

Minutes of the General Assembly
September 25th – 26th, 2010, Brisbane, Australia

1	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	2
2	ACTION LIST	4
3	ATTENDANCE LIST.....	5
4	GENERAL ASSEMBLY MEETING.....	6
4.1	CALL MEETING TO ORDER	6
4.2	ATTENDANCE AND APOLOGIES	6
4.3	BUSINESS MATTERS	6
4.3.1	<i>Approval of Agenda.....</i>	6
4.3.2	<i>Approval of Minutes</i>	7
4.3.3	<i>President's Report</i>	7
4.3.4	<i>Secretary's Report</i>	9
4.3.5	<i>EC Meeting Report.....</i>	10
4.3.6	<i>Treasurer's Report.....</i>	10
4.3.7	<i>Finance Committee Report.....</i>	12
4.4	TASK FORCES.....	13
4.4.1	<i>Task Force on Finances.....</i>	13
4.4.2	<i>Task Force on Membership</i>	14
4.4.3	<i>Membership Amnesty.....</i>	17
4.5	STATUTES & BYLAWS, ELECTIONS, ADMISSIONS AND AWARDS.....	17
4.5.1	<i>Statutes and Bylaws</i>	17
4.5.2	<i>Election IFIP Officers and Councillors.....</i>	18
4.5.3	<i>Admissions Committee.....</i>	19
4.5.4	<i>Internal Awards</i>	20
4.6	IFIP STRATEGY	20
4.6.1	<i>General Strategy Matters</i>	20
4.6.2	<i>Dissemination of High Quality Knowledge in ICT (Strategy Project 1).....</i>	22
4.6.3	<i>International Liaison (Strategy Project 2).....</i>	23
4.6.4	<i>Member Societies (Strategy Project 3).....</i>	24
4.7	CONGRESSES AND MAJOR EVENTS.....	24
4.7.1	<i>WITFOR 2011.....</i>	24
4.7.2	<i>WCC 2010.....</i>	25
4.7.3	<i>IFIP 50th Anniversary.....</i>	27
4.7.4	<i>CIO Forum</i>	28
4.7.5	<i>WCC Future Plans.....</i>	29
4.8	STANDING COMMITTEE'S REPORTS.....	31
4.8.1	<i>Technical Assembly</i>	31
4.8.2	<i>Activity Management Board</i>	32
4.8.3	<i>Developing Countries Support Committee</i>	32
4.8.4	<i>Marketing Committee</i>	33
4.8.5	<i>Member Society Relations Committee</i>	35
4.8.6	<i>Publications Committee.....</i>	36
4.9	INTERNATIONAL PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE PARTNERSHIP (IP3)	38
4.10	OTHER BUSINESS	39
4.10.1	<i>International Young IT.....</i>	39
4.10.2	<i>Digital Human Solidarity Charter</i>	40
4.10.3	<i>Handover Presidency.....</i>	40
4.11	FUTURE MEETINGS	40
4.12	CLOSING OF MEETING.....	40
5	ATTACHMENTS	41
5.1	ATTACHMENT 1: AUDITOR'S REPORT	41
5.2	ATTACHMENT 2: PROFIT & LOSS STATEMENT (TREAS 4)	42
5.3	ATTACHMENT 3: INTERNATIONAL YOUNG IT BOARD.....	43

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

IFIP GENERAL ASSEMBLY SEP 25TH - SEP 26TH 2010, BRISBANE, AUSTRALIA

Membership: The membership of Botswana ceased at 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. The membership of Russia will also cease at the end of 2010 having last paid in 2008 according the changes in S&B. A special one-off amnesty has been offered for all arrears that they remain Full Members if they pay in full 2010 dues.

Finance: General Assembly approved the 2009 accounts. The operating deficit of 91K EUR is attributable to WITFOR 2009 expenditure, an expense that won't occur in 2010. The portfolio has begun a slow recovery to the 2007 levels. It increased in value by Euro 372K EUR. General Assembly accepted the Budget 2011 under the condition that the operational deficit is 50 percent of the proposed budget.

Finance Task Force: The TF stated that because 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. Regarding IFIP's portfolio it has been agreed that the TF asks two additional banks for their proposals for investment strategies and portfolio management. With only this last task remaining, it was decided to end the Task Force as a separate entity and to have this task finished by the Finance Committee (FC). The Task Force members that were not already members of the FC will join FC.

Membership Task Force: A new membership model has been discussed. The Task Force will include the discussed issues and include them into a final proposal for approval in next General Assembly.

Statutes & Bylaws: General Assembly approved the reduction from 3 years to 2 years of the period membership is terminated for non-payment of dues. The enhancement of the election rules for members of the EC to allow also Board members to be elected has been accepted.

Election of Officers and Councillors: Two Vice Presidents have been elected: Mr Engel and Mr Puigjaner. Mr Avram has been elected as Treasurer elect. The new elected Councillors are: Mr Pries-Heje, Mr Robertson, Mr Hinchey and Mr A Min Tjoa.

Admissions: The applications for Full Membership of the Mohammed e-University (HBMeU) representing the United Arab Emirates and of the Engineering School of Communication of Tunis (SUP'COM) representing Tunisia were accepted. Mr Sawhney has been approved as IFIP Individual Member for three years.

World Computer Congress 2010: There were over 1.100 participants in 463 sessions and over 400 speakers. In scientific view the congress was a great success although there were some problems in the forefront of the organisation.

IFIP's 50th Anniversary: An excellent and highly recognized contribution was made in the Gunyah project by a dedicated ACS history group.

CIO Forum: IFIP considers the CIO Forum as a formal and possibly major event of IFIP.

Future World Computer Congress: A proposal for the future WCC has been presented and discussed. It has been decided that the issues touched in the discussion should be included in a new proposal to be submitted to the Board and GA in 2011.

Technical Assembly: New TC Chairs elected: Mr Neuhold (TC5), Mr Pries-Heje (TC8), Mr Phahlamohlaka (TC9) and Mr Gulliksen (TC13).

The proposed new Working Groups were approved: WG 5.6 on "Bioinformatics and its Applications", WG 12.8 on "Intelligent bioinformatics and biomedical systems", WG 12.7 on "Social Networks, Semantics and Collective Intelligence"; and the joint Special Interest Group on "Services in IT" by TC6 and TC8.

The limit of maximum 2 Vice Chairs per TC has been removed from the rules. It is up to the TC to wisely decide on the number of Vice Chairs.

Publications Committee: A new publications contract with Springer for 2011 - 2014 is in place. The quality of the printed material and additionally the operational aspects for the authors and editors has been improved.

After serious operational problems with the Digital Library the Digital Library was finally restored during July 2010. It is expected that the 2009 data will be added within one or two months, and any 2010 data that becomes available will be added by end of this year. As reported the year before there is still a lack of finding a financial model to run the Digital Library. The IFIP budget cannot sustain providing full payment for the Digital Library operation.

International Professional Practice Partnership (IP3): Since the establishment of IP3 many tasks have been accomplished, like creating Professional Standards Committee, creating of an Accreditation Committee and accreditations underway, Principles of Mutual Acceptance accomplished, creating a Global Marketing-Communications Steering Committee, approval of an open engagement policy and the formation of a Global Industry Council.

The most serious issue for IP3 is how to finance the project in the future. There is a strong need for additional membership, for industry insight and for government support.

There is a very strong demand from General Assembly to get a business plan from IP3, especially for the finance part.

International Young IT: A proposal to form an International Young IT Board within IFIP has been presented.

Digital Human Solidarity Charter: General Assembly has decided to support the Digital Human Solidarity Charter and the president will sign it on behalf of IFIP.

Handover Presidency: Mr von Solms handed over the IFIP Presidency to Mr Strous and wished him much success for the future.

2 ACTION LIST

IFIP GENERAL ASSEMBLY SEP 25TH - SEP 26TH 2010, BRISBANE, AUSTRALIA

Task -----	Person / Body -----
Finance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To go into discussions with budgetholders, incl. those for projects, in order to decrease the budgeted deficit with 50% ○ To invite tenders for the auditor of IFIP's accounts ○ To ask two more banks for investment proposals and portfolio management 	Treasurer Treasurer FC
Membership: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To prepare and send a new draft for a membership model to GA members and the Boards of member societies. ○ Discuss comments and suggestions at next Board meeting (March 2011) ○ To present a final version at General Assembly 2011 	Membership TF IFIP Board / Membership TF Membership TF
Strategy Project 1 (DHQK) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To go into discussion about budgeting with Treasurer 	Mr Rannenber
Strategy Project 2 (International Liaison) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Defining an international relationship policy ○ Setting up an inventory of international bodies ○ Establishing and maintaining contacts ○ Advancing the WITFOR process 	ILC ILC ILC ILC / WITFOR
IFIP's 50th Anniversary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Completing and Printing book "50 Years of IFIP" ○ Redesign of history part of IFIP's website 	Mr Brunnstein Mr Brunnstein / TF Website
Future WCC plans <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Include GA comments into new proposal to be presented to the Board and GA 	Mr Strous
Publications <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Update the Digital Library with 2009 and 2010 data ○ Finding a financial model for running the Digital Library ○ Strengthen the Digital Library ○ Completion of copyright form revision ○ Development of a policy on plagiarism ○ Development of AICT 	Publ.Comm. PC with FC Publ.Comm. Publ.Comm. Publ.Comm. Publ.Comm.
International Professional Practice Partnership (IP3) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide General Assembly with a financial business plan ○ Work on a Common Body of Knowledge 	IP3 IP3

3 ATTENDANCE LISTIFIP GENERAL ASSEMBLY SEP 25TH - SEP 26TH 2010, BRISBANE, AUSTRALIA**GA Members Present****Member Society Representatives**

Australia	C Avram	Austria	A Min Tjoa
Canada	G Lane	China	Forrest Lin
Croatia	M Frkovic	Czech Rep	J Pokorny
Finland	O Martikainen	France	G Domeingts
Germany	K Brunnstein	Hungary	M Raffai
India	L Sawhney	Ireland	D Brady
Japan	T Saito	Korea	D Y Kim
Netherlands	L Strous	New Zealand	D Robertson
Norway	J Wibe	Portugal	A Casaca
Slovenia	N Schlamberger	South Africa	B von Solms
Spain	R Puigjaner	Sweden	D Khakhar
Switzerland	R Morel	UK	R Jonson
US-ACM	J Turner	US-IEEE-CS	G Engel
Zimbabwe	L Gudza		

