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1 ATTENDANCE LIST

L Strous President
M Bramer Vice President
M Hinchey Vice President
Y Murayama Vice President
R Puigjaner Vice President
D Brady Honorary Treasurer
A Min Tjoa Honorary Secretary
M Goedicke Councillor
I Grebennik Councillor
F Lin Councillor
J Nawrocki Councillor
F Rammig Councillor
K Rannenberg Councillor
J Wibe Councillor
A Wong Councillor

Observers
D Y Kim Korea (WCC2015)
Sogkun Song Korea (Genicom)
V de Pous IFIP Legal Counsel
E Dundler IFIP General Secretary

Apologies
No apologies
2 ACTION LIST

Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person / Body</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Budgeting proposal: To prepare a detailed policy proposal for discussion at the Finance Committee in Daejeon in 2015 with a view to approval at a special meeting of the Board to be held in Daejeon in 2015. Mr Brady, FC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Portfolio strategy: prepare a proposal for the strategy 2016-2020 for GA 2015. Mr Brady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFIP’s Digital Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To complete implementation and loading of Digital Library PC, INRIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To develop a contract with INRIA for hosting and maintaining IFIP’s Digital Library Mr Rannenberg, PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To establish quality assurance procedures for IFIP publications PC, EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal for new rules for IFIP Awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To draft a proposal (including comments from the Board) Mr Nawrocki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To process comments of the Board and draft final proposal for presentation at GA 2015 Mr Strous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To circulate detailed description to GA and member societies Mr Strous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Voting on final draft at next GA (Sep 2015) Mr Strous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Assembly:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To analyse the problem of event categories and to produce some form of guidance (part of Strategy project 1). Ms Murayama, TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To analyse the background why some TCs have no income from events or publications TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To check via EC websites or otherwise the conditions for IFIP / IFIP bodies to participate in proposals for H2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To start actions according the time plan of QuantumValues EC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMIA
  o To establish a position / person within IFIP as permanent contact to IMIA  Mr Strous, EC

IFIP governance structure
  o To receive comments from the members of the Board and to prepare a proposal for presentation at GA 2015  Mr Strous

IFIP World CIO Forum (WCF)
  o To form a task force to work on future design of this flagship event  Mr Strous

IFIP World Computer Congress (WCC)
  o To form a task force to work on future design of this flagship event  Mr Strous

WITFOR / Digital Equity
  o To work on the organization of a WITFOR in Costa Rica in 2016  Mr Puigjaner
3 BOARD MEETING

3.1 Call Meeting to Order

Mr Strous opened the Board meeting and welcomed all participants. He expressed IFIP’s thanks to the Poznan University of Technology in the person of Mr Jerzy Nawrocki, GA representative of the Polish Academy of for the invitation to Poznan and the generous hospitality arrangements. Mr Nawrocki expressed his pleasure to host the IFIP Board in Poznan.

3.2 Attendance and Apologies

The Secretary Mr Tjoa announced the Board attendance; he mentioned that all Board members are present (please refer to the attendance list). With the present attendance the IFIP Board meeting has a quorum to take decisions.

3.3 Business Matters

3.3.1 Approval of Agenda

The Board unanimously APPROVED the agenda.

3.3.2 President’s Report

Mr Strous informed the Board that the Executive Committee met with Quantum Values end of November in Amsterdam for a full day meeting on the marketing plan. This was a very productive meeting which provided a good overview of the different products that IFIP has and the various stakeholders that have an interest in these products. In addition the Executive Board listed products that IFIP doesn’t have or only in a limited number and that IFIP would like to expand. And finally for all these products it was indicated what kind of marketing efforts should be devoted to each product in order to promote them. The work now at hand is prioritizing the efforts and then start. The status will be presented in the meeting.

Mr Strous reported that after GA 2014 a number of comments have been received on the proposals for membership, fee and governance structures. He thanks all who took the time to send very valuable suggestions. For this meeting revised proposals for the membership and fee structure proposals are on the agenda. These proposals have to be sent to the member societies and GA members as soon as possible after the Board meeting in order to be presented to GA 2015.

Mr Strous reported that through the International Liaison Committee IFIP has some interesting opportunities, in addition to the already existing links with UNESCO and ITU, for new and concrete connections and co-operations. He expected to discuss a number of options during the Board meeting and to report to GA some concrete actions and follow up immediately after the Board.

Mr Strous regretted that sometimes longer timelines for projects and tasks than he would like to see, appeared; but this was a result of being a community based on volunteers with its ups and downs with respect to the availability of spare time. Despite this fact of life, in his view IFIP still manages to accomplish a lot with limited means. Nevertheless, he hoped that IFIP will find ways to enlarge its resources.
3.3.3 Secretary’s Report

Mr Tjoa presented his Secretary’s report and said that since the General Assembly 2014 in Vienna he had many face to face business meetings with the General Secretary Mr Dundler. Current important managerial issues and collaborative aspects were explained in-depth.

Mr Tjoa informed the Board that the consistent work of Mr Dundler with the Austrian Federal Ministry represented by Mr. Prinz and Mr. Wiesmüller resulted in an increased subsidy for 2015 of 25,000 €.

Mr Tjoa informed the Board about the activities of the General Secretary, Mr Dundler, like participating in the CIO Congress 2014 organized on in November 2014 in Loipersdorf, Austria. After this event Mr Tjoa and Mr Dundler had several contacts with the Austrian Computer Society on the possible bidding of Austria to hold the first possible World CIO Forum after China.

Mr Tjoa reported that by the end of 2014 IFIP had 43 Full members with voting rights, 4 Associate members, 10 Honorary members and 6 Ex-officio members. Mr Tjoa regretted that Greece had open dues for 2012 – 2014 and according the IFIP statutes the membership of Greece has been terminated. Membership issues will be discussed in detail under the relevant topic of the agenda of this Board meeting.

