

Minutes of the Board Meeting Mar 7th - Mar 8th, 2009; Delhi, India

1	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	2
2	ACTION LIST	4
3	ATTENDANCE LIST	6
4	BOARD MEETING	7
4.1	Call Meeting to Order	7
4.2	Attendance and Apologies	7
4.3	Business Matters.....	7
4.3.1	Approval of Agenda	7
4.3.2	President's Report.....	7
4.3.3	Secretary's Report.....	9
4.3.4	EB Meeting Report.....	9
4.3.5	Treasurer's Report.....	10
4.3.6	Finance Committee Report.....	12
4.4	IFIP Strategy	13
4.4.1	General Strategic Matters.....	13
4.4.2	AGORA InitiativeS	14
4.5	Progress Reports Task Forces.....	15
4.5.1	Membership Task Force	15
4.5.2	Finance Task Force.....	16
4.5.3	Events Reporting Task Force	17
4.5.4	IFIP Foundation Task Force	17
4.5.5	CIO Forum Task Force	17
4.6	Congresses and Major Events	20
4.6.1	WCC 2008	20
4.6.2	WCC 2010 / Golden Jubilee	20
4.6.3	WCC 2012	22
4.6.4	WITFOR 2009	23
4.7	Projects	23
4.7.1	Professional Practice Programme (I3P)	23
4.7.2	Digital Library.....	25
4.8	Standing Committee Reports	25
4.8.1	Activity Management Board (AMB)	25
4.8.2	Developing Countries Support Committee (DCSC).....	27
4.8.3	International Liaison Committee (ILC).....	28
4.8.4	Marketing Committee (MC)	29
4.8.5	Member Society Relations Committee (MSRC)	30
4.8.6	Publications Committee (PC)	31
4.8.7	Technical Assembly.....	33
4.9	Future Meetings	36
4.10	AoB.....	36
4.11	Closing of Meeting.....	36
4.12	ANNEX 1: Publisher's Report.....	37

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

IFIP Board, March 2009 Delhi, India

- **Membership Issues:** During the meeting of the The Board it was reported that IFIP currently has 51 members (including Corresponding members). Russia rejoined IFIP as a Full member after a break in membership for some years. It was reported that the membership of Chile and Zambia ceased at the end of 2008. At the time of the meeting the following countries were two years in arrears with their subscription and will according to the statutes have no voting right at General Assembly 2009: Botswana, Canada and France.
- **Finances:** Board accepted the 2008 accounts for approval by General Assembly 2009. The financial performance of IFIP was generally in line with the 2008 budget except for a significant fall in the portfolio investments. Proper project accounting would have shown the deficit was due to investment in projects and not due to overheads or negative business operations.
The actual effect on IFIP's total reserves, of the market fall over 2008 is about 15%, because of the unusual large bank deposits during 2008.

- **Congresses:**

WCC 2010: The organisational work on WCC 2010 in Brisbane is on track. Due to strong involvement of TC Chairs 14 conferences have been suggested. A joint IMIA – IFIP event on “e-Health” is under discussion. The worldwide financial crisis forced the Australian exhibition site to cancel the plan to enlarge the exhibition space. This implies that large partner events will compete with IFIP events about space. OC is looking for possible solutions. Publication of Congress Proceedings as “green” publications, which would mean that there will be no printed proceedings, is under discussion.

IFIP Golden Jubilee: Mr Ashley Goldworthy has accepted the task to organize an “IFIP Pioneer Day”. Mr Heinz Zemanek has agreed to work with Mr Brunnstein on the publication of “IFIP 50 years” which will consist of a printed volume and a database accessible from the website. TCs will be asked to contribute a report about their TC and WG work.

WITFOR 2009: WITFOR 2009 will take place in Hanoi, Vietnam from Aug 26th to Aug 28th, 2009 at the National Convention Centre. The Committees are already in place and start working. The program, including schedule, plenary sessions and parallel sessions, is very well on track. IFIP is looking for candidates for the next WITFOR 2011.

WCC 2012: The President reconfirmed that IFIP will not invite invitation for a WCC in 2012. IFIP has decided earlier that WCC 2010 will be the last of the “traditional” WCC conferences. The whole aspect of IFIP's big congresses will be reviewed and alternative models will be created.

- **IFIP Future Strategy:**

Project 1 (Dissemination of high quality knowledge in ICT) has been briefly discussed with TC Chairs with lack of comments and input from TCs. It has been decided to put the project forward to TA after reconsidering the purpose of the project.

Project 2 (International reputation): New contacts to international bodies have been established. In discussions with ITU President Mr Toure has indicated the intention to work closer together with IFIP.

Project 3 (Member Societies): The Task Force elaborated four main principles for this project: IFIP must not compete with its own members, IFIP needs to provide those things that the members cannot individually provide, IFIP needs to recognize (adapt) to a new world, IFIP needs to find a financial model that works in a period of very rapid change. The Task Force will carry on working on these topics and come up with proposals at General Assembly 2009.

Project 4 (Students) not yet started

Project 5 (Practitioners): This is actually the **IP3 (International Professional Practice Programme)**. The Task Force continued its work on basis of the terms of reference confirmed in GA2007. Sponsorship and support from industry had continued even though the economic situation made cash contributions unlikely. The British Computer Society (BCS) informed the Task Force that they will remain as supporter of IP3 but take a passive role for the moment, because of its significant amount of internal work. BCS expects to re-evaluate its position in October 2009. This changed attitude of BCS to IP3 had led Mr Hughes to resign as a BCS representative. He accepted the invitation of IFIP's President to stay as Chair for a few months whilst succession plans are finished.

- **AGORA InitiativeS:** After the success of the approach of "AGORA Initiative on Lifelong Learning" to leave the "silo syndrome" and to go to transversal activities it has been recommended to use this approach also for other activities as "AGORA Initiative on Security". AGORA Initiative on Developing Countries" et al.
- **Digital Library:** The Digital Library is up and running. All IFIP publications published by Springer in 2008 are in the DL. All remaining publications from prior years are supposed to be in by end of March 2009. A new agreement with ACS for operation and maintenance of the DL was completed December 2008.
- **Events Reporting Task Force:** A web-based system for collecting delegate information has been created and TC Chairs were asked to test it for usability. The Task Force has been asked to clarify the legal issues regarding data privacy and to come up with proposals at General Assembly 2009.
- **CIO Forum Task Force:** First initial recommendations like bringing in the IT user community and IT professionals, build-up events and recognition especially for CIOs, create publications, online-communities and Digital Libraries for CIOs, leverage IP3 in this community.
- **Standing Committees:**
Activity Management Board: AMB discussed a proposal for a web-based system for event requests and will present it at General Assembly 2009.

Marketing Committee: In order for a better marketing of IFIP there is the requirement of an information package. As a start an IFIP brochure has been presented. This brochure needs to be completed by information from TCs.

Member Society Relations Committee: Gulf Computer Society (GCS) and the Computer Society of Bosnia-Herzegovina have been accepted as new Full Members.

Publications Committee: Springer announced that a management decision had been made to close the SSBM office in Norwell effective April 30th, 2009 and to transfer the work on the IFIP Main Series to Heidelberg, Germany. There will now be a single point of contact for all IFIP publications published by Springer (IFIP Main Series and LNCS). Negotiations to work on details of a new publications contract will continue.

- **Technical Assembly:** Technical Assemble reviewed its relationship to General Assembly, the Board and the Executive Committee and will come up with proposals for changes / amendments to Statutes & Bylaws at General Assembly.

2 ACTION LIST

IFIP Board, March 2009 Delhi, India

Task	Person / Body
Legal Seat:	
○ Establish legal seat in Austria	Secretary, Secretariat
Finance:	
○ Proposal for improvement of accounting (maybe new accounting system) in terms of clearer form of presentation and nomenclature	Finance TF, Secretariat
○ Preparation of management accounts on quarterly basis	Treasurer, Secretariat
Membership:	
○ Create information package for Member Societies and potential Member Societies	Marketing Comm.
○ To remind Member Societies to submit their reports once a year for General Assembly	Membership Relations Comm.
○ To continue work of Membership Task Force	Mr Engel and TF
○ To review Member Societies reports and to remind MS to send their reports for GA	AMB
○ TA Chair to contact all French TC reps and to advise on options for their future membership	Mr Hinchey
Events Reporting:	
○ Proposal how to legalize data responsibility and privacy	Mr Bramer
CIO Forum:	
○ TO come up with proposal for next steps at GA 2009	Mr Sawhney
IFIP Strategy:	
○ Reconsider the purpose of project 1 and put it forward to TA	Mr Strous
World Computer Congress:	
○ Find structure for WCCs for the future (after 2010)	EC, TCs

World IT Forum:

- Contract for WITFOR 2009 Mr Strous
- Looking for candidates for next WITFOR in 2011 Mr Strous

Digital Library:

- To populate DL with publications from prior years Publ. Comm.
- To establish normal operating procedures Publ. Comm.
- To review templates for e-only publications Publ. Comm.

Activities:

- Renew procedures for event organisers AMB
- Paperless system for handling event documents AMB
- Assemble list of existing conference management systems in order to propose it to TCs AMB

Marketing:

- Finalize IFIP Brochure Marketing Comm.

Publications:

- Work on renewal of Publications Contract with Springer Publ. Comm.
- To produce revised documents for IFIP's website Publ. Comm.

Technical Committee:

- To come up with changes / amendments for S&B reflecting proposed changes in relationship to other bodies of IFIP TA

3 ATTENDANCE LIST

IFIP Board, March 2009 Delhi, India

C Avgerou	Councillor
C Avram	Treasurer
M Bramer	Councillor
G Engel	Vice-President
A Frisiani	Councillor
M Hinchey	Councillor
R Johnson	Secretary
R Morel	Councillor
R Puigjaner	Councillor
L Sawhney	Councillor
N Schlamberger	Vice-President
B von Solms	President
L Strous	Vice-President
J Turner	Vice-President

Observers

K Brunnstein	Chair Golden Jubilee
C Hughes	Chair IT Prof

Secretariat

E Dundler	IFIP Secretariat
B Brauneis	IFIP Secretariat

Apologies

D Brady	Councillor
---------	------------

4 BOARD MEETING

IFIP Board, March 2009 Delhi, India

4.1 Call Meeting to Order

The **President** opened the Board meeting and welcomed all participants. He expressed IFIP's grateful thanks to the Computer Society of India (CSI) and its President Prof. K K Aggarwal and CSI's GA representative Lalit Sawhney for the invitation and the hospitality arrangements.

Mr Sawhney welcomed IFIP's Board and wished it a successful meeting and enjoyable stay in India.