Councillors M Bramer

Honorary Members A Goldsworthy

TC Chairs

TC1	M Hinchey	TC3	B Cornu
TC5	E Neuhold	TC8	Jan Pries-Heje
TC 9	C Avgerou	TC10	B Eschermann
TC 11	K Rannenber	TC12	T Dillon
TC13	A Mark-Pejtersen		

Affiliate members representatives

CEPIS D Brady SEARCC Y Karunaratne

Observers

M de Roche	South Africa	J Gulliksen	Incoming TC13 Chair
J Phahlamohlaka	Incoming TC9 chair	Y Ramasundara	ACS
A Senteni	UAE	Mansoor Al Awar	UAE
Serine El Salhat	UAE	A Burgess	IEEE
B Brauneis	IFIP Secretariat		
E Dundler	IFIP General Secretary		

Apologies

Belgium	D Deschoolmeester		
Brazil	M Walter		
Bulgaria	K Boyanov		
Greece	S Katsikas		
CLEI	R Santos	Proxy to Spain	
Denmark	P Bollerslev	Proxy to Norway	
Italy	A Frisiani	Proxy to US / IEEE	
TC2	B Meyer		
TC6	G Leduc	Represented by R Puigjaner	
TC7	J Henry		
TC14	R Nakatsu		
Honorary Member	P-A Bobillier		
Honorary Member	A Rolstadas		
Honorary Member	B Sendov		

4 GENERAL ASSEMBLY MEETING

IFIP General Assembly Sep 25th - SEP 26th 2010, BRISBANE, AUSTRALIA

4.1 Call Meeting to Order

The President opened the General Assembly meeting, formally welcomed all participants and wished to all a constructive meeting. He thanked the local host, the Australian Computer Society (ACS) represented by Mr Tate from the National Board of ACS for the local hospitality and for the local organisation.

Mr Tate welcomed all participants to General Assembly in Brisbane on behalf of ACS and wished everybody a successful meeting

The President especially welcomed IFIP's Past Presidents, Mr Goldsworthy and Mr Brunnstein. He introduced the new TC Chairs, Mr Neuhold (TC5), Mr Pries-Heje (TC8) and Mr Dillon (TC13), the incoming TC Chairs Mr Phahlamohlaka (TC9) and Mr Gulliksen (TC13) and the acting national representative from France Mr Domeingts attending their first IFIP meeting. **The President** welcomed all observers.

The President also welcomed the representatives of CEPIS (Mr Brady) and SEARCC (Mr Karunaratne). He informed GA that the president of ACS, Mr Wong, would join the meeting later.

4.2 Attendance and Apologies

The Secretary announced the GA attendance and apologies received (please refer to the attendance list). 27 Full Members, 1 Councillor, 1 Honorary Member and 9 TC Chairs with voting rights were represented and 3 valid proxies were given.

Mr Johnson stated that the attendance exceeded the quorum and GA could proceed with its work.

4.3 Business Matters

4.3.1 Approval of Agenda

The President informed the General Assembly that the sequence of items in the agenda were subject to change because of practical timing reasons. **Mr Strous** wished to add a new item on the agenda relating to a proposal of the Young IT Board of the Australian Computer Society. **The President** advised that these issues could be discussed under item 4.10. "Other Business".

GA unanimously ADOPTED the Agenda.

4.3.2 Approval of Minutes

GA unanimously APPROVED the Minutes of the GA 2009 in Hanoi, Vietnam.

GA unanimously APPROVED the Minutes of the BOARD 2010 in Sofia, Bulgaria.

4.3.3 President's Report

Mr von Solms drew attention to his written report and said that at the time he made his speech to support his candidacy for the presidential election in Santiago, Chile in August 2006, he clearly stated that if he was to be elected, he will propose certain changes in IFIP, and that he will then expect the support of the General Assembly for such proposed changes.

Immediately after his election **the President** started to formulate some changes and identify areas where he thought change and investigations were needed. These areas covered the following areas:

- The governance structure of IFIP
- The membership categories and financial future of IFIP
- The international footprint of IFIP

The President addressed the changes proposed and the present status in each of these 3 areas briefly:

The Governance Structure of IFIP

Mr von Solms said that during his 6 years as a TC chair, the one thing which always worried him was the fact that in most cases, after a TC Chair's term ended after 3 or 6 years, the expertise and knowledge of that person was totally lost to IFIP. There were only very few, if any, ways to retain that expertise and knowledge in IFIP. Basically this was only possible if the TC Chair had also been a national GA representative, allowing him/her to continue in IFIP – something that was quite rare. This problem prevented TC Chairs from being involved in the governance of IFIP like chairing Standing Committees etc. This could only be done by changing the governance structure of IFIP.

The second challenge was to change the big and wieldy Council, consisting of at least 25 -30 people into a smaller more agile body which would have a more quick and direct role in the governance of IFIP. The proposal submitted to the General Assembly in August 2007 in Addis Ababa, consisted basically of changing the constituency of the Council into a smaller body, called the Board of IFIP.

Proposed changes included:

- Renaming the Council to be known as the Board
- Discontinuing the baggage loaded position of Trustees, and instituting the position of Councillor, where a Councillor is an elected member to the new Board, and every Councillor has a direct responsibility and accountability
- Establishing the possibility of TC Chairs to be elected as Councillors
- Allowing any Councillor to chair an IFIP Standing Committee
- Allowing the President to appoint two Councillors to the Board.

For obvious reasons the Executive Board (EB) was renamed to the Executive Committee (EC).

These proposals were approved by the GA in Addis Ababa, and some sitting TC Chairs were immediately elected and appointed to the new Board.

At GA 2008 and GA 2009 more TC Chairs were elected, and at the moment 4 sitting TC Chairs are Councillors and therefore members of the Board. Some of them are chairing some Standing Committees, while others are chairing special Task Forces.

The changes also included the elimination of the traditional TA meeting in February/March, requiring all TC Chairs to attend the annual February/March Board meeting. This satisfied the complaint of many TC Chairs that this extra meeting every year was not necessary, although other TC Chairs felt it to be beneficial to meet twice a year.

All these changes resulted in a much smaller body that could react much faster on matters requiring attention. Furthermore every Board member (Councillor) had a specific responsibility, making performance management much easier, and finally TC chairs had direct involvement in the real governance of IFIP, sharing their rich experience to the benefit of IFIP.

The last 3 years have proved that these changes definitely benefited IFIP.

The Membership categories and Financial future of IFIP

The President said that it was clear before his election as President that the existing membership categories of IFIP were outdated, and had to change. Indications were the fact that several bodies enquired about membership, but could not be accommodated in any of the existing ones.

A Membership Task Force was created to totally revisit IFIP's membership categories, and provide new options providing a wider option for membership. This Task Force will provide some final proposals at this General Assembly.

A second Task Force was created to totally review the financial future of IFIP, and to identify new streams of income. This Task Force will also have final proposals available at this General Assembly.

The International footprint of IFIP

The President said that it was also clear to him that IFIP should improve its international footprint by making closer contact with international bodies and agencies. An International Liaison Committee was created to pursue this avenue.

Personal discussions took place with the Secretary General of the ITU, with Commissioners of the EU and with the Assistant Director General of UNESCO. A meeting with the new Director General of UNESCO is planned in the near future.

Evaluation of Basie von Solms term as President

The President said that it was his privilege to serve as President of IFIP during the last 3 years leading up to IFIP's 50th Anniversary. He is convinced that during his term, he has initiated a number of changes which provide a good platform to guide IFIP into its next 50 years; that many more aspects of IFIP will have to change in the next few years to expand the role and position of IFIP is of course true, but he has full confidence in Mr Strous who will be the next President.

Mr von Solms expressed his sincere thanks to everybody who helped and supported him during his term as President, and he trusts that IFIP will grow in such a manner in its next 50 years that it will really be recognized internationally as the pre-eminent body on ICT matters.

4.3.4 Secretary's Report

Mr Johnson was pleased to report that the Secretariat continues to run smoothly and he would like to express all thanks once again to all of them for their hard work for IFIP. **The Secretary** reported that he together with Mrs Raffai and Mr Strous paid a visit to Laxenburg in January and again with Mrs Raffai in June as part of the handover of the role of Honorary Secretary. These were very useful visits and introduced his successor to the IFIP office and its procedures.

Mr Johnson reported that at August 17th, IFIP has 52 Full Members with voting rights. He also informed General Assembly that IFIP's Executive Committee remains committed to increasing IFIP membership and always welcomes details of possible contacts for new members.

In accordance with IFIP Statute 3.4 states **the Secretary** had to report to General Assembly that:

1. The membership of Botswana ceased at the end of 2009 as they last paid their subscription in 2006.
2. 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.
3. The membership of Russia will be suspended at the end of 2010 having last paid in 2008. Representatives of Russia will be unable to participate in TCs and SGs or serve on IFIP's Board from January 2011 unless the outstanding sums are paid. Any elected officers from these countries will be deemed to have resigned at that date and will be replaced.
4. Discussions continue with respect to French membership.

The Secretary informed General Assembly that the President asked the S&B Committee to propose an amendment to S&B to shorten from 3 years to 2 years, the time allowed for non payment of membership dues before IFIP membership is terminated. The only impact of approving this change would be to terminate Russian membership at the end of 2010 rather than the end of 2011.

Mr Johnson understood the President has written to each Full Member in arrears offering a special one-off amnesty for all arrears if it pays for 2010 and he will be making a proposal to General Assembly to agree to this measure.

Mr Johnson informed General Assembly that this is his last report as Honorary

Secretary. Looking back over the past 11 years, his interactions with so many IFIPers have been overwhelmingly characterised by good humour, friendship and a strong sense of shared purpose. There were differences which have been discussed vigorously (even passionately) but unfailingly within the academic conventions which ensured all the participants could share a drink together afterwards!

Mr Johnson thanked for allowing him the opportunity to contribute to fulfilling IFIP's important mission and for the many friendships that he has shared in so many places around the globe. He will follow IFIP's progress with great interest and he wished all every success for the future.

The President thanked Mr Johnson on behalf of General Assembly for his valuable contribution as IFIP's Honorary Secretary to IFIP's success and he gave Mr Johnson the honourable title: "Mr Statutes and Bylaws"..

4.3.5 EC Meeting Report

Mr Johnson reported that EC had held a meeting in Brisbane prior to the General Assembly.

Mr Brunnstein gave a preliminary report on WCC 2010. This will be reported separately under the appropriate agenda item.

Mr Johnson reported that the Executive Committee remains concerned at the lack of plan to move IFIP's Digital Library to financial stability. Additional income appears to be urgently needed or costs will need to be substantially reduced. A separate full presentation will be made to General Assembly.

