

Review of Minutes Regarding Confidentiality Guidelines, Jan. 2005 thru Apr. 2009

In the official records, in the minutes of both the GC & EC, there is no discussion, record or motion of a vote regarding the Confidentiality agreements posted on the web-site. Now in July 2007 we do find:

“Confidentiality agreement. Steve Dreier, John Hay, and John Hales will work on a confidentiality agreement for our review. John Hales will chair this committee.”

Yet interestingly enough, the Guidelines posted on the web-site list as “Approved by General Council July 9, 2006.” Not 2007 or 2008, is it a typo?

When asked – no one could remember.

Records Reviewed:

GC Jan 28, 2005	no mention of GC Confidentiality Guidelines
EC Apr 07, 2006	no mention of Confidentiality Guidelines
EC Jul 06, 2006	noting
GC Jul 09, 2006	a number of Constitutional amendments, no GC Confidentiality Guidelines
EC Oct 22, 2006	no mention of Confidentiality Guidelines
EC Feb 08, 2007	nothing
GC Feb 09, 2007	a number of Constitutional amendments, no GC Confidentiality Guidelines
EC Apr 13, 2007	nothing
GC Jul 22, 2007	no mention of GC Confidentiality Guidelines
EC Jul 22, 2007	Confidentiality agreement. Steve, J. Hay, and J. Hales will work on a confidentiality agreement for our review.
EC Oct 12, 2007	Amendments, no mention of Confidentiality Guidelines

EC Nov 07, 2007	Budget, no mention of Confidentiality Guidelines
EC Jan 24, 2008	noting
GC Jan 25, 2008	noting
EC May 02, 2008	other P&P's, but noting on Confidentiality
EC Jul 02, 2008	nothing
GC Jul 06, 2008	Internet Privacy, Conflict of Interest passed, Promotion Policy failed, but nothing on Confidentiality
EC Oct 17, 2008	nothing
EC Jan 22, 2009	nothing
GC Jan 25, 2009	nothing
EC Apr 24, 2009	nothing

Over the years, folks have been accused of breaching confidentiality. Now it is found, the issue was never deliberated, wordsmithed, or agreed upon.

As I reviewed those minutes, I noted to myself these are good minutes, the Secretaries have done a good job, the minutes are well written, with good detail. Had there been a discussion & vote concerning confidentiality, I find it hard to believe that these Secretaries would have missed noting such an important motion and the resulting proceedings.

The Secretary believes, "in my opinion, the policy statement currently on the website in the Admin section - Executive Committee Confidentiality Guidelines - is the current policy on that subject. Any change will require approval by the EC".

On what bases is this conclusion made?

In order to agree with the current Secretary, we must first acknowledge that:

1 - The previous Secretaries failed completely to record the motion(s), any hints of the discussion, or the vote tally.

2 – When these minutes were approved, a review by all board members failed to catch the missing discussions & motion. (Including the those who made and seconded the motions)

3 - These same failures, regard essential the same document, occurred not once, but twice. Once in the GC and once in the EC. So they had to involve at least 2 different secretaries and 2 different board meetings, committing the same exact error.

I find such a combination of occurrences unrealistic and difficult to accept. And finally, while both documents are very similar, enough so to assume they were drafted by the same author, they do differ in content, in that the EC document has additional clauses.

Therefore, I can only conclude that these Documents have never been reviewed, revised, deliberated or voted on by the GC or the EC and therefore they are invalid and should be removed from the web-site as soon as possible. I would further suggest that the EC send to the P&P committee these documents for appropriate processing before the EC & GC votes on them.

Until then, there are no valid confidentiality agreements for the GC or the EC. Folks, I guess we just going to have to trust each other.

Thank You,

Lenny Cowles

