

ASFA ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
FAO, ROME, ITALY, 4-8 October 2005

SUMMARY REPORT
(including ASFA Partners' Reports)



ASFA ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
FAO, ROME, ITALY, 4-8 October 2005

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 concerning the legal or developmental status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

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

Reproduction of material in this information product for resale or other commercial purposes is prohibited without written permission from the copyright holders. Applications for such permission should be addressed to the Chief, Publishing Management Service, Information Division, FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00100 Rome, Italy or by e-mail to copyright@fao.org

© FAO 2006

PREFACE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Note regarding this document - In this printed portion of the Meeting Report, you will find the actual minutes of the Meeting, and only two of the 61 Annexes (the Agenda and the List of Participants). On the CD-ROM that is included with this document, you will find all of the documents and PowerPoint presentations that were submitted to or presented at the Meeting (they 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). The final assembly of the Report, with all its Annexes, is by Richard Pepe (FAO).

CONTENTS

1. OPENING OF THE MEETING	1
2. ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS	1
3. ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON AND RAPORTEURS	1
4. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA	1
5. ADOPTION OF SUMMARY REPORT OF 2004 ASFA ADVISORY BOARD MEETING	1
5.1 Matters arising from the last (2004) ASFA Advisory Board Meeting	2
6. STATUS OF ASFA PARTNERSHIP	2
6.2 New and potential ASFA Partners	4
6.3 ASFA Partnership Agreement	5
6.4 ASFA Publishing Agreement	6
6.5 Cooperation with WAICENT/AGRIS group	6
6.6 FIGIS-ASFA relations/cooperation	6
6.7 ASFA-IAMSLIC group(s) cooperation	7
7. ASFA SCOPE, COVERAGE, MONITORING AND TIMELINESS	9
7.1 Subject Scope	9
7.2 Coverage	9
7.3 Monitoring	9
7.4 Timeliness	9
7.5 Simplification of ASFA inputting rules and procedures	13
8. ASFA PRODUCTS AND SERVICES	16
8.1 ASFA journals	16
8.2 CD-ROM	16
8.3 Internet service	17
8.4 Document delivery	18
8.5 New outputs and services (by CSA)	18
8.6 Public relation activities, marketing (by CSA and Partners)	18
8.7 Entitlements	18
8.8 Increasing distribution of ASFA information products and services	18
9. PROGRESS WITH MACHINE-READABLE INPUT	19
9.1 DOS-ASFISIS (release-3)	19
9.2 www-ISIS-ASFA	19
10. REPORT ON ASFA TRAINING ACTIVITIES	20
11. STATUS OF ASFIS REFERENCE SERIES PUBLICATIONS	20
11.1 ASFIS-1, Serials Monitored for the ASFIS Bibliographic Database	20
11.2 ASFIS-2, Subject Categories and Scope Descriptions	20
11.3 ASFIS-3, Guidelines for Bibliographic Description	20
11.4 ASFIS-4, Guidelines for Abstracting	20
11.5 ASFIS-5, Guidelines for Indexing	20
11.6 ASFIS-6, Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Thesaurus	21
11.7 ASFIS-7, Geographic Authority List	21
11.8 ASFIS-15, ASFIS List of Species for Fishery Stat. Purposes (ex-ASFIS-8, Tax. Auth. List.)	22
11.9 ASFIS-10, Authority List for Corporate Names	22
11.10 ASFIS-14, ASFISIS (Release-3 User Manual)	22
12. EXPANDED LANGUAGE CAPABILITY IN ASFA	22
13. ASFA TRUST FUND	22
13.1 Status of the ASFA Trust Fund	22
13.2 Proposals in progress, completed or pending further discussion	22
13.3 New and/or ongoing proposals	23
14. OTHER BUSINESS	25
15. PLACE AND DATE OF NEXT MEETING	26
16. REVIEW/APPROVAL OF DRAFT REPORT OF MEETING	26
17. FIFTH DAY OF ASFA BOARD MEETING	26

ANNEXES*

* **Note:** the printed version of this Report contains only Annex 1 (Agenda) and Annex-2 (Participants), so as to contain its size. However, on the CD-ROM that accompanies the Report, you will find **all** of the Meeting documents listed below.

Document numbers (e.g. ASFA/2005/... 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/2005/1) Agenda	27
Annex-2:	(ASFA/2005/1b) List of Participants	29
Annex-2a:	(ASFA/2005/1a) List of Documents	35
Annex-2b:	List of Abbreviations	37
Annex-3:	(ASFA/2005/3) FAO ASFA Secretariat Report	39
Annex-3a:	(ASFA/2005/3a) FAO ASFA Trust Fund Proposal (Staff Support to ASFA Secretariat)	77
Annex-3b:	(ASFA/2005/3b) Admission of New Members to ASFA Partnership	79
Annex-4:	(ASFA/2005/5) UN/DOALOS Report	81
Annex-5:	(ASFA/2005/6) UNEP Report	85
Annex-6:	(ASFA/2005/7) ADRIAMED Report	87
Annex-7:	(ASFA/2005/8) ICCAT Report	89
Annex-8:	(ASFA/2005/9) ICES Report	91
Annex-9:	(ASFA/2005/10) WorldFish Center Report	93
Annex-10:	(ASFA/2005/14) PIMRIS Report	95
Annex-11:	(ASFA/2005/15) SPC Report	97
Annex-12:	(ASFA/2005/16) Argentina (INIDEP) Report	99
Annex-13:	(ASFA/2005/18) Belgium (VLIZ) Report	101
Annex-14:	(ASFA/2005/20) Canada (Fisheries and Oceans) Report	105
Annex-15:	(ASFA/2005/21) Chile (IFOP) Report	107
Annex-16:	(ASFA/2005/22) China, People's Republic of (NMDIS) Report	109
Annex-16a:	(ASFA/2005/22a) NMDIS ASFA Trust Fund Proposal (Manuals)	111
Annex-17:	(ASFA/2005/24) Cuba (CIP) Report	113
Annex-18:	(ASFA/2005/25) Ecuador (INP) Report	115
Annex-19:	(ASFA/2005/26) Estonia (MEI) Report	117
Annex-19a:	(ASFA/2005/26a) MEI ASFA Trust Fund Proposal (Gaps Latvian/Lithuanian Lit.)	119
Annex-20:	(ASFA/2005/27) France (IFREMER) Report	123
Annex-21:	(ASFA/2005/28) Germany (BF) Report	149
Annex-22:	(ASFA/2005/29) Greece (NCMR) Report	151
Annex-23:	(ASFA/2005/31) India (NIO/NICMAS) Report	153
Annex-24:	(ASFA/2005/32) Indonesia (LIPI/PDII) Report	163
Annex-25:	(ASFA/2005/35) Japan (FRA) Report	165
Annex-26:	(ASFA/2005/36) Kenya (KMFRI) Report	167
Annex-26a:	(ASFA/2005/36a) KMFRI ASFA Trust Fund Proposal (Gaps)	169
Annex-27:	(ASFA/2005/38) Mauritania (IMROP) Report	171
Annex-28:	(ASFA/2005/39) Mexico (UNAM/DGB) Report	173
Annex-29:	(ASFA/2005/41) Nigeria (NIFFR) Report	175
Annex-30:	(ASFA/2005/42) Norway (IMR) Report	177
Annex-31:	(ASFA/2005/44) Poland (SFI) Report	179

Annex-32:	(ASFA/2005/46) Russian Federation (VNIRO) Report	181
Annex-32a:	(ASFA/2005/46a) VNIRO ASFA Trust Fund Proposal (Caspian Sea Records)	185
Annex-33:	(ASFA/2005/49) Sweden (IMR) Report	187
Annex-34:	(ASFA/2005/50) Tanzania (IMS) Report	189
Annex-35:	(ASFA/2005/51) Tunisia (INSTM) Report	191
Annex-36:	(ASFA/2005/52) Ukraine (YugNIRO) Report	193
Annex-36a:	(ASFA/2005/52a) Ukraine (YugNIRO) Report of PINRO Training in ASFA Input	197
Annex-37:	(ASFA/2005/53) United Kingdom (NMBL) Report	199
Annex-38:	(ASFA/2005/54) Uruguay (IIP) Report	203
Annex-39:	(ASFA/2005/55) USA (NOAA) Report	205
Annex-40:	(ASFA/2005/56) Viet Nam (FICen) Report	207
Annex-41:	(ASFA/2005/57) CSA Status Report	211
Annex-42:	(ASFA/2005/58) List of ASFA Partners	223
Annex-43:	(ASFA/2005/59) Cambridge Information Group (CSA Calculation of Royalty Payment to ASFA Trust Fund)	235
Annex-44:	(ASFA/2005/60) ASFA Trust Fund Status	237
Annex-45:	(ASFA/2005/61) Seventh Report to the ASFA Board Meeting (2005) on the Project to Distribute ASFA on CD-ROM to LIFDCs in Africa and via Internet to LIFDCs Worldwide	249
Annex-46:	(ASFA/2005/63) ASFA Trust Fund Proposal (Financial support to attend ASFA Advisory Board Meetings)	293
Annex-47:	(ASFA/2005/64) Status of FIGIS-ASFA Cooperation	295
Annex-48:	(ASFA/2005/65) Contributions (input) to ASFA Database by Partners and ASFA Partners Entitlements	297
Annex-49:	(ASFA/2005/66) ASFA Cooperation with IAMSLIC (Theme paper)	301
Annex-50:	(ASFA/2005/67) Final Report on the Works performed at ICIE for upgrading www-ISIS-ASFA	311
Annex-51:	Agreed Actions Items by Participants	325
Annex-52:	Some ASFA Rules which could Possibly be Eliminated or Simplified	331
Annex-53:	The One Millionth Record ... added to the ASFA Database in October 2005	335
Annex-54:	Common Errors Found in ASFA Input Center Records (PowerPoint by V. Soto, H. Wibley) (5 th day of Meeting)	337
Annex-55:	Open Access & Repositories (PowerPoint by P. Simpson) (5th day of Meet.)	383
Annex-56:	Report to the ASFA Board Meeting (2005) on the Project to Distribute ASFA to LIFDCs (PowerPoint by H. Cochrane)	457
Annex-57:	NISC Contribution to ASFA 2005 (PowerPoint by M. Crampton)	465
Annex-58:	Presumed Geographical Categories in ASFA	473
Annex-59:	Proposal to establish an "Aquatic Commons Central Document Repository by S. Hass (1 st draft sent to Partners for comments/approval in principle)	475
Annex-60:	The Aquatic Commons: a Model for Integrating Marine and Aquatic Digital Initiatives PowerPoint by S. Hass (5 th day of Meeting)	489
Annex-61:	Benefits of IAMSLIC Membership and Avenues for Participation in IAMSLIC Resource Sharing (PowerPoint by B. Butler and S. Watkins) (5 th day of Meeting)	527

1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

The Annual Meeting of the Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Abstracts (ASFA) Advisory Board was hosted by the **Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)**, located in Rome, Italy, during 4 to 8 October 2005.

The Meeting was attended by **40 participants** from: 24 National ASFA Partners, 2 UN Partners, 4 International ASFA Partners, the ASFA Publishing Partner, and 2 observers. The Agenda is in **Annex-1**. The names and addresses of the participants are listed in **Annex-2**. The documents presented at the Meeting and the abbreviations used in the Report are listed in **Annex-2a** and **2b**, respectively.

Mr Grainger, Chief of the FAO Fishery Information, Data and Statistics Unit (FIDI), opened the meeting. In welcoming the participants, he noted the record attendance and he mentioned that many ASFA Partners would also be attending the IAMSILIC Meeting to be held the following week, which was a good indication of the synergy between the ASFA and the IAMSILIC groups.

Mr Ichiro Nomura, Assistant Director-General of the FAO Fisheries Department, delivered the opening speech. He welcomed participants to the thirty-fifth annual ASFA Board Meeting, to FAO, and to Rome. He recalled his opening address to the thirty-second ASFA Board Meeting, held at FAO in 2002, by noting the even higher attendance at this year's Meeting. He called attention to the continuing increase in the number of ASFA Partners, from 46 in 2002 to the present number of 55, and he gave a special welcome to 2 of the new ASFA Partners that were present at the Meeting: Senegal (DPM) and the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC). He made reference to the heavy responsibility that the FAO mandate imposes in the area of information, and referred to Article-1 of the FAO Constitution, which requires the *Organization to collect, analyse, interpret and disseminate information relating to nutrition, food, agriculture and fisheries*. He noted how ASFA, through its work in collecting and disseminating information, was helping FAO to fulfil its important information mandate. Also during the opening of the Meeting, Mr Nomura oversaw a small ceremony to announce and to celebrate: that "*the ASFA Bibliographic Database had reached **one million records***" and that the honour of having produced the 1 000 000th record went to the ASFA Partner in France, IFREMER. The ASFA Board congratulated Ms Jacqueline Prod'homme (IFREMER) and the occasion was marked by a celebration toast held directly after the opening speech. A framed copy of the one millionth record (offered by CSA) was also presented to Ms Jacqueline Prod'homme (**Annex-53**). Mr Nomura concluded the Opening Ceremony by wishing the ASFA Board a successful Meeting and an enjoyable stay in Rome.

2. ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS

Mr Pepe (FAO), Editor-in-Chief ASFA and Secretary to the ASFA Meetings, presented this Agenda Item.

3. ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON AND RAPPORTEURS

Mr Jorgens (UN/DOALOS) was elected Chairperson of the Board Meeting and Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) co-Chairperson. Ms Wibley (FAO) was appointed Rapporteur and Mr Pepe (FAO) as assistant Rapporteur.

4. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

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

5. ADOPTION OF SUMMARY REPORT OF 2004 ASFA ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

The ASFA Board agreed to adopt the Summary Report of the 2004 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting (Mar del Plata, Argentina), with recognition that there was a typographical error regarding the figure US\$30 000 appearing on page 26, under Item 13.3.1 "FAO-Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for the year Jan-Dec 2005)" and on page 315, under Item 21.5 "FAO-Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for the year Jan-Dec 2005)". The correct figure should read in both cases US\$40 000 (not US\$30 000).

5.1. Matters Arising from the last (2004) ASFA Advisory Board Meeting

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

6. STATUS OF ASFA PARTNERSHIP

6.1. Report on Intersessional activities of the ASFA Partners

Each ASFA Partner presented a summary Report of its own inter-sessional activities. The FAO ASFA Secretariat summarized the major points/concerns contained in the Reports of Partners not in attendance. The full text of all the Reports is in **Annexes 3- 41**.

6.1.1. United Nations Co-sponsors

- **FAO** - Mr Grainger presented the FAO Report (**Annex-3**)
- **IOC** - (Not present, No Report)
- **UN/DOALOS** - Mr Jorgens presented the UN/DOALOS Report (**Annex-4**)
- **UNEP** - (Not present - Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat (**Annex-5**))

6.1.2. ASFA Partners

- **ADRIAMED** - Ms Milone presented the ADRIAMED Report (**Annex-6**)
- **ICCAT** - (Not present - Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat). Mr Pepe reported that ICCAT contracted the Indian National ASFA Partner, NIO/NICMAS, to carry out their ASFA input. On this subject, in general, Mr Pepe made the observation that the practice of one ASFA Partner contracting another ASFA Partner to carry out its ASFA input, although necessary and beneficial in some cases, could lead to some kinds of literature not being covered adequately. (**Annex-7**)
- **ICES** - Ms Ovens presented the ICES Report (**Annex-8**)
- **WorldFish** - Ms Blok presented the WorldFish Report (**Annex-9**)
- **IOTC** - (Not present, No Report)
- **IUCN** - (Not present, No Report). The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported receiving an E-mail from Ms Thierry confirming that IUCN had resumed preparing ASFA input.
- **NACA** - (Not present, No Report)
- **PIMRIS** - (Not present - Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat) (**Annex-10**)
- **SPC** - Ms Oriente presented the SPC Report (**Annex-11**)
- **Argentina (INIDEP)** - Ms. Cosulich presented the INIDEP report (**Annex-12**)
- **Australia (CSIRO)** - (Not present - No Report)
- **Belgium (VLIZ)** - Mr Haspeslagh presented the VLIZ report (**Annex-13**)
- **Brazil (USP)** - (Not present – No Report)
- **Canada (NRC)** - Mr Daniel presented the NRC Report (**Annex-14**)
- **Chile (IFOP)** - (Not present - Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat) (**Annex-15**)
- **China (NMDIS)** - Mr Luo Xuye presented the NMDIS report (**Annex-16**)
- **Côte d'Ivoire (CRO)** - (Not present, No Report)
- **Cuba (CIP)** - Ms. Hernandez Ceballos presented the CIP Report (**Annex-17**)
- **Ecuador (INP)** - (Not present - Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat) (**Annex-18**)
- **Estonia (EMI)** - (Not present - Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat) (**Annex-19**)
- **France (IFREMER)** - Ms Prod'homme presented the IFREMER Report (**Annex-20**)
- **Germany (BF)** - Dr Kühnhold presented the BF Report (**Annex-21**)
- **Greece (HCMR)** - Ms Goulala presented the HCMR Report (**Annex-22**)

- **Iceland (MRI)** - (Not present, No Report)
- **India (NIO/NICMAS)** - Mr Sainekar presented the NIO/NICMAS Report (**Annex-23**)
- **Indonesia (LIPI/PDII)** - Ms Djatin presented the LIPI/PDII Report (**Annex-24**)
- **Iran (Islamic republic of) (IFRO)** - (Not present, No Report)
- **Italy (SIBM)** - (not present, No Report)
- **Japan (JFRCA)** - Mr. Umezawa presented the JFRCA Report (**Annex-25**)
- **Kenya (KMFRI)** - Mr Macharia presented the KMFRI Report (**Annex-26**)
- **Korea (Republic of) (KORDI)** - (Not present, No Report)
- **Mauritania (IMROP)** - Mr Sow presented the IMROP Report (**Annex-27**)
- **Mexico (DGB)** – Mr. Montes presented the DGB Report (**Annex-28**)
- **Morocco (INRH)** - (Not present, No Report)
- **Nigeria (NIFFR)** - Mr Ibeun presented the NIFFR Report (**Annex-29**)
- **Norway (IMR)** - Ms Skotheim presented the IMR report (**Annex-30**)
- **Peru (IMARPE)** (Not present, No Report)
- **Poland (SFI)** - Ms Brezska presented the SFI report (**Annex-31**)
- **Portugal (IPIMAR)** - (Not present, No Report)
- **Russian Federation (VNIRO)** - Ms Levashova presented the VNIRO Report (**Annex-32**)
- **Senegal (DPM)** – (No Report, New Partner)
- **Spain (IEO)** – (Not present, No report)
- **Sweden (IMR)** - Ms K. Frohlund presented the IMR Report (**Annex-33**)
- **Tanzania (United Republic of) (IMS)** - Ms Nyika presented the IMS Report (**Annex-34**)
- **Tunisia (INSTM)** - (Not present - Report highlighted by the FAO ASFA Secretariat) (**Annex-35**)
- **Ukraine (YugNIRO)** - Ms Charova presented the YugNIRO Report (**Annex-36**)
- **United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (NMBL)** - (Not present-Report highlighted by the ASFA Secretariat) (**Annex-37**)
- **Uruguay (IIP)** - Ms Cristiani presented the IIP Report (**Annex-38**)
- **United States of America (NOAA)** - (Not present - Report highlighted by Secretariat) (**Annex-39**)
- **Viet Nam (FICen)** - Mr Tuyet Nhung presented the FICen Report (**Annex-40**)

During the presentation of the summary Reports, a number of ASFA Partners mentioned difficulty in obtaining and maintaining administrative/financial support, for their ASFA activities, from their upper management or supporting bodies - especially when there were changes in management personnel or restructuring. Mr Pepe (FAO) noted that the FAO ASFA Secretariat was well aware of this recurring problem among Partners, and of its detrimental effects on the continuity of the ASFA Partnership. He reminded the ASFA Board that the FAO ASFA Secretariat is continually looking for ways and opportunities to highlight and promote the importance of the ASFA database and the work of the ASFA Partners (e.g. the celebration ceremony of the 1 000 000th ASFA record). He mentioned the ASFA Homepage (<http://www.fao.org/fi/asfa/asfa.asp>) and how the wealth of information contained there (especially in the FAQ section) could be used for promoting ASFA and for reminding Directors of the Institutes of the ASFA responsibilities, as contained in the ASFA Partnership Agreement. He stressed that the FAO ASFA Secretariat was willing when and where possible to provide some form of written support to an ASFA Partner should they face difficulties in obtaining or maintaining support within their Institute for ASFA activities.

6.1.3. ASFA PARTNER-PUBLISHER (CSA)

- **CSA** - Mr Emerson presented the CSA Report (**Annex-41**).

6.2. New and potential ASFA Partners

The FAO ASFA Secretariat informed the Board that during the intersessional period, the number of ASFA Partners increased to 55 with the joining of three new ASFA National Partners and one new ASFA International Partner:

- Islamic Republic of Iran - *The Iranian Fisheries Research Organization (IFRO)*
- Sénégal - *Direction des pêches maritimes (DPM)*
- United Republic of Tanzania - *Institute of Marine Sciences (IMS)*
- Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) - *The Secretariat of the Pacific Community Library*

See the FAO Report Section 4.2 (**Annex-3**) for information regarding the new Partners, and see **Annex-2** for their full addresses.

6.2.1. Admission of new Partners

As is the custom, the Board gave a ceremonial welcome to each new Partner with a round of applause. See **Annex-3b**.

6.2.2. Potential Partners

Netherlands

Follow-up action item 2 from the 2004 ASFA Board Meeting:

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

Note, in their Intersessional Report, CSA report that they communicated this information to FAO via E-mail in July 2004. The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported no follow-up on this.

[**Note from ASFA Secretariat:** Updated information was provided by CSA on January 11, 2006.]

Ireland

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported on the follow-up activities carried out by Ms Noble (NMBL) regarding the potential recruitment of the Marine Institute (MI) in Ireland. NMBL has also offered to assist in the eventual training of MI should they become an ASFA Partner.

New Zealand

Mr Pepe (FAO) reported on the discussions he had with Ms Kerrie Firth (National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research (NIWA)) mentioning the administrative problems involved in the direct participation of NIWA as an ASFA Partner. Nonetheless, NIWA agreed to contribute un-indexed records to ASFA through automatic downloading from one of their existing databases. Mr Emerson (CSA) confirmed the receipt of some records, and after indexing they were loaded into the ASFA database. CSA mentioned its willingness to continue this arrangement with NIWA.

6.2.3. Strategy for future expansion of ASFA Partnership

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that eventual recruitment activities regarding Egypt, Turkey, Philippines and Thailand were postponed. Mr Pepe (FAO) mentioned the joining of 10 new ASFA Partners over the last 2 years which overextended the capacity of the FAO ASFA Secretariat as regards new recruitment, training, follow-up etc.. Future recruitment of ASFA Partners will continue to be conditioned to the extent that the ASFA Secretariat is able to outsource some of the training and follow-up responsibilities. A small 'Training for Trainers' workshop was planned for the 5th day of the Board Meeting.

6.2.4. Partners dropping out of ASFA

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that as regards ASFA National Partners none dropped out during the intersessional period. However, a few National Partners reported the dropping out of the ASFA Collaborating Centres within their national networks.

6.2.5. Partners removed from the ASFA Partnership

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

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

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that the Instituto Espanol de Oceanografia (IEO), Spain was, for a while, in danger of being removed, however a recent communication to the ASFA Secretariat confirmed IEO's intention to submit ASFA input. They reported having contracted a company to prepare their input. The ASFA Secretariat confirmed receipt of a batch of ASFA input from IEO prior to the Board Meeting.

"Warning List"

Referring to the "Warning List" included under Item 4.3 of the FAO Report (**Annex-3**), Mr Pepe (FAO) explained that the List included those ASFA Partners who were in danger of being removed from the ASFA Partnership for not submitting ASFA input over a prolonged period. Listed were:

IMARPE - Peru: the ASFA Secretariat reported having lost its contact at IMARPE in May 2004 (due to staff change). [**Rapporteur's note:** both contact with and input from IMARPE has resumed]

INP - Ecuador: Mr Montes (UNAM) reported that he received some input from INP for checking prior to the Board Meeting. [**Rapporteur's note:** the records from INP were received by FAO during the Meeting]

MRI - Iceland: the ASFA Secretariat reported that MRI expressed its desire to continue participation in ASFA and foresaw input to be submitted in winter 2005.

NACA: the ASFA Secretariat reported that NACA expressed its desire to continue participation and foresaw the submission of input in the future.

6.3. ASFA Partnership Agreement

As of 1 October 2005, 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 **55** Partners:

4 UN, Co-sponsoring ASFA Partners 41 National ASFA Partners

9 International ASFA Partners 1 Publishing ASFA Partner.

Mr Ibeun (NIFFR) suggested that the ASFA Partnership Agreement should be amended* to state who should be responsible for the local finances incurred in participating in ASFA related meetings. Should it be the FAO ASFA Secretariat or the participating institution?

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that in the existing ASFA Partnership Agreement (signed by all ASFA Partners) there is mention (see below) of attendance at ASFA Board Meetings. However, this mention does not make specific reference to funding.

5.4 Each National ASFA Partner agrees to be represented, to the extent practicable, at all meetings of the Board and at all editorial staff meetings at which technical aspects are to be discussed with a view to making recommendations to the Board. (quoted from ASFA Partnership Agreement).

Further to the issue of funding, Mr. Pepe (FAO) reminded the Board that there is some limited provision for providing funds to attend ASFA Board Meetings through an ongoing ASFA Trust Fund project (this year 15 participants were funded from Developing Countries). The funding provided through this Trust Fund project includes all travel expenses (some local and abroad) incurred during the journey to attend the ASFA Board Meeting plus per-diem, whereas any local expenses incurred for administrative purposes would probably not be funded by the Trust Fund.

Mr Ibeun (NIFFR) stressed the importance for an ASFA Partner to get its Government to recognize that the Institute was actually a representative of the country, and that this recognition could assist the Institute in obtaining extra funding.

