Minutes of the General Assembly
September 13th – 14th, 2013, Poznan, Poland

1 ACTION LIST .................................................................................................................. 2
2 ATTENDANCE LIST........................................................................................................ 4
3 GENERAL ASSEMBLY MEETING............................................................................... 5
   3.1 CALL MEETING TO ORDER ..................................................................................... 5
   3.2 ATTENDANCE AND APOLOGIES ......................................................................... 5
   3.3 BUSINESS ISSUES .................................................................................................. 5
      3.3.1 Approval of Agenda .......................................................................................... 5
      3.3.2 Approval of Minutes GA 2011 ......................................................................... 6
      3.3.3 President’s Report ........................................................................................... 6
      3.3.4 Secretary’s Report ........................................................................................... 6
      3.3.5 EC Meetings Report ....................................................................................... 7
      3.3.6 Treasurer’s Report .......................................................................................... 7
      3.3.7 Finance Committee Report (FC) ...................................................................... 9
      3.3.8 Election of IFIP Officers and Councillors ........................................................ 9
   3.4 TECHNICAL ASSEMBLY (TA) .................................................................................. 11
   3.5 PROPOSALS FOR NEW ACTIVITIES / GROUPS .................................................. 12
      3.5.1 Proposal for establishing a Domain Committee on Cloud Computing ............ 12
      3.5.2 Proposal for establishing a Domain Committee on Big Data ............................ 13
      3.5.3 Innovation in ICT to foster “Save the Earth” .................................................... 13
   3.6 PUBLICATIONS ...................................................................................................... 14
      3.6.1 Publications Committee ................................................................................... 14
      3.6.2 Journal Proposal from ATI ............................................................................. 15
   3.7 PROFESSIONALISM PROGRAM .......................................................................... 15
   3.8 STATUTES & BYLAWS .......................................................................................... 17
      3.8.1 Proposal for e-voting ....................................................................................... 17
      3.8.2 Other S&B Issues ........................................................................................... 17
   3.9 MEMBERSHIP ........................................................................................................ 18
      3.9.1 Admissions Committee .................................................................................... 18
      3.9.2 Membership Structure .................................................................................... 18
      3.9.3 Membership Fee Structure ............................................................................ 19
      3.9.4 SEARCC ....................................................................................................... 20
   3.10 INTERIYT .............................................................................................................. 20
   3.11 STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS .................................................................... 21
      3.11.1 Activity Management Board (AMB) ............................................................... 21
      3.11.2 Developing Countries Support Committee (DCSC) ...................................... 21
      3.11.3 International Liaison Committee (ILC) ............................................................ 22
      3.11.4 Internal Awards Committee (IAC) .................................................................. 22
   3.12 CONGRESSES AND MAJOR EVENTS .................................................................. 23
      3.12.1 World CIO Forum (WCF) 2013 ................................................................... 23
      3.12.2 World Computer Congress (WCC) 2015 ...................................................... 23
      3.12.3 World IT Forum (WITFOR) ........................................................................ 24
   3.13 IFIP STRATEGY .................................................................................................... 24
   3.14 FUTURE MEETINGS ............................................................................................. 26
   3.15 PROPOSAL FOR IFIP STATEMENT ON SECURITY ........................................... 26
   3.16 CLOSING OF MEETING ...................................................................................... 27
4 ATTACHMENTS ............................................................................................................. 28
   4.1 ATTACHMENT 1: AUDITOR’S REPORT ................................................................. 28
   4.2 ATTACHMENT 2: FINANCE GENERAL STATEMENT (TREAS 4) ..................... 32
## 1 ACTION LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Person/Body</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DC on Cloud Computing:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To form a Domain Committee, which should come up within 4 months with a proposal how to proceed</td>
<td>Mr Lin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project proposal “Save Earth”:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To work on a concrete proposal in order to present it to General Assembly</td>
<td>TC5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Digital Library:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To send requirements document to selected organizations that have demonstrated capability to provide a Digital Library and seek proposals from them.</td>
<td>Publ. Comm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Publications:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To work on new online journal on trust management</td>
<td>PC, TC11, PC, EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To issue a termination notice for the current publications contract to Springer (before end of March 2014)</td>
<td>PC, EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To work on next publications contract with Springer</td>
<td>PC, EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Journal proposal from ATI: to include it in the work on marketing</td>
<td>PC, EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International Professional Practice Partnership (IP3)</strong></td>
<td>President, IP3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To work on an enhanced proposal for an incorporation of IP3 in IFIP (structure of IP3, clear benefits for IFIP)</td>
<td>President, IP3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Membership Structure:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To work on an enhanced proposal taking into account the discussions and decisions of GA</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Membership Fee Structure:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To work on an improved proposal taking into account the discussions and comments of GA</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>World CIO Forum 2014:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To discuss financial and other aspects with CIE and to sign a contract with CIE</td>
<td>EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>World Computer Congress 2015:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To evaluate the proposal of the Korean member society and to approve it when it is appropriate after the approval of the Korean government</td>
<td>EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>World IT Forum (WITFOR):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To work on opportunities for a proposal of organizing a WITFOR</td>
<td>President, Mr Puigjaner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International Liaison:</strong></td>
<td>ILC Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To distribute a report to General Assembly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Internal Awards:</strong></th>
<th>IAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o To check the existing criteria for the internal awards and come up with a proposal for enhancement</td>
<td>President, IAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To check the submitted nomination list and reach a conclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>IFIP statement on security:</strong></th>
<th>Mr Rannenberg GA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o To redraft a statement on intentional undermining of security and trust mechanisms in ICT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Approval by General Assembly (e-voting)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>IFIP Strategy:</strong></th>
<th>President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o To distribute the approved document to IFIP’s Member Societies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ATTENDANCE LIST

### Member Society Representatives (28 representatives)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>A Wong</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>A Min Tjoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>R Macedo</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>G Boyton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>F Lin</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>M Frkovic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Rep</td>
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<td>F Rammig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>M Raffai</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
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<tr>
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<td>T Saito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
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<td>J Wibe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>A Casaca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>I Privara</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>N Schlamberger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>B von Solms</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>R Puigjaner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>C Mörtberg</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>R Morel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>R Razouk</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>A McGettrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>I Grebennik</td>
<td>US-ACM</td>
<td>J Turner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ex officio Members

- C Avram (Treasurer)
- M Bramer (Councillor)
- M Hinchey (Vice President)
- K Rannenberg (Councillor)

### Honorary Members

- K Brunnstein

### TC Chairs (11 TCs were represented)

- TC 1: J Sakarovitch
- TC 2: M Goedicke
- TC 3: S Roesvig (rep B Cornu)
- TC 4: E Neuhold
- TC 5: A Pras
- TC 6: J Phahlamohlaka
- TC 7: A Min Tjoa (rep J Pries-Heje)
- TC 8: R Reis
- TC 9: J Phahlamohlaka
- TC 10: R Reis
- TC 11: Y Murayama
- TC 12: M Bramer (rep T Dillon)
- TC 13: J Gulliksen

### Affiliate Members

- CEPIS: D Brady
- SEARCC: Searcc (Vice President)

### Observers

- Walter Prinz (BMVIT Austria)
- Xu Jiajia (CIE (China))
- Brenda Aynsley (IP3 Chair)
- Stephen Ibaraki (IP3)
- Victor de Pous (IFIP Legal Counsel)
- Lorraine Han (Korea)

### IFIP Secretariat

- E Dundler (IFIP General Secretary)

### Apologies

- J Engel (Vice President)
- K Boyanov (Bulgaria)
- P Bollerslev (Denmark)
- B Cornu (TC 3)
- T Dillon (TC 12)
- P Bobillier (Honorary member)

- D Deschoolmeester (Belgium)
- G Marin (CLEI)
- R Delany
- Jan Pies-Heje
- H Takeda
- A Rolstadas

- Proxy to R Puigjaner
- New Zealand
- TC 8
- IMIA
- Honorary member
3  GENERAL ASSEMBLY MEETING

3.1  Call Meeting to Order

The President, Mr Strous, opened the General Assembly meeting, formally welcomed all participants and wished to all a constructive meeting. He thanked the local host, Prof. Joanna Jozefowska, Deputy Rector for Research of the Poznan University of Technology and Prof. Roman Slowinski, President of the Poznan Branch of Polish Academy of Sciences for their hospitality to hold IFIP's General Assembly at the Poznan University of Technology. The President expressed also his thanks on behalf of IFIP to Prof Jerzy Nawrocki for the local organisation.

