

Why Use Concurrence to Adopt This Vermont Privatization Position (Rationale for Using This Form of Member Agreement)

Adopting the language from LWV Vermont's position by concurrence would be more efficient than LWV NYS undertaking a full study to articulate two needed clarifications to the LWVUS Privatization position. Vermont has already undertaken a full study and used its updated position successfully in two legislative sessions.

LWV NYS currently depends on the LWV US Privatization Position which leaves two issues open to inconsistent interpretation. First, while *Impact on Issues* describes healthcare as a right, the privatization position omits mention of healthcare from its list of specific "public services" providing for the "common good." Second, while the privatization position articulates criteria for transferring public "services, assets, and functions" to private entities, it is silent about accountability should a private entity — managing or delivering such a service — fail to serve the common good.

The shortened LWV of Vermont Privatization position clarifies these two issues, first, defining healthcare explicitly as a public good where fiduciary responsibility is due to patients and, second, adding explicit accountability by supporting advocacy to de-privatize a healthcare entity that fails to serve the public good. Concurring with this position will strengthen LWV NYS's ability to use the LWV US position by eliminating inconsistent interpretation.