Mr Tjoa reported that the IFIP Secretariat continues to run smoothly and on behalf of the IFIP officers he would like to take the opportunity to express IFIP’s thanks to the colleagues at Secretariat, especially the General Secretary Mr Dundler for their excellent support.

Mr Strous thanked Mr Tjoa and Mr Dundler for their contacts and effort to the Austrian ministry.

3.3.4 EC Meeting Report

Mr Tjoa reported that the IFIP Executive Committee had 2 meetings between General Assembly 2014 (Vienna) and Board meeting 2015 (Poznan). The members of EC discussed all the issues raised at the GA by National Representatives and TC Chairs, and made efforts to solve them together with the problems and tasks that had come up in the meantime. All these issues are covered in this Board meeting in several items of the agenda.

Mr Tjoa informed the Board that since 2011 all Executive Board minutes of teleconferences and meetings are available on the web for GA members.

3.3.5 Treasurer’s Report

Mr Brady presented his Treasurer’s report to the Board. He explained that the accounts have been maintained during 2014 by the IFIP Secretariat, monitored by the Treasurer, with draft statements (subject to Audit) prepared by CONSULTATIO Wirtschaftsprüfung GmbH & Co KG.

The final audit report will be delivered soon, but the figures shown in the draft below are not expected to change significantly.
Mr Brady reported that for the calendar year 2014 IFIP budgeted to return an operating loss (i.e. excluding portfolio) of €203.852, intended to reflect additional expenditures associated with projects and activities. In the event, these additional expenditures did not occur, resulting in a reduction of some ~€117.000 in expenditure. Additional savings in Secretariat costs and in the Technical Committees means that in total expenses were some €172.958 below budget.

On the income side, membership dues were approximately €30.000 lower than budgeted, largely due to writing off expected dues from Greece and France. On the positive side, there has been an increase in royalties from publications of some €14.547, and also an additional ~€20.000 from Austrian government support and other activities, yielding a modest increase in income (over budget) of €4.126.

Mr Brady said that this created an improvement on the budgeted position of €177.084 resulting in an “operating loss” of €26.768. Taking account of the performance of the portfolio, this translates into a net profit on the year of €79.220.

From the perspective of financial performance, the 2014 result is good for IFIP, though it does indicate that the “business” of IFIP continues to spend beyond its means.

The portfolio has shown a modest growth (an overall increase in total portfolio value of some €126.288 against the 2013 position), in line with the (sometimes turbulent) recovery of markets during 2014.

Mr Brady informed the Board that this portfolio growth differs from the net position stated on the balance sheet by €100.000 (the change in the balance sheet value of the portfolio is €26.288); this is due to two withdrawals from the portfolio taking place during 2014, each of €50.000 (first in January, and then again in December), in order to ensure that IFIP had sufficient cash to meet its obligations.
The portfolio of investments is managed on IFIP’s behalf by UBS in London. It is a “balanced” investment, with costs compatible with expectations. The Treasurer saw no reason to change this position at this time.

The Treasurer emphasized that the operating performance was reasonably good; though worse than 2013, it was better than budgeted, and arguably within the realms of reasonable variation. The Secretariat continued to do a good job of controlling expenditure.

The financial performance does continue the trend of spending beyond our income, and therefore relying (unexceptionally) on portfolio performance; in the long term, this is not sustainable.

The Board unanimously ENDORSED the 2014 accounts for approval by General Assembly 2015.

3.3.6 Finance Committee Report

Mr Wibe presented the Finance Committee report. He informed the Board that Finance Committee went through the statement of financial performance received from the General Secretary in detail. A number of detailed issues relating to the budget for 2015 (already approved) were discussed.

Mr Wibe reported that FC accepted the Treasurer’s report, highlighting the following comment. “From the perspective of financial performance, the 2014 result is good for IFIP, though it does indicate that the “business” of IFIP continues to spend beyond its means.”

Mr Wibe reported that Finance Committee noted that some Technical Committees had generated zero income in royalties and from event proceeds as well. Finance Committee requested Technical Assembly to follow up this issue.

Mr Wibe concluded that Finance Committee agreed with the Treasurer that “The financial performance does continue the trend of spending beyond our income, and therefore relying (unexceptionally) on portfolio performance. In the long term, this is not sustainable.”

The Board ACCEPTED the report.

Mr Bramer presented the following proposal for a policy for budget planning:

Henceforth the Treasurer is to propose an annual budget in accordance with a financial policy as approved by the Finance Committee from time-to-time and endorsed by the Board.

As an interim policy:

(1) The Treasurer is instructed to scrutinize all bids for funding in the coming year submitted via the General Secretary.

(2) The Treasurer is instructed to propose a core budget which is within 110% of the estimated income for the Federation.

(3) The Treasurer shall annotate the budget with explanations of significant changes from the previous year’s actual income and expenditure.
The Treasurer is instructed to prepare a more detailed policy proposal for discussion at the Finance Committee in Daejeon in 2015 with a view to approval at a special meeting of the Board to be held in Daejeon in 2015.

**The Board unanimously ACCEPTED**

**Mr Strous** noted that the Portfolio Strategy 2011 – 2015 (Bylaws annex 6.2.2 IFIP Investment and Portfolio Management Policy) was up for review this year and requested the Treasurer to work on a proposal for GA 2015.

### 3.3.7 Action items from previous meetings

**Mr Strous** presented a proposal for a revised governance structure for IFIP. He showed and explained the Board a clear organization chart in which new bodies like IP3, InterYIT and a new Member Societies Assembly are included. **Mr Strous** asked the Board to think about it and to come up with comments within the next weeks. A proposal will be presented to GA 2015.

