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COUNCIL MEETING
17 – 18 August, 1971, Ljubljana

ATTENDANCE

COUNCIL members present
A. A. Dorodnicyn  President
H. Zemanek  Vice-President
S. Sem-Sandberg  Vice-President
P.A. Bobillier  Secretary
E. L. Harder  Treasurer
A.S. Douglas  Trustee
E Goto  Trustee
R.I. Tanaka  Trustee

COUNCIL members absent
S.F. Beltran  Trustee
D. Chevion  Trustee
I. Plander  Trustee

Invitees present
F.L. Bauer  Chairman CLIPO
S. D. Duyverman  Chairman, Artificial Intelligence Committee
M. Osredkar  Chairman, I.A.G.
P. Renard  Chairman, Executive Committee, IFIP Congress 71
T.J. Williams  Chairman, TC 5
GENERAL ASSEMBLY MEETING
19 – 21 August, 1971, Ljubljana

ATTENDANCE

Officers present

A. A. Dorodnicyn  President   USSR
H. Zemanek    Vice-President   Austria
S. Sem-Sandberg  Vice-President   Sweden
P.A. Bobillier  Secretary   Switzerland
E. L. Harder   Treasurer   Individual member

Honorary Member present
I.L. Auerbach

Full Members present

Y. Mentalecheta       Algeria
J.M. Bennett   (21 August)   Australia
D. Ribbens       Belgium
I. Iliev        Bulgaria
J.N.P. Hume       Canada
TH Herborg-Nielsen  Denmark
J. Tuori        Finland
P. Renard       France
N.J. Lehmann      German Democratic Republic
F.L. Bauer       Germany
I. Kadar        Hungary
D. Chevion       Israel
L. Dadda        Italy
E. Goto         Japan
S.F. Beltran    (21 August)   Mexico
W.L. van der Poel  Netherlands
S.A. Overgaard   Norway
L. Lukaszewicz   Poland

Full Members present (continued)

Miss V. Marting   (21 August)   South Africa
Seated after admission of South Africa and agreement on immediate start of membership and payment of 1971 dues)

R. Moreno-Diaz   Spain
A.S. Douglas   United Kingdom
R.I. Tanaka       U.S.A.
A.P. Zeleznikar   Yugoslavia

Other General Assembly members present

N.I. Bech   Individual Member
S. D. Duyverman   IAG

Full Members presented by proxy

Proxy held by:
J.M. Bennett   Australia   A.S. Douglas (19 August)
T. Oniga       Brazil   S.F. Beltran
J. Duran       Chile   H. Segovia
I. Plander     Czechoslovakia   A. A. Dorodnicyn
Full Members absent
M. Milchberg       Argentina
A. Alvarez Marceu       Cuba
(Representative to be appointed)       Ghana

Committee Chairman present
A. van Wijngaarden       TC 1 Chairman
J.E.L. Peck (acting for T.B. Steel)       TC 2
R.A. Buckingham       TC.3 Chairman
F. Gremy       TC.4 Chairman
T.J. Williams       TC 5 Chairman
M. Osredkar       Executive Committee, Congress 71, Chairman
H. Freeman Committee for Congress Organization Chairman

V. Glushkov       Programme Committee, Congress 71, Chairman
D. Kroneberg Publications and information Committee, Chairman,

Observers present
Gy. Striker       FIACC
A. Jensen       IFORS President
Miss V. Marting       Computer Society of South Africa
(19 August, Until seated as General Assembly Member
after admission of South Africa)
A.A. M. Veenhuis       IAG
P. Dular       Congress 71
J. Kokosinek       Congress 71

In attendance
F.M. Schumacher IFIP Administrative Secretary
W. Donat Assistant to Mr. Zemanek
Erika Bosshard Secretary to Mr. Bobillier
Mrs. S. Prato Secretary to F.M. Schumacher
Mrs.V. Schimmel Secretary to Mr. Zemanek
1. OPENING OF MEETING

The President opened the Council and General Assembly meetings and welcomed all participants. At the General Assembly meeting, he then gave the floor to Dr. S. Ristic, President of the Yugoslav Committee for Information Processing (ETAN) who welcomed all participants, and wished them a fruitful and constructive meeting.

Mr. Bobillier presented the existing proxies.

COUNCIL and GENERAL ASSEMBLY unanimously APPROVED the Agendas and their meetings.

2. READING AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

COUNCIL unanimously APPROVED the minutes, c.Bled-71 and recommended that General Assembly approve the minutes, C.GA. Amsterdam-70.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY APPROVED the minutes (with 2 abstentions), C.GA. Amsterdam-70.

3. IFIP SECRETARIAT GENEVA

Mr. Bobillier presented to the Council the report (C2-Ljubljana-71, Secretariat-1) stating that the Executive Body had received two proposals from Smith, Bucklin & Associates for the renewal of their contract which was to terminate 15 October, 1971. Mr. Bobillier summarized that this organization could not provide IFIP with the services required for the amount of money allotted, all proposals being above $20,000 per year. As Smith, Bucklin & Associates had waived the 90-day notice, it was recommended not to renew the contract, and therefore terminate with Smith, Bucklin & Associates on 15 October, upon mutual agreement effective 30 Sept., 1971.

COUNCIL unanimously APPROVED the report and charged Mr. Bobillier to organize the Secretariat in Geneva with a budget not exceeding $20,000 per year plus out-of-pocket expenses.

Mr. Bobillier presented to the General Assembly the report (GA-Ljubljana-71, Secretariat-1) explaining the decision of the Council.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY NOTED the report.

4. TECHNICAL COMMITTEES

4.1 TC 1 TERMINOLOGY

Mr. van Wijngaarden presented the report (C.GA.-Ljubljana-71, TC 1-1) which noted that the “IFIP Guide to Concepts and Terms in Data Processing”, Vol. I, had appeared at the beginning of August, 1971. Several national groups are busy translating the terms into their national languages. These translations are to be included in the second volume, but none of them is available yet.

The President thanked Mr. van Wijngaarden for his excellent work. Mr. van Wijngaarden indicated that a special vote of thanks should go to Mr. Gould, Chairman of WG 1.1, the person responsible for a good deal of the work.

Mr. Zemanek expressed the hope that the terminology, as published by TC 1, would be applied within IFIP wherever feasible.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY unanimously APPROVED the report.
4.2 TC 2 PROGRAMMING

In the absence of Mr. Steel, Mr. Peck presented the report (C.GA.-Ljubljana-71, TC 2-1 and Appendix I).

4.2.1 TC 2 Scope

Mr. Peck noted that a proposal to change the scope of TC 2 had resulted from the Twelfth Meeting of TC 2 at Eindhoven, Netherlands, in August 1970. The new proposal reads:

“The name of the Committee 2 shall be:

‘IFIP Technical Committee for Programming’.

The scope of the Committee shall include work in:

a) General considerations concerning programming principles and techniques such as concept development, classification and description;

b) the investigation and specification of particular programming languages;

c) the investigation and specification of operating systems;

d) the identification, investigation and specification of additional programming techniques.”

It was felt necessary that TC 2 should assume responsibility for topics generalizing all programming areas, while other groups could assume responsibility for specific applications.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY unanimously APPROVED the new scope of TC 2.

4.2.2 Working Groups

WG 2.1 (ALGOL) held its 14th meeting in Manchester this spring. The resolutions and subcommittees created indicated that WG 2.1 was concentrating on its assumed responsibility for the completion of the ALGOL 68 Report.

A further meeting was scheduled for 30 August – 3 September, 1971, in Novosibirsk, U.S.S.R.

WG 2.2 (Programming Language Description): no report.

WG 2.3 (Programming Methodology), in conjunction with WG 2.1, had proposed that a Working Conference on Programming Teaching Techniques (see below) be organized by TC 2. A further meeting of WG 2.3 was scheduled for 2-7 January, 1972, in Belfast, Ireland.

New WG: Data Base Management: Due to a desire for an international activity dealing with Data Bases and their management, TC 2 was presently considering the establishment of a new Working Group.

4.2.3 Working Conferences

Working Conference on Programming Teaching Techniques:

TC 2 recommended that upon invitation by the Polish Academy of Sciences, such a Working Conference be held in Zakopane, Poland, from 18-22 September, 1972, and requested a grant of $2,000 for its budget. The aim of the Working Conference was to review experience gained by the first four-year courses in Computer Sciences, and to assimilate recent developments in the teaching of programming languages and methodology. It was noted that the list of invited speakers was not closed, and that each national representative could suggest new names for TC 2.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY unanimously APPROVED the recommendation to allocate a grant of $2,000 to the budget of a Working Conference on Programming Teaching Techniques.

A Working Conference on Graphic Languages, to be held from 22-27 May 1972, in Vancouver, Canada, was proposed, and a grant of $2,000 was requested for this purpose.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY unanimously APPROVED the recommendation to allocate $2,000 to the budget of a Working Conference on Graphic Languages.
4.2.4 Publications

Mr. Zemanek expressed his thanks to the editors and publishers of the TC 2 books “ALGOL 68 Implementation” (J.E.L. Peck, and “Informal Introduction to ALGOL 68” (C.H. Lindsey and S.G. van der Meulen).

GENERAL ASSEMBLY unanimously APPROVED the report.

4.3 TC 3 EDUCATION

Mr. Buckingham presented the report (C.GA.-Ljubljana-71, TC 3-1) in which he indicated the meetings which have been held, and the changes in membership.

4.3.1 Working Groups

WG 3.1 (Secondary School Education) had held an important joint meeting with the Working Group of OECD/CERI, the outcome of which was a revised version of the booklet “Computer Education in Secondary Schools – An Outline Guide for Teachers”, which was widely distributed in an number of countries. TC 3 requested General Assembly approval for the following recommendations:

“a) The second edition should be printed by IFIP in a similar format to the IAG version of the first edition – about 2,000 copies – and made available for distribution by the IFIP Secretariat;

b) the cost of this printing might be included in the WG 3.1 budget;

c) other organizations should be permitted on request to reproduce and distribute the booklet, while the copyright should remain with IFIP (for example, it is understood that AFIPS will wish to reproduce the second edition);

d) although a nominal price per copy might be attached to any such reproduction, this should be to cover reproduction and mailing costs only, and there should be no bar to free distribution;

e) all member organizations should be asked to assist with distribution;

f) translations of the booklet should be encouraged; WG 3.1 had already had offers for translation into French, German, Danish and Russian.”

The copyright for translation should remain with IFIP.

Mr. Auerbach recommended that a nominal price be charged for the booklet in order to recover the cost of printing and mailing.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY APPROVED (with 1 abstention) the proposals a) through f).

WG 3.2 (Organization of Educational Seminars)

Mr. Buckingham reported on the recent ADP French Seminar held at Rocquencourt and organized by CEPIA with 35 students from 23 countries.

CEPIA announced the Third ADP Seminar, January to June 1972, again under the aegis of IFIP. TC 3 recommended that IFIP continue to be associated with these seminars and asked the General Assembly to approve the following recommendations:

“a) That a report be prepared on the 1970 and 1971 seminars and published in the IFIP Information Bulletin;

b) that on receipt of this report, the IFIP President be asked to write formally to the French authorities (Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Ministry of Scientific and Industrial Development), as well as CEPIA, thanking them for their enterprise in organizing and financing these seminars;

c) that Mr. Veenhuis be invited to organize an alumni group of students who have attended these and previous seminars;

d) that IFIP cooperate with CEPIA in publishing the essential documentation of the second seminar in French;
e) national IFIP representatives be asked to publicise the seminars in their own countries and to assist in the selection of candidates from their country or in their part of the world;

f) IFIP should use its influence with other international bodies to provide one or more fellowships for students attending the seminar;

g) visits by senior IFIP officials to the seminar should be encouraged.”

Mr. Renard indicated the disappointment of the French Government, noting that the Seminar had been completely financed by French Government funds and had taken place on behalf of IFIP. The French TC 3 members had been largely responsible for establishing the programme. He strongly supported Mr. Buckingham’s report, and suggested that IFIP provide better support for these activities.

Mr. Dadda queried IFIP’s involvement in organizing courses and suggested that IFIP should encourage developing countries to set up their own courses.

