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HIGHLIGHTS

ADMISSIONS:
- an active campaign is being launched to enlarge IFIP’s membership.

NOMINATION COMMITTEES:
- have been established to nominate candidates for the election scheduled for the next General Assembly (Vice-President, Secretary, Treasurer and two Trustees).

REGIONAL CONFERENCES:
- IFIP will pursue an active and positive policy and guidelines will be prepared for IFIP’s role.

S.E. ASIAN REGIONAL CONFERENCE:
- has been planned for August 1976 in Singapore.

CONGRESS 80
- is scheduled for last week July (Japan) and first week August (Australia – Melbourne); further details will be given at the next General Assembly.

TECHNICAL SESSIONS AT GENERAL ASSEMBLY, BRAZIL:
- will be prepared by TC 8 and TC 9.

TECHNICAL COMMITTEES:
- TC 5: will present a change in the Aims and Scope to the next General Assembly.
- TC 6: held successful meeting in South Africa together with National Society; similar meeting is being arranged for October 1975 in Sao Paulo with Brazilian Society.
- TC 8: has been established and approved. Details for the creation of WG 8.1 and WG 8.2 will be presented at the next General Assembly.
- TC 9: will be formally proposed at the next General Assembly. National Societies are requested to nominate members.

SOCIO-TECHNICAL ASPECTS OF AUTOMATION CONFERENCE:
- will be a combined TC 5 / TC 9 Conference, to be held in May 1977 in Varna, Bulgaria.

TASK GROUPS:
- are being established for the subjects: a) Man-Machine Interaction, b) Artificial Intelligence and c) Computer Architecture.

IFIP SUMMARY CORRIGENDUM (updated to February 1975):
- is now available at the Secretariat.

IFIP INFORMATION BULLETIN NO. 9:
- will be issued Summer 1975.

IFIP STANDING ORDERS:
- item 3.1.4 (Finances) has been modified.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Season</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>20 – 21</td>
<td>Rio de Janeiro, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dresden, G.D.R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tashkent, U.S.S.R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td>California, U.S.A. (tentative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>August</td>
<td></td>
<td>Toronto, Canada</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COUNCIL MEETING
Tokyo, Japan - 24 – 26 March 1975
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* 26.3.75
1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

The President opened the Council meeting and welcomed all participants. He expressed his appreciation to Mr. Goto, the host, and his Society for all the arrangements made. It was announced that Mr. Chevion would be arriving for the Meeting’s second session and that Dr. Mentalecheta was unable to attend.

The President introduced Miss Gwyneth Roberts (the new Administrative Secretary) and Mrs. Mico Hirokawa (Conference Secretary).

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Council unanimously APPROVED the Agenda.

3. REVIEW OF LAST MINUTES (C2 Stockholm 74)

Council unanimously APPROVED the Minutes.

Action: A11

Mr. Bobillier pointed out that some people did not receive their copy of the Stockholm Minutes. He, therefore, suggested that the Secretariat be contacted if Minutes were not received within two months of Council and General Assembly Meetings.

The President stressed the importance of action items being listed separately to allow for diligent follow-up.

4. EXECUTIVE BODY REPORTS

4.1 Report of the President

The President announced he would not be presenting a formal report as important items of recent months had been covered in correspondence and would evolve during the course of the Meeting. He added he would briefly report on certain action items discussed at the previous day’s Executive Body Meeting.

4.1.1 IAG Review Committee

Due to the size and scope of IAG, it appears necessary to expand this Review Committee, probably into two sub-divisions. Suggestions are, therefore, required as to who could serve on the IAG Review Committee in expanded form.

The specific responsibility for conducting the review is still, of course, assigned to the cognizant Vice-President.

4.1.2 IFIP Information Bulletin

Bulletin No: 9 will be issued shortly, but news items and articles are still solicited.

Mr. Bobillier brought up the problem of an Editor for the Bulletin, pointing out that the Secretariat should only be responsible for the IFIP Activities section. The President suggested that the responsibility for the content of the Bulletin be divided, with the Secretariat responsible for the Activities section and an Editor responsible for the other sections. Possibly a Trustee might be appointed for this function. This question was left open for further consideration at a later date.

4.1.3 North-Holland Publications

North-Holland has proposed a nominal price increase of 8 – 10% on early publications (1968 – 1971) due to inflation. The Executive Body has accepted and approved same.
4.1.4 Congress 77 – Programme Committee

This Committee is in the formation phase and its Chairman, Mr. Turski, has made specific requests for assistance. He has, thus far, appointed Messrs. Ju. Shmyglevski (SU – hardware), J. Vlietstra (NL – computer-aided design), P. Dixon (CDN – business and governmental applications of information processing) and L. Bolliet (F – information processing and universities), but needs to enlarge the Committee – by possibly six persons – to cover certain open areas: software, numerical methods, theoretical foundations, etc.

The President requested Council to submit names to him in writing, with immediate emphasis on possibilities from Japan and the U.K. to help assure geographic representation. The President noted that he would be meeting with Mr. Turski in Los Angeles in late April.

4.2 Report of the Secretary

Mr. Bobillier presented his report (C1 Tokyo 75 / Secr.-1).

4.2.1 Secretariat

Mrs. Angeloni resigned as Administrative Secretary end November 1974 and Miss Roberts took over the responsibility end January 1975.

Mr. Bobillier requested Council members to report any Secretariat errors or problems to Miss Roberts during the next few months to assist in organizing the Secretariat to deal with the vast and intricate activities of IFIP. Mr. Bobillier also noted that Miss Roberts has very quickly assumed her duties and the work of the Secretariat is proceeding well.

The President congratulated Mr. Bobillier and Miss Roberts in their efforts in coping with the Secretariat changes.

Mr. Bobillier mentioned that the Secretariat had forwarded the 1975 Dues requests early this year and approximately 25% of the budgeted amount had been received to-date.

Mr. Bobillier indicated that the Secretariat had cost approximately SFr. 81,000 in 1974 against a budget (revised Stockholm) of approximately SFr. 93,000.

4.2.2 IFIP Information Bulletin

Mr. Bobillier stated that due to the changes in the Secretariat, it had been impossible to produce Bulletin No: 9; however, it would be issued shortly. He reiterated the deadline for submission of contributions: April 25.

4.2.3 IFIP Summary – Corrigendum

Mr. Bobillier advised that the Corrigendum to the IFIP Summary had now been printed by North-Holland, taking into account all modifications (e.g. member status GA, TC’s WG’s, etc.) to February 1975 and that GA members had been circulated as to their requirements.

Mr. Bobillier expressed his thanks to Mr. Zemanek’s office in Vienna for its help in preparing the Corrigendum.

4.2.4 IFIP Books

Mr. Bobillier pointed out that approximately eight copies of every North-Holland IFIP publication were stored at the Secretariat. The Executive Body had discussed the question of disposing of these books, but had reached no solution of a unanimous nature. The matter will be referred to the Publications Committee for recommendation.

Council NOTED the report.
4.3 Report of the Treasurer

Mr. Tuori presented his report (C1 Tokyo 75 / Treas.-1 to 8) with the exception of Treas. – 6 (Royalty Record) due to lack of updated data.

