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1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

IFIP General Assembly, 28 – 29 August 2000, Beijing, China

1.1 GA 2000: IFIP Membership Issues

There are currently 44 IFIP full members including 2 societies whose membership is temporarily under a 'Freeze'. Out of these, 41 Members currently enjoy voting rights. 33 full members had representatives at GA, and one member was represented by proxy. 10 of the 12 TC Chairs were present.

General Assembly adopted a proposal for a new membership dues category to cater for full membership of societies from countries with small economies. The new dues category is equal to half the lowest current dues level of 1,600 EUR. This strategic initiative is intended to recruit new Members and to assist current IFIP Members that qualify to scale down to the new category. GA encouraged IFIP Members from developing countries to use the IFIP Voucher scheme [http://www.ifip.or.at/minutes/C99/C99_annex1.htm] and EB committed to investigate other mechanisms to assist societies from developing countries and countries in transition.

GA agreed with regret to transform the membership status of the New Zealand Computer Society from full to corresponding membership. NZCS was previously admitted to IFIP full membership in 1997.

A Members’ Forum was held immediately prior to the GA meetings. Many felt that the recruitment of young professionals and their long-term membership is one of the big challenges that computer societies were facing. A number of representatives shared their societies’ experience in expanding their membership base, conducting activities related to professional development and the need for more extensive use of the Internet. The Australian GA representative produced notes, which are available at http://www.ifip.or.at/minutes/GA2000.htm.

1.2 GA 2000: Elections and Appointments

President-Elect: GA elected for President-Elect Mr. R. Aiken, GA representative of US based ACM.

Vice-Presidents: GA re-elected Mr. T. Miura (Japan) and elected Messrs. K. Brunnstein (Germany) and R. Reis (Brazil) for Vice Presidents.

Trustees: GA re-elected K. Boyanov (Bulgaria) and elected Messrs. S. Charmonman (Thailand), R. Kurki-Suonio (Finland), J. Lee (US based IEEE CS) and P. Ralston (Australia).

The new EB and Council composition is available at http://www.ifip.or.at/bulletin/b_counci.htm

The newly appointed Chairs and members of IFIP’s Standing and Ad hoc committees are listed at http://www.ifip.or.at/bulletin/b_commit.htm

1.3 Statutes and Bylaws

GA decided on a major change of the Statutes & Bylaws by replacing the requirement for a “three quarters majority” vote to a “two thirds majority” requirement.
1.4 Finances

General Assembly approved the 1999 accounts. The Final exceptionally good Result, after Special Funds Provision of 66 K CHF, is an increase in IFIP's General Fund by 459 K CHF to 2,116 K CHF. GA reviewed the 2000 income and expenses and approved the 2001 Budget, which includes 422K EUR on the income side and 375K EUR as expenses.

1.5 Technical Activities

TC reports are available at the GA 2000 Minutes web site and contain attendance statistics. TC Chairs are looking forward to active members from all IFIP Member societies and GA representatives are requested to review their membership and to nominate representatives, if appropriate.

GA decided to establish a Task Force on Entertainment Computing. This group would initially operate within the mandate of the Committee for Cooperation with Industry (CCI) and would have the responsibility to explore and develop Entertainment Computing within IFIP. It was felt that this activity should be organized transversally allowing active input from interested TCs and WGs.

CCI will support special congress sessions to attract representatives from Industry. Other issues related to involving IFIP in standards and making IFIP projects and activities interesting to representatives of Industry.

Another important technical activity is the joint TC 6, TC 8 and TC 11 initiative to "kick-start" a series of IFIP conferences on Electronic Commerce. The First Conference is scheduled to take place in October 2001 in Zurich.

The management of IFIP events is good and the activity levels are high. In early August 2000 IFIP had approved 70 events for the current year. The IFIP Events Calendar is located at http://www.ifip.or.at/cal_even.htm

1.6 IFIP 16th World Computer Congress, 21 – 25 August 2000, Beijing

The IFIP World Computer Congress in China was a major success with more than 2000 participants from over 70 countries. The President of the P. R. of China addressed Congress at the Opening session. Mr. Jiang Zemin, an Electrical Engineer by education, continued “off the cuff” in English and was rewarded with a standing ovation.

Many attributed the official Chinese interest in the 16th IFIP Congress, which was in the headlines of the Chinese media, to the importance China attaches to IT for its economic and social development and as a recognition of IFIP’ role in the international IT community.

1.7 Future Congresses

IFIP Congress 2002 in Montreal: The IPC Chair, Jan Wibe and the COC Chair, George Boynton are working closely with the TC Chairs to put forward a very attractive program of activities. The Congress theme is “IT for our Times: Ideas, Research and Applications in an Inclusive World”. A Call for Papers and Contributions will go out in January 2001 and the Congress dates are set for August 25-30, 2002. An IPC meeting is scheduled for 16 - 17 October 2000 in Montreal.
Three excellent bids for Congress 2004 were presented by the delegations of South Africa, France and Israel. All three destinations – Cape Town, Toulouse and Jerusalem – had the flair and the attraction to win. However, GA could choose only one destination and Jerusalem was selected as the site for the IFIP Congress and GA in 2004.

1.8 Publications

For the whole of 2000 Kluwer expects to publish 24 IFIP books. Sales of IFIP proceedings during the first half of 2000 were up by 16% in comparison to the same period in 1999. Several promotional activities were initiated including direct mail to IFIP member societies of the “IFIP Bookshelf” catalogue and other information concerning recently published IFIP books.

[The IFIP Publications pages are located at http://www.ifip.or.at/public.htm and the Publisher’s report is posted on the GA 2000 Minutes web site]

1.9 GA Organization

Following a GA 99 recommendation, Executive Board experimented with a new structure for the organization of Council and General Assembly meetings. The proposed new structure was well appreciated during the March Council meeting in Washington, D.C., but in Beijing it appeared there were some shortcomings with the initial Reporting session. In particular, it was felt that the TC reports should be delivered during the GA sessions. It was agreed that further improvements are necessary and, based on the Washington and Beijing experiences, the new concept for GA/C meetings should be fine-tuned.


1.10 Social Program

There was a rich and diversified program of social events and activities in conjunction with the IFIP Congress and General Assembly. An exceptional concert was offered to Congress participants and the Farewell Party was a festival of Chinese cuisine.

The IFIP Presidents’ meeting and Dinner were very successful. The attending Presidents and alternates had the opportunity to exchange experiences about the activities of their societies and their participation as IFIP full members. A highlight of the Presidents’ meeting was a talk by A. Rolstadas, winner of the 4th Isaac L. Auerbach Award. The meeting was followed by a visit to the Summer Palace and Dinner at the famous “Listening to the Oriole” Restaurant.

The Olympic spirit in the competition for IFIP Congress 2004 was in full flair. The French delegation in cooperation with the Embassy of France hosted a reception at the exclusive Kempinski hotel in downtown Beijing while the South African delegation invited all GA attendees to the South African Embassy. The Organizing Committee of IFIP Congress 2002 in Montreal also took the occasion to demonstrate the “Nouvelle Experience” by inviting everyone to the Canadian Ambassador’s Residence.

During the 40th IFIP Anniversary reception the IFIP President organized an IFIP quiz. The reward was a free WCC 2002 registration and was sponsored by the WCC 2002 Organizing Committee. Reino Kurki-Suonio (Finland) was the lucky winner.
During the CIE Dinner on 27 August, GA found out that Mrs. Rita de Caluwe (Belgium) was celebrating her birthday and a toast was raised to mark the occasion.

1.11 Acknowledgements

It is hard to appropriately express our thanks to our hosts for all their hard work for the organization of a very successful IFIP Congress and General Assembly in Beijing. We wish to place on record IFIP’s grateful thanks to the Chinese Institute of Electronics and to its officers, representatives and staff for the excellent organization and generous arrangements during the IFIP Congress and General Assembly meetings in Beijing.

In Beijing, we made many new friends who, we are confident, have embraced IFIP’s mission and objectives and will keep the IFIP flag flying high in many new areas around the world.
### 2 ACTION LIST

**IFIP General Assembly, 28-29 August 2000, Beijing, China**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>WHAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>Refer to the C 2000 Minutes and GA 2000 Action Lists and follow-up on outstanding commitments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA reps., TC and WG Chairs</td>
<td>Continue to revise TC (and WG, resp. by TC and WG Chairs) membership, consider new nominations and advise Secretariat of changes in membership incl. contact information as soon as they occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Societies</td>
<td>Establish more visible links to the IFIP URL. Promote IFIP and distribute information about IFIP activities among members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Write to member society presidents requesting them to provide more visibility to IFIP activities. Appoint IFIP Liaison to serve on the Awards Committee of the Rhein Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Prepare presentations of the IFIP website for Council/GA meetings. Produce paper related to a proposal to increase the Secretariat staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB, Miura</td>
<td>Further develop a proposal for the more sustained involvement of representatives from industry in IFIP activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miura, Lee, Kamae</td>
<td>Consider organization of an intl. workshop on Entertainment Computing in cooperation with the TC Chairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB, Secretary</td>
<td>Develop simpler procedures for submitting nominations for the Silver Core and the OSA Award. Consider other IFIP Awards. Revise Standing Orders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All budget holders</td>
<td>Exercise careful financial control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President, TC 3 Chair</td>
<td>Progress planning of the IFIP Conference on professional development with CEPIS and SEARCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA, TC Chairs</td>
<td>Consider interaction between TCs and WGs on emerging “hot issues”. Ensure there is a concerted input in the organization of events on such topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC Chairs</td>
<td>Implement TA decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Proactively assert IFIP’s Publication Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCSC</td>
<td>Promote the Voucher scheme for DC participation in IFIP activities and consider new initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Consider new version of the “This is IFIP” leaflet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congress 2000 IPC and OC</td>
<td>Submit final report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congress 2000 IPC and OC</td>
<td>Develop program with active TC involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC and WG Chairs</td>
<td>Inform Member societies of countries in which business meetings are planned and invite the respective GA representatives to attend these meetings. Encourage members to report to their societies about TC and WG activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer, Secretariat</td>
<td>Implement the new membership dues scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Nedkov, Glasson</td>
<td>Further refine the new scheme for the organization of GA and Council meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Nedkov</td>
<td>Develop a PowerPoint presentation of an Annual IFIP report to assist GA representatives in their reporting to Member societies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC and WG Chairs, Secretariat</td>
<td>Ensure that the forms for all IFIP Events are processed and recorded in the Events database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFIP Secretariat</td>
<td>Continue to remind of the IFIP URL and the availability of online information and documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretariat</td>
<td>Maintain a target list of potential IFIP Members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 ATTENDANCE LIST