Cooperation with IMIA: **Mr Strous** reported that implementation of links with comparable groups in IMIA has started. This will be followed up by him and presented to GA 2015.

Statement for security: **Mr Strous** informed the Board that despite a few attempts no follow up activities were taken up on the statement agreed by GA 2013. He will take this up again with the most appropriate TCs (TC-9 and TC-11).

### 3.4 Membership

#### 3.4.1 Retention of Member Societies

**Mr Bramer** presented a proposal for a policy for retaining existing IFIP members. He showed the Board that ten members have left since 2009 and IFIP had a decline from 55 to 43 members in recent years.

He gave a summary of possible reasons for a National Society to remain a member of IFIP: IFIP support its overall aims, the opportunity to send a representative to GA who can influence policy and stand for election as an officer, the opportunity to nominate representatives to TCs and the eligibility for accreditation by IP3 and to join InterYIT. On the other hand he showed that GA does very little but approve policy coming down from above, that most national societies show little interest in their members obtaining officer positions, GA is rarely a ‘policy initiating’ body, there is very little technical discussion at GA. In addition sending representatives to GA and TC meetings is expensive. And last but not least most of IFIP’s technical activity is in the WGs, which is open to all.

**Mr Bramer** made the following concrete proposal to the Board:

- Give marketing team a key short-term objective to devise a retention strategy.
- This is to include clear, easily explainable reasons why large societies (ACM, BCS, ACS etc.) and small societies (especially in developing countries) should remain members.
- IFIP may need to ‘change the product’ before IFIP can sell it.
Mr Strous thanked Mr Bramer for this clear summary of one of the main problems within IFIP.

EC AGREED to include the retention problem into the marketing plan of IFIP.

3.4.2 Membership Structure

Mr Strous presented a proposal for a new membership structure. The goal for the new structure is to make IFIP the truly representative federation of and for societies and associations of computer scientists and ICT professionals in the world.

There are four membership categories proposed:

- Country Member
- Member at Large
- Associate Member
- Honorary Member

Mr Strous explained that the reason for the first two categories is to keep the added value for a number of societies to be the one society to represent their country in IFIP by means of a Country Membership. At the same time through the Member at Large category the possibility for societies to become an IFIP member with voting rights and responsibilities, comparable to country members would be created.

The Associate Membership category already exists, some details are changed in order to make it possible for more organizations to join this category. The Honorary Member category is unchanged.

Mr Strous said that the basic rule is that Country Members and Members at Large have the same, full voting rights with one vote per member. Associate Members and Honorary Members have no voting rights.

Similar to the voting rights, the Country Members and Members at Large pay annual dues according to the same fee structure and level as decided by the General Assembly. Associate Members and Honorary Members do not pay a fee.

Mr Strous proposed that the following organizations may apply for membership:

- National general ICT society
- National scientific / academic society
- National professional society
- International general ICT society
- International scientific / academic society
- International professional society
- Academies of Science, Universities, Research institutes
- Governmental bodies, government related organizations
- UN bodies, NGO’s, Civil Societies
- Industry associations
- Companies
- Individuals

If accepted at GA 2015, the new structure will become effective 1st of January 2016. The current Full Members will become Country Members in most cases. In the few cases where the current Full Member would formally not qualify as Country Member the society will be contacted to discuss the alternatives.
The proposal has been discussed within the Board and Mr Strous has been mandated to send a letter to all GA members asking for discussion of the proposal in their societies and come back with comments.

### 3.4.3 Membership fee issues

**Mr Strous** informed the Board that he had been working on the membership fee model where the fee level would depend on the membership income of a society. This model was already mentioned at GA 2014 (and before) as an alternative. In order to have a good view on the consequences information from the member societies is needed on their membership income. Attempts were made in the past with limited result. With the information available he had calculated some options. In every option some societies would pay more than now, some societies would pay less.

Some member societies already commented very negative on the draft proposal. The Board discussed the comments and the general idea for this alternative. It was suggested to withdraw this alternative. Mr Strous reminded the Board that the current model (based on UN tables) also had a major disadvantage, is not helping to attract (or even keep) members and if applied correctly (i.e. revising the table every three years in conformance with the UN updates) would also result in some members having to pay more and some having to pay less. He asked the Board to vote on continuing to work on the proposal for a membership income based fee model.

The Board voted against continuation with this model (2 in favor, 3 abstentions, 10 against).

**Mr Tjoa** requested to postpone the membership fee problem in order to avoid a link between membership structure and membership fee.

**Mr Strous** took it upon him to work on other options for a fee model. He felt it is necessary to have a proposal for GA 2015.

There was no formal decision from the Board taken. Further steps will be discussed at the next telephone conference of the Executive Board.

### 3.5 InterYIT

**Mr Strous** presented the InterYIT report submitted to the Board by Mr Abeywickrama (Chair of the InterYIT). He reported the results of InterYIT since General Assembly 2014:
- InterYIT has become partner of WCC 2015 with a stream in Daejeon.
- InterYIT launched a website
- As part of the collaboration with SEARCC, InterYIT will be taking part in their upcoming ExCo meeting in Singapore.

**Mr Strous** informed the Board that InterYIT has the following activities lined up for the coming months with the theme developed around "Partner, Strengthen, Empower, Recognize":
- Refresh the board for broader inclusion.
- Implement International Young IT Recognition Scheme
- Non-Financial Partnering with events
• Present/Discuss at International Conferences by Member Societies
• Partner with IP3 - take the message to younger members
• Support local Young IT activities and formation of groups
• Partner/Participate in International Youth/IT Activities

3.6 Statutes and Bylaws

Mr Bramer reported that the committee is currently considering a number of proposals for improvements to the Statutes and Bylaws, particularly relating to the resignation of officers and officers elect.

