



Q&A on Esmée's new strategy and how we make decisions: A Fairer Future

Workshop 2: A Fairer Future | 14 January, 11.50am

Panel:

Hannah Lim, Funding Manager and Social Change Lead

Laura Lines, Funding Manager

Sharon Shea, Director of Portfolio

Q&A

HANNAH LIM: I can see people are still trickling in but I'm going to get this started to make the most of our time together. So, welcome everybody to this focus session on the priorities that make up our strategic aim: A Fairer Future.

Hopefully you all attended the first half of the session but as a reminder, just in case, I'm Hannah Lim a Funding Manager and Social Change Lead at the Foundation. As with the main session, live captioning is available. Please click on the closed captioning or CC button at the bottom of your screens to view these. Thanks again to AI Media who are providing them, and Laura is putting details of the link in the chat function now. Don't panic if you didn't intend to be here and in fact we're trying to get to the sessions on Our Natural World or Creative, Confident Communities, Laura will drop the zoom links to those sessions in the chat now if you do need to make a swift exit. Do remember that all of the sessions are being recorded so you will be able to catch up on those other workshops afterwards.

A quick introduction then to my colleagues in this workshop: Sharon is familiar to those of you who attended the first half of this session and is our Director of Portfolio; Laura Lines is a Funding Manager, and both will be on hand to talk through priorities and to answer questions. Laura, this is the first time the audience would have seen you can I ask you to give a short audio description. Hi there, I'm Laura I'm one of the Funding Managers. I'm a white woman with brown hair and long, curly brown hair. I'm currently working from my lounge in Southwest London. Thank you, Laura.

I'm just going to put this presentation up whilst we talk through the next section. Behind the scenes we also have Gina Crane who's our Director of Communications and Learning who'll be helping us to field your questions later in the session. Thank you, Gina. We also have Will Churchill who's our Technology Lead supporting in the background and hopefully there's no need for you to leap into action, Will. Famous last words!

A reminder to submit your questions using the Q&A function again and really important, if possible, that everyone tries to use the Q&A function rather than the chat because when questions are in the chat, we tend to lose them a bit. And so, the Q&A function is at the bottom of your screens and you can still vote for questions by others that you'd really like to see answered. We'll come to your questions after an overview of the two impact goals and seven priorities that make up the A Fairer Future aim.

To kick us off then, we'll start with the four priorities with the impact goal: **injustice and structural inequality is challenged and changed**. It's important to highlight here the structure of the priorities before we begin - each detail a number of long-term outcomes we're seeking to achieve and it's essential that any application aligns with one or more of these.

This is how they're displayed on the website that you can see here. They're also found in our strategic plan and we've translated them into our Funding Guidance as well. We'll be using this session to talk about some of the factors that sit behind those in how we make decisions about which applications to take forward.

The first priority we'll talk about: **Acting early on the root cause of problems** is structured a little differently as you can see here as they're split to include some more specific outcomes we're seeking to achieve for children and young people as well as for everyone. I'll pass over now to Sharon and then to Laura who will talk through the details of these four priorities

SHARON SHEA: I've been trapped by the mute button. Good morning, nice to see you again. So, acting early on root causes: there's a quite a lot on this slide so I'll just talk through quickly. One of the things that we're very interested in is the potential for scale and influence you've heard a little bit about that this morning. We do recognise the value of local delivery – that's really important, but what we're looking for is evidence of the potential for broader change. So, beyond that locality and clearly looking to support work that reaches those most in need. A single organisation is unlikely to be able to address root causes on their own so we're looking for examples of good connections, good partnerships with statutory as well as a third sector, a range of actors and potential partners who can really kind of help shift the issue.