4.2 Attendance and Apologies

The **Secretary** announced Board attendance and one apology received from Mr Brady (please refer to the attendance list).

4.3 Business Matters

4.3.1 Approval of Agenda

Council unanimously **ADOPTED** the agenda.

4.3.2 President's Report

Mr von Solms drew attention to his report and said that 2008 year had been a very interesting and exciting year for IFIP and he gave a brief overview of some of the most important developments, as well as some of his personal activities.

➤ Membership issues

The President reported that several membership issues were resolved during this period, but some are still open. The Board will get a full report on the membership status of all members. Outstanding documentation of the Gulf Computer Society has now been received, and the GCS can now be welcomed as a full member of IFIP. Russia had also reacted, and after paying its dues, is now again a full member of IFIP. He reported that IFIP received requests from existing members, mostly in developing countries, to downgrade their membership, or even to accept their resignation. This matter is worrying, but will hopefully be addressed by the proposals of the TF on Membership.

➤ Task Forces

The President informed the Board that in order to take IFIP into its next decade Task Forces on important issues with a very wide Terms of Reference each were established:

- ❖ Task Force on membership
- ❖ Task Force on Finance
- ❖ Task Force on investigating the idea incorporating specific IT related practitioners into IFIP
- ❖ Task Force on investigating the idea of a Foundation within IFIP
- ❖ Task Force on a reporting system for attendance at IFIP Events – an Events Information System (EIS)

More information is at the respective agenda item in these minutes.

➤ International Liaison

The President reported that he received an invitation to be a keynote speaker at the EC sponsored conference on 'ICT for a Global Sustainable Future' which took place in Brussels on January 22/23 2009. His presentation gave an overview of IFIP and he has personal discussions with two senior people.

- Mr Hamadoun Toure, Secretary-General of the ITU, who is well aware of IFIP and also very positive about closer cooperation with IFIP, specifically in the area of Developing Countries. He has invited IFIP to join the ITU as a 'sector' member. This will be investigated.
- Mr Antti Petromaki, Deputy DG of the ISM Directorate. The discussion with him and his Deputy, Mr Blixt, went very well, and IFIP received an open invitation to contact them on any project.

➤ WITFOR 2009

The President reported that under the enthusiastic leadership of Mr Strous, WITFOR 2009 is very much on track. A WITFOR website and a logo for WITFOR had been some of the specific developments.

➤ International Professional Practice Partnership (IP3)

The President reported that this status of this project, after the down scaling of the BCS's involvement, will be discussed in detail during the Board meeting. He is still very positive about the future of the whole initiative, and do not see the BCS's step as at all damaging to or delaying the project. He sees it also as a good opportunity to re-investigate closer cooperation with the CEPIS Task Force on Professionalism, and also the initiatives suggested by the GI of Germany.

➤ Publications

The **President** informed the Board that IFIP's Digital Library is now ready for full usage, but a detailed discussion about the future financing model of the Digital Library is very necessary at this stage.

The President informed the Board that a meeting between IFIP and Springer took place on February, 9th, 2009, and full details of the present status will be provided at the Board meeting.

➤ IFIP legal status

The President informed the Board that this matter has not been finalized, although progress had been made. It now seems that IFIP should formally register in Austria, but some important documents are still outstanding.

➤ WCC 2010

The President reported that WCC 2010 is well on track. A detailed report is under the respective item of the agenda in these minutes. **The President** thanked Mr Brunnstein for working on IFIP's special contribution to the event.

➤ Future World Computer Congresses

The President said that a provisional report on this matter is being drafted, and will be briefly discussed at the Board meeting under the specific item of the agenda.

The President forwarded his personal thanks to many IFIP stakeholders, from Eduard Dundler and his office staff in the Secretariat, through the members of the Board, SC Chairs, TC Chairs and WG volunteers who put in a massive amount of effort during the last 6 months.

4.3.3 Secretary's Report

Mr Johnson reported that the Secretariat continues to run smoothly and he expressed his thanks to Mr Dundler and the staff for their hard work for IFIP

Mr Johnson reported that further discussions regarding the legal and financial status of IFIP have taken place since General Assembly 2008. The results and a recommendation will be put to the IFIP Executive Committee and the matter will be covered in their report to the Board meeting.

The Secretary informed Council that at August 20th 2008, IFIP had 51 Members with voting rights. He was pleased to report that following payment of its 2008 dues Russia has rejoined IFIP after a break in membership for some years.

The Secretary reported that according to IFIP's Statutes & Bylaws the membership of Chile and Zambia ceased at the end of 2008. The memberships of Botswana, Canada, and France are suspended with effect from the end of 2008 having last paid in 2006 and will cease at the end of 2009 unless payment resumes.

According to IFIP's Statutes and Bylaws a suspended Member will lose the right to representation at General Assembly and in TCs and SGs. Any representative from a suspended Member who serves on the IFIP Board or as an Officer of a Technical Committee will be deemed to have resigned with effect from the date at which the suspension took effect and will be replaced.

The following members are reminded of overdue membership fees for 2008: Ethiopia, Greece, Kenya, New Zealand, Serbia, Zimbabwe.

The Board **NOTED** the report.

4.3.4 EB Meeting Report

Mr Johnson reported that IFIP's Executive Committee met on Thursday and the main issues considered were:

IFIP Incorporation

Following a discussion with past IFIP President P-A Bobillier and advice received from our auditors, the Executive Committee **RECOMMENDS** unanimously to the Board that IFIP should immediately seek to establish its legal seat in Austria where it will also be incorporated under the relevant Austrian statutes as an international not for profit body.

The Board **APPROVED** the recommendation unanimously.

Professionalism Task Force

The Executive Committee welcomed the comprehensive report received from the Task Force. Charles Hughes had indicated that he would be standing down later this summer and this would be his last IFIP meeting as Task Force Chairman. The Executive Committee expressed general satisfaction with progress and was pleased to note the keen interest from CSI.

Membership

It was noted that Oman had now paid all back dues. Canada has undertaken to pay at least part of its back dues by June 30th 2009. Andorra has resigned after the institute which belonged to IFIP was closed by the Andorran authorities. Russia has

joined IFIP having paid for 2008. The documentation submitted by the Gulf CS has now been approved by MSRC and the GCS will become a member once they pay their first dues.

There appears to be no prospect of obtaining a new French member and all TC members formally representing, or nominated by, the former member will be contacted by the TA Chair to encourage them to obtain suitable alternative affiliations with the IFIP family so as to continue their participation.

CEPIS

The Executive Committee was pleased to note the success of the latest IFIP/CEPIS meeting late last year in Brussels. CEPIS had generously offered the use of their office in the centre of Brussels to IFIP groups to hold meetings.

Joint Events

The Executive Committee has agreed to prepare a policy on the running of joint events especially with the ACM and societies of the IEEE. They are requiring the signing of Memoranda of Understanding to specify rights and responsibilities in respect of joint events. Executive Committee will draft a policy in conjunction with the TCs to act as a template for such agreements.

The Board **NOTED** the report.

4.3.5 Treasurer's Report

Mr Avram referred to his report and said that IFIP's 2008 accounts, maintained by the secretariat, have been reviewed by the auditor in February 2008.

The Treasurer showed a summary of the financial statements as reported to GA in 2008 and extended it to include 2008. He has also added a new section to the summary, summarising IFIP's major asset, the UBS managed balanced investment portfolio. Adding in the summary of portfolio performance, allows reporting of "Operating result" as well as the usual "Result".

Amounts are in thousand Euro (K EUR)

Statement of financial performance

	2008	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003
Income	-174	335	397	739	359	568
Expenses	352	304	279	271	219	374
Result	-526	30	117	467	140	194

Statement of financial position

Assets	2366	2701	2609	2580	2171	2074
Liabilities	437	234	23	101	157	185
Funds	1929	2466	2585	2477	2013	1889

Portfolio

performance	-497	-24	117	265	78	102
-------------	------	-----	-----	-----	----	-----

Financial performance excluding portfolio

Operating income	323	359	280	474	281	466
Expenses	352	304	279	271	219	374
Operating result	-29	55	1	203	62	92

The Treasurer reported that the result of his review of the quarterly portfolio statements dating from 1 July 1999 to and including 31 December 2008 showed an internal rate of return of -0.24% per annum for the period 1 April 1999 to 31 December 2008. Last year was exceptionally poor. IFIP's portfolio was valued at EUR 1.863.000 January 1, 2009, that is EUR 38.000 less than IFIP has invested since 1999. The portfolio performed better between 1/4/1999 and 31/12/2007. It was positive 3.24%.

The Treasurer added that the portfolio is not for running expenses; it can be seen as a reserve for projects.

Mr Bramer and **Mr Sawhney** asked whether portfolio management could be done better. They are advised to contact the Financial Task Force.

The Treasurer informed the Board of his plans to develop during 2009 with the secretariat a method of reporting, probably quarterly, the position and performance of business units (TCs), projects, IFIP, IFIP secretariat.

The Treasurer summarized that IFIP's financial performance was generally in line with the 2008 budget and update as reported in September 2008 except for a significant fall in IFIP's portfolio investments. At General Assembly in 2008, the Treasurer estimated an on target budget year with a small surplus. The 2008 budget included a small positive portfolio performance. This did not eventuate, so IFIP ended the year with a small operating deficit. Proper project accounting would have shown the deficit was due to investment in projects and not due to overheads or negative business unit operations.

The actual effect, on IFIP's TOTAL reserves, of the market fall over 2008 was about 15%, and the actual fall of our UBS portfolio was about 20% from the peak value in early 2008.

This limitation of the fall from 20% to 15% was because of unusually large bank deposits held during 2008.

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

The current world wide financial crisis provides cash rich organisations, like IFIP, with a special opportunity to invest in new projects at lower than normal cost. IFIP has run fewer events in 2008; this should be more in 2009!

The Board unanimously **ACCEPTED** the 2008 accounts for approval by GA 2009.

The Board congratulated **Mr Avram** for the clear presentation.

Mr Sawhney said that the investment for the future has also to be valid for Marketing. **Mr von Solms** agreed and reminded all Standing Committees to think more of investments for the future.

Mr Johnson suggested not only looking into Technical Committees and Working Groups, but also looking at projects with Member Societies. He had the opinion that there are substantial advantages to work with them.

4.3.6 Finance Committee Report

In absence of the Chair of Finance Committee **Mr Strous** presented the report of Finance Committee.

Finance Committee noted that the treasurer's report includes a statement of financial position (balance sheet) and a statement of financial performance (profit and loss) which is one of the clarifications in financial reporting that the FC has been asking for. The annexes to the treasurer's report may still be too detailed to be informative for the Board and GA, they may at the same time be approximately the right level for the Executive Committee to monitor operations.

