

Minutes of the Council Meeting

8 - 9 March 2000, Washington, D.C., USA

Table of Contents

1	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
2	ACTION LIST	5
3	ATTENDANCE LIST.....	6
4	COUNCIL MEETING	8
4.1	Call Meeting to Order	8
4.2	Attendance and apologies	8
4.3	Business issues.....	8
4.3.1	Approval of Agenda.....	8
4.3.2	President's Report	8
4.3.3	Secretary's Report	9
4.3.4	Executive Director's Report.....	10
4.3.5	EB Meeting Report	11
4.3.6	Treasurer's Report.....	11
4.4	Technical Committee Reports.....	13
4.4.1	TC 1 Foundations of Computer Science.....	13
4.4.2	TC 2 Software: Theory and Practice.....	14
4.4.3	TC 3 Education	14
4.4.4	TC 5 Computer Applications in Technology.....	15
4.4.5	TC 6 Communication Systems	15
4.4.6	TC 7 System Modelling and Optimization	16
4.4.7	TC 8 Information Systems	16
4.4.8	TC 9 Relationship Between Computers and Society.....	17
4.4.9	TC 10 Computer Systems Technology	17
4.4.10	TC 11 Security and Protection of IP Systems.....	17
4.4.11	TC 12 Artificial Intelligence.....	17
4.4.12	TC 13 Human-Computer Interaction.....	18
4.5	Technical Issues	18
4.5.1	Technical Assembly.....	18
4.5.2	AMB	20
4.5.3	Publications.....	20
4.6	Congresses	21
4.6.1	WCC 2000	21
4.6.2	WCC 2002	22
4.6.3	WCC 2004 invitations	23
4.7	Standing Committee Reports	23
4.7.1	DCSC.....	23
4.7.2	Marketing.....	24
4.7.3	Statutes and Bylaws	24
4.7.4	Admissions	25
4.7.5	IFIP-UNESCO Liaison	25
4.7.6	Internal Awards	25
4.7.7	IFIP Newsletter	25
4.7.8	Industry Committee	26
4.8	Future Meetings	27
4.9	Other Business	27
4.10	Closing of Meeting.....	27
5	ANNEX 1.....	28

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 Organization

In tune with a GA 99 recommendation Executive Board experimented with a new structure for the organization of the March Council and related meetings in Washington, D.C. A strategy session was incorporated in the program with presentations and discussion on such strategic topics as Digital Libraries and Industry. Some of the elements of the new structure were highly appreciated (for example, the common session between the TC Chairs and the leadership of IFIP's Standing Committees). Further improvements were requested and, based on the Washington experience, the new concept for GA/C meetings will be fine-tuned and further applied during GA 2000 in Beijing.

There is a list of future meetings at <http://www.ifip.or.at/meetings.htm>. IFIP Member societies are encouraged to consider extending invitations to host future GA and Council meetings with open destinations.

There may be some financial support in future to GA/Council hosts from developing countries to ensure that certain types of activities are organized during these meetings. GA 2000 will consider the conditions, levels and requirements for such support.

1.2 Membership Issues

IFIP currently has 44 Full members [including 2 societies whose membership is temporarily under a 'Freeze'].

During Council it was reported that 39 IFIP Full Members have voting rights. This triggered some discussion whether the IFIP membership constituency was stable and representative enough. A message came in from the President of the Irish Computer Society that all arrears, including the dues for the Year 2000, were transferred to IFIP. Soon after, there was also a confirmation that Greece paid all its arrears, hence the number of IFIP voting members is currently 41.

Council endorsed a proposal for a new membership dues category to cater for full membership of societies from countries with small economies. The new dues category, if accepted by GA 2000, will equal half the lowest current dues level of 1,600 EUR and will actually give a chance to societies from over 80% of the countries in the UN membership list to apply for IFIP membership. This strategic initiative is aimed to recruit new Members and to assist current IFIP Members in category 1 that are eligible to scale down to the new category if the scheme is accepted. Council reiterated IFIP's intention to continue with the IFIP Voucher scheme [please refer to http://www.ifip.or.at/minutes/C99/C99_annex1.htm] and noted that in practice the membership dues have decreased by at least 10% since there have been no inflation adjustments for the last 5 years.

1.3 Finances

IFIP's financial affairs are in good order. Council accepted the 1999 accounts for approval by GA 2000. Total income was 887 K CHF, which is outstanding compared to the budgeted 587 K CHF. Income from Return on Assets from the IFIP Portfolio investment was 319 K CHF. Membership dues were 318 K, which is 38 K above Budget. Publications royalties and proceeds from activities are comparable to 1998 figures. Total expenses were 357 K CHF, or 31%, below Budget due to savings in office expenses, Administrative and Technical Supports. The Final Result, after Special Funds Provision of 66 K CHF, is an increase in IFIP's General Fund by 459 K CHF to 2,116 K CHF.

While the 1999 Result is excellent, some expressed caution that the larger part is due to the appreciation of the IFIP portfolio investment and a downturn in the stock market could

negatively impact future financial results. For this reason careful financial planning and financial control should be exercised by all IFIP budget holders and IFIP should consider developing strategic activities and new revenue streams.

1.4 Technical Activities

TC reports are available at the Council 2000 web site. TC Chairs are anxious to have active members from all IFIP Member societies and GA representatives are requested to review their membership and to nominate representatives, if appropriate. Most Reports contain attendance statistics.

The management of IFIP events is in good hands and the activity levels compare to best performance during previous years. The IFIP Events Facilitator was commended for her work. Some discussion took place on the previously considered Risk Fund Management Committee to allow TCs to take higher financial risks in the organization of events, thereby to tap on expected surplus from such activities. Council advised that the current Guidelines and procedures allow leeway for special cases and AMB and the respective IFIP Officers can consider any matter requiring special attention. Procedures should be kept simple and flexible and there is no need to expand the IFIP management structure with additional committees.

[The IFIP Events Calendar is located at http://www.ifip.or.at/cal_even.htm]

1.5 Congresses

IFIP Congress 2000 in Beijing: The IPC and OC are in the last and most important stage of preparations. 2000 papers were submitted, out of which more than 700 were from outside of China. Expectations are for over 1,500 registered participants and all IFIP Member societies, TCs and WGs are encouraged to provide further Congress publicity. Unfortunately, some have still not established links to <http://www.wcc2000.org> . All societies and representatives are requested to take urgent action to publicize IFIP Congress 2000.

IFIP will provide CHF 30,000 to support Congress 2000 participants from developing countries with accepted papers and the scheme will be administered by the Congress OC. US residents have the possibility to apply for partial support to ACM and IEEE CS. Information is posted on the Announcements page of the IFIP URL. Other societies are also encouraged to establish their own schemes in support of participants from their countries.

[A PowerPoint presentation of the Congress 2000 report can be downloaded from <http://www.ifip.or.at/minutes/c2000.htm>]

IFIP Congress 2002 in Montreal: The IPC Chair Jan Wibe and the COC Chair George Boynton will work to put forward a very attractive program of activities. They intend to keep close contact with IFIP's TC & WG Chairs and with IFIP's Member societies.

IFIP Congress 2004: Three invitations were submitted from France - Toulouse, Israel - Jerusalem and South Africa - Cape Town. Site inspection visits are planned before the General Assembly meeting. GA 2000 will vote on the Congress 2004 venue.

1.6 Publications

The Publishers report is posted at the Council 2000 web-site.

Sales of IFIP proceedings during 1999 were up by 13% in comparison to 1998. Several promotional activities were considered including direct mail to IFIP member societies concerning recently published books. All Congress 2000 proceedings will be included in the Congress CD-ROM.

[The IFIP Publications pages are located at <http://www.ifip.or.at/public.htm>]

1.7 Relations with Industry

IFIP will carry out a survey to evaluate the ratio between representatives of Academia and Industry. TC and WG Chairs will be requested to complete a questionnaire so as to assist this survey. The Committee for Cooperation with Industry intends to introduce special congress and conference sessions to attract representatives from Industry. Other issues relate to involving IFIP in "de facto" standards and making IFIP projects and activities interesting to representatives of Industry.

1.8 Marketing -- "This is IFIP"

The "This is IFIP" leaflet was appreciated [an electronic pdf copy can be downloaded from <http://www.ifip.or.at/announce.htm>]. Editors of member society newsletters and journals are encouraged to publish articles on IFIP and its 40th Anniversary during the current year.

1.9 Other Activities

During a special Strategy session John White, ACM CEO and John Keaton, IEEE CS, Manager of Research and Planning, offered PowerPoint presentations on their societies' Digital Library projects and their relationships to Industry. These presentations precipitated a discussion on how IFIP should proceed with its Digital Library project and its intentions to involve industrial representatives in its activities. Both presentations are available online and are intended to stimulate further discussion within IFIP.