Mr Bramer reported that the Statutes & Bylaws Committee checked in addition the procedures for voting on TC / SG level especially voting rights and proxies. The proposal will be checked by the Technical Assembly and endorsed if it is approved by TA.

Mr Bramer informed the Board that the Statutes & Bylaws Committee worked on the election procedure for officers and councillors in order to introduce a simplified voting system.

The Board AGREED to the proposals and requested the Statutes & Bylaws Committee to present it to GA 2015 for approval.

3.7 Publications

3.7.1 Digital Library

Mr Rannenberg reported that the technical discussions and negotiations around the IFIP Digital Library provided by INRIA as a professional service are progressing well. An essential element dealt with currently is setting up the procedures for filling the Digital Library with content and metadata from the several sources. These procedures have a major impact on the operational costs of the Digital Library, so they need to be carefully designed to keep extra effort as low as possible. In parallel IFIP has to make sure, that information on the IFIP entities, that organize the events to which the proceedings belong, is included into the metadata, which is not the case in the metadata received from Springer.

Mr Rannenberg thanked the volunteers of TC 6 for their effort and especially Mr Aiko Pras, who made many IFIP publications available for free access already now at http://dl.ifip.org/ . The current Digital Library is not limited to TC 6 publications and holds for publications 3 years old and older. For more recent proceedings, for which Springer has the exclusive publication rights until they are 3 years old, the table of contents are given. Mr Rannenberg attested that as this is a volunteer effort with no funding going onto it, it would be unreasonable to demand, what one would ask from a professionally operated library in terms of speed of updating with new publications.

Mr Rannenberg emphasized that the TC6 supported Digital Library is a great volunteers effort to function as an intermediate version of the IFIP Digital Library, so that there is already now a much richer Digital Library available than before. Of course IFIP is also making use of this intermediate version to learn for the design and implementation of the future professionally operated Digital Library. However it is clear, that this voluntary effort cannot be guaranteed in a way that could replace the IFIP Digital Library provided as a professional service.
3.7.2 Publications Committee

Mr Rannenberg reported that IFIP has signed a new contract with Springer. This contract is valid since January 01, 2015 and until December 31, 2019 and is then automatically renewed for a period of five years unless it is terminated by either party by supplying to the other party written notice of intent to terminate the agreement nine months in advance of the termination date.

Mr Rannenberg thanked especially Mr Turner, former Chair of the Publications committee, who had done most of the negotiations in his time as PC chair. While Mr Rannenberg had the honor to sign the contract together with Mr Strous as IFIP President, it was Mr Turner, who built the basis for this contract with the support of the whole Publications Committee and many other IFIP volunteers.

Mr Rannenberg informed the Board of some changes in the contract, and some related trends in Springer’s strategies:

- All IFIP publications in SpringerLink will become open access four years after publication. This will start by end of March 2015 the latest and hold for as long as IFIP has a contract with Springer. It covers the publications since the contract between IFIP and Chapman and Hall (and later Kluwer) back in 1996. So many more of the earlier IFIP publications are now available for free (as long as this contract holds). Material of this nature, that is not in Springer Link yet, is planned to arrive there soon. But this is not to be confused with the embargo period for the IFIP Digital Library. After 3 years IFIP can put the author’s versions of IFIP publications published with Springer into the IFIP Digital Library. This has not changed from the previous contract.

- The interaction between a proceedings editor and Springer is subject to all procedures established by IFIP for all IFIP publications. In particular, this includes any quality assurance mechanisms established by IFIP.

- Added specific language in the agreement that IFIP events that publish only local or electronic proceedings, and events that are jointly sponsored, are not required to give Springer the first right of refusal to publish the event proceedings.

- IFIP publications by Springer will now be published formally by Springer International Publishing AG of Cham, Switzerland. However, the operational team will remain in the Springer Heidelberg office and there will be no operational changes that will affect IFIP proceedings editors or authors.

- An IFIP conference whose proceedings are published by Springer can receive 49 print or electronic copies of the proceedings free of charge except for shipping costs. However, it should be noted, that Springer is moving to the option of temporary, normally four weeks, free access to the publication on SpringerLink instead of this option, so at some point in the future there may be only the option to receive temporary free access to the proceedings in SpringerLink.

- No change in open access publication. The fees remain the same.

- Publications on SpringerLink are moving from pdf to an html/e-book compatible format.
Proceedings can be made available to a conference for four weeks around the conference dates, normally two weeks prior and two weeks following the conference.

All printing is by “print on demand”.

For institutions who purchased one or more eBook collections from Springer and their people there is a lower quality, black-white only option, called “MyCopy” for 24.95 USD/EUR (depending on shipping address) per copy including shipping & handling excluding local VAT/Sales tax where applicable. Details can be found on www.springer.com/gp/eproducts/springer-ebooks/mycopy, especially in the “MyCopy Flyer”.

Mr Rannenberg asked the Board inform the Publications Committee of any issues, so that they can be discussed and considered in the work with Springer and for future negotiations.

Mr Rannenberg presented the plans for the near future regarding the Digital Library. A plan and schedule for implementation and maintenance of the DL by INRIA will be completed, including important issues, like:
- definition of the service and service level
- price per article
- duration of contract
- void vendor lock-in
- termination conditions, especially what does IFIP receive in detail (technical, file formats), when the contract is terminated
- The legal framework for publishing articles not published by Springer will be analyzed and amended, if necessary. There are some fundamental issues between IFIP having the copyright or IFIP having a license to publish in the DL, but their clarification does not seem to be of fundamental importance for the progress of the DL.

The BOARD thanked Mr Rannenberg and the Publications Committee for their excellent work and asked the PC to develop and to present a timing plan for the future steps at GA 2015.

Mr Bramer commented that the ownership of software for the Digital Library should be investigated and included in the contract with INRIA.

