

1A Sample emails: TWL's instructions to leave funding to TWL

EMAIL A: Aug. 22, 2022

From: Wingham Rowan <[REDACTED]>
Date: Monday, August 22, 2022 at 11:46 AM
To: Adrian Haro <[REDACTED]>, [REDACTED], [REDACTED]
Subject: Seeking clarity after Thursday's meeting

Adrian,

In our meeting last Thursday you made two assertions that could be read as a walking back on TWL's funding commitment to us. This email seeks to clarify the issue, providing some background on why we are worried.

The two assertions were:

- For our partnership to continue, you required me to accept TWL is not a funder or foundation.
- You advised me strongly to re-embark on my own fundraising, not putting my trust in TWL to fund us.

This follows many months of specifically being told "Trust me (TWL) on funding" and repeated optimistic statements such as "I feel really good about the funding". Earlier this year, TWL publicly, unambiguously, committed \$1m to this Design Sprint.

1. Our vulnerability

In light of the statements above, we stopped fundraising to focus on delivery for the Design Sprint, agreed not to apply to funders who we would otherwise have continued to engage, bought TWL into our conversations with funders, and acted as fact checker for TWL's outreach to funders without having input - or even visibility - of the applications about our work ([REDACTED] is an example of this).

In parallel, you have acknowledged, working with TWL has required us to slow down. To quantify that, expansion involving other cities already in our network was delayed by 7 months to align with TWL's processes:

Nov. 22, 2021: TWL confirm a Design Sprint with Pacific Gateway Workforce Partnership (PGWIN) built around MM4A non-profit's "CalFLEXI" platform". TWL do not want outreach to cities to start until they have announced the project.

Mar. 21, 2022: TWL publicly [announce the project](#) to “test and expand” the platform. TWL now want approaches to other cities interested in launching the platform to wait until TWL have replaced MM4A’s slide deck with their own.

Jun. 29, 2022: TWL finish their deck begun in March. Outreach starts.

This pace leaves us vulnerable to a view among funders we are not achieving. [REDACTED]'s decision to turn down an application because we are “early stage” is one example.

2. Our position

If TWL is ever not in a position to honor the disbursements they offered on March 14, 2022 along with – we all hope – the rebudgeting agreed in July, we would not be in a position to continue partnering with TWL.

3. Our request for clarity

To put this uncertainty to rest, can you confirm that TWL still fully intends to honor its agreements on funding with the only unknown being a slim possibility TWL does not receive the funds allocated by funders to TWL.

If you are willing to confirm that please just reply “Yes” to this email.

Thanks

Wingham

From: Wingham Rowan <[\[REDACTED\]](#)>

Date: Thursday, August 25, 2022 at 11:30 AM

To: Adrian Haro <[\[REDACTED\]](#)>, [REDACTED], [REDACTED]

Subject: Follow up: Seeking clarity after Thursday's meeting

Adrian,

We discussed the email below in our weekly meeting this morning. The following should be recorded for clarity:

Your urging that we “trust me on the funding” pertained to funding for the TWL Design Sprint only, including our disbursements, not wider funding that MM4A may need. We both accept this.

I misreported the dates that outreach to potential expansion cities started. I was approaching other cities in the period between TWL's public announcement of the Design Sprint and the completion of your slide deck. Apologies for my error.

Aside from these points, you are happy to confirm there was no intention to walk back TWL's commitment to the disbursements schedule or hoped for rebudgeting.

Best wishes

Wingham

EMAIL B: Oct. 10, 2022

From: Wingham Rowan <[\[REDACTED\]](#)>

Date: Monday, October 10, 2022 at 2:25 PM

To: Adrian Haro <[\[REDACTED\]](#)>, [REDACTED], [REDACTED], Nick Schultz <Nick.Schultz@pacific-gateway.org>

Subject: For discussion – tomorrow's meeting

Adrian, [REDACTED], [REDACTED],

In last Wednesday's meeting I undertook to come up with "Five ideas to improve our execution". Events have overtaken us since. So, instead, here's five key points that at this end we think it's vital we either all agree on - or recognize we can't agree - over the next couple of weeks. I would like these to form the agenda for discussion with [REDACTED] tomorrow, plus of course any items you wish to add.

