

**ASFA ADVISORY BOARD MEETING**  
**Instituto Nacional de Pesca (INP), Guayaquil, Ecuador**  
**5–9 September 2011**

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



**ASFA ADVISORY BOARD MEETING  
Instituto Nacional de Pesca (INP), Guayaquil, Ecuador  
5–9 September 2011**

**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 authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of FAO.

All rights reserved. FAO encourages reproduction and dissemination of material in this information product. Non-commercial uses will be authorized free of charge. Reproduction for resale or other commercial purposes, including educational purposes, may incur fees. Applications for permission to reproduce or disseminate FAO copyright materials and all other queries on rights and licences, should be addressed by e-mail to [copyright@fao.org](mailto:copyright@fao.org) or to the Chief, Publishing Policy and Support Branch, Office of Knowledge Exchange, Research and Extension, FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy.

© FAO 2012

## 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/FI/asfa/Agreement/an690e/an690e00.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) and the assistant Rapporteur Mr José Garnica.

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

FAO.

ASFA Advisory Board Meeting. Instituto Nacional de Pesca (INP), Guayaquil, Ecuador, 5–9 September 2011. Summary Report (including ASFA Partners' Reports). Rome, FAO. 2012. 78 pp. Includes a CD-ROM.



## CONTENTS

<b>1. OPENING OF THE MEETING</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>2. ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>3. ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON AND RAPPORTEURS</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>4. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>5. ADOPTION OF SUMMARY REPORT OF 2010 ASFA ADVISORY BOARD MEETING</b> .....	<b>2</b>
5.1 Matters arising from the last (2010) ASFA Advisory Board Meeting .....	2
<b>6. STATUS OF ASFA PARTNERSHIP</b> .....	<b>2</b>
6.1 General status of the ASFA Partnership .....	2
6.2 Report on intersessional activities of the ASFA Partners.....	2
6.3 New ASFA Partners.....	4
6.4 Partners dropping out of ASFA.....	4
6.5 Partners removed or in danger of being removed.....	4
6.6 Strategy for future expansion of ASFA Partnership.....	5
6.7 ASFA Partnership Agreement.....	6
6.8 ASFA Publishing Agreement between FAO and ProQuest.....	6
6.9 Entitlements .....	6
6.10 ASFA Cooperation with other groups/initiatives/systems/meetings outside or related to ASFA.....	7
<b>7. ASFA – QUALITY OF ASFA DATABASE (scope, coverage and monitoring, timeliness, accuracy)</b>	<b>8</b>
7.1 ASFA input submitted by Partners and number of records on database.....	8
7.2 Subject scope.....	9
7.3 Coverage and monitoring.....	9
7.4 Timeliness.....	11
7.5 Accuracy of the ASFA records appearing on the database.....	12
7.6 Status of efforts of Partners to include more grey literature in ASFA, including digitization.....	13
7.7 ASFA inputting procedures.....	14
<b>8. ASFA PRODUCTS AND SERVICES</b> .....	<b>16</b>
8.1 ASFA journals .....	16
8.2 ASFA CD-ROM/DVD.....	17
8.3 Internet Database Service.....	18
8.4 New outputs and services (by ProQuest).....	18
8.5 Public relation activities, marketing (by ProQuest and Partners) .....	18
8.6 Document delivery .....	18
8.7 Increasing distribution of ASFA information products and services.....	19
<b>9. PROGRESS WITH MACHINE-READABLE INPUT</b> .....	<b>19</b>
9.1 www-ISIS-ASFA.....	19
<b>10. REPORT ON ASFA TRAINING ACTIVITIES</b> .....	<b>20</b>
<b>11. STATUS OF ASFIS REFERENCE SERIES PUBLICATIONS</b> .....	<b>21</b>
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, Taxonomy Authority List).....	24
11.9 ASFIS–10, Authority list for corporate names .....	24
11.10 ASFIS–16, Help notes in the www–ISIS–ASFA software (used for bibliographic description) .....	25
<b>12 ASFA TRUST FUND.....</b>	<b>25</b>
12.1 Status of the ASFA Trust Fund .....	25
12.2 Proposals in progress, completed or pending further discussion .....	26
12.3 New proposals.....	30
<b>13 OTHER BUSINESS .....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>14 PLACE AND DATE OF NEXT MEETING .....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>15 SPECIAL TOPICS, DEMONSTRATIONS, WORKSHOP DAY .....</b>	<b>32</b>
15.1 Comments on ASFA Input .....	32
15.2 ProQuest tips on searching/using the ASFA database via the CSA Illumina interface.....	33
15.3 IASLIC Z39.50 (resource sharing and document requests).....	33
15.4 AgriOceanDSpace (FAO and UNESCO–IOC/IODE Combine Efforts in their Support of Open Access ).....	33
15.5. Impact of ASFA usage .....	33
15.6 Alternative business models for ASFA.....	35
<b>16 REVIEW/APPROVAL OF DRAFT REPORT OF MEETING .....</b>	<b>36</b>
 <b>Annexes</b> (only the following are included in the printed document – see next page for full list of Annexes)	
<b>Annex–1</b> Agenda .....	<b>37</b>
<b>Annex–1b</b> List of participants .....	<b>39</b>
<b>Annex–1c</b> List of abbreviations .....	<b>43</b>
<b>Annex–44</b> Trust Fund Status .....	<b>47</b>
<b>Annex–54</b> Action items and decisions agreed by participants .....	<b>71</b>

## 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/2011/... 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/2011/1	Agenda
Annex-1a	ASFA/2011/1a	List of documents
Annex-1b	ASFA/2011/1b	List of participants
Annex-1c		List of abbreviations
Annex-2	ASFA/2011/2	Actions agreed by participants at 2010 meeting
Annex-2a	ASFA/2011/2a	Actions agreed by participants at 2010 meeting – French version
Annex-2b	ASFA/2011/2b	Actions agreed by participants at 2010 meeting – Spanish version
Annex-3	ASFA/2011/3	FAO report
Annex-3a	ASFA/2011/3a	ASFA Trust Fund proposal (FAO) "Staff support to FAO ASFA Secretariat 2012"
Annex-4	ASFA/2011/5	UN/DOALOS report
Annex-5	ASFA/2011/7	ADRIAMED report
Annex-6	ASFA/2011/9	ICES report
Annex-7	ASFA/2011/14	NAFO report
Annex-8	ASFA/2011/15	PIMRIS report
Annex-9	ASFA/2011/17	WCPFC report
Annex-10	ASFA/2011/18	Argentina (INIDEP) report
Annex-10a	ASFA/2011/18a	Argentina (INIDEP) Trust Fund Proposal "Digitization and Open Access deposition of Physis, and addition of URIs into ASFA records on database"
Annex-11	ASFA/2011/21	Botswana (ORI) report
Annex-12	ASFA/2011/22	Bulgaria (IO) report
Annex-13	ASFA/2011/23	Brazil (USP) report
Annex-14	ASFA/2011/25	Chile (IFOP) report
Annex-14a	ASFA/2011/25a	Chile (IFOP) Trust Fund Proposal "Creation of an institutional digital archive of IFOP"
Annex-15	ASFA/2011/26	China, People's Republic of (NMDIS) report
Annex-16	ASFA/2011/28	Cuba (CIP) report
Annex-17	ASFA/2011/29	Ecuador (INP) report
Annex-18	ASFA/2011/31	Estonia (EMI) report
Annex-19	ASFA/2011/32	France (IFREMER) report
Annex-20	ASFA/2011/33	Germany (BF) report
Annex-21	ASFA/2011/38	India (NIO/NICMAS) report
Annex-22	ASFA/2011/39	Indonesia (LIPI/PDII) report
Annex-23	ASFA/2011/40	Iran (Islamic Republic of) (IFRO) report



Annex-24	ASFA/2011/41	Ireland (MI) report
Annex-25	ASFA/2011/43	Japan (FRA) report
Annex-26	ASFA/2011/44	Kenya (KMFRI) report
Annex-27	ASFA/2011/46	Lao People's Democratic Republic (LARRec) report
Annex-28	ASFA/2011/48	Mexico (DGB) report
Annex-29	ASFA/2011/51	Nigeria (NIFFR) report
Annex-30	ASFA/2011/52	Norway (IMR) report
Annex-31	ASFA/2011/54	Peru (IMARPE) report
Annex-32	ASFA/2011/55	Poland (NMFRI ex-SFI) report
Annex-33	ASFA/2011/56	Portugal (IPIMAR) report
Annex-34	ASFA/2011/57	Russia (VNIRO) report
Annex-35	ASFA/2011/60	Tanzania (IMS) report
Annex-36	ASFA/2011/63	Uganda (NaFIRRI) report
Annex-37	ASFA/2011/64	Ukraine (YugNIRO) report
Annex-38	ASFA/2011/65	United Kingdom (NMBL) report
Annex-39	ASFA/2011/66	Uruguay (IIP) report
Annex-40	ASFA/2011/67	USA (NOAA) report
Annex-41	ASFA/2011/69	ProQuest report
Annex-42	ASFA/2011/70	ProQuest calculation of Royalty Payment to ASFA Trust Fund
Annex-43	ASFA/2011/71	List of ASFA Partners
Annex-43a	ASFA/2011/71a	Admission of 1 new member to the ASFA Partnership
Annex-43b	ASFA/2011/71b	Growth of ASFA Partnership over the years
Annex-43c	ASFA/2011/71c	List of ASFA Collaborating Centres
Annex-44	ASFA/2011/72	ASFA Trust Fund Status
Annex-44a	ASFA/2011/72a	The ASFA Trust Fund at a glance (approximations)
Annex-44b	ASFA/2011/72c	Expenditure Transaction Listing of ASFA Trust Fund as at 29 June 2011
Annex-45	ASFA/2011/73	13 <sup>th</sup> Rep. Project to distribute ASFA to LIFDCs
Annex-46	ASFA/2011/74	ASFA Trust Fund proposal – Financial support to attend 2012 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting
Annex-47	ASFA/2011/75	Contributions (input) to ASFA database by Partners
Annex-48	ASFA/2011/76	Updated list of Partners' Entitlements
Annex-49	ASFA/2011/77	List of ASFA information products and services
Annex-50	ASFA/2011/78	List of all ASFA Advisory Board Meetings / Editorial Staff Meetings to date
Annex-51	ASFA/2011/79	Status report on "Solutions taken to improve/increase timeliness of ASFA input"
Annex-52	ASFA/2011/80	ASFA Trust Fund project proposal – Utilization of ASFA Trust Fund To Pay IAMS LIC Membership Fees (renewal)
Annex-53	ASFA/2011/81	ASFA Trust Fund project proposal – Mini-ASFA Meeting for African ASFA Partners attending IAMS LIC Conference, October 2011
Annex-54	ASFA/2011/82	Action items and decisions agreed by participants
Annex-55	ASFA/2011/83	Report of GAL Working Group Meeting, 4 September 2011
Annex-56	ASFA/2011/Info-1	Report of Mini-ASFA Meeting in Latin America, October 2010
Annex-57	ASFA/2011/Info-2	Aquatic Commons statistics report (update)

Annex-58	ASFA/2011/Info-3	Comments on ASFA input (PowerPoint) by P. McCoy and H. Wibley
Annex-58a	ASFA/2011/Info-3a	Comments on ASFA input (Spanish version) by H. Wibley
Annex-59	ASFA/2011/Info-4	ProQuest ASFA update Illumina new web platform (PowerPoint) by P. McCoy
Annex-60	ASFA/2011/Info-5	IAMSLIC Resource Sharing and ILL (PowerPoint) by J. Garnica
Annex-61	ASFA/2011/Info-6	AgriOcean DSpace version 2 (PowerPoint) by L. Noble
Annex-62	ASFA/2011/Info-7	ASFA impact evaluation (PowerPoint) by H. Schwamm
Annex-62a	ASFA/2011/Info-7a	ASFA impact evaluation handout 1: Definitions
Annex-62b	ASFA/2011/Info-7b	ASFA impact evaluation handout 2: Impact evaluation for libraries



## **1 OPENING OF THE MEETING**

The Annual Meeting of the Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Abstracts (ASFA) Advisory Board was hosted by the Instituto Nacional de Pesca (INP), located in Guayaquil, Ecuador from 5 to 9 September 2011. The Meeting was attended by 31 participants from: 21 National ASFA Partners, 2 UN Partners, 1 International ASFA Partner, the ASFA Publishing Partner, and 1 observer. 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.

Ms Solis, Director of INP, delivered the opening speech and welcomed the participants to the 40<sup>th</sup> ASFA Advisory Board Meeting. She mentioned that one of the objectives of INP was to carry out biological, technical and economic research related to the development and management of fisheries and said that the publication of the research results was of great importance for Ecuador. The Library at INP was a fundamental tool in the development of scientific investigation programmes, with a vast range of documents related to fisheries, aquaculture and the environment and was involved in information exchange with other libraries all over the world. INP joined the ASFA Partnership in 2005, together with INOCAR as an ASFA Collaborating Centre, and currently process all the fishery and aquaculture related information produced in Ecuador. She said that it was a great pleasure for INP and INOCAR to host the 2011 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting in Guayaquil and also a good opportunity not only to exchange information with the participating countries but also to demonstrate the developments that have been made in Ecuador regarding scientific and aquatic information. Ms Solis wished everybody a successful meeting and a happy stay in Guayaquil.

Mr González Figueroa, FAO Representative in Ecuador; addressed the participants, on behalf of FAO and welcomed them to the meeting. He thanked Ms Solis for having agreed to host the meeting and also the staff at INP, in particular Mr Gaibor and Ms Fernadez, for their work in organizing the meeting. He mentioned that in the 1960s FAO had played an important role in the establishment of INP and congratulated the scientists and staff of INP for the excellent services offered to the scientific community. He also commented that the ever-increasing number of ASFA participating institutes and the longevity of the Partnership was direct testimony not only to the importance of the system but to the information that it captures and disseminates regarding the aquatic environment, fisheries and aquaculture. Mr Gonzalez Figueroa wished the participants a fruitful meeting and pleasant time in Guayaquil.

Mr Grainger, Chief of FIPS, the FAO service which is responsible for ASFA, expressed his gratitude to the FAO Representative of Ecuador, Mr Gonzalez Figueroa, for coming to Guayaquil to be present for the opening of the meeting. He also thanked INP for accepting to host the meeting in Ecuador. He said that the ASFA Board Meetings were a very good opportunity for ASFA Partners to get to know each other and wished everybody a productive meeting and enjoyable stay.

Mr Gaibor, INP, welcomed everybody to the city of Guayaquil and thanked all participants for making the effort to attend the meeting in Ecuador, coming from different parts of the world. He expressed his appreciation to those who assisted him in promoting, supporting and organizing the event and made particular mention to Mr Pepe (retired ASFA Editor-in-Chief) and the support he gave to INP when joining the ASFA Partnership. He also thanked the FAO ASFA Secretariat for its continual support to the ASFA Partnership. He said that it was an honour for INP to host this 2011 ASFA Board Meeting and hoped that everyone would have time to enjoy Guayaquil, as well as working hard to make the meeting a successful one.

## **2 ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS**

Mr Gaibor (INP) presented this Agenda Item.

## **3 ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSONS AND RAPORTEURS**

Ms Noble (NMBL) on behalf of the ASFA Board, and as ex-Chairperson, welcomed Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) as the new ASFA Editor-in-Chief and also expressed her gratitude to Mr Pepe for all his dedication and hard work in carrying out his ASFA-related activities whilst ASFA Editor-in-Chief until his retirement 31 January 2011.

Mr Gaibor (INP) was elected Chairperson of the Board Meeting. Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) was appointed Rapporteur.

## **4 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

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

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reminded the ASFA Partners to bring up any important issues they had highlighted in their intersessional reports during the appropriate Agenda Item.

## **5 ADOPTION OF THE SUMMARY REPORT OF THE 2010 MEETING**

The ASFA Board agreed to adopt the Summary Report of the 2010 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (Casablanca, Morocco).

### **5.1 Matters arising from 2010 meeting**

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

## **6 STATUS OF ASFA PARTNERSHIP**

### **6.1 General status of the ASFA Partnership**

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) referred to documents ASFA/2011/71 (**Annex-43**) and ASFA/2011/71c (**Annex-43c**) which provided lists of the ASFA Partners and their Collaborating Centres and asked ASFA Partners to verify that their information was correct. She requested any changes to be reported to the FAO ASFA Secretariat so that the files could be updated.

### **6.2 Report on the intersessional activities of ASFA Partners**

Each ASFA Partner presented a summary Report of its own intersessional activities. The FAO ASFA Secretariat summarized the major points contained in the Reports of Partners not in attendance.

#### **6.2.1 United Nations Co-sponsors**

- **FAO** – Mr Grainger presented the FAO report (**Annex-3**)
- **IOC** – (Not present, no report)
- **UN/DOALOS** – Ms Rosenboom presented the UN/DOALOS report (**Annex-4**)
- **UNEP** – (Not present, no report)

#### **6.2.2 ASFA Partners**

- **ADRIAMED** – (Not present) – Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-5**)
- **ICCAT** – (Not present – No report)
- **ICES** – (Not present) – Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-6**)
- **WorldFish Center** – (Not present – No report)
- **IOTC** – (Not present – No report)
- **IUCN** – (Not present – No report)
- **NACA** – (Not present – No report)
- **NAFO** – Ms Pacey presented the NAFO report ( **Annex-7**)
- **PIMRIS** – (Not present) – Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-8**)
- **SPC** – (Not present – No report)
- **WCPFC** – (Not present) – Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-9**)
- **Argentina (INIDEP)** – Ms Cosulich presented the INIDEP report (**Annex-10**)
- **Australia (CSIRO)** – (Not present – No report)
- **Belgium (VLIZ)** – (Not present – No report)
- **Botswana (ORI)** – (Not present) – Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-11**)
- **Bulgaria (IO)** – (Not present) – Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-12**)
- **Brazil (USP)** – Ms Pureza presented the USP report ( **Annex-13**)
- **Canada (NRC)** – (Not present – No report)
- **Chile (IFOP)** – Ms Barria presented the IFOP report (**Annex-14**)
- **China (NMDIS)** – Mr Dongxu Li presented the NMDIS report (**Annex-15**)
- **Cote d'Ivoire (CRO)** – (Not present – No report)
- **Cuba (CIP)** – Ms Cruz presented the CIP report (**Annex-16**)

- **Ecuador (INP)** – Mr Gaibor presented the INP report (**Annex–17**)
- **Egypt (NIOF)** – (Not present – No 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)** – (Not present) – Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA (**Annex–20**)
- **Ghana (CSIR)** – (Not present – No report)
- **Greece (HCMR)** – (Not present – No report)
- **Guinea (CNSHB)** – (Not present – No report)
- **Iceland (MRI)** – (Not present – No report)
- **India (NIO/NICMAS)** – Mr Sahu presented the NIO/NICMAS report (**Annex–21**)
- **Indonesia (LIPI/PDII)** – (Not present) – Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex–22**)
- **Iran (IFRO)** – (Not present) – Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex–23**)
- **Ireland (MI)** – (Not present) – Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex–24**)
- **Italy (SIBM)** – (Not present – No report)
- **Japan (JFRCA)** – Mr Hanamura presented the JFRCA report (**Annex–25**)
- **Kenya (KMFRI)** – Mr Macharia presented the KMFRI report (**Annex–26**)
- **Korea (KORDI)** – (Not present – No report)
- **LAO (LARRec)** – Mr Phouthavong presented the LARRec report (**Annex–27**)
- **Mauritania (IMROP)** – (Not present – No report)
- **Mexico (DGB)** – Mr Montes presented the UNAM report (**Annex–28**)
- **Morocco (INRH)** – (Not present – No report)
- **Mozambique (INAHINA)** – (Not present – No report)
- **Nigeria (NIFFR)** – (Not present) – Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex–29**)
- **Norway (IMR)** – Mr Seteras presented the IMR report (**Annex–30**)
- **Peru (IMARPE)** – Ms Antonietti presented the IMARPE report (**Annex–31**)
- **Poland (NMFRI ex–SFI)** – (Not present) – Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex–32**)
- **Portugal (IPIMAR)** – (Not present) – Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex–33**)
- **Russian Federation (VNIRO)** – Ms Levashova presented the VNIRO report (**Annex–34**)
- **Senegal (DPM)** – (Not present – No report)
- **Spain (IEO)** – (Not present – No report)
- **Tanzania (IMS)** – Ms Nyika presented the IMS report (**Annex–35**)
- **Thailand (PMBC)** – (Not present – No report)
- **Tunisia (INSTM)** – (Not present – No report)
- **Uganda (NaFIRRI)** – Ms Endra presented the NaFIRRI report (**Annex–36**)
- **Ukraine (YugNIRO)** – (Not present) – Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex–37**)
- **United Kingdom (NMBL)** – Ms Noble presented the NMBL report (**Annex–38**)
- **Uruguay (IIP)** – Ms Cristiani presented the IIP report (**Annex–39**)
- **USA (NOAA)** – (Not present – Report submitted after the meeting (**Annex–40**)
- **Vietnam (CIS)** – (Not present – No report)

### 6.2.3 ASFA Publisher

- **ProQuest** – Ms McCoy presented the ProQuest Report (**Annex–41**)

### 6.3 New ASFA Partners

Mr Grainger (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that one Institute had signed the ASFA Partnership Agreement during the intersessional period 2010–2011 to become an ASFA National Partner: *National Marine Information and Research Centre (NatMIRC), Namibia*. The training of NatMIRC was carried out together with that of ORI (Botswana) at KMFRI (Kenya) by Mr Macharia on behalf of the FAO ASFA Secretariat in March 2011 (see Agenda Item 10 for further information).

See the FAO Report Section 4.2.1 (**Annex–3**) for information regarding the new Partner and see document ASFA/2011/71a (**Annex–43a**) for further information and full address of the institute.

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

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) mentioned that 3 new Russian Collaborating Centres joined ASFA during the intersession.

### 6.4 Partners dropping out of ASFA

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that no ASFA Partner or Collaborating Centre had dropped out of the ASFA Partnership during the intersession.

### 6.5 Partners removed or in danger of being removed from ASFA

The FAO ASFA Secretariat called the ASFA Partners' attention to the fact that the primary responsibility of an ASFA Partner was the preparation and submission of ASFA input to the ASFA Publisher for inclusion in the ASFA bibliographic database.

Ms Wibley (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 a number of years.

Included in this list were:

**Mozambique – INAHINA** continues to have problems in submitting ASFA input (nothing has been submitted since 2007).

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to contact the ASFA Partner in Mozambique (INAHINA) in order to clarify their status regarding ASFA input. At the upcoming IAMS LIC Conference to be held in Tanzania, in October 2011, the FAO ASFA Secretariat was hoping to organize a one–day ASFA training workshop for some African ASFA partners in an attempt to address and resolve the issues preventing them from submitting input.

**[Rapporteur's note:** Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) met with Ms Alfredo on several occasions during the IAMS LIC Conference, held in Zanzibar, Tanzania in October 2011, to provide some hands–on practice regarding ASFA input preparation. At this writing, a small batch of records, which had been prepared by Ms Alfredo (INAHINA) with the assistance of Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) in Zanzibar, has been submitted to ProQuest].

**Côte d'Ivoire – CRO** No action has been taken by FAO ASFA Secretariat since last Meeting. No input has been submitted since 2005, Mr Odido, IOC/ODIN Africa project office, contacted CRO on behalf of FAO ASFA Secretariat during 2008–2009 intersession and CRO replied saying that they were restructuring and in process of identifying someone for ASFA duties. June 2009, FAO asked CRO again for re–confirmation of their interest in remaining an ASFA Partner. In February 2010, FAO was informed that a person had been hired, but would require training. No communication has been received since.

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to contact the ASFA Partner in Cote d'Ivoire (CRO) in order to clarify their status regarding ASFA input and coordinate eventual training.

**[Rapporteur's note:** An e–mail was sent to CRO by the FAO ASFA Secretariat on 13 October 2011 requesting information as to their interest in staying an ASFA Partner. A positive reply was received. CRO re–iterated their continued interest in belonging to the ASFA Partnership, providing also the name of a person who would be responsible for activities related to ASFA. However, this person would require training. Unfortunately, due to lack of human resources at the FAO ASFA Secretariat, no further action has been taken yet.]

**Spain – IEO** had not been submitting input since 2006. However the company responsible for IEO's input had maintained sporadic contact with the FAO ASFA Secretariat, and a very large batch of input was submitted to the Secretariat for checking in September 2008. Some of these records were checked and returned to IEO, but IEO did not send them to ProQuest. Limited action has been taken by the ASFA Secretariat since the last Meeting. Attempts to contact the company that was preparing ASFA input on behalf of IEO have failed.

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to make one final effort to contact the ASFA Partner in Spain (IEO) in order to clarify their position, or else they would risk being removed from the ASFA Partnership.

[**Rapporteur's note:** An e-mail was sent to IEO by the FAO ASFA Secretariat on 13 October 2011 requesting information as to their interest in staying an ASFA Partner. No reply was received.]

**Viet Nam – CIS** joined ASFA in 2001 (then FiGen) and received ASFA input training in 2002 at FAO. Input has been submitted sporadically over the years; Problems continue and are not resolvable via correspondence. Just before this Meeting, more records were received by the FAO ASFA Secretariat for checking, but previously checked records have never been submitted to ProQuest.

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to contact the ASFA Partner in Viet Nam (CIS) in order to clarify the status of CIS input production and explain the procedure to be followed regarding submission of ASFA records for control/feedback by the FAO ASFA Secretariat.

[**Rapporteur's note:** In November 2011 the FAO ASFA Secretariat met with Ms Diep Vu Ngoc (Library Clerk at the FAO Representation in Vietnam) and discussed the status of CIS as an ASFA Partner. Ms Ngoc said that she would assist the FAO ASFA Secretariat in communicating with CIS regarding this situation. On 8<sup>th</sup> February 2012, the FAO ASFA Secretariat received an e-mail related to previously corrected ASFA input from CIS.]

**Thailand – PMBC** joined ASFA in 2006 and received ASFA input training (May 2007) at FAO. Some input was submitted in 2008 but was interrupted afterwards for various reasons (military service, away from office etc.). Following recent discussions between Mr Grainger (FAO ASFA Secretariat) and the Phuket Marine Biological Center (PMBC), it was recognised by the Director of PMBC that perhaps the centre was not the most appropriate institution in Thailand to be the National ASFA Partner and he suggested that the FAO ASFA Secretariat approach the Chulalongkorn University's Faculty of Science (Marine Sciences) to replace it as the National ASFA Partner. Mr Grainger took the opportunity to investigate this possibility while on duty travel in Thailand in December 2010. See Action Item 6.6.1 for further information.

**Australia – CSIRO** – no ASFA input has been submitted by Australia (CSIRO) to ProQuest since 2007. The inputter reported software problems at the end of 2009. No action has been taken by the FAO ASFA Secretariat since last Meeting.

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to contact the ASFA Partner in Australia (CSIRO) in order to clarify their status regarding ASFA input.

**Senegal – DPM** has not submitted input since 2008, although the ASFA contact had been in communication with the FAO ASFA Secretariat during 2010 to assist in the development of certain features of the www-ISIS-ASFA v1.2 update.

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to contact the ASFA Partner in Senegal (DPM) in order to clarify the situation and request that ASFA input be resumed as soon as possible. At the upcoming IAMSLIC Conference to be held in Tanzania, in October 2011, the FAO ASFA Secretariat is organizing a one day ASFA training workshop for some African ASFA partners in an attempt to address and resolve the issues preventing them from submitting input.

[**Rapporteur's note:** Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) met with Ms Keita (DPM) on several occasions during the IAMSLIC Conference, held in Zanzibar, Tanzania in October 2011, to discuss the status of ASFA input from DPM. Ms Keita explained that she had had some technical problems with the software, and had trained some staff to assist in the preparation of ASFA input. She said that some records were ready and that she would send them to the FAO ASFA Secretariat on her return to Senegal.]

## **6.6 Strategy for future expansion of ASFA Partnership**

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) referred to document ASFA/2011/71b (**Annex-43b**), which describes the growth of the ASFA Partnership over the years and which also lists the main documents which have provided the rationale for the joining and/or recruitment of most Partners into ASFA.

Referring to the geographic distribution of the ASFA Participating organizations, she commented that the ASFA Partners, now 67 in number, were located in 58 different countries. In particular, she highlighted the fact that during the past 20 years, there have been 40 new ASFA Partners and the participation of economically developing countries in ASFA has significantly improved.

### **6.6.1 Potential partners**

Mr Grainger (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported on the Secretariat's recruitment initiatives in the Southeast Asian region, in particular the Philippines, a very important fishing country. He said that this was a region which had gaps regarding the geographical distribution of ASFA partners and mentioned that, whilst on duty travel in the region, he investigated the possibility of recruiting the College of Fisheries and Ocean Sciences, University of the Philippines, Vasayas, Miagao, Iloilo as the National ASFA Partner. The University showed interest in joining ASFA and negotiations were at an advanced stage. He also investigated the possibility of recruiting SEAFDEC as an International ASFA Partner responsible for SEAFDEC publications. SEAFDEC (Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center/Aquaculture Department (SEAFDEC/AQD)) were very enthusiastic in joining ASFA and negotiations were at an advanced stage.



Mr Grainger also reported that, as had been previously suggested by the Director of PMBC, the ASFA Partner in Thailand, in December 2010 he had met with the Dean of the Faculty of Science at Chulalongkom University in Bangkok, who gave his agreement to replace PMBC as the National ASFA Partner. Mr Grainger commented that the Faculty had a important library with some very valuable material for ASFA.

Mr Grainger said that these new potential ASFA Partners would require training and reported that tentative dates for an ASFA Training Session in the region had been suggested for 2012. He added that the possibility of including the ASFA Partners from Laos and Vietnam to take part in the training was also being considered.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) commented that the expansion of ASFA was a critical area and that the future of ASFA very much depended upon it. He said that the material belonging to institutes in the above-mentioned countries was very important and would be a valuable addition to ASFA.

## 6.7 ASFA Partnership Agreement

As of 1 August 2011, 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 67 Partners.

4 UN Co-sponsoring ASFA Partners	51 National ASFA Partners
11 International ASFA Partners	1 Publishing ASFA Partner

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) explained that the ASFA Partnership Agreement defines the 'responsibilities' of the ASFA Partners and also the functions of the ASFA Advisory Board. She mentioned that, when signing the agreement, every ASFA Partner agrees to assume its own responsibilities. In addition, a list of publications to be monitored is provided to the potential ASFA Partners before they sign the Partnership Agreement. She reminded the ASFA Partners that should they come across any difficulties in fulfilling their responsibilities, such as covering their list of publications, they should promptly inform the FAO ASFA Secretariat as there could be ways of re-distributing the titles, if necessary.

A copy of the text of the ASFA Partnership Agreement is available on the FAO ASFA Homepage at: <ftp://ftp.fao.org/FI/asfa/Agreement/an690e/an690e00.pdf>.

The text of the current ASFA Partnership Agreement was drawn up in 1995 and has remained the same since then (except for one amendment passed during the 2008-2009 intersession period regarding the establishment of criteria for the removal from the Partnership Agreement of Partners not fulfilling their responsibilities).

## 6.8 ASFA Publishing Agreement between FAO and ProQuest

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that the current Publishing Agreement was valid until 31 December 2011 and that a meeting had been held with ProQuest regarding renewal of the Agreement for the next 4 year period in November 2010. Mr Grainger (FAO ASFA Secretariat) mentioned that the Agreement was still in the hands of ProQuest and that the FAO ASFA Secretariat was waiting for final comments. He stressed that it was important for the ASFA Secretariat to receive the Agreement as soon as possible so that it could be passed on to the FAO Legal Office in order to have the document ready for signing before the end of the year.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that the legal department of ProQuest had already reviewed the Agreement, containing all the FAO ASFA Secretariat's comments and that it was nearly ready.

**Mr Emerson (ProQuest) agreed** to contact the ProQuest Legal department in order to speed up the final review of the Agreement and would inform the ASFA Board regarding the status of the document by 15 September 2011.

**[Rapporteur's note:** The Publishing Agreement has been signed by both ProQuest and FAO and will be effective from 1 January 2012 to 31 December 2015]

## 6.9 Entitlements (Partner entitlements to ASFA products as listed in above agreements)

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) referred to document ASFA/2011/76, which listed the Entitlements currently received by each ASFA Partner. She asked all ASFA Partners to revise this list and contact ProQuest (attention Ms McCoy) regarding any discrepancies in receiving CDs/DVDs/Print issues. Ms McCoy (ProQuest) commented that she had sent an e-mail via ASFA Board L on March 31, 2011 asking ASFA Partners to review their Entitlements and inform ProQuest of any discrepancies, or should they not wish to receive the printed journals. She said that only a few replies had been received. Ms McCoy mentioned that the ProQuest Sales/Services department often sent out renewal requests, and that should an ASFA Partner receive such a request, they should reply yes via e-mail. She stressed that this did not mean that they would have to pay any renewal subscription.

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) clarified that ASFA Partners should report any problems/difficulties in accessing Illumina to ProQuest (attention Ms McCoy), not the FAO ASFA Secretariat.

NMDIS (China) reported that they had difficulties in accessing Illumina.

