meeting, had received an e-mail from Ms Muñoz, the ASFA contact at the Chile National ASFA Partner, IFOP, explaining that she had now left IFOP. However, she would be sending to FAO some corrected ASFA records that have been pending over the last year.

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) expressed her concern regarding the gap in coverage of the Chilean input and asked whether someone else could cover the input temporarily.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to follow up regarding the issue as to who would be taking over the ASFA responsibilities from Ms Muñoz. It would also investigate the possibility of one of the Chile Collaborating Centres becoming the new Chilean National Partner.

[Rapporteur's note: subsequent to the Meeting very positive contact was re-established with IFOP who is now waiting for FAO to provide ASFA training for the new librarian]

Some discussion was held under this Agenda Item regarding the possibility and feasibility of ASFA Partners outsourcing their ASFA input, should they be in difficulty in fulfilling their responsibilities. This is reported under Agenda Item 7.3 Monitoring.

6.3. ASFA Partnership Agreement

As of 1 September 2008, the ASFA Partnership Agreement (official title: Partnership Agreement Providing for Co-Operation in the Preparation and Publication of the Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Abstracts (ASFA) and the Reconstitution of the Advisory Board) has been signed by 64* Partners:

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

*[**Rapporteur's note:** subsequent to the Meeting the ASFA National Partner in Sweden (Institute of Marine Research, IMR) dropped out of ASFA, and the Marine Institute of Eire joined the ASFA Partnership, leaving the number of National ASFA Partners at 48 with a total of 63 Partners]

6.4. ASFA Publishing Agreement

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

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

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat), referring to the document "Renewed Publishing Agreement between FAO and ProQuest 2008-2011 (**Annex-53**), summarized the main improvements in the current Publishing Agreement. He mentioned that the ASFA Partners in Least Developed and Low Income Food Deficit Countries would also now be granted access to two additional ProQuest databases - CSA Illustrata-Natural Sciences and Water Resource Abstracts. ASFA Partners in Developing Countries would be granted a 75% discount and those in Developed Countries would be granted 25%. The ASFA Collaborating Centres in Developing Countries would also be granted access to the ASFA information products no longer based on the number of ASFA records they produced.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that some improvements to the Publishing Agreement had been requested by ASFA Partners over the past years and had been incorporated where possible into this renewed Agreement. He added that any further amendments would have to be discussed for the next Publishing Agreement (2012-2016).

Ms Noble (NMBL) noted that Developing Countries had benefited greatly from the new renewed partnership, which should give them a great deal of encouragement.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) informed the ASFA Board that the new database product manager would be present later on during the meeting. He added that ASFA Partners could discuss further their entitlements to the new database, which could potentially be altered. However, he added that although the new company, ProQuest, meant that there were now new rules they would still try to keep as flexible as possible regarding new entitlements, although it might be difficult.

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

6.5.1. ASFA-IAMSLIC group cooperation

Ms Noble (NMBL) opened this Agenda item by introducing the paper prepared by the FAO ASFA Secretariat entitled "Status Report on the ASFA Trust Fund Project to Utilize ASFA Trust Fund to Pay IAMSLIC Membership Fees" (**Annex-57**). The paper provided a background to and status of this project which has been paying the IAMSLIC membership fees for various ASFA Partners since 2004.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that during the intersessional period a few Partners had requested their IAMSLIC membership fee be covered under this initiative. Mr Thompson (NAFO) asked whether NAFO could make a request for funding within this initiative. Mr Pepe explained that this Trust Fund Project was preferably only applicable to developing countries and that NAFO would have to pay their own membership fees. However, he strongly recommended becoming a member of IAMSLIC, saying that it is well worth it, referring to the various benefits as listed in the above-mentioned document.

7. ASFA SCOPE, COVERAGE, MONITORING AND TIMELINESS

7.1. Subject Scope

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that there were no changes to the subject scope of ASFA.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reminded the ASFA Partners that the quality of the ASFA database is measured or judged by its scope, coverage and timeliness, and that these factors could contribute to the uniqueness of the database.

Ms Noble (NMBL) added that topics such as input procedures and controlled indexing versus uncontrolled indexing were important factors which affected search results, and therefore were also of importance when considering the quality and uniqueness of the ASFA database.

7.2. Coverage

Ms Noble (NMBL) introduced this Agenda Item mentioning that some ASFA Partners had referred to this topic in their reports. She said all ASFA Partners should be examining the issue as to whether all areas of the subject scope of ASFA are being covered sufficiently, taking into particular consideration grey literature.

Further discussion regarding the monitoring of grey literature is reported in the next agenda item.

7.3. Monitoring

Ms Skotheim (IMR) asked what would be the procedure should she (i.e. the Norwegian ASFA Partner) wish to prepare ASFA input for a book by a Norwegian author published in another country. Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) replied that before preparing ASFA input for the book the procedure was: 1) check the ASFA database to see if the book has not already been entered on the database; 2) contact the ASFA Partner in the "other" country where the book was published to ascertain whether or not they were in the process of preparing input, and if not, would they mind if she did the input; 3) contact the ASFA Publisher (ProQuest) with the same question as in item 2.

Regarding ASFA input for core journals, Ms Skotheim (IMR) asked if those produced by the major publishers were all being covered by ProQuest. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) replied that they did receive core journals from the publishers, but those titles that were under the input responsibility of an ASFA Partner were tagged, so that ProQuest would not do the input, to avoid duplicating the Partners' input.

Mr Thompson (NAFO) referring to journals included in ISI Web of Knowledge and those monitored by ASFA, said that the majority of journals produced by developing countries are not included in the ISI journal list. Ms Noble (NMBL) commented that many non-ISI journals are monitored by ASFA.

Monitoring of Grey literature

Ms Noble (NMBL) reminded ASFA Partners of the offer made by ProQuest at the previous year's meeting whereby they were willing to take over the monitoring responsibility of some journals from other ASFA Partners so that these ASFA Partners could concentrate on the monitoring and input of the grey literature. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) reiterated this offer. This could constitute a factor of uniqueness for the ASFA database, i.e. ASFA becoming a specific/expert database regarding grey literature.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) referred to a Trust Fund Proposal, regarding the identification and listing of Partner's grey literature dealing with aquatic sciences, which was to be considered later on under the appropriate agenda item (**Annex-55**). He also reminded ASFA Partners that when they were preparing input for grey literature, if the standard bibliographic data elements describing the document did not provide sufficient information for users to request the document, then additional information should be entered in the Notes field regarding the availability of the material.

Mr Thompson (NAFO) mentioned publications produced by the UK Department for International Development (DFID), adding that there was much information and literature deposited on their website, but not always available in libraries. Ms Noble (NMBL) commented that she had been in communication with DFID, but due to changes in staff, contact had been lost. She concurred that the DFID project material should be made available. Mr Pettman (FBA) said that when he worked for oneFish, they had made an agreement with DFID for a DFID staff member to produce input on fisheries project data (including project reports) for oneFish. Mr Pettman thought that his contact was still at DFID.

Mr Pettman (FBA) and Ms Noble (NMBL) agreed to contact DFID regarding the possibility of obtaining their project reports/information (grey literature).

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

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) enquired if any ASFA Partners were coming across information regarding grey literature or new journals that they knew were not being covered and if such information was being collected.

Mr Sainekar (NIO) commented that sometimes he received such information from scientists rather than libraries, and he generally passed it on to the FAO ASFA Secretariat.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) replied that information regarding for example a new book of conference proceedings was generally communicated either via ASFA Board-L or directly to an ASFA Partner requesting the possibility of it being monitored. He referred to a company in the UK (NHBS Environment Bookstore) that maintained a catalogue (with abstracts) of books on aquatic sciences from all over the world. He suggested that this information could be fed into ASFA. He added that while journal literature was being covered and coordinated by maintenance of the Monitoring List, perhaps ASFA was lacking in the area of books/monographs, conference proceedings etc.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) asked whether it would be possible for the FAO ASFA Secretariat to set up a "share-point" web site, which could be modified externally by ASFA Partners, whereby they could post such information, e.g. lists of serial titles, books/monographs. He added that in this way, there would be a repository of literature that needed to be covered, i.e. to be entered in ASFA by one of the ASFA Partners that had access to the literature in question.

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

*[**Rapporteur's note:** subsequent to the Meeting the "share point" web site was set up on the FAO server in the form of a reserved ASFA FTP site, at: <ftp://ASFA:2go2ASFA@ext-ftp.fao.org/FI/Reserved/ASFA>]

Outsourcing ASFA input

Mr Thompson questioned the 'correctness' of ASFA Partners outsourcing their input to other ASFA Partners and asked if those ASFA Partners who outsourced input still received their entitlements. Mr Kühnhold (BF) asked who actually gets the credit for the ASFA records that are outsourced.

Mr Pepe replied that technically there was no problem if an ASFA Partner outsourced their ASFA input to another Partner. He added that although in some circumstances it was important that the ASFA Partner in a particular country carried out their own ASFA input, in other cases cooperation between different ASFA Partners was very important. In favour of a Partner doing its own input he said: "by doing its own input a Partner gains experience on setting up, maintaining and searching a database". Also, by doing its own input, a Partner can ensure directly the quality of the indexing and abstracting and take advantage of in-house expertise for help in indexing and abstracting.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that if another ASFA Partner or ProQuest were paid by one particular ASFA Partner for monitoring titles under their responsibility, then the credit would go to the ASFA Partner originating the material, and they would still receive their entitlements. If, however, no payment was involved but titles were actually transferred from one ASFA Partner to another, then credit would go to the ASFA Partner taking over the input responsibility.

Mr Kühnhold (BF) mentioned that outsourcing literature from another country should preferably be kept within the region, so as to facilitate the indexing of local geographical names and species.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) added that outsourcing did not necessarily mean "out of the country", it could be another institute in the same country, i.e. a Collaborating Centre.

7.4. Timeliness

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that it was important to put into perspective the credibility of the ASFA Database and that timeliness was an essential factor. Users want to search a database that is timely as well as comprehensive. Putting records in every now and again was not a very satisfactory way of maintaining the database "up-to-date". He added that some journal articles were taking 2 years to get onto the database.

Mr Thompson (NAFO) commented that the length of time necessary to create an ASFA record was too long. Mr Kühnhold (BF) said that perhaps it was necessary to consider an alternative procedure for submitting records in a more timely way. Further discussion on timeliness related to time that it took to prepare ASFA input is reported under the following Agenda Item 7.5 ASFA Input Procedures.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) insisted that in order to make the database credible, input should be consistent from all ASFA Partners. He asked whether it should be considered paying ASFA Partners to produce input, as a means of enticement, e.g. offering a carrot as a reward, thereby providing some incentive to encourage ASFA Partners to work. He added that many institutes now had their literature available on their own sites.

Ms Noble (NMBL) stated that the access to the ASFA database given to Partners was the carrot, i.e. ASFA Partners were receiving free access to the database in return for providing input. She also added that in other cases, books were received free from the publishers so that they would be cited in ASFA, which could

also be seen as a trade-off, i.e. the institute or library would be saving money by not having to pay for the books.

7.5. ASFA input procedures

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) referred to the inputting into ASFA of mini videos by NOAA, mentioned in their report, and commented that each time something new or different was entered into the ASFA database, ASFA Partners should be notified.

Indexing

Mr Kühnhold (BF) mentioned the detailed indexing which characterizes ASFA records and that this was a distinguishing characteristic of the high-quality of the ASFA database. However, he expressed his concern that inputters were putting a large amount of effort to indexing in detail, whereas it would appear that users of the database may not be taking advantage of this detailed indexing.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) commented that the printed journals needed an index and added that indexing does affect the retrieval of information in the electronic database. He said that ProQuest had carried out a study to compare detailed manual indexing with “automated” indexing.

Ms Skotheim (IMR) asked about the indexing process used by ProQuest and whether records were indexed individually. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) explained that it depended very much on the number of records done, but he said that every record was run on an automated indexing system based on the ASFA Thesaurus and then some were reviewed. He suggested that perhaps the need to change the way indexing is done should be considered. Users do not necessarily use the thesaurus terms to search, but many of them do use other fields, such as the author. The indexing could be used behind the scene to obtain the relevant findings/search results, i.e. the computer search engine uses the indexing terms. He added that young scientists were not using the subject descriptors when searching because they did not have the experience.

He mentioned the possibility of using “visualization tools” to navigate the database (e.g. looking at the terms, mapping cluster searches) i.e. using the thesaurus structure to give a “visual impact”.

Mr Thompson (NAFO) said that it took too long to carry out the indexing of the ASFA records and questioned the need for the ASFA thesaurus/subject descriptors, especially considering the fact that many scientists used their own keywords for both indexing and searching.

Ms Noble (NMBL) commented that ASFA was an “abstracting/indexing” service. A great deal of time and effort was put in by the ASFA Partner so as to assist the users retrieve what they wanted. She said that users will often search using an author’s name because they are aware of the fact that the particular person works on a specific subject area.

Mr Pettman (FBA) commented that the major objective was to get the input (records) into the ASFA system as soon as possible. Detailed indexing did slow this down and the majority of searches used very few terms. He said that both sides, the indexing and the searching, required assistance to be quicker. On the one hand, data input could be helped by use of a terminology tool working behind the system, i.e. using ontology to “bump-up” the indexing. On the other, the terminology tool would help the end-users (searchers) to further redefine their results. In this way, he added, the quality and the granularity of both the indexing and the searching would be improved.

Ms Noble (NMBL) concurred that this could be considered in the future, and asked if and how searchers used the thesaurus terms. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that the thesaurus was used in many ways to assist in searching. One could click on the thesaurus terms to carry out a search, but the majority of users carried out free-text searching.

Mr Kaske (NOAA) referred to the different users of databases. He said that professors and advanced students could generally find what they were looking for because they have the experience in using the search tools available. He likened this situation to a car having five gears – if most people were happy just using first and second gears, this did not mean that a fifth gear was not necessary.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) expressed his agreement. In general, only a small percentage of users were experts, with experience on “how to search”, and therefore would be able to use the indexing terms well in order to obtain the specific results they required quickly (i.e. equivalent to using the fifth gear of a car). Whereas, the greater percentage of users had very little experience in using indexing terms and therefore would use more the free-text searching to get their results, perhaps a larger quantity which then required more time to obtain exactly what they wanted (i.e. equivalent to using the first/second gears of a car). However, just because only a small percentage of users are experts should not mean that they could not have the tools which would enable them to make very specific searches so as to obtain their specific results quickly. That opportunity should always be present in the system for the experienced user.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) concurred that the indexing should not be simplified just because the vast majority did not know how to use indexing terms to search and that all the various search possibilities should be kept.

However, he added that usage is the number one factor to take into consideration for buying/keeping the product in, for example, libraries. If only 1% of research professionals used the database, in many cases this would not be a justifiable reason for maintaining subscription to the product.

Ms Noble (NMBL) referred to Scopus, who claimed that they had professional indexers working for them. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) commented that that their system was very similar to that used by ProQuest.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat), with respect to automated indexing, asked whether taxonomic up-posting was possible and if sea-codes could be automatically added to geographic terms. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) replied that great care had to be taken when developing automated indexing systems. Some taxonomic up-posting could be done, although there would be some exceptions to the rule. Geographic descriptors were more complicated. For further discussion regarding geographic descriptors see Agenda Item 11.6 ASFIS-6, Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Thesaurus.

Ms Noble (NMBL) suggested the formation of an Indexing Working Group, whose task would be to discuss and evaluate the usefulness and/or importance of indexing. The following showed interest in being part of such a Working Group: Mr Sainekar (NIO), Mr Pettman (FBA), Mr Montes (UNAM), Mr Macharia (KMFRI), Ms Prod'homme, ProQuest and the FAO ASFA Secretariat.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that a questionnaire could be circulated via ASFA Board-L regarding the use of automated as opposed to manual indexing. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) suggested that a Trust Fund proposal could be put forward to carry out an indexing survey.

Physical Media

Mr Kaske (NOAA) brought-up the issue of electronically-available literature. He mentioned the fact that many web sites were now becoming richer in content, which could raise some difficulties regarding how this material could be covered in the future. He said that there was a trend for print publications to move to the web and that they may disappear after a few years, resulting in the possible loss of information.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) commented that different media now existed for documents; they could be in paper or electronic form. Web resources should meet specific requirements and he said that this issue needed to be addressed for the future. He said that there was now a change in the way documents were made available. In some cases a series of documents was made available on the web, for example 1-10 articles per day. He added that sometimes the citation was not clearly cited and the document could be later on revised. Therefore the publication year would not always be sufficient, although DOIs could be an answer to this problem.

Environmental Regimes

Ms Noble (NMBL) expressed her concern that the Environmental regime field (M, B, F) was not being used correctly during ASFA input. She referred to discussion regarding this issue at the 2006 Meeting where she had noted that many of the ASFA records prepared by ProQuest did not have any data in the Environmental Regime field (see 2006 ASFA Board Meeting Report, Section 7.5). Some 30% of records with specific geographic descriptors had information missing in the Environmental regime fields, the majority of which were records produced by ProQuest.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) replied that globally adding information to existing records in an automated way was not possible, but some action was being taken regarding this. **Mr Emerson (ProQuest) agreed** to enter the appropriate information in the Environmental regime field of existing records when it would be possible.

General discussion followed regarding the Environmental regime field with Mr Emerson (ProQuest) saying that this field was not used by the average user in searches.

Mr Sainekar (NIO) commented that the name ASFA explained the subject scope – “aquatic sciences” and therefore he felt that information should always be entered in the field Environmental regime field.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that data was entered in this field when the subject content of the record was environmentally-related.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that this field was good for gathering general information about the database itself. That is, with a simple search one could have an idea of how many records on the database dealt with each environment regardless of subject.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) suggested the possibility of changing the way environmental information was entered, by adding a new field to cover “technical/experimental/theoretical” aspects.

Complexity of the ASFA record

Mr Thompson (NAFO) commented on the length of time that it took to create an ASFA record using the www-ISIS-ASFA software. He believed that the input worksheets were too complex and referred in particular to the complicated procedure that was necessary to change bibliographic levels of records. He asked whether it would be possible to use XML format as an alternative to input preparation. He suggested that perhaps a workshop for inputting methods could be of use to discuss this issue further.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that delays in submitting ASFA input were not only due to lack of time available to carry out the input, other factors were often involved, such as internal issues within the ASFA Partner's institute. He added that streamlining some input procedures has been recently done in order to simply ASFA input (see 2006 ASFA Board Report, Section 7.5). He noted that ASFA Partners' input should not always be so time consuming as there is a certain degree of repetition. That is, Partners were generally responsible for preparing input from literature produced in their own countries and from a restricted number of journal titles, and the choice of the geographic and taxonomic terms were often limited or repeated, as were the subject descriptors. He explained that the ASFA record contained many fields because it was not simply a card catalogue entry. Its' complexity enabled it to feed potentially into other different information systems or products. The records could be imported into various systems in different formats, since a complex format can feed into various other simpler systems, but not vice versa.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that the input worksheets (based on the AGRIS worksheet) had evolved over the years and that Mr Rybinski, who was a professor of informatics, had assisted in the development of the input format (i.e. the development of the ASFA input worksheets was not haphazard event). He added that the FAO ASFA Secretariat, being aware of the fact that many of the ASFA Partners were not experienced inputters, had put much effort into making the input software as user-friendly as possible (albeit making the input procedure a little more time consuming).

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that ProQuest could accept input prepared with systems other than www-ISIS-ASFA and that the ASFA Trust Fund money could be used to prepare different formats.

Mr Sainekar (NIO) commented that data was transferred from the NIO Indian Ocean database, using www-ISIS-ASFA in a one-step export.

Adding URL links to existing ASFA records

Follow-up action item 6 from the 2007 ASFA Board Meeting:

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

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

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that an e-mail was sent via ASFA Board-L on 13.08.08 regarding the correct entry of URL addresses. The new upgrade to the www-ISIS-ASFA software will incorporate a modification to the worksheet regarding additional URL address fields. For further discussion regarding the new additional URL address fields in the software, see Agenda Item 9.1 Progress with machine-readable input, www-ISIS-ASFA.

Ms Noble (NMBL), referring to her comments in the UK Report regarding full-text linking to existing ASFA records, asked whether ProQuest could automatically process "blocks" of serial journals that had been digitized retrospectively and made available in institutional repositories since the ASFA records had been prepared. Mr Sainekar (NIO) also commented on the possibility of adding URL links to existing ASFA records which would point to the open archive full text.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that it was not possible to do this automatically and that it is was not easy to get to the old records in a productive way. ProQuest used different filters, for each publisher, to enter the data into their production fields. He explained it was not a simple process; it would require resources and editorial input and also decisions on how to do it, i.e. who would fund the process - ProQuest or ASFA Trust Fund. He stressed that the most straightforward way to add URL links to existing ASFA records was for the ASFA Partners to provide ProQuest with a list of the Accession Numbers of the ASFA records together with the corresponding URL links. Once the records were updated with the information, ProQuest would have to reload the archives, which took some time, before the new data would be visible on the database.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented on how important it was to make ASFA unique and indispensable by putting in the full-text links. He also noted that ProQuest did not have the human resources, nor time or money, to do this.

Ms Soto (ProQuest) clarified that there were 3 separate issues involved: 1) changes to the existing ASFA records (which needed appropriate information from ASFA Partners); 2) archiving records at ProQuest; and 3) the mapping of catalogues and the harvesting of records. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said consideration should be given to paying someone to do the latter, using ASFA Trust Fund money. A priority list would be required regarding the content to be added and he suggested that it should be an ASFA Partner who would do this.

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) reported that she had sent a list of Accession Numbers and URL addresses to ProQuest. Ms Soto (ProQuest) noted that the processing was time consuming with modifications to existing records being carried out a few at a time. Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) requested Ms Cosulich to provide information to the other Latin American ASFA Partners on the procedure she used. He also enquired as to how many ASFA Partners had provided ProQuest with URL links to their existing ASFA records. Ms Soto (ProQuest) replied that, so far, only 3 ASFA Partners had done so - IMR, INIDEP and NIO.