Some time has been devoted to enhancing the WCC / WITFOR websites, controlling of IFIP's finances and IFIP's UNESCO relations. In order to avoid repetition, many of the issues that have been dealt with will be addressed under the respective agenda items.

Mr Johnson reported that the Executive Committee congratulated Brigitte Brauneis on completing 10 years with IFIP and thanked her for all her work.

4.3.6 Treasurer's Report

Mr Avram referred to his report and explained the way it was structured. He said the 2009 accounts were maintained by the IFIP secretariat and reviewed in February 2010 by IFIP's auditor CONSULTATIO. Please find "Auditors opinion" addressed to General Assembly attached (Attachment 1).

The Treasurer showed a summary of the financial statements as reported to General Assembly in 2009 and now extended 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 operational 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 reported that the operating deficit is attributable to WITFOR 2009 expenditure, an expense that won't occur in 2010.

The Treasurer said that the portfolio has begun a slow recovery to the 2007 levels. During 2009 it increased in value by Euro 372,000. It is no longer actively managed as a discretionary portfolio, but is now in a holding state. He has analyzed the portfolio performance 1999 to June 2010, taking into account cash flows in and out; the annual return has been 1.74%. This has been a difficult period financially. The analysis has been made available to the IFIP Finance Taskforce.

During 2009 and early 2010, 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 Task Force will also make recommendations in relation to the use of portfolio returns.

Mr Avram informed General Assembly that the secretariat has sent regular financial reports to the Technical Committees.

The Treasurer reported that during the budget formation process, project leaders and TCs were invited to complete a project budget justification form. Comments on the usefulness of the form are welcome and will be considered for 2012.

Budget requests have substantially been adopted.

For budgeting purposes, **the Treasurer** assumed a portfolio return of 1.76%. **The Treasurer** showed an IFIP Profit/Loss Statement (TREAS 4). Its purpose is to propose a budget for 2011 and place that budget proposal in the context of recent actual financial performance (see attachment 2).

As a conclusion **the Treasurer** presented that

- IFIP is on track to come in a little ahead of budget in 2010
- And he proposed a budget with an overall budget deficit of Euro 149,715, this is less of a deficit than the currently expected 2010 deficit.

The Treasurer summarized that

- IFIP has a strong asset base underpinning the ability to continue confident operations into the near term.
- 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.
- IFIP is on track for 2010 and the General Secretary estimates a better than budget result for 2010.

The Treasurer re-stated the treasurer's comments from years past: IFIP needs to find new business opportunities.

The Treasurer commended the recommendations the Finance Task Force has made to General Assembly in relation to the next steps for IFIP.

The Treasurer thought it prudent, and the IFIP Board agreed in its March meeting, IFIP should review the arrangement with its auditor, and should do such reviews every 5 or so years. This task is yet to start.

General Assembly unanimously **APPROVED** the 2010 accounts.

4.3.7 Finance Committee Report

Mr Wibe presented the report of the Finance Committee. He informed the General Assembly that the Finance Committee welcomed the reporting of the Treasurer on the split between operating results and portfolio management, as this allows analyzing and discussing both items independently.

Mr Wibe reported that the Finance Committee recommends that investments in projects such as the Digital Library and IP3 should be supported by up-to date appropriate business plans in order for the EC to monitor the value of investments twice a year. The FC recommends the EC to allocate clear responsibilities for this.

Mr Wibe reported that with respect to the budget for 2010 the Finance Committee is concerned over the fourth budget in a row with an operational deficit. The FC recommended the Treasurer and EC to review the budget again and recommended General Assembly:

- a) to approve the 2011 budget only under the condition that the operational deficit is reduced by 50% compared with the current proposal and
- b) to charter the Treasurer and EC to target a balanced operational budget in the short term.

To achieve this there is a clear need to increase income or to decrease investments and costs or both.

Mr Strous requested starting discussion immediately with budget holders where to cut for 2011.

Mr Goldsworthy noted that as a principle a budget should not project a loss.

General Assembly ACCEPTED the Budget 2011 under the condition that the operational deficit is 50 percent of the proposed budget.

4.4 Task Forces

4.4.1 Task Force on Finances

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 to General Assembly 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 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.

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 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.

Mr Eschermann reported that the Finance Task Force asked 3 banks for offers for investment strategies and portfolio management. There were detailed discussions with two of the banks. As some fundamental issues were not covered in the proposals of the banks the Finance Task Force did not come to a final recommendation to General Assembly.

The Finance Task Force made the proposal to General Assembly to invite two more banks to make proposals for investment strategies and management portfolio and complete it's report before the next Board meeting.

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

General Assembly AGREED to the proposal to ask two additional banks for their proposals and mandated the Finance Task Force to go into detailed investigations.

With only this last task remaining, it was decided to end the Task Force as a separate entity and to have this task finished by the Finance Committee (FC). The Task Force members that were not already members of the FC will join FC.

Part of the report of the Task Force included the IFIP investment policy (balanced investment portfolio). The proposal was to stay within the basic investment policy IFIP has; but this was not debated within GA.

Mr Goldsworthy put up for discussion whether IFIP should use an external investment manager or whether somebody inside IFIP should take over this task. There was no conclusion on this discussion point.

4.4.2 Task Force on Membership

Mr Strous presented a proposal of the Membership Task Force for discussion to the General Assembly. The background of this paper was that it was felt that IFIP needs a revised membership model for the next decade with expanded membership criteria to accommodate interest in IFIP membership from parties who do not qualify for membership with the present criteria.

Mr Strous explained that GA was not expected to take decisions but to discuss the proposal and to provide input for the next steps.

In order to reflect on a revised membership model, IFIP could (virtually) be divided based on three main types of activities. There would be a professional level organization (with activities like IP3), a technical (learned) organization (with activities in the TCs and WGs), and a development / humanitarian organization (with activities like WITFOR). Members can choose any type of activity they take an interest in.

One of the important elements in the reconsideration of the membership model of IFIP is the position of IFIP in the international community, in particular vis-a-vis United Nations bodies but also broader. At the moment IFIP has a formal status in three important organizations, UNESCO, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, ITU, the International Telecommunication Union (also a UN body) and ICSU, the International Council for Science.

The revision of the membership model should take this into consideration and a new / renewed model should maintain this position, also with a view on the ambition to leverage IFIP's position with such bodies to a greater extent and to expand such links to other bodies.

With all these considerations, it is proposed to introduce a new category of membership: Specialist Members. At the same time it is proposed to simplify the model and eliminate some of the existing membership categories, notably: Corresponding members, Affiliate members, Associate members, Individual members. This will reduce the number of categories from six to three:

- Full member
- Specialist member
- Honorary member

Mr Goldsworthy proposed to take the name "General member" instead of Full member. **Mr Turner** supported the proposal.

Mr Strous explained the three categories:

Full members will be those members that make IFIP qualify as being the international umbrella organization of scientific or technical societies in the field of computer science / informatics / information processing. This is one of the conditions to be acknowledged as an international non-governmental organization (NGO) that is widely representative and expert in its field of activity, and that is recognized as having a genuinely international structure and membership.

Members in this category will be national scientific or technical societies or groups of such societies, in a country (there can be more than one society or group of societies of the same country full member of IFIP). These societies shall be representative of activities in the field of computer science / informatics / information processing.

Full Membership may also be considered for similar organisations in a selected territory provided it can be listed under a name that will avoid any misunderstanding about the territory represented. Full Member societies may belong to a regional group that is also a full member, but should not exceed a quarter of the membership of the group at time of admission.

Full members often represent a country but that does not necessarily mean that the scope of such members are limited to one country – in many cases such members are operating internationally.

Specialist Member of IFIP is an institution or organization which does not qualify to be a Full Member of IFIP. Such an institution or organization 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, or an institution operating internationally like IMIA.

On rare occasions, **Honorary Membership** may be awarded to a person who has displayed exceptional merit in furthering the aims and interest of the Federation. Honorary Membership shall be conferred for life. Each Past-President will be considered for admission as Honorary Member when he ceases to be the representative of a Full Member at General Assembly.

Mr Strous explained the criteria for membership and also a first idea for the voting rights for each category in detail.

Mr Strous said that the revision of the membership model is a good opportunity to also have a look at the fee structure of IFIP. The main requirement with respect to a possible change in structure and level of the fees is that income from membership fees should not decrease compared to the current structure. The income from membership fees is necessary to cover the cost of the IFIP Secretariat.

In order not to make it too complex, here three models for the fee structure are presented

- Current model, based on GDP of countries
- Model based on number of members of member societies
- Model based on membership category

In all three models, honorary members do not pay a membership fee.

The different fee models will be elaborated in cooperation with the Standing Committee on Finance and the treasurer after the discussion on the membership categories.

Mr Strous presented the next steps for the Membership Task Force:

- Process the result of the discussion at GA 2010 in a new version of the draft proposal.
- Send this new draft to the GA members and to the Boards of the IFIP member societies for further comments and suggestions.
- Discuss comments and suggestions at the Board meeting in 2011.
- Work on details of voting rights and fee structures to be discussed at the Board meeting and included in the final proposal for GA 2011.
- Present a final proposal for approval to GA 2011.
- Prepare the necessary changes in Statutes & Bylaws (to be presented at GA 2011 together with the final proposal).
- In the meantime enhance the proposal with further elaborations
 - ❖ on financial aspects of fee structures in order to include in the final proposal also the financial consequences
 - ❖ on Membership criteria
 - ❖ on voting and other rights (such as representation in IFIP bodies and eligibility for offices)

Mr Brunnstein said that the German Society would only support the principle “one country – one vote” and is against a fragmentation of countries. He strongly warned about the consequences of going away from this principle.

Mr Goldsworthy emphasized the importance of “one country – one vote” for the ACS, because it shows that the ACS is **THE** representative body of Australia within IFIP.

Mr Johnson said that the same is valid for the UK. The dissolving of this principle would destroy the brand of IFIP in the UK.

Most of the comments from General Assembly were against the differentiation of Specialist members in classes.

General Assembly ACCEPTED the proposal as a discussion paper and **ASKED** the Task Force to proceed with the proposed next steps.

4.4.3 Membership Amnesty

Mr von Solms presented to the General Assembly on the occasion of IFIP's 50th anniversary the following proposal requesting its approval:

"All IFIP membership fees unpaid up to the end of 2009 are written off if the 2010 membership fee is paid in full before December 31st, 2010."