We all need to recognize the last few days have been a huge shock at this end. Our detailed email exchange with TWL Aug. 22 – Aug. 25 made clear if TWL's confirmed \$1m funding materialized as expected, October would be when scheduled reimbursements would resume and some combination of clearing the backlog of partial re-imbursements and rebudgeting could be expected.

Instead, we faced only another partial disbursement and a consequential near-terminal experience: the loss of [REDACTED] which would have severely stunted our Long Beach operation. (Eventually resolved on Friday.) I know your further \$[REDACTED] from [REDACTED] has been delayed by a month to January but had no idea that would have such profound impact for us in October.

We are now increasing our debt and having to look for even more corners to be cut, and therefore risks to be accepted. This is all forcing a reset at our end, including – inevitably – re-evaluation of the TWL relationship. Below are what I currently believe are the core issues from this side we should focus on understanding as both sides plot the next few months. Some of these I've raised, or started to raise and backed off, earlier in 2022.

1) Disbursement schedule

Your finance team are clearly planning how to allocate the \$[REDACTED](plus other TWL funding that's been alluded to?) over coming months. At this end, we badly need to know ASAP what's being assigned to our disbursements.

I believed we had pretty much done this in exchanges (written and verbal) over the summer. But I will pull what I understood was amicably agreed into one spreadsheet for tomorrow.

2) Fundraising

I have done little fundraising since we partnered with TWL. [REDACTED - TWL STAFFER] did encourage me to maintain independent funder dialogue in April. But against this:

- TWL has publicly committed \$1m to this Design Sprint. Any approach to funders from us risks a "*What have you done with the \$1m? Why do you need more?*" riposte. (For the record: \$[REDACTED] has been dispersed to date.)

- · It was clear I had to choose between the time-consuming work of building momentum in Long Beach and expansion cities (see below) or systematically outreaching to philanthropies who would likely then be unimpressed with our lack of tangible achievement.

- · Adrian repeatedly urged us that we "Trust me on the funding" and made optimistic statements about progress with philanthropists.

I consider my gamble on project momentum vindicated by the movement we're now seeing in the Long Beach pipeline and in our other cities. But it has left us financially dependent on TWL to a degree my board in London – for one – consider unacceptable.

Like it or not, I will now have to crank up a fundraising operation in parallel with this Design Sprint. We need to agree: How does that relate to TWL's better resourced outreach to funders? There are two obvious options:

- · **Collaborative:** We work together, coupling TWL's door-opening heft and Adrian's relationships with detailed knowledge, planning and thinking at this end to show complementary organizations successfully driving forwards to a potentially very big win for America's workers.
- · **Competitive:** I approach and engage or re-engage funders acknowledging we are working with TWL but I am seeking funding directly for PGWP.

My preference is strongly for collaborative. But given events of recent days – and sentiment on my board – it will have to be more of an equal operation. For example, we would need to see:

- · **Facetime:** TWL giving us the space to make our case our way to your putative funders rather than presenting our aims/insights/accomplishments yourselves.

- **Introductions to funders:** I introduced TWL to [REDACTED], [REDACTED] and brought you into the meeting [REDACTED] set up for me with [REDACTED - BIG FUNDER] (because TWL is already a grantee) then left you to take things on in your way. It would be good to see this reciprocated with some of the donors in Adrian's network, particularly those trending government/tech. in their interests.
- · **Joint application writing:** At this end, we agreed not to apply to Workrise, giving TWL a free run for the Design Sprint. But – apart from some partial fact checking – we didn't see the application, let alone feed our learning into it. This seems counterproductive. Our input to applications could improve their quality.
- · **Transparency on allocation:** TWL are clearly using this Design Sprint as part of a sell to funders. But you also have establishment costs and other projects to resource. Understanding the details of this would allow us to evaluate each funder from our perspective and better manage risks. In return we could open our spreadsheets for the granularity of tech. costs, operational overheads, etc. so you could see where our exact painpoints will be.