Ms Joanna Jozefowska welcomed all participants to General Assembly in Poznan and gave an overview about the Poznan University of Technology. She wished a successful meeting, fruitful discussions and ideas. Mr Roman Slowinski welcomed the participants on behalf of the Polish Academy of Sciences (PAS). He presented a short overview about the organisation and the work of PAS.

Mr Strous welcomed especially all representatives of Member Societies and TC chairs attending their first IFIP meeting in that role, Mr Macedo (Brazil), Ms Moertberg (Sweden) Mr Razouk (Syria), Mr Sakarovitch (TC1), Mr Roesvig (TC3), Mr Pras (TC6), Mr Reis (TC10), Ms Murayama (TC11) and Mr Ramasundara (SEARCC).

3.2  Attendance and Apologies

The Secretary, Ms Raffai, announced the GA attendance and apologies received (please refer to the attendance list). 28 Full Members, 11 TC representatives, 2 representatives of Associate Members, 1 Honorary Member and 4 ex officio members with voting rights were represented and 1 valid proxy was given.

Ms Raffai stated that the attendance exceeded the quorum and GA could proceed with its work.

3.3  Business Issues

3.3.1  Approval of Agenda

Mr Strous informed General Assembly that item 17 “Proposal for an IFIP statement on intentional undermining of security and trust mechanisms in ICT” has been added to the agenda.

General Assembly unanimously ADOPTED the Agenda.

3.3.2  Approval of Minutes GA 2011

Mr Strous informed General Assembly that the minutes of the General Assembly meeting 2011 have been approved according the procedure agreed in 2010.
3.3.3 President’s Report

Mr Strous, the IFIP President, presented his report and thanked wholeheartedly all volunteers and the IFIP secretariat for their support and contributions over his three years as President. He said that without this support his job would have been a mission impossible.

He said that he realized that in these three years the number and speed of changes, many of which had already been initiated by his predecessors, has increased. He also realized that this was not an easy process in a diverse community like in IFIP. He repeated that not changing is not an option. The world around changes ever faster and IFIP has to keep up in order to stay relevant, an observation shared by member societies. As an implication of this statement IFIP we will never stop changing. IFIP’s agenda for this year’s meeting again includes some important proposals in this direction.

Mr Strous said that for his second term he intends to put more emphasis on the implementation of the changes and on making sure that the effect of the changes is as big as possible, for IFIP’s communities and towards IFIP’s external stakeholders. He will reflect on this a couple of times under different agenda items.

Mr Strous informed General Assembly that since last GA he has had the opportunity to visit a number of current, past and potential member societies and met with the IFAC board (IFIP’s neighbours in Laxenburg) and the European Commission. These visits were extremely useful in explaining and promoting IFIP’s strategic plans and IFIP’s different lines of activities. It also created a better mutual understanding of each other’s activities and focus areas. The visits underlined his statement above about the diversity of IFIP’s member societies and their lines of activities and membership.

Mr Strous said that it also became clear from these visits that IFIP is often perceived as an organization mainly doing technical work (in its research oriented conferences). Many societies are not aware of IFIP’s other activities, such as its professionalism promotion. Many societies also have a need for more policy oriented work by IFIP, because that would support their community and work. The reactions to IFIP’s new draft strategy document were very positive and a clear indication that the differentiation in IFIP’s lines of activities is the right choice. Another conclusion from these visits was that IFIP has to make a serious attempt to increase its profile and visibility. Mr Strous underlined that in his view this can only be done with the help of professionals. There will be a proposal in the agenda for this, linked to project 6 in the draft strategy document.

Mr Strous said that given the outcome and effect of his meetings with member societies he intends to continue this. He is looking forward to an interesting GA meeting with many important topics to be discussed and decided in order to keep up with the world around. He also looks forward to a second term with all of the volunteers to contribute to an increased visibility and relevance of IFIP.

3.3.4 Secretary’s Report

The Secretary, Ms Raffai reported that since the General Assembly 2012 in Amsterdam the officers of IFIP visited the Secretariat many times and had face to face business meetings with the General Secretary Mr Eduard Dundler. Among
normal business issues and preparations for Board and GA meetings hand-over of the work from Secretary to the Secretary Elect Mr A Min Tjoa has been discussed.

**Ms Raffai** informed General Assembly that the General Secretary represented IFIP and participated in several events and meetings, as CIO Congress 2012 in Austria, CEPIS, IT Olympiad, WCCE 2013, UBS and SPRINGER. The General Secretary also participated in the meetings of technical Committees 2 and 3.

**Ms Raffai** reported that the General Secretary presented several times IFIP to the Austrian government. As a result of this intensive contact IFIP received a subsidy from Austrian government in value of 10,000 Euros.

**Ms Raffai** reported that by end of 2012 IFIP had 46 Full Members, 43 with voting rights. As Bosnia-Herzegovina, Singapore and Thailand have open dues for 2012 and 2013 they lost their voting right for General Assembly 2013; if they will not pay the two years dues until end of this year their membership will terminate 1st of January 2014. Further 10 member societies did not yet pay the fees for 2013; the Secretariat is sending a reminder to these member societies. IFIP has 4 Associate Members, 10 Honorary Members and 6 ex-officio members.

**Ms Raffai** reported that the Secretariat continues to run smoothly and on behalf of the IFIP officers she expressed her thanks to the colleagues of the Secretariat for their hard work.

### 3.3.5 EC Meetings Report

**Ms Raffai** reported that the Executive Committee held altogether 7 meetings during the last year (4 face to face meetings and 3 teleconferences, see the EC Reports on IFIP’s website for details). Between these meetings the EC members had frequent discussions by phone and through emails. Most of the EC meetings had been routine business; detailed information can be found elsewhere in these minutes like for finances, IFIP strategy, membership structure and publications).

**Ms Raffai** reported that EC has unanimously decided 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.

**Ms Raffai** informed General Assembly that the EC has decided to no longer pursue the AGORA project. TC3 has been asked to draft a summary containing guidance for possible future projects following the AGORA approach.

**Ms Raffai** informed General Assembly that within EC the issue of the future of WCCs, WITFORs and WCFs has been discussed. These issues will be discussed in General Assembly in more detail.

### 3.3.6 Treasurer’s Report

The Treasurer, **Mr Avram**, drew attention to his written report and informed GA that the 2012 accounts have been audited. The “Auditors opinion” addressed to the General Assembly is attached to these minutes (Attachment 1). The audited report, titled “Finance General Statement” is attached to these minutes (Attachment 2). It has also added a column for the 2014 budget.
Mr Avram recommended the General Assembly to take note that the Auditor’s report was tabled.

Mr Avram reported that IFIP’s portfolio is managed by UBS in London under a mandate giving them discretion, requiring a largely Euro denominated portfolio with moderate risk, often called a balanced portfolio, balanced between fixed interest assets and equity. As per the most recent review of portfolio strategy, UBS use mainly Exchange Traded Funds at present. UBS has been IFIP’s portfolio managers for 14 years.

Mr Avram reported that he reviewed the portfolio performance over that time and in more detail over recent years. In summary, IFIP’s portfolio is keeping up with inflation. Over the entire time, IFIP achieved a 2.19% per annum compound rate of return. The rate of return fluctuates in line with the movements of the share market. The portfolio is intended to preserve IFIP’s assets, keeping up with inflation, and supplementing IFIP’s income. In 2013 2.01% were budgeted for return. This was based on historical figures. He recommended doing the same for the 2014 budget.

Mr Avram recommended continuing with IFIP’s strategy, and undertaking the next major review of portfolio management during 2015, once every 5 years as planned.

Mr Avram proposed to continue to monitor the long run portfolio performance, and budget a return in line with that long run return.

Mr Avram informed General Assembly that the IFIP Secretariat has developed a system to regularly reports on financial performance and financial position to Technical Committees, project leaders and the IFIP Executive Committee.

Mr Avram concluded that IFIP’s financial performance in 2013 is expected to be much better than the 2012. IFIP has a reasonably consistent portfolio performance and a healthy portfolio.

At General Assembly in 2012, a 2013 budget with a 103K € Euro deficit has been set; the final deficit in 2012 was 24K € Euro. The forecast for 2013 is better than that, perhaps a small surplus of 7K €.

The Treasurer reminded General Assembly that IFIP has a structural financial problem; the income is not enough to cover the costs without help from the portfolio. Ideally IFIP would be growing the portfolio above inflation, but IFIP is not quite up to that at present.

General Assembly APPROVED the recommendations from the Treasurer.

Mr Avram reported that the budget requests have substantially been adopted.

In addition 75K € for marketing IFIP in combination to the IFIP strategy has been included (please see item on IFIP’s strategy).

