messages useful which, once again, does not draw on the people that the messages are supposed to benefit is not likely to be productive. (2) I have been advised that the date of last week's meeting was never entered as a "meeting date" in reviewtrack until after the meeting. (Kevin discovered this when he tried to "vote" green documents from the meeting, and discovered he couldn't do so because there was no corresponding "meeting date" in reviewtrack.) As I understand the system, this means that no one received any emails to remind them of his responsibilities in preparing for last week's meeting. Not only did the meeting miraculously take place without these purportedly indispensable reminders to do one's job, but apparently no one even noticed their absence. I rest my case (for now). Record N B
messages useful which, once again, does not draw on the people that the messages are supposed to benefit is not likely to be productive. (2) I have been advised that the date of last week's meeting was never entered as a "meeting date" in reviewtrack until after the meeting. (Kevin discovered this when he tried to "vote" green documents from the meeting, and discovered he couldn't do so because there was no corresponding "meeting date" in reviewtrack.) As I understand the system, this means that no one received any emails to remind them of his responsibilities in preparing for last week's meeting. Not only did the meeting miraculously take place without these purportedly indispensable reminders to do one's job, but apparently no one even noticed their absence. I rest my case (for now). Record N
messages useful which, once again, does not draw on the people that the messages are supposed to benefit is not likely to be productive. (2) I have been advised that the date of last week's meeting was never entered as a "meeting date" in reviewtrack until after the meeting. (Kevin discovered this when he tried to "vote" green documents from the meeting, and discovered he couldn't do so because there was no corresponding "meeting date" in reviewtrack.) As I understand the system, this means that no one received any emails to remind them of his responsibilities in preparing for last week's meeting. Not only did the meeting miraculously take place without these purportedly indispensable reminders to do one's job, but apparently no one even noticed their absence. I rest my case (for now). Record
messages useful which, once again, does not draw on the people that the messages are supposed to benefit is not likely to be productive. (2) I have been advised that the date of last week's meeting was never entered as a "meeting date" in reviewtrack until after the meeting. (Kevin discovered this when he tried to "vote" green documents from the meeting, and discovered he couldn't do so because there was no corresponding "meeting date" in reviewtrack.) As I understand the system, this means that no one received any emails to remind them of his responsibilities in preparing for last week's meeting. Not only did the meeting miraculously take place without these purportedly indispensable reminders to do one's job, but apparently no one even noticed their absence. I rest my case (for now).
messages useful which, once again, does not draw on the people that the messages are supposed to benefit is not likely to be productive. (2) I have been advised that the date of last week's meeting was never entered as a "meeting date" in reviewtrack until after the meeting. (Kevin discovered this when he tried to "vote" green documents from the meeting, and discovered he couldn't do so because there was no corresponding "meeting date" in reviewtrack.) As I understand the system, this means that no one received any emails to remind them of his responsibilities in preparing for last week's meeting. Not only did the meeting miraculously take place without these purportedly indispensable reminders to do one's job, but apparently no one even noticed their
tremendous amount of worthless email generated by lotus notes During the "dead time" at Monday's staff meeting, as we awaited Tom's arrival, I suggested to Chet that these emails are not read by anyone directly involved in document processing, serve no purpose related to document processing, constitute a cyber-nuisance, waste disk space (which has lately become precious) and should be discontinued. Chet replied: (1) by implying before the assembled staff that I have failed to discharge my meeting-related responsibilities which, even if accurate, would not justify these emails. (One might note that the last arrow (in this case, the only arrow) in the quiver of a weak argument is often aimed ad hominem) (2) by disclosing that, last week, Chet, Val, and possibly others had met to discuss revamping this system. Unspecified improvements were promised. To date, they have not materialized. Two observations: (1) If my recollection is accurate, this is one of the few aspects of the reviewtrack as to which the people who actually review documents had no input. It may not be a coincidence that this is also one of the few aspects of reviewtrack that has proven to be completely useless to those people. If so, any effort to render these
9:15:01 AM
10/02/1996
9:49:30 AM
10/02/1996
CN=Phil Golrick/O=ARRB
CN=R ecord/O=ARRB
CN=David Marwell/O=ARRB @ ARRB;CN=Chet Rhodes/O=ARRB @ ARRB
541CBDC967C72B93852563B70048C916