In terms of teenagers, specialist organisations who really understand this area, their work well. That may be those who are working with young people who are being exploited by criminal gangs or sexually exploited, have good relationships with the police, understand how to work with family and school. Those are all the sorts of things that we're very interested in and, critically, we will prioritise and are excited by programmes that are

developed with young people themselves – where they have helped to sort of shape programmes and where the programmes themselves are the result of what they say would improve the quality of their life and outcomes for them. We're also interested in work that sort of shifts other organisations' ways of working and the way that they deliver their services. The impact doesn't just sit with the organisation, or the two or three organisations working in partnership or collaborating, but there is some potential to shape the way that others work. Next slide, please.

In terms of **Children and Young People's Rights**, we're generally supporting specialist children's law centres absolutely grounded in the issues, they really know all the key players, how the law institutions work, and delivering high quality service grounded in expertise, and also organisations that are campaigning. They've got a lot of skill, a lot of experience campaigning on specific issues.

In terms of how we make our decisions around who we take forward and who we fund, we are very attracted to and much more likely to fund organisations that can demonstrate some really strong meaningful engagement with young people that are impacted by injustice. As I said, they're helping to shape services and delivery, and again, collaboration across the sector working with a range of partners in order to deliver on that impact. And finally, track record. So, track record of influencing policy and wider change – these are stubborn longstanding problems that are not quickly or easily solved, and they need a fair bit of muscle and experience. That's what we're looking for when we're deciding who we're going to fund. I'll hand you over to Laura Lines.

LAURA LINES: Great, thank you, Sharon. I'll be talking about **Young People Leaving Care**. Firstly, unlike our other priorities, this one is not actually open to applications, I'm afraid, so I'll keep this relatively brief. With this priority, we seek to improve support for care leavers by the system and by their own network so they can flourish as an adult and prevent them from falling off the cliff edge when they leave care. We currently have a cohort of around 30 organisations. We don't expect to make many more grants of this to increase significantly and when we do so, it will be by exception where we identify gaps in our focus areas, and we'll be proactive in consulting organisations. We work in a different way with this group as we have a learning partner to help us convene, share learning and be more proactive and identify opportunities for the group to have a collective impact as well as ensuring the voices of care experienced young people inform the work completely. You can find a full list of the organisation we fund under this priority on our website. And I should also flag that we are unlikely to fund work with care leavers outside of this priority.

Moving on to **Tackling Injustice**, Esmée has a long history of funding organisations that challenge injustice. Under the new strategy, we're trying to be more specific about the areas, where we think, have a more strategic impact based on our previous work, networks and expertise. These are race; gender; disability; and immigration status. We're not just looking at these in isolation but how they can intersect and compound how individuals experience injustice. We want to work with organisations who really understand what the

issues are and are clear about the change they want to see. We're particularly looking for work led by those with a lived experience of the issues they are tackling.

This priority is very much about system and culture change. It's not just about improving outcomes for individuals. Whilst we recognise that is important, it's about policy and practice, changing policy and practice. This could be from using your own data and stories as evidence of what the problem is, strategic litigation to change the law or developing and sharing good practice on a wider scale. Organisations will need to be able to demonstrate their ability to influence change so being able to give clear examples of whether you've brought about change and how, and that you have the networks. Make your plans realistic – be that at the grassroots to reach marginalised groups and have their trust with parliamentarians, policymakers, practitioners or the media.

So, there's quite a lot there to ask and we wouldn't expect a single organisation to necessarily be doing all of that but it's important for organisations to be able to understand and convey how they fit in the broader ecosystem. So, how does your approach, networks, expertise complement or differ to others working on the same issues. Who are your partners and how do you work together? And what value are you adding? Lastly, to give a kind of example that demonstrates some of the work we funded that encaptures what I've just been speaking about is [Karma Nirvana](#). Karma Nirvana is a relatively small organisation based in Leeds and it provides direct support to those at risk of or enduring forced marriage or honor-based violence. It's founded by Jasvinder Sanghera, who was a survivor of forced marriage herself. As well as direct support, Karma Nirvana has been a key player in securing wider change including forced marriage becoming a criminal offence. And it had operated a successful multi-agency approach in west Yorkshire, working with the Leeds City Council, West Yorkshire Police and five NHS trusts who all pledged commitment to tackle honour-based violence, and led to a huge increase in identifying the victims and survivors of this crime. So, hopefully that kind of illustrates that the points we're trying to talk about in our priorities and I will hand back to Hannah.