Please find attached an IFIP Profit/Loss Statement (TREAS 4) at attachment 2, its purpose is to propose a budget for 2014 and place that budget proposal in the context of recent actual financial performance.

Mr Avram recommended the General Assembly to adopt the 2014 budget presented.
3.3.7 Finance Committee Report (FC)

Mr Wibe presented the report of the Finance Committee and said as a general comment, that Finance Committee would appreciate to get the report from the treasurer earlier in order to get information in time to react.

Mr Wibe reported that Finance Committee had checked the accounts shown in TREAS3 and TREAS 4 and confirmed the comments from the Treasurer.

Mr Wibe reported that the Finance Committee re-stated the treasurer’s comments from years past: IFIP needs to find new business opportunities. FC agreed to this comment and recommends that EC and TA look into it.

FC recommended that:
- GA discharge the Treasurer and the EC for fiscal year 2012
- GA accept the Auditors’ report

General Assembly ACCEPTED the Auditor’s Report,
APPROVED the figures for 2012
DISCHARGED the Treasurer and EC for fiscal year 2012.

Mr Wibe reported that Finance Committee has been asked by the IFIP Board to draft a proposal for an automatic adjustment of the membership fees to the inflation and to present it in this General Assembly.

Based upon discussions at GA 2012 and Board 2013, the Finance Committee proposed an annual increase of 3% for the period 2014 – 2016. After these years GA has to look into the matter again.

General Assembly discussed this proposal and came to the conclusion that the membership fee is strongly linked to the membership fee structure. Therefore these two issues have to be seen in one unit.

General Assembly has been asked to vote on approval of the proposal. The voting resulted in: against the proposal: 32, abstentions: 4, in favour: 7.

General Assembly REQUESTED Finance Committee to come up with a new proposal linked to the Membership fee structure issues at next GA 2014.

Finance Committee agreed to the request of the President to include 75K € for marketing IFIP in combination to the IFIP strategy (please see item on IFIP’s strategy) in the budget for 2014 and recommended to General Assembly to approve the revised budget for 2014.

After voting (for: 36, against: 2, abstentions: 3) General Assembly APPROVED the proposed budget for 2014.

3.3.8 Election of IFIP Officers and Councillors

Ms Raffai presented the report of the Nominations Committee and informed General Assembly about vacancies in offices and the status of nominations. She informed the
members of General Assembly about the possibility to nominate candidates also from the floor.

Ms Raffai informed General Assembly that there are 28 Full Members, 1 Proxy, 1 Honorary member, 4 ex-officio members and 10 TC Chairs were present totalling to 44 votes.

1. Treasurer Elect
Ms Raffai reported that the current Treasurer, Mr Avram will complete his second term next year; so he is not eligible to be re-nominated. Mr Brady (Ireland) received the necessary nominations from GA members. There was no nomination received from the floor. Mr Brady presented himself and his plans to the General Assembly.

General Assembly ELECTED (40 votes for YES, 3 votes for NO, 1 invalid vote) Mr Brady (Ireland) as Treasurer Elect (2013 – 2014).

2. Secretary
Ms Raffai reported that she completed her second term as Secretary this year; the Secretary Elect Mr A Min Tjoa will start his first term as Secretary at the end of this GA.

3. Vice President (VP)
Ms Raffai reported that there were two vacancies for Vice President (VP) position. Mr Engel completed his second term as VP, so he is not eligible to be re-nominated. Mr Puigjaner completed his first term, so he is eligible for re-election. The Nominations Committee received 3 nominations, namely (in alphabetic order) Mr Bramer (ex-officio), Mr Lin (China) and Mr Puigjaner (Spain). There was no other nomination received from the floor. All three candidates presented their plans for their office in case of election.

The first voting resulted in: Mr Bramer (ex-officio) 25 votes, Mr Lin (China) 25 votes, Mr Puigjaner (Spain) 27 votes. The second run between Mr Bramer and Mr Lin resulted in 24 votes for Mr Bramer (ex-officio) and 20 votes for Mr Lin (China).

General Assembly ELECTED
Mr Puigjaner (Spain) as Vice President (2013 – 2016)
Mr Bramer (ex-officio) as Vice President (2013 – 2016)

4. Councillors
Ms Raffai reported that there were five vacancies for councillors to be nominated.

a. One councillor appointed by the President: This position is presently fulfilled by Mr Wong (Australia) who completed his first, not full term as Councillor. Mr Wong has been nominated by the President.

General Assembly APPROVED by acclamation Mr Wong (Australia as Councillor for a first full term (2013 – 2016)

b. One Councillor nominated by Technical Assembly: This position is presently fulfilled by Mr Goedicke (TC2) who completed his first, not full term as Councillor. Technical Assembly nominated Mr Goedicke as Councillor.
General Assembly APPROVED by acclamation Mr Goedicke (TC2) as Councillor for a first full term (2013 – 2016)

c. One Councillor nominated by National Representatives: This position is presently fulfilled by Mr Lin (China) who completed the term of Don Robertson. Member Societies nominated Mr Lin as Councillor.

General Assembly APPROVED by acclamation Mr Lin (China) as Councillor for a first full term (2013 – 2016)

d. One Councillor position nominated and elected by GA is presently fulfilled by Mr Pries-Heje (TC8) who completed his first full term. So, he was eligible to be nominated for a second term. The second position as Councillor was fulfilled by Mr Bramer (ex-officio) who has been elected in the previous election as Vice President. From the floor came nominations of Mr Nawrocki (Poland) and Mr Rammig (Germany).

In the election by General Assembly Mr Nawrocki received 36 votes, Mr Rammig received 35 votes and Mr Pries-Heje received 12 votes.

General Assembly ELECTED

Mr Nawrocki (Poland) as Councillor to complete the term of Mr Bramer (2013 – 2014)

Mr Rammig (Germany) as Councillor (2013 – 2016)

3.4 Technical Assembly (TA)

Mr Hinchey, Chairman of the Technical Assembly, reported that since last General Assembly some Technical Committees elected new chairs:

- TC1: Mr Sakarovitch replaced Mr Hinchey
- TC6: Mr Pras replaced Mr Leduc
- TC10: Mr Reis replaced Mr Eschermann
- TC11 Ms Murayama replaced Mr Rannenberg

1. Emeritus Members, Chair Elect, Past Chairs

Mr Hinchey informed General Assembly that the possibility of a formal role for emeritus members was considered. Some TCs have such roles (or honorary or category C membership) but there is not a formal role. Such a role may assist retired or other past members receive travel funding from their organizations and continues organizational memory.

To preserve organizational memory, and assist new chairs, TA considered the option of having Chair Elect and Past Chair (or similar titles) roles at both the TC and WG level. TCs/WGs would not be required to have these roles, but for those who wished to have them it may be advantageous to have consistency across IFIP.

TA concluded however that it was better to keep things simple and that as long as TCs did not breach Statutes and Bylaws, then each TC could consider what it wish to do itself.
2. Quality of Publications/AICT

Mr Hinchey informed General Assembly that TA considered the issue of publication quality. This matter was not advanced further due to the late arrival of members.

3. Relationship to Member Societies

Mr Hinchey reported that TC Chairs were requested to ask their TC members and organizers of their events to contact the national member society representatives and the member society's secretariats of the country in which the event takes place. This would be essential to promote the event and get the involvement of the member society.

4. Working Groups

Mr Hinchey reported about the following changes in Working Groups:

- TA agreed to merge WG 3.1 (Informatics and ICT in Secondary Education) and WG 3.5 (Informatics and Digital Technologies in Elementary Education) into WG 3.1 (Informatics and Digital Technology in School Education).
- TA agreed to dissolve WG 3.2 (Informatics and ICT in Higher Education).
- TA agreed to dissolve WG 3.6 (Distance Education).
- TA agreed to dissolve WG 3.8 (Lifelong Learning).
- TA agreed to dissolve SIG 3.9 (Digital Literacy).
- TA approved the establishment of WG 9.10 (ICT uses in Peace and War).
- TA approved the establishment of WG 11.5 (IT Assurance and Audit).
- TA approved the establishment of WG 11.14 (Secure Engineering).
- TA will consider a change of name of WG 11.14 at the next Technical Assembly.
- TA approved migration of SIG 13.1 to WG 13.8 (Interaction Design and International Development).
- TA approved migration of SIG 13.2 to WG 13.9 (Interaction Design and Children).

General Assembly ACCEPTED the report.