This offer would give affected societies the opportunity to stay within the IFIP community by paying their membership fee for this year. It was strongly emphasized that this would be a one-time offer on a special occasion.

Members of General Assembly had opposite views on the proposal and General Assembly decided in a voting to **ACCEPT** the proposal.

4.5 Statutes & Bylaws, Elections, Admissions and Awards

4.5.1 Statutes and Bylaws

Mr Johnson presented on behalf of the Statutes & Bylaws Committee three proposals.

Proposals 1 and 2 are in response to a request from the President to reduce from 3 years to 2 years the period before IFIP membership is terminated for non-payment of dues.

Proposal 1: Change the current wording in S&B article 3.3.1c concerning termination of IFIP Full membership is “if the Full Member is more than three years in arrears with the payment of dues ...” to “**if the Full member is more than two years in arrears with the payment of dues ...**”.

Change the current wording in S&B article 3.3.2c concerning termination of IFIP Affiliate, Corresponding or Associate membership is “if such Member is more than

three years in arrears with the payment of dues ...” to “**if such Member is more than two years in arrears with the payment of dues ...**”.

Proposal 2: Delete paragraphs in S&B article 3.4 (Suspension of GA membership) which no longer apply. Current wording is “A Member with dues outstanding at the end of the year following that in which they were invoiced will be suspended from Membership with immediate effect. Its Membership will be reinstated when such outstanding dues are paid unless it has otherwise been terminated.”

A suspended Member will lose the right to representation at General Assembly and in Technical Committees and Specialist Groups. Any representative from a suspended Member who serves on the IFIP Council or as an Officer of a Technical Committee or Specialist Group will be deemed to have resigned with effect from the date at which the suspension took effect and will be replaced.”

Proposal 3 is proposed by Mr Hinchey and Mr Bramer as provided under Article 7. Change the current wording in S&B article 4.3.1 (Executive Committee – Composition and Election) from “The General Assembly shall elect from among its Full Members and Individual Members” to “**The General Assembly shall elect from among its Full Members, Individual Members and Board Members**”.

General Assembly APPROVED the proposals.

4.5.2 Election IFIP Officers and Councillors

For Vice Presidents

Mr Johnson reported on behalf of the Nominations Committee that there were two vacancies for Vice-President. Two candidates received at least the four nominations for automatic inclusion on the ballot paper. One other name received one nomination. Consequently the committee nominated Mr G Engel (IEEE-USA) and Mr R Puigjaner (Spain).

General Assembly **ELECTED** by acclamation:

Mr G Engel as Vice President

Mr R Puigjaner as Vice President.

For Treasurer Elect

Mr Johnson reported that Mr C Avram has received four nominations. No other nominations have been received.

General Assembly **ELECTED** by acclamation:

Mr C Avram as Treasurer Elect.

For Councillors

Mr Johnson reported that at least 2 Councillors have to be elected. For the Councillor “nominated and elected by General Assembly” no nominations were received prior the meeting. During the meeting Mr Pries-Heje was nominated, supported by the required four nominations.

General Assembly **ELECTED** by acclamation:

Mr J Pries-Heje as Councillor.

For the Councillor “nominated by Member Societies” Mr Robertson received the four nominations required for automatic inclusion on the ballot paper. No other nominations have been received.

The Member Societies **APPROVED** by acclamation:
Mr D Robertson as Councillor.

Mr Johnson informed General Assembly that for Councillor “nominated by TA” Mr Hinchey has been nominated.

The Technical Assembly **APPROVED** by acclamation:
Mr M Hinchey as Councillor.

There was one vacation for Councillor “nominated by the IFIP President”.

General Assembly **APPROVED**
Mr A Min Tjoa as Councillor.

4.5.3 Admissions Committee

Mr Robertson reported that the Admissions Committee received an application for Full membership from the Engineering School of Communication of Tunis (Sup'Com) representing Tunisia within IFIP. The application from SUP'COM is in line with the requirements and contains all necessary documents described in IFIP's Statutes and Bylaws.

Tunisia does not have a computer society in the same sense that most of the countries have. The Sup'Com institute is the best to represent the country.

The Admissions Committee recommended that the General Assembly accept this application and accept Tunisia as a new member.

Mr Strous gave in absence of the professor Adel Ghazel, Dean of Planning and Training, The Engineering School of Communication of Tunis (Sup'Com) a short presentation of the Sup'Com. An important element in the application was the explicit support of the Ministry of Communication Technologies and the explicit acceptance of Sup'Com of the requirement that representatives in IFIP Technical Committees should be nominated from different institutes in Tunisia.

General Assembly ACCEPTED Tunisia as new IFIP member.

Mr Robertson informed General Assembly that an application for Full Membership was received from the Hamdan Bin Mohammed e-University (HBMeU) representing the United Arab Emirates (UAE). The Admissions Committee analyzed the documents supplied and the information meets the standard requirements for membership. The only question on the application is does HBMeU cover enough of UAE. HBMeU will need to act as the representative body for UAE and that other people from other institutes would be appointed as representatives in the TCs. With the above concern in mind the Admissions Committee recommended to General Assembly that the HBMeU be considered for membership.

Mr Mansoor Al Awar the Chancellor of the Hamdan Bin Mohammed e-University gave a short presentation about the university and its activities and confirmed that

HBMU has the explicit government support to represent UAE in IFIP. He also confirmed that a well-balanced representation in Technical Committees would be arranged with representatives from different UAE institutes..

General Assembly ACCEPTED the HBMU as representative of the UAE as new IFIP member.

Mr Sawhney has been nominated as Individual Member of IFIP.

General Assembly APPROVED the Individual Membership of **Mr Sawhney**.

4.5.4 Internal Awards

Mr Johnson presented the report of the Internal Awards Committee. He recommended to General Assembly, on behalf of the Internal Awards Committee, to award the following persons:

IFIP Silver Core Awards - 2010

C Avram	M Bramer	M Cavazza	P Ciancarini
P Darondeau	G Dhillon	T Dillon	P Dowland
E.Dundler	R Earnshaw	G Engel	B Eschermann
J Fiadeiro	S Furnell	D Gaiti	M Hinchey
P Humphreys	K Kimppa	J Krogstie	K Leino
D Marinelli	E Najm	R Nakatsu	S Natkin
P Palanque	A Mark-Pejtersen	J Pokorny	A Pont-Sanjuan
P Radford	P Ralston	I Stavrakakis	B Sunckel
E Trauth	H Yang		

The IFIP President was very pleased to personally present the Silver Core diplomas and pins to Mrs. Mark-Pejtersen and Messrs. Avram, Bramer, Dillon, Dundler, Engel, Eschermann, Hinchey and Pokorny.

Outstanding Service Award

TC8: F Adam M Raffai

Mr Johnson reported that the **Auerbach Award** has been presented to **Mr Khakhar**. It was announced and presented at the WCC 2010 Gala Dinner. See also the press release about this award for more background information.

General Assembly **APPLAUDED**.

4.6 IFIP Strategy

4.6.1 General Strategy Matters

Mr Strous reported to General Assembly on Strategic Matters the status of the Strategy Projects. For the description of the projects is referred to the document that was approved at GA 2007 (IFIP Strategy, 26 August 2007).

Mr Strous requested General Assembly to provide assistance in advancing the projects in such a way that IFIP can indeed successfully achieve its goals and can start thinking about the ambitions for the next five year period (2012 – 2017).

Mr Strous went quickly through the projects:

Project 1. Dissemination of high quality knowledge in ICT.

The project had a difficult start and met rather strong opposition with respect to some of the ideas / suggestions. A few attempts were made to clarify these but at GA 2009 the progress report was still negative. At the Board meeting in March 2010 some ideas from TA / TC chairs were presented that give the project a different angle and approach but will still contribute to the overall strategic aim. See also the minutes of the Board meeting (item 4.5.2 on pages 18-19). More details about the progress will be presented in the report for agenda item 4.6.2.

Project 2. International reputation.

Since GA 2007 good progress has been made with respect to the aims of this project. Many contacts have lead to follow up activities and to raising the profile of IFIP. An extensive report is presented for agenda item 4.6.3.

Project 3. Member societies

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).

After GA 2008 a survey was started by Canadian Executive MBA students. Despite some start-up problems and discussions about context and conditions, the project has recently been completed and a full report has been submitted to the IFIP Executive Committee. This report contains a number of interesting and valuable conclusions and recommendations. At GA the main issues from the report will be presented under agenda item 4.6.4.

The aim of the “awareness part” of project 3 is that *“IFIP will become a prime source of information to support member societies in raising public awareness about opportunities and risks of ICT developments. This will be achieved by collecting and publishing high quality global reviews / position papers on issues of importance to the society at large, such as e-voting, off-shoring and data protection, and by facilitating the access to information already available at member societies.”*

This has not been taken up yet. An opportunity here for IFIP to play a visible role, recently suggested by people outside IFIP, is to make (or at least include) this a main theme in the next World Computer Congress. To be discussed at agenda item 4.7.6.

Project 4. Students.

Given all the projects and activities that require a lot of resources of our volunteers, it is proposed to keep this project on hold for the moment.

Project 5. Practitioners.

Project 5 is actually the IP3 project. For this project, as for all the others, the support of GA and IFIP’s member societies is essential. Reporting on this project is done under the separate agenda item 4.9.

Mr Strous said that progress in general is better than was reported for GA 2009. But there is still a lot to be done to realize our ambitions in the five-year framework from the adoption of the strategy document (even with the freezing of project 4). He is still confident however that most of it can be done.

4.6.2 Dissemination of High Quality Knowledge in ICT (Strategy Project 1)

Mr Rannenberg presented his report to General Assembly 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. In general volunteers know what kind of event they wish to organize, however examples could be useful. It would go beyond the differentiation in the event approval guidelines and more moving towards characterizing events and helping to choose the one with the most appropriate properties.

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

- Time planning for events, submission, and review processes including an analysis of the competition from other events
- 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
- How to build an attractive call-for papers
- How to build a budget
- Conference management systems, e.g. review management systems, their features, strengths and weaknesses
- 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 caretaker 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.

Mr Rannenberg presented a cost – benefit sheet for the Strategy Project 1, showing the objectives IFIP wants to achieve with this Wiki. The timeframe for this activity is set to a start-up phase of 2 years with a following continuous service.

Mr Rannenberg estimated the costs at 25.000 EUR for the first year for setting up the Wiki and 3.000 EUR for running the Wiki depending from the availability and cost of technical services at the IFIP head quarters.

Mr Sawhney supported the idea and will keep contact with Mr Rannenberg.