[Rapporteur's note: The FAO ASFA Secretariat is in the process of sending URL links to FAO publications that were digitized after the ASFA records had been prepared and submitted to ProQuest for those documents]

Mr Kühnhold (BF) said that BF would provide some handles to existing ASFA records and perhaps produce ASFA records if not already existing.

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to remind all ASFA Partners that URL links could be added to ASFA records already existing on the database. ASFA Partners would have to inform ProQuest of the Accession Numbers of the ASFA records and the corresponding URL address to be added to the record.

[Rapporteur's note: The FAO ASFA Secretariat sent a reminder to all Partners via ASFA-Board-L on 19 February 2009]

Mr Sainekar (NIO) mentioned the draft copies of primary publisher material which were sometimes included in institutional repositories and asked whether URL links could be given to these. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that, regarding copyright/permission, publishers would generally allow a limited use. However he suggested reviewing the agreement with the publisher before providing the URL of the institutional repository.

See Agenda Item 13.3.3 ASFA Trust Fund New Proposals for further discussion regarding the digitization of old grey literature material.

7.6. ASFA input production

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) requested further information regarding the 31% increase in ProQuest's input contribution to the ASFA database as mentioned in their intersessional report. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that this represented a "backward availability" of information, i.e. ProQuest collected old records from the Web and put them on the ASFA database.

ASFA Partners were reminded to check the statistics regarding their input to the ASFA Database as listed in the document "Contributions (input) to ASFA Database by Partners and ASFA Partner's Entitlements" (**Annex-50**).

7.7. ASFA Theme Paper

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) introduced this agenda item explaining that this year's theme was "What does it mean to be a Responsible ASFA Partner?". ASFA Partners had been asked to write and submit a paper on the theme. See **Annex-54** for the texts of the various theme papers submitted by the Partners.

8. ASFA PRODUCTS AND SERVICES

8.1. ASFA Journals

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

Ms Soto (ProQuest) circulated a copy of the front pages of the printed ASFA journals, which contained a list of the active ASFA Partners, and asked the ASFA Partners present to check and amend the list if necessary.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) mentioned that subscriptions to the printed ASFA journals had decreased, but that the printed ASFA journals were still being used and in demand; libraries wanted archival copies. However, he pointed out that this was not the way to go for the future, since the printed product only contained a fraction of the records contained on the machine readable database and therefore was not complete.

Mr Grainger (FAO ASFA Secretariat), referring to the use of print journals in general, mentioned that FAO decided to cease production of various printed publications, including the FAO Yearbooks, thereby saving a considerable amount of money. However, this had been faced with opposition by Library staff and users, who complained that this would spoil the series and there would no longer be books on the shelves in the libraries. A compromise was reached whereby summary tables were published together with a CD-ROM containing historical and additional information. Eventually publication would cease, but this was a way of minimizing the negative impact.

8.2. CD-ROM

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) asked whether the CD-ROM/DVD contained the entire ASFA database. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) replied that it did, although there was a time difference in that it took longer for the records to go on CD-ROM/DVD when compared to the electronic version of the database.

As already mentioned by Mr Emerson (ProQuest), Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reiterated that the printed and machine-readable ASFA products differed with respect to the number of records they contained. A considerable number of records appearing in the machine readable ASFA products do not and will never appear in the printed ASFA abstracts journals.

8.3. Internet Service

Access to the full ASFA Database, CSA Illumina, was one of the entitlements of all ASFA National Partners (including the Collaborating Centres in developing countries).

CSA Illumina was now updated biweekly and ASFA Partners were reminded to send their records to ProQuest frequently in small batches.

8.4. Document Delivery

Ms Noble (NMBL) noted that ASFA Partners were not obliged as part of their official ASFA responsibilities to provide document delivery services. She reminded those ASFA Partners who were IAMSLIC members of the Z 39.50 Library and recommended that they use the ILL system offered by IAMSLIC.

Mr Sainekar (NIO) reported that he used both IAMSLIC and the ASFA Board for document delivery. He expressed his appreciation for all the assistance that he had received from other ASFA Partners in obtaining documents and thanked them for their collaboration. Ms Noble (NMBL) noted that this was a good example of resource sharing within the ASFA Partnership.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) concurred, saying that the ASFA Partnership should be used for resource sharing and other matters, such as raising discussions, and should not just be considered as an "input-production" network.

Mr Kühnhold (BF) mentioned that document delivery was very important for grey literature, especially when old reports were not digitized and only one copy existed. Ms Noble (NMBL) said that this highlighted the importance of digitizing such literature and putting it in repositories, and also not forgetting to send the URLs to ProQuest should there already be existing ASFA records for such material.

8.5. New Outputs and Services (by ProQuest)

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that they were constantly improving the search interface to the ASFA database (CSA Illumina). He asked the ASFA Partners for feedback regarding how to make grey literature more visible on the database, rather than having it simply mixed up together with standard peer-reviewed documents. He added that ProQuest were considering some visual aspects regarding changing the interface.

Ms Noble (NMBL) commented that the search interface made no reference to the Geographic Authority List (GAL), which is an important feature of ASFA. She enquired as to the possibility of having a link on the search interface to show the GAL map. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) replied that there were search "help" tools on the interface, but the GAL map was only available from the fact sheet of the ASFA database. Ms Noble insisted that making the GAL map more visible would constitute a very useful tool, suggesting the utility of the map when carrying out biodiversity studies in different parts of the world. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that he would bring up this issue with the interface department, but added that there could be problems since this would mean making changes just for one database. Regarding the possible problems, Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that the "oneness" (i.e. uniqueness of ASFA) could then, in some cases, be considered a handicap rather than a strength (i.e. when the suggested change ran contrast to the existing majority of ProQuest databases).

Mr Kaske (NOAA), referring to Google Maps, asked if ProQuest was using Google locations. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) replied that they did have a GIS system which would allow browsing content on a map interface.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) asked the ProQuest participants to highlight any generalized features that were/could be gained from the CSA-ProQuest merger or if there was any extra ASFA relevant content that could be obtained from the other ProQuest databases. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) replied that there was a great increase in the number of journals that were monitored, now approximately 5000. There was easier access to full-text and an increase in content to be indexed. He mentioned that ProQuest had a plan to make content more transferable where appropriate. He explained that ProQuest had more contacts and that it was partnering with Google. Mr Pepe asked whether ASFA records could be found searching Google. Mr

Emerson said that ProQuest gives everything on Natural Sciences (including ASFA) to Google, but the full ASFA record is not seen in the Google search results.

Ms Soto (ProQuest) informed the ASFA Partners that the updated Thesaurus, with the new terms recently added, would soon be available on the CSA Illumina interface.

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

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) reported that marketing attendances during information meetings/conferences had doubled. He said that since ASFA was a smaller player, there was a need to make sure that it was visible during such meetings.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) noted that it was very important for ASFA Partners to carry out some public relations activities within their own institutes. He reminded ASFA Partners that there was some information on the ASFA web site that could be used as promotion material. He added that the FAO ASFA Secretariat would provide ASFA Partners, if requested, with a letter stating how important their work and their institute's work were regarding ASFA.

8.7. Entitlements

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) reported that ProQuest had many products that perhaps ASFA Partners were not aware of and suggested that they review their subscription and entitlement details. They could be entitled to other products and added that discounts could be available for some products. He recommended that ASFA Partners visit the ProQuest site to get an overall view of the new company and its products and activities.

Ms Soto (ProQuest) reminded ASFA Partners that should they have any questions regarding their entitlements they should send her an e-mail (Vicki.Soto@proquest.com), copied to Mr Emerson (Craig.Emerson@proquest.com).

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) asked ASFA Partners to check their entitlements as listed in the document "Contributions (input) to the ASFA Database by Partners and ASFA Partners Entitlements" (**Annex-50**).

8.8. Increasing Distribution of ASFA Information Products and Services

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) noted that this was the 10th year of the "Project to Distribute ASFA on CD-ROM to LIFDCs in Africa and via Internet to LIFDCs worldwide" and referred to the full report of the project's activities prepared by Ms Hilary Cochrane (FAO consultant) (**Annex- 48**). Besides containing statistics on the initiative, he said that Ms Cochrane's report also contains interesting comments. Mr Pepe said that there were currently 48 institutes receiving ASFA free-of-charge under this project. He noted that a total of 12 institutions became ASFA Partners after participating in this initiative, which was a good measure of the success of the project. He said this initiative was included in the new Publishing Agreement for the next 5-year period.

9. PROGRESS WITH MACHINE READABLE INPUT

9.1. www-ISIS-ASFA

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that a small upgrade to the www-ISIS-ASFA v1.1 software was underway (to be called version 1.2), which would increase the interoperability of the system. The patch would also include some modifications to the worksheets that had been agreed at the 2007 ASFA Board Meeting (e.g. additional URL fields) and various authority lists would be updated.

Mr Pepe referred to the status report of the Trust Fund Project regarding the further development of www-ISIS-ASFA, which had been presented and approved during the 2007-2008 intersessional period (and completed). See **Annex-60**.

Mr Rybinski (ICIE) gave an outline of the activities that had been carried out so far within the framework of this proposal. See **Annex-60** for a full list of the activities. He mentioned that the updated ASFA Thesaurus was already operational. See Agenda Item 11.6 ASFIS-6, Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Thesaurus for further discussion regarding the ASFA Thesaurus. He said that the work most probably would be completed within a couple of months following the Board Meeting.

The www-ISIS-ASFA upgrade could be distributed on CD-ROM as a full installation for first-time users, or as a patch upgrade to the existing version of the software via FTP. Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) clarified that once the upgrade was complete, it would then have to undergo detailed testing before it could be released and issued to the ASFA Partners.

Mr Thompson (NAFO) asked whether the upgrade would be 64-bit compatible. Mr Rybinski replied that the new www-ISIS-ASFA upgrade should work on 64-bit systems without any problems.

Mr Sainekar (NIO), referring to the preparation of ASFA records that had full-text online, questioned the possibility of copying and pasting text directly into the fields of the records. Mr Rybinski said that this would be possible, but an accurate proof-reading should be made, paying attention to some special characters. Mr Thompson (NAFO) suggested the use of a text-editor, such as Notepad, before entering data in the records.

Interoperability

Follow-up action items 4 and 7 from the 2007 ASFA Board Meeting:

4. **Mr Pepe (FAO) agreed** to follow-up with Mr Rybinski (ICIE) regarding the exportation of www-ISIS-ASFA records in XML format, and others.

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

Mr Rybinski (ICIE) explained that the above mentioned version 1.2 of the www-ISIS-ASFA software which is underway would contain a special programme for importing/exporting data in different formats, such as XML, MODS and InMagic. He added that this would allow institutes to download data and load it into different systems or to other institutes. This "exchange of data" could eventually be done via Internet, i.e. data could be taken from the Internet and downloaded into the software.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reminded ASFA Partners that if they needed the capability to import records from local databases into www-ISIS-ASFA they should inform the FAO ASFA Secretariat so that Mr Rybinski (ICIE) could be contracted to prepare appropriate import formats, if possible. Mr Rybinski said that this would depend on the local database and that some minor programming could be necessary.

Mr Thompson (NAFO) asked about the importing of XML records. Mr Rybinski said the system would import data in XML format and automatically convert into www-ISIS-ASFA format. Mr Thompson (NAFO) raised the issue of an alternative input interface, based on XML schema. Mr Rybinski (ICIE) said that a module could be prepared just for data entry, which could then be exported to ProQuest. If the format was semantically compatible with www-ISIS-ASFA it would not be too difficult. A validation programme would then be necessary in order to import the data into www-ISIS-ASFA.

Additional URL field

Mr Rybinski (ICIE) suggested that the additional URL field should be subfielded and repeatable, whereby the URL address would be entered in the first subfield and the description of the URL address would be entered in the second subfield, e.g. Publisher.

Mr Rybinski, ProQuest and the FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to discuss the technicalities of the wording (fixed names) of the field/subfields and how they would be exported for ProQuest.

[Rapporteur's note: this was done]

Thesis/Dissertation supervisor field

Mr Sainekar (NIO) requested an additional field to enter the name of the advisor/supervisor of a Thesis/Dissertation. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that the Thesis/Dissertation field was important and that changing the contents of the system, i.e. adding fields, would improve the granularity of the records.

The **ASFA Board agreed** to the addition of a Thesis/Dissertation supervisor field and **Mr Rybinski agreed** to make the modification to the worksheet as part of the work in this Trust Fund Proposal.

[Rapporteur's note: this was done]

Multiple author affiliations

Ms Prod'homme (IFREMER) re-iterated IFREMER's request for entering multiple author affiliations in the www-ISIS-ASFA software saying her institute very much regretted not being able to do this. She explained that IFREMER was often requested bibliometric data regarding special areas of aquatic sciences, but that with ASFA it was not possible to identify all the French institutes/organizations working on particular subject areas. Therefore, other French databases or the Web of Science were used instead. Ms Prod'homme added that this facility would improve the quality of the ASFA database. Mr Sainekar (NIO) supported IFREMER's request, saying the database should provide some management information (e.g. bibliometric data). He appreciated the fact that this would be complex and time-consuming during ASFA input but stressed the importance of multiple author affiliations in the ASFA record.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) informed the ASFA Board that ProQuest had created a new production system which did have a multiple author affiliation field. However, he explained that it would take time for the system to be developed so as to make that information available at the end-user interface and that this would not be

in the immediate future. He added that the primary journal records did have that information captured, but it was not yet possible to show the information.

The long-term objective was to tag a unique identifier to an author, so as to be able to track his work. He referred to the current utility “community of scholars” whereby records were linked to authors and their affiliations. Ms Noble (NMBL) asked for further information as to when ProQuest would be able to map into the existing structure. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that it would most probably be 2/3 years before the author identification would be usable.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that if ProQuest were now collecting and storing multiple author affiliation data, then perhaps the www-ISIS-ASFA software could be modified now and ProQuest could accept the data. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) explained that the ASFA records that they received from the www-ISIS-ASFA system went immediately into their production database. There would be a need to create the possibility for www-ISIS-ASFA records to go through ProQuest’s standard production system, where all the data was defined into small “granularity”.

Even though ProQuest was not ready to accept from Partners records containing multiple author affiliations, some discussion followed regarding the desirability to modify the www-ISIS-ASFA software now (during the preparation of the 1.2 patch) so as to include the ability to include multiple author affiliations (i.e. in other words the software would be given the capability of holding multiple author affiliations, but the multi author affiliations would not be exported to ProQuest with the records) In this way, once the ProQuest system was ready to accept from Partners records with multiple author affiliations, only a small modification would be necessary for the www-ISIS-ASFA software to be capable of exporting the multiple author affiliations.

Mr Rybinski (ICIE) said that considerable work would be necessary to modify the software, but that it would be possible.

Mr Thompson (NAFO) questioned the need to make the entry of multiple author affiliations in ASFA records mandatory. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that great care should be taken before deciding upon making data entry in a field mandatory. Mr Pepe (FAO) asked ASFA Partners if they all believed that it was important to enter multiple author affiliations and if so, would they do so.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that the primary objective of the ASFA database should be examined, i.e. was it more content rather than bibliometric data or vice versa. He added that ProQuest did receive some requests from users regarding bibliometric information. Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) asked how well ASFA could be used for bibliometric surveys, taking into consideration the fact that ASFA Partners entered the ASFA system (started entering data into the system at different dates). Mr Emerson (ProQuest) commented that it was important to clearly define what input was being done and from what date onwards.

Mr Thompson (NAFO) asked whether ProQuest could automatically fill in authors’ affiliations. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) replied that this could be a possible way to go in the future, but he added that some authors would object to having their personal details/history on record. Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) pointed out that author’ affiliations changed, i.e. authors moved institutes frequently.

The ASFA Board agreed that the software worksheets should be modified so as to be able to enter multiple author affiliations. It would not be mandatory for ASFA Partners to enter multiple author affiliations. These multiple affiliations would only remain in the ASFA Partners’ local databases and would not be exported to ProQuest.

Mr Rybinski agreed to make the necessary modifications to the software (worksheets, display formats, export formats) as part of the work being carried out regarding the upgrade to the www-ISIS-ASFA software. [Eventually, when ProQuest would be able to display the multiple affiliation information on CSA Illumina, the export FST would be modified so as to include this information in the ASFA records sent to ProQuest].

[Rapporteur’s note: Unfortunately, the FAO ASFA Secretariat had to decide NOT to include the “multiple author affiliations” fields in the www-ISIS-ASFA 1.2 software patch/version that was currently being prepared, considering all the necessary changes and testing that it would then have to carry out (this would considerably delay the release of the version 1.2). This decision was also taken considering the fact that the affiliations would not get onto the actual ASFA database but only remain in the Partners’ system.

Authors’ names

Ms Skotheim (IMR), referring to the data entry and searching of authors’ names, mentioned that there were many different formats (e.g. full names, initials etc.) and asked whether there was an Author Authority List.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) replied that the www-ISIS-ASFA software had just a local pick-list, which simply accrued the authors entered during the preparation of the ASFA records. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that algorithms were used to capture authors’ names, which allowed for the different formats. Ms Noble (NMBL) commented that this would mean that however the authors’ names were entered in the database, the ProQuest system would be able to identify them during searches.

Mr Kühnhold (BF), referring to the author pick-list in the www-ISIS-ASFA software, asked whether this would also go through the same validation routine as the taxonomic and geographic pick-lists, i.e. those names not included in the list would result in the software giving a warning message.

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) pointed out that the www-ISIS-ASFA software had different kinds of pick-lists with different functions and different uses. Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) explained the differences between the pick-lists: the subject descriptor pick-list, included in the software, was totally closed, which meant that only terms included on the list were allowed; the serial title, taxonomic and geographic pick-lists, also included in the software, were closed, but gave the possibility to enter other terms; the author pick-list was only a "local" pick-list, i.e. not included in the software, and was open and accruable.

Cross-referencing records

Ms Skotheim (IMR) raised the issue of "cross-reference" linking between ASFA records. She explained that Theses sometimes included individual articles that had been published elsewhere, for which ASFA records existed in the database. Mr Rybinski (ICIE) said that an extra field could be added to the software for such information. Ms Soto (ProQuest) mentioned that the Notes field was used for this purpose. Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that in cases where the Thesis was bound together with previously published articles, as one document, FAO prepared records not only for the thesis, but also for the articles, adding information regarding the citation of the previously published articles in Notes field. Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that Accession Number of the previously published articles could be added. He mentioned that, prior to machine-readable input, the ASFA input sheet did have a Cross-reference field to link Accession Numbers. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that only a "technical link" would be possible, not a "clickable link". He said that in order to cross-refer a dissertation to previously published articles and vice versa, manual efforts would be needed to enter the information, i.e. citation plus accession number, in the Notes field of the record.

Posters

Ms Skotheim (IMR) asked for the addition to the input software of a new document type category for "posters", saying that his had already been discussed/approved at the 2006 ASFA Board Meeting.

Mr Rybinski agreed to make the necessary modification to the worksheet and software as part of the activities being carried out regarding the 1.2 upgrade to the www-ISIS-ASFA software.

[**Rapporteur's note:** this was done]

WEBLIS - Integrated Library Management System

Mr Rybinski (ICIE) gave a PowerPoint Presentation on WEBLIS, a library management system (See **Annex-63**).

He said that this system comprised OPAC, Online Public Access Catalogue (i.e. searching), cataloguing, loan and acquisition modules, and that it could be integrated with the www-ISIS-ASFA software that was used for ASFA data entry. He added that, since many of the ASFA Partners were also libraries, it would be extremely useful and time-saving to have just one system which would enable cataloguing and data entry at the same time, thereby avoiding double data entry. WEBLIS thus provides a tool to those centres which do not have library system or have one but would like to integrate the functionalities of ASFA and WEBLIS into one system.

Some discussion regarding the functionality of this system followed, in the form of questions and answers, which is reported below.

Mr Sainekar (NIO) asked about the transfer of data by users of InMagic. Mr Rybinski mentioned that the data standard would be ASFA and that there would be just one task to convert the data into ASFA. He said some tools would be made available for the conversion and that either the ASFA Partners could do it themselves or request assistance. Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) asked whether a help desk would be available giving some support to users. Mr Rybinski (ICIE) replied that not much training would be necessary and that the necessary documentation would be available. He said that the system would be fairly easy for those already familiar with ASFA, and that a help desk would be available for a few months. He suggested that some regional training could be considered.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) queried the possibility of importing existing ASFA records from CSA Illumina. Mr Rybinski (ICIE) said it depended upon the format, and that if importing records from other sites and databases were to be considered, then some additional tools would have to be defined for this.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) informed ASFA Partners that if they had their own library catalogue system, they were not obliged to use WEBLIS, although they could do so if they wished.

Mr Sainekar (NIO) asked whether all ASFA Partners would receive this system. Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) replied that, if approved and once ready, WEBLIS would be sent to all ASFA Partners. He added that the ASFA Partners would then be free to distribute it to their collaborating centres or other libraries in their country that were not necessarily ASFA Partners. Ms Noble (NMBL) commented how this was another example of "Capacity Building".

Mr Kaske (NOAA) asked if there were a maximum number of records that could be contained in the catalogue. Mr Rybinski (ICIE) replied that there was a restriction of 15 million records, but said that the catalogue could be split invisibly into more than one.

Mr Sainekar (NIO) mentioned that his institute had two databases, a local one and another from which records were sent to ASFA, which contained AM and AMS records. He asked if, when they received requests for monographs, it would be possible to search for them and also if it would be possible to add other search fields. Mr Rybinski confirmed that it would be possible to search for monographs and that it would always be possible to add fields for searching, since the system was developed for librarians.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) questioned the possibility of having a platform-free version that could be used with Linux that would also be UniCode compliant. Mr Rybinski (ICIE) said that this would be possible with a little modification.

Mr Rybinski (ICIE) said that it would take approximately 7/8 weeks to prepare the WEBLIS application, for an approximate cost of US\$10 000.

The ASFA Board agreed to the integration of www-ISIS-ASFA with WEBLIS **in principle**, and requested that Mr Rybinski prepare a Trust Fund Proposal containing all the appropriate information.

