

Financial and Political Manipulation of LEC by Chairman Van Dommelen ---- Part II ----

To : Anyone interested in LEC (the Leuven EMTP
Center at K. U. Leuven in Leuven , Belgium)

From : Dr. W. Scott Meyer , Co-Chairman
Canadian / American EMTP User Group
The Fontaine , Unit 6B
1220 N. E. 17 - th Avenue
Portland , Oregon 97232 ; U. S. A.

Date : 16 November 1993

IX . Introductory Summary

LEC is the Leuven EMTP Center of Leuven, Belgium. As explained in a preceding, 28-page memorandum of the same title that was dated September 10th, Chairman Daniel Van Dommelen has been involved in some highly-irregular financial and political manipulation this past year. In a 5-page letter dated October 22nd, which seems to have been sent to all LEC members, Chairman Van Dommelen defends his management of LEC. To those who do not examine details closely, it might be convincing. Naturally, this writer is going to examine Chairman Van Dommelen's latest writing **very** closely. That is the main reason for writing this second memorandum.

But before discussing what Chairman Van Dommelen wrote, let's note those subjects of the preceding 28-page memorandum that Chairman Van Dommelen did **not** explicitly challenge or address :

Section IV-B : Deceptive treatment of equipment depreciation by LEC ;

Section IV-C : LEC short course income that does not go to LEC ;

Section IV-D : EMTP Newsletter : when was it an LEC publication ?

Section IV-E : Estimating hidden (undisclosed) LEC income ;

Section VI-A : The voting rights of LEC members (democracy) ;

Section VI-B : The questionable honesty of K.U. Leuven publications .

The fourth of these (hidden LEC income) is disputed, but not specifically. Chairman Van Dommelen merely

resorts to general verbal denials --- the unconvincing "I have done no wrong" sort of defense.

Numbering of sections and pages of this present memorandum is a continuation of the numbering used for the original. This not only avoids confusing duplication, it also allows later reference to either part without mention of which part. To avoid any ambiguity, when referenced in later sections, page numbers of this writer's original memorandum will be preceded by the same acronym FPM that was used by Chairman Van Dommelen. This would seem to be constructed from the title.

After a detailed review of Chairman Van Dommelen's letter in the following lengthy Section X, the reader can find news about a replacement EMTP user group for Europe in Section XI .

X . Review of Chairman Van Dommelen's Letter of October 22

In natural order, consider some of the more controversial statements of Chairman Van Dommelen's 5-page letter dated October 22nd. For the record, the copy received here in North America by LEC member Laurent Dubé was mailed more than a week later (the postmark included the date October 28th) .

Point 1 : Chairman Van Dommelen refers to *"preposterous and unjust allegations presented by Dr. Meyer."* We will return to consider this characterization at the end, after a detailed analysis of Chairman Van Dommelen's arguments.

Point 2 : Chairman Van Dommelen claims about the 28-page memo that *"Dr. Meyer did not even address a copy to LEC."* It is true that no copy was addressed to either the Chairman or the Manager of LEC. Instead, a copy was sent to lawyer Hans Claes, the Administrator of K.U. Leuven R&D. Recall that Mr. Claes is the man who signs LEC membership agreements, and who acts *"as the mandatory of Professor Dr. ir. D. VAN DOMMELEN"* (quoted from a 1991 copy of the LEC membership agreement). In letters dated September 16th, it was Administrator Claes who notified LEC members that their agreements were being terminated at the end of the year. So, the Can/Am user group mailed a copy to Administrator Claes. What is Chairman Van Dommelen's complaint about this? Is it possible that LEC's lawyer did not immediately notify Chairman Van Dommelen promptly? If so, it is not this writer's fault.

After complaining as he does about not personally being sent a copy of this writer's original 28-page memorandum, do you suppose Chairman Van Dommelen had a copy of his own letter sent to this writer? If he did, it must have been lost in the mail, or sent by surface mail! For the record, no copy has been received from Leuven as of November 16th. However, unlike Chairman Van Dommelen, this writer is not complaining, since he has contacts who notify him promptly when such important mail is received.