Mr Pepe (FAO) noted that the FAO ASFA Secretariat could not request a Government to recognize or designate a given institute as officially representing ASFA in that country. But presumably, the Institute, could make such a request to its own Government. In this case, **the FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to supply to a Partner (upon request of that Partner) some kind of written support as to what is ASFA, why participation is important, and as to the good work that the Institute is doing as an ASFA Partner.

.....

*(amending the Partnership Agreement) The ASFA Secretariat explained that it would be impractical to amend the actual ASFA Partnership, as that would involve the very difficult task of getting new signatures from all ASFA Partners. The ASFA Secretariat noted that this does not mean that the ASFA Partnership can never be amended. Amendments can be reflected as "Agreed decisions by the Board at a Meeting". However, changes to something as major as the Partnership Agreement would, in all cases, require a majority vote by ALL ASFA Partners – not only by those in attendance at a given Meeting.

Some ASFA Partners (NIO, VLIZ) explained that they had used the ASFA Partnership Agreement in order to make ASFA activities become part of the mandate of their Institutes, and this assisted them in ensuring the continuity of their participation in ASFA.

Ms Skotheim (IMR) mentioned that, because IMR's ASFA activities were not included as part of their regular ongoing library budget, a request had to be made each year for funds.

6.4. ASFA Publishing Agreement

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

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

The number of complimentary ASFA products that Partners receive was discussed further under the Agenda Item 8.7. See section 8.7 of this Report.

6.5. Cooperation with WAICENT/AGRIS group

Unfortunately, WAICENT/AGRIS persons directly involved with cooperation with ASFA were away on duty travel and therefore could not attend the Meeting.

6.6. FIGIS-ASFA relations/cooperation

The FAO ASFA Secretariat explained that the FIGIS-ASFA cooperation was conducted under a Trust Fund project, approved by the ASFA Board in 2002. He also mentioned that FIGIS (Fisheries Information Global System) was a very important undertaking in the FAO Fisheries Department (see homepage: <http://www.fao.org/figis/>)

Geographic Interface (query tool)

Mr Taconet (FAO) presented a status report of this Trust Fund project for the period June 2003 to September 2005 (See **Annex-47**). The unspent funds (approximately half) allocated to this project will be used to finalize: 1) the Geographic Interface query tool (taking into account the comments of this Board Meeting and CSA system requirements), and 2) to support the preparation and integration of additional GIS layers of interest to ASFA in FIGIS.

Mr Taconet (FAO) gave a presentation of the Geographic Interface (query tool) integrated into the CSA-ASFA web service. He demonstrated how an ASFA search could be conducted by linking to the FIGIS geographic query tool, instead of using geographic descriptors. Mr Taconet explained that the various map layers, used by the tool, included the ASFA Sea Area Codes, the FAO Fisheries Statistical Areas (including EEZs) and common country names (which could be extended to include administrative boundaries). Some countries had some inland areas shown, e.g. rivers and lakes, but this was not global.

The demonstration was well received and discussion and comments followed.

Mr Taconet (FAO) asked the ASFA Board what types of concepts or layers they would like to be added, and whether other facilities should be investigated.

Mr Taconet (FAO) and CSA agreed to prepare a list of priority layers for discussion by the ASFA Board.

[Note from ASFA Secretariat: Mr Taconet (FAO) submitted a list of priority layers (**Annex-58**) before the end of the ASFA Board Meeting, and it was circulated to the ASFA Partners for comments as an annex to the Draft Minutes of Action Items agreed. To date no comments have been received]

Mr Jorgens (UN/DOALOS) suggested the use of the term 'theoretical' EEZs, since not all countries have declared EEZs. Mr Taconet (FAO) mentioned that a UN project was being referred to for terminology.

Mr Emerson (CSA) mentioned that CSA were in the process of adding latitude and longitude information to each of the geographic descriptors and asked whether this could be incorporated into the query tool. Mr Taconet (FAO) said that the possibility of querying latitude and longitude could be included.

Mr Pepe (FAO) noted that using a map would assist users in constructing search strategies but that there would also need to be a mechanism for combining the geographic areas with subject and/or taxonomic descriptors in order to refine the search strategy. Mr Emerson (CSA) pointed out that nowadays it was quite common to switch between different sites when doing searches, and that the switching between different sites to consult the various authority lists would be transparent, since it would be the CSA interface which would point to the FIGIS site.

Ms Oriente (SPC) queried the availability of demographic information on the FIGIS interface, Mr Emerson (CSA) mentioned the possibility in the future of linking/pointing to other sites for such information. Mr Taconet (FAO) said that currently it was possible to provide figures regarding the numbers of bibliographic references according to country.

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) expressed appreciation for this visual approach to searching, saying that this would be very useful for those regions which fall under more than one sea area code. Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) added that this visual approach would also be useful for those not familiar with the geographic descriptors.

Dealing with changing country names and amending existing database records

Mr Daniel (DFO) asked whether the mapped geographical areas included changes to country names. Mr Taconet (FAO) replied that the UN project used for National mapping had regular updates which also displayed all disputed areas and that it should be possible to accommodate changes back to a certain date. Mr Emerson (CSA) pointed out that this could not be done with 'old' geographic descriptors, since the terms would have to be re-loaded to incorporate changes. He added that the use of latitude and longitude data could offer a possible solution.

Ms Crampton (NISC) mentioned the NISC search interface and its "Pick Variant" searching tool which included country name changes/variations.

Some discussion followed regarding the difficulties in incorporating name changes in those terms already indexed on the ASFA database. Mr Taconet said that when clicking on a point on the map, different layers could be selected where you could be asked to remove/select/add terms.

Mr Emerson (CSA) noted that the general geographic descriptor terms could not be made more specific unless the ASFA record was re-indexed. Mr Kuhnhold (BF) referred to the example of the 'old' geographic descriptor USSR, which is now replaced by the individual state names, and mentioned how important the specificity and accuracy was in the original indexing.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) suggested that discussions should be limited to those geographic descriptor terms which are available today on the database, and that the older terms may be considered later on at a different phase. Mr Emerson (CSA) added that prioritization was important.

Dynamic links from FIGIS species fact sheets in order to search the ASFA database

Mr Taconet (FAO) demonstrated an example of a dynamic link from the bibliographic references included in the FIGIS Species Fact Sheets to an author search on the ASFA database, whereby all records by the same author that were found on the database were displayed. Other linked queries were possible, such as using keywords within the fact sheets to carry out the search. And eventually mapping could also be included in the dynamic search functions.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat explained to the ASFA Board that only ASFA Partners would be authorized to see the entire search results of such linking between the FIGIS species fact sheets and the ASFA database. Eventually non ASFA Partners with a subscription to ASFA may also be given access the full ASFA database from the FIGIS Fact Sheets. In the case, non ASFA subscribers searching ASFA from the FIGIS Fact Sheets, they would only see a partial or truncated subset of the ASFA search results. In this regard, Mr Emerson (CSA) asked the ASFA Board for suggestions as to how much of and how many of the retrieved ASFA references should be presented to non-ASFA subscribers.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) suggested that non ASFA subscribers have the first 2 searches for free. While Ms Frohland suggested showing only the number of references that were available on the database.

Linking to the FAO FIGIS species fact sheets from the search results on the CSA Illumina site

Regarding the possibility of linking to the FIGIS species fact sheets from CSA Illumina, Mr Emerson (CSA) replied that this would be feasible and that such 'hot-linking' could be made to other databases such as FishBase, in order to provide supplemental information.

Ms Crampton (NISC) remarked on the importance of such interconnectivity, adding that a database is only as good as its links.

6.7. ASFA-IAMSLIC group(s) cooperation

Under this Agenda item, Mr Pepe (FAO) presented the Theme Paper "ASFA Co-operation with IAMSLIC" (**Annex-49**) which highlighted past, current, ongoing and planned initiatives concerning cooperation and interaction between ASFA and IAMSLIC. He also mentioned that on the 5th day of the Meeting 4 speakers (IAMSLIC members) were invited to speak about: the benefits of IAMSLIC Membership (**Annex-61**) which included access to the Z39:50 distributed library, and an initiative to establish a "common repository" for documents (**Annexes 55, 59, 60**).

IAMSLIC task force to assist ASFA in evaluating eventual impact of proposed changes to record/database structure on searching

Mr Pepe (FAO) described his efforts to establish an IAMSLIC task force which could assist the ASFA Board and Secretariat when deciding changes to the ASFA Database or system that might affect search and retrieval or other. A number of questions are being prepared by the ASFA Secretariat for eventual sending to the IAMSLIC task force. He referred in particular to a list of simplification of ASFA Inputting rules that had been prepared by the ASFA Secretariat and sent to CSA for review. This list was later presented to the ASFA Board for comments. For the discussions regarding this list of simplifications see discussions held under Agenda Item 7.5.

ASFA Partners becoming IAMSLIC members

Mr Pepe (FAO) reminded the ASFA Board of the ongoing initiative to have all ASFA Partners become IAMSLIC members and participate in document delivery/resource sharing. At the 2004 ASFA Board Meeting, the ASFA Secretariat suggested that all ASFA Partners join IAMSLIC in order to take advantage of and also to contribute to IAMSLIC's Z 39.50 Distributed Library. At the 2004 Meeting, the ASFA Board agreed that the ASFA Trust Fund could be used to pay for the IAMSLIC membership for those ASFA Partners who could not afford to do so themselves. To date, 11 ASFA Partners requested to be signed up as IAMSLIC members with funding from the ASFA Trust Fund, while 17 replied that they were already IAMSLIC members. The ASFA Secretariat strongly recommends that the remaining 27 ASFA Partners take action to join, if possible. During the intersessional period, the ASFA Secretariat sent an E-mail to all ASFA Partners explaining the benefits to ASFA Partners in joining IAMSLIC.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ), referring to the apparent reluctance that some ASFA Partners have shown during the intersessional period regarding IAMSLIC membership, mentioned the IAMSLIC regional groups and suggested that Partners could contact regional members for information or assistance in becoming IAMSLIC members. He briefly explained the differences between regional and international membership, mentioning that the major goal was to have the same benefits for each IAMSLIC member, regardless of their status (regional or international). Currently, the EURASLIC subgroup members do not have access to Z 39.50, but Mr Haspeslagh said that this was one of the issues under discussion within IAMSLIC.

Below, a few ASFA Partners (already IAMSLIC members) highlight some of the benefits of membership:

Ms Pikula (NOAA) strongly supported the joining of IAMSLIC and mentioned how NOAA had assisted in the setting up of the regional group in South America and the Caribbean. She also commented on how it was often easier for people to attend the regional group meetings, rather than the international.

Ms Crampton (NISC) mentioned the helpfulness of IAMSLIC and, referring to document delivery, said that often you could obtain what you want within one hour. She said there was no downside whatsoever to becoming a member of IAMSLIC.

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) explained to ASFA Partners that it was not necessary to not put their entire catalogue on Z 39.50, and that they would still have the benefits of using the library catalogue. She emphasized the excellent service of IAMSLIC and referred also to their duplicates list.

Ms Oriente (SPC) mentioned SPC's dependence on IAMSLIC, saying that SPC often used IAMSLIC to fulfil their regional requests. She stressed the great usefulness of this resource.

Mr Sainekar (NIO) said that 98% of NIO's requirements had been obtained from IAMSLIC and mentioned how good the service was.

Mr Ibeun (NIFFR) stated that this initiative for funding IAMSLIC membership strengthened the fact that ASFA is helping developing countries.

Regarding the question of eligibility of ASFA Partners for funding from the ASFA Trust to cover IAMSLIC membership fees, in particular, as to whether funding should be limited to ASFA Partners in developing countries only

It was pointed out by a few ASFA Partners that some institutions, from developed countries, simply did not have funds available, administratively speaking, for this purpose.

The ASFA Board agreed that the ASFA Trust Fund continued to be used to pay the IAMSLIC membership fees for a further two years with the eligibility in the initiative being as follows: 1) Developing countries: all *developing country* ASFA Partners and their collaborating ASFA Centres may request the ASFA Secretariat to pay their IAMSLIC membership fees using ASFA Trust Fund monies; 2) Developed countries and Institutions: developed country ASFA Partners, Collaborating ASFA Centres and Institutions may request the ASFA Secretariat to pay their IAMSLIC membership fees, using ASFA Trust Fund monies, only if they have insurmountable administrative problems which prevent them from paying the fee themselves. The FAO ASFA Secretariat noted that if all developing countries ASFA Partners, Collaborating Centres and Institutions were to take advantage of this initiative, the total cost to the ASFA Trust Fund would be approximately US\$900/year.

7. ASFA SCOPE, COVERAGE, MONITORING AND TIMELINESS

7.1. Subject scope

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

7.2. Coverage

Follow-up action item 5.1 from the 2004 ASFA Board Meeting:

Identifying/inputting articles within ASFA subject scope, but appearing in non-aquatic science publications

The ASFA Sec. agreed to circulate the list of journals contained in the paper prepared by J. Baron a few years ago

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported this done.

Ms Skotheim (IMR) mentioned Norway's efforts to extend ASFA coverage in the areas of fish nutrition, fish diseases and fishery economy, noting that some gaps in ASFA coverage were found. Mr Emerson (CSA) suggested that should ASFA Partners identify serial titles within the ASFA scope not being monitored or not included on the ASFA Monitoring List, then they should notify FAO (atten: Ms Lombardi).

