

From: Hay, Kenny  
Sent: 27 January 2009 16:43  
To: Kirk, Liz  
Subject: Climate change response thingy

Liz

Here are my responses to the CC questions:

1. This is a no brainer and should be an absolute priority.
2. This is entirely wrong and will result in the remainder of the FC becoming very precarious in terms of its ability to fund itself properly with the attendant problems this would bring.
3. I concur with union's view on this ,in that if we do not go down the leasing path there is absolutely no need for this measure. IF we end up with leases I still disagree given that the FC is de facto a not for profit trust, isn't it?
4.
  - i. If we are not in practice a de facto not for profit trust then we should have financial safeguards to that effect ie being able to ring fence profit or carry forward profit or unspent funds into the next calendar year.
  - ii. Get rid of the Sir Humphreyesque nonsense that is cpital charge. This is a pointless piece of accounting chicanery and is regularly quoted by our critics as part of our overall cost to the taxpayer when it most clearly is not.
  - iii. Overhaul the grant system and sort out the current mess that allows forestry grant applications to get lost in a pot alongside Archie's chicken shed. The Confor report is extremely informative.
  - iv. Accept that the FC is not going to compete in land purchases for the best ground to turn these into forests without there being a disproportionate cost, ie repositioning appears to result in us selling off 1000ha in the highlands to buy 500ha in the central belt of which only 250ha is afforested - there seems to be an inherent problem here...

Hope this is what you want!

Kind regards

Kenny