

> From: [rogerevans4@](#) **GRO-C**
> To: [kate@](#) **GRO-C**
> CC: [mgregory@](#) **GRO-C**; [stansboy@](#) **GRO-C**
> Date: Tue, 22 Jan 2013 16:34:58 +0000
> Subject: Re: Clarification on your position

>
> Hi Kate, regarding arm of government DH established MfT to administer its funds. It allocates our funds and appoints 3 (1\3) of the Trustees. I agree with your interpretation and we need to open a dialogue. They won't readily do so if Trustees are sending hostile letters. It was a point I was trying to make yesterday. It's an excellent example of why we need to work with them. We must look beyond a decision on 2013\14 financial allocation and the consequences of any action Trustee(s) take now. Roger

> Sent from my BlackBerry® wireless device

>
> -----Original Message-----

> From: Kate Evans <[kate@](#) **GRO-C**>
> Date: Tue, 22 Jan 2013 15:10:44
> To: <[rogerevans4@](#) **GRO-C**>
> Cc: <[mgregory@](#) **GRO-C**>; <[stansboy@](#) **GRO-C**>
> Subject: Clarification on your position

>
>
> Roger,

>
> Further to Russell's email, I have some concerns after yesterday's meeting, which I would like you to address.

>
>
> I will refer to the email I sent to you and the other trustees on 15 January regarding Charity Commission guidance on independence from the state.

>
>
> You said yesterday that MFT is an arm of government 'whether we like it or not'. As Charity Commission guidance clearly states, we cannot be an arm of government/act on its behalf and be a charity. Our concerns are not the government's concerns, we do not exist to carry out their policies or to consider their overall financial position. I feel that we need clarification from the department on how they intend us to operate independently while restricting our financial position. I also feel that trustees will be at risk of not being able to carry out their duties if funding is restricted, and that we need the department to comment on that.

>

>

> I think you should give further explanation on why you believe the timing of Russell's letter is wrong. You agreed with the other trustees that any protestations we make after the DH deliver their decision will be useless. As you vetoed sending the letter, I feel you have a duty to explain to trustees your vision for how we can turn around the department's decision after they have delivered it.

>

>

> Beneficiaries are pushing for a tougher stance, even if it risks the future of the trust. Trustees' unwilling acceptance of any financial restrictions will not satisfy them.

>

>

> I do not like to raise this point, but I feel I must draw your attention to the 'conflicts of interest' section in the aforementioned guidance from Charity Commission. I do not doubt that you have acted in the best interests of beneficiaries in all your discussions with the department. However, I would like you to consider whether you feel you are able to 'rock the boat' to the extent that the other trustees feel is now necessary, given your position.

>

>

> I am sending this email on behalf of myself, Matt and Alan.

>

>

> Regards,

>

>

> Kate