

Minutes of the Board Meeting

Mar 5th - Mar 6th, 2010; Sofia, Bulgaria

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	8
4.3.4	EB Meeting Report.....	9
4.3.5	Treasurer's Report	10
4.3.6	Finance Committee Report	11
4.4	Progress Reports Task Forces.....	12
4.4.1	Finance Task Force	12
4.4.2	Membership Task Force.....	14
4.4.3	Event Reporting Task Force.....	16
4.4.4	CIO Forum	16
4.5	IFIP Strategy.....	17
4.5.1	General Strategic Matters	17
4.5.2	Strategic Project 1	18
4.6	Technical Assembly	19
4.7	Congresses and Major Events	21
4.7.1	WCC 2010	21
4.7.2	IFIP Pioneer Day.....	22
4.7.3	IFIP Golden Jubilee 2010.....	23
4.7.4	WITFOR 2009 / WITFOR 2011	24
4.7.5	Future WCCs	25
4.8	Professionalism Program (IP3)	27
4.9	AGORA InitiativeS	30
4.10	Standing Committee Reports	30
4.10.1	Developing Countries Support Committee (DCSC)	30
4.10.2	International Liaison Committee (ILC)	31
4.10.3	Marketing Committee (MC)	32
4.10.4	Member Society Relations Committee (MSRC).....	34
4.10.5	Publications Committee (PC)	34
4.11	Next Meetings	36
4.12	Closing of Meeting	36

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

IFIP Board, March 2010 Sofia, Bulgaria

Membership Issues: Membership of Botswana ceased at the end of 2009 as they last paid their subscription in 2006. The application of Vietnam has lapsed since no fee had received by the end of 2009. The membership of Ethiopia, Greece and Kenya will cease at the end of 2010 as they last paid their subscription in 2007.

Finances: Board accepted the 2009 accounts for approval by General Assembly 2010. The financial performance of IFIP was generally in line with the 2009 budget. A significant recovery in IFIP's portfolio investments was noted. An operating deficit is mainly attributable to WITFOR 2009 expenditure, an expense that won't occur in 2010.

Finance Task Force: The Finance Task Force appointed in 2009 by the President made a detailed analysis of IFIP's Income and Expenditures and came up with recommendations, which will be presented to General Assembly.

Event Reporting Task Force: The proposal from the Task Force to implement a procedure for obtaining information about delegates to an IFIP event has been accepted. The procedure will be implemented immediately.

CIO Forum: The Board recognised the planned 1st CIO Forum as an opportunity for IFIP to expand it to a series of global events.

IFIP Future Strategy: For project 1 (Dissemination of high quality knowledge in ICT) the implementation of a Wiki has been proposed. This Wiki should support organisers of IFIP events in their work by showing experiences of the organisation of previous events.

Congresses:

WCC 2010: It has been reported that there has been a change of the local organisation team. The new team is working hard to overcome the roadblocks very soon. All members of the Board were worried about WCC 2010, but all of them agreed that it is running and cannot be stopped.

WITFOR: WITFOR 2009 received great media coverage in Vietnam and was a scientific success. Some lessons have been learned for future organisation of WITFORs.

Future WCCs: Some suggestions have been made and discussed how to organise future WCCs in periodicity and in content as well. A proposal will be presented at General Assembly 2010.

Professionalism Program (IP3): In order to safeguard IFIP and IP3's interest, IP3 is taking steps to trademark the name "IP3". A set of Terms of Reference to regulate the longer term of operations of the IP3 project has been prepared and after minor changes approved.

Publications: A new publications contract for 5 years with Springer has been signed. Publication procedures are available at IFIP's website.

Digital Library: Several problems with IFIP's Digital Library will be addressed before General Assembly. However it is essential that a financial model has to be developed for sustaining the operation of the Digital Library.

2 ACTION LIST

IFIP Board, March 2010 Sofia, Bulgaria

Task	Person / Body
Legal Advice:	
○ To seek to engage a lawyer for legal issues on a pro bono basis	Exec. Comm.
International Liaison:	
○ Review the approach to links with international bodies	Exec. Comm.
Finance:	
○ To invite tenders for the auditor of IFIP's accounts	Treasurer
○ To make an inventory of current rules and regulations with respect to financial items and to check for consistency	Finance Committee
Membership:	
○ Proposal for new classification of members	Mr von Solms
○ To continue work of Membership Task Force	Membership TF
Events Reporting:	
○ To implement the proposed data collection system	Mr Bramer, Secretariat
IFIP Strategy – Project 1:	
○ Implementing an IFIP run Event Support Wiki, which could foster exchange of information, tips and hints	Mr Rannenberg
○ To find experienced organiser for sharing start-up information	IFIP Board
World Computer Congress:	
○ WCC 2010: To re-consider registration fee	Mr von Solms, LOC
○ WCC 2010: To provide on WCC website hotels with cheaper rates for students	Mr von Solms, LOC
○ WCC2010: Getting and signing contract	Mr von Solms
○ Future WCCs: To draft a proposal for a new event aimed for 2012 for General Assembly 2010.	Mr Strous, Ms Avgerou, Mr Rannenberg
World IT Forum:	
○ Full Final Report	Mr Strous
○ Update of WITFOR website	Mr Strous
○ To find host for next WITFOR in 2011	Mr Strous
Publications:	
○ To address several problems with the Digital Library as	Publ. Comm.

soon it is known what changes will be required to add the metadata from Springer publications to the Digital Library

- To produce revised documents for IFIP's website Publ. Comm.
- To respond as requested regarding financing the Digital Library to the Finance Committee Publ. Comm.

3 ATTENDANCE LIST

IFIP Board, March 2010 Sofia, Bulgaria

C Avgerou	Councillor
C Avram	Treasurer
M Bramer	Councillor
G Engel	Vice-President
B Eschermann	Councillor
M Hinchey	Councillor
R Johnson	Secretary
R Morel	Councillor
R Puigjaner	Vice-President
M Raffai	Secretary Elect
K Rannenber	Councillor
D Robertson	Councillor
L Sawhney	Vice-President
B von Solms	President
L Strous	President Elect
J Turner	Vice-President
J Wibe	Councillor

Observers

K Brunnstein	General Chair WCC 2010
K Boyanov	Bulgaria
G Lane	Chair IP3
F Lin	CIE (China)
R Liu	CIE (China)

Secretariat

E Dundler	General Secretary
-----------	-------------------

4 BOARD MEETING

IFIP Board, March 2010 Sofia, Bulgaria

4.1 Call Meeting to Order

The **President** opened the Board meeting and welcomed all participants. He expressed IFIP's grateful thanks to the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences represented by **Acad. Kiril Boyanov** and to the University of National and World Economy represented by **Assoc. Prof . Dr. Valentin Kisimov**.

Acad. Kiril Boyanov welcomed Board members on behalf of the President of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences. He reminded the Board that this is the 3rd IFIP event in Bulgaria and that the event is very important for Bulgaria, because it shows that the Bulgarian society is alive and has international connections. He wished to the Board a successful meeting and enjoyable stay in Bulgaria.

4.2 Attendance and Apologies

The **Secretary** announced Board attendance as complete with no absences.

4.3 Business Matters

4.3.1 Approval of Agenda

Board unanimously **ADOPTED** the agenda.

4.3.2 President's Report

Mr von Solms drew attention to his report and said that since the meeting of General Assembly in Hanoi in September 2009, the major part of his time was spent on the IFIP World Computer Congress 2010. Several other projects he wanted to give more attention to, have not received the attention they deserved, but the success of WCC 2010 was of course, extremely important.

The President reported from those issues which took most of his time.

➤ Membership issues

The President informed the Board that he had personal contact with the President of SEE, the previous French member to IFIP. SEE is very anxious to rejoin IFIP, but several aspects have to be resolved first. The matter is still open.

The President also met David Carpenter, the Chief Learning Officer of the Gulf Computer Society. The membership of the GCS is also still open, but other alternatives are being investigated at the moment.

The President reported that IFIP keeps receiving requests from existing members, mostly in developing countries, to downgrade their membership, or even to accept their resignation. This matter is worrying, and solutions will have to be found soon.

➤ Task Forces

The President said that several Task Forces were active during this period, and will report at this meeting. He thanked all the Chairs and members of these Task Forces for their efforts.

➤ International Liaison

The President reported that an invitation was received to attend the launch of the Middle East e-Learning Society (MEEA) in Dubai in February 2010. Together with **Mr Kahn** from UNESCO, IFIP was a co-signatory of the launch document of MEEA. On

behalf of IFIP, **the President** was also invited to attend the first General Assembly of MEEA. IFIP was also invited to be a Honorary member of MEEA. MEEA intends to approach IFIP to join in some capacity.

➤ Publications

The President informed the Board that a new contract with Springer had been finalized and signed.

The IFIP 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. IFIP has to decide whether it wants to continue with the Digital Library, as the intended use is not happening as planned. The matter has received attention in Technical Assembly, and will be discussed at this meeting.

➤ IFIP legal status

The President informed the Board that this matter has been finalized and IFIP has been acknowledged by the Austrian government as legal entity.