Fundraising won't be either totally collaborative or competitive. There will always be nuances. But I'd like to see if we can come up with a plan for active collaboration over the rest of any time working together.

3) Governance

Our work together over the last 8 months has lacked two standard components of standard project planning. Can we agree to implement them?

a) Project plan

I have put forward components of a project plan over the months. But it seemed clear a plan would have to come from TWL to be considered actionable. [REDACTED - TWL STAFFER] has worked on a timeline grid. I now plan to incorporate this into a brief project plan memo for tomorrow.

We won't sign off on it tomorrow, [REDACTED - TWL STAFFER] needs to buy in. [REDACTED - LAUNCH TEAM MEMBER] also. But if we agree on the broad scope (which we pretty much already have done, it will just now be in one memo) then details can be worked through in subsequent weekly meetings.

Our world is too fast moving for a project plan to be anything other than a mutual understanding of intent. All our unknowns make the second component essential.

b) Monthly oversight meetings

A regular oversight meeting would encompass every manager impacted by project decisions:

- · Pacific Gateway/PGWP: NS
- · TWL: AH/LC/JJ
- · PGWP: JL
- · MM4A: WR

Each meeting's purpose is a high-level review of progress since the last get-together plus regular review of risks/opportunities/resource allocation. I propose we take our 9.30AM Thursday slot on the first Thursday of each month for this. Anyone who can't make a meeting can then nominate an attendee to make decisions on their part.

4) Internal communications

Our organizations fervently share the same aims. We are all dedicated professionals. But it's clear we have contrasting values, worldviews, processes and routines. At best this gives us complementary useful insights, ideas and engagement. But – as other events last week again showed – at its worst we trigger each others' tripwires of frustration or offense.

A specific need from this end is to tamp down volatility. So, I propose two steps:

a) Email conversations

In addition to our meetings we should shift to more email based communication. The aim is to impose reflection and make sure we understand each other correctly. Specifically, I intend to switch from talk to email if:

- · I sense a conversation going into a 'gray zone' where my persistence on a point, or need for clarity, looks likely to spawn irritation.
- · I plan to act on something I've been told but may have misunderstood how firm it is in reality.

b) Share the facts:

We can interpret events independently of course. But it would help at this end if we could agree on key facts. Each of the following issues have been misrepresented (unintentionally I'm sure) in recent weeks:

- · **Childcare pilot:** TWL started supporting PGWP AFTER the CARES Act childcare pilot wrapped in Dec. 2020. (A SIFI funded extension of bookings for a few months was internal only.) The pilot was enabled by City of Long Beach and my board, not TWL.

- · **Our introduction:** PGWP and TWL met not through any action by the USCM but when [REDACTED - MUTUAL CONTACT] introduced me to Adrian. (This program did win the USCM prize for best job or economic development initiative in America, but that was earlier.) Many of our WIB directors are involved in USCM and might spot disparity in timelines.
- · **Pre-TWL funding:** Before TWL, we sourced just over \$2m of funding with key enablers being [REDACTED] Foundation, [REDACTED] Foundation, [REDACTED] Foundation, [REDACTED] Foundation (funded us three times) and [REDACTED] Foundation (funded us twice).

5) The outreach operation

a) Shared understanding

At the September advisors' meeting [REDACTED - TWL STAFFER] mentioned his delight the expansion cities had come together quickly. I assumed (possibly wrongly of course) that he meant a group of workforce boards moved through an introductory phase to a "Yes" on partnering within a few months in mid-2022.

I can see how it might look like swift movement. And it maybe we want to allow that perception to remain outside our team. But it's vital for me that everyone understands what I believe was the core reason for that coalescing of cities around this project: years of determined attempts to engage, diarizing of recontact points, befriending of secretaries, crafting of proposals, approaching influencers, sniffing out sub-opportunities and probing every potential problem.