**Ms McCoy (ProQuest) agreed** to look into this issue and help resolve NMDIS' access problem.

Ms Fernandez (INP) reported that they had difficulties in accessing CSA Illumina and requested the possibility of having access through their Intranet so that researchers within the institute could access the database, i.e. by using a shared IP address. Ms Antonietti (IMARPE) and Ms Cruz (CIP) reported the same difficulties and also requested access to Illumina through their Intranet to enable the researchers within their institutes to access the ASFA database

**Ms McCoy (ProQuest) agreed** to investigate with the ProQuest IT department the possibility of providing access to the ASFA database to INP, IMARPE and CIP through shared IP addresses.

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat), referring to Illumina access, asked whether ProQuest would consider providing access to all Collaborating Centres, not just those in Developing Countries. She said that this could act not only as a means of attracting new Collaborating Centres but also as a way of encouraging them to continue participating in the ASFA network. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) replied that this could be possible, but would have to be requested on a case-by-case basis.

Ms Noble (NMBL) mentioned that it was now becoming difficult for some ASFA Partners and/or Collaborating Centres to reach the minimum number of records necessary for their entitlements. She said that many ASFA Partners were now concentrating on grey literature and also, in some cases where the literature under their responsibility was available online, ASFA Partners were giving up the monitoring of some serials titles to ProQuest. (For further discussion regarding monitoring responsibilities see Agenda item 7.3.)

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) stressed that the giving up by ASFA Partners of serial titles on their individual monitoring lists to ProQuest would in no way affect their entitlements; they would still receive their full entitlements, even when not reaching the 250 record requirement.

Some discussion followed regarding free access to Illumina by Collaborating Centres in developed countries and/or the application of greater discounts to subscription prices.

Ms Noble (NMBL) mentioned the difficulty faced by developed countries in recruiting new Collaborating Centres, since it was no longer feasible to prepare the additional 250 records required for "free" access to the ASFA database. Ms Prod'homme (IFREMER) concurred, saying that this issue was discussed every year and expressed her regret that there was no free access for all Collaborating Centres. She referred to the Collaborating Centres in the French network and asked whether they could have free access to Illumina even if not reaching the production figure require. She added that free access and/or greater discounts on subscriptions for developed countries played a very important role in the recruitment of new collaborating centres.

Mr Emerson (PQ) said that the ProQuest Sales Department could be flexible regarding access and discounts and explained that it was the decision of the Regional ProQuest Sales staff. He recommended that ASFA Partners made their individual requests to their local ProQuest sales representative, asking also for his support by copying him in the communication. Mr Emerson suggested that perhaps changes to the entitlements should be included in the Publishing Agreement.

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat), referring to the importance that access to the ASFA database has to collaborating centres, not only as a way of attracting them but also as a means of encouraging them to continue participating in the ASFA Partnership, asked whether it would be possible to include modifications to current entitlements in the new Publishing Agreement.

**Mr Emerson (ProQuest) agreed** to investigate the possibility of including some changes to the entitlements of Collaborating Centres in the current Publishing Agreement, so that more Collaborating Centres would have access and a greater discount would be offered to all Collaborating Centres in developed countries.

[**Rapporteur's note:** A revised table of entitlements has been included in the current Publishing Agreement and will be circulated to ASFA Partners accordingly.]

## **6.10 ASFA Co-operation with other groups/initiatives/systems/meetings outside or related to ASFA**

### FAO

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that there had been several meetings between the ASFA Group and the OEK Group at FAO, discussing various issues such as: open access repositories (how to set them up and manage them); ASFA Thesaurus management and different language versions (Spanish and French); bibliographic metadata standards/development tools. She mentioned in particular that the FAO ASFA Secretariat had been asked by the OEK team to participate in a new Pilot Project on Enhancing Global Open Access to Agricultural/Fisheries Research Publishing during 2011–2012. The feasibility of a common project to enforce the capacities of institutions for open access publishing of scientific and technical

information in agriculture and related sciences was discussed. Ms Wibley said that the FAO ASFA Secretariat would eventually send a questionnaire to ASFA Partners to obtain some feedback this issue. The possibility of carrying out a pilot project with, for example, three interested ASFA Partners who required technical assistance to set up an institutional OA Repository could be considered, using some ASFA Trust Fund money as partial funding. See Agenda item 7.6 for further discussion regarding this issue.

Discussion had also been held with the OEK team regarding use of the ASFA Thesaurus in VocBench, a web-based multilingual vocabulary management tool developed at FAO, by OEK, considering the integration of Spanish and French versions as well as the English version. Mr Schwamm (FBA) reported that Mr Pettman, the person at FBA involved in maintenance of the ASFA Thesaurus, was in contact with the OEK Team. See Agenda item 11.6 for further discussion regarding the ASFA Thesaurus.

### IAMSLIC

Collaboration with IAMSLIC continues through the IAMSLIC membership initiative, whereby membership fees for some ASFA Partners were being paid for by the ASFA Trust Fund. Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) outlined some of the benefits of joining IAMSLIC, mentioning in particular document delivery. She said that a presentation on resource sharing and document requests using the IAMSLIC Z39.50 library would be given on the 4<sup>th</sup> day of the Meeting, together with a live demonstration on how to make a request. A table of those ASFA Partners whose IAMSLIC membership fees are currently being paid through the ASFA Trust Fund, and their renewal dates, is included in the FAO Report on page 24 (See **Annex-3**).

Ms Wibley also mentioned that she gave a presentation on behalf of the FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Branch Library at the annual IAMSLIC conference, held in Mar del Plata, Argentina in October 2010. The presentation, "Visibility and Access through the Aquatic Commons", described the progress made by the FAO ASFA Trust Fund Proposal on the retrospective scanning of grey literature, which also included the provision of URL links to records on the ASFA database, thereby improving accessibility to the grey literature documents contained in ASFA.

## **7 ASFA – QUALITY OF THE ASFA DATABASE (SCOPE, COVERAGE AND MONITORING, TIMELINESS AND ACCURACY)**

*Follow-up Action Item 13 from the 2010 ASFA Board Meeting:*

**13. The ASFA Board agreed** that an ASFA Quality Working Group should be formed to discuss and define quality metrics and draw up some Terms of Reference for an external/independent evaluation of the ASFA database.

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to recruit persons for this Working Group during the intersessional period.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that no action had been taken regarding this issue.

Ms Rosenboom (UN/DOALOS) asked whether ProQuest carried out any quality control on the ASFA records prepared by ASFA Partners, in particular records prepared from grey literature available in document repositories. Mr Emerson (PQ) replied that in general the quality control of an ASFA record was under the responsibility of the ASFA Partner producing the record, whether it be from grey literature or a journal article. Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) re-iterated that it was the responsibility of the ASFA Partner to carry out quality control of their ASFA records and reminded ASFA Partners that they should always check their records carefully before sending them to ProQuest for inclusion on the database. She mentioned the quality control procedure carried out by the ASFA Secretariat in Rome and stressed the importance of proof-reading the ASFA records before submission to the publisher, ProQuest. She also said that although input from new ASFA Partners was checked and feedback provided regarding ASFA in-house rules and regulations, it was always explained to the ASFA Partner that the proof-reading of the ASFA records and the resulting quality of the ASFA record on the database was their responsibility. She added that further discussion regarding quality of ASFA records would be held on the 4<sup>th</sup> Workshop day of the meeting, under Agenda Item 1.

### **7.1 ASFA input submitted by Partners and number of records on the database**

Mr Gaibor (INP) introduced this Agenda Item and asked the ASFA Partners to refer to the figures given on page 21 of the FAO Report (**Annex-3**). Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that as at 5 July 2011 there were **1 464 003** records in the ASFA database. She reminded ASFA Partners that they should periodically consult and check the FAO reserved ASFA ftp site (<ftp://ASFA:PWda28b@ext-ftp.fao.org/Fl/Reserved/ASFA>) to verify that ProQuest had received their ASFA records and that they had been added to the database. Ms Wibley thanked ProQuest, in particular Ms Abram, for providing a monthly Spreadsheet, called ASFA Input Log which contained input statistics for each ASFA Partner. The FAO ASFA Secretariat posted an updated version of the spreadsheet each month on the FAO reserved ASFA ftp site. Ms Wibley stressed that it was in the ASFA Partners' interest to check that the data given in the spreadsheet correspond with the actual records submitted, including the figures given in the Monthly Summary and Totals pages. She added that any discrepancies regarding this spreadsheet should be notified to ProQuest (attn: Natalie Abram at [Natalie.abram@proquest.com](mailto:Natalie.abram@proquest.com)). Should any ASFA Partner have problems accessing the ASFA FTP site, they should notify the ASFA Secretariat (attn: Helen Wibley at [Helen.Wibley@fao.org](mailto:Helen.Wibley@fao.org)).

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) referred to the increasing number of inactive ASFA Partners and the declining number of input produced by the ASFA Partners and said that this was a worrying trend. He noted that although the number of ASFA Partners was increasing, the input they produced was not and stressed that this issue should be addressed, since the expansion of the ASFA Partnership was a critical area for the future of ASFA. He commented that there was a large amount of literature relevant to ASFA only available in the libraries or institutes of ASFA Partner and that it was important to include this information in ASFA. For further discussion regarding coverage of literature and its inclusion in the ASFA database see Agenda item 7.3.

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that it was important to consider the fact that some ASFA Partners were producing less input because they were concentrating on grey literature and had given up some serial titles from their monitoring list to ProQuest. She also commented that the time taken to produce ASFA records from grey literature documents was considerably longer than the time it would take to produce the same amount of records from a serial publication.

Ms Noble (NMBL) referred to the fact that some ASFA Partners were not producing any input and said that perhaps this indicated that the new criteria for removing ASFA Partners from the system were not working. She also expressed her concern regarding the lack of coverage of the serial titles included on the monitoring lists of inactive partners. For further discussion on this issue see Agenda Item 7.3. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) recognized that the FAO ASFA Secretariat took on an important burden and time-consuming task to follow-up on inactive partners and suggested that there was a need to be more stringent on inactiveness.

Mr Montes (UNAM) said that it often took time for new ASFA Partners to mature and establish regular production. He added that many Latin American countries now faced a decreasing trend with respect to the production of printed journals. Often journal publishers changed without any notification, or URL links changed, which resulted in problems to locate the journals. Mr Gaibor (INP) commented on the difficulties in publishing documents, saying that there was a lack of support to research and to publish scientific work due to financial constraints. He referred to collaborating centres and suggested 'linking' between institutes in the same country to facilitate document exchange.

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that at past ASFA Board Meetings, Mr Ibeun (NIFFR) had commented on the irregularity of publications in Nigeria and the uncertainty regarding their status. She also mentioned the situation regarding Mozambique, where the status of publishing the serial titles included on their monitoring list was unknown. She explained that the FAO ASFA Secretariat was endeavouring to help some inactive ASFA Partners who found themselves in this situation by providing them with material that had been scanned through digitization projects and deposited in repositories. The ASFA Partners could prepare ASFA records for this material as part of, or as a substitute for, their regular input.

Mr Seteras (IMR) expressed his support for this initiative, saying that it was good to link digitization projects with the preparation of ASFA records. See Agenda Item 7.6 for further discussion regarding digitization.

## **7.2 Subject scope**

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) asked the ASFA Partners if they believed that there were any areas in the depth and coverage of the subject scope of ASFA that were missing with respect to the topics included in the publication ASFIS Reference Series 2, Subject Categories and Scope Description (Rev.2).

Mr Sahu (NIO) questioned the inclusion of studies on wetland environments and atmospheric issues such as monsoons. Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) replied in general yes, although it could depend on which aspect of these issues was being covered. However, when in doubt and if a subject category covering the aspect under study could be found in the above-mentioned Subject Categories and Scope Description publication, the document should be included in ASFA.

## **7.3 Coverage and monitoring**

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that completeness of coverage was very important to the ASFA database, especially with respect to its quality. She reminded ASFA Partners that great care should be taken to monitor all publications in their respective countries that were relevant to the subject scope of ASFA, especially those serial titles included on their individual monitoring lists. Ms Noble (NMBL) expressed her concern about the gaps in coverage of serial titles included in the monitoring lists of inactive ASFA Partners. She raised the issue of collaboration between ASFA Partners and suggested that partners could work together by temporarily covering those titles, i.e. prepare ASFA records for titles on the monitoring list of other ASFA Partners that were currently not being covered for one reason or another. She added that many of the titles were not only hard copies but were also available online; some of the ASFA Partner institutes had full texts available on their web sites. This allowed more potential for ASFA Partners to provide their literature to other ASFA Partners, so that input could be prepared from them. The FAO ASFA Secretariat said that they could draw up a list of Serial Titles from ASFA Partners currently not producing ASFA records and distribute it via ASFA Board-L. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) commented that a list of serial titles that were available on the web would be very useful and allow for voluntary monitoring by the ASFA Partners. Ms

Noble concurred to the usefulness of such a list, as it would enable ASFA Partners to collaborate in covering gaps in input.

**[Rapporteur's note:** Funds have been set aside by the FAO ASFA Secretariat to address this issue.]

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) also expressed her support for a list of serial titles on the ASFA Monitoring List not being covered by ASFA Partners. She commented on the availability of publications under the responsibility of Spain, Australia and FAO, mentioning that many of them were missing in ASFA. Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) replied that the ASFA Secretariat were aware of their backlog regarding coverage of FAO documents and ASFA input, which had been unavoidable due to the current lack of human resources within the FAO ASFA Secretariat. She said that they were working on the possibility of semi-automating the preparation of ASFA records for FAO publications by importing the metadata in XML format from the FAO Corporate Document Repository to the www-ISIS-ASFA software.

### 7.3.1 Review of coverage and monitoring

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) suggested that a review be conducted of the ASFA Monitoring List, not only to 'clean it up' but also with a view to expanding it, so as to include more serial titles and, at the same time, prioritizing and ranking them. The prioritization should, in his opinion, take into account aspects such as intellectual ranking and quality. He believed that it was important to assess the relevance and excellence of the journals, not only from their academic value. Ms Noble (NMBL) commented that it was important to take also into consideration the subject coverage point of view and not only the relevance of the journal. Mr Emerson stressed that such an objective work should be done by an expert or consultant, perhaps as an ASFA Trust Fund project. Ms Noble (NMBL) referred to a previous ASFA Trust Fund Project carried out by Ms Baron (CEMARE) in 1999 (see 2000 ASFA Board Report, Section 7.2) which had identified gaps in ASFA coverage of socioeconomic aspects and had resulted in the addition of serial titles to the Monitoring List and said that perhaps a similar project could be carried out to expand the Monitoring List further.

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that a consultant could be hired to review the ASFA Monitoring List and also check for gaps. Ms McCoy (ProQuest) suggested that each ASFA Partner reviewed their individual monitoring lists. Ms Wibley replied that the FAO ASFA Secretariat always recommended that each ASFA Partner regularly reviewed their individual monitoring lists and checked for gaps in coverage. Mr Montes (UNAM) commented that there would be a need for criteria/guidelines to follow in order to establish journals as being core journals and also how to deal with gaps in the individual partners' lists. **[Rapporteur's note:** The FAO ASFA Secretariat has hired a consultant to eventually carry out this exercise, amongst other ASFA related activities (time permitting).]

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) recommended that it should be somebody external to control/coordinate such a project, adding that the Monitoring List was a unique aspect of ASFA. He believed that an objective examination by an external expert was necessary in order to take a fresh look at ASFA and examine its objectives. For further discussion regarding this issue see Agenda item 5 of the 4<sup>th</sup> day of the Meeting.

Mr Sahu (NIO) referring to the coverage of serial titles included in the Monitoring List, mentioned that when searching CSA Illumina he had come across some duplicate records (covered by both ProQuest and also the appropriate ASFA Partner) and also had noted various records from titles that were not relevant to ASFA. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that these duplicate/irrelevant records were from the Deep-Indexing database (CSA Illustrata). He explained that ProQuest did not index these records for ASFA, but for the Deep-Indexing database and that the core journals were covered in a separate subset.

Ms Noble (NMBL) raised the issue of the coverage of non-Monitoring List literature, such as monographs and reports, referring in particular to information that was available online on the websites of various international organizations and agencies. Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) explained the procedure to follow for the coverage of monographs (books). She said that if an ASFA Partner wished to prepare records for a book or the proceedings of a conference that was published in their country, they should first check on the ASFA database and also confirm with ProQuest in order to ensure that the book was not already covered. If, instead, an ASFA Partner wished to cover a book that was not published in their country, it should also contact the corresponding ASFA Partner in that country to confirm coverage, in order to avoid duplication of records on the database.

Ms Noble (NMBL) stressed that there would be a need to coordinate efforts in order to include the information that was available online on various agency web sites in ASFA. Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that she had started preparing a list of such agency web sites. For further discussion regarding grey literature in ASFA see Agenda Item 7.6.

**Ms Noble (NMBL) and the FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to liaise regarding the production of a list of international agency websites containing grey literature information which could be entered in ASFA.

**Ms Noble (NMBL) agreed to** coordinate the preparation by different ASFA Partners of ASFA records for literature available on international agency websites

## 7.4 Timeliness

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reminded ASFA Partners that timeliness referred to the time period between the publishing of the document and its appearance on the ASFA database and also the time period between receipt of the document by the ASFA Partner and submission of the ASFA record to ProQuest.

### 7.4.1 Review of timeliness of ASFA records (by ProQuest)

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) stressed that timeliness was a very important factor to be considered with respect to the evaluation of a database, since competition was very intense. He said that it was used in ranking and comparing databases. He commented that when considering the definition of timeliness as being the number of days for a record to appear on the database, with the ASFA database it was a case of months. He added that even when explaining to users of the database that more time was required to prepare ASFA records, the majority did not care anymore about this and perhaps would go elsewhere. He said that timeliness was crucial to the commercial success of a database and affected how it was sold.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that much of the content in ProQuest's databases was available elsewhere and that users were interested in unique material not covered anywhere else. He added that during a commercial sale, the ProQuest staff had only 5 or so minutes to convince a client to buy the database. Not much time was spent on evaluating the database but more emphasis given on how long it took for the articles to appear in the database.

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that the criteria used by ProQuest to evaluate the timeliness of serial titles appearing on the database could not always be applied to the publications monitored by ASFA Partners in developing countries, given the problems and delays they often face regarding publishing documents. Such problems are not encountered by commercial publishers in developed countries. She said that it should be the responsibility of ProQuest to convey this aspect and distinguish between commercial publications and grey literature, i.e. the uniqueness of grey literature was more important than the timeliness.

Ms Noble (NMBL) reported that she had noted that some core journals under ProQuest's responsibilities were 2 years behind on the database. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) requested that ASFA Partners inform ProQuest should they come across delays in the ProQuest serial titles. He explained that it was fairly easy to gauge how quickly content went into the database by using the source list together with the issue number.

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) mentioned the delay in input for some ICES publications, in particular she noted that many of the ICES Annual Science Conferences were missing. In their intersession report, ICES also noted that they had requested ProQuest to prepare ASFA records for their ICES CM Documents for 2008 but the records were still not available on CSA Illumina.

Ms Noble (NMBL) concurred that the ICES publications were important and should be included in the database and added that these were available online and therefore should be easier to get into the ASFA database. Ms McCoy (ProQuest) replied that ProQuest was preparing the ASFA records for these ICES documents and said that it was a difficult process to convert the online versions into ASFA.

Ms Noble asked what the difficulty was. Ms McCoy explained that there had been delays in input caused by office moves by ProQuest and training of new staff. The ICES documents were being processed by ProQuest but there were some difficulties in processing the PDF files.

**Ms McCoy (ProQuest) agreed** to look into the issue and ensure that the records would appear on CSA Illumina as soon as possible.

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) remarked that problems due to internal/infrastructure changes were continually being faced by many of the ASFA Partners and in some cases were responsible for delays in the submission of ASFA input.

Ms Noble (NMBL) referred to the need to improve timeliness, commenting on the time that was needed to populate different systems with the same information, for example ASFA records, Aquatic Commons input, OceanDocs input, She highlighted the need for metadata conversion tools which would facilitate the use of the same information in different systems, for example converting data from ASFA records in a format which could be used in document repositories, such as Aquatic Commons and OceanDocs, thereby lessening the time necessary to produce different outputs of the same information.

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that such a conversion tool now existed, thanks to work conducted by FBA during their Trust Fund Project on "Digitization, Open Access Deposition and ASFA Record preparation of Freshwater Grey Literature 1940–2007". Mr Schwamm (FBA) explained that, during the project activities, it was realized that a conversion tool would considerably lessen the time needed to prepare records for depositing into the Aquatic Commons repository by using the metadata from ASFA records prepared using www-ISIS-ASFA instead of having to copy/paste the information. A small programming tool was developed which could do a batch conversion of ASFA records into AC records, thereby saving a lot of time; then the PDF files would have to be added to the AC record before depositing into the repository.

Ms Noble (NMBL) asked whether a similar tool existed for the OceanDocs repository. Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) replied that a filter had been developed by the OceanDocs team in order to import ASFA records. Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) mentioned that there were problems regarding the conversion of ASFA records into OceanDocs. Ms Cristiani (IIP) commented this was due to the updating of the OceanDocs software, but that she not sure exactly where the problem was. Mr Schwamm (FBA) said that it was a mapping issue between the 2 softwares (Dspace and www-ISIS-ASFA).

**Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) and Ms Cristiani (IIP) agreed** to provide the FAO ASFA Secretariat with specific details of the current problem encountered with the OceanDocs conversion tool.

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to inform Mr Goovaerts (University of Hasselt) regarding the issue with www-ISIS-ASFA/OceanDocs conversion tool and discuss the problems with him during the IAMSLIC conference in Zanzibar in October 2011.

[**Rapporteur's note:** Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) discussed this issue with Mr Goovaerts in Zanzibar, at the IAMSLIC conference during a demonstration of the AgriOceanDspace software. The FAO ASFA Secretariat received communication from Mr Goovaerts in February 2012 that this problem was being looked at, and eventually was resolved in March 2012; it was now possible to import batches of ASFA records into the OceanDocs Repository. The FAO ASFA Secretariat sent a message via ASFA-Board-L on 28<sup>th</sup> March 2012 to inform ASFA Partners that the import tool ASFA-OceanDocs was operational.]

#### **7.4.2 Review of measures taken by ASFA Partners to increase timeliness**

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) referred to recommendations made at the 2009 ASFA Board Meeting regarding solutions to improve/increase the timeliness of ASFA input. (See 2009 Board Report, p.10). She reminded ASFA Partners that they should send their ASFA records to ProQuest more frequently, at least one batch per month, rather than sending them in one large batch just before the annual Board Meeting, or at the end of the year. Ms Wibley also mentioned that if ASFA Partners were having difficulties in preparing ASFA records in a timely manner, they could submit their records to ProQuest for automated indexing.

Ms McCoy (ProQuest) said that very few batches of records had been received from ASFA Partners to be processed through their automated indexing system. For further discussion on automated indexing and the quality of ASFA records, see the next Agenda Item.

#### **7.5 Accuracy of the ASFA records appearing on database**

##### Automated indexing

Ms Noble (NMBL) raised the issue of how automated indexing affected the accuracy of the ASFA record and also questioned the accuracy of the automated indexing process. She referred to Appendix 1 of the UK Intersessional Report (See **Annex-38**) which presented the results of an assessment carried out of some 500 records sent to ProQuest for automated indexing. Some examples of indexing errors were included in the Appendix and Ms Noble highlighted some records showing incorrectly assigned subject categories and incorrect geographic descriptors.

Ms Noble expressed her concern regarding the fact that some 45% of the sample records were missing geographic descriptors and stressed the importance of enriching abstracts with information regarding geographic locations, especially considering the fact that the full text of the documents could not be processed through the automated indexing system. She asked ProQuest whether ASFA Partners could assist in improving the performance of the automated indexing system with respect to the geographic descriptors.

Ms McCoy (ProQuest) said that the geographic descriptors were the most difficult aspect of indexing, since they comprised very long strings in some cases and were not natural language. This meant that great care was needed in building the automated indexing tools. There were many variants in the terms and heavy quality checking was necessary. She explained that training the processing system for automated indexing was an ongoing procedure and added that feedback was essential. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) commented that it was important to put geographic indexing into context with respect to quality. He said that when examining what has changed during the history of ASFA, geographic descriptors were missing in the records 20 years ago and so it was clear that certain missing areas are the same now as before. Ms Noble (NMBL) said that although much time and effort was being spent in improving the Geographic Authority List (GAL) which was used by the ASFA Partners for indexing the geographic locations, it was rather concerning to see that 45% of the records produced by ProQuest did not include any geographic descriptors, especially considering the fact that ProQuest produced 80-85% of the records on the ASFA database. She commented that it was important to identify new geographic descriptors so that they could be included/built-in the automated process. She believed that the users of ASFA should be made aware of the fact that ASFA contained geographic indexing and ProQuest should be stressing this and advertising it more. (For further discussion regarding GAL, see Agenda Item 11.7.)

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) reported that it had been a business decision to develop and use an automated indexing system for the ASFA database as a means of getting more content in the database more quickly at

a lower economic cost. He added that this issue could be included in the Publishing Agreement to be addressed in future discussions with ProQuest. Ms Noble (NMBL) commented that it was important to be aware of this.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) stressed how important it was that ASFA Partners inform ProQuest of errors, since this would assist in improving the automated indexing process.

Ms Noble (NMBL) raised the issue of editing 'old' ASFA records produced by IRL (ASFA publisher before CSA/ProQuest) with respect to the addition of serial title in full. Ms McCoy (ProQuest) said that it was now possible for ProQuest to access these 'old' records. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) commented that these records could be problematic to edit due to their different structure and that it would depend upon the type of modification to be made. If a programmatic match could be made, then an automatic correction would be feasible, but it would be impossible to carry out correction on a one-by-one basis. He stressed that it would be important to indicate clearly whether the editing required data to be replaced or to be added.

## **7.6 Status of efforts of Partners to include more grey literature in ASFA, including digitization**

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) asked whether literature produced by international organizations could be considered as grey literature, and expressed her concern regarding the lack of coverage of material from international organizations in the ASFA database, such as IOC, UNEP and ICES.

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) mentioned that ASFA records for IOC and UNEP publications had been prepared in the past under contract by KMFRI, but there were some problems regarding contract renewal. She said that contact with UNEP had been lost due to various staff changes.

**Mr Macharia (KMFRI) agreed** to temporarily take over the responsibility of monitoring the UNEP publications until the FAO ASFA Secretariat has re-established a working contact with UNEP regarding ASFA.

**Ms Rosenboom (UN/DOALOS) agreed** to liaise with IOC and UNEP regarding the status of their ASFA input the following week when she would be in Chile attending the Workshop in support of the Regular Process.

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reminded ASFA Partners that they should endeavour to provide in their intersessional reports some statistical information regarding the amount of grey literature covered in their ASFA input.

Mr Schwamm (FBA) queried the usefulness of such statistics and Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) replied that they would provide information as to the uniqueness of the ASFA database. Mr Schwamm suggested that the uniqueness of ASFA with respect to coverage of grey literature could also be used for marketing purposes by ProQuest. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that it was important to provide their sales staff with as much information as possible with regard to the uniqueness of ASFA and in this respect statistics were always useful.

Ms Noble (NMBL) mentioned the importance of increasing the percentage of grey literature covered in ASFA. In addition, she highlighted the need to include information in the ASFA record regarding the availability of the literature, so as to facilitate users of the ASFA database in retrieving the literature. She stressed the importance of providing full-text links to such literature and also raised the issue of broken URL links. Mr Emerson (PQ) concurred as to the importance of providing full-text links and commented that new technologies facilitated the identification of broken links, although often there was still a problem in actually retrieving the literature.

### Digitization and Institutional Repositories

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) re-iterated the importance of digitization grey literature and depositing it in document repositories such as Aquatic Commons, OceanDocs. She reminded ASFA Partners that they could put forward ASFA Trust Fund Proposals for this purpose and mentioned that several ASFA Partners were carrying out digitization projects and urged other ASFA Partners to do the same.

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) referred to the FAO-OEKC initiative to enhance access to fishery publishing and said that some institutes may be contacted by the OEKC group, requesting information regarding their capacity to develop and maintain their own repositories. She explained that the main aim of the initiative was to provide support in this area.

Mr Schwamm (FBA) commented that many institutional repositories were generally only of benefit to the organization/institute, but not necessarily useful for research from the point of view of access to the information. He questioned whether ASFA should be involved in projects to assist the development of institutional repositories. Mr Sahu (NIO) said that institutional repositories were very important in India. He mentioned that there were 2 types: open access and non-open access.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) requested clarification regarding what the support to develop repositories involved. Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) explained that the OEKC initiative was at an early stage and at the



moment information was necessary to determine in which areas institutes needed assistance regarding the setting-up and maintenance of repositories, whether it was lack of technological expertise, lack of infrastructure, lack of funds, etc. Mr Emerson commented that most institutes wanted control over their own repositories and often political issues were involved. He said that it was important to consider the fact that the support may not always be continuous.

Ms Noble (NMBL) said that some institutes wished to customize their repositories to their own requirements; for example they would include fields for in-house administration purposes. In addition, only the bibliographic details could be made freely available for some documents such as commercial literature and confidential reports, so as to have control in supplying the information, i.e. there was a legal copyright issue. She commented that it was of value for information seekers to be aware that these publications existed even though the full-text was not freely accessible. In response to a comment that there were more than enough repositories available already, Ms Noble suggested that the important point was that the information was available, rather than where it was available from, adding that harvesters such as Avano would be able to find and aggregate the information.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that while it was important to provide as much assistance as possible regarding digitization and institutional repositories, care should be taken in providing this assistance and also regarding who provided the framework and controlled the infrastructure.

## 7.7 ASFA inputting procedures

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) mentioned the questions raised by Ms Hadebe in the ORI Intersessional Report concerning some ASFA inputting procedures, such as how to prepare records for theses, how to enter documents without abstracts, what to do with broken URL links and how to cover project material.

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to contact ORI and provide explanations regarding the questions related to ASFA input methodology raised in their report.

**[Rapporteur's note:** Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) met with Ms Hadebe during the IAMSILIC conference and one-day ASFA Workshop, held in Zanzibar, Tanzania in October 2011 and clarified the issues raised in the ORI Intersessional report.]

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) raised the issue of ASFA data entry procedures for electronic documents. She mentioned that there was a growing trend for documents to be published first online and then in printed format. This often resulted in different citations for the documents, and also in the fact that the different versions sometimes did not contain identical information.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) commented that it was important to make sure that enough information was provided in the ASFA record so that the document could be obtained. He said that most of the e-documents had unique identifiers, such as DOIs, which facilitated their retrieval and if information such as page numbers was missing it was not that important. He believed that a re-assessment of mandatory data fields should be considered. Ms Noble (NMBL) replied that page numbers were useful in that they provided helpful information regarding the size of the document. She referred to American Geophysical Union journals and their citations in ASFA, explaining that these were incomplete. The publisher's instructions for citing articles included a 6-digit "citation number" but only the first 3 digits appeared in ASFA records. The missing information in the citation meant that the articles could not be cited according to publisher recommendations. Ms Noble explained that this created problems when using ASFA to search for and export records to reference management systems, e.g. Endnote, because the missing information had to be added manually; this required searching online for the relevant references and noting the complete, 6 digit citation numbers. There was a similar problem with online journals published by Hindawi. The "Article ID number" was missing from ASFA records which meant that these references could not be cited accurately until they were amended.

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat), referring to documents that were firstly published online and then in print, mentioned that the current procedure was to prepare 2 separate ASFA records. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) commented that, in the past, some articles were published in 2 different print sources and consequently separate ASFA records were prepared for them. This facilitated the retrieval of the information, since some institutes may have had access to just one of the 2 print sources. However, Mr Emerson did not believe that this should be the same case for articles published first online and then in print and that it would be sufficient simply to prepare one record for the online version, which was generally published first. Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) remarked that this was assuming everybody had access to the web. She pointed out that many ASFA Partners were in countries with poor internet connectivity, so it would be of great use to know that the information they wanted was also available in a printed publication. Mr Emerson said that this could be a valid argument for preparing separate ASFA records for such documents.

Ms Pacey (NAFO) referred to some of the documents/report produced by her institute and explained that ASFA records were prepared for the documents individually after they were published online. At a later date (end of year), all these documents were put together/compiled and published in one book, so she would produce just one ASFA record for the book itself. Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that this was a good way of informing users that the information already published online was now available in print and

would allow those not having good internet access, or those using just the DVD, to get hold of the book, if possible.

#### Possible changes to ASFA inputting procedures

Some discussion was held regarding possible changes to bibliographic data entry procedures which would result from the eventual discontinuation of the printed ASFA journals. This discussion is reported here.

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) explained that some of the inputting procedures were specific only to the printed journal, such as HTML coding for italics, superscript, subscripts, entering the acronym DBO, cross-reference phrase and therefore it was important to have a list of the eventual changes to ASFA inputting procedures so that ASFA Partners could be informed when appropriate. She commented that it would be necessary to go through all the data entry procedures to determine which were specific only to the printed journal and then each of the ASFIS Series guidelines would have to be modified accordingly. It would also be necessary to examine which of these would have implications as to the structure of the www-ISIS-ASFA worksheet, especially in view of the fact that work would be starting shortly on the new Release 2 of the software.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) commented that it was very important to start these discussions, so as to be prepared when the printed journals were eventually discontinued, and that it was good opportunity to do this now at the ASFA Board Meeting, rather than doing it later via ASFA Board-L. He concurred that it was necessary to have such a list, since many of the restrictions in the ASFA records were specific to the printed journal.

