
From: Tarwinska, Rena [mailto:rena.tarwinska@forestry.gsi.gov.uk]
Sent: 13 September 2007 10:15
To: niall
Subject: RE: CVP and the future

Niall

Thanks for this. I understand the CV Partnership will be discussed at your forthcoming meeting with Hugh Insley, so I won't comment in advance of this.

Thanks

Rena

From: niall [mailto:niallt@██████████]
Sent: 10 September 2007 22:47
To: Tarwinska, Rena; Denis O'Kane; Geoff Brown for Sc Water; Gillain Barrie; Mike Batley; richard barton; Robert Hunter
Cc: Thompson, Jeremy; hugh.insley@forestry.gsi.gov.uk
Subject: RE: CVP meeting 23.8 and the future

Rena

Your statement:

"The present arrangement is not fulfilling a useful purpose, and the terms of the concordat stipulate that with the resignation of Clanranald it is now effectively finished"

You are incorrect. I refer to the concordat section 7, which states:

*"This concordat will subsist for a period of **three years** commencing 1st July 2006 notwithstanding the date of signing thereof unless **terminated** by the withdrawal of any of the **Partners** or the **Commission**, **subject to three months written notice**. The Concordat may be extended or replaced by the Commission and one or more Partners after its termination or natural expiry. In the event that a Partner other than the Commission withdraws, **the remaining Partners may agree to sustain the remaining Partnership**"*

So, the actual position is:

1. Clanranald has given notice but this does not take effect until 9th November 2007.
2. CVDG, Scottish Water, North Lanarkshire Council, Stirling Council are all on record stating we wish to "sustain the partnership"

In summary, the Partnership remains and the majority of the Partners want that Partnership to continue but Forestry Commission is jumping the gun and CSFT position remains unknown. Rena, our problems have absolutely nothing to do with the Partnership or the Concordat - the problems stem from the Forestry

07/10/2008

Commissions behavior. For example:

6.3. (f)

*"The **Commission** and the **Partners** agree to promote close co-operation and collaboration in the planning and execution of all agreed projects in accordance with project plans....."*

6.4. (c)

"Create and maintain close working relationships"

6.4. (d)

"Exchange relevant information...."

The record speaks for itself - Forestry Commission has not operated within the terms and the spirit of the Concordat.

In respect of Clanranald and their contribution to the Partnership: Is it one or two of the fourteen Partnership meetings they have attended - I cannot recollect? Let's be clear, the resignation of Clanranald is regrettable but it is all but irrelevant in the overall scheme of things and it is certainly no reason to "finish the partnership." It is utterly preposterous to suggest we dismantle 14 months of partner working and the effort that went into forming the partnership in the years leading up to this and to replace it with what - six bi lateral agreements? So, my first question is very straightforward: Will FCS and CSFT agree to "sustain the partnership" or will you not?

Conversely, Clanranald are pivotal in one very important respect because FCS has stated they are "providing the toilet facility free, as a condition of their lease."

The toilet is possibly the single biggest issue for the partnership not least because it has dragged on for 4 years. We know it is being used as a reason to delay commercial development (café etc.) and it is almost beyond comprehension this situation could become more Machiavellian - but it has:

- The Leader+ cash has been "on the Partnership agenda" since January 2007
- Forestry Commission refused to confirm FESMB decision - a decision which led directly to Leader+ money being returned
- We remain in partnership
- Forestry Commission then denies having any knowledge of Leader+ cash and that FCS cannot help (Ms Whittaker)

Now we hear that FCS are in "bi lateral" discussions with our erstwhile Partner - Clanranald, regarding the re appropriation of the Leader+ funding money - the same money CVDG rescinded for the reasons outlined above. It seems FCS can "help" an ex Partner but not the Partner the money was destined for in the first place. I have two questions on this issue:

1. Are there proposal to re appropriate Leader+ cash previously destined for CVDG in respect of any construction costs associated with the toilet block?
2. Are FCS funding the Reed Bed (a necessary component of the toilet) and if so, why.

Thanks

Niall

Niall Thomson
Chairman
CVDG

Tel [REDACTED]
Fax [REDACTED]
Mob [REDACTED]
Web www.carronvalley.org.uk

-----Original Message-----

From: Tarwinska, Rena [mailto:rena.tarwinska@forestry.gsi.gov.uk]

Sent: 07 September 2007 15:45

To: Denis O'Kane; Geoff Brown for Sc Water; Gillain Barrie; Mike Batley; niall; richard barton; Robert Hunter

Cc: Thompson, Jeremy

Subject: CVP meeting 23.8 and the future

To all,

Please find the agenda and minutes of the last meeting.

Forestry Commission Scotland consider in the present circumstances that the best way forward is to have bilateral meetings with partners.

The present arrangement is not fulfilling a useful purpose, and the terms of the concordat stipulate that with the resignation of Clanranald it is now effectively finished.

Forestry Commission Scotland look forward to providing improved facilities for mountain bikers, horse riders and walkers who all seek a family experience at Carron Valley.

Thanks

Rena Tarwinska
District Forester Community & Environment
Forestry Commission Scotland
Scottish Lowlands Forest District

Tel 01555 660190

+++++ The Forestry Commission's computer systems may be monitored and communications carried out on them recorded, to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. +++++

The original of this email was scanned for viruses by the Government Secure Intranet (GSI) virus scanning service supplied exclusively by Cable & Wireless in partnership with MessageLabs.

On leaving the GSI this email was certified virus-free

This email was received from the INTERNET and scanned by the Government Secure Intranet Anti-Virus service supplied by Cable&Wireless in partnership with MessageLabs. (CCTM Certificate Number 2006/04/0007.) In case of problems, please call your organisation's IT Helpdesk. Communications via the GSI may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

+++++ The Forestry Commission's computer systems may be monitored and communications carried out on them recorded, to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. +++++

07/10/2008

The original of this email was scanned for viruses by the Government Secure Intranet (GSI) virus scanning service supplied exclusively by Cable & Wireless in partnership with MessageLabs.

On leaving the GSI this email was certified virus-free