➤ WCC 2010

The President said that many problems arose since the General Assembly meeting, which required a lot of time. A full report will be given at this meeting.

➤ Future WCC Conferences

The President said that the matter of future World Computer will be discussed at this meeting, based on a short submitted report.

➤ Auerbach Award

The President announced that the Auerbach Award will be given during the World Computer Congress 2010 to one or more people. As a result of IFIP's 50th Anniversary, and as this Award had not been made since 2002, it seems prudent that IFIP considers awarding more than one award this year.

The President asked the Board to approve a small Committee, consisting of the President, Ms Avgerou and Mr Strous, to consider possible awardees, and submit a list to the Executive Committee of IFIP for finalization. He specifically asked the Board for approval that the Committee can add names which did not come from National Member Societies.

The Board **APPROVED** the request.

4.3.3 Secretary's Report

Mr Johnson reported that the Secretariat continues to run smoothly and he expressed all thanks once again to the General Secretary and his team for their hard work for IFIP.

The Secretary reported that Mr Strous, Ms Raffai and he spent a valuable day with the IFIP staff in Laxenburg during January as part of a wider familiarisation exercise prior to the handover of his duties at the end of General Assembly 2010.

The Secretary informed the Board, that following consultation with an Austrian lawyer, IFIP has established that it has enjoyed incorporated status in Austria since the move from Switzerland. The lawyer was checking that the documentation IFIP holds is complete and up to date. This gives all IFIP officers the normal legal protection enjoyed by directors of incorporated companies. The General Secretary is

investigating whether IFIP requires any public liability insurance. A statement giving the formal details of IFIP's incorporated status has been added to the website.

The Secretary said that it has been agreed to issue an Invitation to Tender for the position of auditors to IFIP.

The Secretary informed the Board that at January 28th, IFIP has 49 Members with voting rights. IFIP's Executive Committee remains committed to increasing IFIP membership and always welcomes details of possible contacts for new members.

The Secretary reported to the Board that:

1. The membership of **Botswana** ceased at the end of 2009 as they last paid their subscription in 2006.
2. The application from **Vietnam** has lapsed since no fee had received by the end of 2009.
3. Discussions continue to resolve the membership of **France**.
4. The membership of **Ethiopia, Greece and Kenya** will cease at the end of 2010 as they last paid their subscription in 2007. Representatives of Ethiopia, Greece and Kenya are currently unable to participate in TCs and SGs or serve on IFIP's Board.
5. The voting rights of **Russia** in GA are suspended since they have not paid dues for 2009. Representatives of the society will be unable to participate in TCs and SGs or serve on IFIP's Board from January 2011 unless the outstanding sum is paid. Any elected officers from the country will be deemed to have resigned at that date and will be replaced.

The Secretary reported to the Board that he and Mr Strous met the new CEPIS President Vasile Baltac from Romania, Julian Seymour and Nikos Ioannou from CEPIS. One of the topics discussed was Professionalism and they came to a commitment to make an IP3 presentation in Brussels with EU.

It was common agreement in cooperation on meetings and events, sharing details of events. **The Secretary** reported that he has invited CEPIS to participate in events in Brisbane and he gave an overview on IFIP Golden Jubilee.

The President said that this was the last Board meeting for **Mr Johnson**. He thanked **Mr Johnson** for his work for many years and welcomed **Mrs Maria Raffai** as new Honorary Secretary following General Assembly 2010.

4.3.4 EB Meeting Report

Mr Johnson reported that IFIP's Executive Committee met on the day before. Many issues were covered, among them Finance issues, IP3, Publications and others. In order to avoid repetition, these will be addressed under the respective agenda items.

Mr Johnson reported on the main issues:

➤ WCC2010

Executive Committee expressed concerns about the local organisation of the World Computer Congress 2010, although it has been noted that local control has improved since several replacements in the Local Organisation Committee. Executive Committee is still strongly requesting signing the contract with Local Organisation Committee.

➤ Legal Advice

Mr Johnson reported that Executive Committee is seeking to engage a lawyer for legal issues on a pro bono basis.

4.3.5 Treasurer's Report

Mr Avram referred to his report and said that IFIP's 2009 accounts, maintained by the secretariat, have been reviewed by the auditor in February 2010.

The Treasurer showed a summary of the financial statements as reported to GA in 2009 and extended it to include 2009 actual results. The summary table shows trends in financial performance. The IFIP long term reserves are invested in volatile assets and distort the IFIP financial performance. In order to overcome this situation, the table lists "Operating" income, expenses and an operating result that excludes the portfolio.

Summary financial results 2003 to 2009

Amounts are in thousand Euro (K EUR)

Statement of financial performance

	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003
Income	696	-174	335	397	739	359	568
Expenses	415	352	304	279	271	219	374
Result	281	-526	30	117	467	140	194

Statement of financial position

Assets	2567	2366	2701	2609	2580	2171	2074
Liabilities	329	437	234	23	101	157	185
Funds	2238	1929	2466	2585	2477	2013	1889

Source: 2003 - 2008 from Minutes GA 2009

Source: 2009 Audited Balance Sheet and Income Statement 31/12/2009

Portfolio performance	372	-497	-24	117	265	78	102
-----------------------	-----	------	-----	-----	-----	----	-----

Source: UBS quarterly portfolio reports; spread sheet IFIP-UBS-ver7.xls

Financial performance excluding portfolio

Operating income	324	323	359	280	474	281	466
Expenses	415	352	304	279	271	219	374
Operating result	-91	-29	55	1	203	62	92

The Treasurer informed the Board that during 2009, a Finance Task Force considered a number of finance issues, in particular the long term portfolio returns and will submit to the IFIP Board its conclusions and recommendation in relation to the portfolio and portfolio management. The Taskforce will also make recommendations in relation to the use of portfolio returns. The Treasurer reported that the secretariat has sent financial reports to IFIP's major business units, the Technical Committees. The secretariat has developed a system to regularly report financial performance and financial position to:

- business units (TCs);
- projects;
- IFIP;
- IFIP secretariat.

The Treasurer summarized that IFIP's financial performance (operating) was generally in line with the 2009 budget and update as reported in September 2009. There was a significant recovery in IFIP's portfolio investments.

At General Assembly in 2009, the General Secretary estimated an "on target" budget year with a small deficit. The 2009 budget included a small positive portfolio performance. This was achieved, so we ended the year with a large surplus but a larger than average operating deficit.

The operating deficit is mainly attributable to WITFOR 2009 expenditure, an expense that won't recur in 2010.

The Treasurer re-stated his comments from years past: IFIP needs to find new business opportunities!

The Finance Taskforce has made recommendations in relation to the next steps for IFIP.

The Treasurer endorsed the recommendations.

The Board unanimously **ACCEPTED** the 2009 accounts for approval by General Assembly 2010.

4.3.6 Finance Committee Report

Mr Wibe presented the report of the Finance Committee. He informed the Board that Finance Committee welcomed the reporting on the split between operating results and portfolio performance. This allows analysing and discussing both items independently.

For future reports the Finance Committee proposed to include a comparison of budget with actual data of the previous year.

The Finance Committee would welcome a glossary of specific technical terms used in the financial and Treasurer's report.

The Finance Committee recommended reconciling the management financial reporting provided in the Treasurer's report with audited figures also for past years. The Treasurer will investigate small discrepancies noted and report back to the Finance Committee.

Mr Wibe reported that the Finance Committee fully endorses the recommendations of the Finance Task Force. It strongly advises the Executive Committee to appoint clear responsibilities for the implementation of the recommendations provided by the Finance Task Force and regularly follow up on the progress.

The Finance Committee endorsed the proposal to invite tenders for the auditor of IFIP's accounts.

The Finance Committee recommended to use a common to report on the benefits and potential future income for all major budget items (with the exception of administrative base costs) starting from the budget for 2011.

The Finance Committee welcomed the input on future roles and responsibilities with respect to IFIP finances. This report was seen as a good starting point to clarify these roles and responsibilities for the future. The Finance Committee invited comments on

this document from the Board within the next month, so that an updated document can be communicated to the General Assembly meeting in September.

The Finance Committee will make an inventory of current rules and regulations with respect to financial items. It will check for consistency and will provide inputs regarding potential improvements for the General Assembly meeting in September.

The Board unanimously **ACCEPTED** the report.

4.4 Progress Reports Task Forces

4.4.1 Finance Task Force

Mr Eschermann presented the report from the Finance Task Force. The main purpose of the Task Force was to review the present IFIP Financial Business Plan and to propose a new plan which can take IFIP into the next decade.

Mr Eschermann showed the Board an analysis of the Income and Expenses over the last 7 years. The overall comparison showed that after years of surpluses, IFIP had a moderate deficit since 2007. The major contribution to increased costs came from IFIP's investment in IP3 and WITFOR. Other expense items like the IFIP Digital Library resulted in additional minor cost increases.

Mr Eschermann explained the detailed analysis of the income: The income from membership dues was stable since 2000 with smaller variations due to individual society changes. Income from Event proceeds fluctuated wildly from year to year, rather with a downward trend, particularly in WCC years. Income from Publications also fluctuated significantly between years. The downward trend is more clearly visible than for event proceeds.