FC would recommend a summarised version for distribution to the Board and General Assembly, with the detailed version of course available to all who want it.

The Board **AGREED**

Finance Committee noted that the biggest feature, of course, is the portfolio evaluation (as identified in FC report to GA last September). The fact that it is now only worth what was put in represents in many respects a lost opportunity; however, there is no point lamenting that and we should take it as a useful lesson going forwards. IFIP is not a business – it exists for the benefit of its members in line with its constitution, and all funds (prudently governed by EC and Secretariat) should be employed to this end. Going forward FC wants to see more emphasis on the operating income and expenditure of the Secretariat and IFIP projects (see below), with the portfolio treated as more of a balance sheet item.

FC would recommend – and perhaps this can be got going in time for GA – to start a process of regular *management accounts* i.e. of the day-to-day operations of IFIP and the secretariat; this would usefully provide the separation that we need between operational and exceptional, and also demonstrate a more “hands on the wheel” level of oversight. Similarly, FC feels that the TCs should be treated as business units. The accounting software should be able to support this and if the current software is not adequate enough, changing this might be a wise investment. To EC and Board / GA, then, could be reported a set of individual accounts (at detail or summary level as appropriate) and a set of consolidated accounts; FC expects that this is not necessarily any significant increase in work (all the information is already present) beyond the initial investment in setup, but merely a change in how all this detail is presented.

Regarding the “long term portfolio calculation” – this is enormously useful to help people get a proper perspective on the nature of the real value of this set of investments. As a word of caution – given that the status of the “seat of IFIP”, and its associated taxation status, is somewhat vague – we should get advice in Austria concerning the standard practice for evaluation, and whether or not the apparent “profit” from this investment is considered income for tax purposes.

FC agrees fully with the need to seek new “business opportunities” (see earlier point about what IFIP really is!). Nevertheless, FC expects proposals for such new business opportunities to be supported by a solid business case. This does not mean that FC will oppose a priori (prudent) investment in supporting the preparation of such a business case nor does it mean that each proposed opportunity must be profitable or financially self supporting.

Regarding WCC Milan, FC suggests that the correct thing to do is book the contractual position as a receivable, and then adjust when the final figures come in. Concerning WITFOR and the Digital Library - neither of these should be considered

as a “Secretariat Expense”; these are projects of IFIP, from which the Secretariat should be recovering cost. The apparent cost of the Secretariat is inflated (and so distorted) by these kinds of numbers, and if the Secretariat can recover costs from IFIP on these things it should – this would better reflect the real costs of both of these! Concerning investment in IP3 – again, is this not a project? “Deferred Income” is a business vehicle for tax optimisation – if we are not a taxable business, we should simplify this for all concerned and treat it as a project.

Mr Avram and **Mr Strous** commented that under existing rules the auditor recommends not to book open fees from events, this includes WCCs, as receivables. The issue will be put forward to the Finance Task Force for investigation.

The President thanked the Treasurer and Finance Committee for their work.

The Board **ACCEPTED** the report.

4.4 IFIP Strategy

4.4.1 General Strategic Matters

Mr Strous gave a brief overall view on the status of the IFIP Strategy projects. For the description of the projects it is referred to the document that was approved at GA 2007(<http://www.ifip.org/images/stories/ifip/public/projects/IFIPStrategy/ifip%20strategy%2026%20august%202007.pdf>).

- **Project 1. Dissemination of high quality knowledge in ICT.**

Mr Strous reported that as agreed at TA and GA 2008 the draft of project 1 was re-circulated to the TCs on 15 September 2008. Hardly any comments have been received by the champions since then. The project was briefly discussed at the TC chair meeting on 6 February 2009. Given the lack of comments and input from the TC chairs before that meeting, the outcome and conclusion of that meeting was disappointing. The TC chairs concluded that the presented draft of the project was unexciting but a reasonable starting point. The chairs accepted that they could benefit from more and better information about the quality of their events but were afraid that this could lead to an undesired bureaucratic and mechanistic system of quality assurance. The chairs were to re-read the draft and indicate whether they would have objections to the draft. If not, the project could proceed.

Mr Strous expressed his hope that at the 2009 Board meeting this project can get a new impulse. The slow progress will not make it easy to meet the objectives in the five-year framework. Perhaps applying the project to WCC and WITFOR would provide an example that could demonstrate the value of the approach and lead to “followers”. This project also relates to the work and ideas in project 3 on member societies.

Ms Avgerou and **Mr Bramer** commented that the project is very important to demonstrate where IFIP stands now and where IFIP wants to stand in the future.

Mr Brunnstein expressed his disappointment about the limited progress and also about the little TC involvement.

Mr Turner said that it is extremely important to carry on with this project in order to understand better the nature of IFIP’s events and to improve the quality of events.

Ms Avgerou proposed to put the project forward to TA and to reconsider the purpose of the project (maybe to put the message in other ways) and to bring it to TCs. WCC 2010 could be a target in measuring project 1.

The Board **AGREED** with the proposal.

- **Project 2. International reputation.**

For progress see the report of International Liaison (agenda item 8.3).

- **Project 3. Member societies**

Mr Strous informed the Board that at GA 2008 it was decided to merge projects 3.a. (Member societies: new services) and 3.b. (Member societies: public awareness) into one project 3 (Member societies) and to assign this project to the Membership Task Force chaired by Jerry Engel. For progress see the report of this Task Force under agenda item 5.1.

- **Project 4. Students.**

Mr Strous informed the Board that at GA 2008 George Boynton volunteered to champion this project. Due to late contacting of George Boynton by him about the content and approach for this project, no progress has been made.

- **Project 5. Practitioners.**

Mr Strous said that project 5 is actually the IP3 project. Reporting on this project is done under a separate agenda item 7.1.

Mr Strous expressed his disappointment that for nearly all projects the progress made is not enough to realize IFIP's ambitions in the five-year framework from the adoption of the strategy document. Either extra energy and time has to be put into the projects or the objectives and ambitions have to be reconsidered / adjusted. This needs to be done before General Assembly 2009, when we are two years on the way in the five-year framework.

4.4.2 AGORA InitiativeS

Mr Morel drew attention to his report about AGORA InitiativeS and gave an overview about the Initiative on Lifelong Learning. He showed the history of AGORA events starting with October 2006 in France to the forthcoming 11th AGORA event in 2010 in Brisbane.

An AGORA workshop has been held before this Board meeting in Delhi at the Bharti School of Telecommunications Management, Department of Computer Science & Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology and the Department of Management Studies, Indian Institute of Technology. As an output of this workshop 4 new AGORA studios were created and 2 links to important EU projects were established:

- The MATURE Project <http://www.mature-ip.eu/>
http://www.ifip-tc3.net/IMG/ppt/6JMmature_agora_final.ppt
- The European Network of Living Labs (ENoLL)
<http://www.openlivinglabs.eu/>
http://www.ifip-tc3.net/IMG/pdf/eJOV10_SPILL8_Mulder_Velthausz_Kriens_Harmonization%20Cube.pdf

Mr Morel reported that already at Pohang (Council 2005), when establishing the Task Force for the New IFIP Strategy, some basic ideas were present to:

- Promote transversal activities
- Leave the «silos syndrome»
- Open more on the outside work
- Get more visible and share the excellent work of each
- The IFIP AGORA initiative on Lifelong Learning was started not as a project, neither as a TC3 action but as an example of an approach suitable for other IFIP transversal activities

Mr Morel suggested that according to the new IFIP strategy that the name IFIP AGORA Initiative is kept as a generic term for transverse IFIP reflections and actions. For instance, there could be new transverse activities such as:

- The IFIP AGORA Initiative on Security
- The IFIP AGORA Initiative on Digital Solidarity / Developing Countries
- The IFIP AGORA Initiative on Governance / Ethics / Code of Conduct
- The IFIP AGORA Initiative on Sustainable Development

On each domain above he suggested for example to have at least 3 to 4 TC/WG different with 1-2 external bodies preparing an activity (panels, workshops, etc.) to be included inside WCC'2010.

Mr Morel recommended that IFIP should become gradually a LEARNING ORGANISATION able to collaborate not only with some external bodies but also in between the different parts of its structure i.e. at least TCs and WGs, because ICT in the real World is NOT organised in technical committees working vertically as a series of silos. There is a great opportunity to use WCC'2010 to promote strongly this spirit (need of empowerment from EC).

For full PP Presentation please see <http://www.ifip.org/images/stories/ifip/public/publications/minutes/Board2009/b09-ppt-agera.pdf>

Ms Avgerou fully agreed with the “no silos” structure. She suggested that it should be included in WCC 2010.

Mr Brunnstein said that AGORA approach is an excellent example for cooperation for TCs in contrary the present silo architecture and proposed to transfer this approach to other TCs.

4.5 Progress Reports Task Forces

4.5.1 Membership Task Force

Mr Engel drew attention to his report on the Membership Task and asked the Board for input on the issues raised. The main points are:

- IFIP cannot - indeed, must not - compete with our own members. Individual membership and honorary memberships are under investigation. IFIP needs also to find better ways to cooperate with Member Societies on conference operations and publications. New mechanisms for revenue sharing have to be implemented.
- IFIP needs to provide those things that the members cannot individually provide. IFIP needs to look at ways in which be can serve as a coordinating voice between our membership and governments/NGO. IFIP needs to look for new ways in which it can coordinate the currently active programs of our membership, and IFIP needs

to foster intersociety contacts/cooperation. **Mr Engel** asked for additional programs that IFIP are uniquely equipped to initiate.

- IFIP needs to recognize (or adapt) to a new world.

Mr Engel reported that a couple of suggestions were made for continuing the “one per country approach”. One was to form confederations of societies within a country to provide IFIP membership. Another suggestion was to admit a second national member, it would be necessary to have the approval of the current member. A second problem identified was that it seems strange that a Society in one country might be able to become a member simply by opening a token office in another country which does not currently have an IFIP member. **Mr Engel** said that more input is required to solve the question whether should the new IFIP be an organisation of selected computer societies of the world, or selected national computer societies of the world, normally one per country.

Mr Engel reported that there was general agreement that there should be options for confederations, and geographic organizations within IFIP. Again the very positive example of CLAY was cited several times. There may be some issues in actually defining a geographic organization in the “cyberworld” but it would appear that this may well continue to be the appropriate place for “associate memberships”, but, depending on the answer to the issue above, full membership may also be an option. **Mr Engel** said that more input is required for the problem whether confederations of organisations should be eligible for Full Membership.

- IFIP needs to find a financial model that works in a period of very rapid change.