Point 3: Chairman Van Dommelen claims that *"LEC has been run in a most prudent way and complied with the legal requirement to build up proper workman's compensation for LEC personnel."* Yes, all that unreported income certainly must have built up a proper reserve. This was estimated in Section IV-E on pages FPM-11 through 13. But what legal requirement was being followed, and how much money did LEC accumulate? Members are still waiting for answers to this question. They also would like an explanation for why such accumulations have never been explained. Reread the second paragraph on page FPM-8. The distinction between prudent management and fraud is the size of the hidden income, and the reason details have been withheld from the paying members. Without verifiable supporting numbers, Chairman Van Dommelen's words are worthless.

Point 4 : Chairman Van Dommelen refers to a *"total demotivation to conduct any longer a service center for Dr. Meyer's ATP after this disparaging message."* If the truth hurts, this writer pleads guilty. LEC management has done a lot of wrong things. But since when has LEC been doing things *"for Dr. Meyer's*

ATP?" People who sell expensive memberships (\$3800/year) rather than distribute the program at cost, who hide income during 4 months of the year, and who deny democratic rights of membership agreements --- any and all such persons clearly have not been serving either this writer or ATP. Rather than doing things **for** this writer and ATP, LEC has for several years been doing things **to** this writer and ATP. They have been using ATP to serve themselves. Rather than an ATP service center, in recent years LEC might more accurately be characterized an ATP **dis**-service center --- an organization that now is known to have betrayed the political and financial trust of its members.

Point 5: *"No funds disappear mysteriously"* is the title of Section 1.1. Yet, Chairman Van Dommelen does confirm that left-over funds disappear at the end of each year. Since the amount is unknown, and the destination is unknown, this qualifies as a mystery. Consider Chairman Van Dommelen's defense of LEC's outrageous and irresponsible practice: *"the agreement stipulates that only a cost break-down and a statement of income shall be presented for a given year. Since the unspent funds do not represent either an income or a cost, they are not included in the yearly reports."* This completely ignores the problem of hidden income. Had LEC honestly reported income during more than 8 months of the year, members themselves could compute what was left over at the end of each year. LEC management is responsible for the mystery by its own defective accounting practices. For years, members were not told that LEC was accumulating money, and today still have not told how much. By refusing to acknowledge the existence of a problem, Chairman Van Dommelen seems now to be admitting that LEC made its famous accounting error (of hiding income) deliberately. In other words, the accounting errors were intentional rather than accidental.

An alternative perspective comes to mind after further thought about the preceding paragraph. If the previously-unnoticed disappearance of funds at the end of the year is not a real cost of the user organization, what is? Retail stores lose merchandise to theft by customers and employees, and this is considered a cost of doing business. Why is the disappearance of any money not a cost? If it is not a cost, what is it? Where did the money go? If it really went to a trust account for workman's compensation, why is this not a cost the same way employee wages are? Certainly this writer's interpretation of LEC's contractual obligation (Article 10 requires LEC to *"present a yearly cost break-down and statement of income"*) would be that all money must be accounted for. What honest person would expect less?

Once again, Chairman Van Dommelen raises the defense of workman's compensation. But this is meaninglessly self-serving without supporting numbers (he supplies none). Re-read paragraph 2 on page FPM-8. New information does now emerge, however. Chairman Van Dommelen now claims in writing that *"every unspent franc is still there and no 'unknown beneficiary' has disappeared with the 'hidden income'."* If one believes this, the next question is obvious: when will LEC publicly disclose the amount of money being held, and the ultimate destination of all funds? Is LEC committed to reporting details of any later transfers involving these funds? In the third paragraph on page FPM-8, this writer asked: *"what would prevent LEC management from diverting most of this at some later time (e.g., after the closure of LEC)?"* This writer must observe that Chairman Van Dommelen does not answer this question. Should disposition of the money occur before the end of the year, members might hope for some accounting according to Article 10. But if payments were made after the end of the year (when all existing LEC membership agreements are scheduled to expire), this writer wonders how the average LEC member ever would know the amount and destination of presently-held funds. If any of this writer's money were involved (fortunately, it is not), he would be indignantly angry about Chairman Van Dommelen's sanctimonious and self-righteous defense of his continuing secrecy regarding the accumulation of fees paid by members.

This argument about LEC using a *"state controlled university account"* is more appropriate than Chairman Van Dommelen intended. Rather than provide a believable defense, the university connection clearly was part of the problem. LEC was able to hide income as long as it did only because no one on the outside ever suspected the possibility of such an irresponsible act at a state-controlled institution. It was precisely the preposterous nature of the action that allowed it to pass unnoticed for years. Had LEC been organized by

unknown private individuals having no connection to a reputable university, long ago money would have been scrutinized much more closely by members.

