

From: Tim Little <[redacted]>
Date: February 9, 2009 2:56:47 PM PST
To: Bob Boorstin <[redacted]>
Cc: Jamie Court <[redacted]>
Subject: Re: A conversation, please

Dear Bob,

It's kind of you to ask permission before sending a letter to the Foundation regarding Google's dispute with Consumer Watchdog. Of course, no permission is needed. The Rose Foundation welcomes feedback and comment on all of its grantmaking programs, and all comments directed to the Rose Foundation receive close attention. Please address any letter to me.

However, please do not feel that communicating with the Rose Foundation about Consumer Watchdog in any way substitutes for your direct communication with that organization. As I explained previously, we believe that Consumer Watchdog is raising some very important and fundamental internet privacy questions. I urge you to directly engage them in constructive dialogue over the issues they raise. I assume that you already have Consumer Watchdog's contact information; but if not, I would be happy to supply their phone number.

Sincerely,
Tim

Begin forwarded message:

From: Bob Boorstin <[redacted]>
Date: February 9, 2009 1:26:17 PM PST
To: Tim Little <[redacted]>
Cc: Jamie Court <[redacted]>
Subject: Re: A conversation, please

Mr. Little,

Many thanks for your timely response.

To be clear about my reason for contacting you, I am not asking that you interfere in a grantee's program work. I have been consultant to many philanthropies (Open Society Institute, Rockefeller Brothers, Ford Foundation) and well understand your position.

However, I am contacting you because I know that your foundation and others have and maintain high standards of integrity when it comes to

selecting your grantees. I would not be surprised if, upon acceptance of the money, your grantees not only agree to provide regular reports to you but also to maintain those standards.

In the case of Consumer Watchdog, I want to point out that they have taken it upon themselves to launch attacks upon Google that are totally fictitious. Most recently, they accused our company - without any evidence whatsoever and actually referencing "a rumored lobbying effort" in a press release - of trying to obtain permission to sell patient medical records. I am hoping that as you consider the activities of your grantees and whether to renew your commitments, you will take these kinds of activities into account and consider whether there might be better groups in which to place your trust and resources.

I would like permission from you to address a letter to your Board of Trustees or Board of Directors in which we can highlight the activities of this grantee.

Yrs.

Bob Boorstin

On Mon, Feb 9, 2009 at 3:12 PM, Tim Little <[\[redacted\]](#)> wrote:

Dear Bob,

Thanks for reaching out and getting in touch. However, the Rose Foundation has a long-standing policy of not interfering in its grantees' program work. This position is consistent with best practices in the field of philanthropy. Therefore, I must decline your offer as it appears that it may conflict with our policy and these general best practices. The Rose Foundation believes that Consumer Watchdog is raising very fundamental questions about privacy over the internet. While I recognize that some of the issues being raised may pose challenges for Google, I urge you to engage with Consumer Watchdog in finding constructive responses.

Sincerely,

Tim Little

On 2/7/09 9:27 PM, "Bob Boorstin" <[\[redacted\]](#)> wrote:

Dear Mr. Little,

My name is Bob Boorstin and I handle outreach and communications for Google out of our Washington office.

If you have a moment, I'd like to speak with you about recent activities by one of your recipients, Consumer Watchdog. We've had some difficult interactions and I'd like to inform you about them.

You can reach me at □□□□□□□□, my direct line in the office, or at □□□□□□□□, my cell.

Many thanks in advance for your help.

Yrs.

Bob Boorstin