

Minutes of the Council Meeting

3-4 March 99, Goa, India

Table of Contents

1	ACTION LIST.....	2
2	ATTENDANCE LIST	4
3	COUNCIL MEETING.....	5
3.1	Call Meeting to Order.....	5
3.2	Attendance and apologies.....	5
3.3	Approval of Agenda.....	5
3.4	President's Report.....	5
3.5	Secretariat.....	6
3.5.1	Secretary's Report	6
3.5.2	Executive Director's Report	7
3.6	Executive Board Meeting Report.....	8
3.7	Congresses	10
3.7.1	WCC98	10
3.7.2	WCC 2000 Organizing and Program Committee.....	11
3.7.3	WCC 2002	13
3.7.4	Congress Frequency and Guidelines.....	13
3.8	Publications.....	14
3.9	Marketing.....	16
3.10	Professional Qualifications	17
3.11	Strategic issues and Corporate members.....	17
3.11.1	Strategic issues	17
3.11.2	Corporate members.....	18
	Day 2 of Council meeting: Corporate membership revisited.....	19
3.12	Treasurer's Report	19
3.13	Technical Assembly.....	21
3.14	TC Forum	22
3.15	Activity Management Board	23
3.16	Technical Committees.....	24
3.16.1	TC 1 Foundations of Computer Science.....	24
3.16.2	TC2 Software: Theory and Practice	25
3.16.3	TC 3 Education	25
3.16.4	TC 5 Computer Applications in Technology	26
3.16.5	TC 6 Communication Systems	26
3.16.6	TC 7 System Modelling and Optimization	27
3.16.7	TC 8 Information Systems.....	27
3.16.8	TC 9 Relationship Between Computers and Society	27
3.16.9	TC 10 Computer Systems Technology.....	28
3.16.10	TC 11 Security and Protection of IP Systems	28
3.16.11	TC 12 Artificial Intelligence.....	28
3.16.12	TC 13 Human-Computer Interaction.....	29
3.17	Committee Reports	29
3.17.1	Statutes and Bylaws	29
3.17.2	DCSC	30
3.17.3	Finance Committee	31
3.17.4	IFIP-UNESCO Liaison	32
3.17.5	Internal Awards	33
3.18	IFIP Newsletter.....	33
3.19	Future Meetings	33
3.20	Closing of Meeting	34
	ANNEX 1 - Developing Countries Support Committee "Voucher Scheme"	34
	ANNEX 2 - "Event Facilitator"/"Activities Manager' Job Description.....	36

1 ACTION LIST

IFIP Council. 3 - 4 March 99, Goa. India

WHO	WHAT
All	Refer to GA 98 and C 99 Action Lists and Minutes and follow-up on all outstanding commitments
All GA reps.. TC and WG Chairs	Continue to revise TC (and WG, resp. by TC and WG Chairs) Membership, consider new nominations and advise Secretariat of changes in membership including contact information as soon as they occur
All Member Societies	Establish more visible links to the IFIP URL and to the IFIP Congress 2000 homepage. Promote IFIP WCC 2000
All	Support TC 3 Journal with subscriptions
Member Societies in Arrears	Take note of the change in policy on suspended membership and the interpretation of "more than 3 years" as 3 years and one day. Initiate prompt action for the payment of outstanding dues
EB	Consider a scheme for sharing proceeds with TCs involved in the organization of Conferences as a part of the IFIP Congress
EB. Grafendorfer	Submit a paper on new Congress Guidelines to GA 99
EB. C 2000 IPC	Pursue a plan in support of the Youth Forum
EB. Miura	Produce a proposal for "Corporate membership" for GA 99 decision
EB	Produce a paper and recommendation for GA on Congress frequency
FC. Treasurer	Provide itemized breakdown of recent Congress expenditure to facilitate comparisons with current proposals
Congress OC and IPC Chairs	Ensure that written reports are presented to GA
TA. Bauknecht	Consider interaction between TCs and WGs on emerging "hot issues" such as Electronic Commerce
PC	Proactively assert IFIP's Publication Policy
PC	Secure publishing the Congress 2000 proceedings with IFIP's Publisher
DCSC	Promote the voucher scheme for DC participation in IFIP activities
MC	Develop an IFIP Marketing Strategy. Finalize the design and arrangements for the printing of "That is IFIP" and the policy for accepting advertisements
SBC	Propose a new definition of "majority" in voting for GA 99 approval
TC Chairs	Provide TC reports in electronic form to the Secretariat 2 weeks before Council and GA meetings
Aiken. Grafendorfer. Glasson. Khakhar. Nedkov	Consider changes to the IFIP event management terminology and nomenclature and a mechanism for a sensible financial involvement of IFIP in the organization of events
All Budget holders. Treasurer	Submit proposals to Treasurer for budget 2000 and assist the IFIP cash flow management by more precise estimates
Granado. Morris	Consider new forms for interaction between IFIP and its Member societies: review member society reports and discussion on strategic planning for further actions
Johnson. Morris	Produce a proposal for a new scheme for the organization of G A and Council
Brunnstein. Khakhar. Nedkov	Consult on IFIP's involvement in the African Computing and Communications Summit
TC and WG Chairs. IFIP Secretariat	Ensure that the forms for all IFIP Events are processed and recorded in the Events database
IFIP Secretariat	Continue to remind of the IFIP URL and the availability of online information and documents

IFIP Secretariat. Treasurer	Introduce a new accounting package and Euro-based accounting by 1.1.2000
Nedkov	Implement EBs decision with regard to the Event Facilitator and hire a part-time Administrative assistant
TC 1 Chair	Continue to revise membership to match specifications of a TC
TC 3 Chair	Coordinate with other TCs IFIP's involvement in the UNESCO curriculum development project and further progress activities on the Harmonization of Professional Qualifications
TCI2 Chair	Initiate urgent action to revive WG activities with the TC

2 ATTENDANCE LIST

IFIP Council. 3 - 4 March 99. Goa. India

Council Members Present

P. Bollerslev	President
K. Bauknecht	Past President
W. Grafendorfer	Vice-President
J. Granado	Vice-President
G. Morris	Secretary
D. Khakhar	Treasurer
R. Johnson	Trustee
S. Masduki	Trustee
T. Miura	Trustee
S. Ramani	Trustee
R. Reis	Trustee

TC Chairs Present

G. Ausiello	TC 1
R. Kurki-Suonio	TC2
B. Sam ways	TC3
B. Glasson	TC8
J. Berleur	TC9

Observers Present

G. Boynton	OC Chair. Congress 2002 and MC Member
K. Brunnstein	DCSC Member
S. Delman	Kluvver
X.Li	IPC Member WCC2000
P. Ralston	SEARCC representative and PC Member
J. Rosenfeld	NL Editor and Individual Member
K. Tabata	Japan
M. Yoshizawa	Japan
M. Zhou'	OC Vice-Chair, Congress 2000

IFIP Secretariat

P. Nedkov	Executive Director, CO and UNESCO Liais
D. Havden	

Apologies from Council Members

R. Aiken	Vice-President AMB Chair
K. Boyanov	Trustee

Apologies from TC Chairs

G. Doumein<its	TC5
A. Casaca	TC6
P. Kail	TC7
J.-C. Laprie*	TC 10
B. von Solms	TC 11
B. Neumann	TC 12
J. Hammond	TC 13

Regrets from P. Bobillier. A. Mason and the representatives of 1APR and INFORMS

* attended preceding meetings of the TC Forum with Standing Committees

3 COUNCIL MEETING

IFIP Council. 3 - 4 March 1999. Goa. India

3.1 Call Meeting to Order

The President opened the Council meeting and welcomed all participants. He expressed IFIP's grateful thanks to the Indian Computer Society and to Mr. Ramani, its GA representative for the invitation and the generous hospitality arrangements. He was pleased to introduce the new TC 9 Chair, Mr. Jacques Berleur, attending Council for the first time.

Mr. Ramani welcomed Council on behalf of the Computer Society of India (CSI) and was pleased to note that many Council attendees were able to come to Goa. He referred to the March 99 issue of the IFIP Newsletter where there was an article on the CSI and said that it currently supports a membership of 16,000 individuals and 500 institutions grouped in 62 chapters all over the country. In addition, there are 74 student branches. The last CSI annual conference was held in New Delhi and was attended by 2,000 participants. There are many IFIP events which are organized in India such as the series of Networks conferences and the International Conference on Visual Computing organized in Goa just prior to the IFIP Council meeting. Mr. Ramani invited the TC Chairs to consider Goa as a destination for future IFIP events.

Mr. Bollerslev responded that he would be happy to tell everyone in IFIP of the fine hospitality and excellent arrangements in Goa.

3.2 Attendance and apologies

The Secretary announced Council attendance and regrets (please refer to the list of attendance). He reminded that 3 Council members were not able to come and 5 out of 12 TC Chairs were in attendance. The TC 10 Chair, J.-C. Laprie, was in Goa until yesterday but due to an emergency had to return early. There are no proxies for a Council meeting and with the present attendance the IFIP Council meeting could proceed with its deliberations.

3.3 Approval of Agenda

Council unanimously ADOPTED the Agenda.

3.4 President's Report

Mr. Bollerslev drew attention to his report and said that during 98 IFIP was involved in the organization of 70 events in addition to Congress 98. IFIP's role in 61.6% of these events was that of a Full or Main sponsor.

The President said that all TCs were active. He thanked Mr. Jaervinen whose term as TC 9 Chair had come to an end on 1 January 1999 and once again welcomed the new TC 9 Chair, Mr. Berleur, an initiator of the "Ethics of Computing" project and former chair of WG 9.2.

An increasing interest in IFIP is recently observed on the part of its Members. As of 1 January 99 ACM and IEEE CS have both joined IFIP as Full members. The President had visited the ACM headquarters in New York to attend the final meeting of the former US Member Society FOCUS. The Chief Executive Director of ACM, John White had visited Mr. Bollerslev in Copenhagen. Since GA 98 there are two new Full Member societies from France and Slovenia. SEE (Societe des electriciens et des electronicien) is the successor of AFCET. There are new GA representatives from China, France, Germany, Korea, ACM and IEEE CS.

Unfortunately the Computer Society of Zimbabwe has had financial difficulties and has requested its membership to be transformed to that of a Corresponding Member. This is a temporary arrangement and IFIP is hopeful that CSZ will overcome its problems very soon.

At least one IFIP Member society has serious interests to take part in the bidding process for hosting IFIP Congress 2004. The preparations for Congress 2000 in China are on the fast track and this will be reported during Council 99. Mr. BoUerslev will visit Beijing in late March for a meeting with the Congress 2000 OC and IPC. Congress 2002 in Montreal is also on a good track. Messrs. BoUerslev and Nedkov had visited the Congress site in late October 98 and found everything in relation to the preparations to be in perfect order. Mr. George Boynton was appointed Chairman of the Organizing Committee. The two partner Canadian societies, CIPS and FIQ, have shown keen interest and involvement in the preparations for Congress 2002.

IFIP's cooperation with Kluwer encountered many problems since GA 98 in Budapest. Just prior to Council 99 a meeting was held at the Kluwer Headquarters near Boston which has contributed to moving forward in a positive direction. IFIP was represented by Messrs. BoUerslev, Johnson and Nedkov who met with Kluwer vice presidents, a product manager, a managing editor and the IFIP Kluwer contacts, S. Delman and Y. Lambert. Kluwer's senior management was made aware of the problems and it is felt that now there is more sensitivity to IFIP's concerns and a commitment to avoid a repetition of the shortcomings in future.

