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1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Membership Issues: IFIP has by end of 2012 45 Full members. Ethiopia, Malaysia and Russia had open dues since two or more years and consequently their membership has been terminated according IFIP’ Statutes and Bylaws.

Finances: The Treasurer budgeted for a loss for 2012 of € 102,168, almost all being operating losses. The financial reports showed an operating deficit of € 210,321. The final position was better than budget due to a very positive portfolio performance. The overall 2012 actual result was a loss of € 23,138. The Board endorsed the 2012 accounts for approval by General Assembly 2012.

Cloud Computing and Big Data Taskforce: The proposal of implementing a taskforce on Cloud Computing and Big Data has been presented. The Board agreed that a small group will work on a proposal for implementation for General Assembly.

Congresses and Major Events: The Board decided that a World Computer Congress will take place in 2015 (maybe postponed to 2016). The Board agreed that EC will work on conditions and draft a formal agreement till May 2013. The proposed country is invited to develop the theme into a concrete plan and to present a final proposal at General Assembly 2013. The Board agreed to accept the offer from the Chinese Institute of Electronics (CIE) to hold WCF 2014 in China. Candidate cities might be Beijing or Xian, but others might also be proposed by CIE. The Board accepted that there are no concrete plans for the next WITFOR event at this point.

Digital Library: The appointed task group will draft a document for the requirements for the Digital Library for discussion by the Board.

Technical Assembly: The TA will come up with a proposal for risk sharing in events based on the document created by Mr Eschermann at next General Assembly.

IFIP Strategy: The Board accepted the proposal keeping the projects, doing some fine tuning and installing a mechanism to market the projects. It has been decided to reduce the time horizon of the plan to three years in order to have milestones that are not too far in the future. Another argument was that a three year plan would match with the term of the president and that would allow each president to set goals that can be achieved during their own chairmanship. Each president-elect could then work on the next three-year plan to start at the start of their presidency.

Statutes and Bylaws: The Board asked the members to submit suggestions for improvements to the S&B Committee preferably before May 1, to give the S&B Committee time to work on it.
## 2 ACTION LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Person / Body</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finance:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To draft a document regarding automatic compensation of inflation for membership fees to be presented to GA 2013</td>
<td>Finance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cloud Computing and Big Data</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To draft a proposal for creation of a task force to be brought forward to GA 2013</td>
<td>Mr Lin &amp; group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Membership Task Force</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To collect data from Member Societies about Member categories, number of members in each category and membership fee per category</td>
<td>Mr Strous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statutes &amp; Bylaws</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To work on the postponed articles, like “electronic voting”</td>
<td>Mr Strous, Mr Bramer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IFIP’s Strategy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o to prepare and circulate within the Board of a document of the Five-Years-Plan</td>
<td>Mr Strous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>World Computer Congress</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To work on conditions and to draft a formal agreement till May 2013</td>
<td>EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To present a final proposal for 2015 (or 2016) at General Assembly 2013</td>
<td>Host country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>World CIO Forum</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To work on conditions and to draft a formal agreement till May 2013</td>
<td>EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To present a final proposal for 2014 at General Assembly 2013</td>
<td>Host country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical Assembly:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To prepare final proposal for a Risk Sharing Model for events for General Assembly 2013</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To prepare a proposal for including Emeritus Members in TCs</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To prepare a finance model for co-sponsored events</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Digital Library:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To check the original objectives in order to assess whether they are still relevant and whether they are reachable within one year</td>
<td>Management Review Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To check whether whatever is realistic achievable still has a sufficient value proposition</td>
<td>Management Review Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Publications Committee:**

- To start discussions with Springer about improvements in an optional new contract  
  
  Mr Turner

- To visit Spain and discuss the implementation of the Spanish proposal for an IFIP journal  
  
  Mr Strous

### 3 ATTENDANCE LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L Strous</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Hinchey</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Turner</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Puigjaner</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Avram</td>
<td>Honorary Treasurer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Raffai</td>
<td>Honorary Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Lin</td>
<td>Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Rannenberg</td>
<td>Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Wong</td>
<td>Councillor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observers**

- Zhang Yimin  
  CIE, China
- V de Pous  
  Legal Councillor

**Secretariat**

- E Dundler  
  General Secretary

**Apologies**

- M Bramer  
  Councillor
- G Engel  
  Vice President
- M Goedicke  
  Councillor
- I Grebennik  
  Councillor
- J Pries-Heje  
  Councillor
- A Min Tjoa  
  Secretary Elect
- J Wibe  
  Councillor
4 BOARD MEETING

4.1 Call Meeting to Order
Mr Strous opened the Board meeting and welcomed all participants. He expressed IFIP’s grateful thanks to the Chinese Institute of Electronics (CIE) and Mr Lin, its Deputy Secretary General, for the invitation to Shanghai and the generous hospitality arrangements. Mr Strous thanked the organizers of the meeting for their work. Mr Strous welcomed Mr de Pous, IFIP’s legal councillor as observer.