1.10 Social Program

A special 40th Anniversary reception was organized with the attendance of four IFIP Past Presidents - Heinz Zemanek (1971 - 1974), Pierre Bobillier (1977 - 1983), Asbjorn Rolstadas (1992 - 1995) and Kurt Bauknecht (1995- 1998). Mr. Zemanek shared views and experiences of the early IFIP years. This was followed by a present of a beautiful ceramic vase to IFIP offered by the Chinese GA representative and IFIP Trustee, Mrs. Q. Wang.

1.11 Thanks

IFIP is thankful to the officers and staff of ACM and IEEE CS for the organization and generous arrangements during the IFIP Council meetings in Washington, D.C.

2 ACTION LIST

IFIP Council, 8 - 9 March 2000, Washington, D.C., USA

WHO	WHAT
All	Refer to the GA 99 and C 2000 Minutes and Action Lists and follow-up on outstanding commitments
All	Commemorate IFIP's 40 th Anniversary in an appropriate way
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 incl. contact information as soon as they occur
Member Societies	Establish more visible links to the IFIP URL and to the IFIP Congress 2000 homepage. Promote IFIP Congress 2000 and distribute information about IFIP activities among members
All	Support TC 3 Journal with subscriptions
President, EB, PC	Consult with Member societies how best to proceed with the IFIP Digital Library project
EB, Treasurer	Submit for GA 2000 approval the introduction of a new membership dues category
EB, Miura	Further develop a proposal for the more sustained involvement of representatives from industry in IFIP activities and submit the proposal for GA 2000 review and endorsement
EB, Secretary	Develop simpler procedures for submitting nominations for the Silver Core Award. Consider other IFIP Awards
Miura, Nedkov, TC and WG Chairs	Organize a survey to find out the ratio between representatives of Academia and Industry in IFIP's TCs and WGs
Congress OC and IPC Chairs	Ensure that written reports are presented to GA
TA, TC Chairs	Consider interaction between TCs and WGs on emerging "hot issues" such as Electronic Commerce and ensure there is a concerted input in the organization of events on such topics
PC	Proactively assert IFIP's Publication Policy
DCSC	Promote the Voucher scheme for DC participation in IFIP activities
SBC	Resubmit in time the SBC report with a new definition of "majority" for GA 2000 approval
TC Chairs	Provide TC reports in electronic form to the Secretariat 3 weeks before Council and GA meetings
TC and WG Chairs	Inform Member societies of countries in which business meetings are planned and invite the respective GA representatives to attend these meetings. Encourage members to report to their societies about TC and WG activities
All Budget holders, Treasurer	Submit proposals to Treasurer for budget 2001 and assist the IFIP cash flow management by more precise estimates of expenses and income during 2001
Treasurer, Secretariat	Inform Member Societies whose membership dues fall within new categories
Johnson, Nedkov	Further develop the new scheme for the organization of GA and Council meetings. Ensure that a meeting of FC with the TC Chairs is included in the schedule of meetings prior to GA 2000
Johnson, Nedkov	Develop a PowerPoint presentation of an Annual IFIP report to assist GA representatives in their reporting to Member societies
TC and WG Chairs, 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, TC Chairs	Prepare a matrix of the national representation in all Technical Committees
Nedkov	Prepare a target list of potential IFIP Members
TC 1 Chair	Continue to revise membership to match specifications of a TC
TC 2 Chair	Consider starting a new Journal in Software Architecture
TC 5 Chair	Advise former WG 5.4 members to join other related WGs
TC12 Chair	Initiate urgent action to revive WG activities

3 ATTENDANCE LIST

IFIP Council, 8 – 9 March 2000, Washington, D.C. USA

Council Members Present

P. Bollerslev	President
R. Aiken	Vice-President
W. Grafendorfer	Vice-President
J. Granado	Vice-President
T. Miura	Vice-President
R. Johnson	Secretary
D. Khakhar	Treasurer
G. Boynton	Trustee
K. Brunnstein	Trustee
R. Reis	Trustee
Q. Wang	Trustee

TC Chairs Present

G. Ausiello	TC 1
R. Kurki-Suonio	TC 2
B. Samways	TC 3
G. Doumeingts	TC 5
A. Casaca	TC 6
P. Kall	TC 7
J. Berleur	TC 9
J. Hammond	TC 13

Invited Observers Present

Past Presidents

K. Bauknecht
P. Bobillier
A. Rolstadas
H. Zemanek

F. Aronson	ACM
S. Delman	Kluwer
P. Jiang	China
J. Keaton	IEEE CS
A.-M. Kelly	IEEE CS
Y. Lambert	Kluwer
X. Li	OC & IPC Congress 2000
P. Liu	China
M. Mandelbaum	ACM
J. Rosenfeld	NL Editor
B. Wah	IPC Chair Congress 2000, IEEE CS President Elect
J. White	ACM CEO
J. Wibe	IPC Chair, Congress 2002
M. Yoshizawa	Japan

IFIP Secretariat

P. Nedkov	ED, CO and UNESCO Liaison
D. Hayden	IFIP Secretariat

Apologies from Council Members

K. Boyanov	Trustee
C. Gergely	Trustee
S. Masduki	Trustee
S. Ramani	Trustee

Apologies from TC Chairs

G. Doumeingts	TC 5*
B. Glasson	TC 8
J.-C. Laprie	TC 10
B. von Solms	TC 11
B. Neumann	TC 12

Regrets

P. Ralston	PC Chair*
------------	-----------

* attended meetings prior to Council on 6 and 7 March

4 COUNCIL MEETING

IFIP Council, 8 – 9 March 2000, Washington, D.C. USA

4.1 Call Meeting to Order

The President opened the Council meeting and welcomed all participants. He was thankful for the excellent arrangements provided to Council by the hosting societies -- ACM and IEEE CS -- and was pleased to invite John White, ACM CEO and Benjamin Wah, IEEE CS President Elect to address Council.

Mr. White said that ACM is in transition. There are many challenges such as being relevant and competitive and adding more value to the IT profession. It is important to identify the people that subscribe to the IT profession. It is important for ACM to follow global trends, sort and pursue specific projects and build relationships. IFIP is important to ACM in broadening its global outlook. It looks forward to its further involvement in IFIP and to assist with activities that relate to their strategic issues that were considered during the Strategy session in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Wah was pleased to attend on behalf of IEEE CS and to welcome Council to Washington, D.C. IEEE CS was honored to co-host with ACM the IFIP meetings. The Society is the largest in the IEEE Family with a membership of 103,000 and offices away from headquarters in Tokyo, Moscow, Budapest and Beijing. It has a broad spectrum of membership, runs some 140 conferences annually, publishes 16,000 editorial pages and maintains a full-time staff of 119 persons. Some of the challenges that are currently addressed by IEEE CS were discussed during the Strategy session. IEEE CS is proud to be an IFIP Full Member and welcomed IFIP's Council to Washington, D.C.

The President thanked Messrs. White and Wah and proceeded to explain the new structure of the Council Agenda.

4.2 Attendance and apologies

The Secretary announced Council attendance and regrets (please refer to the list of attendance). Messrs. Boyanov, Masduki and Ramani have sent their apologies as Trustees. The Chairs of TC 8, TC 10, TC 11 and TC 12 had conveyed their regrets.

Mr. Bobillier informed that Richard Tanaka, Past President of IFIP, had very much wished to come to Council but last minute engagements had made this impossible.

4.3 Business issues

4.3.1 Approval of Agenda

Council unanimously ADOPTED the Agenda.

4.3.2 President's Report

The President reminded that this year IFIP celebrates its 40th Anniversary and that a small reception was organized prior to Council. Four IFIP Past Presidents -- Messrs. Bobillier, Rolstadas, Bauknecht and Zemanek -- were in Washington D.C. IFIP intends to have a similar event during the IFIP Congress 2000 in Beijing to commemorate IFIP's Ruby Anniversary in an appropriate way.

A new "This is IFIP" leaflet was available to help Member Societies and TCs in their efforts of getting IFIP known widely. The leaflet is produced as a 40th Anniversary issue and so is the new Information Bulletin, which was distributed in January.

The President and the IFIP Executive Director had participated in the SEARCC Executive Council meeting in December 99. Societies from thirteen countries, out of which 6 IFIP Full members, were represented at that meeting. It was a rewarding experience and **Mr. Bollerslev** was confident that IFIP and SEARCC are in much closer contact now. In December, Mr. Bollerslev had also attended Past President Heinz Zemanek's 80th Anniversary celebration in Vienna. It was touching to see how much IFIP means to Prof. Zemanek and how well IFIP is known in the Austrian IT community and in Austria at large.

Since GA 99 IFIP has been in a very busy mode with approximately 30 conferences and other events organized during this period. There were many very active TCs and WGs.

Relations with UNESCO are in a good state and IFIP-UNESCO Modular Curriculum in Informatics project was successful. There is a new contract for an IFIP/UNESCO Elementary ICT Curriculum to be developed in co-operation with UNESCO's Institute for Information Technologies in Education (IITE) in Moscow.

There were contacts with the European Computer Driving License Foundation in order to find out how IFIP could be involved in similar activities outside Europe. Unfortunately, there was no result.