Mr Emerson said that it was no longer a problem for ProQuest to have multiple-author affiliations in the ASFA record; the new platform could deal with such information. Ms Wibley commented that several ASFA Partners, in particular IFREMER, in the past had requested the possibility to enter addresses for each author, but since it was a problem for the previous ProQuest platform to link the author with the appropriate address, the www-ISIS-ASFA software had not been modified regarding this issue. She pointed out if the software worksheet was to be modified to accept addresses for each author, it would be rather cumbersome and time consuming and perhaps not all ASFA Partners would be able to enter all the data.

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to liaise with Dr Rybinski regarding the eventual modification of the www-ISIS-ASFA software so as to be able to incorporate multiple author affiliations.

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to** liaise with PQ and draw up a list of the changes to ASFA Data Entry procedures which would result from an eventual decision not to continue producing the printed ASFA journals

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to send all ASFA Partners a list of changes in Data Entry procedures via ASFA-Board L, once the ASFA printed journal was discontinued.

#### Secondary Classification codes field and/or the Cross-reference phrase.

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) explained the function of the Secondary Classification codes, and how this field gave the possibility of indicating that the ASFA record covered more than one specific subject area. She also explained the function of the Cross-reference phrase, mentioning that it was a data element specific to the ASFA printed journal, and did not appear in the online database, CSA Illumina.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that historically the Cross-reference phrases and the Classification codes were necessary for the printed journals, but added that in the online environment, the codes did provide some useful information.

Ms Noble (NMBL) referred to the ProQuest Automated indexing process and commented that it was not possible to assign more than one Classification code. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that it was very difficult to assign the subject category codes during the Automated indexing process as it was difficult to build rules for them.

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) said that in her opinion very few people, perhaps only librarians, searched using the subject category codes, and she believed that they were not necessary. Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) asked whether some statistics could be provided as to the use of subject category codes in searching; she said that they could be used as very broad subject descriptors to search in some instances. Ms Noble (NMBL) supported the usefulness of using subject category codes as part of a search strategy and said that they did have a value. She was aware of the hard work and time that it did take time to correctly assign them, but said that the purpose of indexing was to help people retrieve the information that they were looking for. If subject categories were eliminated, she pointed out that much more care would be necessary in assigning subject descriptors, i.e. a more in-depth indexing with many more subject descriptors would be required. Ms McCoy (ProQuest) commented that subject category codes had been proven very useful in some of ProQuest's business databases. She mentioned that the new ProQuest platform allowed the user to filter their results by classification codes.

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) commented that in the past it had been useful to use the subject category codes in searches, but now they appeared to be mixed up with codes from other ProQuest databases. She said that

at her institute they no longer used the codes in search strategies for this reason. Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) asked for further clarification regarding this issue, saying that codes from other ProQuest databases should not affect the results of searches based on ASFA subject category codes. Ms Cosulich replied that she could not provide specific examples, but said that on some occasions the ASFA subject code that was used in the search was different to that found in the search results. Ms Wibley said that this discrepancy was perhaps due to the fact that certain subject categories had become separate journals; for example the pollution and conservation sections of ASFA-1, were separated in 1990 to become a different ASFA journal, ASFA-3. As a consequence, the ASFA-3 subject category codes to be used by ASFA Partners for data entry using the www-ISIS-ASFA software were modified to begin with the number 3 rather than 1, whereas on CSA Illumina, all the subject category codes for ASFA-3 appeared beginning with the number 1. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) explained that some records appearing on the ASFA database were 'shared records' that had an overlap with other ProQuest databases, and therefore other codes from the different databases would be included in the ASFA records. However, he insisted that this should not affect the possibility of searching for ASFA records using the subject category codes. He added that the new platform now split the information regarding the codes for the different databases in a different way, which would make it less confusing for the customer.

**The ASFA Board agreed** to maintain current indexing procedures involving assigning classification codes to the ASFA records.

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) mentioned in the INIDEP intersessional report (See **Annex-10**) that version 1.2 of the www-ISIS-ASFA software now had a field for author-assigned keywords. She said that it would be useful to enter author-assigned keywords in all records, not just those to be processed for Automated indexing. Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) clarified that the author-assigned keyword field had been added to the worksheet originally for the sole purpose of assisting in the automated indexing process; she asked whether the new ProQuest platform now had a field for author-assigned keywords.

Ms McCoy (ProQuest) commented that the Illumina platform did have field called 'Identifiers' for non-Thesaurus terms, but this was not the same as author keywords. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) mentioned that on the new platform there were going to be many new fields, some of whose content was not visible but searchable, and remarked that the author-assigned keywords could be one of these. He said that the capability was there for having the author-assigned keyword field searchable, although several decisions would need to be made before this could be done. Mr Emerson also referred to a new feature, social tagging, where users would be able add their own indexing terms to the records for their own use. He said that the author-assigned keywords were included in the content of the record, although not visible or searchable at the moment. Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that if this was the case, and in reply to the issue raised by Ms Cosulich, then ASFA Partners if they wished could include author-assigned keywords in all ASFA records, not just those to be processed for Automated indexing. Although these keywords would not appear in the ASFA record on the CSA Illumina platform, they would be kept as possible searchable content for the future. Mr Emerson said that there was a potential to do this in the future, but emphasized that the author-assigned keywords field was added to the worksheet to assist the processing of ASFA records sent by ASFA Partners to ProQuest for Automated indexing.

Ms Noble (NMBL) asked Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) whether the reason for using author keywords to assist in the indexing was because the document was difficult to index or because appropriate terms could not be found in the ASFA Thesaurus. Ms Cosulich said that she used the author keywords in order to enrich the record with the author's intention. Ms Noble commented that if it was necessary to add authors' terms for the indexing, maybe this indicated that there were gaps in the Thesaurus coverage of the subject; if this was the case, then perhaps the authors' terms should be suggested as additions for the ASFA Thesaurus. See Agenda Item 11.6 for further discussion regarding ASFA Thesaurus terms.

## **8 ASFA PRODUCTS AND SERVICES**

### **8.1 ASFA journals**

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) asked the ASFA Partners if there would be any objections should ProQuest discontinue the printed ASFA journals. He said that, due to economic pressures, one of the objectives of the publisher was to reduce costs; the production cost of the printed indexes was very high. Mr Emerson pointed out that the printed journal did not represent the database anymore; there was now a 'disconnect' between the ASFA journals and CSA Illumina, i.e. the content was no longer the same. He added that there were not many active subscriptions to the print indexes; only 24 ProQuest customers requested the print version of ASFA. The CD-DVD would be provided instead to all Collaborating Centres.

Mr Montes (UNAM) expressed his support for discontinuing the printed journals, saying that many libraries had limited space to keep the journals. He commented that most users preferred to use the online version of the ASFA database; some were not even aware that the printed ASFA journals existed. He added that problems in internet connectivity were common in many countries and, for this reason, it was important to maintain the ASFA CD-DVD.

**The ASFA Board agreed** to the eventual discontinuation of the ASFA printed journals.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that it was important to set a timeframe for the eventual discontinuation of the ASFA printed journals and include it in the next Publishing Agreement. Ms Noble (NMBL) commented that it would be necessary to survey all ASFA Partners, especially those receiving the print journals, asking their opinion regarding the discontinuation of the ASFA journals.

Mr Grainger (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that the ASFA Board governed the decision-making and that the discussions here showed that the majority of the ASFA Partners present felt that it was no longer justifiable to maintain the print product

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to send a message via ASFA-Board L to ask whether any ASFA Partner would object to this decision, mentioning also that should the answer be yes, a reason would be appreciated.

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) asked ProQuest how the discontinuation of the printed ASFA journals would affect the entitlements of the ASFA Partners. She suggested that, perhaps more Internet access could be provided to Collaborating Centres in order to balance the loss of a product as an entitlement. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that this issue could be included in discussions on improving ASFA Partner entitlements.

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) asked whether, once the printed journal was no longer produced, ProQuest could use the time saved on carrying out quality control on the ASFA records, in particularly with respect to the Automated Indexing. Ms McCoy (ProQuest) replied that Ms Abram, the Aquatic Sciences and ASFA Editor at ProQuest, would be able to spend some time on the manual checking of automated indexed records, should she no longer have to deal with the printed ASFA journals. She added that it would be difficult to measure how much time would be spent doing this. Some discussion followed as to the time to be spent on quality checking of the records and how it could be measured. Ms Wibley suggested that ProQuest provide a brief quality check report in their Intersessional Report, including details such as how much time was spent on checking a certain number of records, and include how many errors were identified and corrected.

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) noted that the eventual discontinuation of the printed ASFA journals would result in some changes to current data entry rules and said that several of the ASFIS series guidelines would have to be amended to incorporate such changes. She referred in particular to the inclusion of the acronym DBO (DataBase Only) at the end of the abstract of ASFA records, which was used to indicate that the record was to appear only in the CSA Illumina database and not in the print product. Ms McCoy (ProQuest) said that it was no longer necessary to include DBO in records, since their conversion software was now able automatically detect the 'older' records, i.e. those published more than 5 years ago. Discussion that was held here regarding changes to ASFA data entry procedures which would occur following the eventual discontinuation of the printed ASFA journals is reported above under Agenda Item 7.7.

## **8.2 ASFA CD/DVD**

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reminded ASFA Partners that the ASFA database on CD-ROM and/or DVD was one of the basic entitlements of all active ASFA Partners. She added that ASFA Partners should refer to document ASFA/2011/76, "Updated list of Partners' Entitlements" (**Annex-48**), and check that they were correctly receiving all their entitlements, including the ASFA CD/DVD.

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) asked whether ProQuest were considering the discontinuation of the ASFA CD/DVDs, in view of their decision regarding the printed ASFA journals. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) confirmed that the production of the CD-DVDs would be continued, explaining that this production was under the direct control of ProQuest.

Mr Grainger (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that for many developing countries, internet access was either very expensive or very unstable, and therefore the ASFA CD-DVDs were very important.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that a request had been made by Ms Cochrane, the FAO Consultant working on the LIFDC project, regarding the possibility of consolidating the 4 quarterly CD-ROMs into one annual CD, so as to reduce the number of CD-ROMs that it was necessary to work with. Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) explained that for new institutes participating in the initiative, it was necessary to send a large number of CD-ROMS; for example to cover a 3 year period, some 12 CD-ROMs would be required.

**Mr Emerson (ProQuest) agreed** to pass on the request to consolidate the 4 quarterly CD-ROMs into one annual CD to the ProQuest development team.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that the problem regarding breaks in the URL links in the CD-ROM, previously mentioned to ProQuest in past ASFA Board Meetings has still not been solved. She said that Ms Cochrane (FAO Consultant) had notified ProQuest on various occasions concerning this issue. Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) explained that the URL address had a space in it, which resulting in the broken link not being clickable. Ms McCoy (ProQuest) asked how many records were involved. Ms Wibley replied that there was a large number of records involved and that this was an old issue, not something recently occurring; Ms Cochrane had sent in the past examples to Ms Soto, previously at ProQuest. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) requested the FAO ASFA Secretariat re-send the various e-mails and details; he expressed his

concern that since the issue had not been resolved so far, this could mean that there was no solution to this, apart from correcting each broken URL link one-by-one, which would not be a feasible solution.

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to provide Ms McCoy (ProQuest) with information on the ASFA records on the CD-ROMs with broken URL links, providing details as to the types and number of records which had this problem.

[**Rapporteur's note:** An e-mail was sent to ProQuest by Ms Cochrane on 30.09.2012 with the details of the broken links as requested.]

### **8.3 Internet database service**

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) commented that the full text links of records were not displayed in the short display format of ASFA records on the CSA Illumina platform; this meant that it was not possible to know if the document was available online unless the records were individually viewed. She said that information regarding the online availability of the document was very important and should be made visible in the ASFA record appearing in the short display format on the CSA Illumina platform.

**Ms McCoy (ProQuest) agreed** to investigate with the development team at ProQuest, the possibility of including online availability information (full-text links) in the short display format of the CSA Illumina platform.

### **8.4 New outputs and services**

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) reported that ProQuest expected to release its new search platform, which was still under development, in mid 2012. He said that the new platform had already been released to a few selected ASFA Partners for feedback, but that the legacy platform would not be continued for much longer once the new research environment platform was released. He mentioned that some new features to the new platform had been requested and this could delay the removal of the legacy platform until late 2012. He added that the new platform had some useful new features, and a different search engine which handled the content differently. Mr Emerson expressed his confidence that ASFA Partners would appreciate the new features, and said that some patience was required since the development of the new platform necessitated a long transition period. He said that Ms McCoy (ProQuest) would be giving a presentation on the new features included in the new platform on the 4<sup>th</sup> Workshop Day of the Board Meeting. See Agenda Item 2 of the 4th Workshop Day Agenda for further discussion regarding the new platform.

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

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) reported that ASFA was continually marketed by ProQuest. Information regarding all marketing activities carried out by ProQuest is included as an annex to their Intersessional Report (See **Annex-41**). He added that ProQuest appreciated efforts made by ASFA Partners to do their own marketing.

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that the Secretariat regularly promoted ASFA within the FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Department as did the FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Branch Library. She said that the ASFA database was made available online to all FAO staff at Headquarters and in the field, through the FAO Intranet. The FAO ASFA Secretariat sent e-mails to all staff within the various services of the Fisheries and Aquaculture Department to remind them on how to access and use the online ASFA database. Ms Wibley mentioned that some ASFA Partners had reported that their institutes include an icon on the desktop of their computers which enabled direct access to the ASFA database. She stressed the importance of continually promoting ASFA within Partner institutes, for example reminding staff about the icon on their desktop and explaining what it was. This would be of use to new staff, in view of the current trends in staff turnover, and would ensure continuity regarding awareness and knowledge of ASFA.

Mr Montes (UNAM) referred to the trial periods offered by ProQuest for testing the ASFA database and asked whether they could be extended. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) explained that these offers were restricted to those who wished to be part of data testing for the new platform. He said that the ProQuest sales agent should be contacted in the country in order to request trials.

### **8.6 Document delivery**

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reminded ASFA Partners that, for those partners who were IAMS LIC members, documents could be requested through the IAMS LIC Z39.50 library. She mentioned that on the 4<sup>th</sup> day of the Board Meeting, Mr Garnica (FAO ASFA Secretariat) would be giving a demonstration on how to use the Z39.50 library to request and receive documents electronically. See Agenda Item 3 of the Workshop Day for further discussion regarding document delivery.

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) noted that IFRO had mentioned in their Intersessional report (See **Annex-23**) that they had difficulties in accessing the web and also in requesting documents from foreign countries.

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to investigate with IFRO the issues mentioned in their report regarding web access in order to clarify exactly what the problem was.

## 8.7 Increasing distribution of ASFA information products and services

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that this was the 13<sup>th</sup> year of the “Project to Distribute ASFA on CD-ROM to LIFDCs in Africa and via Internet to LIFDCs worldwide”. See **Annex–45** for a full report of the project’s activities. Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) highlighted some of the major points. At present 29 institutions in African countries receive ASFA either on DVD or CD-ROM or via Internet; one participant (NatMIRC, Namibia) became an ASFA partner during the intersession period. The total number of currently active institutions receiving ASFA free-of-charge under this project is now 57; 2 participants (Cambodia and SEAFDEC in the Philippines) are considering becoming partners in the near future. Ms Wibley commented that the initiative has shown good success over the years in expanding the ASFA Partnership, as many of the participants have actually become ASFA Partners. She added that the FAO ASFA Secretariat considered this initiative to be fundamental to the FAO information mandate and intended to continue to promote the initiative.

## 9 PROGRESS WITH MACHINE-READABLE INPUT

### 9.1 www-ISIS-ASFA

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that www-ISIS-ASFA v1.2 was the most current version of the software being used by ASFA Partners for ASFA data entry. She referred to the FAO Intersessional Report (**Annex–3**) Section 7 which provided a background to the ASFA data entry software. Release 1.2 was issued in September 2010 and was available for downloading on the FAO reserved ASFA ftp site (<ftp://ASFA:PWda28b@ext-ftp.fao.org/Fl/Reserved/ASFA>) and the majority of ASFA Partners were using this version of the software to prepare ASFA records.

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) informed the ASFA Partners that there had been some problems with the software when using Firefox Mozilla as the Browser, instead of Internet Explorer; it was not possible to enter abstracts more than 5 lines in length. The FAO ASFA Secretariat highly recommended that ASFA Partners used Internet Explorer as their browser when using the www-ISIS-ASFA v1.2 software for ASFA data entry. However, if this was not possible and the browser Firefox Mozilla had to be used instead, Ms Wibley said that Dr Rybinski's team had helped resolve this issue by modifying one of the system files, so should any ASFA Partner come across this problem with the software, they should contact the FAO ASFA Secretariat and the file would be sent together with instructions on what to do to resolve the problem. Ms Wibley added that ASFA Partners should always contact the FAO ASFA Secretariat when coming across a problem during ASFA data entry, whether regarding the www-ISIS-ASFA software or whether regarding ASFA inputting procedures. The FAO ASFA Secretariat would do its best to assist the ASFA Partner in resolving the problem and if not able to do so, would pass on the problem to Dr Rybinski's team.

Ms Wibley mentioned that the re-engineering work by ICIE to the core www-ISIS software was now complete; information regarding the main features of the core programme was included in the FAO Intersessional Report, Section 7.2 (**Annex–3**). She said that she had attended a demonstration of the new core software and the application for the FAO Legal Office; the core programme was no longer DOS-run and therefore did not have any of the DOS restrictions which hampered further development of the www-ISIS-ASFA software. The next step now would be to work towards a Release 2 of the www-ISIS-ASFA application using this new core software. An ASFA Trust Fund Proposal to carry out the development of this application has already been approved in principle at the 2010 ASFA Board Meeting (See Annex–55 of the 2010 Board Meeting Report). The FAO ASFA Secretariat would now have to work together with ICIE in order to draw up the details necessary to develop and improve the application. Ms Wibley explained that the data entry interface, worksheets etc, would not be affected, most of the changes to the software would be 'behind-the-scenes'. She said that the FAO ASFA Secretariat had already drawn up a list of certain improvements to be made to the software and asked ASFA Partners to inform the Secretariat if they had any suggestions or would like to see some changes.

Ms Pacey (NAFO) mentioned that some experts in her institute had queried the use of the word "Corporate" in Corporate Author names. Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) replied that all the titles used for the bibliographic data elements in the ASFA records were based on international standards and explained that the "Corporate Author" was the name of the organization(s) responsible intellectually, technically or editorially for the content of the document. Mr Emerson (PQ) commented that the word "corporate" implied 'business' but this was not the case when referring to Corporate Authors. Ms Wibley suggested that Ms Pacey could clarify this issue with the experts at her institute by referring to the explanation of the meaning of Corporate Author names found in the online Help notes available in the www-ISIS-ASFA software worksheet (by clicking on the words Corporate Author) and also in the document “Guidelines for bibliographic description and data entry using www-ISIS-ASFA software v1.1”.

Ms Pacey (NAFO) asked whether ASFA records could be sent to ProQuest in formats other than ISO format. Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) replied that the new Release 2 of the www-ISIS-ASFA software would most probably have various format options for exporting the ASFA records, such as XML. She said that the various possible formats would have to be discussed with ProQuest, before they could be incorporated in the new Release 2, and asked if ProQuest had any restrictions regarding receiving ASFA records in formats

other than ISO. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) replied that ProQuest could receive the records in any format, but he stressed that consistency was an issue. It would not be possible for ProQuest to receive ASFA records in multiple formats from the ASFA Partners; consistency was important regarding the formats in which ProQuest received the records. Once the formats were decided upon, it would not be a problem for ProQuest's team to develop suitable conversion programs for downloading the ASFA records if they were given sufficient advance notice. Ms Wibley said that this issue would be elaborated further with Dr Rybinksi whilst drawing up the TORs for the work to be conducted for Release 2 and then discussed with ProQuest before finalization. She clarified that with the current version of www-ISIS-ASFA v1.2, ASFA records would still be exported and sent to ProQuest in ISO format.

Mr Schwamm (FBA) referred to the export formats of Release 2 and compatibility with other systems, in particular use of the metadata in the ASFA records for downloading into the Aquatic Commons. He said that it was very important to standardize the metadata output so that they would comply with International Standards. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that the metadata needed to be as granular as possible and stressed that it was not recommendable to simplify the granularity of the ASFA records, since once the granularity was lost, it was not possible to go back.

Ms Noble (NMBL) asked whether the new ProQuest platform would be able to accept accented characters, given the fact they no longer would be a problem with Release 2.0 of the software. She referred in particular to some Icelandic characters. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that this would not be a problem with the new platform.

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) referred to the CSA Illumina database and the downloading options, mentioning that currently it was possible to download ASFA records only in TXT format. She said that it would be extremely useful to have the possibility to download in other formats, such as XML, so that the metadata could be used in other applications. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that currently it was possible to download in TXT format and then convert the metadata available in the TXT file into XML format. Ms Wibley commented that it would be much more useful if this could be done in one step, i.e. downloading records in XML format. Mr Emerson said that the new CSA platform would have different export formats, but he was not sure as to exactly what formats would be available. He also said that depending upon the use of the metadata, some extra programming/conversion work could possibly be necessary. Ms Wibley explained that such a request had been made to the FAO ASFA Secretariat by the Fisheries and Aquaculture Branch Library (FBL), who were currently carrying out a digitization project, which included ASFA records already on CSA Illumina. FBL were downloading the TXT file and copying/pasting the metadata to create records for uploading to the Aquatic Commons repository, which was time consuming. She said that it would save considerable time and effort if it were possible to download the ASFA records in XML format and then upload into the Aquatic Commons repository. She added that FBL were sending the URL links to ProQuest once the records were uploaded to the repository, so that the ASFA records could be updated to have full-text links.

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented on the problems mentioned by Ms Pureza in the IO/USP (Brazil) Report regarding the operation of the www-ISIS-ASFA software at their Collaborating Centre UEFS. They had reported difficulties installing www-ISIS-ASFA v1.2 which were possible due to configuration problems with their computers.

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to contact UEFS to help resolve the problem in installation of the www-ISIS-ASFA v1.2 software and contact Dr Rybinksi should technical assistance be necessary.

## **10 ASFA TRAINING ACTIVITIES**

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) mentioned how important it was for ASFA Partners to ensure continuity of ASFA in their institutes by making sure that sufficient staff were trained in ASFA data entry procedures to cover for people retiring, or changing jobs. She referred to the NIFFR Intersessional Report (**Annex-29**) where Mr Ibeun had reported training staff regarding ASFA procedures before his retirement so as to ensure continuation in ASFA input preparation and also the INIDEP Intersessional report where Ms Cosulich mentioned the training of another staff member in ASFA inputting procedures. Ms Wibley stressed that it was the responsibility of the ASFA Partner to train new staff at their institutes and also at any Collaborating Centre they may have.

Ms Noble (NMBL) raised the issue of having an ASFA Training video. Given the continual need for training, such videos would be very useful and could be distributed to all ASFA Partners to keep at their institutes. Ms Pacey (NAFO) concurred with the usefulness of such a training video.

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented lack of resources at the FAO ASFA Secretariat had hampered investigations regarding the feasibility of the preparation of an ASFA training video. Mr Grainger (FAO ASFA Secretariat) suggested hiring a professional expert to assist in the preparation of such a video, although it was important to take into consideration the fact that changes in procedures, such as the development of Release-2 of the www-ISIS-ASFA software, may affect the 'up-to-dateness' of the video. Ms Wibley said that most of the procedures related to ASFA data entry would not be affected by the new Release-2, such as maintenance of the ASFA Monitoring List, indexing etc and she added that the video could also include other issues such as information about the ASFA Partnership, the CSA Illumina database.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) suggested contacting Mr Pepe (ex-ASFA Editor-in-Chief, FAO ASFA Secretariat) regarding the preparation of the ASFA training video, saying that he would be the perfect candidate, having such an excellent knowledge of the ASFA system. Ms Noble (NMBL) concurred, saying that it would be fundamental to have someone actually knowing the system involved in the preparation of the video, as an expert in producing videos would not have the technical know-how regarding ASFA and therefore would not be able to do it alone. Mr Grainger (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that an expert would be required regarding the actual physical production of the video, since they would have the technical knowledge regarding the various formats available, but was in agreement that Mr Pepe could assist in the preparation of the content of the video, ensuring that it would be prepared in simple, easy-to-understand language.

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to investigate the possibility of producing a training video on ASFA inputting procedures and also obtain an estimate of the costs that would be involved.

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that 3 ASFA training sessions had been carried out during the intersessional period. Two of these were outsourced (the FAO ASFA Secretariat had assisted in their organization) and one was conducted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat: Training session for the new ASFA Partners NatMIRC (Namibia) and ORI (Botswana) carried out in March, 2011, at KMFRI, Mombasa, Kenya, on behalf of the FAO ASFA Secretariat; Training Session for the AdriaMed Collaborating Centre IOF, carried out on 27-29 June 2011 at IOF, Split, Croatia by Ms Milone (AdriaMed); Training session during the mini-ASFA Meeting for Latin American Region, carried out on 25-26 October 2010. Full details of these training sessions may be found in the FAO Intersessional Report, Section 7.3.2 (**Annex-3**).

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that some training sessions were being planned by the FAO ASFA Secretariat for the next intersessional period. She referred to the training of ASFA Partners in the Southeast Asian region, previously mentioned by Mr Grainger (FAO ASFA Secretariat) under Agenda Item 6.6.1, although the date and venue were as yet to be determined; the ASFA Trust Fund money which had been allocated for Refresher Training Sessions, most probably would go towards the training in Southeast Asia, since no Refresher Training Sessions have yet been carried out. She also referred to the one-day training workshop being planned for some African ASFA Partners in Zanzibar, Tanzania following the annual IAMSLIC Conference in October 2011.

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) noted that in the PIMRIS Intersessional Report (**Annex-8**), they had reported that due to a change in staff and lack of training in ASFA input procedures, no input had been prepared for the current year and made a request for assistance in training.

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to investigate the possibility of including a person from PIMRIS should a training be carried out in the Southeast Asian region next year.

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

### **11.1 ASFIS-1, Serials monitored for the ASFIS bibliographic database**

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) explained that ASFIS-1 was a list of the serial titles monitored for the ASFA database by all the ASFA Partners, more commonly called the Monitoring List. This list is maintained at the FAO ASFA Secretariat, by Mr Garnica; it is an ongoing process, and Ms Wibley reminded all ASFA Partners that they should always keep the FAO ASFA Secretariat informed regarding any changes to the titles or regarding the publisher. She requested that the ASFA Partners communicated the changes as soon as possible, rather than waiting until preparing their intersessional report for the Annual ASFA Board Meeting to the FAO ASFA Secretariat, as this created a tremendous workload for Mr Garnica. If the FAO ASFA Secretariat was regularly informed regarding the changes as they happened, this would be an easier task and also ensure that the Master Monitoring List was as up-to-date as possible.

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that the Monitoring List was available in various formats; the pick-list contained in the Serial titles field in the www-ISIS-ASFA software perhaps was the one most familiar to ASFA Partners. She reported that the last update sent to ASFA Partners for inclusion in the www-ISIS-ASFA software was dated 28 March 2010. The Monitoring List is also available for downloading from the FTP site of the FAO ASFA Homepage at [ftp://ftp.fao.org/FI/asfa/Monitoring\\_List/Monlis.zip](ftp://ftp.fao.org/FI/asfa/Monitoring_List/Monlis.zip) Ms Wibley explained that the current process for preparing an updated pick-list involved some programming work by Dr Rybinski before it could be incorporated in the www-ISIS-ASFA software by ASFA Partners. She informed the ASFA Board that the FAO ASFA Secretariat was now changing the system used to maintain the serial titles database; an application had been developed for the www-ISIS-ASFA software, which was much easier to manage. This facilitated the work involved in the preparation of updates and meant that the ASFA Secretariat could directly generate itself the new updates to send to ASFA Partners. She expected that final testing would be carried out within the next few months and then an update prepared for sending to ASFA Partners. The FAO ASFA Secretariat would then be able to send out updates more frequently on a regular basis, such as quarterly, or even on special request by an individual partner. Ms Wibley re-iterated the importance of communicating changes in the serial title information in a timely manner; if an ASFA Partner informed the FAO ASFA Secretariat of a change, it would be included in the updated pick-list within a few months, and this meant that during data entry, the ASFA Partner would be able to select the title from the updated pick-list, rather than having to write the title out in full.



Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) mentioned that the Serials Monitoring List was also available as a text file and explained that this format was for consultation only, and not for loading into the www–ISIS–ASFA software. This text file was periodically made available for downloading from the FTP site of the FAO ASFA Homepage at: [ftp://ftp.fao.org/FI/asfa/Monitoring\\_List/MASTER.txt](ftp://ftp.fao.org/FI/asfa/Monitoring_List/MASTER.txt). The most recent version of the text file was dated 12 August 2011.

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) informed the ASFA Board that it was now possible to generate the Serials Monitoring List in an Excel spreadsheet, thanks to the new application software. She said that this would not only facilitate the FAO ASFA Secretariat's work in updating individual ASFA Partners' lists, but would also facilitate the work of each ASFA Partner in monitoring the status of their own individual lists; it would also simplify the work necessary when notifying the FAO ASFA Secretariat of changes to the serial titles. She added that an example of the Serials Monitoring List in an Excel spreadsheet was available for viewing on the FAO reserved ASFA ftp site (<ftp://ASFA:PWda28b@ext-ftp.fao.org/FI/Reserved/ASFA>) and welcomed any comments from ASFA Partners regarding this new format of the Serials Monitoring List.

### **11.2 ASFIS–2, Subject categories and scope descriptions**

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

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that there were no modifications to the subject categories.

### **11.3 ASFIS–3, Guidelines for bibliographic description**

The latest edition ASFIS–3, *Guidelines for Bibliographic Description and Data Entry (using www–ISIS–ASFA software v1.1)*, is Revision 4, which had been distributed to ASFA Partners in October 2007. The document is available on the FAO ASFA Homepage [www.fao.org/docrep/010/k0446e/k0446e00.htm](http://www.fao.org/docrep/010/k0446e/k0446e00.htm).

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) mentioned that the current Revision 4 of this document now needed further updating, to incorporate changes in data entry following release of version 1.2 of the www–ISIS–ASFA software. She said that due to current lack of human resources at the FAO ASFA Secretariat this had not been possible, but added that the Secretariat was hoping to hire a consultant to assist in the preparation of Revision 5.

### **11.4 ASFIS–4, Guidelines for abstracting**

There had been no change to this publication during the intersessional period; the document is available on the FTP site of the FAO ASFA Homepage at: <ftp://ftp.fao.org/fi/asfa/>.

Some possible changes to the procedures involved regarding the entry of the abstract text, such as formatting codes (italics, superscripts, subscripts) were considered. See Agenda item 7.7 for discussion regarding this issue.

### **11.5 ASFIS–5, Guidelines for indexing**

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

### **11.6 ASFIS–6, Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Thesaurus**

The most recent version of the ASFA Thesaurus was Revision 3 (which was updated in July 2008), a printed version of which was sent to ASFA Partners in June 2009. The printed version of the updated ASFA Thesaurus (Rev. 3) is available at [www.fao.org/docrep/011/k5032e/k5032e00.htm](http://www.fao.org/docrep/011/k5032e/k5032e00.htm) and the updated ASFA Thesaurus pick–list is available on the FTP site of the FAO ASFA Homepage at: <ftp://ftp.fao.org/fi/asfa/>.

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that most ASFA Partners had updated their www–ISIS–ASFA software with the updated ASFA Thesaurus pick–list without any difficulty and were now using it. During the intersession, the FAO ASFA Secretariat reminded ASFA Partners via ASFA Board–L to send comments on the thesaurus, regarding additional terms. Ms Wibley said that not many suggestions had been received and opened the floor to discussion regarding revision of the thesaurus and its maintenance.

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) commented that terms related to sociological aspects were lacking in the ASFA Thesaurus.

Ms McCoy (ProQuest) mentioned that ProQuest had identified a large number (1900) of terms from their Water Resources database and asked whether it would be possible to review them for addition to the ASFA Thesaurus. She asked what the procedure would be for adding such terms to the ASFA Thesaurus. Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that the last exercise to update the ASFA Thesaurus was carried out by FBA in 2008; she explained that the Thesaurus Working Group had examined the various suggested terms and decided upon their hierarchical structure (e.g. new term, forbidden term, related term etc.) and scope notes, before FBA made the appropriate update. She clarified that FBA was still responsible for the maintenance of the ASFA Thesaurus.

Ms Noble (NMBL) raised the issue of the presence of non-ASFA Thesaurus subject descriptors in ASFA records that had been imported from other ProQuest databases, saying that many of them were in fact synonyms of 'forbidden terms' in the ASFA Thesaurus. Some discussion followed as to the appropriateness of the ProQuest terms and the feasibility of adding such a large number of terms to the ASFA Thesaurus.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that the terms were important terms which would benefit everyone, but stressed that they did need reviewing; the possibility of adding the terms initially as 'orphans', i.e. without any hierarchical structure, could be considered to save time (the hierarchy could be added at a later date). He also added that this was an opportunity to add terms to the ASFA Thesaurus given the fact that ProQuest were in a position to supply more subject descriptor terms.

Mr Schwamm (FBA) commented that he had not been involved in the previous exercise of updating the ASFA Thesaurus, but was familiar with the software involved and believed that it would not be a problem to add orphan terms. He said that FBA had been waiting for a reasonable number of new terms to start work on the next update of the ASFA Thesaurus, but as yet very few had been collected by the FAO ASFA Secretariat. He expressed his concern as to the very large number of terms that ProQuest would like to be reviewed and the great deal of time that would be required.