Point 6 : Chairman Van Dommelen's latest explanation of the 4 months of unreported income seems to be a marvel of confusing verbiage. This appears in Section 1.2: *"the reported income is based on the invoices, not on the actually collected payments. As bulk invoicing of all members is done in the beginning of the year and prior to the reporting, all this potential income as been included in the reports."* No problem so far (this seems plausible). But let's resume the quotation for its erroneous conclusion: *"It is thus irrelevant at what time of the year or even in what year a member would actually pay."* Wrong, wrong, wrong! This failure to consider details of hidden income demonstrates LEC management to be either unbelievably stupid and naive, or dishonest. Should members prefer one over the other?

Paragraph 2 on page FPM-5 includes an insertion that illustrates specifically how LEC hid income during 1988. The *"bulk invoicing"* just mentioned corresponds to the first of the four lines. No problem with this. But what about the subtraction of line 4 for members who had not paid by the end of August, Professor? Below the table on page FPM-5, this writer asked: *"when and where will such fees be reported when later they might be collected? The answer is shockingly simple: generally nowhere!"* Chairman Van Dommelen does not address this or any other of the specific, detailed accusations of financial errors anywhere in his writing. *"It is thus irrelevant ?"* No, Professor, it is **not** irrelevant --- because of the deceptive and erroneous way LEC reported its income (during only eight months of a year). Your continuing refusal to explain or deny the evidence of deceptive and erroneous LEC accounting is revealing.

While failing to provide any specifics, Chairman Van Dommelen continues with vague, general assurances: *"a comparison of LEC's yearly reporting of membership fees with the income in the K.U. Leuven R&D accounts, proves that the reporting has achieved a remarkable completeness, as will be shown at the next closed meeting."* Really! The same people who forgot to report income during 4 months of the year, and who at this late date refuse to even acknowledge the obvious error --- these same people now have proven a *"remarkable completeness?"* Precisely because LEC management can not be trusted with money, any such verbal assertion without verifiable numbers must be discounted as being worthless. This is why the Can/Am user group demanded *"a professional, independent audit of all LEC income since its inception in 1985"* (see final paragraph of Section VI). Chairman Van Dommelen does not respond to this demand. Instead, Chairman Van Dommelen says that LEC's *"remarkable completeness ... will be shown at the next closed meeting."* This writer now must wonder: is the final presentation to be for all years, or just for 1993? Article 10 of the LEC Agreement requires *"a yearly cost break-down and statement of income,"* which in the past has been interpreted to mean just the current year. For the past 8 years, such annual accounting has ignored income during 4 of the 12 months. The reader can only wonder whether possibly, for this ninth and final year, the report might be complete and honest? Maybe, now that the secret of hidden LEC income is known to all, and many angry members might be expected to verify any future LEC accounting. But note carefully that complete accounting for just 1993 should be unacceptable to members because it would leave uncorrected the defective accounting of the preceding 8 years.

Point 7 : *"The estimated amount of the reserves is not at all 'staggering'"* according to the title of Section 1.3. Chairman Van Dommelen makes the following accusation: *"Dr. Meyer conveniently forgets that in Lisbon LEC has reported a predictable substantial loss of 1 866 732 BF (Belgian Francs) for the last months of 1992."* How did this writer *conveniently forget* such a detail? He did **not**. If tradition is followed, income and expenses for the final 4 months of 1992 will appear along with the 1993 accounting, which should be presented at the 1993 meeting. What reason is there to believe that anything is missing from LEC's official estimate dated December, 1992 (see last paragraph on page FPM-11)? This writer merely reproduced numbers given to the Steering Committee by LEC management. Note that this writer's estimate of LEC's 1993 yearly profit (1608K) is actually slightly smaller than the figure for 1992 (1615K as shown at the top of page FPM-13). We now are to believe that somehow LEC has lost an extra 1867K during 1993? This writer does not believe

it, and Chairman Van Dommelen does not demonstrate it (his figures are pathetically irrelevant), as the following paragraph will explain.