Mr. Auerbach presented the background leading to these courses. When initiating these Seminars nine and a half years ago, there was a total lack of material to train teachers in the uses of data processing enabling them to introduce courses in their own countries. The first courses provided documentation in English and were sent to National Members for their own use. Translation into French was intended. As the goal of designing the necessary material and making it available had been completed, perhaps IFIP could now try to stimulate teacher training.

Mr. Veenhuis pointed out that such a course was not available in the universities. Consequently, to diffuse such knowledge, the French Government had agreed to offer considerable financial support to these seminars.

Mr. Tanaka proposed the approval of points a) to g) of the report with the exception of f) which should be referred to the Executive Body.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY APPROVED** (with 5 abstentions) points a) to g) with the exception of f).

The President requested that an ad hoc Committee made up of the following persons study item f) of the report: Mr. Sem-Sandberg, Mr. Auerbach, Mr. Buckingham.

Mr. Bauer asked that the Executive Body study all problems related to these national seminars, in the light of Mr. Auerbach’s remarks.

**New WG 3.3 (Instructional Uses of Computers)**

Mr. Buckingham introduced a proposal to create a new Working Group, WG 3.3 on “Instructional Uses of Computers”, with the following scope and aims:

**“Scope**

The use of computers and data processing by computers to aid the educational process, including:

a) computer managed instruction;
b) computer assisted instruction (or learning).

**Aims**

1) To collect and exchange experience in the use of computers in education;
2) to study the ways in which the science and technology of information processing can contribute to the learning process and the assessment of performance;
3) to assist in the design and application of languages and systems to assist the process of instruction and learning;
4) to assist in the development of other computer-based techniques which will help the teacher;
5) to examine the extent to which these techniques can help to satisfy the needs of developing countries, especially in remedying the shortage of well-trained teachers.”

Mr. Buckingham further suggested that Dr. Sylvia Charp chair this Working Group.
Mr. Overgaard explained that computers and teaching were inter-related, and queried whether the scope included the use of computers for teaching.

Mr. Buckingham replied that there would be no restrictions.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY unanimously 

**APPROVED**

the creation of WG 3.3

**New WG 3.4 (Post-secondary Education and Vocational Training)**

Mr. Buckingham proposed the creation of a further Working Group, WG 3.4 on “Post-secondary Education and Vocational Training”, to be chaired by Prof. Alfred Berger, Austria, with the following scope and aims:

“Scope

Vocational training in information processing at a post-secondary school level, excluding courses for degrees in universities and polytechnics.

Aims

1) To collect and exchange experience on curricula already in use;
2) to develop ideas for creating new courses;
3) to examine the feedback from students being trained with the aim of specifying or revising the proposals mentioned in 2);
4) to find out whether a similar need exists in the technological field (e.g. post-secondary education for graduates of technical schools);
5) to study in advance the influence which hardware and software developments should have on such courses.”

Mr. Duyverman pointed out that IAG also handled vocational training, and suggested that there be a close collaboration between IAG and the new Working Group.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY 

**APPROVED** (with 1 abstention) the creation of WG 3.4

**4.3.2 Second World Conference on Computer Education, 1975**

Mr. Buckingham mentioned the recommendation of TC 3 to hold a Second World Conference on Computer Education in 1975, and requested approval for action on the following points:

a) that all TC 3 and General Assembly members be asked whether the IFIP organizations in their countries would wish to host the Conference, and
b) that a meeting of an ad hoc Committee be convened to establish an overall plan for the Second Conference.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY unanimously 

**APPROVED** these proposals.

**4.3.3 UNESCO Proposal “Survey of Higher Education Requirements”**

UNESCO proposed, at a recent TC 3 meeting, to contribute $5,000 for a preliminary survey of higher education requirements suggesting that IFIP and IBI/ICC participate. As TC 3 felt the need for a more precise definition of the scope of the project, it was proposed that Messrs. Buckingham, Hebenstreit and Atchison discuss the question with a representative from UNESCO.

Mr. Bauer expressed the necessity of supporting the defined activity.

Mr. Auerbach drew attention to the fact that a survey of such major importance would require more funds, and was a project which IFIP could not undertake alone. He therefore proposed that IFIP obtain a grant from UNESCO in order to assist them in an advisory capacity with the survey.

Mr. Tanaka proposed that TC 3 be empowered to conduct further evaluation and consult with the Executive Body prior to making a commitment.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY 

**APPROVED** (with 1 abstention) Mr. Tanaka’s proposal.
Mr. Striker indicated that at a meeting of the Education Committee of IFAC at Dresden, a FIACC sub-committee for education had been created. He expressed the hope that the IFIP TC 3 Chairman would participate in the continued work of such a sub-committee.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY unanimously APPROVED the report of TC 3.

4.3.4 Ad-hoc Committee on Education

Mr. Renard presented his ideas on IFIP activities in the field of education. He felt that IFIP had a very important role to play in the computer community, particularly in developing countries. Mr. Renard pointed out that there was no possibility of diffusing information throughout the world and concurrently gathering all the necessary competent people. He suggested that in view of the development of the use of computers in developing countries, IFIP should increase its activities in educational problems. He considered the structure and scope of activities of a Technical Committee would not be flexible enough to permit any significant development, and therefore proposed that Council be charged with studying, either itself or by means of a delegated committee, the possibilities of transforming TC 3 into a SIG involved in educational problems and activities; and to strive to find ways of increasing the activities of IFIP in this field.

The President proposed that an ad hoc Committee be established for this purpose and that it report to the next General Assembly.

Mr. Auerbach felt that Mr. Renard’s recommendation was of great importance and stated that CLIGO had been formally requested to submit a survey on this subject.

The President asked Mr. Renard to act as Chairman of this ad hoc Committee, and appointed the following members: Mr. Buckingham, Mr. Dadda, Mr. Segovia, Mr. Veenhuis.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY unanimously APPROVED the creation of this ad hoc Committee to study the problem by making a complete review of IFIP activities in the field of education, including the activities of the existing TC 3 and possible creation of a new SIG, and to make a proposal to the next General Assembly.

4.4 TC 4 MEDICINE

Mr. Gremy presented the report (C.GA.-Ljubljana-71, TC 4-1) which explained the activity of TC 4.

4.4.1 Working Groups

WG 4.1 (Education of Medical and Paramedical Personnel)

Mr. Gremy reported on a renewal of action of WG 4.1 in which the questionnaire, the principle of which had been adopted in 1970, had in effect been sent to TC 4 members with the idea of eventually distributing it to approximately 90 people throughout the world. An analysis had been made of answers received, and it had been decided to send questionnaires to countries which had not been explored enough.

New WG 4.2: The establishment of a new Working Group on “Input and Output Devices in Medicine” is being discussed, and it was proposed to request that General Assembly empower the Council to approve this Working Group as soon as the Chairman of TC 4 is able to make a precise report.

4.4.2 Working Conferences

A Working Conference on “Computer Applications in Electrocardiogram and Vectocardiogram Analysis” will be held from 11-14 October, 1971, in Hanover.

Another Working Conference on “Mathematical Models in Biology and Medicine” is planned to be held in Varna, May 1972.

4.4.3 Publications

Mr. Zemanek expressed his thanks to the editors and publisher of the TC 4 book “Information Processing of Medical Records” (J. Anderson and J.M. Forsythe.)
Mr. Gremy renewed his appeal urging members who have not yet appointed their TC 4 member to do so as soon as possible.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY APPROVED (with 2 abstentions) the proposal concerning a new Working Group, and the report.

4.5 **TC 5 COMPUTER APPLICATIONS IN TECHNOLOGY**

Mr. Williams presented the report (C.GA.-Ljubljana-71, TC 5-1 and Appendix I).

4.5.1 **Working Groups**

TC 5 proposed the establishment of a new Working Group WG 5.1 on “Transportation Systems” which would work in conjunction with the IFAC Applications Group and the French Organizing Committee as regards the Second Traffic Control Symposium, Paris, France, June 1974. The proposed Chairman was Prof. Johnson Y.S. Luh.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY APPROVED the proposal and empowered the Council to establish a new WG 5.1 upon receipt of a suitable proposal from TC 5.

4.5.2 **Working Conference**

TC 5 proposed a Working Conference on “Principles of Computer-aided Design/Non-electronic Systems” to be held from 16-18 October, 1972, in Eindhoven. The scope includes a complete investigation and definition of the field of computer-aided design, computer systems and associated hardware required, software necessary and costs and potential saving involved.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY APPROVED (with 3 abstentions) the proposal.

Furthermore, a grant of $2,000 was proposed to help arrange this Working Conference and fund the work of the Organizing Committee.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY unanimously APPROVED the proposal (See Budget).

4.5.3 **Symposia**

The following two Symposia are planned:

a) IFAC: Ship Operation and Dockside Automation, Oslo or Stavanger, Norway, 11-14 June, 1973; (IFIP co-sponsorship requested);

b) IFIP: Shipyard and Ship Design Automation, Osaka or Tokyo, Japan, 20-23 August, 1973 (date still in question); (IFAC co-sponsorship approved).

TC 5 proposed to co-sponsor the IFAC symposium a) and to allocate a loan of $2,000 to the TC 5 budget for the IFIP symposium b).

GENERAL ASSEMBLY unanimously APPROVED the proposal (See Budget).

It was further proposed to co-sponsor the IMEKO Symposium, “Information Processing in Measurement Systems”, Delft, Netherlands, 30 October – 2 November, 1972.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY unanimously APPROVED the proposal.

Mr. Williams asked for regulations on the running of symposia.

Mr. Tanaka stated that TC Chairmen should eventually plan their conferences and symposia up to four years in advance. This would then permit the Executive Body, Council and General Assembly to offer suggestions as to the necessity and importance of these meetings.

Mr. Douglas suggested that APC might do this sort of planning and that planning should be done 5 years in advance. The Activity Planning Committee should submit a report defining the limits.
Mr. Auerbach complimented Mr. Williams for the organizing efforts of this Technical Committee. He nevertheless felt that success was measured by the result and effectiveness of these conferences, and at this point, questioned the scope of TC 5 which seemed to be extremely wide.

4.5.4 Cooperation with IFAC (Publications)

IFAC has approved their co-sponsorship for PROLAMAT II scheduled to be held in Budapest, Hungary, in April 1973. IFAC will be the primary sponsor for the Fourth Conference on Digital Computer Applications to Process Control to be held in Zurich, Switzerland in March, 1974, and also for the Second Symposium on Traffic Control as mentioned above, tentatively scheduled for June, 1974, Paris, France.

Mr. Zemanek suggested to publish the proceedings of the two IFAC Conferences under one cover, have IFAC edit it, but have it published as an IFIP book. This would increase the number of sales, and royalties would be shared by both IFIP and IFAC.

COUNCIL unanimously RECOMMENDED that General Assembly approve the report and charged:

- the Activity Planning Committee to establish an outline of regulations for running symposia;
- the Publications Committee to establish a plan for publishing the above-mentioned proceedings under one cover with IFAC as editor, under IFIP’s name.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY APPROVED (with 2 votes against and 1 abstention) the report.

5. SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP

IAG

Mr. Duyverman presented the report (C.GA.-Ljubljana-71, IAG-o,1,1a,2,3 and 4).

5.1 The IAG BUDGET showed the following figures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1970</th>
<th>1971</th>
<th>1972</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73,000</td>
<td>80,500</td>
<td>120,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COUNCIL unanimously RECOMMENDED that General Assembly approve the IAG budget.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY APPROVED (with 1 abstention) the IAG budget with the understanding that expenditures would be kept within the limits of income.

Mr. Harder recommended that General Assembly approve the audited accounts of IAG:

GENERAL ASSEMBLY APPROVED (with 2 abstentions) the audited accounts of IAG.

5.2 IAG PROGRAMME OF ACTIVITIES

Summarizing the IAG programme of activities, Mr. Duyverman stated that during its Fourth General Conference, it was decided to alter the scope of the Activities Executive Committee which would become the Activities Committee to act as an advisory committee. The basic ideas to be promoted in the forthcoming programme were as follows:

- Management information systems,
- Data bases,
- Information systems in public administration,
- Information system operations,
- Computers and society,
- Education and training (in conjunction with TC 3),
- Applications (in conjunction with TC’s).
Mr. Auerbach requested clarification of the activities which had taken place and those which were scheduled for 1972.

Mr. Duyverman replied that there would be thirty events in 1972, as opposed to the seventeen which took place this year.

