



Q&A on Esmée's new strategy and how we make decisions: Our Natural World

Workshop 1: Our Natural World | 14 January, 11.50am

Panel:

Liam McAleese, Director – Our Natural World
Jenny Dadd, Funding Manager and Our Natural World Lead
Simon Wightman, Funding Manager
Matthew Cox, Investment Director

Q&A

LIAM MCALEESE: Okay it's ten to, hi there everyone. My name is Liam McAleese. I'm the Director for the Our Natural World programme at Esmée Fairbairn Foundation and I'd like to thank you for joining us today, particularly during this difficult time.

In the interest of accessibility, we're describing ourselves. So, I am a tall white man with black hair and brown eyes, with my lighting carefully positioned so you can't see the grey and thinning bits on my head. I'm in my spare bedroom in an increasingly snowy Cumbria. I'm going to introduce my colleagues and I'll ask them to wave when I do so. First of all, Jenny Dadd who's our Funding Manager and lead adviser for Our Natural World; Simon Wightman our Funding Manager for Our Natural World; Matt Cox our Investment Director; and we've also got Danny Newton who is behind the scenes and part of the Our Natural World team, he is a project officer. And Laurence Scott, who also some of you may know in Our Natural World too, who's not able to be with us here today.

A couple of points of organisation: as with the main session, live captioning is available so please click the closed caption or CC button at the bottom of your screens to view these. Thanks again to AI Media for providing the live captions today. And also, as per the previous session, please use and submit questions in the Q&A box below. Please feel free to vote and operate questions that helps us answer the ones that matter to most of you. Please use that function. Anything that's really specific or we're not able to answer today, we will try doing so later either on Twitter or through other means. For those who have just joined this session and not been able to join the previous session, this is going to be recorded and the previous session was recorded, and that session included introduction from colleagues about the strategy and process. If you have specific and detailed questions on that, we can

pick some of those up now but also that webinar is available for you to look at as well. We've described this session as a workshop, our aim is to try and speak as briefly as possible and give you more time for questions. What I will do now is just give you a brief overview of the Our Natural World components of our strategy.

I'm looking at my Esmée colleagues – can you see the slides? Great. The first thing to note, and this came up in a question that Caroline answered – although we're here to talk about Our Natural World and you'll see our impact goals and priorities, some of those priorities lend themselves to very specific action. Caroline used peatland for example but the way we view the world and some of the best work that we support really happens at the intersection between our aims and our mission. I would flag a couple – although not exclusively, these aren't the only ones where there's an interdependency around Creative, Confident Communities and the impact goals around communities taking an active role in decisions that affect them and local economies that work better for the people who live there is often a strong intersection between those in Our Natural World priorities. Just to give you two specific examples. That was the first point I wanted to make – yes, we're here to talk about Our Natural World but please consider our broader framework and mission.

So, moving on to Our Natural World, the way that we've structured our priorities: we have a 10-year articulation of the impact we want to see by 2030. You'll see that on the left, that's preserved and improved species health and habitat; clean and healthy freshwater; and sustainable and ethical food. And underneath that, we've articulated priorities for the first five years. We'll talk a little bit more about those in a moment. As Caroline has outlined in the first session, you know, why these? What's our thinking behind these? They have gone through an extensive process of consultation. Both using evidence, the partnerships we've already had, on our own experience, which as Caroline noted is extensive in this sector. But above all, these are the areas where we feel we can make a difference where the range of tools that Shemain outlined – whether that is social investment or grants, or convening or research, that we're seeking to deploy under our new strategy. We feel that these goals lend themselves to that 'tools in the box' process and approach and of course you will know that these priorities are interlinked and very much interdependent.

I'll move on to the next slide now. That is just a snapshot from our website, and I wanted just to explain how we structure things so under each priority of the five in our strategy, we've set out a rationale and set out the long-term outcomes we're seeking to achieve, so that is all available online and would urge you to have a look at that. It's probably not possible to do them justice by going through the detailed long-term outcomes for each five priority areas but if you have any specific questions about our priorities we'd be happy to pick them up in the Q&A. We've set them out, we hope, quite clearly in our strategy and I would urge you to look at that when we're considering applying to us.