4.2 Attendance and Apologies
The Secretary Ms Raffai announced the Board attendance and apologies received (please refer to the attendance list). There are no proxies for a Board meeting but with the present attendance the IFIP Board meeting has a quorum to take decisions.

4.3 Business Matters
4.3.1 Approval of Agenda
Board unanimously APPROVED the agenda.

4.3.2 President’s Report
Mr Strous drew attention to his report and said that he wanted to concentrate on topics which are not covered in more detail by various agenda items.

Mr Strous said that in the past months he had a number of direct personal contacts with some societies and discussed the links between the respective societies and IFIP. The very useful and productive direct contacts have triggered him to put direct contact with member societies higher on the agenda.

Mr Strous said that since last GA and the WCC a lot has happened. During WCC a meeting took place with presidents and representatives of member societies. The purpose of this meeting was to have an informal discussion about issues of concern to the societies and also about the relationship between member societies and IFIP. Some 15 societies were present and, thanks to the WCC, quite a few represented by presidents or vice-presidents. Valuable ideas were suggested about the role IFIP could play as a platform for “meeting” each other to exchange experiences and learn from each other. These ideas will be taken up and implemented. The meeting was very encouraging and worthwhile continuing.

Mr Strous reported that IFIP was happy with the feedback about the content and approach of WCC 2012; but IFIP was not so happy about the finances. This is an issue which has definitely to be discussed at Board and GA meetings. Almost all presentations of WCC 2012 have been made available on the conference website.

Mr Strous reported that he has joined Brenda Aynsley and Roger Johnson to support them in a meeting regarding IP3 with the European Commission. The meeting was very promising for future contacts; the European Commission is starting to pay a lot of attention to skills and professionalism and acknowledges that this goes beyond Europe.

Mr Strous informed the Board that he had a meeting with Elsevier. IFIP’s main publisher is Springer but Elsevier is publishing a few journals for IFIP. He discussed the position and progress of them. Mr Strous was pleased to learn that the International Journal for Infrastructure Protection (IJCIP) is indexed by mid 2013.
4.3.3 Secretary’s Report

Ms Raffai reported that in December 2012 in a meeting together with Mr Strous, Mr Tjoa and Mr Dundler the tasks, duties and responsibilities of the honorary secretary were discussed. Ms Raffai and the honorary secretary elect, Mr Tjoa agreed that during the one-year period they will closely cooperate to ensure a smooth transition in September.

Ms Raffai informed the Board that the General Secretary Mr Dundler took part at the CIO Congress’2012 organized on 18-19th of November 2012 in Loipersdorf, Austria. He expressed his impressions in a report emphasizing that such kind of events sponsored by the IT industry has growing interest every year therefore it is worth to organize and even support such events in order to mediate message to the clients of IT sector.

Ms Raffai reported that beginning of November 2012 Mr Avram and Mr Dundler had a face-to-face meeting with UBS in order to discuss the plans of UBS after their announcement to close their investment banking operation. UBS showed that their plans for Wealth Management are completely in line with the agreed expectations.

Ms Raffai reported that at the end of 2012 IFIP had
- 45 Full Members with voting rights. Malaysia, Ethiopia and Russia had open dues for two or more years and their membership has been terminated according IFIP’ Statutes & Bylaws
- 4 Associate Members
- 10 Honorary Members

Ms Raffai informed the Board that the Secretariat continues to run smoothly and on behalf of the IFIP officers she took the opportunity to express IFIP’s thanks to the colleagues at Secretariat for their work having done for IFIP.

4.3.4 EC Meeting Report

Ms Raffai reported that the IFIP Executive Committee had 3 meetings between General Assembly 2012 and Board meeting 2013. The members of EC discussed all the issues raised at the GA by National Representatives and TC chairs, and made efforts to solve them together with the problems and tasks that had come up in the meantime.

The agenda of the EC meeting held immediately after the GA was generated by the comments, proposals and the tasks that have been dedicated to EC at GA meeting. All matters are covered elsewhere in the agenda.

The second EC meeting (Nov 13th, 2012) was held as a teleconference. The progress on the assigned tasks in relation to the matters covered in this Board meeting was discussed. Besides tasks and decisions related to the plans for the IFIP flagship events also the membership of members with their fee in arrears were discussed.

In the third EC meeting (Jan 17th, 2013) which was also held as a teleconference, the Executive Committee has unanimously accepted, with reference to an earlier agreement on loans and a guarantee, to cover 50 % of the loss of WCC 2012 following a letter from the chair of the organizing body of WCC 2012, the IT Knowledge Development Foundation.
4.3.5 Treasurer’s Report

Mr Avram referred to his report and said that IFIP’s 2012 accounts, maintained by the secretariat, have been reviewed by the auditor in February 2013.