The President wished to acknowledge the efforts of his colleagues in the Executive Board who worked hard as Board members and chairmen of Standing Committees. Mr. BoUerslev is also appreciative of the efforts of IFIP's TC chairs in making IFIP more visible and in asserting IFIP's leadership. Special thanks were due to the IFIP Newsletter editor. Finally, Mr. BoUerslev commended the IFIP Secretariat for its proactive support, quick and effective work and friendliness.

In conclusion, Mr. BoUerslev was happy to report that the overall status of IFIP is very good and that he is proud to represent the Organization.

Mr. Boynton wished to know what has happened to AFCET and the President clarified that AFCET was dissolved.

3.5 Secretariat

3.5.1 Secretary's Report

Mr. Morris reported that currently 37 Full Members have voting rights, 3 have lost their voting rights and 4 Members are in a state of suspended membership.

The Academy of Sciences of Belarus was notified that the offer for Membership was withdrawn due to the fact that they could not meet the admissions criteria during the agreed period of time. Since they are not in debt to IFIP they could reapply for Membership when their financial situation improves in future.

The Computer Society of Zimbabwe (CSZ) resigned from Full Membership at the end of 98 and formally applied for Corresponding membership as from 1 January 99. EB provisionally approved their application, which is subject to endorsement by GA 99.

IFIP's Members from Brazil, Belgium and France are in arrears from 1998 onwards and therefore have lost their voting rights.

IFIP's Members from Albania, Greece, Ireland and Russia have suspended membership and face potential expulsion at the end of 99.

IFIP has only one Associate Member, namely the Philippine Computer Society, which has outstanding dues from 96 onwards. There is no specific rule for expulsion of Members in this category and if the rule for Full Members is applied the Society would face expulsion at the end of 99.

Having mentioned the membership status, the Secretary stressed that Members should regard all outstanding dues as debts. EB considered the current practice of keeping a defaulting Member in its membership lists for a period of up to 4 years by interpreting "more than 3 years" as up to 4 years. From now onwards "more than 3 years" would be considered as 3 years and one day and all defaulting Members are strongly encouraged to take note of this.

Referring to the IFIP Secretariat. Mr. **Morris** said that the normal workload has increased during the last 6 months and more. The main reason for that were problems, arising from the enforced change of publisher. He was grateful to the Secretariat for their positive, helpful and effective work.

Finally, in view of the coming elections at GA 99 the Secretary informed Council that after GA 98 Mr. C. Guy resigned as GA representative of the Computer Society of South Africa which automatically vacated his post as Vice-President. EB had considered this situation and feels that there is no urgency for the election of a temporary successor for the remaining period until GA 99 to fill the vacancy. Mr. Morris informed that Mr. X. Yan had resigned as Chinese GA representative and as Trustee. At GA 99 IFIP shall need to elect or reelect two Vice-Presidents and three Trustees.

Mr. Rosenfeld wished to know the implications of suspended membership on TC membership. The Secretary informed that suspended members lose the right to representation at GA and TC meetings. Mr. **Brunstein** advised that some years ago the IFIP Statutes and Bylaws were changed in order to provide the possibility for TCs to invite experts to become members.

3.5.2 Executive Director's Report

Mr. Nedkov reported that since GA 98 the Secretariat has maintained regular contact with the IFIP entities on matters arising and the Secretariat's activities were quite transparent. For this reason his report was rather short. A synopsis of the GA 98 highlights was circulated immediately after the meetings in Budapest. The GA 98 Minutes were available electronically and in hard copy soon after. Many appreciated the new format. TC Chairs were consulted on changes in the TC and WG membership and the hardcopy IFIP Bulletin was prepared, published and distributed. In parallel, the changes were recorded by Dorothy in the databases and were immediately displayed in the online version of the Bulletin.

The Secretariat prepares the CRC for the last 2 pages of the Newsletter and assists the Editor with the preparation of other Newsletter information. It arranges and uploads the electronic version of the IFIP Newsletter and designs and implements the internal and external reference links. The online issues are normally available one month before the hard copies. Mr. Rosenfeld wished to clarify that he provides the text for the online versions.

The Executive Director reported that the Secretariat was actively involved in the management of IFIP Events. Its involvement would probably be referred to under other Agenda items, however, he wished to highlight that the high activity level of 1998 matches the peak performance during 1997. Naturally, this implied a proactive involvement on the part of the Secretariat. As to Publications, a series of difficulties were encountered in the transition from C&H to Kluwer. These led to a greater workload on operational issues and in searching for ways to improve the contractual and publications process. Resolving problems between IFIP TCs and Kluwer was one particular area in which the Secretariat's assistance was required.

1998 was financially successful and the Secretariat is proud to have assisted this. In late 98 and early 99 the Secretariat had worked closely with the IFIP budget holders, the Treasurer and the Auditor to finalize the 98 accounts and to prepare for auditing.

The IFIP Internet Hub and Gateway has a fresh design and improved access to various sources of information. The daily hits at our web server continue to grow and the IFIP site remains an excellent channel to market IFIP, its membership and activities.

There were many cases since GA 98 in which the Secretariat's assistance was requested. The preparation of the Council meetings in Goa was also an important task and the organization and arrangements worked out well. There were many other routine tasks carried out by the Secretariat which are unnoticeable from a distance but are indispensable for the normal daily work and operations of IFIP.

3.6 Executive Board Meeting Report

Messrs. Bollerslev and Morris reported that EB convened a meeting in Laxenburg in January 99. EB met twice in Goa. prior to the Council meetifig. Some of the issues are reported under this Agenda item while others, for the sake of integrity, will be discussed under the relevant Agenda items.

Mr. Bollerslev said that EB had reviewed a paper submitted by Mrs. Hammond and Mr. Glasson with a job description for the Event Facilitator function. In view of the current experience and knowledge at the IFIP Secretariat, EB had no doubt that this activity should be based in Laxenburg and had no hesitation in inviting Dorothy Hayden to carry out the duties of an Event Facilitator (or Activities Manager). There are plans to recruit an Administrative assistant on a 50% employment basis. The primary responsibility of the Event Facilitator would be to assist event organizers, TC and WG Chairs in organizing IFIP events. The results would be evaluated after a period of 2 years.

Mr. Morris informed that EB will propose Mr. A. Goldsworthy, IFIP Past President, to be admitted by GA 99 as Honorary Member. There would be a new pattern for the organization of future General Assembly meetings, starting with a series of reports at the beginning and a Members' Forum meeting prior to GA. Messrs. Ramani and Masduki would be requested to talk about the achievements and problems of their Societies. IFIP would move to Euro accounting from 1 January 2000. EB considered the TC 13 proposal to establish a Brian Shackel Best Paper Award associated with the TC 13 INTERACT series of conferences. Finally, the Secretary reported that IMIA, an IFIP Affiliate and formerly TC 4, has made contact to explore closer cooperation with IFIP.

Mr. Rosenfeld referred to the proposal for a Brian Shackel Award and was concerned that there was no formal process for approval or disapproval. There should be a provision in the Statutes and Bylaws saying that Council and GA should approve such proposals. Mr. Morris responded that EB had decided to deal with such awards on a case by case basis. Mr. **Rosenfeld** wished to know whether TC 9 had formally requested approval for the Namur Award and the Secretary said that was history. A responsible act would be that if anything is to carry the IFIP name then it should be brought up to EB, Council and GA. Mr. **Brunnstein** clarified that the Namur Award was formally accepted by GA. Mr. **Berleur** thought that such initiatives should not be discouraged. In the case of the Namur Award the city is as much involved as IFIP. IFIP should be careful not to establish complicated mechanisms for award approvals. The **President** clarified that no one wishes to discourage initiatives but it is important that EB knows what is happening and how the IFIP name is used. Mr. **Reis** said that there is a best paper award associated with the TC 10 VLSI conferences. If a WG or a TC decides to establish an award the decision should be taken at their level but IFIP should be kept informed. The Secretary responded that best paper awards are not a concern and IFIP's role is not to censor. Reporting

to Council and GA creates an awareness of what is happening and ensures that IFIP's name is associated with initiatives and awards that deserve merit.

Mr. Glasson was pleased with the decision to reinforce the Secretariat with a half-time employment opening. In his opinion this was long overdue. At the same time, the TC Forum had asked for assistance with "front office" functions which does not appear to have been considered by EB and he would recommend that these arguments are reviewed. In his opinion, the initiative had come from the TC Forum but the TC Forum was not involved in the final decision.

Mr. Rosenfeld wished to know whether the TC Chairs were asking for an additional person or an amended function at the Secretariat. Mr. Glasson said that a new function was requested and there is no need to have it in Laxenburg.

The IFIP Secretary responded that a standard accusation normally has to do with too long periods to implement GA or Council decisions. In this case, a paper was received from Mrs. Hammond and Mr. Glasson and a group was formed to consider the paper and the creation of such a function and report to EB. The group acted quickly and effectively. Mr. Morris did not understand the claim that the job EB decided to implement was not what the TC Chairs asked for. With some very minor exceptions it is exactly what is described in the document given to EB by Mrs. Hammond and Mr. Glasson. The primary responsibility of the new-function would be to work with and assist IFIP event organizers and to ensure efficient communications with organizers and that records are appropriately kept.

Mr. Glasson applauded the speed but there have been no drafts and the views have diverged. The original idea was that a person would be employed to provide assistance with hotel reservations, conference venues, registrations, payments and other. The Australian Computer Society had offered office space for such a person. Mr. Glasson realized that the IFIP Secretariat was under-resourced but that was another matter. Mr. Morris referred Mr. Glasson to the original draft he and Mrs. Hammond had submitted and said that the specification he just made was not there.

Mr. Masduki felt that the concrete activities as outlined by Mr. Glasson are best dealt with locally by the local organizers. He considered it impracticable for IFIP centrally to be involved on such matters. Mr. Glasson opined that there is need for a central function but it does not have to be based in Laxenburg. Mr. Brunnstein said that the issue is not the location but the function and stated that he disagrees and would not support any outsourcing. Mr. Bauknecht also disagreed with any considerations to outsource such a function. Mr. Ralston said that in Budapest he was consulted whether ACS would support such a function with free office space. He had offered such a possibility but so as to avoid any misunderstanding in view of the current discussion he withdraws the offer. At the same time his belief is that all Member societies should support IFIP's activities.

| Please note: further to the discussion a Job Description was distributed to Council participants (see ANNEX 2), followed by a short debate. Mr. Glasson was agreeable with outward looking functions but considered that the domestic functions should not be part of the duties of the Event Facilitator. One reason is that two different types of skill sets are required. Mr. Brunnstein was happy, as, in his mind, the back-office functions are a prerequisite for the outward functions. The President reminded of EB's decision on the subject. |

Mr. Glasson wished to know whether there are any financial implications for IFIP or the ACS if Mr. Goldsworthy was elected to Honorary membership. The Secretary clarified that there are no financial commitments.

Mr. Ralston said that it would be good to have the Council reports well in advance of the meetings. Messrs. Morris and Nedkov clarified that some of the reports are prepared only after the respective Committee meetings. Other reports are provided shortly before the meetings. Since GA 98, whenever such reports are provided electronically, they are loaded on the IFIP website. Mr. Johnson said that with the new reporting session at the beginning of GA all participants will be briefed on what has happened since the last meeting. He further recommended that a possible deadline for the preparation of some of the reports, the TC reports for example, could be 2 weeks in advance of the meetings.

3.7 Congresses

3.7.1 WCC 98

Mr. Grafendorfer referred to the Congress 98 report and highlighted the following:

A. Registrations: No.

of Registrations	1.232	
Cancellations No	84	
Shows Present	132	(without cancellation)
Paying Participants:	1.016	(incl. 130 free registrations like Inv. Speakers, Chairpersons. Keynotes. Sponsors)
Full payment of fees (> 6.000 ATS)	711	
With an IFIP grant	31	
Students	103	
Youth summit participants	31	
Other, not full paying	83	(Part time, reduced fee. etc)

The 40 K CHF minimum guarantee of Congress 98 proceeds to IFIP were paid immediately after the Congress.

