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**IFIP GENERAL ASSEMBLY SEP 9\textsuperscript{TH} - SEP 10\textsuperscript{TH} 2011, PRAGUE, CZECH REPUBLIC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Person / Body</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finance:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To analyse the reasons for the drop in TC income (publications, event fees)</td>
<td>Fin.Comm., TCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To develop a finance plan for the implementation and for running of IFIP’s Digital Library</td>
<td>Fin.Comm., TCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To highlight all exceptional expense in Treasurer’s report</td>
<td>Treasurer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To create a glossary of specific financial terms used in reports</td>
<td>Treasurer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Membership Model:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To work on ways to engage industry</td>
<td>Mr Strous / TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To work on voting rights for Specialist Members</td>
<td>Mr Strous, EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To inform the members in the categories that are abolished and where applicable to invite them to move to another category.</td>
<td>Mr Strous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To provide the data from societies about Member categories, number of members in each category, membership fee per category for 2010 and total income from membership in 2010</td>
<td>Mr Strous, GA Reps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical Assembly</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To finalize the Event Approval and include this in the new set of S&amp;B</td>
<td>Mr Strous, TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To develop models for risk sharing</td>
<td>Mr Hinchey / TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To develop a draft MOU for events run in conjunction with other bodies.</td>
<td>Mr Hinchey / TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domain Committees</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To transform some of the current WITFOR Commissions into new DCs</td>
<td>TC Chairs / Vice Chairs of WITFOR commissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statutes &amp; Bylaws</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To produce a final version of the S&amp;B</td>
<td>Mr Strous / S&amp;B Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To draft separate guidelines for each type of flagship event.</td>
<td>Mr Strous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Web-based Event Approval System</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To work on the implementation of a web-based event approval system</td>
<td>Mr Bramer / Mr Dundler</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Publications
- To complete procedures for a timely flow of information from Springer through IFIP to the ACS DL management team, to have the DL updated in an efficient and timely manner and to include the author full text submissions in the DL. 
- To continue to evaluate the process to determine whether an alternative way to establish and maintain our DL has to be found.
- To find a financial model for running the Digital Library.
- To complete and recommend a policy on plagiarism.
- To consider how to make AICT a stronger series.
- To prepare general guidelines for republishing selected papers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mr Turner / PC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr Turner / PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC / AICT Editorial Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### International Professional Practice Partnership (IP3)
- To contact the IP3 Board and discuss how IP3 can best address the need of increasing participation by member societies and the link of IP3 with other relevant.
- To define the content of an IP3 business plan.
- To discuss with IP3 Board what information is missing in the current reports and how to present the requested information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mr Strous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr Puigjaner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Strous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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GA Members Present
Member Society Representatives (25 representatives)

Australia          A Wong         Austria         A Min Tjoa
Brazil             M Walter       Canada         G Boyton
China              F Lin          Croatia        M Frkovic
Czech Rep         J Pokorny       France        G Domeingts
Germany           K Brunnstein    Hungary       M Raffai
India              L Sawhney       Ireland       D Brady
Japan              T Saito         Korea         D Y Kim
Lithuania          E Telesius      Netherlands   L Strous
Norway             J Wibe          Russia        Y Evtushenko
Slovakia           I Privara       Slovenia     N Schlamberger
South Africa       B von Solms     Spain         R Puigjaner
Switzerland        R Morel         UK            A McGettrick
US-ACM             J Turner

Individual Members Present
L Sawhney

Ex officio Members
M Bramer            Councillor
C Avram             Treasurer

TC Chairs (11 TCs were represented)

TC1                  M Hinchey       TC2          J Nawrocki
TC3                  S Rosvik        TC6          G Leduc
TC7                  J Henry         TC8          J Pries-Heje
TC9                  J Phahlamohlaka  TC10         B Eschermann
TC11                 K Rannenberg   TC12         M Bramer
TC14                 M Rauterberg

Affiliate members representatives
CEPIS                D Brady        SEARCC        A Wong

Observers
Y Zhang              CIO Forum       J Nation      InterYIT
R Johnson           IP3 Representative N Faldamis  Greece (HEPIS)
A Nicolaides        Greece (HEPIS)      I Grebennik    Ukraine
F Rammig            Incoming GA Rep GE

IFIP Secretariat
E Dundler           IFIP General Secretary

Apologies
Belgium             D Deschoolmeester
Bulgaria            K Boyanov
Denmark             P Bollerslev         Proxy to Norway
Finland             O Martikainen       Proxy to Spain
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Proxy/Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>A Frisiani</td>
<td>Proxy to US / ACM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>R Delany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>H Krawczyk</td>
<td>Proxy to J Nawrocki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>A Casaca</td>
<td>Proxy to Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>P. Lokuge</td>
<td>Proxy to Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>D Khakhar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>M Al Awar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-IEEE</td>
<td>J Engel</td>
<td>Proxy to US / ACM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>L Gudza</td>
<td>Proxy to South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC2</td>
<td>M Goedicke</td>
<td>Represented by J Nawrocki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC3</td>
<td>B Cornu</td>
<td>Represented by S Rosvik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC5</td>
<td>E Neuhold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC12</td>
<td>T Dillon</td>
<td>Represented by M Bramer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC13</td>
<td>J Gulliksen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC14</td>
<td>R Nakatsu</td>
<td>Represented by M Rauterberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorary Member</td>
<td>P-A Bobillier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorary Member</td>
<td>A Rolstadas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorary Member</td>
<td>R Tanaka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMIA</td>
<td>H Takeda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3.1 Call Meeting to Order

The President, Mr Strous, opened the General Assembly meeting, formally welcomed all participants and wished to all a constructice meeting. He thanked the local host, the Czech Society for Cybernetics and Informatics (CSKI) and the Charles University in Prague represented by Mr Pokorny for the local hospitality and for the local organisation.

Mr Stuller, Vice President of CSKI welcomed all participants to General Assembly in Prague on behalf of CSKI and wished a successful meeting to the participants. Mr Stuller informed the participants that the Czech Society for Cybernetics and Informatics (CSKI) was founded in 1966 as the Czechoslovak Society for Cybernetics and has currently about 300 members.

Mr Pokorny from the Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics welcomed all participants on the university and wished a successful meeting.

Mr Strous welcomed especially all representatives of Member Societies attending their first IFIP meeting, Mr Wong (Australia), Mr Walter (Brazil), Mr Telesius (Lithuania), Mr Evtushenko (Russia), Mr McGettrick (UK) and all representatives of Technical Committees attending their first IFIP General Assembly, Mr Nawrocki (TC2), Mr Rosvik (TC3), Mr Leduc (TC6), Mr Henry (TC7) and Mr Phahlamohlaka (TC9).

Mr Strous also welcomed the representatives from HEPIS, the applicant for membership from Greece, Mr Faldamis and Mr Nicolaides, the representative from UFI, the applicant for membership of the Ukraine, Mr Grebennik and the observers to this GA, Ms Zhang working on the World CIO Forum, Mr Nation from the InterYIT Group, Mr Johnson the IP3 representative and Mr Rammig from the German Gesellschaft für Informatik.

3.2 Attendance and Apologies

The Secretary, Ms Raffai, announced the GA attendance and apologies received (please refer to the attendance list). 25 Full Members, 1 Individual Member, 11 TC representatives and 2 ex officio members with voting rights were represented and 8 valid proxies were given.

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

3.3.1 Approval of Agenda

Mr Strous informed the General Assembly that the sequence of items in the agenda would be followed as closely as possible but a few changes would possibly occur during the meeting.

GA unanimously ADOPTED the Agenda.

3.3.2 Approval of Minutes GA 2010

Mr Strous informed General Assembly that a new procedure for approval of minutes will be implemented starting with the present General Assembly. A draft of the minutes will be sent to all participants within 4 weeks after the meeting. Comments should be sent within 4 weeks after the sending of the draft. If there are no comments received the minutes are considered to be approved. Minor comments will be processed and without a second round of comments the minutes are considered to be approved. Should there be major comments a new draft will be made and a second round of comments will be started or, in exceptional cases, the comments will be discussed at the next meeting. The decision on the nature of the comments, minor or major, will be made by the President and the Secretary. The final version of the minutes will be circulated within four weeks after end of the comment period.

GA unanimously AGREED to the new procedure and, for the last time under the old time frame, APPROVED the Minutes of the GA 2010 in Brisbane, Australia.

3.3.3 President’s Report

Mr Strous referred to his report for some topics that are either not on the agenda separately or deserve some additional attention or explanation.

- Rules and regulations
  IFIP spends a lot of time on discussing rules, either because IFIP doesn't like the ones it has or because IFIP needs changes and new rules due to a changing world and new activities. These discussions take valuable meeting time and make the meetings less interesting because that leaves little time to discuss content and activities. Therefore in the first year of his term, the President decided to spend some extra effort in catching up on the rules and undertake a complete revision, partly to finally end some debates, partly to make IFIP more flexible and to enable the Federation to react quicker to developments, partly to adapt to the new membership structure and other proposals that are on the agenda for this meeting.

- What is in it for me?
  Mr Strous had the pleasure of attending the opening session of the PLM 2011 conference of working group 5.1. Talking to some of the officers of WG 5.1 he learned that PLM was an existing conference that was organized by a group of people outside IFIP. This group had decided a few years ago to join IFIP because of the global standing of IFIP and the international community it represents. That was a
very encouraging statement for him, because this was exactly the kind of motivation that IFIP has to advertise more.

- **Contacts with GA and TA members**
  Since GA 2010 the President spent quite some time to talk to people inside and outside IFIP to get a picture of IFIP’s image (outside) and of the wishes (inside). He intends to continue such conversations and increase the contacts with different groups in the Federation in the forthcoming year.

- **Regional cooperation and activities**
  Together with the President of the NGI a meeting took place with the President of the Computer Society of Zambia (CSZ). CSZ is keen on establishing contacts with the IFIP community. Different options have been discussed and will be explored further. Most likely a number of neighbouring countries will be invited to see whether a regional activity can be started in southern Africa /SADC. A promising lead, especially since strengthening regional cooperation has been discussed a couple of times already. Another effort to increase regional cooperation as a means to strengthen computer societies and assist them in achieving their goals can be found in a proposal made by SEARC that is on the agenda for this meeting.

General Assembly had no questions or comments with respect to the President’s report.

### 3.3.4 Secretary’s Report

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

**Ms Raffai** informed General Assembly that during the year several business meetings took place together with IFIP President Leon Strous, Honorary Secretary Maria Raffai and General Secretary Eduard Dundler on secretarial issues and also with Ms Fiala and Ms Starzer from the Austrian Academy of Sciences in order to introduce the IFIP President and the IFIP Honorary Secretary.

**Ms Raffai** informed General Assembly that the Austrian Government (BMvit) proposed to transfer the IFIP Secretariat to a new location in Vienna into the renovated building of the OCG (Wollzeile; centre of Vienna). The Executive Committee looked into the proposal, and discussed the advantages of moving the Secretariat (sharing offices and meeting rooms with OCG, being in the centre of a capital city) and disadvantages (higher lease costs without guarantee that this would be subsidized, considerable cost and effort to move the office to a new location) and decided not to make use of the proposal but to stay in Laxenburg.

**Ms Raffai** reported that France, Russia and Ethiopia took advantage of the membership fee amnesty approved by GA 2010, and are still IFIP members. Kenya had replied that they will not be able to pay the fee any longer. Greece (last paid in 2007) did not respond and therefore the Greek Computer Society is no longer member of IFIP. Vietnam and Saudi Arabia have never paid their fees which mean that although their applications were approved, they have in fact never been formally a member of IFIP.
According to the above on 24th February 2011, IFIP has 48 Full Members with voting rights, 3 Corresponding Members, 4 Affiliate Members, 1 Individual Member and 9 Honorary Members.

### 3.3.5 EC Meetings Report

Ms Raffai informed General Assembly about the work schedule of the Executive Committee and the Board. She reported that the Executive Committee held altogether 7 meetings during the last year (4 face to face meetings and 3 teleconferences). Between these meetings the EC members had frequent discussions by phone and through emails. Most of the EC meetings had been routine business; detailed information can be found elsewhere in these minutes, like S&B, membership model, IP3 and InterYIT.

Ms Raffai informed General Assembly that because of the situation in Tunisia the members of the Board considered the risk that not enough GA members would attend the meeting was too high and with a view on the necessary quorum to take important decisions it has been decided in consultation with the colleagues in Tunisia to move GA 2011 to Europe, namely to Prague (Czech Republic).

EC continues to check carefully the progress in the organisation of IFIP’s main events, as there are WCF 2011, WITFOR 2012 and WCC 2012.

### 3.3.6 Treasurer’s Report

The Treasurer, Mr Avram, drew attention to his written report and informed GA that the 2010 accounts have been audited. The “Auditors opinion” addressed to the General Assembly is attached to these minutes (Attachment 1).

Mr Avram showed the Statement of Financial Position, which lists all assets and all liabilities of IFIP. The net position is that end of 2010 IFIP is solvent with net assets of approximately Euro 2.495.000. Of this, Euro 425.616 is being held for TCs and the Developing Countries support fund and Euro 161.237 is being held for the IT Professionalism project.

Mr Avram showed the Statement of Financial Performance which lists both IFIP’s income and IFIP’s expenses. Under the new reporting format, the operating performance, the portfolio performance and finally the net performance of IFIP are separated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary financial results 2004 to 2010</th>
<th>Amounts are in thousand Euro (K EUR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of financial position</td>
<td>2495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liabilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr Avram reported that the portfolio has begun a slow recovery to the 2007 levels. During 2010 it increased in value except for a cash withdrawal of Euro 90,000. It was approximately the same level at the end of 2010 as it was in Jan.2007 before the 2007 bubble. The Treasurer has analysed the portfolio performance 1999 to June 2011, taking into account cash flows in and out, the annual return has been +2.01%. This has been a difficult period financially, however IFIP’s conservative buy and hold strategy and lack of panic selling has enabled this result. The analysis has been made available to the IFIP Finance committee. In line with the resolution of GA 2010, the UBS portfolio of direct investments is now a portfolio of ETFs Exchange Traded Funds. The portfolio is mandated to be 45% equities, 45% bonds and 10% cash. The ratios are slightly more conservative than the mandate but within a small tolerance of it. The change was signed and implemented end of May 2011.

Mr Avram summarized that IFIP has a strong asset base underpinning the ability to continue confident operations into the near term. IFIP financial performance (operating) was generally in line with the 2010 budget and update as reported in September 2010. IFIP had a significant recovery in its portfolio investments for the second year in a row.

Mr Avram concluded that IFIP is on track for 2011, and the General Secretary estimated a much better than budget result for 2011.

Mr Avram said that IFIP is currently in discussion with UBS as to signatories. The past position has had the President, Treasurer and chair of the Finance Committee as signatories, any one to sign. He proposed to add the General Secretary as a signatory with any two to sign. This maintains and improves the integrity of the instruction given to the bank and has the advantage that the General Secretary will be able to request information and instruct the bank to co-operate with auditors by his own signature and without having to fax and post requests around the world to office bearers. It will not allow the General Secretary to move funds alone.

UBS has problems under tightened legal requirements with having Australian, USA and India citizens (plus maybe others) as signatories, the Treasurer is working on the issue and will create a paper to the Board and GA before it becomes a problem to IFIP.

General Assembly APPROVED the proposal to add the General Secretary as a signatory with the restriction that a second signature would be necessary for money transfers.

Mr Avram informed General Assembly that the secretariat has sent regular financial reports to the Technical Committees. The GA will get to discuss the rules governing the financial operations of TCs and WGs later on the agenda. In order to better
oversee the operations, the secretariat has begun a project to collect financial and operational data organised by WG or event. Traditionally IFIP managed TCs; TCs in turn managed WGs and conferences. The change will be done without changing the way TCs and WGs work or interact with the secretariat; it is a record keeping issue that will allow IFIP to monitor trends in numbers of participants and income.

**Mr Avram** reported that in line with the resolution of GA 2010 expressions of interest for an auditor to audit IFIP for the next 5 years were called, received, evaluated and candidates interviewed. The Executive Committee followed the recommendation of the Treasurer and General Secretary and appointed CONSULTATIO for another 5 years. All parties have been notified of the decision. IFIP can be confident in the services and costs of its auditor for the near future and don't need to review the arrangements for the next five years.

The audit format will change slightly in line with normal business practice. The notes to the financials will now be prepared by the General Secretary and used as source material for the audit along with the figures; a new software module will be used to prepare the summary financials in house.

For the future **Mr Avram** re-stated his comments from years past: IFIP needs to find new business opportunities.

**Mr Avram** said that the IFIP secretariat will improve reporting, including reporting of actual operations data not just financial data as it moves over to the new event coding system.

The new portfolio arrangements will be reviewed during 2012, The Treasurer and General Secretary plus maybe a conscript will undertake that task.

### 3.3.7 Finance Committee Report (FC)

The chair of the Finance Committee, Mr Wibe, presented the report of the Finance Committee. He structured his report into five sections:

- **Membership Fee Structure:**
  
  **Mr Wibe** said that the level of the fees and the fee structure has been debated and challenged a few times in the recent past. Also with a view on the proposed new membership structure model, the Finance Committee has started work on investigating possible alternatives to the current model that could do justice to the size and financial position of member societies. Several models, including IFIP’s present model have been investigated. Since a change in the fee structure could have a major impact on the annual dues of many of IFIP’s member societies, it is essential that a thorough analysis takes place to identify the advantages and disadvantages of each alternative. FC has made a start with this analysis but could not complete this due to lack of data about membership numbers and income from membership of our member societies. Therefore the current structure shall remain in place until the analysis is completed. It is planned to have a full report with analysis and proposals for GA 2012.

  In order to achieve this, the GA members and the Boards of the IFIP Member Societies will be asked to provide the following data before December 1, 2011:
General Assembly AGREED to support this effort and assist in getting the requested data.

- Proposal for an inflation correction of the annual membership dues:
  (this item was discussed under agenda item 5 Membership structure because of the direct link to this topic)

  Mr Wibe said that Finance Committee proposed, under the assumption that IFIP stay with the current fee model, an inflation correction for the annual dues. The dues have not been raised at least since 2000, meaning for more than 10 years. The inflation in the European Union from 2000 to 2009 added up to 21.6% and in the USA to 25.6%.

  FC proposed to increase the annual dues for member societies by 10% until a final decision regarding the new membership structure and fee model is taken.

  Discussion and decision on this proposal was postponed until the agenda item Budget 2012.

- Items from the Board meeting in Dublin

  Mr Wibe reported that Finance Committee checked the status of its recommendations made at the Board meeting. Nearly all of the recommendations were implemented. Not finished are the following issues:
  
  • The new publications model agreed with Springer might be a factor in the decrease on income. Another might be the increasing use of co-sponsorship rather than full sponsorship. The Finance Committee asked the Treasurer to discuss with TA Chair possible reasons for the drop in TC income.
  
  • The finances of the Digital Library were discussed. The high cost of 25 Euro to get each paper into the Digital Library was particularly queried. Also the level of use of the Digital Library. The Finance Committee asked the Publications Committee to review its business plan, to consider the high cost of entering papers and to discuss the level of and to look at the appropriateness / completeness of the indexing used by the Digital Library. The FC discussed whether the cost could be reduced by automation. There was also a concern that the question has not been resolved for a long time due to the fact that it has components relevant to the Publications Committee, the Finance Committee and the TA and thus none of these bodies covers the full scope of this issue.
  
  • The Finance Committee requested that all once-off (i.e. exceptional) expenditure should be highlighted in the Treasurer’s report, whether budgeted or not.
  
  • The Finance Committee would welcome a glossary of specific technical terms used in the financial and Treasurer’s report.

  The Finance Committee requested the involved Committees to finish their work on these open issues at next General Assembly at the latest.

General Assembly SUPPORTED the request.
- Auditors opinion
  Mr Wibe reported that Finance Committee recommend to General Assembly to approve the financial statements presented by the Treasurer.

3.3.7.1 Decisions on financial issues: Accounts 2010
General Assembly ACCEPTED the Auditor’s report.
General Assembly APPROVED the accounts 2010.
General Assembly DISCHARGED the Treasurer and EC for fiscal year 2010.

3.3.7.2 Decisions on financial issues: Budget 2012
(The budget 2012 was discussed after agenda item 13 Standing Committees because many of the agenda items included financial aspects with a possible effect on the budget)

Mr Avram presented the budget for 2012 in TREAS4. Budget requests from budget holders have substantially been adopted, but a number of requests have been cut in consultation with the budget holders to reduce the budget deficit. For budgeting purposes, Mr Avram assumed a portfolio return of 2.01%.

The proposed budget shows an overall budget deficit of Euro 25,000. The Treasurer pointed out that the deficit is relatively modest because some assumptions have been made with respect to membership income. First of all, the FC proposal for a 10% inflation correction has been processed, second it was assumed that the new membership structure would result in a number of new member societies and therefore income. The total amount of the increase in membership income is approximately 70K Euro.

Mr Avram recommended the proposed 2012 budget to the General Assembly.

Mr Wibe presented the opinion of the Finance Committee to the proposed budget 2012. FC is concerned that the balanced budget requirement is only met by making very optimistic assumptions on membership income. He said that even taking into consideration the proposed 10% for inflation correction the proposed budget may be too high.

Finance Committee had the opinion that the proposed income for publications with Euro 43,428 showed again the permanent decrease of the income during the last years. FC recommended that this problem should be dealt with by the PC and the TA coming up with proposals what can be done to get a higher income for publications.

Mr Avram proposed to recalculate the membership income in the budget by eliminating the inflation increase and by reducing the assumption of fee of new members.

Mr Strous commented that his action will change the result dramatically and he proposed to General Assembly to accept a higher loss for 2012. Since the membership structure proposal was not accepted on all parts, reducing the estimated income from new members was inevitable. Therefore he asked the General Assembly to consider at least accepting the inflation correction proposal.
Mr Boynton commented that the present membership fees should not be touched. His comment was supported by Mr von Solms with the comment that an increase in membership fees would imply the danger to loose income from the African members of IFIP.

The proposal was strongly debated. Some members indicated that their society also had not increased the membership fee for many years. An increase of 10% could lead to their members questioning the value of the IFIP membership. Other member societies would be affected double because due to economic progress they would also move to a higher scale in the current model. On the other side it was acknowledged that if no correction was implemented, the income from membership in the budget for 2012 would have to be corrected. Some alternative proposals were suggested:

- increase two years in a row by 5%, assuming the new membership structure will be in place after two years;
- consider the increase of 10% as a temporary increase;
- increase by 10% but don’t change the position of the members in the UN scale.

The proposal of FC to raise the membership fee by 10% was NOT ACCEPTED by General Assembly (Voting: 8 in favour, 3 abstentions, 24 against).

The proposal motioned by Mr Schlamberger and seconded by Mr Domeingts to raise the fee by 5% in two consecutive years was also NOT ACCEPTED by General Assembly (Voting: in favour: 11, against: 19, abstentions: 4). The other alternatives were not brought to a vote.

DECISION: The outcome of the discussions and decisions means that the fee structure and fee levels for 2012 remain as they are for 2011.

The Finance Committee proposed that a regular fee correction reflecting inflation is adopted in any new membership model or fee structure. General Assembly POSTPONED the decision until the new membership fee structure proposal is discussed.

Taking into account the outcome of the discussion on the membership income in the budget and the approval of some projects, General Assembly APPROVED the budget 2012 with an operating deficit of 120.000 Euro. Executive Committee was charged to provide the updated budget.

3.3.8 Nominations Committee Report

Mr Strous informed General Assembly that some Honorary Members raised a concern about the geographic representation of IFIPs officers. In particular having two vice-presidents from the same country was considered to be undesirable. The President and the Chair of the Nominations Committee have pointed out that all GA members have a right to propose candidates from the floor and that the election process then includes the "risk" of not achieving the most desirable geographical spread. Furthermore the President referred to the Statutes where it is explicitly mentioned that "the Board should reflect as accurately as possible the representation in the General Assembly, in particular the geographical distribution of the members of the Federation". This concerns the Board and not the Executive Committee for which the Statutes do not provide such a rule. The President is of the opinion that when
looking at the geographical distribution, not only the number of member societies in a region should be taken into account, but also the number of individuals these members represent and the level of active involvement in IFIP. Under the agenda item S&B it will be proposed to add a similar explicit goal with respect to the composition of the EC as there is for the Board.

3.3.8.1 Voting on officers

Ms Raffai informed General Assembly that there was one vacancy for the position of Vice-President. The current post holder, Mr Turner is eligible to be re-nominated, as he has completed his first full term of office. The Nominations Committee received the necessary amount of nominations for Mr Turner and had put forward the nomination to General Assembly. No other candidates have been proposed, neither in advance nor from the floor.

General Assembly unanimously ELECTED Mr Turner for a second term as Vice President.

3.3.8.2 Voting on councillors

Ms Raffai informed General Assembly that there were two vacancies for the position of councillor. The current post holder of one of these positions, Mr Bramer is eligible to be re-nominated as he has completed his first term as councillor. The Nominations Committee received the necessary amount of nominations for Mr Bramer and had put forward the nomination to General Assembly.

General Assembly unanimously ELECTED Mr Bramer for a second term as Councillor.

Ms Raffai informed General Assembly that there was also one vacancy for a councillor to be elected by General Assembly from the current Full Member Society representatives. As the present councillor in that position, Mr Robertson, has resigned after one year in his office there are two years left from his term. No nominations were received before the meeting. From the floor Mr Morel and Mr Lin received the required nominations and stood for election.

The result of the voting was 16 votes for Mr Morel and 27 for Mr Lin with 2 abstentions.

General Assembly therefore ELECTED Mr Lin as Councillor for the remaining two years of Mr Robertson’s term (according to the current rules this does not count as a first term for Mr Lin).

3.4 InterYIT

Mr Nation, Director of Young IT at the Australian Computer Society, presented a proposal to create an International Young IT Professionals group under IFIP: InterYIT. He said that Young IT groups within computer societies represent the future of the ICT industry and of the computer societies themselves. It is from within their ranks that future CIO’s and leaders of industry will arise. It is a Young IT group’s role to ensure that these individuals are provided with adequate professional
development and networking opportunities, and that their voices are heard on matters important to them. These Young IT groups are a relatively new phenomenon and best practices have not been identified yet. Many Computer Societies struggle with how best to cater for their Young Professionals and much duplication of effort has occurred. What is required is a way for all the Young IT groups to share their past experiences and to work together on a way ahead. With this in mind the idea of InterYIT, an international collaboration between Young IT groups, was born.

This combined group will provide a way for all these separate groups to share ideas and events and supply a common framework for them to maximise benefits to their group. Mr Nation said that he believes that InterYIT will provide immeasurable benefit to Young Professionals, member societies and to IFIP itself.

Mr Nation proposed that InterYIT could fit into the IFIP structure on the same level as Technical Assembly and Standing Committees and would report to IFIP’s Executive Committee, Board and General Assembly.

Mr Strous reminded GA of the incredible enthusiasm and speed shown by the initiators in drafting the proposal including a full set of rules governing the group. The first steps were only taken a year ago at WCC2010 and GA 2010. The Board of IFIP at its 2011 meeting in March was highly appreciative of the initiative and progress made and considered InterYIT as a great opportunity to get young IT colleagues involved in national computer societies and in IFIP. The Board therefore DECIDED to approve the establishment of InterYIT as an IFIP body, conditional to final approval by GA 2011. Mr Strous recommended GA to follow the decision of the Board.

General Assembly unanimously ACCEPTED InterYIT as new body within IFIP. The Chair of InterYIT will be part of General Assembly.

3.5 Membership Structure (TF Membership)

Mr Strous presented a proposal for a new membership structure in IFIP. This proposal was the result of a number of drafts that have been discussed and commented upon in the last couple of years. He reminded the General Assembly about the reasons for the proposal, as was also explained in the accompanying letter that was sent to the GA representatives as well as the presidents of the member societies:

- Changing world raises the question how representative IFIP (still) is for the ICT profession;
- Requests from societies and organizations to join IFIP;
- Streamline categories, abolish categories that are redundant and/or have not been useful;
- Repeated advise from Treasurer, Finance Committee and Task Force on Finances that IFIP should look for new business opportunities to safeguard its financial future.

Mr Strous informed GA that in the weeks before the meeting he had received a number of comments via e-mail and he had also talked to some member societies on the phone or in physical meetings. The membership structure has a clear relation with the IFIP strategy, IFIP’s ambitions and the fee structure and level. With respect to fees some comments asked for a value proposition.
Before starting the discussion on each proposed membership category, **Mr Strous** asked for agreement on the classification of organizations (paragraph 3 in the proposal) as a reference framework for the work and discussions on the membership structure.

General Assembly **AGREED** on the proposed classification of organizations as reference framework for the membership structure.

There was also general agreement within General Assembly that IFIP has to change in order to remain present on the market.

**Mr Strous** then started the discussion on each proposed membership category including the criteria and other rules in the corresponding article 2 in the new draft Statutes and article 5 in the new draft Bylaws. For each category he briefly explained the background, he summarized the comments received and he invited GA members to bring forward additional comments if applicable. The discussions focussed on the categories Regular, Specialist and Industry Members.

With respect to Regular Members, the main controversial issue was the proposal to allow more than one society per country in this category (provided those societies would meet the criteria). Two opposite views, one group that was of the opinion that the old concept of having national societies or organizing societies in a country in such a way that representation in IFIP could be considered as a national society was no longer viable given all the developments in many countries, in member societies and in society in general. The other group found it one of the key assets of IFIP’s membership to represent national societies which has advantages in IFIP’s position towards global bodies including UN organizations and also advantages in member societies’ positions in their countries. This discussion therefore concentrated around the question: “What is IFIP / what should IFIP be”, a federation of countries, a federation of national computer societies, a federation of ICT societies in a broad sense or something else.

**Mr Brunnstein** reminded GA of the origin of IFIP where more societies in one country could be member but representation in GA could only be by one person (one vote). A number of countries, like Germany, have organized themselves according to that rule. He brought up the proposal forcing Member Societies of one country to combine all societies of the country in one “Advisory Board” would solve the problem of “one country – one vote”.

**Mr von Solms** said that IFIP cannot exist longer with “one country – one vote” and that he has doubts that the “more societies – one vote” model will work in every country. He proposed that IFIP should go into the direction of being a “society for societies”.

**Mr Boynton** supported the position of Mr von Solms and said that a rule which works for one country does not necessarily work for all the others.

**Mr Rannenberg** raised the question, if everybody can be a member of IFIP, how will IFIP difference to other associations.

**Mr Johnson** was worried about getting more different organisations to IFIP.
The proposed new category of Specialist members in itself was considered to be of added value. The discussion focussed on the criteria and mainly on the questions whether local / national societies should be allowed or only international ones.

The category of Industry Members also met some resistance. It was questioned whether creating a membership category was the best way to achieve a stronger involvement of industry in IFIP’s activities.

Mr Brunnstein reminded GA of the idea that was proposed already some years ago to establish an “Industry Advisory Board” to provide advise to the President, Executive Committee and Board / GA in their work. Besides this proposal he had some doubts that Industry Members would accept that they would have no voting rights, but have to pay membership fee.

Mr Strous concluded that there was agreement on some categories and the related articles in the new set of Statutes & Bylaws, for some categories the comments received and the outcome of the discussion at this GA need to be processed before a final decision can be made. Moreover, additional input is needed and the membership work needs to be linked to the work on IFIP’s next five-year strategy, the value proposition and fee structure work. He will make further visits and contacts with Member Societies within the next 6 months in order to get direct input. The result will be a note on the ambitions of IFIP: what does IFIP want to be and achieve and how to engage different stakeholders. After a first discussion at the Board meeting in March 2012 he will send a draft to the Member Societies for further comments. A final proposal for decision will be presented at General Assembly 2012.

Mr Strous asked General Assembly to vote on the following proposals in one step:

- **Regular Members**: to postpone the new name and criteria and to stay with the current Full Member category for an other year with voting rights as they are;
- **Associate Members**: to accept this name and criteria for the category that is a merger of the old Associate and Affiliate member categories; no voting rights;
- **Specialist Members**: to accept as new category, but membership will initially be limited to international organisations. No voting rights for the moment, work on this to be done and presented at GA 2012;
- **Industry Members**: to remove as new category and to work on different ways to engage industry in the work of IFIP;
- **Honorary Members**: to accept as category with the respective articles in the new set of Statutes & Bylaws but to keep the current voting rights and postpone possible changes in voting rights until GA 2012;
- **Affiliate Members**: to abolish this category (merged with new Associate Members)
- **Corresponding Members**: to abolish this category;
- **Individual Members**: to abolish this category.

General Assembly unanimously ACCEPTED the proposals in one package.

Mr Strous will inform the members in the categories that are abolished and where applicable will invite them to move to another category.
3.6 Technical Assembly (TA): issues affecting S&B and Standing Orders

With a view on handling the new set of Statutes & Bylaws under agenda item 8, the TA issues were split. Here the issues that affect S&B are addressed:
- Event approval procedure, Bylaws annex 6.3.3
- Procedure for TC funds, Bylaws annex 6.3.4

• Event Approval Procedure

The chair of the Technical Assembly, Mr Hinchey, reported that the draft proposal raised two issues of concern for Technical Assembly:
1) Some TCs have rules which they enforce regarding composition of Programme Committees, selection of General or Programme Chair, etc. These need to be considered in the approval process.
2) The current draft implies that a TC Chair may not need to approve an event in the case that it is organized by a WG, and a WG Chair’s approval is sufficient. This may not be the intent, but raises a number of problems. The TC’s budget is impacted by failure of an event to pay its event fee, and the TC Chair must be aware of the potential for this liability. Moreover, it is important that WGs do not schedule events that clash with other events the TC may be planning. For these and other reasons, TA believes that a TC Chair’s endorsement is required as part of the event approval process.

Mr Strous replied that concerning issue 1 he would include this in the text, on item 2 he explained that it has been the intention to have TC chairs approve WG events and if that is not clear enough in the current draft, this will have to be made more explicit.

• Risk Sharing Models and MOU

Mr Hinchey informed General Assembly that a sub-committee of TA has been charged with looking at various risk models. Progress has been made but the sub-committee is not yet ready to report. TA recommended that additional members are added to this sub-committee to enable it to make progress more quickly. The sub-committee has also been asked to look at developing a draft MOU for events run in conjunction with other bodies. A major issue in developing such a draft is that some form of insurance is typically required by the other party (particularly for those bodies based in the US). IFIP may consider some form of (blanket) insurance, or at least provide to event organizers contact details for appropriate insurance providers.

Mr Strous addressed the fact that the draft Event Approval Procedure included a number of improvements compared to the old Event Approval Guideline. When drafting the new procedure he had made an attempt to include risk sharing models and MoU’s. In order not to postpone the improvements he asked GA to agree to:
- removing the parts on risk sharing and MoU from the Event Approval Procedure and work on that separately with an envisaged proposal for GA 2012;
- processing the changes resulting from issues 1 and 2 raised by TA;
- finalizing the Event Approval Procedure in cooperation with TA and include this in the new set of Statutes & Bylaws.

General Assembly unanimously AGREED to the proposal.
• **Procedure for TC Funds**

**Mr Hinchey** reported that TA welcomed the greater autonomy for TCs to control their own funds, as offered by the draft proposed changes in S&B distributed recently by the President. In particular, this draft does not forbid the payment of expenses for TC officers to attend TA and/or business meetings, although it does highlight the need for these to be reasonable.

TA proposed that the draft document distributed by the President should include that the individual TC provides a statement of its rules on reimbursement of travel expenses before any such expenses are authorized. These rules must be approved by TA before the rules come into effect. Such costs also have to be clearly visible in the TC budget and have to be approved by the TC as laid down in the rules about approval of the budget.

General Assembly unanimously **APPROVED** the TA enhanced version of the procedure for TC funds.

### 3.7 IFIP organization chart and substructures

**Mr Strous** presented the proposal for establishing Domain Committees as a new substructure of IFIP. This would not be a competitive body to technical committees, working groups or possible partner organizations but they can strengthen interdisciplinary work between these groups. It will provide an additional opportunity for IFIP members to work with specialised bodies like IMIA but also with CIO communities, government bodies and IT Service companies. The main purpose of a DC is to coordinate efforts with respect to well established and new events (or other kinds of activities) of different TCs / WGs and partner organizations. It is therefore not envisaged that DCs will start their own (series of) events.

The characteristics of the proposed Domain Committees are:

- Domain Committees should be small committees with about 5 to 10 members
- No funds are necessary. Work can and should be done via electronic communications or conference calls. In case of a DC being involved in an event, the required funds should be part of the event budget.
- Chairs of DCs will have observer status in the General Assembly (if they have no other position in GA). This will further strengthen the links, especially in cases where the chair would be from a partner organization. Expenses for attending GA or Board meetings will not be covered by IFIP.
- Establishment and dissolution of DCs is done by the Executive Committee after consultation of TA.

The plan is to transform some of the current WITFOR Commissions into new DCs and this will be done in cooperation between the current chairs and vice-chairs of the commissions.

**Mr Strous** asked General Assembly for approval to establish Domain Committees as a new substructure of IFIP.

General Assembly **APPROVED** unanimously the establishment of Domain Committees.
3.8 Statutes & Bylaws

Mr Strous presented the proposal for restructuring IFIP’s Statutes and Bylaws. He explained the rationale for restructuring to the General Assembly:

- Get rid of outdated rules and rules that haven’t been followed in practice;
- Get rid of complex rules; keep it simple;
- Create clarity and consistency; make it easier to find the applicable rules when they are needed;
- Making rules with as little exceptions as possible;
- Create flexibility for managing / operating IFIP;
- Create possibilities to keep active volunteers involved;
- Adjust to membership structure proposal.

Before discussing the content of the articles, Mr Strous asked the opinion and approval of the General Assembly on the

- general structure (tables of content of Statutes, Bylaws) (nb: structure / ToC of Standing Orders is work still to be done);
- structure of the annexes (for both Bylaws and Standing Orders);
- authority for amendments.

General Assembly unanimously APPROVED this.

Mr Strous went through all articles of the proposed new set of Statutes & Bylaws and also annexes in detail and made his proposals for approval to General Assembly depending on the acceptance of the received comments.

Statutes

Statutes: article 1: ACCEPTED without further comments / discussion.

Statutes: article 2: Comments received:
- Make this more explicit with reference to legal status and decisions by government of Austria
- Add choice of language
First comment was ACCEPTED; the second was REJECTED.

Statutes: article 3: Comments received:
- Sentence on taking account of political, social etc. is not consistent with some parts elsewhere and perhaps no longer in line with IFIP’s ambitions
After discussion it was decided that this comment needs further consideration, therefore REJECTED for now, to be followed up, accept article as it is.

Statutes: article 4: Comments received:
- Strategy should be placed elsewhere since this is under constant review in order to remain relevant
Mr Johnson suggested considering a new formulation.
It was DECIDED to keep the strategy part in, review of strategy is only once every five years, but to ask the S&B Committee to carefully look at the text and improve this where possible.

Statutes: article 5: it was DECIDED that this article has to be changed in accordance with the decisions taken concerning the membership structure proposal under agenda item 5.
Statutes: article 6.1.1: **ACCEPTED** without further comments / discussion
Statutes: article 6.1.2: the formulation about electronic voting led to discussions in GA, the text was not unambiguous and it was also not clear enough whether it covered all possible situations. General Assembly was in favour of creating the option for electronic voting but it was decided to **REJECT** the article for the moment and present a new text to GA 2012.

Statutes: article 6.2: Comments received:
- add Officers in 6.2.1 also as Ex Officio members
- Simplify the proxy rule in 6.2.1: all members, including ex officio members, can give a proxy to any other member, including ex officio members, to vote on issues they are entitled to vote upon
- Align the rule in 6.2.4 about convening an extra GA by the President with the rule in 6.3.4 for the Board (the formulation in 6.3.4 has preference)
All comments received were **ACCEPTED**.

Statutes: article 6.3: Comments received:
- Clarify in 6.3.1 that all councillors are approved by GA, there is only a difference in nominating
- Clarify that secured support means secured financial support
**Mr Johnson** suggested that S&B Committee should look carefully at the drafting.
All comments received were **ACCEPTED**, S&B Committee will look at text.

Statutes: article 6.4: Comments received:
- Comment about secured support same as for councillors
- Comment that not all ex-officio members should be eligible for election as office-bearer
Comment 1 **ACCEPTED**, comment 2 **REJECTED**

Statutes: articles 7 - 11: **ACCEPTED** without further comments / discussion

Statutes: article 12: Comments received:
- Article should not only mention applicable law but also which court of law has jurisdiction
Comment **ACCEPTED**; check with Austrian lawyer precise formulation

**Bylaws**

Bylaws: article 1: **ACCEPTED** without further comments / discussion

Bylaws: article 2: it was **DECIDED** that this article has to be changed in accordance with the decisions taken concerning the membership structure proposal under agenda item 5.

Bylaws: article 3: Comments received:
- align the proxy rule in 3.5 with article 6.2.1 of the Statutes
Comment **ACCEPTED**.

Bylaws: article 4.1: **ACCEPTED** without further comments / discussion
Bylaws: article 4.2: **ACCEPTED** without further comments / discussion
Bylaws: article 4.3: **ACCEPTED** under agenda item 7.
Bylaws: article 4.4: **ACCEPTED** under agenda item 4.
Bylaws: article 4.5: Comments received:
• SCs mentioned in article should be consistent with list in annex 6.1.6
  Comment and article ACCEPTED; check list of Standing Committees at the end of
  the meeting.
  Bylaws: article 4.6: ACCEPTED without further comments / discussion

Bylaws: article 5: ACCEPTED without further comments / discussion

Bylaws: annex 6.1.1: Comments received:
• four lines in table not completed because these lines are not yet addressed in
  articles
  Comment ACCEPTED, decided to draft articles for these lines and submit for
  approval GA 2012.

Bylaws: annex 6.1.2: Comments received:
• disagreement with more rights for honorary members
  DECIDED under agenda item 5 to keep the current rights and revisit this at GA 2012.

Bylaws: annex 6.1.3: following the DECISION under agenda item 3.3.7 the fee
  structure and level for 2012 will be the same as those for 2011.

Bylaws: annexes 6.1.4 and 6.1.5: ACCEPTED without further comments / discussion

Bylaws: annex 6.1.6: list of Standing Committees TO BE UPDATED following
decisions about Standing Committees during GA.

Bylaws: annexes 6.2.1 and 6.2.2: ACCEPTED without further comments / discussion

Bylaws: annexes 6.3.1 and 6.3.2: ACCEPTED without further comments / discussion
Bylaws: annex 6.3.3: TO BE UPDATED in cooperation with TA following decisions
under agenda item 4.6.
Bylaws: annex 6.3.4: TA enhanced version ACCEPTED under agenda item 3.6.

Bylaws: annex 6.4: Comments received:
• move this annex from Bylaws to Standing Orders
  Comment ACCEPTED.

Bylaws: annex 6.5.1: to be drafted and proposed to GA 2012
Bylaws: annex 6.5.2: ACCEPTED under agenda item 3.5

Standing Orders: Explanation: Charters for Standing Committees in Standing Orders
except Admissions Committee and Activity Management Board

Mr Strous asked General Assembly to approve the new set of Statutes & Bylaws
taking into account the decisions about proposed changes. He also asked General
Assembly to mandate the S&B Committee to process the decisions and changes and
produce a final version of the S&B for publication on the website as soon as possible.

General Assembly ACCEPTED the new set of Statutes and Bylaws unanimously and
APPROVED that remaining work will be done by the S&B Committee.
3.9 Professionalism Program (IP3)

**Mr Johnson** (Observer and IFIP Member of IP3 Board) presented his report. The IP3 Board was meeting every 4-6 weeks in a two hour teleconference. He informed GA members that the IFIP Dublin Board meeting had agreed that the IP3 Board should secure the sustainability of the IP3 accreditation process and ensure prior funding existed for all other activities. He was pleased to tell the GA that this had been achieved.

Since Dublin, Mr Lane (Canada) had resigned as Chair in March and been replaced in May by Mr Johnson. Very recently Korea had announced its intention to join IP3 although the resignation of IEEE-CS was to be regretted.

Since the Dublin decisions, income and expenditure were now closely matched and a balanced budget had been adopted for 2012. This had been made possible by removing the costs of a paid Executive Officer and eliminating all but essential travel and other costs. For 2012 the Australian Computer Society was offering substantial support through both volunteer and “pro bono” staff time. The British Computer Society had also confirmed it was resuming full active participation in IP3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Actual 2010</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2011</th>
<th>Actual YTD 2011</th>
<th>Provisional Budget 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec Officer Salary</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exec Officer Expenses</td>
<td>10,402</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Support</td>
<td>29,023</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>8,430</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Fee</td>
<td>7,737</td>
<td>1,634</td>
<td>1,634</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trademarking</td>
<td>9,053</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3,407</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>9,380</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>1,546</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGM</td>
<td>12,899</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7,382</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>€ 123,425</td>
<td>€41,134</td>
<td>€25,989</td>
<td>€13,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership subscriptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Founders)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership subscriptions</td>
<td>3,542</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Non-founders)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td>€ 3,542</td>
<td>€ 10,500</td>
<td>€ 0</td>
<td>€ 13,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net (Loss)/Profit</td>
<td>-€ 119,883</td>
<td>-€ 30,634</td>
<td>-€ 24,989</td>
<td>€ 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Balance Sheet**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Actual 2010</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2011</th>
<th>Actual YTD 2011</th>
<th>Provisional Budget 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opening Balance</td>
<td>€ 287,720</td>
<td>€ 167,837</td>
<td>€ 167,837</td>
<td>€ 144,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Net (Loss)/Profit</td>
<td>-€ 119,883</td>
<td>-€ 30,634</td>
<td>-€ 24,989</td>
<td>€ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing Balance</td>
<td>€ 167,837</td>
<td>€ 139,214</td>
<td>€ 144,859</td>
<td>€ 144,859</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The sixteen members of the IP3 Global Industry Council had expressed enthusiasm to contribute to both WITFOR 2012 and WCC 2012. They were keen to stage a repeat of the 2010 Brisbane international panel session on Professionalism in IT.

Mr Johnson reported that the 2011 IP3 AGM would be held in mid-September and at the Board meeting following the AGM a new Chair would be elected.

In October, IP3’s annual face to face meeting would be held in Vancouver. This would determine the IP3 work programme for 2012 and following years. High priorities were: growing the membership, increasing the number of accredited societies and developing a maturity model for the process of certifying IT professionals. Once the planning process had been completed IP3 would produce an operational plan and supporting balanced budget.

Mr Strous then gave his report into the operation of IP3 as he had requested at the Dublin Board meeting. He had drawn a number of concerns to the attention of the IP3 Board, namely, the need to increase the number of volunteers involved, improve reporting back to IFIP and the GA members, ensure the sustainability of the accreditation process and create job descriptions for IP3 Board members. He stressed the importance to IFIP of increasing participation by member societies and to link IP3 with other relevant initiatives. He will contact the IP3 Board before their face to face meeting to discuss how IP3 can best address his observations.

Mr Strous informed GA that the Executive Committee had asked the IFIP auditor to review the financial transactions and procedures of IP3. The auditor found no irregularities and concluded that the procedures were in accordance with IFIP’s financial regulations. The review did not address whether the charged services were necessary and whether the services were duly accomplished.

Following clarification of several points, Mr Puigjaner proposed that the IP3 project should be terminated as it had failed to provide a business plan showing future projections for membership and accreditations. Mr Morel seconded the motion which was then put to the vote. The voting result was 6 in favour of the motion, 14 against and 10 abstentions. In order to solve the discussion about a business plan, which has been going on for some time, Mr Strous asked Mr Puigjaner to submit to him what he expects to find in a business plan. He will then contact the IP3 chair to discuss what information is missing in the current reports and how to present the requested information.

Seoul Accord

Mr Turner informed General Assembly about the development of the Seoul Accord. He explained that the Seoul Accord is a mutual recognition agreement among agencies that accredit academic computing programs. The scope of the Seoul Accord currently extends only to those accredited baccalaureate-level university programs that prepare graduates for entry-level positions as computing professionals.

The Seoul Accord has been established on December 6th, 2008 in Seoul. Formal effort to organize began at a meeting in Seoul during November 2007. Informal discussions have taken place for a year or two prior to November 2007; a more
formal discussion has been at IFIP's General Assembly 2007 in Gabarone, Botswana.

The founding signatories were the Accreditation Board of Engineering Education Korea (ABEEK), ABET, Inc. (USA), the Australian Computer Society (ACS), the British Computer Society (BCS), the Canadian Information Processing Society (CIPS) and the Japan Accreditation Board for Engineering Education (JABEE). The first general meeting was on June 20th, 2009 in Kyoto. Two new members were admitted: Hong Kong Institute of Engineers (HKIE) and the Institute for Engineering Education of Taiwan (IEET).

Currently the Seoul Accord has eight signatories and no provisional members; ABEEK serves as secretariat. Each signatory is reviewed every six years. Two workshops have been held, in September 2010 in Brisbane and in June 2011 in Taipei.

The vision of the Seoul Accord is to become recognized as the reliable authority on international standards for accrediting professionally-oriented tertiary programs in computing.

3.10 Website (TF Website)

Mr Bramer reported on the work of the Website Task Force which comprised Eduard Dundler and himself. The brief was to look at all aspects of the Federation's web presence. Following initial discussions it was agreed to focus initially on improving the principal IFIP website, www.ifip.org and also on improving the web presence of the TCs and WGs as far as is practicable given the diverse community of TC and WG webmasters. The need for any new features added to be easily maintainable by the IFIP Secretariat was another important consideration.

This led to a presentation by Mr Bramer to the IFIP Board in Dublin at the beginning of March 2011 and a decision to fund an overhaul of the ifip.org website by a small UK company working under his supervision. The work has been completed and signed off on behalf of IFIP by Board Member Mr Robertson.

Mr Bramer explained the aims of the work and the outcomes achieved, which were
- Improving the website home page, focusing on what IFIP is and does.
- Restructuring content. Revising menus to improve navigation.
- Making site more mobile-friendly and compliant with EU disability legislation
- Putting conference information into a database.
- Improving other pages of the website where appropriate, in particular to provide a consistent "look and feel".
- Creating a simplified 'content management system' to augment the current use of Mambo and making it easier for the Secretariat to maintain some parts of the site.
- Improving the 'web presence' of the 13 Technical Committees.

Mr Bramer reported that the revised forms of the www.ifip.org website and the new www.ifiptc.org website have been live for several months with no apparent problems.

General Assembly ACCEPTED the revised website and THANKED the Task Force for its excellent work.
Web-based Event Approval System

Mr Bramer introduced the proposal for a Web-based Event Approval System to General Assembly. The rationale for the proposal includes:

- Automating the Event Approval Process and further develop the Events Database. Also storing associated financial information using them for report generation.
- All stages from initial proposal through to automatic storage in the calendar of events.

Mr Bramer said that the expected benefits are an easier creation of event requests for organizers, also better control of event requests at all stages leading to quicker and more reliable payment.

Mr Bramer reported that internal work within IFIP will start after this General Assembly. An outside company will start their work in 2011. The test system should be ready in February 2012. The System should go live after final approval of the Board in March 2012. The estimated cost would be maximum Euro 10K, to be added to the Budget 2012.

Mr Hinchey reported that TA welcomed the proposal of a web-based event approval system which will offer several benefits both to conference organizers and IFIP in general. Such a system has to be flexible enough to support the preferred and established ways of collaboration between the involved partners without additional overhead.

Mr Strous pointed out that this proposal is linked to the new Event Approval Procedure in the Bylaws. He referred to the discussion under agenda item 4.6 and was happy to note that the decision taken for that issue helped in not delaying the start of work on the web based form.

General Assembly APPROVED the proposal.

3.11 Statutes & Bylaws

This agenda item was reserved for summarizing the discussions on Statutes & Bylaws and agreeing on revised texts following the outcome of agenda item 5. No need to address S&B here because everything was covered under item 5.

3.12 Publications

Agenda items 12.1 Digital Library (TF DL), 12.2 TA on publications and 12.3 Publications Committee (PC) were discussed combined.

The Chair of the Publications Committee, Mr Turner, reported about the achievements within the last year:

1. Revision and update of the IFIP Digital Library
Obtaining timely information on IFIP publications by Springer has progressed much too slowly since the transition to Springer Heidelberg. No metadata since 2009 has yet been received, and until recently no progress had been made on establishing an ftp site or similar mechanism that would allow metadata and links to full text in SpringerLink to be added to the IFIP Digital Library as soon as the text is available in SpringerLink.

The current status of the DL is that it contains metadata for IFIP publications by Springer, plus some from Kluwer, through most of 2009, including links to the full text in SpringerLink. That is, all of the metadata that has been received from Springer has been put into the DL. Additionally, LNCS data is now included, and metadata and links to SpringerLink for all IFIP LNCS publications from late 2009 back to 1975 are included in the DL. Unfortunately, metadata is available for only some volumes of IFIP AICT (formerly the IFIP Main Series) prior to 2005, and the earliest AICT entry in the DL was published in 2001. The total numbers of volumes (i.e., proceedings) currently listed in the DL are 176 for AICT and 126 for IFIP LNCS.

As previously reported, the new format used for the 2009 data was significantly different from the old formats used by Springer Boston/Norwell, and this required the development of new procedures to process the data efficiently. Additionally, it was decided to use a different DL organization, separating the AICT and LNCS series and listing the volumes in order of the volume/issue number. Finally, the 2009 data files received from Springer included everything in SpringerLink up through 2009, duplicating much of what was already in the DL while providing new data on not only the 2009 publications but some pre-2005 publications as well. Processing the duplicate information also caused some delay. So the effort to add the 2009 data has resulted in considerably more work than was originally envisioned.

The main problem with the DL currently is that the author-submitted versions of papers published prior to three years ago have not been loaded into the DL and linked to the metadata. Although this was specified in the agreement with the ACS for the DL, it has not been done because of three main factors. First, a decision was made by the original DL implementors not to load any full text author files into the DL until access to the files was permitted by Springer. Final agreement with Springer was not clarified until September 2010. In the meantime, management of the DL had been shifted from the original group at a university in Australia into ACS headquarters, and the requirement regarding the author files was not communicated to the new management group with the other requirements for the DL. When the current management group began to work to correct the problem, it was discovered that there was no way to even partially automate the process because there is no consistency in the naming or formats of the files before 2009. Thus it appears that the more than 160 volumes involved (approximately 4500 papers) will have to be processed manually. Efforts continue to find a reasonable solution to this problem.

There were no current electronic-only publications submitted for the DL in 2009 or 2010. There were three e-only publications in 2008. An electronic publication that is out of print and not available from any source has been submitted and will be added as soon as normal DL operations resume.

There was some discussion earlier in 2011 as to whether there was interest by the ACS in continuing to provide the DL. Following a change in administrative leadership, the ACS has indicated that it will continue to provide the service until IFIP arranges to transition to another provider.
2. Revision of copyright form
Mr Turner reported that a revised copyright form has been developed by the IFIP Publications Committee and Springer. This form is now on the web as the form to be used for all IFIP AICT and IFIP LNCS publications. The form is much easier to use than previously, allowing editors to insert the series and title information before sending the form to authors, is much easier to understand, and clarifies the rights of authors.

3. Initial approval for a new TC-11 journal
Mr Turner reported that the PC recommended approval, and the Executive Committee followed the recommendation and approved an initial proposal for a new TC-11 journal on trust management. The next step is for the proposers to submit a full proposal, including publisher proposals.

4. MS proposal to republish selected papers from IFIP publications
Mr Turner reported that an IFIP Member Society has proposed that it will select up to two papers annually from IFIP publications and republish the papers in publications of the member society. There would be no cost to IFIP, and no payment by the society was proposed. The possibilities regarding such proposals have been requested from Springer, and we are waiting for a response from Springer.

Mr Turner informed General Assembly about plans and ongoing work in Publications Committee:

1. Continued development of the DL
Mr Turner said that the primary priority of the Publications Committee is to make the DL current and useful. Efforts will continue to complete procedures for a timely flow of information from Springer through IFIP to the ACS DL management team, to have the DL updated in an efficient and timely manner, and to include the author full text submissions in the DL when permitted. The committee will continue to evaluate the process to determine whether we should seek an alternative way to establish and maintain our DL.

Mr Turner reminded that it remains essential that a financial model be developed for sustaining the operation of the DL. The IFIP general budget cannot sustain providing full payment for the DL operation.

Mr Turner showed the current total cost of the DL. These costs do not include the addition of the LNCS entries nor the 2009 AICT entries to the DL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 2008</td>
<td>€ 8,725.00</td>
<td>Initial data loading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2009</td>
<td>€ 19,000.00</td>
<td>Loading 2007 data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2010</td>
<td>€ 20,475.00</td>
<td>Loading backfiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2010</td>
<td>€ 27,275.00</td>
<td>Loading 2008 data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>€ 75,475.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Development of a policy on plagiarism
The intention remains to complete a recommended policy on plagiarism. There is an effort within TA to provide guidelines for conduct for authors and reviewers. Once
these receive TA approval, the Publications Committee will recommend changes to IFIP policies to support the guidelines.

3. **Development of AICT**
   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-series to distinguish between different types of events and publications.

4. **New TC-11 journal**
   Action will be taken if a full proposal for the new TC-11 journal is submitted.

5. **Request to republish selected papers**
   Depending on the response and following negotiations with Springer, the Publications Committee will recommend general guidelines for such proposals.

Mr Turner presented observations made by the Publications Committee regarding the royalties from publications:
- The decline in royalties may be leveling off
- Factors for the declines include:
  - Decline in sales as downloads become available (2004-2005)
  - 2005 contract reduced bulk sales price (and hence royalties) (Main Series)
  - Reduction in royalties for LNCS in 2009
- The current (2010) contract royalty calculation appears to have been effective in reducing/eliminating further decline (The revised royalty calculation became effective in mid-2009.)
- Additionally, conferences have benefited from receiving 48 free copies of proceedings published by Springer.

General Assembly ACCEPTED the report.

Mr Hinchey reported that TA fully supports the Digital Library but needs to know more of the plans for further roll-out, support, financing and long-term maintenance. Several other libraries are in existence, the infrastructure of which may afford IFIP a means of cost-reduction on the library. However the intellectual heritage of IFIP generated from the events over 50 years (with many of their topics not covered elsewhere) needs to be preserved.

Mr Strous informed GA that at the Board 2011 meeting it was agreed that a task force would be establish that should investigate and report on models for sustaining the operation of the DL. Issues like background and history of the IFIP DL, the capabilities needed and desired in the IFIP DL and alternatives for DL providers, including pros and cons for each would be addressed by this Task Force (to be noted that the term “provider” may refer to a means of obtaining and maintaining an IFIP DL, and not necessarily to an entity for producing and maintaining the DL).

