

# REPORT OF THE INTER-DEPARTMENTAL INFORMATION WORKSHOP

SEAFDEC Training Department, Samut Prakan, Thailand  
4-7 February 2020

## INTRODUCTION

1. The SEAFDEC Inter-Departmental Information Workshop was organized on 4-7 February 2020 by the SEAFDEC Secretariat at the premises of the Training Department in Samut Prakan, Thailand. The Workshop was attended by information-related staff from the SEAFDEC Secretariat, Training Department (TD), Aquaculture Department (AQD), Marine Fishery Resources Development and Management Department (MFRDMD), and Inland Fishery Resources Development and Management Department (IFRDMD). The List of Participants appears as **Annex 1**.

### I. OPENING OF THE WORKSHOP

2. In her Opening Remarks, the Secretary-General of SEAFDEC, *Ms. Malinee Smithrithee* recalled that during the discussion at the 20<sup>th</sup> Meeting of SEAFDEC Information Staff Program (ISP) in October 2019 in the Philippines, recommendations were made on specific issues that need to be addressed among the SEAFDEC Secretariat and Departments, particularly on the harmonization of the SEAFDEC Institutional Repository Structure, monitoring of the Repositories, cost of hosting the Repository servers; as well as on monitoring of SEAFDEC websites, enhancing the use of social media, and monitoring of the citations of SEAFDEC publications, among others. She mentioned that the Workshop is, therefore, an opportune time for concerned officers of SEAFDEC to discuss in-depth these issues and explore the ways of working towards harmonizing the overall SEAFDEC information structure. After expressing the appreciation to the AQD Information Team for also serving as resource persons for the Workshop, and encouraging the participants to **actively** take part in the discussions **actively** and to provide valuable inputs, she declared the Workshop open. Her Opening Remarks appears as **Annex 2**.

### II. BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES OF THE WORKSHOP

3. The **representative from the SEAFDEC Secretariat introduced the** Background, Objectives, and Agenda of the Workshop ~~were introduced by the representative from the SEAFDEC Secretariat~~. Specifically, the Workshop was aimed at 1) exploring the ways of addressing the issues and challenges faced by the Secretariat and Departments in the development of the SEAFDEC Repositories; 2) getting consensus on the updated monitoring templates for the implementation of Strategies for Enhancing SEAFDEC Visibility and Communication, particularly the SEAFDEC Websites, SEAFDEC Repositories, and citations of SEAFDEC Publications; and 3) providing the platform for discussing other issues as recommended by the ISP, such as the use of social media for SEAFDEC visibility and data security. The Agenda of the Workshop appears in **Annex 3**.

### III. STATUS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING OF THE STRATEGIES FOR ENHANCING SEAFDEC VISIBILITY AND COMMUNICATION

#### 3.1 Priority Issues on Repositories, Websites, and Social Media Accounts of the SEAFDEC Secretariat and Departments

4. The Workshop took note of the presentations made by the representatives from the Secretariat, TD, AQD, MFRDMD, and IFRDMD on the priority issues encountered in the administration of their respective Repositories, Websites, and Social Media Accounts.

5. The priority issues with regard to the **SEAFDEC Repositories** were subsequently compiled after the presentation of AQD under *Agenda 4.1 on Common Repository Issues*, together with the recommendations from the Workshop on the way forward to address these issues.

6. With regard to the **social media accounts**, while some Departments, *e.g.* MFRDMD whose Facebook accounts are currently personal accounts and/or pages, it was suggested that Departmental Facebook accounts should only be an official Facebook Page. Furthermore, with regard to posts on the social media accounts, it was also suggested that coordination between the Facebook account administrator and technical staff is necessary in order to come up with appropriate captions of the posts, which should be catchy and punchy, as well as to immediately reply to comments/queries in the social media accounts.

#### IV. SEAFDEC REPOSITORY ISSUES

##### 4.1 Common Repository Issues

7. The resource person from AQD, *Mr. Elvi Nemiz*, identified the common repository issues based on his experience while administering and assisting the SEAFDEC Secretariat and Departments in the development of their respective Repositories.