There was general agreement regarding discontent with the present dues system. Relating it to the previous discussion, a Society might be able to significantly reduce its dues by moving a token office to a country that currently has no IFIP member and claiming that they are the “member society” of that country. There was also agreement that the cost of membership dues is often less than the whole IFIP expenses package which includes participation in TCs and WGs and other administrative activities that involve significant costs.

The general consensus that came from the meeting was a need to determine the long term needs for income, and then determine an equitable approach to funding our needs. In this regard, any actions of the Task Force have to be carefully coordinated with the finance Task Force, and probably also with the IFIP strategy group. **Mr Engel** said that more input is required in order to determine what other obligations are appropriate for the member societies beyond that paying dues.

For full report please see <http://www.ifip.org/images/stories/ifip/public/publications/minutes/Board2009/b09-membership-tf.pdf>

Mr Bramer commented that IFIP should not only think of member societies, but also of other important players in IT, like IT hardware suppliers, software suppliers and how to persuade them to join.

4.5.2 Finance Task Force

Mr Avram informed the Board that the Task Force has not yet started its work.

4.5.3 Events Reporting Task Force

Mr Bramer explained the mission of the Events Reporting TF which is to obtain information about the delegates who attend IFIP TC and WG conferences etc., partly so that IFIP can give feedback to the national societies, but also as a basis for management decision making and (very importantly) so that TCs can create mailing lists for TCs and WGs to use to advertise their events. A further very important reason is to give IFIP a database of target delegates for major events, especially WCC.

Mr Bramer informed the Board that he has set up a very basic web-based system at <http://www.ifipevents.org/> that collects delegate information in a form to which virtually any package that organisers use should be able to export and which can easily be used for manual data entry for small non-computerised events. He has invited all TC Chairs to ask their event organisers to enter their delegate information into it for events held in the next few months as a pilot scheme.

In order to overcome legal constraints **Mr Bramer** suggested that IFIP should insist on ownership of the data and the organizer had to destroy the data.

Mr Strous commented that collecting statistical data (no names) has his full support. For using the data for mailing lists he would like to see a button on the event registration form, where the participant can decide whether he wants to be in a mailing list for future events.

Mr Brunnstein saw no problem in reporting on statistics, but expressed concern about responsibility for the personal data.

The Board **ASKED** Mr Bramer to figure out how the data responsibility and privacy problem could be overcome and to carry on with the Task Force and come back at General Assembly.

4.5.4 IFIP Foundation Task Force

Mr Strous informed the Board that some preliminary work has been done, but the Task Force has not yet started its work.

4.5.5 CIO Forum Task Force

Mr Sawhney presented his report about the CIO Task Force. He said that CIOs and other related IT practitioners are deeply involved in the application of Information Processing. There is an important need for those who are actively engaged in the application of IT to interact with those who are involved in its research and development. This could lead to a very meaningful "Industry-Academic" partnership with far-reaching benefits. Therefore, there is the need for a special effort to bring these constituents closer to IFIP.

Mr Sawhney presented the first findings of the Task Force:

- Currently there seems to be no truly international and independent body for CIOs/CTOs, etc. Various CIO communities and user groups do exist; most of them have a regional focus, often backed by publication groups or targeted at CIO's and largely driven by commercial considerations.

- Therefore there is a need for a credible, international and independent organization to address this need. The IFIP, with its broad international reach and long-standing credibility could be the perfect platform for such an initiative.
- While IFIP may not be actively involved with CIOs, some of the National societies and other member societies like the IEEE Computer Society and ACM are very directly involved with the CIO community. IFIP could involve these societies and our Regional Affiliates in this endeavour.
- A very large number of IT professionals work in the IT and IT-Enabled Services Sector and the Consulting profession. The CIO community would be 'richer' with their participation. In any case, there is an interchange between professionals moving from IT services to user companies and domain experts moving to IT services and consulting.
- The depth of technological expertise available with the IFIP will ensure that there is sufficient incentive for these IT practitioners to participate.

Mr Sawhney presented the first initial recommendations of the Task Force:

- Bringing in the User Community and IT services professionals
IFIP needs to provide opportunities to the large body of IT professionals – CIOs, CTOs, ERP practitioners, those working in user companies, in IT and IT-enabled service companies, and consulting firms to come together under the IFIP umbrella to collaborate with their academic and research colleagues.

- Events and Recognition

“Local” Workshops (25-50 participants) could be organized as a build-up to a larger annual conference, in locations where we are able to garner sufficient support for the initiative. These workshops could cover important durable topics and stay away from the latest fads. The quality of the content would differentiate the IFIP events from the others.

Annual Conference – IFIP could organize an Annual Global Conference once IFIP has gathered enough momentum through its workshops and other initiatives. Australia is hosting the WCC 2010 in Brisbane. This might be a good time to launch the first global conference, if IFIP has already had a few Regional events between Oct 2009 and March 2010. This full-day Conference would feature eminent international speakers (6-8), speaking in depth about the most relevant issues facing the CIO community globally. A panel discussion with distinguished participants could also be a part of the agenda.

Recognition – IFIP can also recognize the CIOs who have made the most significant contributions in the area of IT, through a recognition initiative. The recognition initiative could be a IFIP Distinguished Professional Award to 6-8 outstanding professionals each year. These chosen professionals would deliver a professional talk at the global event, which would be web-cast live. These talks would also be published in a commemorative volume, released at the recognition event. Timing-wise, the above Annual Conference and first Recognition initiative could tie in very well with the prestigious World Computer Congress 2010 being held in the Golden Jubilee year of IFIP, and could be managed by the WCC Program Committee.

- Publications, On-line Communities and the Digital Library
Quarterly Newsletter – A quarterly newsletter published and made available for download on the IFIP site. This newsletter will utilize the most relevant research

from the existing TCs and WGs involved in topics directly relevant to this professional community. The newsletter can also be e-mailed to CIOs who subscribe on the website.

On-line Community for CIOs – A sub-site within the existing IFIP website can be created specifically for the Global CIO community, this site would give them the opportunity to interact with peers and share key learnings and insights. This site could be linked to the IFIP, IEEE and ACM Digital Library and Journals, to provide additional value to the community.

- Professional Certification

Professional Development is an important focus area for CIOs/CTOs and other related IT practitioners. The International Professional Practice Partnership, IP3 can be leveraged in this regard. IP3 would give the IFIP CIO initiative further relevance and credibility; in turn this program will also benefit from the industry support they will receive as a result of this initiative.

In time to come, this certification activity could be complemented with a virtual education academy, leading to accumulation of credits towards full-fledged certification.

- The Way Forward

To begin with, IFIP could mobilise about 50 CIOs / CTOs and professionals from the IT services and consultancy professions from 5 – 8 countries and initiate a Special Interest Group on 'Enterprise Use of ICT' covering issues of IT Governance, management of IT infrastructure and Enterprise Software Applications, so that the CIO Inclusion idea can be kick-started as soon as possible.

This group could focus on bringing together existing capabilities and activities of Member Societies (rather than competing with them), their CIO affiliates, Regional CIO Forums, Professional / Industry Associations, Technical Committees and Working Groups of IFIP active in the Enterprise space, Applications area and Infrastructure / Network issues, and start with the initial objective of promoting Events, Publications and Certification – specifically targeting the user and IT services communities.

The objective should be to address the leadership end of the market, CIOs, CTOs and IT services professionals, working down through the business consultants and ending at the operational users (knowledge workers).

Mr Sawhney said that the IFIP CIO Inclusion initiative would be a great opportunity to bring these IT practitioners closer to IFIP. This would be beneficial to the CIO community as well as the existing IFIP constituents. The Task Force is optimistic that with the right level of focus and collaboration within the organization, this initiative could turn into one of the most important and rewarding programmes within IFIP.

Ms Avgerou and **Mr Engel** were in favour to go for this new initiative.

Mr Johnson proposed to go to national groups where they exist and invite them to become involved.

Mr von Solms proposed that the initiative should continue.

4.6 Congresses and Major Events

4.6.1 WCC 2008

Mr Frisiani presented the final report on WCC 2008 (Please see summary report of OC by Mr Occhini and full report of IPC by Ms Bishop and Mr De Lotto at <http://www.ifip.org/images/stories/ifip/public/publications/minutes/Board2009/b09-wcc2008-jb-idl-rep.pdf>). He reported that WCC 2008 was convened under the high patronage of the Italian Republic, the patronage of Ms Viviane Reding, EU Commissioner for Information Society and Media and the local Italian government.

Mr Frisiani showed some key figures as:

- 13 Technical Conferences,
- 6 Cross Sessions,
- 10 Industry Oriented Sessions and
- 29 Keynote Speakers
- 400 accepted papers
- 17 publications
- 17 sponsoring exhibitors

Mr Frisiani reported 1.530 registered participants, with 571 paying participants. On the financial side an income of 645K EUR and expenditures of 731K EUR were reported.

Mr Frisiani identified also some area of weakness, including lack of support by IFIP for marketing and mailing, concurrence of other international events, unpopular period in Italy, coordination with IFIP publisher, CD version of the proceedings not made available, books not distributed charged to AICA and TC's coordination.

Mr Johnson was disappointed about the relation of the number of registered participants to the number of paying participants.

Mr von Solms conveyed his thanks to the successful WCC to Mr Occhini and AICA.

4.6.2 WCC 2010 / Golden Jubilee

Mr Brunstein as General Congress 2010 Chair reported on behalf of Mr Casaca, IPC-2010 chair, and Mr Lloyd, OC-2010 chair (please see full report at <http://www.ifip.org/images/stories/ifip/public/publications/minutes/Board2009/b09-wcc2010-gj-rep.pdf>).

World Computer Congress 2010 in Brisbane, Australia:

Due to strong involvement of TC chairs, 14 conferences have been suggested and a Program Chair, who will represent the related PC in the International Committee, has been nominated for each event. A joint IMIA-IFIP event on "e-Health" is under discussion in close collaboration with reputed experts from Brisbane.

As suggested in IFIP GA 2008, specific partners (ISACA, AusCERT, PMI et al.) are invited to organize events with some relation to overall themes covered by IFIP events. These events are meant to attract a larger audience to improve the financial ground (aka income) of IFIP WCC 2010.

OC chair Mark Lloyd has reported that one impact of the worldwide financial "crisis" on OC-2010 planning has been the announcement that the plan of the exhibition site to enlarge (indeed: double) the Congress and Exhibition space has been cancelled.

That implies that large “partner” events (such as ISACA with several hundred participants) may compete with partially smaller IFIP events about space. One idea to reduce the competition pressure by reducing IFIP’s session duration (usually 90 min) significantly (e.g. to 30-60 min) is hardly acceptable for IFIP events.