Mr. Tuori indicated that Treas.-1 (Statement of Receipts and Expenditures fiscal 1974) and Treas.-2 (Auditors’ Report covering fiscal 1974) were self-explanatory.  

Action: Treas./Secretariat

As to Treas.-3 (1974 Income / Expense vs Budget), Mr. Tuori drew attention to the budgeted loss of approximately SFr. 91,000 and the actual loss of approximately SFr. 31,000. He stated that the apparent overdraft in Mr. Douglas’ account was due to the annual budgeting system whereas, in point of fact, this was in order in the overall appraisal. The President requested that, henceforth, budgeted unforeseen expenses be listed when actual. He thanked Mr. Tuori for the clear and concise presentation of this report.

The President queried the 1975 Income / Expense vs Budget trend. Mr. Tuori admitted it was difficult to judge at the present time as the majority of expenditures generally take place toward the end of a calendar year.

Referring to Treas.-4 (Cumulative Record of Loans and Grants active in 1973 and 1974), Mr. Tuori drew attention to the loan of SFr. 5,000 for Eval. Of DDL which had been effected in 1974 although budgeted for in 1975.

Mr. Tuori indicated that Treas.-5 showed the Dues situation as at 28 February 1975 in respect of 1974 and 1975. The President remarked that approximately 25 % of the 1975 Dues had been paid and a policy should be established as to the receipt date of Dues. He proposed urging all GA members to pay their Dues at the beginning of the year and added that it would be most opportune if the date for payment of Dues could be defined as prior to each Spring Council Meeting.

Action: Treas./Secretariat

Council unanimously AGREED to this proposition and it was decided that Mr. Tuori will draft a letter, to be sent out by the Secretariat, in this respect.

As a result of discussions in the Executive Body / TC Chairmen Meeting in Amsterdam in November 1974 on delays in reimbursing expenses, Mr. Tuori proposed a change in the Financial Standing Orders- Treas.-8: namely, that item 3.1.4 be amended as follows: “All expenditures … budget. In unusual … Chairman. The TC Chairman can approve, without the prior approval of the cognizant Vice-President, expenditures up to the limit of SFr. 750,00. However, a copy of the expense request shall simultaneously be sent to the cognizant Vice-President…”

Council APPROVED the Treas.-8 report and NOTED the Treas. – 1,2,3,4,5,and 7 reports.

Mr. Tuori requested further information on the amount to be included in the 1975 budget for the Programme Committee of Congress 77, stating that if there were to be a Meeting in Autumn, the PC may require money. The President read a passage from Mr. Turski’s letter requesting guidance on this subject and referring in particular to unforeseen postal / telephone expenses, technical assistance, typing and clerical help, rental of meeting rooms and travel expenses. The President felt that the first three items were probably IFIP’s responsibility, but that the rental of meeting rooms should be gratis; however, the question of travel expenses posed a problem. Mr. Douglas argued that if we want the PC to be a group of independent people operating for scientific reasons, then we should pay for their travel. The President replied that it was impossible for IFIP to support all the travel expenses. Mr. Renard suggested that a certain sum of money be made available to the PC Chairman to be used on a discretionary basis when it is apparent a PC member has no financial support for travel. Mr. Tuori consequently proposed a 1975 emergency budget (loan) of SFr. 5,000 for the Programme Committee of Congress 77.

Council unanimously APPROVED Mr. Tuori's proposal.
5. IFIP CONGRESSES

5.1 Congress 74 and MEDINFO

Mr. Zemanek stated he had not distributed any report as it was his intention to present a full report to the General Assembly. Also, at the present time, he was only in possession of a provisional financial statement.

Mr. Zemanek felt that the Congress had been highly successful from every point of view. As to the financial side, he indicated an approximate surplus of SFr. 200,000 although a few bills are still pending. Mr. Zemanek announced the main problem was related to MEDINFO which spent thrice-fold the amount budgeted for printing and underlined the necessity of Congress and Conference Chairmen being actually aware of the finances to avoid astronomical differences between actual and budget. Mr. Zemanek insisted that Programme Committees should adhere to the standard IFIP procedures with regard to acceptance of papers and manuscripts (i.e. controlling the number of papers and quality of the manuscripts.) With regard to Congress 74, Mr. Zemanek said the Swedish printer turned out to be extremely costly. The printing expenses worked out at approximately $ 60 – 65 per head which is really excessive. Mr. Zemanek added that IFIP would receive back part of these expenses from the Royalties, but urged that Royalties be kept out of Congress budgets and stated that “our principle should be to keep Royalties separate from other business.”

Mr. Zemanek terminated his oral report by stating he had participated at the closing event of the Organizing Committee and found the spirit excellent. He felt the Scandinavian people could be proud of what they had achieved.

Mr. Bennett requested a copy of the provisional financial report to use as a basis for the Congress 80 figures. Mr. Zemanek admitted that he only had a three-page letter, not an official document. The President added that it was an informal, progress report and reaffirmed that a full report on Congress 74 and MEDINFO would be presented to the General Assembly in Rio de Janeiro.

The President expressed Council’s appreciation of Mr. Zemanek’s zealous efforts and stated that in spite of unpredicted problems, Congress 74 had certainly been a most successful event.

5.2 Congress 77 - Organization

Mr. Bobillier indicated that no report had been received from Mr. Finch.

Mr. Tuori intimated it had to be made clear to the Organizing Committee that the Programme Committee expenses should be included in the Congress budget. After discussions as to responsibilities, the President summarized to the effect that the Programme Committee reports to the President, but its budget is part of the Congress budget which is approved by the General Assembly.

Mr. Bobillier drew the attention of Council to the fact that no provision existed for Congress 77 Programme Committee expenses in the IFIP 1975 budget. (Refer to Report of the Treasurer – pages 7 and 8 of these Minutes.)

5.3 Congress 77 - Programme

The President suggested reviewing Mr. Turski’s report (C1 Tokyo 75 / C.77 - Programme).

Action: President

Mr. Dorodnicyn pointed out that the time-table for the Programme Committee Meetings was vague and definite times and locations should be established well in advance to allow participants adequate preparatory time (including procurement of visas, etc.). The President agreed to follow up on this point with Mr. Turski, adding it was imperative that the Executive Body be kept well aware of the concepts and objectives of the programme.

Action: APC Ch.

The President drew Council’s attention to point 1.1 of Mr. Turski’s report – namely: “The Toronto Congress should provide more to computer-user audiences than the past IFIP Congresses without appreciably lowering the standard of quality established by the past Congresses.” He stated that the question of Congresses being too scientifically-oriented and too academic had been discussed at the Executive Body Meeting and, as a result, the APC Chairman had proposed setting up a meeting
between Mr. Turski and members of the Executive Body, possibly also with TC Chairmen, to confer on this issue. September 1975 was mentioned as a possible time for this meeting.