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that it would take a considerable amount of time to review such a large number of terms, and that it would be more feasible to do this in smaller batches. She also pointed out that although there were a large number of terms to be reviewed, this did not necessarily mean that such a large number would eventually be added to the ASFA Thesaurus, especially given that some of the ProQuest terms were ASFA Thesaurus forbidden terms.

**Mr Schwamm (FBA) agreed** to liaise with Mr Pettman (FBA) regarding the possibility of adding orphan terms to the ASFA Thesaurus and also to determine what would be a suitable number of terms that could be dealt with in a reasonable time-frame.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that they had discussed possible collaboration with the OEKC/AGRIS group at FAO regarding the ASFA Thesaurus and its maintenance. OEKC have developed a new management tool called VocBench, a web-based multilingual vocabulary management tool that could transform thesauri, authority lists and glossaries into SKOS/RDF concept schemes. Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that OEKC were in communication with FBA regarding this issue.

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

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that the work being conducted by FBA on the ASFA Trust Fund project regarding updating the GAL and correcting the geographic descriptor pick-list in the *www-ISIS-ASFA* software was now at the final stages. The Master files of the GAL and the geographic descriptor pick-list were sent to the FAO ASFA Secretariat by FBA in October 2010, together with the revised guidelines on geographic indexing. Ms Wibley said that the publication *ASFIS-5, Guidelines for indexing using www-ISIS-ASFA software* would be updated to contain the revised section on geographic indexing provided by FBA. More details regarding the GAL project may be found in the FAO Report, Section 5.7 (**Annex-3**).

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that during the intersession, the Geographic Working Group had discussed some issues regarding the format of the pick-list terms and consistency with the GAL Master files. Prior to the start of this meeting, the Geographic Working Group had met to discuss a few remaining issues and decide upon the next steps to take. Ms Noble (NMBL), who acted as the Chairperson at the GAL Working Group meeting highlighted some of the discussions held, a report of which can be found as an annex to this report (See **Annex-54**). She reported that the various changes to be made to the terms would be made by FBA, during winter 2011/2012.

Mr Schwamm (FBA) provided a brief outline of the work carried out by FBA regarding the GAL project. He mentioned that the geographic descriptor pick-list now contained some 24,000 strings and also thanked all ASFA Partners who had sent lists of corrections/additions to be made to the pick-list. Mr Schwamm raised the issue of the need to continually update this pick-list. He said that new terms would always have to be added and suggested that the list should be reviewed on an annual basis.

Ms Levashova (VNIRO) raised the issue of multilingual versions of geographic descriptors and asked whether it was possible for ProQuest to do "behind-the-scene" searching for synonyms. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) replied that it was very expensive to acquire a comprehensive geographic database for use with ASFA. He said that there were restrictions with respect to the new ProQuest platform, which was geared towards a collective approach to its databases.

Ms Fernandez (INP) mentioned that there had been changes in the provinces of Ecuador and these were not included in the pick-list of geographic descriptors in the *www-ISIS-ASFA* software. Mr Schwamm (FBA) said that it would be possible to add these to the GAL if INP provided FBA with a list of the new terms.

**Ms Fernandez (INP) agreed** to provide a list of new geographic descriptors, reflecting the new province names in Ecuador, to Mr Schwamm (FBA), Ms McCoy (ProQuest) and Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat).

## 11.8 ASFIS–15, ASFIS List of species for fishery statistical purposes (ex ASFIS–8, Taxonomic Authority List)

Ms Wibley (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. The list, which contains species of commercial importance to fisheries and aquaculture, was compiled and computerised by the FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Information and Statistics Service. It was updated once–a–year, generally in February/March, and then posted on the FAO Fisheries web page at [www.fao.org/fishery/collection/asfis/en](http://www.fao.org/fishery/collection/asfis/en). Ms Wibley reminded ASFA Partners that the list was not comprehensive and did not contain all taxonomic species in the world, so during ASFA data entry it would be necessary to manually enter the names of species not included in the pick–list. She said that the eventual Release 2 of the www–ISIS–ASFA software would be updated with the most recent version of the list.

Ms Noble (NMBL) raised the issue of introducing a more comprehensive list that also contained species that were not commercial, commenting that this would also assist ASFA Partners in data entry and reduce errors due to inconsistencies in spellings or use of incorrect names.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that there were various different taxonomic databases that were very comprehensive and could be used to replace the current one, for example ITIS, but added that perhaps it was not necessary to actually include such databases as a pick–list in the www–ISIS–ASFA software since this could drastically slow down the software. Many of the databases could be downloaded in different formats and were also periodically updated. He suggested that perhaps it would be more practical if the software could link to external databases. Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that not all ASFA Partners had a constant reliable Internet access and some could be working on stand–alone computers that did not have access at all to Internet, therefore having to link to an online taxonomic database would not be a suitable solution for all. She said that Release 2 of the www–ISIS–ASFA software would have fewer restrictions as to the size of internal databases, i.e. pick–list, as compared to the current version 1.2.

Mr Grainger (FAO ASFA Secretariat) explained that Mr Garibaldi (Fishery Statistician, FAO), was responsible for updating the list and also maintained the 3–alpha code system used (*this system was developed by CWP to establish a common system to exchange data among the members and facilitate the reporting of fishery statistics from national correspondents*). The list contained not just commercial species, but also by–catch species and other species which Regional Fishery Bodies have requested to be included. The list is now quite comprehensive and could be considered as a census of marine life.

Ms Noble (NMBL) mentioned that although commercial species were included in the current pick–list, often studies were carried out regarding the food organisms of commercial species and many of these species were missing. Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) commented that she often had to enter many taxonomic species names that were not included in the current pick–list. Mr Schwamm (FBA) said that the list was also lacking with respect to freshwater species. Mr Gaibor (INP) referred to the fact that much research was currently being carried out on endangered species and said that it was also important for these species to be also included in the taxonomic pick–list.

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) suggested that during the development of Release 2 of the www–ISIS–ASFA software, some testing could be carried out regarding the feasibility of incorporating a more comprehensive taxonomic species list, taking ITIS as an example. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) concurred that such testing would be useful as a means of examining the way forward regarding this issue.

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to investigate with Dr Rybinski the possibility of incorporating ITIS in the eventual Release 2 of the www–ISIS–ASFA software as the taxonomic pick–list.

## 11.9 ASFIS–10, Authority list for corporate names

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) explained that this list was contained as a pick–list in the www–ISIS–ASFA software and that ProQuest maintained the Master File of the Corporate Author Authority List. An updated version of the list was included in version 1.2 of www–ISIS–ASFA, released in September 2010. Ms Wibley reminded ASFA Partners to keep a record of any Corporate Author names not found in the software pick–list and send them to Ms McCoy (ProQuest) so that the master Corporate Author list can be kept up–to–date. She suggested that ASFA Partners kept a list of these new names and then sent the list to ProQuest on a regular basis, rather than sending names one at a time.

Ms Noble (NMBL) suggested that ASFA Partners reviewed their own lists of Corporate Author names and informed ProQuest of additions to be made. Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that not all ASFA Partners would necessarily have their own individual list of Corporate Author names, but just referred to the pick–list that was available in the software, so this could be a difficult exercise. Ms Noble said that most Partners would be aware of departments or services that should be included as Corporate Author names and that ASFA Partners could check against the pick–list to see if they were included and then inform ProQuest of those names that were missing.

**Ms McCoy (ProQuest) agreed** to send an e–mail to all ASFA Partners via ASFA Board–L, requesting them to revise their lists of Corporate Author names and send a list of new names, i.e. those not included in the

current pick-list of Corporate Author names in the www-ISIS-ASFA software, to ProQuest by the end of 2011.

[**Rapporteur's note:** Ms McCoy sent an e-mail via ASFA Board-L 18 November 2011 requesting ASFA Partners to send ProQuest a list of Corporate Author names to be added to the Master Authority File by end December 2011].

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

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reported that this document was a printed version of the online help notes included in the www-ISIS-ASFA software. She said that the current version 1.2 of www-ISIS-ASFA contained help notes that had been updated in accordance with the changes to data entry procedures incorporated in version 1.2. She said that the FAO ASFA Secretariat would be preparing a revised version of ASFIS-16 to reflect the updated help notes in the software, human resources permitting. Ms Wibley commented that the online help notes were available in English, French and Spanish, and clarified that the French version required updating before ASFIS-16 could be compiled.

## **12 ASFA TRUST FUND**

### **12.1 Status of the Trust Fund**

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) introduced this Agenda Item, referring to two documents: "ASFA Trust Fund Status" ASFA/2011/72 (**Annex-44**), which recorded how the Trust Fund money was being spent by the various ASFA Trust Fund Projects carried out by the ASFA Partners; and "The Trust Fund at a glance" ASFA/2011/72a (**Annex-44a**). She explained that the exact deposits, spending and estimated balance of the ASFA Trust Fund were always reported as accurately as possible by the FAO ASFA Secretariat at each ASFA Advisory Board Meeting. Ms Wibley reported that the 2010 Royalty payment from ProQuest was US\$231 348.29; she referred to document ASFA/2011/70 (**Annex-42**), which showed the calculation by the ASFA Publisher of the 2010 Royalty payment for the year 2010 and said that the payment had been deposited in June 2011 with FAO, who holds the ASFA Trust Fund on behalf of the ASFA Partners.

The **Balance** of the Trust Fund is **US\$1 078 907**, at the date of this meeting. The FAO ASFA Secretariat urged ASFA Partners to come forward with ideas and/or proposals to use the ASFA Trust Fund money for the benefit of the ASFA system with respect to increasing its utility to users and its long-term viability. Ms Wibley said that ASFA/2011/72 (**Annex-42**) gave a detailed account of the status of the ASFA Trust Fund and also of the various projects in progress or completed.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) commented that there was a large amount of money in the Trust Fund and reiterated the importance of using this money. He asked whether it would be possible to invest the money in some way as to generate some interest. Mr Grainger (FAO ASFA Secretariat) replied that this was not possible as it was not in line with FAO administrative procedures; however, FAO charges no costs for maintaining these funds. He encouraged all ASFA Partners to come forward with ASFA Trust Proposals and use the Trust Fund Money for the benefit of the ASFA Partnership. He mentioned that the FAO ASFA Secretariat was proposing to increase the sum of ASFA Trust Fund money allocated to support the Secretariat in carrying out activities for the collective benefit of the ASFA Partnership. See below under Agenda Item 12.3.2.

Ms Pacey (NAFO) suggested that the production of an ASFA Training Video could be done as an ASFA Trust Fund Proposal. She said that not only would such a video be of great help to ASFA Partners in assisting with training within their institute, for example to help cope with staff turnover, but also would reduce the need for travelling across the globe to participate in ASFA Training courses.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) raised the issue of extending the use of the ASFA Trust Fund to assist more ASFA Partners attend the ASFA Board Meetings, including some partial support towards those in developed countries. He commented that many institutes were facing budgetary restrictions regarding international travel, which was affecting the number of ASFA Partners, both from developing and developed, being able to attend the annual ASFA Board Meetings. He suggested that, considering the fact that there was a balance over 1 million US\$, the current sum of US\$40 000 which was allocated to provide financial assistance to ASFA Partners to attend the Board Meeting should be expanded and also include ASFA Partners from developed countries.

Mr Grainger (FAO ASFA Secretariat) supported the suggestion made by Mr Emerson to increase the funds available to support attendance at the ASFA Board Meetings and also extend the assistance to ASFA Partners from developed countries. He expressed his concern that there were quite a few ASFA Partners from developed countries who were not attending the Board Meetings and said that perhaps if they were to receive some small financial support it would give them the possibility to attend and actively participate at the Meetings. He mentioned, as an example, the fact that the ASFA Partner in Ireland, MI, had never attended an ASFA Board Meeting, but had offered to host the next meeting in 2012, as it was financial easier to bring everybody to their institute rather than attend the meetings themselves. Mr Grainger suggested that ASFA Partners from developed countries could be provided with some partial funding, i.e. to cover either travel

costs or accommodation costs. He said that some sort of formula would have to be developed so that it could be applied to requests for funding.

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) clarified that currently, the ASFA Trust Fund Proposal to assist ASFA Partners from developing countries to attend the ASFA Board Meeting had a sum of US\$40 000 which went towards both travel and accommodation costs. She said that at this meeting the FAO ASFA Secretariat was proposing to increase the sum to US\$45 000, given the increasing trend in travel costs.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) commented that the formula for should be as simple as possible, such as for example, doubling the amount to US\$80 000 and determining a maximum amount of US\$2 500 for each request for financial support for travel costs from ASFA Partners from a developed country. Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) clarified that this would not affect the sum of money allocated to ASFA Partners from developing countries and that they would still receive funding, if requested, for both travel and accommodation.

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to decide upon a formula for the partial funding of attendance to the ASFA Board Meetings by ASFA Partners from developed countries and circulate it via ASFA Board–L during the intersessional period for approval, before the end of 2011.

Ms Noble (NMBL) raised the issue regarding difficulties faced by some ASFA Partners in actually receiving the money for the work carried out during an ASFA Trust Fund Project. She said that this prevented some ASFA Partners from putting forward ASFA Trust Fund proposals, since the funds received by their institute would not actually go to the persons carrying out the work. Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) commented that this was an issue that she faced at her institute, which had prevented her in recent years from putting forward ASFA Trust Fund proposals. She said that it could be a common problem in institutes in other countries, especially in Latin America. Mr Gaibor (INP) said that he had also faced similar difficulties in order to receive the ASFA Trust Fund disbursement allocated to his institute to assist in hosting this meeting. See Agenda Item 12.2.14 for further discussion regarding this.

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) clarified that the Letter of Agreement (LoA) that was drawn up by the ASFA Secretariat for ASFA Trust Fund Projects had to follow standard FAO practice, whereby the agreement must be between FAO and an institute; thus, payment had to be made to the institute and not an individual person. She said that the possibility of 2 ASFA Partners working together on an ASFA Trust Fund Project, could be examined with one of the ASFA Partners organizing the work and the other actually carrying out the work. The institute organizing the work would receive the funds and then distribute them accordingly to the persons carrying out the work at the other institute. However, Ms Wibley stressed that the FAO ASFA Secretariat would first have to investigate as to the possibilities of preparing LoAs with more than one institute. She reminded ASFA Partners that ASFA Trust Fund proposals could only be put forward by ASFA Partner institutes and not by any other institute.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that perhaps it would be possible for ProQuest to put forward an ASFA Trust Fund Proposal under their name, with the activities to be carried out by another ASFA Partner. In this way ProQuest would manage the funds and could possibly contract and pay a person (or institute) to carry out specific tasks mentioned in the LoA. Further discussion regarding this option is reported under Agenda Item 12.3.5.

Ms Noble (NMBL) raised the issue of putting forward Trust Fund proposals using a standard template, mentioning that this had been discussed last year. Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that one example of an ASFA Trust Fund proposal had been posted on the reserved ASFA ftp site. She added that more examples would be added in the future, time and human resources permitting.

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

### Completed

#### **12.2.1 Financial support to attend the 2010 ASFA Board Meeting (INRH, Morocco, 2010) (US\$40 000)**

This refers to last year's Meeting (2010) held at INRH, Casablanca, Morocco. The allocated sum (US\$40 000) plus US\$18 538 unspent from the previous year's allocation brought the total available sum to US\$58 538.

The total amount disbursed was US\$39 538. The under spending (US\$19 000) was added to the 2011 allocation.

The following 13 ASFA Partners received full or partial assistance to attend the 2010 ASFA Board Meeting: CNSHB (Guinea), NIO.(India), IIP (Uruguay), IMS (Tanzania), INIDEP (Argentina), INSTM (Tunisia), NIOF (Egypt), NMDIS (China), SPC (Noumea), IBSS (Ukraine), UNAM (Mexico), SFI (Poland) and LARRec (LAO).

### **12.2.2 Staff support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for 2010) ( US\$60 000)**

This project proposal covered the period January–December 2010 and was intended 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. See ASFA/2011/72, Part–3, item–8 (**Annex–44**).

### **12.2.3 Further development of www–ISIS–ASFA software as regards interoperability, additional URL fields, and updating picklists) (i.e. release 1.2) (US\$21 195)**

The FAO ASFA Secretariat issued the update (called www–ISIS–ASFA 1.2) on 9 September 2010. This project was actually completed during the 2008–2009 intersession (see the ICIE report as Annex–56 in the 2009 Meeting Report). However, the release was delayed until the end of 2010 due to testing required by the ASFA Publisher.

### **12.2.4 Regional Mini–ASFA Meeting (Latin America) (25–26 October 2010) (US\$20 000)**

After a number of postponements, this Meeting was hosted by INIDEP, Argentina, so as to run back–to–back with the 2010 International IAMSLIC Meeting and the Latin American Regional IAMSLIC Meeting. At the Meeting, the FAO ASFA Secretariat addressed some problems relating to ASFA input preparation (training) as communicated to it by the Latin American partners prior to the meeting. The total amount spent for this regional mini–ASFA meeting exceeded the allocated US\$20 000 by approximately US\$5 500; this excess amount was taken from the sum allocated as support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat.

For a short Report of the Mini–ASFA Meeting see Annex–3 of the FAO Intersessional Report (**Annex–3**). For the full report in Spanish, see ASFA/2011/Info–1 (**Annex–55**).

### **12.2.5 Utilization of the ASFA Trust Fund to pay the IAMSLIC membership fees for ASFA Partners – renewal request for membership fees expiring in 2009–2010**

The renewal of the project was agreed at the 2009 Meeting and called for the sum necessary (approx. US\$ 1 240) to renew all 31 of the currently sponsored IAMSLIC membership fees which were then to expire in either 2009 or 2010.

See Table–1, in section 2.2.5 of ASFA/2011/72 (**Annex–44**) for a list of the ASFA Partners whose IAMSLIC membership fees are currently being paid (some since 2004) using money from the ASFA Trust Fund, and the next expiring dates.

The next group of ASFA Partners (29) whose membership is expiring is at the end of 2011 and 2012. The sum required to renew these 29 memberships is very small when compared to the potential document delivery benefits. The approximate cost is around US\$1 200.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat would be requesting that this Initiative (Trust Fund project) be renewed to cover the membership fees (29 at this counting) expiring at the end of 2011 and 2012. The renewal of this proposal is contained in ASFA/2011/80 (**Annex–52**) and is discussed below under Agenda Item 12.3.3.

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

At the 2009 meeting (see section 12.2.8 of 2010 Board Meeting Report), the FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that the scanners had been delivered to 4 of the 6 institutes that requested them. To date, a fifth institute (CSIR/Ghana) has also received the scanner. FAO administrative problems have so far prevented the purchase/delivery of the final scanner to NIO/India. Considering the elapsed time, it would appear that NIO probably no longer requires this equipment.

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

To date, approximately 750 of these Trust Fund records are on the database. The FAO ASFA Secretariat is waiting for an update from VLIZ regarding this.

In progress

### **12.2.8 Financial support to attend the 2011 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (Ecuador) (US\$40 000)**

This project refers to this year's meeting and is considered as being "in progress" until the meeting is finished and the last expense claim is filled (this often takes several months).

Funds were used for the following 14 ASFA Partners to attend this year's ASFA Board Meeting: CIP (Cuba), NIO (India), IIP (Uruguay), IMS (Tanzania), INIDEP (Argentina), KMFRI (Kenya), LARRec (LAO), NMDIS (China), UNAM (Mexico), USP (Brazil), VNIRO Russia, IMARPE (Peru), NaFIRRI (Uganda), IFOP (Chile).

As usual, any eventual overspending or under spending will be subtracted from or added to next year's allocation.

This is an ongoing proposal; renewal of this proposal for 2012 is presented as ASFA/2011/ 74 (**Annex–46**) and is discussed and reported below under Agenda Item 12.3.1.

#### **12.2.9 Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat for 2011 US\$90 000**

This project 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. This proposal covering January – December 2011 remains classified as “in progress” until the end of 2011. For 2011, \$90 000 was allocated by the Board. There was an overspending of US\$6 480 for the previous (2010) year's allocation. Therefore, the TOTAL funds available for 2011 are US\$83 520.

For a listing of the spending made/planned for 2011 see ASFA/2011/72 (**Annex–44**), (Part 3, item 3). Any under or overspending during 2011 will be carried forward or subtracted from the 2012 allotment.

This is an ongoing proposal; renewal of this proposal for 2012 is presented as ASFA/2011/3a (**Annex–3a**) and is discussed and reported below under Agenda Item 12.3.2.

#### **12.2.10 Updating the Geographic Authority List (GAL) for the www–ISIS–ASFA software (continuation) (US\$24 950)**

This project proposal was approved during the 2009–2010 intersession period via ASFA–Board–L to be carried out by the UK collaborating ASFA centre, FBA, as follow up to discussions at the 2009 Meeting (see Annex–52 of 2010 Meeting Report). A progress report was presented by FBA at the 2010 Board Meeting (see 2010 Board Report: section 11.7 and Annex 39a). Also see Annex 60 of the 2010 Report for report of the Geographic Working Group that met during the 2010 Meeting. A second progress report was presented by FBA at this meeting.

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

For this project, the FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Department Library is digitizing the grey literature in its possession and is depositing the documents in the Aquatic Commons and/or OceanDocs repositories; ASFA records will eventually link to these full–texts. To date, a total of **540** documents have been digitized. PDF copies have been uploaded into the Aquatic Commons repository. See FAO Report Section 6.1.1 for further details of the project and also ASFA/2011/Info–2 (**Annex–57**) for an update regarding the status of the project.

#### **12.2.12 Computer Equipment for CNSHB, Guinea**

This project proposal was approved in principle at the 2009 ASFA Board Meeting. However, delivery of equipment was not realized due to administrative difficulties between FAO Headquarters and field office. Considering the long delay, confirmation is required that equipment is still needed, however no further contact from Guinea has been received by FAO regarding this issue.

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to contact the ASFA Partner in Guinea and investigate the status of this project, i.e. whether the equipment is still required.

**[Rapporteur's note:** The FAO ASFA Secretariat's last contact with CNSHB regarding this issue was on 24.02.2012, but as yet no reply has been received.]

#### **12.2.13 KMFRI – Identify and list grey literature published in Kenya not in ASFA (US\$7 320)**

This project proposal was approved at the 2009 Meeting (See 2009 Report, Section 13.3.5 and also **Annex–26b**). It aimed to identify, collate and list grey literature published in Kenya, with a view to entering the references into the ASFA database, digitizing the full–text and depositing them in OceanDocs repository.

First payment has been made by the FAO ASFA Secretariat and partial advance on final payment is being processed in order to keep project running. For details regarding the status of the project activities, see the KMFRI Report, ASFA/2011/44 (**Annex–26**).

#### **12.2.14 Small Financial Incentive to ASFA Partner Institute hosting ASFA Board Meeting (2010 – INP, Guayaquil, Ecuador) (US\$2 500)**

This project proposal was suggested and approved at the 2009 Board Meeting for all successive Meetings. (See 2009 Report, Section 13.3.8 and also Annex–58)

The funds are sent by FAO Rome to the FAO Representative's office in the country of the Meeting for disbursement to the hosting Institute as per FAO Administrative procedures. The purpose of the funds is, for the most part, to be utilized for: transportation of participants to and from airport; provision of paper copying services, computer and computer projector, coffee breaks etc.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat sent a request for disbursement of the funds to INP for this year's Meeting to the FAO Representative's office in Ecuador on 27 June 2011.

Mr Gaibor (INP) reported having faced numerous technical difficulties regarding disbursement of the funds from the FAO Representative Office in Ecuador, and as yet had not actually received the funds. He suggested that, in order to avoid other ASFA Partners facing the same problems in the future, the funds should be sent well in advance so as to ensure that the hosting institute would obtain the funds before the start of the Board Meeting.

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to initiate the administrative procedures for advance disbursements of the funds to be sent to the ASFA Partners hosting a Board Meeting at least 4–5 months before the meeting.

#### **12.2.15 IMS (Tanzania) – Scanning of fisheries catch and scientific results from 1999–2009 (US\$10 625)**

The project proposal was approved at the 2009 Board Meeting (See Annex–34a of 2009 Meeting Report.) It aims to collect and scan fisheries catch and scientific reports deposited at the Division of Fisheries and the Tanzania Fisheries Research Institute of the Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries Development (approx 500). ASFA records would be prepared and the full text deposited in the IMS and Aquatic Commons repositories. Details of the status of this project proposal may be found in the IMS Report, (**Annex–35**).

#### **12.2.16 FBA (UK) – Digitization, open access deposition and ASFA record preparation of freshwater grey literature, 1940–2007(US\$15 000)**

This project proposal was approved at the 2010 ASFA Board Meeting (see 2010 Report, Section 12.3.4 and Annex–39b). It aims to bring a range of freshwater grey literature (approx 500 documents), previously available only to a small audience, to a wider user base, by digitizing it and depositing it in a repository and also preparing ASFA records (including URI links).

During the activities of the project, it became obvious that a conversion tool for metadata exchange between the 2 different systems (www–ISIS–ASFA/Aquatic Commons) would lead to a considerable time saving, avoiding duplication of effort. In view of this, and in agreement with the FAO ASFA Secretariat, it was decided to prepare such a tool which would enable the conversion of ASFA records prepared with the www–ISIS–ASFA software into an xml–file that could be imported into the Aquatic Commons. Funding for the preparation of this tool would come from the allotment to FAO under the ASFA Trust Fund project proposal “Staff support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat”. (Note: this tool will also be of great use to other ASFA Partners carrying out similar digitization projects requiring preparation of ASFA records).

Pending

#### **12.2.17 (FAO) – Adapting WWW–ISIS–ASFA to the re–engineered www–ISIS–ASFA core program (including modifications to the www–ISIS–ASFA software, making it Release–2)**

Agreed in principle at the 2010 ASFA Board Meeting (see Annex 55 of 2010 Meeting Report), the final approval is now awaiting a breakdown of the activities and timescale. Lack of human resources at the FAO ASFA Secretariat has delayed liaison with ICIE regarding this issue. This project is intended to adapt the www–ISIS–ASFA application to the core www–ISIS programme which, among other things, will render the application Linux and UNICODE compliant.

**[Rapporteur's note:** the FAO ASFA Secretariat has been in contact with Dr Rybinski regarding this issue and due to current lack of human resources at the Secretariat all further activities have been postponed to the end of the year.]

#### **12.2.18 NIOF/Egypt – Filling the missing gap (US\$ 14 160)**

This proposal was approved in principle at the 2009 Board Meeting (See Annex–17a of 2009 Meeting Report). It aims to fill in some of the missing gaps (NIOF estimated about 2360 records) regarding Egyptian literature in the ASFA database. The final approval for implementation is still pending until NIOF is able to submit its regular ASFA input without need for checking.

#### **12.2.19 CIS/Vietnam – Scanning of Viet Nam Fisheries technical and scientific results from 2000–2008**

This proposal was approved in principle at the 2009 Board Meeting (US\$14 690). See Annex 41a of 2009 Report. The final approval for implementation is still pending until CIS is able to submit its regular ASFA input without need for checking.

#### **12.2.20 ASFA Training Session (yearly) (US\$14 000)**

Agreed by the Board at the 2007 Meeting (see section 13.3.7 of the 2007 Report), this project would authorize the ASFA Secretariat to organize and carry out, once a year, a small training session of about 5 participants in the ASFA Input procedures for those Partners, in need of training or re–training. To date, no



yearly courses have been held due to lack of time and human resources at the ASFA Secretariat. It is possible that one year's allotment will be partially transferred to assist another ASFA training event with funding problems.

#### To be re-submitted

The following 3 YugNIRO project proposals were agreed at the 2004 Board Meeting, see section 13.3.5 and Annex 29c of the 2004 meeting report, however, for various reasons they have been dormant/pending since 2004.

#### **12.2.21 Translation of ASFA Thesaurus into Russian and development of Russian-English Thesaurus**

#### **12.2.22 Translation of www-ISIS-ASFA "Help Notes" and front end into Russian**

#### **12.2.23 Translation of www-ISIS-ASFA Guidelines into Russian**

The eventual re-activation of these projects can now only proceed after discussion and reconsideration with the ASFA Secretariat and possible re-submission for approval to Board.

### **12.3 New Proposals**

Mr Sahu (NIO) asked whether it was possible to put forward new ASFA Trust Fund Proposals during the intersession period.

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that although it was acceptable to put forward ASFA Trust Fund Proposals during the intersession period, the FAO ASFA Secretariat highly recommended that ASFA Partners were present at the ASFA Board Meeting to put forward their Trust Fund Proposals. In this way, any questions or discrepancies could be discussed and clarified before being put to the vote. She explained that when Trust Fund proposals are put forward and discussed at the ASFA Board Meeting, sometimes it becomes necessary to modify or re-write them, in which case this they can be re-circulated via ASFA-Board-L for voting, since any issues raised during the Board Meeting had been clarified.

#### **12.3.1 Financial support to attend the ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (for year 2012) (US\$45 000)**

This is an ongoing Trust Fund project proposal (See **Annex-46**). It is reviewed each year by the Board to maintain or update the amount of allocated funds. The FAO ASFA Secretariat requested that the sum for this year was raised to \$45 000.

**The ASFA Board approved** the proposal.

#### **12.3.2 Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year Jan-Dec 2012) (US\$100 000)**

This is an ongoing proposal (See **Annex-3a**) that is reviewed and renewed each year by the Board to update the amount of funds allocated to the FAO ASFA Secretariat. At the 2010 Board Meeting the proposal was approved for the one year period, January-December 2010 at US\$90 000. This year, the FAO ASFA Secretariat was requesting renewal of the proposal with a sum of US\$100 000. Mr Grainger said that FAO was facing budget reductions due to reduced donor funding. In order for the FAO ASFA Secretariat to maintain the same level of support to the ASFA Partnership, it would be necessary to outsource some work and hire additional temporary staff to assist in ASFA related activities.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) asked whether there was a risk of reduction in FAO's support to ASFA, as a consequence of the budgetary reductions, especially in view of the large sum available in the ASFA Trust fund. Mr Grainger (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said there had been various cutbacks in various areas in the FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Department and posts had been abolished in some sectors, but he had fought hard to keep all 3 staff posts of the FAO ASFA Secretariat, which were maintained by Regular Programme funds. He re-iterated his total commitment to support ASFA and told the Board that ASFA was well recognized within the FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Department as a priority area. He believe that providing this extra financial support to the ASFA Secretariat shows the commitment of the ASFA Partnership to supporting the work of the FAO and this should be seen as something positive.

**The ASFA Board approved** the proposal.

#### **12.3.3 Utilization of ASFA Trust Fund to pay IAMSLIC membership fees (US\$1 175)**

This is an "ongoing" proposal (See **Annex-52**) presented every two years to the Board for review and re-approval. The proposal is to renew the 29 IAMSLIC membership fees expiring in 2011 and 2012, for a further two years (estimated cost US\$1 175). A list of the ASFA Partners whose membership fees need renewal is included in **Annex-52**. Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) asked the ASFA Partners to inform the ASFA Secretariat should there be any name changes, so that the table could be updated before sending to IAMSLIC.

**The ASFA Board approved** the proposal.

#### **12.3.4 IFOP Trust Fund Proposal "Scanning of Fisheries Catch and Scientific Results from 1999–2011" (US\$ 12 850)**

This proposal will involve the scanning of 1000 reports, the preparation of bibliographic records and their sending to ProQuest for uploading to the ASFA database (See **Annex–14a**) Its aim is to digitally preserve literature in fisheries and aquaculture and make it available both at the international and national level.

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that the actual number of records to be prepared was not contained in the table of project activities. Ms Barria (IFOP) said that the total number of records to be prepared would be 1000. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) queried the costs and asked if they included overheads, mentioning that in past ASFA Trust Fund proposals, overheads were not generally included.

Ms Noble (NMBL) asked where the scanned documents would be deposited. Ms Barria (IFOP) said that the reports would be digitized and made available in the document repository on the IFOP server. Some discussion followed regarding the availability of the scanned reports in the IFOP repository. Mr Satya (NIO) commented that if the IFOP repository was not OA compliant, then the documents could not be harvested. Ms Noble suggested that the documents be included in an Open Access Repository. Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that IFOP could consider using the new conversion tool prepared by FBA which would enable the ASFA records prepared for the documents to be uploaded into the Aquatic Commons repository.

Mr Sahu (NIO) queried the scanning costs, mentioning that the costs should be indicated per page rather than per document.

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) suggested that IFOP reconsidered the activities that would be involved in the proposal, for example whether or not abstracts would be written, the documents would be included in a repository, and also reviewed the timeframe and costs involved for each of the tasks.

**The ASFA Board approved in principle** the proposal, pending the submission of a revised proposal containing specific details of all the tasks involved, including also the uploading of the records into an OAI compliant repository such as Aquatic Commons and/or OceanDocs.

#### **12.3.5 INIDEP Trust Fund Proposal "Digitization, Open Access deposition and addition of URIs into ASFA records of marine and aquatic sciences papers from a historical regional journal: Physis" US\$10 350**

This proposal aims to make available to a wide international user base, a selection of marine and aquatic papers from an Argentinean core historical natural sciences journal (Physis), which is currently available to only a small audience in printed format. (See **Annex–10a**) It involves the digitization of the documents and uploading of the PDF files into Aquatic Commons. Some 500 records from this journal are already on the ASFA database and so the metadata from these records would be converted into XML format and uploaded as a batch file into Aquatic Commons including the PDF. Information would be provided to ProQuest regarding the full–text links to be added to the ASFA records and also any corrections that had been noted, so that the ASFA records on the database could be updated.