What happens during the final 4 months of each year, according to official LEC accounting? First, there is no income from members who pay late (after August). This is LEC's old problem of failing to record such payments during 1/3 of each year as detailed on pages FPM-5 through 7. Second, LEC has salaried employees who are paid about 1/3 of their annual salaries during this final third of the year. LEC claims that this amounts to 1486K. Finally, there are miscellaneous expenses and income (smaller amounts). The total is -1867K, which Chairman Van Dommelen calls *"a predictable substantial loss"* (see preceding paragraph). Predictable? Yes. A loss? No. It is nonsense to characterize this negative number as a loss. LEC has suffered no loss. Remember, LEC operates on an annual basis, and it expects every member to pay its entire yearly fee within the first month of the year. Long before the final four months of the year, LEC already has money in the bank to cover expenses of all later months. Once again, Chairman Van Dommelen is telling a story backwards. If LEC spends money **after** it collects the money rather than before, LEC is the **beneficiary** (the recipient) rather than some kind of charitable **benefactor** (the giver of a gift). This should be obvious to anyone with common sense. It explains why financial banks can be profitable : they hold other people's money. Money can be invested to grow with time, and --- sudden inspiration --- this would seem to represent yet another source of possible hidden income for LEC. Yes! Eureka! Where does LEC report growth of the money, obtained from LEC members, that it has been holding secretly? The answer is obvious : nowhere.

We now know three ways LEC has secretly accumulated money that is paid by members: 1) unreported late payments during the final 4 months of each year; 2) unreported new memberships during the final 4 months of each year; and 3) growth of membership fees that could be invested somewhere. This third and final item escaped this writer and other critics previously. Considering the compounding of interest (exponential growth), a lot of money could be involved. Why? Because LEC has been accumulating large amounts of unreported income. Let's discuss the possibilities in general terms. Of course, money that is needed in a few months typically is kept in a bank, and the rate of interest paid for such deposits often is small. But money held for longer periods typically is much more profitable. In the USA, pension funds commonly invest the savings of their members in business as financial equity. Large shopping malls are common investments, as are the stock markets. Now, American stocks have averaged more than 15% annual gains for both the last 5 years and also the last 10 years ending in 1992 as measured by the S&P 500 index. As a crude estimate of how much money might be involved, suppose those LEC profits shown on pages FPM-12 and 13 had been invested at a constant, 15% annual rate of return. Instead of the total for all years being 6708K, this would have grown by the end of 1993 to a little over 10 million francs --- more than 50% larger than the previous estimate.

Point 8 : *"Repaying of the loans taken out nine years ago from university funds at the start of the LEC adventure"* is the way Chairman Van Dommelen ends Section 1.3. Is this not evidence of yet more defective LEC accounting? If interest on loans was being paid, why would it not appear in the annual accounting? Unlike LEC's artificial depreciation, real interest is a legitimate business expense. If LEC bookkeepers were honestly doing their duty, why would they not include interest paid in their *"yearly cost break-down"* as required by Article 10? Since Chairman Van Dommelen provides no numbers, it is impossible to know whether any such payments might be consequential. Also, there is no clear indication of who took out the loans (was it really LEC?). In the absence of numbers and names, Chairman Van Dommelen's latest revelation should not inspire substantial sympathy, in this writer's opinion.

Point 9 : *"In Lisbon no figures have been used to challenge LEC."* This title and the following writing of Section 1.4 vehemently deny having been confronted in Lisbon with figures like those in Section IV-E (pages FPM-12 and 13). This writer wrote the following sentence on the last line of page 3: *"This is the function of Section IV, which reveals written estimates similar to what were used to confront LEC Chairman Van Dommelen in Lisbon that Saturday in June following the European spring meeting."* Chairman Van Dommelen is correct that this sentence is in error. This writer wants to correct the error now by replacing the single word

used by the word *prepared* .

It was Mr. Dubé who reported to this writer about information that had been prepared, but that never was used, apparently. While this writer was talking to both Mr. Dubé and Prof. Correia de Barros on the telephone November 8th, he heard both agree that the prepared figures had not been used. Why not? This writer was told that errors were discovered at the last minute, and that, in any case, there already had been more than enough argument. To conclude, this writer thought he was giving proper credit to others for an earlier public exposure. He should instead have given credit to a private presentation that was not actually shared with all 13 persons attending the meeting. Chairman Van Dommelen's objection is sustained : In Lisbon, the prepared estimates were **not** shared with the two LEC representatives.