[Rapporteur's note: Subsequent to the Meeting, Mr Rybinski did prepare and submit to the FAO ASFA Secretariat a proposal to develop WEBLIS with ASFA input functionality, at an estimated cost of Euro 8 575.

However, the FAO ASFA Secretariat has not taken any further action on this matter because, in the meantime, a promising possible alternative Integrated Library Management software system called ABCD (supported by BIRME) was launched. The FAO ASFA Secretariat is currently having an in-house computer specialist evaluate some of the pros and cons of both systems. Also on 4 March 2009, the ASFA Secretariat asked ASFA Partners via ASFA-Board-L for further confirmation regarding their eventual need and use of Integrated Library Management software.]

10. REPORT ON ASFA TRAINING ACTIVITIES

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that no ASFA training sessions were held at FAO headquarters during the intersessional period, however the ASFA Secretariat helped organize/carry out six "outsourced" training sessions. Mr Pepe thanked Mr Marco Montes (UNAM/Mexico), Ms Nicoletta Milone (AdriaMed/Italy), Mr James Macharia (KMFRI/Kenya) and Ms Jacqueline Prod'homme (IFREMER/France) for their efforts in carrying out the ASFA training sessions on behalf of the FAO ASFA Secretariat.

Mr Pepe referred to some of the problems that had been reported by ASFA Partners during the training and/or follow-up regarding inadequate equipment. He noted how some of the issues brought up under Agenda Item 6.2.5, during the discussions on the "criteria for the removal of Partners not fulfilling their input responsibilities" were important in ensuring successful results following the training of a new ASFA Partner. That it was important to establish the technical needs of an ASFA Partner before carrying out the training. Mr Pepe commented that the recruitment, training and follow-up of an ASFA Partner should be considered and organized like a "development project" which required a detailed plan and planning. Ms Noble (NMBL) said that capacity building was important and that good planning was essential.

11. STATUS OF ASFIS REFERENCE SERIES PUBLICATIONS

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

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

He added that the list was also available as a "text file" that could be used for consultation only. The most recent updated version of the text file was that of 16.1.2009 and was available for downloading from the FTP site of the FAO ASFA Homepage at: ftp://ftp.fao.org/FI/asfa/Monitoring_List/MASTER.txt.

[Rapporteur's note: At this writing the most recent updated version of the text file is that of 22.05.2009]

The ASFA Partners were reminded to notify the FAO ASFA Secretariat (attention: Ms Helen Wibley (Helen.Wibley@fao.org)) as soon as possible of any changes or additions/deletions to the titles of serial journals included in their monitoring list. The FAO ASFA Secretariat would then make the necessary modifications to the Master Serial Monitoring List, so that it would always be as up-to-date as possible.

11.2. ASFIS-2, Subject Categories and Scope Descriptions

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that although there were no modifications to the subject categories, there was an up-dated list of subject areas considered to be outside of the subject scope of ASFA.

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

[**Rapporteur's note:** Subsequent to the Board meeting the FAO ASFA Secretariat circulated the update on 10 March 2009]

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

11.3. ASFIS-3, Guidelines for Bibliographic Description

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

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

11.4. ASFIS-4, Guidelines for Abstracting

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that there was no change to this publication. It is available on the FAO ASFA Homepage FTP site at: <ftp://ftp.fao.org/fi/asfa/>

11.5. ASFIS-5, Guidelines for Indexing

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that there was no change to this publication. It is available on the FAO ASFA Homepage FTP site at: <ftp://ftp.fao.org/fi/asfa/>

11.6. ASFIS-6, Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Thesaurus

Mr Pettman (FBA) presented the ASFA Thesaurus Maintenance Report (**Annex-40a**). He thanked the FAO ASFA Secretariat, the Thesaurus Working Group and Mr Rybinski for all the assistance that they had provided during the production of the updated thesaurus and its integration in the www-ISIS-ASFA software. The new thesaurus had been distributed to ASFA Partners in July 2008 for uploading into the software. See **Annex-62** for a list of the new terms that had been added to the new thesaurus.

Mr Pettman (FBA) said that a Microsoft Word version, based on the style of the current printed thesaurus was produced and explained that before publishing the new printed version there were some formatting issues that needed to be examined and decided upon, namely: alignment of the columns, the position of hyphenated terms and the inclusion of "cont'd" for columns going over more than one page. He also pointed out that should a hierarchical version of the ASFA Thesaurus be required, it would be considerably longer (approx 100 pages more) and would also require much more reformatting and editing.

Ms Noble (NMBL) thanked Mr Pettman (FBA) on behalf of the ASFA Board for all the hard work that he had put into this activity. She commented that in order to make the "cosmetic" changes, a lot more time and effort would be necessary. Mr Kaske (NOAA) asked whether the format of the printed product would affect the electronic version of the thesaurus. Mr Pettman (FBA) replied that the format would neither affect the version of the ASFA thesaurus contained in the software or searching procedures and/or results.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) asked whether the current ASFA Thesaurus pick-list in the www-ISIS-ASFA software is in a non-hierarchical version. Mr Pettman (FBA) confirmed that it was and that Mr Rybinski would have to do some work on the pick-list should a hierarchical version be required.

The ASFA Board agreed to accept the format of the Word version of the ASFA Thesaurus as it currently is and that there would be no need for a multi-hierarchical version.

[**Rapporteur's note:** The print version of the ASFA Thesaurus was mailed to all ASFA Partners in June 2009]

Updating the ASFA Thesaurus

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that the ASFA Thesaurus would be open for up-dating and **would circulate a form for suggesting new terms**. He asked how long it would take to incorporate new updates the Thesaurus. Mr Pettman (FBA) said that a small number of terms (e.g. 200) could be processed within a few days. He added that it would be a more time-consuming task to produce the formatted output for a new print version.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) suggested updating every 3-4 years with consideration given to removing terms no longer used – such terms could be mapped to the “use” term. Out of the 8000 terms in the ASFA Thesaurus, approximately only 2000 terms were used regularly. He said that ProQuest could use information from logged searches to identify the most-frequently used thesaurus terms. He believed mapping natural language words to lead terms would help non-experienced users in using the ASFA Thesaurus.

Other uses of the ASFA Thesaurus

Mr Pettman (FBA) informed the ASFA Partners that different formats of the ASFA Thesaurus existed, such as OWL and SKOS, and that such files had been sent to relevant partners in the NeOn project. He added that a request had been made by Fisheries and Oceans Canada for an Excel spreadsheet version so that they could have a list of keywords to index their database of images and other media.

Ms Noble (NMBL) commented that it was interesting to see that other organizations/institutes found the ASFA Thesaurus useful for their own purposes.

Translation of the ASFA Thesaurus

Mr Pettman (FBA) reported that work had not yet started regarding this issue, due to extra unforeseen work regarding the preparation of the different formats of the thesaurus, but hoped that work could commence during the next intersessional period.

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) mentioned that some 800 descriptors from the ASFA Thesaurus in use for the INIDEP bibliographic databases had been translated into Spanish. She added that it was a useful tool for those indexing and classifying for ASFA, repositories and other databases.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that some translation of the ASFA Thesaurus lead terms into French had already been carried out by the French ASFA Partner.

11.7. ASFIS-7, Geographic Authority List

Follow-up action item 8 from the 2007 ASFA Board Meeting:

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

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

Mr Kühnhold (BF), as Chairperson of the Geographic Authority List Working Group, summarised the current situation regarding the Geographic Authority List. He mentioned that ASFA is valued-added by the fact that geographic descriptors are entered in the database. He gave a brief outline of the various points that had been brought up during discussions held at past Board Meetings: the pick-list contained in the www-ISIS-ASFA software was no longer an "Authority List"; it contained many errors (mistakes in spellings and geographical locations). All ASFA Partners were in agreement that the list needed cleaning-up. Various solutions had been examined, such as using external lists, GIS systems, linking to the software but each had their advantages and disadvantages. Mr Kühnhold said that no list would ever be able to contain all the geographic locations in the world and that there would be no perfect solution. However, he recommended that the first step should be to "clean-up" the list, which would involve downloading the list, correcting it and uploading it into the www-ISIS-ASFA software.

Ms Noble (NMBL) said that UK ASFA Collaborating centre (FBA) would be, later in the Meeting, putting forward a Trust Fund project proposal to update the geographic authority list and transform it to a thesaurus format. The pick list would be cleaned up and correct entries would be added to the thesaurus version of the authority list. (See **Annex-40b**).

Further discussion regarding this issue is reported under the Trust Fund Proposal itself in Agenda Item 13.3 ASFA Trust Fund New Proposal.

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

Follow-up action item 9 from the 2007 ASFA Board Meeting:

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

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that, according to Mr Rybinski, the total size of one ISIS database is 500MB (approximately 15 million terms), and the largest picklist was the Thesaurus, which was 1.5.MB.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) explained that ASFIS-15, the ASFIS List of Species for Fishery Statistical Purposes, was contained as a “taxonomic descriptor” pick-list in the www-ISIS-ASFA software to assist in data entry. He said that the list was compiled/computerized by the Statistics Section of FAO/FIES and that it

was updated once-a-year. The list may be downloaded from the FAO Fisheries Web site (<http://www.fao.org/fi/statist/fisoft/asfis/asfis.asp>) as a text file and converted into Excel or Access software, but could not be imported in this format into the www-ISIS-ASFA software. Mr Pepe mentioned that the latest version of the list would be included in the next upgrade to the www-ISIS-ASFA software.

Synonyms and Up-posting

Mr Kühnhold (BF) said that ASFA was now 38 years old and that species' names changed over time. He suggested that taxonomic synonyms should be linked to the correct name. In this way, at the search stage, it would be possible to use just the "current" taxonomic name, and the system would automatically search also for all the synonyms.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) queried ProQuest as to their ability to up-post, including the possibility to link to synonyms. He suggested that there were 2 possibilities: up-posting done automatically at the input stage or at the search stage. He explained that with up-posting, it would be possible to carry out a general search using a Family name in order to cover all the species within that family. Ms Fey (SFI) asked whether, if just the Genus name was entered, the search results would include all species under that genus name. Mr Pepe confirmed that this was the case. Mr Thompson (NAFO) questioned the need for up-posting at the input stage, but said that it would be very useful at the search stage.

Various taxonomic authorities were mentioned, e.g. ITIS, uBIO, FishBase and CephBase. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) noted that there could be some restrictions regarding the use of some authority lists in commercial systems.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that if they were provided with a clear definition of "what was required", i.e. with respect to linking with synonyms and up-posting to higher taxonomic names, they could investigate the possibility of using a taxonomic authority.

ProQuest agreed to look into the requirements and feasibility of up-posting at the data entry and search interface.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to survey the ASFA Partners and then provide ProQuest with some information. **Mr Pettman (FBA) and Mr Thompson (NAFO)** agreed to assist the FAO ASFA Secretariat regarding this issue.

Ms Levashova (VNIRO) asked what the procedure was regarding the data entry for taxonomic names with "variants", "subspecies" and "formae". Mr Thompson (NAFO) said that it was general practice to include the abbreviations "var.", "subsp." and "form." as part of the taxonomic name.

11.9. ASFIS-10, Authority List for Corporate Names

This list is contained as a pick-list in the www-ISIS-ASFA software. An updated version of this list would be included in the eventual new version (1.2) of www-ISIS-ASFA. The FAO ASFA Secretariat reminded ASFA Partners that they should send ProQuest (attention Ms Soto: Vicki.Soto@proquest.com) the names of new corporate authors, not included in the current pick-list, so that ProQuest can keep the master Corporate Author list updated.

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

This manual was intended for use with the old DOS-ASFISIS software. ASFA Partners should no longer be using this software for ASFA data input submission.

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

This publication reproduces in printed format the "Help Notes" contained in the www-ISIS-ASFA software. The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that the English "Help Notes" were updated so as to correspond with the revised and updated edition of ASFIS-3, Guidelines for Bibliographic Description and Data Entry (using www-ISIS-ASFA software v1.1) which was distributed to ASFA Partner in October 2007.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat recognized the need to re-print this publication and also revise both the Spanish and French version of these Help Notes, but no deadline could be given as to when this would be possible.

12. EXPANDED LANGUAGE CAPABILITY IN ASFA

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) highlighted some of the steps taken over the years in order to expand the language capacity of ASFA, notwithstanding that the working language of the ASFA system and most of the manuals were is English. Mr Pepe mentioned that Russian had now become an official UN language and he referred to the translation of some of the ASFA documentation, noting that during the intersessional period the ASFA Information Fact Sheet had been voluntarily translated into Russian by Ms Levashova (VNIRO). The FAO ASFA Secretariat thanked Ms Levashova for the translation.

13. ASFA TRUST FUND

13.1. Status of the ASFA Trust Fund

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) introduced this Agenda Item, referring to the document ASFA/2008/ 69 "ASFA Trust Fund Status" (**Annex-47**).

The **Balance** of the Trust Fund is **US\$ 851 417**. ProQuest deposited US\$ 254 593.54 in royalties for the year 2007. See **Annex-46** for the ProQuest calculation of the year 2007 royalty payment. **Annex-47** provides a detailed account of the financial status of the ASFA Trust Fund.

13.2. Proposals in Progress, Completed or Pending Further Discussion

13.2.1. Financial support to attend 2008 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (IMR, Norway, 2008)

(in progress) This project refers to **this** year's (2008) Meeting, so the project should be considered as being "in-progress" until the meeting is finished and the last expense claim is filed (this sometime takes months). Funds were used for the following 14 ASFA Partners to attend this year's ASFA Board Meeting: CIP, IIP, INIDEP, INRH, KMFRI, KORDI, NIO/NICMAS, NIOF, NMDIS, SFI, YugNIRO, UNAM, USP and VNIRO. Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) noted that IMR, the hosting ASFA Partner for this year's Meeting, had sought and received some external sponsoring to assist financing the meeting.

This is an on-going proposal, and the renewal of this proposal for 2009 is contained in **Annex-49** and is discussed and reported under Agenda Item 13.3.1 ASFA Trust Fund New Proposals (see below).

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

(in progress) This project is to assist the ASFA Secretariat with its work/initiatives/formation for the collective benefit of the ASFA Partnership. See the document ASFA/2008/69 ASFA Trust Fund Status, Section 3 Item 4 (**Annex-48**) for a partial listing of the activities funded under this Trust Fund project.

This is an on-going project proposal. The request for re-confirmation of this proposal for 2009 is contained in **Annex-3a** and is discussed under Agenda Item 13.3.2 ASFA Trust Fund Proposals completed, in progress or pending (see below).

13.2.3. Further development of www-ISIS-ASFA software as regards interoperability, additional URL fields, and updating picklists (€13 553)

(in progress) This project was approved during the 2007-2008 intersessional period to the Board via ASFA Board-L. See **Annex-60** for details of the proposal. Some further developments to the software had been requested by the ASFA Board during this meeting (e.g. additional option to the Type of Document field for Posters, and an additional field for Thesis advisor/supervisor) and Mr Rybinski said that he would incorporate these modifications within the project.

13.2.4. (Russia–VNIRO) – Input of Barents and Norwegian Seas Literature (US\$3 960)

(in progress) This project was approved by the Board in 2006 (see 2006 Report, Annex 35a and section 13.3.8). The contract between FAO and VNIRO to carry out this work was finalized in May 2008. Ms Levashova (VNIRO) reported that the preliminary work had been done: 310 relevant papers had been selected and CSA Illumina had been checked to avoid duplication. The first batch of 25 records has been sent to ProQuest.

[**Rapporteur's note:** subsequent to the Board Meeting VNIRO completed this project in March 2009]

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

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

At the 2004 Meeting (see 2004 Meeting Report: section 13.2.1.3) VLIZ revisited the project proposal redefining the number of records to be processed to approximately 10, 000 and increasing the time frame. Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that there had been technical problems regarding the format of the records and their conversion to www-ISIS-ASFA, explaining the further delay. However some progress had been made regarding the conversion of the records into a downloadable format for ProQuest.

[**Rapporteur's note:** subsequent to the Board Meeting and behind a request from VLIZ, Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) visited VLIZ in November 2008. Regarding the 10 000 historical records (1900-1999) on the VLIZ - IMIS database which are basically in ASFA format and ready to be exported to ProQuest, it was agreed between VLIZ and ProQuest that the records could be sent to ProQuest and the small discrepancies would be rectified/added by ProQuest (e.g. missing subject category codes)]

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

(in progress) This project had been discussed and approved at the 2004 Meeting and renewed for two additional 2 year periods at the 2005 and 2007 ASFA Board Meetings (see section 8.4 of the 2004 Meeting Report, section 6.7 of the 2005 Report, and section 13.3.6 of 2007 Report).

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reminded those ASFA Partners and Collaborating ASFA Centres who were not members of IAMSLIC to consider the benefits of joining. Full details regarding the status of this project may be found in **Annex-57**.

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

(in progress) This proposal had been agreed, in principle, at the 2006 ASFA Board Meeting (see 2006 Report, section 13.3.7 and Annex 32a) and given final approval at the 2007 ASFA Board Meeting (see 2007 Report, section 13.2.16. The proposal involves the preparation of about 700 records.

[**Rapporteur's note:** subsequent to the Board Meeting NIFFR has begun submitting ASFA records to the ASFA database in relation to this project]

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

(in progress) This proposal was approved in principle by the Board at the 2007 Meeting, pending some clarification from IAMSLIC regarding certain issues (see 2007 Report, section 13.3.5). Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) explained that under this project proposal, ASFA Partners could suggest specific titles to be digitized and also carry out the digitization of the items. There was an IAMSLIC "Digital Collection Development" taskforce within the Aquatic Commons Board who would also identify collection development priorities for the repository. The FAO ASFA Secretariat has contacted ASFA Partners on numerous occasions requesting suggestions for digitization with reference to this proposal, however, there has not yet been any positive response from ASFA Partners.

Therefore, the FAO ASFA Secretariat is putting forward a Trust Fund Project Proposal whereby ASFA Partners (who would like to participate) would be paid a sum to identify and list the grey literature in their institute/country that they could enter into ASFA including digitization. Such a list could include grey literature already with records in ASFA, but not yet digitized. Details regarding this proposal are contained in **Annex-55** and are discussed under Agenda Item 13.3 ASFA Trust Fund New Proposals (see below).

13.2.9. Supply of scanners (for ASFA related use) to those ASFA Partner Institutes which lack the funding to buy equipment (approx US\$6 100)

Follow-up action item 10 from the 2007 ASFA Board Meeting:

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

(completed) This proposal had been presented to the Board via ASFA-Board-L listserv (29 January 2008) and approved during the 2007-2008 intersessional period (see **Annex-59** for details and status report). A total of 9 ASFA Partners received scanners (IIP, NIFFR, NaFIRRI, VNIRO, YugNIRO, NIOF, IFOP, FICen, INSTM).

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

(completed) The following 9 ASFA Partners received full or partial assistance to attend the 2007 ASFA Board Meeting: DPM, IMROP, IMS, INAHINA, INIDEP, NIFFR, NIO/NICMAS, NMDIS, VNIRO.

13.2.11. Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year Jan -Dec 2007) (US\$50 000)

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

For the period January - December 2007, **US\$72 422** was spent. Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) clarified that there was a **US\$14 586** carry-over of unspent funds from the previous year's allocation, and that the overspent US\$7 836 was deducted from the 2008 allotment.

See the document ASFA Trust Fund Status, Section 3 Item 13 (**Annex-47**) for a list of how the FAO Secretariat utilized the funds.

13.2.12. (Russia-VNIRO) Input of Caspian Literature II (US\$10 270)

(completed) This proposal had been approved by the Board at the 2005 ASFA Board Meeting (see section 13.3.6 and Annex-32a of the 2005 ASFA Board Meeting Report). The project was completed by VNIRO in March 2008. A total of 702 records were added to the ASFA Database.

13.2.13. (Kenya-KMFRI) Elimination of Gaps (US\$18 200)

(completed) This proposal was approved by the Board at the 2005 ASFA Board Meeting (see section 13.3.5 and Annex-26a of the 2005 ASFA Board Meeting Report). The project was completed by KMFRI in December 2007. A total of 3910 records were added to the ASFA Database.

Mr Thompson (NAFO) commented that this figure of ASFA records was not mentioned in the statistics included in the KMFRI report. Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) explained that this was a Trust Fund Project for input that was outside their normal monitoring responsibilities and added that the money had been sent to the institute. Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that ASFA input prepared under Trust Fund Projects were visible on the ProQuest ASFA Summary Page. Mr Pepe said that the document "History to-date of SPECIAL ASFA Projects-input of historical materials (or other gaps)" (**Annex-61**) did record the input of historical material and gaps.

Mr Kuhnhold (BF) asked how many people were involved in the project. Mr Macharia (KMFRI) replied that 4 people had carried out the work. He added that this project had been a very good experience for preparing ASFA input.

Ms Skotheim (IMR) raised the issue of who should receive the money for such Trust Fund Projects – the institute or the person(s) carrying out the work. Ms Levashova (VNIRO) explained the general scheme at her institute for receiving and utilizing the money from the Trust Fund Project. After receiving the funds, the Institutional Financial Department took the overheads (20-30%) and the remaining money was dedicated to those collaborators who carried out the work. Ms Levashova, as Head of the ASFA Centre and organizer of the Trust Fund Project, personally decided how to divide the sum among the participating staff, according to the contribution of each inputter. The official request was then given to the management of the institute who would grant the staff with the sums decided. Ms Levashova added that the final sum received by the inputter was also taxed. However, not all institutes permitted this type of procedure. Mr Macharia (KMFRI) said that the money had paid for the overheads and explained that the money going to the staff had to be taxed, so 50/60% went to the institute and the government. Mr Sainekar (NIO) said that at his institute, 50% went to the person and 60% went to the institute.