[REDACTED - SHARED CONTACT]'s networks and credibility have always been the key starting point. TWL's involvement and a tight labor market were the spark that lit a fire. But system change involves an unrelenting sales job to create the kindling. There is so little incentive for public agencies to move first on an innovation. We have to persuade multiple players individually to take the risk.

I can cite multiple examples of how this operation has worked for us: [REDACTED - SHARED CONTACT]'s continuous lack of interest in re-engaging (he did then thank me for my pushiness that tipped [REDACTED] into action), [REDACTED - SHARED CONTACT]'s "No" which had to be turned into a "Yes". The barriers and the sales/checking operation is even more acute in shaping our Long Beach pipeline.

This activity, with its own rhythms, risks and dependencies, has to run alongside more complex work developing operational procedures and technology functionality. To inform your thinking, I would like to take you into an overview of these processes one day.

The reason I want us all to understand – and appreciate – all this, is it is so susceptible to disruption. Adrian, you have the best skills of anyone I know when it comes to rapidly deflating conflict. But the aftershocks of statements, plus the time and mental energy consumed in any flareup makes it so important we keep things on an even keel, even if that makes us seem comically bureaucratic in conversing over email.

b) Developing the outreach operation

Our outreach operation is about to seed others. We are developing an outreach project for each of [REDACTED], [REDACTED], and so on. It's not clear how much we can rely on staff on the ground. I have zero doubt that our ability to fine tune the outreach and intelligence gathering in each city will determine overall success.

Specifically I would like us to think through:

- · **Record keeping:** [REDACTED - TWL STAFFER] created a well-researched high level spreadsheet for our city approaches. It now needs to evolve into a tracker of prospects, targets, contacts and intelligence for each city. I ask that instead of grouping people who have engaged into one row on the overview he builds a tab for each city with a row for each prospect and captures participants, developments, insights and suggestions during calls with cities.
- · **Customer service ethos:** Our WIB directors all talk to each other about us. I would like us to view them and their staff as customers as much as partners. So, for example, we offer dates for calls not ask them to do so, we offer to draft emails, and so on. If the administrator in [REDACTED - CITY] tells her counterpart in [REDACTED - CITY] we made her life really easy we have scored an important win. (This factor is – as an example - why we are increasing debt at this end so the [REDACTED - CITY] research trip proceeds rather than embarrassing [REDACTED] in front of his board.)
- · **Meeting delegation:** We all have to miss scheduled meetings periodically. But doing so has to be accompanied by acceptance that decisions will be made by others and the absentee might not be as well briefed as otherwise. This is better than disrupting others' planning or workflow to get back in the loop before the next meeting.
- · **Context-switching:** We all need focused time to plow through a specific activity. Outside of meetings, "We need to speak this afternoon" or "Can you turn this round ASAP" requests destroy productivity creating backlogs and undone tasks.

The above is my list of key points for agreement or understood-non-agreement from this end as of this writing. TWL will obviously have a comparable list and again it might be useful to get it into one email for clarity.

Wingham

EMAIL C: Nov. 4, 2022

From: WRowan <[REDACTED]>

Date: Friday, November 4, 2022 at 12:28 PM

To: Nick Schultz <Nick.Schultz@pacific-gateway.org>, Adrian Haro <[REDACTED]>, [REDACTED], [REDACTED]

Subject: Project Oversight Meeting: decisions and follow up

[REDACTED], Adrian, [REDACTED], [REDACTED],

Because of the extreme financial precariousness at this end, our clear possibility for success next year, and a history of misunderstanding each other, I think it's more important than ever to make sure we are aligned on what's decided at our key meetings and where everyone stands.

Yesterday's session was truncated, we only had time to focus on resources after Adrian joined. before [REDACTED]'s hard stop. We discussed two proposals from this side:

1) Clarity on disbursements

- · TWL have already committed to pay the full scheduled disbursement for this month (\$48,646) plus the costs of [REDACTED]'s employment, separately agreed with [REDACTED].
- · December's disbursement will be clarified within two weeks.