3.5 Proposals for new activities / groups

3.5.1 Proposal for establishing a Domain Committee on Cloud Computing

Mr Lin, the Deputy Secretary General of the Chinese Institute of Electronics (CIE) presented a proposal for the establishment of an IFIP Domain Committee for Cloud Computing. He showed that a big and growing interest on the market for this topic exists. Mr Lin presented to General Assembly the mission and purposes of the proposed Domain Committee:

- To promote the influence and importance in cloud computing academia and industry,
To identify all relevant issues concerning cloud computing and to clarify how these issues can be addressed and solutions can be provided,

To provide the international platform for communication and collaboration on cloud computing projects, research and application.

The Committee will address academics and experts, CIOs, CTOs and IT professionals, Cloud Computing service providers and governments. These groups should be addressed in the following ways:

- IFIP members should establish cloud computing group in their society
- Establish secretary office for coordinating the international efforts
- Host IFIP cloud computing conference in Beijing in May, 2014
- Publish cloud computing technology paper
- Help with government in cloud computing policy making
- Draft cloud computing related standards

General Assembly discussed the proposal and appreciated unanimously the idea, as it is seen as very important for IFIP to get involved in Cloud Computing and saw this topic as an opportunity for showing IFIP’s leadership.

Many good suggestions were made for the further development of possible activities and the start of the group. It was especially emphasized that the DC should not only focus on organizing events but should also contribute to the other strategic lines of activities of IFIP such as policy papers and statements. It was also mentioned that the DC should liaise with existing groups working on cloud computing, both inside and outside IFIP. This after all is the idea behind a Domain Committee. Many participants at the meeting already expressed their interest in joining this DC.

General Assembly APPROVED the establishment of a Domain Committee for Cloud Computing.

Mr Lin thanked GA for the approval and the trust of GA and will include the suggestions in the next steps to start the DC.

### 3.5.2 Proposal for establishing a Domain Committee on Big Data

Mr Lin had submitted a proposal for the establishment of an IFIP Domain Committee for Big Data. With a view on the efforts and resources needed to successfully start the DC Cloud Computing and also with the next World CIO Forum being hosted by CIE in 2014, he decided to withdraw this proposal and submit it again at an appropriate time in the future.

### 3.5.3 Innovation in ICT to foster “Save the Earth”

Mr Strous drew the attention of General Assembly to the document of the project proposal of Dr Rattan K Datta (please the document on IFIP’s website). In this proposal Mr Datta explained that by getting the benefit of the growing penetration of ICT and hence forth intermingling of cultures and communities, it would be possible to achieve our objective of sustained development and at the same time to keep our planet earth healthy and green. Mr Datta proposed that IFIP has to take the lead for the important social responsibility of the community to pay back in the form of efforts and development of processes to “save planet earth”.

Mr Lin thanked GA for the approval and the trust of GA and will include the suggestions in the next steps to start the DC.
General Assembly discussed the proposal and came to the conclusion that it is not concrete enough to start an activity. General Assembly found it an interesting proposal however and **DECIDED** that a group (within TC5) should work with **Mr Datta** on a concrete proposal to be presented at next General Assembly.

### 3.6 Publications

#### 3.6.1 Publications Committee

**Mr Turner** presented the Publications report. He informed General Assembly of the accomplishments since the 2012 GA meeting:

1. **IFIP Digital Library**
   Work on the addition of full author text for 2008 publications to the Digital Library that was managed by the ACS, was completed. This completed the work of the ACS relative to managing the Digital Library, although the ACS continues to host the now much out-of-date Digital Library as a prototype of capabilities that are needed in a successor Digital Library.
   A task group, appointed by the IFIP President to recommend a way forward in finding a new Digital Library provider, completed a requirements document for the IFIP Digital Library. The intention is to send this document to selected organizations that have demonstrated a capability to provide such a Digital Library and to seek proposals from these organizations.

2. **TC-11 journal**
   **Mr Turner** reported that an initial agreement for a new, online journal on trust management has been signed with the editors, but additional work remains to be done.

3. **Author and referee codes of professional conduct**
   **Mr Turner** reported that the author and referee codes of conduct that were adopted at the General Assembly 2012 meeting have been placed on the IFIP website in the publications pages.

4. **Meeting with Springer**
   **Mr Turner** informed General Assembly that the IFIP President, Publications Committee Chair, and Publications Officer/General Secretary met with the computer science editor in charge of Springer’s computer science proceedings series and, the technical staff responsible for IFIP publications at Springer in Heidelberg in mid-August. The discussion was very helpful in learning about Springer’s views and plans for future publications. It was decided that IFIP should issue a termination notice for the current publishing agreement in order to allow some modifications to be incorporated into a new agreement for 2015-2019. This notice not to renew the current agreement is due in March 2014. It appears unlikely that progress can be made on reducing the length of time following publication during which the inclusion of author papers in the IFIP DL is prohibited.
   **Mr Turner** informed General Assembly that discussions will begin in late 2013 with Springer relative to modifications for the next publications agreement.

5. **Indexing for IFIP Publications**
   IFIP publications by Springer are currently being indexed by all relevant major indexing services. Some services are considerably behind in adding available
publications to the index; however Publications Committee will monitor the process in order to speed it up.

6. Journal proposal from ATI
The Publications Committee has discussed the journal proposal from ATI. In general there is skepticism as to the value of such a journal, although it is an interesting project and the skepticism is not unanimous among committee members. There is consensus that the proposed cost is far too high, and that available funds should be spent on an IFIP digital library before investing in such a journal.

7. Implementation of AICT Editorial Board oversight in IFIP publications
Mr Turner informed General Assembly that procedures were discussed during the meeting with Springer to incorporate the ability of designated IFIP officials to have access to submissions for conference proceedings. After obtaining this ability then appropriate oversight procedures can be implemented.

The intention remains to involve the AICT Editorial Board, along with the PC, in considering how to make AICT a stronger series, perhaps using sub-lines to distinguish between different types of events and publications.

3.6.2 Journal Proposal from ATI

Mr Strous informed General Assembly that the Spanish Computer Society (ATI) has sent a proposal for an IFIP journal (please see document on IFIP’s website) for discussion in General Assembly. The Publications Committee has discussed this proposal in its meeting (please see respective paragraph in the report of Publications Committee above).

Mr Puigjaner explained the proposal to the General Assembly and informed GA that ATI has the experience on managing the simultaneous publication of a journal in two languages (English and Spanish) acquired in the cooperation with CEPIS. He said that journal would be a communication mean to increase the connection between all member societies and it would be a place where IFIP scientist and engineers would have the possibility of publishing their works. If this idea is considered as interesting a discussion between IFIP and ATI would be necessary to establish the exact cooperation rules and terms, like editorial board, publication director, costs, etc. Mr Puigjaner suggested that if the cost is considered to high there several possibilities of reducing it, as, for example, publishing five numbers instead of six.

Mr Strous mentioned that in his view the proposal provided a good opportunity to reach out to the Latin American countries and Spanish speaking communities in general. If successful the approach could also be seen as a model for other larger areas / language groups. It could also be seen as a marketing tool.

General Assembly expressed their doubts whether there is really interest in such publications and expressed also their concerns about the significant costs. More work should be put into an answer for the question, what IFIP wants to achieve with this journal. GA did not approve the proposal but, upon suggestion by Mr Strous, asked the Executive Committee to include it in the work on marketing and will discuss it again in the context of the marketing plans.

3.7 Professionalism Program

Ms Aynsley and the IP3 team spoke to the role of IFIP IP3 and the services they can provide to IFIP members as well as discussing their activities.
Services for members include:

- Offering mutual recognition of professional ICT practitioners certified under an IP3 accredited program by their professional association.
- Accreditation of professionalism schemes of IFIP members.
- Promoting ICT professionalism and IFIP/societal value/benefits to the whole ICT Ecosystem stakeholders as IP3 engage with them at national, regional and world meetings and events as shown in the 2013 Annual Report.
- Working with any organisation that wishes to support the global partnership in promoting ICT professionalism.
- Establishing a Global Governments Alliance to improve the reach of IFIP in influencing the standards of ICT Professionalism.
- Increasing the awareness of IFIP and IP3 through marketing activities e.g. maintaining the IP3 website which has just been remodelled and launched this month. The team can also provide IFIP members with opportunities to use IP3’s web facility to blog or promote events in addition to the own.