7.3. Monitoring

Ms Lombardi (FAO) explained to the Board that the ASFA Monitoring List contains a list of all the serial titles covered by the ASFA Partners. She stressed how important it was that ASFA Partners notify the FAO ASFA Secretariat should there be any change to a title name or should any title have to be deleted from the list or any new title added to the list (e.g., if an ASFA Partner can no longer monitor a journal, or if a journal ceases publication). This list is updated regularly to include any modification and will be included in the soon to be released updated version of the www-ISIS-ASFA software. Since 2000, the list also contains information regarding: 1) the issue and year from which the ASFA Partner started to monitor a journal; 2) the last issue and year of the journal which the ASFA Partner ceased to monitor; and, 3) the last issue and year of the journal which has ceased publication.

The ASFA Partners were reminded that the Monitoring List is available on the ASFA Homepage and CSA Illumina site, so that users can see what is covered by ASFA. The ASFA Partners could refer to this list when carrying out retrospective indexing.

Mr Sainekar (NIO) reported that, aside from being responsible for the literature in India, they had taken on the responsibility for monitoring some publications under the Bay of Bengal programme but were having difficulties in actually receiving the publications.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to follow-up and arrange to have publications sent directly to NIO.

7.4. Timeliness

Mr Emerson (CSA) opened the discussion on timeliness, i.e. the length of time that it takes for a publication to appear on the ASFA database.

He stressed that timeliness was a key factor to which users assign primary importance. Therefore while recognizing the importance and utility of Partners filling gaps through ASFA Trust Fund projects, he urged Partners not to forget that there is a need to increase the speed by which records go onto the database. He mentioned CSA's efforts to speed up the processing time of their input by downloading electronic publications using special programs (discussed further in the section "Electronic processing of documents by CSA", below). He also re-iterated the willingness of CSA to take over the monitoring of those Partners' publications which were available electronically (i.e. so CSA could apply their electronic processing procedures to these publications).

CSA Recent References

Further to ways of speeding up the appearance of references in the ASFA database, Mr Emerson (CSA) explained that the "CSA Recent References" are records consisting of only the "citations" (i.e. without abstracts and without indexing). This type of record is added to CSA Illumina within a few days of the full text being published.

The above citations are purchased from the British Library. Another source of recent references is CSA's production database which holds many abstract records awaiting indexing. Unlike the citations described above, these records have full abstracts, author affiliations, and so on, but they do not have indexing. He noted that the system will be improved so that these records will be available for searching on CSA Illumina. These records will undergo quality checks and include an "Indexing in process" tag to distinguish them from a completed (indexed) record. Once the record is indexed, the completed abstract record will replace the original non-indexed record. In this way, several thousand records will be available to ASFA users, several weeks or months before they would normally be seen.

The possibility of Partners sending “non-indexed” records to CSA for inclusion in the ASFA Database as “Recent References

Mr Emerson (CSA) asked the ASFA Board to consider the possibility of Partners sending “non-indexed” records to CSA. He explained that, in this way, the records could be made available to users via CSA Illumina, immediately. These records would be tagged to distinguish them from the rest of the records on the database. The responsibility for completing the “non-indexed” records (adding the indexing) would still belong to the ASFA Partner, who would resend to CSA the records, once they have completed the indexing. CSA would then replace the tagged records with the completed records.

The **ASFA Board agreed** to study/observe the records of this type that CSA was including on the database, before deciding to implement the same procedure themselves.

Below, some of the comments and discussions regarding this proposal are reported below:

(Lack of the indexing terms)

Ms Oriente (SPC) stressed the importance of indexing terms for searching and said that indexing is invaluable. She asked whether this system of non-indexed records would affect alerts. Mr Emerson replied that this system in fact increases the alerts, since the records appear on the database faster. He also agreed that indexing is very important.

(Problems in keeping track of the records)

Mr Kuhnhold (BF) commented that such a system of sending non-indexed records to CSA could create some problems with the ASFA Partner during preparation of input, i.e. how to identify, or keep separate, those records that were complete with indexing from those that were non-indexed.

Mr Daniel (DFO) queried the mechanism of matching such records, i.e. how would non-indexed records be replaced with the indexed ones. Mr Emerson (CSA) mentioned the Accession Number as the means of identification, although he admitted that there was always the danger of not removing a record.

(Indexing as a factor of “*uniqueness*” in distinguishing the ASFA database)

[Rapporteur's Note: During the Meeting, the idea of the need for ASFA to maintain (and further develop) its level of “**uniqueness**” as a comparative advantage was referred to numerous times.]

Mr Pepe (FAO), while agreeing that timeliness was an important factor, mentioned that the “*uniqueness*” of the ASFA database was largely due to the fact that the all records were indexed and abstracted and expressed his concern that including non-indexed records would mean ASFA losing some of this important “*uniqueness*”. Mr Emerson (CSA) agreed that this “*uniqueness*” of ASFA was important, but added that this was only so if the database was up-to-date and had complete coverage.

Ms Oriente (SPC) also stressed the greater importance of the “*uniqueness*” of the ASFA database as opposed to timeliness, especially with respect to the inclusion of grey literature. She explained that all of the SPC literature is grey, and since most of the records do not contain abstracts the inputter had to spend more time to do the abstract and indexing.

Ms Rossi (FAO) queried the significance of the word “*uniqueness*” regarding coverage of serial publications that are not online or coverage of publications in different languages. Mr Emerson replied that “*uniqueness*” may be defined as the volume of coverage of any document type not available in another service.

Google Scholar

Referring to future challenges to ASFA and the need for ASFA to maintain its “*uniqueness*”, Mr Emerson (CSA) mentioned Google Scholar, a free service that allows searching across many disciplines/sources (such as peer-reviewed papers, theses, books, abstracts, articles) from academic publishers, professional societies, preprint repositories, universities and other scholarly organizations. He added that, although the service is very limited, for most users it may be good enough, especially since there is no cost involved.

Submitting records without English abstracts

Mr Sow (IMROP) mentioned that his centre covered about 100 records per year and that most of the publications had French abstracts. Since it was difficult for his centre to prepare abstracts in English, he asked whether it was possible to send the records to CSA complete with indexing, but with no English abstract. Mr Emerson replied that records with no English abstracts were accepted, but only in cases where the ASFA Partners were having difficulty in providing English abstracts. He pointed out that many ASFA Partners went to great time and effort to translate or write English abstracts and that this factor should be highly appreciated by all, since this added to the uniqueness of the ASFA database.

Mr Kuhnhold (BF) suggested that there could be some form of ASFA solidarity whereby ASFA Partners could assist others in the translation of abstracts into English.

Machine-assisted indexing

Follow-up action item 9 from the 2004 ASFA Board Meeting:

Regarding machine-assisted indexing

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

Mr Jorgens (UN/DOALOS) requested CSA to report on the status of its testing and use of their machine-assisted indexing tool.

Mr Emerson (CSA) explained that the machine-indexing tool uses the English text (and non-English text when available) in the titles, abstracts and author keywords of the records to create the subject descriptor indexing terms. The tool requires intellectual input to construct the rules for converting words in the English text into usable indexing terms. He stressed that CSA still checked every record that had machine assisted indexing and that, although many changes had to be made, this system is still time saving.

Following Mr Pepe's (FAO) request to see the difference between records that were machine-assisted indexed/checked, Mr Emerson (CSA) said that CSA would send such records upon request of a Partner. He added that in some subject areas, machine-assisted indexing is good but that in others it was not.

Mr Jorgens (UN/DOALOS) asked about the cost effectiveness of ASFA Partners using CSA's machine-assisted indexing tool, i.e. if ASFA Partners sent their records to CSA for machine-assisted indexing and then CSA returned the records to the ASFA Partners for checking. Mr Emerson (CSA) said that this would take too much time and cost and added that it was more important to have the 'raw' record on the database quickly, with the indexing carried out as soon as possible thereafter (i.e. referring to the CSA Recent references mentioned above).

Electronic processing of documents by CSA

Follow-up action item 7 from the 2004 ASFA Board Meeting:

Regarding Automatic Data Entry

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

Mr Emerson (CSA) continued the discussion regarding timeliness by referring to the spider/crawler/robot system used at CSA to automatically download web documents, and by describing how they were processed into the ASFA production system. He explained that this system was limited to online material and to publishers which provide the entire content of the bibliographic data and that it comprised two components: the first involved CSA's IT department, requiring some specific programming, and the second was under editorial control. The procedure for downloading Web documents is included in the CSA Report (**Annex-41**)

He mentioned some of the software that is currently freely available, citing WebReaper as an example. This software downloads every link from a publisher's web site, but you have to select the information required. He also cited macro software, whereby volume, issue and journal name are used to automatically download new journal issues in a much more controlled way than web crawlers. Both of these types of software collect HTML-tagged files of the bibliographic citation plus abstract, which are subsequently converted to tagged ASCII files via MS Word macros. These tagged files can then be loaded easily into production systems.

Regarding the feasibility of this system for ASFA Partners who produce an average of 100/year records, Mr Emerson (CSA) affirmed that this system would be of most use to those ASFA Partners who cover publications that are available online and published in consistent format.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) asked if the system could search open-archive software, thereby opening up a perspective for grey literature. Mr Emerson (CSA) replied that this system could be applied to any open-access journals and institutional repositories could also be targeted. He added that it takes about 1 hour to develop a programme for a particular Publisher.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) questioned the duplication of work by some ASFA Partners, since they were re-keying records that CSA already had bought from the publishers for input into their other databases. He queried the possibility of CSA sending these records to the ASFA Partners responsible for those publications for completion, i.e. indexing. Mr Emerson replied that this would be difficult to organize and would create more work for CSA, since the records would have to be created, flagged, sent to the ASFA Partners and then sent back to CSA for downloading onto the database. However, it could be done if a standard process were to be developed, i.e. programming work would be necessary.

Abstracts

Follow-up action items 6.1 and 6.2 from the 2004 ASFA Board Meeting:

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

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

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

Modify/edit author abstracts

Ms Frohlund (IMR) opened the discussions citing the ASFA Abstracting Guidelines mention modifying author abstracts by removing or even adding text, such as taxonomic terms or geographic locations.

Some discussion followed regarding the need to modify/edit author abstracts:

Regarding copyright, Mr Kuhnhold (BF) requested clarification regarding copying/scanning/inclusion of abstracts in ASFA input. Mr Emerson (CSA) said author abstracts are reproduced by secondary publishers under the copyright principle of "fair use" *, and that should a primary publisher have difficulty with such reproduction (submitted by any ASFA partner), CSA would resolve the issue with the primary publisher. *([http://fairuse.stanford.edu/Copyright and Fair Use Overview/chapter9/index.html](http://fairuse.stanford.edu/Copyright%20and%20Fair%20Use%20Overview/chapter9/index.html))

Mr Pepe (FAO) explained that historically, due to extreme field/space limitations in the printed ASFA journals, there were very big problems regarding abstract length, and very often the abstract text had to be heavily edited for length and formulae, references, tables etc. were always removed. During a certain period, for abstracts that were modified, the editor used to add his/her initials after the abstract. He also mentioned that sometimes the English abstracts appearing in foreign publications were illegible. Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) added that modification of the abstract in this case was a means of quality control, and should be seen as improving the quality of the abstracts appearing on the ASFA database.

Mr Sainekar (NIO) said that his institute often requested the authors of the articles to write the abstract if the article did not have one, as an author abstract is more authentic than one written by the abstractor/indexer. Mr Ibeun (NIFFR) commented that his institute preferred to maintain the original abstract, so as not to create conflict with the author.

Mr Emerson (CSA) commented on the time that was necessary to modify an abstract and noted that a less-than-perfect abstract did not necessarily negatively reflect on the ability of a researcher to retrieve the record in an abstracts database search.

Regarding the need for abstracts to be as informative as possible, Mr Pepe (FAO) noted that sometimes out-of-necessity the ASFA abstract becomes the only source of information available to some users, and therefore the extra effort to make a good quality abstract may be very important, especially regarding accuracy. He reminded ASFA Partners that should they not be able to write an abstract in English, they should write one in their own original language and ensure a very in-depth indexing of the record.

Abstract for the same record published in different languages and/or at different times

Ms Oriente (SPC) mentioned the case of the same document being published in different languages as unique publications, but not necessarily at the same time, which created some difficulty regarding preparation of the abstract. Mr Emerson (CSA) said the same abstract could be used for the 2 different records. Ms Lombardi (FAO) mentioned that FAO often published the French version of a document prior to the English version, so the 2 records could have different versions of the same abstract.

Italics, super and subscripts

The visual impact of the abstracts was discussed, referring to italics, super and subscripts. Mr Emerson (CSA) pointed out that the use or non-use of such coding did not affect the retrieval of information. Therefore, it was not of great importance to modify the text as regards italics, super and subscripts. Ms Wibley (FAO) pointed out that in some cases the non-use of superscripts could affect the representation of the data, referring to the use of the function 'power' as in 10⁶, and therefore in such cases the use of superscripts, or subscripts, had to be maintained. Particular care should be taken when using the HTML coding, that the coding has been typed accurately.