Mr Avram reported that in 2012, IFIP budgeted for a loss of €102,168, almost all being operating losses. The financial reports show an operating deficit of €210,321. The final position was better than budget due to a very positive portfolio performance. The overall 2012 actual result was a loss of €23,138 Euro.

Mr Avram reported that IFIP’s portfolio served the purpose intended, as a reserve for backing risky projects like the large conferences in 2012. The IFIP portfolio has continued, its recovery of recent years; the long run rate of return through 2012 has been about 2% p.a. IFIP budgeted for a return of about 3% in the 2013 budget based on performance to the end of June 2012.

Mr Avram proposed to continue to monitor the long run portfolio performance, and budget a return in line with that long run return. He will also review, during 2013, the performance of UBS as portfolio manager. Mr Avram said that IFIP’s portfolio is being managed as agreed by UBS. The portfolio is balanced, there is exposure to emerging markets, but not very much, it is invested in exchange traded funds, most independent of UBS, and the costs of management are in line with the quoted expectation. The portfolio has performed as expected as the markets have picked up and IFIP can expect to have better performance in 2013. The one issue of concern is the proportion of UBS in-house ETFs being used; this issue is being actively monitored by the treasurer.

Mr Avram said that IFIP Secretariat has sent financial reports on a regular basis to IFIP’s business units.

Mr Avram concluded that IFIP’s financial performance was much worse than in 2012 than 2011. These losses were mainly in the large conferences and the associated income.
guarantees. This is not expected to impact 2013. IFIP have had a renewed and upward trend in its portfolio investments.

Mr Avram said that at General Assembly 2012, he estimated a budget year 2012 would have a loss of about 102,000 the loss was less due to portfolio performance; but not as good as it might have been without the extraordinary conference losses.

Mr Avram said that IFIP has a structural financial problem; the income is not enough to cover IFIP’s costs without help from the portfolio. Ideal would be a growth of the portfolio above inflation. This did not happen in 2012.

Mr Avram re-stated the treasurer’s comments from years past: IFIP needs to find new business opportunities. IFIP needs to review its policy on guarantees to conferences. The portfolio is being carefully watched. A statement about the ongoing portfolio mandate and the performance of UBS as portfolio manager has been delivered to the board in 2013.

Mr Strous added that writing off some dues from previous years caused a drop of income in 2012.

4.3.6 Finance Committee Report
Mr Puigjaner reported on behalf of the Finance Committee and said that the financial reports distributed by the General Secretary gave a good overview of the financial situation of IFIP.

The Finance Committee recommended that EC have a look into the necessity to write-off membership fees of Ethiopia, Malaysia, Russia and Sweden.

The Finance Committee regretted that WCC 2012 and WITFOR 2012 have made a substantial loss. FC recommended that EC have a critical look into the future of these big events to avoid such losses.

Mr Puigjaner said that in previous years FC has asked EC and TA for finding new ways of income. FC wanted to repeats its recommendation to EC and TA to find new streams for income.

The Finance Committee asked the Treasurer to deliver his report in sufficient time ahead of the GA/Board meetings in order to finish its own report 10 days ahead of the GA/Board meeting.

Mr Wong commented that Malaysia has expressed its intention to re-apply as IFIP member.
Mr Strous informed the Board that Sweden has paid its membership fee for 2013 and will stay as FULL Member:

The Board unanimously ENDORSED the 2012 accounts for approval by General Assembly 2013.

4.3.7 Action items from previous meetings
Mr Strous went through the action items from previous Board / General Assembly meetings.
➢ Minutes from the Board 2012 meeting:
  o Review of performance of UBS portfolio manager – done
Split income both from events and from publications in order to create a basis for analysing TC income – done

To draft a document regarding automatic compensation of inflation for membership fees to be presented to GA 2012 – will be presented to GA 2013

To collect data from Member Societies about Member categories, number of members in each category and membership fee per category - insufficient input from the Member Societies; this will be discussed later at this Board meeting

To work on the postponed articles, like “electronic voting” – S&B Committee is asked to come up with proposals at GA 2013

To control the working of the new Event Approval – finished. All event approval requests are handled over this system

To prepare a status report of the Strategic objectives – will be discussed later at this Board meeting

IP3: To prepare a detailed business plan – will be shown and discussed later at this Board meeting

Digital Library: To define a group for management review of the Digital Library; to check the original objectives in order to assess whether they are still relevant and whether they are reachable within one year – this item will be discussed later at this Board meeting

Minutes from the General Assembly 2012:

Future of IFIP’s flagship events - this item will be discussed later at this Board meeting

Put Author and Referee Codes of Conduct on IFIP’s website in order to encourage conference organizers / authors to review and send comments and suggestions to PC / EC. – done

Investigation of involvement of AICT Editorial Board in quality monitoring – will be discussed later at this Board meeting