The Finance Task Force recommended tying event income and also royalty income in IFIP's bookkeeping to the relevant conference series and correct year to allow yearly analysis per event series.

Mr Eschermann showed the detailed analysis of the expenses: The costs are dominated by the costs for the secretariat. TC costs have been stable over time. Besides the overall balance between income and costs, partial balances are also desirable: Balance between member society dues and permanent costs (secretariat) and income from publications and event proceeds with TC funds and projects.

Mr Eschermann said that with the limited ability to analyse past income streams, predictions for 2015 are difficult. But assuming no changes (business as usual) and no investment in new activities there will be a deficit of about 80K EUR per annum.

Based on the overall analysis the Finance Task Force made the following recommendations:

1. with IFIP's ambitions and considering the difficulty of distributing work among unpaid volunteers, its administrative core functions like secretariat are not dispensable (costs would rather increase and not decrease)
2. as there is a clear and growing discrepancy between increasing costs and stable or decreasing income, an increased reliable income is necessary. Additional sources of income have to be established.

Out of a listing of potential future income sources the Finance Task Force recommended to give the following income sources the highest priority:

- a. income from assets
- b. income from events (conferences, ...)
- c. contributions from members (re-evaluate membership categories, ...)
- d. sponsoring by international organisations, corporations, foundations, governments, ... (typically, sponsoring can be obtained for specific activities / events, but not for general expenses)
- e. teaching / education materials for IT in developing countries, e.g. paid by UNESCO, OECD, ...

Mr Eschermann reported that the Finance Task Force urges Executive Committee to take action and to allocate clear responsibilities and regularly follow up on these top candidates to generate additional income in the future. For future investment / cost positions, the Finance Task Force suggested a common template to provide the necessary input (please see Attachment 1 of these minutes).

Mr Eschermann reported that the Finance Task Force analysed the performance of IFIP's financial assets. The present situation is: IFIP holds its long-term financial assets in a mixed fund EUR portfolio managed by UBS. There is currently insufficient clarity about the purpose for which the financial assets are held and based on which an explicit risk / return trade-off decision can be made. The compound yearly return over 10 years is in the same order of magnitude as the portfolio management fee charged by UBS. There is no defined benchmark against which the UBS portfolio performance is compared, nor is there a defined frequency / process of evaluating the portfolio manager.

The Finance Task Force developed a proposal how the reserves could be invested, split into slices for liquidity, risks, projects and capital with different investment time horizon and risk profile.

The Finance Task Force made the following recommendations to the Board:

1. to define / confirm the reserves / amounts that IFIP should keep in its financial assets and define / confirm investment guidance / constraints to determine desired portfolio risk / return profile
2. to assign financial consultant to propose portfolio strategy and potential asset managers based on item 1 above with a budget allocation of about 3.000 EUR.
3. to decide on portfolio strategy and initial asset manager based on item 2 above.

Mr Strous regarded the analysis made by the Task Force as basis for further distributed thinking and acting. He suggested appointing persons to pick up the five proposals.

Mr von Solms thanked the Task Force for their excellent work supported fully the recommendations and endorsed the investment strategy.

The Board **AGREED** on recommendations of the Task Force and forwarded them to Executive Committee.

4.4.2 Membership Task Force

Mr Engel presented the report from the Membership Task Force. He explained the current composition of members of IFIP and the current problems:

- the current model allows IFIP to accommodate membership through the geographic locations of their headquarters
- it is increasingly difficult to find volunteers for various roles within the organisation, as well as supporting the activities.

Mr Engel reminded the Board to the vision of IFIP to be the leading organisation for IFIP's fields of interest in the world and that IFIP wants to be the kind of organisation that will regularly serve as a trusted source for information by governments and non-governmental organisations. This would need participants involved in all levels of the organisation, and representatives of the diversity of the organisation.

Mr Engel reported that the Task Force identified the main impediments to achieve the vision:

- a. membership in IFIP is restricted to one society per country
- b. costs of membership and participation in activities
- c. access to the best people in the field who may not be active in IFIP's member societies

Mr Engel reported that the Membership Task Force suggested to add to membership two new classes, truly international membership societies in IFIP's field of interest, and consortia of organisations which are defined by their members own standards, provided not-for-profit laws are not violated. The second suggestion was, to require all members to identify those specific areas in which they intend to contribute to IFIP, such as specific TCs, Professional Activities, Humanitarian Activities, etc. Those involved with an established number of activities should be full members. The others should be associate members. So, full membership would require active participation.

As a conclusion **Mr Engel** presented the following alternatives for IFIP:

- a. a class of membership where there is direct membership in individual IFIP activities by non-profit organisation
- b. removing the one full membership per country restriction
- c. status quo
- d. combination of the three options mentioned before.

Mr von Solms presented an alternative possibility of a change in IFIP's membership procedure with the introduction of a "Specialist Member": A Specialist member is an institution which does not qualify to be a National Member of IFIP. Such an institution will specialize in specific aspects of ICT, and can be within national boundaries, some type of regional society crossing the borders of one country or even an international institution operating internationally. Such an institution can have individuals as members, or societies as members, or no members of any type at all. Examples are

- a University or a Research Institute of a University
- an institution operating within countries in the geographical region of the institution like the Middle East e-Learning Association
- an institution operating internationally like IMIA.

Mr Strous presented another alternative proposal: This alternative merely tries to embed the new institutions that are interested in joining (the work of) IFIP into the current classes.

He proposed the classes should cover the following types of members:

- ❖ Full members:
 - national computer societies, covering the whole field of computer science / informatics
 - if no national computer society exists, an institution (academy of science, university, research institute) could be admitted as full member, provided this institution is formally recognized by the government as the country representative body and is accepted by the other institutions in the country
 - if more “national” computer societies exist in the country, these can become full member (provided they cover the whole field of computer science / informatics)
 - a regional association consisting of member countries (covering the whole field of computer science / informatics)

- ❖ Corresponding members: Abolish, no added value. Risk that societies want to move to this category to save fees.

- ❖ Associate members:
 - national or international computer science / informatics societies covering one or more specific areas but not the whole field (e.g. IMIA)
 - a regional association consisting of member countries covering one or more specific areas but not the whole field (e.g. the Middle East e-Learning Association)

- ❖ Affiliate members:
 - A University or a Research Institute of a University
 - NGO's, IGO's, special networks (e.g. from UN bodies),
 - ICT industry associations

- ❖ Honorary members: Keep as it is, clarify the rules about eligibility.

- ❖ Individual members: Abolish in order to avoid competition with member societies.

Mr Puigjaner explored the membership model of CLEI (Conferencia Latinoamericana de Estudios en Informatica) for possible changes in the IFIP membership model. In this model the members of this association are universities (sometimes their labs, schools or departments) or professional non-profit societies of the Latin America geographical area, but allowing also memberships of Canada and USA (for geographical proximity), and from Spain and Portugal (for historical and language reasons).

A similar solution could be implemented for IFIP with a difference in term of fees: The present total country fee should be reduced depending on the members of each country; for example each member of some country could pay $2/(1+\text{number of members of the country})$. In this way each member pays less and IFIP income from this country is increased.

The different proposals were heavily discussed within the Board.

Mr von Solms informed the Board that he together with the authors of the reports will consolidate the reports and come up with a finalized proposal at General Assembly 2010.

4.4.3 Event Reporting Task Force

Mr Bramer reported that at the President's instigation he was looking at the question of obtaining information about the delegates who attend IFIP TC and WG conferences etc., partly so 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 was to give IFIP a database of target delegates for major events such as WCC. The lack of cumulative mailing lists of past delegates is a long-standing and urgent problem for IFIP. Even lists of delegates to past WCCs are not retained.

Mr Bramer presented the following proposal:

- IFIP Secretariat would send a standard letter to all event organisers as a single A4 sheet accompanying the receipt letters for their event approval forms.
- In these letters organisers would be invited to take part in a data collection exercise on a voluntary basis.
- Those opting in to the scheme would place an additional text box on their conference websites. This would give delegates the choice of opting in or out of a scheme to allow their names and email addresses to be provided to IFIP solely for the purpose of sending them information about other IFIP events that may be of interest to them. They will be told that they can remove themselves from the mailing list at any time simply by emailing the Secretariat.
- After the event is over, organisers will be able to use the simple data collection system at <http://www.ifipevents.org> to pass the information on to IFIP.
- All email circulars sent out to the addresses collected using this system will end with the line 'To remove yourself from this mailing list send an email to ifip@ifip.org'.

The Board **ACCEPTED** the proposal and **RECOMMENDED** to implement the procedure as soon as possible.

4.4.4 CIO Forum

Mr Forrest Lin (Deputy Secretary of the Chinese Institute of Electronics) and **Mr Liu Ru Lin** (Vice President & Secretary General of the Chinese Institute of Electronics) presented the plan for the "First Global CIO Summit", which would take place in Shenzhen, China in November 2011. **Mr Lin** explained the background for the summit and said that with the increasingly integration of the IT industry and economy, great emphasis is put upon promoting the use of ICT. CIOs play a crucial role in every country. To meet future challenges from globalization, CIOs should comprehend and apply IT from international perspectives. It is important to know the IT technology trends and applied direction; It is pressing urge to learn from experience and successful case study among CIOs from different countries.