IFIP General Assembly, 28 – 29 August 2000, Beijing, China

Members Present

Argentina          C. Berdichevsky
Austria            W. Grafendorfer  Vice-President
Australia          P. Ralston
Belgium            R. de Caluwe
Brazil             R. Reis
Bulgaria           K. Boyanov
Canada             G. Boynton
China              Q. Wang
Czech Republic     J. Dolezal
Denmark            P. Bollerslev  President
Finland & TC2      R. Kurki-Suonio
France & TC10      J.-C. Laprie
Germany            K. Brunnstein
Greece             S. Katsikas
Hungary            C. Gergely
India              R. Srinivasan
Israel             M. Gottlieb
Ireland            D. Dolan
Italy              A. Frisiani
Japan              T. Miura  Vice-President
Korea              S. Choi
Norway             J. Wibe
Poland             Z. Bubnicki
Portugal           J. Granado
Singapore & SEARCC A. Siow
S. Africa & TC11   B. von Solms
Spain              A. del Moral
Sweden             D. Khakhar  Treasurer
Switzerland        K. Bauknecht
Thailand           S. Charmonman
UK & CEPIS         R. Johnson  Secretary
US based ACM       R. Aiken  Vice-President
US based IEEE CS   J. Lee
Hon. Member        A. Goldsworthy
Ind. Member        J. Rosenfeld

Members represented by Proxy
Slovenia           N. Schlamberger  Proxy to W. Grafendorfer
TC Chairs Present (in addition to those listed above)

TC 1  G. Ausiello
TC 3  B. Samways
TC 6  A. Casaca
TC 8  B. Glasson
TC 9  J. Berleur
TC 12 B. Neumann
TC 13 J. Hammond

Observers Present

France  A. Costes
Israel  N. Cohen
Japan  M. Yoshizawa
S. Africa  P. Aspinall
Switzerland  R. Morel
US based IEEE CS  G. Pollock
CLEI  M. Solar
WCC2000 OC  M. Zhou
WCC2000 PC  X. Li
Kluwer  Y. Lambert

IFIP Secretariat

P. Nedkov  Executive Director
D. Hayden  Events Facilitator

Apologies

Hon. Member  P. Bobillier
Hon. Member  A. Melbye
Hon. Member  G. Morris
Hon. Member  A. Rolstadas
Hon. Member  B. Sendov
Hon. Member  R. Tanaka
Hon. Member  H. Zemanek
Slovenia  N. Schlamberger
Syria  B. Mounajed
Tunisia  A. Miled
TC5 Chair  G. Doumeingts
TC7 Chair  P. Kall
IAPR  R. Kasturi
INFORMS  M. Saltzman
WCC2000 IPC  B. Wah
4 IFIP GENERAL ASSEMBLY MEETING

28 – 29 August 2000, Beijing, China

4.1 Call Meeting to Order

The President opened the General Assembly meeting and welcomed all participants. He was grateful to the Chinese Institute of Electronics for the excellent arrangements and was pleased to invite Mr. Zhang, Vice President of the Chinese Association for Science and Technology (CAST) to address GA.

Mr. Zhang said that the IFIP Congress in China was a great success. China was eager to catch up with the advanced countries in the IT field and CAST was the largest NGO in China with over 3 million individual members working in the fields of science and technology. The CAST Vice-President welcomed the opportunities IFIP provides to Chinese scientists and specialists to collaborate with the rest of the world and wished the General Assembly in Beijing successful deliberations.

The President thanked Mr. Zhang for his welcome remarks and introduced the newcomers to an IFIP General Assembly:

Mr. S. Choi, representing the Rep. of Korea
Mr. A. Frisiani, GA representative of Italy
Mr. S. Katsikas, GA representative of Greece
Mr. J. Lee, GA representative of US based IEEE CS
Mr. R. Srinivasan, GA representative of India
Mr. P. Aspinall, South Africa
Mrs. N. Cohen, Israel
Mr. A Costes, France
Mr. R. Morel, Switzerland
Mrs. G. Pollock, US based IEEE CS
Mr. M. Solar, CLEI

4.2 Attendance and apologies

The Secretary announced the GA attendance, proxies and regrets (please refer to the Attendance List). 41 IFIP Members currently have voting rights. Representatives of 33 Full Members were in attendance and another member society was represented by proxy.

Quorum - 21
Present and proxies - 34

In addition, 10 of the 12 TC Chairs were present.

Mr. Johnson advised that this attendance makes it possible for GA to proceed with its work and presented a schedule for nominations, presentations and elections.
4.3 Business issues

4.3.1 Approval of Agenda

Mr. Rosenfeld wished to add new items on the agenda relating to the Youth Forum, the Computer Driving License and Digital Libraries. The President advised that these issues could be discussed under item 11. “Other Business”.

General Assembly ADOPTED the Agenda.

4.3.2 Approval of the Minutes

4.3.2.1 GA Petaling Jaya 99

General Assembly unanimously APPROVED the Minutes of the GA 99 meeting in Malaysia.

4.3.2.2 Council Washington, D.C. 2000

Mr. Berleur pointed out that on p. 17 of the Minutes there was reference to Holvast (NL) as the new WG 9.3 Chair. This should be corrected to “WG 9.2 Chair”.

With this remark, Council members unanimously APPROVED the Minutes of the March 2000 Council meeting in Washington, D.C.

4.3.3 President’s Report

The President reminded GA that this year IFIP commemorates its 40th Anniversary. Several activities were organized and the Secretariat has provided wide visibility to the occasion.

IFIP currently has 44 Full Members, 3 Corresponding Members and 11 Affiliated International Organizations. There are plans to engage actively with CEPIS and SEARCC to organize an IFIP Conference on Professionalism during 2001.

Mr. Berleur wondered what is meant by a Conference on Professionalism. The President explained that, based on previous experience with the Harmonization project, he had sent a letter to CEPIS and SEARCC inviting their input in the organization of an IFIP Conference, which could lead to further initiatives. Mr. Johnson added that an important objective would be to propose a program to promote professionalism within the informatics industry. Mr. Berleur found it strange that this initiative is taken by EB with Affiliates and not via IFIP’s TCs which is the customary way to proceed with technical activities. Mr. Bollerslev said that actually TC 3 would be involved on behalf of IFIP. Mr. Bauknecht reminded that there was no positive result from the Harmonization project.

In April, Mr. Bollerslev was in Argentina for meetings with SADIO and was pleased to note the enthusiasm and efficiency of the SADIO Officers. He also visited Chile and held meetings with representatives of the Chilean Computer Society to discuss direct membership in IFIP. In July and August, during his WCC 2004 site inspection visits, he met presidents and representatives of the IFIP Member societies of Israel, South Africa and France.

Since the March Council 2000 meeting, 37 IFIP conferences were organized which shows a high activity level. Relations with UNESCO continue to broaden. The first phase of a project for an
IFIP/UNESCO Elementary ICT Curriculum was successfully completed and cooperation with the Moscow based UNESCO Institute for Information Technologies in Education is developing well.

IFIP was invited to serve on the Award Committee of the Eduard Rhein Foundation for which a more formalized agreement will be developed. Among the award recipients of this Foundation were Bernard Shaw, Herbert von Karajan, Konrad Zuse, Heinz Zemanek and Tim Berners-Lee.

Mr. Lee wished to know more about the arrangements and the President advised that he would appoint an IFIP German-tongued representative to sit on the Award Committee meetings of the Foundation.

Mr. Bollerslev said that IFIP has gained prestige with the successful organization of the 16th Congress in Beijing. The 17th Congress in Montreal will now be in the limelight and 3 excellent invitations were submitted for WCC 2004. The President and the Executive Director had visited the venues for site inspection.

In June, a meeting of the Executive Board was held at the IFIP Headquarters in Laxenburg and many strategic and organizational issues were reviewed.

Mr. Bollerslev concluded by thanking the Executive Board members and the IFIP Secretariat for all the support and assistance at all times.

4.3.4 Secretary's Report

Mr. Johnson reminded that 41 Full members had voting rights. Since Council 2000, Greece paid its fees for 1999. Armenia is in arrears for 1999. The membership of Albania and Russia was frozen since GA 99. The Admissions Committee will propose to GA to accept the request from the Computer Society of New Zealand to transfer its membership from Full to Corresponding.

Mr. Johnson said that the Secretariat is busy and the Executive Director and his staff are to be congratulated on maintaining their high level of support to IFIP activities. The Secretary in conjunction with the Executive Director will prepare a short PowerPoint presentation describing IFIP’s activities during 2000. GA members are encouraged to use this presentation, to be available electronically, to update their member societies and others on IFIP matters. Mr. Boynton thought that a PowerPoint report is a good initiative but he would wish to see more proactive initiatives such as the President making contact with specific societies. Mr. Samways said that he had used the current PowerPoint presentation from the IFIP web site to promote IFIP and TC 3 activities.