Proposal for Emeritus Members – TA will come up at GA 2013

Proposal for TC Chair Elect and Immediate Past TC Chair – TA will come up at GA 2013

To distribute GI Memorandum regarding membership – will be taken as basis for membership structure discussion later at this Board meeting

4.4 Proposal Cloud Computing and Big Data Taskforce

Mr Lin the Deputy Secretary General of Chinese Institute of Electronics (CIE) presented a proposal for implementation of a taskforce for Cloud Computing and Big Data. He showed that there exists a big and growing interest on the market for these topics. Mr Lin said that the technical problem is to be solved by joint efforts of academic and industry, such as large-scale distributed computing, virtualization, security and privacy service regulation and legal framework. In order to underline the importance of this area Mr Lin presented a list of Big Data Security and privacy challenges, like secure computations in distributed programming frameworks, security best practices for non-relational data store, secure data storage and transactions logs, end-point input validation/filtering, and others.

Mr Lin proposed the next steps, as to

- set up the taskforce approved by IFIP, and elect an international expert as the leader for this taskforce.
- establish the secretary office of the Taskforce based in the Chinese Institute of Electronics.
- connect with the country members and recommend the right representative.
- organize the first GA of Cloud Computing and Big Data Taskforce.
plan to launch the first IFIP World Cloud Computing Congress in 2014(2015), and 
manage to make WCCC(WC3) a flagship event of IFIP.

The Board had the opinion that this topic is spread over some existing TCs and was 
not convinced that a new Technical Committee or Special Interest Group is the best 
model.

The Board agreed that a few persons will work together with Mr Lin on a proposal 
which will be circulated to Technical Assembly and brought forward to General 
Assembly 2013. Mr de Pous, Mr Hinchey and Mr Rannenberg offered their 
willingsness to work on this proposal. The concept of Domain Committee will be 
included in the considerations.

4.5 IFIP Strategy – Next five years plan
Mr Strous presented the enhancements on the IFIP strategy paper as a basis for 
discussion later in this Board meeting.

4.6 Congresses and Major Events
Mr Strous started the discussion regarding IFIP’s flagship events by defining the 
basic questions for each of the events:
- what does IFIP want to achieve with the event
- who does IFIP want to attract with the event
- how is IFIP going to do that
- by which group(s) of IFIP
- with whom as partners (if any)

4.6.1 World Computer Congress (WCC)
Mr Strous said that the initial reaction after WCC 2012 was never to have a WCC 
again. But, during and after General Assembly 2012 there was still support for a 
WCC and concrete interest from two member societies came up. Mr Strous said that 
if IFIP chooses the right approach and set the right conditions, a WCC can be an 
activity that is a major conference in IFIP’s field, engages IFIP in the distribution of 
major results of its scientists, uses novel publication means, results in advice for 
politics / societal institutions and raises IFIP’s profile and impact. The approach for a 
WCC has to go for one theme that has an impact on society and covers the research 
part, the application part, the policy part and build a bridge between these parts.

The Board discussed all pros and cons and came to the following result:
- IFIP has to be careful with assigning topics to a conference
- IFIP cannot afford running conferences on its own risk; the host country has to 
  control it financially;
- IFIP has to receive part of the event fee before handing over the licence.
- There will be WCC in 2015 (maybe postponed to 2016)
- Proposed theme for the next WCC: Smart Cities
- Proposed host country for the next WCC: South Korea

The Board agreed on the next steps:
The EC will work on the conditions and to draft a formal agreement till May 2013. The 
proposed host country is invited to develop the theme into a concrete plan, based on 
conditions and agreement, and present a final proposal at General Assembly 2013.
4.6.2 World CIO Forum (WCF)
Mr Lin expressed the strong interest of China to hold the next WCF in China in 2014.

The Board agreed to accept the offer from the Chinese Institute of Electronics (CIE) to hold WCF 2014 in China. Candidate cities might be Beijing or Xian, but others might also be proposed by CIE.

The EC will work on the conditions and to draft a formal agreement till May 2013. Invite host country, based on conditions and agreement, to develop the theme into a concrete plan and present a final proposal at General Assembly 2013.

4.6.3 World Information Technology Forum (WITFOR)
Mr Strous reported that there was no progress in the work on the issues discussed at last General Assembly 2012. The issues will be taken up by him with the people involved in previous WITFORs, although there are difficulties to find someone to take the lead and motivate the others.

The Board accepted that there are no concrete plans for the next WITFOR event at this point in time.

4.7 Publications
4.7.1 Digital Library
Mr Turner reported that ACS has completed loading the 2008 author papers into the Digital Library. This can now serve as a prototype for links to published papers in SpringerLink and to the author submissions in the DL (open access). The ACS is no longer providing any DL services except to host the existing version.