Ms Aynsley explained to General Assembly how IFIP IP3 works with organisations:

- IP3 work through the Global Industry Council with high level individuals (from Google, Microsoft, Cisco, Infosys, Accenture amongst others) and in recent times it expanded the membership of the GIC to include notable organisations. Individuals do not pay fees but organisations will pay an annual registration/membership fee. IP3 meets with its GIC members on a regular basis using technology and occasionally in face to face mode e.g. at WCC2012 in Amsterdam. This engagement leads to a payback from GIC members in terms of them providing valuable advice to IFIP and IFIP IP3, their active participation in speaking engagements and sponsorship in events, e.g. WCC2012, advocacy and promotion of the need for ICT professionalism and IFIP/society value within their own spheres of influence.
- IP3 works with its members who have expressed an interest in developing a professionalism scheme. IP3 has a tool kit of information, it has mentoring arrangements to support their progress, answer questions and offer suggestions. IP3’s accreditation of their professionalism/certification scheme is based on general principles and IP3’s ability to map their choices with the own. IP3 do not impose a particular set of tools or frameworks and it emphasise that their scheme must work for them, whilst it must also take into account the principles IP3 has in its guidelines.

Ms Aynsley informed General Assembly of some significant news:

- The first of the new non IFIP member, ITI from Egypt hosting the World Economic Forum and are willing to host IFIP IP3 events in 2014, has joined IP3 and has a seat on the Board of IP3. ITI is an educational institution that the Egyptian government has established, they have relevant programs for academic to work transition and that makes them of interest to IP3 and to IFIP. They want to achieve accreditation of their education programs from the Seoul Accord and IP3 will help them by sharing information about its member's experience in that as well as consulting its Board Observer, Mr Turner, Chair of Seoul Accord. IP3 will work with ITI for them to gain membership of IFIP as soon as membership categories allow for this.
- IP3 is here to collaborate, to support ICT professionalism globally and welcome and urge ongoing dialogue with IFIP members and those stakeholders from their respective ICT Ecosystems to improve the understanding of the work of IP3. IP3 invites one to one dialogue with GA members and their stakeholders and is challenging every member to work with IP3 in their country to open doors and facilitate discussions so that this
time next year IP3 can demonstrate significant progress.

Mr Strous thanked Ms Aynsley for the detailed report and he confirmed that a lot of progress has been made.

Incorporation of IP3 in IFIP

Mr Strous presented to General Assembly a proposal for a more formal incorporation of IP3 in IFIP’s structure. He said that IP3 is presently separated from IFIP and the original partnership of the founding societies, as there were ACS, BCS, CIPS, IEEE-CS, IFIP, has changed. Mr Strous proposed to make IP3 a similar substructure in IFIP as InterYIT, including its own set of governing rules but as a formal part of the IFIP S&B.

Mr Strous said that this incorporation would bring a stronger link of IP3 with IFIP member societies. As IP3 is already doing a marvelous job in branding IFIP in all their contacts and presentations this embedding would increase this profiling and branding. It would be a logic move with a view on IFIP’s ambitions in the field of professionalism and IFIP’s strategy project 4. The proposed structure would allow IP3 to keep some “arms length” which would be helpful in linking with different types of organizations.

The Proposal has been discussed in General Assembly. Although the benefits for IFIP of a stronger link with IP3 were acknowledged, some alternative options for the way this could be done were suggested. In addition a few issues were raised that needed further clarification before a decision could be taken. These concerned for instance legal issues such as liability.

Mr Strous thanked GA for the discussion and suggestions and will work on an enhanced proposal together with the IP3 team.

3.8 Statutes & Bylaws

3.8.1 Proposal for e-voting

Mr Bramer presented to General Assembly a proposal for a new Bylaw 3.8 which would enable ‘electronic voting’ outside of its scheduled face-to-face meetings. The Bylaw also related to voting by both the Executive Committee and the Board.

General Assembly was generally supportive of the idea of an electronic voting system in order to speed up IFIP’s operation and the presented system was appreciated. However a number of issues were raised relating to privacy protection caused by maintaining an archive of the individual voting results on a permanent basis. In addition some concerns were expressed about the security of the IT system and the risk that this could be hacked. After some discussion GA decided that the security risk was an acceptable risk. With respect to the privacy issues a change of wording was proposed for the final sentence of the penultimate paragraph so that instead of ending 'will be displayed on the website as a permanent record' it now ended 'will be displayed on the website up to the end of the following General Assembly, at which time they will be removed from both the website and the Federation’s database'. All results of voting between two GA meetings will be included in the minutes of the GA in the way it is done now, i.e. in total numbers. It was also agreed to amend the wording to make it clear that all information about individual votes is confidential to members of the General Assembly and the IFIP Secretariat.
Finally it was agreed that the electronic voting system be amended so that the voter is asked to tick a box to give explicit agreement to his/her name and vote being stored in the IFIP e-voting system database and used in accordance with Bylaw 3.8.

Under provision of these changes General Assembly **APPROVED** the new Bylaw (43 pro, 0 abstentions, 1 against).

### 3.8.2 Other S&B Issues

**Mr Bramer** presented to General Assembly a list of proposed changes in IFIP’s Statutes and Bylaws in order to eliminate some inconsistencies and clarify a few items.

General Assembly unanimously **APPROVED** the proposed changes in Statutes & Bylaws.

### 3.9 Membership

#### 3.9.1 Admissions Committee

**Mr Strous** informed General Assembly that he had received an apology from **Mr Engel** who could not attend GA for health reasons. **Mr Engel** finished his second term as Vice President. **Mr Strous** thanked **Mr Engel** for his contributions to IFIP in a number of roles, among others as chair of the Admissions Committee.

#### 3.9.2 Membership Structure

**Mr Strous** presented to General Assembly a proposal for IFIP’s membership structure. Taking into account the discussions on previous proposals, the current proposed membership structure further reduced the number of categories to:

- full member
- associate member
- honorary member

**Mr Strous** elaborated on the general rules, criteria and conditions for each of the proposed membership categories in the note. The goal is to keep these as simple as possible and at the same time create greater possibilities for IFIP to expand its’ membership base.

**Mr Rammig** presented proposals from the German member society (GI). One proposal concerned the option to have more than one society in a country being eligible for IFIP full membership. Some suggestions for criteria were made. Another proposal concerned individual membership. Member societies should have the possibility to offer a “Gold Membership” to their members. Those members may pay an extra fee and by this earn personal membership of IFIP, together with dedicated benefits to be discussed. E.g. they may be the only persons eligible to be nominated as TC members or other positions within IFIP. A third proposal concerned the voting rights; it was suggested to link the voting rights to the number of full paying personal members of member societies.
A lively and constructive discussion took place and many arguments and suggestions were brought forward with respect to advantages and disadvantages of all the proposals. The overall conclusions and decisions were:

- a large majority of GA was in favour of the proposal made by GI to create the possibility to have more than one full member in a country;
- criteria and conditions should be carefully drafted, for all membership categories; the ones presented during this GA are a starting point for further elaboration;
- the proposal for individual membership was only supported by a very small number of member societies;
- general agreement on reducing the number of categories to the three listed in the proposal of Mr Strous;
- the GI proposal on voting rights is to be included in the discussion and further work on this issue as part of the next step in which the arguments and suggestions of this meeting will be processed into the next draft.

General Assembly REQUESTED Mr Strous to work on an enhanced proposal taking into account the discussions and decisions of the meeting.

3.9.3 Membership Fee Structure

Mr Strous presented to General Assembly Finance a proposal for a new model for IFIP’s membership fee. Presently the model is based upon UN Scale of Assessment and therefore on the GDP of countries. Alternatives would be a model based on membership numbers or a model based on membership income of the member societies.

Mr Strous proposed a membership fee structure based on the membership income of the member society; and a fee level (percentage) decided by GA every second year (or every year?). GA was informed that the proposal was a quick analysis based on limited data and its’ main purpose was to give some idea about the consequences of a change in the fee structure.

Mr Strous informed General Assembly about some issues and questions with respect to this:

- The basis for the calculation was a limited analysis of relative old data,
- Should a capping of the fee per member society be included?
- Should there be a minimum fee
- If the membership fee has to cover the costs of the Secretariat even an increase of 1% is not enough (calculated with capping)
- There is the risk that member societies do not want to report data about their income from their fee for membership
- There is also the risk some member societies drop out because of sharp increase

However, despite the issues and open questions Mr Strous was of the opinion that a fee based on income is the fairest model and he invited GA to discuss it and make suggestions for improvement of the proposal.

General Assembly welcomed the proposal and concluded that this indeed would be a more logic approach compared to the current model. One suggestion that was made concerned the option of a gradual transition during a limited number of years. That would “soften” the change for some societies.
General Assembly REQUESTED Mr Strous to process the comments made and to enhance the proposal as soon as possible in order to give Member Societies time to check the analysis and the proposal and discuss the impact on them. The goal is to present a final proposal to the General Assembly of 2014, aiming at implementation on January 1st, 2015.