B. Participants with grants:

IFIP grants •		EU grants	
Argentina	1	Belarus	
Australia (TT-Speaker)	1	Bulgaria	2
Austria	1	Croatia	2
Brazil	1	Czech Republic	7
China		Egypt	1
Egypt	3	Estonia	2
Greece	1	Hungary	5
India	3	Lithuania	2
Japan (Chinese)	1	Moldavia	1
Kenya		Poland	6
Lebanon	1	Romania	2
Mexico	2	Russia	9
Mongolia	1	Slovakia	4
Nepal	1	Slovenia	1
Nigeria	2	Ukraine	11
Palestine	1	Uzbekistan	2
Rep. of Georgia	1	Yugoslavia	2
Singapore	1		
Thailand	1		
United States	2		
TOTAL:	31	TOTAL:	62

Total sum awarded from IFIP for IFIP grants to support developing country participants: 24.000 CHF (inch 4.000 from AMB/TC3 for TeleTeaching); Total sum granted from the EU: 30.000 EUR (approx. 50 K CHF at current conversion rates)

C. Conference statistics:

Share of participation in the conferences under the umbrella of Congress 98:

SEC	FUND	TCOOP	ICCHP	IT&Knows	TTEACH	KnowRight	1 undeclared
16.6%	3.6%	10,5%	10.2%	10.1%	28.0%	6.5%	14.5%

Mr. Grafendorfer said some accounts are still not finalized but it is expected that the total Congress 98 associated expenditures would be about 1.072 K CHF. Subsidies from various institutions and organizations amount to 495 K CHF. Other revenues include participation fees of 630 K CHF, income from social events of 69 K CHF, proceedings (3.5 K CHF), Exhibition (5.5 K CHF) and other bringing the total Income to 1,203 K CHF, thereby forming a positive Congress 98 balance of about 131 K CHF.

Since the staff costs of the two Partner Societies were not budgeted in the Expense side of the Congress the positive balance in part would compensate these expenses.

Mr. Samways observed that bank charges were 4% of the expenditures and considered this to be rather high. From his experience, expenditures on credit card payments should be about 2%. Mr. Grafendorfer clarified that the sum includes all associated bank charges and not only credit card charges.

Mr. Miura wished to know why Japan figures in the column of IFIP grants for participants supported by IFIP and Mr. Grafendorfer explained that the grant was awarded to a Chinese living in Japan.

Mr. Rosenfeld pointed out that if all IFIP associated expenses are accounted the income to IFIP of about CHF 16 K is rather low and congresses are becoming a minor income factor to IFIP. He wished to know whether any other proceeds would come to IFIP. Mr. Grafendorfer responded that some royalties would be paid but these would be small sums. Mr. **Khakhar** pointed out that the IFIP support to DC participants should not be considered as a Congress expense only.

Mr. Granado observed the reported number of "No Shows" and thought their names should be published. Mr. Bollerslev felt that there could be good reasons for some of them so it might be inconsiderate to put all "No Shows" in the same category.

Mr. Boynton believed that besides the financial income to IFIP there is a great marketing value in Congresses and Mr. Reis added that the technical contributions of an IFIP Congress are the most important product. Mr. **Delman** recalled that, if properly contracted, IFIP could receive significant royalties from the sales of Congress proceedings.

The President was grateful to the Congress 98 IPC and OC for their efforts on behalf of IFIP and thanked **Mr. Grafendorfer** and **Mrs. Toth** for their hard work.

Council **APPLAUDED**

3.7.2 WCC 2000 Organizing and Program Committee

Mr. Li referred to his PowerPoint presentation and said that he would present the combined reports of the IPC and OC. He informed that an action list of 48 items was agreed to serve as guidance to the various Congress 2000 committees. The Congress logo is now ready and its

design is based on symbols including the Great Wall, a dragon, the earliest form of distance message (information) transfer, a road towards the future and a friendship link between IT professionals around the World.

A WCC 2000 website is up since December 98 at <http://www.wcc2000.org/>. A preliminary version of the Call for Papers is available at this site. The information is structured around the seven federated conferences, allowing browsers to get into individual conferences quickly. Welcome messages from the IFIP President the IPC Chair and the OC Chair will be displayed. A "News/Schedule" item will show important dates in the preparation and other Congress related information. Information on registrations, fees and forms will be posted. A list of conference Chairs and responsible officers is developed with contact information for inquiries. All conference CfPs have a similar format with the full conference name, "In cooperation^ status. Conference Theme, Topics of Interest Program Committee. Submission Guidelines and Contacts.

Mr. Li referred to the registration fee structure (in US Dollars):

Before 1 May, 2000

Non-student	\$580
Student	\$200

After 1 May. 2000

Non-student	\$650
Student	\$300

Group registrations (for 15 persons or more, N/A for students)

Before 1 May. 2000	\$480
After 1 May. 2000	\$550

Registration fees include a welcome reception and banquet, access to all conferences, tutorials and exhibition, coffee breaks, conference package (including a CD-ROM with all conference proceedings, hard copy proceedings of one conference, Congress program, map of Beijing, invitations to events and other.

The OC currently is detailing the budget based on the following estimates:

Attendance:

	Overseas	Domestic
A. Minimum	800	1.200
B. On Target	1.000	1,500
C. Optimistic	1.200	1.800

Income:

From registrations, assuming 30% are students and 60% are group rates

	<u>A-2000</u>	<u>B-2500</u>	<u>C-3000</u>
all early	\$848,000	\$1,060,000	\$1,272,000
70% early	\$895,400	\$1,111,735	\$1,343,100
50%early	\$927,000	\$1,158,750	\$1,390,500
30% early	\$958,600	\$1,190,315	\$1,437,900

Profit from Exhibition: \$80,000

Expenditure (for 2000 attendees):

IPC	\$232,500
OC	\$238,000
Congress	\$346,060
IFIP's share	\$80,000/\$90,000/\$ 100,000
Contingency (10%)	\$89,000
Total:	\$985,560

IFIP's share as considered for A, B and C respectively

Balance:

	Income	Expenditure	Surplus
A	\$1,007,000	\$ 985,560	\$21,440
B	\$1,238,750	\$1,192,672	\$46,078
C	\$1,470,500	\$1,380,072	\$90,428

* figures in income column assume 50% early birds

Mr. Grafendorfer commented that the Organizers should budget sufficient funds for mailing. He also wondered if travel expenses were included in the OC budget. Mr. Li responded that travel expenses from 1995 onwards for reporting to Council and GA and all other associated Congress travels were included. Mr. Glasson thought it would be helpful if the FC Chair and the Treasurer could earn- out a comparison of expenses for, say, the last 3 Congresses. Mr. Johnson said that a brief summary' of the reported budget would be useful to have in the Council Minutes and wondered under which item the Congress proceedings are budgeted. Mr. Li said that the costs for proceedings are incorporated in the IPC budget. Mr. Brunnstein cautioned that the values of different budget items van- from one country to another so comparisons with previous congresses are not necessarily indicative.

Mr. Rosenfeld pointed out how important it is to quickly put together a list of speakers. Mr. Li responded that the IPC Chair, Mr. Wall is working on this.

Mr. Johnson stressed the importance of mailing lists to promote Congress and said that CEPIS would be happy to provide access to European members.

The President reminded of his intention to visit China later on in March to meet with representatives of the IPC and OC. One important issue would be to very quickly integrate the IFIP SEC2000 conference within the Congress format.

Mr. Reis wondered whether discounts would be provided to IFIP Members. Mr. Brunnstein opined that such discounts could be handled via the Group discounts scheme. Mr. Grafendorfer recalled that Congress 98 had a special rate for IFIP Members.

3.7.3 WCC 2002

Mr. Bollerslev was very happy with the arrangement for Congress 2000 in Montreal.

The Congress 2002 OC Chair, Mr. Boynton, said he would like to have the same format as in Vienna and Budapest and invited TC chairs to take an active part in putting together a fine program. Mr. Boynton noted that the contract for Congress 2002 was signed.

3.7.4 Congress Frequency and Guidelines

Mr. Bollerslev advised that the frequency of IFIP Congresses had been considered by a number of recent IFIP General Assemblies. Prior to Council 99 EB revisited the issue and holds the

opinion that the 2-year cycle works well and IFIP should continue with it. The President informed Council that Mr. Golds worthy had submitted a paper on new Congress Guidelines. EB considered this very useful and EB members were requested to provide comments to Mr. Grafendorfer who will prepare a detailed proposal, based on Mr. Goldsworthy's paper, and submit it to GA 99.

Mr. Rosenfeld drew Council's attention to an article in the March 99 issue of the Newsletter where he presents his views on IFIP Congresses and their frequency.

Mr. Brunnstein suggested that IFIP Member societies should be consulted on the issue of Congress frequency and how they regard Congress in terms of benefits. He opined that congresses are valuable in many ways but the 2-year cycle requires too much effort on the part of IFIP's TCs. Mr. Berleur agreed and said that the procedure for preparing the Congress program is not clear and TCs cannot jump in at short notice. He thinks that the 2-year cycle is too short for planning and decision making at the TC level. Mr. Bollerslev reported that from Congress 2000 onwards proceeds will be shared with TCs and a conference under the Congress umbrella should be considered as part of the regular TC activity.

Mr. Reis felt that Congresses contribute to the IFIP visibility and to spreading its mission around the world. In his mind, if IFIP considers changing cycles then why not go the other way and think of having a Congress every year. Mr. Boynton thought that IFIP operates in a fast growing field and it needs events that draw continuous participation from industry.

3.8 Publications

Mr. Johnson referred to his report and said that in the second half of 98 serious problems were encountered by several TCs. Publications were one of the major items discussed during the January 99 meeting of EB. It was decided that Messrs. Bollerslev, Johnson and Nedkov should visit the Kluwer headquarters in Norwell to meet with senior Kluwer representatives and to discuss all problematic issues. These had to do with inappropriate communications, a rather extended production and delivery time, increased editorial workload and disappointing sales figures and royalties during 1998. The PC Chair reported that the Kluwer leadership was sensitive to these problems so as to avoid their future repetition and to gain confidence in the ability to develop an effective long-term relationship between IFIP and Kluwer.

The TC 3 Journal was also considered and it was agreed to arrange for a longer contractual arrangement to justify' substantial investments on the part of Kluwer. In addition, TC 3 was encouraged to look for ways that would increase the number of individual subscribers at US \$60 per year. The IFIP President is in contact with the WCCE 2001 organizers to check if a one-year trial subscription could be incorporated in the conference registration.

Mr. Johnson was pleased to report that there were several positive developments with IFIP's Publisher. Kluwer has committed to a lead time of 12 weeks from the receipt of the manuscript. Publications will be marketed at a number of conferences (a list of such conferences is maintained) and it is expected that sales, particularly in North America, would substantially increase. The price matrix for bulk sales will remain the same as in 98 and changes will occur only in the year 2000. The Newsletter production continues in a satisfactory mode.

Finally, the PC Chair reported that the PC Terms of Reference and membership were considered. There would be a core group of 4 to 5 members with at least one TC Chair and the IFIP Secretary (acting as PC Secretary) and the IFIP Executive Director as *ex officio* member.

The Kluwer representative, Mr. S. Delman referred to his report which contained detailed information on the year of transition, the 1998 sales, expectations for 99, marketing activities and production. He said that the transition is now nearly complete. An IFIP website is

established at <http://www.wkap.com/ifip> where event organizers and volume editors would find everything they need to plan for the publication of their conference proceedings. All IFIP books since December 94 are available through the customer service departments in Boston and Dordrecht, A full time editor. Yana Lambert, was hired exclusively to work on the IFIP series and to support their continued success.