The Global CIO Summit will allow Chinese CIOs to meet and interact with their peers from other countries. At this summit, participants will be able to debate the impact that IT and the current financial climate is having upon the industry. Participants can share the global knowledge in the information management industry.

Mr Lin said that about 600 CIOs, 50 government officials, 50 media and sponsors are expected to attend the summit. The conference will be supported by Ministries of China, the China Association for Science and Technology, IFIP, the Chinese Institute of Electronics and the Shenzhen government.

Mr Lin said that the expectations to IFIP are to support the summit with:

- The influence of IFIP in academic world and Industry all over the countries greatly enhances this summit
- Recruitment of overseas keynote speakers
- Recruitment of overseas audience
- Experience of organizing international event contributes to the success of this summit
- Publication within IFIP members

Mr Sawhney said that it has to be worked out that this summit is not only a Chinese event, but also helps to plan future events in other countries. There has also an international program committee to be established. There is a challenge for CIOs to inform themselves about what to do in emerging markets. He saw it very important that the organisers of the summit have to look for sponsorship from the industry.

Mr Brunstein said that there a strong need for a global event on the CIO topic. He saw the summit as an excellent opportunity for IFIP to step into this area.

Mr von Solms assured general support from IFIP for initiative and thanked the Chinese delegation for the initiative.

4.5 IFIP Strategy

4.5.1 General Strategic Matters

Mr Strous reported that the overall impression has not changed; progress made (in general) is not enough to realize the ambitions set out in 2007. Following the discussions already taken place and still to take place during this Board meeting, it is strongly suggested that the Executive Committee urgently evaluates the situation and takes action to increase the likelihood of realizing the ambitions or presents proposals to adjust the ambitions.

- Project 1- Dissemination of high quality knowledge in ICT: A brief report from Mr Rannenberg will be at item 4.5.2 in these minutes.
- Project 2 - International reputation: Please see item 4.10.2 (International Liaison) in these minutes.
- Project 3 - Member societies: Please see item 4.2.2 (Membership Task Force) and item 4.10.4 (Member Societies Relations Committee) in these minutes.
- Project 4 - Students: There was no progress to report.
- Project 5 - Practitioners: Please see item 4.8 (IP3) in these minutes.

4.5.2 Strategic Project 1

Mr Rannenberg presented his contribution to IFIP's Board using input from many IFIP volunteers, especially TC Chairs, most especially Ms Avgerou and Mr Leduc.

Mr Rannenberg said that to continue contributing to the dissemination of high quality knowledge in ICT IFIP volunteers need a balanced set of support, incentives, and sometimes reviews of success and feedback. Especially support and incentives are needed to convince volunteers to make an event an IFIP event.

Many volunteers organizing an IFIP event do this for the first time and experience issues that are new for them, but generally known to more experienced organizers. Unfortunately the transfer of knowledge between IFIP generations is not optimal, so too much time is spent on fighting organizational issues that could otherwise be spent on improving the event content.

While IFIP has Event Approval Guidelines (EAG), they do not cover all the aspects needed. A livelier instrument for the exchange of experience is required. This could also serve as an incentive to organizers to make their event an IFIP event.

Mr Rannenberg suggested implementing an IFIP run Event Support Wiki, which could foster exchange of information, tips and hints. Typical topics could be:

- The IFIP guidelines
- How to choose the appropriate type of event
- The different publishing instruments for proceedings and their (contractual) options
- How to make use of the IFIP Digital Library
- Conference management systems, e.g. review management systems, their features, strengths and weaknesses
- Time planning for events, submission, and review processes including an analysis of the competition from other events
- How to work with the upcoming codes for referees and authors
- How to organize best-paper-awarding and best-student-paper-awarding

A Wiki as described will not be successful on its own. It needs initial input from experienced organizers and especially a moderator to tidy up and reorganize content and discussion threads. IFIP should consider incentivizing some experienced organizers for sharing start-up information and especially a caretaker for maintaining the system.

An IFIP run or IFIP sponsored Event Management System could be the next logical step for supporting event organizers providing additional stability that can come from a long-standing organisation.

As many volunteers organizing an IFIP event do this for their first time and transfer of knowledge between IFIP generations is not optimal, **Mr Rannenberg** suggested implementing a list of existing and upcoming event types. It would go beyond the differentiation in the event approval guidelines more towards characterizing events and helping to choose the one with the most appropriate properties. Examples include:

- IFIP wide events, such as WCC or WITFOR (NB: For WCC or a follow-up Bertrand Meyer has lead a discussion among TC Chairs and collected input)
- "Classic" scientific conferences with call-for-papers, review of full papers and published conference proceedings
- Less informal working conferences based on less formal paper selection prices, maybe with post-proceedings or paths towards journal publications

- Basic IFIP Schools or tutorials with mainly tutorial presentations by experienced speakers
- Advanced IFIP schools or PhD symposia with elements of working conferences, e.g. selected presentations by participants, maybe leading to publications in post-proceedings
- Combinations of the above best suited for WGs and TCs to nurture their respective communities.

Mr Rannenberg said that it would be essential to know which WGs do high research quality work, which ones foster innovative research but may be marginal in terms of research status, which ones cater mainly for junior researchers and are not very demanding in terms of quality. This is qualitative information, which cannot be easily drawn from statistics, such as acceptance of papers ratio.

Review of success and feedback should happen for WGs who haven't organized visible and successful events for more than 2 years, or for WGs who show signs of trouble, depending on the discretion of the TC Chair.

TC Chairs or TC Management may, in addition, ask to provide information about "competitors", i.e. other institutions organizing events in the same area, and the WGs judgement about the relative standing in terms of size of event, distinctive features, and overall quality. It could also be useful to know who the WG considers the most influential people in their area: individuals, university departments, research centres, publications.

WGs may also wish to outline the difficulties and issues hindering their success, if any, especially if IFIP can address those.

TC Chairs can then feedback on the WGs visions and results, comparing them with those of other WGs and give advice to overcome weaknesses and difficulties. They can also collect issues stemming from shortcomings in the IFIP organisation or issues, that IFIP could help with and report them to e.g. the TA.

Some of these activities may also useful for assessing events organized on TC level. This depends from the situation in the respective TC, e.g. whether and what TC-level events exist in the respective TC.

Mr Hinchey commented that there is a strong need for a review system as suggested by Mr Rannenberg; he also would see an Event Support Wiki as very important.

Mr Rannenberg asked the Board to support the implementation of a Wiki.

The Board **AGREED** in starting the project and will send possible candidates for a Wiki to Mr Rannenberg. The Board set the deadline for a demonstration of the system at General Assembly 2010.

4.6 Technical Assembly

Mr Hinchey presented the report from Technical Assembly. He informed the Board that TA considered the following issues regarding Technical Committees and Working Groups:

Changes in TC membership/leadership

- TA noted the establishment of a new joint WG 1.9 and WG2.11 on Verified Software, following a TC-2 vote and prior approval by TC-1, TA and notification to GA.

- TA welcomed the appointment of Kris Sikorski (US) as WG1.1 Chair and Till Mossakowski (DE) as WG1.3 Chair.
- The WG6.3 change in aims and scope was approved by the TA.
- The TA suggests that the new WG6.11 name could be “Communication Aspects of the e-World”; it is felt that the working group name should be simple and not an exhaustive list of topics, but rather one that has potential to be meaningful in the long term. If this is accepted by TC-6, the change is approved. Otherwise, TC-6 needs to be represented by its Chair or delegate at the next TA in Brisbane to reopen the discussion.

New WGs

- A decision on the proposed TC-5/TC-12 joint working group on Bioinformatics was deferred until represented by the relevant TCs.
- The Establishment of a joint WG8.11/WG11.n on “Information Systems Security Research” is approved by TA, if this name change towards a more precise description is accepted by TC-8. Otherwise, TC-8 needs to be represented by its Chair or delegate at the next TA in Brisbane to reopen the discussion.
- A potential joint WG on “Digital Services” between TC-2, TC-8 and TC-11 is under consideration. A decision is postponed until the TA in Brisbane when more information is expected.
- The Establishment of WG11.12 is approved by TA with a recommendation that the participation should be made broader, including re-inviting potential participants who had previously declined.

Mr Hinchey informed the Board that TA received a detailed interpretation of IFIP’s finances including sources of revenue and expenditure from Mr Eschermann.

Mr Hinchey reported that the Technical Assembly actioned the TA Chair to look into options for event sponsorship and events proceeds, the range of possibilities spanning from the current model of events “paying” to use the IFIP name through to financial underwriting and profit sharing. This will be discussed at the TA in Brisbane.

Mr Hinchey reported that much concern was expressed over the organization of WCC 2010, in particular the organization at the Australian end. Several conferences have low numbers of submissions, while others seem to have fared reasonably well, but even those were affected by inconsistencies and lack of responsiveness by the organizers in Australia, especially with regard to the web pages.

The TA felt that the future of WCC needs further discussion. However, it is believed that WCC in its current form is unsustainable and needs to be replaced.