Mr. Auerbach questioned the international aspects of IAG activities.

Mr. Duyverman explained that the majority of IAG activities were to take place in Eastern and Western Europe. IAG would be prepared to broaden their scope as much as possible. Nevertheless, extension into the rest of the world largely depended upon the development of desks.

COUNCIL unanimously RECOMMENDED that General Assembly approve the IAG programme of activities.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY unanimously APPROVED IAG’s programme of activities, and requested that IAG seriously consider extending their activities in Latin America, Africa and Asia.

5.3 IAG DESKS

Mr. Duyverman reported that in spite of the hope he had expressed during the Council meeting in Bled to submit a detailed report on IAG desks, the material available was insufficient. He announced that he would present a report to the next Council meeting.

Mr. Auerbach regretted the long delay since the Amsterdam meeting in implementing and idea which was a very good one.

Mr. Zemanek noted that Council wished to hear more about the structure and operation, and wished himself to know on what organizational grounds IAG would operate.

Mr. Veenhuis stated that a certain confidence was necessary to begin this project. As noted in Appendix 2 of the report, the Board of Directors was to try to arrange meetings of delegates from various regions. Each desk was to be considered separately, and referred back to the Executive Body.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY NOTED the report reiterating the General Assembly recommendation taken at the Amsterdam meeting:

- “General Assembly notes the plan of IAG to organize regional desks being an extension of IAG Headquarters and asks the IAG Board of Directors to work out rules for operation of such desks in agreement with the IFIP and IAG members in the region prior to the establishment of such desks.”

Mr. Duyverman confirmed his indication to the Council at the Bled meeting that “suitable plans were being prepared concerning the details of desk operations and would be submitted as soon as possible for IFIP approval.”

5.4 IFIP AND IAG FOUNDATION

The Foundations Committee had met in Copenhagen on 20th June, 1971. Several points had been raised but no solution had been reached. “As stated previously, the legal responsibility and liability for the IAG is up to now fully with IFIP”. The IAG Foundation, if approved by IFIP, would report on financial and economic policy matters to the Board of Directors and IAG General Conference, and subsequently to the IFIP Council and IFIP General Assembly.

Mr. Sem-Sandberg explained that there were two foundations under consideration. The first was an IFIP foundation acting as an organization specifically dealing with funds raised for IFIP. The second was an IAG foundation required by IAG to establish itself as a legal entity in Holland. The solution would be to incorporate IAG as an IFIP subsidiary in Holland in order to protect IFIP from any financial risks taken by IAG:
Mr. Harder proposed that Council charge the Foundations Committee to proceed with the study of details for the establishment of a Foundation, and to consequently present a document to the next General Assembly outlining the procedure recommended by the Committee. This would include the limitation of IFIP liabilities.

After discussion in Council and General Assembly, the following action was taken.

COUNCIL CHARGED the Foundations Committee to make such a report to the next General Assembly.

Mr. Sem-Sandberg recommended that General Assembly charge the Executive Body to make investigations and come up with a practical solution, and further authorize the Executive Body to take proper steps in conjunction with IAG for an incorporation of IAG in the Netherlands in the most suitable form.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY APPROVED (with 2 abstentions) the recommendation.

This effectively terminates the ad hoc Committee previously appointed to recommend regarding a Foundation for IAG.

5.5 IAG REPRESENTATION IN THE IFIP COUNCIL

According to a proposition of the IAG Board of Directors dated 20 July, 1971, the IFIP Statutes and Bylaws should provide that the IAG Board of Directors be entitled to appoint a Trustee to the IFIP Council.

COUNCIL RECOMMENDED that General Assembly charge the Statutes and Bylaws Committee to study the matter including all possible consequences and communicate the final recommendation to the next Council meeting.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY APPROVED (with 1 abstention) the recommendation.

5.6 IAG COMMUNICATIONS

The IAG Board of Directors proposed that the publications now called “IAG Communications” and “IFIP Information Bulletin” be renamed “IFIP Communications” which would permit diffusion of general IFIP information on a more regular basis. Although responsibility for the publication would remain with IAG, there would be close cooperation.

Mr. Tanaka proposed that this question be referred to the Publications Committee and that this Committee report to the next Council meeting.

COUNCIL unanimously APPROVED the recommendation.

5.7 IAG MEMBERSHIP

Mr. Duyverman presented document IAG-4 which lists IAG National Members, and international organizations which had become affiliate members of IAG.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY APPROVED (with 3 abstentions) the document.

COUNCIL NOTED the IAG report.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY NOTED the IAG report.
6. **NEW TC’S AND SIG’S**

6.1 **ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE**

Mr. Bauer made a short oral report and announced that a Working Lunch of the Artificial Intelligence Committee was scheduled for 24 August, 1971, with several people from IJCAI. Thereafter, the Committee would submit a report to the next Council meeting dealing with the proposed affiliation of IJCAI to IFIP. Furthermore, he stated that an IFIP representative would attend the IJCAI meeting to be held in London, England, from 1-3 September, 1971. Mr. Bauer felt that the existing structure of IJCAI would not be appropriate for a Technical Committee. He recommended that General Assembly make as equitable an offer as possible, including a change in the Statutes and Bylaws if considered necessary.

Mr. Sem-Sandberg requested that the report of the Artificial Intelligence Committee be included with the Minutes of the Ljubljana meetings.

The President asked Mr. Bauer to send his report to the Secretariat not later than 15 September, 1971.

COUNCIL NOTED that the Committee will present a report to the next Council meeting.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY NOTED the oral report.

6.2 **DESIGN OF NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL DATA TRANSMISSION NETWORKS: NEW TC 6 DATA COMMUNICATION**

Mr. Sem-Sandberg presented the report (C.GA.-Ljubljana-71 DNIN-1). The Committee had worked mainly through individual discussions and had held a meeting in Ljubljana on 17 August, 1971. One of the results was to amend the name of the proposed new Technical Committee, suggesting instead “Technical Committee for Data Communication”. The Committee would have the following aims and scope:

“The aims of the Committee are to promote the exchange of information related to data communication;

- to bridge some of the gaps existing between users, teleadministrations and computer- and equipment manufacturers;
- to establish working contracts with international bodies concerned with data communication, among others with CCITT; CEPT; IEEE; ISO and ECMA.

The scope of its work includes: all aspects of data communication, such as research, design, manufacture and operation of products and systems related to data communication including related programming methods and data base management systems.

Some non-exclusive examples of areas of special interest to the Committee are:

- National and international data communication networks; private and/or dedicated systems exemplified by banking-, transportation-, industrial- and other applications; terminal equipment and modems; the problems of distributed computing and the information interchange between individual data bases within a network of computers.”

COUNCIL unanimously RECOMMENDED that General Assembly approve the establishment of TC 6 and requested the current Committee to propose a chairman to the President before the next Council meeting.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY APPROVED (with 2 abstentions) the report and the establishment of TC 6.

6.3 **OPTIMIZATION. NEW TC 7 ON OPTIMIZATION**

The President presented the report (C.GA.-Ljubljana-71 OP-1). The formation of a Technical Committee on Optimization had been considered at the Bled Council meeting. A thorough investigation of this question showed that special attention should be paid to implementing a really international
representation of people interested in this field. Representatives from six countries had expressed their readiness to begin the work if this were approved by General Assembly.

Mr. Dadda asked if the question of cooperation and competition with IFAC had been studied.

The President replied that Optimization was going far beyond the technical matters dealt with by IFAC, for instance in economics. Nevertheless, a new TC 7 had to take care to cooperate with other organizations such as IFAC and IFORS.

COUNCIL unanimously RECOMMENDED that General Assembly approve the report and authorize the Council to establish TC 7 as soon as its aims and scope have been worked out in detail.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY APPROVED (with 3 abstentions) the report including delegation of authority to the Council for the creation of TC 7.

6.4 OTHER NEW ACTIVITIES

After some discussion about proposed new activities on Simulation and Numerical Analysis, in the form of TC’s or SIG’s, these matters were referred to the Activity Planning Committee for consideration.

7. COMMITTEE REPORTS

7.1 ACTIVITY PLANNING

Mr. Zemanek presented the report (C.GA.-Ljubljana-71 APC-1). The Activity Planning Committee had held a meeting after the Bled Council meeting which had essentially become an IFIP Working Conference on the Future of Information Processing. The outcome was of great utility as not only the papers presented – dealing with general topics, computer technology and applications – were to be published with those of the 10th Anniversary celebration, but also it was generally felt beneficial to have a technical event along with each Council and General Assembly meeting. The Activity Planning Committee will study planning such events.

Mr. Zemanek also pointed out that IFIP had to cooperate rather than compete with similar IFAC activities. A new chairman was to be appointed for the Activity Planning Committee in due time.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY NOTED the report

7.2 STATUTES AND BYLAWS

7.2.1 Report of the Statutes and Bylaws Committee

Mr. Tanaka presented the report (C.GA.-Ljubljana-71 STC-1 and Appendix I), containing proposals for changes in the IFIP Statutes and Bylaws according to discussions resulting from the meeting of this Committee on 15 and 16 June, 1971. These proposals dealt with the following matters:

- Elimination of inconsistencies regarding approval of IAG Budget;
- Procedures for conducting meetings;
- Qualification of two-thirds majority voting rule;
- Admissions criteria;
- Assistant Secretary;
- Clarification and revision of articles on conferences sponsorship;
- Possibility of providing an additional Vice-President position;
- Minor changes.

7.2.2 Majority Requirements in the Statutes

With regard to the qualification of a two-thirds majority voting rule and after discussion, the following proposals were made:
i) Two-thirds approval of all Full Members is required for decisions relating to termination of membership;

ii) Two-thirds approval of Full Members present or represented by proxy is required for decisions relating to admission of Honorary and Individual Members, discharge of an Officer or Trustee, disapproval of the IAG Budget.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY APPROVED (with 4 abstentions) the proposals.

iii) Two-thirds approval of Full Members present or represented by proxy is required for decisions relating to amendments.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY APPROVED (with 1 vote against and 4 abstentions) the proposal.

iv) A simple majority of Members present or represented by proxy is required for decisions on all other matters.

7.2.3 Third Vice-President of IFIP

Concerning a third Vice-President office, several General Assembly members spoke in favour of the creation of this new office during the current General Assembly meeting.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY APPROVED (with 1 abstention) the proposal and AGREED (with 6 abstentions) to elect two Vice-Presidents during the Ljubljana meeting.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY APPROVED (with 2 abstentions) the report of the Statutes and Bylaws Committee.

7.3 FINANCE

7.3.1 Report of the Finance Committee

Mr. Bobillier presented the report (C.GA.-Ljubljana-71 PC-1). With regard to dues, Mr. Bobillier pointed out that although not all Members had confirmed their agreement to the new schedule proposed by the General Assembly, the overall result was a success. The total schedule was not $17,500 as opposed to the previous sum of $9,625.

The Finance Committee also felt that IFIP could avoid the unnecessary expense of having an outside auditor by appointing, from among its members, two or more auditors for this purpose. The Finance Committee therefore proposed that General Assembly appoint auditors from within IFIP.

Mr. Auerbach expressed his disapproval, stating that the purpose of an auditor was that an independent financial organization from outside verify reports, and sign for their accuracy, so that the Treasurer would not be personally responsible.

Mr. Harder pointed out that he had made a conditional proposal which depended solely upon a unanimous approval. He therefore withdrew the proposal of the Finance Committee.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY unanimously APPROVED the report.

7.3.2 1970 Audited Accounts

Mr. Harder presented the report (C.GA.-Ljubljana-71 T-1) which showed net assets at the end of 1970 of $158,424.87. Total expenses were $28,951.04 and total income was $71,305.10. (It should be noted that an amount of $72,142.88 was received in 1970 as surplus from Congress 68).

COUNCIL unanimously RECOMMENDED that General Assembly approve the report

GENERAL ASSEMBLY APPROVED (with 1 abstention) the report.
7.3.3 Interim Account to 30 June, 1971

Mr. Harder presented the report (C.GA.-Ljubljana-71 T-2) which gave details of the receipts, $22,042.37, and the expenditures, $20,148.76 plus loans $22,493.31.

