

From: [rogerevans](#); GRO-C  
To: GRO-C; GRO-C  
CC: [jan](#); GRO-C  
Subject: Minister Letter  
Date: Sat, 26 Jan 2013 10:15:34 +0000

Dear Trustee,

In case you are still considering whether to send an individual trustee letter to DH I want to clarify a few factual points with you before you decide.

I note that several Trustees are not prepared to sign such a letter. I agree with their rationale for not being prepared to do so.

Several of you have asked me what influence DH has over the Macfarlane Trust. The answer is -a lot. The Government (through DH) set up MFT in the first place and could close us down at any time if they so wished. DH appoints three of our nine Trustees and they are our sole source of funding. The relationship is bound up in a Trust Deed and an amended version was agreed unanimously by our Board a year ago. A DH appointed Trustee challenging DH in the proposed way would raise a number of questions within DH- about loyalty,for instance.

I must remind you again that a decision has not been made/announced by DH on funding; we continue to chase them vigorously and draw their attention to the repercussions of the long delay. As I said at the Board meeting on Monday I know the way Central Government works and I suspect DH has already made a recommendation to the Ministers on our funding and the reserves. This will not be an isolated decision and will be incorporated in a much bigger one of the entire health care spending programme for 2013/14-totalling billions of £s. The information Jan gave us on Monday of her induction meeting with DH was very helpful but it was not new to you. It was identical to the information I have given you, and beneficiaries, for some months. I very much doubt that a letter from several individual Trustees (or from the Board either) will influence whatever recommendation they have made. What it will do is antagonise them and badly damage our future working with civil servants who are supportive of MFT.

In the future, MFT will have to work with DH. We can't change our relationship them in the near future, particularly as most of us have signed the Trust /DH Deed. Antagonism will not make for a meaningful, productive, relationship. They will not want to work with Trustees who have been hostile to them in this way. It risks future years' funding allocations and will jeopardise discussions on other issues. For instance, the charitable relationship between DH and MFT, and the meaning of charitable need have been raised by you recently. I agree tha we should open a dialogue with DH on these when funding is known. I would be surprised if DH will be prepared to do so involving Trustees who are hostile to them.

In an email to me Russell advocates "taking the battle to DH". I don't recognize a battle in this context. DH have not started a fight with MFT and it would be very unwise for a group of individual Trustees to pick a fight with DH and Central Government. You don't bite the hand that feeds you.

May I once again refer to the letter of 9th November 2012, which accompanied the Business Case, agreed by all Trustees, and submitted by the whole Board; you already have a copy. It makes a forceful and compelling case, in my view.

In the private part of the Board meeting on 24th September we agreed, unanimously, that it was essential to work corporately and present a united front. I am disappointed that so soon after, an issue has been raised by a Trustee which challenges this. Not only will it damage MFT in the eyes of the DH but with others we have to work with. In the short term sending a protesting, hostile, letter may appear attractive. In the longer term the damage could be immense.

As Chairman I would, therefore, urge those of you who may still be considering signing up and sending a letter not to do so.

The message that will be received by DH, and will reach others, is not one of the need for more funding but of a fractious and dysfunctional Board.

I am available throughout most of the weekend if you wish to discuss with me.

Give me a call.

Regards,

Roger Evans