Mr Turner informed the Board that a task group chaired by PC Chair Mr Turner with members Mr Leduc (Belgium) and Mr Rauber (Austria) has been appointed to make recommendations relative to possibilities for a new DL provider. This DL task group will begin by developing a requirements document for the DL. A draft of this document may be available for discussion by the Board. Comments will be invited by the PC and the TA, after which a final document will be developed.

The task group will then develop a list of possible DL providers with financial implications. If any action is needed by GA then the intention is to have a decision made during GA 2013.

4.7.2 Publications Committee (PC)
Mr Turner presented the report of the Publications Committee. He reported that the author and referee codes of professional conduct have been approved by GA 2012 and have been put on the IFIP website along with the procedures for distributing the codes to authors and referees.

Mr Turner informed the Board that the current agreement with Springer is effective through the end of 2014. If IFIP wishes to make any changes to the agreement and these are not mutually agreed by March 2014, then IFIP must give notice that it does not wish to renew the existing agreement by the end of March 2014. Discussions are underway with Springer to arrange one or more meetings to discuss ways to improve IFIP’s publications as well as possible modifications to the publications agreement. The intent is that there will be a meeting within the next six months, with additional
meetings as needed, and any issues relative to modifications in the publications agreement will be decided prior to March 2014.

Mr Turner reported that following discussions during various meetings associated with GA 2012, two members of the PC drafted a proposal to help improve the quality of IFIP publications and to provide a mechanism for the investigation of questions of failure to follow established procedures by editors and referees. This document is under discussion by the PC, and has been discussed by TA. TA has recommended adoption of the exceptional procedure but wishes to have further discussion of the regular procedure during the TA face-to-face meeting in September this year.

The upcoming discussions with Springer will include ways that AICT editors can become more involved in oversight of AICT volumes. The possibility of involvement also in IFIP LNCS will also be explored. Efforts will continue to find effective mechanisms for providing quality assurance without overburdening AICT editors or adopting procedures that delay the timely publications of proceedings.

Mr Puigjaner presented an offer from the Spanish Computer Society (ATI) regarding an electronic journal for IFIP. ATI offered IFIP the knowhow of publishing a journal in two versions (Spanish and English) as ATI did for CEPIS. The agreement with CEPIS has been stopped but the infrastructure and the experience still exists and can be profitable for IFIP. Some open issues, as who appoints the editorial board, who has the copyright of the papers and how to share the costs have to be discussed.

Mr Strous commented that this would be a starting point for discussion whether IFIP should have a journal in order to be more visible in the Information Technology world.

The Board decided that EC should find somebody who will visit Spain and have a discussion on this topic.

4.8 Technical Assembly

Mr Hinchey presented the report from Technical Assembly.

- AICT QA Process

Mr Hinchey reported that TA considered the issues of quality assurance of the AICT book series and in particular the draft proposals that were produced by a task force of the TA and the Publications Committee. He said that there has been concern by some AICT editorial board members that their names were being used on publications where they had no editorial control over the selection of volumes nor the quality of those volumes. However, some concern was expressed over the amount of work that would go into implementing the proposed QA process. Mr Rannenberg pointed out that the level of effort required by editorial board members is not that great and there are only in exceptional cases that intervention is required. For these exceptional cases there needs to be a process, but for 99% of the cases there may be no need for intervention. A process for exceptional cases is needed, but a process for regular situations also needs to be put in place.

TA agreed that the QA process should be incorporated in some way into the next Springer contract. It is understood that Springer is interested in having such procedures in principle. Their problem is that there is no written procedure as of yet.
TA would like to propose to the Publications Committee to have 2 or more members per TC on the Editorial Board so that the workload does not become too heavy.

TA agreed to accept the procedure for exceptional cases as provided for now but would like to consider the regular procedures at the Technical Assembly in September.

- Publications Contract with Springer

Mr Hinchey said that TA would like to have the QA process for the AICT book series for exceptional cases incorporated into a future Springer contract. If such an alteration means negotiating a new contract, TA would recommend putting Springer on notice, even if the intention is to stay with Springer as the publisher.

- Conference Models

Mr Hinchey informed the Board that Mr Eschermann circulated proposals in 2011 regarding conference models but has received no feedback. His proposals addressed:

- Issues of participating in risk sharing model, like clear definition of responsibility for risk management, division of responsibility and limitation of risk.
- People can use IFIP logo for amount of time without a fee. Only benefit to IFIP is visibility. IFIP might consider similar policy to IEEE (2 years in cooperation and no more).
- Benefit to member societies.
- Insurance, in particular with co-sponsorship with IEEE and especially for events in the US. Secretariat has not been able to come up with solution to insurance for events outside Europe. The General Secretary will come up with a proposal.

To date, IFIP has not been able to sign the standard IEEE MoU because the rules forbade taking risk. There are many good events that cannot be supported since they do not have the financial reserves to take this risk.