COUNCIL NOTED the report

GENERAL ASSEMBLY NOTED the report

7.3.4 Financial Summary

Mr. Harder presented the report (C.GA.-Ljubljana-71 T-2.1) which indicated a total income of $22,042.00, a total expenditure of $20,149.00, net worth $160,317.00, at end June 1971 not taking into consideration approximately $12,000.00 form IFIP Congress 68 surplus not yet transferred; this as compared to a net worth of $158,424.00 at the end of 1970.

Mr. Harder also introduced a chart which indicated (in thousands US Dollars) the cash flow projection for 1972. The estimated net worth at the end of 1971 was 145.8 compared to 132.8 at the end of 1972.

Mr. Harder drew General Assembly's attention to the fact that due to the fixed charges now established by IFIP (Secretariat in Geneva), the ratio actual expenses/planned expenses is increasing. In future years, IFIP will be obliged to use reasonable part of the reserves, until the next Congress surplus is received, probably 1975.

COUNCIL NOTED the report

GENERAL ASSEMBLY NOTED the report

7.3.5 IFIP Loan and Grant Record

Mr. Harder presented the report (C.GA.-Ljubljana-71 T-2.2) dealing with the following loans:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loan</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IFIP Congress 71</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAG (Seminar Papers)</td>
<td>2,825</td>
<td>2,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADP Seminar, Level I</td>
<td>4,026</td>
<td>4,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Seminar Programme</td>
<td>3,768*)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Conf. on Education</td>
<td>8,074</td>
<td>8,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$28,693</strong></td>
<td><strong>$24,925</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*) see next page

A grant of $3,911 was made to the IFIP 71 Programme Committee, up to June 1971, estimated $5,400 total.

Mr. Harder explained that breaking even on Congress 71 simply meant that the $10,000 loan would be repaid, in addition to $5,000 expenses of the Programme Committee, totalling $15,000.

Mr. Auerbach asked about the possibility of having the other loans returned.

Mr. Harder answered that return of the loan made to the ADP Seminar, Level I, might be difficult.

Mr. Buckingham stated that the necessary steps would be taken to recover the loan to Cepia of $3,000.

Mr. Harder stated that the Advanced Seminar Loan appeared less likely to be repaid by any immediate seminar surplus. The work is taking the direction of curriculum development. It would be more properly financed as committee expense.
Mr. Auerbach suggested that in order to have a more precise and factual balance sheet, loans with low probability of return should be written off as expenses. Accordingly, he proposed to write off the loan of $3,768 for the Advanced Seminar Programme and consider this as a 1971 expense. Nevertheless, he pointed out that TC 3 should be everything possible to recover the money.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY APPROVED (with 2 votes against) the proposal and NOTED the report.

Mr. Harder reported that $4,000 of the loan to World Conference on Education had just been repaid. The balance hinges on sale of Proceedings and return in 1972 appears possible.

7.3.6 Royalty Record

Mr. Harder presented the report (C.GA.-Ljubljana-71 T-3) which indicated an amount of $7,318.00, royalties received by IFIP during 1971, and a cumulative total over the years of $32,662.00.

Mr. Harder noted that the sum of $188.00, royalties for the IAG Journal, would be returned to IAG.

COUNCIL NOTED the report.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY NOTED the report.

7.3.7 IFIP New Dues Situation

Mr. Harder presented the report (C.GA.-Ljubljana-71 T-4) with the following figures:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970 Schedule</td>
<td>$ 9,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed New Schedule</td>
<td>$21,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepted 1971 Schedule</td>
<td>$19,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971 Dues Paid, 30 June</td>
<td>$13,250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Harder thanked those Members who had accepted the increase of dues which enabled IFIP to undertake new programmes. He urged all those who had not confirmed their acceptance to do everything within their power to have this done.

Mr. Beltran stated that the level of dues might be reconsidered in Latin American countries if IFIP would increase their activities in these countries.

Some minor modifications were made to the document.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY APPROVED the report.

7.3.8 IFIP Budget 1972

Mr. Harder presented the report (C.GA.-Ljubljana-71 T-5 revised) to the General Assembly. The 1972 budget, including expense and loans, would amount to $74,800.00. The 1972 budgeted expense would be $58,300.00 as compared to $52,360.00 in 1971. The total income (not including returned loans) would be $32,125.00, as compared to $28,400.00 in 1971.

Mr. Beltran stated that the Chilean Society requested a loan of $5,000 for an ADP Seminar in the Spanish language to take place from August 1972 to January 1973. He noted that the loan would be returned no later than March 1973, and that the guarantee would be shared between Mexico and Chile.

Upon recommendation of an ad hoc committee which examined this request, the related amount was included in the proposed 1972 budget.

Mr. Herborg-Nielsen said that he could not approve the budget as presented because it was not balanced.
Mr. Auerbach stressed that the goal of an organization such as IFIP was not to have income exceeding expenditure every year. He strongly felt that in view of the Congress planning the budget should be considered on a 3-year cycle rather than as a 1-year operation. He further suggested that a reserve be set up for loans that have a low probability of return.

Mr. Bauer recommended that the Activity Planning Committee prepare a three-year budget (for 1972-1974).

The President charged the Secretariat to distribute the following documents along with the Minutes:
- T-5, IFIP Budget 1972;
- T-6, IFIP New Dues Situation;
- 1971 Budget

GENERAL ASSEMBLY unanimously APPROVED the 1972 budget

7.4 ADMISSIONS

7.4.1 Admissions Committee Report

Mr. Renard presented the report (C.GA.-Ljubljana-71, AC-1, AC-1.1, AC-1.2, AC-1.3, AC-1.4).

7.4.2 U.A.R. National Computer Committee

Mr. Renard spoke of the application for affiliation with IFIP introduced by the National Computer Committee of the U.A.R. (Document AC-1.1). All documents had been received from this Society, with the exception of the statutes. The Admissions Committee therefore still wished to verify that this organization was representative of the computer community in the U.A.R. A report would subsequently be submitted to the General Assembly.

Council charged the Admissions Committee to discuss the matter with the delegate of the U.A.R. before the General Assembly meeting and thereupon make a final recommendation to the General Assembly.

At the General Assembly meeting, Mr. Mentalecheta asked whether there was a precedent where an applicant society was admitted without having submitted its statutes.

To the knowledge of those present, such later took place in the first year of IFIP's existence when applicants were the Academics of Sciences of Countries.

Mr. Renard added that there was no evidence that the National Computer Committee was an extension of the Academy of Sciences of the U.A.R.

Messrs. Tanaka and Sem-Sandberg suggested to adhere to the recommendation of the Admissions Committee.

The President opposed this recommendation arguing that an admission should not be postponed only because of missing statutes.

Mr. Renard stated that the Admissions Committee considered it very important to study the statutes in order to ensure that the organization in question would properly represent the entire computer community of that country.

Mr. Douglas proposed that the Executive Body be empowered to make the decision regarding the admission of the U.A.R. National Computer Committee, upon receipt of their statutes.

Mr. Sem-Sandberg made the additional proposal that the Admissions Committee first make its recommendation to the Executive Body which could proceed with the final decision.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY APPROVED (with 2 abstentions) the proposals by Messrs. Douglas and Sem-Sandberg charging the Executive Body to take the final decision upon receipt of the statutes of the National Computer Committee of the U.A.R, taking due account of the recommendation of the Admissions Committee.
7.4.3 **Computer Society of South Africa**

Regarding the application for affiliation with IFIP introduced by the Computer Society of South Africa (Document AC-1.2), Mr. Renard stated that all documents concerning this admission had been obtained, and that the Admissions Committee recommended to the General Assembly to admit the Computer Society of South Africa as a Full Member of IFIP.

COUNCIL RECOMMENDED (with 2 abstentions) the admission of the Computer Society of South Africa.

During the General Assembly meeting, Mr. Bobillier suggested that Miss Marting, the representative of the Computer Society of South Africa, be given an opportunity to address the General Assembly.

Miss Marting stated that her Society afforded to all races the possibility of working in the computer field. Admission to the Society was purely a matter of merit. Upon her return to South Africa, she would be opening a conference on data communications. She considered that just as all computer professionals were concerned with physical data transmission, so communication on all common levels was necessary. No professional development was possible in isolation, and if it was the desire to help less developed races, then the best atmosphere in which this could be done was within the community of IFIP.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY APPROVED (with a vote of 20/7/3) the admission of the Computer Society of South Africa as a Full Member of IFIP.

Mr. Harder proposed that the dues for South Africa be set at $500.00 for 1971. Miss Marting accepted to pay the dues for 1971.

7.4.4 **Automatisation Commission of Roumania**

Mr. Renard indicated that the application for affiliation with IFIP introduced by the Automatisation Commission of Roumania (Document AC-1.3) was incomplete. The Admissions Committee therefore recommended to postpone the discussion until additional appropriate information was obtained.

The President requested whether or not the report could be changed in the case that all documents were received during the General Assembly.

Mr. Douglas noted that the one month's notice could be waived.

COUNCIL unanimously APPROVED to waive the one month's notice if the required documents arrived by 21 August, 1971.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY APPROVED (with 5 abstentions) the following recommendation of the Admissions Committee:

"The IFIP General Assembly notes with great interest the application of the Automatisation Commission of Roumania and charges the Admissions Committee to take the necessary steps to get the additional appropriate information required for admission."

7.4.5 **Brazil Membership**

Regarding Brazilian representation in IFIP (Document AC-1.4 revised), Mr. Renard pointed out that membership dues had not been paid since 1965 and no answer had been received in reply to the six different IFIP letters sent to ABRACE, between 25 November, 1969 and 3 March, 1971. On 13 August, 1971, the Secretariat received a letter from Professor Teodoro Oniga, IFIP representative from ABRACE, dated 9 August, 1971. Professor Oniga stressed that no matter what future plans may be, ABRACE had the firm intention to absolve its back dues and expressed the wish that termination of the Brazilian affiliation with IFIP be avoided.

In view of this fact, Council recommended that ABRACE be offered a last opportunity to pay their back dues under the following conditions:
Payment of all back dues up to the end of 1970, amounting to $832.00 to the IFIP bank account at Swiss Bank Corporation, Geneva, by 31 December, 1971.

Mr. Renard mentioned that contacts had been established with another computer organization, SUCESU, whose activity seemed important, and who had expressed an interest in being the representative of their country. This however had yet to be confirmed by supporting documents.

Mr. Beltran qualified that ABRACE and SUCESU were taking measures to merge.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY unanimously APPROVED the Council recommendation including the above conditions and reaffirmed that the membership of ABRACE would be terminated automatically if one of these conditions was not fulfilled.

Among other general considerations, it was suggested that the Admissions Committee study the question of denomination of countries used within IFIP and other international organizations and submit a report and recommendation to the next General Assembly regarding possible modification to be introduced in IFIP’s current practice.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY APPROVED (with 1 abstention) the recommendation.

7.5 NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE

7.5.1 Election of a Vice-President

Mr. van der Poel presented the following nominations of the Committee:

Mr. Goto for the 3-year term;
Mr. Douglas for the 1-year term.

The President asked if further nominations were made from the floor.

Mr. Segovia nominated Mr. Beltran for both terms.

After discussion, it was suggested that the three persons run for the 3-year term. The person receiving the majority would be elected for the 3-year term and the remaining two candidates would run for the 1-year term.

Mr. van der Poel indicated that the Nominations Committee nominated Mr. Douglas also for the 3-year term.

Vice-President for 3 Years:
A secret ballot for the 3-year term resulted as follows:

First Ballot:  
Mr. Goto  15  
Mr. Beltran  9  
Mr. Douglas  7  

Second Ballot:  
Mr. Goto  22  
Mr. Beltran  9  

The President then declared Mr. Goto duly elected Vice-President for a term of 3 years and congratulated him on his election.

Mr. Goto expressed his thanks and stated that he was fully aware of the difficult duties of a Vice-President and would do everything possible to make IFIP a really international organization.

Vice-President for 1 Year:
A secret ballot for the 1-year term resulted as follows:

Mr. Douglas  22  
Mr. Beltran  11
The President declared Mr. Douglas duly elected Vice-President for a term of 1 year and congratulated him on his election.

Mr. Douglas thanked the President and delegates assured that he recognized the responsibility of being elected IFIP Vice-President.