8. Based on the presentations made by SEAFDEC Secretariat and Departments on priority issues and concerns arising from their respective Repositories (*Agenda 3.1*), the Workshop consolidated the common issues and the corresponding suggested solutions, as follows:

Common Issues/Solutions	SEC	TD	AQD	MFRDMD	IFRDMD
<b>System/server</b>					
1. Difficulties in the acquisition of repository statistics ( <i>Suggested solutions</i> : the methods presented by the resource person should be applied to generate the statistics)	x	x		x	x
2. Outdated hardware (physical server) and software ( <i>Suggested solutions</i> : upgrading of existing hardware and software)			x		
3. Low performance (always nearing 99 % CPU and RAM usage) ( <i>Suggested solutions</i> : upgrading of existing hardware)	x	x	x		
<b>Budget</b>					
4. No budget allocated specifically for staff responsible for repositories ( <i>Suggested solutions</i> : raise awareness of the importance of repositories to respective Department Chiefs)		x	x	x	
5. No budget specifically allocated to cover the cost of the servers (equipment and hosting) ( <i>Suggested solutions</i> : consider the options proposed by AQD on hosting physical server at AQD)				x	
<b>Data inputs</b>					
6. Non-standardized metadata <i>Suggested solutions</i> : - Metadata <b>dc.contributor.corporateauthor</b> should be used for company/institution/corporate author ( <i>e.g.</i> SEAFDEC should be placed in <b>dc.contributor.corporateauthor</b> and not in <b>dc.contributor.author</b> )	x	x	x	x	x

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The format of the corporate author (<b>dc.contributor.corporateauthor</b>) for SEAFDEC publications should be standardized (<i>e.g.</i>, SEAFDEC/TD or SEAFDEC Training Department should not be used). Instead, the format (Center, Department), <i>i.e.</i> Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center, Training Department should be used.</li> <li>- The format of the publisher (<b>dc.publisher</b>) for SEAFDEC publications should be standardized (<i>e.g.</i>, SEAFDEC/TD or SEAFDEC Training Department should not be used). Instead, the format (Department, Center), <i>i.e.</i> Training Department, Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center should be used.</li> <li>- The ambiguity of authors' names should be clarified, <i>e.g.</i>, by providing variant names</li> </ul>					
<p>7. Non-compliance with the best practices for the naming of PDF files (<i>Suggested solutions</i>: guide would be developed by AQD and disseminated to other Departments)</p>	x	x		x	x
<p>8. Use of uppercase (or lowercase) in the title of publications (<i>Suggested solutions</i>: sentence case or title case (caps lower case) should be used instead of all caps)</p>	x	x		x	x
<p>9. Lack of key metadata and metadata quality control (<i>refer to issues and suggested solutions in item 6</i>)</p>	x	x	x	x	x
<p>10. Use of uncontrolled vocabulary (<i>Suggested solutions</i>: conduct of training on the use of ASFA and AGROVOC keywords)</p>	x	x	x	x	x
<p>11. Absence of keywords in articles (<i>e.g.</i> Fish for the People) and other publications (<i>Suggested solutions</i>: request authors to submit also the keywords for every article)</p>	x	x		x	x
<p>12. Non-automatic harvesting of newly uploaded items (<i>Suggested solutions</i>: Departments that upload new Item should notify the concerned staff of Secretariat and AQD)</p>	x	x	x	x	x
<p>13. Difficulties in mapping items that belong to more than one collection (<i>Suggested solutions</i>: For publications that could be matched with more than one sub-community, the items should be deposited based on suggested prioritization (<i>please see the last bullet of Para. 13</i>))</p>	x	x	x	x	x
<p>14. Communities, sub-communities, and collections not harmonized, and proper inputting not carried out:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Type of items not properly categorized (<i>e.g.</i>, item which is a magazine article, classified as a book chapter)</li> <li>- Some old publications could not be categorized under the current structure</li> </ul> (<i>Suggested solutions</i>: use the revised harmonized repository structures)</p>	x	x	x	x	x
<p>15. Language (presence and/or use of non-English text/characters) (<i>Suggested solutions</i>: use of OCR software and ask native speakers to proofread and process output of</p>		x		x	x