In 1998, 29 books were published and royalties totaled US \$ 88,061 (US \$ 38,606 from ITP sales and US \$ 49,455 from KAP sales). Sales and royalties in 98 were very low due to the lack of significant promotion by ITP for the period July 97 - August 98 and because of the delay in getting the IFIP backlist into the Kluwer system. Kluwer believes that the shortfall is not lost but actually delayed. 25 to 30 new IFIP titles are envisaged to be published in 99. A straight-line projection of the sales for the last 5 months of 98 would yield US \$ 680,220 in 99 sales revenue, however. Kluwer expects to do better.

Better marketing is essential for improving the performance of the IFIP series and activities foresee direct mail promotion, delegate databases, discounts, better visibility of IFIP books at conferences, exhibitions, an active and effective Kluwer website, advertisements in journals, abstracting services and other. Kluwer believes that the IFIP book sales in North America can significantly increase as a result of its marketing activities.

Finally, Mr. Delman reiterated that Kluwer guarantees a production and delivery schedule of 12 weeks after receipt of a CRC that is ready to go to press and needs no pre-production work. Templates are available from the Kluwer website and Ms. Y. Lambert <ana.lambert@wkap.com>, the new editor for the IFIP series, is available for further technical assistance and inquiries. Guidelines for IFIP Editors and Authors are in the process of development and will be provided soon.

Messrs. Berleur and Ausiello stressed that many important international conferences are missing in the Kluwer marketing list. Most conferences cover only the North American region. Mr. Delman responded that the conference list is under constant revision and updating and he would welcome any further suggestions.

Mr. Berleur was unhappy that many of the questions raised by the TC Chairs did not find an answer in the PC report. Mr. Johnson said he is prepared to quickly react verbally and to provide a written response later on.

Mr. Brunnstein welcomed the increased marketing efforts but was unhappy and would not support any attempts of Kluwer to acquire conference participation data so as to create Delegates Databases for marketing purposes. This, among many issues, is a matter of privacy.

Mr. Reis noted that, apart from the bulk sales, post conference sales are rather low. Mr. Delman said that the target for post conference sales, complementary to bulk sales, is in the region of 300-400 books worldwide.

Mr. Brunnstein's information was that the contract with Kluwer is basically the same as that with C&H. In his opinion the Publication Committee should be more active in determining which proceedings are publishable and which are not. He recalled the case with the TC 9 Ethics book and said that what Publisher sees as marginal may actually turn into a best seller. Messrs. Brunnstein and Berleur stressed that the PC should be more proactive in asserting an IFIP publication policy rather than leaving this in the hands of the Publisher and Mr. Glasson thought that more guidance and policy statements should be available on procedures and contracts with non-standard publishers.

3.9 Marketing

Mr. Grafendorfer referred to the MC report and said that a leaflet entitled "This is IFIP" is in the pipeline and the last draft was reviewed in Goa. A final revision of the text and style would be carried out and then MC would proceed with the printing. The estimated cost per leaflet is 0.12 CHF. Leaflets would be sent to TC and WG Chairs and to Member societies but before that a survey would be carried as to their individual needs.

Advertising in the Newsletter was discussed. MC and EB are in favor. The following rates for B&W advertisements were set:

Full page	US \$ 800
Half page	US \$ 550
1/3 page	US\$450
1/4 page	US\$350

Prices for inserts would be doubled but in all cases Kluwer will be consulted with regard to costs and MC would follow-up to investigate whether these rates are adequate. Issues related to the "screening" of advertisements impact on deadlines would be evaluated in detail, nevertheless, it is proposed that the Newsletter Editor would be responsible for accepting advertisements whereas the IFIP Secretariat would take care of financial matters.

The MC Chair said the Secretariat had encouraged Members to create links to the IFIP URL. It may be useful to establish and display at the IFIP website a list of Member Society events and a Web store for selling publications, hats, T-shirts, ties, etc. Mr. Nedkov responded that such things are best handled via links. After GA 98 he had written to IFIP's Members suggesting they establish an "IFIP page" on their website where they could post their Annual IFIP Reports as well as information on conferences, publications and any other items they wish to market within the IFIP community and at large. When such nodes (with links to IFIP) are established the IFIP Secretariat would provide a central hub at the IFIP URL to guide visitors their way. Mr. Ramani thought that publications could be marketed via Amazon.com and also referred to the ICCG experience in the publications field.

Mr. Grafendorfer said that IFIP and IFIP's events were often supported by other organizations and this should be acknowledged. A mechanism should be established so that supporters receive recognition in the Newsletter and in other IFIP publications. Mr. Johnson thought the logos of all supporters could be displayed at the IFIP webpage. Mr. Nedkov said that in principle supporters are not a defined category and there are so many of them, ranging from a handful which support IFIP centrally and having many others at the national level that provide support to IFIP events held in the respective countries. The latter receive recognition in the conference materials. Mr. Berleur did not support the idea of having company logos displayed on the IFIP URL.

The Newsletter Editor had informed MC that there are many inactive NL correspondents and that very few Calls for Papers are submitted.

With regard to the meeting with the TC Chairs, Mr. Grafendorfer said that a Marketing Strategy was requested to provide a mechanism and a channel for promoting conferences and publications, including non-Kluwer publications, and to enhance the profile of IFIP's entities. MC had given some thought to this and would continue discussion by e-mail. It wished to consider marketing via electronic channels, advertisements in journals, printed material and a larger distribution of the Newsletter to universities and Member societies. TC and WG chairs are encouraged to provide information about their activities to Member Societies' journals and to the IFIP Newsletter.

3.10 Professional Qualifications

Mr. Samways presented to Council the last draft document related to the project "Harmonization of Professional Standards" which was prepared by Messrs. I. Mitchell (NZCS), P. Juliff (ACS) and J. Turner (ACM).

The document is available at http://www.ifip.or.at/minutes/C99/C99_harmonization.html

Mr. Morris was not clear how professional qualifications could be "harmonized". Now, this term is replaced by "professional standards". He wondered whether the document meant anything and whether such a document could really turn into a standard. He wished to know-win- the WTO suddenly disappeared from all references. Mr. Samways replied that WTO did not express interest and for this reason contacts continue only with ISO.

Mr. Brunnstein said that some years ago he was in touch with Ms. P. Glenn and had cautioned that there would be great difficulties with this project. For example, the preparation of the draft involved only representatives of English speaking countries. He thinks that instead of looking for standards and contracts IFIP should concentrate on contents. The Working Party had not approached SIG 9.2.2 which is a permanent group on ethics.

Mr. Boynton agreed with Messrs. Morris and Brunnstein and said that the project may relate to mobility of IT professionals but it would hardly have a significant impact on recruitment policies.

Mr. Rosenfeld opined that the project is on the agenda for a long time, unfortunately there is little value in the document so why should IFIP spend more money and waste resources.

Mr. Samways recalled that the membership of Writing Party was selected so as to cover the international scene. The document is presented to Council for comments and for moving on to the next stage. The good news is that ISO is interested and a draft Memorandum of Understanding is considered to allow IFIP to submit drafts to ISO for consideration and adoption as ISO/IFIP Standards.

Mr. Nedkov reminded that GA should endorse the project document before it can be submitted to ISO. Mr. Brunnstein requested for other viewpoints to be reflected in the document and said that TC 9 could help.

The President recalled that IFIP's Member societies are interested in the project and that work should continue. As to the Memorandum of Understanding he feels that the general attitude at Council is supportive.

3.11 Strategic issues and Corporate members

3.11.1 Strategic issues

Mr. Granado said that EB is keen on keeping an efficient communications channel for suggestions and criticisms and welcomes all appropriate contributions on strategic matters. At its last meeting EB decided to create two task forces:

- Messrs. Morris and Johnson will work on a proposal for a new scheme for the organization of IFIP Council and General Assembly meetings:
- Messrs. Morris and Granado will consider new forms for interaction and cooperation between IFIP and its Member Societies.

At GA 99 a Members' Forum will convene prior to the GA meeting. IFIP Member societies would be requested to share experiences so as to identify issues of concern and projects of common interest.

Member society reports and proposals would be reviewed in order to consider and select a couple of small, interesting and innovative projects for GA's approval. The success of such projects could lead to extending the scope and number of such activities, which in the longer term would widen the spectrum of services provided to IFIP's Members.

Mr. Rosenfeld wondered whether this was the net outcome of the brainstorming in Canberra. The President said that it is part of it and more will come. Mr. Morris informed that he has summarized and reported material from Members' reports. A selection was available. A "bottoms up" approach would be suggested whereby Societies report and propose projects at the Members' Forum which are then presented to GA for approval.

3.11.2 Corporate members

Mr. Miura recalled that during GA 98 in Budapest Mr. Goldsworthy had presented four items under the Strategic Plan Action Agenda, the first one being to "institute a program to more actively involve participation from industry".

Mr. **Miura** thought this to be very important and following GA 98 arranged a meeting with the Japan Electronic Industry Development Association - JEIDA - to introduce IFIP's activities and seek their interest in IFIP. Contact between IFIP and JEIDA may prove beneficial for both organizations. One possible outcome could be to have JEIDA representatives as members of IFIP WGs. Mr. Miura considers that if the JEIDA - IFIP relationship develops well the example could be used to develop further relationships with industry in other countries.

JEIDA is an influential non-profit organization representing the electronic and information industry in Japan. It is interested to acquire a better understanding of the market needs and lead technologies in areas in which IFIP operates.

Mr. Tabata briefly presented JEIDA's activities.

[Please be informed that a detailed presentation on JEIDA is available from its URL at: <http://www.ieida.or.jp/index-e.html>]

Mr. Johnson found the presentation very stimulating and wondered what the nature of corporate membership could be. Would the JEIDA representatives express their corporate or their personal views at the WG level? **The President** clarified that there is currently no corporate membership and this category should not be confused with Affiliate membership. Mr. Bauknecht advised that currently WG membership is by appointment in view of qualifications and not through representation.

Mr. Brunnstein found the proposal excellent. Moreover, it comes from a Member society, which provides patronage. WG membership slots could be developed to accommodate JEIDA representation. Mr. **Bollerslev** said that EB thought it was a good idea and for that reason had requested Mr. Miura to make a presentation to Council and to invite comments. Mr. Glasson found the proposal interesting and did not see any serious obstacles. **Mr. Berleur** believed that the issue should be considered at the various IFIP levels before a decision is taken.

Mr. Rosenfeld thought it might be useful to know more about corporate members of national Member societies. Mr. Brunnstein said that GI has several corporate members and representatives from industry. These do not have voting rights. German ministries are also interested in GI's work. **Mr. Ramani** said that in India corporate membership was established as a mechanism for industry to participate in conferences.

Mr. Morris wondered about the nature of this cooperation - would it be bureaucratic or technical? If JEIDA were to appoint a representative would it be from the Association or from one of JEIDA's members? Mr. Miura informed that as JEIDA has WGs the idea is to send experts from its WGs to the IFIP WGs. Mr. Masduki thought that there would be great value if such a scheme was adopted.

Mr. Grafendorfer said that he sees no problem if TCs and WGs accept JEIDA representatives immediately. Mr. Rosenfeld responded that it is true for WGs but not the case with TCs. Mr. Glasson, as TC Chair, was prepared to explore ways to bring JEIDA representatives to IFIP. He sees a "win-win" situation, which is a good symbol and both sides should optimize on it.

