
This is a summary of my 45 minute call with Ms. Rosso. Items below are not necessarily in the order they were discussed.

1) There is going to be a new By-Laws and Organizational review committee form, and I have been invited to participate. I agreed to do so, after the Special Meeting and vote is held on the by-laws proposals for which I have submitted petitions. I am not willing to abandon those efforts in place of just sitting on this committee.

2) The petitions are still being validated. Perhaps by the end of next week I should have an answer. I noted that I have another 20 or 30 I can submit that came in after my additional submission. If you are a current member and have not signed the petition, please do so at <https://jsweb.net/isc2>.

3) Supposedly there are "legal" issues with my proposals. She will send me written details. One she mentioned is my Proposal #8 adds a section 12 to part IX of the existing by-laws, where there currently only 10. I don't see the big deal in renumbering, or noting that there is no section 11. I also pointed out that since I put forth 9 proposals, invalidating 1 of them should not invalidate the other 8. I'll update after I see what the "legal" issues actually are.

4) There was a lot of discussion about transparency or the lack thereof, and lack of trust in the Board and in the General Counsel. I noted the many perceived lies that have been told regarding the latest election and the By-Laws vote.

1. October 19th BrightTalk session. Zach Tudor noted that the Board was "taking the approach to communicate". He said the proposed changes were communicated to members prior to the vote. I told Clar that I contacted every single US chapter of the ISC2 to urge them to vote against the by-laws, and those I heard back from, not a single one of them had been contacted, including the National Capital Region chapter, which I think is the closest to the Alexandria offices of ISC2. I did not see any draft proposals on the ISC2 Community Boards, on the /cissp or /cybersecurity boards of [reddit.com](https://www.reddit.com), in the cissp group of LinkedIn, or posted to the cisspforum@groups.io. So where was the advance communication? She did not have an answer. The members of the Board have never used any of those methods of communication with the exception of a few introducing themselves. As far as any substantive contact with the Board, there has not been any.
2. The email sent by ISC2 on Nov. 1st that gave the names of the 5 candidates for election, noted the open nomination process and stated that more than 80 people had been interviewed by the Nominating Committee, but in fact, only 15 were actually interviewed.
3. In the Dec 14th BrightTalk Session, Zach Tudor noted (paraphrased), " There was a concerted effort to vote this down without understanding the need for it. If we had gotten constructive feedback, it would have been better." I asked how he expected to get constructive feedback when an all or nothing submission was given to the membership to vote on, with no opportunity to provide any constructive feedback to change anything.
4. I've asked to see a number of formal policies of the organization starting with the policy

not to disclose vote totals in Board elections. I've been told by the General Counsel that it is policy not to provide copies of such policies. I asked to see that policy, and was told that the organization does not provide copies of policies to anyone except those they choose to publish. I pointed out that I thought that was "bullshit".

5. The "policy" of the organization of sending out an email on behalf of petitioners was changed without notice. Only when several of us asked to have said email sent in accordance with the Election FAQ where we told the rules had changed. The Election FAQ was changed the next morning. I have no idea if the Board made this change or Graham Jackson just decided this on his own.
6. Jill Say in the Sept. 6th BrightTalk session said, "We were never in the situation where we had to exclude really good people as far as I am concerned." This was in reference to narrowing down to a slate of 5 people. I noted that I was personally insulted by that, and I'm sure that there were more than 5 "really good people" in the 87 that were nominated.

The bottom line is I do not trust Graham, and I do not trust the Board. I don't know if that trust can ever be regained. Any time your trust is lost, personal or professional, it takes a lot of work to regain that trust.

5) I have been invited to meet with Clar at the Alexandria office later in January and she said she would show me any policy I want to see. I have to get back to her with a proposed date and time.

6) Clar is going to try to get me the total number of write-in votes received, valid or not, and the lowest number of votes received by a successful candidate, without giving any names for the candidates (successful or write-in).

7) I brought up Joe Duffy's issue about recertification often lapsing online simply due to a lack of the new expiration date not being updated. I said there is no reason why if AMFs and CPEs are all up to date 30 days before expiration that 3 years can't be added to the expiration date so that no lapse occurs. I understand if someone waits until the last minute to pay their fees that a lapse may occur, but that would be on them. Given the 60 day window for completing this, those that are early should never see a lapse. She agreed and said she would look into this issue.

8) I noted that the bio's for the director candidates were rather sparse. Given the level of data that every candidate supplied to the Nominating Committee, including answers to questions, resumes, and letters of recommendation, surely the bios could have been more detailed so that we would know the qualifications of those on the election ballot. She did not know why the bios were like they were.

I'm sure I'll have more opportunities to talk to her. Feel free to share any concerns with me that you would like to be brought up.

Steve Mencik