A few other points before I hand over to Simon and Jenny. I just wanted to reflect on the new strategy and what will be similar and what would be different. Because we realised, looking at partners and colleagues who are attending today, some we've worked with before and some we haven't ever worked with. And apologies if there's a bit of duplication

from some of the material earlier but I think it's important to make some of these messages. The first thing is that we will continue to work with brilliant organisations who are doing great work and can be really clear on how they deliver our impact goals in a way that is fresh and transformational. And we still recognise that there is a need to support core and unrestricted costs – that's something that we've heard from you that makes a difference. We're still up for supporting the unusual and unloved things that might be higher risk but is going to lead to higher impact. Those components of how we work haven't changed much.

But what has changed is that we are going to be more proactive as a funder. We will be working in a different way with some partners than we have done in the past, using our tools, co-commissioning, co-creating. Please don't think of us now just as a funder although that will be a principal tool that we will use. Please think of us as a partner as to how we can deliver the impact goals we are articulating together. We will also be increasingly proactive so, within the priorities that are in front of you now, the priority part, priorities we will be working proactively with developing what we're describing as a roadmap to articulate work that we're going to proactively commission as well as considering work that you may have and opportunities you may want to come to us with, which is a slight difference in approach than we've previously taken.

We do realise that our focusing down on these five priorities will mean that it will be increasingly harder for to secure grants from Esmée. It is already hard and we realise that part of today and part of these conversations is to help you be really clear what we're about and also be clear as to whether we're the right funder for you.

So, please do look at the impact areas that are outlined in detail on our website and really consider whether the work is a really clear fit to our impact goals, whether it is ambitious, transformational and going to make the long-term impact that we're seeking to achieve.

The other point I'd just like to briefly make is around Diversity, Equity and Inclusion. Like others, we've not done enough to proactively work with communities and groups who are disproportionately affected by the climate and nature crisis and growing inequality. We've made a strong start and commitment to this by forming a youth panel for example as well as publishing and taking action on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion. We know that this is a particular issue in the environment sector, which alongside farming is one of the least diverse, and we will be actively considering how we use our influence as a funder as well as funding organisations and actions actively particularly around organisations that are led by racialised communities or serving people from racialised communities. That is core to our mission, and I want to just make you aware of that now.

That was all I was going to say in terms of introduction to the priorities. Please do pick up if you have specific questions underneath what we're interested in peat, water, nature-friendly farming etc.

I'm going to hand over to Simon and Jenny now, Jenny first, just to offer their reflections and experience on what we look for, and really what makes a great collaboration. Jenny if I invite you to kick off.

JENNY DADD: Thanks for that, Liam. I would say collaborations come in many different forms and shapes and sizes, and what we're really interested in is the unusual ones, very often, from the intersection between our different areas of interest. So, very much how young people can become the new environmental leaders for the future, thinking about the arts and the role that it can play in emphasising and communicating the difficulties we're in, and providing some positivity and solutions and very often the collaborations are at a community level. We very much would look to see the potential of mixing up, like I say, the arts and the social change, and the children young people interest in all of that and some collaborations come around where people know that they coexist with organisations that they can work with in very different ways so very much thinking about unusual suspects but also collaborations beyond the third sector, potentially. So, who is there the opportunity to work with? That may be a government agency that you can collaborate with, maybe even a local business that has got environmental interest. So, looking beyond our traditional third sector and thinking beyond that. Potentially, those partnerships, the collaboration could bring some private sector money. We know that in the environmental sector, we're not going to solve the problems we have with philanthropic money alone so is there the potential to bring in some private sector investment? And really, the things that are genuine collaborations rather than manufactured for the purpose of an application, maybe they've been collaborations that have been in the offing for quite a long period of time and there just needed some kind of facility to strengthen that. Maybe that's where Esmée could help out. And on that I'll hand over to Simon.

SIMON WIGHTMAN: I'm a tall white man with curly hair. You won't see this because the way I've angled the camera, but I'm surrounded by Lego because my children have taken over this spare room that I'm using as an office, so there are loads of spaceships and all kinds of stuff on the windows still in front of me.

I guess it's a good thing that lots of the things that excite me about applications and ideas have already been covered by colleagues but I think one of the recurring things that's come up is the ability for a grant, that we do for a grant, that we develop with an organisation to have an impact that goes way beyond that grant – either by demonstrating a new way of doing things that people haven't tried before, or by scaling up something that's been tried in a small way but you found a way of really building that and increasing its impact. That's certainly something to look at. It matters less exactly what we're being asked to fund so if what you need to achieve the change that you want and it's an exciting change, is a little bit of administrative capacity or a little bit of core funding, then I think we're really open to those conversations. We don't need to be the funder that's funding the project officers and the kind of, I guess, the more, the more glamorous bits of project development. We'll fund the sort of help that you need.

