1E - 220822

From: WRowan <[REDACTED]>
Date: Monday, August 22, 2022 at 11:45 AM
To: Adrian Haro <adrian@theworkerslab.com>, [REDACTED - TWL STAFFER], [REDACTED - TWL STAFFER]
Subject: Follow up to Thursday's meeting

Adrian, [REDACTED - TWL STAFFER], [REDACTED - TWL STAFFER],

I undertook to come back to you after feeding back on Thursday's meeting to my stakeholders. I have talked at the UK end and, in light of the broad agreement reached on Thursday, don't plan to trouble our US people on this. Here's our response:

1. **Key points of the meeting and agreements reached**

The meeting followed an agenda put up in Google Docs by AH. Responses/agreements/decisions are in red after each:

AH opened saying he wanted to drill down into wiliness to partner. Partnership required WR to agree on three points:

1. Partnership is not transactional. It involves compromise which takes time. (AH did recognize WR "does not have time".)

    1. All at this end continue to simply not understand this point, particularly given TWL's unwillingness to offer their understanding of partnership. ("[P]artnership is partnership, there's nothing more to it" – meeting of Aug 11/email of Aug 12.) However, all working relationships involve compromise. **POINT SEEMS TO BE AGREED**.

2. TWL is not a foundation or funder, it doesn't leave grantees alone to get on with it. TWL has goals that WR needs to remember.

    1. WR clarified, TWL is **not JUST a funder**. Re-iterated commitment to assisting with TWL's learning on the Design Sprint. **QUALIFIED POINT AGREED.**

NOTE: This point and one below, created a new worry at this end, SEE SEPARATE EMAIL.

3. The Trust Factor. AH needs WR to try harder to trust TWL: "I think you believe we're not with you".

    1. WR re-affirmed his conviction that TWL's commitment and personal support for our project is completely trustworthy but re-iterated "I have concerns about TWL execution". **QUALIFIED POINT AGREED**

2. **Other items discussed**

We then worked through AH's agenda of points raised by WR in email logs of meetings of recent days:

4. AH apologized for stating "everyone in philanthropy (and government) told me to avoid you". He misspoke and should have said "most people in philanthropy (and government) told me to avoid you". **APOLOGY ACCEPTED**. WR re-iterated his request for learning on why AH was told this. Agreed to discuss on call this Friday.

5. AH stands by his view that WR has been paranoid and exhibited passive aggressive behavior. **NO COMMENT**

6. AH stated "we need to keep talking about race". **ACCEPTED**: WR has re-iterated he is not an expert on race in America but is happy to aim to be more intentional in anti-racism approach.

7. AH has decided TWL must drive the weekly meeting. There will be an open agenda put up by [REDACTED - TWL STAFFER] for anyone to add to. [REDACTED - TWL STAFFER] will follow each meeting by circulating a decision/agreement log and an actions log. [REDACTED - TWL STAFFER] will also produce a list of responsibilities on the project. **TOTALLY AGREED**: WR has pushed repeatedly for project management disciplines, more than once being labelled "passive aggressive" for doing so.

8. AH reminded WR that he must do his own fundraising alongside TWL's efforts for the Design Sprint. **AGREED**. The lessons of reliance on TWL have been learned. (And see separate email).

3. **Outcome of meeting**

The hour-long meeting seemed to conclude with AH's satisfaction on his core three issues, plus subsidiary points, and therefore his determination the partnership could continue.

4. **Additional response from this end**

My board wish to add:

A routine weekly meeting between TWL and WR on August 11 unleashed uncertainty, significant additional work, and a lingering emotional toll on an already fragile operation struggling with a sudden downturn in funding. The cause seems to have been nothing more than a feeling by TWL's CEO that WR did not want to partner with TWL, despite his making clear this was not the case.

We believe reassurance on this kind of premonition is best handled with a quiet one-to-one asking for feedback. We are particularly alarmed that we have no way of knowing if/when this situation could reoccur. We remind TWL of the importance of steady, painstaking work at this end which necessarily underpins TWL's design sprint.

And a suggestion:

No interest was expressed in my comment that “I have concerns about TWL’s execution” on Friday. If you were willing to address my issues, as we have addressed Adrian’s, with a meeting, I will likewise prepare an agenda on the assurances that would resolve those concerns. I don’t know if this possibility is within TWL’s process, or comfort zone. But [REDACTED - TWL STAFFER] has visibility of my calendar and could slot something in for us.

Bestest

Wingham