Preparations for WCC 2000 are progressing well with intense and lively discussion between EB, IPC and OC members. **Mr. Bollerslev** was happy to report that some 2000 papers were submitted out of which more than 700 from outside of China. One of the Keynote speakers, Sir Tony Hoare, was recently knighted and the President wondered whether the IPC and COC had any influence in this. Jan Wibe was appointed IPC Chair for WCC 2002 and invitations, together with the revised guidelines for IFIP Congresses, were issued after GA 99. The status of invitations will be reported under the appropriate Agenda item.

Executive Board held a meeting in New York in January 2000. A new Council scheme was considered and agreed and it was felt that there is a need for a new "issues driven" agenda. Ideally, meetings could run in three consecutive parts: Reporting – Discussions – Decisions, and should accommodate for strategy debates.

Finally, **the President** thanked his EB colleagues and the IFIP Secretariat for their help and assistance at all times.

4.3.3 Secretary's Report

The Secretary reported that 39 Full members currently hold voting rights. Greece had paid all back dues up to 1999. Armenia and Greece were in arrears for 1999. Ireland, despite assurances, had not yet paid its back dues. Albania and Russia were offered a freeze of membership following the GA 99 decision. New Zealand had applied to change its membership from Full to Corresponding and GA 2000 will have to decide on this application. The Philippines (Associate member) are in arrears since 1996 and since they have not responded in any way about their intentions they will be deleted from the IFIP list.

Mr. Johnson said the Secretariat was now 2.5 people with the addition of Ilse Ockermueller in October 1999. This had enabled Dorothy Hayden to develop the Events Facilitator role as agreed by GA. The Executive Director's report will provide further details and **the Secretary** wished to commend the Secretariat for the valuable services that it provides.

The annual round of Officer elections will take place during GA 2000 in Beijing. At present, the following vacancies are known:

- President Elect
- 1 Vice President – Mr. Miura
- 3 Trustees – Messrs. Boyanov, Gergely, Ramani

All were eligible for re-election. Notice of any further vacancies will be given when they become known. Nominations will be called in accordance with the IFIP rules and **the Secretary** requested that everyone gives this matter serious consideration.

Finally, **Mr. Johnson** briefed Council on the two-day strategy discussion EB held in January 2000 at the ACM offices in New York. Among the major topics were marketing the role of IFIP and IFIP's 40th Anniversary, the effectiveness of GA/Council meetings, IFIP Congresses and cooperation with Industry. Most of these will be discussed under the various agenda items.

The Executive Director would prepare a target list of potential new member societies. A proposal was made to invite SEARCC and CEPIS to jointly organize an IFIP conference on "Professionalism in Informatics – Challenges and Opportunities" in 2001.

Mr. Rosenfeld wished to know whether the current level of 39 voting members was a matter of concern. **The Secretary** responded that the membership was stable and there were considerations of new schemes and activities to increase the number of IFIP Members.

Mr. Rosenfeld and **Mrs. Hammond** noted that it is important to have Russia and some of the former Soviet states engaged in IFIP. **Messrs. Brunstein and Nedkov** informed that there were new contacts with Ukraine and some of the Baltic States and hoped these will materialize in future membership. **Mr. Brunstein** further opined that stronger patronage support should be provided to IT societies in the Baltic States and Eastern Europe as a whole.

Mr. Boynton pointed that ACM and IEEE CS are expanding in areas in which IFIP is active and wondered whether such competition would affect IFIP's level of membership. **The Secretary** recalled that these two societies were based on individual membership while IFIP was a Society of societies.

Mr. Ausiello wondered why NZCS has withdrawn from membership. **The Secretary** said they were actually requesting a transfer from Full to Corresponding membership. **The President** believed that the cost of their participation in IFIP activities is probably one of the factors. However, if one takes into account the planned registration fee for a future SEARCC convention in New Zealand, it appears that regional costs are not lower. **Mrs. Hammond** confirmed that a major expense factor for participants from Australia and New Zealand is international travel costs.

[**Please note:** Ireland and Greece have paid all back dues and the current number of voting members, as at 15 March, is 41].

4.3.4 Executive Director's Report

Mr. Nedkov said the Secretariat is the IFIP clearinghouse and as such maintains regular contact with all IFIP entities. Given the fact that the Executive Director's report was on the Council web-site before the meetings and that the Secretariat was quite transparent in its activities, **Mr. Nedkov** wished to be brief in his report. All routine administrative matters since GA 99 in KL were handled promptly. The IFIP Information Bulletin was prepared and distributed. The Secretariat had assisted with the "This is IFIP" leaflet and with other documents and information materials. All IFIP activities -- events, publications and projects -- were supported and facilitated. In December, January and February the 1999 accounts were finalized for auditing. The information services of the Delivery Co. are appreciated by many. A half-time

administrative assistant was recruited in October 1999 and Mrs. Hayden was able to concentrate more on event management.

The Executive Director was thankful to Council members and TC Chairs, for their trust and support, which had permitted the Secretariat to function the way it did since GA 99. **Mr. Nedkov** was grateful to the Secretariats of ACM and IEEE CS for all their assistance in preparing the IFIP Council meeting in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Samways, on behalf of the TC Forum, wished to put on record the TC Chairs' appreciation of the work carried out by the Secretariat and their thanks for the support and positive developments.

4.3.5 EB Meeting Report

Messrs. Bollerslev and Johnson advised that EB had met in January 2000 and also prior to Council. Many issues were covered, among them the new format of GA and Council meetings, marketing, congresses, publications and digital libraries, industry and other. So as to avoid repetition these will be addressed under the respective agenda items.

Mr. Johnson said that the "ifip.org" domain is registered but not used by another organization located in London. The Executive Director and **Mr. Johnson** will pursue the possibility of having this domain for IFIP. **The Secretary** reported that there was a letter from the Eduard Rhein Foundation with a proposal for closer contacts and cooperation with IFIP. The IFIP President will respond favorably to investigate areas of interest. Finally, **Mr. Johnson** said a PowerPoint presentation of an Annual Report is planned in order to facilitate the reporting of IFIP GA representatives to their societies.

4.3.6 Treasurer's Report

Mr. Khakhar referred to his report and said that the IFIP Auditor had reviewed the 1999 accounts in February 2000.

The 1999 Result, after amortization and depreciation according to approved policies and after Special Funds Provisions, is a surplus of 459,359 CHF. The result is much better than the forecast of 200 K CHF made by the Treasurer at the General Assembly 99 in Kuala Lumpur.

Compared to 1998, the 1999 Result shows an increased Income, not accounting for the appreciation of CHF 319,511 in portfolio investment, while expenses have increased only marginally.

The Final Result, after Special Funds Provision of 66 K CHF, is an increase in IFIP's General Fund by 459 K CHF.

Key figures for the last five years are:

<i>(Amounts in K CHF)</i>	1999	1998	1997	1996	1995
<i>Income</i>	887	621	570	646	606
<i>Expenses</i>	357	327	327	345	447
<i>Result</i>	525	240	243	300	159
<i>Assets</i>	3000	2422	2156	1889	1520
<i>Liabilities</i>	169	189	138	126	58
<i>Funds</i>	2781	2182	2017	1763	1462

The **Total Income** was 887 K CHF, which is outstanding compared to the budgeted 587 K CHF. Income from Return on Assets, managed by UBS London since 1990, is 319 K CHF. However, this figure includes a difference of CHF 249 K between book value and market value of the portfolio investment and legal practice in Austria does not allow accounting profit without sales. IFIP's practice is to show both appreciation and depreciation of the portfolio investment on the Income side. Dues from Members were 318 K CHF, which is 38 K CHF above budget. Royalties from Publications decreased marginally compared to 1998 and are 16 K CHF below the budgeted 175 K CHF. Proceeds from IFIP Events are roughly the same as in 1998, not counting the proceeds for WCC 98.

Total Expenses were 357 K CHF, or 31%, below budget. This is due to savings in office expenses, administrative and technical supports. The total Secretariat expenses for 1999 were 252 K CHF, which is well within the allocated budget.

Expenses of the 12 Technical Committees were in total 40% below the budgeted amount and show considerable variations. 11 TCs had positive TC Fund balances available for 1999, and 2 TCs spent part of this balance during 1999. For 2000, 10 TCs have positive Fund balances available to the extent of 424 K CHF. The Technical Support expenses were 10 K CHF, or 75%, below budget, relating to AMB, TA and DCSC. The Special Activities Fund increased by 59 K CHF to the amount of 149 K CHF.

The Final Result, after Special Funds Provision of 66 K CHF, is an increase in IFIP's General Fund by 459 K CHF to 2,116 K CHF.

Council unanimously **ACCEPTED** the 1999 accounts for approval by GA 2000.

No amendments were proposed to the Year 2000 Budget as adopted by GA 99.

With regard to the preparations for the Year 2001 Budget, **the Treasurer** will take into consideration the 1999 Result and the 2000 Budget. In the process of preparations he will invite all IFIP budget holders to submit their comments and recommendations in written form well before the GA 2000 meetings.