Mr Strous regretted that no volunteers had been found to take up this task. He made an appeal to the GA members to help in this investigation. Mr Leduc and Mr Rannenberg volunteered to be the Task Force and Mr Turner would be the link with the Publications Committee. A first report is expected for the Board 2012 meeting.
3.13 Standing Committee Reports

3.13.1 Activity Management Board (AMB)

Mr Dundler reported from the AMB that presently there are only two members at the AMB, Max Bramer and the General Secretary; due to this lack of members no pro-active work has been performed during the last year. The AMB reduced its work monitoring the administrative aspects of all planned activities of Technical Committees and Working Groups.

Mr Dundler informed General Assembly that AMB in a short analysis noted that the number of events was in the same range as the last years. The income from the event fees was also stable (nearly 60,000 EUR each year) with the exception of 2007 and 2010, where the fee from the WCCE was received in addition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nbr events (main)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nbr events (co-sponsored)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event fee received</td>
<td>59,297</td>
<td>94,585</td>
<td>57,079</td>
<td>55,608</td>
<td>71,009</td>
<td>24,911</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As there is no income from most of the co-sponsored events, AMB asked Finance Committee and Technical Assembly to come up with a finance model for events with inclusion of the co-sponsored events (where work of IFIP volunteers is also included).

Mr Dundler informed GA about ongoing work and plans for the coming year:
- Establishing a charter for AMB and finding members for AMB
- Event Request Approval System (together with TF Website)
- Policy for MoUs for Co-sponsoring
- Event Fee Structure (in cooperation with TA and President)

General Assembly ACCEPTED the report.

3.13.2 Admissions Committee (AC)

In absence of the Chair of the Admissions Committee, Mr Avram informed GA that the Admissions Committee had received four proposals / applications. These included two applications for Full Membership. The representatives of these two applicants were given the opportunity to present their societies.

Mr Grebennik from the Ukrainian Federation of Informatics (UFI) gave a presentation about UFI and showed that UFI has 40 universities and research institutes as collective members and 1174 individual members. UFI is structured in 16 regional organisations; each regional organisation units individual members of the region (10 – 30 persons); each university-collective UFI member has a group of employees and students (20 – 40 persons) which are working in UFI; some individual
UFI members (50 persons) represent regions in Ukraine which have not regional UFI organisations.

**Mr Faldamis** (President of HePIS) and **Mr Nicolaides** (Vice President of HePIS) gave a short presentation of the Hellenic Professionals Informatics Society (HePIS) as a non-profit organization which has been established in Greece and which aims at meeting the expectations of both professionals and scientists in the field of Information & Communications Technologies (ICT). HePIS has 300 active ICT professional members, while its network expands to a number of 1,000 individual members. HePIS closely cooperates with governmental and non-governmental organizations, academia, NGOs, the private and the public sector and computer societies. One of HePIS strategic objectives, is to establish a mutual assistance network with other computer societies and organizations, on a global scale with a view to encourage collaboration on issues that interest professionals and academics in the field of Informatics, Communications and New Technologies offering support on a regular basis.

**Mr Avram** informed General Assembly that the IFIP Admissions Committee had reviewed the provided material from UFI and concluded that the organization, serving approximately 1100 individual members, demonstrated ties to both government and academic bodies and showed an outstanding record for research and planning. The IFIP Admissions Committee unanimously recommended IFIP full membership for UFI.

General Assembly ACCEPTED the Ukrainian Federation of Informatics (UFI) as new IFIP Full Member with 34 votes in favour, 2 votes against and no abstentions.

**Mr Avram** informed General Assembly that in late July the IFIP Admissions Committee received the application from HePIS for full membership in IFIP. The application was circulated to the Committee, and the material submitted documenting the organization of the society, the background of the leadership was reviewed. The organization serves approximately 1300 professional and associate members, and also represents Greece in CEPIS and several other organizations.

Because of time constraints not all members of the Admissions Committee had been able to respond to the chair in time (recommendations for membership must be sent to GA 40 days before the meeting). The members that did respond, forming a majority of the IFIP Admissions Committee, recommended IFIP full membership for HePIS.

General Assembly ACCEPTED HePIS as new IFIP Full Member with 34 votes in favour, 1 vote against and 1 abstention.

**Mr Avram** reported that ICT Switzerland, the current IFIP member society is an umbrella organization of twenty-four societies, and SI (Swiss Informatics Society), one of the members of ICT Switzerland, have requested that the IFIP membership be transferred to SI. The reason for the change is based on SI having a more direct interest in the areas of interest of IFIP. As SI will remain a member of ICT Switzerland an indirect connection will remain.

Having checked the request and criteria in S&B, the IFIP Admissions Committee unanimously recommends that the IFIP General Assembly approve the transfer.
General Assembly unanimously APPROVED the transfer of membership.

Mr Avram reported that a proposal for an IFIP Honorary Membership has been submitted for Mr Brunnstein. The nomination documents the more than thirty-five years of outstanding service that he has dedicated to IFIP. It is the unanimous recommendation of the IFIP Admissions Committee that the IFIP General Assembly approve the conferral of Honorary Membership on Mr Brunnstein.

General Assembly unanimously APPROVED the conferral of Honorary Membership on Mr Brunnstein and congratulated him.

Mr Brunnstein, who had already indicated some time ago that this would be his last GA as representative for GI, thanked GA for the honour and expressed his willingness to keep serving IFIP, not in the last place as one of IFIP’s historians but now also as Honorary Member. He then introduced to General Assembly his successor as German GA representative Mr Rammig.

3.13.3 Developing Countries Support Committee (DCSC)

Mr Puigjaner presented the report of the Developing Countries Support Committee and said that the committee is composed of the chairmen of the two WGs especially dedicated to Developing Countries and a representative of each continent with an important proportion of developing countries.

Mr Puigjaner reported that DCSC has decided to restrict its activities to fund activities developed by WGs as a consequence of the drastic reduction of the budget allocated to this committee from 20,000 Euros to 6,000 Euros. The criteria for funds allocations are:
- activities proposed by the WGs 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 in countries different to the one of their residence.

The money has been used to fund PhD students from developing countries to attend events of two working groups and tutorialists to support teaching activities in a developing country by another working group.

Mr Puigjaner informed General Assembly that in late 2010, Prof. Siraj Shaikh proposed to IFIP to join a network oriented to the networking in developing countries (RESISD). Given the objective of the network, the Executive Committee had decided to join this effort. The proposal was submitted for funding in the UK but unfortunately the proposal has not been accepted.

3.13.4 International Liaison Committee (ILC)

The Chair of the International Liaison Committee, Mr von Solms reported on the activities of the ILC. All members of the ILC had a large number of meetings on all levels in UNESCO and its related Institute for Information Technologies in Education (IITE), ITU, UNCTAD, World Digital Solidarity Agency and others. For an overview
see the ILC report. Members of the ILC are also in some cases members of governing bodies on behalf of IFIP in such groups. And they are participating in activities like WSIS Forums. All these meetings and the involvement of the volunteers increased IFIP’s visibility and reputation.

One particular meeting and initiative was brought to the attention of GA. Not because this was more important than the others but because it revealed a weak spot in IFIP with respect to the ambitions to increase relationships with the above-mentioned IUN bodies and involvement in their activities, in particular IFIP’s desire to be asked for advise. Mr von Solms informed General Assembly that he was invited in May 2011 by the ITU to take part as a session moderator, in the Fourth Parliamentary Forum on Shaping the Information Society – The Triple Challenge of Cyber-Security: Information, Citizens and Infrastructure. During that visit he was invited by the Secretary-General of ITU to attend a meeting on Digital Object Architectures (DOA). At this meeting IFIP was requested to identify experts within IFIP who can work with the ITU on projects in the DOA area. IFIP’s Executive Committee gave its approval for the request and it was sent to all TC and WG Chairs. Unfortunately, no reaction was received from any such expert in IFIP. The matter is still open.

3.13.5 Internal Awards Committee (IAC)

Mr Pries-Heje presented the report of the Internal Awards Committee. The Internal Awards Committee published a call for nominations to all relevant parties within IFIP on 29 June 2011. This year (2011) there was only a call for nominations for the Outstanding Service Award (OSA). By the deadline 31 July 2011 six nominations had been received.

Based on the received nominations and after careful consideration the Internal Awards Committee recommended the following six persons for the IFIP Outstanding Service Award (OSA):
- Prof. Miklos Biro
- Prof. Ernesto Damiani,
- Prof. Julia Lawall
- Prof. Jerzy Nawrocki.
- Dr. Rick Schlichting
- Prof. Rogério Atem de Carvalho

General Assembly APPROVED the Outstanding Service Award for the six nominees and congratulated them with this recognition of their contributions to IFIP.

3.13.6 Marketing Committee (MC)

Mr Sawhney presented the report of the Marketing Committee and said that a rethinking of the major issues of IFIP, like membership, events, income stream and IP3 is necessary and has been already started since last GA in Brisbane.

Mr Sawhney reminded GA that new geographies and new constituencies force IFIP to react in a short time frame. Specific geographies have to be identified and visited. There is a need for a Global Advisory Board for IFIP’s President in order to align
IFIP’s focus to market needs and to invite leaders representing above constituencies. With the new membership model new constituencies have to be attracted.

Mr Sawhney informed General Assembly about the major marketing tasks, like marketing IFIP’s major events World Computer Congress and WITFOR. Marketing Committee sees also the necessity to increase IFIP’s income from existing offerings, as there are events and royalties from publications.

Mr Sawhney said that in his opinion the best way to market IFIP can only be done by all the different groups within IFIP, as there are
- the TCs and Working Groups
- the President and the Executive Committee Members
- the General Secretary
- the IFIP Secretariat
- the GA members
- all Member Societies.

Mr Sawhney said that the effectiveness of a stand-alone Marketing Committee is not as big as IFIP had hoped for some years ago. With the above statement about marketing being part of the work of all groups in IFIP in mind, he proposed to General Assembly to dissolve the Marketing Committee and to encourage the Executive Committee to find new ways. All the work can be transferred to the above mentioned groups of IFIP.

Mr Strous fully supported the proposal of Mr Sawhney.

General Assembly unanimously APPROVED the proposal.

3.13.7 Member Society Relations Committee (MSRC)

Mr Strous informed General Assembly that the Chair of the MSRC had to resign, because the New Zealand Computer Society had assigned a new GA representative. He thanked Mr Robertson for his work for the MSRC.

Mr Strous informed General Assembly that in his view, similar to the Marketing Committee, the MSRC as a stand-alone committee charged with increasing the relationship with and between member societies despite many attempts and different approaches has not been as successful as was hoped for. He feels that direct contacts with Member Societies and prospective Member Societies are much more effective.

Mr Strous therefore proposed to General Assembly to dissolve the Member Society Relations Committee and to ask IFIP’s Executive Committee to find new ways to increase contacts with its member societies.

General Assembly ACCEPTED the proposal with 1 abstention and none against.

3.13.7.1 CEPIS
Mr Brady reported that CEPIS has presently 36 Member Societies from 33 countries. CEPIS’s focus is on IT Skills, Professionalism, Education and Research, Women in IT, and Green IT.

The major activities of CEPIS are in:
- IT Skills Certifications
- Taking an active part in the European Union (CEN/ISSS, Euro-Inf, EQANIE, ECWT, European e-Skills Association)
- Publications of Reports and Position Statements
- Workshops, like e-Skills Pro
- SINS (LSI and Software Quality)
- Projects, like Professional e-Competence in Europe and European Professional Framework

Mr Brady informed General Assembly that aims of the “Professional e-Competence in Europe” projects are to provide a picture of the competences of ICT practitioners in Europe; to promote and to raise awareness of the European e-Competence framework; to work towards developing a pan-European vision of professionalism. In an online survey disseminated in greater Europe 2.000 respondents out of 28 countries participated.

National reports and the European report can be found at http://www.cepis.org/professionalecompetence.
The survey can be found at http://ecompetence.cepis.org.

