

## APPENDIX 3

### Address by Chair at Meeting 5<sup>th</sup> Aug. in Gorthleck hall

The trust is a mechanism created by a previous CC to deal with relatively modest amounts of money. All trust directors since its inception are to be commended for their work and it must be remembered it is largely undertaken in a voluntary capacity. From a personal point of view, I believe they could have been a bit more imaginative and proactive in engaging with the community on the benefits it could bring them.

However with the size of money that will be arriving over the coming years I believe this meeting is a good starting point for us to engage with a key issue:

Is this mechanism (trust), in its present form fit for purpose?

Key points to remember are:

The trust is given the privilege of managing the money,

The money belongs to the community as a whole, **not** the Trust,

The CC can decide to use another mechanism if it sees fit i.e. advise the Renewable Developers to send the money to a different organisation.

A mechanism such as a Company/Trust is essential to maximise the tax breaks available from being registered and/or a charity. Make our money go further.

The fact we have this petition clearly indicates the Trusts present mode of operation based on this latest constitution (separation from the CC), is causing polarisation of views and conflict within our community. Something under our CC constitution we are obliged to try and prevent.

There are a number of alternatives being used by other communities on how to manage the money.

1. From total separation between Trust and CC (Closed doors and communities becoming sectionalised) to the other pole where the two organisations are intimately run (no conflict and consensus)

So open book operation with genuine accountability to the wider community (their money) would seem to be an absolute minimum we need to work towards through reviewing the mechanism we wish to use.

The democratic issue largely comes about from the fact that the community has no direct input (election/vote) on who the trust directors are, effectively what the money will be spent on.

2. To hold elections similar to that for the CC for replacement of the retiring Directors, however this would lead to two organisations rightly claiming to represent the views of the community.

The inevitable problem this creates, as evidenced elsewhere, is when the other organisation disagrees with the CC. If they disagree, they can't both be right about what the community wants, resulting in a split and conflict within the community.

3. The other alternative I have seen working very well is where there is a Trust/company but all the decisions on giving grants, investments etc. are taken by the democratically elected CC members. The Trust/company only has office bearers to be legal and to carry out the administration, research and creation of policies and proposals for the CC to decide upon.

This avoids having two bodies claiming to represent the communities opinions, makes everything open and accountable (all business conducted at a CC meeting) and clearly democratic as the decision makers are held to account through the election process.

So his meeting, albeit timing not ideal, as a good thin which will help us focus on the issues around the community benefit monies and engage with our community on what their wishes are for the way forward.

Iain Brown (Chair)