13.2.14. To strengthen ASFA Partner in Kenya (KMFRI) in order to provide ASFA Training Support for other ASFA Partners in Africa and so as to assist FAO ASFA Secretariat (provision of computer equipment) US\$5 000

(completed) This proposal was approved by the Board at the 2007 ASFA Board Meeting (see section 13.3.3 of the 2007 ASFA Board Meeting Report). The following equipment was delivered to KMFRI: one desk top computer with monitor, one printer, one scanner and one external hard-disk drive (for back-up purposes).

The total cost of the equipment was estimated at US\$5 000 (the actual cost was around US\$3 500).

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) noted the fact that in July 2008, the new ASFA Partners from Uganda and Ghana and the Kenya Collaborating centre in Kenya were trained at KMFRI utilizing this equipment.

13.2.15. (KMFRI) Elimination of Gaps - Phase two

(pending) This project proposal (approx US\$21 459) had been presented at the 2007 Meeting and was approved in principle (see 2007 ASFA Board Meeting Report, section 13.3.8). It involves the preparation of some 2000 records for the following 2 titles: Journal of the Fisheries Research Board of Canada (1934-1972) and Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom (vols. 1-62).

The FAO ASFA Secretariat explained that at the 2007 Meeting, there had been some discussion regarding the Journal of the Marine Biological Association, since ProQuest were possibly processing this journal. The project proposal was pending revision by KMFRI regarding the journals, number of records and costs, and then final approval of the revision by the Board with authorization to proceed. KMFRI was to circulate the revision via ASFA –Board-L during the intersessional period.

18. Follow-up action item 18 from the 2007 ASFA Board Meeting:

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

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

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that access to the content of Journal of the Marine Biological Association was being checked. He explained that ProQuest had a publishing agreement with Cambridge University Press

and that there were some problems regarding the harvesting and use of the metadata. He suggested that the period covered should be 1940-1972. Ms Noble (NMBL) said that her institute had digitized this journal and had flat PDF files available which could be supplied to KMFRI for data input.

Some discussion followed regarding the preparation of ASFA input for journals that were under the responsibility of other ASFA Partners. Mr Thompson (NAFO) commented that ASFA Partners should concentrate on their own monitoring responsibilities and grey literature. Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that there was a new Trust Fund Proposal being put forward later on at this meeting regarding the identification of grey literature in ASFA Partners' countries. Mr Thompson (NAFO) clarified that he did not wish to minimize in any way the great job that was being done by KMFRI, but only wished to express his concern about grey literature.

Mr Macharia (KMFRI) said that it was not their intention to cover journals that were under the responsibility of other ASFA Partners, but added that the two journals were available in KMFRI's library.

Ms Noble (NMBL) commented that if other ASFA Partners did not have the resources to do such input, she believed that there should be no problem if KMFRI were able to do this input.

Mr Kaske (NOAA) added that, although it could be considered un-ethical doing the ASFA input elsewhere, if this was the only way of getting such important input into the ASFA database, then it was reasonable.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that there was some US\$800 000 available in the ASFA Trust Fund and that retrospective indexing was very important, as was grey literature.

Mr Thompson (NAFO) raised the issue of itemizing prices and asked whether a price should be set per record. Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that prices would be different according to the work involved in preparing the record, i.e. whether it needed translation, scanning, writing of abstract, etc. He suggested that Mr Macharia reviewed the number of records and total costs involved, according to the cost per record.

Mr Macharia (KMFRI) agreed to revise the proposal, by re-defining the number of records being done and adjusting the cost accordingly. This would be circulated via ASFA Board L intersessionally.

13.2.16. (FAO) Mini ASFA Meeting (Regional)

(pending) This Trust Fund Proposal had been approved at the 2006 ASFA Board Meeting (see 2006 ASFA Board Meeting Report, section 13.3.4 and Annex 57).

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) explained that during the 2007 intersession the time available at FAO and INIDEP (where the Meeting was to be hosted) had not been sufficient to organize this Meeting. Therefore, the Meeting was postponed until further notice. However, this Trust Fund Proposal was being put forward again this year by IMARPE. See **(Annex-32a)**. Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) reported that the Latin American Partners were still in favour of this meeting and that it would be an important venue for them to discuss their problems. She added that the Peruvian partner was enthusiastic to host the meeting and that it would help strengthen and reinforce Latin American participation in ASFA. Mr Pepe specified that this Trust Fund Proposal would cover participation only for ASFA Partners in the Latin American region and would not be used to bring non-ASFA Partners to the meeting. He also said that the ASFA Secretariat due to staff shortages could only be minimally involved in the organization of this meeting.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat noted that the listed costs showed some discrepancies and **agreed** to review the costs.

13.2.17. (FAO) www-ISIS-ASFA - towards a Release-2

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

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that further discussions regarding a new major release 2 had not been carried out due to lack of staff resources in the FAO ASFA Secretariat and the non-urgency of developing major new Release-2. However, he explained that, **in the meantime**, the FAO ASFA Secretariat was concentrating its efforts on the more urgent follow-up to the request made at the 2007 ASFA Board Meeting for **increasing the interoperability** of the www-ISIS-ASFA software by having developed some export/import programmes for those ASFA Partners using different systems/repositories. This eventual upgrade to the software would be called release 1.2.

See sections 6.6 and 9.1 of the 2007 ASFA Board Meeting Report and also the document "Further development of www-ISIS-ASFA software as regards interoperability, additional URL fields, and updating picklists" (**Annex- 60**).

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

(Pending) This Trust Fund proposal, from 2006, was not approved at the 2006 Meeting (see 2006 ASFA Board Meeting Report section 13.3.10 and Annex 24a) but had been designated for further discussion between the FAO ASFA Secretariat and PDII-LIPI. It had been suggested that a training of one or two PDII-LIPI staff at FAO would take place some time, probably at FAO, with FAO paying the travel and per-diem of one trainee and PDII-LIPI paying for the other. This is still pending action from FAO.

13.2.19. (FAO) ASFA Training Session (US\$14 000)

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

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

13.2.21. Translation of www-ISIS-ASFA “Help Notes” and front end into Russian

13.2.22. Translation of www-ISIS-ASFA Guidelines into Russian

(Pending) These 3 proposals were approved by the Board at the 2004 ASFA Board Meeting (see section 13.3.5 and Annex-29a.b.c of the 2005 ASFA Board Meeting Report). Difficulties, on the FAO ASFA Secretariat's part, regarding the initial administrative organization of project rendered the proposals as “pending”.

Ms Kulakova (YugNIRO) agreed to discuss with the Director of her Institute the possibilities of carrying out these proposals.

[**Rapporteur's note:** subsequent to the Meeting Ms Kulakova communicated that YugNIRO still had an interest in proceeding with the previously approved Trust Fund projects and would like an update from FAO ASFA Secretariat as to exactly what was now the status of the work to be done.]

13.3. New and/or Ongoing Proposals

13.3.1. Financial support to attend the ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (for year 2009)

(approved) This is an ongoing Trust Fund project proposal (**Annex-49**). It is reviewed each year by the Board to maintain or to update the amount of allocated funds. At the last two ASFA Board Meetings in 2006 and 2007 the sum allocated was US\$40 000.

The ASFA Board approved the proposal for the sum to remain at US\$40 000 for the 2009 Meeting.

13.3.2. Staff Support to the ASFA Secretariat (for year Jan-Dec 2009) (US\$60 000)

(approved) This is an ongoing Trust Fund project proposal that usually is reviewed and renewed each year by the Board to maintain or to update the amount of funds allocated to the FAO ASFA Secretariat. (See Annex-3a of the 2007 ASFA Board Meeting Report.) However, at the last (2007) ASFA Board Meeting the proposal was approved for a two year period (2008 and 2009) at US\$60 000 per year.

13.3.3. (FAO) Identifying and Listing Grey Literature published in your country not getting into ASFA

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) introduced this Trust Fund project proposal, commenting that its purpose was to identify and list grey literature published within the ASFA Partners' countries with a view to later entering the references to these publications in ASFA, digitizing the documents and depositing them into a repository (**See Annex-55**). The Board was requested to comment on this draft proposal including some indication on how to coordinate such a project and also as to how much funding should be allocated.

Ms Noble (NMBL) suggested that Union Lists could be used as a starting point for identifying material/grey literature that was not getting into ASFA. She said that many ASFA Partners were in fishery institutes and had many “old” reports sitting on the shelves, which could be digitized and made available in ASFA with URL links. She asked how many ASFA Partners had Library Catalogues with titles that were not on their Monitoring List. Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) said that everything was included in their Library Catalogue, but that not all of the titles were on INIDEP's Monitoring List. She added that INIDEP has identified some grey material, such as FAO development projects in the South American Region during the 1960s and 1970s that needed to be digitized. INIDEP were favourable towards preparing a Trust Fund Proposal for this digitization, but there were some interoperability problems since the records were in one system and then would have to be exported and entered in other systems. Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) mentioned that there was also a problem

regarding funding and payment of the staff, i.e. the institute would receive the money and it would go towards equipment/software utilities which were not needed/related to ASFA activities.

Mr Kaske (NOAA) mentioned that his institute had identified reports that were not indexed and that some were being digitized. These were mainly 1960s and 1970s literature.

Mr Kühnhold (BF) said that his institute had plans to digitize old ICES committee meeting papers back to the 1950s to produce PDFs, which would be linked to the record in ASFA. Ms Lund (ICES) commented that they had received a request from Canada to scan ICES papers back to the 1930s and 1940s. **She suggested that this work should be coordinated by both BF and ICES.**

Mr Kühnhold (BF) asked ProQuest if they knew whether any grey literature databases existed, such as those containing EU reports. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that many existed, but it would be necessary to manually go through and look for the literature.

Ms Skotheim (IMR) said that her library had material that had been digitized but did not belong to the IMR repository and they did not know where it could go. Ms Noble (NMBL) suggested depositing this material in Aquatic Commons.

Mr Pettman (FBA) mentioned the cooperation between IAMSLIC and Aquatic Commons, i.e. there was an IAMSLIC Trust Fund Project for digitizing documents for inclusion in repositories such as Aquatic Commons.

Mr Thompson (NAFO) referred to the new “ecosystem approach” to fisheries which has meant that there was a demand for “old” literature. Reports were being prepared together with all the historical literature as a package.

Some concern was raised regarding digitization of grey literature and making it available in repositories and copyright rules.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that all documents have a publisher and that copyright was assigned to any document. However, for grey literature, if the ASFA Partner’s institute owned total rights, then there would be no problem regarding digitization and full text linking.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that it was important to take copyright rules into consideration, but clarified that this Trust Fund proposal would concentrate on high quality grey literature. He provided some clarification as to the definition of grey literature: stating in general that it was literature that was not easily available through commercial channels, although this is not the only definition.

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) commented that each ASFA Partner could select titles from their monitoring list for digitization, if they had copyright permission.

Ms Fey (SFI) raised the issue of non-English grey literature. She said that her institute had many papers/theses that were in Polish and that perhaps were not useful to the ASFA database. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that any language would be appropriate and could be internationally useful, but he clarified that the ASFA record would have to have an English title, not necessarily an English abstract. Ms Noble (NMBL) commented that should someone believe a non-English record to be useful, they would have it translated.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) urged the ASFA Partners to come forward and start providing lists and/or digitizing old literature for which ASFA records already existed. He said that if one ASFA Partner were to start, others would follow.

13.3.4. (UK-FBA) Geographic Authority List (US\$24 000)

(Approved) This Trust Fund project proposal put forward by FBA intends to update the existing Geographic Authority List (GAL) and convert it into a thesaurus-like structure or architecture for incorporation as a pick-list into the www-ISIS-ASFA software. See **Annex-40b**.

Mr Pettman (FBA) explained that he had examined the GAL and believed that it could be put into a thesaurus-like structure, since it has clear granularity. This would be important for an eventual integration with some kind of ontology. He added that some modification would be necessary in order to make it compatible with the www-ISIS-ASFA software and this would require discussion with Mr Rybinski (ICIE).

He commented that both the printed version of the GAL and the pick-list in the www-ISIS-ASFA software required correcting. He mentioned that AGROVOC had some 1,500 geographical descriptors that could be lined up. He added that FBA would offer to maintain the List for a trial period of 1 year.

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

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) questioned the usefulness of the pick-list and the sea codes.

Ms Noble (NMBL) commented that the pick-list at the moment contained various errors and caused many problems during data input. She said that this Trust Fund Proposal would clean up the list, removing the errors and then re-incorporate it into the software.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) commented that cleaning up the authority file was important and added that the sea code structure was a fundamental part of the list.

Mr Gajanan (NIO) suggested each ASFA Partner cleaning up their local geographic terms included in the list.

Mr Thompson (NAFO) asked whether it would be possible to use an area map, where one could zoom in and see the literature. Ms Noble (NMBL) said that there had been a Trust Fund project regarding a GIS interface. Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) explained that a geographic interface did exist, but there were some problems in integrating it with ProQuest's interface, it was not 100% workable. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) clarified that there were still several issues that needed to be overcome regarding the visualization of the data. However, he said that for the end-user a visual environment would be very important.

Mr Kaske (NOAA) mentioned the possibility of adding longitudes and latitudes.

Mr Pettman (FBA) said that this ASFA Trust Fund project proposal would be an initial phase in preparing the Geographic Authority List to be ready for future applications such as a geographical interface/map. It would not be just a simple "cleaning-up" of the pick-list of geographic descriptors, but would provide the possibility of producing different formats for different applications. Transforming the Geographic Authority List into a "thesaurus" structure would enable the list to work with other systems in the future. For example, an ontology editor could be used to add latitude and longitude data and other GIS information.

The ASFA Board approved the Proposal.

13.3.5. (UK- FBA) African Water Bodies – Duplicate materials (US\$6 000)

(Approved) Mr Pettman (FBA) commented that many scientists' collections were being deposited in libraries. His institute, FBA, had a large collection of duplicate printed material and some unpublished material (data, images and specimens) mainly relating to East African water bodies, covering the period 1930-1990. He explained that he had neither the time nor the resources to prepare an inventory of the materials, but would like to send the material to African ASFA Partners for digitization and inclusion into ASFA. See **Annex-40c**.

This Trust Fund Proposal would provide funds for examining the materials with respect their relevance to ASFA Partners, sorting and listing according to region and format (books, reports, grey literature etc) and also listing any unpublished material (data, images) that could be digitized. Based on the lists obtained, FBA could then produce a report with recommendations that could be circulated to ASFA Partners for discussion as to the next steps to be taken regarding the literature.

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

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) asked whether the proposal would include distribution/mailing of the material. Mr Pettman (FBA) clarified that mailing costs were not included.

Ms Noble (NMBL) asked if a cost estimate for digitizing the material locally could be given. Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) noted perhaps scanning costs would be less than the mailing costs of the paper documents, and therefore it would be better to sent in digitized format on CD-ROMs. Mr Pettman (FBA) replied it would not be possible to give any cost figures until the material was examined. Ms Noble said that some ASFA Partners would prefer receiving the material in hard copy format, rather than just digitized.

Mr Kaske (NOAA) said high-speed scanning could destroy the documents, but perhaps they could be re-bound.

Mr Thompson (NAFO) suggested funds be used to buy scanners and pay for the scanning to be done in the UK. CD-ROMs could then be distributed to the African ASFA Partners. He did not see the justification in sending hard copy material to just one library. Ms Noble (NMBL) pointed out that the hard copy sent to an African ASFA Partner could then be scanned and ASFA input prepared. She said material scanned in the UK, would still remain with the problem of what to do with the hard copy. Mr Kaske (NOAA) suggested that assistance by foreign embassies could be requested regarding transportation of the material. Ms Skotheim (IMR) said that perhaps Research Vessels could be contacted for transportation assistance.

Mr Pettman (FBA) said that he would explore all the possibilities regarding mailing/distribution of the material. He added that some of the material could be justified to be sent via mail.

The ASFA Board approved the proposal.

13.3.6. (Guinea - CNSHB) Inventory of literature sources in aquatic sciences and fisheries in Guinea, constitution of an ASFA national network in Guinea and acquisition of computer equipment (US\$7 040)

This Trust Fund Proposal requested funds for computer equipment to carry out preliminary work regarding the preparation of list of literature in aquatic sciences and fisheries in Guinea. See **Annex-33a**.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that Guinea was not yet active as an ASFA Partner and commented that the Trust Fund proposal needed further clarification.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to contact the Guinea ASFA Partner, CNSHB, and provide them with more information as to ASFA Trust Fund Proposals, i.e. explain to them that an ASFA Partner first has to be actively producing ASFA input autonomously before being able to put forward ASFA Trust Fund proposals.

13.3.7. (Senegal - DPM) Digitization of the Report on fisheries statistics in Senegal from 1963 to 2000

DPM had included in their Report a proposal for digitization their Report on fisheries statistics for the period 1963-2000. See **Annex-36**.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to contact DPM and request that they put forward a Trust Fund Proposal in a more detailed format. Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that this Trust Fund Proposal could be then approved in principle until DPM were autonomous in their input. This would depend upon their productivity during the next year.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) asked whether DPM had produced any ASFA input. Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) replied that some records had been prepared and were already on CSA Illumina.

Mr Kühnhold (BF) questioned the importance of retrospective indexing for statistical data. Mr Kaske (NOAA) said that such statistical data were very useful. Mr Thompson (NAFO) concurred that reports of fishery statistics were extremely useful. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that the addition of historical statistical data to the ASFA database was important.

13.3.8. (Kenya - KMFRI) Further strengthening KMFRI ASFA Training Centre

This Trust Fund Proposal requested funding for 2 desktop computers and 1 laptop for KMFRI to be used for training ASFA Partners and follow-up activities. See **Annex-25a**.

Mr Macharia (KMFRI) commented on the difficulties that he had whilst carrying out the training of the new ASFA Partners from Uganda and Ghana, in that he had to borrow PCs from other departments within his institute.

Mr Thompson (NAFO) asked whether the hardware was necessary for just the training course or for follow-up activities. He also questioned the pricing of the laptop computer. Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) replied that extra computers were necessary for both the training course and follow-up activities, since the ASFA Partners would send their ASFA records to the trainer for checking.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) suggested that rather than specifying the costs of the PCs, it would be better to list the specifications. Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that details should be provided as to how the pricing was arrived at.

The ASFA Board approved the proposal **in principle**, but the proposal required re-writing, regarding the specifications and pricing. The amended proposal would be circulated via ASFA Board-L during the intersessional period.

13.3.9. (FAO) Supply of scanners (for ASFA related use) to ASFA Partners lacking funds to buy such equipment

(Approved) This Trust Fund Project was already presented and approved during the 2007-2008 intersessional period (and completed). See **Annex-59**.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reminded those ASFA Partners that had received scanners under this Trust Fund Proposal that they should include in their intersessional Reports their use of the scanner, i.e. it is expected to see some accountability. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) concurred that accountability was necessary and that it was important to know how the scanners were used.

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) asked whether this proposal could be put forward again for new ASFA Partners. Mr Sainekar (NIO) said that his institute would like to apply for a scanner under this proposal.

The ASFA Board agreed to put forward again this proposal.

14. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

15. FOURTH DAY OF ASFA BOARD MEETING (SPECIAL TOPICS AND DEMONSTRATIONS)

15.1. Demonstration of digitizing documents for repositories

Mr Seteraas (IMR) gave a brief demonstration on how to digitize documents for repositories using the software Adobe Acrobat. This software had a user-friendly interface which allowed all operations to be done in one programme. He described all the procedures step-by-step. He explained that a searchable document was 2-layered, comprising the image of the document plus the searchable text underneath. See **Annex-65**.

15.2. Sampling literature - repeatability of searches

Ms Folkestad (University of Bergen) gave a presentation on carrying out literature searches on different databases. See **Annex-66**. She described the results of a survey carried out to compare the results obtained from different databases (ISI Web of Science, Biological Abstracts and ASFA) and Full-text archives (JSTOR, Blackwell Synergy. and Oxford Journals). The overlap between the 3 databases was around 50%, whereas overlap between journal archives was low. The low overlap between the databases and the journal archives meant that the choice of database determines to a large degree which references are found. Findings of the survey indicated that for an exhaustive overview of a subject, it was necessary to search on more than 1 database. A documentation of databases and search methods used was necessary to allow comparison between studies and repeatability of searches. Google Scholar's coverage of other databases ranged from 80% ASFA to 100% Oxford Journals. Relevant articles were hard to find when searching on Google Scholar, due to the large number of hits, i.e. "noise".

Some issues regarding the findings of this survey were discussed, details of which are reported below.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that ASFA was provided to Google, but not all the data fields. Ms Folkestad said that Google did not provide an overview of which databases were covered.

Mr Sainekar (NIO) commented that of the 3 databases included in the comparative study, ASFA was a specialized database whereas the others were more general, although biological.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) mentioned that the 50% overlap that was found between the databases compared had not changed over the years and that surveys had always concluded that more than one database should be searched.

Mr Kaske (NOAA) commented that a student, when carrying out searches, would have more time available and therefore could get enough information by carrying out exhaustive searches, but added that this took a lot of time, too much time. Ms Folkestad concurred that time was important and that researchers had time constraints. She stressed that there was a need to document what kind of searches had been done, i.e. it was important to document which databases were searched and explain what had been done. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) referred to relevancy ranking and said that how the database displays and ranks the results was important. Ms Folkestad said she would take into consideration some of the comments made on her presentation during the finalization of the research/paper.

15.3. Comments on ASFA Input

Ms Soto (ProQuest) and Ms Wibley (FAO) gave a PowerPoint presentation pointing out those areas of ASFA input preparation where ASFA partners should pay particular attention, so as to avoid errors and inconsistencies. This included some live demonstrations using the www-ISIS-ASFA software. (See **Annex-67**)

15.4. ProQuest tips on using/searching CSA Illumina

Ms Soto (ProQuest) gave a demonstration regarding the ASFA production cycle at ProQuest. She explained some of the new features and some of the Administrative functions that can be set and/or modified on the CSA Illumina interface. (See **Annex-68**)

15.5. Demonstration of CSA Illustrata

Ms Lauridsen (ProQuest) gave a presentation of CSA Illustrata-Natural Sciences, explaining some of the features. Partners were told that if they contributed to this database they could receive free access. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that the subject area was currently mostly natural sciences, but that Illustrata was growing and covering/including more subject areas.