HANNAH LIM: Thanks very much both. Do keep those questions coming through. I can see some dropping into the Q&A box now but keep submitting them about all priorities throughout the presentation. If there's a specific point relating to a specific priority make sure you let us know which one you'd like us to come back to and talk further about.

I'm going to talk now then a little more detail about our second impact goal within A Fairer Future: **a new inclusive generation of leaders and artists** and the three priorities that contribute to this.

Empowering young leaders was a priority in our previous strategic plan and it remains an important part of our work. As a Foundation, we're most interested in work that can demonstrate that the young people engaged are those who would not normally have their voices heard, who might feel excluded, not listened to, or not perhaps have viewed themselves as leaders. We're looking for examples of young people developing their own skills but also influencing wider change through their campaigns and advocacy work, and that

the organisation that they're engaging with is able to support them in creating those opportunities to do so.

We also want to understand the potential progression routes for young people. Are there opportunities and networks created for them to take their next steps? This means that we're less likely to fund very short-term programmes of work or where organisations lack a track record in developing young leaders or where they lack youth engagement in their organisational plans and set up. We're also unlikely to fund work that's focused solely on more general employment outcomes. An example of this priority in practice, to bring to life some of those points, would be [We Belong](#), a relatively new organisation that has spun out of the work of young people with [Just For Kids Law](#). They're working for young migrants in the UK wanting to see more affordable routes to citizenship, equal access to higher education and more young people becoming change makers. The joint CEOs are both young people with lived experience of the immigration system as is the majority of the board. And they've been really smart in using strategic litigation, parliamentary and media activity. For example, an academic review of their successful high court challenge to widen access to student finance highlighted how the use of young people's lived experience was crucial in making that case.

Our next priority: **Removing barriers to creative careers**. It might sound really obvious but one of the most important things is being able to be clear about the barriers that you're seeking to address. We are looking for work that is a bit unusual – maybe it's trying something new or maybe it's just quite specific to its area. We're also looking for those progression routes, again, that there is a potential next step to be made for those going through programmes of work and that there is good evidence of people making those steps forward in their careers. This is likely to mean that talent development is central to the applicant organisation's work and builds on their previous experience. It doesn't, however, have to solely be about entry into creative careers, and that's quite important. We're equally interested in career progression and leadership development work and programmes that support the technical and admin roles as well as artistic ones.

We're unlikely to fund those small numbers of trainee positions within an organisation. We're really looking for those more open and advertised programmes of work and this priority is focused on professional post-school training not on work with schools. Wider impact is important to this priority but that doesn't necessarily equate to huge numbers being worked with directly. An example of this priority would be [Graeae Theatre](#) who are delivering at scale and achieving long-term change by working with a network of theatre partners across England to support their engagement with emerging playwrights with disabilities.

And finally, then, our **Cultural Education** priority. This, however, is currently also closed to applications. We're conducting further work to explore how our funding can make the most impact in this area and we plan to publish more on our thinking later in 2021. We plan to be as open about our research and learning in this area as possible as we develop those plans. So, do keep an eye on our website and communications for more details.

Q&A

I'm going to stop sharing the slides now. We hope that was helpful as an overview and we'll now start diving into your questions. Do keep submitting those through the Q&A

Function.

Can partnerships and connections include bringing in corporate partners as funders, providing pro bono support etc.?