3.9.4 SEARCC

Mr Ramasundara, Secretary General of SEARCC presented the strategy plan of SEARCC for 2013 - 2018. SEARCC has the vision to be the key collaborative body for national ICT professional associations in the Asia Pacific region. The mission of SEARCC is to advance the ICT profession and create economic and social growth in the Asia Pacific region. The drivers to achieve this are:

- to drive economic prosperity across the region through the advancement of the ICT profession
- to facilitate the delivery of relevant and valuable programs and services for the benefit of its member associations
- to collaborate and build relationships with key international stakeholders in order to progress mutual goals and interests
- to exemplify good governance and thought leadership by building capability and achieving results.

SEARCC is planning for the next 5 years for Recognised Accreditation and Regional Standards, Practical Research and Relevant Publications, Prestigious Competitions, Successful Conference Program and Effective Governance and Clear Positioning.

Mr Ramasundara informed General Assembly that SEARCC has a new President, Mr Mahesh Perera (CSSL President) following Mr Nick Tate (ACS President). SEARCC has presently 7 members, 1 observer and 3 prospects.

Mr Ramasundera informed General Assembly that the next SEARCC conference will be organized in Malaysia in 2014 by Prof Dr Ahmad Zakibin Abu Bakar (President MNCC).

Mr Strous thanked Mr Ramasundera for his report and wished SEARRC all the best with its ambitious strategy plan for the next 5 years.

3.10 InterYIT

Mr Strous informed General Assembly that no report was submitted to GA by InterYIT despite several requests. The InterYIT chair is in the process of handing over to a new chair. GA strongly expressed its’ disappointment and concern, also with a view on the allocated budget for InterYIT.

GA REQUESTED the President and the Executive Committee to take appropriate action.
3.11 Standing Committee Reports

3.11.1 Activity Management Board (AMB)

Mr Dundler reported that the IFIP Secretariat worked together with TC Chairs and Event organizers in order to get all relevant data for planned and performed events in time into IFIP’s web-based approval system, and consequently in IFIP’s event database. Mr Dundler showed a chart how the IFIP events developed over the last 6 years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Nbr events (main)</th>
<th>Nbr events (sponsored / supported)</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Event fee received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>57.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>55.608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>71.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>78.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>58.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>23.046</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For 2013 a total income from events of 60.000 is expected.

Mr Dundler said that the statistic presented shows that the total number of events was in 2012 slightly above the years before, but it shows very clear that half of the 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 us where effort needs to be put into income generation.

As there is no income from sponsored / supported events, TA and FC are 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).

General Assembly ACCEPTED the report.

3.11.2 Developing Countries Support Committee (DCSC)

Mr Puigjaner reported from DCSC that the composition of the committee has not changed in its structure, but some members have changed. It is composed by the chairman of the two WGs specially dedicated to Developing Countries (Mr Sein, chairman of the WG9.4 on Social Implications of Computers in Developing Countries and Mr Shaikh, chairman of the WG6.9 on Communications Systems for Developing Countries) and a representative of each continent with an important proportion of developing countries, Asia-Oceania (Mr Agrawal from India), Latin America (Ms Marin, President of CLEI) and Africa (Mr Gudza from Zimbabwe).

Mr Puigjaner informed General Assembly that for 2013 the funds of € 10.000 were allocated. The budget requested for 2014 is € 12.000 euros because there are a number of event organizers of different TCs that have advanced their intention of requesting a grant to the DCSC according the approved criteria.
Mr Puigjaner reported that DCSC funded the following activities after the last GA:

- TC8 Summer school in Thailand       € 1.000
- World Congress on Computer Education, WCCE 2013       € 1.500
- IFIP 9.4 Conference ‘Into the Future: Themes, insights and agendas for ICT4D research and practice Partners for Development: ICT Actors and Actions’        € 2.000
- TC9 / TC11 Summer school ‘Privacy and Identity Management for Emerging Services and Technologies’        € 1.000
- TC6 Latin American Tutorials In Networking (LATIN 2013)        € 2.000
- 9th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence Applications and Innovations (AIAI 2013)        € 1.250
- 25th IFIP International Conference on Testing Software and Systems (ICTSS’13)        € 1.250

General Assembly ACCEPTED the report.

3.11.3 International Liaison Committee (ILC)

Mr Strous apologized for not managing to finish the ILC report. This will be distributed to GA before the end of the year.

3.11.4 Internal Awards Committee (IAC)

In absence of Mr Pries-Heje, Chair of the Internal Awards Committee Mr Tjoa presented the report of the Internal Awards Committee. The Internal Awards Committee published a call for nominations to all relevant parties within IFIP for the Outstanding Service Award (OSA) and the IFIP Silver Core. By the deadline 15 August 2013 thirty-three nominations had been received for the Silver Core Award, and eighteen nominations for the Outstanding Service Award.

Mr Tjoa reminded General Assembly that for the Silver Core the following should apply:

"Eligible for nomination are: living persons who have served during a period of six years or more, and have been present at no less than 2/3 of the meetings in the following positions or equivalent: General Assembly Member or Member of an IFIP Standing Committee, Chair of a Technical Committee.

The Vice-Chair and Secretary of an IFIP Technical Committee and Chair, Vice-Chair and Secretary of a Working Group are also provisionally eligible on the above basis but the TC Chair must be consulted before an award is formally proposed. If there is disagreement the President will decide."

The Internal Awards Committee was in a number of cases of the opinion that the criteria for Silver Core were not met and proposed to award these candidates with the Outstanding Service Award instead. These proposals to change were challenged by some GA members.

Following that debate, the criteria themselves were questioned. Some GA members considered the criteria not to be selective enough. The feeling was for instance that serving two terms and doing nothing else should not be enough to get an award.
General Assembly REQUESTED the Awards Committee to have a look at the criteria for IFIP’s Silver Core and OSA and come up with proposals.

General Assembly MANDATED Mr Strous to check the nominations list, especially on the proposed changes, contact Mr Pries Heje about it and reach a conclusion within four weeks.

### 3.12 Congresses and Major Events

#### 3.12.1 World CIO Forum (WCF) 2013

Mr Lin, Deputy Secretary General of The Chinese Institute of Electronics (CIE), had presented to GA 2012 the outcome and success of the first IFIP World CIO Forum that took place from November 1st – 4th 2011 in Shenzhen. The plan to have the next WCF in 2013 in another country did not materialize. In order not to lose the positive effect of the first edition, it has been decided at the Board 2013 meeting to accept the offer from CIE to hold the next World CIO Forum again in China in 2014. The IFIP Executive Committee drafted conditions as a basis for a formal agreement (formal agreements are to be used for all IFIP flagship events).

To GA 2013 Mr Lin presented the CIE proposal to hold the next World CIO Forum 2014 in Beijing, China, November 5th – 7th 2014. The structure and approach are largely similar to the 2011 edition. Mr Lin informed General Assembly that an Advisory Body, Ministry of Industry and Information Technology, China Association for Science and Technology, Advisory Committee for State Informatization and the Beijing Municipal Government, has been implemented. The IFIP World CIO Forum will be organized by the Chinese Institute of Electronics (CIE).

Mr Lin said that the organizers will do their best to secure local government financial support and they hope to convene the efforts of all the member countries to help with invitation of overseas CIOs. But the financial burden is still the problem to be worked out.

GA made a number of suggestions. Among others it was strongly recommended to get CIO networks from around the world involved in the event.

General Assembly supported the proposal for WCF 2014 and MANDATED the Executive Committee to discuss the financial and other aspects in more detail with CIE and sign a contract with CIE.

#### 3.12.2 World Computer Congress (WCC) 2015

Mr Kim presented the proposal of the Korean Institute of Information Scientists and Engineers (KIISE) to hold the next World Computer Congress in 2015 in Daejeon, Korea. The WCC would be held under the theme: “Creating new IT oriented Jobs for near future in developed countries as well as in developing countries”. The conference program will be focussed on:

- New IT oriented jobs for near future
- Seoul Accord related topics
- IP3 related topics
- K-12 creative IT education
Connected to the congress several fairs are planned, as a job fair, a university fair and a venture Idea fair.

**Mr Kim** said that it is planned to hold the WCC 2015 on October 4th till October 7th, 2015 in the Daejeon Convention Center (DCC Korea).

**Mr Kim** informed General Assembly about the background of this proposal from KIISE:
- An IFIP WCC has never been held before in Korea
- The Software market has steadily grown in Korea (5.6% since 2007)
- There is strong investment from the Korean government in the software industry
- Strong financial and administrative support from the government
- Special events for WCC 2015 are planned
- Developing countries are encouraged to participate
- Support for young professionals will be available

**Ms Han** and **Mr Kim** showed a presentation of Daejeon and the surrounding as well as a detailed plan of the convention center.