General Assembly is **interested in carrying on** with the project but requested Mr Rannenberg to contact IFIP's Treasurer about the budgeting of the project (in the context of the discussion of the budget 2011).

4.6.3 International Liaison (Strategy Project 2)

Mr Strous thanked **Mr Morel** for his work as Chairman of the ILC, as Mr Morel is terminating his office as Councillor.

Mr Strous presented his report as an integrated report about the International Liaison Committee and the Strategy Project 2 to the General Assembly. It will be investigated how to align the different reports in an efficient and clear way for the next GA.

Mr Strous reminded General Assembly about project 2; it was mentioned that this project is defined as international reputation and covers the strategic aims 3.c, 5.a, 5.b, 5.c that are listed in the Strategy document (version 26-8-2007) and the matching strategic objective, that within 5 years IFIP will be considered one of the leading sources of advice on ICT related issues, including for UN organizations. This should be measured by at least one annual request for advice from three international organizations, including UN bodies.

Mr Strous informed General Assembly about the next steps:

Setting up an inventory of international bodies

At the moment IFIP has a formal status in three important organizations:

- UNESCO, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization;
- ITU, the International Telecommunication Union (also a UN body);
- ICSU, the International Council for Science.

The relationships of IFIP can be grouped into relationships with:

- Official UN bodies, including UNESCO and ITU;
- "IFIP comparable" organizations, such as ICSU and WITSA;
- Governments and inter-governmental organizations (IGO's);
- Industry, including Chambers of Commerce and industry associations;
- Other: NGO's (not included in the above), funding organizations, etc.

For each group it has to be decided what the (main) goals of relationships are; which individual organizations or parts of these organizations within the group should get priority attention; and what kind of relationship should be established / maintained;

Establishing and maintaining contacts

Mr Strous said that with a number of bodies good contacts already exist on several levels. It is advised to set up a planning that will help to establish and maintain the contacts in a structured manner. This is necessary given the voluntary nature of IFIP and the limited resources that are available for this.

Advancing the WITFOR process

Mr Strous said that as a next step it is necessary to summarize the main elements of the separate WITFOR report with emphasis on the changes in structure (to make it sustainable) and the plans for changes in approach / content. There is still increasing interest of countries to host a WITFOR.

Organizing / participating in joint events in developing countries

Mr Strous presented a list of conferences and meetings where IFIP has participated and established contacts. See detailed report.

Mr Morel reported from IFIP's connection to UNESCO that

- The work has been splitted with Eduard Dundler, Bernard Cornu, Leon Strous and himself
- Bernard Cornu gave for the last TC3 annual meeting (June 2010 in Amiens) a report of his actions
- Eduard Dundler takes care of the representation of IFIP inside UNESCO.
- Leon Strous had contacts with the new responsible assistant director general of UNESCO

Mr Morel informed General Assembly about the conferences he participated in last year. See detailed report.

4.6.4 Member Societies (Strategy Project 3)

Mr Strous informed General Assembly about the progress in the membership survey carried out by the University of Fredericton. The aim of the survey is to find a sustainable basis for IFIP to grow and to finance its existence with the opportunity to find a market place for IFIP.

The first findings of the group will be analyzed by IFIP's Executive Committee and afterwards reported to General Assembly.

4.7 Congresses and Major Events

4.7.1 WITFOR 2011

Mr Strous informed General Assembly that negotiations with a candidate are coming to an end and he expects to finalize the contract with the government within the next months. The WITFOR was planned to take place in 2011, but because of the delay in

establishing the right contacts it will most likely be postponed to 2012. As soon there is a concrete result he will inform General Assembly.

4.7.2 WCC 2010

The President welcomed **Mr Wong**, President of the Australian Computer Society (ACS) and incoming president of SEARCC. **Mr Wong** was proud to inform General Assembly that the WCC 2010 was an outstanding event for ACS. He said that the Australian Local Organizers took over an inherited burden, but had succeeded in delivering an excellent congress.

Mr Tate from the Organization Committee reported that it came apparent late last year that the congress needed much more work than done so far. Beginning of 2010 the whole management has been changed; the local Organizing Committee has been reduced to 5 or 6 persons. With this action and also other hard decisions it was possible to deliver a well-organised event. **Mr Tate** showed some statistical data about the congress:

- 1.125 registered participants
- 463 sessions
- Over 400 speakers
- Participants from 54 countries

Mr Tate was glad to report that the feedback of the congress from government and the industry as well was very good.

Mr Tate reported from the financial side that it was clear at the beginning that the congress will have a substantial loss that will be born by the ACS; a rough estimate was given to GA but final figures will be reported at a later stage.

Mr von Solms thanked for the quick overall report and confirmed that IFIP will get no event fee. This is justified with the clause in the WCC contract, that there will be no event fee paid if the loss is more than AUD 80.000.

Mr Casaca, Chair of the International Program Committee, reported that the congress was organised in 8 streams, including also non-IFIP conferences. There were 4 industry sessions within these streams. One panel was held at plenary level and several others at the conference level. He said that there were 7 invited plenary speakers and in addition in nearly every conference also one invited speaker. A good exhibition, with reference to IFIP's 50th anniversary was organised. 13 Proceedings published by Springer were produced.

Mr Casaca summarized that

- the Congress went on smoothly and its content had high quality. There was a general feeling that the participants appreciated the technical quality of the Congress.
- the scientific conferences ran as foreseen, have been well attended and there was a very low number of no-shows. The industry sessions reflected on a number of IT issues of great interest to the Australian and global IT community and they have been also highly attended.

- the thirteen volumes of the conference proceedings contained all the selected papers and have reached Brisbane in time for their distribution to participants. Late registered participants will receive proceedings by post.
- the logistical facilities have been excellent. The only known problem was that, on some days, some of the rooms allocated to scientific conferences had a limited capacity, which has been exceeded by the number of participants. However, the program could be held without any serious glitch.
- lunches and coffee breaks have been held in the exhibition area, which was a very good idea for all participants to meet. The local organization made a great job in making the Congress run as planned and in a very smooth way.

Mr Casaca thanked everybody who helped to make the congress a success.

Mr Brunstein as General chair of WCC2010 presented his report and said that with about 1.200-1.300 participants the number of participants was slightly over those from recent IFIP WCCs. From an IFIP standpoint, the scientific and technical content was very good and well presented. Apart from few aspects (space allocation for smaller events), also the organisation by Brisbane Congress and Exhibition was good.

Mr Brunstein said that WCC 2010 was not a normal WCC, as also indicated in the bid request, where the relation to IFIP's 50th Anniversary was explicitly mentioned. This aspect was explicitly addressed in the application of all bidders. Regarding the bid of ACS, as presented by Mark Lloyd to GA 2007, as well as his subsequent presentations in Board meetings and GAs, an innovative structure was proposed: related IFIP and ACS/Industry conferences should be organised under a common header called "stream", thus allowing interoperation of these events. A number of streams were proposed even before suggested conferences were known. Concerning IFIP's 50 Years, it was suggested to include video presentations of IFIP Pioneers Prof. Maurice Wilkes and Prof. Heinz Zemanek in the Opening session, to demonstrate the WCC link relation to IFIP's 50th anniversary.

Regrettably, essential requirements and suggestions have been neglected:

- the structure of "streams" could not be implemented, esp. as the suggested Industry sessions were unknown until July/August 2010;
- the request to include video addresses with IFIP Pioneers Maurice Wilkes and Heinz Zemanek in the opening session, was not honoured; this was only partially corrected upon intervention of President van Solms as both videos were presented at the beginning of the Gala dinner (though without any intro);
- agreements to include the Auerbach Award in the Gala Dinner, was also neglected, as this was announced as ACS (Pearcy) Award Ceremony. This was also partly corrected at the Gala dinner upon Prof. von Solms intervention, but the slot of 10 minutes assigned for IFIP Golden Jubilee and Auerbach award permitted even no short address of the awardee.
- Finally, and not least important: the financial outcome (for which we have only some general indication) is very "different" from what proposed. With proposed break-even in the order of 1.000 participants, the outcome is very negative. Present figures project a huge deficit (probably higher than the threshold of 80.000 Euros, below which IFIP was guaranteed its share).

Moreover, despite IFIP president's request for an updated budget (which he repeated in an OC meeting, which he visited shortly before the event), IFIP had no indication where the money was spent.

Some of these problems were evidently the consequence of late changes of the OC Chair (since February: Nick Tate) as well as the change of the Congress organiser (since 2009: Event Planner, EP). While Nick did his best to get many problems left by the original OC chair under control, activities of EP (which were evidently unexperienced in conferences of this kind) raised many problems and persistent protest of IFIP conference and program chairs. It was only due to persistent insistence of Prof. Casaca as well as repeated interventions of Prof. von Solms that problems could be solved, though partly rather late. The website with the final program was available after many interventions in correct form only in June, too late for adequate marketing, at least overseas.

Part of the promises in the bid related to IFIP 50th Anniversary was almost disregarded in the program plan, although corrections were fairly made on-site. The only very positive aspect was the exhibition of historical artefacts, documents and memorabilia of Australian computer history, prepared very well by a special ACS group lead by Prof. Ashley Goldsworthy. The financial outcome for IFIP may be really negative (if final figures prove in detail what has been announced).

Overall, the Congress itself was a scientific success, well documented in IFIP Springer publications. But concerning finances and the visibility of IFIP's 50th Anniversary, this "could have been done better".

Mr Brunnstein thanked again Mr Tate and Mr Casaca for their excellent work.

Mr von Solms thanked Mr Brunnstein and Mr Goldsworthy for their work and engagement. Going from a position considering transferring the congress he honoured again the work of Mr Tate. The President was very proud about the outcome of 13 books.

Mr Goldsworthy said that Mr Tate as Chairman of the Local Organisation Committee took over a complete disaster and has done a tremendous job to deliver an excellent product.

Ms Avgerou reported from the Technical Committees that all involved Committees are very happy about the Congress.

4.7.3 IFIP 50th Anniversary

Mr Engel from IEEE and Mr Lin from the Chinese Computer Society (CIE) brought congratulations from their Societies to IFIP's 50th anniversary and handed over presents to the IFIP President.

Mr Brunnstein informed General Assembly of the status of sub-projects of IFIP's 50th Anniversary:

1. From the book "36 Years of IFIP" the overview of IFIP's development, and in detail IFIP Membership, locations and dates of all IFIP Councils and General Assemblies, are now complete from 1960 until 2010 on IFIP's website.