The President was pleased to note so many positive comments and said that the issue would be brought back to EB to prepare a paper for GA 99 consideration. Mr. Reis was of the opinion that IFIP should move forward quickly. If everybody is in agreement then the matter should be processed faster so that Council can provisionally accept JEIDA and then formalize the decision at GA 99.

Mr. Morris was not clear of the scope of such a scheme and thought that this should be clarified. Provided TC Chairs are in agreement, WG Chairs can be encouraged to accept JEIDA representatives. Later on, if deemed useful and necessary, IFIP could consider establishing a new membership class. Mr. Granado was in support of such an approach as it has strategic implications.

The President thanked Mr. Miura for initiating this discussion and said that he would see that there is further input from Council and GA representatives so that a formal decision can be made in Kuala Lumpur.

Day 2 of Council meeting: Corporate membership revisited

Mr. Granado informed that a group consisting of Messrs. Masduki, Glasson and himself had met with Mr. Miura and his staff to progress the matter a little further. It was agreed that the main issue is to find an organizational framework for cooperation between IFIP and JEIDA. Mr. Johnson wished to know whether JEIDA's participation in WGs and possibly TCs would imply the payment of a subscription fee or a donation. Mr. Rosenfeld thought it wonderful to move ahead quickly and said that JEIDA should share the costs of any administrative overhead. He wondered what influence JEIDA would have in IFIP.

Mr. Berleur pointed out that yesterday's discussion did not make any reference to membership while today implications are made.

Mr. Brunnstein believed that JEIDA's representation should be encouraged at the technical WG level. However, any considerations with respect to a Corporate membership scheme should be first consulted with IFIP's Members. Mr. Granado agreed.

Mr. Miura noted that many opinions and ideas were expressed on the issue of links between IFIP and industry. Currently, Japanese firms do not know IFIP well. Mr. Miura considers that the matter should be currently processed within the allowable S&B provisions. In parallel, consultations should continue for a more formalized decision by GA 99.

3.12 Treasurer's Report

Mr. Khakhar drew attention to his report and informed Council that the 1998 accounts were reviewed by the IFIP Auditor in February 99 in Vienna.

The 1998 Result, after amortisation and depreciation according to approved policies and after Special Funds Provisions, is a surplus of 156.808 CHF. which is in accord with his forecast of CHF 150K at GA 98 in Budapest.

Compared to 97. the 98 Result shows approximately the same Income level without accounting for the appreciation of 59K CHF of the portfolio investment while expenses had slightly increased (not considering the write-off of 53K CHF for Congress 96).

The Final Result, after Special Funds Provision of 83 K CHF. is an increase in IFIP's General Fund by 156KCHF.

Key figures for the last five years are:

<i>(Amounts in KCHF)</i>	1998	1997	1996	1995	1994
<i>Income</i>	621	570	646	606	513
<i>Expenses</i>	380	327	345	447	576
<i>Result</i>	240	243	300	159	-63
<i>Assets</i>	2372	2156	1889	1520	1380
<i>Liabilities</i>	189	138	126	58	77
<i>Funds</i>	2183	2017	1763	1462	1303

The Total Income of 621 K CHF is much better than the budgeted 571 K CHF. Income from Return on Assets, managed by SBC London since 1990. is 91 K CHF. However, this figure includes a difference of 58 K CHF between book value and market value of the portfolio investment and the legal practice in Austria does not envisage accounting for profits without sales. IFIP's practice is to show both appreciation and depreciation on the income side. Dues from Members were below budget. Royalties from Publications decreased by 45 K CHF, or 22%. to 162 K CHF. Proceeds from TC Events remain at the level of 1997. Following a GA 98 decision. 50% of the guaranteed proceeds of 100 K CHF from Congress 96 were written-off.

Total Expenses were 380 K CHF or 27% below budget. This is due to savings in communications expenses, administrative and technical support. The total Secretariat expenses for 1998 were 2-71.5 K CHF. which is below the allocated budget.

Expenses of the 12 Technical Committees were in total 53% below the budgeted amount and show considerable variations. 9 TCs had positive TC Fund balances available for 1998, and 2 TCs spent part of this balance during 1998. 8 TCs increased their Funds balance during 1998 while 2 TCs decreased it. For 1999. 11 TCs have positive Fund balances available, totalling 41 7 K CHF. The Technical Support expenses were 15 K CHF or 70% below the budget relating to AMB. TA and DCSC. The Special Activities Fund, which was created at the request of GA 97 for initiating new activities, increased by 58 K CHF to the amount of 89 K CHF.

The Final Result, after Special Funds Provision of 83 K CHF, is an increase in IFIP's General Fund by 156 K CHF. or 10%. to 1.656 K CHF.

Council unanimously ENDORSED the 1998 accounts for final approval by GA 99.

In consultation with EB and the Executive Director the Treasurer does not propose amendments to budget 99 adopted by GA 98. There will be additional expenses at the Secretariat for staff and equipment but these could be accommodated within the existing funds.

Council unanimously APPROVED.

With respect to preparations for the 2000 Budget, Mr. Khakhar will keep in mind the 98 Result and the 99 Budget. All budget holders are invited to submit comments and recommendations in written form well before the GA 99 meetings in Kuala Lumpur. The Treasurer informed that budget holders could submit their proposed 2000 budgets in CHF instead of Euro. Mr. Rosenfeld commented that IFIP is improving in forecasting its income but is still not on target to predict expenses.

3.13 Technical Assembly

Mr. Bauknecht referred to his report and said that the TC participation was low with only 5 TC Chairs in attendance. Two TC chairs were expected to deliver State-of-the-field reports but no such presentations were prepared. TA considers that this practice should continue and therefore invites the TC Chairs to select between themselves the candidates for such reports at the next TA meeting in Malaysia.

Mr. Bauknecht said that some time was devoted during TA to discuss the proposal for an Event Facilitator (please refer to the discussion under agenda item 6).

The TC Forum's report was reviewed and it was agreed that two proposals should be forwarded to Council:

- To consider a standard procedure to allow IFIP TCs and WGs to support financially the organization of their events and events jointly organized with other organizations.
- To consider changes to the IFIP terminology and nomenclature, and in particular the use of the term "sponsor"; so as to bring it in line with that used by other organizations.

Mr. Glasson wished to say that a short discussion had already taken place. There are a number of issues related to the organization of events, funds and financial risks, loans and financial returns and other which should be addressed. Mr. Grafendorfer opined that IFIP Events should be organized by its Member societies. Mr. Kurki-Suonio said that for TC 2 and TC 1 conferences National societies are not counterparts in the majority of cases. Mr. Brunnstein cautioned IFIP to be careful to commit itself to financial risks. Mr. Ramani believed that IFIP's role in a conference is not so much the money that it contributes rather than the publicity, program and publications' credit. Seed money should be invested only in conferences with a high credit rate and limits should be set. Mr. Rosenfeld was not necessarily happy with the current nomenclature but does not think the suggested scheme has significant advantages.

The TA Chair proposed a group including Messrs. Aiken (Chair), Grafendorfer, Glasson, Khakhar and Nedkov to review these proposals and to report back to GA 99.

Mr. Bauknecht said that some discussion emanated on which IFIP body is responsible to identify new topics and new important areas for IFIP technical activity. It was pointed out that TA has such a mandate and TA agreed to continue this discussion in Malaysia.

Mr. Bauknecht reported the following with regard to management issues and decisions:

TCI A new WG1.7 on "Theoretical Foundations of Security Analysis and Design" was approved and so were the new Aims and Scopes of WG 1.6

TC2 Attempts to get some feedback from software-related industry by inviting industrial advisors to TC2 meetings were only partially successful. Such attempt will continue in future.

- TCS Reports were submitted on the status of the following 3 projects:
- UNESCO Informatics/Computing University Curriculum
 - Building higher education informatics curricula for developing countries
 - Harmonization of Professional Standards

TC6 Approval of the new name for WG 6.10 and the new TC 6 Aims and Scope was postponed to GA 99. Issues related to Electronic Commerce should be dealt with on a broader scope rather than within a TC 6 WG. TA recommends Mr. Bauknecht to discuss the matter with Mr. Volker Tschammer and with other interested parties.

Mr. Nedkov thought that the TC 6 Chair should be involved in those contacts as he had written to all TC Chairs to consult with them on conferences and activities in the field. Mr. **Khakhar** said a SIG is established within TC 6 and its work should continue. Mr. Brunnstein informed that he was also involved in this and that security and legal aspects related to electronics commerce is a fast growing field. Links should be created between IFIP's TCs to coordinate activities in the field.

TC7 Two new Working Groups - "Discrete Event and Monte Carlo Simulation" and "Fractals and Chaos Theory" - are in process of establishment and their Aims and Scope and membership will be presented to TA for approval during GA 99.

TC8 WG8.4 is revived and under a new leadership. TCS plans a strategic discussion on how-to deal with a WG that has reached the end of its life cycle.

TC9 Various new activities and changes are in progress.

TCI 1 There is a formal proposal for IFIP/Sec 2000 to be integrated in the WCC 2000 format.

TC 12 A Proposal is made to suspend WG12.2 to allow a new definition of Aims and Scope and to obtain an active WG leadership. TA is concerned that 4 out of 6 WGs are suspended.

TC 13 TA supports the proposal for a Brian Shackel Award.

TA had also discussed other issues, in particular Publications, which will be reported elsewhere.

Finally, Mr. Bauknecht wished to thank the TC chairs and said that he was impressed by their hard work during the meetings in Goa.

3.14 TC Forum

Mr. Glasson drew attention to his report and said the TC Chairs had met with the Chairs of IFIP's major Standing committees and had reviewed issues related to strategic planning, marketing, publications, activity management and developing countries.

The TC Forum was pleased to see a reactivated Marketing Committee, which had agreed to develop and promulgate an IFIP Marketing Strategy based on stronger involvement of national representatives. Ten issues were surfaced for discussion with the Publications Committee. Unfortunately, there was insufficient time for discussion. One key area of concern was the need to differentiate between IFIP's Publication Policy and that of Kluwer.

A principal item for the meeting with AMB was the "Event Facilitator" position and it was agreed to raise this issue for discussion during TA and Council. The TC Forum agreed that the changes made to the event guidelines and forms were in the right direction and should be commended. A number of suggestions with regard to content and procedures were made. In this context, Mr. Glasson suggested that event organizers should not have to see and to complete

the Event Forms in future. Mr. Nedkov wondered how information and authorization is to be managed should such a proposal be adopted and Mr. Morris was mystified by this suggestion.

Mr. Glasson said that a number of DCSC initiatives were discussed. The appointment of a DCSC representative from each TC was agreed and a voucher system to improve developing country involvement in IFIP activities was welcomed. During the discussion it was recognized that there is a need for developing countries promotional material and that this material should be developed by DCSC in cooperation with the Marketing Committee.

Following these meetings the Forum had focused on what it regarded as a key issue for IFIP, namely IFIP's perceived unwillingness to provide financial support for, and thereby take some of the financial risk associated with events that IFIP runs alone or in association with other societies.

[Please note: for the sake of integrity issues raised by the TC Forum report are covered under agenda items 6. 13. 15. and 17]

3.15 Activity Management Board

Mr. Nedkov said that the AMB Chair, Mr. Aiken, had written to the TC Chairs and to EB that due to sickness he was not able to attend. Mr. Aiken had requested the Executive Director to meet with the TC Chairs on his behalf and to deliver the AMB report to Council.

All GA 98 recommendations with respect to AMB policy documents were considered. In consultation with the past and current TC Forum Facilitators the Event Guidelines and the respective notes to event organizers were revised so as to reflect the IFIP Policy on Event Insurance.