IFIP’s technical and other bodies were kindly invited to contact **Mr Kim** with further ideas, suggestions and questions.

**Mr Kim** explained to General Assembly that due to changes in the Korean government the final commitment for the support by the government will come within the next two months. Therefore he asked General Assembly to mandate the IFIP Executive Committee to approve the final proposal for the WCC 2015 after the commitment of the government has arrived.

General Assembly unanimously supported the proposal and MANDATED the Executive Committee to evaluate the final proposal and to approve it when it is appropriate after the final commitment of the Korean government.

3.12.3 World IT Forum (WITFOR)

**Mr Strous** informed General Assembly that it is not feasible to hold a new WITFOR conference before 2016. He will work with **Mr Puigjaner** on proposals for new WITFOR activities.

3.13 IFIP Strategy

**Mr Strous** presented the 5 aims and projects of IFIP’s Strategy Plan for 2013 – 2016 and explained General Assembly to which group or person within IFIP they are assigned:
- Technical / Scientific oriented aim:
  - Project 1: Dissemination of high quality knowledge in ICT: Vice President, Technical Assembly
- Policy / Application oriented aim:
  - Project 2: International reputation: International Liaison Committee
- Member Society oriented aim:
  - Project 3a: Digital Library: Publications Committee
  - Project 3b: Position papers for topics of relevance for MS: Vice President
Project 4: Professionalism: IP3

Digital Equity oriented aim:
- Project 5: Digital Equity: Vice President, International Liaison Committee

Project 6: Marketing has been added to the Strategy document. Mr Strous said that all strategy aims and projects have a strong and direct relationship to an improvement of IFIP’s marketing. Recent feedback from quite a few member societies, as for instance also noted in the GI memorandum, has highlighted the need for IFIP to strengthen its global brand and improve communication with governments, the industry and the wider community, including its members, in order to regain its standing as an influential body capable of speaking for the global ICT profession.

Mr Strous presented to General Assembly a list of what IFIP’s member societies want IFIP to do:
- Raise IFIP’s international profile and thus increase its status and influence;
- Engage in strategic lobbying of international agencies and bodies, national governments for the benefit of ICT professionals;
- Demonstrate its relevance and contribution to ICT through planned, regular communication to key audiences and stakeholders;
- Drive the ICT professionalism agenda;
- More effectively communicate the outcomes and outputs of WCs and TCs to the wider ICT community;
- Provide more effective opportunities for ICT professionals to engage, contribute, learn and connect.

Mr Strous presented to General Assembly the following recommendations
- Engage an ICT-specialist writer/PR consultant to develop and distribute key messages to build recognition, credibility and relevance for the IFIP brand. This will improve IFIP’s ability to engage with governments, gain a hearing in the ICT and business sectors and more effectively serve the needs of its member societies and the wider community.
- Review/refresh the IFIP website to build currency and relevance, and to make it an effective platform to demonstrate the vast store of knowledge to which IFIP has access.
- Establish IFIP as THE voice for the global ICT sector and profession, able to speak knowledgeably, objectively and credibly on almost any issue and not influenced by the commercial agendas of vendors and other stakeholders.
- Review the events strategy to improve sustainability, relevance and access for members.
- Stage an international meeting on professionalism for national ICT Ministers/policy-makers.

Mr Strous explained that recommendations a and b relate to Strategy project 6 Marketing and partly to project 3.a Member societies. In order to effectively improve IFIP’s branding and communication Mr Strous proposed to allocate for a period of two years, starting with the budget 2014, an amount of € 75K annually to engage paid professionals for this purpose. This amount is based on the estimation that the work will be a part-time job of approximately one third fte (50 hours per month for an hourly rate of 100 euro which would then be 60K) and the rest (15K) for improving website and other communication means. The Executive Committee will work on the outline of the marketing strategy and plan and have these reviewed by professionals. This strategy and plan will then be the basis for the paid professionals to do the work.
**Mr Strous** said that this amount can be seen as an investment and that the benefits, including financial ones, will have to come from the other projects and activities.

The proposal was heavily discussed within General Assembly. There were worries about financial control and no trust that expected effects will come. It has also been discussed that it is not clear what IFIP’s product is which has to be marketed.

The following motion was proposed to be voted on:
- To put € 75K into the budget for 2014 for work on marketing activities
- Not more than 5% is available for preparation of the marketing plan
- As soon the plan is ready and checked by General Assembly, GA will decide on an approval of the rest of the budget

General Assembly **APPROVED** the marketing project under the conditions agreed (voting: Pro: 29, against: 9, abstention: 1).

General Assembly unanimously **APPROVED** the Strategy 2013 – 2016 document and **MANDATED** Mr Strous to distribute it to Member societies.

### 3.14 Future Meetings

**Mr Grebennik** presented the offer from the Ukrainian Federation of Informatics (UFI) to hold General Assembly 2014 in Kiev, Ukraine.

General Assembly **ACCEPTED** unanimously the offer and fixed the dates as for September 12th / September 13th, 2014.

**Ms Raffai** presented the schedule for the next meetings:

**2013**
- 14th September: postGA EC meeting next the GA meeting, Poznan

**2014**
- 7th of March: preBoard EC meeting Atlanta (USA)
- 8th – 9th of March: Board meeting in Atlanta (USA)
- 9th of March: postBoard EC meeting in Atlanta (USA)
- 11th of September: preGA EC meeting Kiev (Ukraine)
- 12th-13th of September: GA meeting in Kiev (Ukraine)

**2015**
- March: Board meeting invitations are welcome
- September: GA meeting after WCC2015 in Daegjeon (Korea)

EC teleconferences are held at least twice every year in the middle both between GA–Board and Board–GA meetings; and special EC teleconference meeting(s) will be organized if certain issues require immediate action(s).

### 3.15 Proposal for IFIP statement on security

**Mr Rannenberg** presented a proposal for an IFIP statement on intentional undermining of security and trust mechanisms in ICT and the Internet by government agencies and other major actors. He said that it is now a new and extraordinary
situation, as there can be seen a systematic, intentional undermining of security and trust mechanisms in ICT and the Internet. This is endangering the fabric of the Internet and the Information Society and it contradicts the claim of those actors to be trusted.

Mr Rannenberg said that based on experience the most important aspects seem to be the following:

- A stop of government measures, that are intentionally weakening the security mechanism of ICT and internet technologies;
- Proper descriptions and explanations of current and future weaknesses;
- A trust infrastructure, that cannot be dominated by major players;
- Transparency of ICT and the related infrastructures and operation procedures;
- Implementation of protection mechanisms, that users can really control;
- An infrastructure of independent institutions to assess the security and reliability of complex ICT.

In an intensive discussion a very large majority of the General Assembly AGREED that IFIP should have a public statement about this issue and it AGREED with the general outline and text. Parts of the text should be checked and possibly redrafted. GA also AGREED that Mr Rannenberg would ask a few colleagues to assist with the text and that a final proposal would be sent to GA for approval via the electronic voting system.

3.16 Closing of Meeting

The President thanked the outgoing Secretary Ms Raffai on behalf of IFIP for her hard work and service for IFIP. He presented the IFIP trophy to her. Mr Nawrocki expressed his thanks to Mr Strous and the General Assembly for holding its meeting in Poznan, Poland. He also thanked Mr Dundler for his help to organize the GA meetings.

The President once more thanked the hosts for their hospitality and the participants of General Assembly for the very constructive and active contributions and wished everybody a good journey home.

The President declared the meeting closed.
4 ATTACHMENTS

4.1 Attachment 1: Auditor’s Report

Report of the auditors to the members of the General Assembly of

IFIP
INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION FOR INFORMATION PROCESSING

on the financial statements for the year ended 31st December 2012

As auditors of your federation, we examined the accounts and the financial statements for the year ended 31st December 2012 in accordance with legal requirements. Our audit was performed in accordance with auditing standards promulgated by the profession. We confirm that we meet the legal requirements concerning professional qualification and independence.

Based on our examination we conclude that the accounts and the financial statements are in accordance with the law and the requirements of the statutes.

We recommend that the financial statements submitted to you be approved.

Vienna, April 25th 2013
CONSULTATIO
Wirtschaftsprüfung GmbH & Co KG

IFIP’s aims and activities

IFIP is a multinational non profit organisation primarily having its legal seat in Austria and its secretariat in Laxenburg. In 2009 the change of the seat of the Federation from Switzerland to Austria was concluded. The legal seat and also IFIP’s aims are written down by statutes and bylaws.

IFIP represents according to its statutes a non profit organisation. IFIP was granted the legal status of a non governmental international organisation on September 20th, 1996. In October 2009, the Austrian tax authorities confirmed the tax exemption status because of public utility for the years of 2009 to 2013.