the OCR)					
16. Dates not standardized ( <i>e.g.</i> use of Buddhist calendar) ( <i>Suggested solutions</i> : convert manually to Gregorian calendar)		X			
<b>Monitoring/reporting of impact</b>					
17. Tracking of citations and Altmetrics of each item not practiced ( <i>Suggested solutions</i> : promote the registration of researcher ID; track only selected publications or authors; promote items available in repositories in social media and other sources that Altmetric-track)	X	X		X	X
18. Monitoring template and summary report not harmonized ( <i>Suggested solutions</i> : use the harmonized template agreed at this Workshop)	X	X	X	X	X
<b>Items/publications</b>					
19. Inventory of all publications not carried out completely ( <i>Suggested solutions</i> : conduct <b>an</b> inventory to also include publications without electronic files)	X	X	X	X	
20. Digitization of old publications not complete ( <i>Suggested solutions</i> : conduct inventory and continue digitization based on priority)	X	X	X	X	
21. Publications that are for sale could not be uploaded ( <i>Suggested solutions</i> : provide at least the basic bibliographic record and seek approval from AQD management to upload “for sale publications”)			X		
22. Difficulties in uploading very large file sizes ( <i>Suggested solutions</i> : break large files into chapters or parts or as divided in the respective publications; <b>and</b> make sure that PDF files are optimized for web viewing)		X		X	
23. Printed or hard copies of important files for digitization not available elsewhere ( <i>Suggested solutions</i> : source the original files from Departments and correspondingly digitize the files)	X	X	X	X	X
<b>Human resources</b>					
24. Lack of dedicated staff to handle digitization and processing of files in the optical character recognition (OCR) software and maintaining the repository ( <i>Suggested solutions</i> : raise the awareness of all Department Chiefs on the need to have full-time staff)	X	X	X	X	X
25. Inadequate knowledge and technical expertise in managing repositories ( <i>Suggested solutions</i> : conduct training for concerned staff)	X	X		X	X
<b>Data access by the audience</b>					
26. Difficulties in searching/finding publications using search engines ( <i>e.g.</i> , files larger than 5MB may not have been indexed in Google Scholar, SEAFDEC books and reports may be indexed in Google Books instead) ( <i>Suggested solutions</i> : break large files into chapters or parts or as divided in the respective publications; <b>and</b> make sure that PDF files are optimized for web	X				

viewing)					
27. Some uploaded items (journal articles) do not have full text due to copyright restrictions ( <i>Suggested solutions</i> : provide a link to owner's site or seek approval from item owner)	x	x	x	x	x
28. Some items are not searchable ( <i>Suggested solutions</i> : generate PDF files with searchable texts using optical character recognition (OCR) software; for old publications follow the level of prioritization provided in <b>Para 9</b> below)				x	
<b>Back-up</b>					
29. No offsite back-up of repository servers ( <i>Suggested solutions</i> : establish back-up in other site(s))			x		x
30. No automatic back-up of repository servers ( <i>Suggested solutions</i> : establish scheduled back-ups)			x		x
31. Disaster risk, possible intrusion, and corruption of repositories ( <i>Suggested solutions</i> : establish disaster management plans and security measures)			x		x

9. With regard to old publications, the Workshop suggested that these should be made available in the Repositories for easy retrieval, but under different levels of prioritization:

- Publications that are still in high demand should be digitized immediately and should have searchable texts
- Publications that are not in high demand but need to be kept for its historical or archival value should also be digitized, not necessarily to have searchable text. Important metadata fields should be provided such as title, author(s), year published, abstract/description, keywords, and ~~the~~ publisher.
- Publications that may not be much in demand could still be submitted in the repository. Important metadata fields should be provided such as title, author(s), year published, abstract/description, keywords, and ~~the~~ publisher. A request button will be available in the repository. Even without the PDF, when users need such publications, requests could be sent directly to the Administrators and scanning of documents on demand can be done.

10. In order to enhance the capacity of the Administrators and Submitters in indexing the digitized publications (*e.g.*, assigning of ASFA and AGROVOC keywords), it was suggested that the SEAFDEC Secretariat should consider organizing a one- or two-day workshop on this subject before the ISP Meetings.

11. On the need for each Department to have staff dedicated to working on the Repositories, this concern should be raised to the Department Chiefs Meetings (DCMs) through the ISP Meetings. Furthermore, the current Repository Administrator from each Department should regularly report to their respective Department management regarding the utilization of repositories by stakeholders, and the significance of having Department Repositories in enhancing the visibility of SEAFDEC, which could be a justification for the Departments to consider allocating additional staff and budget for the Repositories in the future.