Mr. Johnson concluded his report by saying that during the June EB meeting in Laxenburg a preliminary list of potential new IFIP members was developed. This work will continue and contacts will be established so as to encourage new applications.

4.3.5 Executive Director's Report

Mr. Nedkov reported that activities and operations were handled promptly. Immediately after GA 99 and Council 2000 the most important decisions and information were circulated. The Minutes were available soon after and all known changes in the lists of IFIP, GA, TC and WG officers and members were updated and uploaded on the web. The new IFIP Information Bulletin was distributed in January. The Secretariat worked closely with MC to prepare the “This is IFIP” brochure. The ‘99 accounts were finalized and prepared for auditing in January 2000. A Demographics survey was carried out after Council 2000. There were regular contacts with the
The Executive Director informed GA that in October 99, Mrs. Ockermueller joined the IFIP Secretariat as a half-time Administrative Assistant but had to leave in April 2000. He was very happy to report that another assistant was recruited. Mrs. Brigitte Brauneis started work in July and is making good progress.

The Secretariat was actively involved in the management of IFIP Events. Special attention was devoted to assist, facilitate and enhance the activities of IFIP's TCs and WGs. Dorothy's work as Events Facilitator was praised during the Council meeting in Washington D.C. Since then, she made further progress despite the fact that for three months there was no other administrative assistance and now in addition to her duties she devotes time to work with Brigitte. The results were excellent and Mr. Nedkov wished to place on record his thanks to Dorothy and his appreciation of her work for IFIP.

General Assembly APPLAUDED.

The IFIP Publications process has also improved - the link between event organization and publications was stronger and a new service was introduced to inform IFIP’s member societies and editors of new IFIP titles.

The IFIP Internet Hub and Gateway continues to grow. The web site is an excellent medium for the promotion of IFIP, its membership and activities to a worldwide audience. The Secretariat is involved in public relations, advisory services and consultations and these activities are appreciated by many.

The preparations for the Washington Council and the GA in Beijing were of high priority. The 16th World Computer Congress in Beijing was a major endeavor and a lot of effort was invested to promote the 40th Anniversary of IFIP. The Secretariat had its 5th Anniversary in Laxenburg and there were photos and articles related to the occasion at http://www.ifip.or.at/secr.htm.

The Executive Director concluded by saying that the Secretariat was devoted to serving such a great multicultural organization as IFIP. It has many friends around the World, which is both a privilege and a responsibility to continue providing satisfactory services.

General Assembly APPLAUDED.

4.3.6 EB Meeting Report

Messrs. Bollerslev and Johnson advised that EB had met in January in New York and in June in Laxenburg and IFIP’s activities were closely monitored. So as to avoid repetition, many of the issues that have been dealt with will be addressed under the respective agenda items. There is an ongoing review of the IFIP Awards. The Standing Orders will be reviewed during an EB meeting in Tokyo in February 2001, which will be hosted by IPSJ.

4.3.7 Treasurer's Report

Mr. Khakhar referred to his report and explained the way it was structured. He said that the IFIP Auditors had reviewed the 1999 accounts in February 2000. The 1999 Result, after amortization and depreciation according to approved policies and after Special Funds Provisions, is a surplus of
459,359 CHF. The result is much better than the forecast of 200 K CHF made by the Treasurer at the General Assembly 99 in Kuala Lumpur.

Compared to 1998, the 1999 Result shows an increased income, not accounting for the appreciation of CHF 319,511 in portfolio investment, while expenses have increased only marginally. The Final Result, after Special Funds Provision of 66 K CHF, is an increase in IFIP’s General Fund by 459 K CHF.

Key figures for the last five years are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>2422</td>
<td>2156</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>1520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liabilities</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds</td>
<td>2781</td>
<td>2182</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1763</td>
<td>1462</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Total Income was 886 K CHF, which is outstanding compared to the budgeted 587 K CHF. Income from Return on Assets, managed by UBS London since 1990, was 319 K CHF. However, this figure includes a difference of CHF 249 K between book value and market value of the portfolio investment and legal practice in Austria does not allow accounting profit without sales. IFIP’s practice is to show both appreciation and depreciation of the portfolio investment on the Income side. Dues from Members were 318 K CHF, which is 38 K CHF above budget. Royalties from Publications decreased marginally compared to 1998 and are 16 K CHF below the budgeted 175 K CHF. Proceeds from IFIP Events are roughly the same as in 1998, not counting the proceeds for WCC 98.

Total Expenses were 361 K CHF, or 31%, below budget. This is due to savings in office expenses, administrative and technical supports. The total Secretariat expenses for 1999 were 252 K CHF, which is well within the allocated budget.

Expenses of the 12 Technical Committees were in total 40% below the budgeted amount and show considerable variations. 11 TCs had positive TC Fund balances available for 1999, and 2 TCs spent part of this balance during 1999. For 2000, 10 TCs have positive Fund balances available to the extent of 424 K CHF. The Technical Support expenses were 10 K CHF, or 75%, below budget, relating to AMB, TA and DCSC. The Special Activities Fund increased by 59 K CHF to the amount of 149 K CHF.

The Final Result, after Special Funds Provision of 66 K CHF, is an increase in IFIP’s General Fund by 459 K CHF to 2,116 K CHF.

General Assembly unanimously ACCEPTED the 1999 audited accounts.

The Treasurer informed that the financial status for 2000, as at 31 July, shows a surplus of EUR 182,024. Total income was EUR 306,392, which includes membership dues (EUR 169,200), royalties from publications for the second half of 1999 (EUR 62,627), activity proceeds (EUR 50,683) and return on assets (EUR 23,880). The total expenses for the period were EUR 101 K out of which the main part was for the Secretariat’s operational costs. No other major expenses have occurred.
For the remainder of the year the following major income and expenses could be expected:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income (in K EUR)</th>
<th>Expenses (in K EUR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Royalties 65</td>
<td>Travel 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds from activities 75</td>
<td>Salaries 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return on Assets 30</td>
<td>Office Expenses 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newsletter 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auditor’s Fee 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DCSC related activities 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TC related activities 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miscellaneous 40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Treasurer’s estimate is that 2000 will result in a surplus of approximately EUR 135 K.

In preparing the 2001 Budget, the Treasurer had taken account of the 1999 Actual Result and 2000 Budget Approved. He had also considered the budget requested by the budget holders.

The 2001 Budget Proposed implied a total income of 422 K EUR and total expenses of 374 K EUR, with a surplus yield of 47 K EUR. On the income side Royalties of 89 K EUR are foreseen. Other components of the income consisted of membership dues (170 K EUR), proceeds from activities (55 K EUR) and return on assets (108 K EUR). On the expense side, the Secretariat related expenses are budgeted at 240 K EUR. Other major expenses relate to TC funded expenses for special activities and DCSC support. The DCSC budget includes compensation for developing countries under the Voucher scheme.

General Assembly APPROVED the proposed Budget 2001 (with one abstention).

4.3.7.1 Finance Committee Report

Mr. Granado drew attention to his report and stressed that 1999 was an exceptional financial year for IFIP in several ways. There was an appreciation of the stock market, 2 member societies based in the USA were paying dues and several societies with outstanding dues have settled their obligations. Due to these factors, the Income has grown with roughly 48% over that of 1998. At the same time the expenses increased with 9% over these in 1998. This is much larger than the inflation rate and is not necessarily justified in terms of activities.

The FC Chair continued by saying that most of the previously defined objectives were achieved. These included good management of Income and Expenses, maintaining a fund level of at least five times the annual expenses, developing the Return of Assets as an important income stream and maintaining bank deposits which do not exceed the budget. Several financial objectives remain to be accomplished. A reasonable income on bank deposits and a better cash flow management has to be ensured in order to optimize IFIP’s investments and funds allocation.

The Finance Committee wished to draw GA’s attention to the over-heated status of the world capital markets, which might lead to a decrease of the portfolio in future. There was a discrepancy between the budgeted and actual “dubious dues written off”. The Austrian support for the operations of the Secretariat, which in 1999 was 40 K CHF, is now small in comparison with the Return on Assets.

Mr. Granado drew attention to the TC Fund statistics provided by the Treasurer for the period 1988 – 1999 and said that most TCs had positive fund balances with the exception of TC 3, TC 9
and TC 12 which are encouraged to review their activities so as to generate surpluses. Such surpluses will allow them to initiate future activities and not to rely only on central IFIP funding.

**Mr. Bauknecht** was surprised to see that the TC 3 accumulated funds were spent. **Mr. Samways** explained that the TC 3 WCCE conference in Australia was successful and that had helped build a positive TC Fund. Since then, there were activities in developing countries that have not generated surpluses. TC 3 is in a position to accumulate a positive fund but this would mean that it should restrict some of its currently planned activities in developing countries.

**Messrs. Samways, Berleur and Neumann** were upset that their TCs were singled out and that there was an implication of mismanagement. **Messrs. Khakhar and Granado** responded that the report is based on the actual status of income and expenses in order to allow GA members to see the trends. There was no implication of mismanagement. Years ago there were TC Reviews and these were abolished in favor of continuous reviews. The idea was to provide GA with pertinent information related to financial performance and this is the duty of the FC and the Treasurer.

**Mr. Granado** requested GA on behalf of FC to approve the 1999 audited accounts and to congratulate the Treasurer and the Secretariat for their excellent work.

General Assembly AGREED.

[Please also refer to the Treasurer’s report].

