



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 27, 2009

Ms. Renée Mauzy
General Counsel
Texas Department of Information Resources
P.O. Box 13564
Austin, Texas 78711-3564

OR2009-15251

Dear Ms. Mauzy:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 359548.

The Texas Department of Information Resources (the "department") received a request for information related to the department's contract with IBM. You state you have released some of the requested information. You state you have no information responsive to a portion of the request.¹ You claim that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.139 of the Government Code. You further inform us that release of the requested information may implicate the proprietary interests of IBM. Accordingly, you have notified IBM of the request and of its right to submit arguments to this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We have received comments from IBM. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

The department raises section 552.139 of the Government Code. As recently amended by the 81st Legislature, section 552.139 provides as follows:

¹ The Act does not require a governmental body that receives a request for information to create information that did not exist when the request was received. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information that relates to computer network security, to restricted information under Section 2059.055 [of the Government Code], or to the design, operation, or defense of a computer network.

(b) The following information is confidential:

(1) a computer network vulnerability report; and

(2) any other assessment of the extent to which data processing operations, a computer, a computer program, network, system, or system interface, or software of a governmental body or of a contractor of a governmental body is vulnerable to unauthorized access or harm, including an assessment of the extent to which the governmental body's or contractor's electronically stored information containing sensitive or critical information is vulnerable to alteration, damage, erasure, or inappropriate use.

(c) Notwithstanding the confidential nature of the information described in this section, the information may be disclosed to a bidder if the governmental body determines that providing the information is necessary for the bidder to provide an accurate bid. A disclosure under this subsection is not a voluntary disclosure for purposes of Section 552.007 [of the Government Code].

Gov't Code § 552.139. You state that revealing the information you have marked could subject the information resources of the state to attack or unauthorized access if published. Upon review, we determine that the department must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.139 of the Government Code.²

The department asserts that a portion of the requested information is confidential under section 552.101 of the Government Code due to a confidentiality provision contained in a master services agreement between the department and IBM. The department explains that the subject matter of the letter relates to issues that are to be resolved by IBM and the department using a confidential informal dispute resolution process, as specified in the master services agreement. However, the department has not directed our attention to any law, nor are we aware of any law, that makes the submitted letter confidential. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 611 at 1 (1992) (common-law privacy), 600 at 4 (1992) (constitutional privacy), 478 at 2 (1987) (statutory confidentiality). Additionally, we note that information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party that submitted the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex.*

² As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

Indus. Accident Bd., 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, a governmental body cannot overrule or repeal provisions of the Act by agreement or contract. See Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) (“[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the Act] cannot be compromised simply by its decision to enter into a contract.”), 203 at 1 (1978) (mere expectation of confidentiality by person supplying information does not satisfy requirements of statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Therefore, unless the information at issue falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectation or agreement to the contrary. Therefore, the department may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

IBM asserts that portions of its information are excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 protects: (1) trade secrets, and (2) commercial or financial information the disclosure of which would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained. Gov’t Code § 552.110(a), (b). Section 552.110(a) protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. See *id.* § 552.110(a). A “trade secret”

may consist of any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one’s business, and which gives [one] an opportunity to obtain an advantage over competitors who do not know or use it. It may be a formula for a chemical compound, a process of manufacturing, treating or preserving materials, a pattern for a machine or other device, or a list of customers. It differs from other secret information in a business in that it is not simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business, as for example the amount or other terms of a secret bid for a contract or the salary of certain employees. . . . A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business. Generally it relates to the production of goods, as for example, a machine or formula for the production of an article. It may, however, relate to the sale of goods or to other operations in the business, such as a code for determining discounts, rebates or other concessions in a price list or catalogue, or a list of specialized customers, or a method of bookkeeping or other office management.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); see also *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex. 1958); Open Records Decision Nos. 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

There are six factors to be assessed in determining whether information qualifies as a trade secret:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company’s] business;

- (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and others involved in [the company's] business;
- (3) the extent of measures taken by [the company] to guard the secrecy of the information;
- (4) the value of the information to [the company] and to [its] competitors;
- (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing this information; and
- (6) the ease or difficulty with which the information could be properly acquired or duplicated by others.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also* ORD 232. This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for exemption is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. ORD 552. However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) is applicable unless it has been shown that the information meets the definition of a trade secret and the necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish a trade secret claim. Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) protects “[c]ommercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.110(b). This exception to disclosure requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. *Id.* § 552.110(b); *see also Nat’l Parks & Conservation Ass’n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974); ORD 661.

After reviewing the submitted information and the arguments, we determine that IBM has failed to demonstrate that any portion of the submitted information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has IBM demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. Accordingly, no portion of the remaining submitted information may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

We also find that IBM has failed to provide specific factual evidence demonstrating that release of any of the submitted information would result in substantial competitive harm to its interests. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 (for information to be withheld under commercial or financial information prong of section 552.110, business must show by specific factual evidence that substantial competitive injury would result from release of particular information at issue), 319 at 3 (information relating to organization and personnel, professional references, market studies, qualifications, and pricing are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110), 175 at 4 (1977) (resumes cannot be said to fall within any exception to the Act). Accordingly, we determine

that none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

The department points out that some of the information is protected by copyright. A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted information unless an exception to disclosure applies to the information. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). An officer for public information must also comply with copyright law, however, and is not required to furnish copies of copyrighted information. *Id.* A member of the public who wishes to make copies of copyrighted information must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 at 8-9 (1990).

In summary, the department must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.139 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released, but any information protected by copyright must be released in accordance with copyright law.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Chris Schulz
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CS/cc

Ref: ID# 359548

Enc. Submitted documents

cc: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Cynthia McLean
Vice President and Global Project Executive
State of Texas Data Center Services
IBM
400 West 15th Street, Suite 1200
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)