4.3.6.1 Finance Committee Report

The FC Chair said IFIP is in a healthy financial state and most of the previously defined objectives were achieved. These included good management of Income and Expenses, maintaining a fund level of at least five times the annual expenses, developing the Return of Assets as an important income stream and maintaining bank deposits which do not exceed the budget.

Mr. Casaca was surprised that only 2 TCs had good results in terms of event proceeds during 1999. **Mr. Brunstein** was happy with the result but did not wish to see IFIP turning into a financial organization. In his mind, it would be important to invest into new activities. **Messrs. Granado and Aiken** agreed with the notion of "investing in activities" rather than spending. **Mrs. Hammond** felt that all TC Chairs should meet with the FC prior to Council and GA in order to get more detailed briefings on finances so as to understand how central funds can be used to support technical activities.

Mr. Granado continued by informing that several financial objectives remain to be accomplished. A reasonable income on bank deposits and a better cash flow management has to be ensured in order to optimize IFIP's investments and funds allocation. There was a need to reduce the number of current accounts and to open a savings account for term deposits. The Finance Committee wished to draw Council's attention to the over-heated status of the world capital markets, which might lead to a decrease of the portfolio in future. There was a discrepancy between the budgeted and actual "dubious dues written off". The Austrian support

for the operations of the Secretariat, which in 1999 was 40 K CHF, is now small in comparison with the Return on Assets.

Mr. Nedkov responded that a more precise figure for the Austrian financial contribution towards IFIP is likely to be roughly double the reported sum. Austria covers the rent for the IFIP premises and there are a number of organizations in Austria which are supportive of IFIP and its Secretariat.

Mr. Granado requested Council on behalf of FC to accept the 1999 audited accounts and to congratulate the Treasurer and the Secretariat for their excellent work.

Council **AGREED**.

[Please also refer to the Treasurer's report].

The FC Chair conveyed FC's support of the proposal for a new decreased level of membership dues [Please refer to Annex 1]. **Mr. Brunstein** opined that the scheme is an excellent future investment.

Mr. Granado said that FC had considered the existing levels of membership dues and proposes that there should be readjustments to the dues of several member societies as follows:

Austria	Cat. 2 => Cat. 3
Canada	Cat. 3 => Cat. 4
Czech Republic	Cat. 2 => Cat. 1
India	Cat. 1 => Cat. 2
Israel	Cat. 1 => Cat. 2
Italy	Cat. 3 => Cat. 4
Korea	Cat. 2 => Cat. 3
Portugal	Cat. 1 => Cat. 2

Council **DECIDED** that a letter should be prepared and sent to these societies explaining the dues structure and the reason for the proposed readjustments.

Mr. Granado proposed that these societies are offered the possibility of advance payments [by 25 August 2000] of their dues for the period 2001 – 2003 at the current level. This will give them the benefit of paying dues according to the readjustment only after 2003.

Council **AGREED**.

4.4 Technical Committee Reports

[Please be advised that the complete TC reports are available electronically at <http://www.ifip.or.at/minutes/c2000.htm>]

4.4.1 TC 1 Foundations of Computer Science

TC 1 homepage: <http://www.dis.uniroma1.it/~ifip-tc1/>

C 2000 report available at: http://www.ifip.or.at/minutes/c2000/tc1_report.htm

Mr. Ausiello referred to his report and said that the last TC 1 meeting was held on 5 May 99 in Atlanta, USA. The next TC 1 meeting will be organized in July 2000, in conjunction with ICALP 2000 conference in Geneva.

The TC 1 Chair was reelected by electronic ballot for a second term for the period 1.1.2000 – 31.12.2002.

15 National Societies have formally nominated their representatives to TC 1. These are from Austria, Bulgaria, China, Denmark, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Thailand, ACM and IEEE CS. All previous members are invited to meetings until

formal nominations and appointments are made. It was worth noting that countries with strong theory communities such as the Czech Republic, France, GB, India, Russia, Spain and the Netherlands have not yet nominated their representatives.

There is an active involvement of leading experts in the WGs and in most cases these groups are widely recognized. Major issues to report include the preparations of the First IFIP International Conference on Theoretical Computer Science, 17 – 19.8.2000, Sendai, Japan, awarding prizes to young conference participants and investigating the establishment of a general prize in the Theory field. TC 1 would like to see in future an active presence of theoretical issues during IFIP World Computer Congresses. Several scenarios were envisaged for Congress 2002 in Montreal.

The President wished to know the expected number of participants in the Theoretical Conference in Japan and **Mr. Ausiello** responded that the number was approximately 150.

On behalf of TA **Mr. Aiken** commended Mr. Ausiello for the excellent progress made so far.

4.4.2 TC 2 Software: Theory and Practice

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

C 2000 report available at: <http://www.cs.tut.fi/~rks/ifip/rep.c00.html>

Mr. Kurki-Suonio said that not much has happened since GA 99. The last TC 2 meeting was held on 19-20 June 99 in Munich, Germany and was attended by 17 representatives and WG Chairpersons. This year's meeting is scheduled for 5-6 June in Limerick, Ireland.

Since GA 99 there were two new TC 2 members from GB and Sweden.

Two books were recently published by Kluwer. TC 2 was involved in the organization of FM 99 in Toulouse in September, 1999. There were 295 papers submitted for the ICS 2000 Conference of Congress 2000, 108 out of which were international.

TC 2's WGs are active and involved in the organization of events. A *State-Of-The-Art* Seminar is planned for January 2001 in Bolivia.

Mr. Delman wondered whether there might be a possibility to start a new Journal in Software Architecture after such a WG is approved by TA. **The TC 2 Chair** believed this is good idea and was prepared to discuss it in further detail. **The President** agreed that this might turn into an interesting project.

4.4.3 TC 3 Education

TC 3 homepage: <http://www.edu.ge.ch/cptic/prospective/projets/ifip/>

Council 2000 report available at: http://www.ifip.or.at/minutes/c2000/tc3_report.htm

Mr. Samways informed Council that the 50th TC 3 meeting was held on 1-2 August 99 in Irvine, USA. The 51st meeting is planned for 24-25 November 2000 in Copenhagen, Denmark. Since last GA, there was a new Argentinean TC 3 representative and new WG 3.6 Chair and Vice Chair. A number of persons had special responsibilities.

TC 3 is active in planning and organizing two major conferences, namely ICEUT 2000 in Beijing and WCCE 2001 in Copenhagen where TC 3 also plans to have an "Industry Day". Preparations are underway for a conference in Chile in April 2000 and another in New Zealand, in July 2000.

Mr. Miura was pleased to note the "Industry Day" during WCCE 2001 and wished it success.

The first phase of the IFIP - UNESCO project for a Modular Curriculum in Informatics was completed and an UNESCO expert meeting in Vienna was held in February. A second phase envisages the involvement of ACM and IEEE CS to produce a global university IT Curriculum. It is hoped that this will result in sharing teaching/learning materials with colleagues from developing countries. TC 3 is also working on an "Elementary ICT Curriculum" which was recently commissioned by UNESCO.

Mrs. Hammond wished to know how the second phase of the Modular Curriculum would involve other TCs interested in the matter. **Mr. Samways** responded that WG 3.2 had plans and activities in the field before IFIP was invited to carry out this project. The idea for a new version was always there and contacts with ACM and IEEE CS were established. **Mrs. Hammond** was not satisfied as other TCs had a lot of experience and potential and it was strange that the two societies are mentioned but no efforts were made to identify other IFIP bodies. **Mr. Berleur** reminded Council that he had offered before TC 9's cooperation on this project and he is reiterating this offer now. **Mr. Casaca** said that TC 6 had nominated a representative for the Curriculum project but he had not been contacted and involved. **Mr. Samways** said that information was sent to all nominated TC representatives.

The TC 3 Journal on Education and Information Technologies continues into its 4th year and all IFIP Members were requested to support it with subscriptions. WCCE 2001 delegates will be offered a 1-year free subscription upon registration. The project for the Harmonization of Professional Standards in IT was on hold due to lack of funds in 1999. Only one meeting is envisaged for 2000 to take place in August. TC 3's WGs are active. The TC 3 web pages continue to expand with up-to-date information on TC 3 activities.

Mr. Nedkov noted that the conference in Chile is a good occasion to investigate Chilean membership. With respect to the Harmonization project he wished to know whether New Zealand's application for Corresponding membership would affect the status of the project leader. **Mr. Samways** confirmed that Chilean membership is investigated. As to the Harmonization project, it may well be necessary to search for another leader who will be available to undertake the work.

Mr. Aiken was pleased that the report contained the key TC 3 pages and encouraged other TCs to do the same when reporting.

Finally, **Mr. Samways** expressed a concern that there were no details of the availability of IFIP funds to support Congress 2000 participants from developing countries. [Please also refer to the discussion on this subject under item 4.7.1.]