**The FC Chair** conveyed FC’s support of the proposal for a new decreased level of membership dues [Please refer to Annex 1]. **Mr. Brunnstein** opined that the scheme is an excellent future investment.

**Mr. Granado** requested GA to take note and endorse the amendments (approved by the March 2000 Council) to the existing levels of membership dues of several member societies as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Existing Category</th>
<th>New Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Cat. 2 =&gt; Cat. 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Cat. 3 =&gt; Cat. 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Cat. 2 =&gt; Cat. 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Cat. 1 =&gt; Cat. 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Cat. 1 =&gt; Cat. 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Cat. 3 =&gt; Cat. 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Cat. 2 =&gt; Cat. 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Cat. 1 =&gt; Cat. 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The FC Chair** said that these societies are offered the possibility of advance payments by 25 October 2000 of their dues at the current level for the period 2001 – 2003. This will give them the benefit of paying dues according to the readjustment only after 2003. **Mr. Nedkov** reminded that the original deadline was set for 25 August 2000 and most of these societies have already paid. **The Treasurer** confirmed that actually an extension of the original deadline was suggested.

General Assembly AGREED.

Finally, **Mr. Granado** said that the 2000 Forecast does not foresee any serious surprise and recommended to GA to approve the proposed IFIP budget for 2001.

**Mr. Gergely** saw a trend in making surpluses. He wondered whether IFIP should continue building its general fund or it should adopt a policy of 0 balances in future. **Messrs. Granado and Brunnstein** welcomed activities that can be considered as future oriented investments and the
Treasurer clarified that many TCs have their positive fund balances and at the TC level can consider supporting new activities which justify TC funds. [Please also refer to the Treasurer’s report].

4.4 Elections

4.4.1 Officers

For President Elect

The Secretary reminded GA that the Nominations Committee for Officers had put forward the nominations of Messrs. Aiken, Brunnstein and Khakhar and there were no further nominations from the floor.

Round 1 Results:
- R. Aiken (US based ACM) 19 votes
- K. Brunnstein (Germany) 15 votes
- D. Khakhar (Sweden) 10 votes

Round 2 Results:
- R. Aiken (US based ACM) 25 votes ELECTED
- K. Brunnstein (Germany) 19 votes

For Vice-Presidents

The Secretary reminded GA that the Nominations Committee for Officers had put forward the nominations of Messrs. Miura and Boynton. Messrs. Brunnstein and Reis were nominated from the floor.

Results:
- G. Boynton (Canada) 19 votes
- K. Brunnstein (Germany) 35 votes ELECTED (2000 – 2001)
- R. Reis (Brazil) 26 votes ELECTED (2000 – 2001)

4.4.2 Trustees

The Secretary reminded GA that the Nominations Committee for Trustees had put forward the nominations of Messrs. Boyanov, Kurki-Suonio and Ralston. In addition, Messrs. Charmonman and Lee were nominated from the floor.

General Assembly ELECTED the following new Trustees by acclamation:

- R. Kurki-Suonio (Finland) ELECTED (2000 – 2003)*
- C. Charmonman (Thailand) ELECTED (2000 – 2002)*
- P. Ralston (Australia) ELECTED (2000 – 2001)*

* - terms determined by a draw

The President congratulated the newly elected Officers and Trustees.

General Assembly APPLAUDED.
4.5 Congresses

4.5.1 WCC 2000

Mr. Li, as Secretary of the IPC was pleased to say that the Congress was very successful with 2,067 attendees taking part in the 8 conferences and related events. He could only provide a preliminary report as many issues and data related to the Congress have to be analyzed. The auditing process will be carried out during a period of two months and the finalized accounts will be available in December.

The preliminary figures show that the number of Chinese and the number of international participants are roughly equal. The registrations for the 8 conferences were as follows:

- ICSP2000: Signal Processing - 24%
- ICCT2000: Communication Technologies - 20%
- ICS2000: Software – Theory and Practice - 12%
- ICEUT2000: Educational Uses of ICT - 11%
- SEC2000: Information Security - 11%
- ITBM2000: IT for Business Management - 9%
- ICDA2000: Chip Design Automation - 7%
- IIP2000: Intelligent Information Processing - 6%

49% of all Congress participants were from China. There were international participants from over 70 countries with significant attendance from Japan (8%), USA (6%), Germany (3%), Australia (2%), Norway (2%), Finland (2%), UK (2%), Italy (2%), France (2%) and the rest of the World (22%).

75% registered by fax, 15% online and 10% by ordinary mail. The reason for the low online registration was that it took longer than expected to set-up the agreement with the Bank of China.

Mr. Brunnstein wished to know about the second SEC conference and Mr. Li clarified that this was an auxiliary event.

The President requested Mr. Li to convey IFIP’s thanks to the Congress IPC and OC for their hard work in making the 16th IFIP Congress a big success and reminded that a Final Congress report will have to be prepared for Council and GA.

4.5.2 WCC 2002

Messrs. Wibe and Boynton informed GA that after a creative process it was decided that the 17th Congress will have the title “Information Technology for our Times: Ideas, Research and Applications in an Inclusive World”. The program will develop around Theory/Technology, Education and Industry/Business in close cooperation with IFIP’s TCs. A meeting of the IPC is scheduled for 16-17 October 2000 in Montreal and all participating TCs will be invited to send a representative.

Mr. Rosenfeld opined that GA should know what is going on with the Congress as IFIP has the primary responsibility for the Program. Mr. Neumann felt that this GA can endorse the process of preparations but it would not be feasible for GA to make decisions now with regard to the content. Mr. Boynton responded that some of the fields are changing so quickly that it would be necessary to keep the program open for the time being. If any TCs feel at a later stage that something is wrong then they could warn the President. Both the IPC and the OC Chairs report to the President.
In order to have a stronger feedback to GA with regard to future Congress programs Mr. Brunnstein suggested that a first analysis of the WCC 2004 program is carried out during GA 2001 and requested that this enters the Minutes as a decision. Mr. Lee disagreed as he felt that such subordination will undermine the role of the IPC and Mr. Berleur added that he would not be able to commit to future programs at a stage when his commitments to WCC 2002 are in progress.

Mr. Boynton informed GA that the key dates are set for January 2001 (Call for Papers and Contributions), 31 October 2001 (deadline for submission of papers) and August 25 – 30, 2002 as the dates of the 17\textsuperscript{th} IFIP Congress.

Based on a conservative attendance figure of 1,300 and 195 free registrations the proposed early registration fee was EUR 625 and regular registration was set at EUR 735. The projected total revenue was EUR 1,487 K, out of which 22\% would be expected from sponsorship and 6\% from the Exhibition. The total projected expenses were EUR 1,292 K, out of which 10\% for IPC related expenses, 6\% for the Secretariat and 84\% for organization (out of which 29\% for promotion, 37\% for local arrangements and 17\% for “Other” items).

GA felt that the deadline for paper submissions was too early.

\[A WCC 2002 PowerPoint presentation to GA is available at \url{http://www.ifip.or.at/minutes.beijing2000.htm}\]

4.5.3 WCC 2004

Messrs. von Solms and Aspinall (South Africa), Messrs. Laprie and Costes (France) and Mr. Gottlieb and Mrs. Cohen (Israel) made excellent PowerPoint and video presentations in support of their proposals [The details are contained in the bidding documents].

Based on these presentations the following financial summary table was drawn for GA to consider:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>INCOME TO</th>
<th>IFIP</th>
<th>Reg. Fees (EUR)</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Extras</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guaranteed</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>75 K Euro</td>
<td>32 Euro per participant + 10 % of profit</td>
<td>Early – 625 Normal – 695</td>
<td>Proceedings, 2 soc. events, p.c.o. costs</td>
<td>-35 free regs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>32 K Euro</td>
<td>32 Euro per participant + 50 % of profit</td>
<td>Early – 350 Normal – 450 Late – 560</td>
<td>Proceedings, 4 soc. Events, p.c.o. costs</td>
<td>-various EU arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>40 K Euro</td>
<td>In addition to the 40 K Euro, 32 Euro for each registered participant</td>
<td>Early – 580 Normal – 650</td>
<td>Proceedings, soc. events, p.c.o. costs</td>
<td>-40 free regs. -20 free regs. + accomm. for DC participants -arrangements for free tickets and accomm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Bollerslev reported that the President and the Executive Director were involved in the site inspection visits in June and July. The objectives were to review the facilities and conditions for
hosting an IFIP Congress in the respective countries and to assess the academic, industrial and governmental support that an IFIP Congress can hope to receive.

**Israel:** The Convention Center in Jerusalem meets all requirements for hosting major international events. There are sufficient hotels within close proximity. Hostels and cheaper accommodation are available to budget participants and students upon request. Jerusalem is about 45 km from Ben Gurion international airport. Israel offers a variety of pre and post conference tours. IPA, the IFIP member, is currently experiencing an upward trend in its membership and operations. At a meeting with the IPA President, the IFIP representatives were assured of IPA's commitment in making the Congress a successful event if GA decided to select Jerusalem as the site of IFIP Congress 2004. IPA's bid is developed along the lines of the invitation presented during GA 1998 in Budapest. Israeli and El Al officials are dedicated to ensure serious security measures. The issue of visas for all bona fide participants was raised and there are assurances that an official letter of guarantee will be provided.