Mr Thompson (NAFO) expressed his interest in Illustrata, saying that the data included in tables and graphs etc were very important. He asked whether the captions/legends were included in searches.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) replied that the objective was to find the most relevant article for the search by using the captions of the tables or images.

Mr Pepe (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that he had showed Illustrata to some FAO professional staff/research scientists and that they were very impressed. He reminded ASFA Partners in developed and low income food deficit countries that they had free access to CSA Illustrata and Water Resources Abstracts (WRA) in addition to their free access to the ASFA database. Other ASFA Partners, if they wished, could have access to Illustrata with a discount.

16. PLACE AND DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Mr Sainekar (NIO) reported that the Director of NIO had offered to host the 2009 ASFA Board Meeting.

The ASFA board thanked NIO and agreed that the 2009 ASFA Board Meeting would be held at NIO, Goa, India. The exact dates would be confirmed by NIO and circulated to all ASFA Partners via ASFA Board-L.

[**Rapporteur's note:** FAO ASFA Secretariat communicated the exact dates of the Meeting (7-11 September 2009) by E-mail to all Partners on 15 January 2009]

17. REVIEW/APPROVAL OF DRAFT REPORT OF MEETING

The Board reviewed and approved the Draft of the "Items and Actions Agreed" during the Meeting. See **Annex-64**.

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

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

AGENDA
ASFA Advisory Board Meeting
IMR, Bergen, Norway, 1-5 September 2008

- 1. OPENING OF THE MEETING**
- 2. ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS**
- 3. ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSONS AND RAPORTEURS**
- 4. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**
- 5. ADOPTION OF THE SUMMARY REPORT OF THE 2007 MEETING**
 - 5.1 Matters Arising (from 2007 Meeting)
- 6. STATUS OF ASFA PARTNERSHIP**
 - 6.1 Report on the Inter-sessional Activities of ASFA Partners
 - 6.1.1 United Nations Co-sponsors (FAO, UN, IOC, UNEP)
 - 6.1.2 ASFA Partners
 - 6.1.3 ASFA Publisher (ProQuest)
 - 6.1.4 Report of 2007 Meeting of ASFA African Partners
 - 6.2 New and Potential ASFA Partners and Partners risking removal
 - 6.2.1 Admission of new partners
 - 6.2.2 Potential partners
 - 6.2.3 Strategy for future expansion of ASFA Partnership
 - 6.2.4 Partners dropping out of ASFA
 - 6.2.5 Partners removed from the system (including new criteria for removal)
 - 6.2.6 Partners in danger of being removed
 - 6.3 ASFA Partnership Agreement
 - 6.4 ASFA Publishing Agreement between FAO and ProQuest
 - 6.5 ASFA Co-operation with other Groups/Initiatives/System/Meetings outside or related to ASFA
- 7. ASFA SCOPE, COVERAGE, MONITORING and TIMELINESS**
 - 7.1 Subject Scope (includes all literature dealing with the aquatic environment)
 - 7.2 Coverage (extent, or completeness, to which documents falling under the ASFA subject scope are being monitored by Partners in terms of: geographic, language, time span, document type, and media coverage)
 - 7.3 Monitoring (the systematic scanning and input of the literature relevant to the subject scope of ASFA which is published in Partner's own country, e.g. serials, monographs, & other docs.)
 - 7.4 Timeliness... (the time period between when a document is published and its reference appears in ASFA)
 - 7.5 ASFA Input procedures
 - 7.6 ASFA input (i.e. records produced)
 - 7.7 ASFA Theme Paper
- 8. ASFA PRODUCTS AND SERVICES**
 - 8.1 ASFA journals (includes discussion on: accuracy of records, timely receipt of updates, presentation etc.)
 - 8.2 CD-ROM (includes discussion on: accuracy of records, timely receipt of updates, presentation etc.)
 - 8.3 Internet Service (includes discussion on: accuracy of records, timeliness, presentation, features etc.)

- 8.4 Document Delivery
- 8.5 New Outputs and Services (by ProQuest)
- 8.6 Public Relations Activities, Marketing (by ProQuest and Partners)
- 8.7 Entitlements (Partner entitlements to ASFA products and services)
- 8.8 Increasing Distribution of ASFA Information Products and Services

9. PROGRESS WITH MACHINE READABLE INPUT

- 9.1 www-ASFA-ISIS

10. REPORT ON ASFA TRAINING ACTIVITIES

11. STATUS OF ASFIS REFERENCE SERIES PUBLICATIONS

12. EXPANDED LANGUAGE CAPABILITY IN ASFA

13. ASFA TRUST FUND

- 13.1 Status of the Trust Fund
- 13.2 Proposals completed in progress, or pending further discussion
- 13.3 New Proposals

14. OTHER BUSINESS

15. PLACE AND DATE OF NEXT MEETING

16. SPECIAL TOPICS, DEMONSTRATIONS, WORKSHOP DAY (see Draft Agenda)

17. REVIEW/APPROVAL OF DRAFT REPORT OF MEETING

.....

AGENDA for 4th day of Meeting
(SPECIAL TOPICS, DEMONSTRATIONS, WORKSHOPS)

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

- 1.1 Update on Aquatic commons project and related practical issues (H. Wibley, R. Pepe, FAO)
- 1.2 Demonstration of the digitizing of documents for repositories (by K. Seteraas, IMR)

2. Comments on ASFA Input (records) (persistent problems encountered in Partners input and advice) (by FAO (H. Wibley) and ProQuest (V. Soto))

3. ProQuest tips on searching/using the ASFA database via the Illumina Internet web interface (by V. Soto, ProQuest)

4. Demonstration of Illustrata (by H. Lauridsen, ProQuest)

5. Demonstration of WEBLIS (by H. Rybinski, ICIE)

6. Sampling Literature - repeatability of searches (by H. Folkestad, University of Bergen Library)

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

UN CO-SPONSORING ASFA PARTNERS

FAO

Mr Richard Grainger

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)

Fisheries and Aquaculture Information and Statistics Service (FIES)

Fisheries and Aquaculture Department

Viale delle Terme di Caracalla

00153, Rome, Italy

Tel: (39) 06 570 54828 / Fax: (39) 06 570 52476

E-mail: richard.grainger@fao.org / URL: <http://www.fao.org/fi>

Mr Richard Pepe

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)

Fisheries and Aquaculture Information and Statistics Service (FIES)

Fisheries and Aquaculture Department

Viale delle Terme di Caracalla

00153, Rome, Italy

Tel: (39) 06 570 56380 / Fax: (39) 06 570 52476

E-mail: richard.pepe@fao.org / URL: <http://www.fao.org/fi>

Ms Helen Wibley

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)

Fisheries and Aquaculture Information and Statistics Service (FIES)

Fisheries and Aquaculture Department

Viale delle Terme di Caracalla

00153, Rome, Italy

Tel: (39) 06 570 56331 Fax: (39) 06 570 52476

E-mail: helen.wibley@fao.org / URL: <http://www.fao.org/fi>

INTERNATIONAL ASFA PARTNERS

ICES

Ms Solveig Lund

International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES)

H. C. Andersens Boulevard 44-46

1553 Copenhagen V, Denmark

Tel. (+45)33 38 67 00/(40 direct) / Fax: (+45) 33 93 42 15

E-mail: solveiq@ices.dk / info@ices.dk

URL: <http://www.ices.dk>

NAFO

Mr Anthony Thompson

Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO)

P.O. Box 638

Dartmouth, Nova Scotia

Canada B2Y 3Y9

Tel: (+1-902) 468 7542 / Fax: (+1-902) 468 5538

Email: athompson@nafo.int

URL: <http://www.nafo.int>

NATIONAL ASFA PARTNERS

ARGENTINA

Ms Guillermina Cosulich

Instituto Nacional de Investigación y Desarrollo Pesquero (INIDEP)

Biblioteca y Servicio de Documentación

Casilla de Correo 175

7600 Mar del Plata, Argentina

Tel: +54 (23) 86 0963 / 2404 / Fax: +54 (23) 86 1830 / 1831

E-mail: biblio@inidep.edu.ar

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

BELGIUM

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

BRAZIL

Ms Thais Corbisier
Universidade de São Paulo
Instituto Oceanografico (IO/USP)
Praça do Oceanografico, 191
Cidade Universitaria-Butanta
CEP 05508-900
São Paulo, SP, Brazil
E-mail: asfa-br@io.usp.br
URL: <http://www.io.usp.br>

CHINA

Mr Luo Xuye / Mr Yang Ying
National Marine Data and Information Service (NMDIS)
State Oceanic Administration of China (SOA)
93 Liuwei Road, Hedong District
Tianjin 300171, People's Republic of China
Tel. (86) (22) 2401 0827 / Fax: (86) (22) 2401 0926
E-mail: lx@nmdis.gov.cn / yangy@nmdis.gov.cn / asfa@mail.nmdis.gov.cn
URL: <http://www.coi.gov.cn>

CUBA

Mr Rafael Tizol
Centro de Investigaciones Pesqueras (CIP)
Ministerio de la Industria Pesquera (MIP)
5TA, Avenida y 246 Barlovento, Santa Fe'
Ciudad de la Habana, Cuba
E-mail: : tizol@cip.telemar.cu / asfa@cip.telemar.cu
URL: <http://www1.cubamar.cu/cip/cip.htm>

EGYPT

Mr Ahmed El Nemr
Ministry of Scientific Research
National Institute of Oceanography and Fisheries (NIOF)
Kayet bey, Alexandria, Egypt
Tel: 20 -3- 4801553
E-mail: ahmedmoustafaelnemr@yahoo.com
URL: <http://www.niof.sci.eg/>

FRANCE

Ms Jacqueline Prod'homme
Institut français de recherche pour l'exploitation de la mer (IFREMER)
Bibliothèque La Pérouse/Centre de documentation sur la mer
15 rue Dumont d'Urville
B.P. 70
29280 Plouzane, France
Tel: +33 2 98 49 8871 / Fax: +33 2 98 498884
E-mail: jprodhom@ifremer.fr / jacqueline.prodhomme@ifremer.fr
URL: <http://www.ifremer.fr> / <http://www.ifremer.fr/blp>

GERMANY

Mr Walther Kühnhold / Mr Matthias Ruetze
Scientific Information Centre
Johann Heinrich von Thünen Institute
Federal Research Institute for Rural Areas, Forestry and Fisheries
Leuschnerstr. 91
21031 Hamburg, Germany
Tel: +49 40 73962-247 / Fax: +49 40 73962-299
E-mail: matthias.ruetze@vti.bund.de
URL: <http://www.vti.bund.de>

GREECE

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

INDIA

Mr Gajanan H. Sainekar
National Institute of Oceanography (NIO) (CSIR)
National Information Centre for Marine Sciences (NICMAS)
Library CSIR
Dona Paula, 403 004, Goa, India
Tel: +91 (0)832 2450 450/370 / Fax: +91 (0)832 2450 602/603
E-mail: saine@nio.org
URL: <http://www.nio.org>

JAPAN

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

KENYA

Mr James Macharia
Kenya Marine and Fisheries Research Institute (KMFRI)
ODINAFRICA
P.O. Box 81651
Mombasa, Kenya
Tel: 254 41 471129 / 254 41 475151-4 / Fax: 254 41 475157
E-mail: jmacharia@kmfri.co.ke / jmacharia@gmail.com
URL: <http://www.kmfri.co.ke>

KOREA, REPUBLIC OF

Mr Jong-Yup HAN
Korea Ocean Research and Development Institute (KORDI)
Library and Information Section
Ansan P.O. Box 29
Seoul 425-600, Rep. of Korea
Tel. (+82-31) 400-6465 / Fax: (+82-31) 409-0325
E-mail: jyhan@kordi.re.kr
URL: <http://www.kordi.re.kr> / <http://library.kordi.re.kr>

LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

Mr Kaviphone Phouthavongs
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
Living Aquatic Resources Research Center (LARReC)
Data and Information Unit
P.O.Box: 9108, Vientiane, Lao People's Democratic Republic
Tel: (856-21) 215 015 / Fax: (856-21) 214 855
E-mail: kaviphone@mrcmekong.org / Larrec.info@gmail.com larrec@gmail.com
URL: <http://www.mekonginfo.org/partners/larrec/index.htm>

MEXICO

Mr Marco Montes
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM)
Edificio Anexo de la Dirección General de Bibliotecas (DGB)
Subdirección de Servicios Especializados
Departamento de Bibliografía Latinoamericana
Apartado Postal 70-392
México, D.F., 04510, México
Tel. (52) 55 5622-3958 / 5622-3959 / Fax: (52) 55 5616 1436 / (52) 55 5622 4001
E-mail: marco@dgb.unam.mx / URL:dgb.unam.mx

MOROCCO

Ms Bouchra Bazi
Institut National de Recherche Halieutique (INRH)
Address: N 2, Rue de Tiznit
Casablanca 01, Maroc
Tel. 212 2 20 08 49 / 212 2 26.81.92 / Fax: 212 2 26.69.67
E-mail: bouchra_79@hotmail.com / inrh@inrh.org.ma
URL: www.inrh.org.ma

NORWAY

Ms Brit Skotheim / Ms Wenche Vadset / Mr Kristian Seteras
Institute of Marine Research (IMR)
Nordnesgaten 50
5817 Bergen, Norway
Tel: 0047 55236885
E-mail: brit.skotheim@imr.no / wencke.vadset@imr.no / kristian.seteras@imr.no
URL: <http://biblioteket.imr.no>

POLAND

Ms Iwona Fey
Sea Fisheries Research Institute (SFI)
Kollataja Street 1
81-332 Gdynia, Poland
Tel. +48 58 73 56 278 (Library) / Fax: +48 58 73 56 110
E-mail: ifey@mir.gdynia.pl / asfa@mir.gdynia.pl / infolib@mir.gdynia.pl
URL: <http://www.mir.gdynia.pl>

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

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

UKRAINE

Ms Ekaterina Kulakova
Southern Scientific Research Institute of Marine Fisheries and Oceanography (YugNIRO)
World Ocean Fishery Resources Department
2 Sverdlov Street 98300
Kerch, Crimea, Ukraine
Tel. (380) (6561) 21065 / 380 (6561) 21012 / Fax: (380) (6561) 61627
E-mail: katia_faust@mail.ru / island@crimea.com / fish@kerch.com.ua

UNITED KINGDOM

Ms Linda Noble
Marine Biological Association
National Marine Biological Library
Library and Information Services
Citadel Hill
Plymouth PL1 2PB, United Kingdom
Tel: (44) (1752) 633 266 / Fax: (44) (1752) 633 102
E-mail: LNO@MBA.AC.UK
URL: <http://www.mba.ac.uk/nmbi>

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

URUGUAY

Ms. Andrea Cristiani
Universidad de la Republica, Fac. Vet.
Instituto de Investigaciones Pesqueras
1160 Tomas Basañez St.
11300, Montevideo, Uruguay
Tel. (598 2) 622 14 96 / Fax: (598 2) 628 0121
E-mail: acris@adinet.com.uy / acris@fvet.edu.uy
URL: <http://www.pes.fvet.edu.uy>

USA

Mr Neal Kaske
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)
Library and Information Services Division
NOAA Central Library (SSMC3, 2nd floor)
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910, USA
Tel: 301 713 2600 x131 / Fax: 301 713 4599
E-mail: Neal.Kaske@NOAA.gov
URL: <http://www.lib.noaa.gov>

PUBLISHING ASFA PARTNER

PROQUEST

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

OBSERVERS

NORWAY

Ms Hege Folkestad
University of Bergen Library
Science Library
P.O. Box 7808
N-5020 Bergen
Norway
Tel: +47 55 58 48 03
hege.folkestad@ub.uib.no

POLAND

Mr Henryk Rybinski
Institute for Computer and Information Engineering (ICIE)
ul. Mazowiecka 14,
Warsaw, Poland
E-mail h.rybinski@gmail.com

PROQUEST

Ms Helle Lauridsen
ProQuest
7200 Wisconsin Ave.
Bethesda, Maryland 20814, USA
Tel: 1-800-843-7751 / Fax: 1-301 961 6740
E-mail: Helle.Lauridsen@proquest.com

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- ADRIAMED** - Scientific Cooperation to Support Responsible Fisheries in the Adriatic Sea (Italy)
- ASFA** - Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Abstracts
- ASFIS** - Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Information System
- ASFISIS** - Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Integrated Set of Information Systems (Micro CDS/ISIS package for preparing ASFA input and for retrieval)
- BF** - Informations- und Dokumentstionsstelle, Bundesforschungsanstalt für Fischerei (Germany)
- CIP** - Centro di Investigaciones Pesqueras (Cuba)
- CNSHB** - Centre National des Sciences Halieutiques de Boussoura (Guinea)
- CRO** - Centre de recherches océanologiques (Côte d'Ivoire)
- CSA** - Cambridge Scientific Abstracts (ASFA Publisher)
- CSIR** - Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (Ghana)
- CSIRO** - Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization (Australia)
- DGB** - Dirección General de Bibliotecas (Mexico), part of CICH
- DPM** - Direction de pêches maritimes (Senegal)
- DFO** - Department of Fisheries and Oceans (Canada)
- EMI** - Estonian Marine Institute
- FAO** - Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (Italy)
- FBA** - Freshwater Biological Association (UK)
- FiCen** - Fisheries Information Center (Viet Nam)
- FIES** - Fishery and Aquaculture Information and Statistics Service, FAO
- FIGIS** - Fisheries Global Information System, FAO
- FRA** - Fisheries Resource Agency (Japan)
- FTP** - File Transfer Protocol
- GAL** - Geographic Authority List
- GIS** - Geographic Information System
- HTML** - Hypertext Markup Language
- IAMSLIC** - International Association of Aquatic and Marine Science Libraries and Information Centers
- ICCAT** - International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (Spain)
- ICES** - International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (Denmark)
- ICIE** - Institute for Computer Information and Engineering (Poland)
- IDS** - Internet Database Service
- IEO** - Instituto Español de Oceanografía (Spain)
- IFOP** - Instituto de Fomento Pesquero (Chile)
- IFREMER** - Institut français de recherche pour l'exploitation de la mer (France)
- IFRO** - Iranian Fisheries Research Organization
- IIP** - Instituto de Investigaciones Pesqueras (Uruguay)
- IMARPE** - Instituto del Mar del Perú

IMR - Institute of Marine Research (Norway)
IMR - Institute of Marine Research (Sweden)
IMROP - Institut Mauritanien de Recherches Océanographiques et des pêches (Mauritania)
IMS - Institute of Marine Sciences (Tanzania)
INAHINA - Instituto Nacional de Hidrografia e Navegacao (Mozambique)
INIDEP - Instituto Nacional de Investigación y Desarrollo Pesquero (Argentina)
INP - Instituto Nacional de Pesca (Ecuador)
INRH - Institut national de recherche halieutique (Morocco)
INSTM - Institut national des sciences et technologies de la mer (Tunisia)
IOC - Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (Unesco)
IOTC - Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (Seychelles)
IPIMAR - Instituto Portugues de Investigação Maritima (Portugal)
IUCN - The World Conservation Union (Switzerland)
JFRCA - Japan Fisheries Resource Conservation Association
KMFRI - Kenya Marine and Fisheries Research Institute
KORDI - Korea Ocean Research and Development Institute
LARReC - Living Aquatic Resources Research Center (Lao People's Democratic Republic)
LIFDC - Low Income Food Deficit Countries
MEI - Estonian Marine Institute
MI - Marine Institute (Eire)
MRI - Marine Research Institute (Iceland)
NACA - Network of Aquaculture Centres in Asia-Pacific (Thailand)
NaFIRRI - National Fisheries Resources Research Institute (Uganda)
NAFO - Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (Canada)
NCMR - National Centre for Marine Research (Greece)
NICMAS - National Information Centre for Marine Sciences (India)
NIFFR - National Institute for Freshwater Fisheries Research (Nigeria)
NIO - National Institute of Oceanography (India)
NIOF - National Institute of Oceanography and Fisheries (Egypt)
NISC - National Information Services Centre (South Africa)
NMBL - National Marine Biological Library (UK)
NMDIS - National Marine Data and Information Service, State Oceanic Administration (People's Republic of China)
NOAA - National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (USA)
NRC - National Research Council (Canada)
OAI - Open Archive Initiative
ODINAFRICA - Ocean Data and Information Network in Africa
ODINCARSA - Ocean Data and Information Network in Caribbean and South America
PIMRIS - Pacific Islands Marine Resources Information System (Fiji)
PINRO - Polar Research Institute of Fisheries and Oceanography (Russia)
PMBC - Phuket Marine Biological Centre (Thailand)

SFI - Sea Fisheries Institute (Poland)

SIBM - Società Italiana di Biologia Marina (Italy)

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

SPC - South Pacific Commission (New Caledonia)

UNAM - Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México

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

UNEP - United Nations Environment Programme

URI - Uniform Resource Identifier

URL - Uniform Resource Locator

USP – Universidade de São Paulo (Brazil)

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

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

WRI - Water Research Institute (Ghana)

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

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

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

ASFA TRUST FUND STATUS (as of July 2008)

CONTENTS

PART 1: Record of Deposits and Balance

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

PART 2: Trust Fund Project Proposals

2.1 Projects IN PROGRESS

- 2.1.1 Financial support to attend (THIS) 2008 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (IMR, Norway, 2008)
- 2.1.2 Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year Jan -Dec 2008)
- 2.1.3 Further development of www-ISIS-ASFA software as regards interoperability, additional URL fields, and updating picklists
- 2.1.4 (Russia-VNIRO) – Inputs of Barents and Norwegian Seas Literature
- 2.1.5 (VLIZ, Belgium) - Collect, sort out, and prepare approximately 15,000 complete bibliographic references dealing with aquatic environment (from North Sea, in particular the Southern Bight area)
- 2.1.6 Utilization of the ASFA Trust Fund to pay the IAMSLIC Membership fees for ASFA Partners
- 2.1.7 (NIGERIA – NIFFR) ASFA Trust Fund proposal filling the missing gap
- 2.1.8 Initiative to support the “Digitization” of grey literature & advice as to what should be digitized

2.2 Projects COMPLETED (in Intersessional period 2007- 2008)

- 2.2.1 Supply of scanners (for ASFA related use) to those ASFA Partner Institutes which lack the funding to buy equipment
- 2.2.2 Financial support to attend the 2007 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (KMFRI, Kenya, 2007)
- 2.2.3 Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year Jan -Dec 2007)
- 2.2.4 (Russia-VNIRO) Input of Caspian Literature II
- 2.2.5 (Kenya-KMFRI) Elimination of Gaps
- 2.2.6 To strengthen ASFA Partner in Kenya (KMFRI) in order to provide ASFA training support for other ASFA Partners in Africa and so as to assist FAO ASFA Secretariat (provision of computer equipment)

2.3 Projects PENDING (further discussion and/or action)

- 2.3.1 (KMFRI) Elimination of Gaps Phase II (*requires further information from KMFRI and final approval Board*)
- 2.3.2 (FAO) MINI ASFA MEETING (REGIONAL) (*postponed*)
- 2.3.3 (FAO) www-ISIS-ASFA –towards Release-2 (*postponed*)
- 2.3.4 (PDII-LIPI- Indonesia) - ASFA Trust Fund Proposal relating to ASFA input preparation and training
- 2.3.5 ASFA Training Session (*postponed*)
- 2.3.6 (YugNIRO- Ukraine) Translation of ASFA Thesaurus into Russian and development of Russian-English Thesaurus (*postponed*)
- 2.3.7 (YugNIRO- Ukraine) Translation of www-ISIS-ASFA “Help Notes” and front end into Russian(*postponed*)
- 2.3.8 (YugNIRO- Ukraine) Translation of www-ISIS-ASFA Guidelines into Russian (*postponed*)

2.4 NEW PROJECT PROPOSALS AND ONGOING UP FOR RE-APPROVAL 2008-2009

- (ASFA/2008/71) 2.4.1 Financial support to attend the ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (for year 2009)
- 2.4.2 (FAO) - Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year Jan -Dec 2009) (*\$60 000*) **already approved**
- (ASFA/2008/77) 2.4.5 (FAO) - Identifying and Listing the grey literature in your country not in ASFA (ASFA/2008/77)

PART 3: Summary List of ALL Proposals

PART 1: RECORD OF DEPOSITS AND BALANCE

1.1 YEARLY DEPOSITS MADE INTO TRUST FUND

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

** (there are no Trust Fund payments for 2003-2008 from BF, because BF no longer makes the ASFA database available commercially to external users).