An alternative model may be to emphasize invited speakers of international renown. A proposal in this direction was drafted by Bertrand Meyer.

Mr Hinchey reported that TA voted to adopt a new Publication Author and Referee Code of Conduct developed by Bertrand Meyer and reflecting feedback from TC Chairs and others. The Board is requested to endorse this policy and support implementation.

The Board requested TA to forward the issue up to the Publications Committee and to bring it up in consultation with the Publications Committee at General Assembly 2010.

Mr Hinchey said that IFIP needs to make more strategic use of IFIP's Digital Library. Content needs to be strengthened, the interface needs to be improved and adequate linking from other sites is required.

Mr Hinchey reported from the Technical Assembly that it was noted that there is no great imperative for a strategic evaluation (Strategy project 1) of TCs and WGs. However, this is a great need for incentives to TC and WG volunteers to ensure their contribution to IFIP's long-term objectives and the Board is requested to consider these.

Such incentives may include:

- Base funding for travel to business meetings for TC and WG Chairs and/or selected TC members not supported by their own institutions or member society. This would likely result in better attendance at TA and GA as well as TC meetings.
- Allowing additional roles within WGs and TCs, such as additional Vice Chair position, to recognize contributions of active members and reduce loads on Chairs of larger and more active TCs and WGs.

The Board requested Technical Assembly to formulate this issue and come up with a proposal at General Assembly 2010.

4.7 Congresses and Major Events

4.7.1 WCC 2010

Mr Avram gave a short presentation of the status of the preparation of the World Computer Congress 2010 in Brisbane. He informed the Board that

- registration fees and options for accommodation are available on the WCC website,
- call for papers has been issued. Closing date has been postponed to March 15th, 2010,
- an IPC meeting in Amsterdam, Netherlands has been fixed, soon after the close of call for papers,
- there has been a change of the local organisation team, with Dr. Nick Tate taking over from Mark Lloyd as Chair of the Local Organising Committee,
- the Australian Computer Society has contributed significant additional internal resources to help with the delivery of the congress
- other content is being developed within themed streams that align with appropriate IFIP conferences
- the congress will be addressed by the Premier of Queensland

Mr Sawhney requested that someone from IFIP near to the location, in this case Mr Avram should be part of the Local Organising Committee in order to represent the interest of IFIP. The request has been rejected as a possible conflict of interest.

Mr Brunnstein commented that the situation has improved, but is far away from the original bid.

Mr Brunnstein presented the report of the International Program Committee on behalf of the IPC Chair Mr Casaca.

Mr Brunnstein informed the Board that presently 18 conferences had received about 550 submitted papers. While review of submitted papers will start immediately, with

some more papers expected up to the final deadline March 15, 2010. Due to the small number of papers to some events, considerations are underway to combine several events with related themes. Consequently, the initial number of 18 events may be reduced (to the order of perhaps 10 - 12). An IPC meeting (Amsterdam, April 16-17, 2010) will decide upon the final program.

Congress proceedings will be edited by Prof. Mike Hinchey and published under IFIP Springer Publication Contract. Following GA 2009 decision, every participant in an IFIP conference will receive one conference proceeding of her/his choice included in Congress fee.

The initial suggestion to establish a relation between IFIP conferences and partner events is presently missing, but may hopefully be implemented when sufficient information about partner events is available; at the IPC meeting at the latest.

Mr Brunstein requested that in order to make IFIP World Congress 2010 a significant success, both concerning content and the numbers of speakers and participants, it is mandatory that the following is publicly available:

- registration fee, hotels,
- details about non-IFIP conferences,
- IPC budget, and agreement for plenary keynote speakers, conditions offered to IFIP conferences keynote speakers.

Ms Avgerou expressed her concerns that the high registration fee would prohibit people to attend. She was worried that people will also withdraw their papers. She said that there is heavy interest in daily registration fees.

Mr Avram commented that the present exchange rates to AUD have changed the fee to "unacceptable". He informed the Board that lower cost accommodations will be offered and that daily registration fees, against IFIP's advice at the time of the bid, will be offered.

Mr Rannenberg requested the Local Organising Committee to lower registration fee for students.

Mr Sawhney requested that because vision has been stripped since bidding time and the ambition has changed, so as a consequence the fee should also be changed.

Mr Brunstein said that the reduction in size is explainable by the global financial crisis; he warned that there will be a significant loss, if the Local Organising Committee reduces the registration fee.

All members of the Board are worried about the WCC 2010, but all of them agreed that it is running and it is impossible to stop it. So, everybody will do its best to make it a success.

The Board **AGREED** to sign the WCC contract, with the inclusion of the Roles & Responsibilities document.

4.7.2 IFIP Pioneer Day

Mr Brunstein reported on behalf of the Pioneer Day Chair Mr Goldsworthy from the preparation of the IFIP Pioneer Day on the occasion of IFIP's 50th anniversary. The

IFIP Pioneer Day is commissioned to remember pioneer work under IFIP umbrella. Moreover, IFIP Pioneer Day will remember pioneers with important contributions in various areas of Informatics and its applications.

IFIP Pioneer Day is organised by Prof. Ashley Goldsworthy supported by a committee of Australian experts. Based upon discussions in General Assembly 2010, the definition of IFIP Pioneers has been rewritten:

“An IFIP Computer Pioneer is one who, through active participation in IFIP Technical Committees or related IFIP groups, has made outstanding contributions to the theoretical, technical, commercial or professional aspects of computing.”

Presently, 7 TC chairs have submitted 29 names of pioneers within their TC areas. For each pioneer, a short text has been requested to describe her/his contributions. The list will also include IFIP presidents with information about their contributions.

Related to IFIP Pioneers and their work-, artefacts, texts and videos will be presented at a dedicated exhibition in the Congress centre at “Gunyah”, representing an ancient meeting place of original Australian inhabitants.

The IFIP Pioneer Day committee will submit, at IPC meeting, a program to be included at a specific “IFIP Pioneer Day” (possibly Wednesday = Day 3), which may be combined with the “History of Computing” event, where also papers on other pioneers will be presented.

At the evening of IFIP Pioneer Day, during Congress dinner, it is planned that IFIP’s President van Solms honours awardees (selected by an award committee) with IFIP’s prestigious “Auerbach Award”.

A 50th anniversary book will be printed under control of secretariat. **Mr Brunnstein** asked for contribution from TC Chairs, from founding members and also for contributions of past presidents. A vision part of it will be covered from Mr Strous. There is the plan to print 250 copies, and the book will also be available in IFIP’s Digital Library.

The Board **DECIDED** that there will be no “Pioneer Award” established. The Board **REQUESTED** the Executive Committee to come up with a proposal for a list of pioneers.

The Board **REQUESTED** Mr Brunnstein to find out more details of pioneer day in Australia.

The Board was seriously **WORRIED** about costs.

4.7.3 IFIP Golden Jubilee 2010

Mr Brunnstein reported that besides IFIP World Computer Congress, IFIPs 50th anniversary offers an opportunity to reflect what IFIP has achieved and discussion where IFIP should develop in the future, including potential changes of directions. Evidently, Member Societies and the IFIP Working Force, including TCs and WGs, can make significant contributions.

One forum for reflections about IFIP history and achievements as well as suggestions for future directions will be the 4th edition of IFIPs history series, with previous 3 volumes edited by IFIP Historian Heinz Zemanek:

- 1st volume: The first 10 Years: The Skyline of Information Processing North Holland 1972
- 2nd volume: A Quarter Century of IFIP: The Silver Summary with volume 2: IFIP Bibliography 1960-1985 (605 pages) North Holland 1986
- 3rd volume: 36 Years of IFIP: The IFIP Pink Summary, IFIP Laxenburg

Plans for volume 4, co-edited by Heinz Zemanek and Klaus Brunnstein, include addressing developments since 1986:

- contributions from TC chairs about last developments,
- invited contributions from founding member societies, and
- a chapter on experiences, developments and visions

The book (about 350 pages, printed under IFIP secretariat Laxenburg 2010) will also be available in IFIP Digital library. In addition, "IFIP Living History Database" will be implemented (supported by Technical University of Vienna) which shall include information from all IFIP future events and work, but this database shall also include important documents from IFIP foundation to present). Moreover, it is discussed to scan selected original documents for inclusion in IFIP DL and IFIP Living History DB.

4.7.4 WITFOR 2009 / WITFOR 2011

Mr Strous presented his report on WITFOR 2009 and said that the Forum was in organisational and content terms very successful and received great media coverage in Vietnam. But on the other hand **Mr Strous** reported that WITFOR 2009 caused a loss to IFIP of about 100K EUR. This resulted from the speakers' expenses, because IFIP was not able to find sponsors for this item as originally assumed. By changes in the agreements with the hosts this loss should not happen again. There are some open issues which will be solved till General Assembly, like presenting a full final report and update of the website.

At General Assembly 2009 the following issues were identified:

- in order to guarantee continuity for the next events, a proposal for "governing" structure has been distributed for comments; and also the "staffing" problem has to be completed
- on financial side a budget template has to be drafted and distributed for comments
- the contract terms have to be revised and checked by legal advisor
- planning for next WITFOR is still a problem to be solved
- communication is still an issue, but it is expected to improve as soon new structure is in place
- guidelines and procedures should be handled by new structure

Mr Strous informed the Board about his work on WITFOR 2011 and said that two months work on a candidate host country was unsuccessful. Also finding alternatives was not at first successful.