4.4.4 TC 5 Computer Applications in Technology

Directory information: <http://www.ifip.or.at/bulletin/bulltcs/memtc05.htm>
Council 2000 report available at: http://www.ifip.or.at/minutes/c2000/tc5_report.htm

Mr. Aiken informed Council that the TC 5 report was most critical during the TA meeting. TC 5 was looking for another Chair and if any Council members have ideas about this they should get in touch with Mr. Doumeings. There were discussions about merging WG 5.2 and WG 5.3 and concerns about WG 5.6 but the discussion will continue at the TC 5 level.

4.4.5 TC 6 Communication Systems

TC 6 homepage: <http://www.ifip.tu-graz.ac.at/TC6/>
Council 2000 report available at: http://www.ifip.or.at/minutes/c2000/tc6_report.htm

The TC 6 Chair reported that the last TC 6 meeting was held in Szentendre, Hungary (29-30 August 99). The next meetings are scheduled for 13-14 May in Paris, France,

25-26 August in Beijing, China and 30-31 March 2001 in Cape Town, South Africa.

There were no changes in membership and officers since GA 99. TC 6 would appreciate to have nominations from Argentina, Australia, Egypt, Korea, Israel, Ireland, the Netherlands, Singapore and Thailand.

The President suggested that a matrix of national representation in all TCs might be of help to make societies aware in which TCs they are not represented. He wondered whether the Secretariat could develop such a matrix. **Mr. Brunnstein** thought that the Secretariat should not be directly involved in matters relating to substitution or appointment of TC representatives. **Mr. Berleur** said he also had difficulties in getting representatives from some countries and encouraged GA representatives to be active in this respect.

Mr. Casaca said all WGs are very productive in organizing events. A series of tutorials were held in Argentina and Paraguay and TC 6 intends to continue this practice in future. There were high level TC 6 conferences in South East Asia such as the Broadband Communications 99 in Hong Kong and Smartnet 99 in Thailand. TC 6, however, does not have a contact in India and there the TC 6 activity has decreased.

The TC 6 finances are in good shape and the officers are looking for ways to encourage new activities. Travel assistance was provided to speakers at conferences in Poland, Brazil and Thailand. Loans, student grants and funds for best paper awards will be available in future.

The TC 6 Chair felt that the marketing of IFIP Events at the national level by IFIP's Member Societies needs improvement. Since GA 99, Kluwer has published six TC 6 proceedings and everything seems to be going fine except for the pricing policy.

4.4.6 TC 7 System Modelling and Optimization

Directory information: <http://www.ifip.or.at/bulletin/bulltcs/memtc07.htm>

Council 2000 report available at: http://www.ifip.or.at/minutes/c2000/tc7_report.htm

Mr. Kall reported that the next TC 7 Business meeting will be held during the 20th conference on Systems Modelling and Optimization, 23 - 27 July 2001 in Trier, Germany. TC 7 and its WGs have several forthcoming events.

Referring to the previous discussion on attendance and representation, **the TC 7 Chair** felt the reasons range from lack of money to lack of interest and said that he has also tried to be proactive in looking for representatives. The TC 7 Vice Chair, Prof. Lasiecka now represents ACM.

Mr. Brunnstein noted the plans for a TC 7 Conference in Romania in 2001 and wondered whether there were any contacts on future Romanian membership to IFIP.

Mr. Nedkov said that Mr. Boyanov as an IFIP Trustee was in contact with representatives of the Romanian Academy of Sciences. The IFIP Secretariat has followed up with information on IFIP.

4.4.7 TC 8 Information Systems

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

C 2000 report available at: http://www.ifip.or.at/minutes/c2000/tc8_report.htm

Mrs. Hammond reported on behalf of the TC 8 Chair and said that the next business meeting is scheduled for 17-19 August 2000 in Hong Kong, China. One interesting issue on the agenda is how to deal with a WG that has reached the end of its lifecycle. TC 8 is involved in ICIS and has the intention to examine its role in the field of E-Commerce.

Mr. Brunnstein had the feeling that E-Commerce is an area in which many other TCs should be involved and was surprised that this has not happened. **Mr. Bauknecht** said that an IFIP conference on E-Commerce is planned to take place in Zurich during the fall of 2001. All TCs are invited to contribute.

4.4.8 TC 9 Relationship Between Computers and Society

TC 9 homepage: http://www.info.fundp.ac.be/~jbl/IFIP_tc9/index.html

C 2000 report available at: http://www.ifip.or.at/minutes/c2000/tc9_report.htm

Mr. Berleur reported that the last TC 9 meeting was held in June 99 in Stockholm and the next meeting was scheduled for 27 – 28 May 2000 in Cape Town, South Africa.

Since GA 99 there were new TC 9 members from South Africa, Slovenia and Austria. Membership remains under review and contacts were made with Member societies to encourage regular attendance. Mr. Holvast (NL) is the new WG 9.3 Chair since 1 January 2000.

During its last meeting (Stockholm, June 1999) TC9 initiated a descriptive framework for the so-called information/knowledge society. This activity is further referred to as the "TC9 Project" and a document of some 30 pages was circulated among TC9 members. A task force will progress this activity and will report back to TC9 at its next meeting in Cape Town, May 2000.

The list of forthcoming TC 9 events includes:

- The next in series "Woman, Work and Computerization" Conference, 8-12 June 2000 in Vancouver, Canada,
- HOIT 2000 Conference on "IT at Home: Virtual Influences on Everyday Life", 28-30 June 2000, Wolverhampton, GB, and
- Conference on Social Implications of Computers in Developing Countries, 24–26 May 2000, Cape Town, South Africa.

TC9 recommends that general-interest common sessions, relevant to the TC 9 scope of activities, are included in the technical program of IFIP Congress 2002.

4.4.9 TC 10 Computer Systems Technology

Directory information: <http://www.ifip.or.at/bulletin/bulltcs/memtc10.htm>

No Report.

4.4.10 TC 11 Security and Protection of IP Systems

TC 11 homepage: <http://www.ifip.tu-graz.ac.at/TC11>

C 2000 report available at: http://www.ifip.or.at/minutes/c2000/tc11_report.htm

Council took note of the TC 11 report.

4.4.11 TC 12 Artificial Intelligence

TC 12 homepage: <http://www.usc.edu/schools/business/atisp/AI/TC-12/>

Directory information: <http://www.ifip.or.at/bulletin/bulltcs/memtc12.htm>

C 2000 report available at: http://www.ifip.or.at/minutes/c2000/tc12_report.htm

Council took note of the TC 12 report.

4.4.12 TC 13 Human-Computer Interaction

TC 13 homepage: <http://www.ifip-hci.org>

C 2000 report available at: http://www.ifip.or.at/minutes/c2000/tc13_report.htm

Mrs. Hammond reported that the 16th TC 13 meeting was organized in conjunction with INTERACT 99 in Edinburgh. The 17th meeting is planned for 31 March – 1 April 2000 in Eindhoven, the Netherlands.

28 IFIP Full Members were currently represented in TC 13. There are new members from South Africa and Brazil and nominations from India and Singapore are expected. It was a concern that the Canadian representative did not attend meetings.

In 1999 the principal activity was the organization of INTERACT 99, hosted by the BCS and the British HCI Group. A total of 573 attendees from 34 countries had taken part in the full range of events including papers, posters, panels, laboratory overview and other. An exhibition was organized throughout the conference days. IOS Press published the conference proceedings. TC 13 was grateful to DCSC for providing a grant of CHF 4,000 to assist 5 participants from developing countries. The Brian Shackel Award was presented for the first time.

The TC 13 Chair said the TC 13 web-site is extensively redesigned and TC 13 now has a new domain. All WGs were active. The Conference Chair of INTERACT 2001 in Japan will present a status report at the forthcoming TC 13 meeting. TC 13 will be involved in the APCHI 2000 conference, which will take place in Singapore in November. TC 13 was gaining greater recognition with the successful series of INTERACT Conferences and with other activities of its WGs. New WG members are solicited and new activities will be initiated in future.

Mr. Boynton congratulated TC 13 for its ability to draw people from industry for the INTERACT conferences. The Congress 2002 Organizing Committee will investigate this experience. **Mrs. Hammond** said that the industry stream was indeed successful.

4.5 Technical Issues

4.5.1 Technical Assembly

Mr. Aiken referred to his report and informed Council that during the TA meeting the Executive Director and Mrs. D. Hayden were invited to make a presentation on the IFIP event management process with a particular emphasis on the activities of the Event Facilitator. The TC Chairs were pleased with the reports and commended the Secretariat for its work and activities. **Mr. Berleur** concurred and said that it is always a pleasure to do business with the Secretariat. He is happy with the fine working relationship.

The TA Chair reported that only one major annual TC report would be requested in future for GA. Only short updates would be expected for Council. These will cover activities between GA and Council and information on any other matters requiring TA decision. Most TCs had only one annual meeting and there is hardly a need to prepare a full report, which overlaps with the information previously presented at GA.