Mr Rannenberg informed the Board that the PC begins to work on the implementation of a quality assurance for all IFIP publications by an IFIP editorial board. He asked for a feedback from the Technical Assembly on the proposal for regular quality assurance, which has been developed within the Technical Assembly.

Mr Rannenberg reported that the intention remains to involve the AICT Editorial Board, along with the PC, in considering how to make AICT a stronger series, perhaps using sub-lines to distinguish between different types of events and publications. A new sub-line “Festschriften” for honoring individual researchers and their scientific work or they institutions or fields may be of use, as some IFIP volunteers participate in those projects honoring other IFIP volunteers, but the publications move into other channels. This idea will as a next step be checked with Springer.
3.8 Technical Assembly

Mr Hinchey presented the report from Technical Assembly, which covered the following topics:

a. **New publications contract with Springer:**
   Mr Hinchey informed the Board that Mr Rannenberg had informed the Technical Assembly about the new publications contract with Springer, especially about the changes and the related trends in Springer’s strategies.

b. **AICT**
   Mr Hinchey informed the Board that the Publications Committee have asked for an update to the list of Editorial Board members for the AICT series. Currently the board consists in most cases of the TC Chair. This can continue or it may be a good time for TCs to nominate new members (either because the TC Chair position has changed or is about to change).

c. **IFIP Digital Library**
   Mr Hinchey reported that Mr Rannenberg gave a detailed update on the status of the IFIP Digital Library (please see above report from Publications).

d. **Event approvals and fee**
   Mr Hinchey reported that a great misunderstanding regarding event fees and approvals exists within the Technical Committees. It was pointed out in a recent EC meeting that the need for a fee to be paid and for the organizer to commit to that is clearly stated on the event approval system. Notwithstanding, many event organizers claim to know nothing about the fee, the need to commit to it, and claim they have not budgeted for it and therefore cannot pay. Others say that they will not pay and will not organize future events if they have to pay the fee.

   This problem has continued for a long period of time. Part of the problem is a misunderstanding of IFIP joint events and IFIP supported events. Ms Murayama has kindly volunteered to research the issues and to try to produce some form of guidance. This will be a useful contribution to Strategy Project 1 which aims to build a support tool for (inexperienced) event organizers.

   Mr Strous commented that the event categories and qualifications are elaborated extensively in the Bylaws (annex 6.3.3 Event approval procedure). The rules laid down in this annex have been approved by GA, including the TC chairs. Having been involved in some of the discussions about event fees and categories his observation is that in many cases organizers are not aware of these rules (and in some cases are not willing to follow them). He expects organizers to know and follow the IFIP rules. If the rules are too complex or prohibitive he welcomes proposals for changes. In this context he also expects TC and WG management teams to inform organizers and pay attention to transfer of knowledge about IFIP procedures and rules.

e. **Statutes and bylaws**
   Mr Hinchey said that at the previous TA meeting, Ms Murayama led a discussion on TC 11’s proposal to allow WG Chairs to give a proxy to another WG Chair in TC meetings. Currently the S&B requires that proxy holder to be a national representative, which is seen as very restrictive. However, this was seen as an oversight and not an intentional restriction on WG Chairs. S&B Committee is working on a number of changes to S&B to be discussed at this Board meeting (please see item S&B above).
f. Marketing

**Mr Hinchey** said that he had informed Technical Assembly that Quantum Values (Australia) have been retained by IFIP to engage in the generation of a marketing plan. EC meet a representative of the company in Amsterdam in November and generated a table of issues and stakeholders to drive a plan. This has already been distributed by the President. An update on progress and plans will be on the respective item at this Board meeting.

g. AOB

a. TC9

**Mr Hinchey** informed the Board that Ms Whitehouse has reported to the TA that TC9 will hold WG 9.4 and 9.8 conferences and summer schools between WG9.2/9.5/9.6 and TC11. These will not be held in South Korea, however. They also have plans for a pan-TC conference in September 2016.

b. TC8

**Mr Hinchey** informed the Board that Mr Pries-Heje has reported that TC8 will have a track on Big Data Information Systems as part of WCC in South Korea. The CFP has been distributed. TC8 also plan a business meeting co-located with WCC.

c. H2020

**Mr Hinchey** said that in response to a query from TA, the General Secretary advised that IFIP does not have a PIC. This means it cannot bid (or partner) for H2020 proposals at this time. However, TC and WG members are very active in submitting proposals. The Board requested TA check via EC websites or otherwise the conditions for IFIP / IFIP bodies to participate in proposals for H2020.

The Board took note of the report.

3.9 Committee Reports

3.9.1 Activity Management Board (AMB)

**Mr Dundler** reported that the IFIP Secretariat worked together with TC Chairs and Event organizers in order to get all relevant data for planned and performed events in time into IFIP’s web-based approval system, and consequently in IFIP’s event database. Based on these databases he showed the following development of events:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nbr events (main)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nbr events (co-sponsored / supported)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Event fee received**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71.009</td>
<td>78.016</td>
<td>59.344</td>
<td>81.332</td>
<td>33.796</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mr Dundler** said that this statistic shows clearly that the total number of events in the last years is nearly stable with a slight increase in “IFIP events”. But it can also been
seen that including the € 36,915 event fees outstanding for events held in 2014, there is a decrease in the income from event fees.

Mr Dundler informed the Board that AMB figured out in 2013 / 2014 that there was a misunderstanding within TCs / WGs of the event guidelines in respect of the categories of events. Most of the events were categorized as “IFIP supported events” instead of “IFIP events”. The category “IFIP supported events” is meant typically for events that serve goals of IFIP and cannot be (co)organized by IFIP (e.g. UN events, government events). This led to the result that for this category no IFIP fee is obligatory. Together with TA the TC Chairs and WG Chairs were informed about this misunderstanding and since then the number of “IFIP events” is growing.