I'll take this one first off and then if Laura and Sharon have got examples please feel free to chip in. So, yes, partnerships, connections, can include corporate partners as well. As we sort of said in the first part of this session, we're really looking, where possible, for those kind of unusual connections between organisations. We recognise that the change that we're often talking about is long-term, it is going to take time and it needs a range of types and nature of organisations pushing on it to help. This is really where we see the connection between our Fairer Future work potentially and our work that Shemain talked about in the first session around our tools. So, thinking about corporate behavior through our Environmental, Social and Governance policies, with our endowment, for example. So, yes, really keen to see where those partnerships can add value.

Laura or Sharon, do you have anything to add on that one whilst Gina passes me another question?

LAURA LINES: I was just thinking that I think if you're working with different organisations like corporates or statutory services, I think we would be looking for them to hopefully be making a contribution financially as well as kind of resource. We are funding with leveraging other funding but not necessarily to pick up the whole budget.

HANNAH LIM: Yeah, thanks for a really good point we've got another question that, Sharon, I'm going to come to you for this one.

When you're looking for evidence of broader change, are we looking for that to be evidenced within the envelope of our funding or is it about influence and future potential? And is scale about number of people or about something else? So, really something about the kind of broader change and scale that we're talking about.

SHARON SHEA: Thank you. The evidence can be track record as we said earlier, so, demonstrating where you have been able to achieve some change. It can also be about the future and I guess when you are talking about the future, what we'd be looking for is that you understand the kind of routes to that. So, who is it that you need to have on side? Who do you need to influence? Are there particular policy levers that need to be pulled in order to create that change? It's a mixture of both, if I've answered the question correctly. Yes, some evidence of what you have done in the past but actually also some sense that you

know what the kind of path, what the kind of route map is through to that change, and who you will need to align with, challenge, work alongside – in order to create that change.

In terms of in terms of scale, that's a bit of 'how long is piece of string' question. We don't have a fixed view on that. But it may be that for a network that if it's something to do with early years, where we're really wanting to see transformative change, then the scale would be something that could be influenced by the Department for Education being involved around minim standards which would apply across the UK or across England and Wales. In that way, it might be a piece of work that had only been delivered in a region or a particular part of the country, but actually through regulation or legislation, there is an opportunity for substantial scale.

HANNAH LIM: Thank you, Sharon. Laura I'm going to pass this next question to you.

The question is: can work be focused on longer-term outcomes for young people in lower socioeconomic communities specifically?

LAURA LINES: I think we haven't – under tackling injustice – we haven't specifically said that. I guess poverty or lower socioeconomic circumstances is a priority, but we obviously know that that does compound a lot of the issues we are tackling. I think it's how it intersects with those other kinds of areas we've identified, and I think some of that work with young people would come under the root causes or young people and children's rights. So, I think it'd be case-by-case. But how it fits across – it can cut across a variety of our priorities. If it has a strong match to those then we would consider it.

HANNAH LIM: Thank you, Laura. I'm going to take this next question.

We've been asked: what's your definition of a creative career? When we're talking about the priority around removing barriers to creative careers what are we talking about?

The answer is that we're usually looking at the subsidised art sector for adult practice. But for young people we're open to all creativity which could be industry based or it could be broader than that as.

And I noticed another question before from someone asking about the age ranges and that we were talking about with young people.

For our priorities that are specifically focused on children and young people, so, say empowering young leaders, we usually classify young people as naught to 25. I mean we're not kind of hard and fast with those limits so if organisations are working more flexibly over a longer period of time with young people and some slip past that that age range, then that's fine. Early years work – we'll be looking generally at naught to fives and then within that tackling root causes priority, obviously we're also looking at work with teenagers there as well. A lot of that tends to be focused around the transition and points in a young person's

life, so, across the different priorities, naught to 25 would be the age range that we would be talking about.

We've got a question here, Sharon, I'm going to come to you.

Can you drill down more into what a good connection would look like? So, I think this was specifically asked in relation to that first priority around tackling root causes so when we say we want to see good connections and partnerships between organisations that are working on an issue, what do we mean by a good connection?