Mr. Nedkov reminded that in Budapest a decision was taken not to give approval to convene events in a country where the IFIP Member society is suspended because of outstanding dues. Since the implications of this decision may have a greater outreach than originally intended. AMB wished to have some further guidance from Council. Messrs. Brunnstein, Berleur and Glasson recommended that there may be universities and other organizations within the country of a suspended Member that are eager to be involved in IFIP and this decision would hamper their involvement..

[Please note: after the Council meeting EB considered the discussion under this point and agreed to support a policy that allows the organization of IFIP events in a country where the Member society has been suspended or its membership terminated provided that society is not associated with the organization of the IFIP Event.]

The Executive **Director** drew attention to the 1998 event proceeds, the IFIP Active Event Report for the period 1.1. 98 - 31.12.2001 and to the following statistics:

S P O N S O R S H I P						
(Data as per 8.2.99)						
	TOTAL	FULL	MAIN	CO-	JOINT	OTHERS
1995	68	11 16.18%	37 54.41%	15 22.06%,	2 2.94%	4.41%
1996	64	6 9.38%	34 53.13%	17 26.56%	4 6.25%	4.69%
1997	73	19 26.03%	30 41.10%	17 23.29%	1 1.37%	6 8.22%
1998	71	13 18.31%	32 45.07%	26 36.62%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%
1999	34	13 38.24%	15 44.12%	5 14.71%	1 2.94%	0 0.00%
2000	4	2 50.00%	? 50.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%,	0 0.00%,
2001	2	1 50.00%	0 0.00%	1 50.00%,	0 0.00%	0 0.00%

The 98 figures show another very good year for IFIP. Income from Event Proceeds (not accounting WCC 98) was to the extent of CHF 96.8 K, which was nearly double the budgeted amount. The event management process is running fairly smoothly, but it involves a lot of follow-up actions from the Secretariat. There are excellent communications with the AMB Chair for which the Secretariat is grateful to Mr. Aiken.

Looking ahead, Mr. Nedkov cautioned that as at 8 February there were only 34 recorded events in the IFIP database to take place during the current year. The documentation of another 10 is in the pipeline or was received after that date. He had written to all TC Chairs requesting their assistance to follow up on planned but not yet recorded events. Dorothy is also making direct contact whenever information is available. It is essential to have all IFIP officers at the WG and TC level involved in this process as the processing and recording of **IFIP** events has a substantial impact on event proceeds and royalties from publications. Mr. **Johnson** was interested to know how many events were registered at this time in 98. Mr. **Nedkov** responded that on 18 February 98 there were 55 Events recorded for the whole of 1998.

Finally, the Executive Director referred to his meeting with the TC Forum and said that the TC Chairs had commended the improvements to the Event Guidelines and forms. Several suggestions were made - some have to do with editing and style and these can be implemented immediately while others imply fundamental changes to the existing policy and should be carefully considered by AMB before a draft for changes could be proposed for endorsement.

3.16 Technical Committees

! Please be informed that all TC reports submitted electronically are available from the online Council 99 Minutes at <http://wAvw.ifip.or.at/minutes/goa99.html>

3.16.1 TC 1 Foundations of Computer Science

TC 1 homepage: <http://hermes.dis.uniroma1.it/lfip-Tcl/>
Council 99 report available at: <http://www.ifip.or.at/minutes/C99/C99 TCI .htm>

Mr. Ausiello reported that the main TC 1 effort was to start new WGs and to promote new initiatives. Two WGs were established in hot areas such as term rewriting and formal methods in security. The third TC 1 meeting was organized in Brno, the Czech Republic, in conjunction with MFCS 98. The next TC 1 meeting will be organized in conjunction with the Federated Computing Research Conference on May 99 in Atlanta, the USA.

The TC 1 Chair noted that 12 National Societies have formally nominated their representatives to TC 1. These are from Austria, Bulgaria, China, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Thailand and the United States/ACM. The rest of the TC 1 membership remains essentially the same as the former SG 14. All GA representatives are encouraged to assist in nominating their Society's representative to TC 1. The 6 WGs have the active involvement of leading experts and in most cases these groups are widely recognized in their respective fields. TA approved WG 1.7 on Theoretical Foundations of Security Analysis and Design. All WGs are involved in the planning and organization of events and efforts are made to recruit young researchers.

Mr. Morris advised that so far there is no information about the WG 1.6 membership. Mr. Johnson wished to know whether the contract for the book on Algebraic Foundations of Systems Specification by Springer Verlag was coordinated with the IFIP Secretariat. Mr. Nedkov responded positively.

3.16.2 TC 2 Software: Theory and Practice

TC 2 homepage: <http://www.cs.tut.fi/~rks/ifip/tc2.html>

Council 99 report available at: http://www.ifip.or.at/minutes/C99/C99_TC2.htm

Mr. Glasson reported on behalf of Mr. Kurki-Suonio. The last TC 2 meeting was held in conjunction with a WG 2.2/2.3 conference on Programming Concepts and Methods in Shelter Island, NY, 12 - 13 June 98, and was attended by 14 national representatives and WG Chairs and 1 advisor from industry. The next meeting is scheduled for 19-20 June 99 in Munich, Germany, in conjunction with a WG 2.3 meeting.

Since GA 98 there are no new TC 2 members. There are inactive members from Australia, France, Israel, Italy, Portugal, Slovakia, South Africa and Sweden. Nominations of representatives from Canada, ACM and IEEE CS are expected. Mr. Kazman was appointed as WG2.7(WG 13.4) Chair.

TC 2 is involved in the organization of FM 99 and Congress 2000 and will explore whether a WG should be established in the field of software architecture. Most WGs are active with planned events.

3.16.3 TC 3 Education

TC 3 homepage: <http://www.ge-dip.etat-gc.ch/cptic/ifip/welcome.html> Council 99

report available at: http://www.ifip.or.at/minutes/C99/C99_TC3.htm

Mr. B. Samways informed that the 49th TC 3 meeting was held on 29 and 30 August 98 in Vienna. The 50th meeting is scheduled for August 99 in Irvine, USA and the 51st meeting is planned for 24-25 November 2000 in Copenhagen, Denmark. Since the last TC 3 meeting there are changes and additions to the TC 3 membership list from Bulgaria, Canada, China, Greece, India, Israel, Italy, Japan, Portugal and USA/ACM. New Chairs and Vice-Chairs were appointed for WG 3.3, WG 3.4 and WG 3.5 and there is a new TC 3 Secretary from Australia. TC 3 WGs are active. Some problems were encountered with the unexpected resignation of the WG 3.3 Chair, the change in dates of a WG 3.7 meeting, the sale of C & H to Kluwer and some personal difficulties of the TC 3 Secretary which have resulted in inconsistent communications. The TC 3 webpages continue to expand with up-to-date information on TC 3 activities.

The TC 3 Journal on Education and Information Technologies continues into its 4th year of existence and all IFIP Members are requested to support it by soliciting papers and encouraging subscriptions. Deryn Watson (GB) has taken over as Editor-in-chief as from January 99. Mr. Samways referred to the last page of the new Information Bulletin where promotional material on the Journal is included and an URL is provided where free online sample copies can be obtained.

TC 3 works with UNESCO on a University Modular Curriculum and continues with the project for the development of a Curriculum at the elementary' level. In preparing for the IFIP/UNESCO Modular Curriculum very⁷ tight deadlines are set by UNESCO. The next deadline is 15 May 99 and it would be important for TCs wishing to take part in the work on the project modules to nominate their representatives and inform the TC 3 Chair as soon as possible. Mr. Berleur wished to know whether Mr. Levrat is a member of the project steering group. The TC Chair confirmed Mr. Levrats involvement. Messrs. Morris and Boynton were baffled by the variety of inconsistent terminology used in the project documents. Mr. Brunnstein advised that a revision should be carried out to adopt proper terminology. Mr. Bauknecht encouraged other TCs to take an active part in all further work.

TC 3 is involved in the International Olympiads in Informatics and future links with CEPIS are envisaged via the "Harmonization project" and other activities. Contacts with other TCs are encouraged with a History of Computing project with TC 9 and a workshop during the TC 13 INTERACT 99 Conference.

Financially TC 3 needs support as education in general has always had limited funding. The TC 3 Chair believed that it would be useful to continue the "Guidelines for Good Practice" series and to support a project for the TC 3 website to offer a route into national education policies for which financial support would be needed.

3.16.4 TC 5 Computer Applications in Technology

Directory information: <http://www.ifip.or.at/bulletin/bulltcs/memtc05.htm>

No Report

3.16.5 TC 6 Communication Systems

TC 6 homepage: <http://www.ifip.tu-graz.ac.at/TC6/>

Council 99 report available at: <http://www.ifip.or.at/mmutes/C99/C99 TC6.htm>

Mr. Bauknecht reported on behalf of the TC 6 Chair. The last meeting was held on 22 and 23 October 1998 April in Tozeur, Tunisia. Future meetings are scheduled as follows:

Meeting 99/1 - Copenhagen, Denmark, 23-24 April 99

Meeting 99/2 - Szentendre, Hungary, 29-30 August 99

Apart from the appointment of the ACM delegate to TC 6 there were no other changes in the TC 6 membership. All WGs are active with a number of flagship events and other conferences. Two Task Groups are in existence - TG 6.9 on Communication Systems in Developing Countries and TG 6.11 on Electronic Commerce. A number of problems related to publications were experienced with Kluwer, in particular with the proceedings of Middleware 98 and HPN 98.

Brazil, Israel, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Thailand, Argentina, Ireland, Korea, Singapore, Russia and Egypt were requested to nominate TC 6 representatives but this has not yet happened. An active delegate from Australia would also be appreciated.

3.16.6 TC 7 System Modelling and Optimization

TC 7 homepage: <http://www.ifip.or.at/tc07.htm>

Council 99 report available at: <http://www.ifip.or.at/minutes/C99/C99 TC7.htm>

Mr. Bauknecht reported on behalf of the TC 7 Chair and said that since GA 98 there were no meetings. The next annual business meeting is scheduled for 13 July 99 in conjunction with the 19th IFIP Conference on System Modelling and Optimization. Cambridge, GB.

There is a new representative from India. Confirmations of the ACM and IEEE CS representatives are expected. There were changes in the WG 7.5 membership, several WGs had organized events and the proceedings of the 18 IFIP Conference on System Modelling and Optimization were published.

3.16.7 TC 8 Information Systems

TC 8 homepage: <http://ifiptc8.cis.gsu.edu/ifip>

Mr. B. Glasson reported that the last TC 8 business meeting was held on 29 - 30 August 98 in Vienna. The next meetings are scheduled for 26-27 June 99 in Copenhagen, Denmark and for 18-19 August 2000 in Hong Kong.

The TC 8 Chair said that there was a mixed level of activity of the various WGs. WG 8.1 had attempted to organize events in developing countries. An event in China was successful while a planned event in India had to be cancelled. WG 8.4 is being revived under new leadership while WG 8.5 aims to extend its membership to all World regions.

Some strategic planning is envisaged to revive dormant TC 8 Members. All WGs plan to designate webmasters for their Internet services.

Mr. Brunnstein referred to the TC 8 attendance statistics and noted that there appears to be some disarray in the TC 8 meeting participation. Mr. Glasson said that this is on the TC 8 Agenda.

3.16.8 TC 9 Relationship Between Computers and Society

TC 9 homepage: <http://www.uta.fi/jarjestot/ifip/>

Council 99 report available at: <http://www.ifip.or.at/minutes/C99/C99 TC9.htm>

Mr. Berleur referred to his report and said that the last TC 9 meeting was held on 29 August 98 in Geneva. Switzerland.