But, anyway, AMB sees a problem in the fact that some organizers do not include the agreed IFIP fee into the event budget and inform only after the event IFIP that there is no money planned for a fee or that the event made a loss and therefore the organizer is not able to pay the fee.

Mr Dundler said that this problem has already been reported to Technical Assembly, where it has been discussed and TA is looking for solutions (Please see TA report above in this minutes).

3.9.2 Developing Countries Support Committee (DCSC)

Mr Puigjaner reported that the composition of the committee has not changed in its structure; but MD Agrawal former representative of India in the GA and representative of Asia and Oceania in the DCSC committee, has been replaced by Ms Murayama, IFIP Vice President, representative of Japan in the GA and chair of TC11.

In consequence, the appointed members of the DCSC are:

- Maung Kyaw Sein, Chairman of the WG9.4 on Social Implications of Computers in Developing Countries
- Siraj Shaikh, Chairman of the WG6.9 on Communications Systems for Developing Countries
- Gabriela Marin, President of CLEI, for Latin America
- Yoko Murayama, Japan representative at the IFIP GA, for Asia-Oceania
- Lawrence Gudza, Zimbabwe representative at the GA, for Africa.

Mr Puigjaner informed the Board that the criteria for funds allocations remained unchanged, and they were:

- Activities proposed by the Working Groups specially dedicated to the developing countries.

- Activities related with developing countries either done in some developing country or for allowing the participation of people from developing countries in activities developed in countries different to the one of their residence.

After the good experience of 2013 with two meetings for assigning funds (January and July) among the requests arrived before January 1 and July 1, respectively, for 2015 it is planned to use the same method. Exceptionally in 2014 there has been a third allocation to reallocate some unused fund (grant not completely used or organizers that have resigned to some allocated grant)
Mr Puigjaner reported on the activities that were supported by DCSC since General Assembly 2014.

Mr Puigjaner proposed a change of the fund allocation timing regulation to the Board: Currently the DCSC allocated grants of the current year budget to activities to be held in the same year. This is problematic for the organizers of events to be held or with the Call for Papers deadline in the first months of the year. He proposed that DCSC should be allowed to allocate money of this year budget to events to be held next year in the allocation period of July.

The BOARD unanimously APPROVED this proposal.

Mr Puigjaner asked the Board to increase the budget for 2015 for the DCSC by € 6.000, to absorb the consequence of the accepted change above.

The BOARD unanimously APPROVED the increase of the budget for DCSC for 2015 by 6.000 €

3.9.3 International Liaison Committee (ILC)

Mr Strous gave an overview of the existing relationships between IFIP and international organizations. Also a few potential valuable relationships are mentioned:

- UNESCO
  He said that IIP has a formal consultative partnership relation with UNESCO and is listed as an international non-governmental organization (NGO). Formal relations are aimed at sustained cooperation with UNESCO in its fields of competence. Admission is granted to international NGOs that are widely representative and expert in their field of activity, and are recognized as having a genuinely international structure and membership. The IFIP General Secretary is the liaison officer for IFIP to UNESCO. In addition, the IFIP President has regular contacts with the Deputy Director General in charge of the Communication and Information Sector and with key staff members of this sector. Occasionally meetings in Paris are attended.

  Besides this general connection IFIP TC3 has a permanent connection with UNESCO through Mr Wachholz, who is the representative of UNESCO in TC3. At the 15th session of the IITE Governing Board in October 2014, Dr Mansoor el Awar, the IFIP GA representative for the United Arab Emirates, was elected as the chair of the new Governing Board.

  IP3 is also increasingly in contact with UNESCO staff. The goal for IFIP is to achieve associate partnership relationship status. To work more closely together with UNESCO in a number of projects, both in the Communication and Information Sector and the Education Sector, including of course the IITE. Possibly in formal joint projects, either on IFIP level, on TC level or jointly with an IFIP member society.

  Plans will be elaborated between the ILC and the respective TC’s / member societies.

- ITU – International Telecommunication Union
Mr Strous informed the Board that IFIP is a sector member of the ITU sectors T (Telecommunication Standardization) and D (Development). An ITU sector member fully participates in the work of corresponding ITU Sector Study Groups, or Working Groups thereof, in the Sector's Regional and World Telecommunication Conferences, Advisory Group and other relevant workshops, seminars and meetings.

The IFIP General Secretary is the central contact for IFIP to ITU. In addition, the IFIP President has regular contacts with the new Secretary General of ITU and some key staff members. Occasionally meetings in Geneva are attended as well as major events. The Swiss GA representative, Raymond Morel, also has a regular contact on many levels with ITU.

The IP3 group of colleagues has in recent years developed an increasing contact and participation in ITU events.

The plan for IFIP is to continue contributing to the major events and programmes of ITU and to work more closely together in a few concrete joint projects.

- **ICSU – International Council for Science**
  Mr Strous informed the Board that IFIP is a scientific associate member of ICSU. Scientific associate members are organizations in fields cognate to those of ICSU, whose scientific activities do not fall primarily within the scope of a single Scientific Union Member and which have been in existence for at least six years.

  The contacts with ICSU are via the General Secretary and the IFIP President. This mainly consists of an information flow from ICSU to IFIP. There have been no IFIP groups involved in ICSU activities until now.

  Via its link with ICSU IFIP has started getting involved in the 3rd UN World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction (WCDRR).

- **UNCSTD – UN Commission on Science and Technology for Development**

  This commission addresses a number of topics that are also focus areas for IFIP. It will be investigated what kind of relationship and cooperation can be established with UNCSTD.