Is it important that the prepared materials were not used? Are LEC managers any less guilty of hiding money from members because they first saw the figures in this writer's September memo rather than during the June meeting in Lisbon? Why does Chairman Van Dommelen make the erroneous attribution seem so important? He says this writer *"reports incorrect information. Erroneous reporting of facts by Dr. Meyer is thus patent ..."* Chairman Van Dommelen is indignant because this writer credited someone else with being the first to confront him with detailed estimates of hidden LEC income? Note carefully that it is **not** the accusation about LEC's financial irregularities that is incorrect, or any way in error. Chairman Van Dommelen's continued indignation is amusing in its exaggeration: *"the few discontented 'critics' apparently have preferred to get outside help ..."* Enough, please! Mr. Dubé made a stupid but honest mistake (forgetting a detail of the argument) that does not need to be overdramatized. The surprising thing is that none of the other five Steering Committee members who had been sent advance copies of the memorandum signaled this mistake. Perhaps they did not believe the distinction to be consequential?

Since those prepared-but-unused figures have been mentioned, it might be worthwhile to document them for historical reasons. Mr. Dubé gave this writer photocopy around the end of June. The Lisbon estimates are more detailed than this writer's Section IV-E. Totaling 10 pages, each year begins on a new laser-printed page. There is not enough room to show all of this here, but it is easy to compare yearly surpluses as hastily estimated in Lisbon with what this writer later published (the column on the right):

	Lisbon	Portland
Surplus for 1986	68,347	-68,347
Surplus for 1987	130,398	130,398
Surplus for 1988	874,768	662,431
Surplus for 1989	765,480	182,480
Surplus for 1990	478,136	1,906,857
Surplus for 1991	1,085,948	670,257
Surplus for 1992	1,449,068	1,615,468
	-----	-----
Total for all years :	4,852,145	5,092,221

No estimate for 1993 was made in Lisbon, so this row is missing. Each of the final two years (1991 and 1992) had two estimates in Lisbon, and this writer consistently took the larger. Although the totals agree closely, the two distributions of surplus as a function of time differ substantially because the Lisbon figures attempted to report in the year of actual payment those fees that were paid late. This writer chose the simpler alternative of reporting such late payments in the year they were due (this is the effect of disallowing LEC's subtractions for payments later than August of the year they are due). This writer's total is a little higher because he assumed that all members eventually paid, whereas the Lisbon figures tried to allow for members who never paid (according to LEC accounting).

To summarize Section 1.4, Chairman Van Dommelen seems to attack the messenger (this journalist) while deliberately ignoring the message (LEC management has been hiding lots of money from its members). The reader is advised to note carefully that Chairman Van Dommelen did not dispute the accuracy of figures

presented in Section IV-E. This would seem to demonstrate the weakness of LEC's position.

Point 10 : Chairman Van Dommelen's *"dictatorial tendencies"* are worth clarifying since he wants to leave this judgement up to the reader (see the last sentence of Section 1.4). LEC membership agreements state that *"a simple majority (over 50%) will decide issues."* Before Steering Committee members realized what Chairman Van Dommelen had been doing with their money, they sensed what he was doing with their voting rights: attempting to deny them. Their concerns one year ago were well founded, it turned out, as documented in the final 2 paragraphs of Section VI-A (pages FPM-14 and 15). That is the case for Chairman Van Dommelen. Now consider this writer. How has he been dictatorial? Let's ask some questions: 1) Whom does he control? 2) Whose money has he been secretly holding? and finally, 3) Whose voting rights is he denying? The answers are: 1) No one, 2) No one's, and 3) No one's, respectively. It is particularly curious that Chairman Van Dommelen would challenge this writer's use of the term *"dictatorial tendencies"* when not once in his own writing does he directly address the issue of the voting rights of his own members. This was a major issue in the preceding memorandum (Section VI-A on page FPM-14), and Chairman Van Dommelen continues to avoid the issue.

Point 11 : *"Notwithstanding the compliance of LEC"* is a curious end to the sentence about this writer's 1991 ultimatum. LEC management **did** seem to agree verbally to comply with the ultimatum. But could LEC be trusted to stop selling memberships to those who wanted only ATP? This was the concern in Portland during the months following the hastily-issued ultimatum : how could any such agreement be enforced? In retrospect, the subsequent decision not to trust LEC was the right decision (look what LEC management did with its member's money). Then, two years later, after the discovery of hidden income and other LEC irregularities, this writer issued a second ultimatum. Not only did he do it, he is **proud** of having done it! If the issuing of 2 ultimatums in 8 or 9 years of association bothers Chairman Van Dommelen, this writer is pleased. His only regret today is that he tolerated the associated LEC abuses as long as he did.