2. In addition, all minutes of Councils / Boards and GAs since 1960 have been transcribed, with the kind support and much work of Mrs. Dundler assisted by her husband. These documents (partly machine typed and almost impossible to scan) are presently available on IFIP's website.
3. Concerning the publication of contributions to "50 Years of IFIP", the book will be published under IFIP Press (printed in Hungary). In a digital pre-publication, available from IFIP Website, reports from several IFIP office holders as well as contributions from most TCs have been made available online.

Mr Brunnstein reported that some sub-projects are still to be completed:

1. Apart from completing and printing the book "50 Years of IFIP", it is planned to digitize at least the first two books (addressing 10 and 25 years of IFIP). Concerning the book "36 Years of IFIP", only one copy is left which will be destroyed during the process of scanning; the decision whether to scan is open. From this book, charts 0 and 1 have been transcribed into digital form (so far: a large spreadsheet). With some more charts (e.g. concerning office holders, honorary members and TC developments), some work is still to be done (but TC and WG history can hardly be done without support of related TCs).
2. A redesign of the IFIP History part of IFIP website is advisable (possibly within an update of IFIP Website structure). Such a redesign would also support a significant improvement of the presentation of "IFIP Living History", by including not only valuable contributions from the Past but also to include documents about ongoing developments. Concerning documents addressing History of ICT, it is worthwhile to notice that IFIP WG 9.7 at the end of its History Conference agreed to collect papers about ICT History. It is intended to invite groups working on ICT History in Member Societies to join such projects, output of which may be linked via IFIP Living History database and website or even documented there.

Mr Brunnstein said that concerning IFIP WCC 2010, general visibility of IFIP 50 Years Anniversary was below expectations (as reported elsewhere). But an excellent and highly recognised contribution was made in the Gonyah project by a dedicated ACS History group, chaired by Ashley Goldsworthy with support of Max Burnett, William Caelli, Allan Coulter, Graham Rees, Gordon Rose and Wilbur Williams. It is intended to place the documents and photos of the artefacts on IFIP History Website under a dedicated Gonyah entry.

Also on behalf of Heinz Zemanek, IFIP Historian and author of the 3 preceding IFIP History books and co-author of "50 Years of IFIP", **Mr Brunnstein** thanked explicitly Eduard Dundler for his most valuable support. He also thanked Mrs. Dundler for her work dedicated to transcribing of all minutes of Councils and GAs. Finally, he very much appreciated the excellent work of Ashley Goldsworthy and his group.

4.7.4 CIO Forum

Mr Lin informed General Assembly about the status of the CIO Forum 2011. He said that a local Organization Committee has already been established and also the venue with Shenzhen, China has been fixed. The ministry of Industry and Information Technology of China has given the written official approval to the proposal of hosting IFIP World CIO Forum. An International Advisory Board with Basie von Solms as

Chair and Leon Strous is proposed with all IFIP Vice Presidents and others as members.

Mr Lin reported that an official website will be available very soon, and the press release on the primary print media will be launched. He said that there are some open questions, like how to recruit the overseas CIOs, how to bring the function of IFIP into full play, and how attendees can be attracted as expected.

Mr Lin asked for support for recommendation of IFIP's GA representatives to national CIOs to participate. He requested IFIP to take the CIO Forum as a formal and major event of IFIP.

Mr Sawhney proposed that the CIO Forum could be one of IFIP's flagships in the near future.

Mr Johnson requested Mr Lin to get into close contact with IP3 in order to include IP3 in the Forum.

Mr Tjoa said that the organizers should consider making packages for CIOs for flights to China.

4.7.5 WCC Future Plans

Mr Strous presented a proposal for a "New IFIP World Computer Congress" prepared by Ms Avgerou and Messrs Rannenber and Strous to General Assembly for discussion. The challenge for IFIP is to create a flagship event that is not a reboot of the current WCC but a drastic change compared to the current one and that can attract participation beyond the current IFIP community.

Mr Strous said that the authors propose to organize a research-oriented conference, aiming to secure IFIP's reputation as a learned society at the avant-garde of the full spectrum of ICT-related research, from basic theoretical science to social concerns; targeting the research communities and reflexive professionals/policy makers.

The new event should be a high level top quality event that:

- has a status and reputation of an event not to be missed;
- gives IFIP exposure as the community that you have to be part of;
- brings IFIP to the attention of organizations and people that would otherwise not have heard of IFIP nor be interested in learning about it;
- attracts new groups of volunteers to our activities;
- is a worthy successor of the WCC as new IFIP flagship event.

The focus of the event is on the latest ICT research developments, emerging phenomena enabled by ICT, and persistent controversies requiring ongoing research debate.

Mr Strous said that this event has to be quite clearly differentiated from industry and government conferences and, in terms of focus and goal, it has to be differentiated from "ordinary" academic conferences. The event should address questions and topics of importance for researchers. Differentiation from "ordinary" academic conferences can for instance be achieved by having only plenary sessions and having top level invited researchers from both academia and industry (labs) divided

in three categories: big names from the past, current research and research areas and the research / researchers of the future. The third category could address topics that will likely become hot topics in the near or distant future and it could include young researchers that are expected (by their peers) to become the big names of the future.

As a starting point such an event does not require preplanning in terms of frequency and duration; although IFIP should aim for some degree of regularity, and have a pre-specified time, it may be organised as topics emerge and become feasible for a conference.

Mr Strous presented the details of the proposal and informed GA about comments in advance:

- Title of the new event: there was a feeling shared with many GA members that the name should remain WCC. The new proposed titles did not reflect sufficiently what the event is aiming at.
- Targeted type of participation: the idea of attracting new communities to the WCC should not be abandoned whereas the own constituency should be one of the prime participants groups.
- Ambition: The main ambition is to create a top quality event that nobody wants to miss the next time and to position IFIP as the international organization delivering specialised research conferences of the highest quality on the hottest topics. GA felt that the ambition for a flagship event should be higher than the proposed 300 - 400 participants.
- Timing: All timing proposals as well for the period in the year as for the year itself have advantages and disadvantages. The final timing will depend on the final proposal and the planning of other events like WITFOR:
- Duration / structure / program content: no specific comments other than the wish for a less complex structure than the past couple of editions.
- Outcome: With respect to the outcome of WCC an interesting question was raised during the discussions: "How has the world changed after the IFIP WCC?". This is a good question to guide the further thoughts about a new WCC.
- Responsibilities: A number of issues concern the responsibilities and organizational structure. An important aspect is a closer link and involvement of IFIP in the organizing part (and not only in the program part). This will be taken into account in the next version of the proposal.
- Financial issues: no specific comments other than the observation that IFIP is (still) not in a position to risk taking in a conference of this planned size.

Mr Strous appreciated the comments from General Assembly and will include them in a redrafted proposal.

Next steps: given the comments made, there is some work to be done on the proposal. If the proposed next steps of the original proposal would be followed, the usual bidding process would not start before the next GA. This would imply the next WCC taking place in 2014 and thus a four year gap.

In order not to have such a long time between the 2010 WCC and the next event **Mr Strous** offered to General Assembly to hold the next WCC in Amsterdam. This would eliminate the bidding process. A full proposal (comparable to a “normal” bid) would be presented to GA 2011. GA could then have a final go / no go decision. Whether this would be WCC 2012 or WCC 2013 will depend on the feasibility of the proposal and the planning of the next WITFOR.

Mr Robertson and **Mr Sawhney** supported the offer.

General Assembly unanimously **ACCEPTED** the offer.

4.8 Standing Committee's Reports

4.8.1 Technical Assembly

Mr Hinchey presented the report of Technical Assembly and said that Technical Assembly welcomed the new TC Chairs: Mr Neuhold (TC5), Mr Pries-Heje (TC8), Mr Phahlamohlaka (TC9) and Mr Gulliksen (TC13).

Mr Hinchey reported that TA approved the establishment of

- WG 5.6 on “Bioinformatics and its Applications”,
- WG 12.8 on “ Intelligent bioinformatics and biomedical systems”
- WG 12.7 on “Social Networks, Semantics and Collective Intelligence”
- The joint Special Interest Group on “Services in IT” by TC6 and TC8, which will engage with other TCs and WGs, in particular TC2.

General Assembly **TOOK NOTE** of the establishment of the Groups.

Mr Hinchey reported that TA requests to remove the restriction of having 2 Vice Chairs and allowing the number of Vice Chairs to be at the discretion of the TC Chair and proposed that the limit should be increased to 4 Vice Chairs.

General Assembly **APPROVED**.

Mr Hinchey reported that TA requests clarification on the eligibility of WG Chairs to stand for election as TC Chairs. Currently only category A and B members may stand for election, category C members stand not. WG Chairs are not explicitly addressed.

General Assembly **DECIDED** to move forward this request for clarification to S&B Committee.

Mr Hinchey informed General Assembly about the request from TA to Publications Committee to provide information on the Springer conference system which may be freely used by IFIP events and which integrates with Springer's workflow.

Mr Turner confirmed that Publications Committee will take care to provide necessary information.

Mr Hinchey informed General Assembly that TA has the opinion that a business model is needed very urgent for running IFIP's Digital Library.

Mr Hinchey reported that TA considered the current financial model for events, because no financial underwriting draws the quality of IFIP events into question. He said that a sub committee will consider the benefits and drawbacks of various financial models and clarify alternatives and issues.

Technical Assembly also considered the future of WCC and the current proposal for a replacement.

General Assembly ACCEPTED the report.

4.8.2 Activity Management Board

Mr von Solms reported that there were no activities from the AMB last year.

4.8.3 Developing Countries Support Committee

Ms Avgerou presented to General Assembly the report of the Developing Country Support Committee and said that the main issue addressed by the DCSC since last General Assembly is the way IFIP might strengthen operations of computer societies, or other professional ICT organizations in developing countries. Initially DCSC explored the possibility of inviting existing and perhaps ex African societies (Botswana, Ethiopia, Kenya, Nigeria, South Africa, Tunisia, Zimbabwe, Egypt, and Zambia) to a workshop in Kampala, Uganda, where a WG9.4 workshop took place in March 2010. It has been decided not to pursue this plan because there was uncertainty what information/knowledge an IFIP workshop should aim to provide to African member societies and it was thought that other institutions we should aim to cultivate links with in Africa should be explored. It has also been explored the possibility of organizing a workshop for Latin American societies. Similar difficulties with Africa exist here. 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 was therefore considering the possibility of organizing an IFIP workshop for Latin American computer societies. Ramon Puigjaner is programme chair of the CLEI 2010 conference (18-22 October) in Asuncion, Paraguay and he will explore the possibility for an IFIP event there. A meeting with SEARCC members for 23rd September, in Brisbane has been scheduled. This meeting is also explorative, aiming to find out what kind of support SEARCC societies would like to get from IFIP. This will help to organize a useful workshop for them in the future.