The President again drew attention to Mr. Turski’s request for assistance in strengthening the PC Committee (Refer to Report of the President – pages 4 and 5 of these Minutes). Mr. Bennett suggested the possibility of inviting TC Chairmen to join the Committee. Mr. Zemanek added that if TC Chairmen were to be considered, their assistance should be given individually and not as a structural unit.

**Action:** CPC Ch.

Mr. Bennett indicated the usefulness of the contents of the Conference Policy Committee interim report. The President asked Mr. Bennett to forward a copy of this report to Mr. Turski.

**Action:** APC Ch.

Referring to point 2.1 of the report listing the potential Congress areas, Mr. Zemanek suggested that “Applications in Humanities and Arts and Relationships between Computers and Society” be included.

Council APPROVED this suggestion.

Questions were raised as to whether TC 4 anticipated staging a MEDINFO 77. Mr. Iliev answered that TC 4 were holding a meeting in Budapest at the beginning of April 1975 during which a decision would be taken in this respect. Mr. Douglas queried if Council should favour such a project to which the President replied that the matter could be more fully discussed when TC 4’s formal proposal was available.

5.4 Congress 80

Mr. Bennett presented the progress report of Congress 80 negotiations (C1 Tokyo 75 / C.80) – compiled in collaboration with Mr. Goto. He pointed out that this matter is being actively pursued as five to six meetings had been held since the last General Assembly.

Mr. Bennett indicated that the absence of a final Congress 74 financial report – to give them guidance – had hindered their budgetary planning, but the preliminary results had, however, enabled them to produce a first budget (just prior to the Council Meeting). Mr. Bennett said they wished to present their anticipated costs in terms of U.S. Dollars (with the Swiss Franc equivalent) at today’s value as it was impossible to forecast the financial trend between now and 1980; nevertheless, the costs would be revised on a yearly basis to allow for inflation and exchange rate fluctuations.

Mr. Bennett stated if the General Assembly approved our plan, and the outlook seemed to be affirmative, they would like to have a Committee Chairman and Financial Controller appointed at the Rio de Janeiro General Assembly – the latter to oversee the budgets, etc. of both Australia and Japan which would have their own Finance Committees.

The question of dates was discussed and it was decided that the originally-envisioned schedule of last week in July (Japan) and first week in August (Australia – Melbourne) was most appropriate in order to cater for University participants whose vacation period was not flexible. Regarding Japan, it was proposed that the technical session of the Congress take place in Kyoto with the exhibition in Tokyo. The President remarked this was a very creative, but perhaps impractical idea entailing extra expenses and felt the Japanese Congress week should be concentrated in one location.

Council CONCURRED.

Mr. Renard pointed out he had received strong opinions in his National Society against the idea of a two-Continent IFIP Congress with many stating that they feared unsatisfactory arrangements and excessive expenses. Mr. Renard summarized by saying he would appreciate receiving answers to the following questions for the next General Assembly:

a) will a speaker perform in both places;

b) will the same or specific topics be treated in the two locations;

c) who will pay the transportation cost of those speakers who have to appear in both places;

d) will the registration fee allow people to get to both locations.
Mr. Bennett confirmed that replies would be given to Mr. Renard’s questions during the Rio de Janeiro Meeting and indicated the current status whereby a speaker’s preference for location would be satisfied if at all possible; also, it was intended to indicate in the “Call for Papers” the location in which certain subjects would be treated.

Mr. Bennett requested guidance in respect of publication costs to which Mr. Zemanek replied that the preprints could be produced in Australia or Japan (to eliminate unnecessary forwarding charges) provided an agreement was reached with North-Holland (Mr. Fredriksson) to subsequently publish the volume.

6. TECHNICAL COMMITTEES AND IAG

6.1 TC 2 (Programming)
TC 5 (Computer Applications in Technology)

Mr. Douglas stated that as no action on Council’s part was requested, it was not thought necessary to present a written report, especially as Working Groups and Conferences were proceeding according to plan. There had, however, been an overlap of several activities which, for the most part, had been resolved although there still existed certain conflicts which could not be avoided. Mr. Douglas indicated this year’s schedule:

- WG 2.1 - Munich, August 25 – 29
- WG 2.2 - Nancy, September 8 – 12
- WG 2.3 - Vienna, September 1 – 5*
- TC 2 - Balatonszeplak (Hungary), September 8 – 12:
  - Working Conference on Software for Minicomputers

(* World Conference on Computers in Education – Marseilles at the same time)

Mr. Dorodnicyn asked about the activities of WG 2.2 and WG 2.3, since he was not aware of any current results. Mr. Douglas admitted WG 2.2 had been in disarray, was now resurrected and discussing the general structure of languages; WG 2.3 meets regularly and produces voluminous notes of its affairs. Mr. Zemanek also pointed out that WG 2.3 is trying new ways, which is a difficult task, and one cannot expect clear results yet as this group is looking for tools and ideas. He added that WG 2.2 could best be defined as “on the abstract side” and WG 2.3 as “on the practical side.”

Mr. Douglas further indicated that a new group – WG 2.5 (Numerical Software) had held its first meeting in Oxford mid-January 1975 under the Chairmanship of Mr. J.C.T. Pool. As to WG 2.4 and the other new group – WG 2.6 (Data Bases), a report on their activities would be presented to the General Assembly in Rio de Janeiro.

Mr. Dorodnicyn asked about the activities of WG 2.2 and WG 2.3, since he was not aware of any current results. Mr. Douglas admitted WG 2.2 had been in disarray, discussing the general structure of languages; WG 2.3 meets regularly and produces voluminous notes of its affairs. Mr. Zemanek also pointed out that WG 2.3 is trying new ways, which is a difficult task, and one cannot expect clear results yet as this group is looking for tools and ideas. He added that WG 2.2 could best be defined as “on the abstract side” and WG 2.3 as “on the practical side.”

TC 5: Mr. Douglas advised that we had been offered sponsorship, a place on the Programme Committee and no financial commitments in respect of CAD 76 (Computer-Aided Design Conference) to be held in the United Kingdom. This request originated through Mr. Vlietstra although TC 5 had been involved with the organization of CAD 76. Mr. Douglas requested Council’s approval to make an agreement in this respect. The President queried the publications arrangement to which Mr. Douglas replied that this point had not yet been covered. The President subsequently put forward a motion for IFIP sponsorship of CAD 76 in the United Kingdom, representation on the Programme Committee, no financial involvement and, to the extent possible, application of the IFIP policy in regard to publications.

Council unanimously **APPROVED** the motion.

Mr. Douglas concluded by saying there were no other requests on the part of TC 5 and all activities were proceeding according to plan.
TC 3: Mr. Iliev presented his report on the activity of TC 3 together with a summary of future activities (C1 Tokyo 75 / TC 3-2). He pointed out that the last TC 3 meeting had taken place in Paris in February 1975 at which a new revised five-year plan for Working Conferences had been approved. Mr. Iliev mentioned that the budget asked for 1976 is the same in amount and in distribution as for 1975 (i.e. SFr. 10,000) and that two grants would be requested; however, that these items would be substantiated and put forward to the General Assembly in Rio de Janeiro. Mr. Iliev announced that Messrs. Wolbers and Hebenstreit had been re-elected as Chairman and Vice-Chairman respectively. Also, the Aims and Scopes of TC 3 and its WG's had been slightly modified as a result of the Review Committee’s report.