I think Jenny touched on the opportunity to work to combine our ability to make grants with our ability to develop work through social investment. And then did a really good job of explaining that we're really looking at the environmental impact we deliver – not about making returns from any of that kind of stuff. And that we can combine grants and social investment and I think within the environment sector, there's an awful lot of opportunity to build what we do in that space and to deliver a change through different kinds of innovative ways of using funding. That can be really something quite straightforward like a bridging loan for organisations that just need to cash flow a project or it can be something a little bit more innovative and a little bit more complicated.

I also think Jenny did a really a good job of going through partnerships which was which was another thing I really like to look at – innovative partnerships either that build a broad alliance for change that's harder to ignore for decision-makers and for policymakers. Or that just demonstrate that you're not working alone, that there is this sort of broad alliance.

I think the final point and it's another one that I think others have brought up, is if your work affects communities in some way through its delivery then some really clear thinking and hopefully evidence about how those communities are being brought along with the change. If it's an early-stage project development, then that might be an element of the work that we can help you to support. But it's really something that we need to see that you've thought about in some pretty clear detail. I think that's probably all from me.

Q&A

LIAM MCALEESE: Great, thanks, Simon and Jenny. So, some good questions coming in. One which I think you've just answered Simon – about what stage communities are involved in a project we would consider projects, certain projects that are very narrow in focus that don't necessarily have to involve the community – for example, if it's a very specific, niche piece of people and restoration, but those will be the exception. Simon said the best projects will need really good community involvement at their heart, and we can actually support organisations as part of the proposal in doing that. I hope that answers a question from Olivia.

I'm going to go to a question now from Laurinda – often, there is a mismatch between what senior management of corporate organisations say in their goals for the environment e.g. water companies and the priorities of their more conservative regional staff; will Esmée be able to help by using its high level connections to help influence? That's a really interesting question, Laurinda. Simon, Jenny, did you want to offer some reflections on that?

SIMON WIGHTMAN: Only to say, yes, in any way in any way we can, I think, we absolutely will be up for that. I might bring Matt in at some point to talk about how we might influence sort of corporate behaviours through things other than our sort of grant-making and social investment, but I think, increasingly, we're working with water companies at different levels, and with NGOs like the [RSPB](#) in that. And we can help to emphasise those voices, to add

ours to it, absolutely. But it might be useful for Matt to give a little bit of an overview of our sort of influence of corporates.

MATTHEW COX: By all means. Obviously, within the environment space corporates have a huge part to play and our endowment is a billion sterling which is what funds our £45 million. For the last seven years now, we've been increasingly using our endowment in the background to influence where we can and the attraction of us to companies is that we're genuinely a long-term investor. So, we have a 10-year plus time horizon, which clearly aligns with some of the challenges in the environment space.

Where we can use our influence, either as an investor via our endowment or a potential investor, a thoughtful potential investor, companies are very amenable to conversations. As an example, just within the last three months via one of our fund managers, I've had group meetings with the Head of Sustainability at Sainsbury's and also at a newly appointed role at Amazon, would you believe, to hear their side of the story. So, we do have connections and we're looking how best we can use those to complement the work of the Our Natural World team.

JENNY DADD: If I could just chip in – it's a very good question and we are alert to greenwashing, and I think it's fair to say that that we keep an eye out for that. But it's also, we know that there are people that work outside the third sector that have a commitment to the environment and improving the environment. It wasn't farmers that set out on a particular day to say we're going to reduce the number of farmland birds – that was never their intention. It's our farming practices and the incentives that they were given that has led us to that position. So, we recognise that corporates across all kinds of interests, local authorities, media companies, there are people who care very passionately about the environment and I think if you're an organisation out there and you have, like I said before about partnerships, if you've got a useful partnership that you can bring to pass as part of an application, do emphasise that.

LIAM MCALEESE: Thank you for that. I'm going to combine two questions now around thematic split and I think it says geographical split. One is: do you fund projects in London as part of the strategy or do you tend to support non-urban projects? And the second question: do you have a split of funds in mind across the priority areas within Our Natural World or across the three colours of your strategy. Jenny can I ask you to kick off on that please?