7.5.2 Election of Trustees

Mr. Tanaka presented the following candidates of the Nominations Committee:

- Mr. Duyverman (3-year term)
- Mr. Moreno-Diaz
- Mr. Mentalecheta (1-year term)

There being no further nominations from the floor, GENERAL ASSEMBLY unanimously approved close of nominations.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONFIRMED (by a vote of 27/1/3) these nominations, thus electing all these candidates. The President then declared duly elected Trustees: Mr. Duyverman and Mr. Moreno-Diaz for 3 years and Mr. Mentalecheta for a term of one year.

7.6 PUBLICATIONS AND INFORMATION

7.6.1 Mr. Kroneberg presented the report (C.GA.-Ljubljana-71, PIC-1)

**New IFIP Publications**
The three IFIP publications in 1971 were:

- a) ALGOL 68 Implementation,
- b) Informal Introduction to ALGOL 68;
- c) IFIP Guide to Concepts and Terms in Data Processing.

**Congress 71 Proceedings**
Mr. Kroneberg noted that, according to a decision at the last Council meeting, the material for pre-prints of Congress 71 had been collected by North-Holland and printed in Ljubljana. The final proceedings would be published no later than Spring 1972.

**IFIP Terminology**
Mr. Kroneberg indicated that the University of Concepcion, Chile, had requested permission to translate the IFIP Vocabulary into Spanish. It was brought to their attention that the Guide to Concepts and Terms in Data Processing has now replaced the IFIP Vocabulary.

**FIACC Sub-Committee on Publications**
During the FIACC meeting of Publication Officers of the five organizations, it was proposed to have a permanent Sub-Committee on publications and information exchange for eventual coordination on future projects amongst the five organizations. The subsequent idea of creating a common journal, or of enlarging by common effort the only existing journal, IFAC Bulletin, within the community, was not favoured by the IFIP representative. Another meeting will be held in Dusseldorf on 14-20 October, 1971.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY unanimously approved the report.

7.6.2 IFIP Correspondents

Mr. Bobillier presented his proposal (C.GA.-Ljubljana-71, PIC-2 and Resolution 1) to appoint an IFIP correspondent in each Member Society. This would improve communication between the IFIP organization and its Members.

COUNCIL unanimously recommended that General Assembly approve the proposal.
Mr. Bennet proposed that the resolution be amended to read, "... the IFIP General Assembly recommends to its Members to appoint an IFIP Correspondent, who may be the General Assembly representative, whose responsibilities will be..."

GENERAL ASSEMBLY APPROVED (3 votes against and 1 abstention) the report and adopted the following resolution:

"The General Assembly recommends that each Member Society appoint an IFIP Correspondent, who may be the General Assembly representative, whose responsibilities will be:

- to inform, on a regular basis, the IFIP Secretariat and, upon occasion, other member societies, of all significant events within his society relating to the IFIP fields of interest;
- to bring to the individual members of his society information regarding the IFIP activities, publications, events, etc., using the best vehicle available for this purpose such as local journal, newsletter, national information bulletin;

that the name, affiliation, address(es), etc., of the appointed IFIP Correspondent be communicated to the IFIP Secretary who shall issue a periodically updated list of all Correspondents to be published in the IFIP Information Bulletin."

7.7 IFIP CONGRESS

7.7.1 Congress 71 Organizing Committee

Mr. Osredkar presented the report (C.GA.-Ljubljana-71, C. 71 OC.-71). As of 15 August, 1971, the total number of registered participants to Congress 71 was 2,400 of which 2,100 are actual participants, 260 exhibitors, 29 reporters, altogether from 45 countries. The space sold for the exhibition was currently 2,778 sq.m. The anticipated total income was $310,000, which was somewhat lower than the anticipated second alternative budget adopted by the General Assembly at Amsterdam in 1970. The total expense was $304,500, resulting in a surplus of $5,500 (after reimbursement of total amount loaned by IFIP). Despite the resolution taken concerning free lunches for members and Chairmen or Vice-Chairmen of sessions, it was not possible for the Organizing Committee to absorb those costs and this would be charged to Congress expenses. The Congress account will be presented in draft form in April 1972 (approximately 90 % complete), and the final accounts will be presented to the General Assembly meeting in the fall of 1973.

Mr. Harder expressed his appreciation for the excellent cooperation by the Congress Organizing Committee in all matters, particularly that of abiding by the agreed budgets.

COUNCIL NOTED the report

GENERAL ASSEMBLY unanimously APPROVED the report

7.7.2 Congress 71 Programme Committee

Mr. Glushkov presented the report (C.GA.-Ljubljana-71, C. 71 PC.-1). It had been decided that 32 invited papers and 218 submitted papers would be included in the timetable, national balance being a prime criterion. The deadline for presenting final versions of invited papers was 15 April, 1971, and of submitted papers 13 May, 1971. Those sent after these dates had not been accepted. The final programme therefore consisted of 29 invited and 214 submitted papers. The four Symposia completed a coverage of the information processing field and contributed to national balance, and the six informal discussions lent greater actuality to the topics dealt with at the Congress.

Translation
To assist non-English speaking participants, volunteers were to be recruited for translation during discussions, signs were to be placed at the Chairman’s desk indicating the language to be used, and labels were to be placed on the participant’s identification badges, indicating the language spoken.

Mr. Bauer expressed the slight concern of his Society regarding the low ratio of papers accepted versus papers presented by Germany.
Mr. Beltran also expressed his serious concern relating to the papers presented by the Latin American countries. Only one paper had been accepted, and there was no Session Chairman from Latin American countries.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY APPROVED (with 1 abstention) the report and authorized the Chairman of the Programme Committee to decide on the substitution of speakers. Finally it expressed IFIP’s thanks and appreciation to the Programme Committee for all their efforts.

7.7.3 Congress Organization

Committee Report
Mr. Freeman presented the reports (C.GA.-Ljubljana-71, COC-1 and COC-2). This committee was to act as a permanent planning and coordinating committee for future IFIP Congresses. The specific tasks are tentatively to provide assistance to both the Organizing and Programme Committees for IFIP Congress 74, to arrange for the preparation of an IFIP Congress Manual, to continually review the policies and procedures concerning the holding of IFP Congresses, to devise a standard procedure for selection of future congress sites. With regard to this point, a set of guidelines was being prepared to assist countries in submitting proposals. Therefore, when a new congress site was to be selected, a call for preliminary proposals plus a set of guidelines would be sent to all IFIP Member Societies. This first proposal would be brief, and from the responses, two or three would be chosen and asked to submit detailed proposals in order to facilitate arriving at a final decision.

Suggestions for Future Congresses
Mr. Renard made two suggestions which he hoped would be considered when arranging future congresses. Firstly, he thought it necessary that the preliminary programme of the Congress be distributed along with the Congress booklet containing registration material (Action Folder). Secondly, the proper contact in each country should be the Member Society, or any person delegated by them.

Mr. Tuori considered that the low number of participants at Congress 71 may be due to the fact that the programme of the Congress was too scientific and did no sufficiently address the practitioners.

Mr. Freeman explained that practical difficulties could arise from implementing Mr. Renard’s first suggestion due to the rapid evolution of new knowledge in fields of study represented at the Congress, making it necessary to set the date for submission of papers as close to the time of presentation as possible.

Congress Organization Committee Task Statement
Mr. Freeman requested approval for the following Task Statement, (Document COC-2):

“The Committee for Congress Organization reports to the Council and General Assembly, and acts for them in the planning and operation of IFIP Congresses. The Committee is expected to provide advice and the benefit of past experiences, as well as guidance concerning standards and the long-term objectives of IFIP to specific IFIP Congress Executive and Programme Committees, and to review and approve the operating plans and budgets of these committees prior to their presentation to the General Assembly for final approval.”

GENERAL ASSEMBLY unanimously APPROVED the report and the Task Statement.

7.7.4 Congress 74 Organization

Mr. Sem-Sandberg presented the report (C.GA.-Ljubljana-71, C. 74-1). According to a decision of the General Assembly in Amsterdam in October, 1970, much preparatory work in the planning of Congress 74 in Stockholm had been done. An ad hoc Executive Committee had been formed consisting of:

Mr. S. Sem-Sandberg (Chairman)
Mr. P. Svenonius (Vice-Chairman)
Mr. D. Hellstedt (Secretary)
Mr. K. Hultman
Mr. H. Rällfors
Preparations completed thus far are such items as facilities for an interim secretariat, proposals for Congress 74 logo and letterhead, further negotiations with exhibit contractor, proposals for a permanent organization for IFIP Congress 74 administration, proposals for a leaflet “Welcome to IFIP Congress 74”, proposals for scope and aim, and a preliminary budget.

Mr. Tanaka expressed the necessity for the Congress budget to plan a surplus. Mr. Tanaka further remarked that it was too early for printing and distributing a leaflet, and recommended to postpone this action to a later date.

Mr. Douglas considered that the winter of 1972 would be sufficiently early for distribution, as that would allow 18 months.

Mr. Sem-Sandberg requested $10,000 loan to Congress 74 of which $5,000 was to be made available as for the beginning of 1972. Additionally, he requested on behalf of the Programme Committee the approval of a grant of $1,000 to enable them to begin work.

Mr. Harder pointed out that a $5,000 loan would cover all the work of the Committee, whether done by themselves or another organization.

7.7.5 Congress 74 Programme

Mr. Zemanek proposed that Mr. Freeman be appointed Chairman of the Programme Committee for Congress 74.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY unanimously APPROVED the appointment.

COUNCIL unanimously RECOMMENDED that General Assembly approve the report.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY unanimously APPROVED the report.

7.8 INTERNATIONAL LIAISON

7.8.1 Liaison with International Governmental Organizations (CLIGO)

Mr. Auerbach presented the report (C.GA.-Ljubljana-71, CLIGO-1).

United Nations
The Chairman of the Committee had written to the Secretary General of the United Nations supporting Resolution E/4800. This Resolution was to appear on the agenda of the 50th Session of the UN Economic and Social Council, and thereafter be placed before the 26th Session of the UN General Assembly in September, 1971. However, ECOSOC subsequently adopted Resolution 1571/L which recommended delaying the adoption of Resolution E/4800. As CLIGO considered this delay undesirable, it was proposed that the following resolutions be approved, and that power be given to the Chairman to bring these to the attention of all appropriate authorities:

“ i) IFIP takes note with interest of the resolution 1571/L adopted by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations at its 50th Session

ii) IFIP recalls its close cooperation with the Secretary General of the United Nations in the preparation of his report entitled “The Application of Computer Technology for Development” (Document E/4800), in response to resolution 2458 (XXIII) of the General Assembly.

iii) At the time of the issue of the report, IFIP indicated that it supported and endorsed the conclusions and judgements in it, believing that it was balanced and contained recommendations that merit immediate implementation. IFIP still holds this view.

iv) IFIP further expressed its willingness to assist the United Nations family of organizations in any way which might be considered useful. IFIP reiterated this willingness to assist the United Nations.

v) In view of the continuing rate of change in the various aspects of information and computer technology, delays in implementation could have an adverse impact on the developing countries. IFIP is concerned that the adoption of Resolution 1571/L, which calls for a further report, before action is considered, will impose undesirable delay on the implementation of the proposals contained in E/4800.
vi) IFIP particularly emphasises its view that the proposal in E/4800 for the establishment of an International Advisory Board for Computer Technology for Development merits support and immediate implementation. IFIP believes that such a Board would be able to act as an effective instrument for stimulating the sound application of such technology for the benefit of the developing countries and for mobilizing the interest and capability of the international professional community for this purpose. IFIP expresses the hope that the U.N. General Assembly at its 26th Session in the fall of 1971 may be in a position to act favourably on that proposal."

Mr. Bobillier asked if this was the unanimous opinion of the Committee.

Mr. Auerbach replied affirmatively.

Mr. Renard wished to know why ECOSOC had recommended a delay.

Mr. Auerbach explained that there had been a misunderstanding on the part of ECOSOC, and that it was alleged that IBI-ICC had not been consulted.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY APPROVED (with 4 abstentions) the resolutions.

IBI-ICC

Mr. Auerbach stated that Professor Bernasconi, Director General of IBI-ICC, wanted to appoint a representative of IFIP to their Executive Council. He also wished to appoint a group of experts to assist in the formulation of a programme of work for the Centre. Provided that the offer was ratified by the IBI-ICC General Assembly, it was recommended that the IFIP General Assembly empower the President, upon recommendation from CLIGO, to make the necessary appointments.

Mr. Tanaka asked if acceptance would create new obligations for IFIP.