Mr Eschermann suggested the following rules regarding risk:

- The maximum potential financial risk of the individual conference is less than x% (e.g. 25%) of the corresponding IFIP TC funds.
- IFIP's share of the budgeted surplus of the conference would give at least as much IFIP income as the current IFIP fee (calculated per person per day)
- The sum of all financial risks for conferences taken by the TC is less than y% (e.g. 75%) of the TC funds.
- All financial information provided to IEEE and/or ACM is provided to IFIP as well.
- If the conference is an established series, it has a "sufficiently" good financial track record (WG/TC chair should have the decision about what "sufficiently" means for a particular conference).
- Signing of such MoUs can only be done by IFIP headquarters (i.e., not by some WG member) based on providing evidence for all of the above and the approval by WG and TC chair.
TA agreed that these were reasonable rules that would not put any TC or TC Chair at a less advantageous position than currently. TA agreed to accept these rules, with the values of X and Y to be set.

TA will come up with a final proposal, including the values X and Y, at General Assembly 2013.

- Emeritus Members, Chair Elect and Past Chairs
  Mr Hinchey informed the Board that the possibility of a formal role for emeritus members and for Chair Elect and Past Chairs was considered again. As agreed previously, TA will bring a proposal for such roles to the GA in September. The TA Chair will generate an additional draft of such a proposal to be discussed by TA by email.

- Replacement of member society representatives
  Mr Hinchey reported that TA noted the problem of non-responsive and non-engaged member society representatives. It was proposed that following a period of non-participation, the member society should be asked to provide a replacement representative. If there is no response within a given period of time, TA proposes to remove that member society’s representative (and inform the member society) until such time as a nomination is received.

- Digital Library
  Mr Hinchey reported that the issue of the Digital Library was discussed again, repeating many of the concerns from prior TA meetings and with the TC Chairs emphasizing their support for the library. Given that ACS does not seem interested to continue hosting the Digital Library, possible partners for IFIP to negotiate with were mentioned. TA would like to ask the Publications Committee to join for a joint videoconference on the topic of the Digital Library.

4.9 International Young IT Professionals initiative
No report received. The President will follow up this issue.

4.10 Professionalism Program (IP3)
Ms Aynsley has been connected to the Board meeting via SKYPE. She presented the IP3 report and said that IP3’s business plan has been endorsed by the IP3 Board however the budget will not be approved until IP3 Board meeting on 6 March 2013. Ms Aynsley apologized for the tardiness of supplying these documents to both the IFIP Board and the IFIP Rep Mr Wong. IP3 once again plan to run an investment budget similar to last year to continue to invest its reserves in recruitment and reputation building for the benefit of IFIP and IP3 members. IP3 intends to continue this model for the foreseeable future. As discussed at the General Assembly in Amsterdam, the aim has been to attempt to budget to achieve a €5000 deficit. As the Chairman of IFIP IP3 Ms Aynley continues to have the support of her Society, the Australian Computer Society which has committed funding to advancing the IP3 mission through providing administrative support and contributing funding to allow her to travel as necessary to serve in her role as Chairman, as she should. Ms Aynsley was very grateful for the support of IP3 members in terms of both personal
time from individuals and in the case of ACS, the additional financial support they offer to advancing the mission of IP3.

**Ms Aynsley** reported that a summary of IP3’s achievements was prepared and presented to the General Assembly in Amsterdam last year and the situation continues in the same vein into this year as the Business Plan shows. IP3 is continuing to market quite aggressively through participation in a number of activities aimed at increasing awareness within the ICT eco-system of professional societies, civil society, industry and regional associations. IP3 spent time working through its GIC contacts to start dialogues with industry to increase awareness of the ICT professionalism message in the belief that IP3 needs to build a critical mass in order to achieve success in building the professionalism partnership.

**Ms Aynsley** said that they belief that the past 12 months has been a watershed year and they think IP3’s interactions with prospective members in Malaysia, The Netherlands, Poland, Egypt and with industry groups including The Open Group, the Institute for Certification of Computing Professionals, and SEARCC are progressing. IP3 is working on finalizing an MOU with SEARCC and expect that to be in place by mid-year. IP3’s Global Industry Council continues to grow its influential membership which offers advice and support to the IP3 Board through its Chairman Stephen Ibaraki. IP3 Board members continue to commit huge amounts of time in advancing the IP3 Partnership and the importance and value of their contribution is noted.

**Ms Aynsley** informed the Board that this month she has travelled to Europe to meet with potential members, the European Commission through Andre Richier and involving CIONet through Frits Bussemaker. Roger Johnson has accompanied her on this journey to good effect. Similarly this week she and Stephen Ibaraki participated at the UNESCO/WSIS+10 Forum in Paris conducting a session on ICT Professionalism.