Mr Strous commented depending on the number of sessions offered, he sees no problem with a limited time per session. **Mr Brunnstein** answered that the number of sessions will be determined at IPC.

The Board **ACCEPTED** this restriction **only** if the same number of presenters can be accommodated.

Mr Brunnstein would remind TC Chairs in order to support planning of space allocation, to submit an estimation of the likely number of participants in their events (e.g. where based on related experiences).

As the next step it is planned that Program Committees prepare their Call for Paper, which will be published on the WCC 2010 website, by July 1, 2009. At General Assembly in Hanoi final decisions concerning the program structure will be made, including a first estimate of space allocation to events.

Mr Brunnstein reported that concerning publication of Congress Proceedings, OC chair Mark Lloyd prefers “green” (and less expensive) publication (that is: CD for every participant, no printed volume). On IFIP’s side, the decision about publication will be related to IFIP’s decision on its future Publication Policy, and TC chairs and IPC must also be asked to submit their requests for publication of their event(s).

The Board **REQUESTED** IPC to go back to TCs to submit their requirements.

Mr Strous suggested the installation of a publications chair.

IFIP Pioneer Day & related ICT History Conference

Mr Brunnstein reported that Ashley Goldsworthy has accepted the task to organise “IFIP PIONEER DAY”, which will be augmented with a Conference on “History of Computing” organised by Arthur Tatnall (chair of TC-9s related Working Group).

A long list of pioneers (with statements about their contribution) has been developed. TC chairs and WG chairs have been asked to comment and update these suggestions; among additional suggestions, it was suggested to include a reference to events organised at the occasion of Konrad Zuse’s 100th anniversary in 2010.

Mr Johnson expressed his doubts on the list of Pioneers. He could not figure out what qualified people to be on the list. The list failed to reflect the contribution made by IFIP. Therefore he suggested creating a list of IFIP people.

Mr von Solms added that this is a very sensitive area and IFIP has to be very careful in creating this list. Also there should be more credit to IFIP people as pioneers; possible all IFIP past presidents should be listed.

The Board **STATED** that the “Pioneer Day” is an “IFIP Pioneer Day” and that the pioneers identified should be those who had been involved with IFIP.

Publication "IFIP 50 years"

Mr Brunstein reported that Heinz Zemanek has agreed to work with him on this publication which will consist of a printed volume summarizing essential facts and developments of IFIP. Here, TCs will be asked to contribute a report about their TC and WG work. The book will be complemented with a database, accessible from IFIP website, which collects developments in all areas of IFIP work, especially including TCs, WGs, task groups, projects, publications at al. The idea is to present IFIPs work and results in an easily retrievable form on a regularly updated (aka "living") website.

IFIP Days in Member Societies (national) events

Mr Brunstein reported that IFIP President and Member Societies Relations Committee will be asked to suggest to member societies to include an "IFIP Day" in their national event in 2010. IFIP support could come from the IFIP representative of the respective Member Society, or IFIP could offer to send some speaker active in IFIP.

4.6.3 WCC 2012

Mr von Solms reconfirmed that IFIP will not issue invitations to bid for a WCC in 2012. The main reason for that is that IFIP has decided earlier that WCC 2010 will be the last of the 'traditional' WCC conferences, and that the whole aspect of big general IFIP conferences will be reviewed, and alternative models and ideas will be created.

WITFOR will probably stay in the odd years, with WCCE keeping its 5 year cycle. But this should not influence thoughts and suggestions about the format and future of WCC.

At this point in time, it seems very clear that the existing approach of having a WCC every 2 years will change – in fact there seems to be voices for totally disbanding WCCs, or at least changing it to a longer cycle.

Some possible approaches are:

- Have a WCC every 4 years and combine it with the conference of a specific TC in that year. This may, for example result in the IFIP World Conference on Information Security, with the input from other TCs doing work in security working with TC 11. A sub-option to this might involve non-IFIP organizations to be part of such an event. In that way we can have the IFIP World Conference on HCI, again with relevant TCs working with TC 13.
- Combine with a Member Society to expand its annual conference to a WCC type of event
- Combine with other non member societies to expand to a WCC type of event
- The ideas from the Technical Assembly
- Totally cancel the idea of a WCC

Mr von Solms invited the members of the Board to bring up suggestions which will be discussed during GA 2009.

The Board **AGREED** not to have a WCC in 2012.

4.6.4 WITFOR 2009

Mr Strous presented his report on WITFOR and said WITFOR 2009 will take place in Hanoi, Vietnam from Wednesday, August 26th to Friday, August 28th, 2009. The venue is the National Convention Centre (NCC).

Mr Strous said that the committees are already in place and working. WITFOR received very good support from the Vietnamese government. The commissions started already to build up membership. A formal launching event was beginning of this year. The program, including schedule, plenary sessions, parallel sessions, processing is very well on track.

Mr Strous informed the Board about some issues which have to be solved within the next time. Although the WITFOR website is now up and running, content has to be put in urgently. The organizers are looking for sponsors for expenses of speakers. Marketing of WITFOR is an open issue and has to be solved quickly. It is not so easy to find resources for the commissions.

Mr Strous informed the Board that he is looking for candidates for the next WITFOR in order to guarantee continuity.

The Board **NOTED** the report.

4.7 Projects

4.7.1 Professional Practice Programme (IP3)

The IP3 Task Force had submitted a comprehensive report on IP3 progress and current issues which should be read in conjunction with these notes. **Mr Hughes'** presentation therefore focused on an update on progress, the current status of IP3 and next steps.

A crucial part of the IP3 programme is offering advice and support to member societies which wish to develop professionalism and member certification programmes. The Member Society Support Service has been developed to meet these requirements and is being implemented from April 2009.

Certifications for IITP had been awarded to ACS in September 2008 and provisionally to CIPS in December 2008. A summary of the assessment criteria is included in the IP3 report.

Sponsorship and support from industry, including from Microsoft and Avenade, had continued even though the economic situation made cash contributions unlikely. Microsoft has also invited IP3 to join the Global Community Leadership Council when it is formed in 2010. Stephen Ibaraki, past president of CIPS, is undertaking a business development role on behalf of IP3.

The general account balance stands at €335K and a review and update of the business plan is being undertaken by a team led by Kim Denham, ACS CEO.

WCC2008 had been a great success in raising the level of interest and commitment to professionalism with multiple presentations and published papers from IP3 members. The Declaration organised by AICA had been signed by many organisations, including IP3 and IFIP, and had subsequently also been approved by CEPIS Council.

In recent months IP3 had presented at conferences organised by IT Star, TC3 and the EU and a variety of articles and newsletters had been published.

The BCS CEO had written to IP3 at the end of 2008 making criticisms, revealing that BCS had trademarked IITP and implying that BCS was withdrawing from IP3. Following further communications BCS withdrew the criticisms, apologised for not notifying IP3 earlier that it was trade-marking IITP internationally and intending to apply it for its own purposes and that BCS was not withdrawing from IP3 but that because of the significant amount of internal work BCS was remaining a supporter of IP3 but taking a passive role. Concerns had continued about the BCS position and attitude to IP3 but these had been allayed by statements from the President and a recent email from Prof. Jim Norton, VP Professionalism, which Mr Hughes quoted from as follows: "My focus will be in putting in place the new structures, processes and procedures which will make our revised and rigorous approach to CITP a reality... I expect this to be complete by October this year and at that point we will re-engage with IP3 and others and make our fundamental decisions about the international professionalism agenda...BCS expects to re-evaluate its position on international collaborations in October 2009, once it has completed the initial phase of work on revising CITP in the UK". The changed BCS attitude to IP3 had led Mr Hughes to resign as a BCS representative.

Several strong additions had been made to representation on the IP3 Task Force by the founding societies: Kim Denham, CEO ACS, Greg Lane, Chairman of the CIPS Canadian Council and Jim Moore, IEEE CS Chairman of the Professional Practices Board, replacing Steve Seidman, had all been welcomed to the team. BCS had appointed Susie Kay as Director of Professionalism and Colin Thompson had offered to stand down in her favour and David Clarke took the position vacated by Mr Hughes. The day before the Board meeting BCS announced that Susie Kay had left its employment.

Next steps for the Task Force were summarised and the enthusiastic and productive meetings held during the week with CSI, the Indian government and NASSCOM were noted. Professor KK Aggarwal, CSI President, had announced the previous evening CSI's intention to launch a professionalism in IT programme and member certification, joining a growing number of societies pursuing similar objectives.

Mr Hughes concluded by noting that he had been invited to continue as chairman of IP3 by Professor von Solms, IFIP President, and the Task Force. He had been pleased to accept the invitation for a few months whilst succession plans were finalised. This would be his final attendance at IFIP Board. He commented that over the past 2½ years the IFIP IP3 programme had made a significant impact and that the development of IT professionalism was now a certainty. The issue was whether this would be piecemeal and competitive with different organisations acting independently or whether we could indeed work collaboratively to achieve the ultimate prize of a prestigious global profession.

Mr Hughes thanked the Board for its support of him and IP3 and the significant contributions of many individual members. He believed IFIP had a unique opportunity to lead the world and sincerely hoped the Board would embrace this with alacrity and enthusiasm.

The **Board** joined the President in warmly thanking **Mr Hughes** for his report and leadership of IP3 and members expressed regret that he was stepping down.

Several members expressed concern about the international trade-marking of IFIP's IITP designation by BCS. ACS indicated that the trade marking in Australia had been undertaken in September 2008 after ACS had been awarded IITP certification at a formal event attended by the BCS President elect. IP3 had raised this issue with BCS and there was a correspondence trail. After significant discussion it was agreed that **Mr Johnson** would brief Mr von Solms and that the President would then telephone the President of BCS to express IFIP's concerns.

Board members welcomed the growing involvement in IP3 of non English speaking countries.

Ms Avgerou wished for TC involvement in IP3 and suggested that IITP is only process rather than content. **Mr Hughes** challenged this statement and suggested the accreditation manual, available on the website, contained significant content. IP3 had invited involvement from all TCs and had been working with TC3, TC8 and TC9.

The discussion closed with **Mr Brunstein** noting that many member societies are very supportive and expressing pleasure at the involvement of CSI whilst noting that there are different systems in some countries and areas of commonality should be explored.

Mr von Solms expressed sorrow at Mr Hughes departure and thanked him very much for his significant and enthusiastic contribution to IP3 and IFIP.