Mr. Auerbach replied that there would be no new obligations, in particular no financial ones.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY APPROVED (1 vote against and 2 abstentions) the recommendation.

FIACC

Mr. Auerbach further quoted, "... the Committee .... recommended that General Assembly direct its representatives to FIACC to work energetically towards promoting the Status of FIACC with relation to UNESCO, and request them to report on what steps need to be taken to this end."

Mt. Striker read several statements from UNESCO indicating their support regarding FIACC status and their promotion of FIACC activities. He strongly advised that General Assembly adopt the recommendation.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY unanimously APPROVED the recommendation.

UNESCO

Mr. Auerbach transmitted the desire of the Committee to "recommend that the General Assembly approve the appointment by the President of an observer to a UNESCO meeting, to be held in October in Paris, dealing with the development of UNISIST".

GENERAL ASSEMBLY unanimously APPROVED the recommendation.

7.8.2 Liaison with International Professional Organizations (CLIGO)

Mr. Bauer presented the report (C.GA.-Ljubljana-71, CLIPO-1).
In view of the established action of FIACC, no meeting of the Committee had been held since the last General Assembly. Messrs. Douglas and Zemanek had attended a FIACC meeting in Dresden, in March, 1971.
Three points of importance were raised at that meeting:

i) The relationship with IFAC: Mr. Zemanek had stressed the importance of cooperation with IFAC, as an overlapping definitely existed. In this respect, Mr. Zemanek, in his capacity as Vice-President, had taken action to smooth over the difficulties regarding the Conference in Norway in 1973 and the IFAC Congress in Paris in 1972;

ii) The status of FIACC with regard to UNESCO: It was hoped that UNESCO would agree to recognize FIACC as being in Category A in which case some funds may be available to support FIACC/IFIP activities;

iii) Cooperation that could and should be established with FID: It was also agreed to approach FID to ascertain their attitude.

Mr. Zemanek stated that he had invited FIACC to hold its next meeting in Vienna. This meeting will follow the next Council meeting and will have as its goal the establishment of closer contacts.

Mr. Bauer stated that the major goal of CLIPO had been concluded.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY unanimously APPROVED the report.

7.8.3 Reorganization of CLIPO and CLIPO

Mr. Auerbach mentioned that the Committee proposed to have CLIGO and CLIPO united. This would create the "Committee for International Liaison", which should be chaired by a senior member of IFIP, possibly a Vice-President. It was suggested that Mr. Douglas be appointed Chairman of the new Committee.

Mr. Jensen stated that IFORS had equally established such a committee and that care should be taken that activities do not overlap. This could be avoided by maintaining a contact between the IFIP and IFORS representative in each country.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY APPROVED (5 against, 4 abstentions) the recommendation to merge CLIPO in the new Committee for International Liaison.

7.8.4 FID Round Table Conference

Mr. Duyverman presented the report (C.GA.-Ljubljana-71, FID-1).

This meeting was an informal exchange of ideas and plans concerning possible ways of reducing unnecessary overlap and strengthening effective international cooperation in the information field. Eleven international organizations were represented. The report clearly defined the list of areas where cooperation between the participating organizations seemed desirable. The most important achievement of this meeting was to establish contacts with representatives of other international organizations. One of the conclusions of the discussion was that there was general need and interest for Secretary Generals of international organizations to meet at regular intervals.

Mr. Zemanek thought that FID at the present time was reluctant to join FIACC because the five associations were more technically-oriented than FID. It was possible that FID would change their mind in the future and decide to join FIACC.

COUNCIL unanimously CHARGED the International Liaison Committee to study the questions raised in Mr. Duyverman's report and report to the next Council meeting.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY NOTED the report.
7.8.5 Computer Contributions to Development in Developing Countries

Mr. Beltran proposed the appointment of an ad hoc Committee to study the possible creation of a new Technical Committee on “Computer Contributions to Development in Developing Countries.

As such a subject was clearly within the mission of the International Liaison Committee, it was proposed that this Committee study the matter.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY unanimously APPROVED the proposal.

7.9 MANPOWER

Mr. Tanaka presented the report (C.GA.-Ljubljana-71, MPC-1 and MPC-2). Since the last Council meeting in Bled, several recommendations had been implemented. The IFIP Summary had been published, letters had been forwarded to individual General Assembly members requesting lists of names for persons willing or available to work on IFIP projects, and the IFIP Secretariat had been asked to compile a historic summary of all IFIP participants. The Committee still had much left to do, and would continue to compile lists of names as they are received.

COUNCIL unanimously RECOMMENDED that General Assembly approve the report.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY APPROVED (with 1 abstention) the report.

8. CONFERENCES

8.1 IFIP CONFERENCES


Mr. Zemanek presented the report (C.GA.-Ljubljana-71, Man-Machine Conference 1972). A working conference on this subject was to be held in Vienna in the fall of 1972. Contacts with the ILO regarding co-sponsorship had not been fruitful. The following recommendations were offered for approval:

- that an ad hoc Committee be appointed to further investigate the matter and that, during Congress 1971, this Committee attempt to arrange a more elaborate programme with the speakers;
- that an informal meeting of people interested be organized during the Congress;
- that General Assembly approve the tentative plan to hold this conference so that further decisions including financial support could be taken by the Council in the spring of 1972.

Mr. Beltran questioned the approach asking whether it dealt with economic aspects or rather with the socio-technical, humanistic aspects.

Mr. Zemanek qualified that those who were offering cooperation were more sociologically-oriented.

Mr. Jensen offered the assistance of IFORS.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY APPROVED (with 1 abstention) the recommendations.

8.1.2 PROLAMAT II

Mr. Williams presented an oral report in which he noted that details were being worked out for the basic planning of the Conference as follows:


GENERAL ASSEMBLY NOTED the report.
8.2  IFIP CO-SPONSORED CONFERENCES

1972 International Zurich Seminar on Integrated Systems for Speech, Video and Data Communications

Mr. Zemanek presented the report (C.GA.-Ljubljana-71, Zurich Seminar-1) which was essentially a call for papers for this seminar which will be concerned with integrated digital communication systems for speech, video and data. New ideas, research and development work on digital networks, including techniques and methods of coders and decoders for speech, music and video signals will be discussed. Invited papers shall also cover recent progress in the general area of digital processing of analog signals and the theory of network synchronization. The scope of the seminar will also include applications of the integration concept to peripheral equipment. Mr. Zemanek proposed that IFIP co-sponsor this Seminar.

COUNCIL unanimously RECOMMENDED that General Assembly approve the co-sponsorship.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY APPROVED IFIP co-sponsorship of the Seminar and NOTED the report.

8.3  OTHER CONFERENCES

8.3.1  U.S. / Japan Computer Conference

Mr. Tanaka presented the report (C.GA.-Ljubljana-71, US/Japan Comp.Conf.-1). This Conference, scheduled for October 1972, was to promote an understanding amongst individuals and organizations in the field of information processing. It would be a self-supporting conference, organized by the Information Processing Society of Japan (IPSJ) and AFIPS, and presided over by two co-Chairmen, appointed respectively by IPSJ and AFIPS. Both IPSJ and AFIPS would provide a working capital of $10,000 as refundable deposits. Any financial loss would be borne equally by both organizations. Believing that the Conference demonstrated cooperation between organizations having a common bond in IFIP, and believing that the members of IFIP would profit from the papers presented, IPSJ and AFIPS would welcome the support of IFIP in sponsoring the Conference.

Mr. Harder suggested that IFIP provide a $5,000 guarantee.

Mr. Douglas proposed that IFIP agree to provide a guarantee up to $5,000 for any loss over and above $20,000, IFIP in this case acting as the second guarantor.

COUNCIL unanimously RECOMMENDED that General Assembly approve the proposal.

Mr. Bech recommended that General Assembly not follow the proposition of Council to co-sponsor the Conference.

Mr. Goto indicated that he was willing to withdraw his request for a deficit guarantee from IFIP.

Upon request from Mr. Bennett for more background information, Mr. Tanaka emphasized that only a catastrophe could produce a loss. A financial contribution was the only means by which an organization could be considered an official sponsor.

Mr. Overgaard felt that IFIP should not sponsor conferences of a national nature, but only those of an international character.

Mr. Harder spoke in favour of the proposal made by Council qualifying that this could be considered a medium for activity on IFIP’s behalf, enabling IFIP to be active in a new part of the world and diffuse information.

Mr. Chevion proposed that IFIP co-sponsor the Conference without a guarantee.

Mr. Herborg-Nielsen asked for information on the budgeted surplus and to whom it would be directed.

Mr. Tanaka replied that the surplus would amount to between $20,000 and $80,000, and would be equally divided between AFIPS and IPSJ.
Mr. Auerbach strongly felt that unless IFIP shared in the surplus, there should be no offer of co-sponsorship. Furthermore, he suggested that a much more active approach should be taken in promoting activities in all Pacific nations, so that such a Conference would become a regional Conference. He would then propose a co-sponsorship without guarantee.

Mr. Tanaka assured that there was no intent on taking a passive approach to internationalism, and that although the allocation for publicity was not large, the committee would welcome other participants.

Mr. Bennett proposed that the name of the Conference be changed and suggested, “The U.S./Japanese Information Conference”.

Mr. Auerbach proposed that IFIP not co-sponsor the Conference

GENERAL ASSEMBLY AGREED (12/5/14) not to co-sponsor the Conference.

8.3.2 Mechanical Aspects of Electronic Design

Mr. Williams presented an oral report in which he noted that it would not be desirable for IFIP to co-sponsor this Conference as the subjects were too restricted and the timetable too limited.

COUNCIL NOTED the report.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY APPROVED (with 3 abstentions) the recommendation not to sponsor this Conference.

9. ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMITTEES AND APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

Mr. Zemanek indicated that a number of changes would have to be implemented after the General Assembly when the names of people available were known. This was also due to the new committees which would have to be set up in the future.

Mr. Bobillier recommended that new General Assembly members be invited to participate in the work of the various committees.

GENERAL unanimously ASSEMBLY APPROVED the recommendation.

A list of existing IFIP Committees and their membership is given in the Annex to these Minutes.

10. OTHER GENERAL ASSEMBLY BUSINESS

10.1 FUTURE COUNCIL AND GENERAL ASSEMBLY MEETINGS

Council Meeting

5-7 April, 1972, Vienna, Austria

Mr. Zemanek confirmed that this meeting was being sponsored by the Austrian Member Society.

Council and General Assembly Meeting

24-27 October, 1972

Mr. Iliev confirmed the invitation of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences to hold the IFIP Council and General Assembly meetings in Sofia, Bulgaria.
10.2 RECOGNITION TO GENERAL ASSEMBLY MEMBERS

The President expressed IFIP’s gratitude to Messrs. Linsman and van Wijngaarden for their devotion to the work of IFIP over many years.

Mr. Zemanek and Mr. Douglas, on behalf of the General Assembly and Council, expressed a vote of thanks to the President.

Mr. Harder presented the President with a small token of gratitude to remind him of a close association with some 50 people over the years.

11. INAUGURATION OF THE NEW PRESIDENT, HONOURING OF PAST OFFICERS

In a special session after the Congress, Mr. Dorodnicyn handed over to Mr. Zemanek the IFIP gavel as the symbol of the presidency of the Federation. He expressed his thanks to all those who had helped him to discharge his responsibilities during the last three years, adding his wishes for the best of luck to his successor.

On behalf of IFIP, Mr. Zemanek then presented Mr. Dorodnicyn with an Atmos clock in recognition of his great services to the Federation. He stressed how much all IFIP Officers had appreciated working with him in this office.

The President also expressed the gratitude of IFIP to Mr. Chevion, who had served as Vice-President from 1968 to 1970.

There being no further business, the President closed the Meeting and thanked all participants for their active cooperation and the local Organizing Committee for its efforts and hospitality.