**South Africa:** Meetings were held with two regional Ministers (Economic Affairs and Tourism and Finance and Development Planning) who reassured the IFIP representatives that there is a strong commitment of the regional and central governments to the South African bid. Two particular issues were discussed - safety and the completion of the Cape Town Convention Center. The regional government is undertaking serious measures to reduce crime. The Cape Town Convention Center is planned as an impressive modern conference facility, which will be ready and in full operation by mid 2003. Ambitious construction activities will soon begin to transform the whole Waterfront area (where the Conference Center will be located) into an elegant location and there are sound guarantees that the project will be in exploitation by mid 2003. There are many hotels in immediate proximity to meet the requirements of all conference participants. The airport is very close and there are no problems with international flight connections and travel. The Western Cape region and South Africa provide excellent opportunities for tourism and for pre and post conference tours. The IFIP representatives held meetings with the CSSA President, the CSSA GA representative, other representatives of CSSA and of the two professional organizers, SBS and Global Conferences. South Africa's invitation offers a possibility for future involvement of other African countries and this should certainly be considered.

**France:** Toulouse is certainly attractive as it is the second largest university city in France with a wide network of IT research institutions and a strong regional industry, crowned by "Airbus Industrie". The region offers a variety of possibilities for pre and post conference tours and individual tourism. The recently constructed modern Convention Center was visited. It provides excellent facilities for the organization of an IFIP Congress. There are many hotels and catering options in immediate proximity. It takes about 20 minutes from the airport to reach the hotels and the conference center. There are convenient international flight connections via Paris and other major European gateways. The IFIP representatives met with representatives of business and research. Many of them are involved in IFIP and its activities and are prepared to assist the organization of Congress 2004 if GA chooses Toulouse. The IFIP representatives met the Deputy Mayor for international relations, the Director of the Office for Tourism and a Member of Parliament and were assured of the local and regional support.

**Mr. Bollerslev** concluded that the site inspection team has no hesitations that all three societies can organize a successful IFIP Congress and have prepared very attractive invitation packages for GA to consider. There were no issues to report that might create major infrastructure problems. The three cities - Jerusalem, Cape Town and Toulouse - offer unique possibilities for professional contacts and tourism.
Voting

Round 1 Results:
CSSA/South Africa 16 votes
SEE/France 9 votes
IPA/Israel 19 votes

Round 2 Results:
CSSA/South Africa 20 votes
IPA/Israel 24 votes

The President thanked the representatives of the 3 societies for their invitations and congratulated Mr. Gottlieb. Mr. Gottlieb was grateful to GA for supporting the Israeli invitation and said IPA was enthusiastic to work for a successful IFIP Congress 2004 in Jerusalem.

General Assembly APPLAUDED.

4.6 Technical Issues

4.6.1 Technical Assembly

The TA Chair drew attention to his report and said Mr. G. Boynton was invited to brief TA on WCC 2002 developments. There was an exchange of ideas regarding the Program and the involvement of TCs. Cooperative efforts will be made among TCs to develop program tracks. The Chairs of TC sponsored conferences were invited to attend an IPC meeting in Montreal on 16 and 17 October.

[Please also refer to item 5.2 of the Minutes].

Mr. Aiken reported that the CCI Chair had presented CCI initiatives to TA. CCI aims to encourage participation of young researchers, industrial and governmental representatives in IFIP’s TCs and WGs. The TCs had welcomed suggestions for participants in WG conferences as the best means to involve new persons in WG activities. A discussion on a new approval process for WG members had resulted in agreement that the current procedure of having new WG members approved by the TC is best. The TC Chairs had agreed that IFIP involvement in standardization work could be an important initiative and had requested CCI to develop a specific proposal to which they could react.

The TA Chair said that Mr. Miura had invited Dr. T. Kamae from IPSJ to present initial ideas regarding an initiative for the establishment of a new specialist group on “Entertainment Computing”. There was strong support for this initiative and the CCI was invited to pursue the establishment of such a group in cooperation with the TC Chairs. One proposed way to proceed was to organize an international conference in this area with CCI involvement.

[Please also refer to item 6.2 of the Minutes].

Mr. Aiken drew GA’s attention to the following issues related to IFIP’s Technical Committees:

TC1: TA congratulated TC 1 for the successful TCS conference in Japan.

TC2: A new TC2 Chair, Dr. Armando Haeberer (AR), was unanimously elected by the TC and will enter office on 1 January 2001. TA had approved a new name for WG2.4 “Software Implementation Technology” and agreed to the establishment of WG2.10 on Software Architecture.
TC3: TA noted TC 3’s request for the support of other TCs in promoting and participating in WCCE 2001 in Copenhagen.

TC5: TA urged TC5 to continue to work on a merger of WG5.2 and 5.3.

TC6: TA approved new names for WG6.1 “Architectures and Protocols for Distributed Systems”, WG 6.2 “Network and Internetwork Architectures”, WG 6.4 “Internet Applications Engineering” and WG 6.6 “Management of Networks and Distributed Systems” and agreed to the suggested restructuring of WGs 6.1, 6.2, 6.4, 6.6, 6.7, 6.8 and 6.10. The TC Chair will revise the Aims and Scopes of these WGs and will resubmit them to TA for final approval.

TA had provisionally agreed to the establishment of a new WG 6.11 on “Electronic Commerce – Communication Systems”. A number of suggestions were made for the rewording of its Aims and Scope. It was agreed that the name and text should make it clear that the WG focuses on the communication aspects of Electronic Commerce. TC6 was encouraged to provide a revised proposal to TA.

TC7: TA approved TC7’s recommendation to discontinue its WGs on “Discrete Event Systems” and “Chaos and Fractals”. The Chair is requested to inform the WG members of this decision.

TC8: TA approved the recommendation of TC8 to discontinue WG8.7 due to inactivity. The TC Chair will inform the WG members of this decision. A change of title, aims and scope of WGs 8.3 and 8.4 was envisaged.

TC9: TA approved the revised Aims and Scope of WG9.5 “Applications and Social Implications of Virtual Worlds”.

TA approved a TC9/TC11 proposal to create a provisional joint working group, 9.6/11.7 on “Information Technology: Misuse and the Law” under the administrative responsibility of TC9. Its Aims and Scope will have to be approved by TA. TA endorsed the initiative for a joint working conference in Bratislava (June 2001) as a first step in strengthening this cooperation.

TC10: TA approved the discontinuation of WGs 10.6 and 10.7 due to lack of activity and overlap with existing activities. The TC Chair will inform the WG members of this decision and will encourage 10.7 members to join 10.5.

TC11: TA agreed to a proposal by TC11 to circulate a statement on “Information Security Professionals” to all TCs for comments and TA endorsement.

TC12: TA applauded the Chairman’s ongoing efforts to strengthen this TC.


Mr. Aiken informed of the TC 6 – TC 8 – TC 11 initiative for a new Electronic Commerce conference series. The first conference will convene in October 2001 in Zurich. Other TCs were invited to take part in future conferences.
The TA Chair concluded his report by saying that GA should consider the concept of a “horizontal TC” as new fields such as Electronic Commerce emerge and IFIP needs to be proactive. Such fields cut across the activities of several TCs and the concept of a transversal organizational structure might adequately serve the rapid evolution of these areas.

Mr. Brunnstein opined that IFIP is hierarchically structured and agreed that a transversal new structure will allow more cooperation between TCs.

4.6.1.1 TC Forum

Mr. Glasson reported on behalf of Mr. Samways, the TC Forum Moderator who had to leave earlier. He said that the TC Chairs had a series of informal consultations to discuss internal TC items and to meet with the Chairs and members of IFIP’s Standing Committees and in particular with PC, MC, AMB, DCSC, CCI and FC.

One matter of particular concern was the schedule of future Council and GA meetings. Mr. Glasson said that the TC Forum had considered a proposal for a new format. The President reminded that the current schedule was sent as a draft to all TC Chairs to comment before it was formally announced. Mr. Bollerslev further recalled that the TC Forum is an informal body for consultations between TC Chairs. With these two comments he invited Mr. Glasson to assist the Secretary in the preparation of the next draft schedule for Council and GA.

Mr. Aiken wished to put on record his thanks to Mr. Samways as the Moderator of the TC Forum during the last year. He welcomed Mr. B. Neumann as the next Moderator until GA 2001.

Please also note:

The attending TC Chairs made brief presentations of their reports. The full reports, including participation statistics, are available at http://www.ifip.or.at/minutes/beijing2000.htm

Regularly updated directory information for all IFIP Technical Committees and Working Groups is available at http://www.ifip.or.at/bulletin/bulltcs/b_tcs.htm

The locations of the TC web sites are:

**TC 1 Foundations of Computer Science:**
Web site: http://www.dis.uniroma1.it/~ifip-tc1/

**TC 2 Software: Theory and Practice**

**TC 3 Education**
Web site: http://wwwedu.ge.ch/cptic/prospective/projets/ifip/

**TC 5 Computer Applications in Technology**
Directory information: http://www.ifip.or.at/bulletin/bulltcs/memtc05.htm

**TC 6 Communication Systems**
Web site: http://www.ifip.tu-graz.ac.at/TC6/

**TC 7 System Modelling and Optimization**
Directory information: http://www.ifip.or.at/bulletin/bulltcs/memtc07.htm

**TC 8 Information Systems**
Web site: http://ifiptc8.cis.gsu.edu/ifip

**TC 9 Relationship Between Computers and Society**

**TC 10 Computer Systems Technology**
Directory information: http://www.ifip.or.at/bulletin/bulltcs/memtc10.htm
TC 11 Security and Protection of IP Systems  
Web site: http://www.ifip.tu-graz.ac.at/TC11/

TC 12 Artificial Intelligence  
Web site: http://www.usc.edu/schools/business/atisp/AI/TC-12/  
Directory information: http://www.ifip.or.at/bulletin/bulltcs/memtc12.htm

TC 13 Human-Computer Interaction  
Web site: http://www.ifip-hci.org

General Assembly took note of the submitted reports.