TC 4: Mr. Iliev presented his report on the activity of TC 4 (C1 Tokyo 75 / TC 4-1). He indicated that two Working Conferences were scheduled to take place later this year, namely: Computer Aids to Drug Research and Information Systems for Patient Care. Also, the TC 4 Review Committee would meet in September. No financial support was requested. Mr. Iliev also indicated that the trend within TC 4 to transform into a SIG was a serious question and certain members were in favour of financial independence. After discussion, Mr. Dorodnicyn ventured that, in principle, it would be possible to transform TC 4 into a SIG on condition it had a reliable financial source and could administer same. This matter was left in abeyance.

The question of MEDINFO 77 was raised and the President stated TC 4 should not yet consider MEDINFO 77 in the U.S.A. as a “fait accompli.” A discussion ensued as to the proximity of MEDINFO 77 to Congress 77 in time and location. Mr. Douglas pointed out the general rule whereby “major IFIP events should not be held within six months of an IFIP Congress." The President summarized Council’s propositions:

a) advise TC 4 if they desire to stage a MEDINFO 77, then a formal, detailed proposal must be presented in Rio, otherwise, there will not be enough time;

b) MEDINFO 77 should be arranged either one week prior to or following Congress 77 at a convenient location to allow people to participate at both events without undue expense (maybe in Toronto, but not a criterion).

**Action:** TC 4 Cog. V-P

Mr. Iliev promised to convey Council’s thoughts on MEDINFO 77, in writing, to Mr. Roukens

Council NOTED the report.

n.b. The TC 4 documents submitted by Mr. Roukens arrived in Tokyo too late for examination by Mr. Iliev and Council members. If any action is called for, this will be dealt with by correspondence.

TC 7: Mr. Iliev presented his report on the activity of TC 7 together with a summary of future activities (C1 Tokyo 75 / TC 7-3). Based on the documents submitted by Mr. Balakrishnan (C1 Tokyo 75 / TC 7-1 and 2).

Mr. Iliev confirmed that the summary of future activities was indeed the final plan and would not be subject to revision. He added that some of the Conferences had already been approved, the others would be presented for approval at the Rio de Janeiro General Assembly.

Mr. Iliev, however, requested Council to approve a grant of SFr. 4,000 for the Working Conference sponsored by WG 7.1 on “Modelling and Simulation of Water Resource Systems” scheduled for early September 1975 in Ghent, Belgium. He added the proceedings would be published and the Royalties assigned to IFIP. The President requested Council’s decision on this matter

**Action:** Treas.

Council unanimously **APPROVED** this addition to the 1975 budget.
Mr. Bennett requested guidance on the Royalties situation in connection with the jointly-sponsored (IFIP / ACM-Sigmetrics) Symposium on “Computer Performance Modelling and Evaluation” planned for Spring 1976 in Cambridge, Mass. Considering the confusion as to whether a grant or a loan had been requested and the fact that each sponsoring organization would be responsible for 50% of the deficit / profit. After discussion, the President summarized two alternatives: a) IFIP would grant SFr. 4,000 with no guarantee against deficit and with 100% of the publication Royalties or, b) IFIP would grant SFr. 4,000 with an additional guarantee of SFr. 2,000 against loss (provided ACM loaned under the same conditions) and a 50/50 split of surplus, if any, and 100% of the Royalties.

Action: President

Council APPROVED the first alternative, but EMPOWERED the President to negotiate with TC 7 if ACM-Sigmetrics did not agree with that approach.

6.3 TC 6 (Data Communication)

Mr. Chevion regretted there was no report available as the TC 6 Chairman, Mr. Curran, had been obliged to resign due to his employment transfer and increased responsibilities. Mr. Chevion announced the Committee would be meeting in Paris in April and a new Chairman would have to be proposed or nominated. He added that Mr. Curran had suggested Mr. Keith Uncapher, who is willing to take over for one year, and hoped this proposition would be approved by the President and Council so that Mr. Uncapher could enter the post immediately.

Mr. Chevion indicated that the Committee had had a very successful meeting in Johannesburg, South Africa in November 1974; which had been coupled with a meeting of the National Society. Mr. Chevion said that a similar meeting was being organized for October 1975 in Sao Paulo with the Brazilian Society in connection with the SUCESSU Congress. He added that the South African representative was currently taking care of the arrangements for Sao Paulo.

Mr. Chevion mentioned there had been a continuation of work on the UNISIST programme and a new Working Group was being planned, but these items would be reported following the TC 6 Paris meeting.

The President mentioned he had known Mr. Uncapher for a considerable time, a man of integrity who would not take on a commitment unless he could do it well. The President added he understood Mr. Uncapher would be ready to perform the duties of “Acting Chairman”, but this would be for a limited duration only, to assure the continuity of TC 6 pending the appointment of a Chairman.

One of the conditions for a TC 6 demonstration in Brazil is a visit by the South African TC 6 representative to Sao Paulo, to establish the telecommunications and technical requirements for that meeting.

Action: President

Following a proposition put forward by Mr. Chevion, Council unanimously gave a VOTE of thanks to Mr. Curran in appreciation of his work as Chairman of TC 6. The President will convey this to Mr. Curran.

6.4 IAG

Mr. Renard presented his report (C1 Tokyo 75 / IAG-1) together with a provisional (unaudited) financial statement for 1974 and a draft programme of 1975 activities. He pointed out that the 1974 financial results had been positive with a surplus of approximately Guilders 32,000 and a donation of Guilders 29,000. Due to this, IAG’s cumulative deficit had been considerably reduced during 1974 from Guilders 83,000 to 22,000. Mr. Renard mentioned that fewer activities had been planned for this year to decrease the risk of cancellations; however, he drew attention to the Seminar to be held in Vienna in June on “Policies and Functions for National Institutes of Computing Studies” as this was a new activity for IAG. Mr. Renard said that the Review Committee had not yet started its study as it was still awaiting various documents on past activities, etc. in order to facilitate its work. He confirmed that these documents were now being compiled by IAG. Mr. Renard finalized by indicating that the number of partners had decreased.

Council NOTED the report.
6.5 New TC’s and SIG’s  
TC 8 (Information Systems)  
TC 9 (Relationship between Computers and Society)

TC 8: The President asked if everybody agreed with the contents of Mr. Langefors’ report (C1 Tokyo 75 / TC 8-1) concerning the formation of TC 8 and WG’s 8.1 and 8.2. It was recalled that the General Assembly had delegated to the Council the authority to create TC 8 and the proposed Working Groups.

Council unanimously APPROVED establishing TC 8, with the following Aims and Scope:

TC 8 INFORMATION SYSTEMS

AIMS and SCOPE

1. Undertake research into the problems, formulation of concepts and theory, and methods of designing, implementing, maintaining and using information systems in organizations in general.

2. Undertake research into the formulation of concepts and theory of the effects of information systems upon organizations and society.