Ms Avgerou said that overall, although there is a great deal of appreciation of IFIP in developing countries, as the success of WITFOR indicates, the limited number of developing countries' member societies is a continuing problem. DCSC is looking forward to IFIP's new membership strategy, hoping that it will create scope for new member institutions and will allow better developing countries' participation in IFIP.

Ms Avgerou reported that DCSC is involved 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 15 November) consists of a number of parallel events. SUPCOM (the new IFIP member society for Tunisia) and IFIP will co-organize one of these parallel events and it will be a workshop aimed at

strengthening the scientific research capabilities of developing countries. Given the interest of the DCSC in creating research capabilities, we are particularly interested in this event.

Ms Avgerou informed General Assembly 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.

Ms Avgerou informed General Assembly that DCSC will be formally involved in the organization of the next WITFOR.

Ms Avgerou informed General Assembly that she finishes her term as DCSC chair this year.

Mr von Solms thanked Ms Avgerou for her work on behalf of the IFIP Executive Committee. **Mr Brunstein** honoured the work of Ms Avgerou as Chair of Technical Committee 9.

4.8.4 Marketing Committee

Mr Sawhney presented his report on behalf of the Marketing Committee and said that IFIP is already doing a re-think on major issues, like membership, major events and income streams. Separate discussions on these issues are scheduled at the General Assembly.

Mr Sawhney said that Marketing Committee needs to work with the TA to get them to market their events beyond their immediate TC constituency, and even outside IFIP. To help in marketing these events beyond its immediate TC / Working Groups, it is needed to fill the database of past and prospective participants in IFIP activities (as proposed by Max Bramer and agreed at GA 2009), so that the event organizers can reach out to a larger audience, those who have expressed interest in IFIP events in the past.

Mr Sawhney said that it is necessary to get the TA and the Publications Committee to work together to explore ways to get the TCs and Working Groups to use the IFIP channels to publish more of their research work. Having made a major commitment to the Digital Library, it is now necessary to 'market the Digital Library' more aggressively to Member Societies, and even beyond IFIP, to attract more academics, researchers and professionals to access IFIP's Digital Library. The Publications Committee needs to work with the TA and Member Societies to find 'creative' ways to get revenues from the DL. This could even include getting member societies to publish their journals and publications using the IFIP DL infrastructure, at marginal cost, i.e. not only marketing IFIP publications, but also making member society publication available to a wider IFIP audience.

Mr Sawhney explained that marketing IFIP in new geographies and new constituencies has to become a major area of focus, if IFIP has to grow in this decade – organically and inorganically. The Membership activity needs to focus on some specific regions of the world, which have not participated in IFIP activities so far. This will require Board members and the General Secretary travelling to different technical events in these parts of the world and introduce IFIP to them.

The Membership Task Force is working on new models for IFIP membership and to attract new constituencies which are not currently active in IFIP. The Marketing Committee could work with ILC 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.

Mr Sawhney reported from another suggestion of Marketing Committee considering 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 to align their efforts and offerings to the 'real-world' needs of the IT users, industry and the professional community. As these efforts bear fruit and our activities become more 'relevant' in today's context, we could attract more members from a more broad-based audience.

Mr Sawhney said that improvement in communication with Member Societies, within IFIP and with the outside world is needed. There is a need to check how well the current format of IFIP News meets our members' expectations. We have discontinued circulation of the printed IFIP Bulletin (as more current information is available on our web-site), we may like to check whether the Member Societies and TCs are missing this.

As part of the efforts to market IFIP more effectively amongst the IFIP constituency and beyond, there is a need for a major effort to develop a new, contemporary website using the latest technology, and a committed resource to gather content from the greater IFIP world and keep it fresh and relevant. 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.

The Secretariat and the Marketing Committee 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.

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. There is a need to discuss how well this brochure fulfils this need, and how it can be circulated in order to get the maximum mileage out of this.

Mr Sawhney said that Key Projects, like IP3 or the Digital Library have the potential to reach out to a much larger audience than within IFIP. 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. The IP3 team could take the help of the Standing Committees on Marketing, Member Society Relations and DCSC to devise a formal marketing effort in this regard.

4.8.5 Member Society Relations Committee

Mr Robertson presented the report of the Member Society Relations Committee and said that a number of attempts have been made in 2010 to contact Member Societies representatives by email to discuss the engagement of member societies within IFIP. He said that it was disappointing to report that there was very little response to the email sent out.

Mr Robertson requested the Members at GA to provide feedback on the following issues:

- how best to engage in dialogue
- what would interest Member Societies
- how to build stronger relationships between Members
- how to get more participation in IFIP by the members of Member Societies

The MSRC made the following suggestions for consideration:

- To enable the success of Member Society engagement may require setting up working groups or committees similar to the Technical Committees or perhaps Special Interest groups (SIGS) where those with common interests can interact.
- due to the geographic spread of Members it might be needed to setup online tools to enable the ease of communication on a regular basis. Meeting once a year is too infrequent to make any progress. This could be an online Forum to facilitate discussion topics, or a WIKI to facilitate document collaboration and for collecting best practice, templates, policies processes and other documents useful to Member Societies.
- a facility to enable Members to promote and either provide free or sell tools, products and services to other members.

These ideas will depend on how the Members react and participate going forward. Due to the lack of participation in engaging the member Society representatives no progress has been made on the above suggestions. While this is disappointing it remains of concern to better engage with our Member Societies.

General Assembly ACCEPTED the report.

4.8.5.1 CEPIS

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

The main activities of CEPIS are in:

- IT Skills Certifications, like ECDL and EUCIP
- Taking an active part in the European Union (CEN/ISSS, Euro-Inf, EQANIE, ECWT, European e-Skills Association)
- Publications of Reports and Position Statements
- Workshops, like e-Skills Pro
- Projects, like Harmonise, e-Skills Foresight Scenario and Pan-European Professional e-Competence Report

4.8.5.2 SEARCC

Mr Wong, the President of SEARCC and President of the Australian Computer Society (ACS) welcomed again IFIP's General Assembly in Brisbane and informed about some facts of the World Computer Congress 2010 (please see point 4.7.2 WCC2010 of the agenda). He also expressed the opinion of SEARCC that there is a need for strong computer societies and he therefore asked IFIP for help to acquire local Member Societies.

Mr Karunaratne presented the report from SEARCC. He reported that SEARCC has currently 6 members (Australia, India, Malaysia, New Zealand, Sri Lanka and Thailand) and three prospective members (Pakistan, Taiwan and Papua New Guinea).

Mr Karunaratne informed General Assembly about the activities of SEARCC in the last year:

- SEARCC'2010 Convention – Brisbane, Australia
- Introduction of IP3 accreditation program led by Australian Computer Society (ACS)
- skill Development, Job Placement & Consulting at the Malaysian National Computer Society (MNCC)
- international Schools Software Competition
- representation in IFIP TCS & WGs
- moving Forward

The next SEARCC EXCO meeting will take place in India 2011.

SEARCC is represented and active in IFIP's TCs and WGs, like TC2, TC11, TC13, and WG 8.2, WG 11.8 and WG 11.9.

4.8.6 Publications Committee

Mr Turner reported on behalf of the Publications Committee that 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.

The operation of publications in IFIP AICT (formerly the IFIP Main Series) is going well through the Springer Heidelberg office. The quality of the printed material has improved, and the operational aspects for the editors and authors appear to have improved as well.

Mr Turner informed General Assembly that revised and expanded web pages for the publications section of the IFIP web site have been installed on the web site. Information on having proceedings put into the Digital Library has been added, as well as instructions to editors, and Word and LaTeX templates for the Digital Library.

Mr Turner reported that the Publications Committee has discussed a revision of the copyright form for Springer publications, and requested revisions were sent to Springer in late August. The previous revision, submitted to Springer in August 2008, was finally put on the Springer web site on 18 February 2010. The delay was

primarily due to issues associated with the transition from the Norwell office of Springer to Heidelberg.

Mr Turner informed General Assembly that 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. The updated version was approved by the IFIP Board and placed on the IFIP web site in March 2010.

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

○ Continued development of the Digital Library.

Obtaining timely information on IFIP publications by Springer has progressed much too slowly since the transition to Springer Heidelberg. The 2009 data has been received, but no 2010 data has yet been received, and no progress has been reported on establishing an ftp site or similar mechanism that would allow metadata and links to full text in SpringerLink to the IFIP DL as soon as the text is available in SpringerLink.

There were serious operational problems with the DL during April-July of 2010. These problems were due to inadequate backups and testing of new software. Procedures have been established to prevent a recurrence, and the operation of the DL has been transferred to the main IT section of the ACS. The DL was finally restored during July, 2010. It now contains complete references to publications beginning in 2005, and the available pre-2005 information should be included soon. It is expected that the 2009 data will be added within one or two months, and any 2010 data that becomes available will be added by the end of the year.

It should be noted that there is a good bit of variation in the format of existing data, so procedures must be revised for different sets of data, and this has slowed the building of the DL with the available backfiles. It is anticipated that the process will function much more efficiently once the format and transfer mechanisms for the Springer Heidelberg information are established. Additionally, beginning with the 2009 publications we receive the data for IFIP LNCS publications in addition to IFIP AICT.

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

It is essential that a financial model be developed for sustaining the operation of the DL. The IFIP general budget cannot sustain providing full payment for the DL operation.

○ Completion of copyright form revision.

The intention is to obtain agreement between the Publications Committee and Springer on a new form as soon as possible, and to have the new form on the Springer web site.

○ Development of a policy on plagiarism.

Work has begun to recommend an IFIP policy on plagiarism. Input has been received from Technical Assembly, and there was some discussion at the informal

PC meeting in Sofia.

- Development of AICT.
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.
- Addressing the need for/trend towards electronic publishing.
As electronic publishing in respected venues becomes increasingly important, we need to continuously consider ways to strengthen our Digital Library and to ensure that our publications, both with Springer and e-only publications in our Digital Library, are found by various search engines and are included in relevant bibliographies.
- Providing input as needed for financing the Digital Library.
The PC will respond as requested regarding financing the Digital Library.

General Assembly NOTED the report.