JENNY DADD: Yeah, going in with the second part of that first. There's not a pre-identified sum of money year-on-year that we look to split between the different areas of interest. Esmée, until relatively recently, used to spend about 50% of its money on what we called social change, which would now come under the category of largely Fairer Futures, but to a certain extent, Creative, Confident Communities. And in more recent years there's been a very even spread between our different priorities. Our Trustees have given a clear indicator that they feel that Esmée can make a real difference in the environmental and food space, and so the intention is that the spend will get higher in Our Natural World than we've had previously on the grant side of things, and most probably on social investment.

We are a reactive funder, so it depends what comes through our door to a certain extent. But the spend levels are intended to go up, not dramatically compared to where they were, like say when we got parity between the different sectors. It's not dramatic increase beyond that, but there is a heavier commitment.

In terms of the London question, and we do support work in London. Most certainly any work that has more of an urban focus, we would stress the need that it does really need to extend into our interests in Creative, Confident Communities and Fairer Futures, and what we are keen to see is projects that can be replicated. So, if something is good and local then that's terrific and certainly in places like London, there are a lot of funding opportunities we may not be the right funder for - what is good and local and is intended to stay good and local. But if it's something pushing at the boundaries, something exploratory that others could pick up, that's when Esmée gets interested.

LIAM MCALEESE: Thanks Jenny. I'm going to go to a question from James Lord. Partnership building takes time and resources; can an applicant organisation approach Esmée with a proposal that includes intentions to form the right partnerships within the project, or would you expect all the partnerships to be in place prior to applying? Simon do you want to kick us off on that?

SIMON WIGHTMAN: Yeah, sure. If I'm totally honest, if a proposal came in that had an aspiration for project development but no evidence that any of those project partners had been engaged, and it was just a commitment to engagement at some point in future without really having a feel for the interest from those partners, I don't think that would be for me. Reading that as a Funding Manager, I don't think that would be a very strong pitch. But what we do recognise is absolutely the point James makes in his question that developing a fully functioning partnership, which has developed some fairly detailed work streams, knows exactly how it's going to approach a project and what it's going to do, that does take resource and that's absolutely something that we might be able to help with within a proposal. So, I think we need to see that there's a coalition of the willing, but we don't need to see a full detailed and fully agreed programme of what you intend to achieve because that may well be what you're coming for support with. I don't know if anybody else wants to add to that.

JENNY DADD: I'd say a bit of an existing track record on successful partnership working. It may be that you've got a track record on something and you're looking to explore something completely different. If I give the example of [Hubbub](#) who we've supported since their very early days – after the Brexit vote, they made a decision to focus on areas where there was tension basically between the yes and the no voters, and where there was a lot of difficulties, and to really focus on those areas and think about where they could make an intervention. Prior to that, we've been supporting their work on fast fashion. They came to us and said we really want to switch to this Brexit focused work and actually the issue we want to work on is fly tipping, and it's in Bolton. So, it goes to show that we can be there supporting an organisation as it flips to a new area of interest but what Hubbub could show

us before they came to us was a decent track record on all sorts of environmental impacts so we know they're capable of forming partnerships with local authorities, with corporates etc. They've got that the skills base, if you like, to be able to form the partnerships, but they can flip their focus.

LIAM MCALEESE: Okay, thanks very much, Jenny. I'm going to go to a question around transformational. So from the BH Food Partnership – that's [Brighton & Hove Food Partnership](#): when you talk about the transformational, can you can that be for a specific area, for example, we work in Brighton & Hove, or do you only see transformational as being a wider scale, national interest? Jenny do you want to pick up on that, please?

JENNY DADD: it's an interesting question from an organisation that I think we would see as being top of the tree in the work that they do. So, you're certainly transformational locally and I think the key for us is – can other areas follow that model? And we were fully aware that what works in one location may not work exactly in another. But the skills and experience that you've gained as part of your work in Brighton & Hove, how transferable is that to other places? How much would you like to see other places get to the sort of success that you have achieved? I think that's the key in all of this and, like I say, we know we've done a fair bit of work with coastal communities, and what may work in Grimsby certainly does not work in Hull so, we know it's not as straightforward as that. Obviously, you've been through a long process, very experienced, you've done very well. So, it may be that the model that you have, elements of it, are transferable, tweakable to other places, that sort of thing. We're always very interested in approaches where they've achieved the gold standard, basically, and how much can that be taken up. What's the appetite, really? Are we seeing other places coming to you, saying can we learn from you? How did you do it? Can you help us? That's where Esmée can start to help you replicate.