Geneva, 1 November 1971
SCP/1052
IFIP COMMITTEES

I. At the end of the General Assembly meeting the President had appointed (confirmed) the following IFIP Committees with their membership:

ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE
P. RENARD
L. Lukaszewicz
Y. Mentalecheta

FINANCE COMMITTEE
W.L. VAN DER POEL
E.L. Harder
J. Tuori

STATUTES & BYLAWS COMMITTEE
R.I. TANAKA
P.A. Bobillier
D. Chevion
N.J. Lehmann
Y. Mentalecheta
W. Donat (Advisor)
M. Verhelst (Advisor)

PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE
D. KRONEBERG
F. Genuys
W. Goldberg
Z. Pawlak

INTERNATIONAL LIAISON
A.S. DOUGLAS
I.L. Auerbach
F.L. Bauer
S.F. Beltran
D. Chevion
S.D. Duyverman
V.M. Glushkov
C.C. Gotlieb
Y. Mentalecheta
R. Moreno-Diaz

NOMINATIONS COMMITTEES

Nominations Committee Vice-President
J.N.P. HUME
L. Dadda
I. Kadar

Nominations Committee Secretary and Treasurer
A. ZELEZNIKAR
M. Milchberg
S.A. Overgaard

Nominations Committee Trustees
L. LUKASZEWICZ
R. Moreno-Diaz
D. Ribbens
FOUNDATIONS COMMITTEE
E.L. HARDER
N.I. Bech
W.L. van der Pool
D. Ribbens

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEE
F.L. BAUER
E. A. Feigenbaum
E.L. Harder
J.N.P. Hume
V. Kovalevsky

IFIP EDUCATION POLICY COMMITTEE
P. RENARD
R.A. Buckingham
L. Dadda
H. Segovia
A.A. M. Veenhuis

IFIP SEMINAR FELLOWSHIPS COMMITTEE
S. SEM-SANDBERG
I.L. Auerbach
R.A. Buckingham

CONGRESS 77 and 80 SITE SELECTION COMMITTEE
L. ILIEV
J.N.P. Hume
S.A. Overgaard

RECOGNITION
E.L. HARDER
P.A. Bobillier

II. Membership of all other Committees will be announced by the President later; they are:

PUBLIC INFORMATION COMMITTEE (newly-established)

ACTIVITY PLANNING COMMITTEE

MANPOWER COMMITTEE

CONGRESS ORGANIZATION COMMITTEE (COC)

COMMITTEE ON MAN/MACHINE

CONGRESS 74 PROGRAMME COMMITTEE

CONGRESS 74 ORGANIZING COMMITTEE

NOTE: A COMPLETE LIST OF ALL IFIP COMMITTEES WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE

IFIP INFORMATION BULLETIN No. 4

TO APPEAR IN DECEMBER, 1971.
**1972 BUDGET**

APPROVED BY GENERAL ASSEMBLY
LJUBLJANA, AUGUST 21, 1971
(U.S. Dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>1972 BUDGET</th>
<th>1971 Amsterdam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Dues for 1972</td>
<td>19,125</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back Dues Royalties</td>
<td>6,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Less FID Reimbursement</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFIP Congress 71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return of Loan</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td>32,125</td>
<td>28,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income (not including returned loans)</strong></td>
<td>32,125</td>
<td>28,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                     | Budgeted Expense and Loans | 68,436 |
|                     | Budgeted Expense           | 52,360 |
### IFIP 1972 Budget (U.S. Dollars)

(Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approvals Required</th>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>1972 Budget</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President's Acct.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences *</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Travel</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Expenses</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(* Consider as 1,500 Grant; 1,500 Loan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V.P. Acct. Sem-Sandberg</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office Expenses</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Travel/Others</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel and Subsistence</td>
<td>800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V.P. Acct. Goto</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office Expenses</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Travel/Others</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel and Subsistence</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V.P. Acct. Douglas</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office Expenses</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Travel/Others</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel and Subsistence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secretary</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secretary Expenses</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treasurer</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer Expenses</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Secretary</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fee</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Expenses</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Expenses</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Charges</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditor’s Fee</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unesco Dues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFIP Inf. Booklet</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17,200</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Technical Committees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TC Chairmen</th>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TC 1 Terminology</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC 2 Languages</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC 3 Education</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC 4 Medicine</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC 5 Technology</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC 6 Data Communication</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC 7 Optimization</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 15,500

(With exception of Emergency Travel for WG members, up to $500, TC 1; $2,000, TC 2; $1,000, TC3; $500, TC 4 may be approved by TH Chairman alone.)

**Other committees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IFIP / 74</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFIP / 71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COC</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLIGO +</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLIP</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIC</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 3,200

**To Conferences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V.P.</th>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graphic Languages, TC 2</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming Training Technology, TC 2</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varna Working Conference, TC 4</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of Computer Aided Design / Non-Electronic Systems, TC 5</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 7,000
IFIP

1972 BUDGET
(U.S. Dollars)

(Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approvals Required</th>
<th>LOANS TO CONFERENCES</th>
<th>1972 BUDGET</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEMINARS, GROUPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckingham and</td>
<td>Advanced Seminar</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>12,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sem-Sandberg</td>
<td>Programme (1972 and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>second half 1971)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>IFIP Congress 74</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>($10,000 through 1974)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IFIP Congress 71</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.P.</td>
<td>ADP Seminar, Chile, TC 3</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.P. (Douglas)</td>
<td>Shipyard Automation</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conf.-Japan, TC 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ship Automation-Oslo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total for new loans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(including $1,500 from Pres. Acct.)</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>16,076</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL OF EXPENSE AND LOANS | 74,800 | 68,436 |

TOTAL EXPENSE | 58,300 | 52,360 |

SCP/1025
### IFIP NEW DUES SITUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>1970 schedule</th>
<th>Proposed new schedule</th>
<th>Accepted 1971 schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALGERIA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARGENTINA</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUSTRALIA</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUSTRIA</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELGIUM</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAZIL</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BULGARIA</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANADA</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILE</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUBA</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZECHOSLOVAKIA</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENMARK</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINLAND</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANCE</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERMANY</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.D.R.</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHANA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNGARY</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISRAEL</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITALY</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAPAN</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEXICO</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NETHERLANDS</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORWAY</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLAND</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAIN</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWEDEN</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWITZERLAND</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITED KINGDOM</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.A</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUGOSLAVIA</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH AFRICA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**  
9625 21750 19125
### IFIP BUDGET - 1971

(U.S. Dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCOME</th>
<th>FINAL</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member Dues for 1971</td>
<td>16,000 (1)</td>
<td>9,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back Dues</td>
<td>--- (1)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royalties</td>
<td>4,000 (2)</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFIP Congress 68-Surplus</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prolamat. 69-Surplus</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return of Loan</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>8,400 (3)</td>
<td>5,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAG Loan-Pub. ADP Sem. Papers</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                                                   |            |             |
| Total of Income and Ret’d. Loans.                | 28,400     | 20,535      |
| Deficit Covered by Reserves                      | 40,036     | 40,385      |

|                                                   |            |             |
| Budgeted Exp. and Loans                          | 68,436     | 60,920      |
| Budgeted Expense.                                | 52,360     | 32,645      |
IFIP BUDGET - 1971

(U.S. Dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approvals</th>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>FINAL 1971</th>
<th>REFERENCE 1970 - PRAGUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pres.</td>
<td>President's Acct.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td>(4) 3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emergency Travel</td>
<td>(5) 500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office Expenses</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>5,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.P</td>
<td>V.P Acct. Zemanek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zemanek</td>
<td>Office Expenses</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emergency Travel</td>
<td>(5) 500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.P</td>
<td>V.P Acct. Sem-Sandberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sem-Sandberg</td>
<td>Office Expenses</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emergency Travel</td>
<td>(5) 500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Travel and Subsistence</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>800</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,400</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec.</td>
<td>Secretary Expenses</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treas.</td>
<td>Treasurer Expenses</td>
<td><strong>1,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**IFIP BUDGET - 1971**

(U.S. Dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approvals Req'd</th>
<th>EXPENDITURES-CONT.</th>
<th>FINAL 1971</th>
<th>REFERENCE 1970 - PRAGUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE SECY.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fee</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&amp;</td>
<td>&amp; 5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office Expenses</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&amp;</td>
<td>&amp; ....500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Travel Expenses</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&amp;</td>
<td>&amp; 1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bank Charges</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auditor's Fee</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bulletin</td>
<td></td>
<td>.....500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unesco Dues</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IFIP Information Booklet</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>10,145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(5)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TECHNICAL COMMITTEES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V. Wijngaarden &amp; Zemanek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steel &amp; Zemanek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckingham &amp; Sem-Sandberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gremy and Zemanek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams and Zemanek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC-1 Terminology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC-2 Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC-3 Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC-4 Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC-5 Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER COMMITTEES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genuys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Committee-IFIP Congr. 71.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auerbach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaison with Int. Govt. Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaison with Int. Prof. Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Except Emergency Travel for WG members, up to $500 TC-1, $1,500 TC-2, $1,000 TC-3, $500 TC-4, may be approved by TC Chairman alone.
## IFIP BUDGET - 1971

(U.S. Dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approvals Req'd</th>
<th>Grants to Conferences</th>
<th>Final 1971</th>
<th>Reference 1970 - Prague</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harder &amp; Sem-Sandberg</td>
<td>TC-2 Working Conf. on ALGOL-68 Implementation – Munich 1970</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harder &amp; Sem-Sandberg</td>
<td>TC-3 World Conf. on Computer Educ.</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Grants</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,500</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Loans to Conferences, Seminars, Groups**

| Harder & Sem-Sandberg | ADP Seminars, Level 1 (6) | 0 | 3,040 |
| Harder & Sem-Sandberg | Advanced Seminar Program (7) | 12,576 | 6,135 |
| Harder | TC-3 World Conf. on Educ. 1970 (8) | 0 | 7,600 |
| Dorodnicyn | IFIP Congress 71 | 2,000 | 10,000 |
| **Total Loans** (Incl. $1,500 from Pres. Acct.) | **16,076** | **28,275** |  |

**Total of Expense and Loans**

| Total Expense and Loans | 68,436 | 60,920 |
| **Total Expense** | **52,360** | **32,645** |
1. Annual Dues of thirty-two members is expected to be at least $16,000 in 1971, based on replies received up to October 30, 1970. Back dues at end of 1969 - $1,600. Annual payments of current and back dues are approximately equal to annual dues.

2. Approximately $13,000 royalties received in 1970, of which approx. $9,000 was on IFIP-Cong. – 68 proceedings and is non-repetitive.

3. 7% of $120,000 = $8,400.

4. Considered as $1,500 Grants (expense), and $1,500 loans, but President is free to divide $3,000 between grants and loans as desired.

5. Emergency travel for WG members of activities is provided in TC Budgets. Additional amount are in V.P. Budgets to supplement this if necessary and to provide for other emergency travel authorized by V.P.’s. An additional amount in the President’s budget provides supplemental funds for the above or other emergency travel at the President’s discretion.

6. ADP Seminars, Level 1. Total loan authorized $6,000 in 1968 and additional $1,000 in 1970. At the end of 1969, $6,057.23 of the authorized amount had been loaned. In 1970 up to Sept. 22, 1970, additional amounts of $2,700, less $361.31 (bank Account closed) were loaned, making the total loan $8,396, or $1,396 over budget. Nothing is therefore included in the 1971 Budget. Subsequently at Amsterdam the General Assembly authorized the conversion of a $1670 loan to the London ADP Seminar, and a $2700 loan to the Hungarian ADP Seminar to grants. Thus $ 4026 is loaned as of Oct. 30, 1970.

7. Advanced Seminar Program. $12,000 budgeted in 1968. $1,500 transferred to Budget item for loan to World Conf. on Education in March 1969. The authorization was increased by $5,500 in 1971 to a total authorization of $16,000. Of this $3,425 ,- has already been loaned leaving a balance of $12,576 ,- for 1971.

8. World Conf. on Comp. Educ. Total Loan authorized up to the end of 1070, - $8,000. Amount loaned up to Sept. 22, 1970, $8,074. No further amount budgeted for 1971.

9. $5,000 had been approved in Atlantic City cumulative for 1969, 1970 and 1971. This has been increased to $5,400 based on Mr. Genuy’s urgent request, citing additional expenses expected. $3,644 had been budgeted through end of 1970. Balance (rounded) of $1,760 is budgeted for 1971. However, any part of $5,400 not expended in 1969 or 1970 is available for 1971.
The Committee met on Monday, August 23rd, Committee member Kovalevsky being unfortunately absent. It discussed thoroughly the situation of the International Joint Council on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI), which was once more characterized as a loose, flexible informal gathering, without juridical existence and without clearly defined goals. It was recognized that this has advantages, in particular in the short run, for the IJCAI members. On the other hand, difficulties can be foreseen. It was agreed that the following points should be mentioned as advantages IFIP offers, at the lunch meeting, which was planned for the following day:

a) Prestige – a place in the world;
b) Extension to new countries;
c) Organizational support, in particular from IFIP representatives in IFIP member countries;
d) Systematizing finances.