Point 12 : *"Successful start and growth of LEC"* is the title of Section 2.1. This writer sees no great points of contention other than the claim that LEC growth demonstrates the quality of its service. As with any monopoly, what is the standard of comparison? This writer's guess is that ATP would have propagated faster in Europe if LEC fees had been lower. Once there is an alternative user group in Europe (see Section XI) that encourages the sharing of ATP among any two licensed users, we will know for sure. This writer hopes a new user group will achieve substantially wider dissemination of ATP than LEC did.

Point 13 : *"Steering Committee goals are incompatible with Dr. Meyer's views on LEC's role"* is the title of Section 2.2. This is possible. But how is this relevant to the now-obvious financial and political irregularities of LEC? Once again, readers must not confuse the messenger with the message. If the information is demonstrably true, who cares where it came from? Possible differences between the Can/Am user group and the Steering Committee do not prevent the Can/Am user group from understanding and using details of LEC's irregularities. Nor do differences in any way diminish Can/Am appreciation of those Steering Committee members who stood up for their principles and opposed the financial and political manipulation once they understood it thoroughly (following the Lisbon meeting).

Point 14 : Section 2.2 ends with the charge that *"Alternate distribution channels have then been tried out by Dr. Meyer with varying success, with the hope of provoking ..."* Not really. If this writer had wanted to break LEC, he would have selected an alternative ATP distributor in Europe long ago. This was not done for two years. Instead, the Can/Am user group limited its action to the free licensing of users anywhere in the world. Note carefully that the Can/Am User Group continues to refuse to mail ATP materials across the ocean. Clearly, it was not LEC that was to be broken, but rather its lucrative monopoly on the licensing and distribution of ATP in Europe. The goal was to pressure LEC to provide an inexpensive alternative --- which never seemed to happen for the average company. How many of those 70 or so companies knew that it was not necessary for them to pay for ATP? Did LEC really advertise such facts? If so, where, when, and how

conspicuously? For two years, LEC seemed to continue to prey on the ignorance of many ATP users in Europe. This is the context in which this writer made his comment on August 21st (this message may have arrived in Belgium the following day). To correct the explanation from Chairman Van Dommelen, this writer's entire sentence will be presented: *"Frankly, I am surprised that such a significant emigration did not begin earlier (e.g., the end of 1991)."* Note that there is nothing about provoking anyone. It was simply an historical observation. Unfortunately, this writer made a poor prognostication. In retrospect, it was the **lack** of Can/Am provocation (i.e., failure to establish an alternate distribution center in Europe) that allowed LEC to be so profitable during the past two years. If this writer knew then what he knows now about LEC finances, there would have been plenty of provocation long ago!

Point 15 : The title of Section 2.3 is provocative enough: *"LEC is neither needed nor wanted for the development according to Dr. Meyer."* Once again, LEC management seems to have confused details. What the Can/Am user group insists upon is direct contact with the real program developers. This was explained to the world at the top of page 4 of our January newsletter. It is true that we do not want LEC to act as an intermediary for the work of others. Instead, we want to receive that work directly from the real developers in order to minimize distortion and errors. Had LEC managed to distinguish itself in any ATP modeling that interested developers in Portland (LECPlot does not count!), it would have been included in the direct communication. Unfortunately, years of experience have convinced this writer that "help" from LEC often is worse than nothing. As an example, read the story about LEC correction of the METRIC bug of FURNAS in Rio de Janeiro (see pages 11 and 12 of the April newsletter). Alternatively, consider the simpler matter of timing EMTP speed on different computers (pages 10-12 of the July, 1992, issue). Busy with other things, this writer has learned to ignore LEC "help" whenever possible during the past two years, and this no doubt has frustrated LEC staff, which seems to have had ambitions of doing great things (doing them for whom is another question entirely). But the inabilities of LEC staff are neither the fault nor the responsibility of developers in Portland. Years ago, LEC staff stopped working in ways that were compatible with program developers in Portland, so LEC staff often were ignored by this writer. The final word about this should appear in the October newsletter, where a 2-page story should provide a detailed summary of our consideration of "isolated corrections" that have been proposed by LEC.