The appointment of a Vice-Chair is pending. There are new Chairs of WG 9.1 and WG 9.6 and the Chairperson for WG 9.4 was reelected for a second term. There are new TC representatives from Australia, Austria, the Czech Republic, India, Poland and US A/ACM. Member societies currently not represented are encouraged to nominate representatives.

The 5th Conference on Human Choice and Computers (HCC-5) was organized from 25 to 28 August 98 in Geneva. At the time of the business meeting WG Chairs got together to discuss ways to increase contacts and cooperation. A forum resembling the "Club of Rome" is dedicated to brainstorming ideas and recommendations on the Information Society. A SIG within WG 9.1 on Women, Work and Computerization will probably mature into a new⁷ WG. It will be involved in the 7th WWC Conference, scheduled to take place in June, 2000 in Vancouver. Canada. Most WGs have plans for future events.

Mr. Beieuer mentioned that some TC 9 working groups were responsible for the organization of successful conferences. WG 9.4, for example, has gained significant experience in the organization of successful regional conferences in developing countries and it also publishes a well-read newsletter. On the other hand, the IFIP Congress format of specialized conferences and tracks creates some difficulties to TC 9 to be visible due to the fact that the trend for specialization does not necessarily harmonize with the holistic approach adopted by TC 9.

Mr. Bauknecht noticed that WG 9.6 is earning out its activity predominantly by email. Mr. Brunnstein considered that for serious matters some form of confirmation should be requested.

Mr. Rosenfeld was interested to receive information on the Namur Award.

3.16.9 TC 10 Computer Systems Technology

Directory information: <http://www.ifip.or.at/bulletin/bulltcs/memtc10.htm> Council
99 report available at: http://www.ifip.or.at/minutes/C99/C99_TC_10.htm

Mr. Bauknecht referred to the TC 10 Report and said there were no major issues to report.

The next TC 10 meeting is scheduled for 30-31 August in Toulouse, France. The most active working groups are WG 10.3, WG 10.4 and WG 10.5. A very successful PACT 98 conference was held in October 98 in Paris. The DCCA - 7 Conference in San Jose, California had a good submission of papers but had moderate attendance. WG 10.4, in cooperation with IEEE CS, is proceeding to establish a new conference on Dependable Systems and Networks with a participation share of IFIP equal to 25%. The first edition of this conference is expected to take place in 2001 and a special arrangement between the two organizations should be negotiated and signed. The 10th WG 10.5 conference was held in September 98 in Germany and the organization of CHDL 99 and VLSI 99 is in the pipeline.

Mr. Rosenfeld noted that for DCCA-7 the submission figures exceeded the conference participation. Mr. Glasson opined that this is due to the fact that often participation funding is conditional to an accepted paper.

Mr. Boynton felt that some of the WG names need a review to better reflect their Aims and Scope.

3.16.10 TC 11 Security and Protection of IP Systems

TC 11 homepage: http://www.ifip.tu-graz.ac.at/TC_11/
Council 99 report available at: http://www.ifip.or.at/minutes/C99/C99_TC_11.htm

Mr. Bauknecht reported on behalf of the TC 11 Chair and said there was little to report as only one TC 11 activity had materialized since GA 98. The next TC 11 meeting is scheduled for September 99 in Amsterdam, the Netherlands. TC 11 had formally proposed that the IFIP/SEC 2000 conference should be integrated in Congress 2000.

There are new members from Belgium, Tunisia, Poland and US A/ACM. There was no response from a number of countries with respect to their representation in TC 11. In general, TC 11 and its WGs are in good shape and a more comprehensive report will be delivered to GA 99.

3.16.11 TC 12 Artificial Intelligence

Directory information: <http://www.ifip.or.at/bulletin/bulltcs/memtc12.htm> Council
99 report available at: http://www.ifip.or.at/minutes/C99/C99_TC_12.htm

Mr. Bauknecht reported on behalf of the TC 12 Chair. The next meeting is scheduled to take place in conjunction with IJCAI 99. 31 July - 6 August, Stockholm. There are new TC 12 members from Austria, Denmark, New Zealand and Slovakia. The TC 12 Chair has proposed to suspend WG 12.2 in order to allow a redefinition of its Aims and Scope and to solicit an active leadership. Currently, WG 12.5 and WG 12.6 are active and both are contributing to the preparations of the International Conference on Intelligent Information Processing under the umbrella of IFIP Congress 2000 in Beijing.

Mr. Bauknecht informed that EB had considered the unfortunate status of TC 12 with 4 out of 6 suspended working groups. There were some serious concerns about the situation and whether TC 12 should continue. Given the importance of the AI field EB agreed that Mr. Neumann should have some more time to redefine the TC 12 priorities and to revive its WG activities.

Mr. Brunnstein supported EB's recommendation and said that Mr. Neuman deserves the chance as he is an excellent expert in the AI field and will do his best. Mr. Rosenfeld wondered whether a TC can be active without WGs and whether the remaining WGs should not be incorporated within other TCs. The TA Chair responded that at the beginning he had similar thoughts but since Mr. Neumann has shown ability for leadership he should be given some more time.

3.16.12 TC 13 Human-Computer Interaction

TC 13 homepage: [http://www.csd.uu.se/ifip tc 13/](http://www.csd.uu.se/ifip%20tc%2013/)

Council 99 report available at: [http://www.ifip.or.at/minutes/C99/C99 TC 13.htm](http://www.ifip.or.at/minutes/C99/C99%20TC%2013.htm)

Mr. Glasson said that the TC 13 Chair had requested him to present the highlights of her report to Council 99. The first TC 13 electronic meeting was organized in November 1998 and this was a major experience for TC 13. The next regular meeting was held on 12-13 February 99 in San Sebastian, Spain. TC 13 continues to develop well. 25 IFIP Full Members of IFIP are represented on TC 13. Nominations of representatives from a number of Societies are expected. There are new Chairs of WG 13.3 and WG2.7(13.4). Mr. Oestreicher (Sweden) was appointed TC 13 Vice-Chair with special responsibility for information resources.

The organization of INTERACT 99 is making good progress with 226 paper submissions from 26 countries. Further submissions are expected by May 99. EU and UNESCO assistance is solicited. Japan was awarded the INTERACT 2001 Conference to be hosted by IPSJ.

Finally, Mr. Glasson recalled the proposal for a Brian Shackel Award [please refer to the discussion under Agenda item 6].

Mr. Brunnstein noted the TC 13 electronic conference and suggested that perhaps TC 11 and TC 13 should also experiment with visual conferences. A problem there might relate to bandwidth. Mr. Khakhar added that telephone conferences, such as these organized by ICCS could also be considered.

3.17 Committee Reports 3.17.1

Statutes and Bylaws

Mr. Morris wished to have Council's considerations on the definition of "majority" in GA voting. The current IFIP practice is regulated by Statute 4.1.3 "Quorum and Majority" and Statute 7 "Amendments".

According to this practice, if GA is considering a contentious amendment of the Statutes, needing three-quarter majority, then abstentions actually count as a vote "against". This, besides

creating great trouble in monitoring the actual voting process, makes the achievement of change very difficult.

Mr. Morris has discussed this with the Chair of S&B and with EB. There are two possible alternatives to the current practice. The first is that "a (three-quarter) majority of all Members is required", whether present or not. This, however, would be totally impracticable. The other is that "a (three-quarter) majority of votes cast" is required. Abstentions in this case would not count nor would absent Members without proxies. This said, he wished to know Council's opinion on this matter in order to have a formal proposal prepared for GA 99 discussion and decision.

Mr. Berleur felt that IFIP must take a broader look and should investigate legal practices under different juridical systems. Mr. Masduki suggested that a two-thirds majority could also be considered and Mr. Boynton added that in Canada many organizations comply with the two-thirds majority vote on important issues. Mr. Johnson thought that there will always be difficult decisions, irrespective of whether it is a two-thirds or three-quarter majority, and favored the second. Mr. Ramani preferred not to count abstentions or alternatively to move to a two-thirds majority vote.

3.17.2 DCSC

Mr. Khakhar reported that since GA 98 there were a number of initiatives relating to DCSC including preparations and organization of tutorials in Latin America and South East Asia. DCSC had met in Goa and reviewed some of its activities. DCSC members felt the Committee should be better organized and proactive and should work closely with the representatives of IFIP's Member societies from developing countries. It is also essential for DCSC to work closely with IFIP's TCs. Messrs. Glasson and Samways had prepared a paper on the role of TC representatives to DCSC.

The DCSC Chair referred to an idea of Mr. Nedkov for a DCSC scheme based on "vouchers" by which Member societies would be encouraged and stimulated financially to participate in certain IFIP activities. A Task Force consisting of Messrs. Ramani, Samways and the IFIP Executive Director was established immediately after the DCSC meeting to prepare a document on the proposed scheme for Council's endorsement [please refer to ANNEX 1 of the Minutes].

Mr. Johnson thought that this was an excellent and imaginative proposal and wished it well. Mr. Berleur found it very important that the final decision on what the available funds would be utilized belongs to the respective Societies and extended his full support to the scheme. Mr. Granado also thought the proposal is excellent and said that if the scheme performs well during the initial 3-year period IFIP could consider extending it for a further period.

The President requested Council's opinion on whether IFIP should announce and implement the scheme immediately instead of waiting for the approval of GA 99. He felt there is no need to wait since there are DCSC funds to launch the scheme.

Council ENDORSED

Mr. Khakhar advised that DCSC would consider preparing an IFIP brochure with information specially targeted at the needs of developing countries. This will be done in cooperation with MC. The DCSC Chair and the IFIP Executive Director will also consider preparing material on IFIP's activities in developing countries for the IFIP URL.

With regard to an invitation received by IFIP to take part in an African Computing and Telecommunications Summit (25 - 27 August 99, UK). DCSC, in consultation with the TC chairs, had decided to investigate whether this is a commercial event before IFIP's participation

is confirmed. For this purpose the **DCSC Chair** will make direct contact with the organizers while Messrs. Brunnstein and Nedkov will consult UNESCO's involvement.

Mr. Brunnstein had informed that there is a probability that UNESCO's InfoEthics 2000 and the KnowRight 2000 Conference are organized in parallel in Vienna. If that happens to be the case then DCSC should consider some support for East European participants. Finally, Mr. Khakhar said that next Summer School on Information and Communication Security will be organized in August 1999 in Greece. DCSC may consider supporting representatives from IFIP's Members from Eastern Europe which are not in arrears. DCSC may consider a maximum support of up to CHF 5.000 for this activity.

3.17.3 Finance Committee

The FC Chair, Mr. **Granado** reported that the FC met and examined the IFIP accounts and the Treasurer's report. An item in the report for the write-offs related to Congress 96 and membership dues was misplaced. This, however, does not influence the accounts and result and will be corrected. The Treasurer's report is a concise document, which gives a clear idea of the IFIP's finances and accounts.

FC had considered the 1998 Budget and accounts and has noted that:

Bank Deposits: there is an excess of cash

Dubious Dues: dues of IFIP members from Albania, Belgium, Brazil, Greece, Ireland, the Philippines and Russia are confirmed as written off

Miscellaneous Receivables: relating to the agreed mechanism for WCC 96 in Canberra;

Dues received in advance: dues from Portugal and China

Pension Fund: needs to be adjusted

Adjustment to dubious outstanding dues: related to Belarus, France and New Zealand

Portfolio Investment income: is better than budgeted

Portfolio Management fees: related with the new portfolio policy

Special Activities Fund expenses: committed DC support to Congress 98

Mr. Granado said that the final balance of the IFIP accounts represents an excess of cash which, had it been transferred to the Portfolio Investment, could have provided an extra 9,7 K CHF of income. The excess funds on our bank accounts actually do not have a useful purpose. The balance was brought down to the budget indications by January 1999. It is an issue that must be followed carefully.