LIAM MCALEESE: Okay, I'm going to ask Simon and Matt a couple of questions around investment and financing. The first to Matt: just talk a little bit about the experience we developed in supporting land purchase for nature conservation and improvements as well as some of the other outcomes in Our Natural World. And a related question, that's come in which is: whether we mix social investment and grant – so, this is an environmental project we're involved in with local partners, is restoring an area that will be a rich carbon sink when established. Would Esmée be interested in the mixed grant and social investment approach, restoring habitat and producing the evidence needed to drive private sector money towards habitat restoration? Who wants to go first on that? Matt?

MATTHEW COX: Yes, so land purchase has been part of our social investment fund for a number of years now and is an incredibly attractive risk/reward as well as being very helpful for our partner organisations. We buy land on behalf of other organisations, and then provide an option for them to buy that from us – typically between, sort of, 12 months and two years, which perhaps stops the land falling, for example, into hands of developers. It might be the [Woodland Trust](#) etc. The returns to us are relatively low but the risk to us is also relatively low, and benefits the organisation. Particularly what's happened in the last 10 years our social investment fund has been going, is that investment returns have been very,

very hard to come by with interest rates being so low. That now is an attractive financial return in a very difficult environment, and we would like to look for opportunities to increase that in particular, certainly. We have conversations with partner investors in the sector on what we can do with that. And then I might defer to Simon on the question of social investment mixed with a grant.

SIMON WIGHTMAN: So, it's another way – the short answer is yes, I think. And in particular, I think when you look at in England, the investment readiness fund that the Government's putting out, I think what we see that supporting is probably by and large projects that are not very far from generating the revenues that they need to sort of pay back that upfront capital. And I think that's great. I think the risk there is that we get a lot of projects that, actually, the risks are fairly small, or the pathways to returns are already fairly well established. What we miss out on is the opportunities to support work that's much more innovative, that's tackling different kinds of environmental problems, that these approaches haven't really yet got to grips with.

Where those projects are a fairly long way away from actually generating any returns, what they need is some grant funding to work out how to do that, to work out the partners, to work out who will pay for those services, and that kind of thing. So, that actually, what we can build is a much broader base of how we can apply, not just social investment, but also potentially institutional investment in the future at delivering environmental problems. I think absolutely where what you need to test things that haven't been tested before, then we'd definitely be interested in that. And the other way that grants and social investment can be combined is when there's a large project, of which part of it will have the potential to generate returns, but not all of it, and therefore you will need to combine grants and social investment.

We don't need to do both – so, we can work with other funders if you've got Government funding for elements of projects, and there is a little bit of grant funding from us that could help to really increase the potential of that, and the impact of that, then that's also something that we can look at.

JENNY DADD: I should add it's really easy for us to slip into our own language and I know we've got a really broad audience here so social investment is where the money goes out of the Esmée door, but it comes back into us. Whereas the grant money goes out the door and does not come back to us. I think I said earlier that we need more than philanthropy to recover from the environmental crises that we're in, and so, social investment is a good way to have a revolving fund which can be accessed many times over, if you like, rather than money just, when I say just, that's not, that probably sounds bad, but I think it's healthy to have a mix of social investment and grants finance. It tends to be the most progressive organisations that that seek out that mix as well. So, for us, it's a sign of an ambitious organisation that's willing to think about a broader funding mix.

LIAM MCALEESE: Okay, thanks. So, if you receive similar bids, will you encourage charities to join up? Jenny, you want to talk to that one, please?

JENNY DADD: Do you mind just repeating? I didn't catch that

LIAM MCALEESE: If you receive similar bids will you encourage charities to join up?

JENNY DADD: We're really keen, again with the environmental crisis that we face, the joint biodiversity and climate crisis, people have to come together. So, you know, the third sector, I've got a nature reserve here and I've got a nature reserve here, well, how do we join them? How do we create the corridors that join those specific sites for conservation because existing on their own or existing for one particular type of species is not going to solve the crisis that we're in. We really want to see organisations coming together and collaborating – not to force it, not if it's going to not work for people. But we've seen some big nature conservation projects such as [Back from the Brink](#), which brings together many of what I would call the species conservation NGOs. They're particularly interested in plants or birds, together with the Government agency and those with a bit more of a broader remit. And certainly, it's not easy, the climate sector tends to draw on a different type of person than the major conservation sector, but we need to blend them because it's a joint crisis. The more that organisations can work together, the better, I think. But not, like I say, not to make things uncomfortable, but if we're to run as fast as we need to run, and see the scale of change that we need to see very quickly, we have to have much stronger collaboration in the sector.