But now there is a good candidate found, who confirmed support from the national computer society. Meetings will be planned for April / May, also with government and as many "necessary" parties as possible. A decision on feasibility of next WITFOR in 2011 will be taken in April / May this year. The ambition is to have it in 2011 in order to keep the momentum, but if 2011 is not feasible, the next WITFOR will move to 2012.

4.7.5 Future WCCs

Mr von Solms reported that IFIP's General Assembly has decided that the future of its WCC program will be re-evaluated to determine if these series of international congresses should proceed after WCC 2010, and if so, in what way.

As part of this re-evaluation process, General Assembly has decided that no invitations for WCC 2012 will be extended. The first possible date for a WCC, if continued, will be 2013.

Mr von Solms repeated the suggestions contained in the 2009 report to General Assembly:

Suggestion 1: Move back to a 3 year cycle. Although this will cause overlap with WITFOR every 6 years, that should not be a big problem – in fact, as suggested later, some real synergy may be forthcoming in such 'joint years'.

Suggestion 2: Appoint a permanent long term Professional Conference Organizer (PCO) for a period of at last 3 cycles. Such a PCO will then become the 'corporate memory' of WCCs (and WITFORs if needed).

Of course, such a PCO should be very experienced, and should have an international footprint

Suggestion 3: IFIP does not go out on invitation to its members anymore to host a WCC. Rather, with the research input from the PCO, IFIP approached a specific member and enquires whether the member is willing to host the WCC

Suggestion 4: The format of WCCs be redesigned to fit the changing market. This will again be a responsibility of the contracted PCO.

Suggestion 5: Possible ways of redesigning WCC:

- expand the present idea of co-existing technical and industry streams
- negotiate with a TC to have the TC's annual event (in the specific year) co-located with the WCC, and concentrate/align the WCCs content relevant to the TC event
- negotiate with a MS to have the WCC co-located with the MS's annual event (in that specific year)
- negotiate with another international organization/body to have the WCC co-located with that body's annual event (in that specific year)

At General Assembly 2009 the idea of a PCO was questioned, and had not been investigated further.

The growing complexity, risk and effort involved in organizing a WCC along the traditional lines, is again displayed by WCC 2010. The importance of Suggestion 4 above had been clearly underlined by the organization of WCC 2010. IFIP must move to a position where it has no financial expectations at all from a possible WCC, and totally leave it open to the party who has accepted the responsibility. If that party makes a profit, fine, but IFIP's main goal must be to expand and maintain the IFIP brand name. **Mr von Solms** made the following proposal for next IFIP WCCs:

1. Move to a 3 year cycle and consider a possible WCC in 2013
2. Create an open and generic Bid Document, making provision for some of those aspects mentioned in Suggestion 5 above.
3. Circulate the Bid Document as wide as possible

4. Negotiate and finalize the decision at the Board meeting in 2011.
5. An example : TC 3 is 50 years old in 2013, and is organizing a WCCE 2013. An option is to approach TC 3 to determine if they are interested to organize WCCE 2013 on a wider basis to become a WCC/WCCE 2013. This is in line with bullet 2 in Suggestion 5 above
6. An example: Several opinions believe that the next IFIP WCC must consist only of well known invited speakers to comprehensively cover the new developments in the ICT field. This can be done by a MS, or an independent body who sees value in the idea.

A heavy discussion about advantages and disadvantages of the proposed solutions took place.

Mr Eschermann recommended focusing on the question what WCC is for – a congress on global ICT themes or a congress on specific topics.

Mr Puigjaner urged not to ignore previous experience of IFIP's members.

Ms Avgerou liked the idea of having a major event with invited speakers. "Rebooting" will not be the solution. She said that IFIP should encourage networking and also explore a different exclusive event.

Mr Wibe commented that TC3 will not be involved in a WCC, if it is in the same year as WCCE.

Mr Brunstein stated that it would not be reasonable to reboot the WCC in the old fashion; it would be necessary to invent new functions. He said that the weakness of IFIP is that it is behind the newest solutions. That means also that the structure has to be changed. **Mr Brunstein** proposed that IFIP should strengthen networking between TCs / Executive Committee.

Mr Johnson was not convinced about a "rebooting model". In his opinion WCC should be a global event, but focussed on specific topics and IFIP should also consider risk sharing with the organisers.

Mr Turner was sceptical about all of the suggestions. He would propose to establish a conference on new exciting things in ICT and to go to a different audience.

The Board discussed a written proposal from Bertrand Meyer made in the TA meeting. This proposal implied a "rebooting" of the World Computer Congress characterised by world class invited speakers, highly selected submitted papers, involvement of Technical Committees, attractive venues, distinguished IPC Chair and including a small number of associated conferences. The proposal also suggested that responsibility for key organisational task should not be subcontracted by the Organising Committee. This proposal will be taken into account together with issues raised during the discussion at the Board meeting.

Ms Avgerou, Mr Strous and Mr Rannenberg suggested drafting a proposal for a new event aimed for 2012 for General Assembly 2010.

The Board **ACCEPTED** unanimously the suggestion.

4.8 Professionalism Program (IP3)

Mr Lane (Chairman of IP3) presented his report about the Professionalism Program. As noted last year, the rationale for the IP3 programme remains the ambition to create a modern, worldwide IT profession with the capability to build and maintain an international body of IT professionals working to assured standards of competence and integrity, recognised and respected for the value they bring to the delivery of IT solutions which enable transformational change for the benefit of all.

In Hanoi, General Assembly approved the creation of a new IFIP Board, the IP3 Board, charged with running IP3. The new Board has not yet met in person, which it plans to do in Brisbane alongside the IFIP WCC 2010, but has met twice via teleconferences lasting in total 6 hours. In addition numerous smaller teleconferences have been held on a wide range of issues as the partnership continues to energetically progress its work.

General Assembly resolved in Hanoi to ask IFIP Executive Committee to work with the IFIP member societies represented in IP3 to prepare a set of Terms of Reference to regulate the longer term operation of the IP3 project and its relationship to other IFIP bodies. **Mr Lane** presented the Terms of Reference to the Board and invited the Board to approve these Terms of Reference.

Mr Lane informed the Board that IP3 continues to extend an invitation to IFIP member societies to join the seven existing members. New Zealand Computer Society and Computer Society of South Africa are both planning to seek accreditation by IP3 late in 2010. **Mr Lane** held a meeting, accompanied by IP3 officials, with Angela Burgess, Executive Director of the IEEE-CS and Pieter Botman, IEEE-CS nominated IP3 Board member.

Mr Lane reported that formal and informal discussions with CEPIS are continuing. The CEPIS Professionalism TF published a lengthy report in November. Discussions are in hand concerning a joint study to develop a Body of Knowledge. Further the annual joint meeting of senior officers of IFIP and CEPIS took place on February 22nd 2010 and professionalism was on the agenda.

Mr Lane reminded the Board that the British Computer Society (BCS) had suspended their active participation in IP3 while their transformation programme was carried out. Following the completion of this programme the BCS is currently reviewing its position. Some informal discussions have taken place in which representatives of IP3 updated the BCS on the IP3's recent progress.

Mr Lane reported that Akira Shibata (Information Processing Society of Japan), Paul Matthews (New Zealand Computer Society) and Moira de Roche (Computer Society of South Africa) have filled the three places on the Board for member societies (other than founding societies). Charles Hughes (IP3 Past Chairman) and Colin Thompson (IP3 Chief Assessor) have been co-opted to occupy two of the three co-opted Board places. The IP3 Board has approved Terms of Reference for its Accreditation and Standards Boards.

Mr Lane informed the Board that in order to safeguard IFIP and IP3's interest, in line with legal advice IP3 has obtained, IP3 is taking steps to trademark the name "IP3". The trademarks will be held by IFIP as the incorporated body. It is planned initially to file trademark papers in Canada and Austria. The latter is a signatory (along with many developed countries) to the Madrid protocol which simplifies filing of papers in other signatory countries. Canada is not a signatory and CIPS will make a local filing

in IFIP's name and IFIP will grant the Canadian Information Processing Society an exclusive licence to use "IP3" in Canada. Legal agreements to affect this have been prepared.

Mr Lane said that following the success of IP3's participation in WCC 2008 in Milan, plans are in hand for IP3 to contribute significantly to WCC 2010 in Brisbane. Plans are currently being finalised with a high calibre panel session on "Building a Global IT Profession" being proposed, several papers are being submitted to the Learn IT conference strand together with a proposal for a second panel focussed specifically on professional education. It is also hoped to launch a programme for CIOs. Consideration is being given to having a one day meeting alongside WCC to promote and explain IP3. A meeting with the Seoul Accord signatories is also being scheduled.

Mr Lane reported that Roger Johnson has accepted an invitation on behalf of IP3 to join the Programme Committee of the European Workshop on Computing & ICT Professionalism (EWCIP) co-sponsored by ATI (Spain) and CEPIS in June. Roger Johnson and Moira de Roche are currently preparing a paper for submission on behalf of IP3. IP3 is also submitting a paper to the IEEE-CS Professionalism conference being held in April 2010 in Montreal.