#### 4.2 Harmonization of Communities and Sub-communities for SEAFDEC Repositories

12. The Workshop took note of the presentations made by the SEAFDEC Secretariat, TD, AQD, MFRDMD and IFRDMD on the current structure of their respective Repositories that had been developed in line with the harmonized structure agreed during the 18<sup>th</sup> ISP Meeting in 2017. Nevertheless, considering the difficulties faced by the Departments in uploading their items based on such agreed structure, it was discussed and decided that the 2017 harmonized structure should be

revised. The revised Harmonized Structure, which should be followed by the SEAFDEC Secretariat and Departments in the development of their respective Repositories, is shown as **Annex 4**.

13. For the SEAFDEC Repositories, the following suggestions related to the repositories, were also considered during the Workshop:

- The structure of the Repositories previously sorted by alphabetical order should be modified and sorted based on the importance/relevance of the subjects. To address this issue, numbers have been assigned to the *Top-level Communities* and *Level-1 Sub-Communities* accordingly.
- In order that the Repository of SEAFDEC as a whole would properly reflect the *Items* owned by the SEAFDEC Secretariat and MFRD, the Repository server of the Secretariat should be adjusted in the future to have 3 *Top-level Communities*, namely: 1) SEAFDEC Repository (harvested items from TD, AQD, MFRDMD, IFRDMD; and mapped the files from Secretariat and MFRD); 2) SEAFDEC Secretariat Repository; and 3) SEAFDEC/MFRD Repository.
- Harmonization of the Repository structure among the Secretariat and Departments was agreed only up to *Level-2 Sub-community*, and the Departments could have flexibility with their respective *Collections*. However, if Departments would like to add or make changes to the *Collection*, these should be communicated with the Repository Group e-mail to accommodate the change as appropriate.
- For articles from Departments published in “Fish for the People,” records will be submitted to and the PDF will be uploaded by the Secretariat under Sub-community “Journals/Magazines,” *Level-2 Sub-community* on “Fish for the People” in SEAFDEC Secretariat Repository. While the Departments will only submit the records and do not upload the PDF under *Collections* of “Fish for the People” under *Sub-community* “Magazines and Newsletter by SEAFDEC Staff” under *Community* on “SEAFDEC External Publications” but only link to the PDF stored in the Secretariat Repository.
- For IFRDMD and MFRDMD Repositories, national projects publications could be in *Top-level Community*, but *Collections/Items* will not be harvested for the SEAFDEC Repository.
- For publications that do not belong to SEAFDEC (e.g. articles in non-SEAFDEC publications, publications under national projects), the respective Departments should be cautious in uploading the PDF files of such publications, e.g. should only link to PDF files at owners’ websites, or seek approval prior to uploading these in the SEAFDEC Repository.
- For MFRDMD Collection on “Specimens,” and “News Clippings” considering the different nature of the metadata (scientific name, picture, information on the species, etc.) and copyright restrictions compared with institutional repository items (title, authors, abstract, etc.), it was suggested that ideally this could be deposited in separate repositories but not in the institutional repository. However, if MFRDMD maintains this in a repository, this will not be harvested for the SEAFDEC Repository. It was also noted that at present, AQD is maintaining a separate news clipping repository dubbed as the Aquatic News Index (ANI) and plans to develop a digital repository for its FishWorld museum collections.
- For publications that could be matched with more than one sub-community, the items should be deposited based on the following prioritization:
  - For publications under collaborative projects (e.g., SEAFDEC-Sweden, SEAFDEC-FAO, etc.), the items should be deposited first in “SEAFDEC Collaborative Project Publications,” and should be mapped later to relevant thematic subjects.
  - For other technical publications, the items should be deposited first in relevant thematic subjects and should be mapped later to appropriate item types (e.g., books, proceedings, etc.).

#### **4.3 Practical Session Using Harmonized Communities and Sub-communities**

14. During the practical session, the Administrators of the SEAFDEC Secretariat and Departmental Repositories modified their own repository systems based on the previously agreed harmonized communities and sub-communities.