With respect to cash flow management, the **FC Chair** believed that IFIP should manage its financial assets according to some well-formulated cash flow projections. In spite of previous indications of EB it was not yet possible to make good progress. With staff reinforcement and a new allocation of tasks, better cash flow management may be achievable.

FC was very pleased to confirm an earlier forecast at GA 98 that the portfolio management done by UBS has improved. The annual Return on Assets is about 5% (2% income + .3% appreciation). Bearing in mind that the inflation rate associated to the CHF was below 1% this may be considered as a rather good performance.

The overall financial state of IFIP is healthy. IFIP's assets grew by another 10% and they are now slightly over 5 times the 1998 operational expenses.

With respect to the IFIP Secretariat's expenses, **Mr. Granado** pointed out that in spite of the very tight operations management, the new salary revision associated with a half-time recruitment would increase expenses in future. **The FC Chair** referred to a GA recommendation that the annual Secretariat expenses should be within the level of the total membership dues. In the year 2000 he foresees that the operational costs would be slightly over

240 K CHF against a maximum income from Member society dues of 280 K CHF (which more likely would be below 240 K CHF)

IFIP's portfolio investment and the accounts at UBS were changed to Euro reporting as of January 99. This proved practical as the exchange rate at the time was very favorable. IFIP's book keeping and Austrian accounts will be in Euro as of 1 January 2000, after a new accounting package is introduced and tested. From January 1st 2000 onwards all membership dues will be invoiced in Euro. Some Member Societies currently complain about the "unfair" costs associated with the successive depreciation of their local currencies versus the Swiss Franc. With the introduction of the Euro as IFIP's reference currency this tendency would most likely increase. One possible solution is to accept membership dues payments in advance, say, for up to 3 years, with a guarantee that no consequent dues increase will affect these payments.

Mr. Nedkov referred to what was said about excess cash on bank accounts and cash flow management and clarified that these issues have nothing to do with additional staff. Actually, the cash levels on bank accounts at year-end should be able to meet all IFIP liabilities from the past year and for approximately 2 to 3 months in advance when the income flow is low. This is a matter of caution and cash flow management, which in turn relates to indications from the budget holders. Following GA 98, a significant amount was transferred to the portfolio investment per the instructions of GA. **The Executive Director** pointed out that the term "write-offs" with reference to membership dues should be used with care. In the FC report reference is made to a number of countries whose dues were "written off. Actually, all defaulting members are expected to pay their back dues. According to normal accounting practices an adjustment to dubious dues is made in order to safeguard IFIP in the event that defaulting Members would not be able to honor their debt. **The Treasurer** agreed. Mr. **Reis** said that the Brazilian membership dues are paid by the Brazilian National Science Foundation and that very soon the 98 and the 99 dues will be processed.

Mr. Boynton wished to know who manages the portfolio investment. Messrs. **Granado** and Khakhar responded that a professional UBS manager is responsible. IFIP only indicates the risk level and the policy is not to take high risk.

3.17.4 IFIP-UNESCO Liaison

Mr. Nedkov referred to his written report and recalled that IFIP was reelected in November 98 as Member of the NGO-UNESCO Liaison Committee. Following the elections he was invited to propose an information and communication platform for the NGO Liaison Committee and this was reviewed and adopted. An NGO Liaison Committee Website was established at: <http://www.ifip.or.at/UNESCO/unesco.htm>.

The project work-plan for the IFIP/UNESCO Project for Curriculum Development was finalized and the first installment of USD 5,000 of the UNESCO contribution (USD 18,000) was transferred to IFIP. There are reasons to believe that if other TCs are effectively involved in the project the activity could acquire an ongoing character.

IFIP was invited to the UNESCO InfoEthics conference and exhibition from 1 to 3 October 98 in Monaco. IFIP's participation was made possible by arrangement with Prof. K. Brunnstem who represented IFIP and delivered a presentation on IFIP and its activities.

Several projects and joint activities are currently investigated. The **IFIP-UNESCO Liaison Officer** will consult on possibilities for UNESCO assistance to the IFIP WCC 2000 in Beijing. Mr. Nedkov was pleased to inform that the WG 9.5 Chair, Mr. G. Cyranek was recently appointed as Regional Informatics and Telematics Adviser in the UNESCO office in Addis Ababa. Contact is maintained to explore assistance that can be provided by the Addis Ababa office to promote regional participation in IFIP.

3.17.5 Internal Awards

Mr. Morris advised that he would circulate information to TC Chairs and seek their nominations for the 1999 OSA awards to be approved by GA 99 in Malaysia.

3.18 IFIP Newsletter

Mr. Rosenfeld said that the Newsletter currently has a circulation of about 3.300 individual copies and another 1.000 are sent in bulk to IFIP Members and conference organizers. He brought with him to Goa copies of the March 99 issue for Council participants. The December 98 issue of the **IFIP** Newsletter marked the completion of the 15th year of its publication.

Mr. Rosenfeld was pleased to work with Kluwer. One slight problem was that his contacts at Kluwer were always changing. The Newsletter Editor is hopeful that with the appointment of Ms. Y. Lambert all will work well **in future**.

Mr. Morris advised that Council should congratulate Mr. Rosenfeld for the 15th Anniversary of the Newsletter and stressed that it is not the beginning but the continuation that deserves greater glory!

Council **APPLAUDED**

3.19 Future Meetings

The Secretary advised that two invitations were received for hosting the March 2000 IFIP Council meeting - from **IEEE** CS supported by ACM for Washington D.C. and from the Norwegian Computer Society for Oslo.

Council voted **IN FAVOR** of Washington D.C.

Mr. Morris informed Council of the forthcoming General Assembly and Council meetings:

1999 General Assembly	Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia Sunday, September 5 - 9
2000 Council	Washington D.C, USA Sunday, March 5 - 9
2000 General Assembly	Beijing, China Thursday, August 24 EB Saturday August 26- 29 GA
2001 Council	Italy
2001 General Assembly	Open destination

Mr. Masduki advised that the original intention was to hold GA 99 in Cyberjaya but since the project would not be completed by September 99 arrangements will be made to convene the meetings at the Sunway Convention Center in Kuala Lumpur. He will send out invitations to GA 99 participants so that they could plan their visit and apply for Malaysian entry visas, if necessary, at an early convenience. Hotels are available at the convention center.

3.20 Closing of Meeting

The President once again thanked the Computer Society of India for the extended warm hospitality and congratulated Dr. Ramani and Mr. Arakal and their team for the excellent arrangements, which exceeded by far all expectations.

Council APPLAUDED

Mr. Bollerslev thanked all Council members and attendees for their contributions and declared the Council meeting closed.

ANNEX 1 - Developing Countries Support Committee "Voucher Scheme"

IFIP wishes to encourage a greater involvement in its work of persons from developing countries who are full members of IFIP.

There are currently 20 full member societies within IFIP, which according to the IFIP classification are termed "developing countries" and most of these fall within category 1 paying an annual subscription of 2700 CHF. Unfortunately these countries find it difficult to supplement these funds to partake in IFIP activities and to gain full benefit from their IFIP membership. Some developing countries are financially unable to send their national representative to Technical Committee meetings and often find it difficult to support even one delegate per year at an IFIP conference. As a result IFIP's name is not getting the publicity and exposure that it deserves particularly in light of the time and effort it allocates to supporting developing countries.

In order to help (to begin to) rectify this situation in a way that cannot be abused, the Developing Countries Support Committee wishes to expand an idea from IFIP's Executive Director. In order to encourage developing countries (who are full members of IFIP) to support their own persons the Developing Countries Support Committee wishes to offer a "matching grant" up to a maximum figure of 1000 CHF for each of the next three years. Allowable expenditure will be:

1. Attendance at an **IFIP only organized event.**

This would encourage the Computer Society in an IFIP developing country to offer assistance to persons able to attend an IFIP only organized event. The computer society would have control over who they support, knowing the benefits to that person, to their Society and to their country. In addition the Society would be able to determine the feedback and the 'cascading' that they require from their delegate. By only allowing "IFIP only" organized events Developing Countries Support Committee can ensure that the IFIP funds are not used to support competing or other organizations.

2. Purchase of IFIP Publications.

This would enable Societies in IFIP developing countries to purchase IFIP conference proceedings (currently at a 30% discount), IFIP publications and IFIP journal subscriptions. As a further opportunity conference organizers are often pleased to sell additional copies of proceedings at the "bulk copy" purchase price that they obtain from the IFIP Publisher. In this way IFIP's name and IFIP's high standard of published material is more widely circulated in its developing countries.

3. Attendance of the National representative at Technical Committee meetings.

Much of the work of IFIP is through its Working Groups and these are overseen by the twelve Technical Committees. Hence attendance by the developing countries' National representatives at Technical Committee meetings is to be encouraged. This will enable the developing countries to contribute to IFIP planning and to be in a position to recommend IFIP events and IFIP publications to their computer society members and colleagues in their home country.

Not allowable will be:

- A. Any support for IFIP General Assembly Representative
- B. Any support for events in which IFIP's role is only as a co-sponsor
- C. Any support for non-IFIP events

The reason for these three restrictions is that the "vouchers" should not be used to assist with IFIP members' normal expenditure or used to support other organizations.

Mode of Operation

During this three-year project developing countries may NOT "earn-over" from one year to the next, and must report such allowable expenditure to the IFIP Secretariat by 1st December each year.

By 1st December of year one of the project a letter from the respective Society should be sent to the IFIP Secretariat, signed by the Society's President or Chief Executive and the IFIP General Assembly representative. This should detail the expenses (within the allowable list) made during the year and be supported by copies of invoices.

In January the following year the IFIP Secretariat will invoice the Society for its IFIP Membership dues for that year with the appropriate reduction up to a maximum of 1000 CHF. *(Therefore a Society who had spent more than 2000 CHF from the allowable list in year one, whose IFIP Membership was 2700 CHF would only be invoiced for 1700 CHF in year two).*

Should no letter be received at the IFIP Secretariat by 1st December in year one then the 1000 CHF for that year for that IFIP Member is lost.

The above process is repeated for each of the three years.

ANNEX 2 - "Event Facilitator"/"Activities Manager" Job Description

The overall responsibility is to work pro-actively with and assist organisers in their planning and preparation for IFIP events, to ensure that our systems are effective and efficient and to ensure that IFIP's record keeping requirements are met.

Outward Looking

General

Be the focal point on all issues relating to the organisation of IFIP events and event initiatives. Seek proactively to assist event organisers through the provision of appropriate guidance, help, information and effective systems.

Detail

1. Encourage TCs and WGs to run events by helping to minimise the amount of effort required by organisers.
2. Support organisers in the promotion of events by assisting them with examples and other promotional material, by identifying appropriate promotion channels and by working with the organisers. Member Societies and partners to promote IFIP events most effectively.
3. Assist event organisers in the preparation of the required forms, documents and reports in accordance with required timescales.
4. Build up records of attendees and other facets of IFIP Congresses, conferences and other events and use them appropriately and positively in the organisation of new events.
5. Assist event organisers in their local responsibilities through the provision of written guidance, check lists and other appropriate means.

Domestic

General

Undertake regular reviews of the written and electronic systems that we use to manage events and ensure that these are up-to-date, effective and efficient.

Detail

1. Manage the IFIP events database
2. Generate event update sheets and other event documents and information
3. Monitor the handling of applications for loans and grants, ensuring that they are processed efficiently, transferred when required, and repaid promptly.
4. Monitor that proper accounts are kept and that the IFIP sponsorship fee is paid.
5. Maintain and publish statistics on events, loans, grants, proceeds and other key items.
6. Prepare the calendar of events for the web and the Newsletter.