4.7.2 Digital Library

Mr Turner presented his report on the progress of IFIP's Digital Library. He was happy to say that all IFIP publications published by Springer in 2008, plus three 2008 e-only proceedings were in the DL by the target date of 15 December 2008. All Springer publications from 2007 were scheduled to be added by 31 January 2009, but this deadline was missed. All remaining publications from prior years are supposed to be in the DL by 31 March 2009. New publications are to be added within eight weeks of receipt of the electronic files by the DL managers.

A new agreement with the ACS for operation and maintenance of the DL was completed in December 2008 and became effective January 1, 2009. The agreement approved at the 2008 GA meeting was accepted by the ACS without modification. The agreement is effective until modified by mutual agreement or terminated by either party with at least six months advance notice.

Mr von Solms reminded the Board that as the financial issue already exists and a quick solution has to be found.

4.8 Standing Committee Reports

4.8.1 Activity Management Board (AMB)

Mr Frisiani reported that the AMB has continued to debate the three issues identified in previous meetings.

➤ Event web forms

The proposal for a Web version approach of the event request forms (please see full report at <http://www.ifip.org/images/stories/ifip/public/publications/minutes/Board2009/b09-amb-rep.pdf>) has been debated within AMB. It delineates the structure of the system that could be implemented at the Secretariat. It should be pointed out that an

approach similar to the one suggested has been implemented for instance by the IEEE Computer Society which is using a web-based application, named CIMA, for technical meetings data submission, budget approval, conference closing procedure, historical data storage. At the same time it should be kept in mind that the procedure is based on the existing event forms and that therefore its actual implementation should take into account possible future changes in the arrangements for event risk sharing and for publication of proceedings.

After a detailed discussion the following changes to the existing forms are recommended to the Board:

- (1) in the "EVENT REQUEST FORM":
 - a. remove AMB chair approval (this had been decided in Amsterdam but the form has not been updated consequently);
 - b. in the section "Statement of understanding": (a) replace "final report" with "Event Report Form"; (b) change the deadline for the submission of the "Event Report Form" from the present 3 months to 6 months; (c) require that the fourth paragraph, beginning with "I accept ..." be substituted by a sentence such as "All financial and legal liabilities for this event are covered by the attached MOU" (this is essential for cosponsored events).
- (2) in the "IFIP EVENT REPORT FORM":
 - a. remove the word "IFIP" from the title and add IFIP's logo on top of the document;
 - b. replace "Main Organizer Contact" with "Event Organizer".
- (3) in the "IFIP PAYMENT REQUEST FORM" remove the word "IFIP" from the title and add IFIP's logo on top of the document.

AMB recommended also:

- (4) to review and update the event form guidelines;
- (5) to ask the Secretariat to remind event organizers of the necessity of submitting the Event Report Form two weeks after the conclusion of the event and two weeks before the 6-month deadline;
- (6) to ask event organizers to prepare a form for registration of attendants which provides the option to allow IFIP to use the collected information (such as e-mail address) in connection with future IFIP sponsored or co-sponsored events.

➤ Event risk sharing

Mr Frisiani reported that he received several expressions of interest and promises of contributions; but unfortunately none arrived. After discussing this issue AMB concluded that the requirement of having a specific MOU for each event should remove all the problems raised in the past by TC chairs.

In addition AMB recommends:

- (7) to prepare comprehensive guidelines for TC chairs, covering in particular financial aspects.

➤ Conference management system

Mr Frisiani reported that also on this issue the new contributions from TCs have been limited: only TC 8 indicated what they are doing:

- TC 3 uses and is happy with a proprietary system, named ICMS (IFIP Conference Management System), developed by professor Anton Knierzinger and co-workers.

- TC 8 uses and is happy with EasyChair conference system, which is available for free, hosted at the University of Manchester Computer Science Department and undergoes continuous enrichments and developments.
- TC 12 uses and is happy with a proprietary system developed by Max Bramer.

Outside of TCs it may be pointed out that, for ACM and IEEE-CS approved events, registration and meeting planning services are provided through centralized services.

AMB assumed that it is not reasonable for IFIP, at least in the present situation, to establish a centralized service, therefore the AMB recommends:

- (8) to wait for the conclusion of the discussions with Springer, since it may be possible that at their conclusion another tool may become available;
- (9) to illustrate again at that point the identified alternatives to the TC chairs.

Mr von Solms suggested to AMB to assemble a list of the available systems and to hand it over to TCs; so, they have a basis for decision what system they would like to use.

Mr Bramer offered to TCs that they can use the TC12 system hosted on the TC12 server.

The Board **AGREED** with the conclusion to wait for the agreement with Springer.

4.8.2 Developing Countries Support Committee (DCSC)

Ms Avgerou reported that following the GA discussion on the DCSC plan in August 2008, DCSC action in the past 6 months focused on three areas: supporting DC participation in TC events; organizing events for the developing of ICT research capabilities in DCs; organizing an event aiming at knowledge transfer from stronger member societies to DC societies.

- a) Use of available funding to support DC participation in the events of TCs.
At the GA meeting in Milan, the TC chairs expressed interest in using DCSC funding to support participants from developing countries attending their events, and asked to be informed about procedures and available funding. The DCSC chair wrote to them explaining the simple procedures to be followed and asking them to submit requests for up to 2000 Euros per TC for 2009.

The total sum requested from DCSC fund was 12.000 Euro. These requests have been approved by DCSC and can therefore be used in 2009. The request from TC8 to transfer the quota to 2010 will be discussed with the IFIP treasurer.

- b) Strengthening research capabilities in developing countries.
In addition to assisting research students, academics and practitioners from developing countries to participate in IFIP conferences, the DCSC in its plan of action identified the need to assist in the development of research capabilities in DCs. The rationale for such action is based on the observation that research by DC scholars is rarely published in highly ranked international journals. Even in special issues on developing countries only a small fraction of published papers have authors from DCs.

On 12 Dec 2008, Chrisanthi Avgerou and Leon Strous met in Paris with Ted Stohr, chair of the Association for Information Systems (AIS) Special Interest Group (SIG) on ICT and Global Development, and Gianluca Miscione from the

International Institute for Geo-Information Science and Earth Observation (ITC) and discussed possibilities for joint efforts to raise funding for organizing research capabilities development in developing countries. As a result of this meeting IFIP is partner in a research network building proposal to the EuropeanAid EU programme. Details on the project will be explained when the proposal is accepted.

Also, during the HCC8 (Human Choice and Computers) conference in Pretoria, September 2008, we (IFIP) were invited by delegates to the conference to organize a 'summer school' in Africa to explore arguments on the role of ICT for development formed in local research centers and to seek ways for their effective dissemination through publications. Some of the DCSC existing funds may be used to support such an event in 2010.

- c) Another area of action in the DCSC plan is strengthening the development of institutions regarding the diffusion of ICT and their social consequences. Specifically, DCSC identified the need to provide assistance for the effective operations of computer societies, other professional ICT organizations, data protection agencies, etc. DCSC explored the possibility of organizing a meeting with SEARCC member societies in New Delhi, but it didn't materialize. DCSC is now planning for such an event in Hanoi following WITFOR 2009 and the GA meeting.

The Board **WELCOMED** the report.

4.8.3 International Liaison Committee (ILC)

Mr Morel drew attention to his report on ILC (please see full presentation at <http://www.ifip.org/images/stories/ifip/public/publications/minutes/Board2009/b09-ppt-ilc%20%20rep.pdf>).

Many contacts to international organisations were made at several events, like at

- ITU meeting in Geneva to prepare the WSIS clusters,
- the Digital Solidarity Lyon Conference: This meeting brought together 500 international experts who have actively contributed to the debate could follow the official statements as well as those of major international bodies (UNITAID UN, Gaid UN, ITU, UNDP, World Bank), the international networks (Global Cities Dialogue, Eurocities, World Association of Women Entrepreneurs, Women's Forum) and large companies or foundations (Microsoft, Intel, Alcatel Lucent, Orange, Havas, Fondation Merieux).
- EU Project Paradiso : The Paradiso project (see WWW.PARADISO-FP7.EU) launched with the support of the European Commission (DG INFORMATION SOCIETY AND MEDIA) aims at identifying strategic research directions on network and service infrastructures suited to the perspective of a global (truly) sustainable future.
- 2 links with important EU projects:
 - The MATURE Project
 - The European Network of Living Labs (ENoLL)
- Meeting with OECD on "Global Project on Measuring the Progress of Societies"

In addition ILC was involved in 2008 in several activities in order to get into close contact to the international communities:

- UNESCO follow up as usual through Eduard Dundler, Bernard Cornu and Raymond Morel with WSIS clusters, ANDIL project, activities in some events i.e WCCE'2009, WITFOR'2009, etc.
- AGORA on LLL conference New Delhi workshop and 2009 calendar
- IP3 Task Force

4.8.4 Marketing Committee (MC)

Mr Sawhney referred to his report and said that the Marketing Committee has defined that it needs to work on the following fronts:

- Fostering an increased awareness of IFIP and its products in the communities IFIP serves;
- Marketing IFIP Internationally - in new geographies and new constituencies, like the CIOs.
- To achieve these targets an Information Package on IFIP is required. This could start with an IFIP Brochure, and then move on to helping the TCs, the different projects and the organizers of our events to market our activities better, outside our TCs, to our Member Societies, their members and to the wider IT profession, the large IT services industry and the IT vendors.

Mr Sawhney presented a draft of a proposed IFIP brochure and asked for help to complete information. Especially information of some TCs are missing and they are requested to send their contribution within the next weeks.

- Getting the IFIP community to work together, across TCs and WGs, and with Member Societies
- Having the IFIP Web-site to lead to all our digital presence – TCs, WGs, Digital Library, Member Societies' web-sites.

Mr Sawhney informed the Board that in order to elicit the requirements of IFIP's stake-holders, MC has prepared two questionnaires (one for Member Societies and one for TCs / WGs). He hopes that all these useful inputs will help the Board Members and Chairs of the various Standing Committees and Task Forces, and the Technical Committees to calibrate the future plans for their respective areas, in line with the requirements.

As the MC is also responsible for communications with IFIP members, members of Member Societies, Affiliate Members and sister Federations, MC has to look how it can provide a two-way flow of information between IFIP Member Societies and IFIP, and also reach out to the larger academic, research and professional community outside the MS membership, e.g. the highlights of our WGs / TCs' events, and major congresses, WITFOR, etc. need to be publicized in the printed publications of our member societies.

Of course IFIP's presence on the web needs improvement. At the very least all MS web-sites should have links to the IFIP / TC / WG web-sites. In addition, IFIP needs to drive traffic to its web-sites. This requires the web-site to be more useful and attractive, have dynamic content and interactivity.