SHARON SHEA: In terms of a good connection, it might be that if you're a neighborhoodbased organisation delivering early years support that as well as maybe your ward counselor, for example, that you would also have connections with the sort of primary school or where those children would be rooted through in terms of their education. We're interested in early years but also they're part of wider families, so, if there are family centres within the town or the locality, are you connected to them? If you are seeking to support better local authority practice in relation to early years, do you have the connections that you need at local authority level to have those conversations, to present that evidence to try and create that change.

In terms of the connections, it could be with staircase organisations if I can put it that way – where the children that you're working with will be moving on to. If it's around legislation regulation, then do you have those relationships and with those statutory policy organisations. And if it's about the things that are wrapped around that child in terms of their family, do you have the connections and relationships with institutions, organisations that can provide some of that wider contextual support, which may not be necessarily focused on the child themselves but does create better quality of life for the family carers and so on.

HANNAH LIM: Great, thank you, Sharon. I see we've got another question about that and root causes priority which I will take now as well.

The question was: does that root causes priority only apply to children, young people?

The answer is no. Within that priority, in the way that we have outlined what we're looking for, and on the website, and in the strategic plan in terms of those long-term outcomes – one is focused on early years, one is focused on teenagers, and one is what we class as for everybody. But we are looking for quite specific work within that. So, we're not looking at programmes that are solely delivering an earlier model of intervention themselves. We are looking for where and that model or organisation is working with others to shift the way in which they are delivering their services towards acting earlier as well. An example would be a cross-funder programme that we have supported called the [Early Action Neighborhood Fund](#), which looked to deliver new models of early action in three different areas across England in Coventry, Norwich and in Hartlepool. That really created a broad range of partnerships in those places. In Coventry, for example, legal practitioners were working in

partnership with children's social care to try and address families' problems with legal support before issues reached crisis point and to change the way in which those families' relationship with perhaps the local authority, with children's social care, children and family hubs within the area were viewed. So, thinking about when another family came forward to interact with those services, what was their experience then as well?

I'll take another question before I then come to Laura for another one after that.

When you talk about developing young leaders, is this restricted to creative and cultural work?

The answer to that one is no. Within our empowering young leaders priority, we're looking for a whole range of work. Really, we're looking for the work to be defined essentially by young people themselves. So, what is the change that they want to make, and what are the manners in which they might seek to achieve that change? For some organisations, we support like [Beatfreaks](#), they are a creative organisation and they would be using creative techniques to achieve change. Others, for example, like the [Advocacy Academy](#), would be working with young people to support them to learn campaigning and advocacy and strategies so they can take forward, say, parliamentary or media influencing. It can be a broad range within that priority.

Laura can I come to you for this one.

It says: are you open to funding second-tier delivery organisations where our partners have direct contact with end beneficiaries? So, a bit about second-tier organisations.

LAURA LINES: Yes, we are open to this and we already fund quite a few in this space and I think, it's really been clear about what the added value is. We appreciate that lots of the frontline delivery organisations don't have capacity to do the kind of collecting and drawing together all the data in the policy influencing work. So, actually if infrastructure, second-tier organisations are able to take that information and feed into policy and have a wider influence, then we're very positive about that. But I think it needs to make sure that it is an equitable relationship between the delivery organisation the second-tier, and that the voices have been heard, and that funding isn't being disproportionately given to some over others. I think it's about looking at the relationships between them and how they work together to bring about the change they want to see. A couple of examples we fund: [Clinks](#) in the criminal justice sector, and also [Imkaan](#) in the violence against women and girls sector. They support people working on the frontline to do their jobs, and to influence policy and practice at a wider a higher level.

HANNAH LIM: Thank you, Laura. A question about EOIs for Sharon.

Should we focus on our overall mission or a specific project that might be more closely aligned. It's really hard to do both in 100 words. We know that 100 words is really short so what should people be focusing on within that EOI, Sharon.