LIAM MCALEESE: Okay thanks, Jenny. We have a few minutes left. I'm going to come to you in a minute because we are asked a question around whether we have any particularly good examples of projects that illustrate the new strategy that you want to share. I'll try and quickly look at some of the other questions and go back to them.

So, one from Roy Baker: do you have a timescale in mind for how long a project will be funded – for five years, longer if the impacts can't be achieved in just a few years? What's our thoughts on that? Our thoughts are we want longer-term relationships, so, up to five years is something that we would actively encourage and consider in our new strategy. We do anticipate longer lasting relationships, and, in some cases, the implications may be fewer, longer-lasting relationships. Five years is something that we would happily consider, recognising some of the timescales in Our Natural World are indeed way beyond five years.

There's a question around whether as a recently registered charity, are we eligible to apply? The answer is yes, in principle, if you meet the other criteria in terms of eligibility.

We've got three minutes now, so if I just ask Simon and Jenny to just answer the question around any specific examples of a project that just demonstrates our new strategy. Simon do you want to go first?

SIMON WIGHTMAN: Okay, I can go first. I noticed there was a question around do we support policy work in the chat and certainly, yes. So, one so we've supported, for example, [Greener UK](#), a sort of a coalition of NGOs working on Government policy pre- and post-

Brexit. We're also supporting the [Broadway Initiative](#), which is bringing together an alliance of both NGOs working on policy and corporate bodies and businesses, just to show there's a broad alliance around strong environmental governance. It isn't just the NGO shouting, there's a strong sort of body of corporates that want to see that as well. So, we can support policy through those sorts of initiatives like Broadway like Greener UK.

Just one of the questions on scale – we support a very small organisation called [Little Ouse Headwaters Project](#) on the Norfolk, Suffolk border, which is buys up small bits of wetlands, tries to link them together to create one much bigger piece of wetland restoration. It's a small, largely community-led project, but I mention it to illustrate that sometimes I don't know of something like that happening elsewhere, and if there's a real example of something that could be transformative, it doesn't need to be huge, it doesn't need to be a huge organisation leading it. So, that's one.

And the last one I would leave you with is a development grant to an organisation called [Sea Ranger Service](#), which is a Dutch organisation, which takes groups of people usually at risk of long-term unemployment, builds them up with maritime skills and develops custom-made builds that go out and then do conservation work at sea, obviously with properly trained captains and all of that sort of thing. They're working, for example, on seagrass restoration projects, and so, we've supported a piece of work to look at whether that model could be transferred into a UK context. So, sort of a narrative idea that we thought might have legs.

JENNY DADD: Just to add on the policy side of things from what Simon's already said, we do support a fair amount of policy work because there's a lot of other funders that really don't like to. So, that's why we're in that space. And to highlight a particular grant recently under the new strategy, which illustrates it well: [Doc Society](#), who are an arts organisation, and they have got a project with us we support core costs, so a post within the organisation to work with documentary makers from unusual backgrounds on climate change. So, not your usual suspects, regurgitating the usual information on climate change, very much reaching out into disadvantaged communities for their own stories on climate.

LIAM MCALEESE: Okay, so it's now half past 12. That's the time that we've advertised the workshop for. I'm conscious that I haven't got to Richard, Robin's, Ed's or Nikki's questions – my apologies. We have a record of them but unless you've registered with your email address, we aren't going to contact you, so, the best way of answering them: if you're able to send them to communications@esmeefairbairn.org.uk. Then we will get an answer to them. Forgive me for not getting to it in the session. I think they're mostly quite specific, but we will give you an answer to that after and can I thank you all once again for taking the time to join the webinar.

If you have further questions, the contact details I'm just trying to find the end slide which has them on there. We'll have a recording of this session and we're answering further questions on Twitter this afternoon, I think. There we go, that is the contact details, our website, our Twitter handle, and this afternoon under #AskEsmee. There'll be further

opportunity to ask questions. I think that's it. Thanks all for your time. Thanks for Simon, Jenny, Matt and Danny behind the scenes, and AI Media, and have a nice afternoon.