Point 16 : The final sentence of Section 2.3 is interesting. BPA funding somehow *"makes the recommendations of the Steering Committee for more money (e.g. by cutting services superfluous and contrary to the original LEC philosophy."* Where is that *original* LEC philosophy stated? Chairman Van Dommelen cites no specific reference. Chairman Van Dommelen's objection seems contrived to this writer, who can recall no LEC inclination to support many different platforms prior to 1990. In fact, one of the things that upset this writer during his October, 1990, stay in Leuven was the fact that LEC staff did not seem to be using **any** translator --- not even the Apollo translator to produce EMTP FORTRAN for LEC's own Apollo workstations. For Apollo, LEC staff had been directly editing old Apollo EMTP FORTRAN. This was one reason it took this writer so long to reconcile differences: LEC had not been modifying UTPF segments the way Portland developers do, and the way tools were left in place when this writer departed 2 years earlier. This writer can only conclude that LEC staff did what they wanted to do, on whatever systems they wanted to work with, and then argued with Steering Committee members about the value of some of this work (e.g., the continuing expensive support for the dying IBM mainframe version). It is hard to criticize the Steering Committee for trying to guide LEC staff. That was their job.

Point 17 : *"Steering Committee concentrates on the wrong issues"* is Chairman Van Dommelen's title for Section 2.4. Oh, really? Where is it written that the Steering Committee is supposed to try to convince developers in Portland of anything? There is a written mandate for the Steering Committee, and this was mailed to LEC members under cover of an LEC letter dated 5 September 1991. Section 3.3 on pages 19 and 20 of this document, which was adopted by majority vote at the following meeting, conveys some rather broad powers to the Steering Committee: *"The steering committee shall be responsible for revising the present connections between LEC and KUL R&D authority ... The steering committee will appoint a manager who will be*

responsible for the overall organization, management and activity of LEC following the guidelines given by the committee itself." It is hard to appreciate Chairman Van Dommelen's complaint about financial questions or changes to LEC. Is it likely Chairman Van Dommelen would have been happier if the Steering Committee had replaced Chairman Van Dommelen's own existing Manager, Guido Empereur? Democracy is as democracy does. By written contract, LEC members were given the right to decide issues, and this writer can not consider any more important one than knowing how much of the members' money had been hidden. Rather than being *"contrary to the agreement with the individual members"* as Chairman Van Dommelen claims, this all would seem to be in accord with membership agreements. Maybe this is what alarmed Chairman Van Dommelen the most: he realized his hiding place for money might be discovered? If Chairman Van Dommelen did not want democracy, he never should have put that right in LEC membership agreements. LEC or its agent printed the contracts, so Chairman Van Dommelen certainly was in control. It is too late now to object. Today, LEC members and the Steering Committee are standing up for their rights whether or not this pleases Chairman Van Dommelen.

Point 18 : Within Section 2.5, Chairman Van Dommelen writes that *"The FPM document criticizes the K.U. Leuven R&D proposal, but amputates it of all its motivation and analysis."* Yes, this writer pleads guilty to having removed the advertising of LEC's lawyer. The purpose was to consider the proposal itself, not the unsuccessful arguments used by its salesmen to convince Steering Committee members. The last place this writer would go to find real LEC motivation would be an LEC attorney, who, after all, is paid to represent LEC interests. It is interesting to note Chairman Van Dommelen's assertion that *"it was agreed to have the document discussed in writing."* Apparently this followed refusal of the Steering Committee to give its approval there in Lisbon, and Chairman Van Dommelen's subsequent withdrawal of short course profit (see the final paragraph of Section III on page FPM-4). Following a demand for immediate approval, this represents a *favorable reception?* Well, maybe for a Chairman who must have been able to sense that his once-firm control of LEC was being lost.

Point 19 : Section 3 is entitled *"Conclusion,"* and it ends in the declaration that Chairman Van Dommelen has *"asked that K.U. Leuven R&D terminate the agreement with the members at the end of this year."* Once again, note the characteristic ambiguity. If LEC really is going to quit business at the end of the year, why would Chairman Van Dommelen not state this? Readers are advised to note carefully that termination of existing agreements is not the same as the closure of LEC. It is conceivable that LEC might attempt to continue to operate next year under all-new agreements. This writer pointed this out to E-mail subscribers of the Fargo EMTP list server on September 29th. Unless and/or until LEC clarifies this point publicly, no more meaningful EMTP materials will be communicated to LEC by the Can/Am user group. This was explained to LEC Manager Empereur in E-mail dated October 24th. But possibly this policy was a mistake. It does represent another ultimatum, and Chairman Van Dommelen does not like these. To avoid a possible future complaint about this, let's quickly modify the Can/Am policy to remove the condition. The corrected policy now is simpler: Never again will ATP materials be shared with Leuven.