1.2 BALANCE

• ALL Funds deposited in Trust Fund to date (sum of entries in section 1.1 above)	(+) \$2 029 836.	(\$1 775 243) (last year)
• COMMITTED funds (sum of all committed funds listed under Part 3)	(-) \$1 223 064.	(\$1 026 370) (last year)
• Funds returned to balance unspent (see items 51, 51a and 83 in Part 3)..... (note: Not all unspent funds are returned to balance. In the case of ongoing proposals, that are renewed each year such as: "Financial support to Attend Board Meeting" and "Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat", the funds are carried over to the next year's allotment. In other cases, the funds have been spent on similar or follow-up activities to the original proposal)	(+) \$ 47 135.	
• Overspent (see item 46 and 80 in Part 3)	(-) \$2 490.	
BALANCE	(+) US\$ 851 417.	(\$794 118) (last year)

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

This section describes briefly “What is the ASFA Trust Fund?”

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

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

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

WHAT IS AN ASFA TRUST FUND PROJECT PROPOSAL?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

PART 2: TRUST FUND PROJECT PROPOSALS

PART-2:

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

2.1 Projects IN PROGRESS

(in progress) 2.1.1 Financial support to attend (THIS) 2008 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (IMR, Norway, 2008)

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

At this writing, the following 15 ASFA Partners will receive full or partial assistance to attend this year's ASFA Board Meeting: CIP, IIP, INIDEP, INRH, KMFRI, KORDI, NIFFR, NIO/NICMAS, NIOF, NMDIS, SFI, YugNIRO, UNAM, USP, VNIRO*.

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

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

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

This is an ongoing proposal - so EACH year it requires "updating" with regard to the cost for the next year's (2009) allocation. The "Updating" of this proposal for the 2009 Meeting is presented as ASFA/2008/71 and is mentioned under the "New Proposals" section 2.4.1 below. It will be discussed under Agenda item 13.3.)

(in progress) 2.1.2 Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year Jan -Dec 2008) (\$60 000)*

This proposal remains classified as "in progress" until the end of 2008.

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

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

To date for the period January - July 2008, **\$57 421** has been spent/committed. See Part-3, item-4 for a list of how the FAO Secretariat utilized the funds.

Under or over spending will be brought forward and calculated against the 2009 allotment.

This is an ongoing proposal which the Board suggested be reconfirmed each year. HOWEVER, the reconfirmation of this proposal for 2009 is NOT necessary, because at the last Board Meeting the Board also agreed to the 2009 allocation (i.e. also \$60 000).

(in progress) 2.1.3 Further development of www-ISIS-ASFA software as regards interoperability, additional URL fields, and updating picklists)

The need to increase the interoperability of the www-ISIS-ASFA 1.1 software was raised at the 2007 Meeting (see sections 6.6, 9.1 of 2007 Report) and the FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to organize a meeting between the ASFA computer programmer (H. Rybinski), the ASFA Partner in Belgium (J. Haspeslagh), and the person responsible for the Unesco/IOC Oceandocs repository (M. Goovaerts) to discuss the interoperability of ASFA records between the various systems (i.e. ASFA, local library systems, repositories etc.) with the outcomes of these talks to be one or more contracts to be drawn up by the FAO ASFA Secretariat to carry out the necessary work to facilitate this interoperability.

The proposal resulting from the above meeting was presented during the 2007-2008 intersessional period to the Board via the ASFA-Board-L listserv (18 April 2008) and **it was approved**. See **ASFA/2008/ 82** for details of the proposal.

The original cost of this project was Euro **11 975.00**, however the actual cost was raised an additional Euro 1 578 Euro (with the addition of 3 additional tasks) to a total cost of Euro **13 553.00**. A Letter of Agreement (LOA) between FAO and ICIE (H. Rybinski) has been drawn up as the means for carrying out the work.

(in progress) **2.1.4 (Russia–VNIRO) – Inputs of Barents and Norwegian Seas Literature (US3960)**

This proposal (see 2006 Report, Annex 35a and section 13.3.8) was agreed by the Board in 2006. It was originally envisaged that the ASFA Collaborating Center PINRO would be carrying out the project proposal, but instead VNIRO has now took over the work for this project. The contract between FAO and VNIRO to carry out this work was finalized in May 2008 and VNIRO send the first batch of records for this project in June 2008.

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

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

(in progress) **2.1.6 Utilization of the ASFA Trust Fund to pay the IAMSLIC Membership fees for ASFA Partners**

See ASFA/2008/79 for a more detailed status report of this project.

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

The cost to the ASFA Trust Fund of "extending" this project for the present 2 year period (mid 2007 to mid 2009) was estimated at \$840. During this intersessional period, **\$295*** of the \$840 was spent to pay for 7 new or expired IAMSLIC membership fees (see table in **ASFA/2008/79**). Before the end of 2008 a further 12 Partners will need their membership fees renewed for a cost of **\$480*** bringing the total spending to (**\$790**)* which is close to the originally estimated \$840 for this 2 year period.

* (7 membership fees (\$20/each) for 2 years (Feb. 2008 to Feb. 2010) = $7 \times \$20 \times 2 = \280 (plus the \$15 wire charges) corresponds to a sub-TOTAL of **\$295** (two hundred and ninety-five dollars), and (12 membership fees (\$20/each) for 2 years (Jan. 2009 to Dec. 2010) = $12 \times \$20 \times 2 = \480 (plus the \$15 wire charges) corresponds to a sub-TOTAL of **\$495 and a Grand total of \$790**. Cost of Iamslic membership fee can verified on the IAMSLIC homepage <http://www.iamslic.org/index.php?section=3>.

To date (from 2004), this initiative has cost the ASFA Trust Fund a total of \$1 355

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

(in progress) **2.1.7 (NIGERIA – NIFFR) ASFA Trust Fund proposal filling the missing gap (\$8 060)**

At the writing of this Report, the contract (Letter of Agreement) between FAO and NIFFR to carry out this work is in the process of finalization for signature and should be “in progress” by the time of the Board Meeting. The proposal to fill some of the missing gaps in the ASFA Database for Nigerian literature was agreed, in principle, at the 2006 ASFA Board Meeting (see 2006 Report, section 13.3.7 and Annex 32a) and given final approval at the 2007 ASFA Board Meeting (see 2007 Report, section 13.2.16). The proposal will involve the preparation of about 700 records.

(in progress) **2.1.8 Initiative to support the digitization of grey literature and advice as to what should be digitized (proposal put forward by IAMSLIC) \$28 000**

Background

At the 2007 Board Meeting, see section 13.3.4 of 2007 Report, the Board agree to remove its ban on the considering, for ASFA Trust Fund financing, project proposals coming from outside the ASFA Partnership (i.e. only as regards project proposals coming from the IAMSILIC Executive Board for a trial period of 2 years and up to a one time total of \$28 000). The above mentioned project proposal on digitization was tabled at the 2007 Meeting by the FAO ASFA Secretariat on behalf of IAMSILIC for discussion and approval. The Board approved the proposal, in principle (see section 13.3.5 of 2007 Report), however it's final approval or the "putting into action" of this proposal was to await a clearer indication from IAMSILIC on the following 3 issues: 1) actual materials to be digitized, 2) who will be digitizing and 3) insurance that the records being digitized would also be entered in ASFA.

Since the last Board meeting, the above issues were clarified by R. Pepe (FAO), who met at the last IAMSILIC Meeting with some key IAMSILIC members (i.e. present and incoming Presidents of IAMSILIC and the Chair of the Aquatic Commons Implementation taskforce). Therefore, the project proposal should now be considered as finally approved. It was agreed between R. Pepe and the above mentioned IAMSILIC officers that: the digitization of material for inclusion in the Aquatic Commons repository was of primary importance to IAMSILIC, and therefore, instead of the \$10,000 mentioned in the original IAMSILIC Trust Fund digitization proposal, the entire \$28 000 allocated by the ASFA Board to IAMSILIC for the 2 year trial period should go towards the digitization. The ASFA Partners can suggest specific titles to be digitized and can do the digitization of the items as well. A newly created IAMSILIC "Digital Collection Development" taskforce within the Aquatic Commons Board will also identify collection development priorities for the repository, and these recommendations will point to many other documents. It was agreed that the FAO ASFA Secretariat would implement (disburse) this \$28 000 project through its offices by contacting the ASFA Partners and soliciting their specific nominations of materials to scan etc.. The FAO ASFA Secretariat would also identify which ASFA Partners are willing/wanting to do the scanning and work out/negotiate with the ASFA partner(s) a "contract" to do the work, and a procedure to follow.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat has contacted the ASFA Partners on numerous occasions requesting suggestions for digitization with reference to the above project. In addition, some ASFA Partners have been supplied with scanners (although not specifically to serve this project). There has not yet been any positive response from Partners. THEREFORE, at this meeting the FAO ASFA Secretariat will put forth an ASFA Trust Fund Project proposal whereby ASFA Partners (who want to participate) will be paid a sum to identify and list the grey literature in their institute/country that they could enter into ASFA including digitization. Such a list could include grey literature already with records in ASFA, but not yet digitized. See **ASFA/2008/77**.

2.2 Projects COMPLETED (during Intersessional period 2007- 2008)

(completed) 2.2.1 Supply of scanners (for ASFA related use) to those ASFA Partner Institutes which lack the funding to buy equipment

This proposal was presented to the Board via ASFA-Board-L listserv (29 January 2008) and approved during the 2007-2008 intersessional period (see **ASFA/2008/81** for details).

The estimated cost of this project was **\$7 270.00**, however the actual cost will be less (approx. **\$6107.00**)

The following ASFA Partners received scanners and scanning software:

ASFA PARTNER receiving scanner	COST of SCANNER	COST of SOFTWARE	NOTES (equipment/software received)
1. Instituto de Investigaciones Pesqueras, Uruguay	\$410	\$211	HP Scanjet 5590 and Adobe Acrobat Standard v8 for Windows
2. National Institute for Freshwater Fisheries Research (NIFFR), Nigeria	\$596	\$211	HP Scanjet 5590 and Adobe Acrobat Standard v8 for Windows
3. National Fisheries Resources Research Institute (NaFIRRI), Uganda	\$533	\$211	Adobe Acrobat Standard v8 for Windows
4. Russian Federal Research Institute of Fisheries and Oceanography (VNIRO), Russia	\$345	\$211	PENDING action by UNDP office in country Cost Plusstek Optic Book 3600 Scanner and Adobe Acrobat Standard v8 for Windows
5. Southern Scientific Research Institute of Marine Fisheries and Oceanography (YugNIRO), Ukraine	\$350	\$211	PENDING action by UNDP office in country Epson Perfection V500 and Adobe Acrobat Standard v8 for Windows
6. Ministry of Scientific Research National Institute of Oceanography and Fisheries (NIOF), Egypt	\$452	\$211	HP Scanjet 5590 and Adobe Acrobat Standard v8 for Windows
7. Palma Instituto de Fomento Pesquero (IFOP), Chile	\$464	\$211	HP Scanjet 5590 and Adobe Acrobat Standard v8 for Windows

8. Ministry of Fisheries of Viet Nam Fisheries Informatics Centre (FICen), VietNam	\$483	\$211	HP Scanjet 5590 and Adobe Acrobat Standard v8 for Windows
9. Ms Institut National des Sciences et Technologies de la Mer (INSTM), Tunisia	\$575	\$211	HP Scanjet 5590 and Adobe Acrobat Standard v8 for Windows
TOTAL COST	\$4208.00	\$1899.00	PENDING items 4 and 5 above
Note regarding cost of <i>Adobe Acrobat Standard v8 per Windows</i> : License for Adobe Acrobat Standard v8 per Windows, English Euro 130,00 cad. I.V.A. excluded. Installation CD for Acrobat Std v8 Win, English Euro 35,00 cad. I.V.A. excluded. Total: 165Euro = \$211 (exchange rate 3 April 2008)			

(completed) **2.2.2 Financial support to attend 2007 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (KMFRI, Kenya, 2007)**

The sum of \$40,000 was allocated at the 2006 Meeting to support attendance at the 2007 Board Meeting in Kenya. The allocated sum minus the \$2 252 overspent from the previous year's allocation brought the total available sum to \$37 748.

The final total amount disbursed was \$25 064. The unspent \$12 684 was added to the 2008 Meeting allocation.

The following ASFA Partners received full or partial assistance to attend the 2007 ASFA Board Meeting: DPM, IMROP, IMS, INAHINA, INIDEP, NIFFR, NIO/NICMAS, NMDIS, VNIRO.

(completed) **2.2.3 Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year Jan -Dec 2007) (\$50 000)***

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

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

For the period January – December 2007, **\$72 422** was spent. See Part-3, item-13 for a list of how the FAO Secretariat utilized the funds.

The overspent US\$7 836 was deducted from the 2008 allotment.

(completed) **2.2.4 (Russia-VNIRO) Input of Caspian Literature II \$10 270**

This proposal was agreed by the Board at the 2005 ASFA Board Meeting (see section 13.3.6 and Annex-32a of the 2005 ASFA Board Meeting Report). The project was completed by VNIRO in March 2008. A total of 702 records were added to the ASFA Database.

(completed) **2.2.5 (Kenya-KMFRI) Elimination of Gaps \$18 200**

This proposal was agreed by the Board at the 2005 ASFA Board Meeting (see section 13.3.5 and Annex-26a of the 2005 ASFA Board Meeting Report). The project was completed by KMFRI in December 2007. A total of 3910 records were added to the ASFA Database.

(completed) **2.2.6 To strengthen ASFA Partner in Kenya (KMFRI) in order to provide ASFA Training Support for other ASFA Partners in Africa and so as to assist FAO ASFA Secretariat (provision of computer equipment) \$5 000**

This proposal was put forward by FAO and agreed by the Board at the 2007 ASFA Board Meeting (see section 13.3.3). The following equipment was delivered to KMFRI: one desk top computer with monitor, one printer, one scanner, one external hard-disk drive (for back-up purposes).

The total cost of the equipment was estimated at \$5000 (the actual cost will be around \$3 500)

In July 2008, the new ASFA Partners from Uganda and Ghana and the Kenya Collaborating center in Kenya were trained at KMFRI utilizing this equipment.

2.3 Projects PENDING (further discussion and/or action)

(pending) **2.3.1 (KMFRI) Elimination of Gaps - Phase two**

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

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

(postponed) **2.3.2 (FAO) Mini ASFA Meeting (Regional)**

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

During 2007 the time available at FAO and INIDEP (where the Meeting was to be hosted) was not sufficient to organize this Meeting during the intersessional period. Therefore, the Meeting was postponed until further notice. The situation still stands as such. It would appear that this Meeting is not urgent or of priority.

(pending) **2.3.3 (FAO) www-ISIS-ASFA –towards Release-2**

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

At the 2006 Board Meeting, the www-ISIS-ASFA Working Group (comprised of: Mr Emerson and Ms Soto (CSA), Mr Goovaerts (Universiteit Hasselt), Mr Haspesslagh (VLIZ), Mr Jorgens (UN/DOALOS) is now deceased, Ms Lombardi (FAO) retired, Mr Pepe (FAO), Ms Wibley (FAO), Mr Pissierssens (IOC), Ms Prod'homme (IFREMER) and Mr Rybinski (ICIE) met on the evening of 5th day to initiate this development of Release-2. The document "*Some suggested changes to the ASFA input procedures (and consequential changes to www-ISIS-ASFA software and rules contained in the guidelines for bibliographic description and data entry*" (see Annex-54 of 2006 Board Report) was introduced by R. Pepe. This document had been previously circulated to CSA and Mr Rybinski and included their comments. The Working Group examined the initial list of suggested changes contained in the document and the discussions and decisions are recorded in the above mentioned Annex-54 and section 17.5 of the 2006 Meeting Report. The FAO ASFA Secretariat (L.Lombardi, lead) compiled a draft list of changes based both on this meeting and further changes identified by FAO for which Ms Lombardi has consulted with CSA and ICIE on these changes.

Following the above, the next step is for the FAO ASFA Secretariat to draw up a contract with ICIE and have Mr Rybinski (ICIE) come to FAO for more detailed discussions with the FAO Secretariat regarding the changes to be made. **However the contract and further discussions have not yet been carried-out due to lack of staff resources in the FAO ASFA Secretariat and the non-urgency of developing Release-2.**

Furthermore, in the meantime, the FAO ASFA Secretariat has concentrated its efforts on the more urgent follow-up to the request made at the 2007 Meeting for increasing the **interoperability** of the www-ISIS-ASFA 1.1 software (see sections 6.6, 9.1 of 2007 Report) by having developed some export/import programmes for Partners using different systems/repositories. See item 2.1.3 of this document and **ASFA/2008/82**

(pending) **2.3.4 (PDII-LIPI- Indonesia) - ASFA Trust Fund Proposal (\$11 000) relating to ASFA input preparation and training**

Pending Action FAO

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

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

organize an outsourced training.

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

(pending) **2.3.5 ASFA Training Session (\$14 000)**

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

(pending) **2.3.6 (YugNIRO- Ukraine) Translation of ASFA Thesaurus into Russian and development of Russian-English Thesaurus**

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

(pending) **2.3.7 (YugNIRO- Ukraine) Translation of www-ISIS-ASFA "Help Notes" and front end into Russian**

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

(pending) **2.3.8 (YugNIRO- Ukraine) Translation of www-ISIS-ASFA Guidelines into Russian**

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

2.4 NEW PROJECT PROPOSALS AND ONGOING UP FOR RE-APPROVAL 200-2009

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

(NEW) **2.4.1 Financial support to attend the ASFA Advisory Board Meeting** (for year 2009)

This proposal (**ASFA/2008/ 71**) is reviewed each year by the Board to eventually update the amount of allocated funds. At the last two ASFA 2006 and 2007 the sum allocated was \$40 000.

THEREFORE, the renewal of this Trust Fund project proposal for 2009 meeting is for discussion at **US\$40 000..**

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

*** NO PROPOSAL NECESSARY THIS YEAR, BECAUSE APPROVED FOR 2 YEARS AT LAST BOARD MEETING**

This is an ongoing proposal that usually is reviewed and renewed each year by the Board to update the amount of funds allocated to the FAO ASFA Secretariat. However, at the last (2007) Board Meeting the proposal was approved for a two year period (2008 and 2009) at \$60 000 per year. Therefore, there is NO proposal this year in need of review or approval.

A partial listing of the spending and planned spending, to date, is visible in Part - 3 of this paper in the table item - 4

(NEW) **2.4.3 Identifying and Listing Grey Literature published in your country not getting into ASFA**

See ASFA/2008/77, the purpose of this proposal is to identify and to list the grey literature published in the ASFA Partner countries - with the idea of later entering the references to these publications in ASFA, digitizing the documents, and depositing them in a repository. Therefore this project proposal will attempt to establish an inventory of the grey literature to be input into ASFA. In the "listing", could also be included the existing references to grey literature already present in the ASFA database, but without a digitized full-text version of the document deposited in a repository.

The results of this project are ultimately intended to increase the utility of ASFA to users, and to insure the long-term viability of the ASFA database with respect to other information sources.

The Board will be requested to comment on this draft proposal including indication on how to coordinate such a project and as to how much funds should be allocated.