2023 disbursements

- · I have proposed an extended project plan and rebudgeting. [REDACTED - TWL STAFFER] is working with TWL's finance team on a response to this. We anticipate having that response within two weeks.
- · In response to a question about end dates for our work together, Adrian said he intends the Design Sprint to end after June 2023 or when five cities are ready.

Backlogs

- · Adrian stated that the \$63,000 backlog from partial disbursements in Aug./Sept./Oct. "will be paid". (Presumably this will be factored into the rebudgeting plan.)

Budgeting: internal costs

It was mentioned by TWL that, with TWL's internal costs included, around \$[REDACTED] of the \$1m previously committed to this Design Sprint has now been spent. This is clearly a significant figure in TWL's thinking; have I got it right? (The exact figure was not confirmed.) This is the first time such a number has been shared with us.

To date, PGWP/MM4A has received \$[REDACTED] in the Design Sprint. So, TWL's internal costs already total \$[REDACTED]. That's 111% of spend on the grantees supporting TWL's internal costs. I must have got the \$[REDACTED]K figure wrong? Either way, there are services in that spend that merit scrutiny as we teeter on a knife edge of resources between success and failure. Given our enforced crash course in how to run an ever more frugal operation at this end, we would be happy to suggest ways TWL's costs could be trimmed significantly.

2) Introductions to funders

It is clear I need to re-build an independent fundraising operation. We became too financially dependent on TWL while focusing on project readiness and building momentum. And it's always been clear we would need funding after the Design Sprint.

We believe we are the best people to explain our project to funders, who often want to dive into details of any aspect. There are broadly two ways we could seek to reengage philanthropy at this stage:

- **Standalone:** Previously we have adopted a model of (a) getting press coverage for our learning/accomplishments/potential (b) using that buzz as a door opener to funders.
- **Collaborative:** TWL has networks, resources and brand recognition with funders that we can't equal. That could be leveraged by door opening for us with targeted funders.

We strongly favor the second option. Our playbook is time-consuming and we would rather keep our powder dry with the press until there are strong worker impact stories to offer. Plus, we both probably want to avoid "*Why aren't you working together on fundraising?*" questions when we both approach the same targets. Option two should also work for TWL, I envisage an "education" suggestion rather than a "can they pitch" ask from TWL.

At this end, we have unique experience around (a) the public workforce system as a potential agent for system-change (b) the realities of commercial labor platforms (c) the ways platform technologies can be used to empower lower-paid workers. An offer to share that has worked well for us in the past. Funding relationships may then develop.

Time is tight and I don't want a fudged understanding of what we mean in option two to slow us down. For clarity; I am suggesting (a) [REDACTED - TWL STAFFER] and I work up a list of 10 or so philanthropies/connector organizations where TWL have dialogue, if not grantee status (b) TWL then suggest to each organization they take a look at us as an example of the kind of work TWL supports, ideally following up an email with a call (c) if there's no response in around six weeks we would consider the opening to have not worked and revert to a standalone plan for that organization in future.

I had hoped TWL would do this as a favor. It would be the same spirit in which I have introduced TWL to people in my network of funders. These no-strings introductions were disparaged in yesterday's meeting, so I will list some of them to keep our dialogue informed. (Dates are for relevant emails.)

Introductions include: Bringing Adrian into my monthly last-Friday meeting of advisors that included [REDACTED], [REDACTED], and [REDACTED] (May 17, '21), getting TWL grantees a slot in front of [REDACTED] philanthropy group (Jun. 22, '21), passing on specific intelligence to help TWL's application to [REDACTED] (Dec. 2, '21), asking [REDACTED] to include TWL in my meeting with them set up by [REDACTED] (Apr. 14, '22), brokering a potential webinar for TWL with [REDACTED] funders (Jul 14, '22 - email to [REDACTED - TWL STAFFER]).

The slidedeck issue

Adrian stated yesterday that TWL's door opening for us is conditional on us not saying anything that could harm TWL's reputation. That's obviously a given from this end, if TWL's clout with the funder got us through the door we want that lustre of a respected organization to rub off on us.