General Assembly noted that A. Haeberer (Argentina) was elected as the next TC 2 Chair as of 1 January 2001 and APPLAUDED the current TC 2 Chair, Mr. Kurki-Suonio, for all his hard work during a period of 2 terms.

4.6.2 Industry

Mr. Miura referred to his report and said that IT is developing very rapidly and it is important for people from academia, industry and government related organizations to collaborate within IFIP in order to bring a synergetic effect. CCI was established to assist such interactions.

CCI had organized a survey on IFIP demographics. 38 working groups and 5 technical committees had participated and based on their responses the composition of the IFIP WG and TC membership is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academia</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government related</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CCI objective is to increase the share of Industry in IFIP. So as to attract representatives from Industry CCI plans a session related to Industry at WCC 2002. Topics, such as IT Collaboration between Academia and Industry in the 21st Century and Digital Appliances would be considered for possible inclusion in the Congress.

Mr. Miura stressed that Standardization activities are very important as IT systems are global and open. Standardization is important to Industry and IFIP's role in this area could be that of an Advisor, a Mediator and a Reviewer.

The CCI Chair suggested that it might be valuable if IFIP reviews its current procedures for approving WG membership in order to allow young researchers and people from industry to quickly join as members. IFIP should consider new TC and WG activities that attract Industry such as IT and Digital appliances, environment issues and other.

A proposal for a new activity on "Entertainment Computing" was considered by TA and had received support from the TC Chairs.

[Please also refer to item 6.1 of the Minutes].

In view of TA's support to this initiative Messrs. Miura and Aiken moved that GA establish a Task Force on Entertainment Computing. The TF would initially operate within the mandate of the Committee for Cooperation with Industry (CCI) with the responsibility to explore and develop Entertainment Computing within IFIP as a matter of high priority. It would be based on transversal
organization allowing active input from interested TCs and WGs. The way forward would be to organize an international workshop.

General Assembly AGreed to establish a Task Force on Entertainment Computing.

4.6.3 AMB

Mr. Nedkov drew attention to the following statistics for IFIP sponsored events:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IFIP EVENTS status as at 8 August 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The activity levels in 1999 and 2000 were high.

Mr. Rosenfeld would have liked to see a comparison with the 1999 figures at the same time last year and Mr. Nedkov responded that the 1999 status was reported in the GA 99 Minutes. At the same time last year there were 61 registered events for 1999. In 19 events IFIP’s role was that of a full sponsor, in 25 events IFIP was a main sponsor, in 16 events IFIP was a co-sponsor and in 1 event IFIP was a joint sponsor.

Mrs. Hayden reported that the number of events in which IFIP’s role is that of a Main or Full sponsor has increased. This was achieved with a lot of work: from the first contact with conference organizers until the closure of the conference files. After Council 2000, in addition to her duties as Event Facilitator Mrs. Hayden had to take over the duties of the part-time assistant. Fortunately, this did not have a negative impact on the event management process. It would be greatly appreciated if TC and WG Chairs will continue to support the Secretariat's efforts to facilitate the organization of IFIP’s well-established events.

Mr. Glasson was pleased to say that the TC Chairs were happy with the services of the IFIP Secretariat in monitoring and facilitating the organization of conferences.

4.6.4 Publications

Mr. Ralston drew attention to his report and said that the TC Chairs had somewhat poorly received the process of the PC meeting. In future, there needs to be better advance preparations. With regard
to the WCC 2000 proceedings it was agreed that the TC Chairs, Kluwer and the PC Secretary would explore the possibility of publishing edited volumes of the various conferences.

The PC Chair informed that it had been agreed with Kluwer to prepare a price grid for conference bulk sales between 40 and 74 copies. Such publications are to be considered as exceptions to the current agreement and the idea is to work out a formula, which includes a scaled down royalty to IFIP. Marketing of IFIP publications was considered and the PC, in cooperation with Kluwer, will produce a document outlining the benefits and the value of publishing in the IFIP Series. TCs were requested to inform Kluwer of major events at which they recommend Kluwer to set up stands. Kluwer will develop an electronic button for member societies to use on their web sites so as to link directly to the IFIP catalogue.

Mr. Ralston and Mrs. Lambert reported that the year 2000 was off to a strong start with 12 new titles published by Kluwer as of June 30. The publication process seems to be going smoothly and the first half of 2000 has shown continued growth for the IFIP book series. By comparison, only 8 new IFIP books were published in the first half of 1999. Sales revenues for IFIP titles totaled $297,686 for the first half of 2000, which represented an increase of 16.15% over sales of $256,290 for the first half of 1999. Sales of the 12 front list titles (published since January 1, 2000) accounted for $141,577 of total revenues for the first half of 2000, and sales of 163 back list titles (published prior to January 1, 2000) accounted for $156,109 of total revenues. Royalties due IFIP totaled $46,693 for the first half of 2000. This represented an increase of 6.53% over royalties of $43,830 for the first 6 months of 1999.

10 more manuscripts have gone into production for publication in the second half of 2000 and another 2 more outstanding manuscripts are expected, thus bringing the number of new IFIP titles this year to 24. The relatively low number of projected titles in 2000 is due, in large part, to the fact that the Chinese hosts published 7 of the 8 World Computer Congress proceedings volumes. Contracts were issued for 6 volumes to be published in 2001 and preliminary contacts were made for another 10-12 volumes. Kluwer hopes to receive 15 more proposals in the next few months so as to reach a minimum of 30 IFIP proceedings volumes in 2001.

The "IFIP Bookshelf" with descriptions of IFIP titles going back to 1997 was mailed to the entire IFIP community. New IFIP titles are included in Kluwer’s monthly New Title Bulletin and in quarterly discipline-specific brochures, which are mailed to over 7000 institutional librarians around the world. Kluwer advertises IFIP books in niche-specific brochures, as well as at hundreds of conferences around the world. Every new IFIP title is listed on the Kluwer web site and advertised via the Kluwer ALERT service for electronic announcements.

TC Chairs are encouraged to advise conference organizers and volume editors to contact Kluwer as early in the conference planning process as possible, and to consult the "Guidelines for Editors of IFIP Conference Proceedings" as well as the "Timeline for the Publication Process" posted on the web.

Mrs. Lambert concluded her report by saying that a price elasticity experiment was carried out. This year's Database Security volume was published in May 2000 and priced at $ US 99.50. While it will be over a year before the full measure of the experiment will be observed, 88 copies were sold in less than 3 months. The previous year’s volume was published in April 1999 with a list price of $160.00 and has sold 113 copies to date.

Mr. Grafendorfer was keen to have the performance of the Database Security sales reported during the forthcoming Council and GA meetings. Mr. Casaca encouraged Kluwer to consider the production of CD Masters. TC 6 was interested to explore online publications.
Mr. **Reis** wished to know what is the Library share in all sales and Mrs. **Lambert** responded that it was 68%. Mr. **Srinivasan** was of the opinion that book prices were very high and wondered whether paperbacks would be cheaper. Mrs. **Lambert** said the cost difference is insignificant and recalled that Kluwer had suggested that IFIP books that are more than 3 years old can be offered to societies in developing countries at bulk prices. Mr. **Khakhar** felt that such an offer might not be well received by these societies. Mr. **Nedkov** informed that Elsevier had arrangements for free distribution of out-of-print books to developing countries with the postage costs paid by IFIP.

Mr. **Rosenfeld** inquired about the subscriptions for the EIT Journal and Mrs. **Lambert** responded that they are few but it is hoped that with the WCCE 2001 in Copenhagen subscriptions will increase substantially.

*[The Publisher's report is available at [http://www.ifip.or.at/minutes/beijing2000.htm](http://www.ifip.or.at/minutes/beijing2000.htm)]*

Mr. **Ralston** ended his report by pointing out that the PC had not had enough time to fully consider the issue of Digital Libraries. He was of the opinion that this particular activity needs to be treated as a project with a project director who would have the responsibility to submit to EB for approval a scope and plan for implementation. Mr. **Brunstein** protested that as a member of PC he was never involved in any discussion concerning Digital Libraries and that such an important issue is handled so lightly.

*[During the EB meeting after GA, the President asked Mr. Brunstein to chair a small ad hoc group including the PC Chair and the Secretary with the objective to propose how IFIP should proceed with a Digital Library project.]*

### 4.7 Standing Committee Reports

#### 4.7.1 Statutes and Bylaws

Mr. **Johnson** referred to the SBC report and the recommendation of SBC to replace "three quarters majority " by "two thirds majority " in the following articles:

- Article 3.2 (page 7)
- Article 3.3.1 a) (page 8)
- Article 3.3.2 a) (page 8)
- Article 4.2.1, para. 3 (page 12)
- Article 4.3.1, para. 6 (page 14)
- Article 7 (page 16)

General Assembly **AGREED.** (One abstention)

**The Secretary** informed that SBC recommends some minor modifications regarding Specialist Groups so as to remove today's contradictory statements related to the establishment of SGs. The recommendations are:

- 4.1.2, p 11, line 6: remove "and Specialist Groups"
- Bylaws Section 4, p 29, line 2: remove "and Specialist Groups"
- 6 Appendix, p 37: after the line "Specialist Group TA (4.5)" add a new line: "Chairman President (4.3.3)"

General Assembly unanimously **AGREED.**
Finally, the Secretary drew attention to the recommended editorial changes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Art.</th>
<th>line</th>
<th>Suggestion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.1a</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>&quot;Information&quot; (remove gap)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.1a</td>
<td>12/13</td>
<td>Delete &quot;Only Full Members have the rights to the assets of the Federation&quot; (see Art 7 p16, approved in 96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.1c</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&quot;Members&quot; (capital M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Delete final sentence (see Art 7, p16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Change title to &quot;The Membership of an Affiliate, Corresponding or Associate Member&quot; Add at end - c) &quot;If an Associate Member is three years in arrears with the payment of dues&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.1.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Delete &quot;Corresponding&quot; (Such Members are not members of GA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>After &quot;proxy&quot; add &quot;and ex-officio members&quot; (Such members are entitled to vote - see 4.1.1. p10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Start new paragraph with &quot;In the case of...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Delete &quot;at least 40 days prior to the election&quot; (This is inconsistent with &quot;one month&quot; in lines 8/9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>The normal practice is to hand over a voting card so replace &quot;orally&quot; by &quot;by handing his voting card to whoever&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Add at end &quot;web pages&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.3.2</td>
<td>10/12</td>
<td>Delete &quot;s&quot; in &quot;organisations&quot; and &quot;elections&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.3.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Add at end &quot;web pages&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>TC Officer appointment is by TC Chair, not TA Chair.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Assembly unanimously AGREED.