SHARON SHEA: It is tough, we do recognise that. And it's something that we'll be keeping under review – how that works for you and how it works, critically, how it works for you but also how it works for us, I think I would say.

Something that we couldn't find from your website or reading your annual review. So, I think if it's a project that's aligned, that's always going to be driven by your mission, and so I would say use that time, that space, those hundred words to tell us about that programme of activity, that project. Because if we invite you, we've got an opportunity to hear more about your mission and also, it's something that we would be able to find just by looking at your website, all your latest and your reports, or reviews. I think use that space, use those words to demonstrate that alignment, to demonstrate your vision and to tell us something that we wouldn't know, that we wouldn't understand if you hadn't shared that with us.

HANNAH LIM: I think that's right, Sharon, thank you. And I think also important to flag for people as well that our funding is a mix of unrestricted funding of core cost funding and project funding as well so if you feel that your mission itself is really aligned to the aims and goals that we're talking about then you can apply for unrestricted funding. It doesn't always have to be a sort of restricted project or specific programme of work. It's really where you think there is the greatest kind of synergy between the aims that we're talking about and the aims, as Sharon said, there within your mission and would be things that that we would recognise by looking at your kind of organisational information as being important to you.

Sharon, going to come back to you again for this one, I hope you don't mind.

How do we align giving funding for core costs, on that note, I've just been talking about. How do we align giving that funding for core costs with having specific outcomes? So, what would usually appear to be more related to project delivery. So, that question about core costs and relationship to outcomes that we set.

SHARON SHEA: This is a sort of killer question that we've had quite a few times I think. How I would think about it or how we would think about it is that we, through the due diligence process, we're understanding you as an organisation, your vision, your direction of travel, you know, what you're passionate about. And I think that we want to be able to see where you are heading, and that you understand, that you know what it will look like when you've arrived. I think the sort of unrestricted funding piece is that we aren't necessarily, we don't need to be prescriptive about the route that you take to that impact or outcome. So, you say to us this is where we want to be in three- or four-years' time. This is what a good outcome, solid impact looks like. And that's what we connect with you about. That's what we are going to work with you alongside. We recognise over a two, three, four-year, five-year period, you may have to change direction, actually, in order to accommodate change within your locality, and the unrestricted funding really gives you, as an organisation, an opportunity to use different approaches, change directions. But very much with that outcome and impact upper most in your mind. So, it's around giving you the flexibility. But at the outset, both of us on both sides, understanding where we're heading.

HANNAH LIM: I think it's really important at this point about unrestricted funding and outcomes that we really view outcomes as a tool for learning. And something that are helpful and reference and check-in point as we move through the period of the grant. But as Sharon said, there is flexibility baked into that in terms of the way that that we would use those outcomes in our management of any grant or investment and relationship with an organisation.

We've had a question about cultural education – about what consultation are you doing and how can organisations get involved.

So, at the minute we'll be starting that off with a more focused piece of research and scoping work which I believe we are going to commission shortly, before moving to a kind of broader consultation with organisations in the sector. I'm afraid I don't have any more timelines to commit to on that as I'm sure you can, everybody is dealing with it at the minute, it's a fluid situation externally, shall we say. We will be publishing information on our website as soon as we can say anything more definite about our direction or what we will be saying externally about that priority.

We've got a question here that I'm going to come to Laura and Sharon on.

It says: are you happy to work with other funders?

Laura, maybe you could give an example of where we're working with other funders at the minute, within the work that you're doing?