Mr. Aiken said it was agreed that the calculation of proceeds from the conferences in the Congress format would be based on the pro-rata registrations for individual conferences, whereby fifty percent of the proceeds from registrations less any DCSC grants or other direct IFIP costs would go to the respective TC. In case several TCs take part in the organization of a conference, they should between themselves decide how to split the TC share. It was further agreed that issues related to guarantees for payment of the minimum fee to IFIP are subject to the Congress contract under the overview of EB.

Mr. Aiken said TA had supported the TC 5 Chair's recommendation to dissolve WG 5.4. The TC 5 Chair will advise members of the former WG 5.4 to join other related WGs within TC 10.

With respect to the previously considered Risk Fund Committee to manage special project requests, TA was on the opinion that a simple procedure to consider special cases, which do not fall under the IFIP Event Guidelines, would be sufficient. A Risk Fund Committee could deal with any special proposals to participate in the organization of conferences which require a commitment to significant loss sharing.

Messrs. Brunstein, Berleur, Rolstadas and Johnson felt there was no need to create new ad hoc committees, as this will needlessly inflate the existing management structure. **Mrs. Hammond** thought submissions for such special proposals could be made in the normal way via the TC Chairs and the Secretariat to AMB. **Mr. Casaca** felt that the only difference would be that such proposals imply a degree of risk in absorbing a level of loss share in return of a percentage of the conference surplus. **Messrs. Brunstein and Berleur** stressed that in all cases such risks should always be considered as exceptions and would demand very special circumstances.

Council **AGREED** to the following formulation:

“Under very special circumstances TC Chairs can submit project requests to commit IFIP to a profit/loss sharing arrangement exceeding the provisions of the IFIP Event Guidelines. Such requests would be considered by the AMB Chair and the Treasurer and are to be submitted via the IFIP Secretariat”.

4.5.1.1 TC Forum

Mr. Samways reported that a number of useful meetings were held prior to Council. The TC Forum meeting with all Standing Committee Chairs was particularly useful as it had the advantage of addressing issues from the viewpoint of several committees and the meeting covered more in a joint session than would have been possible in individual meetings. On the other hand, no meeting was held with the Finance Committee prior to Council and TC Chairs felt that such a meeting would be very useful to clarify budget and other financial matters. Therefore, they request that such a meeting would be planned during GA 2000.

The TC Forum Moderator informed that Mr. Wibe, the IPC Chair for Congress 2002, had met with the TC Chairs to share his ideas concerning the Program and the International Program Committee. He had requested the TC Chairs to contribute in identifying the main themes of the Congress, which at this point he saw as a series of tracks rather than individual conferences. Delegates would register for the Congress as a whole and choose their own program within the format. Some concern was expressed with such an approach, nevertheless, the TC Chairs will interact with the IPC and OC Chairs in order to develop the program framework.

With regard to Publications, the TC Chairs would appreciate to receive further clarification with regard to Kluwer's pricing policy and royalties. The Publications Committee has agreed to prepare a written document on the subject. There are reports from WGs that Kluwer's prices are high, that 12 weeks lead-time is too long and that CD-ROMs are not easily available. The TC Chairs were of the opinion that better marketing of IFIP books is needed as they were marketed only to 7,000 libraries.

Mr. Delman clarified that along with the library sector, IFIP's proceedings are also marketed to individuals.

Mr. Samways reported that the TC Chairs were happy with the new “This is IFIP” Leaflet. **Mrs. Hammond** had volunteered to look at ways to incorporate individual TC information in the next version. Some recommendations were advanced that IFIP Members should invest more efforts in their countries to promote IFIP and that GA representatives should be proactive in

replacing “sleeping” members. It was also felt necessary to review the IFIP Awards and to make them relevant to the current circumstances.

4.5.2 AMB

Mr. Granado reported that the IFIP activity level during 1999, both in numbers and financially, was stable and drew attention to the following IFIP Events/AMB sponsorship statistics:

SPONSORSHIP as per 11. 2. 2000						
	TOTAL	FULL	MAIN	CO-	JOINT	OTHERS
1995	68	11 16.18%	37 54.41%	15 22.06%	2 2.94%	3 4.41%
1996	64	6 9.38%	34 53.13%	17 26.56%	4 6.25%	3 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	64	20 31.25%	25 39.06%	17 26.56%	1 1.56%	1 1.56%
2000	44	19 43.18%	11 25.00%	11 25.00%	3 6.82%	0 0.00%
2001	5	2 40.00%	2 40.00%	1 20.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%
2002	1	1 100.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%

The most important information relates to Full and Main Sponsorship.

For comparison, the reported 1999 registered events to Council 99 were 13 full, 15 main, 5 co-sponsored and 1 jointly sponsored event. Prospects for 2000 and beyond are good.

Mr. Rosenfeld was pleased that there was a comparison between the 1999 and 2000 figures for the same period of time.

4.5.3 Publications

Mr. Johnson reported on behalf of the PC Chair who had chaired the PC meetings but had to leave Washington just before Council. Major issues that were addressed by PC related to pricing and policy, including IFIP’s role as a disseminator of information, quality, target audiences sales and revenue expectations.

It was suggested that IFIP’s web-site pages should provide a link to “amazon.com” and references to IFIP proceedings with other publishers. The New Author’s Guidelines and Timeline are up and running and there are plans for more extensive marketing targeted at IFIP’s entities and conference participants. In future Kluwer will deliver information on the pattern of sales between individuals and libraries. The Digital Library project is an important initiative and IFIP needs to decide on the model that it wishes to follow.

Mr. Johnson invited Mrs. Lambert to deliver the Publisher’s Report. **Mrs. Lambert** reported that during the second half of 1999 16 new volumes were published and contracts were issued for another 20 volumes to be published in 2000/2001. It was pleasing that all pre-conference proceedings volumes in 1999 reached the conference venues in time. The contractual process has improved, Kluwer’s web-site at <http://www.wkap.com/ifip> was streamlined and there were a

number of other positive developments. A new agreement was reached for the TC 3 Journal on Education and Information Technologies. A moderate growth in sales, books published and revenues was observed as momentum continues to build up for the IFIP book series. Revenues for the last 6 months of 1999 totaled USD 333 K and for the whole of 1999 they were USD 589 K. Compared to the whole of 1998, there was an increase of 13,4% in the 1999 royalties to IFIP.

9 books were scheduled for publication in the first half of 2000 and 4 more manuscripts are expected in March this year. Kluwer's objective is to publish a minimum of 30 titles in 2000. Kluwer introduced its new bulk sale prices in December 1999 and looks forward to carry out a price elasticity experiment with the Database Security proceedings. There are plans to extend the promotional efforts within the IFIP community and ensure broader marketing.

[The full report is available online at <http://www.ifip.or.at/minutes/c2000.htm>]

Mr. Rosenfeld wished to know the terms of the new agreement for the TC 3 Journal. **Mr. Delman** replied that the ownership and copyright were transferred to Kluwer but would revert to IFIP if for some reason in future Kluwer decides to discontinue publication.

Messrs. Grafendorfer and Boynton reminded Council that in the meetings prior to Council it was noted that comparable books are available at a lesser price. Another problem that had been mentioned was that books do not reach a wide audience. **Mr. Delman** responded that the price elasticity project would be of help in evaluating the effect of lower pricing.

Mr. Casaca said that high prices and the fact that only about 200 copies are sold worldwide indicate that the cost factor should be taken seriously. **Mr. Delman** said that the performance of the series should also be evaluated on the background of a decreased conference attendance rate. **Mr. Reis** pointed that ACM and IEEE CS proceedings were cheaper and **Mr. Delman** said that may be so because these societies have a large income from membership subscriptions and do not have additional marketing costs while Kluwer has to work with Agents and cannot charge membership dues.

Mr. Rolstadas urged everyone to start thinking about higher quality rather than high prices. The main customers of IFIP proceedings are libraries. Individuals represent a secondary market segment. **Mr. Casaca** agreed that quality is important but there were WGs that find Kluwer publications expensive and will be forced to publish elsewhere.

Mr. Bollerslev informed Council that an agreement was reached with Kluwer to have the SEC 2000 proceedings included in the Congress 2000 CD-Rom.

4.6 Congresses

4.6.1 WCC 2000

Mr. Wah, Congress 2000 IPC Chair, presented the IPC and OC report which included update information on Congress developments, the electronic submission system, information on keynote speakers, special events and a schedule for the time until Congress 2002.