3. The main areas of study are:
   a. Analysis and specification of the needs for information within organizations.
   b. Analysis and overall design of information systems for organizations.
   c. Administration of information and data in organizations.
   d. The effective utilization of information systems in organizations and society.

Action: TC 8 Cog. V-P

Council NOTED TC 8’s intention to create WG 8.1 and WG 8.2, but suggested that the titles and Scopes be clarified in order to avoid any ambiguity when presented to the General Assembly for approval and that the APC Chairman be kept aware of the situation. It was agreed that Mr. Douglas would follow up on these matters with Mr. Langefors.

TC 9: As Chairman of the TC 9 Task Force, Mr. Zemanek presented his report (C1 Tokyo 75 / TC 9-1 - 4) which requested Council to formally propose to the next General Assembly the creation of TC 9 (Relationship between Computers and Society). Mr. Zemanek said he had sent out a letter requesting National Societies to appoint TC 9 members and to-date eight names had been nominated. Mr. Zemanek drew attention to Mr. Gotlieb’s questionnaire concerning potential Working Groups – those which receive the most interest will be started first.

In parallel, Mr. Zemanek announced that preparations for the Conference on “Socio-technical Aspects of Automation”—originally planned by TC 5, but now agreed to be a combined TC 5 / TC 9 Conference—had been continued. The organizer of this Conference, scheduled for May 1977 in Varna, is the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences; Mr. Dobrev has accepted to be the OC Chairman with the support of Mr. Iliev. Mr. Hatvany will represent TC 5. Mr. Zemanek added that they hoped to have further representatives from socialistic countries and trade union people involved in the work. Mr. Zemanek confirmed he had conversed at length with Messrs. Williams and Gotlieb and his report was the consensus of all parties concerned.

Mr. Zemanek proposed that Council either approve the Aims and Scope of TC 9 in Tokyo or delay until the Rio de Janeiro Meetings. Additionally, on behalf of the Chairman, he requested Council’s approval of the initial steps taken for the Varna Conference and a preliminary budget of SFr. 1,500 for TC 9.

Action: TC 9 CH. + Ad Hoc Group Secret’t

The President specified that since final approval by the General Assembly is desirable anyway, Council would prefer Mr. Gotlieb and the Ad Hoc Group to submit a proposal of TC 9 Aims and Scope to the Council Meeting in Rio de Janeiro for subsequent presentation to the General Assembly. It was suggested, also that this document be sent to the Secretariat in time for distribution to General Assembly members one month prior to the Meeting.
Council **NOTED** the report and unanimously **APPROVED** a 1975 preliminary budget of SFr. 1,500 for TC 9.

7. **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

7.1 Activity Planning

**Review Committees**

**Task Groups**

Activity Planning: Mr. Renard presented his report (C1 Tokyo 75 / APC-1). It was noted that the updated plans of TC 2, 4, 5, and 6 were missing.

**Action:** Treas.

The President urged the Cognizant Vice-Presidents to ask the TC Chairmen to send in their plans or a confirmation letter that the current plans remain unchanged by end April.

Although “5-year” plans are now referred to, the President requested that we adhere to the original “6-year” plan concept.

Mr. Bobillier requested that the APC Chairman and the Secretariat be duly advised of any changes in order to maintain the plans on a current basis.

The President requested the APC Chairman to distribute to all GA members a formal 6-year plan and asked the Secretariat to initiate a numbering system in this respect.

It was observed that IAG does not have a long-range plan of activities and the objective was expressed to put this into effect for the future.

It was confirmed that TC 8 and TC 9 would prepare technical sessions for the Rio de Janeiro General Assembly although there might be a problem for the respective Chairmen to finance their travel to Rio de Janeiro.

**Review Committees** - it was confirmed that the TC 2 and TC 5 RC reports were distributed in February 1975 and that the TC 3 RC report had been distributed at the Stockholm General Assembly.

The President observed that the RC reports were rather tolerant and would be more useful with a larger content of constructive criticism. He added that, contrary to a previous instruction, they should only be distributed to Executive Body members and the APC Chairman; the results of that review would subsequently be presented to the General Assembly.

Commenting on the results of the TC 5 RC report, Mr. Douglas pointed out that TC 5 has done an excellent job and deserved congratulations. He stated that a change in the Aims and Scope of TC 5 would be proposed to the General Assembly in Rio de Janeiro.

Mr. Bobillier put forward a motion that Council thank and congratulate Mr. Williams for the significant accomplishments of TC 5.

**Action:** Secretary / President

Council unanimously **AGREED** and a letter to Mr. Williams will be prepared by the Secretary for the President’s signature.

Mr. Renard reiterated that the IAG Review Committee had not yet started its work, but that a first meeting was scheduled for June 1975. It was felt appropriate to enlarge the Committee by persons with certain qualifications (an expert in the field of administration problems, a representative of a National Society where IAG is undertaking important work, etc.) and names were solicited. (Refer to Report of the President – page 4 of these Minutes).
Mr. Renard mentioned the problem of potential overlap of IAG and TC 8 activities (which could be allowed if controlled). However, it was a problem which should not be overlooked.

**Task Groups** - Mr. Renard indicated that APC suggested the setting up of three current Task Groups, namely:

- a) Man-Machine Interaction
- b) Artificial Intelligence
- c) Computer Architecture

Mr. Renard advised that Mr. Piloty would be prepared to act as Chairman of c) as he was currently engaged in a similar Task Group on Computer Structure and certain of his present collaborators would join with him. As to b), Mr. Renard pointed out that different names had been suggested whereupon a Council member proposed the name of Mr. Rosenfeld. Mr. Dorodnicyn queried whether this Task Group should be recognized under this name as another Group – active in Pattern Recognition – already existed. The President drew attention to a request from the International Joint Committee on Pattern Recognition for affiliation with IFIP and felt that the submitted document (C1 Tokyo 75 / APC-2) could be used as a nucleus for this Task Group.

**Action:** APC Ch.

Mr. Renard concluded that final plans for the establishment of these Task Groups would be presented to the President.

Council **NOTED** the APC report.

### 7.2 Finances

Mr. Tuori presented his report (C1 Tokyo 75 / FC-1) and drew attention to certain problems discussed at a recently-held Finance Committee Meeting.

Mr. Tuori advised that someone from one of the socialist countries had written, mentioning the difficulties encountered in having to pay registration fees for IFIP programmes in hard currency and had suggested other approaches. Mr. Tuori requested Council’s thinking on this matter. Mr. Bobillier replied that our fees were exceedingly low compared to other International organizations and felt we should not make any exceptions to current procedures for the time being. No action was taken.

Mr. Tuori pointed out that IFIP investments were still kept in Dollars in the Trustee Deposit Account. As part of the general discussion, he noted the difficulties of monitoring and investing IFIP assets, a task made even more difficult by devaluation and inflation factors.

After discussion on other investment possibilities, Council **AGREED** to continue with the present arrangement (which only involves a forward six-month commitment) and congratulated Mr. Tuori on his conscientious handling of the matter.