4.9 International Professional Practice Partnership (IP3)

Mr Lane presented his report on IP3 to General Assembly. He informed General Assembly what has been accomplished since IP3's establishment:

- Office of the Chair and Executive established
- Professional Standards Committee created
- Accreditation Committee created and accreditations underway
- Principles of Mutual Acceptance accomplished
- Global Marketing-Communications Steering Committee created
- Open engagement policy approved
- Global Industry Council formed

Mr Lane reported on the issues for IP3:

- need for additional membership
- need for industry insight
- need for government support
- Face-to face meetings are reducing rapidly the financial reserves. Even without face-to-face meetings IP3 needs a minimum of 80.000 Euro per year. The original idea of a revenue stream from certified members is not viable in the short term. Focus on accreditation model is also not viable. Government support is not likely in the short term.
- Tension between industry support and independence.

Mr Lane explained how IP3 can provide added value to IFIP, to individuals, to Business and Employers and to Member Societies by its strong industry contacts, as a leader in the development of ICT professionalism, creating new opportunities and can increasing the value of IFIP membership.

Mr Lane informed General Assembly of its plans for 2011, as there is a need for increasing its membership, reaching out to the broader ICT community, and encouraging its members, supporters to share experience, relationships and mentoring.

Mr Lane said in order to build an ICT Profession for the 21st Century, IP3 partners invite all IFIP societies committed to raising practitioner standards in ICT to join IP3 to build a world class community of ICT professionals.

Mr von Solms reminded General Assembly that IP3 is an IFIP project and that IFIP invested money in IP3.

Mr Puigjaner said that he had asked at the Board meeting in Sofia for a business plan and he has not received one till now. **Mr Lane** answered that there is a business plan but not a financial business plan in the way Mr Puigjaner and other GA members had expected; but IP3 will work on it.

Mr Brunstein congratulated IP3 to the conference in Brisbane; but he also expressed his concerns about the process regarding a “common body of knowledge”. **Ms de Roche** answered that each accredited country has its own “CBoK”, but there should be a common available.

Ms Avgerou asked for expectations of a return on investment; she also asked for monitoring of finances within IP3.

Mr von Solms summarized that there is a demand on a business plan, especially for the finance part. He confirmed that on the short term there is no return of investment to be expected.

The issues of the Common Body of Knowledge and the financial business plan will be monitored by the Executive Committee and have to be solved as soon as possible, well in advance of the next Board meeting at the latest.

With these commitments **General Assembly ACCEPTED** the IP3 report.

4.10 Other Business

4.10.1 International Young IT

Mr Nation presented on behalf of the Young IT Board of the ACS a proposal to General Assembly to form an International Young IT Board that would represent the views of young professionals within IFIP and foster the communication of ideas and resources between Young IT Boards within member societies (see attachment 3).

The President and **Mr Strous** thanked Mr Nation and his colleagues for the enthusiasm and the efforts to present a well-thought proposal at such a short notice (the idea emerged less than a week before GA). Both commented to GA that this was finally a concrete initiative to include young professionals in IFIP. Mr Nation and his colleagues were asked to work on a full detailed proposal and present this to the Board in March 2011. Both were confident that this could be a quick and effective start of a new group in IFIP.

General Assembly APPLAUDE and WELCOMED the proposal.

4.10.2 Digital Human Solidarity Charter

Mr Strous asked General Assembly for endorsement of the Digital Human Solidarity Charter. He will then sign the document officially on behalf of IFIP at a conference in Tunisia in November 2010.

General Assembly unanimously **ENDORSED** the Digital Human Solidarity Charter.

4.10.3 Handover Presidency

Mr von Solms handed over IFIP's Presidency to **Mr Strous** and wished him good luck and success for the future. He also thanked General Assembly for its support during his presidency.

Mr Strous thanked **Mr Johnson** for his work as IFIP's Honorary Secretary and handed over to Mr Johnson a token showing the appreciation of his hard work for IFIP. **Mr Johnson** was grateful to GA for honouring him with this unexpected recognition. He had been involved in IFIP for many years and has many fond memories and friends in IFIP.

Mr Strous also thanked Mr von Solms for his time as President and also for his other roles (TC chair, vice-president, president-elect). He reminded IFIP of the changes that have been initiated by Mr von Solms, changes that are essential for the effectiveness and efficiency of IFIP and that Mr Strous wants to see completed during his term of presidency. He handed over to Mr von Solms a similar token of appreciation and was happy to have Mr von Solms still in the Executive Committee for another year in the role of immediate past president.

4.11 Future Meetings

The next meetings are:

2011	
Board	March 3 rd - 5 th , Dublin, Ireland
GA	September 9 th - 11 th , Tunis, Tunisia

2012	
Board	March – invitations are invited
GA	<i>September – invitations are invited</i>

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 once more thanked the hosts again for their hospitality and the participants of General Assembly for coming. He wished everyone a safe journey home and declared the meeting closed.

5 ATTACHMENTS

5.1 Attachment 1: Auditor's Report

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

I F I P
INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION FOR
INFORMATION PROCESSING

on the financial statements for the year ended 31st December 2009.

As auditors of your federation, we examined the accounts and the financial statements for the year ended 31st December 2009 in accordance with legal requirements. Our audit was performed in accordance with auditing standards promulgated by the profession. We confirm that we meet the legal requirements concerning professional qualification and independence.

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

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

Vienna, April 2010
CONSULTATIO
Wirtschaftsprüfung GmbH & Co KG

5.2 Attachment 2: Profit & Loss Statement (TREAS 4)

Sep 9th, 2010

IFIP Profit / Loss Statement (TREAS 4)

	2008	2009	Bud 2010	Jan-Jun 2010	Estim.2010	Prop 2011
INCOME	318.884	325.864	308.550	248.281	289.800	332.000
Dues from Members	156.800	164.200	167.000	170.000	158.000	164.000
Return On Assets	10.052	4.874	5.000	37	5.000	7.000
Royalties from Publications	85.594	72.817	76.750	32.589	59.000	79.000
Proceeds from Activities	59.088	57.618	59.800	45.655	67.800	57.000
Congress Proceeds	0	25.800	0	0	0	25.000
Other Income	7.350	555	0	0	0	0
EXPENSES	352.150	416.909	526.615	126.840	448.017	494.715
Admin.Secretariat	186.103	189.511	216.565	82.368	198.890	216.665
Admin.Support	41.404	28.062	49.500	12.154	35.292	56.000
Technical Committees	56.519	82.176	88.050	8.705	69.500	101.050
DCSC Supp to TC Events	2.600	3.235	15.000	1.000	10.000	26.000
Projects	83.307	19.770	132.500	8.439	127.500	70.000
Events (WCC, WITFOR, CIO)	-17.783	94.156	25.000	14.174	6.835	25.000
PROFIT / LOSS (excl. Portfolio)	-33.266	-91.046	-218.065	121.440	-158.217	-162.715
Return On Portfolio	-497.121	371.734	-1.000	17.040	1.118	13.000
PROFIT / LOSS	-530.387	280.688	-219.065	138.480	-157.099	-149.715

5.3 Attachment 3: International Young IT Board

Executive Summary

The Australian Young IT Board of the ACS proposes to form an International Young IT Board that would represent the views of young professionals within IFIP and foster the communication of ideas and resources between Young IT Boards within member societies. A short-term plan is outlined at the end of this document.

Australian Young IT

In 2003 the Australian Computer Society created the Young IT Board to represent the views of young professionals within the society. This board, which has representation on the ACS Congress, was completely managed by young professionals throughout Australia.

Structure

The Australian Young IT Board comprises representatives from each of the state and territories around the country. Each of these representatives is a voting member of their local Branch Executive Council and the Chair of their own local Young IT committee.

Achievements

In the 7 years that the Young IT Board has been in existence the Young IT members have managed a significant number of events and contributed to the direction and strategy of the ACS. Each year the Young IT Board has successfully managed their own National Conference (this year was held in conjunction with the WCC) and held at least one event in every state and territory each month. Young IT now makes up 41% of the ACS membership and is an actively growing segment. The leaders of the Young IT are the future leaders of the ACS. Currently an ex-Young IT chair is a member on the ACS Congress and another is the Northern Territory Branch Chair. Some states have a significant number of Young IT members on their board, in particular the ACT who have a quarter of their BEC held by Young IT members.

International Young IT Proposal

The Australian Young IT Board proposes to create an International Young IT that can pursue two primary goals:

1. Foster communication between the various member societies' Young IT boards to share resources and experience and to discuss opportunities and challenges
2. Represent the views of Young Professionals within the IFIP structure.

We feel that this is an incredible opportunity for IFIP and our board and would benefit Young Professionals around the globe.

Goal 1: Foster communication

The National Young IT board in Australia's primary focus is on ensuring that the state representatives have access to the resources they need to stage their events and interact with members. The International Young IT board would have a similar focus and would be able to leverage the ideas and resources of the various member boards.

The Young IT Board in Australia has significant experience in running events targeted at young professionals and would be able to share these ideas and resources to other boards.

In turn, those other boards would be able to share how they have achieved their results.

A sub-goal would also be to encourage the formation of specific National Young IT boards in societies that do not currently have such representation. The International Young IT Board would be able to discuss the governance arrangements and how having a Young IT Board can help the member society. This in turn creates access to more and more young professionals to communicate ideas and opportunities.

Goal 2: Representation

IFIP performs a significant contribution to our industry, however prior to the WCC the majority of Young IT members in Australia had no knowledge of IFIP. This sad truth is why IFIP needs a Young IT component so that the excellent work of the technical boards can be communicated to young professionals. This would serve a dual purpose – on the one hand it would allow young professionals to understand what IFIP does, get involved and access the amazing people working within IFIP and on the other it would allow IFIP to get perspective on their projects from a younger viewpoint.

When the ACS created the Young IT Board it gave them access to a younger perspective on their events and policies. Young IT has been active in promoting the ideas of young professionals and has ensured that policies and events the ACS has run have considered how it benefits young professionals.

Plan

We propose the following plan for the short term:

- IFIP form an International Young IT Board with a set number of member societies. This would initially be limited to those societies with existing Young IT Boards of some description. The exact governance position within IFIP (technical board, community board etc) is open for discussion.
- That board will communicate with the various societies and will produce a report detailing the 5 initiatives that the Young IT boards would like the International board to pursue.
- IFIP commit to sending the International Young IT Representative to the General Assembly in March 2011 in Ireland to deliver this report for further discussion and approval.
- IFIP to provide a space on their website for the International Young IT Board to describe itself, list the societies involved and begin active communication with members.

We believe this plan is realistic and would provide significant benefits to IFIP and member societies. The long term plan would come out of the report delivered to the General Assembly and would also include how the International Young IT Board would help form National Young IT Boards in the other member societies.