Note that blame for the cancellation of LEC membership agreements is placed on this writer who brought *"these complaints into the open public place in most disparaging terms. As a consequence,"* But is this really what happened? The Can/Am user group would be flattered to think that its efforts (all that writing, followed by printing and mailing) had been so productive so quickly. Unfortunately, the historical record requires that credit be shared with others. The more than 160 printed copies of this writer's memorandum dated September 10th were not actually mailed from Portland until September 13th or the 14th (two days were required). Years of experience with transatlantic mail suggest that it is practically impossible that such copies would have been received overseas in time to have prompted the cancellation announcements (Registered letters dated September 16th from Leuven R&D). Either Chairman Van Dommelen had decided to cancel the membership agreements without any knowledge of the impending mailing, or he had been forewarned of what was coming by any one of more than half a dozen persons in Europe who had been informed by E-mail of Can/Am intentions. It would appear to this writer that at most the **threat** of publication was adequate to inspire the

LEC cancellation. What an impressive example of the power of the free press (in some cases, actual printing may be unnecessary)! The Can/Am user group probably could have saved the \$400 cost of printing and mailing!

Point 20 : Section 4 announces the long-delayed 1993 annual meeting. But a meeting for what purpose? Half an hour of *"presentation of cost break-down and statement of income?"* Well, maybe this is one case where LEC trickery will succeed. Whereas this writer originally had been urging heavy attendance by informed members, it now appears that the 1993 meeting might not be worth the effort for anyone who must travel any significant distance (e.g., an hour or more). By scheduling a meeting without technical content, LEC management probably can guarantee minimal attendance, and thus will avoid much criticism. Yet, how can critics of LEC management complain too loudly? Traveling to Leuven and arguing about the missing money was not a pleasant prospect. Maybe a meaningless final meeting **does** provide the appropriate symbolic end for an organization that long ago seemed to lose its direction, and which became the victim of its own mismanagement --- technical, political, **and** financial.

Point 21 : To conclude this detailed review of Chairman Van Dommelen's letter, this writer now returns to that deferred initial point. Recall that the Chairman referred to *"preposterous and unjust allegations presented by Dr. Meyer."* Well, one consequential error (Point 9) was made in the original writing, but this did not involve a preposterous or unjust allegation. The detailed estimate of hidden income with which Chairman Van Dommelen was not confronted in Lisbon appeared in this writer's previous memo, and Chairman Van Dommelen continues to refuse to address such details. Instead, he merely issues general, categorical denials of the form "I have done no wrong." Unfortunately, the documented financial deception that has been practiced for years by LEC management is **very** wrong, and everyone knows it. For years, the technical and political mistakes of LEC management were overlooked by many members. But those financial mistakes, involving the under-reporting of income, were another matter entirely. Everyone understands money (it is objective and concrete rather than subjective and abstract), and the accurate accounting of it should be a minimum requirement of any organization that handles it in significant quantities. It is scandalous that the Chairman of such an organization would refuse to release accurate accounting after serious errors in the organization's reports have been brought to his attention. Not at all preposterous or unjust, the accusations of financial and political mismanagement of LEC are accurate. Furthermore, they would seem to have stuck to LEC Chairman Van Dommelen himself (as opposed to others) if only because he seems to have accepted full responsibility by his repeated denials of the documented deception.

XI. Alternative European EMTP User Group

Prof. Correia de Barros of IST in Lisbon is speaking on behalf of the Steering Committee with which Chairman Van Dommelen had refused to meet (his letter dated September 14th declared: *"it appears furthermore useless and unnecessary to have another Steering Committee meeting."*). This would seem to be the start of the replacement user group for Europe. Dated November 11th, a one-page letter from her to all LEC members announces that the Steering Committee and other interested parties will be meeting in Leuven on November 25th --- the day before the LEC meeting. Each person attending is advised to bring at least 4 blank, formatted, 1.44-Mbyte, 3.5-inch floppy disks if new Salford EMTP materials are wanted.

E-mail of Prof. Bruce Mork's Fargo EMTP list server should be followed by those who want news as it breaks. Can/Am use of conventional mail is necessarily limited by cost and slowness.