- **UNISDR – UN Office for Disaster Risk Reduction**

  Mr Strous said that the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR) serves as the coordinating body for the Third UN World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction. This event will be held from 14 to 18 March 2015 in Sendai City, Miyagi Prefecture, Japan. Several thousand participants are expected, including at related events linked to the World Conference under the umbrella of building the resilience of nations and communities to disasters.

  IFIP has looked into options to participate in and contribute to this event. Specifically of course concerning the information and communication aspects of disaster risk reduction. Vice-president Ms Murayama will attend this event.

In general IFIP participated formally and contributed in relation to the institutions aforementioned.
3.9.4 Internal Awards Committee (IAC)

Mr Nawrocki reported that the Internal Awards Committee received at GA 2014 the order to draft a proposal for new rules for IFIP Awards and to include the comments received in Vienna. In general any member of any IFIP body should be eligible for any service award. In addition technical distinctions, e.g. IFIP Expert and IFIP Fellow, should be established. Such a distinction would be a recognition of someone’s scientific/technical achievements.

Mr Nawrocki presented the proposed description of the three IFIP awards, like
- Service award (replacing the outstanding service award)
- Silver core
- Auerbach award.

Mr Nawrocki asked the members of the Board to send comments to the proposal to his attention. He will include the comments in a final proposal and prepare changes to the Statutes and Bylaws for a presentation to the General Assembly 2015 to decide.

3.10 Flagship Events

3.10.1 IFIP World CIO Forum (WCF) 2014

Mr Lin presented the report on the World CIO Forum 2014. He reported that the IFIP World CIO Forum 2014 was successfully held on 10-12 Nov at Xi’an, China. The event was sponsored by IFIP and organized by the Chinese Institute of Electronics (CIE). 1000 audiences from 10 countries, including CIO, decision makers, government officials and professors attended the event. During the 2 days, there were 46 presentations, 7 panel discussions, 5 paralleled sessions and 1 technical tour.

Mr Lin highlighted that the key to success is government support. He said that financial sponsoring from local government and industry was essential. A key element for a success is the establishment or leverage of an international CIO union or society. Mr Lin reported that the participation of International CIOs was still a problem, because there is no international organization that focus on CIO community and additional IFIP have less influence among CIOs.

Mr Lin said that a WCF runs automatically in a business model dilemma. If there is free registration then the organizer has a big financial risk; on the other hand a registration fee lowers the CIO attendance.

Mr Strous thanked Mr Lin for the successful organization of the IFIP World CIO Forum and announced that there are points of concerns into which IFIP has to look in order to have the IFIP WCF as a flagship in the future.

3.10.2 Future WCF

Mr Strous proposed to the Board to set up a task force for working in the area of CIOs. Based on the experience with the IFIP World CIO Forum 2011 and 2014 it is worth to continue. The task force should discuss conditions and constraints and come up with a proposal for continuation with the next months.

The Board APPROVED the proposal and asked Mr Strous to set up a relevant task force.
3.10.3 World Computer Congress (WCC) 2015

Mr Kim presented the status of the organization of the World Computer Congress 2015. The congress will take place in Daejeon, Korea from October 4 – 7, 2015 under the theme “Opening our future together” in the Daejeon Convention Center. Mr Kim said that 2,000 attendees and 20 exhibits are expected. The congress is hosted by International Federation for Information Processing (IFIP) and the Korean Institute of Information Scientists and Engineers (KIISE), organized by the Ministry of Science, ICT and Future Planning, Daejeon Metropolitan City and Daejeon International Marketing Enterprise.

Mr Kim presented an overview of the tentative program and announced that as co-located conferences 11 separate conferences and forums will be present in WCC 2015.

Mr Kim informed the Board about the fixed registration fees and what is included in the several registration categories. He gave also an overview about the budget for the congress.

Mr Strous thanked Mr Kim for the huge effort he has put into the project. He saw the organization on track and suggested that in his view attractive keynotes are a key for success.

The Board committed IFIP to promote the congress wherever possible.

3.10.4 Future WCC

Mr Nawrocki presented to the Board the idea of a new concept for a WCC in 2017. He said that IFIP is losing recognition, because it is evident that the number of national members decreases and some representatives of national members complain that it is difficult for them to convince their management bodies to pay the fees. This means that IFIP should focus on a few really important events or services it will be recognized by. As additional observation over the last WCCs, Mr Nawrocki found that the IFIP World Computer Congress needs a „re-engineering”.

Mr Nawrocki presented the fundament that should be followed for a “New IFIP World Computer Congress”:

- IFIP WCC should be, first of all, for the IFIP people
- IFIP WCC should be a federated conference, i.e. a number of small, co-located conferences sharing a few well recognized keynote speakers
- IFIP WCC should be cheap in the sense of conference fee and hotels
- IFIP WCC should be accompanied with presenting main IFIP awards
- TC chairs and WG chairs should be asked for their opinion

Mr Nawrocki declared that the Polish Academy of Sciences and the Poznan University of Technology would be happy to host WCC 2017 (2018?) in Poznan, Poland.

Mr Strous proposed to the Board to set up a task force for working on the future of WCCs similar to the task force for WCFs. The task force should discuss conditions and constraints and come up with a proposal for continuation of WCCs within the next months. The concept presented by Mr Nawrocki would be included in this discussion. Timing should be such that a concrete proposal can be presented to GA 2015.
The Board APPROVED the proposal and asked Mr Strous to set up a relevant task force.

3.10.5 Future WITFOR / Digital Equity

Mr Puigjaner reported that since GA 2015 there were interesting discussions on topics related to future digital citizens and how to form them. On February 25, after the meeting “Towards tomorrow’s successful digital citizens: A policy Think tank” held in London, UK a meeting for discussing activities related to Digital Equity was held.

Mr Puigjaner informed the Board that Digital Equity will be a topic for a series of conferences in 2015 and further.