IFIP’s basic aims are to promote information science and technology, but IFIP does not take any account on political, social or economic aspects of its members.
Therefore IFIP carries no commercial activities neither world-wide nor especially in Austria. IFIP’s statutes represent public utility also to the Austrian tax authorities. Public interest is also documented by the fact that the “Bundesministerium für Verkehr, Innovation and Technologie” covers the cost of the rent in Laxenburg.

IFIP’s main activity is the organisation of international conferences and similar events within information processing, in co-operation with its 49 national member organisations and others. The full members are members with voting rights.

In November 2011 the statutes were revised by the General Assembly Meeting in Prague in some sections (seat and legal entity in Austria, Categories of membership, and applicability of Austrian law). Also the bylaws were adapted.

The annual number of international conferences and events is currently 64. IFIP’s role in these events is to initiate the events and involve itself in defining the conference theme, preparing the technical program, reviewing the submitted papers, editing the proceedings, and establishing adequate co-operation with local organisers. The latter normally carry the financial responsibility of the events and occasionally submit proceeds to IFIP. IFIP also cooperates with selected publishers who publish and market quality proceedings from most of the events and submit royalties to IFIP. Further income results from member dues and the return of portfolio investment.

Publications in the name of the Working Groups of the Technical Committees (TC) become official IFIP publications after approval. To create a financial incentive for the TCs to generate a net financial contribution to IFIP a defined provision is credited to the fund balance of each TC.

Organisation and book keeping

All transactions are handled and accounted by the secretariat, normally as bank transfers. The accounts are balanced monthly and reported quarterly by the Treasurer to the Executive Board and Finance Committee. As part of IFIP’s financial safeguard the books of account are audited annually by a chartered accountant, appointed by General Assembly. CONSULTATIO Wirtschaftsprüfung GmbH & Co KG, Vienna is approved as the IFIP auditor.

IFIP’s Administrative Secretariat is located in Laxenburg near Vienna. The staff for the Administrative Secretariat is placed at IFIP’s disposal by the Austrian Academy of Science. There are two persons (Mr. Dundler, Mrs. Brauneis) who prepare Board and General Assembly (GA) meetings and maintain IFIP’s accounts, files and archives. A part-time administrative assistant is supporting the secretariat. The Secretariat also assists the volunteer Officers of IFIP, elected by the General Assembly to its Board and Executive Committee, or appointed by the President, in performing their duties, mainly by responding to inquiries and requests for information.

Description of the book keeping system

IFIP uses bookkeeping software of BMD which was adopted for the needs of the organisation. This system is in common use in Austria and represents a high standard. Since 2000 the accounts are recorded in €. Other currencies are converted to the exchange rates of the transaction’s date.
The chart of accounts is based on IFIPs structure in tradition to the Geneva bookkeeping system and the reports of the Treasurer. The treasurer got all accounts and information to report to the GA.

As the staff of the secretariat is employed by the Austrian Academy of Science salaries and contributions to social security are handled by it and charged to IFIP.

Results of the audit

IFIP’s financial operations are accounted in € as reference currency. The fiscal year is the calendar year. Key figures for 2012 are charged dues in the amount of € 136,800 (invoiced dues in the amount of € 160,000 less dues written off in the amount of € 23,200), incomes of royalties and proceeds in the amount of € 149,046,99 income of bank deposits of € 224,12, a total income amounting to € 286,071,11. On the other side there are expenses amounting to € 497,415,01. IFIP created a profit of portfolio investment in the amount of € 206,234,28. Income of portfolio investment comprises the increase of market value of portfolio investment from 2011 to 2012 in the amount of € 210,135,28 (“non realized profit”) and a loss created by portfolio investment in the amount of € 3,901.

Due to the agreements concerning fund provision € 19,050,69 were transferred from “special funds” to “general funds”. The final result of the year considering the above mentioned income and expenses as well as fund provisions is a loss of € 24,160,31.

Assets amount to € 2,291,841,27, accruals, liabilities and deferred income to € 22,557,20 and funds to € 2,269,284,07. About 96 % of the assets are kept as a bank-managed, mainly € based portfolio in the UK division of IFIP’s bank, UBS AG.

Within our auditing we examined

- the amortization of fixed assets in 2012
- the setting and payment of the member dues
- the bank confirmation and confirmation for Portfolio
- liabilities for services and deliveries performed in 2012 and invoiced in 2013
- the valuation of dues and loans outstanding
- accruals
- the payroll of the Austrian Academy of Science and the liability charged to IFIP as well as the balance at the end of 2012
- Accounting of royalties and proceeds
- cash-payments and payments made from bank account (samples) – it is only possible to check payment request but not acceptability of the expenses
- the recording of the portfolio investment according to the report of the portfolio manager
- the TC funds provisions
We report on the results of the audit as follows:

- Recording and balancing follow the rules of IFIP and correspond to Austrian law with exemptions specified below:

  Portfolio investment is recorded with market value. The valuation with market value corresponds to International accounting standards (IFRS). Commercial law of Austria does not allow realizing profit without sales – on the other hand devaluation is necessary, if market value is lower than book value. That means that portfolio investment should be valued at the lower of cost or market value according to Austrian commercial law. In 2012 market value is higher than book value by € 143,884,44.

- Assets of IFIP are shown at historical cost (except the already mentioned portfolio investment which is normally recorded with market value).

  - Furniture and equipment are depreciated, the rate of depreciation ranks between 20 and 33,3 %.

  - Outstanding dues are recorded according to the rules of IFIP but if there were doubts in receiving the payment an allowance is done in the balance sheet.

  - Services rendered for IFIP in 2012, invoiced or paid in 2013 were recorded as liabilities.

  - Bank accounts follow the bank statement.

  - Following the practice of IFIP royalties of the second half of 2012 are not recorded in the balance as an account receivable.

  - Different to prior years event fees outstanding are carried as an asset at an amount of 23,376,63 €.

  - The final result of 2012 is a loss of € 24,160,31. The result includes positive income of Portfolio investment in the amount of € 206,234,28.

To cover our auditing we got a representation letter (Vollständigkeitserklärung) signed by the IFIP Treasurer (Chris Avram) and IFIP’s General Secretary (Eduard Dündler), that all known assets and liabilities are included in the final balance 2012 and that there are no further non recorded obligations.
### 4.2 Attachment 2: Finance General Statement (TREAS 4)

#### IFIP Finance General Statement (TREAS 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues from Members</td>
<td>159.000</td>
<td>170.400</td>
<td>136.800</td>
<td>175.000</td>
<td>161.280</td>
<td>161.280</td>
<td>170.000</td>
<td>172.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return On Assets</td>
<td>1.843</td>
<td>2.481</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royalties from Publications</td>
<td>56.631</td>
<td>69.841</td>
<td>64.017</td>
<td>43.428</td>
<td>42.247</td>
<td>69.551</td>
<td>51.693</td>
<td>68.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds from Activities</td>
<td>71.009</td>
<td>61.944</td>
<td>85.030</td>
<td>47.288</td>
<td>15.791</td>
<td>48.300</td>
<td>46.602</td>
<td>68.507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congress Proceeds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.161</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>15.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>25.435</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.500</td>
<td>9.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin.Support</td>
<td>31.294</td>
<td>24.809</td>
<td>16.285</td>
<td>47.750</td>
<td>4.651</td>
<td>25.500</td>
<td>42.000</td>
<td>44.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Committees</td>
<td>62.411</td>
<td>39.302</td>
<td>63.722</td>
<td>104.174</td>
<td>23.760</td>
<td>69.700</td>
<td>86.302</td>
<td>79.705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCSC Supp to TC Events</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>7.152</td>
<td>8.135</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>2.999</td>
<td>10.000</td>
<td>10.000</td>
<td>12.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects</td>
<td>86.043</td>
<td>54.158</td>
<td>8.716</td>
<td>45.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23.000</td>
<td>50.000</td>
<td>125.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events (WCC, WITFOR, CIO)</td>
<td>10.265</td>
<td>10.761</td>
<td>183.270</td>
<td>9.500</td>
<td>-3.828</td>
<td>-11.000</td>
<td>17.000</td>
<td>13.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROFIT / LOSS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC Fund Provision</td>
<td>8.256</td>
<td>-8.421</td>
<td>-19.051</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2.000</td>
<td>-2.000</td>
<td>-2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return On Portfolio</td>
<td>140.815</td>
<td>-140.625</td>
<td>206.234</td>
<td>21.000</td>
<td>16.299</td>
<td>75.000</td>
<td>75.000</td>
<td>103.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>