IP3 has commissioned a leading PR firm to develop a Communications Plan and has established a small Communications Steering Committee to complete development and then roll-out the plan.

Mr Lane informed the Board about new developments within IP3. The New Zealand Computer Society launched their ITCP professional certification last year and has received tremendous support from their IT community.

IP3 adopted SFIA level 5 as the benchmark for accreditation purposes for "professional membership" of IP3 member societies. SFIA level 5 identifies specific levels of relevant knowledge and experience. While SFIA has wide visibility in Europe and some other parts of the world, other Skills Frameworks are used elsewhere. As a result it is important to determine equivalencies between SFIA and other frameworks. The first such mapping exercise is being carried out in Canada to examine the equivalence of OSPM and SFIA. The results of this exercise may well be of value outside IP3. Consideration is also being given to a mapping to the European Competence Framework (e-CF).

The IP3 Board has finalized a formal three year strategic and operational Business Plan. Its implementation is managed by Roger Hart, who has been appointed Interim Executive Officer.

Most recently, the IP3 Board ratified the terms of reference for both its Professional Standards Council and the Accreditation Board. The former is responsible for advising on all issues associated with IP3 professional standards requirements. The latter is responsible for ensuring the effective operation of the assessment and accreditation regimes related to all IP3 accreditation programmes.

Mr Lane said that being sensitive to the needs of IT users and the IT supply industry is the key to IP3's long term success. The IP3 Board has agreed in principle to the need to have an independent body (provisionally called the Global Industry Committee, working at arms length which can advise it on industry opinion. It has

also been agreed to prepare a corporate sponsorship package to seek further industry support for the IP3 mission.

Mr Lane presented the financial statement to the Board and said that expenditure in the second half of 2009 was limited to reimbursement of staff costs provided to support IP3. Net expenditure for the 6 month period was just over €15,600. Initial work has been started on identifying a number of business development opportunities that would create a non-membership dues revenue streams for IP3.

Mr Lane presented the key new actions for the coming half year to the Board:

1. New Zealand and South Africa are expected to seek accreditation during 2010
2. Trademarking of the IP3 name in selected countries
3. Preparation for the IP3 presence in Brisbane for WCC 2010 which will include the first face to face meeting of the IP3 Board and IP3's first AGM Delivery of a significant announcement at WCC: The "Brisbane Declaration"
4. An international Communications Steering Committee, with members from Australia, Canada, Japan, New Zealand, and South Africa has started to roll-out a Marketing and Communications Plan
5. Implementation of other parts of the Business Plan subject to resource and other constraints
6. Development of equivalence mappings between SFIA and other skills frameworks

Other activity scheduled for the coming half year includes:

1. Appoint Vice Chairs from different geographic regions
2. Hold further meetings with IEEE-CS during the Computing Professionals 2010 Conference in Montréal
3. Hold inaugural meeting of the Developing Nations Committee
4. Establishment of a Global Industry Committee to initiate links with leading IT vendors and other external bodies
5. Continue to strengthen links with CEPIS and SEARCC members societies
6. Roll out new version of IP3's web site

Mr Puigjaner was missing a comparison of the revenue of the present status to the plan. He expressed his concerns that IFIP has only the same rights as the other founding members although IFIP's share in founding was much higher. He was also missing a plan for repayment of the founding money. **Mr Johnson** answered that the IP3 team will supply IFIP's Board with a business plan in order to address the concerns.

Mr Johnson explained that the plan of IP3 includes a reduction of the expenditure to the level of income once income level comes to an operating level. It is planned to repay the founding monetary support.

Mr Engel requested a better articulation of the value of certification. The IP3 team will distribute new information material to Board members.

Mr Rannenberg requested an expected breakeven. He also requested some minor changes to the Terms of Reference. He also proposed to have more than one IFIP member on the IP3 Board.

Mr Strous thanked the IP3 Board for the progress. He advised the IP3 team to go to countries and to start talking to computer societies and other stakeholders in order to

present / clarify IP3 and its aims and approach in order to push IP3 forward. During those visits the needs of the societies may become clear.

Mr Eschermann requested minor changes to the proposed Terms of Reference.

Mr Strous commented that in his opinion representation of IFIP members in the IP3 Board is sufficient.

Mr von Solms suggested accepting the Terms of Reference after minor editorial corrections.

The Board **AGREED** that the Terms of Reference are revised by **Mr Strous** and **Mr Johnson**, circulated at Executive Committee for agreement.

The Board **ACCEPTED** the Terms of Reference with one abstention providing there are no substantial changes and also accepted by the Executive Committee.

4.9 AGORA InitiativeS

Mr Morel drew attention to his report about AGORA Initiatives. He reported that after the 9th AGORA workshop, which took place in Hanoi during the WITFOR 2009, the 10th workshop took place in Krakow, Poland under the title “ Changes in Education Nowadays; Digital Potential versus Cognitive Traps”.

Mr Morel reported that the AGORA Initiative ANDIL (AGORA Network against Digital Divide by means of Information Literacy) has been sponsored by the UNESCO Participation Program 2008-2009. Unfortunately it was not possible to apply for an UNESCO support under the new Participation Program 20010-2011, because of the workload on the volunteers in this project.

Mr Morel informed the Board that the AGORA team continues to collaborate with two projects from the European Union (MATURE project and ENoLL (The European Network of Living Labs).

Mr Morel informed the Board that Sindre Rosvik takes over the chairmanship for AGORA.

4.10 Standing Committee Reports

4.10.1 Developing Countries Support Committee (DCSC)

Ms Avgerou reported that the main issue addressed by the DCSC since the General Assembly in Hanoi was the way IFIP might strengthen operations of computer societies, or other professional ICT organizations in developing countries. DCSC explored two possibilities:

a) assisting African societies.

Initially DCSC considered the possibility of inviting existing African societies to a workshop in Kampala, Uganda, where a WG9.4 workshop is taking place in March 2010. DCSC decided not to pursue this plan because it were lacking information on societies/organizations that it should invite and on information/knowledge that an IFIP workshop should aim to provide to them. Still DCSC thought a better approach is to explore the institutions it should aim to cultivate links with in Africa. To that end, Leon

Strous made promising contacts when he attended the ICT4All forum in Tunisia, 24-25 November.

Ongoing action:

- compiling a list of computer societies / other institutions in Africa that IFIP should aim to attract, either as members, or as partners in the effort to promote ICT and development
- developing a simple questionnaire to understand main issues of concern for ICT professional organizations and other institutions promoting ICT and development in Africa. This information will form the basis for an event that will be useful for African societies.

b) organizing a workshop for Latin American societies.

Similar difficulties existed here, as for Africa. IFIP has only CLEI and Brazil as full members, and Argentina and Chile were members until recently. However, the existence of CLEI, which is active and relatively influential, makes a difference. DCSC is therefore considering the possibility of organizing an IFIP workshop for Latin American computer societies.

Ongoing action:

- Ramon Puigjaner is programme chair of the CLEI 2010 conference (18-22 October) in Asuncion, Paraguay and he is exploring the possibility for an IFIP event there.

Ms Avgerou informed the Board that there is an opportunity for the DCSC to play a major role in the organization of a workshop in the next ICT4All Forum (10-12 November 2010) in Tunisia. The day before the official ICT4All-Tunis+5 conference (Tuesday 9 November) consists of a number of parallel events. Tunisia invited IFIP to organize one of these parallel events and they are interested in a workshop aimed at strengthening the scientific research capabilities of developing countries. Given the interest of the DCSC in creating research capabilities, IFIP is particularly interested in this event.

Ms Avgerou informed the Board that the research network building proposal to the EuropeanAid EU programme announced at the GA meeting in Hanoi reached the final stage of the assessment process but in the end was unfortunately unsuccessful.

The Board **SUPPORTED** the idea of using Developing Countries Support money for participants of WCC 2010 from Developing Countries.

4.10.2 International Liaison Committee (ILC)

Mr Morel presented a list of events organised by IFIP or where IFIP was involved:

- ❖ Mediterranean Conference on Information Systems in collaboration with IFIP in September 2009
- ❖ International Scientific Conference in Krakow in October 2009 (Changes in Educations Nowadays)
- ❖ Forum Green and Connected Cities in December 2009 in Strasbourg

Mr Morel attended meetings of the World Digital Solidarity Agency at Lyon in October 2009 and February 2010 and in May 2010 in Geneva.

Mr Morel informed the Board that he participated in the preparation activities and meeting at ITU for the WSIS Forum. The WSIS Forum will be organised by ITU, UNESCO, UNCTAD and UNDP.

In February 2010 **Mr Morel** participated in the Annual Forum on e-Learning Excellence in the Middle East in Dubai, which was also sponsored by IFIP.

Mr Morel reported that Mr Dundler followed up IFIP's connections to UNESCO. It was not possible for TCs to follow the proposal of Mr Dundler to participate into UNESCO's Participation Program 2010-2011, because of lack of time of volunteers.

