

X-Sieve: CMU Sieve 2.2
X-Sender: cashe@hesiod (Unverified)
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.1
Date: Sat, 30 Aug 2003 23:06:45 -0400
To: Jeanette Fershtman <jfershtm@mit.edu>, <mac-houseteam@mit.edu>,
<macdesk@mit.edu>, <thebulb@mit.edu>, <kumpf@mit.edu>, <nealm@mit.edu>,
<bashir@mit.edu>, <smeri@mit.MIT.EDU>
From: Colin Ashe <cashe@MIT.EDU>
Subject: Re: follow up e-mail
X-Spam-Score: -3.9
X-Spam-Flag: NO
X-Scanned-By: MIMEDefang 2.28 (www . roaringpenguin . com / mimedefang)

Hi,

I just talked to Mike and you all should have gotten his email about the position of the GRTs. In addition to the arguments that Mike made, it should be noted that as one of the parties to whom the apology is addressed in the first bulleted point, it doesn't make sense for GRTs to also be included as authors of the letter. If the letter were only to explain how the rush process worked and to express our commitment to finding a better solution for next year, then I would gladly be named on the letter. However, as the letter is currently constructed, if we were to be included, we would be apologizing for something over which we had no control or responsibility. So, unless the letter is completely reconstructed to be only a letter of explanation and expression of commitment for the future (which I do NOT advocate), I think it is best if GRTs' names are left off the letter.

Colin Ashe
E-Entry GRT