In addition, the MC would work with the Member Society Relations Committee and the Developing Countries Support Committee to reach out to new prospective members and geographical groupings, to promote IFIP membership. A few more

countries might join IFIP if our products / value proposition are properly presented. However this will need aggressive marketing by experienced, senior IFIP volunteers traveling to these countries with credible and attractive sales collateral (the Info-Pack discussed above).

The Board **ACCEPTED** the report and asked Mr Sawhney to come up with printing costs for the requested IFIP brochure.

4.8.5 Member Society Relations Committee (MSRC)

Mr Schlamberger reported that MSRC discussed the following issues the meeting:

➤ MEMBERSHIP MATTERS

Established in 2008 by International Computer Driving License Gulf Countries Society Foundation and having provided their Statutes the General Assembly 2008 has granted GCC provisional membership. GCC has subsequently provided Statutes that are compliant with IFIP requirements so MSRC will recommend to the General Assembly 2009 admitting GCC to full membership.

The Board **APPROVED** the application of GCS

MSRC was happy to notice that Russian Academy of Sciences has renewed its membership and paid their dues for 2008. However, the dues for 2007 have not been paid. MSRC will ask for the position of the Board on this matter.

The Board **AGREED** to accept Russia as a new member starting in 2008.

The Ministry of Innovation, Research and Strategic Projects of the Government of Andorra has informed IFIP Secretariat that Centre Nacional d'Informàtica d'Andorra which was the member of IFIP ceased to exist. MSRC will recommend to formally terminating the CNIA membership.

The Board **AGREED**

Chilean Computer Society has failed to pay its dues for 2006, 2007 and 2008. After requesting them again to pay their dues its membership has been terminated at the end of 2008.

French member society Societe des Electriciens et des Electroniciens has not paid their dues for 2007 and 2008. It has been advised by the Secretariat that the SEE membership will be suspended at the end of 2008 and that representatives of SEE will be unable to participate in the work of Technical Committees. The issue will be put forward to General Assembly 2009.

The Board **AGREED**

Sultan Qaboos University of Oman has been advised by the Secretariat that SQU membership will suspended at the end of 2008 because it has failed to pay its dues for 2007 and 2008 and that representatives of SQU will be unable to participate in the work of Technical Committees.

The Secretariat informed the Board that in December Oman has paid its dues and is not longer in arrears.

➤ FUTURE PLANS

MSRC is looking forward to Members Societies reports that MS are expected to submit to GA under the present rules. MSRC hopes to find there an additional input for its future activities.

Mr Schlamberger said that MSRC would be glad to collaborate with the Task Force on Membership to help developing a new membership model.

➤ IFIP INFO PACKAGE

MSRC has seen the IIP as a necessary instrument in order to be able to carry out more substantial contacts.

4.8.6 Publications Committee (PC)

Mr Turner presented the report of Publications Committee and said the work of PC has been concentrated on the renewal of the publications contract with Springer (besides the IFIP Digital Library).

Mr Turner reported that a group representing IFIP met with a group of Springer representatives on 9 February 2009 in Heidelberg. President von Solms was unable to attend, and appointed Mr Strous to lead the IFIP delegation, which also included Mr Dundler and Mr Turner. The lead for Springer was Mr Hofmann. At the meeting Springer announced that a management decision had been made to close the SS+BM office (Springer Norwell) effective April 30, 2009, and to transfer the work on the IFIP Main series from Norwell to Heidelberg. Therefore the agenda for the meeting essentially doubled in anticipated size to include procedures for the transition of IFIP Main Series management to Heidelberg in addition to terms for a new contract.

Work on IFIP Main Series publications that are scheduled to be published through April 2009 will continue to be managed and produced from Norwell. Publications that are scheduled from May 1 to December 31 will be transferred to Heidelberg, and in fact manuscripts that have been submitted previously have already been transferred to Heidelberg, and editorial processing for May publications is almost complete. The email address ifip@springer.com has been redirected to the IFIP contact in Heidelberg.

The Heidelberg group that will manage the Main Series for the remainder of the current contract (and likely under the new contract as well) is the same group that manages the LNCS Series. Thus there will now be a single point of contact for all IFIP publications published by Springer, and the templates and submission procedures for the IFIP Main and IFIP LNCS series will be the same. Some additional advantages of the new management are that the books will be typeset, and such things as tables of contents, running heads, and page numbers will be generated by the Springer editorial staff. There no longer will be a need to submit camera-ready copy, nor a pdf file of the entire volume.

The new management group in Heidelberg would like to make some immediate changes in the IFIP Main Series:

- A name change to something that is more descriptive of the series content and more attractive from a professional and marketing perspective is requested. Issue/volume numbers and the series name will be prominently displayed on the cover, title page, and spine, and the name of the conference (for proceedings) also will be prominently displayed on the cover. The Publications

Committee has discussed a series name and will make a recommendation at this Board meeting.

- Create an editorial board for the series, even if the board functions in name only. The Publications Committee is discussing ways to do this and will make a recommendation by the time of the Board meeting.
- Include information about the contents on the back cover of each issue/volume.

Additionally, a change to a soft cover was recommended, possibly with colour and other design modifications as well. For the time being the covers will remain the same, and the Publications Committee will discuss changes to the cover, coordinating with the Marketing Committee as appropriate.

Discussions relative to the new contract were cordial and professional. Each point in the goals and terms for the new contract that IFIP submitted in advance was discussed. Springer was requested to provide terms for a new contract in writing before the time of the Board meeting. Unfortunately this has been delayed by Springer.

Mr Turner presented the plans and ongoing work for the Publications Committee:

1. Continued development of the DL. Work will continue to establish normal operating procedures, with modifications as needed for the transition to the Springer Heidelberg office. These efforts include providing more direct linkage from the DL to full text in SpringerLink. The templates for use by e-only publications also will be reviewed.
It is essential that a financial model be developed for sustaining the operation of the DL. A decision is requested as to responsibility for developing a DL financial model.
2. Transition from Springer SS+BM (Norwell) to Springer Heidelberg. As previously mentioned, the Publications Committee is discussing a name for the Main Series and an editorial board for the series.
3. Establishment of a new publications contract. Negotiations will continue to work out the details of a new publications contract with Springer.
4. Updating the IFIP web site. Revised documents to reflect the change to Springer Heidelberg will be placed on the IFIP web site.

Mr Turner presented the recommendations and requests of the PC to the Board:

1. Approval of a new name for the IFIP Main Series. PC proposed **AICT** ("IFIP Advances in Information and Communication Technology")

The Board **APPROVED** the name.

2. Approval of procedures for establishing an editorial board for the IFIP Main Series. Members TC Chairs of each TC

The Board **APPROVED** the establishing of an editorial board.

3. Define responsibilities and target dates for developing a financial model to support DL operations.

The Board **AGREED**

4. Discussions about softcover / hardcover for the proceedings is in progress

Mr Strous presented a copy of the latest Journal from TC11 published with Elsevier which has recently been published. - **Mr von Solms** congratulated TC11.

4.8.7 Technical Assembly

Mr Hinchey reported on issues from Technical Assembly (please see full report at: <http://www.ifip.org/images/stories/ifip/public/publications/minutes/Board2009/b09-ta-rep.pdf>):

1. Relationship to GA, Board and EC

1.1 Meetings

While the TC Chairs appreciate that the intention of eliminating a TA co-located with the Board meeting was to remove travel and financial pressures on TC Chairs, the result has been negative. While TC Chairs will continue to have electronic communications, this is not a substitute for an in-person meeting and there is a strong wish to continue to have two face-to-face meetings a year.

At the GA in Milan, the TC Chairs requested reinstatement of a TA meeting co-located with the Board meeting, and this was agreed for Delhi. However, TA like all committees is asked to produce a written report two weeks in advance of the Board and after substantial discussion between TC Chairs it was decided that on this occasion the TA should take place in February prior to the Board meeting in Delhi in March. Whilst the intent of asking TA to meet at a time other than co-located with the Board was to facilitate the production of advance reports, this has caused even more travel and financial problems for those TC Chairs who are Board members. Moreover, the lack of a TA presence in Delhi has had an impact on other committee meetings that are not now being held.

In future TA intends that its meetings should be co-located with the Board and GA meetings, but will send in reports agreed by email discussion two weeks beforehand. While TA will endeavour to make such reports comprehensive, TA respectfully asks the Board to consider that there may be some matters that arise during the TA meetings themselves that need to be addressed.

The Board **ACCEPTED** the proposal

1.2 Board Meeting location

TA requests that Board (formerly Council) meetings be held in a fixed venue (e.g. Laxenburg) have been made regularly since the Seoul meeting. TA notes that this would mean reduced travel and pressure for the IFIP staff and, while not ideal for TC Chairs based outside of Europe, would enable TC Chairs to plan travel more easily as well as in many cases reducing costs.

2.3 Role of TA

TA is a major contributor to IFIP, being the main technical contribution of the society. TC Chairs need to identify the strengths of their TCs to determine the ways in which they can most effectively contribute to the achievement of the Federation's aims. For example this might be achieved by organising a series of world-class conferences, by influencing policy makers or the international research agenda, or by bringing IFIP expertise and know-how to less developed countries. Not all TCs need to contribute in the same way.

2.4 Participation of TC Chairs

Members of the TA are grateful for the attempts that have been made to give greater voice to TC Chairs in IFIP. However the TA feels that this is still not sufficient. In particular, TA wishes TC Chairs to be full members of GA rather than merely ex officio members.

TA will table a proposed amendment to necessary Statutes and Bylaws to enable all TC Chairs to be full members of GA and hence eligible to stand for election as officers; all elected officers to complete their term of office regardless of any changes in their GA membership status.

Mr Hinchey informed the Board about the proposal of TA to ask General Assembly to vote on proposed amendments in IFIP's Bylaws in Hanoi.

Mr von Solms and **Mr Johnson** informed the Chair of TA that proposals for changes of the Bylaws have to go to Statutes and Bylaws Committee first.

Mr von Solms said that in principle TC Chairs could be allowed as observers to the Board, but because they could not take part in the discussion, it will probably not be acceptable. **Mr von Solms** stated also that the smaller size of the new Board had made it more efficient and productive.

The Board **ACCEPTED** that the proposals of the TA be conveyed to the General Assembly.

2. World Computer Congress

There was a widely held view that the current style of WCC (with a number of separate conferences, each run by a single TC) is no longer serving IFIP well. There were mixed views on whether WCC should continue after 2010, be cancelled altogether or replaced by another biennial or triennial flagship event. If the last of these, it was unclear what format it should take and there were mixed views on whether any new event should or should not use the name WCC.