#### **5. MONITORING CITATIONS OF SEAFDEC PUBLICATIONS**

15. The several methods of monitoring citations, reflecting the frequency with which the publications are cited were noted, as explained by the resource person from AQD, *Mr. Stephen Alayon*, who also explained that monitoring could be undertaken using different tools, *i.e.*, Clarivate Analytics - Web of Science (*webofknowledge.com*), Scopus (*scopus.com*), Google Scholar (*scholar.google.com*), etc. Moreover, *Mr. Alayon* also suggested the ways and means of having increased citations of SEAFDEC articles/publications, as follows:

- Researchers should acquire their respective researcher IDs by registering in *orcid.org*, *ResearcherID.com*, or *Google Scholar* profile so that each researcher could be distinguished as an identical person, even if researchers change their names or family names in the future.
- SEAFDEC staff publishing articles in journals, books, and conference proceedings should affiliate SEAFDEC in those publications. The uniform name, “[Laboratory/Station], [Department], Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center” and in spelled out form *e.g.*, “Aquaculture Department, Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center,” should be used as an affiliation for publications. It should also be used on the metadata *dc.publisher* when uploading articles in SEAFDEC Repository.
- SEAFDEC Secretariat and Departments should deposit old publications, *e.g.*, those of MFRD and MFRDMD that already have some citations including information on their citations, in their respective Repositories to enhance access and retrieval to those publications and to increase citations in the future.
- Items in SEAFDEC Repositories should be promoted through official Facebook and other social media accounts, and could also be promoted using SEAFDEC staff personal accounts with URL/Handle provided to facilitate downloading of the items, as this would also increase the citations and Altmetrics in the future.

16. The Workshop recalled the need for recording the number of citations of SEAFDEC publications, which was raised during the previous ISP meetings as part of the monitoring of the annual progress in the implementation of the Information Strategies for Enhancing SEAFDEC Visibility and Communication. Nevertheless, considering that monitoring of citations must be undertaken by each specific registered author or specific publication, and there is currently a very large collection of publications produced by SEAFDEC, it was, therefore, suggested that future monitoring of citations may not necessarily be included in the future monitoring of the Information Strategies. However, the monitoring of citations could still be undertaken for individual researchers, highly cited papers, and significant publications especially when their citations are of interest and reporting of such is needed.

#### **VI. MONITORING OF SEAFDEC WEBSITES AND REPOSITORIES**

##### **6.1 Monitoring of SEAFDEC Repositories**

17. The methods for monitoring SEAFDEC Repositories were introduced and demonstrated by the resource person from AQD, *Mr. Elvi Nemiz*. During the practical session, the Administrators of the Repositories of respective Departments underwent actual practice on how to monitor the SEAFDEC Repositories and came up with DSpace statistics using the SOLR Stat.

18. Subsequently, the harmonized template and summary report for monitoring the SEAFDEC Repositories (**Annex 5**) was agreed upon and henceforth such a template would be used for monitoring the SEAFDEC Repositories in 2020, the results of which would be reported during the 21<sup>st</sup> ISP Meeting. Furthermore, to facilitate reporting of figures by the Administrators of respective Department Repositories, the agreed template would be uploaded in the Google Sheets together with Google Slides that provide instructions on the use of SOLR Stat (*i.e.* codes for extracting information based on the template).

## **6.2 Monitoring of SEAFDEC Websites**

19. The method for monitoring the SEAFDEC websites using Google Analytics was explained by the resource person from AQD, *Mr. Ronilo Subaldo*. Other tools available that could be used for monitoring the Websites were also introduced, *e.g.* Google Dashboard, Google Data Studio that could be customized to come up with the required data.

20. After the discussion, it was also agreed that the harmonized template and summary report for monitoring the SEAFDEC Websites (**Annex 6**) should be used for monitoring of SEAFDEC Websites in 2020, the results of which would be reported during the 21<sup>st</sup> ISP Meeting. The Administrators of the respective Departmental Websites also underwent actual practice in customizing the Google Dashboard based on the agreed template.

## **VII. HOSTING REPOSITORIES AND WEBSITES**

21. The Institutional Repositories of SEAFDEC Secretariat and Departments have been established and operational for few years already although with different hosting arrangements. As discussed during the Workshop, considerable high costs are incurred from using the Virtual Private Server (VPS) hosting, especially for the SEAFDEC Secretariat, TD and MFRDMD. In this connection, the representative from AQD, *Mr. Ronilo Subaldo* presented options for maintaining the Repositories of these Departments using the physical server hosted by AQD (**Annex 7**). Under the proposal and based on the assumption that the three Repositories would be hosted at AQD, there would be a one-time installation cost of 1,633.41 USD, plus the monthly operating cost of 39.20 USD/month for each Repository.