- The 2015 WSIS Forum could be portrayed as the first in a series of events that are taking place over the 2015-2025 time-horizon. A set of digital equity challenges is to be investigated, coming up with a range of different solutions. A proposal has been submitted by Mr Puigjaner for a series of activities to be held on the topic of “Digital equity in developed and developing countries” in the context of the 2015 WSIS Forum.

- A TC3 Working Conference on A New Culture of Learning: Computing and Next Generations will be held in Vilnius (LT) in July 1-3, 2015. A workshop or panel with contribution of Raymond Morel and other specialists proposed by him is planned to discuss on the influence of topics like security, privacy, governance, etc. on the education needed for attaining digital equity.

- For the World Computer Congress, September 4-7, 2015 in Daejeon, Korea, Mr Puigjaner will make a proposal to organize a focused workshop in the framework of WCC about Digital Equity with possibly a format of short inputs, several questions to answer and lot of time for discussions and “white paper” style output.

- For February 2016 a two-day WG9.2 workshop in Barcelona, Spain is planned on a topic and with a format similar to the one held recently in London.

Mr Puigjaner reported that in the above mentioned meeting held in London, the possibility of organizing a conventional conference in the WITFOR spirit connected or not with Digital Equity in 2016 was considered. Mr Puigjaner is in close contact with CLEI to work on a proposal to organize a WITFOR like event with the format of a conventional conference jointly organized by CLEI and IFIP in Costa Rica in September 2016. The topics could be interesting for developing countries to choose among education, infrastructure, government and health in connection with Digital Equity. The Board congratulated Mr Puigjaner to his hard work to re-animate the spirit of WITFOR and asked him to continue on his plans with Costa Rica.

3.11 Marketing Plan

Mr Strous reported about the status on the work on IFIP’s marketing plan. He explained the matrix created in the marketing meeting with QuantumValues in Amsterdam.
Mr Strous will submit a timeline for the actions according the matrix to the members of the Board and asked the Board to work through these documents. He asked the Board to come back with comments in order to start with the proposed tasks.

### 3.12 Professionalism Program (IP3)

Mr Wong presented an update on the work within IP3 since the GA 2014 in Vienna on Sept 2014. He reported that the New Zealand Computer Society (IITPNZ) has partnered with BCS for SFIA Level 5 accreditation. They hope to work with IP3 to accredit their Technologist certification (Level 3) which will be launched early in 2015. IITPNZ are also starting to accredit Degree programmes in NZ, based on the ACS model.

Mr Wong informed the Board that Mr Ibaraki (VC Strategic Partnerships) continued his excellent work with his interviews of high profile ICT leaders. Recently, he interviewed the incoming ITU Secretary-General Houlin Zhao.

Mr Wong reported from the IP3 Standards Accreditation Council (SAC) that
- following the accreditation visit to ACS by the IP3 Standards Accreditation Panel led by Mr Schofield in November 2014, the IP3 Board approved ACS’ accreditation for the Professional Certification, and Technologist Certification for a 5 year period.
- CIPS has some issues with their new structure where they have a virtual Head Office need to be resolved and then accreditation will proceed.
- IITPSA plan to be accredited in Q2 2015.
- NGI/NGN/VRI are aiming for mid-2015, will start engaging with SAC early in 2015.
- IPSJ are in the planning process for 2016 at the earliest.
- Dialogues have commenced with ISACA. ISACA have 4 ISO accreditation. They will engage with IP3 and hope to get on the calendar for 2015.

Mr Wong informed the Board that Mr Timmermans from NGI/NGN/VRI attended the European E-Skills conference on behalf of IP3. The first day focused on E-Learning, and he noted that there was some tension between commercial and non-commercial (academic) interests. There is also a “divide” between the different geographical regions of Europe. Following the IFIP President’s Forum in Vienna, BCS President, Ms Bacon also presented on IT Professionals Licensing at the EU E-Skills conference.

Mr Wong was happy to announce that the application from the Swiss Institute to join IP3 was formally accepted by the IP3 Board in December 2014.

Mr Wong informed the Board that Ms Ainsley, Mr Ibaraki and Ms de Roche are planning to attend and present at the World Summit for the Information Society (WSIS) in Geneva in May 2015. IP3 plans to present a Thematic Workshop on: “The Enabling Infrastructure” – a true Knowledge Society requires a strong ICT foundation that is innovative, flexible and trustworthy.

Mr Wong showed an IP3 proposed work plan for 2015.

### 3.13 Next Meetings

Ms Murayama kindly offered to host the next Board meeting in Tokyo, Japan and this offer was accepted by the Board.
The next meetings are:

2015
EC meeting (preGA)  October 8th  Daejeon (Korea)
GA meeting  October 9th – 10th  Daejeon (Korea)
EC meeting (postGA)  October 10th  Daejeon (Korea)

2016
EC meeting (preBoard)  March 7th  Tokyo (Japan)
Board meeting  March 8th – 9th  Tokyo (Japan)
EC meeting (postBoard)  March 9th  Tokyo (Japan)
EC meeting (preGA)  October  invitations are welcome
GA meeting  October  invitations are welcome
EC meeting (postGA)  October  invitations are welcome

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

3.14 AoB
Mr Strous invited the Board to a short brainstorming for suggestions for concrete actions that could be completed in the next few months. The written action points were collected and Mr Strous will distribute a summary to the Board and start the action as much as possible..

3.15 Closing of Meeting
Mr Nawrocki thanked all the members of the Board for their coming to Poznan. Mr Strous thanked everybody for attending the meeting and conveyed to Mr Nawrocki and the Poznan University of Technology) IFIP’s appreciation of the hospitality arrangements.

He declared the Board meeting closed and wished the participants a safe journey home.