Other special characters such as Greek letters were also discussed. Ms Soto (CSA) explained that Greek letters appeared correctly only in the printed ASFA journals, whereas on CSA Illumina the Greek letters were written out. She added that the coding for the Greek letters (and also for italics) was still maintained in all the records, so that in the future, should CSA's software permit it, it may be possible for Greek letters to appear correctly on CSA Illumina (and also for words to appear in italics).

The ASFA Board agreed that there was no problem in adding extra information (such as taxonomic names or geographic locations) to abstracts provided by publications. It was not necessary to make changes to the Author supplied abstracts unless grammatical errors/spelling mistakes were detrimental to the retrieval of the information. If abstracts had to be cut (due to problems of field/record length), then a phrase such as "Abstract shortened by ASFA" could be added at the end of the abstract.

[Rapporteur's note: A copy of the E-mail sent on 2.11.2005 only to the ASFA Partners sending input to FAO for checking will be circulated to all ASFA Partners by the FAO ASFA Secretariat via ASFA Board-L.]

7.5. Simplification of ASFA inputting rules and procedures

Follow-up action item 6.3 from the 2004 ASFA Board Meeting:

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

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

Mr Pepe (FAO) explained that the ASFA Secretariat was in the process of reviewing the inputting guidelines for ASFA so as to identify those procedures which could be simplified. Ms Lombardi (FAO) prepared a draft "List" (**Annex-52**) of some rules regarding bibliographic description of the ASFA records that could perhaps be simplified or modified in order to simplify and quicken ASFA input. This List was circulated to the ASFA Partners for discussion during the meeting and the results of the discussion, on some of the items, are reported below together with what was tentatively agreed. Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) commented on the importance of discussing exactly what needs simplifying.

The Board agreed that no formal decision (only tentative agreement) was to be made during the discussion of the items concerning the simplification of inputting procedures, as it was felt that there was a need (expressed by Ms Cosulich - (INIDEP)) for more time to consider the implications of some of the simplifications, adding that some of them required checking with standard cataloguing rules.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to circulate the list of tentative decisions made during the Board Meeting regarding the simplification of inputting procedures to all ASFA Partners for discussion by ASFA Board-L and then they would be put to a vote.

Some of the comments/discussions made regarding the above mentioned "List" are reported below under individual item headings:

English title field

Currently on the ASFA database there is a mixture of capitalization in the English titles, whereby some words appear all in capital case, others in title case etc. Mr Pepe (FAO) mentioned that the major problem was when downloading journals from the publishers' websites, since some publications have the titles all in upper case. Mr Emerson (CSA) said that CSA makes every reasonable effort conform to the bibliographic rules to modify the capitalization in the titles, adding that consistency was important. Mr Kuhnhold (BF) mentioned the difference in time that was needed for keying in the text as opposed to downloading (copying and pasting) and then having to modify the text to remove unnecessary capitalization. Ms Rossi (FAO), with respect to the Non-English titles, observed that in some languages, such as German, the capitalization could change the meaning of the word. Mr Kuhnhold (BF) agreed, but added that in most cases the context of the word was sufficient for understanding its meaning. Mr Sainekar (NIO) re-iterated the need for standardization, mentioning that cataloguing rules should be followed, especially when transferring records from one database to another.

The ASFA Board tentatively agreed to keep the current rule contained in the Bibliographic Guidelines regarding capitalization and ignore the decision taken at the previous ASFA Board Meeting to 'Enter the English title as cited in the document regardless of capitalization'.

Regarding the current rule requiring changing of Roman numbers to Arabic numbers (unless part of a proper name), **the ASFA Board tentatively agreed** to abolish the rule and to leave Roman numbers as given.

Regarding the rule on the use of italics for Latin expressions (such as *ad hoc*, *in vivo*) and the names of fishing/research vessels, **the ASFA Board tentatively agreed** to abolish this rule and leave such expressions or vessel names as given. However, following request by several ASFA Partners, italics should still be maintained for Latin Genus and species names. This rule will also be applicable to the abstract fields. Although the text in italics is only visible in the printed ASFA journals, CSA maintains the coding for italics, for those records appearing on CSA Illumina, so that eventually the italics could be displayed should the software be modified so as to allow it.

Follow-up action items 8.2 and 8.4 from the 2004 ASFA Board Meeting:

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

8.4 The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to contact/refer to 'ISO' standards regarding individual tables for the different languages.

Author's names (diacritical marks and accented characters)

Regarding the Table of Diacritical characters prepared by the Diacritical Committee, as requested at the 2004 ASFA Board Meeting, Ms Lombardi (FAO) asked whether it had been officially agreed by the Board to be referred to during ASFA input. She noted that there were discrepancies with some Turkish characters that would be misrepresented if using the letters given in the Table. Mr Kuhnhold (BF) said that the Table could be reviewed/modified if thought necessary. He asked whether UNICODE could solve problems regarding the use of diacritical/accented characters. He said that in order for ASFA to be fit for the future, it should be as easy and simple as possible, adding that UNICODE is the future. He also noted that the records already on the database which originally contained diacritical/accented characters had been represented in different manners in the past and therefore search strategies would have to take this into consideration.

Ms Oriente (SPC) asked for an explanation of UNICODE. Mr Kuhnhold (BF) explained that it was a standardized coding (an extended table) for characters of different languages, whereby any letter from any language may be represented.

Mr Emerson (CSA) said that the use of UNICODE would mean many changes that other vendors, like Dialog, may not accept. He suggested that UNICODE could be considered for the future, and added that the use of UNICODE was a strict cost issue. He asked whether, since most of the problems with using diacritical/accented characters concerned one particular field in the ASFA record, i.e. the Author field, it would be really worth all the time and money spent.

Mr Kuhnhold (BF) suggested continuing with the transliteration for consistency, but referring to some form of standardization, such as that given in the Table produced by the Diacritical Committee. Ms Lombardi (FAO) pointed out that some Turkish words would become illegible, should the transliteration in the table be followed. Mr Kuhnhold (BF) replied that perhaps it would be easier to simply remove the diacritical marks, as done with accents, since this would not involve any costs and the authors' names would still be recognized. He noted that many publishers simply omitted the diacritical marks.

Mr Emerson (CSA) added that the majority of databases stripped off the diacritical marks, unless the languages did not have a Latin root. Mr Kuhnhold (BF) said that although the removal of diacritical marks may change the meaning of the word, this would not be of great importance since the correct meaning would be understood by the context. Ms Lombardi (FAO) added that since the removal of accents was also changing the meaning of some words, would it really matter if the diacritical marks were also to be removed.

Ms Ovens (ICES) mentioned that some International Journals were actually starting to use diacritical marks and added that ASFA would now be appearing to go against the stream.

Ms Crampton (NISC), with respect to searching words that contained diacritical characters, asked how the Illumina search engine actually worked. Mr Emerson (CSA) commented that the problem with diacritical characters was at the input stage rather than at the searching stage.

Mr Pepe (FAO) suggested the possibility of an ASFA Trust Fund Proposal to carry out a survey to see how the removal of accents and diacritical marks affects searches on the ASFA database. Mr Jorgens (UN/DOALOS) proposed polling members of IAMSLIC regarding the use of diacritical marks. Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) remarked that other communities should be involved in the polling, not only IAMSLIC.

Mr Emerson (CSA) said that CSA generally hired out to carry out polls and told the ASFA Board that the cost of a survey of approximately 25 questions would be about US\$10 000-15 000.

Mr Jorgens (UN/DOALOS) suggested that ASFA Partners send ideas regarding a polling survey to CSA.

The Board tentatively agreed that diacritical marks will be stripped and that ASFA Partners should cease transliterating characters from Latin-based languages. (To be communicated to Partners, in detail, via ASFA Board-L)

Mr Kuhnhold (BF) agreed to send out a revised table of the exceptions of diacritical characters which still need to be transliterated, making reference to the original table contained as Annex 1 of the Guidelines for Bibliographic Description and Data Entry (using the www-ISIS-ASFA software). [**Note from FAO ASFA Secretariat:** this revised table was prepared by Mr Kuhnhold (BF) and Ms Lombardi (FAO) and distributed to the ASFA Board later on during the Meeting (**Annex-52**)

Ms Frohlund (IMR) commented that this new rule (stripping diacritical marks) would change search results. Mr Emerson (CSA) remarked that although this could be the case, most searchers try both variants when it came to searching words with diacritical characters. Ms Oriente (SPC) suggested that CSA could make an announcement regarding this change. Ms Frohlund agreed that the searchers needed to be informed with respect to such a change.

Ms Soto (CSA) informed the ASFA Partners that the CSA Illumina Help and Support pages for Searching using the Browse Indexes did provide some information regarding searching for words which may have spelling variations. Mr Daniel (Canada) suggested using the Browse Index to search for authors' names rather than manually typing them in, since they could be entered in different ways.

CSA agreed to provide information on the CSA Illumina Help Pages on how to do searches for words (authors' names) which could include diacritical characters.

Author's affiliation field

Ms Oriente (SPC) queried the use/importance of the authors' addresses. Mr Emerson (CSA) replied that the address was not only used for communication purposes regarding the articles, but also used for searches on demographic information. Ms Rossi (FAO) asked why subfielding was necessary for the authors' addresses. Mr Emerson (CSA) pointed out that this facilitated browsing (or searching) by city or country.

The current rule requires a hierarchical data entry whereby the smallest element of the Institute/Organization should be entered first, followed by the highest element. However, Ms Lombardi (FAO) pointed out that since this rule is rarely applied it could be abolished.

The ASFA Board tentatively agreed to type the author's address as indicated in the document and also to consider the possibility of changing the structure of the Author Affiliation field in the www-ISIS-ASFA software so as to contain 3 subfields (not 4): postal address (name of institute, street, city), country (which could be a pick-list) and e-mail address.

Corporate Author field

Some discussion was held regarding the structure and management/maintenance of the Corporate Author Authority List. Mr Emerson (CSA) explained that the list of Corporate Author names was maintained at CSA, and reminded ASFA Partners that they should send any new names, i.e. those not included on the Corporate Author pick-list included in the www-ISIS-ASFA software, to CSA so that the list could be updated regularly.

Asked about the structure of the Corporate Author names and whether the list was standardized, Mr Emerson (CSA) replied that the list should be standardized, but added that since the new additions came from the ASFA Partners, often not according to standard abbreviations, perhaps the names should go to FAO first for standardization.

The ASFA Board agreed that ASFA Partners would send to CSA (vsoto@csa.com) the names of NEW Corporate Authors, preferably as a short list (rather than one-by-one) by June 2006. CSA would incorporate the new names into the Master Corporate Author List and then send an updated list of Corporate Author names to Dr. Rybinski for incorporation into an eventual future release 1.2 of the www-ISIS-ASFA software.

Conference name field

Regarding the rule concerning the use of numerical figures, as opposed to words, to denote the number or frequency of the conference, **the ASFA Board tentatively agreed** to abolish this rule, so that the number may be entered as it appears in the document, (e.g. the words "Third Conference" do not have to be changed to "3. Conference"). **The ASFA Board tentatively agreed** also to maintain the current rule contained in the Bibliographic Guidelines regarding capitalization of words in the Conference name field.

Document/Report/Patent number field

Regarding the rules to replace all punctuation marks and spaces in the Document number with hyphens, Ms Lombardi (FAO) commented that these rules were hardly ever applied. **The ASFA Board tentatively agreed** to abolish these rules regarding entry of the document/report/patent number and enter the number as it appears in the document. Mr Emerson (CSA) pointed out that this would ensure consistency with the original and therefore assist in full-text searching.

8. ASFA PRODUCTS AND SERVICES

8.1. ASFA journals

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

8.2. CD-ROM

Follow-up action item 11.1 from the 2004 ASFA Board Meeting:

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

Comments on the new CSA ASFA CD-ROM

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported receiving reports from several ASFA Partners regarding the new CSA ASFA CD-ROM and that some of the Partners included comments in their Reports.

Mr Pepe (FAO) informed the Board that a consultant was contracted to review the new CSA ASFA CD-ROM against the previous OVID version and the NISC ABAFR CD-ROM. The review examined the database content and coverage, database protocols and capabilities, and end-user searching. Ms Cochrane (FAO) gave a PowerPoint Presentation highlighting the major findings of the review (**Annex-56**). Ms Crampton (NISC) asked why only the NISC ABAFR CD-ROM (and not also the MOFR CD-ROM) was used in the comparison –noting the ABAFR CD-ROM only contained the ASFA-1 subset. Ms Cochrane (FAO) replied that the ABAFR CD-ROM was used in the comparison since it was the one that the countries participating in the LIFDC project receive. In any case, it was the functionality that was being tested rather than the content.

Mr Pepe (FAO) asked, in synthesis, whether the functionalities of the CSA, ASFA CD-ROM were the same as the previous OVID CD-ROM. Ms Cochrane (FAO) said that overall it was inferior, since it was lacking in many of the previous functions such as saving search history or searching the ASFA thesaurus. She added that there were problems in using the CSA ASFA CD-ROMs on a network, and also that the CD-ROMs had to be searched separately, i.e. simultaneous searching was not possible.

Mr Emerson (CSA) recalled the termination of CSA's agreement with SilverPlatter to produce the ASFA CD-ROM, in order to remind the Board as to "why" CSA was now producing the ASFA CD-ROM.