Mr. Tuori stated that the Finance Committee intends to present its Long-Range Plan to the General Assembly in Rio de Janeiro for approval, but with certain modifications and suggestions for other sources of income. In regard to the latter, Mr. Tuori put forward the idea of regional congresses, profit-making workshops and an increase of membership Dues.

Mr. Chevion voiced his support for holding seminars between Congress years and suggested they be initiated on a high-level with the approval of APC.

As part of a discussion on IFIP Dues, and the structure for maintaining or increasing the Dues, Mr. Dorodnicyn felt that financial problems of IFIP could not be solved by increasing the Dues. Mr. Bennett emphasized that if an increase were envisaged, no set percentage prediction should be made, but ample forewarning should be given. Mr. Douglas indicated that the Dues generally covered the administrative expenses and should be maintained at a level required to cover at least the fixed expenses of the Secretariat. Mr. Chevion concurred and added that the Secretariat should be able to count upon a secure income at least two years ahead. Mr. Bobillier said that the increasing of Dues was an extremely delicate subject and proposed attracting more countries to become members of IFIP (Refer Admissions).
Mr. Keilhau put forward the following resolution – the Finance Committee should consider the Dues situation under the principle that they should cover the administrative expenses at a minimum and any predictable increases should be reflected in a modification of the Dues. The President added that Council recognized the financial problem and charged the Finance Committee to prepare a course of action which would permit the Dues to cover at least the fixed administrative expenses of IFIP.

Council unanimously VOTED in favour of this resolution and NOTED the report.

7.3 International Liaison (ICIL)

Mr. Douglas said he could not make a formal report as ICIL had not met since the last Council Meeting; however, he commented on certain events which had taken place in the interim.

He indicated that Mr. Zemanek and he had attended the Annual Meeting of FIACC as representatives of IFIP.

Mr. Douglas indicated that the status of IFIP’s relationship with IBI/ICC had been clarified as a result of Mr. Renard’s participation at the General Assembly of this Body. He further added that a continued form of contact could be established, with Mr. Renard representing our interests while his homologue would be Mr. Costa. The President agreed.

Mr. Douglas referred to the question of the IBI/ICC Technical Advisory Board and the necessity of a coordinated approach when dealing with UNESCO, etc. He recommended that FIACC represent the five societies in this respect. The President is planning to write to Mr. Bernasconi on this matter.

Mr. Douglas noted that our relationship with UNESCO was positive, but that recent resolutions made by UNESCO seemed to imply a hampering of freedom of association and general exchange of technical matters. The President has received clarification from the new Director-General and has written to him to reiterate IFIP’s support of open and unrestricted participation. Mr. Douglas suggested that our dialogue with UNESCO should be quoted to WHO where a similar issue had arisen.

Mr. Douglas confirmed that FIACC’s activity insofar as it related to UNESCO would be paid for by the latter. He advised that if FIACC put forward suitable proposals for further projects, UNESCO would consider investing additional funds. Mr. Renard asked if FIACC could upgrade its member status with UNESCO from “B” to “A”. Mr. Douglas felt this might be possible within the next year or two, but indicated that FIACC was now considered to be a valuable source of help to UNESCO.

7.4 Statutes and Bylaws

There was no report in respect of this Agenda point.

7.5 Conference Policy

Mr. Bennett presented his report (C1 Tokyo 75 / CPC-1) and indicated it was an interim progress report. His circulated letter requesting Conference Policy opinions and suggestions has so far resulted in only seven replies, in spite of a recent letter by the President reminding all of their commitment to respond. However, even these few letters represented the views of different Bodies and raised a number of useful points.

Mr. Renard said he would like the Conference Policy Committee to establish a set of rules for IFIP involvement in regional conferences and indicated this should be one of its main tasks.

After a discussion as to whether IFIP should be involved and / or take initiative in organizing regional conferences, the President proposed the following resolution to be taken by the Conference Policy Committee as a starting point for its work. IFIP should either take the initiative, where appropriate, or be involved in regional conferences. In other words, IFIP should pursue an active and positive policy.

Council unanimously ACCEPTED the resolution.
Council subsequently requested that the Conference Policy Committee prepare guidelines for IFIP's role with regard to regional conferences, including a statement on Royalties. It was recalled that the basic policy calls for all Royalties to go to IFIP, with only occasional deviations.

**Action:** CPC

The President suggested that Mr. Bennett issue a circular letter to General Assembly members pointing out that Council had passed a resolution on regional conferences. The letter should present current recommendations in implementing the resolution, for comment and reactions.

**Action:** CPC CH.

7.6 **Publications**

There was no report in respect of this Agenda point.

7.7 **Admissions**

Mr. Keilhau presented his report (C1 Tokyo 75 / AC-1) and stated there had been no meeting of the AC since the Stockholm General Assembly. He advised as follows:

- **AUSTRIA** - a new Austrian Body, the President of which is Mr. Zemanek, has made formal application, and we look forward to the readmission of Austria at the next General Assembly.

- **PHILIPPINES** - pursued an enquiry received from an organization, but have heard no further. However, he felt it would not have been eligible as it appeared to be a pure governmental agency.

- **ROUMANIA** - contact running smoothly and anticipate we will have a formal application to present at the next General Assembly.

- **THAILAND** - contact has been made and he would be visiting Bangkok after this Council Meeting to appraise the situation.

- **BURMA** - an interest has been expressed and this will be pursued.

The President added that two applications had been received several months ago from Mexico and the situation remains unsolved. He has offered to visit that country if the visit would solve the problem. The objective is to have a formal application from one Body prior to the Rio de Janeiro General Assembly.

**Action:** CPC CH.

The President said he would like to charge the AC Chairman to initiate an active campaign to enlarge IFIP's membership. An immediate approach is to prepare a list of countries not in IFIP for subsequent mailing to General Assembly members for their help in those areas.

**Action:** CPC

The President also requested the AC to prepare a complete plan, at least in time for the Brazil General Assembly Meeting, but sooner if possible.

**Action:** A11

Mr. Douglas mentioned there were UNITED NATIONS projects in both the Philippines and Burma and perhaps ICIL could be contacted in this respect.

The President said that anyone aware of any projects should immediately advise the Admissions Committee.

Mr. Keilhau said he would appreciate Council's advice on the eligibility of governmental political agencies for IFIP membership, bearing in mind the Statutes and Bylaws ruling in this respect. Mr. Renard replied that we should adhere to the Statutes and Bylaws, but if the organization seeking affiliation is a permanent structure and is representative of the country's overall activities in Information Processing, then it should be considered.

Mr. Bennett suggested that Council members propose potential members where they have a personal contact which could be used by the AC Chairman. The following suggestions ensued:
Mr. Chevion - Venezuela, Columbia
Mr. Iliev - Greece, Turkey
Mr. Douglas - Hong Kong, Singapore (the British Computer Society has offices there), China (Taiwan) Iraq
Mr. Dorodnicyn - North Korea, Portugal, Iran

Action: AC CH.

It was agreed that Mr. Keilhau would call for assistance from these persons in establishing contact.

Council NOTED the report.

7.8 Nominations

The President announced the establishment of the following Nomination Committees, to nominate candidates for the election scheduled for the Brazil General Assembly Meeting.

