
From: [russell@](#) **GRO-C**
Subject: Re: Minister Letter
Date: Tue, 29 Jan 2013 10:36:11 +0000
To: [stansboy@](#) **GRO-C**

Thank you for your email and I very much appreciate your comments.
I have no objection to your giving my stance a wider audience amongst the beneficiary community.
I am a little surprised that Matt & Kate have not shared their views.
It seems that most trustees are keeping their heads below the parapet for fear of being Rogerred!!!!
Russell
On 27 Jan 2013, at 20:32, Alan Burgess <[stansboy@](#) **GRO-C**> wrote:

Dear Russell,

I fear you are right in so much that we have left this matter too late and it makes me question as to why certain Board members want to be Trustees if they are not going to, for whatever reason, actively support the Beneficiaries, as the stance Roger is taking seems to infer that the MFT will always be subservient to the DH and will have to accept whatever sum they give us even though we are finding it impossible to meet Beneficiaries needs on present funding!

Russell I can't thank you enough on behalf of Beneficiaries for your stance on this matter and if it's OK with you I will ensure that the Beneficiaries are made aware of your support in this matter (in a way that won't give all the details of course!!) It means an awful lot to me and would mean so much to the Beneficiaries to know that certain members of the Board have their best interests at heart.

I have been so grateful for your support in this matter but now I feel quite despondent as it is obvious that Roger does not want to rock the DH boat and regrettably nor do some of the [Trustees](#). Like you I will bow to the majority, but will do so with a heavy heart and depending on the outcome of whatever the DH gives and the Board's response to that, I will have to look at my position on the Board, as it seems to me now I will have to answer to my conscience as to whether I should carry on, as I am really not sure I could put up with these problems for another two years of my tenure.

I hope your trip to Israel goes well and you enjoy the wedding .

Once again Thank you ,

Alan

Subject: Re: Minister Letter
From: [russell@](#) **GRO-C**
Date: Sun, 27 Jan 2013 19:31:56 +0000
CC: [jan@](#) **GRO-C**
To: [roger.evans@](#) **GRO-C** ; [stansboy@](#) **GRO-C** ; [vanessa.martlew@](#) **GRO-C** ; [elizaboyd@](#) **GRO-C** ; [ecjackman@](#) **GRO-C** ; [mgregory@](#) **GRO-C** ; [kate@](#) **GRO-C** ; [flourpowerpat@](#) **GRO-C**

At no time have I suggested, nor do I do so now, that individual Board members write separately to the Minister.

A letter signed by all trustees is what gives it its force and impetus.
I am trying, with difficulty, not to read into Roger's reply another personal attack on me.
Trustees are not, or certainly should not be, puppets. All of us are entitled to express our opinions with moderation and to try and persuade colleagues on the Board to a point of view.
By sending you the letter I revised, following comments at the Board meeting, I was trying to do just that.
Personally, I do not recall a vote, at the Board meeting, as to whether it was appropriate to send a letter, even in revised form, to the Department. There was certainly consensus that the initial draft letter should not be sent, with which I concurred. If there had been a vote and it was resolved not to send a letter, why did Roger want me to email him a copy when he had a hard copy handed to him. Roger quotes me from the email I sent him following the meeting. The entire text follows:

Attached please find the draft letter, as requested.
I have made 4 revisions to cover the points of concern expressed by you and some trustees. If you retained the draft I handed to you today, the revisions are self-evident.
I still strongly believe that such a letter should be sent before a final decision is communicated to us, notwithstanding Jan's expressed view. We have to take the battle to the DH and not just be an Oliver Twist asking for more when handed down the crumbs.
You have been very close to the discussions. Do you really think, in the light of what Jan said to us following her meeting last week, that the Department are going to do anything other than substantially reduce our annual allocation?
Regards,
Russell

There is nothing, in my view, in the language or tone of that email that anyone should take offence at. I was still trying to persuade Roger to my way of thinking but clearly to no avail.
And this applies to three other trustees who have responded, making a total of four against the idea of sending a letter now. But we are a Board of 9 trustees!
And what if the two trustees who were not present at the Board Meeting had been in favour of sending a letter? What then?
If the adjectives, 'fractious' and 'dysfunctional', are appropriate to describe our Board, what is the Chairman doing to ameliorate such a situation? Does his email help or hinder?
I am not aware of any suggestion having been made, since the first signs became apparent prior to Xmas that we are likely to get reduced funding, that we meet as a Board to discuss the several possible outcomes and decide upon a strategy.
We are expected to await the outcome and then decide the strategy. That, to use Alan Burgess's word, is being re-active, when, in my view, shared by Alan, we should be pro-active. What do other trustees think?
Was my revised draft letter 'hostile' or did it, as was intended, seek to embarrass the Minister/Department into reconsidering their decision?
I do not recognise Roger's statement that '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.' If such wording finds itself into the Minutes, my suspicions about the recent past Minutes will be confirmed.
I agree that we need to work together to reach a consensus. Those in a minority should be prepared to accept the view of the majority and accept collective responsibility. That is how I have always worked.
But I fear the moment has passed.
Regards,
Russell

On 26 Jan 2013, at 10:15, Roger Evans <rogerevans4@GRO-C> wrote:

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 that 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