Notwithstanding the many recognized benefits (emphasized by Mr McGinty (CSA) and Mr Emerson (CSA)) of using CSA Illumina for online access to the ASFA database (i.e. additional features, timeliness of updates etc.), numerous ASFA Partners (including the FAO ASFA Secretariat) highly stressed the importance and need for maintaining a highly functional ASFA CD-ROM platform and product.

Mr Emerson (CSA) stated that CSA was endeavouring to produce a replacement ASFA CD-ROM to the best of its ability, but that CSA was producing only one CD-ROM product (i.e. **only** for the ASFA Partners), therefore the costs involved were high. CSA recognized that some countries still depend upon the CD-ROM, but they (CSA) must decide upon the best way to produce it, economically. In any case, he re-iterated CSA's commitment to make the ASFA database available on CD-ROM.

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

Ms Keita (DPM) commented that the ASFA CD-ROM was very useful and valuable in Senegal. They could not always rely on Internet connectivity to CSA Illumina for access to ASFA, and many scientists prefer the CD-ROM because they could search themselves on their own PCs.

Mr Ibeun (NIFFR) commented that the ASFA CD-ROM was the main source of information for the Libraries in Nigeria and that it was extremely useful for their scientists. He mentioned that Internet access is not widespread in Nigeria.

Ms Oriente (SPC) stressed the extreme importance of the ASFA CD-ROMs and explained that many of the islands in the SPC region cannot use the online version of ASFA. Online access is very expensive and often does not exist in the region.

Mr Sainekar (NIO) commented on the difference in the Source information of the record provided in the CD-ROM and in CSA Illumina. He referred to the NIO report where some examples were included, as Annexes, showing that important source information is missing in some records.

Mr Pepe (FAO) reiterated the importance of the ASFA CD-ROM platform/product to the FAO ASFA Secretariat as regards: 1) the LIFDC project (the CD-ROM is distributed free to LIFDC countries - the possibility to provide ASFA to LIFDCs is a major justification for FAO to participate in the ASFA Partnership, and 2) the "basic" ASFA entitlements (the CD-ROM is part of the basic entitlements received by all ASFA National Partners - see also section-8.7)

CSA might consider an agreement with NISC to produce ASFA only CD-ROM

Mr Emerson (CSA) stated that CSA might also consider investigating the possibility of creating an agreement whereby NISC might supply an ASFA-only CD-ROM to the ASFA community.

The possibility of producing the ASFA database on DVD was also mentioned by Mr Emerson (CSA), however some uncertainty as to the accessibility of this medium in Africa was mentioned. Ms Cochrane (FAO consultant) reported that use of the DVD versions of the ASFA database would not be a problem for the LIFDC countries and also noted that this would overcome the problem of simultaneous searching using different CD-ROMs, since just one DVD would be sufficient to carry the entire ASFA Database, which is currently separated into 2 CD-ROMs.

Ms Crampton (NISC) agreed that DVDs could be a useful solution and added that it would not be costly to produce them.

Considerable discussion followed on the possible cooperation between CSA and NISC in the production of an equivalent ASFA CD-ROM product. Ms Crampton said that NISC understood the costly development involved in maintaining CD-ROMs and added that NISC would be willing to negotiate working together with CSA on this matter.

Mr McGinty (CSA) asked whether NISC could give free copies of the ASFA CD-ROM to the ASFA Partners in developing countries. Ms Crampton replied that NISC could give the ASFA CD-ROM at good prices but not for free.

Mr McGinty (CSA) suggested the possibility of using the ASFA Trust Fund to purchase the CD-ROMs, and perhaps other NISC CD-ROMs, for distribution.

CSA and NISC agreed to discuss the possibility of collaborating together to produce an ASFA-only CD-ROM for distribution to the ASFA Partners (and Collaborating ASFA Centres) and would inform the ASFA Board via ASFA Board-L.

CSA agreed to investigate the possibility of participating towards some of the costs involved to produce the ASFA CD-ROM with the NISC platform. Mr Emerson (CSA) stated that improvements to the current ASFA CD-ROM, including those requested by some ASFA Partners, need to be included in the negotiations with NISC on how the CD-ROM is to be produced.

Setting up of the new CD-ROM on LAN

Follow-up action item 11.2 from the 2004 ASFA Board Meeting:

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

Mr Emerson (CSA) said that should ASFA Partners have problems in using the CD-ROMs on a network, they should request assistance from the CSA Help Desk at support@csa.com, with copy of the e-mail to him at cemerson@csa.com. He added that should the problem not be resolved, then the ASFA Partners should contact Mr Emerson directly, asking him for follow up on the matter.

CD-ROM Linux-compatible

Follow-up action item 11.3 from the 2004 ASFA Board Meeting:

11.3 CSA agreed to investigate the possibility of making the CD-ROM Linux-compatible.

Mr Sainekar (NIO) re-iterated his requests that the CSA ASFA CD-ROMs could be searched simultaneously and that they could be searched under the Linux operating system.

Mr Emerson (CSA) explained that the software architecture used in the present version does not allow for this, but reported that the CSA Chief Technology Officer is investigating new software packages which may suit the needs of the ASFA CD users in a more efficient manner.

In response to the question by Mr Daniel (Canada) regarding the number of CSA ASFA CD-ROMs that are currently being produced, Mr Emerson (CSA) said that approximately 200 CD-ROMs are produced by CSA and added that these ASFA CD-ROMs were supplied only to the ASFA Partners.

8.3. Internet service

Follow-up action item 12 from the 2004 ASFA Board Meeting:

12. Regarding the ASFA on the CSA Internet Service

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

Mr Emerson (CSA) highlighted some of the new developments to the new Web platform, CSA Illumina, referring to the enhancements listed in CSA's Status Report for 2005 (**Annex-41**) He added that CSA were constantly endeavouring to make improvements to this new Web platform.

8.4. Document delivery

Mr Pepe (FAO) mentioned that on the 5th day of the ASFA Meeting (see item 17) there would be 4 IAMSLIC speakers who would be speaking about IAMSLIC membership benefits and document Repositories which are both directly related to document delivery. (See also **Annexes- 55, 59, 60, 61**)

Ms Keita (DPM) mentioned the repository being developed at *Direction des Pêches Maritimes*, within the framework of OdinAfrica, which contained full-text linking to African marine/oceanographic literature.

8.5. New outputs and services (by CSA) See further details in CSA Report (**Annex-41**)

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

Mr McGinty (CSA) reported that ASFA could face a period of difficulty due to the current competition of "free" services in the field of searching and retrieving scientific information. He mentioned Google Scholar which has a good search engine, and which works for free. Therefore there is reluctance among some users to use pay services, such of ASFA. He said, many people, worldwide, think that all information should be free. However, he stressed that ASFA has a tremendous reputation and is a highly crafted, indexed work which renders it unique in many ways.

Mr Emerson (CSA) stressed the importance of maintaining uniqueness and timeliness in ASFA, so as to be able compete with other Abstracting and Indexing (A&I) Services (e.g.Web of Science and Scopus).

8.7. Entitlements

The FAO ASFA Secretariat informed the ASFA Board of the proposed amendment to ASFA Partners Entitlements, whereby:

The ASFA Secretariat requests of CSA: that all "active" ASFA Collaborating Centres be entitled to receive one ASFA CD-ROM product 1978-to date notwithstanding the fact that the collective input from that country (National Partner and Collaborating Centre(s)) has not exceeded 500 records.

Mr Nhung (Vietnam) questioned the need for 500 records to be produced by a new ASFA Partner before being entitled to access to CSA Illumina. Mr Jorgens (UN/DOALOS) stated that, for a new partner, it would be useful to have immediate access. Mr Emerson (CSA) replied that access to CSA Illumina is given even if just 1 ASFA record is produced. He explained to the ASFA Board that as soon as a Partner joins the ASFA Partnership, they should make a request to CSA for access to CSA Illumina.

Mr Emerson (CSA) reminded the ASFA Board that when they have any queries regarding their ASFA entitlements, or should they not wish to receive any of the ASFA products, **they should contact CSA.**

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to send out a reminder to ASFA Partners via ASFA Board-L to remind them of their entitlements and also to remind them to contact CSA (cemerson@csa.com) should they have any questions or problems regarding this matter. (see **Annex-48**)

Based on the basic entitlement to ASFA Partners, **CSA agreed** to provide additional entitlements (CSA Illumina access and CD ROM) to active ASFA Collaborating Centres in developing countries, up to a limit imposed by the CD software license. Typical license restrictions typically range anywhere from 150-300 CDs. This entitlement is no longer strictly limited to input numbers.

CSA stated that they would investigate the possibility of producing additional ASFA CD-ROMs, so that all ASFA Input Centres (whether National Partners or Collaborating Centres) could have sufficient copies.

FAO agreed to provide CSA with a complete list of ASFA National Partners and Collaborating Centres.

8.8. Increasing distribution of ASFA information products and services

Ms Cochrane (FAO) reported on the status of the LIFDC Project for 2004-2005 (see **Annex 45, 56**). For the LIFDC countries in Africa, the number of institutions able to access ASFA is now 38 (increase of 2 over last year). Five of these institutions have become ASFA Partners (Ecuador, Mauritania, Nigeria, Senegal and Tanzania), leaving 34 currently participating in the Project. For the rest of the world initiative, the total number of recipients in LIFDC countries other than Africa remains 13, with one institution added and one becoming an ASFA Partner (Indonesia). The 6 new ASFA Partners that have been recruited this year from the LIFDC Project is a measure of the continuing success of the project.

Ms Cochrane (FAO) noted the difficulties in communicating with the institutions, mentioning that often the requested "acknowledgement of receipt" was never returned to FAO. This resulted in problems not only in obtaining feedback as to the usefulness of the CD-ROMs, but also in knowing whether or not they are even receiving it. Ms Collins (FAO) commented that sometimes the communication could be addressed to the wrong person, who perhaps would not reply or even forward the letter to the right person. She added that some countries in Africa have just recently got access via Internet and therefore may no longer be interested in the CD-ROM. She suggested that perhaps the project should concentrate on those countries in Africa where Internet access is not available.

Ms Cochrane (FAO) mentioned that several countries involved in the project had reported problems with Internet access, and that this highlighted the important role of CD-ROM technology in most countries in Africa and many other developing countries. Referring to figures from UNDP's Human Development Report and combining them with problems in Internet access in developing countries, she pointed out that there was a great divide between low/middle and high income groupings. She suggested that the project could be beneficial to a wider grouping of countries, other than LIFDCs, for example those who cannot afford to subscribe to ASFA or those who would prefer to have ASFA on CD-ROM because their Internet access is not consistent or affordable.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) noted that there were some European countries included on the FAO LIFDC list, and queried as to their selection and inclusion on the list. Ms Cochran (FAO) replied that the list was developed from FAO country and regional maps.

Ms Crampton (NISC) mentioned that NISC carries out many training activities in Africa. She said that should any of the Institutions require training on how to use the CD-ROM, NISC could provide a trainer who could visit the institutions to train the people involved.

NISC

Ms Crampton (NISC) gave a PowerPoint Presentation (**Annex-57**) on the NISC contribution to ASFA. She provided the ASFA Board with a brief historical background to the development and setting up of the NISC databases and explained how the collaboration between CSA and NISC was enhancing the ASFA database.

Mr Pepe (FAO) recalled the situation whereby ASFA Partners did not have free access to the NISC products containing ASFA records. Mr Emerson (CSA) suggested that CSA could take the royalties away from the NISC ASFA CD-ROMs so as to reduce prices. Mr Pepe said that ASFA Partners should receive the NISC CD-ROMs free, or at nominal costs. Ms Crampton (NISC) noted that some payment would have to be made for the CD-ROMs. Mr Pepe re-iterated his regret that ASFA Partners didn't receive NISC CD-ROMs and commented that NISC would only be asked to distribute their CD-ROMs to ASFA Partners.

NISC and CSA agreed to investigate the lowering of the cost of the NISC ASFA Products (CD-ROMs and Internet Access) for ASFA Partners and Collaborating ASFA Centres.

9. PROGRESS WITH MACHINE READABLE INPUT

9.1. DOS- ASFISIS

FAO does not plan to maintain or continue the development of DOS ASFISIS. However, ASFA Partners may, if necessary, continue to use this software to create/submit ASFA records to the ASFA Publisher.

Follow-up action item 18 from the 2004 ASFA Board Meeting:

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

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

At this writing, practically all active ASFA Partners are using the new *www-ISIS-ASFA* software.

9.2. www-ISIS-ASFA

A "minor upgrade" to the *www-ISIS-ASFA* release-1 software (which will be called release 1.1) was agreed at the last ASFA Board Meeting (see Annex-46 of 2004 ASFA Board Meeting Report). The ASFA Secretariat reported that most of the work on this "upgrade" has been completed (see ICIE Report, **Annex-50**). The installation manuals, troubleshooting guidelines and help notes were in the process of being completed by the ASFA Secretariat. Following the observation by Mr Jorgens (UN/DOALOS) that some knowledge in IT technology was useful in understanding the software, Mr Pepe (FAO) highlighted the importance of step-by-step guidance and explained why the ASFA Secretariat was taking great care in preparing the step-by-step instructions in the manuals.

The FAO ASFA Secretariat highlighted some of the new functions of the upgrade and mentioned its user-friendliness. Mr Pepe (FAO) commended the FAO ASFA Secretariat (Ms Lombardi, Ms Wibley, and Ms Rossi) for their efforts in developing/testing the upgrade 1.1 of www-ISIS-ASFA. A short demonstration of some of the features contained in the new release was given to the ASFA Partners by Ms Lombardi (FAO), Ms Wibley (FAO) and Ms Rossi (FAO) on the 5th day of the Board Meeting.

Follow-up action item 19 from the 2004 ASFA Board Meeting:

Regarding www-ISIS-ASFA

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

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that it was a question of money. ICIE could do it for US\$21 000.

10. REPORT ON ASFA TRAINING ACTIVITIES

Mr Pepe (FAO) reported on this Agenda item by mentioning the training sessions carried out at FAO (by: Ms Lombardi (FAO), Ms Wibley (FAO), Ms Rossi (FAO) and Mr Pepe (FAO)) which included: IMROP, Mauritania and INRH, Morocco (September 2004); IFRO, Iran (June 2005); DPM, Senegal (September, 2005); WorldFish Centre (October 2005). He also referred to 4 other training sessions that were outsourced to other ASFA Partners: PINRO, Russia (October 2004) carried out in Russia by Mr Romanov (YugNIRO); SPC and PIMRIS (December 2004), carried out in Fiji by Mr Ganashan Rao (ex-PIMRIS coordinator); IMS, Tanzania (December 2004), carried out in Kenya by Mr Macharia (KMFRI); and IOF, Croatia (April 2005) carried out in Italy by Ms Milone (AdriaMed). These experiments to outsource the training and follow-up met with varied success. Obviously, the development of a number of ASFA trainers who can operate autonomously on behalf of the ASFA Secretariat will require time and the continuing efforts by the ASFA Secretariat in the training of trainers. On the 5th day of the ASFA Meeting, there will be a brief meeting with two of the ASFA Partners who have assisted FAO in providing ASFA training.

11. STATUS OF ASFIS REFERENCE SERIES PUBLICATIONS

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

This publication (commonly called the 'Monitoring List') lists the serials monitored by the ASFA Partners. See discussions held under **Agenda Item 7.3 Monitoring** for an explanation of the list.

Follow-up action item 20.1 from the 2004 ASFA Board Meeting:

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

In their report, CSA mentioned that the data are now available and that they will be sending the information to the FAO ASFA Secretariat as soon as possible.

11.2. ASFIS-2, Subject Categories and Scope Descriptions

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

11.3. ASFIS-3, Guidelines for Bibliographic Description

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to make amendments to this publication so as to incorporate any simplification procedures eventually agreed upon by the ASFA Board.

11.4. ASFIS-4, Guidelines for Abstracting

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to make amendments to this publication so as to incorporate any simplification procedures eventually agreed upon by the ASFA Board.

11.5. ASFIS-5, Guidelines for Indexing

The FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed to make amendments to this publication so as to incorporate any simplification procedures eventually agreed upon by the ASFA Board.

11.6. ASFIS-6, Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Thesaurus

Follow-up action item 20.2 from the 2004 ASFA Board Meeting:

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

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

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

The ASFA Secretariat reported that an e-mail was sent 8 July 2005. The following requested to be part of the Committee: C. Nelson (PIMRIS), L. Noble (NBML), J. Prod'homme (IFREMER), R. Oriente (SPC).

Various ASFA Partners, in their Reports, requested the addition of some terms to the ASFA Thesaurus (See the Reports of SPC, Tunisia, UK). Mr Pepe (FAO) said that some ASFA Partners had sent short lists of suggested terms to be added to the ASFA Thesaurus.

Mr Ibeun (Nigeria) suggested an evaluation of the use of "Identifiers" and their possible addition to the ASFA Thesaurus.

Mr Pepe (FAO) reported on the FAO Ontology project (FAO Report **Annex-3**). He said it is under active development, both within the FAO and outside. He said that when the full FAO ontology is created, the ASFA Thesaurus will be a part of it, together with the AGRIS Agrovoc thesaurus and other FAO vocabularies. These vocabularies will be maintained through a terminology tool, being developed by FAO GIL/WAICENT, called 'Terminology Workbench'. As regards maintenance of the Thesaurus, Mr Pepe said he was advised to load the thesaurus into the Protégé software and use it for updating/maintaining, since this software would be compatible with loading into the Workbench. He reported that following discussions between the FAO ASFA Secretariat and the UK ASFA Partner (Linda Noble), one of the UK Collaborating Centres (Ian Pettman), Freshwater Biological Association (FBA), had offered to carry out the work relating to the ASFA thesaurus update and regular maintenance instead of offering to do more document input.

Mr Emerson (CSA) expressed enthusiasm regarding the possibility of a Collaborating Centre maintaining an Authority List, and suggested that they could possibly be paid out of the ASFA Trust Fund.

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat** and **CSA agreed** to discuss the arrangements with ASFA Partners, specifically the UK ASFA Partner, regarding both the maintenance of the ASFA Thesaurus by one of the UK Collaborating ASFA Centres and also their entitlements.

Ms Keita (DPM) enquired if there was a French translation of the ASFA Thesaurus. Mr Pepe (FAO) reported on that there are plans to develop a French and Spanish version of the thesaurus. He mentioned some of the technical aspects related to the Ontology project, but also added perhaps it might be better to go ahead with the translation rather than waiting for the project. He mentioned that some of the terms had already been translated, e.g. Agrovoc terms. Ms Keita confirmed the utility of a French version of the ASFA Thesaurus for French-speaking ASFA Partners to assist them in preparing ASFA input.

Mr Sow (IMROP) mentioned that he had received some complaints from the authors of articles contained in publications covered by his institute saying that the keywords supplied by the authors were not found, i.e. they could not be used as ASFA subject descriptors. Mr Emerson (CSA) pointed out that some training is required to use the ASFA thesaurus.

11.7. ASFIS-7, Geographic Authority List

Follow-up action item 20.3 from the 2004 ASFA Board Meeting:

*The Board recognized that the Geographic pick-list in www-ISIS-ASFA contained many errors and that it was not an Authority List. The **Board agreed** that the pick-list should be used with care, to assist in data entry, and that the FAO Secretariat should remind Partners of this. The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** to send an E-mail via ASFA-Board-L reminding Partners of the limitations present in the current www-ISIS-ASFA geographic terms picklist and hints to follow regarding its use.*

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

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

The FAO ASFA Secretariat reported that it had sent an E-mail "Reminder and hints on how to use the Geographic Descriptor Pick-List in www-ISIS-ASFA when indexing" via ASFA Board-L 09.09.2005.

With respect to use of the Getty Thesaurus of Geographic Names online, Mr Pepe (FAO) referred to the comments included in the UK Report, which concluded that although inland areas were listed, marine areas were not well represented in the list. Mr Emerson (CSA) noted it was not necessary to use only one Authority List, other databases could be used for the marine areas. He added that it would be very expensive for any one ASFA Partner to maintain such an Authority List.

Ms Frohlund (IMR) suggested that the possibility of going down to very low specific geographic levels could be considered for the future.

The **FAO ASFA Secretariat** and **CSA agreed** to prepare a Terms of Reference for a consultancy (to be financed from the ASFA Trust Fund) to clean up and maintain the current Geographic Authority List, and circulate it to the ASFA Board via ASFA Board-L.

Regarding the MarBEF project, which uses the terms in the ASFIS Geographic Authority List for the North Atlantic and Mediterranean Region, **Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) agreed** to liaise between the FAO and the MarBEF Project Coordinator to obtain further information as to how the terms were used/cleaned up and how to incorporate the changes and additions into the ASFIS Geographic Authority List.

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

This list contains approximately 10, 000 “taxonomic descriptors”, i.e. the Latin scientific names of species that may be used during indexing. The list is contained as a pick-list in the www-ISIS-ASFA software. The pick-list is open, but is not accruable, which means that any species not found on the list may be entered manually during data entry, but the species name is not automatically added to the List for future use.

11.9. ASFIS-10, Authority List for Corporate Names

For information on the Authority List for Corporate Names see the discussions held concerning the Corporate Author Field under the section heading **Simplification of ASFA inputting rules and procedures** (p15).

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

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

12. EXPANDED LANGUAGE CAPABILITY IN ASFA

The carrier language of the ASFA system is English. Nonetheless over the years, the FAO ASFA Secretariat has taken steps to increase or to incorporate the use of other languages in the ASFA system. See FAO Report (**Annex 3, Section 11**) for a list of steps taken to expand the language capacity of ASFA.

13. ASFA TRUST FUND

13.1. Status of the ASFA Trust Fund

The balance in the Trust Fund account is **US\$538 666.00**. CSA deposited US\$212 998.00 in royalties for the year 2004. **Annex-43** and **Annex-44** give a slight breakdown of the calculation of CSA Royalty payment and details on the status of the Trust Fund.

13.2. Proposals in progress, completed or pending further discussion

13.2.1. www-ISIS-ASFA (1.1) Maintenance Release (US\$7 900)

Completed - not yet released. This project was agreed at the 2004 Board Meeting (see Annex-46 of 2004 Board Meeting Report) and carried-out by ICIE of Poland. FAO increased the funding by US\$3 700 to add some further changes not in the original proposal (FAO covered the extra funding using funds allocated to it by Trust Fund project “Support to ASFA Secretariat”). Release of this up-grade is pending the completion of the support/installation/troubleshooting documentation that should accompany the release. The ICIE Report of the work carried out under this Trust Fund project is contained in (**Annex-50**).

13.2.2. VNIRO, Russian Federation - Input of "old" unique literature (approx. 700 records) on Caspian Sea from 1770 -1970 (US\$ 6 000)

This project was completed during the intersessional period in April 2005. All records (698) can be viewed on the ASFA database on the CSA Illumina web site using this search strategy in the "Quick" search box: TR=VNTF* . Note, VNIRO is submitting a proposal for continuation to this project (**Annex-32a**)

13.2.3. PIMRIS Convert approx. 500 Records from PIMRIS database into ASFISIS format

This project (US\$ 3 500) was completed during the intersession. All records (431) can be viewed on the CSA Illumina web site by using this search strategy in the "Quick" search box: TR=PITF*

13.2.4. FAO Financial support to attend 2005 ASFA Board Meeting (US\$35,000)

This project refers to **this** year's (2005) Meeting so the project must be considered "in- progress" until the Meeting is finished and the last expense claim is filed. The funding was used to fund the following 15 ASFA Partners to attend the Board Meeting: CIP, DPM, FICen, IIP, IMROP, INIDEP, KMFRI, NIFFR, NIO/NICMAS, NMDIS, PDII/LIPI, SFI, UNAM, VNIRO, and YugNIRO. The renewal of this proposal for 2006 is contained in (**Annex-46**) and was discussed under Agenda item 13.3.2 (below).

13.2.5. FAO Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year Jan -Dec 2005) (US\$40,000)

The funds were used for activities to support the ASFA Partnership in its running, development, and maintenance (see **Annex-44**, section 2.1.2 for a partial listing). The renewal of this proposal for 2006 is contained in (**Annex-3a**) and was discussed under Agenda item 13.3.1 (see below).

13.2.6. VLIZ, Belgium - Collect, ... prepare approximately 10,000 complete bibliographic references ... (from the North Sea, in particular the Southern Bight area (US\$18,000)

At the 2004 Meeting (see 2004 Meeting Report: section 13.2.1.3), VLIZ revisited this proposal by redefining the number of records to be processed (from 15,000 to approximately 10,000), and by increasing the time frame for its completion. This Trust Fund Proposal is still in progress. See the Belgian Intersessional Report (**Annex-13**) for details as to the current status of the work.

13.2.7. FAO ASFA-FIGIS Interaction

The proposal to develop a map based query facility (GIS) to ASFA was agreed at the 2002 Board Meeting (**Annex 3b** & section 13.2.14 of 2002 Meeting Report - US\$20 000). See (**Annex-47**) for the status of this proposal. The tools, in the testing stage, were demonstrated by Mr Taconet (FAO), in order to solicit feedback for the finalisation of the graphic interface, and for guidance for subsequent development steps.

13.2.8. To fill the gaps in Database concerning Latvian and Lithuanian aquatic literature

This Trust Fund project from Estonia (MEI) for \$4 800 was submitted to the Board for approval during the 2004-2005 intersessional period via E-mail (ASFA-Board-L, 22 June 2005). It was approved (**Annex-19a**)

13.3. New and/or ongoing proposals

13.3.1. FAO Staff Support to the FAO ASFA Secretariat (for year Jan -Dec 2006)

Ongoing proposal. This proposal (**Annex-3a**) is to assist the FAO ASFA Secretariat in carrying out work for the collective benefit of the ASFA Partnership. Mr Grainger (FAO) emphasized the importance of these funds in enabling the ASFA Secretariat to carry out work otherwise not possible under FAO's Regular Programme, especially with respect to budgetary restrictions that the proposed major FAO reform may imply.

The ASFA Board agreed to this FAO Trust Fund Proposal for **US\$40 000**.