Mr Montes (UNAM) asked for clarification regarding the corrections to be made to the Physis records already appearing on the database, mentioning that this publication was formerly under the responsibility of UNAM. Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that, prior to the preparation of machine–readable input, the ASFA records were prepared on paper and then "re–keyed" into the system, a process which allowed errors to be made.

**ProQuest agreed** to investigate the possibility of preparing a joint Trust Fund Proposal with INIDEP and also examine possible ways of financing INIDEP through ProQuest

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to investigate the possibility of preparing Letter of Agreements for joint Trust Fund projects which involve more than one ASFA Partner.

**[Rapporteur's note:** the FAO ASFA Secretariat was informed that, according to FAO administrative rules and procedures, this is not possible]

**The ASFA Board approved in principle** the proposal, pending investigation by ProQuest and the FAO ASFA Secretariat regarding the administrative issues of joint Trust Fund proposals. The proposal would be re–written and re–submitted for voting via ASFA Board–L during the intersessional period.

During discussion of this proposal, Ms Noble (NMBL) raised the issue of correcting or adding information to "old" ASFA records on the database. These discussions are reported under Agenda Item 7.5.

#### **12.3.6 FAO Trust Fund Proposal "Mini–ASFA meeting for African ASFA Partners attending IAMSLIC Conference, October 2011" (US\$10 000)**

The scope of this Trust Fund Proposal (see **Annex–53**) is to facilitate attendance of African ASFA Partners at the 2011 IAMSLIC Conference to be held in Zanzibar so that a mini–ASFA Workshop could be held back–to–back with the IAMSLIC/AFRIAMSLIC conference on 22 October 2011. Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA

Secretariat) said that the mini-ASFA meeting in Zanzibar would give the African ASFA Partners an opportunity to share their knowledge and experiences regarding ASFA. The ASFA Secretariat would also be able to provide some technical support regarding any problems concerning ASFA input or use of the data entry software.

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) expressed her support for this ASFA Trust Fund Proposal, mentioning the success of the Latin American mini-ASFA Meeting that had been held the previous year in October 2010 in Argentina. She said that it was an excellent opportunity to get together to discuss any doubts or problems relating to ASFA.

Mr Phouthavongs (Laos) commented that it was very important for ASFA Partners to share their problems and experiences; many ASFA Partners had expertise in other areas outside of the ASFA system which could assist others. He expressed his hope that a similar mini-ASFA Meeting would be held next in Southeast Asia.

Ms Noble (NMBL) said that she fully supported this Trust Fund proposal, commenting that such regional mini-ASFA meetings were a very cost-effective way of reinforcing training. She believed that mini-ASFA meetings were good opportunities to strengthen cooperation/collaboration within the partnership.

**The ASFA Board approved** the proposal.

[**Rapporteur's note:** the one-day ASFA Workshop was successfully carried out on 21st October 2011]

#### Collaboration between ASFA Partners

Mr Schwamm (FBA) raised the issue of collaboration between ASFA Partners in carrying out ASFA Trust Fund Proposals. He reported that FBA would like to put forward some retrospective indexing Trust Fund Proposals to prepare historic input from some old freshwater journals and that they had done some background investigation with a few journals. Mr Schwamm explained that some of the publications were not just in English and would require Spanish, Italian or French translations for the abstracts. He suggested the possibility of working together with other ASFA Partners, who could cover the non-English documents. He referred to the publication *Hydrobiologia* as an example, saying that the old issues contained articles that were only in German, French and Italian. He said that FBA would be willing to prepare an ASFA Trust Fund Proposal and asked whether any ASFA Partner would like to contribute to the project, by preparing ASFA records for the non-English papers. FBA would be responsible for distributing the funds according to the amount of input prepared by the collaborating ASFA Partner.

Mr Montes (UNAM) said that he would be available to collaborate with FBA in such a Trust Fund proposal regarding Spanish papers.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) commented that there could be some administrative difficulties concerning the distribution of the funds, i.e. how the payments would be made, but expressed his enthusiasm regarding this type of cooperation between ASFA Partners.

**Mr Schwamm (FBA) agreed** to draw up some lists of publications which could be involved in historic input Trust Fund Proposals.

[**Rapporteur's note:** the FAO ASFA Secretariat received an e-mail from FBA regarding this issue on 3 November 2011, which contained a list of 4 core freshwater journals together with a breakdown of the numbers of English and non-English documents/articles which would be involved. An ASFA Trust Fund proposal was put forward by FBA for voting intersessionally in March 2012]

## **13 OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

## **14 PLACE AND DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that the ASFA Partner in Ireland, the Marine Institute, had reaffirmed its offer to host the 2012 ASFA Board Meeting. The last week of June 2012 had been suggested as possible dates for the meeting.

**The ASFA Board agreed** that the 2012 ASFA Board Meeting would be held at the Marine Institute (MI), Galway, Ireland, 25–29 June 2012.

Ms Antonietti (IMARPE) informed the ASFA Board that her institute IMARPE extended an invitation to offer the 2013 ASFA Board Meeting, in Callao, Peru. The exact dates were to be confirmed, but she suggested the months of September or October.

## **15 SPECIAL TOPICS, DEMONSTRATIONS, WORKSHOP DAY**

### **15.1 Comments on ASFA input**

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) gave a PowerPoint presentation on ASFA input (see **Annex-58**). Various aspects relating to the submission of ASFA records to ProQuest and also to the preparation of ASFA

input using www-ISIS-ASFA software were covered, highlighting areas where ASFA partners should pay particular attention so as to avoid errors and inconsistencies. Ms Wibley also provided some live hands-on demonstrations, including how to connect to the FAO reserved ASFA ftp site and explaining the various folders available in this site.

Mr Gaibor (INP) asked if the presentation could be explained in Spanish to the Latin-American ASFA Partners present at the Board Meeting and also whether it could be translated into Spanish for their benefit. Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) agreed to repeat the presentation in Spanish to the Latin American participants after the Meeting was closed.

[**Rapporteur's note:** Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) translated the PowerPoint Presentation into Spanish and provided the FAO ASFA Secretariat with a copy in November 2011. This will be included as an **Annex** to the report.]

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

Ms McCoy (ProQuest) gave a demonstration on the ASFA database using the CSA Illumina platform (see **Annex-59**). She described the new ASFA Editorial Team at ProQuest and their activities. Some examples of searching on the CSA Illumina interface compared with the new ProQuest platform were provided to highlight some of the new features now available when searching the ASFA database.

## **15.3 IAMSLIC Z39.50 (resource sharing and document requests)**

Mr Garnica (FAO ASFA Secretariat) gave a demonstration on the IAMSLIC Z39.50 Distributed Library and Interlibrary Loan program (see **Annex-60**), mentioning that use of the Z39.50 for document delivery was one of the benefits of being a member of IAMSLIC. He explained that requests for documents should be first made using the Z39.50, rather than sending requests to the IAMSLIC or ASFA lists, in order to avoid creating a lot of work for many different people. He stressed that the time taken to make the request and receive the document using Z39.50 was minimal compared with the time and effort made by many others searching for the same document on their own repositories, which would often result in receiving unnecessary duplicate copies of the same document from different sources. Ms Noble (NMBL) commented on the importance of having guidelines to explain to the user how to use the Z39.50 correctly, especially with respect to commercial journals. Mr Garnica replied that guidelines were available on the IAMSLIC website regarding International lending and document delivery.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) raised the issue of copyright and asked how that was handled in this system. He commented on the potential negative indirect impacts on publishers like Elsevier, saying that they often had to adjust their subscription models accordingly. Mr Garnica said that there were different policies in different countries and the IAMSLIC Resource Sharing Committee was examining the issue. He said that all requests were monitored and originators of non copyright protected material were contacted.

## **15.4 AgriOceanDSpace (FAO and UNESCO-IOC/IODE combine efforts in their support of open access)**

Ms Noble (NMBL) gave a presentation on AgriOceanDSpace (see **Annex-61**), on behalf of Ms Pikula (Chair, GEMIM), AgriOceanDSpace is a customized version of DSpace open source repository software, the aim of which is to promote and enhance open access to scientific information in oceanography, marine science, agriculture and related sciences. The presentation explained how the FAO and IODE communities, who were working separately on customizing DSpace, initiated this joint initiative to develop a common repository tool.

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) expressed her enthusiasm for AgriOceanDSpace, commenting that it was a good tool for institutes in developing countries that had limited IT support. She said that the software could be downloaded and customized according to the individual requirements of different institutes/organizations.

## **15.5 Impact of ASFA usage**

Mr Schwamm (FBA) gave a presentation on the ASFA impact evaluation (IE), or "Does ASFA make a difference" (See **Annex-62**). He said that this was a very important issue, commenting that he had to justify at his institute why FBA was a part of the ASFA system and that an IE on ASFA could be very beneficial not only to ASFA Partners to justify the time spent by staff on contributing to ASFA, but also to ProQuest in order to assist in selling the ASFA database. The presentation provided an outline of IE and methods involved, indicating the processes involved in each step. Mr Schwamm distributed a hand-out on "Doing impact evaluation for libraries" and discussed the application of IE to an Abstracting and Indexing service such as ASFA (see **Annex-62b**). As an example, the theme "Meeting aquatic sciences researchers' needs" was applied to ASFA, with 2 objectives: To provide an A&I service that positively contributes to aquatic research; and, To secure ASFA as the main service for finding literature on sustainable fisheries issues. Mr Schwamm commented that since ASFA was a service with a long history, a "before – after" study would be feasible, i.e. the impact of access to ASFA could be evaluated.

The presentation was well received by the ASFA Partners and many of them commented on the urgent need for an evaluation of the impact of ASFA and its future viability.

Mr Grainger (FAO ASFA Secretariat) mentioned that FAO was using a results-based management system and continually evaluating the impact of what was being done, justifying it and making changes for the future. He said that IE was a very relevant issue to ASFA and added that the important question was how it could be done. He added that some indicators as to the importance of ASFA did already exist, such as the IAMSILIC statement that ASFA is the most authoritative bibliographic database in aquatic sciences, but some qualitative indicators were necessary regarding the impact of ASFA. He believed that the presentation provided some useful ideas that were worth following up.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) commented that an evaluation of the impact of ASFA was necessary and added that, in order to survive it was important to know whether ASFA was useful or not. He said that, although ProQuest could not take a lead in such an evaluation, it could assist with the provision of information that could be of use; for example, sales figures could provide an idea as to the trends in the purchase of ASFA. Mr Emerson recommended that somebody external to ASFA carried out the evaluation and believed that timing was critical, i.e. the sooner the better.

Mr Montes (UNAM) concurred with the need of such an evaluation. He said that the ASFA Partners were a heterogeneous group from different social and economic backgrounds and perhaps, as a start, each ASFA Partner could establish 3 important IE aspects that could affect them within their own environment. He also believed that an evaluation of ASFA should be carried out by an external person, but suggested that the ASFA Partners could provide tools to facilitate the work.

Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) remarked that the need for an impact evaluation of ASFA had been discussed on many occasions during past ASFA Board Meetings without arriving at any concrete decisions. This indicated the complexity of carrying out such an evaluation and said that perhaps the most difficult aspect was 'how to start' or knowing who to contact to ask for assistance. She urged ASFA Partners to come up with ideas or suggest someone who could help initiate the process.

Mr Schwamm (FBA) said that he could perhaps approach the organizations mentioned in the presentation, to provide some assistance to help in the initial stages, i.e. how to start, who could help. He suggested that contacting the World Bank and the International Initiative for Impact Evaluation could be a possibility. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) commented that just because these 2 organizations were involved in impact studies did not necessarily mean that they themselves carried out IE, but perhaps they could provide some assistance which would help start in the right direction.

Ms Noble (NMBL) said that IE was a very complicated issue and that there were 2 basic aspects to consider in the evaluation of ASFA: evaluating the quality of the product, i.e. the ASFA database, and evaluating the importance of ASFA within the institute/organization of the ASFA Partner, i.e. a local benefit. Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that both these aspects were related, i.e. quality of ASFA database could help justify the importance of ASFA to the institution. Ms Noble pointed out that cost was also an important factor which affected the use and impact of ASFA. Mr Schwamm (FBA) said that ease of use, accessibility and content coverage were also factors to be considered aside from the quality of the database.

Ms Noble commented on the difficulty of using usage statistics as an indicator of the importance of the ASFA database, since the database was used by searchers in different ways.

Mr Grainger (FAO ASFA Secretariat) referred to an external evaluation carried out in the early 90s regarding FAO's participation in ASFA. He said that most of the recommendations made in the report had been implemented (such as increased participation in ASFA by developing countries, addition of non-English abstracts and implementation of the LIFDC project). Mr Grainger also mentioned that an Independent External Evaluation (IEE) had been conducted on the FAO Fisheries Department by the FAO Office of Evaluation a few years ago and perhaps somebody there could assist. He commented that an external consultant would be more useful, but would require collaboration of the ASFA Partners.

Ms McCoy (ProQuest) suggested the formation of an Impact Evaluation Working Group that could liaise with an external consultant.

Mr Emerson (ProQuest), Mr Schwamm (FBA), Ms Noble (NMBL), Mr Montes (UNAM) and Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) agreed to be part of the Impact Evaluation Working Group.

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to investigate an independent evaluator in consultation with the FAO Office of Evaluation and report back to the ASFA Board within 2–3 months.

**Mr Schwamm (FBA) agreed to** investigate a potential evaluator through the organizations mentioned in his presentation.

**[Rapporteur's note:** Mr Schwamm (FBA) informed the FAO ASFA Secretariat on 12.10.2012 that he had contacted the organization *International Initiative for Impact Evaluation* and that they had provided some contact names.]

See the discussion reported below under Agenda Item 15.6 for further comments on impact evaluation of ASFA.

## 15.6 Alternative business models for ASFA

Mr Emerson (ProQuest) gave a presentation on the current business model of ASFA and possible alternative models from the ProQuest point of view. He started by referring to the minutes of the 1976 ASFA Editorial Board Meeting and went on to examine how ASFA had changed over the past 25 years. He said that it was important to examine the original objectives established by the ASFA Partnership when it was set up and not only see whether they were being achieved but also if they were actually pertinent today, i.e. does the researcher need now what was thought to be needed in the past. In terms of evolution, it was important to change or mutate in order to survive. Mr Emerson presented some statistics showing the current trends in subscriptions to the ProQuest databases and explained that subscriptions for individual databases, such as ASFA, were going down, but that subscriptions to packages, such as Biological Sciences where ASFA was included, were going up. He said that it was important for ProQuest to respond to current needs. Libraries were facing budget cuts and therefore were looking to spend their money in a more cost-effective way, such as buying ASFA bundled together with other databases.

Mr Emerson commented that search engines were now very sophisticated and with the availability of full-text, the need for high quality indexing has been reduced. With the development and evolution of the worldwide web, much more information/literature is available on the internet today; researchers can search and generally find what they want. Secondary publishers like ProQuest could not afford to rely solely on content, since today it is very easily available elsewhere. There was a transition going from content identification to a service model, moving towards data discovery and other services. Mr Emerson said that it was important to ask the question: if ASFA did not exist and were to be started up today, would it be done in the same way, i.e. by creating a bibliographic database. When considering the future prospects of ASFA, he believed that various issues should be considered: perhaps effort should be concentrating on content not freely available elsewhere; perhaps a commercial publisher should not be involved; perhaps ASFA could be produced on a volunteer model. Mr Emerson recommended that some concrete action be decided upon before the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of ASFA. It was very important to do an Impact Evaluation and then act on the recommendations.

A discussion followed the presentation with various ASFA Partners commenting upon several of the different issues raised during Mr Emerson's presentation. Some of the discussion is reported below.

Mr Sahu (NIO) said that although it was possible to search and find information on the Internet by using search engines such as Google, users of the ASFA database were very satisfied and he was of the opinion that the current model was still very useful. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) concurred that the current model could still be viable for many more years. He referred to comments made in 2000 by a professional information expert regarding the evolution of primary journals, who stated that within 5 years primary journals and hard copies would no longer be available. Mr Emerson said that 10 or so years later this was not the case, but there was a trend in this direction. Therefore, although ASFA could continue with its current model for the next years ahead, it was important not to be complacent, but to be prepared and be ready to change when necessary.

Mr Grainger (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that ASFA had a very good reputation, adding that other publishers had shown interest in ASFA. However, he added that it was important to be realistic and not be complacent, and highly supported going ahead with an evaluation of ASFA. The major issue, in his opinion, was how to do the evaluation, and whether it would be useful to look at the number of hits on the database, or the number of requests. He said that the number of requests (searches) was not always a good indicator of the impact, and stressed the need of finding means to assess the value of ASFA. He added that a person could make one request and make a crucial decision based upon the results of that request, which would lead to a huge impact. Mr Emerson concurred and commented that the presentation given by Mr Schwamm (see previous Agenda Item 15.5) raised the issue of the importance of having qualitative indicators as well as quantitative indicators. He said that it was important to take into consideration who ProQuest were trying to please – the researchers or the people actually making the purchasing decision. In order to survive, it was necessary to be aware of what others were doing in the same field.

Mr Schwamm (FBA) commented that perhaps this issue of impact evaluation should be discussed at the beginning of the ASFA Board Meeting rather than at the end, given its importance. Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) said that the ASFA Board Meeting Agenda was always circulated to ASFA Partners before the meeting so that changes/additions could be suggested. Ms Noble (NMBL) commented that it would be better to get the essential topics out of the way first, and then concentrate on evaluation. Ms Wibley explained that up until several years ago, the ASFA Board Meetings lasted only 4 days. She said that a few years ago, an extra 5<sup>th</sup> Workshop day was added after completion of the meeting. It was found that some useful discussion and decisions came up during this day, so it was decided to include the workshop day as part of the meeting. In this way, the discussions, decisions and any action items could be recorded and included as part of the minutes of the meeting. She stressed that just because the discussions on valuation were held towards the end of the ASFA Board Meeting, this did not mean that they were of no importance.

Mr Gaibor (INP) said that evaluation was an important tool for any organization, and was related to the promotion of ASFA within any country, but especially for the developing countries. It was important for researchers to have access to data, as this would result in an increase in the number of users of ASFA in the future.

Mr Seteras (IMR) referred to the selling of databases in bundles and said that it would be useful to know whether, if given the possibility to choose individual databases, institutes would choose ASFA, if offered at discounted prices. Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that ProQuest gave some flexibility regarding choosing components of a collection of databases, and explained that the sales staff were oriented towards selling large clusters, but they did promote ASFA within the packages. Mr Emerson said that the possibility of providing ASFA for free could be considered. Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that when discussing which way to go in the future, it was important to consider all possible consequences, especially with respect to entitlements and royalty payments. She said that providing the ASFA database for free could make it impossible for institutes to justify being part of ASFA. Mr Grainger (FAO ASFA Secretariat) commented that when trying to recruit new ASFA Partners, it was always important to explain to the institute that the ASFA database was a good window for their publications as well as saying that would receive a commercial product (the ASFA database) as part of their entitlements. Ms Noble (NMBL) said that often explaining that to be part of the ASFA system was beneficial to the institute, since it was making the institute's publications available worldwide, was not enough. She added that preparing ASFA records was a cost to institutes and that it was important to emphasize that they would receive a 'commercial product' for free. Mr Grainger commented that an IE survey would most probably examine the aspect of costs versus benefits, when examining the future and viability of ASFA.

## **16 REVIEW/APPROVAL OF DRAFT REPORT OF MEETING**

The Board reviewed and approved the Draft of the "Action Items and Decisions Agreed" during the Meeting (see **Annex-54**).

**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 Guayaquil, Ecuador 5–9 September 2011

- 5 Sept (9:00AM) **1. OPENING OF THE MEETING**
- 2. ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS**
  - 3. ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSONS AND RAPPORTEURS**
  - 4. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**
  - 5. ADOPTION OF THE SUMMARY REPORT OF THE 2009 MEETING**
  - 5.1 **Matters Arising** (from 2010 Meeting)
  - 6. STATUS OF ASFA PARTNERSHIP**
  - 6.1 **General status of the ASFA Partnership**
  - 6.2 **Report on the Inter–sessional Activities of ASFA Partners**
  - 6.2.1 **United Nations Co–sponsors (FAO, UN, IOC, UNEP)**
  - 6.2.2 **ASFA Partners**
  - 6.2.3 **ASFA Publisher (ProQuest)**
  - 6.3 **New ASFA Partners** (Admission/welcome new partners)
  - 6.4 **Partners dropping out of ASFA** (at their own will)
  - 6.5 **Partners removed or in danger of being removed from ASFA** (for not fulfilling inputting responsibility)
  - 6.6 **Strategy for future expansion of ASFA Partnership**
  - 6.6.1 **Potential partners**
  - 6.7 **ASFA Partnership Agreement**
  - 6.8 **ASFA Publishing Agreement between FAO and ProQuest**
  - 6.9 **Entitlements** (Partner entitlements to ASFA products as listed in above Agreements)
  - 6.10 **ASFA Co–operation with other Groups/Initiatives/System/Meetings outside or related to ASFA** (IAMSLIC group(s), IOC/ODIN projects etc.)
- 6 Sept (9:00AM) **7. ASFA – QUALITY OF ASFA DATABASE (scope, coverage & monitoring, timeliness, accuracy)**  
(The importance of scope, coverage and timeliness in judging the quality of a database – general statements)
- 7.1 ASFA input submitted by Partners & number of records on database**
  - 7.2 Subject Scope** (the subject areas being covered by the ASFA database)
  - 7.2.1 **Review of the subject scope of ASFA**
  - 7.3 Coverage and monitoring** (extent to which documents within ASFA subject scope are entered in ASFA)
  - 7.3.1 **Review of the coverage and monitoring**
  - 7.4 Timeliness** (time period between publishing of document and appearance on database and/or time period between receipt of document in partners' institute and submission to ASFA Publisher)
  - 7.4.1 **Review of timeliness of ASFA records (by ProQuest)**
  - 7.4.2 **Review of measures taken by ASFA Partners to increase timeliness**
  - 7.5 Accuracy of the ASFA Records appearing on database** (comments from Partners and ProQuest)
  - 7.6 Status of efforts of Partners to include more grey literature in ASFA including digitization**
  - 7.7 ASFA inputting procedures**(suggestions to improve procedures, rules etc)
  - 7.7.1 **Inputting 'Electronic documents'**
- 8. ASFA PRODUCTS AND SERVICES** (Review of each of the ASFA information products as to general characteristics, future development etc.)



- 8.1 ASFA journals (ASFA-1, ASFA, 2, ASFA,3)
- 8.2 ASFA CD/DVD ROM
- 8.3 Internet Database Service
- 8.4 New Outputs and Services
- 8.5 Public Relations Activities, Marketing (by ProQuest and Partners)
- 8.6 Document Delivery
- 8.7 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**

**7 Sept (9:00AM) 12. ASFA TRUST FUND**

- 12.1 Status of the Trust Fund
- 12.2 Proposals completed, in progress, pending further discussion & status of some proposals ..
- 12.3 New Proposals

**13. OTHER BUSINESS**

**14. PLACE AND DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

**8 Sept (9:00AM) 15. SPECIAL TOPICS, DEMONSTRATIONS, WORKSHOP DAY**

(see provisional mini-agenda below for the 4<sup>th</sup> day of meeting day)

**9 Sept (9:00AM) 16. REVIEW/APPROVAL OF DRAFT REPORT OF MEETING**

.....

**mini – AGENDA for 4<sup>th</sup> day of Meeting**

*(dealing with SPECIAL TOPICS, DEMONSTRATIONS, WORKSHOPS)*

- 8 Sept. (9:00AM) 1. Comments on ASFA Input (records)** (persistent problems encountered in Partners input and advice) by FAO (Helen Wibley) and ProQuest (Paula McCoy)
- 2. ProQuest tips on searching/using the ASFA database via the Illumina Internet web interface** by ProQuest
- 3. IAMSLIC Z39.50** (resource sharing and document requests) by FAO (José Garnica)
- 4. AgriOceanDSpace** (FAO and UNESCO-IOC/IODE Combine Efforts in their Support of Open Access) presented by Linda Noble on behalf of Linda Pikula
- 5. Impact of ASFA usage** by FBA (Hardy Schwamm/Ian Pettman)
- 6. Alternative business model(s) for ASFA** by ProQuest (Craig Emerson)

## **LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

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

#### **FAO**

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

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

**Mr Jose Garnica**  
**Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)**  
Statistics and Information Service (FIPS)  
Fisheries and Aquaculture Department  
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla  
00153, Rome, Italy  
Tel.: (39) 06 570 52418 Fax: (39) 06 570 52476  
E-mail: [Jose.Garnica@fao.org](mailto:Jose.Garnica@fao.org) / URL: [www.fao.org/fi](http://www.fao.org/fi)

### **INTERNATIONAL ASFA PARTNERS**

#### **NAFO**

**Ms Alexis Pacey**  
**Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO)**  
2 Morris Drive, Dartmouth, Nova Scotia  
Canada B3BIK8  
Tel.: ++1 902 468-7139 / Fax: ++1 902 468-5538  
E-mail: [apacey@nafo.int](mailto:apacey@nafo.int) / URL: [www.nafo.int/](http://www.nafo.int/)

#### **UN/DOALOS**

**Ms Annebeth Rosenboom**  
**United Nations Secretariat**  
Division for Ocean Affairs and  
the Law of The Sea (UN/DOALOS)  
Office of Legal Affairs, Room DC2-0432  
UNITED NATIONS  
2 U.N. Plaza  
New York, N Y 10017, USA  
Tel. (1) (212) 963 5048 / (212) 963 3963 / Fax: (212) 963 5847  
E-mail: [rosenboom@un.org](mailto:rosenboom@un.org) / URL: [www.un.org/Depts/los/index.htm](http://www.un.org/Depts/los/index.htm)

### **NATIONAL ASFA PARTNERS**

#### **ARGENTINA**

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

## **BRAZIL**

**Ms Maria de Jesus Pureza**  
**Universidade de São Paulo**  
**Instituto Oceanografico (IO/USP)**  
Library – IO/USP  
Praça do Oceanográfico, 191  
Cidade Universitária–Butanta  
São Paulo, SP, Brasil – CEP 05508–900  
Tel. (0055) (0xx11) 3091–6505 or 6590 / Fax: (0055) (0xx11) 3091–5040  
E–mail: [pureza@usp.br](mailto:pureza@usp.br) – [bibio@usp.br](mailto:bibio@usp.br) / URL: [www.io.usp.br](http://www.io.usp.br)

## **CHILE**

**Ms Ghislaine Barria Gonzalez**  
**Instituto de Fomento Pesquero (IFOP)**  
Sistema de Bibliotecas IFOP  
Blanco 839  
Valparaíso, Chile C.P. 2370282  
Tel. 56 (32) 2151664 / Fax: 56 (32) 32 24 00  
E–mail: [ghislaine.barria@ifop.cl](mailto:ghislaine.barria@ifop.cl) / URL: [www.ifop.cl](http://www.ifop.cl)

## **CHINA, PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC**

**Mr Dongxu Li/ Ms Xiaoyan Sun**  
**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 0836 / Fax: (86) (22) 2401 0926  
E–mail: [dx@mail.nmdis.gov.cn](mailto:dx@mail.nmdis.gov.cn) / [asfa@mail.nmdis.gov.cn](mailto:asfa@mail.nmdis.gov.cn) / [hyda@mail.nmdis.gov.cn](mailto:hyda@mail.nmdis.gov.cn)  
URL: [www.coi.gov.cn](http://www.coi.gov.cn)

## **CUBA**

**Ms Oria Cruz Barrera**  
**Centro de Investigaciones Pesqueras (CIP)**  
Ministerio de la Industria Alimenticia (MINAL)  
5TA, Avenida y 246 Barlovento, Santa Fe'  
La Habana, Cuba  
Tel. (537) 209 7875 / (537) 209 8966  
E–mail: [oria@cip.telemar.cu](mailto:oria@cip.telemar.cu) / [asfa@cip.telemar.cu](mailto:asfa@cip.telemar.cu) / URL: [www1.cubamar.cu/cip/cip.htm](http://www1.cubamar.cu/cip/cip.htm)

## **ECUADOR**

**Mr Nikita Gaibor / Ms Isledy Fernandez**  
**Instituto Nacional de Pesca (INP)**  
Letamendi 102 y La Ría  
Guayaquil, Ecuador  
Tel. (593)–4 2416 0369 / 2416 036 / Fax: (593) –4 240 2304  
E–mail: [ngabor@inp.gob.ec](mailto:ngabor@inp.gob.ec) / [nickgc\\_2000@yahoo.com](mailto:nickgc_2000@yahoo.com) // [ifernandez@inp.gob.ec](mailto:ifernandez@inp.gob.ec)  
URL: [www.inp.gov.ec](http://www.inp.gov.ec)

**Ms Alicia Alvarez**  
**Oceanographic Institute of the Navy (INOCAR)**  
Ave. 25 julio, via Puerto Maritimo  
Base Naval Sur  
Guayaquil, Ecuador  
E–mail: Alicia Alvarez: [biblioteca@inocar.mil.ec](mailto:biblioteca@inocar.mil.ec)

## **FRANCE**

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

## **INDIA**

**Mr Satya Ranjan Sahu**  
**National Institute of Oceanography (NIO) (CSIR)**  
National Information Centre for Marine Sciences (NICMAS)  
Library  
Dona Paula, 403 004, Goa, India  
Tel. +91 (0) 832 2450 ext. 370 / Fax: + 91 (0) 832 2450 602/03  
E–mail: [satya@nio.org](mailto:satya@nio.org) / URL: [www.nio.org](http://www.nio.org)

## **JAPAN**

**Dr Yukio Hanamura**  
**National Research Institute of Fisheries Science,**  
**Fisheries Research Agency (FRA)**  
2-12-4 Fukuura, Kanazawa-ku,  
Yokohama-shi, Kanagawa 236-8648, Japan  
Tel.: (81) 45-788-7609 / Fax (81) 45-788-5001  
E-mail: [hanamura@affrc.go.jp](mailto:hanamura@affrc.go.jp) / URL [www.nrifs.fra.affrc.go.jp](http://www.nrifs.fra.affrc.go.jp)

## **KENYA**

**Mr James Macharia**  
**Kenya Marine and Fisheries Research Institute (KMFRI)**  
KMFRI ASFA Input Centre  
ODINAFRICA INFORMATION CENTRE  
English Point-Mkomani  
Tamarind Road  
PO Box 80100, 81651  
Mombasa, Kenya  
Tel. + 254 20 475151/ Fax: + 254 20 475157  
E-mail: [jmacharia@kmfri.co.ke](mailto:jmacharia@kmfri.co.ke) / [jmachariah@gmail.com](mailto:jmachariah@gmail.com) / URL: [www.kmfri.co.ke](http://www.kmfri.co.ke)

## **LAO, People's Democratic Republic**

**Mr Kaviphone Phouthavong**  
**Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry**  
Living Aquatic Resources Research Center (LARReC)  
Data and Information Unit  
POBox: 9108, Vientiane  
Lao People's Democratic Republic  
Tel.: (856-21) 215 015 / Fax: (856-21) 214 855  
E-mail: [kaviphone@gmail.com](mailto:kaviphone@gmail.com) / [Larrec@gmail.com](mailto:Larrec@gmail.com) / [Larrec.info@gmail.com](mailto:Larrec.info@gmail.com)  
URL: [www.mekonginfo.org/partners/larrec/index.htm](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 Ext. 107 / Fax: (52) 55 5616 1436 / (52) 55 5622 4001  
E-mail: [marco@dgb.unam.mx](mailto:marco@dgb.unam.mx) / URL: [www.dgbiblio.unam.mx](http://www.dgbiblio.unam.mx)

## **NORWAY**

**Mr Kristian Seteras**  
**Institute of Marine Research (IMR)**  
Nordnesgaten 50  
5817 Bergen, Norway  
Tel.: 0047 55236885  
E-mail: [kristian.seteras@imr.no](mailto:kristian.seteras@imr.no) / URL: [biblioteket.imr.no](http://biblioteket.imr.no)

## **PERU**

**Ms Emira Antonietti**  
**Instituto del Mar del Perú (IMARPE)**  
Esq. Gamarra y General Valle s/n  
Chucuito, Callao, Apartado 22 – Oficina 301  
Callao, Peru  
Tel.+511 6250847 / Fax: (51-14) 465-6023  
E-mail: [eantonietti@imarpe.pe](mailto:eantonietti@imarpe.pe) / URL: [www.imarpe.gob.pe](http://www.imarpe.gob.pe)

## **RUSSIAN FEDERATION**

**Dr Sofia Levashova**  
**Russian Federal Research Institute of Fisheries and Oceanography (VNIRO)**  
Head of ASFA Center  
V. Krasnoselskaya17  
Moscow, 107140, Russian Federation  
Tel.: +7 (499) 2640089  
E-mail: [asfa@vniro.ru](mailto:asfa@vniro.ru) / URL: [www.vniro.ru](http://www.vniro.ru)