Vice-President: B.G. Cox (Chairman)
L. Gvozdjak
J. Tuori

Secretary: P.A. Bobillier (Chairman)
N.J. Lehmann
S. Sem-Sandberg

Treasurer: H. Zemanek (Chairman)
I. Kadal
G.N. Boyd

Trustees (2): P. Renard (Chairman)
L. Lukaszewicz
E. Goto

7.9 Public Information

There was no report in respect of this Agenda point.

7.10 Recognition

There was no report in respect of this Agenda point.

8. CONFERENCES

8.1 WCCE (World Conference on Computers in Education)

Action: STC CH.

Mr. Chevion presented his report (C1 Tokyo 75 / WCCE-STC-1) and mentioned the STC had recently met in Paris and found the progress in the WCCE preparations to be satisfactory. He indicated that the budget had been reviewed and updated, six very good financial contributions had been promised and it appeared there would be a reserve for unforeseen expenses. Mr. Zemanek asked if the budget had ever been formally approved by IFIP and Mr. Douglas queried if the cost for simultaneous translation was included. Mr. Chevion replied that the simultaneous translation was accounted for and that the budget had been presented to the last General Assembly. Mr. Zemanek said the General Assembly had only noted the report, not approved same. Mr. Renard, therefore, suggested that the report be redistributed to Council for approval.

Action: APC CH.

Mr. Chevion pointed out that in the proposed contract with North-Holland, the Royalties are shared between AFCET and IFIP and that this fact was widely known within AFCET. The President stated that IFIP's normal rule was to separate the conference surplus from Royalties on publications, and that the IFIP assumption was probably that the Royalties would not be shared. However, in view of the ambiguity, and the late date for resolving this matter, it was suggested that Mr. Renard try and negotiate with AFCET on this point. After discussion on this problem, Mr. Douglas put forward a motion calling for Mr. Renard to discuss the question of Royalties with AFCET with the objective of having all of the publication Royalties credited to IFIP, but that the matter is not to be pressed.
Council **ADOPTED** this motion, with one opposition.

**Action:** APC CH.

The **President** subsequently requested Mr. Renard to advise him and the Secretary, in writing, of the outcome of his discussions. The Secretary was instructed to hold the publications contract until the matter is cleared.

Mr. **Bennett** said he had been asked to comment on the PC Meeting and indicated that the anticipated number of papers for the event was 160 and not 150. In answer to a query raised by Mr. **Zemanek**, he replied this fact would not affect the budget.

Mr. **Douglas** proposed that the arrangements for the WCCE as reported to Council by the STC Chairman be approved.

Council **APPROVED**, with four abstentions.

8.2 **ECI (European Cooperation in Informatics)**

The subject of ECI and its general relationship to IFIP was discussed at length. As discussed during the Executive Body Meeting in Amsterdam in November 1974, the **President** had written to three of the existing regional organizations – located in Scandinavia, Eastern Europe and Western Europe. Replies had earlier been received from the first two groups and the response from ECI was hand-carried to the Council Meeting by Mr. Douglas.

It was generally agreed that full and complete cooperation with regional groups would be desirable.

Mr. **Douglas** proposed that a meeting be held perhaps in August or September 1975 to discuss the general matter of European cooperation. He proposed that the General Assembly members from the following countries might be those invited:

- Norway, Poland, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United, Kingdom, U.S.S.R., Yugoslavia.

The proposed Chairman for this meeting would be Mr. Zemanek and one of the objectives would be to discuss the possibility of holding an IFIP European Conference at some time between 1978 and 1981.

**Action:** President

The **President** noted that scheduling a meeting of such a large proportion of the IFIP GA representatives just prior to the October General Assembly Meeting in Brazil would create competition for the General Assembly Meeting and attendance at either or both of these meetings might suffer as a result. It was, therefore, decided to suspend plans for this meeting and the President will attempt to meet with the executives of ECI as soon as possible (within the next few months) to discuss and clarify the IFIP and ECI relationship.

Council indicated that it was in favour of scheduling a major IFIP event in Europe sometime during 1978.

**Action:** Committee

The **President** said a proposal should, therefore, be prepared for Council to present to the next General Assembly Meeting and appointed the following committee: Messrs. Douglas (Chairman), Keilhau, Zemanek, Iliev and / or Dorodnicyn. This activity supplements, but is separate from Mr. Bennett’s CPC work. Mr. **Chevion** requested that this proposal be circulated to the General Assembly members in sufficient time for them to consult their Societies prior to the Rio de Janeiro Meeting.

Mr. **Renard** introduced the report (C1 Tokyo 75 / CPC-2) and explained that ECI was planning to hold a Conference in 1976 which would be known as ECI 76. The Executive Body recommended that IFIP be involved and had decided it would be fruitful if the IFIP President met with ECI executives to define IFIP’s involvement.

**Action:** President

Council unanimously **AGREED** that the President may decide on co-sponsorship or patronage, as appropriate, without financial involvement.
8.3 S.E. Asian Regional Conference

Mr. Bennett presented a document indicating that plans for a S.E. Asian Regional Conference to be held in Singapore in August 1976 were underway. He recalled that this idea had been proposed by Mr. Narasimhan at Stockholm. The President stated he was very much in favour of such a Conference. Mr. Bennett said they were planning on a three-day meeting with approximately 200 participants.

Mr. Bennett indicated that the proposed topics are:

a) Problems in transferring computer technology to the countries of S.E. Asia.

b) Databases for developing countries.

c) Data communications for development in S.E. Asia.

Mr. Bennett requested Council to consider granting IFIP sponsorship if approached by the Conference Committee, perhaps for a loan up to approximately SFr. 15,000.

Mr. Tuori indicated that if IFIP were the only sponsor, the amount of SFr. 15,000 should be regarded as a maximum and that a loan no more than SFr. 10,000 might be more appropriate.

After discussion, Council AGREED to IFIP sponsorship of this Conference and to two official IFIP delegates – Messrs. Bennett and Narasimhan. However, the question of the loan would have to be raised at the General Assembly in Rio de Janeiro and an answer could, therefore, only be given end October 1975

9. FUTURE COUNCIL AND GENERAL ASSEMBLY MEETINGS

The President confirmed the Rio de Janeiro schedule as follows:

EXECUTIVE BODY MEETING - October 19 (Sunday)

COUNCIL MEETING - October 20 (Monday)
- October 21 (Tuesday a.m.)

GENERAL ASSEMBLY - October 22 (Wednesday)
- October 24 (Friday)

JOINT APC / EXECUTIVE BODY MEETING - October 21 (Tuesday p.m.)

SUCESSU CONGRESS - Sao Paolo
October 27 - 31

10. OTHER COUNCIL BUSINESS

10.1 Appointment of Task Groups

The President indicated that the new Task Groups have not yet been appointed and that the matter is under study together with the APC Chairman.

10.2 Request from the International Joint Conference on Pattern Recognition (IJCPR)

The President presented document (C1 Tokyo 75 / APC-2) concerning the formal request for affiliation with IFIP from the Standing Committee for the International Joint Conferences on Pattern Recognition put forward by its Vice-Chairman, Herbert Freeman.