LAURA LINES: We're very happy to work with other funders and I think, again, it's thinking about our place within this. Some of the funders are very expert in specific areas where we're much more generous so I guess in terms of the migration space we would work with the likes of [Barrow Cadbury](#) and [Unbound](#). And similarly, in criminal justice, we've worked with Barrow Cadbury quite a bit because they're more experienced. There's also collaborations happening in terms of where funders come together to meet to share learning and networks – through the Migration Exchange and through the [Criminal Justice Alliance](#) and issue-based networks through the [ACF](#) so we're definitely in touch with lots of other funders and where we can come together and add value to things and fund different aspects together. Some funders who are less keen on campaigning work and we're more happy to be more vocal about some stuff, so, it's where we fit in that mix. But very happy to work with other funders.

HANNAH LIM: Sharon, do you have anything to add?

SHARON SHEA: We're absolutely happy to work with other funders. Laura's given some criminal justice funder examples. On the arts side of things, we've worked very closely with the [Paul Hamlyn Foundation](#). And in terms of our communities, place-based work, we've worked closely with the [Rank Foundation](#) and the [Tudor Trust](#). The benefit there is not just the just the money and the scrutiny but actually is different styles of funding. As Laura said,

some funders are very hands-on, really engaged, they really understand their patch well and we can learn from working alongside and funding alongside them. So, yes, very open to that.

HANNAH LIM: Thanks both. The only thing I'm going to add there as well as around our relationship with other funders when we are supporting an organisation, we're really keen to make things as straightforward for grantees as possible – particularly when it comes to reporting. So we operate an aligned reporting process where organisations are able to send us a report that they are already producing if they feel it covers the outcomes and work that we're supporting and where there are other funders funding the same or similar parts of an organisation's work with us, we're very happy to work with those funders and agree a reporting structure that works for everybody so that you don't have to submit three, four, five different reports for the same piece of work to different funders. So, yes, very happy to work with other funders and there's lots of ways that we do so.

I'm going to take this question: Are you looking to fund proposals that specifically address one of the areas you just described, or can you address more than one? I think this is in relation to the priorities – are we looking to align with one priority or more.

The answer is that they're both valid. We ask organisations, when they apply, to identify the priority that they think they most closely align with. We also give organisations an opportunity through that Expression of Interest form to select other secondary priorities that they think they can act well with as well. And certainly, we're looking for a fit with priorities, but we will also always be analyzing that internally within Esmée as well. If you select a priority as the primary priority, say, and we actually feel you fit better with another one, we would be moving you around and telling people that as well. We are looking for those interconnections. We understand that none of this work happens within silos and that there will always be relationships between and across those priorities as well. Sharon do you have any other comment on that in terms of how we're looking for people to fit between and across the strategy?

SHARON SHEA: No, I think you've covered it. Thank you.

HANNAH LIM: Good, Sharon, I am going to come to you and just for a comment on this last one before I wrap up about COVID flexibility.

So, recognising that it's hard for organisations to deliver against our strategy at the minute maybe but if their mission and track record match and they need unrestricted funds, can they apply?

SHARON SHEA: Yes, absolutely. We had hoped that right now we'd be in a period, all of us, of recovery and we're not quite there yet. We recognise that the uncertainties that lie ahead for all of us make it incredibly difficult to plan in any meaningful way. We are completely open and flexible – it's that organisational alignment and we can make grants to just give you some time to catch your breath and recover a bit. And then, at a later stage, talk to us about strategic outcomes.

HANNAH LIM: Thank you, Sharon. And thank you to all of you. I'm really sorry but I'm going to have to draw this to a close now, that's all we've got time for. So, thank you to Laura and Sharon for co-hosting this session, to Gina and Will keeping things running smoothly behind the scenes. And thank you to all of you for taking the time to join us today. We hope that you found the session useful and we will be putting up a slide at the close of the webinar for a couple of minutes with some contact details and further sources of information. If you'd like to get in touch with more comments, more questions, we'll be posting answers to questions on Twitter that we haven't had a chance to address in the session and we'll use #AskEsmée. If you're interested in hearing more about the priorities within the other strategic aims, you haven't missed the opportunity. All the sessions have been recorded and will be posted on Esmée's website shortly. And thank you again for joining us and goodbye for now.