22. The Workshop expressed the appreciation to AQD for the proposal, noting its advantages in terms of reducing future costs for hosting the Repositories of the SEAFDEC Secretariat, TD and MFRDMD, and enabling the staff of AQD to easily provide the necessary support to the Repositories. Some concerns were however expressed, particularly on security and safety aspects, although it was assured by the AQD representative that back-ups would be kept at places different from where the Server is located, to minimize disasters, corruption or interruption of repositories. Nonetheless, he added that this also comes with additional expenditures on the part of these three Departments, *e.g.* one-time payment of 1,000 USD.

23. After the discussion, the representative from AQD was requested to recalculate the overall cost to include the cost of the additional back-up equipment; and circulate the revised proposal to the SEAFDEC Secretariat, which in turn would subsequently share the information with TD and MFRDMD for eventual consultation with their respective Department Chiefs. This matter and the results from the consultations with the respective Chiefs would be discussed again at the 21<sup>st</sup> ISP Meeting, and the report would be submitted to the DCM in 2020 for consideration. In addition and for security reasons, the Workshop discussed and agreed that back-ups of the Repositories should be made by respective Departments and kept in each Department, while electronic files of all publications should also be kept aside from those in the Repositories, *e.g.* in hard disk or uploaded in the cloud.



## VIII. ENHANCING THE USE OF SOCIAL MEDIA FOR SEAFDEC VISIBILITY

24. The resource person from AQD, *Mr. Rex Delsar Dianala*, introduced the role of social media in information communication, focusing on official Facebook accounts as these are the most popular media with largest numbers of users (**Annex 8**). He also emphasized the importance of creating effective contents of the social media posts to attract more viewers and communicate the information successfully with the target audience, especially the fisheries stakeholders. During the practical session, the SEAFDEC information staff also created social media calendars of their respective Departments, which would serve as planning tool for scheduling their social media posts.

25. Furthermore, in order to have harmonized Facebook Page among the Departments, the Workshop also agreed on the following:

- Facebook type: to be “Facebook Page” and not personal account
- Category: to be “Non-profit organization” with other relevant categories to be added by the respective Departments
- Name for SEAFDEC Secretariat: to be “SEAFDEC - Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center”
- Name for Departments: to be “SEAFDEC/[Department full name]”, e.g. SEAFDEC/Training Department
- Profile picture: should be SEAFDEC logo with similar color (based on the SEAFDEC Standard for Official Documents and Stationeries). The SEAFDEC Secretariat would share the said logo to all Departments.

## IX. CYBER AND DATA SECURITY

26. The resource person from the Asian Institute of Technology (AIT), *Ms. Tina Marie Rodvong* who has experience in social media and marketing as well as in promoting the visibility of organizations, presented the various aspects of Social Media Visibility and Security. She also provided information on social media rules of engagement and awareness of cyber security.

27. With regard to the security of websites and repositories, the SEAFDEC Secretariat and Departments provided updates on the current status of data security measures that are being adopted by each Department, e.g. renewal of SSL Certificate, registration or renewal of domain name of SEAFDEC websites, installing Firewall, among others. To maintain the security of the websites and Repositories, it was agreed that all Departments should apply SSL Certificates when renewing the contract for websites, but in the meantime, could use the LetsEncrypt certificate authority which is for free.

## X. CONCLUSION AND WAY FORWARD

28. The Workshop adopted the Report of the Inter-Departmental Information Workshop, including the conclusion and recommendations as shown in the Report.

## XI. CLOSING OF THE WORKSHOP

29. The SEAFDEC Secretary-General, *Ms. Malinee Smithrithee* congratulated the Workshop participants for coming up with general agreements and the ways forward on several issues such as the SEAFDEC Repositories, SEAFDEC websites and their monitoring, as well as other issues that pave the way toward sustaining the coordinated works among the SEAFDEC Secretariat and Departments, for enhancing the SEAFDEC visibility in the future. She also expressed the appreciation to all Departments, and especially the resource persons from AQD for their contribution, and declared the Workshop closed.