Mr Brady informed General Assembly in more detail about the European Professional Framework which has the goal of enhancing ICT professionalism and mobility across Europe. A European Training Programme for ICT Managers has to be developed in order to promote new competencies to better address the future challenges of ICT driven innovation. Target groups are ICT Practitioners and ICT Managers.

The project is split into two phases. Phase one is for understanding the environment and includes research and interviews to produce state of play report. In phase two detailed proposals will be generated for validation, promotion and refinement of Framework based on research. The Interviews addressed in phase one the need for, and structure of an ICT Professionalism Framework; impact of certification programmes on job mobility and career development; how competence frameworks can be used to develop ICT Professionalism; what training or education is best to develop the future CIO / IT Manager; ethical considerations for an ICT profession and current Bodies of Knowledge (BoK) in use.

An interim report has been approved by the European Commission. It will be published shortly.

Mr Brady said that phase two is starting.

3.13.7.2 IMIA

Mr Strous informed General Assembly that the IMIA representative, Mr Takeda, has sent his apologies. Mr Strous was pleased to inform IFIP GA on behalf of Mr Takeda that the IMIA GA in its September meeting responded very positive to Mr Takeda’s report on the first joint IMIA – IFIP conference on e-Health as part of WCC 2010 in
Brisbane. IMIA expressed a formal interest in following up on this success with a second joint event during WCC 2012 in Amsterdam. The IPC chair of WCC 2012 and the IFIP President will follow up on this with IMIA.

3.13.7.3 SEARCC

Mr Wong, the President of SEARCC presented the report from SEARCC. He reported that SEARCC has currently 7 members; four of them are also IFIP members.

Mr Wong informed GA that the SEARCC’2011 Convention under the title "Collaboration for Inclusive Growth" takes place on December 12 – 13, 2011 in Mumbai, India hosted by Computer Society of India (CSI). The Organizing Committee is chaired by MD Agrawal (President CSI). See [www.searcc-2011.org](http://www.searcc-2011.org).

Mr Wong informed General Assembly that the ISSC 2011 (International Schools Software Competition) will take place October 27th – 30th, 2011 in Chennai, India hosted by Computer Society of India (CSI). The Organizing Committee is chaired by Prof Trimurthy (Former President CSI).

Mr Wong reported that SEARCC started revisiting the strategic direction, objectives and activities to better serve the Asia Pacific region. This is of relevance, because IFIP and SEARCC will only be as strong as its individual members. He said that we must consider our stakeholders, activities and how we could best achieve our objectives today and tomorrow in a sustainable manner.

Mr Wong explained to General Assembly that sharing best practices - methodology, systems and processes for the benefit of developing countries is necessary. He explained to GA a project proposal from SEARCC. The project is aimed at assisting computer societies in strengthening their own society, increasing their position in their countries and in that way also increasing their abilities to join the international community and be active. Starting in the South East Asian region, the approach could also be applied to other regions. He recommended that IFIP through the DCSC supports the SEARCC Sharing best practices initiative by initially investing USD 10,000.

Mr Strous proposed to share this project in order to learn from each other by sharing best practice.

Mr Tjoa suggested that if a country enters SEARCC it should be linked that it also enters IFIP.

General Assembly DECIDED to support the SEARCC proposal with 10,000 USD.

3.14 Technical Assembly

Parts of the TA report have been discussed under agenda items 6 and 12.2. Other issues of TA are reported here.
Author and Referee Codes of Conduct

Mr Hinchey reported that TA was glad to receive the draft Codes of Conduct for both Authors and Referees, prepared primarily by Bertrand Meyer with input from members of TA. TA believed that the definitions of plagiarism and self-plagiarism and the description of those behaviours that are and are not allowed are highly appropriate. However, the legal ramification of two of the proposed sanctions may leave IFIP open to liability. Namely, reporting the offence to a violator’s supervisor or to the larger community, could well lead to legal action. Therefore TA proposed to avoid these extreme sanctions altogether or at least to ensure that it is clear they are imposed only in the most egregious situations and only with approval from IFIP (and not imposed by event organizers).

Transversal Activities

Mr Hinchey reported that TA noted the letter from the President that highlights opportunities for collaboration with AGORA/MATURE and encourages such transversal activities.

Working Groups

Mr Hinchey reported that Technical Assembly APPROVED:

- the creation of a new joint WG between TC-2, TC-6 and TC-8 (WG 2.14/6.12/8.10 on Services-Oriented Systems), replacing the existing joint SIG on Services in IT between TC-6 and TC-8 and satisfying TC-2’s desire for a WG in this area.
- the dissolution of WG-6.7 (Smart Networks) following 4 years of inactivity despite attempts to replace WG officers and re-invigorate the WG.
- the dissolution of WG-8.8 (Smart Cards) which was requested previously. No further progress in rectifying the situation has been made in the last year, in spite of efforts by the President.
- the change of name of WG-11.3 from Data and Application Security to Data and Application Security and Privacy, to be consistent with the name of the TC and also of WG11.3’s main event.
- the creation of WG-12.9 on Computational Intelligence, which raises the importance of several topics within the Artificial Intelligence community in TC-12.

General Assembly ACCEPTED the report.

3.15 Congresses and Major Events

3.15.1 WCC 2010

Mr Brunnstein reported that the IFIP World Computer Congress 2010, held September 20-23, 2010 in Brisbane, Australia at the Brisbane Convention and Exhibition Center, was a very successful event, both in view of the diversity and richness of IFIP conferences and numbers of participants. Due to special circumstances, IFIP WCC 2010 had significant financial problems which affected both the Australian Computer Society (suffering from a significant loss) and IFIP (which could not receive its guarantee sum, following contractual agreement).
IFIP World Computer Congress 2010 offered a wide variety of ICT related themes, organised by several IFIP Technical Committees and Working Groups. In addition the Australian Computer Society, host of IFIP WCC 2010, organised 7 more events, including a conference of the South East Asia Regional Computer Confederation (SEARCC) and a conference organised by IFIP's IP3 project.

Following initial suggestions, both IFIP and ACS events were organised in 8 streams to allow interoperation between related conferences with a total of almost 700 presentations. While participants registered for IFIP events used the opportunity also to visit non-IFIP events, the degree of interoperation between IFIP and non-IFIP events was below expectation.

Under the editorial supervision of Mike Hinchey, IFIP’s publisher Springer published 330 papers presented at various conferences in 13 volumes, some jointly in one volume.

Mr Brunnstein reported that IFIP WCC 2010 attracted more than 1250 participants, about 900 for IFIP events and about 350 for non-IFIP events. The figures of the organising company indicate that 2/3 were full-time participants, with significant numbers of 1-day participants and also with “complimentary” tickets. According to this report, about 60% came from Australia. In summary, IFIP World Computer Congress 2010 and the associated events was very successful. Regrettably, some parts of the world – especially including North America – were less engaged.

Mr Brunnstein presented an extract from the provisional financial report from ACS:

Income from Conferences: 1,140 k AU$
Income from Exhibition: 37 k AU$
Conference Expenses: -1,546 k AU$
Exhibition Expenses: -68 k AU$

Result: -436 k AU$

--> Contracted IFIP guarantee 0 k AU$

The reason for this negative financial outcome is essentially due to problems in winning major sponsorship from the Australian government, whereas the government of Queensland made significant contributions, and some major companies, against original plans presented at application. Moreover, expenses in the initial stage were significantly larger than planned. When Anthony Wong, new ACS president started his term in early 2010, supported by CEO Bruce Lakin, a large financial gap was detected. Consequently, the newly appointed OC chair Nick Tate succeeded, to significantly reduce the expected deficit.

Mr Brunnstein thanked especially Mr Basie von Solms for his personal engagement to minimise the risks and problems in the fore field of WCC 2010.
3.15.2 IFIP Golden Jubilee

Mr Brunnstein reported that major activities remembering the 50th anniversary of IFIP were organised during IFIP World Computer Congress 2010 in Brisbane, Australia.

For presentation in the opening session of IFIP WCC 2010, a video interview was prepared with Professor Maurice Wilkes, who represented the British Computer Society during the IFIP foundation meeting (first IFIP Council) in Rome, under the chairmanship of IFIPs first president Isaac L. Auerbach. Moreover, another video interview was prepared with Professor Heinz Zemanek, who was charged during the IFIP foundation meeting in Rome to organize - as its 1st chair - IFIP TC-2 “Programming Languages” (now: “Software: Theory and Practice”). As it was regrettably not possible to include these interviews in the Opening Session, both videos were presented during the Gala Dinner, which also included a short presidential appreciation of IFIPs 50th anniversary, as well as delivering the Auerbach Award to past Honorary Treasurer Prof. Dipak Khakhar for his work in IFIP, esp. related to the establishment of the WITFOR conference series.

To remember the development of Information and Communication Technologies, a specialist group collected historical artefacts, including even some mechanical “computing” devices from the 19th and 20th centuries, as well as some historical computers and special devices used in Australia. Plans to import a valuable model of an early Zuse computer, which seemed adequate in the memory of Konrad Zuse in the year of his 100th anniversary, could not be realized due to excessive insurance costs. The artefacts were presented in an exhibition booth which was named “Gunyah” after an Australian aboriginal dwelling; the exhibition was accompanied by a well prepared booklet describing those artefacts as well as including some information about IFIP.

Mr Brunnstein reported that related to the series of 3 previous books, published at specific years of IFIPs development (after 10, 25 and 36 years, all edited by Heinz Zemanek), another major project was to summarize the State-of-IFIP in a 4th book: “50 Years of IFIP”. After some period of interaction between editors and some authors (longer than planned and expected), some technical problems in preparing the print copy could finally be solved as Springer’s Mrs. Siebert-Cole offered to assist in checking and producing the final print copy as well as the chapters for the web presentation on IFIP’s website and Digital Library in the quality of IFIP’s AICT series. The book was printed in Hungary, with kind support by Ms Raffai, and distributed to IFIP Member Societies, authors and TC Chairs in March 2011, and it was published on the IFIP website, with corrections published in June 2011.

Mr Brunnstein thanked the authors, Mr Eduard Dundler and Springer’s Mrs. Siebert-Cole for their support.

Mr Strous thanked Mr Brunnstein for his engagement and his outstanding work for the World Computer Congress and IFIP’s Golden Jubilee. He handed an IFIP Trophy over to Mr Brunnstein in recognition of his long lasting and excellent work for IFIP.
3.15.3 WCF 2011

Ms Zhang and Mr Lin, both from the Chinese Member Society, presented the report about the World CIO Forum 2011. Ms Zhang informed GA about the committees involved in WCF. The Ministry of Industry and Information Technology of China has given official approval to CIE hosting IFIP World CIO Forum. WCF 2011 will take place at the Shenzhen Wuzhou Guest House which is built according to five-star hotel standards and well located.

Mr Lin reported that the registration is open since August this year. It includes program selection, hotel reservation, shuttle service and payment information. The standard registration fee is 800 USD.

Mr Strous thanked Mr Lin and Ms Zhang for their report and for their huge efforts to make WCF 2011 a success. He is looking forward to attend this new type of event for IFIP and encourages all GA members to promote the event quickly and also to consider participation themselves.

3.15.4 WITFOR 2011

Mr Sawhney reported that WITFOR 2012 will be held in New Delhi, India in April, 2012 with 4 parallel themes of Agriculture, Education, Health, E-Government / Governance, under the overarching theme of ‘Sustainable Human Development’.

Mr Sawhney said that he is excited about WITFOR taking place in April 2012 in India, because of the unique opportunity to combine the ICT expertise for which India is known, with the need for more and better implementations of ICT for many people in this developing country.

Participation of the respective government ministries and specialist organizations in the domains of the themes is essential. The overall program co-chairs are Professor S.V. Raghavan (Scientific Secretary in the Office of the Principal Scientific Adviser to the Government of India and long-time involvement in TC-6) and Professor Chrisanthi Avgerou (London School of Economics, Past Chair of TC-9 and the DCSC and involved in previous WITFOR events). They are co-chairing the overall program committee of around 25 persons. Members are among others the chairs and vice-chairs of the eight WITFOR Commissions that have been the driving forces for all WITFORs so far.