4.7.2 Admissions

Mr. Gergely drew attention to his report and said the New Zealand Computer Society had applied for a change in its membership status from Full to Corresponding. A formal note was received in February 2000. While it is hoped that NZCS in future may reconsider its membership status based on a definite will for a greater involvement on the part of its members, currently AC can only regret that such a process of disengagement is solicited. Mr. Siow believed this application was based on financial considerations.

General Assembly ACCEPTED with regret the transfer of the NZCS membership from Full to Corresponding.

The AC Chair felt it gratifying to see SADIO, reinstated as a Full Member at GA 1999, as a very active IFIP Member and welcomed the report of the President on his visit to Chile and Argentina. There were inquiries about procedures for possible membership of Romania and Ukraine but no formal applications were received so far.

4.7.3 DCSC

The DCSC Chair said that since GA 99 a number of activities were supported by IFIP. TC 6 organized tutorials in Argentina and Thailand in late 99. The series will continue with tutorials in Mexico and Costa Rica in September 2000. DCSC had supported Central & Eastern European participation in the Summer School on Information and Computer Security, June 2000, Stockholm. This is an EU financed project, which will finish next year and then the summer schools will be
taken over by TC 11. Following a Council decision, DCSC had allocated CHF 30,000 in support of WCC 2000.

With regard to strategic initiatives, Mr. Khakhar said Council 2000 supported the Scheme for a new decreased level of membership dues for societies from small countries (ANNEX 1). DCSC now requests GA approval. The annual dues under this new category in 2001, if accepted by GA, would amount to 800 EUR, which is 50% of the current lowest level.

General Assembly APPROVED with 3 abstentions.

The DCSC Chair continued by requesting GA’s approval for a project to encourage full members in developing countries to organize IFIP events and another project in support of such members hosting IFIP Council and General Assembly meetings. The President objected to this request as EB had considered both proposals prior to the GA meetings and had requested Mr. Khakhar to discuss them first in DCSC and then bring them back to EB for further consideration. Messrs. Khakhar and Brunnstein were against such a tight EB control on all matters requiring decisions. Mr. Khakhar recalled that the Voucher scheme was first considered by DCSC and then passed on to Council without EB endorsement. The President said the parallel was not appropriate since there had already been an EB discussion and decision on how to proceed with these two proposals and Mr. Khakhar attended the EB meeting.

Mr. Nedkov said that the proposal for IFIP events in Developing countries as it currently stands is really not of interest to these societies. The suggested scheme is complicated and the effect of it, if introduced, is dubious. For this reason it is best to have it further considered and refined. Mr. Casaca was against such “gymnastics” which only complicated event management. He felt that there should be only one procedure to which all IFIP events must comply irrespective whether they are organized in industrial or in developing countries. There were other funds in the budget, which can be used to support societies from developing countries without complicating and causing disorders to the management process.

Mr. Lee moved that this debate is closed and that GA requests EB to reconsider the two proposals.

General Assembly AGREED.

In reference to an earlier discussion about investments for the future, Mr. Casaca stressed that TC6 is one of the biggest contributors to the IFIP Special Activity Fund. Since he sees that the activities are expanding and the IFIP Secretariat is overworked, he requested the President to consider an increase of the staff from 2.5 to 3 persons. The President said he would take this issue up with EB and the Executive Director.

General Assembly AGREED.

4.7.4 IFIP-UNESCO Liaison

Mr. Nedkov said that IFIP was an active Member of the NGO-UNESCO Liaison Committee. In February 2000, the Committee met with the new Director General of UNESCO. A project for a Joint NGO/UNESCO Committee on Communications and new Technologies was prepared by a sub-group of 3 Liaison Committee members, among them the IFIP representative.

The IFIP/UNESCO project for an Informatics Curriculum Framework 2000 for Higher Education was completed successfully and a follow-up meeting was organized in Vienna. The project documents are available in pdf format at http://www.ifip.or.at/projects.htm. Another project for the
development of a "Elementary ICT Curriculum for Teacher Training" was in progress. The IFIP project group was in close contact with the Moscow based UNESCO Institute for Information Technologies in Education (IITE). This work will most probably lead to a high profile international ministerial meeting of UNESCO Member States.

An International Workshop on Virtual Education was held in Fortaleza, Brazil from 9 to 11 December 1999 and it was organized under the co-sponsorship of UNESCO and IFIP TC 9. Mr. Berleur said that TC 3 was also involved in the conference. The UNESCO Regional Office for Science and Technology in Montevideo supported the IFIP TC 3 WG 3.1 conference "The Bookmark of the School of the future" in Vina del Mar, Chile, 10-14 April 2000. The WG 9.5 Chair, G. Cyranek, was employed as Regional Informatics and Telematics Adviser in the UNESCO office in Addis Ababa. His office had provided some support for the WG 9.4 conference on Social Implications of Computers in Developing Countries, 24-26 May 2000 in Cape Town where a parallel event of the RINAF UNESCO network was convened.

A high profile UNESCO conference on INFOethics 2000: Right to Universal Access to Information in the 21st Century will be held in Paris, 13-15 November 2000 [web site http://webworld.unesco.org/infoethics2000/index.html ]. Mr. Brunstein said he was involved in previous INFOethics conferences. Currently TC 9 is cooperating with UNESCO in organizing a regional INFOethics conference in Vienna, which will take place prior to the one in Paris. He will most likely take part in the Paris event. Mr. Berleur said he would appreciate Mr. Nedkov’s assistance in establishing direct contact with the UNESCO representative, Mr. Montviloff.

4.7.5 Internal Awards

The Secretary advised that TC 7 and TC 12 had submitted nominations for the Outstanding Silver Award (OSA) as follows:

TC 7
  Prof. Keiji Yajima (Japan)

TC 12
  Prof. Boi Faltings (Switzerland)
  Prof. Mark Musen (USA)
  Prof. Zhongzhi Shi (China)

Mr. Casaca suggested that in future short resumes for the candidates are provided.

Mr. Johnson recommended GA to endorse the proposals.

General Assembly AGREED.

Mr. Johnson reported that he had invited the TC Chairs to submit comments on the OSA. So far comments were received from TC2, TC12 and TC13. Further input would be welcome. A report will be prepared for Council 2001.

4.7.6 Marketing

Mr. Grafendorfer drew attention to his report and said that the “This is IFIP” leaflet was printed and distributed. Further copies were available from the Secretariat and a pdf file of the leaflet is available for downloading from the IFIP URL. It would be important to assess the usefulness of the leaflet so as to consider printing an update and further distribution to all TC and WG members.
A TC specific information brochure was requested by the TCs and Messrs. Reis and Grafendorfer will investigate the costs in their countries for a print-run of 5,000 copies per TC. Mr. Srinivasan said that printing was cheap in India and also offered to assist.

The IFIP web site was an important marketing channel and so were the existing list servers. The 40th Anniversary of IFIP was a central event this year and the IFIP President will write to IFIP’s members to use the occasion and request them to distribute articles about IFIP through their publications. The MC Chair recommended that IFIP Member societies include on their stationary "Member of IFIP www.ifip.or.at" and promote IFIP success stories.

The MC Chair reported that new IFIP Congress guidelines were available with bidding requirements, procedures, documents and helpful checklists. The online IFIP Calendar of events provides useful links to event sites. In Beijing, the emphasis on “IFIP” as the organizer of the 16th WCC was not sufficient and MC felt that event organizers should ensure that IFIP receives more visibility during their events. Mr. Rosenfeld thought that the marketing of the 16th Congress provided a vague link to IFIP. Mr. Brunnstein suggested that “IFIP” should always be included in the conference title. Mrs. Hammond felt that the IFIP acronym needs to be incorporated in the IFIP logo.

The MC Chair recalled that in Washington concern was expressed that IFIP books were expensive and that an experiment to test the price elasticity was conducted. The Secretariat promotes IFIP publications by sending information on published titles and discounts to IFIP’s Member societies and Editors. There are companies that support IFIP events and these should be appropriately acknowledged. A list of potential new IFIP members was created and will be maintained on a continuous basis. Advertising was discussed before and MC felt that generating revenue from advertisements is not a high priority to MC. One option is to consider engaging a commercial firm to organize this activity on behalf of IFIP. Advertisements could be included in the IFIP Newsletter, the Information Bulletin, in future issues of “This is IFIP” and in IFIP proceedings.

Mr. Grafendorfer reminded that IFIP should refresh its mission and provide what academia and industry need today. Another issue has to do with improving the information flow between member societies, TCs and WGs. MC had briefly considered an idea for an IT Portal under IFIP’s control which could become the primary source of IT information in the World.