But specifically, Adrian tied door opening to acceptance of a slidedeck to be used for our messaging. We have been through this conversation previously and again, to save time, I believe I can get straight to the core of where we disagree:

- · **TWL see one central slidedeck for the Design Sprint as critical.** That deck is to be meticulously built over months by your communications consultant then checked by everyone involved. The last attempt to create such a deck generated slides that I didn't feel were good enough, Adrian also eventually came round to this view. I understand your consultant has been at work on a second iteration in recent weeks.
- · **We see slidedecks as secondary tools.** Our messaging is evolving constantly and needs constant restructuring around each audience and experience of the presenter. This has broadly worked for us: multiple national philanthropies extended their remit to provide funding and key cities want to launch after being pitched. For us, **momentum** is a far more powerful message than slides anyone could come up with.

As example of our dynamic approach, I rebuilt several of our slides for [REDACTED - CITY] between roundtables last week as details of local priorities and painpoints emerged. The key difference with TWL seems to be; we are happy at this end to agree a framework for messaging then have each of us engage prospects from their unique viewpoints and our own individual authentic voice with whatever materials we are comfortable with (within brand consistency).

It's also a given that we all need to be open to feedback. I have learned much about America's racial sensitivities from TWL and worked to implement the learning, not always perfectly, in pitches. TWL have taken correction from this side on operational aspects of the program.

As a next step. I am keen to get [REDACTED - TWL STAFFER] up to speed so he is eventually confident to do opening pitches without me. This could impact in [REDACTED] particularly because he is only a short ride away. I would encourage him to find his own narrative through the material, perhaps from a "my generation" perspective which would be unauthentic from others on the team.

But personally, I would much rather we focus on the real determinant of success at this stage: **quality of our “outreach machine”**. It is our ability to target, engage, follow up, convince, track, and serve prospects that should be constantly refined. Messaging and decks would organically improve as a by product of this effort. [REDACTED - TWL STAFFER] is providing support for this machine but there is certainly room for improvement all round.

Preparation for Wednesday’s meeting

However, the core slidedeck is important to TWL, so we will again give it time from this end. We have booked an hour together next Wednesday. To maximize the value of that, it was suggested I list the core messaging as I see it in advance.

Here it is:

Systematic support for non-standard workers.

- · *“Systematic” = scalable, sustainable, backed by WIBs, not ad-hoc initiatives.*
- · *“Non-standard worker” = people working outside the home but not regular hours at one location.*
- · Your problem we want to solve:
 - o What we know about your NSW’s
 - o How they are connecting to employment at the moment
 - o Why that is so awful + why attempts to roll back excesses aren’t working
- · The systematic solution:
 - o Sleeping giant: government employment services – full service for job seekers, nothing for NSW’s
 - o Why this requires a tech. platform > what the platform must do
 - o Glimpse of the platform (I save demo’s for Q + A)
- · Implementation:
 - o Why market making is needed locally
 - o How we would market make
 - o Long Beach’s value as a pathfinder

[REDACTED] mentioned his need for progress yesterday. I also am under heavy pressure for delivery from my board. Anything TWL can do to help us get into the next phase ASAP is hugely appreciated. And any transparency or datapoints you can share about your funding/anticipated funding and internal costing is really helpful in our attempts to project and plan during the current quicksands.

All the best for everyone’s weekends.

Wingham

EMAIL D: Jan 20, 2023

From: WRowan <[REDACTED]>

Date: Friday, January 20, 2023 at 9:12 AM

To: Adrian Haro <[REDACTED]>, [REDACTED]

Subject: Re: Follow up to project meeting 230119

Adrian,

Good to catch up in our routine meeting yesterday. The apology for loss of temper last week appreciated, (the view "it will probably happen again" less so). As promised, what we agreed and my follow ups:

1) My 5 asks

This is where we've arrived at on my 5 asks of TWL at this point:

- · **[REDACTED - TWL STAFFER] availability:** [REDACTED] to be available for setting up and taking meetings in [REDACTED], likely [REDACTED] and – further down the track – we hope, [REDACTED]. **Yes.**
- · **Split forces: Agreed:** I'll lead [REDACTED]/ [REDACTED], you'll drive Chicago. We'll consult with each other and invite to meetings where needed. Proviso: You want to have an additional presence in [REDACTED] discussions because of TWL's roots.
- · **Intro's to funders:** I think we're coming to a **compromise**. TWL will introduce us to a select, small, group of philanthropies where you have a strong connection. You will frame us your way and then we start from there in our education of the funder. You have said you will ask [REDACTED] to take another meeting with WR when you talk to them in the next two weeks.
- · **WR to the US:** You've **agreed to revisit** possibilities for enabling this with your board, particularly given receipt of [REDACTED]'s funding. Aim is to be back for mid-Feb.
- · **Permission Framework endorsements:** **Yes**, TWL will seek to induce key worker supporting organizations to blog about us or provide a quote in email. The aim isn't to get full scale endorsement (although that would be nice) but a list of "this program is interesting and we'll be watching it" quotes. That creates a framework of buzz for the organizations we're engaging. My initial list of organizations:

1.	TABLE REDACTED		
2.			
3.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.			
9.			
7.			
8.			
9.			
10.			
11.			
12.			

2) Timetable

We're focused on March for launch in [REDACTED] because that's when the new Bond dollars are slated to start flowing. We agree on a May start in Chicago. I anticipate June for [REDACTED], but you are thinking earlier. We need more information from [REDACTED]'s early meetings.

I must keep stressing: we are embarking on this insanely ambitious project with < 10% of the resources needed and that a commercial outfit would command. So:

Priorities for activity: Policy, big-picture strategy, TWL learning and everything else has to take a back seat for the next couple of months to:

- · Tech. readiness (we still don't have a full picture of which functionality will be foregrounded in each launch so we're having a shot at upgrading them all)
- · Market Making
- · Beyond Jobs' direct connections to funders

I appreciate TWL's need to keep building its collateral. The best resource for that really is the manual we did with 40 workforce boards, [available here](#). (I did offer you a hard copy in Long Beach, but you said you like electronic.) A coffee-shop session with that on your iPad will tell you more than I can in an hour's meeting.

Respect for worktime: Context shifting and other productivity killers to be kept to the essential.

Budgets: We really are hoping TWL will enable the extra Long Beach person and additional developer we discussed through the fall.

3) Getting [REDACTED - TWL STAFFER] up to speed

It's unfortunate [REDACTED - TWL STAFFER] was off yesterday. I had hoped to dedicate most of our meeting to encouraging him to articulate his thinking about market making in [REDACTED]. (My plan is that I led on the core demand primary organizations with both of us present and he takes it from there with all the others.)

I bought [REDACTED] in Long Beach up to speed on how to do this. The relationship with Operational Managers will be far more personal than with organizational leadership; they have to believe we (which means [REDACTED]) knows what he's doing, has their back, and will see they come out looking good. That means he has to make the market his way with as much guidance/support as he needs to build personal confidence/authenticity/enthusiasm.

- · [REDACTED - TWL STAFFER], I want to use the Alameda call with [REDACTED] at 10AM on Monday to pivot into Phase Two there. I am hoping you can be setting up meetings ASAP after the call. Can you and I cram in a session to explore market making on Zoom 9AM-10AM on Monday? Otherwise you'll be going in blind. Just send a Zoom if that works for you. If it doesn't I don't know what we're going to do, my call windows are filling rapidly.

4) Attachments

As promised:

- · **Ten steps to launch**: This can become a high level timetable for any region.
- · **Market Making learning prompts**: This came out of work to get James comfortable with market making, I was planning to amend/send it after hearing JJ's thinking but we're against the clock now, so here it is.
- · **The questions we ask**: A pro-forma interview for an Operational Manager – not be followed slavishly, more a prompt list to check at the end of an interview.
- · **Our launch modelling spreadsheet**: Simple version attached

Regards

Wingham