## **TANZANIA**

**Ms Edna Nyika**  
**Institute of Marine Sciences (IMS)**  
University of Dar es Salaam  
PO Box 668  
Zanzibar, Tanzania  
Tel.: +255 24 2230741/ +255 24 2232128 / +255 713 612879 / Fax: +255 24 2233050  
E-mail: [nyika@ims.udsm.ac.tz](mailto:nyika@ims.udsm.ac.tz) / [qretanyika@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:qretanyika@yahoo.co.uk) / URL: [www.ims.udsm.ac.tz](http://www.ims.udsm.ac.tz)

## **UGANDA**

**Ms Alice Endra**  
**National Fisheries Resources Research Institute (NaFIRRI)**  
P.O Box 343  
Jinja, Uganda  
Tel.: 256-043-4120484 / Fax: 256-043-4120192  
E-mail: [aendra2000@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:aendra2000@yahoo.co.uk) / URL: [www.firi.go.ug](http://www.firi.go.ug)

## **UNITED KINGDOM**

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

**Mr Hardy Schwamm**  
**Freshwater Biological Association (FBA)**  
The Ferry Landing  
AMBLESIDE  
Cumbria LA22 0LP, UK  
Tel.: +44 (0) 15394 42468 / Fax: +44 (0) 15394 46914  
Email: [hschwamm@fba.org.uk](mailto:hschwamm@fba.org.uk) URL: [www.fba.org.uk](http://www.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](mailto:acris@adinet.com.uy) / [acris@fvet.edu.uy](mailto:acris@fvet.edu.uy)  
URL: [www.pes.fvet.edu.uy](http://www.pes.fvet.edu.uy)

## **PUBLISHING ASFA PARTNER**

### **ProQuest**

**Dr Craig Emerson**  
**ProQuest**  
7200 Wisconsin Ave.  
Bethesda, Maryland 20814, USA  
Tel.: 1-800-843-7751 / Fax: 1-301 961 6740  
E-mail: [Craig.Emerson@proquest.com](mailto:Craig.Emerson@proquest.com)  
URL: [www.csa.com](http://www.csa.com)

**Ms Paula McCoy**  
**ProQuest**  
620 S. Third St.  
Louisville KY 40202, USA  
Tel.: 1-502-569-1239  
E-mail: [Paula.mccoy@proquest.com](mailto:Paula.mccoy@proquest.com)  
URL: [www.csa.com](http://www.csa.com)

## **OBSERVERS**

**Ms María Cristina Tigse**  
**Biblioteca**  
**Universidad del Pacífico**  
Km 7 1/2 Via a la Costa  
Guayaquil, Ecuador  
Tel.: +593 (4) 287 3387 / Fax: +593 (4) 287 3977  
E-mail: [mariacristina.tigse@hotmail.com](mailto:mariacristina.tigse@hotmail.com)  
URL: [www.upacifico.edu.ec/](http://www.upacifico.edu.ec/)

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- ADRIAMED** – Scientific Cooperation to Support Responsible Fisheries in the Adriatic Sea (Italy)
- AGRIS/OEK** – International Information System for Agricultural Sciences and Technology, Knowledge Management and Library Services
- ASFA** – Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Abstracts
- ASFIS** – Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Information System
- ASFISIS** – Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Integrated Set of Information Systems (Micro CDS/ISIS package for preparing ASFA input and for retrieval)
- BF** – Informations- und Dokumentstionsstelle, Bundesforschungsanstalt fur Fischerei (Germany)
- CIP** – Centro de Investigaciones Pesqueras (Cuba)
- CIS** – Centre of Information and Statistics (Vietnam)
- CNSHB** – Centre national des sciences halieutiques de Boussoura (Guinea)
- CRO** – Centre des recherches océanologiques (Côte d'Ivoire)
- CSA** – Cambridge Scientific Abstracts
- CSIR** – Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (Ghana)
- CSIRO** – Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization (Australia)
- DGB** – Dirección General de Bibliotecas (Mexico)
- DOI** – Digital Object Identifier
- DPM** – Direction des pêches maritimes (Senegal)
- DFO** – Department of Fisheries and Oceans (Canada)
- EMI** – Estonian Marine Institute
- FAO** – Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (Italy)
- FBA** – Freshwater Biological Association (UK)
- FIPS** – Fisheries and Aquaculture Department, Statistics and Information 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
- HOORC** – Harry Oppenheimer Okavango Research Centre, Botswana
- HTML** – Hypertext Markup Language
- IAMSLIC** – International Association of Aquatic and Marine Science Libraries and Information Centers
- ICCAT** – International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (Spain)
- ICES** – International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (Denmark)
- ICIE** – Institute for Computer Information and Engineering (Poland)
- IDS** – Internet Database Service
- IEO** – Instituto Español de Oceanografía (Spain)
- IFOP** – Instituto de Fomento Pesquero (Chile)

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

**IFRO** – Iranian Fisheries Research Organization

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

**IMARPE** – Instituto del Mar del Perú

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**JFRCA** – Japan Fisheries Resource Conservation Association

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

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

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

**LIFDC** – Low Income Food Deficit Countries

**MEI** – Estonian Marine Institute

**MI** – Marine Institute (Ireland)

**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)

**NatMIRC** – National Marine Information and Research Centre (Namibia)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**OAI** – Open Archive Initiative

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**UNAM** – Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México

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

**UNEP** – United Nations Environment Programme

**URI** – Uniform Resource Identifier

**URL** – Uniform Resource Locator

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

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

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

**VTI** – Johann Heinrich von Thünen Institute (Germany)

**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

### CONTENTS

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

<b>1.1</b>	Yearly Deposits made into Trust Fund by ProQuest.....	<b>1</b>
<b>1.2</b>	<b>BALANCE</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>1.3</b>	<b>What is the ASFA Trust Fund &amp; ASFA Trust Fund Project Proposals</b> .....	<b>2</b>

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

<b>2.1</b>	<b>Projects IN PROGRESS</b> .....	<b>3</b>
2.1.1	Financial support to attend (THIS) 2011 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (Guayaquil, Ecuador)	
2.1.2	Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for 1 year Jan 2011 –Dec 2011)	
2.1.3	Updating Geographic Authority List (GAL) for www-ISIS-Software (continuation)	
2.1.4	Initiative to support the digitization of grey literature and advice as to what should be digitized (proposal put forward by IAMSLIC) \$28 000	
2.1.5	Guinea/CNSHB – Computer Equipment for CNSHB	
2.1.6	KMFRI/Kenya – Identify and List grey Literature published in Kenya not in ASFA	
2.1.7	FAO – Small Financial Incentive to ASFA Partner Institute (INP) hosting ASFA Board Meeting	
2.1.8	IMS/Tanzania – Scanning of Fisheries Catch and Scientific Results from 1999–2009	
2.1.9	FBA/UK) <i>Proposal 'Digitization, Open Access Deposition and ASFA Record Preparation of Freshwater Grey Literature, 1940–2007</i>	
<b>2.2</b>	<b>Projects COMPLETED (in Intersessional period 2010– 2011</b> .....	<b>6</b>
2.2.1	Financial support to attend the 2010 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (INRH, Morocco)	
2.2.2	Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for Jan 2010 – Dec 2010)	
2.2.3	Further development of www-ISIS-ASFA software as regards interoperability, additional URL fields, and updating picklists	

2.2.4	MinI ASFA Meeting (Regional Latin America Regional) 25–26 October 2010	
2.2.5	Utilization of ASFA Trust Fund to pay IAMSLIC subscription fees	
2.2.6	Supply of scanners (for ASFA related use) to those ASFA Partner Institutes which lack the funding to buy equipment (continuation of project)	
2.2.7	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)	
<b>2.3</b>	<b>Projects PENDING (further discussion and/or action).....</b>	<b>8</b>
2.3.1	ASFA Trust Fund project proposal – Adapting WWW–ISIS–ASFA to the re–engineered www–ISIS–ASFA core program	
2.3.2	NIOF/Egypt – Filling the missing gaps	
2.3.3	CIS/Viet Nam – Scanning of Viet Nam Fisheries technology and Scientific Results from 2000–2008	
2.3.4	ASFA Training Session yearly	
2.3.5	YugNIRO– Ukraine Translation of ASFA Thesaurus into Russian and development of Russian–English Thesaurus	
2.3.6	YugNIRO– Ukraine Translation of www–ISIS–ASFA “Help Notes” and front end into Russian	
2.3.7	YugNIRO– Ukraine Translation of www–ISIS–ASFA Guidelines into Russian	
2.3.8	PDII–LIPI– Indonesia – ASFA Trust Fund Proposal relating to ASFA input preparation and training	
<b>2.4</b>	<b>NEW PROJECT PROPOSALS AND ONGOING UP FOR RE–APPROVAL 2011.....</b>	<b>9</b>
2.4.1	Financial support to attend the ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (for year 2012) ( <i>ASFA/2011/74</i> )	
2.4.2	FAO – Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year Jan –Dec 2012) ( <i>ASFA/2011/3a</i> )	
2.4.3	FAO – Utilization of ASFA trust fund to pay IAMSLIC membership fees ( <i>ASFA/2011/80</i> )	
<b>PART– 3:</b>	<b>Summary List of ALL Proposals.....</b>	<b>10</b>

## PART-1: RECORD OF DEPOSITS AND BALANCE

### 1.1 YEARLY DEPOSITS MADE INTO TRUST FUND

Year	<u>ProQuest deposits</u>		<u>BF (Germany) deposits**</u>	
	US\$	(deposit date)		(deposit date)
2010	\$231 384.29*	6/2011	***	
2009	\$201 666.04*	5/2010	***	
2008	\$249 826.62	8/2009	***	
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	

\* (at this writing, clarification by ProQuest is pending whether this sum includes the December 2009 royalty that ProQuest mistakenly omitted from last year's deposit (therefore it is not possible to state the increase /decrease in the royalty payment)

\*\* (the total 2009 royalty payment should be higher, because royalties for December 2009 sales were inadvertently omitted from calculation by ProQuest – this error will probably be corrected by adding to 2010 year's payment.

\*\*\* (there are no Trust Fund payments for 2003–2010 from German ASFA Partner BF, because they no longer make the ASFA database available commercially to external users).

**1.2 BALANCE (as July 2011)**

<p><b>1. ALL <u>Funds Deposited</u> in ASFA Trust Fund account from beginning in 1995 to date (i.e. including 2010 Royalty payment)</b></p>	<p>US\$2 715 694.00</p>
<p><b>2. <u>ALL Funds that are Spent or Committed*</u> from beginning to date</b>  <small>*according to ASFA Secretariat's record. Not all committed funds are necessarily disbursed (i.e. spent)</small></p>	<p>US\$1 636 787.00</p>
<p><b>3. <u>BALANCE available for future spending/committing at this/future Board Meetings</u></b>  <small>*(this figure is the difference between rows 1 and 2 above).</small>  <b>3.1 <u>NOTE:</u> the Actual Cash residing in the ASFA Trust Fund</b> according to FIDP is, of course, higher than this balance. It is \$1 220 918 because a considerable amount of the "committed" funds have not yet been disbursed even if recorded as such in the tables that follow (i.e. the Trust Fund projects that are either in progress or pending or other Admin has not yet processed).</p>	<p>US\$1 078907.00*</p>

**In conclusion, the sum available for committing to ASFA Trust Fund projects at this and or future Meetings is currently US\$ 1 078 907.**

### **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\$200,000+ /year).

The deposits, balance, and projects underway etc. are reported as accurately/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 it 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 2011 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (Ecuador)

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 16 ASFA Partners will receive full or partial assistance to attend this year's ASFA Board Meeting: CIP (Cuba), NIO (India), IIP (Uruguay), IMS (Tanzania), INIDEP (Argentina), KMFRI (Kenya), LARRec (LAO), NIFFR (Nigeria), NMDIS (China), UNAM (Mexico), USP (Brazil, VNIRO Russia, IMARPE (Peru), NaFIRRI (Uganda), IFOP (Chile), INRH (Morocco).

The Funds available for this Meeting are US\$59 000 derived as such: US\$ 40 000 allocated (agreed) by the ASFA Board at the 2010 Board Meeting, plus \$19 000 unspent from last year's Meeting (2010).

The total amount disbursed is not available at this writing as all tickets and itineraries have not been determined or finalized and people sometimes must cancel at last minute (the estimated expenditure to date is \$48 400). 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 allocation. The "Updating" of this proposal for 2012 is presented as ASFA/2011/ 74 and is mentioned under the "New Proposals" section 2.4.1 below. It will be discussed under Agenda item 12.3.)

#### *(in progress)* 2.1.2 **Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for 2011) \$90,000**

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

This proposal covering January – December 2011 remains classified as "in progress" until the end of 2011. For 2011, \$ 90 000 was allocated by the Board. There was an overspending of \$6 480 for the previous (2010) year's allocation. Therefore, the TOTAL funds available for 2011 are \$83 520.

To date for 2011 (January – July 2011), \$51 886 has been spent/committed. See Part-3, item-3 to get an idea how the FAO Secretariat utilized the allotment.

Under or overspending during 2011 (including carryovers from previous years) will be carried forward or subtracted from the 2012 allotment.

***This is an ongoing proposal which the Board suggested be reconfirmed each year. The "Updating" of this proposal for 2012 is presented as ASFA/2011/3a and is mentioned under the "New Proposals" section 2.4.1 below. It will be discussed under Agenda item 12.3).***

#### *(in progress)* 2.1.3 **Updating Geographic Authority List (GAL) for www-ISIS-ASFA software (continuation) (\$24,950)**

This project was circulated and approved via ASFA-Board-L to be carried out by the UK collaborating ASFA centre FBA as follow up to discussions at the 2009 Meeting (see ASFA/2010/Info-1). The 1<sup>st</sup> payment against this project has been processed.

A progress report was presented by FBA at the 2010 Board Meeting (see 2010 Board Report: section 11.7 and Annex 39a. Also see Annex 60 of the 2010 Report for report of the Geographic Working Group that met during the 2010 Meeting).

In summary, the following GAL related tasks should be completed or nearing completion:

- 1 The writing of the new forward to GAL and compilation of a new list for references section
- 2 Re-draft of the geographic indexing guidelines (ASFIS 5 Reference Series)
- 3 Split out pick list into 49 national partner areas, revise strings in line with new GAL rules, send to National partners for comment and incorporate feedback.
- 4 Do the same as the above task for the remaining countries and sea areas – revise strings in line with new GAL rules. Send to ASFA Secretariat at FAO for comment and incorporate feedback
- 5 Check the latest list of terms from ProQuest (12,000 geographic keyword strings used in 2008/9) against lists from 2 previous tasks and add any important omissions
- 6 Assess partners' comments and incorporate any additions or corrections needed
- 7 Re-align the 2009 draft Geographic Thesaurus with the new rules and the Pick List entries
- 8 Provide versions of enhanced GAL to ASFA Secretariat, ICIE and ProQuest in a range of formats (Word, text, XML etc.)
- 9 Provide versions of enhanced Thesaurus in XML to NeOn Project and get converted to ontology (no cost here because – cost included in NeOn project)

In addition, the above-mentioned meeting of the Geographic Working Group (GWG) that met during the 2010 Meeting, discussed and/or agreed upon the following – only briefly summary is given below) :

- a) the GWG agreed that the “English form” rule should be adhered to, however for major alterations (such as the Indonesia and Poland Pick List files), Excel spreadsheets containing two columns [ A) the original string exactly as quoted and B) the corresponding replacement string] should be prepared and sent to ProQuest for subsequent search and replace on the database of existing records. ProQuest agreed that this could be done on the majority of the records but that the earlier records (pre 1980 with AN numbers between 06283000–06382000) were archived and so could not be altered.
- b) very general terms – FBA has been deleting these (e.g. Germany, North) from the revised Pick List. GWG agreed
- c) Coastal lagoons and lakes – those with outlets to the sea were being given sea codes, those without were not. GWG agreed
- d) Deltas (with and without a sea code) – inland deltas have not been given sea codes (e.g the delta of Saskatchewan River, Inner Niger Delta; and Okavango Delta in Botswana). Coastal deltas have been given sea codes. GWG agreed
- e) Strings that take a long time to verify (i.e. appeared well formed but FBA could not find reference to the particular feature within a reasonable time) – These strings were being left in the Pick List. GWG agreed
- f) Provinces, Counties etc. – FBA has been deleting these labels as a general rule except in the few instances where the inclusion of these labels would prevent confusion or add value (e.g Nigeria, Rivers County). It was suggested that national partners should be consulted on this. FBA suggested that this process should be explained in the covering email when the lists were sent out for national partner feedback and each partner asked for any comment at that time. GWG agreed.

The following actions were agreed: 1) FBA to prepare Excel spreadsheets containing two columns [ A) the original string exactly as quoted and B) the corresponding replacement string] for Indonesia and Poland plus any other countries with major changes subsequently found and send these to ProQuest. 3) ProQuest to perform a search and replace operation with these strings in the Geographic Field on the database of existing records (excluding those records that have been archived).

A progress report will be presented by FBA at this Meeting.

*(in progress)* **2.1.4 Initiative to support the digitization of grey literature and advice as to what should be digitized**  
(proposal put forward by IAMSLIC) \$28 000

As reported last year, the FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Department Library is working on this project. It is utilizing the funds to digitize grey literature in its possession and is depositing the documents in the Aquatic Commons repository and/or OceanDocs repositories. ASFA records will eventually link to these full-texts To date, a total of **540** documents have been digitized. PDF copies have been uploaded into the Aquatic Commons repository and include the following:

- 15 papers from the *Bulletin of the Institute of Marine Biology & Oceanography (Fourah Bay College, University of Sierra Leone)*
- 75 papers from the *Technical Documents from the Lake Victoria Fisheries Research Project*
- 431 papers from the Conference Proceedings of the Fisheries Society of Nigeria (FISON):
- 19 papers from the *Technical reports of the Nigerian–German (GTZ) Kainji Lake Fisheries Promotion Project*



FBL will provide the institutions with CD-ROMs containing the PDF files of the uploaded documents for offline consultation. These will also be distributed upon request to other users in the region.

URL links have been sent to ProQuest and these have been added to the already existing ASFA records.

Other institutions have been contacted regarding possible interest in participating in the project.

In the second phase, the project will prepare ASFA records for those documents/articles not existing on CSA Illumina. (Note: FBA (Freshwater Biological Association) is working on a tool that will convert XML records created with the www-ISIS-ASFA software into the Aquatic Commons xml format. This tool will enable batch import of multiple records into the AC and will be of great use for the second phase of the project).

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

*(in progress)* **2.1.5 (Guinea, CNSHB) Computer Equipment for CNSHB**

Delivery of equipment was not realized due to administrative difficulties between FAO Headquarters and field office. Considering the long delay, confirmation is required that equipment is still needed.

HISTORY: Approved at the 2009 Meeting, but with a request from the Board for further clarification regarding the need for the equipment. On 26 Feb. 2010, the FAO ASFA Secretariat received an e-mail from CNSHB providing the further clarification. Basically, when CNSHB joined ASFA, it did not have the computer and connectivity problems that it has now and which warranted the request for the equipment (the mobility provided by the laptop will facilitate record collection from the collaborating centers and also the sending of records from a cyber internet café where the connectivity is better..

*(in progress)* **2.1.6 (KMFRI– Identify and listing grey literature published in Kenya not in ASFA (US\$7 320)**

First payment made and partial advance on final payment is being processed in order to keep project running. A preliminary progress report provided the necessary justification for this advance.

KMFRI will report on the status of the project at this Meeting.

History: This proposal aims to identify, collate and list grey literature published in Kenya, with a view to entering the references into the ASFA database, digitizing the full-text and depositing them in OCEANDocs repository (See Annex-26b of 2009 Report).

*(in progress)* **2.1.7 (FAO ASFA Secretariat) Small Financial Incentive to ASFA Partner Institute hosting ASFA Board Meeting (US\$2500) at INP, Guayaquil, Ecuador**

This project was suggested and approved at the 2009 Board Meeting for all successive Meetings. The 2010 meeting at INRH in Morocco was the first time an ASFA Partner benefitted from this initiative and this Meeting at INP, Ecuador, will be the second time.

The funds are sent by FAO Rome to the FAO Representative's office in the country of the Meeting for disbursement to the hosting Institute as per FAO Administrative procedures. The purpose of the funds is, for the most part, to be utilized as follows: transportation of participants to and from airport; provision of paper copying services, computer and computer projector, coffee breaks etc.

*(in progress)* **2.1.8 (IMS–Tanzania) Scanning of Fisheries Catch and Scientific Results from 1999–2009 (\$10, 625)**

This project is being carried out via a Letter of Agreement between FAO and IMS. The first payment has been made. The project aims at making widely available, in full text format, fisheries catch and scientific reports (grey literature) deposited at the Division of Fisheries and the Tanzania Fisheries Research Institute of the Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries Development (See Annex–34a of 2009 Meeting Report). The documents would be collected, scanned and then bibliographic records (approx. 500) would be prepared both for ASFA and the IMS/Aquatic Commons repositories.

IMS will report on the status of the project at this Meeting.

*(in progress)* **2.1.9 (FBA–UK) Proposal ‘Digitization, Open Access Deposition and ASFA Record Preparation of Freshwater Grey Literature, 1940–2007 (\$15 000)**

This project was agreed at the 2010 ASFA Board Meeting (see Annex–39b of the 2010 Meeting Report) and is being carried out via a Letter of Agreement between FAO and FBA. The first payments have been made and the project is nearly completed. This project will bring a range of freshwater grey literature (approx 500 documents), previously available only to a small audience, to a wider user base, by digitizing it and depositing it in a repository and also preparing ASFA records (including URI links).

FBA will report on the status of the project at this Meeting

## **2.2 Projects COMPLETED (during Intersessional period 2010– 2011)**

*(completed)* **2.2.1 Financial support to attend the 2010 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (INRH, Morocco, 2010)**

The following 13 ASFA Partners received full or partial assistance to attend the 2010 ASFA Board Meeting: CNSHB (Guinea), NIO.(India), IIP (Uruguay), IMS (Tanzania), INIDEP (Argentina), INSTM (Tunisia), NIOF (Egypt), NMDIS (China), SPC (Noumea), IBSS in place of YugNIRO (Ukraine), UNAM (Mexico). SFI (Poland) and LARRec (LAO).

The Funds available for the 2010 Meeting at INRH, Morocco were US\$58 538 thusly derived: US\$ 40 000 allocated (agreed) by ASFA Board at 2009 Board Meeting, plus \$18 538 unspent from the (2009) Meeting.

The total amount disbursed for the 2010 Meeting was US\$39 538. The under spending (US\$19 000) was added to the 2011 allocation. Note, sometimes even at this writing (late date) the Travel Expense Claims submitted by the participants after the travel are still being discussed/processed by FAO Administration (therefore possibly not yet charged against the account, which may then throw off slightly the record keeping in hand compiled records such as this).

*(completed)* **2.2.2 Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for 2010) ( \$60 000)**

This project proposal covered the period January–December 2010. It was 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.

The allotment for 2010 was \$60,000. However, the spending exceeded the allocation by \$6 480 (see Part–3, items–7). This overspending is subtracted from the total amount available for 2011 (see Part–3, items–2).

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

This project was actually completed during the 2008–2009 intersessional period (see the contractor's, (ICIE) work report in the 2009 Meeting Report (ASFA/2009/78)). The testing of the software update by the ASFA Publisher for compatibility was only completed in June 2010.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat issued the update (called www–ISIS–ASFA 1.2) on 9 September 2010.

**History:** This update to the software mainly addresses the need to increase the interoperability of the www–ISIS–ASFA version 1.1 of the software (increased export and import functionality, including a function to import INMAGIC records). This was requested by the Board at the 2007 Meeting. The actual project proposal was circulated to the ASFA Partners for voting during the 2007–2008 intersession via the ASFA–Board–L listserv (18 April 2008) – it was “approved” (see ASFA/2008/ 82, in the 2008 Meeting Report for details and a record of this proposal). The update to the software contains, besides the export/import programs that will enable Partners to import and export their records to and from other systems/repositories, also some additional URL fields and the updating of the pick–lists contained in the software. A new field “Author supplied key words” was also added for eventual use in assisting the ProQuest software to carry out automatic indexing.

(completed) **2.2.4 (FAO) Regional Mini-ASFA Meeting (Latin America) (25–26 October 2010),**

After a number of postponements, we are pleased to report that this Meeting was hosted by INIDEP, Argentina, so as to run back-to-back with the 2010 International IAMSLIC Meeting and the Latin American Regional IAMSLIC Meeting. At the Meeting, the FAO ASFA Secretariat addressed some problems relating to ASFA input preparation (training) as communicated to it by the Latin American partners prior to the meeting.

For a short Report of the Mini-ASFA Meeting see the FAO Report, Annex-3 (ASFA/2011/ 3). For the full report in Spanish, see ASFA/2011/Info-1.

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

(completed) **2.2.5 Utilization of the ASFA Trust Fund to pay the IAMSLIC Membership fees for ASFA Partner (renewal request for membership fees expiring in 2009–2010)**

History of project: This project refers “to paying the IAMSLIC Membership fees for both ASFA Partners and ASFA Collaborating Centres who do not have the funds, or are not able for administrative reasons to pay for membership to IAMSLIC”. The project was first discussed/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 renewal of the project was agreed at the 2009 Meeting and called for the sum (approx. **US\$ 1 240**), necessary to renew all 31 of the sponsored IAMSLIC membership fees which expiring in either 2009 or 2010 (see table-1 below).

The Table below lists the ASFA Partners whose IAMSLIC membership fees are currently being paid using money from the ASFA Trust Fund – some since 2004 – and the next expiring dates.

Name	Institution	Country	Expiration Date	Note
1. Guillermina Cosulich	INIDEP	Argentina	2014 – Dec – 31	already subscribed/ extended to 2014
2. Sin Joan Lee	PIMRIS	Fiji	2012 – Dec – 31	
3. Hadebe Zanele	HOORC	Botswana	2014 – Dec – 31	
4. Ghislaine Barria	IFOP	Chile	2012 – Dec – 31	
5. Xiaoyan Sun	NMDIS	China	2012 – Dec – 31	
6. Amady Sow	IMROP	Mauritania	2012 – Dec – 31	
7. Andrea Cristiani	IIP	Uruguay	2012 – Dec – 31	
8. Isledy Fernandez	INP	Ecuador	2012 – Dec – 31	
9. Ekaterina Kulakova	YugNIRO	Ukraine	2012 – Dec – 31	
10. Shahla Jamili	IFRO	Iran	2013 – Dec – 31	already subscribed/ extended to 2013
11. T. Silaja	CIFT	India	2012 – Dec – 31	
12. Pham Tuyet Nhung	FICen	Viet Nam	2011 – Dec – 31	
13. Jusni Djatin	PDII-LIPI	Indonesia	2011 – Dec – 31	
14. Olga Akimova	IBSS	Ukraine	2011 – Dec – 31	
15. Thitima Pinamanee	PMBC	Thailand	2011 – Dec – 31	
16. Marco Montes	UNAM	Mexico	2011 – Dec – 31	
17. Thavone Phommavong	LARReC	Lao	2011 – Dec – 31	
18. Raphael Okeyo	KMFRI	Kenya	2011 – Dec – 31	
19. Maria Kalenchits	MEI	Estonia	2012 – Dec – 31	
20. James Macharia	KMFRI	Kenya	2012 – Dec – 31	
21. Moses Ibeun	NIFFR	Nigeria	2012 – Dec – 31	
22. Bouchra Bazi	INRH	Morocco	2012 – Dec – 31	
23. Ahmed El Nemr	NIOP	Egypt	2011 – Dec – 31	
24. Domingo Tasso Junior	USP	Brazil	2011 – Dec – 31	
25. Margarita Portal Roldan	IMARPE	Peru	2011 – Dec – 31	
26. Eloisa de Sousa Maia	IO/USP	Brazil	2012 – Dec – 31	
27. Alice Endra	NaFIRRI	Uganda	2012 – Dec – 31	
28. Arame Ndiaye Keita	DPM	Senegal	2012 – Dec – 31	
29. Ana Maria Alfredo	INAHINA	Mozambique	2012 – Dec – 31	
30. Edna Nyika	IMS	Tanzania	2012 – Dec – 31	
31. Kaba Fode Karim	CNSHB	Guinea	2012 – Dec – 31	
32. Marian Jagge	CSIR	Ghana	2012 – Dec – 31	
33. Maria Ashilungu	NatMIRC	Namibia	2014 – Dec – 31	already member until 2014

***The ASFA Secretariat reminds ASFA Partners and Collaborating ASFA Centres again: If you are not a member of IAMSLIC please consider the benefits of joining (e.g. access to the Z39.50 distributed library).***

*(completed)* **2.2.6 (continuation of project) Supply of scanners (for ASFA related use) to those ASFA Partner Institutes which lack the funding to buy equipment**

History: This project (continuation or "round two") was agreed by the Board at the 2008\* ASFA Meeting (see item 13.3.9 of the 2008 Meeting Report). During "round-two" of the project the following six ASFA Partners requested scanners: IMS, Zanzibar; CSIR, Ghana; NIO/NICMAS, India; IMROP, Mauritania; UNAM/DGB, Mexico; and IMARPE, Peru. The total cost was estimated at approx. US\$3 600. For your information, the first round of this project "round-one" (approved during the 2007–2008 intersessional period (see ASFA/2008/81 for details) and costing approx. US\$6107.00, supplied scanners and scanning software to the following nine Partners: IIP, Uruguay; NIFFR, Nigeria; NaFIRRI, Uganda; VNIRO, Russia; YugNIRO, Ukraine; NIOF, Egypt; IFOP, Chile; FICen, VietNam; INSTM, Tunisia.

At last year's meeting (see section 12.2.8 of 2010 Board Meeting Report) the ASFA Secretariat reported the scanners having been delivered to 4 of the 6 institutes that requested them. To date, a fifth institute CSIR/Ghana has also received the scanner. Administrative problems have prevented the purchase/delivery of the scanners to NIO/India and it appears that NIO is getting along with its existing equipment.

*(completed)* **2.2.7 (VLIZ, Belgium) – Collect, sort out, and prepare approximately 15,000 complete bibliographic references dealing with the aquatic environment (from the North Sea, in particular the Southern Bight area. \$18,000**

History of project: this proposal (\$18 000) was put forward/approved during the 2002–2003 intersessional period via ASFA–Board–L (2003 Meeting Report: section 13.3.1.5 & Annexes 14,14a for full details of project). At the 2004 Meeting (2004 Meeting Report: section 13.2.1.3) VLIZ revisited the project proposal redefining the number of records for processing to approx. 10, 000 and increasing the time frame. For a long time, the project had difficulties in developing a program to automatically transfer VLIZ records from their institutional database to the ASFA Publisher in ASFA format. VLIZ even provided funds to Dr Rybinski (ICIE) to assist them in working out the problems. Finally, it appears the problems (or most of them) have been resolved and some of the records have been sent to the Publisher. VLIZ agreed not to receive full payment for this project proposal (\$6000 less), as some of the records would be supplied without the indexing as originally agreed.

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

*(pending)* **2.3.1 ASFA Trust Fund project proposal – Adapting WWW–ISIS–ASFA to the re-engineered www–ISIS core program (including modifications to www–ISIS–ASFA, making it Release–2)**

The project proposal was agreed in principle at the 2010 ASFA Board Meeting, see Annex 55 of that Meeting Report. The final approval will include a breakdown of the activities and timescale and the Euro value will be fixed at the time of the signature of the contract.

This project to adapt the www–ISIS–ASFA application to the core programme is the logical follow-up to the recently completed project to re-engineer the www–ISIS core program so that it would become, among other things, Linux and UNICODE compliant. Note: ASFA Trust Fund money was not used for the re-engineering of the www–ISIS core program as this was financed by the various services within FAO that use the www–ISIS software.

*(pending)* **2.3.2 NIOF/Egypt – Filling the missing gap (US\$ 14 160)**

This proposal was approved in principle at the 2009 Board Meeting ((See Annex–17a of 2009 Meeting Report). It aims to fill in some of the missing gaps (NIOF estimated about 2360 records) regarding Egyptian literature in the ASFA database. **The final approval for implementation is still pending until NIOF is able to submit its regular ASFA input without need for checking.**

*(pending)* **2.3.3 CIS/Vietnam – Scanning of Viet Nam Fisheries technical and scientific results from 2000–2008**

This proposal was approved in principle at the 2009 Board Meeting (**US\$14 690**). See Annex 41a of 2009 Report. **The final approval for implementation is still pending until CIS is able to submit its regular ASFA input without need for checking.**

*(pending)* **2.3.4 ASFA Training Session (yearly) (\$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 to be at FAO, Rome. **None of these yearly courses have been held to date. Perhaps, one year's allotment will be partially transferred to assist another ASFA training event with funding problems. To date this has not yet been done**

THE FOLLOWING 3 YUGNIRO PROJECTS HAVE BEEN DORMANT/PENDING SINCE 2004, FOR VARIOUS REASONS.

THE EVENTUAL RE-ACTIVATION OF THESE PROJECTS CAN NOW ONLY PROCEED AFTER DISCUSSION AND RECONSIDERATION WITH THE ASFA SECRETARIAT AND POSSIBLE RE-RESUBMISSION FOR APPROVAL TO BOARD .

*(pending)* **2.3.5 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 the project have rendered the proposal "pending".

*(pending)* **2.3.6 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).

*(pending)* **2.3.7 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).