Mr. Nedkov stressed that marketing channels, activities and tools were maintained by the Secretariat on a continuous basis. One such important channel is the IFIP web site. GA representatives are busy people and during General Assemblies IFIP should make best use of their time. So as to contribute to well-informed GA discussions and decisions it would be useful to have at GA a presentation on the current state of PR activities and the IFIP web site. With this in mind, the Executive Director offered to prepare such presentations for future General Assemblies.

General Assembly AGREED.

4.7.6.1 IFIP Newsletter

Mr. Rosenfeld reported that a large combined first and second issue of the IFIP Newsletter was produced to commemorate the 40th Anniversary of IFIP. Several favorable comments on that issue were received. The September issue was available in Beijing and the December issue should be out in November.

For each issue of the Newsletter approximately 3100 copies are mailed out to individual subscribers, 900 copies to Member societies and 150 to event organizers. A one-sheet sample of the
September issue was printed in China for the delegates of the 16th IFIP Congress. It included a welcoming message from the IFIP President and an article about Asbjorn Rolstadas as the recipient of this year’s Auerbach Award.

Mr. Rosenfeld said that the Newsletter is available digitally from the IFIP Web pages. Starting with the 40th anniversary issue in June, only the PDF version is provided online and the Newsletter Editor wondered if the html version is necessary and GA members responded that this was not necessary.

Mr. Rosenfeld mentioned that prior to GA it had been suggested that the Newsletter should not print information that does not reflect favorably on IFIP. He felt that such censorship is bad for IFIP. The President felt that at times opinions are expressed which might create wrong impressions for people who are not familiar with IFIP’s affairs. For this reason he had asked the NL Editor to take care in presenting balanced articles. Mr. Rosenfeld felt the Newsletter was originally conceived as a vehicle for giving the IFIP community news about the Federation. It has subsequently proved to be a good publicity vehicle for IFIP and he has tried to strike a balance between these two goals.

Mr. Rosenfeld had requested IFIP Council members and TC Chairs to give him information for their biographies, but not everyone has responded. He receives very few calls for papers to include in the Calls for Papers column. His experience with Kluwer continues to be pleasant.

4.8 Member Society Issues and Reports

The President said that a Members’ Forum was held prior to GA. Attracting and keeping young professionals as members was one of the biggest challenges that most computer societies were facing. Mr. Bollerslev had asked Mr. Ralston to produce a short report for the meeting but it appears there was some misunderstanding. Nevertheless, following GA he will be in contact with Mr. Ralston so as to have some written material from the meeting.

The Secretary reminded GA that all annual Member Society reports that were submitted electronically to the Secretariat are available at the IFIP web pages. He encouraged GA representatives to go through the submitted reports.

[Soon after GA 2000 Mr. Ralston submitted his notes which are now posted at http://www.ifip.or.at/minutes/beijing2000.htm along with the Member Society reports]
4.9 Appointments

TECHNICAL ASSEMBLY
K. BRUNNSTEIN, Chairman
TC Chairs
Affiliate Member Representatives
Ex-officio: Executive Board

STANDING COMMITTEES
ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT BOARD
R. REIS, Chairman
Ex-officio:
- DCSC Chairman
- Executive Board

ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE
R. REIS, Chairman
P.A. Bobillier
Z. Bubnicki

CONGRESS COMMITTEE
R. AIKEN, Chairman
J. Granado
P. Nedkov

COMMITTEE FOR COOPERATION WITH INDUSTRY
T. MIURA, Chairman
R. Aiken
G. Boynton
A. Goldsworthy
A. Grim
G. Pollock
A. Rolstadas
H. Soboll

DEVELOPING COUNTRIES SUPPORT COMMITTEE
D. KHAKHAR, Chairman
K. Boyanov
K. Brunnstein
S. Masduki
A. del Moral
B. Mounajed
B. Samways
A. Sarhan
R. Srinivasan
Ex-officio:
- Contracts Officer
-TC Correspondents

FINANCE COMMITTEE
J. GRANADO, Chairman
M. Gottlieb
S. Masduki
A. del Moral
Ex-officio: - Treasurer

MARKETING COMMITTEE
W. GRAFENDORFER, Chairman
G. Boynton
R. de Caluwe
C. Gergely
R. Reis
N. Schlamberger
Ex-officio:
- PC Chairman
- Newsletter Editor

PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE
P. RALSTON, Chairman
K. Brunnstein
G. Davis
R. Johnson
B. Neumann
Q. Wang
Ex-officio:
- Contracts Officer
-TC Chairs
-MC Chair
Invited Observers: Kluwer representative

STATUTES AND BYLAWS COMMITTEE
P. BOBILLIER, Chairman
A. Melbye
G. Morris
J. Dolezal
R. Johnson

AD HOC COMMITTEES
NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE FOR OFFICERS
R. JOHNSON, Chairman
J. Granado
G. Morris

NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE FOR TRUSTEES
T. MIURA, Chairman
K. Brunnstein
A. Siow
Q. Wang

IFIP HISTORIAN
H. ZEMANEK

IFIP NEWSLETTER EDITOR
J. ROSENFELD

IFIP UNESCO LIAISON OFFICER AND CONTRACTS OFFICER
P. NEDKOV
4.10 Future Meetings

The Secretary advised Council of the following schedule of future meetings:

GENERAL ASSEMBLY/COUNCIL (and related meetings)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Naples, Italy</td>
<td>4 - 8 March, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Brazil, possibly Natal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Bled or Portoroz, Slovenia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Montreal, Canada</td>
<td>(in conjunction with the 17th IFIP Congress)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Open for invitations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Bilbao, Spain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.11 Other Business

Mr. Rosenfeld reminded GA that he had requested a short discussion related to the issues of the Youth Forum (Future Forum), Digital Libraries and the Computer Driving License. He has heard some complaints from representatives of the Future Forum that they were not given the visibility and support during the Congress. He had listened to their representatives at the closing ceremony and was not fascinated with any “earth shaking” conclusions of their deliberations in Beijing. For this reason he wondered what is IFIP’s intention for the Future. The President explained that there was no direct organizational link. They were provided with the contacts and were facilitated by the Congress OC with meeting rooms, some financial and organizational assistance. IFIP Members have also supported young participants from their respective countries. The intention is to have a similar arrangement for WCC 2002 where they will be invited to organize their meetings. Messrs. Glasson and Berleur said TC 3 and TC 9 would be happy to provide an umbrella for the Future Forum to meet during WCC 2002 but this does not imply financial assistance.

With regard to the Computer Driving License project Mr. Bollerslev opined that while IFIP helps promote the project internationally he is not optimistic that IFIP can get directly involved in the organization. Mr. Nedkov explained that the ECDL is expanding outside of Europe via the IFIP network. The President and the Executive Director have personally assisted the promotion of the ECDL in Argentina, Israel, Singapore, South Africa and elsewhere. Many IFIP Members regard the ECDL as an IFIP project. IFIP member societies in Europe and internationally benefit from the visibility and promotion provided to the scheme by IFIP.

Mr. Brunnstein believed that the project related to Digital Libraries has serious cultural implications, which should be carefully addressed by IFIP. For this reason, he was surprised that in the PC report there was a recommendation without any input and discussion in PC.

Mr. Boynton felt that at times the GA discussion was strained and suggested that more effort should be made by everyone to avoid unnecessary friction.

General Assembly AGREED.
4.12 Closing of Meeting

The President thanked once again CIE and its officers, representatives and staff for their hospitality and efficient support. He was grateful to all GA attendees for their contributions and declared the Beijing GA meeting closed.

5 ANNEX 1

PROPOSAL for a scheme to introduce a new decreased level of membership dues for societies from small and developing countries

Proposed by Dipak Khakhar and Plamen Nedkov

The IFIP membership dues categorization of its Member Societies is based on the scale of assessment of the apportionment of the United Nations expenses. On this basis, IFIP has adopted five categories, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>UN scale of assessment as at 30.9.1999 document ST/ADM/SER.B/547</th>
<th>Annual dues for year 2000 EUR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.001-0.28%</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.28%-0.83%</td>
<td>3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.83%-2.50%</td>
<td>4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.50%-7.50%</td>
<td>6,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.50% or more</td>
<td>12,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During GA 99 in KL, DCSC and IFIP's Executive Board were requested to prepare a proposal as to enable smaller societies to participate as full members without disrupting the IFIP financial and management system.

The main track of thought was to consider a scheme based on an objective categorization such as the UN scale of assessment. The IFIP Treasurer and the IFIP Secretariat reviewed the status of contributions of the UN regular budget as at 30 September 1999. Based on this review it is felt that the countries which can be termed as small (economically) and developing are basically those that fall within the 0.001 – 0.14 bracket.

With this in mind it is recommended that category 1 is split in 2 parts and a basic unit fee of EUR 800 is introduces as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Category</th>
<th>UN scale of assessment as at 30.9.1999 document ST/ADM/SER.B/547</th>
<th>Annual dues for year 2000 EUR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.001-0.14%</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.14-0.28%</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.28%-0.83%</td>
<td>3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.83%-2.50%</td>
<td>4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.50%-7.50%</td>
<td>6,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.50% or more</td>
<td>12,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the existing members – Albania, Andorra, Bulgaria, Egypt, Iceland (if it were to upgrade from Corresponding to Full), Slovakia, Slovenia, Tunisia, Syria and Zimbabwe (if it were to upgrade from Corresponding to Full) would qualify for this category. This would lead to a direct loss in income of EUR 6,400. However, as a result Iceland and Zimbabwe probably will apply for a full membership.

A tremendous impact would be that societies that cannot currently afford to pay the basic unit fee would have a possibility to do so if the scheme is approved.