13.3.2. Financial support to attend annual 2006 ASFA Board Meeting

Ongoing proposal. This proposal (**Annex-46**) is reviewed each year by the Board to update the funds for allocation for the subsequent Meeting. It was originally proposed by NOAA at the 1997 ASFA Board Meeting (where US\$6 000 was allocated to support attendance at the 1998 Meeting). This sum has been updated during the past years, taking into consideration the continual increase in the number of ASFA Partners. At the 2004 Meeting, the ASFA Board agreed to increase the funds to US\$35 000.

The ASFA Board agreed to this FAO Trust Fund Proposal and approved a 10% increase making the sum **US\$38 500** for the 2006 Board Meeting, with the understanding that any unspent money would be carried forward to the next Trust Fund Proposal to attend ASFA Board Meetings the following year.

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

Following Mr Kuhnhold's (BF) question as to whether the funds have been fully spent in the past, Mr Pepe (FAO) explained that there was a time difference between budgeting and ticketing, and that the full amount spent would not be known until the last claim was filed. However, he added that initial estimates indicate that this year's funds will be totally spent, including any unspent funds from past years.

Mr Jorgens (UN/DOALOS) suggested increasing the sum to take into consideration increased expenses. Mr Pepe (FAO) said that up until now the money had been sufficient. He suggested that the UN co-sponsoring Partners also consider providing funding assistance, if necessary or possible. He mentioned the continuing increase in the number of ASFA Partners and said that this year 15 members had received financial support to attend this year's meeting.

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) noted this year's record attendance and suggested that an increase in the funds would help maintain such high attendances. Mr Kuhnhold (BF) suggested an increase of 10%, bringing the sum to US\$38 500, and that any unspent money would be carried forward to the following year.

13.3.3. NMDIS (China) - Compilation of www-ISIS-ASFA Manuals/Guidelines in Chinese

Mr Yang Ying (NMDIS) introduced this Proposal (**Annex-16a**), mentioning the need for NMDIS to have Chinese versions of the ASFA input manuals/guidelines as regards the www-ISIS-ASFA software. He explained that the increased publishing of ASFA-related documents in China requires the setting-up of new collaborating centres and the training of new part-time input staff to cope with the increase in ASFA input. He noted that both the new staff and existing staff would benefit from the manuals and reference materials in their native languages. The translation into Chinese of the www-ISIS-ASFA Help Notes and the software front interface would be included in this Trust Fund Proposal. Mr Yang Ying said that NMDIS would wait until the release of the updated version 1.1 of the www-ISIS-ASFA software before translating some of the documents to ensure that any changes in input procedures would be incorporated.

The ASFA Board agreed to this NMDIS Trust Fund Proposal for **US\$10 000**, on the understanding that some translations would be made after release of the new version 1.1 of the www-ISIS-ASFA software and the relevant manuals and guidelines.

13.3.4. INP (Ecuador) - Elaboration of the Ecuadorian database report in marine science corresponding to INO, INOCAR & other Ecuadorian Institutions 1999-2005 (\$15 400)

Mr Pepe (FAO) introduced this Proposal (**Annex- 18**). He noted that INP was a new ASFA Partner that had just started producing ASFA input. He said that the first 25 ASFA records, were received by FAO during the week of the ASFA Board Meeting. Mr Montes (UNAM) mentioned that despite the fact that this proposal was describing activities to be carried out that were part of normal ASFA input activities, he was also aware of the fact that INP did have problems within their organization regarding their computer and CD-ROM reader. Mr Emerson (CSA) commented that although the ASFA Trust fund was not normally used to finance the regular ongoing ASFA input of an ASFA Partner, perhaps funds could be provided for hardware, e.g. PCs. Ms Frohland (IMR) suggested that INP re-formulate the proposal, removing the hiring of personnel (since that is a pre-requisite for participating in ASFA). Mr Jorgens (UN/DOALOS) suggested INP provided a new proposal, for 1 PC and 1 printer, which could be circulated intersessionally.

The ASFA Board did not agree to the INP Trust Fund Proposal. The Board suggested the proposal could be submitted at next year's Meeting (with further clarification), after INP has more experience with preparing ASFA input. The inclusion, in the proposal, of the line "hiring of personnel" was not considered appropriate, if the proposal was referring to INP's regular ASFA input preparation, as having the required staff should be part of an institute's regular responsibility when joining ASFA. However, it was noted that if INP's regular participation in ASFA is hindered by lack of a computer/printer, INP should submit a proposal for this purpose, intersessionally via ASFA-Board-L, to be voted upon.

13.3.5. KMFRI (Kenya) - Elimination of gaps

Mr Macharia (KMFRI) introduced this Proposal (**Annex-26a**). He explained that the proposal was a revision of the Proposal presented at the last Advisory Board Meeting in Mar del Plata, Argentina. The list of titles for which ASFA input would be carried out was revised following contact with the ASFA Partners responsible for their approval. The total number of records for which input will be prepared is 4000.

The ASFA Board agreed to the KMFRI Trust Fund Proposal, with a revision of the figure for overheads to US\$4 200, making the total sum to read **US\$18 200**.

Some of the comment/discussion regarding this proposal are reported below:

Mr Jorgens (UN/DOALOS) pointed out an error in the Budget figure given for overhead costs, and that it should read US\$4 200 and not US\$6 000, making the total US\$18 200, instead of US\$20 000.

Mr Emerson (CSA) pointed out that the earlier issues of the publication Marine Biology do not contain abstracts. Mr Macharia (KMFRI) confirmed that KMFRI would prepare abstracts for any document not having one.

Mr Emerson (CSA), while recognizing the importance of covering back issues of primary journals, and grey literature, reminded ASFA Partners of previous discussions (at past Meetings) regarding this issue, where it was agreed that any Partner could present such a Trust Fund Proposal, however only provided that the Partner was also fulfilling its regular ASFA inputting responsibility for the current publications on its monitoring list. Mr Pepe (FAO) expressed also his concern that the work to be conducted under this Trust Fund Proposal might compromise KMFRI's regular processing of the Kenyan ASFA input.

Mr Macharia (KMFRI), however, reassured the ASFA Board that his institute would continue to prepare their regular ASFA input as well as that involved under the Trust Fund Proposal.

Further to the discussion on this proposal, Ms. Keita (DPM), and Mr Sow (IMROP) questioned the inclusion of journals that were not published in Africa. It was clarified that the KMFRI Trust fund proposal did include the processing of gaps identified from some non African journals, because KMFRI had access to the physical documents, on their premises.

Ms Keita (DPM), asked whether the grey literature to be covered under the Kenyan proposal was from Africa or also from other countries. Mr Macharia (KMFRI) replied that only African grey literature was to be covered under the project proposal.

In reply to the question by Mr Ibeun (NIFFR) of the existence of a "standard" inputting cost, Mr Jorgens (UN/DOALOS) explained that cost depended upon: costs in the location where the input was being prepared, and the processing necessary to create the record (e.g. copying/pasting of abstract vs. writing).

Mr Ibeun (NIFFR) noted that KMFRI was the first ASFA Partner in Africa, and has been the only one for many years. However, now that there are several other ASFA African Partners he hoped that, together, they would be able to assist in preparing ASFA input for the African literature, so that KMFRI could concentrate on carrying out such valuable input as that included in this Trust Fund Proposal.

13.3.6. VNIRO (Russian Federation) - Input of Caspian Sea old literature

Ms Levashova (VNIRO) introduced this Proposal (**Annex- 32a**). The work is a continuation of the previous VNIRO Project (which covered the Russian Caspian Sea literature for the period 1770-1970). In this second project the documents come from the Russian and Soviet literature and all the printed publications are available in the VNIRO library. She explained that this second project will involve more work in the preparation of the ASFA input, since all the publications are in Russian with no abstracts.

The ASFA Board agreed to the VNIRO Trust Fund Proposal for US\$10 270.

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

Ms Oriente (SPC) mentioned the importance of such work, since the history of science is very important.

Mr Emerson (CSA) expressed his concern regarding the decline of regular ASFA input by VNIRO sent to CSA last year. Ms Levashova said that they would be hiring a specialist to carry out the work for the project and that VNIRO would be regularly carrying out their normal ASFA input.

14. OTHER BUSINESS

Follow-up action item 4.1 from the 2004 ASFA Board Meeting:

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

Ms Cosulich (INIDEP) requested the ASFA Secretariat for information on the feasibility of carrying out a Latin American, Mini ASFA Meeting. Mr Pepe (FAO) reported that the ASFA Secretariat had brought up the matter at the IODE-GEMIM meeting and the idea was supported, in principle.

Ms Cosulich and the Latin American Group of ASFA Partners agreed to assist the ASFA Secretariat in investigating the feasibility and costs involved in organizing a Mini-Regional Meeting for ASFA Partners. Their findings and suggestions would be circulated to the ASFA Board ASFA Board-L.

Mr Tuyet Nhung (FiCen) suggested another Meeting be considered for Asia. The **FAO ASFA Secretariat agreed** that this could be considered at some future date. Mr Pepe suggested that Mr Tuyet Nhung (FiCen) investigate the possibilities regarding the preparation and organization of such a Meeting in Asia and then let the ASFA Secretariat have the details, via E-mail.

In reference to the fact that this year's ASFA Board Meeting was held back-to-back with the Annual IAMSLIC Meeting, Ms Pikula (NOAA) said that several ASFA Partners, including herself, felt that attending meetings for two consecutive weeks was too long to be away from the office. Some other Partners commented that they would not have been able to attend both Meetings if they had not been back-to-back.

15. PLACE AND DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Mr Haspeslagh (VLIZ) offered to host the 2006 ASFA Board Meeting during the first full week of September. He said that VLIZ will use the facilities of the nearby IODE Project Office for the Meeting.

The **ASFA Board thanked VLIZ and agreed** that the 2006 ASFA Board Meeting would be held in Belgium. The exact dates would be confirmed by VLIZ via ASFA Board-L. The desirability of extending the meeting to 5 days, like this Meeting, will be decided during the Intersessional period.

[Note from FAO ASFA Secretariat: the final dates of the 2006 ASFA Advisory Board Meeting are 4-8 September 2006 (5 days). For administrative reasons, it was necessary for the FAO ASFA Secretariat to immediately (without discussion) include the potential 5th day as part of the Meeting, in order to ensure that the reservation for that day of the Meeting was not allocated to another Meeting].

16. REVIEW/APPROVAL OF DRAFT REPORT OF MEETING

The Board reviewed/approved the Draft of the "Items and Actions Agreed" during the Meeting (**Annex-51**).

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.

17. FIFTH DAY OF ASFA BOARD MEETING(presentations by IAMSILIC speakers etc.)

After many years the ASFA Board Meeting was extended to 5 days (on an experimental basis) as agreed at the last ASFA Board Meeting [see section 6.6, Question 4.4 of the 2004 Board Meeting Report]. The Agenda of the 5th day was to be dedicated to special workshops/seminars/theme papers etc. (see Agenda below).

Since the 5th day of the ASFA Meeting was held after the "Minutes" of the Meeting were agreed (on the 4th day), the proceedings of the 5th day are not covered in this Report, nor were any official decisions taken (agreed) by the Board during the 5th day.

AGENDA used for 5th day of ASFA

1. Open Access, Publishing and Institutional Repositories, IAMSILIC Z39: 50 Distributed Library and IAMSILIC Marine Science Repository

- Barbara Butler - Benefits of IAMSILIC Membership (membership issues) (**Annex-61**)
- Steve Watkins - Avenues for Participation in IAMSILIC Resource Sharing (resource sharing through Z39:50 Distributed Library and participation in the Union List of Marine and Aquatic Serials) (**Annex-61**)
- Pauline Simpson - Open Access and Institutional Repositories (**Annex-55**)
- Stephanie Haas - The Aquatic Commons: a model for integrating marine and aquatic digital initiatives (**Annexes-59,60**)

[Rapporteur's note: Ms Haas drafted a proposal (**Annexes-60**) for an "Aquatic Commons" repository which was then circulated to ASFA Partners (by R.Pepe) via ASFA-Board-L for comments and approval in principle. The same proposal was also circulated among the IAMSILIC membership for comments by Ms Haas]

2. Comments on ASFA Input (persistent problems encountered in Partners input and advice)

- Ms Soto (CSA) , Ms Wibley (FAO)

[Rapporteur's note: Ms Soto (CSA) together with Ms Wibley (FAO) presented a PowerPoint presentation (**Annex-54**) of common ASFA inputting errors]

- Since some of the input problems will be eliminated with the enlarged validation routine which is contained in the revised www-ISIS-ASFA 1.1 software (not yet released). These new features may be demonstrated alongside the present errors.

[Rapporteur's note: New features of the www-ISIS-ASFA 1.1 software (not yet released) were demonstrated by: Ms Lombardi (FAO), Ms Wibley(FAO), and Ms Rossi (FAO) - to show that some of the input problems will be eliminated with the enlarged validation routine which is contained in the revised software]

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

- (Vicki Soto (CSA), Craig Emerson (CSA))

4. Other: Training of trainers,

- Luciana Lombardi (FAO), Helen Wibley (FAO)

[Rapporteur's note: Ms Lombardi and Ms Wibley met briefly with Mr Macharia (KMFRI) and Mr Montes (UNAM) to provide tips/advice on the training and follow up of new ASFA Partners]