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

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

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

	COMMITTED	DISBURSED	NOTES
1. Development of Export/Conversion programs for www-ISIS-ASFA software (Euro 13 553) (USD 21 195.54) (1 Euro=USD 1.5639, European Central Bank Exchange rate 20 May 2008)	\$21 195.	\$0	LOA In progress of being signed by ICIE (originally Euro 11975, some additional tasks added raised figure to Euro 13 553)
2. Supply of scanners (for ASFA related use) to those ASFA Partner Institutes which lack the funding to buy equipment (9 Scanners \$4 208 + 9 Adobe Acrobat software \$1 899 = \$6 107)	\$7 270	\$6 107	completed except for delivery to 2 of 9 institutes without FAO office in country
sub-total	\$28 465	\$6 107	

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

	COMMITTED	DISBURSED	NOTES
3. Financial Support to attend annual (2008) Board Meeting * [\$ 40 000 was allocated by Board at 2007 Meeting for the 2008 Meeting. However, \$12 684 carry-over from last year plus \$2954 donated by NIFES, Norway makes TOTAL funds available for the 2008 Meeting = \$55 638] (Note, the additional \$15 638 is not shown in the "Committed" column, but is calculated as part of balance available to be spent.)	\$40 000*	\$50 000	Underway. Final sum disbursed not available at this writing. Eventual under/overspending will be balanced against next year's allotment as has been the case in the past
4. Staff Support to FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year 2008) [\$ 60 000 was allocated by Board for 2008, however there was an over-spending of \$7836 from the previous (2007) year's allocation, see item-12] Therefore, the TOTAL funds available for 2008 = \$52 164 * (Note, the \$7 836 overspent funds is not shown in the "Committed" column, but it is/will be calculated as part of total balance to be spent) ** The Spending or committed so far for 2008 has been \$57 421 (\$52 164 - \$57 421 = minus \$5 257 (i.e. \$5 257 overspending which be deducted from the 2009 allotment of \$60 000) - \$18 700 - assistance to FAO ASFA input preparation 2008 - sub-contract to AdriaMed (underway) . The final spent will be much less than budgeted - \$6 800 for ASFA information products to LIFDC countries (underway) - \$2 440 training YugNiro in Ukraine by E. Romanov (completed) - \$5 812 training in Kenya by KMFRI staff of two new ASFA National Partners (Ghana, Uganda) and the Kenya collaborating center plus per-diem for Ghana and Uganda participants to attend AFRIAMSLIC/ASFA Africa group meeting and IOC-Odin meeting that was held back-to-back with training. (completed) - \$1 300 honorarium for KMFRI to carry out above training and feedback for Ghana and Uganda Nationals ASFA Partners (underway) - \$1 597 training of NIOF in Egypt by N. Milone (completed) - \$1 526 training of ICCAT in Spain by M. Montes and H. Wibley (Montes cost covered by ICCAT) (completed) - \$3 423 training of ASFA Partner Guinea, in France, by J. Prod'homme (sum is for Mr Kaba's travel to/perdiem in France, IFREMER) (completed) - \$5 000 (estimate) 1 FAO ASFA Staff member to attend IAMSLIC Meeting Sept. 2008 (to be undertaken) - \$1 019 FAO ASFA Secretariat mission to National Institute of Fisheries in Egypt and recruitment as ASFA National Partner (completed) - \$3 300 hiring of consultant (L. Lombardi) to assist FAO ASFA Secretariat for 20 days (underway) - \$700 conversion Monitoring list by ICIE from master database FAO format to format of www-ISIS-ASFA (completed) - \$1004 for H.Rybinski to attend 2008 ASFA Board Meeting - \$2 800 attendance FAO Secretariat at Online conference (estimate) - \$2 000 Board Report 2007 (print and distribution)	\$60 000*	\$ 57 421**	all items underway, completed, or still to be undertaken

5. To strengthen ASFA Partner in Kenya (KMFRI) in order to provide ASFA Training Support for other ASFA Partners in Africa and so as to assist FAO ASFA Secretariat (provision of computer equipment) \$5 000	\$5 000	\$5000	completed
6. Digitization of Grey Literature from Economically Developing Countries for Inclusion in the IAMS LIC Aquatic Commons Digital Document Repository (including guidance and assistance from the ASFA Board in identifying and contributing the literature to be digitized). Note – This is the first Project proposal approved by the ASFA Board after the Board granted a WAIVER to the policy regarding use of ASFA Trust Fund (i.e. now the IAMS LIC Executive Board is allowed to submit project proposals for a 2 year trial period up to total of \$28 000). This project was originally put forward by IAMS LIC for \$10 000 (of the total \$28 000 allocated to them). But after a Meeting between FAO ASFA Secretariat and members of IAMS LIC Aquatic Commons Board and IAMS LIC President, it was concurred that all \$28 000 of the IAMS LIC allotment could be allocated to this project considering its importance and priority for IAMS LIC.	\$28 000*	\$0	slow to progress
7. Utilization of the ASFA Trust Fund to pay the IAMS LIC Membership fees for ASFA Partners (extension of initiative for a further two years)	\$840	\$790	in progress
8. ASFA Training Session (\$14 000) (ASFA/2007/76)	\$14 000	\$0	not yet carried-out
9. (KMFRI) Trust Fund Proposal Elimination of Gaps - Phase II *Approved in principle. To be revised with respect to the journals, number of records and costs, and circulated via ASFA Board L by KMFRI during the intersessional period	\$21 459 estimated	-	Approved in principle*
sub-total	\$169 299	\$112 207	

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

	<u>COMMITTED</u>	<u>DISBURSED</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
10. Digitizing Grey Literature and helping to identify it for inclusion in IAMS LIC Repository - \$10 000. *(Eventually agreed at 2007 ASFA Board Meeting (for \$28 000) – see above item - 6)	\$ -	\$ -	No quorum* *(Eventually agreed at 2007 ASFA Board Meeting (for \$28 000) – see above item - 6)
sub-total	\$0	\$0	

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

	<u>COMMITTED</u>	<u>DISBURSED</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
11. Financial Support to attend (2007) Board Meeting * [\$ 40 000 allocated by the Board for 2007 Meeting, however there was a MINUS carry-over of \$2 252 from 2006 Meeting to subtract from 2007 allocation Therefore, the TOTAL funds available for the 2007 Meeting = \$37 748] * Note, the minus \$2 252 is not shown in the "Committed" column, but is calculated as part of balance available to be spent. ** US\$25 064 was spent (the under spending of \$12 684 will be added to next year's allotment as has been the case in the past).	\$40 000*	\$25 064**	Completed
12. Staff Support to FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year 2007) * (\$ 50 000 was allocated by Board for 2007, however there was a carry-over of \$14 586 unspent from the previous (2006) year's allocation (see item-19). Therefore, the TOTAL funds available for 2007 = \$64 586 * Note, the \$14 586 carry-over unspent funds is not shown in the "Committed" column, but it is/will be calculated as part of total balance to be spent ** Spending for 2007 (period January - August 2007) was \$72 422 as follows:	\$50 000 *	\$72 422**	all items are completed

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - \$6 020 - assistance to FAO ASFA input preparation 2007 - sub-contract to AdriaMed - \$6 800 for ASFA information products to LIFDC countries - \$7 738 www-ISIS-ASFA training at FAO for new ASFA Partners in Lao and Thailand (sum refers to their travel to Rome & per-diem in Rome) - \$9 865 Training of trainers course M. Montes and J. Macharia at FAO Rome (sum refers to their travel to Rome & per-diem in Rome) - \$350. to use FAO training room/facilities for training courses (\$70/day) - \$ no cost - one FAO staff member invited to participate in UNEP/GPA meeting in China expensed paid by UNEP \$1 594 (while in China for above GPA meeting, one day visit to ASFA Partner in Tianjin and Seoul – R. Pepe) - \$500 www-ISIS-ASFA training of 1 SPC staff member outsourced to R. Oriente (sum refers to her honorarium) - \$718 (while in Kenya for Board Meeting one day visit to ASFA Partner (UNEP) in Nairobi - R.Pepe, travel and per-diem cost) - \$7 000 ASFA Staff member attendance at 2007 IAMSLIC Meeting in US - \$700 conversion Monitoring list by ICIE from master database FAO format to format of www-ISIS-ASFA - \$4 174 funding to attend 2007 ASFA Board meeting for potential new ASFA partners Ghana, Uganda, and 1 day per diem for I. Pettman (thes.) - \$4 142 (\$6 802 = total cost of training of Peru and Ecuador trainees by M.Montes in Ecuador (\$4 142 of total was paid from funds allocated to ASFA Secretariat and \$ 2 660 from funds left over from \$6000 allocated to INP- Ecuador Trust fund project for equipment) - see item directly following this one - \$1382* travel (H. Rybinski) to Unesco/ IOC/IODE project office in Oostende, Belgium, 19 and 20 November for Meeting regarding ASFA Interoperability, follow-up to 2007 Board meeting, Meeting. *(actual cost \$1 800, but \$418 was contributed by VLIZ for work done on its behalf = \$1382) by H. Rybinski) - \$1 609 travel (R. Pepe) to Unesco/ IOC/IODE project office in Oostende, Belgium, 19 and 20 November for Meeting regarding ASFA Interoperability, follow-up to 2007 Board meeting, Meeting. - \$2 830 ASFA Secretariat attendance at Online Information Conference 2007 (R.Pepe) - \$9 000 printing distribution 2 ASFIS Ref Series pubs (Mon list, Bib. Guide) - \$2 000 Board Report 2006 (print and distribution) - \$6 000 print/distrib. www-ISIS-ASFA installation manuals& Board Reports (2004-2006 (should have been calculated under previous year's expenses) <p>Overspending (- \$7836) is deducted from the 2008 allotment.</p>			
<p>13. INP-Ecuador Trust Fund project proposal (Elaboration of the Ecuador database..This was a request for 2 PC's and printers, plus training. Only \$3 340 spent on equipment. Funds remaining used for training of Ecuador & Peru staff by M. Montes. See item-12</p>	\$ 6 000	\$3 340	Completed \$ 3340 spent on equipment. Remaining 2660 for Ecuador & Peru training by M. Montes
<p>14.(FAO) ASFA Trust Fund project proposal Mini-ASFA-Meeting (regional) plus eventual \$5 000 from IOC</p>	\$ 20 000	\$0	postponed
<p>15.(FAO) ASFA Trust Fund project proposal Training of Trainers. \$10 000 for training and \$10 000 for video.</p>	\$20 000	\$ 9 782.00	½ completed (video not yet produced)
<p>16. (NIFFR –Nigeria) Trust Fund proposal –Filling Gaps</p>	\$6 990	\$0	LOA sent to NIFFR for signature in 2008, 1 st payment will be made on signature
<p>17.(Russia - VNIRO) ASFA Trust Fund project proposal, Input of Barents and Norwegian Seas Literature</p>	\$ 3960	\$0	LOA sent to VNIRO for signature
<p>sub-total</p>	<p>\$146 950</p>	<p>\$110 608</p>	

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

	COMMITTED	DISBURSED	NOTES
<p>18. Financial Support to attend (2006) Board Meeting</p> <p>* (\$ 38 500 was allocated by the Board for the 2006 Meeting, however there was a carry-over of \$2 289 unspent from the previous year's allocation. Therefore, the TOTAL funds available for the 2006 Meeting = \$40 789.</p> <p>* Note, the \$2 289 carry-over is not shown in the "Committed" column but that is \$38 500* the total sum used to calculate the available funds for the Meeting.</p> <p>** US\$43 041 was spent. Overspending (\$40 789 – \$43 041= - \$ 2 252) will be subtracted from 2007 allotment, as has been the case in the past).</p>	\$38 500*	43 041**	completed
<p>19. Staff Support to FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year 2006)</p> <p>* (\$ 40 000 was allocated by Board for 2006, however there is a carry-over of \$3 131 unspent from the previous (2005) year's allocation. Therefore, the TOTAL funds available for 2006 = \$43 131</p> <p>* Note, the \$3 131 carry-over of unspent funds from previous years is not shown in "Committed" column, but is calculated as part of balance to be spent</p> <p>** Spending for 2006 (period January - December, 2006) \$28 545 has been spent as listed below. The unspent funds \$14 586 was carried forward to 2007 allotment. (\$43 131- \$28 545 = \$14 586) (see item-12)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - \$ 2 530 (instead of budgeted 18 700) - assistance in FAO ASFA input preparation 2006 - sub-contract to AdriaMed, - \$ 2 200 Admin assistance for ASFA Board Meet. (1month when employed) - \$ 7 484 for ASFA info. products to LIFDC countries- admin, contacts, etc. - \$ 3 047 one extra FAO staff to attend ASFA Board Meeting VLIZ, Belgium) - \$ 816 www-ISIS-ASFA training for NAFO (per-diem UN-DOALOS staff) - \$ 3 478 www-ISIS-ASFA training at FAO for INAHINA (Mozambique) - \$ 350. to use FAO training room/facilities for training courses (\$70/day) - \$ 780 Coffee breaks at 2005 ASFA Board Meetings (completed) - \$ 6 582 1 FAO ASFA Staff member to attend IAMSLIC Meeting, USA, Oct. 2006 and meeting with UN-DOALOS chief - \$ 1 278 H. Rybinski to attend ASFA Meeting Oct. 2006 	\$40 000 *	\$28 545**	all items are completed
<p>20. (China) Compilation of www-ISIS-ASFA Manuals and Guidelines in Chinese</p>	\$10 000	\$10 000	completed
<p>21. (Kenya-KMFRI) Elimination of Gaps</p>	\$18 200	\$18 200	completed during 2007-08 intersession
<p>22. (Russia-VNIRO) Input of Caspian Literature II</p>	\$10 270	\$ 10 270	completed during 2007-08 intersession
sub-total	\$116 970	\$110 056	

2004 - 2005 Intersessional Project Proposals

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

	COMMITTED	DISBURSED	NOTES
<p>23. Estonia –EMI – Latvian and Lithuanian Aquatic Serials processed for ASFA Database</p>	\$ 4 800	\$ 4 800	Completed
sub-total	\$4 800	\$4 800	

2004 Project Proposals (project proposals put forward & approved at the **2004** Board Meeting, INIDEP, Argentina)

	<u>COMMITTED</u>	<u>DISBURSED</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
<p>24. Financial Support to attend annual (2005) Board Meeting *(\$ 35 000 was allocated by Board for 2005 Meeting) (with carry-over of \$ 8 716 unspent from previous year. The total funds available 2005 Meeting = \$43 716 * The Balance in the "Committed" column does not include the carry-over of \$8,716 unspent for previous 2004 Meeting)</p>	\$35 000*	\$41 385	completed , unspent \$2 331 carried over to 2006 Meeting. (43716 - 41385 = \$2 331)
<p>25. Staff Support to FAO ASFA Secretariat (for 2005) *(\$ 40 000 was allocated by Board for 2005) (with carry-over of \$2 165 from previous year (see below). The total funds available for 2005= \$42 165 * The Balance in the "Committed" column does not include the carry-over of \$2 165 from unspent Jan-Dec 2004 allocation. ** Spending: - \$ 4 474. assistance in ASFA input preparation 2005 - sub-contract to AdriaMed (originally budgeted at \$8 800, but only \$4 474 was spent) , - \$10 710. for ASFA information products to LIFDC countries - admin, contacts, including comparative study of new CSA CD-ROM. – (underway) - \$14 115. ASFA CD-ROMS for LIFDC project: NISC subscription - 15 CD's, - \$ 3 700. for additional features added to terms of reference for www-ISIS-ASFA upgrade (not in original T.F proposal - \$1 500. www-ISIS-ASFA training for Senegal-DPM (week preceding Board Meeting) - \$ 795. www-ISIS-ASFA training for Iran-IFRO (only air ticket) - \$1 500. use FAO training room/facilities for training courses (\$70/day) - \$ 240. nominal fee paid for FAO attendance (R. Pepe) at Marine Metadata Workshop (all expenses paid by organizers - except \$240) - \$2 000 per diem for 4 IAMSLIC speakers attending ASFA Board Meeting (Resource sharing and repositories)</p>	\$40 000 *	\$39 034**	completed , unspent \$3 131 carried over to 2006. \$42 165 - \$39 034 = \$3 131
26.(FAO) www-ISIS-ASFA Maintenance Release (upgrade 1.1)	\$7 900	\$7 900	completed
27. (FAO) Utilization of ASFA Trust Fund to pay for ASFA Partners membership fees in IAMSLIC	\$1 060	\$1 060	on-going 2 years
28. (YugNIRO- Ukraine) Translation of ASFA Thesaurus into Russian and development of Russian-English Thesaurus	\$15 000		pending release of version 1.1
29. (YugNIRO- Ukraine) Translation of www-ISIS-ASFA "Help Notes" and front end into Russian	\$2000		pending release of version 1.1
30. (YugNIRO- Ukraine) Translation of www-ISIS-ASFA Guidelines into Russian	\$5 000		pending results of exercise to simplify input rules/procedures
31. (INIDEP - Argentina) Marine Bibliogr. Information from Latin America and Caribb. Region ... (1955-1980) 1st Stage: S.A. Chile	\$0*		* withdrawn by INIDEP
sub-total	\$105 960	\$89 379	

2003- 2004 Intersessional Project Proposals

(i.e. proposals put forward and approved during intersession via ASFA-Board-L) **NONE**

2003 Project Proposals (project proposals put forward and approved at the **2003** Board Meeting, CIP,Cuba)

	<u>COMMITTED</u>	<u>DISBURSED</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
<p>32. Financial Support to attend annual (2004) Board Meeting (US\$ 30 000 was allocated by Board for 2004) (carry over of \$3 642 from previous years (see below). The total funds available for 2004 = \$33 642 * Balance in Committed column does not include the following carry-over : a) extra \$1 941 unspent for 2003 Meeting) b) extra \$1 030 unspent for 2002 Meeting) c) extra \$ 671 unspent for 2001 Meeting)</p>	\$30 000*	\$24 926	completed , unspent \$8,716 (\$33,642-\$24,926=\$8716) is moved to 2005 Meeting allocation

<p>33. Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for 2004) *(US\$ 30 000 was allocated by Board for 2004) (with carry-over of \$33 685 from previous years (see below). The total available funds for 2004 = \$63 685</p> <p>* Balance in "Committed" column does not include the following carry-over : a) unspent \$852 from unspent Jan-Dec 2003 allocation b) unspent \$22,200 from unspent Jan-Dec 2002 allocation c) unspent \$9,833 from unspent Jan-Dec 2001 allocation d) unspent \$800 from unspent Jan-Dec 2000 allocation</p> <p>** Spending: - \$ 6 484 assistance in ASFA input preparation - sub-contract to AdriaMed, - \$ 2 500 Input of missed IOTC documents by NIO (completed Nov. 2005) - \$10 497 for ASFA information products to LIFDC countries (administration, contacts etc.) - \$ 4 000 ASFA CD-ROMS for LIFDC project: subscription - Ovid for 40 CD's - \$12 045 ASFA CD-ROMS for LIFDC project: subscription- NISC for 15 CDs, - \$ 3 587 www-ISIS-ASFA training for Mauritania (in September), - \$ 2 701 www-ISIS-ASFA training for Indonesia (in June), - \$ 2 787 www-ISIS-ASFA training & follow-up for Nigeria by KMFRI at KMFRI) (in June 2004) (completed) - \$ 2 746 www-ISIS-ASFA training & follow-up for Ecuador by Montes (training completed, follow-up completed 1st 100 records), - \$ 3 388 FAO recruitment of Indonesian ASFA Partner - visit to Institute while in region by R.Grainger , - \$ 2 854 FAO attendance at IAMS LIC by R.Pepe (in September). - \$ 2 250 travel-perdiem Ms Nyika-Tanzania to www-ISIS-ASFA training at KMFRI & follow-up by KMFRI) (12/2004), (follow-up underway) - \$ 3 531 www-ISIS-ASFA training of SPC, and PIMRIS at PIMRIS (by G. Rao, ex-PIMRIS co-ordinator). Costs include his honorarium, travel and per diem and SPC participants travel and per diem (Dec. 2004), - \$ 6 480 assistance in ASFA input preparation - sub-contract to Ms Milone for 700 records (ex-AdriaMed)</p>	\$30 000*	\$65 850**	<p>completed, unspent \$2,165 (\$65,850 - \$63,685=\$2165) is moved to Year 2005 allocation, see item-25).</p>
<p>34. (VNIRO – Russia) Input of old unique literature Caspian Sea from 1770-1970</p>	\$6 000	\$6 000	completed
<p>35. UNAM, Mexico – Translate into Spanish the ASFIS Reference Series (No. 2, ASFIS Subject Categories and Scope Descriptions and No. 3, Guidelines for Bibliographic Description and Data Entry</p>	\$7 000	\$7 000	completed , available on FAO ASFA FTP site
sub-total	\$73 000	\$103 776	

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

	<u>COMMITTED</u>	<u>DISBURSED</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
36. Collect, sort, input of "historical" bibl. Records (KMFRI)	\$15 000	\$15 000	completed
37. Collect, sort, input of "historical" bibl. Records (VLIZ)	\$18 000	\$11 000	underway 2 payments made
sub-total	\$33 000	\$26 000	

2002-2003 Intersessional Initiatives taken by the FAO ASFA Secretariat using funds "left over" from completed proposals where there was under spending (therefore these are not "proposals" in the strict sense of the word. However FAO did, at previous Meetings, declare its intentions regarding the deployment of these "left over" funds, and received no objections to such use)

<p>38. www-ISIS-ASFA training for VNIRO Partner *(using funds (\$8 002) unspent from ASFA training workshops, see item-43)</p>		\$2 900*	completed
<p>39. Translation www-ISIS-ASFA Help Notes into Spanish *(using funds (\$8 002) unspent from ASFA training workshops, see item-43)</p>		\$1 500*	completed
<p>40. Translation www-ISIS-ASFA Help Notes into French *(using funds (\$8 002) unspent from ASFA training workshops, see item-54)</p>		\$1 500*	completed
<p>41. Translation of Bibliographic Guidelines into Portuguese *(using funds (\$8 002) unspent from ASFA training workshops, see item-54)</p>	\$2 700		(lost contact)
sub-total	\$2 700	\$5 900	