*(pending)* **2.3.8 PDII-LIPI/ Indonesia – ASFA Trust Fund Proposal (\$11 000) relating to ASFA input preparation and training**

One of the conditions for this project to be eventually approved was to get a staff member from PDII-LIPI well trained in the ASFA input techniques, so that he/she (and not FAO) could then organize and carry out ASFA training within Indonesia for PDII-LIPI's many collaborating centers. A PDII-LIPI staff member was trained for 1 week at FAO in 2010. As soon as the PDII-LIPI staff member gains suitable experience in ASFA inputting, the FAO ASFA Secretariat would provide some assistance (i.e. advice) to PDII-LIPI in carrying out the training for its collaborating centres.

Background – This proposal (see 2006 Report, Annex 24a and section 13.3.10) was not approved and was designated for further discussion between the FAO ASFA Secretariat and PDII-LIPI. The ASFA Secretariat informed PDII-LIPI that rather than FAO carry out the training, PDII-LIPI should do it once it became proficient in ASFA input preparation. It was agreed that a training of one or two PDII-LIPI staff at FAO would be organized in the future with FAO paying travel/per-diem of one trainee.

## **2.4 NEW PROJECT PROPOSALS AND ONGOING UP FOR RE-APPROVAL 2011-2012**

### **– For discussion/approval by Board – Agenda item 12.3 –**

*(for re-approval)* **2.4.1 Financial support to attend next year's ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (year 2012)**

This proposal (ASFA/2011/ 74) is reviewed each year by the Board to eventually update the amount of allocated funds. At the last four ASFA Meetings (2007-2010) the sum allocated has been held at \$40 000. The ASFA Secretariat, at this Meeting, will request that the sum is increased to \$45 000.

**THEREFORE, the renewal of this Trust Fund project for the 2012 meeting in Ireland is for discussion at US\$45 000. (For discussion/approval by Board – Agenda item 12.3)**

*(for re-approval)* **2.4.2 (FAO) – Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year Jan –Dec 2012, \$100,000)**

This is an ongoing proposal (ASFA/2011/3a) that is reviewed and renewed each year by the Board to update the amount of funds allocated to the FAO ASFA Secretariat.

**The renewal of this Trust Fund project proposal for 2012 is for discussion at US\$100 000. (For discussion/approval by Board – Agenda item 12.3)**

*(for re-approval)* **2.4.3 (FAO) – Utilization of ASFA Trust Fund to pay IAMS LIC membership fees**

This is an "ongoing" proposal (ASFA/2011/80) presented every two years to the Board for review and re-approval. The proposal is to renew the 29 IAMS LIC membership fees that will expire in 2011 and 2012, for a further two years (estimated cost \$1 175).

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

The purpose of this list is to keep a detailed record of ALL ASFA Trust Fund proposals/spending, although some of the figures are approximate.

### 2010–2011 Intersessional Project Proposals (proposals put forward and approved during intersession via ASFA–Board–L)

None			
------	--	--	--

### 2010 Project Proposals (project proposals put forward/approved at the 2010 Board Meeting, INRH, Morocco)

	COMMITTED	DISBURSED	NOTES
<b>1. Financial Support to attend annual (2011) Board Meeting</b> *[\$ 40 000 was allocated by Board at 2010 Meeting for the 2011 Meeting. However, the \$19 000 carry-over of unspent funds from the 2010 meeting makes the <b>TOTAL funds available for the 2011 Meeting = \$59 000</b> (Note, the additional \$19 000 is not shown in the committed column but is summed together with the \$40 000 and consider the available funds for this Meeting.	\$40 000*	\$48 400	<b>Underway.</b> Final sum disbursed not available at writing. Eventual under/over spending will be balanced against next year's allotment, as done each year.
<b>2. Staff Support to FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year 2011)</b> [\$ 90 000 was allocated by Board for 2011. There was an overspending of \$6 480 for the previous (2010) year's allocation – see item labelled Staff support to FAO ASFA Secretariat for 2010 on next page] Therefore, the TOTAL funds available for 2011 = \$83 520 * (Note, the \$6 480 overspending from 2010 is shown in the "Committed" column, and is calculated as the total balance to be spent) ** The Spending or committed as calculated at July 2011 is approx.\$51 886  – \$1 118 Board Report 2010 (print and distribution) – \$ 2 700 hiring of consultant (L. Lombardi) to assist FAO ASFA Secretariat (30days in second part of 2011) – \$2 000 – assistance to FAO ASFA input preparation for 2011 by Uruguay – \$2 000 training of Namibia and Botswana ASFA Partner – sub-contract to KMFRI (travel & per diem and LOA) (dates March 2011) – \$7 813 for ASFA information products to LIFDC countries (underway) – \$8 100 Travel to 2011 ASFA Board meeting HWibley & J Garnica) – \$5 000 Attend IAMSLIC Conf and Mini ASFA workshop (HWibley) and one day per diem for approx. 4 African ASFA Partners for Mini ASFA workshop following IAMSLIC Conf. – \$3 000 Attend Online Conf (H Wibley) – \$3 180 overtime ASFA backlog (J Garnica) – \$2 525 Amendment LOA Meta data conversion tool (complimentary to FBA digitization Trust Fund project) – \$900 Master file Monlis patch to ICIE, Poland – \$3000 For Conversion of Kardex serials list registration to ABCD software – \$2 550 Scanning of old Kardex paper serial registration cards – \$8 000 RGranger visit to ASFA Partner and potential SEAFDEC, Thailand, Philippines while in region (some costs estimated)	\$83 520*	\$51 886**	all items in progress, underway, completed, or to be undertaken
<b>3. Adapting WWW–ISIS–ASFA to the re-engineered www–ISIS–ASFA core program</b> (including modifications to www–ISIS–ASFA, making it Release–2) Euro 15 000 *(dollar amount estimated using 1Euro = \$1.4)	\$21 000*		
<b>4. Proposal 'Digitization, Open Access Deposition and ASFA Record Preparation of Freshwater Grey Literature, 1940–2007' (ASFA/2010/64b) US\$ 15,000</b>	\$15 000	\$4 500	1 <sup>st</sup> payment made
<b>5. Small Financial Incentive to ASFA Partner Institute hosting ASFA Board Meeting (INP) Guayaquil, Ecuador</b>	\$2 500	\$2500	instructions given to FAO Rep to make payment
<b>subtotal</b>	162 020	\$	

### 2009–2010 Intersessional Project Proposals (proposals put forward and approved during intersession via ASFA–Board–L)

	COMMITTED	DISBURSED	NOTES
<b>6. Updating Geographic Authority List (GAL)</b> FBL Trust Fund proposal (\$24,950) it is follow –up discussed at 2009 ASFA Board Meeting (circulated for vote via ASFA–Board–L in Jan 2010)	\$24 950	\$7 000	circulated and approved ASFA–Board–L 21/Jan/2010 First payment made
<b>subtotal</b>	\$24 950	\$7 000	

**2009 Project Proposals** (project proposals put forward and approved at the 2009 Board Meeting, NIO, India)

	<u>COMMITTED</u>	<u>DISBURSED</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
<p><b>7. Financial Support to attend annual (2010) Board Meeting</b>                      *[\$ 40 000 was allocated by Board at 2009 Meeting for the 2010 Meeting. However, the \$18 538 carry-over of unspent funds from the 2009 meeting makes the <b>TOTAL funds available for the 2010 Meeting = \$58 538</b> (Note, the additional \$18 538 is not shown in the committed column but is summed together with the \$40 000 and consider the available funds for this Meeting. Unspent 19 000 added to 2011 allotment</p>	\$40 000*	\$39 538	Completed. Although final sums may vary slightly from FAO official accounting
<p><b>8. Staff Support to FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year 2010)</b>                      [\$ 60 000 was allocated by Board for 2010. There was an overspending of \$1 361 for the previous (2009) year's allocation – see item labelled Staff support to FAO ASFA Secretariat for 2009 on next page]                      Therefore, the TOTAL funds available for 2010 = \$58 639                      * (Note, the \$1 361 overspending from 2009 is shown in the "Committed" column, and is calculated as the total balance to be spent)                      ** The Spending for 2010 was \$65 119                      (overspent) (\$65 119 – \$58 639) = \$6 480 (approximation)                      – \$1 118*** Board Report 2009 (print and distribution)                      – \$ 8 250 hiring of consultant (L. Lombardi) to assist FAO ASFA Secretariat (50 days first half of 2010) (completed)                      – \$2 700* hiring of consultant (L. Lombardi) to assist FAO ASFA Secretariat (30 days 2<sup>nd</sup> half of 2010) (underway) *(new reduced FAO rates)                      – \$3 494 FAO staff member (J. Garnica) to attend IFLA conference (completed) + conf fee                      – \$ 4 554 – secondment (S. Kalayanova) to ASFA from FAO/AGRIS group for 6 days in 2010. (completed)                      – \$ 10 000– meeting with ProQuest in Bethesda (USA) regarding renewing of ASFA Publishing Agreement (R.Grainger, R.Pepe)                      – \$2016 training of Bulgaria ASFA Partner – sub-contract to AdriaMed.                      – \$3 615 training of PDII/Indonesia at FAO , Rome                      – \$3 000*** Grainger visit to ASFA Partner in Thailand while in region                      – \$3 000 attendance FAO Secretariat (RPepe) 2010 Online conference                      – \$7 472**** for ASFA information products to LIFDC countries (underway)                      – \$4 385 1 FAO ASFA Staff member to attend IAMSLIC and Mini Latin American Meeting Oct. 2010, Argentina                      – \$5 443 overspending for ASFA mini Meeting charged here                      – \$5032 translation of 2010 ASFA Meeting action list into French and Spanish, as agreed at Board                      – \$1040 FAO Staff to IOC/IODE Ocean Academy as lecturer (some costs estimated)</p>	\$58 639*	\$65 119**	completed,
<p><b>9. (NIOF/Egypt) Trust Fund Proposal Elimination of Gaps 2360 records – approved in principle, pending NIOF becoming autonomous in input preparation and regularly submitting input</b></p>	\$14 160	\$0	approved in principle
<p><b>10. (KMFRI/Kenya) Identifying and listing grey literature published in Kenya not in ASFA</b></p>	\$7 320	\$2 440	1 <sup>st</sup> payment
<p><b>11. Strengthening CNSHB (Guinea) ASFA Centre computer equipment</b></p>	\$3 575	\$0	approved in principle, pending clarification
<p><b>12. Utilization of the ASFA Trust Fund to pay the IAMSLIC Membership fees for ASFA Partners expiring in Dec 2009 (project extended for a further two years 2010–2011).</b></p>	\$1 240	\$1 350	\$455 for 10 renewals expiring Dec 2009 & 1 new member \$895 for 22 renewals expiring Dec 2010
<p><b>13. (CIS/Viet Nam) Scanning of Viet Nam Fisheries Tech and Sci Results from 2000–2008</b></p>	\$0	\$0	approved in principle
<p><b>14. (Tanzania) Scanning of Fisheries Catch and Scientific Results 1999–2009</b></p>	\$10 625	\$6000	1 <sup>st</sup> payment made
<p><b>15. Small Financial Incentive to ASFA Partner Institute hosting ASFA Board Meeting INRH, Morocco</b></p>	\$2 500	\$2500	instructions given to FAO Rep to make payment
<p><b>sub-total</b></p>	\$138 059	\$54 337	

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

none

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

	<u>COMMITTED</u>	<u>DISBURSED</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
<p><b>16. Financial Support to attend annual (2009) Board Meet.</b>                      * [\$ 40 000 was allocated by Board at 2008 Meeting for the 2009 Meeting. However, the \$10 330 carry-over of unspent funds from the 2008 meeting makes the <b>TOTAL funds available for the 2009 Meeting = \$50 330</b> (Note, the additional \$10 330 is not shown in the "Committed" column, but is calculated as part of balance available to be spent.)</p>	\$40 000*	40 000**	<b>Completed.</b> Although final sums may vary slightly from FAO official accounting
<p><b>17. Staff Support to FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year 2009)</b>                      [\$ 60 000 was allocated by Board for 2009. There was an over-spending of \$3 693 for the previous (2008) year's allocation, see year below]  <b>Therefore, the TOTAL funds available for 2009 = \$56 307</b>                      * (Note, the \$3 693 overspending from 2008 is shown in the "Committed" column, and is calculated as the total balance to be spent)  <b>** The Spending for 2009 has been \$57 668</b>                      (\$56 307 – 57 668 = minus \$1361 (i.e. the \$1 361 overspent balance will be subtracted from 2010 allotment.                      – \$0 – assistance to FAO ASFA input preparation 2009 – sub-contract AdriaMed. No work carried out this year                      – \$ 4 025 – secondment (S. Kalayanova) to ASFA from FAO WAICENT-AGRIS group for 10 days in 2009.                      – \$6 800 for ASFA information products to LIFDC countries                      – \$4 278 (estimate) 1 FAO ASFA Staff member to attend IAMSLIC Meeting Sept. 2009, Belgium                      – \$ 8 250 hiring of consultant (L. Lombardi) to assist FAO ASFA Secretariat (50 days) (completed)                      – \$1 925 attendance FAO Secretariat at 2009 Online conference (estimate)                      – \$1 118 Board Report 2008 (print and distribution) *(estimated cost)                      – \$12 699 meeting with ProQuest in Bethesda (USA) regarding strategic planning present(R.Grainger, R.Pepe, A.Thompson, I.Pettman)                      – \$3 725 training of trainers course (A. Cristiani) to FAO, Rome                      – \$4 200* training of A. Sow (Mauritania) at IFREMER by J. Prod'homme includes honorarium *(approximate cost)                      – \$2 297* Training (in Chile) &amp; follow-up of Chile/IFOP input by A. Cristiani (travel/per diem \$1 677 + contract \$1000) *(approximate cost)                      – \$1 897 laptop for ASFA Partner (IIP/Uruguay) for utilization in ASFA training and follow-up activities in Latin America                      – \$1 514 attendance FAO Secretariat (J. Garnica) at International Conference for Digital Libraries and the Semantic Web, Trento, Italy                      – \$1 297 J. Macharia (KMFRI) to AFRAMSLIC, Tanzania, to carry out ASFA Training *(travel/per diem)                      – \$3643 (approx.) Printing and mailing ASFA Thesaurus                      Overspending (– \$1 361) is deducted from the 2010 allotment.</p>	\$56 307*	\$57 668 **	all items in progress, underway, completed, or to be undertaken.
<p><b>18. FBA Geographic Authority List – update of List FBA African Water Bodies – duplicate Material organized for eventual scanning and ASFA input</b></p>	\$30 000	\$30 000	
<p><b>19. Continuation of project–To Supply of scanners (for ASFA related use) to those ASFA Partner Institutes which lack the funding to buy equipment</b>                      *estimated cost to date of (still 2 partners pending purchase)</p>	\$3 666	\$1130*	in progress
<p><b>20. Further Strengthening KMFRI (Kenya) ASFA Training Centre – computer equipment: Kenya 2 PCs, 1 portable, 1 dehumidifier</b></p>	\$3 700	\$3 971*	approved during intersession by vote. *(final price) <b>completed</b>
<p><b>21. Utilization of the ASFA Trust Fund to pay the IAMSLIC Membership fees for ASFA Partners</b></p>	\$750	\$750	
<b>sub-total</b>	\$134 423	\$133 519	

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

	<u>COMMITTED</u>	<u>DISBURSED</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
<p><b>22. Development of Export/Conversion programs for www-ISIS-ASFA software</b> (Euro 13 553) (USD 21 195.54) (1 Euro=USD 1.5639, European Central Bank Exchange rate 20 May 2008)</p>	\$21 195.	\$21 195	LOA In progress of being signed by ICIE (originally Euro 11975, some additional tasks added raised figure to Euro 13 553)
<p><b>23. Supply of scanners (for ASFA related use) to those ASFA Partner Institutes which lack the funding to buy equipment</b>                      (9 Scanners \$4 208 + 9 Adobe Acrobat software \$1 899 = \$6 107 (still not final cost as problems acquiring delivering scanner for USSR)</p>	\$7 270	\$6 107*	<b>completed</b> except for 1 institutes without FAO office in country
<b>sub-total</b>	\$28 465	\$27 302	



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

	<u>COMMITTED</u>	<u>DISBURSED</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
<p><b>24. Financial Support to attend 2008 Board Meeting</b>  * [\$40 000 was allocated by Board at 2007 Meeting for the 2008 Meeting. However, there was a \$12 684 carry-over from the 2007 Meeting plus and there was \$2765 donated by NIFES, Norway – making the <b>TOTAL funds available for the 2008 Meeting = \$55 449</b>] (Note, the additional \$15 449 is not shown in the “Committed” column, but is calculated as part of balance available to be spent.) <b>The final amount spent was \$45 119.</b>  The unspent <b>\$10 330</b> is carried over to the allotment for 2009 meeting.</p>	\$40 000*	\$45 119	<b>Completed.</b> The unspent funds will be added to next year’s allotment as has been the case in the past
<p><b>25. Staff Support to FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year 2008)</b>  [\$ 60 000 was allocated by Board for 2008 (actually \$120 000 for the 2 year period 2008–2009). There was an over– spending of \$12 156 from the previous (2007) year’s allocation]  <b>Therefore, the TOTAL funds available for 2008 = \$47 844</b>  * (Note, the \$12156 overspent funds are shown in the “Committed” column, and will be calculated as part of total balance to be spent(i.e. subtracted from \$60 000)  <b>** The Spending during 2008 was \$ 51 537</b>  (\$47 844 – \$51 537 = –\$3 695 (i.e. the negative \$3 695 overspent will be subtracted from the 2009 allotment of \$60 000)  – \$2 007 spent (\$18 700 allocated) – assistance to FAO ASFA input preparation/follow-up/training 2008 – sub-contract to ADRIAMED.  – \$6 800 for ASFA information products to LIFDC countries (completed)  – \$2 440 training YugNiro in Ukraine by E. Romanov (completed)  – \$5 812 training in Kenya by KMFRI staff of two new ASFA National Partners (Ghana, Uganda) and the Kenya collaborating center plus per diem for Ghana and Uganda participants to attend AFRIAMSLIC/ASFA Africa group meeting and IOC–Odin meeting that was held back-to-back with training. (completed)  – \$1 300 honorarium for KMFRI to carry out above training and feedback for Ghana and Uganda Nationals ASFA Partners (completed)  – \$1 597 training of NIOF in Egypt by N. Milone (completed)  – \$1 526 training of ICCAT in Spain by M. Montes and H. Wibley (Montes cost covered by ICCAT) (completed)  – \$3 423 training of ASFA Partner Guinea, in France, by J. Prod’homme (sum is for Mr Kaba’s travel to/perdiem in France, IFREMER) (completed)  – \$11 083 FAO ASFA Staff member (R.P) to attend IAMSLIC Meeting 2008  – \$1 019 FAO ASFA Secretariat mission to National Institute of Fisheries in Egypt and recruitment as ASFA National Partner  – \$3 300 hiring of consultant (L. Lombardi) to assist FAO ASFA Secretariat for 20 days (completed)  – \$ 1 674 FAO ASFA Secretariat (R. Pepe) to IOC/IODE Project Office and VLIZ (Belgium) to discuss ASFA continuity  – \$700 conversion Monitoring list by ICIE from master database FAO format to format of www–ISIS–ASFA  – \$1004 for H.Rybinski to attend 2008 ASFA Board Meeting  – \$2 905 attendance FAO Secretariat (R. Pepe) at Online conference  – \$2 000 Board Report 2007 (print and distribution)  – \$2 947 FAO Secretariat (R. Grainger) visit to China with side visit to ASFA Partner in Tianjin  Overspending (– \$3 695) is deducted from the 2008 allotment.</p>	\$47 844*	\$ 51 537**	all items <b>completed</b>
<p><b>26. To strengthen ASFA Partner in Kenya (KMFRI) in order to provide ASFA Training Support for other ASFA Partners in Africa and so as to assist FAO ASFA Secretariat (provision of computer equipment) \$5 000 budgeted (but actual cost was \$1930.60)</b></p>	\$5 000	\$1 931	<b>completed</b>
<p><b>27. Digitization of Grey Literature from Economically Developing Countries for Inclusion in the IAMSLIC Aquatic Commons Digital Document Repository</b> (including guidance and assistance from the ASFA Board in identifying and contributing the literature to be digitized).  <b>Note</b> – This is the first Project proposal approved by the ASFA Board after the Board granted a WAIVER to the policy regarding use of ASFA Trust Fund (i.e. now the IAMSLIC 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 IAMSLIC for \$10 000 (of the total \$28 000 allocated to them). But after a Meeting between FAO ASFA Secretariat and members of IAMSLIC Aquatic Commons Board and IAMSLIC President, it was concurred that all \$28 000 of the IAMSLIC allotment could be allocated to this project considering its importance and priority for IAMSLIC.</p>	\$28 000*	\$0	slow to progress. Therefore, the FAO ASFA Secretariat asked the FAO Fisheries Library to identify and digitize using some or all of these funds.
<p><b>28. Utilization of the ASFA Trust Fund to pay the IAMSLIC Membership fees for ASFA Partners</b></p>	\$790	\$790	This cycle completed – for continuation 2008–2009, see 2008 Table of Project proposals
<p><b>29. ASFA Training Session (\$14 000) (ASFA/2007/76) (this proposal was approved to take place each year)</b></p>	\$14 000	\$0	not yet carried-out

<b>30. (KMFRI) Trust Fund Proposal Elimination of Gaps – Phase II</b> *Approved in principle. To be revised with respect to the journals, number of records and costs, and circulated via ASFA Board L by KMFRI during the intersessional period <b>CANCELLED at 2009 Meeting \$21 459</b>	\$0	\$0	Approved in principle* cancelled NO longer valid
<b>sub-total</b>	<b>\$135 634</b>	<b>\$99 377</b>	

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

	<u>COMMITTED</u>	<u>DISBURSED</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
<b>31. Digitizing Grey Literature and helping to identify it for inclusion in IAMSLIC Repository – \$10 000.</b> *(Eventually agreed at 2007 ASFA Board Meeting (for \$28 000) – see above year 2007 project proposals)	\$ -	\$ -	<b>See above under year 2007 project proposals</b>
<b>sub-total</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	

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

	<u>COMMITTED</u>	<u>DISBURSED</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
<b>32. Financial Support to attend 2007 Board Meeting</b> * [\$ 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 <b>Therefore, the TOTAL funds available for the 2007 Meeting = \$37 748]</b> * Note, the minus \$2 252 is not shown in the “Committed” column, but is calculated as part of balance available to be spent. ** US\$25 064 was spent (the under spending of \$12 684 will be added to next year’s allotment as has been the case in the past).	\$40 000*	\$25 064**	<b>Completed</b>
<b>33. Staff Support to FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year 2007)</b> * (\$ 50 000 was allocated by Board for 2007, however there was a carry-over of \$10 266 unspent from the previous (2006) year’s allocation (see last year). <b>Therefore, the TOTAL funds available for 2007 = \$60 266</b> * Note, the \$10 266 carry-over unspent funds is not shown in the “Committed” column, and calculated as part of total balance to be spent ** Spending for 2007 (period January – August 2007) was <b>\$72 422</b> as follows: – \$6 020– assistance to FAO ASFA input prep. 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 Peru & Ecuador training by M.Montes in Ecuador (\$4 142 of total was paid from funds allocated to ASFA Secretariat and \$ 2 660 from funds left over from \$6000 allocated to INP– Ecuador Trust fund project for equipment) – see item directly following this one – \$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 Online Info. Conf. 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) Overspending (– \$12 156) is deducted from the 2008 allotment.	\$50 000 *	\$72 422**	<b>all items are completed</b>

<b>34. INP–Ecuador Trust Fund project proposal</b> <b>(Elaboration of the Ecuador database.</b> This was a request for 2 PC's and printers, plus training. Only \$3 340 spent on equipment. Funds remaining used for training of Ecuador & Peru staff by M. Montes. See item–12	\$ 6 000	\$3 340	<b>Completed \$ 3340 spent on equip. Remaining 2660</b> for Ecuador & Peru training by M. Montes
<b>35. (FAO) ASFA Trust Fund project proposal Mini–ASFA–Meeting (regional)</b> plus eventual \$5 000 from IOC	\$ 20 000	\$24 400	undertaken in 2010, to run with IAMSLIC Meet.
<b>36. (FAO) ASFA Trust Fund project proposal Training of Trainers.</b> \$10 000 for training and \$10 000 for video.	\$20 000	\$ 9 782.00	½ <b>completed</b> (video not yet produced)
<b>37. (NIFFR –Nigeria) Trust Fund proposal –Filling Gaps</b>	\$6 990	\$6 990	<b>completed</b> LOA operative in 2008. completed June 09
<b>38. (Russia – VNIRO) ASFA Trust Fund project proposal, Input of Barents and Norwegian Seas Literature</b>	\$ 3960	\$3960	<b>completed</b> LOA sent to VNIRO for signature
<b>sub–total</b>	<b>\$146 950</b>	<b>\$121 558</b>	

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

	<u>COMMITTED</u>	<u>DISBURSED</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
<b>39. Financial Support to attend (2006) Board Meeting</b> * (\$ 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. <b>Therefore, the TOTAL funds available for the 2006 Meeting = \$40 789.</b> * Note, the \$2 289 carry–over is not shown in the "Committed" column but that is the total sum used to calculate the available funds for the Meeting. ** US\$43 041 was spent. Overspending (\$40 789 – \$43 041= – \$ 2 252) will be subtracted from 2007 allotment, as has been the case in the past).	\$38 500*	43 041**	<b>completed</b>
<b>40. Staff Support to FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year 2006)</b> * (\$ 40 000 was allocated by Board for 2006, however there is a negative carry–over of \$1 199 unspent from the previous (2005) year's allocation. <b>Therefore, the TOTAL funds available for 2006 = \$38 801</b> * Note, the \$1 199 negative carry–over of overspent funds from previous year is shown in "Committed" column instead of allocated \$40 000). ** approx. spending for 2006 (period January – December. 2006) = <b>\$28 545</b> is listed below. The unspent funds <b>\$10 226</b> was carried forward to 2007 allotment. (\$38 801– \$28 545 = \$10 226) – \$ 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	\$38 801 *	\$28 545**	all items are <b>completed. \$10 226</b>  carried over to next year
<b>41. (China) Compilation of www–ISIS–ASFA Manuals and Guidelines in Chinese</b>	\$ 10 000	\$10 000	completed
<b>42. (Kenya–KMFRI) Elimination of Gaps</b>	\$18 200	\$18 200	completed during 2007–08 intersession
<b>43. (Russia–VNIRO) Input of Caspian Literature II</b>	\$10 270	\$ 10 270	completed during 2007–08 intersession
<b>sub–total</b>	<b>\$115 771</b>	<b>\$110 056</b>	

### 2004 – 2005 Intersessional Project Proposals

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

	<u>COMMITTED</u>	<u>DISBURSED</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
<b>44. Estonia –EMI – Latvian and Lithuanian Aquatic Serials processed for ASFA Database</b>	\$ 4 800	\$ 4 800	<b>Completed</b>
<b>sub–total</b>	<b>\$4 800</b>	<b>\$4 800</b>	

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

	<u>COMMITTED</u>	<u>DISBURSED</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
<p><b>45. Financial Support to attend annual (2005) Board Meeting</b>                      *(\$ 35 000 was allocated by Board for 2005 Meeting) (with carry-over of \$ 8 716 unspent from previous year. The total funds available 2005 Meeting = <b>\$43 716</b>                      * 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	<b>completed</b> , unspent \$2 331 carried over to 2006 Meeting. (43716 – 41385 = \$2 331)
<p><b>46. Staff Support to FAO ASFA Secretariat (for 2005)</b>                      *(\$ 40 000 was allocated by Board for 2005) (with a minus carry-over of – \$2 165 from previous year (see below).                      The total funds available for 2005= <b>\$37 835</b>                      * The Balance in the "Committed" column includes the negative carry-over of – \$2 165 from overspending in 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>	\$37 835 *	\$39 034**	<b>completed</b> , overspent \$1 199 to carry over to subtract from 2006 alloc. \$37 835 – \$39 034 = \$1199
<p><b>47. (FAO) www–ISIS–ASFA Maintenance Release</b> (upgrade 1.1)</p>	\$7 900	\$7 900	<b>completed</b>
<p><b>48. (FAO) Utilization of ASFA Trust Fund to pay for ASFA Partners membership fees in IAMSLIC</b></p>	\$1 060	\$1 060	<b>on-going 2 years</b>
<p><b>49. (YugNIRO– Ukraine) Translation of ASFA Thesaurus into Russian and development of Russian–English Thesaurus</b></p>	\$15 000		pending release of version 1.1
<p><b>50. (YugNIRO– Ukraine) Translation of www–ISIS–ASFA "Help Notes" and front end into Russian</b></p>	\$2000		pending release of version 1.1
<p><b>51. (YugNIRO– Ukraine) Translation of www–ISIS–ASFA Guidelines into Russian</b></p>	\$5 000		pending results of exercise to simplify input rules/procedures
<p><b>52. (INIDEP – Argentina) Marine Bibliogr. Information from Latin America and Caribb. Region ... (1955–1980) 1<sup>st</sup> Stage: S.A. Chile</b></p>	\$0*		* withdrawn by INIDEP
<b>sub-total</b>	<b>\$103 795</b>	<b>\$89 379</b>	

**2003– 2004 Intersessional Project Proposals**

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

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

	<u>COMMITTED</u>	<u>DISBURSED</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
<b>53. Financial Support to attend annual (2004) Board Meeting</b> (US\$ 30 000 was allocated by Board for 2004) ( carry over of \$3 642 from previous years (see below). The total funds available for 2004 = <b>\$33 642</b> * Balance in Committed column does not include the following carry-over : a) extra \$1 941 unspent for 2003 Meeting) b) extra \$1 030 unspent for 2002 Meeting) c) extra \$ 671 unspent for 2001 Meeting)	\$30 000*	\$24 926	<b>completed</b> , unspent \$8,716 (\$33,642-\$24,926=\$8716) is moved to 2005 Meeting allocation
<b>54. Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for 2004)</b> *(US\$ 30 000 was allocated by Board for 2004) (with carry-over of \$33 685 from previous years (see below). * <b>The total available funds for 2004 = \$63 685</b> * Available funds includes the following carry-over : a) unspent \$852 from unspent Jan-Dec 2003 allocation b) unspent \$22,200 from unspent Jan-Dec 2002 allocation c) unspent \$9,833 from unspent Jan-Dec 2001 allocation d) unspent \$800 from unspent Jan-Dec 2000 allocation ** Spending: - \$ 6 484 assistance in ASFA input preparation – sub-contract to AdriaMed, - \$ 2 500 Input of missed IOTC documents by NIO (completed Nov. 2005) - \$10 497 for ASFA information products to LIFDC countries (administration, contacts etc.) - \$ 4 000 ASFA CD-ROMS for LIFDC project: subscription – Ovid for 40 CDs - \$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 1 <sup>st</sup> 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)	\$30 000*	\$65 850**	<b>completed</b> , overspent \$2,165 (\$63,685 – \$65,850 = -\$2165) and is moved to to be subtracted from Year 2005 allocation.
<b>55. (VNIRO – Russia) Input of old unique literature Caspian Sea from 1770–1970</b>	\$6 000	\$6 000	<b>completed</b>
<b>56. UNAM, Mexico – Translate into Spanish the ASFIS Ref.Series</b> (No. 2, ASFIS Subject Categories and Scope Descriptions and No. 3, Guidelines for Bibliographic Description and Data Entry	\$7 000	\$7 000	<b>completed</b> , available on FAO, ASFA FTP site
<b>sub-total</b>	<b>\$73 000</b>	<b>\$103 776</b>	

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

	<u>COMMITTED</u>	<u>DISBURSED</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
<b>57. Collect, sort, input of "historical" bibl. Records (KMFRI)</b>	\$15 000	\$15 000	<b>completed</b>
<b>58. Collect, sort, input of "historical" bibl. Records (VLIZ)</b> *(VLIZ agreed to reduce amount from 18 to 12 000 because it would not be submitting indexing terms with some records)	\$18 000	\$12 000*	<b>underway</b> 2 payments made. No further payments necessary
<b>sub-total</b>	<b>\$33 000</b>	<b>\$27 000</b>	

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

<b>59. www-ISIS-ASFA training for VNIRO Partner</b> *(using funds (\$8 002) unspent from ASFA training workshops, see year 2000)	*	\$2 900*	<b>completed</b>
<b>60. Translation www-ISIS-ASFA Help Notes into Spanish</b> *(using funds (\$8 002) unspent from ASFA training workshops, see year 2000)	*	\$1 500*	<b>completed</b>
<b>61. Translation www-ISIS-ASFA Help Notes into French</b> *(using funds (\$8 002) unspent from ASFA training workshops, see item-54)	*	\$1 500*	<b>completed</b>
<b>62. Translation of Bibliographic Guidelines into Portuguese</b> *(using funds (\$8 002) unspent from ASFAtainingworkshops, see year 2000) (est\$2700)			<b>(lost contact)</b>
<b>sub-total</b>		<b>\$5 900</b>	

