

on my e-mail 15/11

Charles Lister

24/09/2002 12:38

To: "Peter Stevens" <peter@GRO-C>
cc: Robert Finch/PH6/DOH/GB@GRO-C; Vicki King/PH6/DOH/GB@GRO-C
Amal Rushdy/PH6/DOH/GB@GRO-C; Taylor/PH6/DOH/GB@GRO-C
Subject: MFT position paper

Peter

I've just had a chance to take a quick first look at your paper which raises a number of interesting issues. We can discuss these in detail when we meet tomorrow but my initial reaction is to wonder whether this is too detailed a document to use as the basis of a meeting with Hazel Blears. There seem to be a number of issues here that we need to put our heads together to think through before asking the Minister for a view, and my inclination would be to see if we can make your paper for Hazel Blears more of a strategic overview. Underlying all of this seems to be a question about how the Trustees and the Department see the role of the Trust going forward and I think the first stage is to get some clarity on that broader issue.

Charles

----- Forwarded by Charles Lister/PH6/DOH/GB on 24/09/2002 12:14 -----



"Peter Stevens"

<peter@GRO-C>

20/09/2002 17:24

To: Charles Lister/PH6/DOH/GB@GRO-C
cc:
Subject: MFT position paper

Charles

In advance of our meeting next Wednesday I thought it might be helpful for you and others to have sight of the attached.

We have been talking for some time of a meeting with the Minister, but I have been procrastinating while trying to work out what reasons to set out for such a meeting. Roger Tyrrell, one of our new Trustees, suggested a position paper that would show some of the key issues with which we are grappling, and the attached is the result.

If you (and team) can agree on this as an approach and on this document as a suitable basis for the meeting, I will compose an appropriate letter to Ms Blears and send it with the attached.

The position paper has been seen and approved by all Trustees (negative approval by 3). The only areas of possible change are the costings in section 3.2, which are my estimates that are subject to verification by the staff at Alliance House.

I am hoping Roger will join Ann and me next Wednesday, but have not yet confirmed his availability. Ann and I have agreed agenda items, but in her absence today I am not clear whether she has been able to send them through to Robert. Other than the attached paper, the only item that does not readily flow from previous discussions is the question of possible changes to the Trust Deed to let us treat homosexual partners as we do heterosexual ones - our current differential treatment appears to reflect a bygone age.

Looking forward to seeing you on Wednesday. Have a good weekend.

:Peter



- September 2002 position paper.doc