**Ms Aynsley** reported that just this week following IP3’s presentation on professionalism at UNESCO/WSIS+10 in Paris Stephen Ibaraki and she spoke with Professor Colin de la Higuera from SPECIF which is the French Society for Education and Research in Computer Science. SPECIF promotes Education in informatics in Universities, Research in informatics in the academic world, and the specificities of academic jobs in informatique. Professor de la Higuera is considering having SPECIF join IFIP and IP3 at the invitation of the current IFIP member Société de l’Electricité, de l’Electronique et des Techn. de l’Information et de la Communication – SEE, according to him. His hesitation in taking this move is in evaluating the value proposition of membership in what is seen as a fairly moribund, lacklustre society comprised of long serving members. He seemed somewhat heartened by the existence of the IP3 project as evidence of some enthusiasm and energy and he claims to actively support its professionalism message. Also as a result of this participation IP3 has been invited to submit a paper promoting professionalism as an area of interest to UNESCO within the WSIS framework particularly addressing ethics. Work has already begun on this. The IP3 Board members are considering for 2013-14 the ways in which IP3 can add value to the IFIP membership and to the ICT eco-system. IP3 is currently exploring deepening relationships with employers through some form of process that will make it easy for accrediting IP3 members in their own certification programs to leverage this service. IP3 is actively seeking a relationship with the European Commission in its Grand Coalition itself involving industry in addressing e-skills shortages and collaborating in a project to identify best practice instances and examples which is creating value in the IP3 partnership within the EC.
Ms Aynsley summarized that it has been a year of building and 2013 will continue this process. She believes IP3 will have new accrediting and supporting members at the end of this year, that IP3 will have increased its visibility and vibrancy through the planned program of activity and engagement.

Mr Strous thanked Ms Aynsley for her effort to market IP3. He said that comments and questions regarding IP3’s business plan will be collected and sent to her.

4.11 Committee Reports

4.11.1 Activity Management Board (AMB)

Mr Dundler reported that the total number of events held in 2012 has increased; but this was achieved by an increase of the cosponsored events, while the IFIP main events stayed on the same level. All planned events and also all relevant data for performed events are stored in the new web-based approval system, and consequently in all IFIP’s event databases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Events</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nbr events (main)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nbr events (co-sponsored)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Event fee received in bookkeeping: 57.079 55.608 71.009 61.944 85.029

Although the intention was to keep the income in the year the event took place, the statistics show an overlap of the income to the following years.

Mr Dundler reported that AMB noted that the new event management system shows very clear that many of IFIP’s events generate no income at all (“co-sponsored events”). A small number of TCs / WGs are generating most of the event income. At least that shows where effort needs to be put into income generation.

As there is no income from most of the co-sponsored events, TA is asked to come up with a finance model for events with inclusion of the co-sponsored events (where work of IFIP volunteers is also included).

4.11.2 Developing Countries Support Committee (DCSC)

Mr Puigjaner reported that the committee has changed some members and is composed now by Mr Westrup (Chair of WG 9.4), Mr Shaikh (Chair of WG 9.6), Ms Marin (President of CLEI), Mr Agrawal (GA representative of India), Mr Gudza (GA representative of Zimbabwe) and himself as Chair of the DCSC.

Mr Puigjaner reported that since GA 2012 the following activities were supported:

LANC 2012: 1.500 Euro for student travel grants.
TC8 Summer School in Thailand: funded with 1.000 Euros to help the travel (not the stay) of a tutorialist to the Summer School.

World Congress on Computers in Education (WCCE 2013): This activity has been funded with 1.500 Euros to help the travels (not stays) of PhD students with an accepted paper for presentation.

IFIP 9.4 Conference 'Into the Future: This activity is funded with 2.000 Euros to help the travels (not stays) of PhD students with an accepted paper for presentation, as it is one of the two WG specifically devoted to developing countries.

Privacy and Identity Management for Emerging Services and Technologies (IFIP Summer School 2013): This activity has been funded with 1.000 Euros to help the travels (not stays) of PhD students with an accepted paper for presentation.

IFIP TC6 Latin American Tutorials In Networking (LATIN 2013): This activity has been funded with 2.000 Euros to help the travels (not stays) of the tutorialists, as it is one of the two WG specifically devoted to developing countries.

4.11.3 International Liaison Committee (ILC)

Mr Strous informed the Board that he had agreed with Mr Tjoa to move the Chair from Mr Tjoa to Mr Strous, because of the election of Mr Tjoa as Honorary Secretary. The composition of the Committee remains as it was: Mr Cornu, Mr Dundler, Mr Morel, Mr Puigjaner, Mr von Solms, Mr Strous, Mr Tjoa.

Mr Strous reported that UNESCO has participated in WCC 2012 by taking care of a session on open access. The session was successful and the cooperation with UNESCO on this topic will be continued.

Mr Strous reported also from the continued involvement of IFIP in UNESCO and ITU events. In the week of the Board meeting, TC-3 and IP3 are involved in a major event of UNESCO in Paris, Towards Knowledge Societies – For Peace and Sustainable Development, First WSIS+10 review meeting. In May TC-3 and IP3 will participate again in the annual WSIS Forum at ITU in Geneva.

Mr Strous informed the Board that IFIP has nominated a candidate for the Science Committee of the Future Earth Project of ICSU. Selection will take place in April.

Mr Strous reported that ILC will start working on upgrading IFIP’s UNESCO relation from Consultative to Associate status. In addition ILC will list actual and possible international relationships and prioritize them.

4.11.4 Internal Awards Committee (IAC)

Mr Strous informed the Board that the Internal Awards Committee will publish a call for nominations to all relevant parties within IFIP in May 2013. This year IAC will call for Outstanding Service Award (OSA) nominations as well the Silver Core Award nominations.

4.12 Membership

4.12.1 Admissions Committee (AC)

Mr Strous informed the Board that no report from the Admissions Committee has been received.
4.12.2 Membership Structure

Mr Strous informed the Board that following the discussion at GA in Amsterdam and the input received from some member societies, such as the note from GI, a final note will be presented in time for GA 2013 with the aim of concluding the topic.

4.12.3 Membership fee issues

The Board asked the Finance Committee to draft a proposal for an automatic adjustment of the membership fees to the inflation and to present it at next General Assembly 2013.

4.13 Statutes & Bylaws, Standing Orders

Mr Strous said that the idea is not to have a lengthy discussion under this agenda item but to have a brief listing of topics/articles that need to be looked at by the S&B Committee in time for proposals for GA 2013. Besides an overall consistency check, the following is a first list of topics:
- create the possibility to conduct electronic voting in order to be more flexible and quick;
- eliminate the possibility to nominate candidates for officer positions from the floor;
- in respect to the next five year strategy: evaluate whether or not to transform Statutes article 3 Objectives into a Mission statement;
- look at article 4.1.1 of the Statutes concerning the part about more than one member from the US (issue already raised by some honorary members);
- article 4.3 (what does it add to mention (only) for Associate Members that they are observer);
- should proxies for Board meetings be possible?

Mr Strous said that these and additional suggestions should be submitted to the S&B Committee within the next weeks after the Board meeting, preferably before May 1, to give the S&B Committee time to work on it.

4.14 IFIP Strategy – Next five years plan

Mr Strous presented the existing five years strategy plan and proposed some changes as basis for discussion and development of a new strategy plan. Mr Strous proposed to convert article 3 of the Statutes into a mission statement. Mr Strous said that IFIP’s strategic aims are to be accomplished by its’ lines of activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IFIP lines of activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical / scientific oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(aim 1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The strategic aims will be translated into activities by providing answers to the questions:
- What do we want to achieve with each line of activities
• Who do we want to address / attract with each line of activities
• How are we going to do that
• With whom
• By which group(s) of IFIP

The revised document has been discussed at length in the Board and it has been agreed that to the different projects of the strategy members of the Board have to be identified and allocated. It has been accepted that the document will be the guide for the next years.

Mr Strous will enhance the document taking into account results from the discussion in the Board.

The discussion was interrupted due to time constraints and proceeded on the next day.

Mr Strous saw that some minor changes to the document to be necessary. It would be mandatory showing what IFIP does and translating IFIP’s knowledge to the needs of IFIP’s stakeholders in order to become more effective. He proposed to keep the projects, do some fine tuning and install a mechanism to market them.

Mr Rannenberg commented that the strategy should not necessarily follow the trend, but also should show positions to advance ICT related topics.

The Board agreed that it is essential to actively market the work of IFIP by utilization of press release, translating the knowledge into common understanding and a strong positioning in international newspapers.

Mr Strous proposed to reduce the time horizon of the plan to three years in order to have milestones that are not too far in the future. Another argument would be that a three year plan would match with the term of the president and that would allow each president to set goals that can be achieved during their own chairmanship. Each president-elect could then work on the next three-year plan to start at the start of their presidency.

The Board accepted the proposals from Mr Strous.

4.15 Next Meetings

The next meetings are:

2013
EC meeting (preGA) September 12th Poznan (Poland)
General Assembly September 13th – 14th Poznan (Poland)
EC meeting (postGA) September 14th Poznan (Poland)

2014
Board meeting at the beginning of March invitations are welcome
GA meeting September invitations are welcome

The Executive Committee holds teleconferences at least twice a year between GA-Board and Board-GA meetings, and special EC teleconferences will be organized if certain issues require immediate action(s).
4.16 AoB

The Board discussed the option to reduce the Board meeting and the related meetings to two days.

The Board decided to remain on the existing schedule of three days in order to have sufficient time for face-to-face discussion.

4.17 Closing of Meeting

Mr Strous once again conveyed to Mr Lin the representative of the Chinese Institute of Electronics (CIE) IFIP’s appreciation of the hospitality arrangements. He thanked all Board representatives for their contributions and declared the Board meeting closed.