Following discussion as to IJCPR’s acceptability as an affiliate under the Statutes and Bylaws and in relation to existing activities, the President summarized by saying ICJPR is an active organization which
wishes to retain its identity, but, at the same time, become affiliated with IFIP and we should give it an answer.

**Action:**
APC CH.

Council indicated (with one abstention) that it was, in principle, in favour of this affiliation. However, to define the organizational structure, it would be necessary for the Admissions Committee to study the matter, in collaboration with the Activity Planning Committee, the Statutes and Bylaws Committee, and an expert from the Task Group on Artificial Intelligence (to be nominated by Mr. Renard) in order to make a proposal to the General Assembly in Rio de Janeiro.

**AC / APC / SBC**

The President appointed Messrs. Keilhau (Chairman), Renard and Lehmann to prepare the proposal.

President

In the interim, the President will reply to Mr. Freeman’s request, indicating that Council favoured an affiliation, but that a final decision would be taken at the General Assembly in Rio de Janeiro.

11. **CLOSING OF MEETING**

The President thanked the Council members for their contributions and again expressed to Mr. Goto, the Host, and his Society the Council’s appreciation of all the arrangements made.

The President then declared the Meeting closed.
ACTION LIST

1. COUNCIL members: to make suggestions for IAG RC in expanded form
   Reference: p. 4.1.1.

2. ALL members: to make contributions to Bulletin No: 9
   Reference: p. 4.1.2, 4.2.2

3. COUNCIL members: to make suggestions for Congress 77 PC
   Reference: p. 4.1.4

4. COUNCIL members: to give advice to Secretariat
   Reference: p. 4.2.1

5. SECRETARY: to contact PC re IFIP books.
   Reference: p. 4.2.4

6. TREASURER / SECRET‘T: to list unforeseen expenses when actual.
   Reference: p. 4.3

7. TREASURER / SECRET‘T: to distribute letter re Dues receipt date policy
   Reference: p. 4.3

8. TREASURER: to amend IFIP 1975 Budget to include emergency loan
   of SFr. 5,000 for the PC of Congress 77.
   Reference: p. 4.3

9. PRESIDENT: to follow up with Mr. Turski on time-table for Congress 77
   PC meetings.
   Reference: p. 5.3

10. APC CH.: to set up meeting between Mr. Turski (re Congress 77),
    Executive Body members and possibly TC Chairmen
    Reference: p. 5.3

11. CPC CH.: to send a copy of the CPC interim report to Mr. Turski
    Reference: p. 5.3

12. APC CH.: to arrange for “Applications in Humanities and Arts and
    Relationships between Computers and Society” to be included in the
    Congress 77 Programme
    Reference: p. 5.3

13. CPC CH.: to reply to Mr. Renard’s questions on Congress 80
    during the Brazil Meeting.
    Reference: p. 5.4

14. TC 5 COG. V-P: to negotiate on behalf of IFIP re CAD 76 in the
    United Kingdom
    Reference: p. 6.1

15. TC 4 COG.V-P: to convey Council’s thoughts on MEDINFO 77, in writing,
    Mr. Roukens.
    Reference: p. 6.2

16. TREASURER: to amend IFIP 1975 Budget to include grant of SFr. 4,000
    for the WC (WG 7.1) “Modelling and Simulation of Water Resource
    Systems”.
    Reference: p. 6.2

17. PRESIDENT: to negotiate with TC 7 if ACM-Sigmetrics do not agree
    with IFIP approach re Symposium on “Computer Performance Modelling
    and Evaluation”.
    Reference: p. 6.2

18. PRESIDENT: to convey to Mr. Curran Council’s appreciation of his
    work as Chairman of TC 6.
    Reference: p. 6.3

19. IAG: to submit documents on its past activities, etc. to Mr. Renard.
    Reference: p. 6.4

20. TC 8 COG. V-P: to follow up with Mr. Langefors re titles and Scopes
    Of WG 8.1 and WG 8.2
    Reference: p. 6.5
21. TC 9 CH. + AD HOC GROUP: to submit a proposal of TC 9 Aims and Scope to the Council Meeting in Brazil. 
SECRET'T: to distribute document to GA members one month prior to the Meeting. p. 6.5

22. TREASURER: to amend IFIP 1975 Budget to include preliminary budget of SFr. 1,500 for TC 9. p. 6.5

23. COG.V-P's: to request TC Chairmen to send in their activity plans. 
ALL members: to adhere to “6-year” plan concept and advise the APC Chairman and Secretariat of changes. p. 7.1

24. APC CH.: to distribute to all GA members formal 6-years plan. 
SECRET'T: to initiate numbering system. p. 7.1

25. APC CH. / IAG: to put into effect an IAG long-range plan of activities. p. 7.1

26. PRESIDENT: to send congratulations letter to Mr. Williams (TC 5 Chairman). p. 7.1

27. APC CH.: to present to the President final plans for establishment of Task Groups p. 7.1

28. FC: to prepare a course of action re Dues p. 7.2

29. PRESIDENT: to write to Mr. Bernasconi re coordinated approach when dealing with UNESCO. p. 7.3

30. CPC: to establish set of rules for IFIP involvement in regional conferences p. 7.5

31. CPC: to prepare guidelines for IFIP's role with regard to regional conferences, including a statement on Royalties. p. 7.5

32. CPC CH.: to issue a circular letter to GA members re Council's Resolution on regional conferences p. 7.5

33. AC CH.: to initiate active campaign to enlarge IFIP's membership. 
AC: to prepare complete plan in time for Brazil General Assembly Meeting. p. 7.7

34. ALL members: to advise Admissions Committee if aware of any projects. p. 7.7

35. AC CH.: to call for assistance from Messrs. Chevion, Iliev, Douglas and Dorodnicyn in establishing contact with potential members. p. 7.7

36. STC CH.: to redistribute to Council members the WCCE budget report. p. 8.1

37. APC CH.: to discuss with AFCET the question of Royalties relating to the WCCE and to advise President and Secretary outcome of discussions. 
SECRETARY: to withhold publications contract pending clarification p. 8.1

38. PRESIDENT: to arrange to meet with ECI executives. p. 8.2

39. COMMITTEE (IFIP event in Europe during 1978): to make a proposal to the General Assembly at Rio de Janeiro. 
SECRET'T: to circulate proposal to GA members prior to Meeting. p. 8.2

40. PRESIDENT: to decide on co-sponsorship or patronage of ECI 76. p. 8.2

41. S.E. ASIAN REG. CC: to raise question of loan for the S.E. Asian Reg. Conference at the Brazil General Assembly Meeting. p. 8.3
42. **APC CH.**: to nominate an expert to join AC, APC and SBC to make a proposal to the General Assembly at Rio de Janeiro re IJCPR’s affiliation with IFIP.  
   AC/APC/SBC: to prepare the proposal.  
   p. 10.2

43. **PRESIDENT**: to write to Vice-Chairman of IJCPR.  
   p. 10.2