The Department of IT, Ministry of Communications and Information Technology has committed to support WITFOR 2012 as the Nodal Ministry of the Government of India, providing Institutional support and book the conference venue for inviting the Prime Minister and other dignitaries. The IT Secretary has agreed to be Co-Chair of the International Steering Committee and Joint Secretary, E-Governance, Ministry of IT has agreed to head the Theme Program Committee on ICT in E-Governance. These arrangements are likely to be documented later this month.

Mr Sawhney reported that it has been agreed to appoint 9.9 Media, a Media House in New Delhi, as the Professional Conference partner for WITFOR 2012, to help in a number of ways, like attracting high level speakers, taking care of organizational / logistic issues and acquiring sponsors.
Mr Sawhney said that in November and December meetings with the International Program Committee, with the organizers and with other stakeholders (like ministries) are scheduled.

Mr Strous commented that each WITFOR requires different approaches and faces different challenges because of the differences in host countries. He is looking forward to a successful WITFOR 2012 and thanked Mr Sawhney for all his efforts so far.

3.15.5 WCC 2012

Mr von Solms, General Conference Chairman and Chairman of the International Program Committee of WCC 2012 reported that IFIP’s General Assembly has agreed to accept the invitation form IFIP’s Dutch member, the NGI, to host the IFIP WCC 2012 in Amsterdam in September 2012.

Mr von Solms informed General Assembly that the IPC was constituted by inviting interested persons from identified stakeholder communities:

a. 5 members appointed by IFIP Technical Assembly (TA) (to represent the TCs and WGs);

b. 5 members appointed by IFIP General Assembly (GA) (to represent the member societies);

c. 3 members appointed by NGI;

d. 1 member appointed by IFIP IP3 (professionalism partnership);

e. 1 member appointed by IFIP InterYIT (representing the young IT professionals);

f. 3 members from industry /associations), appointed by the Board of the IT Knowledge Development Foundation

g. 3 members from government / UN bodies, appointed by the Board of the Foundation;

h. 4 members appointed by the IPC chair.

Mr von Solms reported that the IPC has been active for the last 3 months in identifying conference topics, streams, speakers and structure. Good progress has been made along the lines defined by the original document submitted to GA. He informed General Assembly that the IPC meeting which will take place on October 7th–8th, 2011 in Amsterdam will provide much more direction and more clarity about the structure, topics and speakers.

Mr von Solms invited all GA members to contact him (basievs@uj.ac.za) with any suggestions, proposals etc.

Mr Strous presented the report of Mr Fons de Breet, the Chair of the Local Organising Committee of WCC 2012 and said that after the approval of the bid of NGI, the real work for the Local Organizing Committee (LOC) has started. From March 2011 onwards the chairman of LOC with support from the other members of the Steering Committee has contacted several experienced and/or enthusiastic IT-professionals to participate in one or more roles in the LOC. There is now a mixture of very experienced members but also a couple of young IT-professionals. The LOC is responsible for organizing WCC 2012 as an event in Amsterdam in 2012.
professional congress organizer has been hired for the administrative and logistic support.

Mr Strous informed GA that monthly meetings of the Steering Committee are held and many more meetings of the LOC and subcommittees. One key task is acquiring sponsors and that is difficult during the summer holiday season. This activity will increase from September onwards. He invited the GA members to regularly check the www.wcc-2012.org website for progress.

3.15.6 WCCE 2013

Mr Morel presented shortly the report from the World Computer Conference in Education 2013 (WCCE 2013).

The 10th IFIP World Conference on Computers in Education, 2013 will be organized in Toruń, Poland in July 2nd – 5th, 2013. The main theme of the conference is: “learning while we are connected”. The conference will be hosted by the Nicolaus Copernicus University of Toruń.

The conference themes include
- Changing pedagogy: formative assessment, teacher role, student role, e-assessment, shared pedagogy, e-pedagogy
- Emerging tools for education: wiki, blog, social networking, micro-blog , Web 2.0, Web 3.0, mobile technologies
- Learning 3.0 vs. digital pedagogy: collaborative, adaptive, personalised, AI, learner centred, e-participation
- Developing computational thinking: learning programming, programming environments, visualisation of algorithms, modelling, simulation, informatics / computing curricula, understanding computing, taxonomy of computing
- Attracting students to learn sciences: interactive learning, collaborative investigations, team work, virtual laboratories, online experiments
- Re-engineering teacher education: new teacher roles, professional development, pre-service education, peer learning, practices research
- Collaborative learning communities: online, social networking
- Researching ICT in education: new research approaches , new methods, innovative strategies , new models, complex systems , inquiry learning
- Learning through games and simulation: online gaming, contests, competitions, serious games, science simulations
- e-Inclusion and e-Participation: special educational needs, gender issues,
- Virtual schooling: learning objects, distance learning, curriculum integration, mentoring, evaluation issues, teacher collaboration, PLE, lifelong learning,
- Re-structuring education systems versus Management of Complexity 2.0: policy, e-safety, restructuring classrooms , learning spaces, change theories

3.15.7 WITFOR 2013

Mr Puigjaner reported that after the sequence of Europe, Africa and Asia, the EC considered that the next two WITFOR events should take place in Latin America, one in South America and another in Central America. A careful selection process had resulted in the list of possible candidates being reduced to Paraguay, Perú and
Uruguay (in alphabetical order). In October 2010, this idea was presented at the CLEI (Conferencia Latinaomericana de Estudios en Informática) Board in its meeting held in Asunción (Paraguay) and was unanimously accepted and considered as very interesting and important for Latin America. The choice of the possible countries was considered as appropriate.

Requested by the IFIP President, Ramon Puigjaner made in February 2011 an exploratory visit to Paraguay in order to estimate the interest of this country in organizing WITFOR 2013. During his visit he met:
- The President of the Commission for Sciences and Technologies of the Paraguay Parliament
- The President of the National Council of Science and Technology
- The advisor on Science and Technology of the Paraguay Republic President’s Cabinet.
- The Rector of the Universidad Nacional de Asunción

In the Board meeting held in Dublin early March it was agreed that Mr Strous and Mr Puigjaner will visit Asunción for a formal visit to the Paraguayan authorities in order to confirm the interest of them in the organization of WITFOR 2013 in Asunción. On July 13th – 15th, 2011, a number of meetings took place to discuss the possibility of organizing WITFOR 2013 in Paraguay. Also meetings with industry and academia took place to discuss their interest and willingness to participate.

Many meetings with many different groups of participants took place. The core team besides Mr Strous and Mr Puigjaner consisted of Prof. María Elena García (FP UNA) and Mr Nicolás Pereyra (Gabinete Civil) had meetings with the

- the Cabinet of the President of the Republic of Paraguay
- the National Council for Science and Technology CONACyT (Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología
- the Plan Director of the office is inside the Cabinet of the President of the Republic of Paraguay
- the Commission on Science and Technology
- the National University of Asuncion
- Itaipu, a company owned by the Paraguayan and Brazilian governments
- COPACO, the biggest telecom company of the country
- the Chamber of Commerce Commission on IT

Mr Puigjaner and Mr Strous found that there is a keen interest in hosting and organizing WITFOR 2013 in Paraguay from all parties that they have spoken with. All considered it of great importance and value for the country to host such an event. Although WITFOR is a global event, the focus obviously will be Latin America. Language is an issue, as a minimum there will have to be translation facilities for Spanish. The dates for WITFOR 2013 will have to be second half of June because of change in Parliament and Government in July and August, respectively. This planning is essential to get the commitment of the current government.

Mr Puigjaner informed General Assembly that the next steps will be to sign a formal agreement and setting up the program and organizing committees.
3.15.8 WITFOR General

Mr Strous briefly presented to General Assembly a template for the organisational structure of WITFORs. He said that organising a WITFOR conference is quite challenging each time due to the specific nature, mixture of stakeholders and involvement of governments of different countries, with different history, culture and rules.

WITFOR would benefit from having a consistent organizational approach in terms of committees and responsibilities. That helps in assigning the key positions to the right people in an early stage.

As part of the further work on revising and updating the Standing Orders, the plan is to take the Congress Guidelines as a starting point and draft separate guidelines for each type of flagship event. Part of these guidelines concerns the formal agreements / contracts with the government of the host country. The intention is to finalize the guidelines before the IFIP Board meeting in 2012.

General Assembly ACCEPTED the proposed template.

3.16 Future Meetings

Ms Raffai presented the schedule for the next meetings:

2011
Sep 9th, 2011 postGA EC meeting, Prague following the GA meeting

EC teleconference: at the beginning of December 2011

2012
Mar 1st, 2012 preBoard EC meeting in Budapest
March 2nd – Mar 3rd, 2012 Board meeting in Budapest hosted by John von Neumann CS (Hungary)
March 3rd, 2012 postBoard EC meeting in Budapest

EC teleconference: at the beginning of June 2012

Sep 27th, 2012 preGA EC meeting in Amsterdam
Sep 28th - 29th, 2012 GA meeting in Amsterdam hosted by Dutch CS, Amsterdam (Netherlands)
Sep 29th, 2012 postGA EC meeting in Amsterdam

EC teleconference at the beginning of December 2012

2013
March Board invitations are welcome
August /September GA invitations are welcome

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

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

The President declared the meeting closed.
4 ATTACHMENTS

4.1 Attachment 1: Auditor’s Report

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

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION FOR
INFORMATION PROCESSING

on the financial statements for the year ended 31st December 2010.

As auditors of your federation, we examined the accounts and the financial statements for the year ended 31st December 2010 in accordance with legal requirements. Our audit was performed in accordance with auditing standards promulgated by the profession. We confirm that we meet the legal requirements concerning professional qualification and independence.

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

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

Vienna, April 2011
CONSULTATIO
Wirtschaftsprüfung GmbH & Co KG
### 4.2 Attachment 2: Profit & Loss Statement (TREAS 4)

**Aug 17th, 2011**

**IFIP Profit / Loss Statement (TREAS 4)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues from Members</td>
<td>164.200</td>
<td>159.000</td>
<td>164.000</td>
<td>170.000</td>
<td>164.000</td>
<td>175.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return On Assets</td>
<td>4.874</td>
<td>1.843</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>7.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royalties from Publications</td>
<td>72.817</td>
<td>56.631</td>
<td>79.000</td>
<td>35.979</td>
<td>67.900</td>
<td>43.428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds from Activities</td>
<td>55.609</td>
<td>71.009</td>
<td>57.000</td>
<td>12.635</td>
<td>46.700</td>
<td>47.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congress Proceeds</td>
<td>25.800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25.000</td>
<td>9.160</td>
<td>9.160</td>
<td>40.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin.Secretariat</td>
<td>187.502</td>
<td>184.989</td>
<td>242.100</td>
<td>95.390</td>
<td>211.985</td>
<td>225.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin.Support</td>
<td>28.062</td>
<td>31.294</td>
<td>51.000</td>
<td>12.013</td>
<td>34.900</td>
<td>47.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Committees</td>
<td>82.176</td>
<td>54.155</td>
<td>96.050</td>
<td>14.817</td>
<td>61.250</td>
<td>90.824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCSC Supp to TC Events</td>
<td>3.235</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>4.652</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>6.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects</td>
<td>19.770</td>
<td>86.043</td>
<td>77.500</td>
<td>34.685</td>
<td>60.185</td>
<td>45.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events (WCC, WITFOR, CIO)</td>
<td>94.156</td>
<td>10.265</td>
<td>25.000</td>
<td>3.892</td>
<td>15.500</td>
<td>9.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return On Portfolio</td>
<td>371.734</td>
<td>140.815</td>
<td>18.000</td>
<td>161.781</td>
<td>125.000</td>
<td>21.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROFIT / LOSS</strong></td>
<td>280.688</td>
<td>61.552</td>
<td>-147.650</td>
<td>224.159</td>
<td>28.940</td>
<td>-90.818</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>