More than 2000 papers were submitted including over 700 from overseas attendees. The target attendance was 2000 including 800 from outside China. The OC was involved in many marketing efforts and IFIP and its member societies are requested to help promote Congress. Information on registration rates is posted on the Web and there were new rates for group registrations. An electronic submission system was introduced to assist paper reviews, comments and final submissions of camera-ready papers. So far Dr. Makoto Nagano (JP) and Prof. Sir Tony Hoare (GB) are confirmed as Keynote speakers. Several workshops, panel discussions, a Pioneer's Day, a Youth Forum and other events are envisaged. The following deadlines were set for further preparations:

- March 25 Authors notified of the status of their paper
- April 25 Camera ready papers submitted electronically to OC
- May 15 Advance program on the Web
- May 25 Proceedings sent to Publisher
- July 15 Final program on the Web
- July 30: CD-ROM with all conference proceedings ready
- August 19 Congress Press release
- August 21 Opening of IFIP Congress 2000

[Please note that the full report is available online at <http://www.ifip.or.at/minutes/c2000.htm>]

Mr. Rosenfeld was interested to know more about the process of submissions and how spelling and grammar will be corrected. **Mr. Wah** said that email submissions will be the normal procedure, however, in cases of extensive changes hard copies might be requested. **Mr. Aiken** confirmed that he has used the system and it works well. If there are too many corrections then one option is to suggest the paper for a poster session.

Mr. Johnson added that the review process follows a standard procedure and the only unusual element is that it is electronically based.

Mr. Samways informed Council that the ICEUT 2000 papers were uploaded on a site in Austria to facilitate review. **Mr. Grafendorfer** wished to know whether registered participants would have access via the Web to accepted papers. **Mr. Wah** responded that this should not be a problem.

Messrs. Johnson and Boynton observed that the percentage of US submissions was low. **Mr. Wah** believed this was due to the general trend of dropping conference attendance in North America.

Mr. Johnson requested that information with regard to registrations for accompanying persons should be provided.

Messrs. Aiken, Brunnstein and Berleur cautioned IPC to be careful in using and providing email addresses of potential participants as this is a privacy issue in addition to the data protection laws which vary from country to country.

4.6.2 WCC 2002

Mr. Boynton said that in Washington he had a series of discussions with the Congress 2002 IPC Chair, Jan Wibe. They are both committed to organizing a first class conference in Montreal and the intention is to work closely with the TCs. The Organizing Committee will soon define its objectives with regard to fund raising, sales force and “congress ambassadors”. It would be important to consult with the TC Chairs and define the Congress theme.

Mr. Nedkov said that there were many foundations in North America that support exchange agreements and schemes with Eastern Europe and developing countries. It would be useful if OC explores this channel to provide support to persons who normally would not be able to register and attend due to lack of funds.

Messrs. Brunnstein and Berleur opined that IFIP’s TC Chairs need a platform to enable them to be proactive. There should be a degree of flexibility in order not to have an overall theme imposed on the individual conferences. **Mr. Johnson** endorsed the idea that Congress 2002 should be a “happy mix” of events, which can be marketed as a whole and individually.

[Please also refer to item 4.5.1.1]

4.6.3 WCC 2004 invitations

The President advised Council that 3 invitations were received for IFIP Congress 2004. Israel had resubmitted its invitation for Jerusalem, and there are invitations for Toulouse, France and Cape Town, South Africa. EB had taken into consideration the pleasing fact that there is significant interest in hosting IFIP congresses. EB requested the President and the Executive Director to proceed with the site selection visits and to report back to GA on the status.

Mr. Rosenfeld wished to know what would be the role of the Site Inspection Committee and the President responded that both Mr. Nedkov and himself were members of that committee.

4.7 Standing Committee Reports

4.7.1 DCSC

Mr. Khakhar said DCSC supports the scheme prepared by the Executive Director and the DCSC Chair to introduce a new decreased level of membership dues for societies from small countries (ANNEX 1) and requests Council to endorse it for GA 2000 approval. The annual dues under this new category in 2001, if accepted by GA, would amount to 850 EUR, which is 50% of the current lowest level.

Messrs. Aiken and Brunstein liked the scheme and felt there would be unanimous support for this strategically important initiative. At the same time, they noted that a slight increase in the proposed 2001 dues for the regular categories was suggested. They felt that the dues levels should remain unchanged with the lowest new category set at 800 EUR instead of 850 EUR. **Messrs. Khakhar, Nedkov and Granado** clarified that the proposed minimal increase of 100 EUR per category actually is intended to partially offset the rounding-down in the transfer from CHF to EUR accounting and the current exchange rate.

In view of the good financial situation, Council **AGREED** to request GA 2000 to adopt the scheme with the lowest level set at 800 EUR and no change to the other categories.

Mr. Khakhar reported that IFIP's Full members from developing countries were entitled to use the Voucher scheme to buy IFIP books. DCSC recommends IFIP to consider providing subsidies to societies from developing countries hosting IFIP Council and General Assembly meetings to ensure that certain types of activities are organized during these meetings. CHF 30,000 are available to Congress 2000 to support international participants from developing countries with accepted papers. Finally, in April 2000 a symposium is scheduled in Syria and Lebanon and DCSC has agreed to support the travel expenses of two IFIP lecturers.

Mr. Samways was unhappy that meetings overlapped and made it difficult for some TC Chairs to attend DCSC. He was interested to have funds available to support IFIP conferences that are organized in developing countries.

Mrs. Hammond said that the DCSC grant provided to INTERACT 99 was put in good use but she felt that general guidelines and procedures how to administer such funds would prove useful. She felt that in addition to the voucher system DCSC should consider other activities to promote and provide access to IFIP books.

Messrs. Aiken and Samways felt that DCSC should administer the grant of CHF 30,000 for Congress 2000 and TC Chairs should have the possibility to apply directly. **The DCSC Chair** responded that it is normal practice to request the COC to administer such a grant and he would strongly oppose IFIP getting involved. **Mr. Brunstein** was opposed to last minute changes and felt the COC should exercise a tight control so that these funds are used efficiently. **The President** advised that EB would discuss the grant administration and will recommend a procedure to the Congress 2000 Organizing Committee.

4.7.2 Marketing

Mr. Grafendorfer drew attention to his report and said that the "This is IFIP" leaflet was printed and distributed. A pdf format is available from the IFIP URL. The 40th Anniversary of IFIP was a central event this year and MC encourages Member societies to include articles on IFIP in their publications. They may use parts of the leaflet or make contact with the Secretariat for further material.

Advertising was an issue, which was discussed before and it would be important to identify the audience to which such advertising is to be directed. One option is to consider engaging a commercial firm to organize this activity on behalf of IFIP. Advertisements could be included in the IFIP Newsletter, the Information Bulletin, in future issues of "This is IFIP" and in IFIP proceedings. During the Washington meetings MC felt that generating revenue from advertisements is not a high priority to MC. At the same time it would be useful to contact ACM and IEEE CS to see what arrangements can be made to publish information on IFIP activities in their media.

The MC Chair reported that new IFIP Congress guidelines were available for the bidding requirements, procedures, documents and helpful checklists. There are a number of other ongoing tasks related to marketing, which are carried out by the IFIP Secretariat.

Mr. Grafendorfer reminded of MC's report to GA 99 and said that IFIP should refresh its mission and provide what academia and industry need today. It should market its successes, for example its contribution to developing countries. During the MC meeting with the TC Chairs concerns were voiced that IFIP publications do not reach a wide audience. This is an issue which should be addressed by all Standing Committees. Another issue has to do with improving the information flow between member societies, TCs and WGs. GA representatives and TC Chairs should become IFIP advocates in their member societies so that IFIP's activities are better known and further outreach to other national institutions is ensured. Finally, **the MC Chair** said that the IFIP Executive Director would prepare a potential list of new members.

Mr. Johnson observed that MC is trying to identify channels rather than to develop messages. **Mr. Nedkov** also felt it should be within IFIP that the concept for a vision and messages are developed before any further action is taken. **Mr. Boynton** agreed and added that it is also important for MC to facilitate the process. MC will continue with its endeavors.

Mr. Reis was supportive of contacts with ACM and IEEE CS so as to ensure the use of their media to promote IFIP. **Mr. Brunnstein** cautioned that there are risks in more aggressive marketing as this may imply competition. **Mr. Aiken** agreed and said that a balanced approach should be achieved. MC should be realistic about what can be expected from IFIP's Members and there should be an understanding on matters related to competition.

4.7.3 Statutes and Bylaws

Mr. Bobillier referred to his paper concerning the proposed change from a "three quarters majority" to "two thirds majority" requirement. SBC recommends the following amendments to IFIP's Statutes and Bylaws:

Replace "three quarters majority " by "two thirds majority " in the following articles:

- Article 3.2 (page 7)
- Article 3.3.1 a) (page 8)
- Article 3.3.2 a) (page 8)
- Article 4.2.1, para. 3 (page 12)
- Article 4.3.1, para. 6 (page 14)

- Article 7 (page 16)

Mr. Berleur thought S & B need further tidying, i.e., there were different references to specialist groups, which in his mind were contradictory. **The SBC Chair** said he would investigate the references and would be grateful if any other matter implying change to the S & B is brought to his attention.

4.7.4 Admissions

[Please refer to Agenda item 3.3.]

4.7.5 IFIP-UNESCO Liaison

Mr. Nedkov said IFIP is an active Member of the NGO-UNESCO Liaison Committee, which recently had met with the new Director General of UNESCO. A project for a Joint NGO-UNESCO Committee on Communications and new Technologies is considered and hopefully would be launched in the near future.