There was lengthy discussion about the form a new flagship event might take. Some of the points made were that IFIP needs to organize events that are timely and important (examples given include: technology and the global financial crisis; terrorism, security and privacy; IT in the military; cybersecurity). IFIP needs to influence IT-related policy worldwide, and to partner with appropriate international bodies. This in turn would make it more attractive for top people to come to WCC or its successor. The current financial model, focused on having large numbers of attendees at a biennial multi-disciplinary event is part of the problem.

It was felt that the current organisational arrangements were a barrier to the TC Chairs organising the higher-quality and more innovative events that we would like to see, especially those of an inter-disciplinary nature. However, it is still not too late to influence the content of WCC 2010. The (non-TC) members of the conference committee need to be carefully chosen, so that all concerned are eager to innovate rather than continue with arrangements that worked well in the past but are now holding the Federation back. Finalising the arrangements for WCC 2010 (taking into account the above points) is a matter of urgency, on which TC chairs should be consulted. Binding decisions for WCC-style events after 2010 should not be made at this time.

Action: The TA encourages all stakeholders in IFIP at the Board meeting or otherwise to join in a debate about the future of the WCC series. The TA intends to bring one or more proposals to the 2009 GA on this topic.

Mr von Solms requested TA to bring their proposals for a reorganisation to his attention as he is already in consideration about the future of WCCs (please see issue under agenda point 6.2)

3. Publication Contract

The recently reported willingness of Springer to discuss a move to publication in Europe was well received. The TC Chairs present were unanimous in their discontent with the current contract. In particular, TA highlights the need to have publications available in the IFIP digital library much more quickly (after no more than 6 months and preferably immediately).

4. IP3

TA understands that BCS is suspending its involvement in and financial support for IP3 although not pulling out officially. It is worrying to have an initiative to liberate TCs from being the major financial generator for IFIP run into problems so early and to lose one of its driving forces.

While the future of IP3 is being considered, the TA would like the opportunity to take a closer look at the project

For content, to ensure it reflects technical quality;

To understand the process by which the syllabus was derived (need to establish if TCs have ownership over this syllabus and its evolution);

To understand its implementation given the emerging situation with the originating societies;

To determine the likelihood that other societies will go along with it

5. IFIP Strategy Project 1

The current draft of Project 1 under IFIP strategy was considered unexciting, but a reasonable starting point. On the one hand TC Chairs would benefit from greater information about the quality of their events; on the other an unnecessarily bureaucratic and mechanistic system of 'quality assurance' would not be welcome.

TC Chairs will re-read and notify Mr Hinchey if they have objections to the current draft of Project 1. Otherwise it should proceed.

6. Delegate Information Management System

Mr Bramer presented a prototype delegate information management system. The purpose of this system is:

to give feedback to national societies on participation from their members;

for management information;

to provide mailing lists for future events.

The system will be piloted for report back to the Board in Delhi and the GA in Hanoi. Issues of data protection will of course need to be taken into account when using this new system. The use of data from the Milan 2008 WCC in particular needs to be investigated.

7. Any Other Business

Tharam Dillon (AUS) has been elected as TC-12 Chair to succeed Max Bramer whose term ends at the end of the 2009 GA.

TC-11 has decided to present the 2009 IFIP TC-11 Kristian Beckman Award to Klaus Brunnstein to honour his persistent work to underline and make known the importance of information security to the international community, his holistic approach at a time when this required a stand beyond and ahead of the mainstream, and his integrative initiatives to make the work in IFIP not only an academic gathering but also to enable interactions with and between a broad group of users, such as societies and organizations.

Thanks were expressed to Chrisanthi Avgerou for kindly providing a meeting room and refreshments for a Sunday meeting.

4.9 Future Meetings

The next meetings are:

2009	GA	August 29 th - 31 st following WITFOR 2009
2010	Board GA	March 4 th - 6 th , Sofia, Bulgaria September 24 ^h - 26 th , Brisbane, Australia following WCC 2010
2011	Board GA	March, Dublin, Ireland September – invitations are invited

The attention of member societies is drawn to the importance of venues having easy access to major international airports.

4.10 AoB

Mr von Solms informed the Board that he will not stand for a 2nd term as IFP President.

Board members supported the President's view that nominations from the floor for President are undesirable. Statutes & Bylaws Committee will review the rules for voting on IFIP officers. EC will review Standing Orders. **Mr Johnson** will distribute information about the voting process.

4.11 Closing of Meeting

The President concluded by again thanking the hosts for their hospitality and everyone present for their contributions.

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

4.12 ANNEX 1: Publisher's Report

Contents:

IFIP Book Program

- Announcement
- Titles Published

SpringerLink

IFIP Journal

Financial

Appendix A:

- Titles Published, 2008-2009
- Scheduled Titles, 2009

Appendix B:

- Total Sales and Royalties by TC
- IFIP-LNCS January-June 2008

IFIP Book Program

Announcement

The Publisher would like to take this opportunity to announce an exciting change at Springer. Effective immediately, the IFIP Main Series will be changing hands at Springer. Going forward, the IFIP Main Series will be handled primarily by Ms. Erika Siebert-Cole in the Springer Heidelberg, Germany office.

Ms. Siebert-Cole has been fully debriefed on the details of the current and future IFIP book projects, and will work with the volume editors and TC chairs to see them through to completion. Support in the Norwell, Massachusetts office will still be available for outstanding questions and support as needed.

Please continue to send correspondence, questions, and concerns to ifip@springer.com. This mailbox will continue to be monitored by Erika Siebert-Cole in conjunction with Kelly Moritz for the duration of the transition period. We are confident that this will be a seamless transition that will only prove to benefit the IFIP Main Series.

Titles Published

The Publisher is happy to report that in the 2008 calendar year, 32 books were published in the IFIP Main Series. Of the 32 books published in 2008, 14 titles were sent to the 20th World Computer Congress held in Milan, Italy in September. To date in 2009, 4 books have published with 4 volumes in production due out within the next two months.

As always, the Publisher would like to see a continued growth in the IFIP Series and welcomes your suggestions for harnessing any new publications. Please examine closely the list in Appendix A of this report and alert the Publisher to projects not listed; also please recruit your conference organizers to publish in the IFIP series.

IFIP on SpringerLink

Usage Statistics

The Publisher is pleased to report that there were approximately 170,000 full-text downloads of IFIP series books from SpringerLink from January to December, 2008. This figure is very much in line with the upward trend in the volume of downloads and usage of IFIP series texts. The Publisher is confident that this number will only increase as more attention is devoted to online content in the upcoming years.

IFIP Journal

Education and Information Technologies

Education and Information Technologies continues to publish on time in 2009, with one issue in production and three issues left to plan for the calendar year. The article budget for EAIT this year is 20 articles total. The Publisher reminds Technical Committee 3 and other relevant communities to encourage their members to submit papers to EAIT at www.edmgr.com/eait. In order to keep building a strong line-up of papers for the 2009 issue schedule, we hope to receive many more submissions to the journal.

Although the IFIP main series will now be handled by Erika Siebert-Cole in the Heidelberg office, the Publisher wishes to emphasize that there will be no changes made to the management of this journal at Springer. Please continue to contact Kelly Moritz with comments, questions, and feedback, and for more information on how IFIP members and their colleagues can submit papers for consideration for *Education and Information Technologies*.

Usage

Full-text downloads for *Education and Information Technologies* in the 2007 calendar year reached an impressive high, at 24,090 downloads in 2007 as compared to 17,944 in 2006 and 14,674 in 2005. Usage statistics are now available for the 2008 calendar year, and The Publisher is happy to report that downloads for the journal are still very much on course, with 24,104 full-text downloads from January to December.

The Publisher continues to encourage the community to subscribe to Table of Contents Alerts for EAIT. Table of Contents Alert is an opt-in service for SpringerLink users. To sign in, the user would go to the journal page on www.springer.com and follow the simple sign-up instructions to the right of the page.

The advantage to signing up for Table of Contents Alerts is that the Society can keep abreast of the new and exciting content appearing in the journal. In addition, EAIT readers and members of the community will be the first to receive information on new issues.

Financial**Summary of Books Published, Revenues, and Royalties - March 2009**

The following information, previously given in narrative form, is consolidated into one chart.

	<i>USD</i>	<i>Euro</i>	<i>New Books</i>
<i>January—June 1999</i>	\$256,290.99	€266,542.63	8
<i>July—December 1999</i>	\$332,633.65	€345,939.04	16
<i>January—June 2000</i>	\$297,686.69	€309,594.19	12
<i>July—December 2000</i>	\$355,897.89	€391,487.68	11
<i>January—June 2001</i>	\$261,495.37	€291,567.34	8
<i>July—December 2001</i>	\$289,309.21	€324,315.57	15
<i>January—June 2002</i>	\$218,871.18	€244,763.70	8
<i>July—December 2002</i>	\$414,840.22	€418,615.27	23
<i>January—June 2003</i>	\$449,935.03	€408,271.11	13
<i>July—December 2003</i>	\$287,117.00	€248,557.00	8
<i>January—June 2004</i>	\$122,224.00	€99,099.00	6
<i>July—December 2004</i>	\$406,789.89	€324,486.37	28
<i>January—June 2005</i>	\$257,281.63	€200,087.93	12
<i>July—December 2005</i>	\$234,616.49	€198,037.01	13
<i>January—June 2006</i>	\$246,597.82	€199,349.70	25
<i>July—December 2006</i>	\$310,264.27	€248,367.30	9
<i>January—June 2007</i>	\$133,614.70	€106,389.60	10
<i>July—December 2007</i>	\$321,983.30	€226,106.00	18
<i>January—June 2008</i>	\$156,895.64	€106,560.80	10
<i>July—December 2008</i>	\$304,824.61	€207,280.73	22

- *Royalties paid to IFIP for the IFIP Series totalled €8,254.04 (\$12,135.27) for the first half of 2008, and royalties paid to IFIP for the second half of 2008 totalled €10,181.61 (\$14,972.95), for a year total of €18,435.65 (\$27,108.22).*
- *Sales data by TC is included as Appendix B.*
- *Royalties paid to IFIP for the IFIP-LNCS series totalled €54,979.50 for the entirety of 2008.*
- *Summary of royalties over time:
Royalties paid to IFIP for the IFIP Series in 2006 totalled €51,181 (\$41,149) with €62,435 paid in Royalties to IFIP for the IFIP-LNCS series. In 2005 the Royalties totalled €56,728 (\$46,048), with €57,580 paid in Royalties to IFIP for the IFIP-LNCS series. In 2004 the Royalties totalled €89,736 (\$71,856), with €74,613 paid in Royalties to IFIP for the IFIP-LNCS series.*