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

	<u>COMMITTED</u>	<u>DISBURSED</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
42. Funding to attend Oct.2002 IAMSLIC Meeting (1 person)	\$2 500	\$2 790	completed , overspent \$290.
43. Conversion of 1971 ASFA Journals (NIO)	\$8 500	\$8 500	completed
44. Financial Support to attend annual (2003) Board Meeting	\$30 000	\$28 059	completed (unspent \$1 941, moved to 2004 Meeting,
45. Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year 2003) \$8,800 for assistance in ASFA input preparation (sub-contract to AdriaMed); \$10,497 for ASFA information products to LIFDC countries; \$2000 to identify gaps in FAO monitoring list; \$2500 to attend www-ISIS, training at ICIE; \$2674 - FAO attendance at Online Conference 2003 (R.P); \$1744 FAO attendance at Thesaurus maintenance seminar (R.P); \$933 to print 2003 Board Report.	\$30 000	\$29 148	completed (unspent \$852 moved to 2004 year allocation
sub-total	\$71 000	\$68 497	

2001 Project Proposals (proposals put forward and approved at 2001 Board Meeting, IFREMER, Brest)

	<u>COMMITTED</u>	<u>DISBURSED</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
46. Financial Support to attend annual (2002) Board Meeting	\$25,000	\$23,969.	completed (unspent \$1030, moved to 2004 Meeting, allotment
47. Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for 2002) (\$8,800 for assistance in ASFA input preparation(sub-contract to AdriaMed)	\$30,000	\$8,800	completed (unspent \$22 200 moved 2004 allocation,
48. Support to implementation of www-ISIS-ASFA interface (start when software was issued – 10/2002) *(plus additional funds to attend 2002 Board Meeting (see next item)	\$10,000*	10,000	completed
49. Funds to attend 2002 Board Meeting for Dr Rybinski	\$1,500	\$1,688	completed
50. ASFA-FIGIS Interaction	\$20,000	\$20 000	completed but not yet operational to public
51. Correction of the ASFA Descriptors fields *(subject to negotiation - this project includes possible extension \$5000 – see next item)	\$19,800*	0	cancelled funds returned to balance
51a Extension of project to other Partners	\$5 000	0	cancelled funds returned to balance
sub-total	\$111 300	\$64 457	

2000 Project Proposals (proposals put forward and approved at 2000 Board Meeting, NIO, India)

	<u>COMMITTED</u>	<u>DISBURSED</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
52. Financial Support to attend annual (2001) Board Meeting *(extra \$4,629 disbursed from unspent 2000 allocation, item-59	\$15,000	\$18,958*	completed (unspent \$671, moved to 2003 Meeting allocation
53. Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year 2001) (expenditure for Rybinski to 2001 Meet.\$1688, Cort to L.America\$6039, Input support\$3900, CDs to LIFDC\$7000, Transl. Help notes\$3000)	\$31,460	\$21,627	completed (unspent \$9833 moved to 2004 allocation
54. Workshops for familiarization(training) in ASFA input preparation	\$28,800	\$20,798	completed (unspent \$8002 to be spent on future training related to www-ISIS-ASFA
55. Support to the Dev. of Web based interface to ASFIS	\$10,000	\$10,000	completed 10/2002
56. Provision of ASFA Centres in former USSR with translation (ASFIS-2, Subject Categories and Scope Descriptions)	\$1,500	\$1,500	completed
57. Conversion of ASFA Printed Journals into machine readable format (1971-1974). 1973 Conversion	\$15,000	\$15,000	completed
58. Conversion of ASFA Printed Journals into machine readable format (1971-1974). 1972 Conversion	\$15,000	\$15,000	completed
sub-total	\$116 760	\$102 883	

1999 Project Proposals (proposals put forward and approved at 1999 Board Meeting, NOAA, USA)

	<u>COMMITTED</u>	<u>DISBURSED</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
59. Financial Support to attend annual (2000) Board Meeting *(unspent \$4,629 moved to support attendance at 2001 Meeting, item-52)	\$15,000	\$10,371*	completed
60. Staff support to ASFA Secretariat (Ms Wibley) (for the period January 2000 -December 2000)	\$31,460	\$30,660*	completed *(unspent \$800 transferred to 2004 year allocation)
61. Improvement of ASFA Database by Germany (BF)	\$15,000	\$15,000	completed
62. Request for training from Kenya (RECOSCIX-WIO)	\$3,000	\$2,825	completed
63. Conversion of ASFA printed journals into machine readable format (1974 volume) by India (NIO)	\$15,000	\$15,000	completed
64. Addition of 45,000 abstracts to 1975-77ASFA database-China	\$17,000	\$17,000	completed
65. Formatting ASFA Thesaurus by Julia Hudson	\$2,000	\$2,000	completed
sub-total	\$98 460	\$92 856	

1998 Project Proposals (proposals put forward and approved at 1998 Board Meeting, FAO, Rome)

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

1997 Project Proposals (proposals put forward and approved at 1997 Board Meeting, SFI, Poland)

	<u>COMMITTED</u>	<u>DISBURSED</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
71. Financial Support to attend annual Board Meeting	\$6,000	\$3,500*	completed *(\$2,500 moved to 1998 allocation,
72. Staff support to ASFA Secretariat (Ms Wibley) (for the period January 1998 -December 1998)	\$25,200	\$25,200	completed
73. Extension of ASFA potential in Ukraine (YugNIRO)	\$3,000	\$3,000	completed
74. Provision of ASFA Centres in former USSR with reference material for input (translations) (YugNIRO)	\$3,500	\$3,500	completed
75. ASFISIS Maintenance (Dr. DeSmet)	\$2,000	\$1,400*	completed *(\$600 returned to balance due to over budgeting)
76. Training for PIMRIS (travel Mr. Rao) *(disbursed exceeds committed, because for administrative reasons, FAO could not issue the most economic ticket as per original estimate)	\$3,000	\$5,200*	completed , overspent \$2200.
77. Convert 500 Records (from PIMRIS database into ASFISIS formatting) * (New contract stipulated in 2004 with Ganeshan Rao)	\$3,500	\$ 3 500	completed *
78. Analysis of ASFA for Scope and Coverage with eventual recommendations for improvement	\$6,500	\$6,500	completed
sub-total	\$52 700	\$51 800	

1996 Project Proposals (proposals put forward and approved at 1996 Board Meeting, FAO, Rome)

	<u>COMMITTED</u>	<u>DISBURSED</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
79. Manual on ASFISIS software and Data Entry *(funds credited to FAO FIDI budget (because FAO carried out the work))	\$6,000	\$6,000*	completed
80. Logo for ASFA competition	0	0	costed at \$2500, but later cancelled
81. Statistical Analysis of ASFA Database	0	0	completed costed at \$7000, no charge by CSA
82. ASFA User Survey	0	0	cancelled-never budgeted
sub-total	\$6 000	\$6 000	

1995 Project Proposals (proposals put forward and approved at 1995 Board Meeting, BF, Germany)

	<u>COMMITTED</u>	<u>DISBURSED</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
83. Workshops for familiarization with the ASFA input methodology (ASFA Training Session, 3-7 June 1996, FAO)	\$34,000	\$11,645*	completed *(unspent \$22,335 returned to Balance)
84. Review of the ASFA Partners Monitoring of Serials for ASFA (follow-up to 1994 review)	\$5,000	\$5,000	completed
85. IOC Study Grant.. (\$8,000)	0	0	cancelled
86. Chinese proposal sub-project 1, Identification of ASFA information users and suppliers in China	\$4,000	\$4,000	completed
sub-total	\$43 000	\$20 645	

GRAND TOTAL	\$1 223 064	(\$1 022 171)	
	COMMITTED	DISBURSED	

.....

The Full text of most of the Trust Fund Project Proposals cited in the above tables is contained in the corresponding year's ASFA Advisory Board Meeting Report: (Hamburg, 30 May-2 June 95) (FAO, Rome, 28-31 May 96) (Gdynia, 22-25 April 97) (FAO, Rome, 9-12 June 98) (NOAA, 25-28 May 99), (NIO/NICMAS 19-22 September 2000) (IFREMER, Brest 19-22 June 2001) (FAO, Rome, 18-21 June 02) (Cuba, 15-18 July 2003) (INIDEP, Argentina 29 June-2 July 2004) (FAO, Rome, 4-8 October 05) (VLIZ, Belgium 4-8 September 2006) (KMFRI 3-7 September 2007).

(R. Pepe, July 2008)

List of Action Items and Decisions Agreed at ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (IMR, Bergen, Norway, 1-5 September 2008)

[Note: some discussion is included for a few of the Action Items/Decisions in order to put them into perspective. The full discussions will be reflected in the Minutes of the Report]

The 2008 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting was held at the Institute of Marine Research (IMR), Directorate of Fisheries, Bergen, Norway, 1-5 September 2008. Mr Tore Nepstad, Managing Director of IMR, gave the opening speech. Ms Liv Holmefjord, Director General of Fisheries of the Directorate of Fisheries, also addressed the ASFA Board. Ms Noble (MBA) was elected Chairperson and Ms Skotheim (IMR) co-Chairperson. Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) was elected Rapporteur.

Agenda Item 6.2.2 (New and Potential ASFA Partners)

Regarding the discussion on potential new ASFA Partners....

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

Agenda Item 6.2.5 (Partners removed from the system)

Regarding the discussion on the new criteria for removal of ASFA Partners, as proposed by the FAO ASFA Secretariat in the document ASFA/2008/80

2. The **ASFA Board agreed** to the new criteria for removal *(as modified and agreed during the Board Meeting)*.
3. **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to circulate the new criteria to all ASFA Partners via ASFA Board-L. A majority vote would render the new criteria as an Amendment to the Partnership Agreement.

Agenda Item 6.2.6 (Partners in danger of being removed)

Regarding the discussion on ASFA Partners in danger of being removed and those ASFA Partners that are included on the "Warning List" due to the fact that no ASFA input has been produced by them during the past 2/3 years

4. **Ms Skotheim (IMR) agreed** to contact the Iceland ASFA Partner and ask them what their problem is (i.e. why they are not producing any ASFA input) and also if they are still interested in being a member of the ASFA Partnership.
5. **The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to contact IOTC and ask them if they were still interested in being a member of the ASFA Partnership and, if so, who would be doing their ASFA input *(previous ASFA input had been contracted out to NIO (India) a few years back)*
6. *Mr Montes (UNAM), referring to the delay in input produced by the Ecuador ASFA Partner following the ASFA Training Course conducted at INP, Ecuador, in August 2007 mentioned that the ASFA contact, Mr Gabor, appeared to be having some internal problems within his institute regarding ASFA activities. He suggested that it could be useful if FAO sent another letter to the Director of the Institute, similar to the one sent 2 years ago which highlighted the importance of their institute being part of the ASFA Partnership. The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed* to send the letter and follow up on this issue. It would also investigate the possibility of the Ecuador Collaborating Centre, INOCAR, becoming the Ecuador National Partner, should INP continue to have difficulties in carrying out its ASFA responsibilities.
7. *Mr Pepe (FAO) mentioned that the FAO ASFA Secretariat had just received an e-mail from Ms Muñoz, the ASFA contact at the Chile National ASFA Partner, IFOP, explaining that she had now left IFOP.*

However, she would be sending to FAO some corrected ASFA records that have been pending over the last year. **The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to** follow up regarding the issue as to who would be taking over the ASFA responsibilities from Ms Muñoz. It would also investigate the possibility of one of the Chile Collaborating Centres becoming the new Chilean National Partner.

Agenda Item 7.3 [Monitoring]

8. With respect to the project information (grey literature) produced by ODA/DFID, **Mr Pettman and Ms Noble agreed to** contact DFID regarding the possibility of obtaining this grey literature.
9. **Mr Thompson agreed to** investigate with Regional Fisheries Bodies regarding their grey literature and its availability.
10. *Regarding the collection of information concerning new areas of grey literature/new journals that ASFA Partners know are not being covered and entered into ASFA ProQuest asked whether it would be possible for FAO to set up a "share-point" site, which could be modified externally by ASFA Partners, whereby they could add such information, e.g. lists of serial titles, books/monographs so as to have some sort of "repository" of literature that needs to be covered, i.e. entered in ASFA by one of the ASFA Partners. **The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to** investigate the possibility of setting up such a site for this purpose.*

Agenda Item 7.5 ASFA Input Procedures

11. *Regarding the Environmental Regime field in ASFA records and missing information in this field in the records produced by ProQuest **ProQuest agreed to** enter the appropriate information in the Environmental Regime field in existing records when it would be possible.*
12. *Regarding the digitization of the full text of ASFA records that already exist on the CSA Illumina database and the inclusion of this literature in institutional repositories..... **the FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to** send an e-mail via ASFA Board-L to remind all ASFA Partners that URL links could be added to ASFA records already existing on the database. ASFA Partners would have to inform ProQuest of the Accession Numbers of the records in question and the corresponding URL address to be added to the record.*

Agenda Item 9.1 www-ISIS-ASFA

Regarding the previously approved Trust Fund Proposal "Further development of www-ISIS-ASFA software as regards interoperability, additional URL fields, and updating of pick-lists"....

Additional URL fields

13. *Mr Rybinski (ICIE) suggested the addition of a sub-fielded URL address field that was repeatable..... **Mr Rybinski, ProQuest and the FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to** discuss the technicalities of the wording (fixed names) of the field/subfields and how they would be exported for ProQuest.*

Additional field for the Advisor/Supervisor of theses/dissertations

14. *Mr Sainekar (NIO) requested the addition of a field where the name of the advisor/supervisor of theses could be entered..... **The ASFA Board agreed to** this suggestion and **Mr Rybinski agreed to** make the modification to the worksheet as part of the work in this Trust Fund Proposal.*

Multiple author affiliations

15. *Ms Prod'homme re-iterated IFREMER's request for the possibility of entering multiple author affiliations in the www-ISIS-ASFA software.....this information would be of great use in bibliometric surveys to identify which institutes/organizations are working in particular subject areas... ProQuest mentioned that their new production system captures multiple author affiliation information, but that it would take time before their development team could make that information available at the end-user interface..... it would be possible, but not in the immediate future.*
The ASFA Board agreed that the software worksheets should be modified so as to be able to enter multiple author affiliations. It would not be mandatory for ASFA Partners to enter multiple author affiliations. These multiple affiliations would only remain in the ASFA Partners' local databases and would not be exported to ProQuest.

Mr Rybinski agreed to make the necessary modifications to the software (worksheets, display formats, export formats) as part of the work in this Trust Fund Proposal. [Eventually, when ProQuest were able to display the multiple affiliation information on CSA Illumina, the export FST would be modified so as to include this information in the ASFA records sent to ProQuest].

Type of Document field

16. *Ms Skotheim (IMR) asked whether it would be possible to add a new document type category for "posters" this had already been agreed at the 2006 ASFA Board Meeting.... Mr Rybinski agreed to make the necessary modification to the worksheet and software as part of this Trust Fund Proposal*

WEBLIS - Integrated Library Management System Presentation

17. *Mr Rybinski gave a PowerPoint Presentation on WEBLIS, a library management system that can be integrated with the www-ISIS-ASFA software that is used used for ASFA data entry.He explained how the system worked. The ASFA Partner, once receiving the WEBLIS system, would be free to distribute it to other libraries in their country that were not necessarily ASFA Partners. Mr Rybinski said that it would take approximately 7/8 weeks to prepare the application, for an approximate cost of \$10,000.*

The ASFA Board agreed to the integration of www-ISIS-ASFA with WEBLIS **in principle**, and requested that Mr Rybinski prepare a Trust Fund Proposal containing all the appropriate information.

Agenda Item 11 [Status of ASFIS Reference Series Publications]

11.2 [Subject Categories and Scope Descriptions]

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

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

11.5 ASFA Thesaurus

19. *Regarding the format of the ASFA Thesaurus for printing concerning the 3 cosmetic issues: alignment of the columns, the position of hyphenated terms and the inclusion of "cont'd" for columns going over more than one page*

The ASFA Board agreed to accept the format as it currently is and therefore no extra "manual" modifications would be necessary.

20. *Regarding the possibility of printing the ASFA Thesaurus in a hierarchical structure showing all the levels of narrower/broader terms*

The ASFA Board agreed to have the ASFA Thesaurus printed in a non-hierarchical structure, like the latest print version available.

11.8 ASFIS List of Species

21. *Regarding taxonomic names and synonymsMr Kühnhold (VTI) asked whether it would be possible to link synonyms to the correct species nameswhether this could/should be done at the data input stage and/or at the search stage was discussed ProQuest said that if they were provided with a clear definition of "what is required", also with regard to up-posting to higher taxonomic categories, they could investigate the possibility of using a "taxonomy authority" **ProQuest agreed** to look into the requirements and feasibility of doing this at the data entry and search interface. **The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to survey the ASFA Partners and then provide ProQuest with some information. **Mr Pettman (FBA) and Mr Thompson (NAFO) agreed to** assist the FAO ASFA Secretariat regarding this issue.*

Agenda Item 13.2 [Pending Proposals]

22. Regarding the Trust Fund Proposal "Elimination of gaps (KMFRI)- Phase Two"

This project, presented at the 2007 ASFA Board Meeting, was pending revision by KMFRI regarding the journals, number of records and costs and also waiting for confirmation by ProQuest as to whether they were able to provide KMFRI with electronic version of JMBA.....

Mr Macharia (KMFRI) agreed to revise the proposal, by re-defining the number of records being done and adjusting the cost accordingly. This would be circulated via ASFA Board L intersessionally.

23. Regarding the Trust Fund Proposal “Mini ASFA Regional Meeting” (see ASFA/2008/50a)

*This project had been approved in principle at the 2006 ASFA Board Meeting, but was postponed in 2007. Following discussion between the Latin American ASFA Partners during the intersessional period, IMARPE, the Peruvian ASFA Partner has offered to host this meeting in June 2009. The listed costs show some discrepancies. **The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to** review the costs.*

24. Regarding the pending Trust Fund Proposals from YugNIRO “Translation of ASFA Thesaurus into Russian and development of Russian-English Thesaurus”, “Translation of www-ISIS-ASFA Help Notes and front end into Russian” and “Translation of www-ISIS-ASFA Guidelines into Russian”

Ms Kulakova (YugNIRO) agreed to discuss with the Director of her Institute the possibilities of carrying out these proposals.

Agenda Item 13.3 [New Proposals]

25. Regarding the Trust Fund Proposal Financial support to attend the 2009 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (ASFA/2008/71) \$40,000

The **ASFA Board approved** the proposal.

26. Regarding the Trust Fund Proposal by FBA “Geographic Authority List” (ASFA/2008/62b) \$24,000

This Trust Fund Proposal to update the Geographic Authority List would involve: transforming it to a “thesaurus” format; cleaning up the current terms included in the pick-list contained in the www-ISIS-ASFA software; adding correct entries to the “thesaurus” format of the GAL.....

Mr Pettman (FBA) explained that this Trust Fund Proposal would be an initial phase in preparing the GAL to be ready for future applications such as a geographical interface/map. It would not be just a simple “cleaning-up” of the pick-list, but would provide the possibility of producing different formats for different applications.....

Transforming the GAL into a “thesaurus” structure would enable the list to work with other systems in the future. For example, an ontology editor could be used to add latitude and longitude data and other GIS information.....

The **ASFA Board approved** the Proposal.

27. Regarding the Trust Fund Proposal by FBA “African Water Bodies - Duplicate Material” (ASFA/2008/62c) \$6,000 (maximum)

FBA had a large collection of duplicate material, mainly relating to East African water bodiesthey would be prepared to sort out and provide a list of the documentsthe material could be digitizedsent to appropriate African ASFA Partner for inclusion in ASFA either electronically or perhaps shipped..... The Trust Fund Proposal would be to provide funds for FBA to carry out the examination, sorting and listing of the documents and also explore possible ways of sending the material to the African ASFA Partner.

The **ASFA Board approved** the proposal.

28. Regarding the Trust Fund Proposal put forward by CNSHB in their report (ASFA/2008/34a)

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to contact the Guinea ASFA Partner, CNSHB, and provide them with more information as to ASFA Trust Fund Proposals, i.e. explain to them that an ASFA Partner first has to be actively producing ASFA input autonomously before being able to put forward ASFA Trust Fund proposals.

29. Regarding the Trust Fund Proposal put forward by DPM in their report (ASFA/2008/54)

DPM mentioned in their report a proposal to digitize their Report on fisheries statistics from 1963 to 2000.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to contact the Senegalese ASFA Partner *and request that DPM put forward a Trust Fund Proposal in a more detailed format.*

30. Regarding the Trust Fund Proposal "Further strengthening KMFRI ASFA Training Centre" (ASFA/2008/41A)

This Trust Fund Proposal would further strengthen KMFRI's position as an ASFA Training Centre by providing them with funds for dedicated computer equipment which would be used not only for Training activities but also for follow-up of ASFA Partners input (rather than having to borrow computers from other departments in the institute)

The ASFA Board approved the proposal **in principle**, but the proposal required re-writing, regarding the specifications and pricing. The amended proposal would be circulated via ASFA Board L during the intersessional period.

31. Regarding the ASFA Trust Fund Project "Supply of scanners (for ASFA related use) to those ASFA Partner Institutes which lack the funding to buy equipment" (ASFA/2008/81)

Mr Sainekar (NIO) asked whether it would be possible for his institute to receive a scanner under this project.....the FAO ASFA Secretariat suggested that this Trust Fund Proposal be sent out again via ASFA Board-L to give other ASFA Partners a chance to apply..... ProQuest mentioned that some form of accountability would be of importance.Mr Pepe (FAO) said that some of the ASFA Partners who had already received scanners did mention use of the scanners in their reports (to digitize documents for their repositories/document delivery, to scan abstracts into ASFA)

The ASFA Board agreed to put forward again this proposal.

Agenda Item 15. Place and Date of Next Meeting.

32. Mr Sainekar (NIO) reported that the Director of his institute offered to host the 2009 ASFA Board Meeting. **The ASFA board thanked NIO and agreed** that the 2009 ASFA Board Meeting would be held at NIO, Goa, India. The exact dates would be confirmed by NIO and circulated to all ASFA Partners via ASFA Board-L.

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