The President and the TC 3 Chair had reported on projects and contracts for Curriculum development. **The IFIP-UNESCO Liaison Officer** wished to stress on regional cooperation. Contacts with UNESCO's Offices in Asia, Africa and Latin America were established. Regional support was solicited for IFIP Congress 2000 and other IFIP events such as the International Workshop on Virtual Education, Fortaleza, Brazil, 9 to 11 December 1999 and IFIP TC 3 WG 3.1 Conference "The Bookmark of the School of the future" in Vina del Mar, Chile, 10-14 April 2000. The Sector for Communication, Information and Informatics at the Paris Headquarters is supportive of disseminating information on IFIP. A link to the IFIP Congress 2000 web-site was provided.

Mr. Nedkov referred to the following useful UNESCO links:

- National Commissions: <http://www.unesco.org/general/eng/partners/commission/index.html>
- Communication, Information, and Informatics:
<http://www.unesco.org/webworld/en/ciiform.htm>
- List of NGOs with UNESCO: <http://www.unesco.org/general/eng/partners/ong/liste.html>

4.7.6 Internal Awards

Mr. Johnson informed Council that there was a paper on IFIP Awards. EB will review the Silver Core Award. The intention is not to change the rules but to develop a simpler and easier procedure for submitting and approving nominations. This will have to be addressed by GA 2000 in Beijing.

Mrs. Hammond opined that more awards are necessary in order to recognize volunteers who have significantly contributed to the activities of IFIP but are not eligible under the OSA and SC Awards. **The President** requested the TC Forum meeting in Beijing to address this issue in more detail.

4.7.7 IFIP Newsletter

Mr. Rosenfeld reported that the December 1999 issue of the Newsletter had not appeared in time and as a result the schedule for the next issue failed and there was no March 2000 Newsletter. The June Newsletter will appear as a combined March/June issue with approximately 20 - 24 pages and will contain the follow-up article on Auerbach. The Newsletter circulation is approximately 4,500 out of which 3,300 copies are sent to individuals and the rest in bulk goes to societies and event organizers. **The Newsletter Editor** was very pleased with the services provided by Kluwer and Mrs. Lambert.

4.7.8 Industry Committee

Mr. Miura drew attention to his report and said the Committee for Cooperation with Industry (CCI) had kept in regular contact. Some of its members had met in New York during the January EB meeting and also prior to Council. The following main issues requiring further action were identified:

Survey to find the ratio in IFIP between representatives of Industry and Academia

CCI plans to organize a survey to investigate the status of industry representation in IFIP's TCs and WGs. The following categories of membership are suggested:

- Industry(manufacturing/service)
- University/Education
- Government
- Others

Mr. Rosenfeld wished to know whether any action were taken so far. **Mr. Nedkov** responded that Council's input in the preparation is solicited and then a questionnaire will be prepared and sent out to IFIP's TC and WG Chairs requesting their feedback.

Mr. Brunnstein drew attention to the fact that the CII Chair's report contains only two sub-categories for industry, namely, manufacturing and service. In his mind, a broader definition is needed to include banks, portals, software and IT production and other.

Mr. Miura agreed and thought that insurance companies and consulting firms should also be accounted for.

"Industry" sessions during IFIP Congresses and main events

Mr. Miura had discussed this idea with Mr. Boynton with regard to Congress 2002.

"De facto standards" and TC/WG involvement

Mr. Miura said that "de facto standards" were very important in Today's interconnected world. While IFIP is not involved in the institution of standards, IFIP's TCs and WGs could address standardization issues that are "in the cradle". Issues related to interface, documentation, ontology, protocols and digital applications are very important.

Mr. Brunnstein felt that "de facto standards" often come from manufacturers and prove to be viable for very short terms. There is a niche for IFIP. **Mr. Aiken** wondered how IFIP should address this and **Mr. Brunnstein** encouraged the development of a process to enable IFIP's TCs and WGs to evaluate the areas, in which they could meaningfully contribute. He believed that one such area relates to program languages.

Mr. Kurki-Suonio said there were no problems for TC 2 to connect to research in industry but it was difficult to make contact with the middle layer management responsible for planning. **Mr. Brunnstein** felt that in standardization activities it was not essential to have contacts with the middle layer management.

Mr. Johnson believed it important to distinguish between "standards creation" and "reviewing of standards". **Mr. Rosenfeld** reminded Council that years ago IFIP had decided not to be involved in standards but only to consider activities related to pre-standards. **Mr. Nedkov** pointed out to the Council 97 discussion with respect to standards and possibilities for cooperation with ISO at the pre-standard phase. **Mr. Casaca** had some experience in the standardization field and said that basically it requires a professional approach. All such

activities need a professional attitude and he does not see how this can be organized on a volunteer basis.

Industry involvement in IFIP's TCs and WGs

Mr. Miura said that such issues as Standardization, Globalization and Social Implications are of interest to Japan and he would wish to have them considered by IFIP's TCs and WGs. **Mr. Berleur** cautioned that standardization and globalization were separate issues. **Mr. Aiken** felt that TCs and WGs were in their mandate to consider how to connect to Industry.

Finally, **the CCI Chair** suggested that some changes to IFIP's Statutes and Bylaws might be necessary in order to encourage representatives from Industry to join TCs and WGs.

4.8 Future Meetings

The Secretary advised Council of the following schedule of future meetings:

GENERAL ASSEMBLY/COUNCIL (and related meetings)

2000	GA	Beijing, China 26 - 29 August, 2000
2001	Council	Naples, Italy 4 - 8 March, 2001
2001	GA	Open for invitations
2002	Council	Open for invitations
2002	GA	Montreal, Canada (in conjunction with the 17th IFIP Congress)
2003	Council	Open for invitations
2003	GA	Bilbao, Spain (tentative)

Mr. Johnson invited Member societies to consider invitations for hosting future Council and GA meetings.

4.9 Other Business

Mrs. Lambert informed that Kluwer would be willing to sell to IFIP Members from developing countries IFIP proceedings at bulk price after 3 years from the date of publication.

4.10 Closing of Meeting

The President once more thanked the two hosting societies for their hospitality and efficient support. He said he was grateful to Council members and TC Chairs for their contributions and declared the Washington Council meeting closed.

5 ANNEX 1

PROPOSAL

For a scheme to introduce a new decreased level of membership dues for societies from small developing countries

Prepared by Dipak Khakhar and Plamen Nedkov

The current categorization of IFIP Member Societies is determined on the basis of the scale of assessment of the apportionment of the United Nations expenses. On this basis, IFIP has adopted five categories, as follows:

cat. 1	0.001-0.28%	UN scale of assessment	cat. 1
			[Societies as of the Year 2000 paying annual dues = EUR 1,600]
cat. 2	0.28%-0.83%	UN scale of assessment	
			[Societies as of the Year 2000 paying annual dues = EUR 3,200]
cat. 3	0.83%-2.50%	UN scale of assessment	
			[Societies as of the Year 2000 paying annual dues = EUR 4,800]
cat. 4	2.50%-7.50%	UN scale of assessment	
			[Societies as of the Year 2000 paying annual dues = EUR 6,400]
cat. 5	7.50% or more	UN scale of assessment	
			[Societies as of the Year 2000 paying annual dues = EUR 12,800]

During GA 99 in KL, DCSC and IFIP's Executive Board were requested to prepare a proposal with a cost analysis of how such a scheme can be implemented so as to enable smaller societies to participate as full members without disrupting the IFIP financial and management system.

The main track of thought was to consider a scheme based on an objective categorization such as the UN scale of assessment. The IFIP Treasurer and the IFIP Secretariat reviewed the Status of contributions of the UN regular budget as at 30 September 1999. Based on this review it is felt that the countries which can be termed as small (economically) and developing are basically those that fall within the 0.001 - 0.14 bracket.

With this in mind a recommendation is advanced to split cat. 1 in 2 parts as follows:

- a. **0.001-0.14%** of the UN scale of assessment
- b. **0.14 -0.28%** of the UN scale of assessment

and establish a basic unit fee of EUR 850 for cat a. The financial implications will be:

From the existing members -- Albania, Andorra, Bulgaria, Egypt, Iceland (if it were to upgrade from Corresponding to Full), Slovakia, Slovenia, Tunisia, Syria and Zimbabwe (if it were to upgrade from Corresponding to Full)-- would qualify for this cat. This would lead to a direct loss in income of EUR 5,250. However, as a result Zimbabwe (and probably Iceland) will apply for full membership.

If EUR 850 is accepted as the basic unit fee then the current cat. 1 (b) will be valued in the year 2001 at EUR 1,700 [or EUR 100 higher than the Year 2000 fee], which will also lead to a small increase in the levels of the other categories.

A tremendous impact would be that societies which cannot currently afford to pay the basic unit fee (the majority of UN members) will have a possibility to do so if the scheme is approved.