The Committee also reviewed the situation with respect to other potent groups on Artificial Intelligence:

SIGART, A Special Interest Group of ACM in the USA;

Activities on AI in the British Computer Society (AISB);

Work on AI in the Academy Institutes of the USSR.

Moreover, the Journal “Artificial Intelligence”, published by North-Holland, is to be considered as a major factor. Its Editors and Editorial Board comprise:

B. Meltzer (Edinburgh University)
B. Raphael (Stanford Research Institute)
E. Feigenbaum (Stanford University)
A. Newell (Carnegie-Mellon University)
S. Amarel (Rutgers University)
M. Minsky (MIT)
J. McCarthy (Stanford University)
M. Aizerman (Institute of Automatics and Telemachanics, Moscow)
N. Nilsson (Stanford Research Institute)
D. Michie (Edinburgh University)

and others.

Committee member Feigenbaum, Chairman of TA-2 of the Congress 71, has relied in his Congress work about AI heavily on most of the persons listed above, which are only partially represented in the IJCAI, and on some others not connected to IJCAI.

Thus, the Committee concluded that the affiliation of the IJCAI with IFIP as a special interest group was one, but not the only, possible way to do something for AI within IFIP and that caution was necessary in the coming negotiations. It was agreed that the IFIP side should propose to discuss in particular details on

1) Scope
2) Programme
3) Structure
4) Representation within IFIP
5) Finances
6) Publications

and that it should observe what the other side asks for.
At the lunch meeting on Tuesday, August 24th, from 12.30 to 15.00, on the following were present:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IJCAI</th>
<th>IFIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. Amarel 1,2</td>
<td>F. Bauer, Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Nilsson 1,2</td>
<td>E. Feigenbaum 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Riley</td>
<td>E. Harder, Treasurer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Tyler</td>
<td>J. Hume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Walker 1</td>
<td>R. Tanaka, Chairman Statutes and Bylaws Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H. Zemanek, President-Elect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member of
1 Conference Committee Second IJCAI
2 Editorial Board Journal AI

It turned out that the desires for help brought forward from the IJCAI side were identical with the points a) to d) that the IFIP side offered. There was repeatedly the request for a certain autonomy, but it was also recognized that this had to have limits. The IFIP side stressed a) that obtaining funds, travel subsistence, visa, etc. might be greatly facilitated if a congress were held under the IFIP flag. This was accepted favourably by the other side, as well as point b), where the need for extension of the activities to other countries than the leading ones was recognized. Point c) meets with a desire on the IJCAI side, expressed by D. Walker, for more stability. This desire is coupled to some concern on the IJCAI side about the financing of the Second Congress. (See also the Report by S. Gill, C.GA. Amsterdam – 70, AIC-1.) Here it was stressed by the IFIP side that IFIP can neither finance a congress nor go into insurance activities and that financial guarantees should be sought from Governments in Congress countries, but that IFIP can act as a financial buffer; that it can initiate activities with a loan and that it can earmark revenues (including royalties from Proceedings) for later dedicated use. It was made clear that the work of a special interest group on AI within IFIP essentially has to be self-sustaining, but that IFIP offers additional help of all kinds. Mr. Tanaka expressed the view that in due time, all IFIP TC’s and SIG’s have to obtain help from the central administration.

The main reluctance on the AI side seems to originate from their antipathy against too many organizational bindings. The President-Elect mentioned the autonomy offered by the IFIP SIG Bylaws and added that IFIP would be willing to accept even certain changes in the Bylaws to meet special needs of IJCAI. Mr. Nilsson stressed the point that some of their members prefer to keep the disorganized status. Mr. Tanaka stated that there have to be certain restrictions on the freedom IFIP can offer, for example, IFIP will have to reserve

- a) budget approval,
- b) publication policy,
- c) coordination of certain activity dates,

but there was a warning expressed by the chairman about this negative catalog being possibly not complete. For example, truly international representation should be reflected in any IFIP body.

With respect to details of the points 1) to 6), the IJCAI side was little prepared. On the scope, there was no unanimity on whether it included the arrangement of Congresses only or some other activities, like sharing information and stimulating research. The Chairman of the AI Committee therefore invited the IJCAI to formulate their ideas and wishes, hopefully using the opportunity the London Congress (1-3 September, 1971, Imperial College) offers, and to approach IFIP as soon as possible, in order to prepare actions for the next Council meeting. Mr. Walker offered either to do this or to let IFIP know that for the time being, the discussion should not be carried further. Probably, on the IJCAI side, the intention is to await the success of their conference, but at the same time, to keep in contact with IFIP in case some financial loss occurs, recovery of which might be sought from IFIP.

The chairman of the AI Committee also expressed the Committee’s view that it was important to reach now the people that do significant work in AI, and that IFIP was trying in the first instance to do this through the existing IJCAI. It was the right moment to do it, before IJCAI would become too rigid in its organization.

If it seems worthwhile, committee member E. Feigenbaum will add to this report a situation report on the London Congress.

F.L. Bauer
Chairman, AIC

Ljubljana, 27th August, 1971
ACTION LIST

ATTACHMENT 5

I Technical Committees, TC 2 Programming
Point 4.2.3, Working Conferences
* GENERAL ASSEMBLY MEMBERS are reminded that the list of invited speakers for the Working Conference on Programming Teaching Techniques is not closed, and suggestions of names would be welcome.

II Technical Committees, TC 3 Education
Point 4.3.1, Working Group 3.2
Mr. VEENHUIS is invited to organize an alumni group of students who have attended the ADP Seminars.

Point 4.3.1, Working Group 3.2, Part (e)
* GENERAL ASSEMBLY MEMBERS are requested “…to publicize the seminars in their own countries and to assist in the selection of candidates from their country or in their part of the world”.

Point 4.3.1, Working Group 3.2, Part (f)
MESSRS. SEM-SANDBERG, AUERBACH and BUCKINGHAM form an ad hoc Committee which has been requested to study Part (f) of the report which states that “IFIP should use its influence with other international bodies to provide one or more fellowships for students attending the seminar”.

Point 4.3.2, Second World Conference on Computer Education, 1975
* GENERAL ASSEMBLY MEMBERS and TC 3 MEMBERS are requested to inform “…whether the IFIP organizations in their countries would wish to host the Conference” and to have a meeting of an ad hoc Committee to establish an overall plan for the Second Conference.

Point 4.3.3, Unesco Proposal “Survey of Higher Education Requirements”
TC-3 is requested to conduct a further evaluation with regards to the preliminary survey, and further consult with the EXECUTIVE BODY prior to making a commitment.

Point 4.3.4, Ad-hoc Committee on Education
MESSRS. RENARD (Chairman), BUCKINGHAM, DADDA, SEGOVIA and VEENHUIS form an ad hoc Committee which has been requested to study the possibilities of transforming TC 3 into a SIG involved in educational problems and activities and to find ways of increasing the activities of IFIP in this field, and to make a proposal to the next General Assembly.

III Technical Committees, TC 4 Medicine
Point 4.4.1, New WG 4.2
** COUNCIL is to approve this Working Group as soon as the Chairman of TC 4 is able to make a precise report.

- Point 4.5.4, Cooperation with IFAC (Publications)
ACTIVITY PLANNING COMMITTEE is requested to establish a plan for an outline of regulations for the running of symposia.

PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE is requested to establish a plan for publishing the following proceedings under one cover with IFAC as editor, under IFIP’s name:

- Fourth Conference on Digital Computer Applications to Process Control, Zurich, Switzerland, March 1974, and,
- Second Symposium on Traffic Control, Paris, France, June 1974

IV Special Interest Group, IAG

- Point 5.3, IAG Desks
IAG is requested to have its Board of Directors work out rules for operation of regional desks in agreement with the IFIP and IAG members in the region prior to the establishment of such desks.

* General Assembly Members
** Executive Body Members or Council Members
- **Point 5.4, IFIP Foundation**
  FOUNDATIONS COMMITTEE (COUNCIL) is requested to proceed with the study of details for the establishment of a Foundation, and to consequently present a document to the next General Assembly outlining the procedure recommended by the Committee, including the limitation of IFIP liabilities.

** EXECUTIVE BODY is requested to make investigations and come up with a practical solution, and to take the proper steps in conjunction with IAG for an incorporation of IAG in the Netherlands in the most suitable form.

- **Point 5.5, IAG Representation in the IFIP Council**
  STATUTES AND BYLAWS COMMITTEE is requested to study the matter including all possible consequences and communicate the final recommendation to the next Council meeting.

- **Point 5.6, IAG Communications**
  PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE is requested to study the matter of combining the IAG Communications and the IFIP Information Bulletin, renaming the new publication, “IFIP Communications”, which would permit diffusion of general IFIP information on a more regular basis; and report to the next Council meeting.

V New TC’s and SIG’s
- **Point 6.2, Design of National and International Data Transmission Networks: New TC 6 on Data Communication**
  COMMITTEE FOR DESIGN OF NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL DATA TRANSMISSION NETWORKS is requested to propose a Chairman to the President before the next Council meeting.

- **Point 6.3, Optimization: New TC 7 on Optimization**
  **COUNCIL is to establish TC 7 as soon as its aims and scope have been worked out in detail.**

VI Finance
- **Point 7.3.7, IFIP New Dues Situation**
  GENERAL ASSEMBLY MEMBERS who have not yet confirmed their acceptance of the new dues are urged to do everything possible to have this done.

VII Admission
- **Point 7.4.4, Automatisation Commission of Roumania**
  ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE is requested to take the necessary steps to obtain the additional appropriate information required for admission.

- **Point 7.4.5, Brazilian Membership**
  ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE is requested to follow up the opportunity given to ABRACE to pay their back dues up to the end of 1970, amounting to $832.00 to be deposited to the IFIP bank account at Swiss Bank Corporation, Geneva, by 31 December 1971.

- **Denomination of Countries**
  ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE is requested to study the question of denomination of countries used within IFIP and other international organizations and submit a report and recommendation to the next General Assembly regarding possible modifications to be introduced in IFIP’s current practice.

VIII Publications and Information
- **Point 7.6.2, IFIP Correspondents**
  MEMBER SOCIETIES are requested to appoint an IFIP Correspondent and advise the Secretariat of the name and address of that Correspondent.

IX **IFIP Congress**
- **Point 7.7.1, Congress 71 Organizing Committee**
  Mr. OSREDKAR is requested to prepare, as stated, the Congress account in draft form to be presented to the next Council meeting.

X International Liaison
- **Point 7.8.1, Liaison with International Governmental Organizations (CLIGO), Section United Nations**
  INTERNATIONAL LIAISON COMMITTEE is to proceed to support Document E/4800, “The Application of Computer Technology for Development” with a view to having this adopted by the United Nations.
** PRESIDENT, upon receiving the proper recommendation, is requested to appoint a representative of IFIP to the IBI-ICC Executive Council, and also a group of experts to assist in the formulation of a programme of work for the Centre.

* GENERAL ASSEMBLY MEMBERS are requested to direct their representatives to FIACC to work energetically towards promoting the status of FIACC with relation to Unesco, and report on what steps need to be taken to this end.

INTERNATIONAL LIAISON COMMITTEE is requested to study the questions raised in Mr. Duyverman’s report and report to the next Council meeting.

INTERNATIONAL LIAISON COMMITTEE is requested to study the possible creation of a new Technical Committee on “Computer Contributions to Development in Developing Countries”.

AD HOC COMMITTEE to be appointed is requested to investigate the matter further, including arranging a more elaborate programme.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY MEMBERS are requested to submit any bidding offers to act as host for Congresses 77 and 80 to be IFIP Secretariat as soon as possible.

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE and WORKING GROUP CHAIRMEN are requested to submit a list of names, addresses and, if possible, field of qualifications of all previous members of their particular group, should this have not already been done. This is a contribution to the History of IFIP project.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY MEMBERS, TECHNICAL COMMITTEE and WORKING GROUP CHAIRMEN are urged to submit an article for the next edition of the IFIP Bulletin which is to be issued by end November.