Mr von Solms informed the Board that the connection of IFIP to the Middle East e-Learning Association (MEEA) will be important for IFIP in this area and IFIP will strengthen it.

4.10.3 Marketing Committee (MC)

Mr Sawhney presented a list of areas within IFIP where Marketing Committee could play a catalytic role:

➤ Promoting IFIP events

The TCs are good at promoting their events amongst their own membership. However many of these events have inter-disciplinary interest beyond the immediate TC audience IFIP is addressing today. Marketing Committee needs to work with the Technical Assembly to get them to market their offerings beyond their immediate TC constituency.

Marketing Committee need to take the help of the Member Society Relations Committee to see how the Member Societies can be involved more directly in organizing more IFIP events, with 'risk-sharing mechanisms' and to promote greater 'Regional' participation.

➤ Promoting IFIP publications

Mr Sawhney said that Marketing Committee needs to work with Technical Assembly and the Publications Committee to examine ways to get the Technical Committees and Working Groups to use the IFIP channels to publish more of their work. Having made a major commitment to the Digital Library, IFIP now needs to 'market' this more aggressively to Member Societies, and beyond IFIP, to attract more academicians, researchers and professionals to access IFIP's Digital Library.

➤ Marketing IFIP in new geographies and new constituencies

Mr Sawhney said that since the Membership Committee is working on newer models for IFIP membership, Marketing Committee could work with them to attract new constituencies not currently not active in IFIP – IT Professionals / CIOs, IT Service Companies, Consultants, IT Product Companies, Communications companies, IT Trade bodies, Market Research companies. IFIP's current membership model of one member society per country does not allow all constituencies – not represented in these societies – to be addressed by IFIP.

There are global and regional organizations, NGOs and other bodies, focused on promoting ICT development and research in related disciplines, and applying these technologies. Marketing Committee could work with International Liaisons Committee to identify such organizations which may be willing to support some specific areas / projects / events / publications of IFIP, and to 'market' IFIP capabilities in these areas.

Another outstanding marketing task involves forming an Advisory Board for the IFIP President, consisting of influential global CIOs and leaders of IT companies – hardware, software and IT service companies, and heads of IT Research labs. This Advisory Board could help IFIP TCs, WGs, conference organizers, the Publications Committee and projects like IP3 and AGORA to align their efforts and offerings to the 'real-world' needs of the IT users, industry and the professional community.

➤ Communication with its Members and Member Societies

Mr Sawhney said that Marketing Committee is responsible for communications with Member Societies, Affiliate Members like IMIA and VLDB and federations like CEPIS and SEARCC, and their members. IFIP has to see how a regular flow of information between Member Societies and IFIP, the Board and the TCs can be provided, and also reach out to the larger technical community even outside the MS membership. Highlights of IFIP's events, and major congresses, need to be publicized in the printed publications of our member societies and on their websites. This communications role needs to be formalized.

➤ Using our Web presence more effectively

Mr Sawhney said that as part of IFIP's efforts to market IFIP more effectively amongst the IFIP constituency and beyond, IFIP needs to have the IFIP Website lead to all our constituents' digital presence – TCs, WGs, Digital Library, IFIP conferences, Affiliates and Member Societies' websites.

Mr Sawhney said that a new, contemporary website using the latest technology, and a committed resource to gather content from the greater IFIP world (MSs, TCs, events, etc.) and keep it fresh and relevant should be developed. This may require IFIP to invest in a Web 2.0 platform, which could support collaboration between all parts of IFIP and allow those who cannot support a web presence – maybe organizers of specific events, to use this IFIP platform.

In addition, the Secretariat and Marketing Committee will need to work with the TA, TCs and WGs, and the Member Societies, CEPIS, SEARCC, IMIA, VLDB, UNESCO, ITU, etc. to see that all their respective web-sites reflect the IFIP affiliation and provide links to the IFIP web-site.

➤ The new IFIP Brochure

Mr Sawhney reported that IFIP has a new brochure to introduce IFIP around the world, to prospective members, to National Societies and at various IFIP events. The basic purpose of this brochure is to promote IFIP, to convey the wide variety of activities that IFIP promotes, its global leadership and the wide scope of IFIP's coverage of the entire spectrum of ICT. The assumption is that more countries may join IFIP, or we may attract more participation in IFIP activities, if our products / value proposition are properly presented in credible and attractive sales collateral. It also lists down all the key people who can be approached by potential members and participants in our activities. Discussion is needed how well this brochure fulfills its need, and how it can be circulated in order get the maximum mileage out of it.

➤ Key Projects, like IP3

Mr Sawhney said that recent projects like the Digital Library and IP3 have the potential to reach out to a much larger audience than IFIP's Technical Committees, Working Groups and Member Societies. Therefore these projects should be promoted actively through the member societies, to the relevant target segment. In the case of IP3, it needs to be publicized to the Engineering Student community, young professionals and to industry, their potential employers. Marketing Committee

and the MSRC could help the IP3 team to devise a formal marketing effort in this regard.

➤ **Members' Expectations from IFIP**

Mr Sawhney said that the marketing efforts proposed before, need to be based on what IFIP's members want from IFIP. IFIP needs to constantly re-check how its current offerings align with its members' expectations, to its immediate and prospective membership, countries currently outside IFIP and other computer professionals, academics and the research committee around the world. Marketing Committee can work with the MSRC to elicit the requirements of IFIP's Member Societies, possibly through questionnaires, and / or through a focused session at the General Assembly, so that these inputs help the Board and the Technical Committees to calibrate the future plans for their respective areas, in line with the members' requirements.

Mr Sawhney said that as IFIP completes 50 years, IFIP needs to start re-investing in the future, so that it remain relevant in the years ahead.

The Board **NOTED** the report.

4.10.4 Member Society Relations Committee (MSRC)

Mr Robertson reported that MSRC has noted that a number of Member Societies have not paid their membership fees and are either going to loose voting rights or have their membership fee lapsed.

Mr Robertson informed the Board that recently all representatives have been invited to enter into dialogue on their roles at General Assembly in Brisbane. The purpose of this dialogue is to work on the creation of a program and forum provided there is enough interest. The form of the program will depend on the MS feedback over the next couple of months.

Mr Robertson informed the Board that in September 2010 the New Zealand Computer Society (NZCS) will celebrate their 50th anniversary. You can find more about this event at www.innovation.org.nz

4.10.5 Publications Committee (PC)

Mr Turner presented the report of Publications Committee. He informed the Board about the accomplishments since the General Assembly 2009.

- ❖ Negotiations on the new publications agreement with Springer were concluded successfully in December, and the new agreement has been signed by appropriate IFIP and Springer officials. The agreement is for the years 2010-2014. The terms of the agreement are essentially as reported during GA 2009.
- ❖ Revised and expanded web pages for the publications section of the IFIP web site have been sent to the Secretariat and are operational by the time of the Board meeting. Information on having proceedings put into IFIP's Digital Library has been added, as well as instructions to editors, and Word and LaTeX templates for the Digital Library.

- ❖ The Publications Committee has begun discussion on a revision of the copyright form for Springer publications. The previous revision, submitted to Springer in August 2008, was finally put on the Springer web site on 18 February 2010.
- ❖ The AICT Editorial Board has been listed at the front of AICT volumes since late September.
- ❖ Supplement 2 to the IFIP Statutes and Bylaws has been updated to reflect the new publisher office, plus some minor editorial changes.

Mr Turner reported on the plans and ongoing work of the Publications Committee

- ❖ As soon as information is obtained on the format and transmission mechanism for electronic files of Springer publications, work will resume addressing several problems with the Digital Library. The current Digital Library is something of an embarrassment, but the ACS is reluctant to put effort into addressing the problems until it is known what changes will be required to add the metadata from Springer publications to the Digital Library. As stated in previous reports, it is essential that a financial model be developed for sustaining the operation of the Digital Library.
- ❖ There is the intention to obtain agreement between the Publications Committee and Springer on a new form for the copyright as soon as possible, and to have the new form on the Springer web site.
- ❖ Work has begun to recommend an IFIP policy on plagiarism. Input has been received from Technical Assembly, and there will be some discussion at the informal PC meeting in Sofia.
- ❖ It is intended that information be sent to conference organizers regarding publication options as soon as an organizer contact is known by the Secretariat. Procedures for doing this are under discussion.
- ❖ The intention is to involve the AICT Editorial Board, along with the PC, in considering how to make AICT a stronger series, perhaps using sub-series to distinguish between different types of events and publications.
- ❖ As electronic publishing in respected venues becomes increasingly important, IFIP needs to continuously consider ways to strengthen IFIP's Digital Library and to ensure that IFIP's publications, both with Springer and e-only publications in the Digital Library, are found by various search engines and are included in relevant bibliographies.
- ❖ Publications Committee will respond as requested regarding financing the Digital Library to the Finance Committee.

The Board **APPROVED** the revised Supplement 2.

4.11 Next Meetings

The next meetings are:

2010	
GA	September 24 th - 26 th , Brisbane, Australia following WCC 2010
2011	
Council	March, Dublin, Ireland
GA	September – invitations are invited
2012	
Council	March – invitations are invited
GA	September – invitations are invited

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

4.12 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.