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

	<u>COMMITTED</u>	<u>DISBURSED</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
<b>63. Funding to attend Oct.2002 IAMSLIC Meeting (1 person)</b>	\$2 500	\$2 790	<b>completed</b> , overspent \$290.
<b>64. Conversion of 1971 ASFA Journals (NIO)</b>	\$8 500	\$8 500	<b>completed</b>
<b>65. Financial Support to attend annual (2003) Board Meeting</b>	\$30 000	\$28 059	<b>completed</b> (unspent \$1 941, moved to 2004 Meeting,
<b>66. Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year 2003)</b> \$8,800 for assistance in ASFA input preparation (sub-contract to AdriaMed); \$10,497 for ASFA information products to LIFDC countries; \$2000 to identify gaps in FAO monitoring list; \$2500 to attend www-ISIS, training at ICIE; \$2674 – FAO attendance at Online Conference 2003 (R.P); \$1744 FAO attendance at Thesaurus maintenance seminar (R.P); \$933 to print 2003 Board Report.	\$30 000	\$29 148	<b>completed</b> (unspent \$852 moved to 2004 year allocation
<b>sub-total</b>	<b>\$71 000</b>	<b>\$68 497</b>	

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

	<u>COMMITTED</u>	<u>DISBURSED</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
<b>67. Financial Support to attend annual (2002) Board Meeting</b>	\$25,000	\$23,969.	<b>completed</b> (unspent \$1030, moved to 2004 Meeting, allotment
<b>68. Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for 2002)</b> (\$8,800 for assistance in ASFA input preparation(sub-contract to AdriaMed)	\$30,000	\$8,800	<b>completed</b> (unspent \$22 200 moved 2004 allocation,
<b>69. Support to implementation of www-ISIS-ASFA interface</b> (start when software was issued – 10/2002) *(plus additional funds to attend 2002 Board Meeting (see next item)	\$10,000*	10,000	<b>completed</b>
<b>70. Funds to attend 2002 Board Meeting for Dr Rybinski</b>	\$1,500	\$1,688	<b>completed</b>
<b>71. ASFA-FIGIS Interaction</b>	\$20,000	\$20 000	<b>completed but not yet operational to public</b>
<b>72. Correction of the ASFA Descriptors fields</b> *(subject to negotiation – this project includes possible extension \$5000 – see next item)	\$19,800*	0	cancelled funds returned to balance
<b>51a Extension of project to other Partners</b>	\$5 000	0	cancelled funds returned to balance
<b>sub-total</b>	<b>\$111 300</b>	<b>\$64 457</b>	

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

	<u>COMMITTED</u>	<u>DISBURSED</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
<b>73. Financial Support to attend annual (2001) Board Meeting</b> *(extra \$4,629 disbursed from unspent 2000 allocation, item-59 )	\$15,000	\$18,958*	<b>completed</b> (unspent \$671, moved to 2003 Meeting allocation
<b>74. Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year 2001)</b> (expenditure for Rybinski to 2001 Meet.\$1688, Cort to L.America\$6039, Input support\$3900, CDs to LIFDC\$7000, Transl. Help notes\$3000)	\$31,460	\$21,627	<b>completed</b> (unspent \$9833 moved to 2004 allocation
<b>75. Workshops for familiarization(training) in ASFA input preparation</b> *(unspent \$8002 to be spent on future training. See above 2002-2003 Intersessional Initiatives)	\$28,800	\$20,798	<b>completed</b> (unspent \$8002) *
<b>76. Support to the Dev. of Web based interface to ASFISIS</b>	\$10,000	\$10,000	<b>completed</b> 10/2002
<b>77. Provision of ASFA Centres in former USSR with translation</b> (ASFIS-2, Subject Categories and Scope Descriptions)	\$1,500	\$1,500	<b>Completed</b>
<b>78. Conversion of ASFA Printed Journals into machine readable format (1971-1974). 1973 Conversion</b>	\$15,000	\$15,000	<b>Completed</b>
<b>79. Conversion of ASFA Printed Journals into machine readable format (1971-1974). 1972 Conversion</b>	\$15,000	\$15,000	<b>Completed</b>
<b>sub-total</b>	<b>\$116 760</b>	<b>\$102 883</b>	

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

	<u>COMMITTED</u>	<u>DISBURSED</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
<b>80. Financial Support to attend annual (2000) Board Meeting</b> *(unspent \$4,629 moved to support attendance at 2001 Meeting, item-52)	\$15,000	\$10,371*	<b>Completed</b>
<b>81. Staff support to ASFA Secretariat (Ms Wibley)</b> (for the period January 2000 –December 2000)	\$31,460	\$30,660*	<b>completed</b> *(unspent \$800 transferred to 2004 year allocation)
<b>82. Improvement of ASFA Database by Germany (BF)</b>	\$15,000	\$15,000	<b>Completed</b>
<b>83. Request for training from Kenya (RECOSCIX-WIO)</b>	\$3,000	\$2,825	<b>Completed</b>
<b>84. Conversion of ASFA printed journals into machine readable format (1974 volume) by India (NIO)</b>	\$15,000	\$15,000	<b>Completed</b>
<b>85. Addition of 45,000 abstracts to 1975–77ASFA database–China</b>	\$17,000	\$17,000	<b>Completed</b>
<b>86. Formatting ASFA Thesaurus by Julia Hudson</b>	\$2,000	\$2,000	<b>Completed</b>
<b>sub-total</b>	<b>\$98 460</b>	<b>\$92 856</b>	

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

	<u>COMMITTED</u>	<u>DISBURSED</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
<b>87. Financial Support to attend annual Board Meeting</b>	\$10,000	\$12,500*	<b>completed</b> *(extra \$2500 from unspent 1997 allocation)
<b>88. Staff support to ASFA Secretariat (Ms Wibley)</b> (for the period January 1999 –December 1999)	\$25,200	\$25,200	<b>Completed</b>
<b>89. A systems analysis specification for a Windows-based data entry software (ASFISIS/Win) (Dr. DeSmet)</b>	0	0	<b>Cancelled</b>
<b>90. Extension of ASFA Potential in Lithuania</b>	\$2,500	\$2,500	<b>Completed</b>
<b>91. Coverage of Fishery Economics &amp; Related Subjects in ASFA.</b>	\$5,000	\$5,000	<b>Completed</b>
<b>sub-total</b>	<b>\$42 700</b>	<b>\$45 200</b>	

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

	<u>COMMITTED</u>	<u>DISBURSED</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
<b>92. Financial Support to attend annual Board Meeting</b>	\$6,000	\$3,500*	<b>completed</b> *(\$2,500 moved to 1998 allocation,
<b>93. Staff support to ASFA Secretariat (Ms Wibley)</b> (for the period January 1998 –December 1998)	\$25,200	\$25,200	<b>Completed</b>
<b>94. Extension of ASFA potential in Ukraine (YugNIRO)</b>	\$3,000	\$3,000	<b>Completed</b>
<b>95. Provision of ASFA Centres in former USSR with reference material for input (translations) (YugNIRO)</b>	\$3,500	\$3,500	<b>Completed</b>
<b>96. ASFISIS Maintenance (Dr. DeSmet)</b>	\$2,000	\$1,400*	<b>completed</b> *(\$600 returned to balance due to over budgeting)
<b>97. Training for PIMRIS (travel Mr. Rao)</b> *(disbursed exceeds committed, because for administrative reasons, FAO could not issue the most economic ticket as per original estimate)	\$3,000	\$5,200*	<b>completed</b> , overspent \$2200.
<b>98. Convert 500 Records (from PIMRIS database into ASFISIS formatting) *</b> (New contract stipulated in 2004 with Ganeshan Rao)	\$3,500	\$ 3 500	<b>completed*</b>
<b>99. Analysis of ASFA for Scope and Coverage with eventual recommendations for improvement</b>	\$6,500	\$6,500	<b>completed</b>
<b>sub-total</b>	<b>\$52 700</b>	<b>\$51 800</b>	

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

	<u>COMMITTED</u>	<u>DISBURSED</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
<b>100. Manual on ASFISIS software and Data Entry</b> *Board (Board approved \$6000 for this manual, but work was carried out by FAO FIDI staff without charging against Trust fund)	0*	0*	<b>completed</b>
<b>101. Logo for ASFA competition</b>	0	0	costed at \$2500, but later <b>cancelled</b>
<b>102. Statistical Analysis of ASFA Database</b>	0	0	<b>completed</b> costed at \$7000, no charge by CSA
<b>103. ASFA User Survey</b>	0	0	<b>cancelled– but never budgeted</b>
<b>sub-total</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	

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

	<u>COMMITTED</u>	<u>DISBURSED</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
<b>104. Workshops for familiarization with the ASFA input methodology (ASFA Training Session, 3–7 June 1996, FAO)</b>	\$34,000	\$11,645*	<b>completed</b> *(unspent \$22,335 returned to Balance)
<b>105. Review of the ASFA Partners Monitoring of Serials for ASFA</b> (follow-up to 1994 review)	\$5,000	\$5,000	<b>completed</b>
<b>106. IOC Study Grant.. (\$8,000)</b>	0	0	<b>cancelled</b>
<b>107. Chinese proposal sub-project 1, Identification of ASFA information users and suppliers in China</b>	\$4,000	\$4,000	<b>completed</b>
<b>sub-total</b>	<b>\$43 000</b>	<b>\$20 645</b>	

<b>Committed funds and Disbursed funds</b> (according to FAO ASFA Secretariat's <u>approximations</u> in Tables above)	<b>\$1 636 787 committed</b>	<b>1 230 342</b> (according to FAO ASFA Secretariat's records, which are not synchronized with dates of actual financial transaction by FAO Prog. Coordinating Unit)
--	------------------------------	--

**Notes**

1. The full text of most of the Trust Fund Project Proposals cited in the above tables is contained in the corresponding year's ASFA Advisory Board Meeting Report: (Hamburg, 30 May–2 June 95) (FAO, Rome, 28–31 May 96) (Gdynia, 22–25 April 97) (FAO, Rome, 9–12 June 98) (NOAA, 25–28 May 99), (NIO/NICMAS 19–22 September 2000) (IFREMER, Brest 19–22 June 2001) (FAO, Rome, 18–21 June 02) (Cuba, 15–18 July 2003) (INIDEP, Argentina 29 June–2 July 2004) (FAO, Rome, 4–8 October 05) (VLIZ, Belgium 4–8 September 2006) (KMFRI, Kenya, 3–7 September 2007) (IMR, Norway, 1–5 September 2008) (NIO/NICMAS, India, 7–11 September 2009), (INRH, Casablanca, Morocco 5–9 July 2010).

2. Figures under “financial support to attend annual Board meetings” may be approximates, usually based on initial estimates of flight tickets and days per–diem. The final calculations and travel expense claims TECs are sometimes one year or more in arriving and settling and also “Staff support to FAO ASFA Secretariat” are also often based on initial estimates. Sometimes these figures do get rectified in the tables.

3. Most other lines in the above List are fairly easy to keep track of (i.e. are not estimates).

In any case, the (real) cash balance in the ASFA Trust Fund as reported to ASFA Secretariat by the FAO Programme Coordination Unit, FIDP, from their official database/records is reported in section 1.2.

A print out of the records as kept by the FAO Programme Coordination Unit, FIDP, from their official database/records (updated as 2 March 2010) can be seen on the FAO ASFA reserved ftp site at:

<ftp://ASFA:PWda28b@ext-ftp.fao.org/FI/Reserved/ASFA> in the folder [ASFA\\_Trust\\_Fund\\_FAO\\_Programme\\_Coordination\\_Unit\\_FIDP\\_records](#)





**Minutes of Action Items and Decisions Agreed  
at  
ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (INP, Guayaquil, Ecuador, 5-9 September 2011)**

*[Note: some discussion is included for some of the Action Items/Decisions in order to put them into perspective. The full discussions will be reflected in the Minutes of the Report, which will be completed and circulated to the participants of this meeting within 4-6 weeks ]*

The 40<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of the Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Abstracts (ASFA) Advisory Board took place from 5 to 9 September 2011 at the Instituto Nacional de Pesca (INP) located in Guayaquil, Ecuador. The meeting was opened by Ms Pilar Solis, Director of INP, Mr Alan Gonzalez, FAO Representative in Ecuador, Mr Richard Grainger, Chief of the FAO service responsible for ASFA, and Mr Nikita Gaibor (INP). This year the Meeting was attended by 30 participants, representing 23 ASFA Partners. Mr Gaibor (INP) chaired the Meeting and the Agenda was completed on time. The main reporter was Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat).

**Agenda Item 6.5. (Partners removed or in danger of being removed from ASFA)**

1. *INAHINA reported in 2009 a lack of serials to be monitored for ASFA, following their discontinuation....they continue to have problems in submitting ASFA records .....*

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to contact the ASFA Partner in Mozambique (INAHINA) in order to clarify their status regarding ASFA input. [At the upcoming IAMSLIC Meeting in Tanzania, the FAO ASFA Secretariat is organizing a one day ASFA training workshop for some African ASFA partners in an attempt to address and resolve the issues preventing them from submitting input.]

2. *Regarding the status of submission of ASFA records by Cote d'Ivoire (CRO).... no communication since 2010, when CRO informed FAO that a person had been hired to do input, but would require training ....*

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to contact the ASFA Partner in Cote d'Ivoire (CRO) in order to clarify their status regarding ASFA input and coordinate eventual training

3. *Regarding the status of submission of ASFA records by Spain (IEO) and problems in communication....*

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to make one final effort to contact the ASFA Partner in Spain (IEO) in order to clarify their position, or else they would risk being removed from the ASFA Partnership.

4. *Regarding the status of submission of ASFA records by Viet Nam (CIS) .... some new records had been received by the FAO ASFA Secretariat just before the meeting .....no news about the records pending correction from previous years...*

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to contact the ASFA Partner in Viet Nam (CIS) in order to clarify the status of CIS input production and explain the procedure to be followed regarding submission of ASFA records for control/feedback by the FAO ASFA Secretariat.

5. *Regarding lack of submission of ASFA input by Australia (CSIRO) to ProQuest since 2007....*

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to contact the ASFA Partner in Australia (CSIRO) in order to clarify their status regarding ASFA input.

6. *Regarding lack of submission of ASFA input by Senegal (DPM) since 2008*

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to contact the ASFA Partner in Senegal (DPM) in order to clarify the situation and request that ASFA input be resumed as soon as possible. [At the upcoming

IAMSLIC Meeting in Tanzania, the FAO ASFA Secretariat is organizing a one day ASFA training workshop for some African ASFA partners in an attempt to address and resolve the issues preventing them from submitting input.

#### **Agenda Item 6.8. (ASFA Publishing Agreement between FAO and ProQuest)**

7. *Regarding the finalization of the current Publishing Agreement before the end of the year .... Mr Grainger (FAO ASFA Secretariat) mentioned that the Agreement was still in the hands of ProQuest and that the FAO ASFA Secretariat was waiting for final comments ..... it was important to receive the Agreement as soon as possible in order that FAO could pass it on to the Legal Office so that the document would be ready to be signed before the end of the year. Both parties would aim to have the document ready for signing by 1<sup>st</sup> November*

**Mr Emerson (ProQuest) agreed** to contact the ProQuest Legal department in order to speed up the final review of the Agreement and would inform the ASFA Board regarding the status of the document by 15 September.

#### **Agenda Item 6.8. (Entitlements)**

8. *NMDIS (China) reported that they had difficulties in accessing the ASFA Database (CSA Illumina) ..*

**Ms McCoy (ProQuest) agreed** to look into this issue and help resolve the problem.

9. *INP (Ecuador) reported that they had difficulties in accessing the ASFA Database (CSA Illumina) and requested the possibility of having access through their Intranet so that researchers within the institute could access the database ..using a shared IP address*

**Ms McCoy (ProQuest) agreed** to look into this issue with the ProQuest IT department and help resolve the problem.

10. *IMARPE (Peru) reported that they had difficulties in accessing the ASFA Database (CSA Illumina) ) and also requested the possibility of having access through their Intranet so that researchers within the institute could access the database ....using a shared IP address*

**Ms McCoy (ProQuest) agreed** to look into this issue with the ProQuest IT department and help resolve the problem.

11. *CIP (Cuba) reported that they had difficulties in accessing the ASFA Database (CSA Illumina) ) and also requested the possibility of having access through their Intranet so that researchers within the institute could access the database ....using a shared IP address*

**Ms McCoy (ProQuest) agreed** to look into this issue with the ProQuest IT department and help resolve the problem.

12. *Regarding access to CSA Illumina for Collaborating Centres in developed countries .... Ms Prod'homme (IFREMER) asked whether the Collaborating Centres in her network could have access to Illumina even if not reaching the production figure required for free access ...Ms Noble (NMBL) mentioned that free access to Illumina would give an incentive to Collaborating Centres to join the ASFA Partnership..... perhaps a greater discount could be offered to the Collaborating Centres .....perhaps more Collaborating Centre in developed countries could have free access ...*

**Mr Emerson (ProQuest) agreed** to investigate the possibility of including some changes to the entitlements of Collaborating Centres in the current Publishing Agreement, so that more Collaborating Centres would have access and a greater discount would be offered to all Collaborating Centres in developed countries.

#### **Agenda Item 7. (ASFA – Quality of the ASFA Database)**

##### **Agenda Item 7.3 (Coverage and monitoring)**

**13.** *ICES mentioned in their report that they had requested ProQuest to prepare ASFA records for their ICES CM Documents for 2008 ... the records were still not available on CSA Illumina*

**Ms McCoy (ProQuest) agreed** to look into the issue and ensure that the records would appear on CSA Illumina as soon as possible. [The records were currently being processed]

#### **Agenda Item 7.4 (Timeliness)**

**14.** *Ms Noble (NMBL) commented on the need to populate different systems with the same information....e.g. ASFA records, AC input, OceanDocs input .....there was a need to improve timeliness ... using the conversion tool developed by FBA to convert ASFA records into a format which would facilitate batch import into the AC repository .... Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) mentioned problems regarding the OceanDocs conversion tool.....Ms Cristiani (IIP) commented this was due to the updating of the OceanDocs software .... not sure exactly where the problem was*

**Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) and Ms Cristiani (IIP) agreed** to provide the FAO ASFA Secretariat with specific details of the current problem encountered with the OceanDocs conversion tool.

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to inform Mr Marc Goovaerts regarding the issue with OceanDocs conversion tool and discuss the problems with him during the IAMSLIC meeting in Zanzibar in October.

#### **Agenda Item 7.6. (Status of efforts by ASFA Partners to include more grey literature in ASFA, including digitization)**

**15.** *Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) commented on the lack of coverage of grey literature from some international organizations ....e.g.. IOC, UNEP, ICES,*

**Ms Rosenboom (UN/DOALOS) agreed** to liaise with IOC and UNEP the following week in Chile at the CCCP meeting regarding the status of their ASFA input

**16.** *Regarding the gaps in coverage for UNEP publications ....previously done under contract by (KMFRI) ....contact regarding ASFA has been lost with UNEP, so the contract had not been renewed*

**Mr Macharia (KMFRI) agreed** to temporarily take over the responsibility of monitoring the UNEP publications until the FAO ASFA Secretariat has re-established a working contact with UNEP regarding ASFA

**17.** *Regarding increasing coverage of grey literature ..... Ms Noble raised the issue of information that was available online on the websites of various international organizations and agencies.... in order to include such information in ASFA there would be a need to coordinate efforts.....*

**Ms Noble (NMBL) and the FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to liaise regarding the production of a list of international agency websites containing grey literature information which could be entered in ASFA.

**Ms Noble (NMBL) agreed** to coordinate the preparation by different ASFA Partners of ASFA records for literature available on international agency websites

#### **Agenda Item 7.7 (ASFA Inputting procedures)**

**18.** *Regarding the ORI (Botswana) report and their mention of some questions regarding ASFA inputting procedures .... how to prepare records for theses .....how to enter documents without abstracts ....broken URL links .... how to cover project material...*

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to contact ORI and provide explanations regarding the questions related to ASFA input methodology raised in their report. [At the upcoming IAMSLIC Meeting in Tanzania, the FAO ASFA Secretariat is organizing a one day ASFA training workshop for some African ASFA partners in an attempt to address and resolve the issues preventing them from submitting input.]

19. *Regarding possible changes to inputting procedures following the eventual discontinuation of the production of the printed ASFA journals, e.g. no longer necessary to enter DBO, no longer use HTML coding for italics, no need for X-reference phrase .....*

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to draw up a list of the changes to Data Entry procedures which would result from an eventual decision not to continue producing the printed ASFA journals.

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to send all ASFA Partners a list of changes in Data Entry procedures via ASFA-Board L, once the ASFA printed journal was discontinued.

20. *Entering multiple-author affiliations ..... ProQuest said that this was no longer a problem with their interface – the new platform could deal with such information....*

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to liaise with Dr Rybinski regarding the eventual modification of the www-ISIS-ASFA software so as to be able to incorporate multiple author affiliations.

21. *Regarding the use of Classification codes..... Mr Emerson questioned the need to keep on assigning classification codes to the ASFA records.....perhaps the codes were not of use when searching on the CSA Illumina database .....*

**The ASFA Board agreed** to maintain current indexing procedures involving assigning classification codes to the ASFA records.

## **Agenda Item 8 (ASFA Products and Services)**

### **Agenda Item 8.1 (ASFA journals)**

22. *Mr Emerson (ProQuest) asked the ASFA Board if they were to object should ProQuest discontinue the printed journals .....*

**The ASFA Board agreed** to the discontinuation of the ASFA printed journals.

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to send a message via ASFA-Board L to ask whether any ASFA Partner would object to this decision. [should the answer be yes, a reason would be appreciated]

### **Agenda Item 8.2 (ASFA CD/DVD ROM)**

23. *Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) mentioned that a request had been made by Ms Hilary Cochrane, the FAO Consultant working on the LIFDC project, regarding the possibility of consolidating the 4 quarterly CD-ROMs into one annual CD.*

**Mr Emerson (ProQuest) agreed** to pass on the request to consolidate the 4 quarterly CD-ROMs into one annual CD to the ProQuest development team.

24. *Regarding breaks in the URL links in the CD-ROM, i.e. spaces ....this meant that the links were not clickable ...Ms Cochrane (FAO) had notified ProQuest on various occasions regarding this issue ...*

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to provide Ms McCoy (ProQuest) with further details as to the types and number of records which had this problem.

### **Agenda Item 8.3 (Internet Database Services)**

25. *Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) asked about the possibility of having the full-text link of the ASFA record always visible in the short display format of CSA Illumina ..... currently it is not possible to know whether the record was available online unless you viewed each record individually...*

**Ms McCoy (ProQuest) agreed** to investigate this possibility with the development team at ProQuest.

## **Agenda Item 8.6 (Document delivery)**

**26.** *Regarding the IFRO (Iran) report and their mention of difficulties in accessing the web and in requesting documents from foreign countries.....*

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to investigate with IFRO the difficulties mentioned in their report regarding web access in order to clarify exactly what the problem was.

## **Agenda Item 9.1. (www-ISIS-ASFA)**

**27.** *Regarding the problems mentioned by Ms Pureza in the IO/USP (Brazi) Report concerning functioning of the www-ISIS-ASFA software at their Collaborating Centre UEFS ....there were difficulties installing v1.2 .... internal problems with their computer ....*

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to contact UEFS to help resolve the problem in installation of the www-ISIS-ASFA v1.2 software and contact Dr Rybinski should technical assistance be necessary.

## **Agenda Item 10 (Training )**

**28.** *PIMRIS mentioned change in staff ..... no input prepared this year due to lack of staff trained in ASFA input methodology ..... requested assistance in training.*

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to investigate the possibility of including a person from PIMRIS should a training be carried out in the Southeast Asian region next year.

**29.** *Regarding the continual need for training sessions/material, e.g. frequent staff turnover at institutes.....usefulness of videos.... they could be distributed to all ASFA Partners to keep at their institutes*

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to investigate the possibility of producing a training video on ASFA inputting procedures.

## **Agenda Item 11.6 (ASFIS-6, ASFA Thesaurus, Rev. 2)**

**30.** *Regarding revision of the Thesaurus and the addition of new terms ....Ms McCoy (ProQuest) mentioned that ProQuest had identified some 1900 terms from their Water Resources database that they wished to add to the ASFA Thesaurus ....these terms come from another ProQuest thesaurus and therefore have their own hierarchy ....Mr Emerson said that these terms would need reviewing .... could examine the possibility of adding these terms as orphans, i.e. without the hierarchical structure, in order to save time ..*

**Mr Schwamm (FBA) agreed** to liaise with Mr Pettman (FBA) regarding the possibility of adding orphan terms and also to determine what would be the number of terms that could be dealt with in a reasonable time-frame.

## **Agenda Item 11.7 (ASFIS-7, Geographic Authority List)**

**31.** *Ms Fernandez (INP) mentioned that there were changes in the provinces of Ecuador and these were not included in the pick-list of geographic descriptors in the www-ISIS-ASFA software.....*

**Ms Fernandez (INP) agreed** to provide a list of new geographic descriptors, reflecting the new province names in Ecuador, to Mr Schwamm (FBA), Ms McCoy (ProQuest) and Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat).

## **Agenda Item 11.10 (ASFIS-10, Authority List for Corporate Names)**

**32.** *Regarding updating the master list of corporate author names maintained by ProQuest ....Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) reminded ASFA Partners to send ProQuest a list of new corporate author names, i.e. names not found on the pick-list in the www-ISIS-ASFA software ...*

**Ms McCoy (ProQuest) agreed** to send an e-mail to all ASFA Partners via ASFA Board-L,

requesting them to revise their lists of Corporate Author names and send a list of new names to ProQuest by the end of 2011

#### **Agenda Item 11.15 (ASFIS–15, ASFIS List of Species for Statistical Purposes)**

- 33.** *Regarding the pick–list of taxonomic descriptors that is included in the www–ISIS–ASFA software ...several ASFA Partners commented on the fact that the current list contained mainly commercial species and needed expansion to include other species names ....perhaps the list could be replaced by another taxonomic list such as ITIS ...*

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to investigate with Dr Rybinski the possibility of incorporating ITIS in the eventual Release 2 of the www–ISIS–ASFA software as the taxonomic pick–list.

#### **Agenda Item 12.2 (Proposals completed, in progress or pending further discussion)**

- 34.** *Regarding the Trust Fund Proposal ‘Computer equipment for CNSHB, Guinea’ ..... due to administrative difficulties the equipment was never delivered....*

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to contact the ASFA Partner in Guinea and investigate the status of this project, i.e. whether the equipment is still required. [No further contact from Guinea had been received regarding this issue]

#### **Agenda Item 12.3 (New Proposals)**

- 35.** *Regarding budgetary constraints faced by some ASFA Partners in developed countries which prevents them from attending ASFA Board Meetings ... Mr Emerson (ProQuest) suggested that ASFA Trust Fund money could be utilized to provide them with some partial funding....., e.g. a maximum of US\$2 500 per ASFA Partner....this would give more ASFA Partners the possibility to attend the annual ASFA Board Meeting*

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to decide upon a formula for the partial funding of attendance to the ASFA Board Meetings by ASFA Partners from developed countries. This would be circulated via ASFA Board–L during the intersessional period for approval, before the end of 2011.

- 36.** *Regarding the Trust Fund Proposal Financial ‘Support to attend the 2012 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (ASFA/2011/74)’ \$45,000*

*This proposal requests funding to support the attendance of ASFA Partners in developing countries at the 2012 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting ..*

**The ASFA Board approved** the proposal.

- 37.** *Regarding the Trust Fund Proposal ‘Staff Support To ASFA Secretariat (For January – December 2012)’ (ASFA/2011/3a) US\$ 100,000*

*This proposal is meant to assist the FAO ASFA Secretariat in carrying out work/initiatives for the collective benefit of the ASFA Partners. Mr Grainger (FAO ASFA Secretariat) explained that the FAO ASFA Secretariat was asking for an increased sum of US \$ 100,000 for this project proposal for the year 2012*

**The ASFA Board approved** the proposal.

- 38.** *Regarding the Trust Fund Proposal ‘Utilization of ASFA Trust Fund to pay IAMSLIC membership fees (ASFA/2011/80) US\$1 175*

*This is an “ongoing” proposal (ASFA/2011/80) presented every two years to the Board for review and re–approval. The proposal is to renew the 29 IAMSLIC membership fees that will expire in 2011 and 2012, for a further two years (estimated cost \$1 175).*

**The ASFA Board approved** the proposal.

- 39.** *Regarding the IFOP Trust Fund Proposal ‘Scanning of Fisheries Catch and Scientific Results from 1999–2011’ (ASFA/2010/25a) US\$ 12 850*

*This proposal will involve the scanning of 1000 reports, the preparation of bibliographic records and their sending to ProQuest for uploading to the ASFA database.....Some questions were raised regarding the tasks involved in the project activities .....Ms Barria clarified that the documents would be digitized and included in the IFOP repository..... it was suggested that the records be included on an Open Access Repository such as Aquatic Commons..... IFOP could use the FBA conversion tool to assist in this task....the extra work involved would increase the timeframe to 18 months ...the proposal would need re-writing to include the various extra task involved, the new timeframe and reviewed costs*

**The ASFA Board approved in principle** the proposal, pending re-submission with details of all the tasks involved, which would include uploading the records into an OAI compliant repository such as Aquatic Commons and/or OceanDocs.

**40. Regarding the INIDEP Trust Fund Proposal 'Digitization, Open Access deposition and addition of URIs into ASFA records of marine and aquatic sciences papers from a historical regional journal: Physis' US\$10 350**

*This proposal aims to bring a selection of marine and aquatic papers from a core historical natural sciences journal, regional in scope, which is available now to a small audience only in printed format, to a wider international user base..... it involves digitization of the documents, uploading of PDF files into Aquatic Commons, downloading of the records from the ASFA database, conversion of the metadata into XML format, upload batch file into Aquatic Commons including the PDF, information provided to ProQuest regarding inclusion of the full-text links for the records and also information regarding any corrections noted.*

*Some technical problems regarding how to put forward the proposal so that the staff at INIDEP carrying out the work would receive the funds were discussed..... Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) explained that, due to the administrative procedures at INIDEP, it would be impossible to distribute the funds to the persons involved.....Mr Emerson (ProQuest) said that perhaps ProQuest could put forward the Trust Fund Proposal together with INIDEP .....this could facilitate distribution of the funds ...*

**ProQuest agreed** to investigate the possibility of preparing a joint Trust Fund Proposal with INIDEP and also examine possible ways of financing INIDEP through ProQuest

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to investigate the possibility of preparing Letter of Agreements for joint Trust Fund projects which involve more than one ASFA Partner.

**The ASFA Board approved in principle** the proposal, pending investigation by ProQuest and the FAO ASFA Secretariat regarding the administrative issues of joint Trust Fund proposals. The proposal would be re-written and re-submitted for voting via ASFA Board-L during the intersessional period.

**41. Regarding the FAO Trust Fund Proposal 'Mini-ASFA Meeting for African ASFA Partners attending IAMSLIC Conference, October 2011 US\$10 000**

*The scope of this Trust Fund Proposal is to facilitate attendance of African ASFA Partners at the 2011 IAMSLIC Conference to be held in Zanzibar so that a mini-ASFA Workshop could be held back-to-back with the IAMSLIC/AFRIAMSLIC conference on 22 October 2011.*

**The ASFA Board approved** the proposal.

**42. Regarding collaboration between ASFA Partners in carrying out ASFA Trust Fund Proposals .....Mr Schwamm (FBA) mentioned that FBA would like to put forward some Trust Fund Proposals to carry out some historic input ..... the old publications were not just in English .... some required Spanish, Italian, French translations ...He suggested the possibility of working together with other ASFA Partners who could cover the non-English documents....Mr Montes (UNAM) commented that he would be interested in such collaboration.**

**Mr Schwamm (FBA) agreed** to draw up some lists of publications which could be involved in historic input Trust Fund Proposals.

**43. Regarding the ongoing Trust Fund Proposal "Small financial incentive to the ASFA Partner hosting a Board Meeting' ... Mr Gaibor (INP) mentioned the technical difficulties he encountered before he could obtain the funds from the FAO Representative Office in Ecuador ...other ASFA Partners could face the same problems**



*..... perhaps the funds could be sent more in advance so as to ensure the hosting institute would obtain the funds before the start of the Board Meeting ....*

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to initiate the administrative procedures for advance disbursements of the funds to be sent to the ASFA Partners hosting a Board Meeting at least 4–5 months before the meeting.

#### **Agenda Item 14 (Place and date of next meeting)**

**44. The ASFA Board agreed** that the 2012 ASFA Board Meeting would be held at the Marine Institute (MI), Galway, Ireland, 25–29 June 2012.

#### **Agenda Item 15 (Special topics, demonstrations, workshop day)**

##### **Agenda Item 15.5 (ASFA impact evaluation)**

**45.** *Following the presentation by Mr Schwamm (FBA) examining the impact of ASFA, many ASFA Partners commented on the urgent need for an evaluation of the impact of ASFA and its future viability.....an external consultant should be hired to do this.....Ms McCoy (ProQuest) suggested the formation of an Impact Evaluation Working Group that could liaise with an external consultant.... Mr Grainger (FAO ASFA Secretariat) mentioned the Independent External Evaluation (IEE) that had been conducted on the FAO Fisheries Department a few years ago ....*

**Mr Emerson (ProQuest), Mr Schwamm (FBA), Ms Noble (NMBL), Mr Montes (UNAM) and Ms Wibley (FAO ASFA Secretariat) agreed** to be part of the Impact Evaluation Working Group.

**The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to investigate an independent evaluator in consultation with the FAO Office of Evaluation and report back to the ASFA Board within 2–3 months.

**Mr Schwamm (FBA) agreed** to investigate a potential evaluator through the organizations mentioned in his presentation on ASFA impact evaluation.

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

**Browsing document system requirements:  
Adobe® Reader® for Windows®, Linux® or MacIntosh®**