
From: Alan Burgess <stansboy@ GRO-C >
Sent: 22 January 2013 16:15
To: kate evans <kate@ GRO-C >; Matt Gregory <mattgregory42@ GRO-C >
Subject: RE: Yesterday's meeting

Hi to you both,

Thanks for sending the email and the reply will be interesting. I think Rogers reply to Russell's letter tells us all we need to know, and having spoken to Russell today he would really appreciate any support you could give him by showing the other Trustees your support for the letter.

Take Care

Alan

Date: Tue, 22 Jan 2013 13:26:33 +0000
Subject: Re: Yesterday's meeting
From: kate@ GRO-C
To: mattgregory42@ GRO-C
CC: stansboy@ GRO-C

Thanks both. I will send the email and include your names. I appreciate the support.

Kate

On 22 Jan 2013 13:09, "Matt Gregory" <mattgregory42@ GRO-C > wrote:

Kate,

You make a number of excellent points. I was thinking on my (hideously convoluted) journey home that we had been forced to abandon a course of action that it was obvious that the vast majority of those present favoured. I have to be honest and say that I am beginning to lose faith in Roger as he appears to lack the will to consider difficult courses of action. I think your last paragraph is wholly appropriate and needs to be asked.

If you feel that it will have any benefit, I would be happy to add my name to these queries. In any case, I would like to hear his reply.

Thank you for this.

Matt.

On 22 Jan 2013 12:17, "Kate Evans" <kate@ GRO-C > wrote:

Hi both,

After the events of yesterday, I felt I needed some responses from Roger to clarify his position. I was intending to send the email below just from myself but I wondered if you had any thoughts or would like to discuss a different approach.

Thanks,

Kate

Roger,

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.

--

Kate Evans

Cascada Media

Tel. UK:

GRO-C

Tel. AU: