

MONITOR INSTITUTE

A member of the Monitor Group

Presentation of the RE-AMP Case Study

Transcript of Q&A with the audience at The Hub SOMA, April 29th 2011

Rick Reed: We're a part of the network and build their capacity. So intentionally, those working groups, each have an elected leader and that elected leader has a half time staff person. That half time staff person could have been in a centralized place. And instead that half time staff person is based in whatever organization the elected working group leader is in. Likewise the media center could have been a centralized place but instead we ask who in the network has good media chops or ready and who wants to enhance them raise your hand. We picked an organization who raised their hand. We have been enhancing their capacity. So it's another key element of not becoming centralized but pushing resources as close to the ground as possible in building capacity in members.

Heather McLeod Grant: And the next two principals really draw on some of the things that we have been talking about with respect to the structure but principle number 4 was about cultivating leadership at many levels so we have talked about this but there is this steering committee each working group has a leader. I mean this is basically a network full of leaders right? And there are multiple opportunities unlike a hierarchical organization where you have to have a career path and you have to wait till the executive director retires after 25 years in order to move up. This is an organization that is really full or a network that is full of leaders. And the whole purpose is to cultivate leadership and give people leadership opportunities throughout the entire system.

Rick Reed: In a way, this network is really a platform for emergent leaders to find a constituency for their ideas. And so, if you've got a great idea, as an example, we have an annual meeting every year. It's the one time of year when the body of the whole gets together: foundations, NGOs, we all meet for 2 days. And at one of our annual meetings, a baker's dozen, 13 advocates got together in a side room and said we need transportation to be part of RE-AMP. So they just basically formed a caucus, went to the elected steering committee and advocated for it, and they got it. Likewise, people in the rural parts of our state were saying you know, you guys have the right ideas about what we should be advancing - energy efficiency, renewables, but you're talking about it in ways that are really urban. You know they don't speak

to rural people and rural people's lives. We need a rural caucus to figure out how to frame these issues in a way that rural folks can identify with. So they, there was a leader that wanted to do that. This woman Sarah Shanahan and she just organized a constituency and they've been doing it ever since. So this is just a great model for folks who have the energy and desire to elevate an issue and find a constituency and move it forward.

Heather McLeod Grant: Now one other thing I would say is there's also a leadership exercised in this group by funders but it is very much in the context of the collective. They have their own working group and a combination of funders and non profits sit on the strategic action fund and make collective decisions about allocating grant resources. The other thing is that I found quite interesting was the role of consultants. And this isn't meant to be a plug for hiring consultants but I do think that it's interesting to observe and I think any of us who have experienced trying to collaborate, you actually need somebody who is going to hold the space. And you need people who have the analytical tools like David Sybit did with the systems mapping or folks like Scott Spann and David Sybit who came in and did some of the graphic recording and still does graphic recording at their meetings. What we've been learning is that self organizing is a great principle and people still need hand rails. So that's what we've been talking a lot about what are the hand rails, how do you create the structures that enhance and facilitate and catalyze self organizing because sometimes people left to their own devices without a facilitator, it's actually really hard to make forward progress. And as you said, we've all sat in meetings where people are just kind of piling on, going in different directions, and there's nobody there who's collectively helping the group understand what it knows and help that collective wisdom emerge.

Rick Reed: I would go further than that and just say, there's a whole set of social technologies that people various consultants have become really expert in bringing them in is a fantastic addition to help people move forward faster. Cause that's the other piece of all this. We got to make progress fast, we don't have a lot of time. And I would just again sort of tip of the hat to Garfield Foundation and some of the other foundations for actually investing in it. A lot of times, people feel like it's a luxury

and we found that it's actually not a luxury, it's a core part of how we try to do business.

Heather McLeod Grant: So we've talked about this one as well. A little bit on [restrictive](#) but multiple opportunities to connecting communicate, so it really is about combining online and offline and I think that's the next frontier for social sector workers. How do you use the right tools and the right creative right spaces for people to connect and share information, whether that's happening in an online environment like on the comments, where you are posting documents, you are sending out queries, you are communicating via email or other platforms online or in person and I think this is another thing we have been learning in our practices where is that the end person convening shouldn't be underestimated both at the beginning when you were studying this just the importance of actually bringing people together to collectively problem solve and then the importance of reconvening every year this annual meeting where all of the leaders of the network come together for several days and I actually attended their convening last August outside of Chicago and its very probable because it is about building this relationships and building net trusts and net senses like we are in this together. You can then use this email in between these meetings, you can use other tools by that fundamental human connection, I think it's actually really important... so I don't think this could have all happened in a purely virtual space even though the virtual space is a great component to the end person convenings

Rick Reed: I would just add to that, simple things people just say, you know once leadership changes over time, people take different jobs, new people get hired. Once you meet somebody face to face, it's much easier to send them an email, to call them on phones and then I would just want to say one other about learning because so much of this is learning from each other and you know people learn through different styles and different means and so that's another piece. Our analyst, she writes reports, she hosts webinars, she goes to working group meetings in person to share results. There is a whole range of ways that people learn, instead there is no magic as to what's the best way to do this and the answer is all of the above. So if you really want to make sure that people are metabolizing the kind of information

coming through the system, you have to meet them where they are and give them the kind of information that they most easily learn from

Rick Reed: And that actually is a [perfect seaway](#) to our last principle which is to remain adaptive and emergent and committed to a long-term vision. So I think what then is really interesting about the RE-AMP network is observing how much is constantly changing like even when we were going depressed on this case study and we were fact checking like oops nope we have got you know it's not 123 non profits, its 125 and oops were we adding this new caucus you got to put the wrong caucus and so it's just the ability for the network to constantly respond and adapt and I just think in last couple of years, this network is about 7 years old and in the last year you have really doubled down on the learning piece, they have actually just hired somebody to come in and do a formal evaluation of impact and network, health and resilience. But in addition you have got this new online learning system. So you are really putting a lot more emphasis now on trying to understand what you know and how things are working across the network and help it adapt and move in directions when your needs are rising

Heather McLeod Grant: I don't want to sound like a broken record shouting out Garfield but it's really rare. Garfield basically assigned me, given me the flexibility and the freedom to play this role in the network of constantly scanning and seeing what do we need now, what do we need next, what's holding us back and then trying to figure out an also having about the RE-AMP and Garfield cheque book to figure how do we fill that gap, how do we address that need, how do we expand on that opportunity and so that's incredibly rare and I think it's an important thing to have at our networks of disposal in order to keep it from basically calcifying in place. RE-AMP is incredibly dynamic. I can give you a list of 10 things that just emerged we've dealt with and it helps the network to get smarter, better, more effective. It's never the same, it's always evolving and changing.

Heather McLeod Grant: Terrific, so with that, that was the last of our six principles now we want to open it up to you guys to respond to some of your questions. We would also love to hear some of your stories or experiences with the networks that

you have been a part of. I suspect we should probably try and use the microphone so that we can get this on the recording.

So who would like to ask the first question ?

Question: My name is Barbie, I am with [Richard Change](#). I am curious to understand how you expanded your network to a 125, specifically those naysayers that you talked about and those foundations who are the smartest guys in the room. Do they them on board and just in general, how did you do that?

Rick Reed: Thank you for asking. A lot of RE-AMP's growth was purely organic and so for example when we went from, we identified our four places to intervene in the system and there were around the table, at that point a dozen NGOs. Within those NGOs, the people who participated in the mapping, there were folks who had clear expertise and shown had leadership in that group and so the Garfield Foundation basically went to a person for energy efficiency, a person for renewable energy, etc. for people.....

Here's the USD 50,000 planning grant. A symbol your dream team of people who can tell us ok we see this is worth a intervene but specifically how much renewable energy are we in need by 2030 in order to get this 80% of reduction and whatever we do over the next five years. So we gave them a USD 50,000 planning grand set, build your dream team, at the same time we Garfield paid for the Grove Consulting Group who was great in helping people do strategic planning. So each of the four groups had access to a professional consultant who was expert in strategic planning, and they built the dream team organically within, went from about 12 people upto about 40. So that was the first leap getting the 40 NGOs who are all co-planning and basically at the same time those 40 were immigrated, their thinking was elevated their minds, a meno map what they needed to do and how the system worked and how things were integrated. All of that happened all of the same time. From those 40, it just became we have a very simple membership requirement, I actually brought them, I could read them off but I will basically say as an NGOs you have to agree that you are on board for the goal of 80% reduction in global warming pollution. You have to agree that you going to share, you are going to participate in atleast one working group and you are going to share information with your colleagues and you are going use the framing that comes out of our media shock based on the best public

opinion we search we can come up with, you are going to use that framing to be accountable to the network about that and about foundation, it's a similar sort of said things, you are going to align your priorities with insights and analyzes the mergers from RE-AMP over time. It's so reflects this things if success breeds success and people were showing they were more progress and so other folks decided hey this is it for me. A big change happened in 2007. Upto 2007, there was no funding associated with RE-AMP whatsoever in terms of grant making but in 2007 we established, but two and a half years after we really got organized our pooled fund and that pooled funding gave people even more motivation are the members of the network basically ballooned after it was possible to get funding through a RE-AMP sort of avenue. In terms of the naysayers the answer is there are some of our best partners now, it's absolutely fantastic, we are incredibly integrated. There are still samrtest guys in the room but they don't have to be kings of the hill anymore. They are totally happy with integrating what they know in the work we are learning. We are a national organization. RE-AMP has literally hundreds of eyes and ears in the field bringing intelligence into the network. They have got one percent in the mid-west who are their eyes and ears and so that one percent deeply participates in what we are doing and is committed totally respect the quality the intelligence that's coming out. So, likewise with the NGO or the few NGOs they were naysayers they see the value in it they are finally deeply integrated in some of our past collaborators

Heather McLeod Grant: Yeah. Great. More questions.

Question: First of all, I am in awe of this effort. It's really really really remarkable. Thank you. I certainly see it going beyond the climate change as just the model of how they take on a really complex unaesthetic moving forward with such effectiveness. And in the mean time grow with the capacity of over players to do this systemic work. So what I am also stuck by that you truly manage to get expertise, infrastructure, and resources and put them together for the sake of this initiative. Can you speak a little more about the infrastructure. You spoke about the infrastructure in just enough, you say do not much but not too little. Can you speak to that, I am just little curious what that was like?

Rick Reed: As Jenny said, we didn't start with the idea of a network. So what we started to ask ourselves and when I say ourselves, we should really give credit, Jenny was a part of this, David Sybit , Routh, and another consultant, we call ourselves the i-team, the integration team and this question of what are the functions we need, so that's the key questions, whatever you design what are the functions that are absolutely essential and then let's see how we can put those in our work. If you want, I can get you through our thinking on that. We wanted a democratic governance structure where reflected the commitment of foundations and NGOs to work shoulder to shoulder. We wanted that to be demonstrated in a democratic way, that became our steering committee. So that's the steering committee. We wanted a locus of activities for advocates who are working on same initiatives to plan together and benefit from each other's expertise, that became our working groups and the working group structure. We need an official way to communicate across dates and across working groups and a way for people be able to work online, that became our comments, our password protected comments. We needed professionally developed communication materials, basically use public opinion research over time to frame issues in a way to be valuable to all members of the network. That became our media center. We needed to shorten the cycles of learning so that once we learn something in one part of the network, it is as quickly as possible, transferred to other part of the network. That became our learning in progress system. And then, we ultimately figured out we needed a pooled fund to distribute grants but even more than just pooled funds, we needed to reflect this great resource of intelligence from the network into this pooled fund was all about getting not a group of funders together but our working group leaders and contributing donors sitting together on a committee creating a process that enabled folks in all the states to determine from where best ideas were, what's ready for prime time in your state to sit into that committee, let the committee review it and develop or ask peace not based on what some foundation or staff figured out but based on what the people on the ground are telling us are the most important opportunities at this time. So those were the basic core functions that we figured out we needed and then we just out these things in place to do it.

Heather McLeod Grant: Can I add just one very quick comment. I have been working for just last 6 months with a business alliance for local living economies and

trying to help them design a network infrastructure, it's based on some of these principles and then also interestingly enough for both National Sierra and national Autobahn society which are membership organizations that fell under the division they were actually organizations rather than networks and now need to relearn how to be networks and we build that connective tissue and a decentralization and the ability to self organize. So I think you can actually take these principles and design principles and think about how you apply them in other fields and issue areas and that's precisely why we were so interested in the RE-AMP work because I think you guys have really bang on the cutting edge of discovering this next practice

I just want to add that the leadership is been incredibly important and particularly in the first couple of years Garfield foundations was willing to play that and Ricks still plays it tremendous leadership role. In fact he is graduated to his senior look over and he's been far more sophisticated in the last few years the role he plays, but we actually decided through our governance structure, to hire staff that we do have a coordinator, our working groups has assistance and there is staff in there but that's de-centralized and I think that's really the key to the network structure that we have organically evolved to. So leadership is so key and network is not going to happen without leadership, you might have evolved leadership, create opportunities for leadership but somebody has got to raise the hand.

Next question. There is another that appeared.

Question: RE-AMP seems to have been very effective with creating systemic change and I am curious as to your decision to, it seems there are no corporate partners and network and I am wondering if that is the case and so do you think that is successful in creating systemic change because the intended outcomes were more policy-related and advocacy-related instead of needing to include the corporate sector in a more tangible results approach.

Rick Reed: It's really insightful question and if I was asked to do it over again or look at it different issue and think of who the network should include, I would absolutely from the beginning include a strong business contingent. I would look at the supply chain, I would look at who, again it has to people who are interested in reforming the system but I would include that. The reason RE-AMP doesn't, is a

legacy. From the early days, when we were so focused on stopping coal and the business of utilities and their usage 70% of the electricity in the mid-west generated from coal and it turns out if you were a renewable energy generator, provider or you are part of that supply chain, utilities didn't basically will black pole you if you came out in support of or you're a part of this network that they also knew was really radically trying to fight new coal players. So the folks who were working on coal really didn't want the utilities involved in this renewable energy sector under the same roof as the coal people and the renewable energy businesses didn't want to have many things to do with us because it was bad for their business. And now taking in all the way to the present, we are trying to look at supply chain, we are trying to look at especially large industrial users of energy and working with them to do co-generation and other kinds of practices and having them become a part of our advocacy network but it is back filling compared to having started that from the beginning

Question: Hi, ...in the presentation we saw, kind of two ends of the process, so we heard about the network building and the infrastructure and then we heard about the arch comes on other hand and I am particularly interested in what happened in between and so specifically for all of those foundations and NGO's that we're involved in the network, I am wondering if you can talk about the specific activities that a lot of these organizations were involved in, I am assuming that a lot of it was policy advocacy focus. But particularly what were the activities and how did those change from the beginning to the end. Did they take on new things that were not doing before, did they stop doing certain things, did they change their programs...that kind of thing

Rick Reed: Wow, what a great question! The fundamental change, absolutely fundamental change was that people stopped looking at just....basically you are right its policy in-advocacy, almost all of the activities, policy in-advocacy. When you look at the dollar flow and activities..almost all of that. The fundamental change in that and it's remarkable, you can really see it before our eyes and in practice. Before RE-AMP, let's say I wanted to get something to happen in Minnesota on energy efficiency, I go to the legislature and talk to sympathetic members and let's say another group wanted to do something on renewables, they'd go and talk to

sympathetic members and somebody else was really thinking we got a more regulation on coal, they would go..and what the legislators would do is they would play one set of advocates off against the other. And so I'll give you your energy efficiency but you got to be with me when I turn down these renewables or when we say no to these reforms for coal. After RE-AMP it was absolutely crystal clear no one could win unless we all win. If you look at 2007, holistic comprehensive legislation that dealt with the whole ball of wax was able to be passed in Minnesota, was passed in Illinois, was recently tried and failed in the end in Wisconsin. They have been looking at it like that in Iowa. When you look at how they basically educate legislators around it, they show him this wonderful series of graphs and they say with energy efficiency alone this is how much emissions reductions you get. Add renewable energy to it, look it goes up by this much. Add a carbon policy to it, it goes up that much, we actually get to the whole 80% and it helps people to see that one can't be played-off against the other, we need it all. That was the most fundamental change. And we have seen foundations actually open up their thinking, that we don't fund this, we only fund that, there is still some of that. But it is a lot more porous than it was when we first started.

Question: So, I want to echo that it is a fantastic, really inspiring story. I do want to inquire a little bit about some of the tougher things that happened behind the scenes and I am kind of wondering with these 125 organizations, how they have dealt with their individual missions? I could imagine that it could be a little bit of a challenge. Whether any of them ended up merging, whether there was staff resistance because people were afraid that their jobs were now obviously redundant. Any things like that and how you overcame them?

Rick Reed: Who says we overcame them?

I will say, in part, I'm going to answer this in two parts. So the first part has to do with our elected steering committee. So if you have got skin in the game in energy efficiency in our region, your organization gets to vote on who represents you on the steering committee and likewise with each renewable energy, with coal, you get to vote. Skin in the game is defined as at least a half time staffed person, dedicated to this issue. So at the steering committee level, it has been inspiring to watch people leave their organizational hats at the door, and not just the steering committee. The

steering committee makes policy, it allocates resources that are for the network as a whole to benefit from, to the media center, to the [commons] etc. But we also have this pooled grant fund and those say working group leaders sit on that and disburse 3-4 million dollars a year along with foundation colleagues contributing donors and it is truly remarkable and inspiring to watch them leave their state hat at the door. 'Better get the most money I can for Minnesota or for Illinois..No!' To watch them leave their organization hat at the door..'Oh Man! My organization really wants to get a part of this'. It says as much about the individuals really as it does about the network overall.

Heather McLeod Grant: I just want to add something to this as an observation about RE-AMP and also other networks we have looked at. I think we hear the word collaboration and this is collaboration. But I think there is a tendency to sort of become very Kumbaya about it and assume that self-interest would just go away and I think what I found most enlightening about writing about RE-AMP was that they actually took self-interest as a given. In fact it was a premise of the system's mapping. It's like start with your own assumptions, and your own mission, and which piece of system you are working on and it's about aligning self-interest with collective interest and at the end of the day it's about these non-profits recognize that they themselves are going to have more impact and be more successful and attract more resources if they are actually sharing this information because they are going to become more effective. I think it actually reduces in some ways the friction in the system, because you don't end up with that system where you have two or three organizations trying to do exactly the same thing, competing for the same part of funding. Because they are sharing information and they have a shared systems map they can actually say, 'Oh well you are going to focus on this. Well, either we are going to team up with you and we are going to get double the bank for the buck by doing this together and lobbying the legislature together. Or we are going to differentiate, we are going to take this piece here and you take that piece there but together they make a whole'. So, in some ways it can reduce some of that competition that's built into the way the current funding strings and non-profit dynamics work

More questions...comments???

Question: So I've done a lot of similar work around complexity and network development, it's really inspiring to hear how you all are approaching all of this. And got a million nerdy tactical questions. But I guess that my biggest one relates to what you were saying..which is how much and how are you targeting staff at the mid-level? It sounds like that you are doing lot of intentional relationship development across organizations at an executive level. Are you also able to do that at staff level? I have found in my experience that there is lot of potential leadership that can really get expressed.

Rick Reed: Not so much....I would say that in the working groups...I have got a disclaimer which is that I am less at the mid-level and lower. At this point in my relationship with RE-AMP is that I am with the leadership body and the various folks...In a way I am partially ignorant to how much is going on. But to the degree that working groups are the place for program level people. So not executive directors...but a given organization may be is working on two-three different issues, their program person is going to be part of working group and they will plug-in in that way. But in terms of a much more... I don't have a good answer to your question

Heather McLeod Grant: Opportunity for adaptation and emergence in more shared leadership, right? Jenny, did you want to say something on that?

Jenny Curtis (Garfield Foundation): I wanted to add to that because I actually disagree with Rick a little bit. For one thing the [commons] is open to anybody in the organization. So we have a 125 members, that's 125 organizations, we have 425 participants. So there is opportunity for staff at mid-levels or whatever levels to access information and certainly the working groups and I also want to bring to attention that our annual meeting is a 140 people and there are certainly not 140 executive directors there. There is a lot of discussions going on in the hallways and I think that is a lot more of the program people, far more than senior level management

Heather McLeod Grant: Good Point....Ok, this gentleman here...

Question: Hi, I am Michael, Roots of Change. Curious about a couple of things...first of all fantastic, I've followed the story for a while and really it's amazing, how wonderful... it's blooming into this incredible thing. I am curious about a couple of things. The difference you talked about 3-4 million dollars that you have in the funds for the investment in the work that's going on this field but how much are you spending on infrastructure pieces? The pieces that hold this together, the facilitation efforts, the analysis efforts, the convening efforts.

And the second thing is in terms of the fact that you said it's mostly policy work. How are you dealing with this issue of boundaries between lobbying and advocacy in the foundations, the relationship to their money?

Rick Reed: First question, are there collective infrastructure that ...pictograph that Noah created to show the system. Between 700,000-800,000 dollars a year supported by currently 14 different foundations. So 14 foundations contribute an average of 50,000 dollars but it goes from 25,000 up to 75,000 or maybe even a hundred. The organizations that are getting grants from us are very clear on the distinction between C4 or lobbying work and all the things you can do up to that line. Most of them or at least the ones that are crossing that line have other sources of income. They are membership organizations, they have individual donors etc. So some of them actually provide services that they generate money from... that's unrestricted. So there's a clear line there...But I absolutely...we try to get as close as close to that line as possible. Let me give you an example of which I am actually really proud of. When you look at the advocacy policy lifecycle, most foundations simply focus on what's happening in a given legislative session or maybe with regulators, whatever. There's a pre part to that, those people every two years, there's an election, and so it seems silly to us to wait until after the election and the whoever gets elected to randomly try...work with them, talk to them about our issues. Elections are a great time and ours happen to be renewable energy and not so much framing it as climate change but framing it as clean energy and energy efficiency and being smarter about our energy. It turns out public opinion research that we commissioned shows that's a winning issue - whether you're a Democrat or a Republican or a Green or any political stripe. And so at 2010, we spent 3 quarters of a million dollars, first doing public opinion research, developing a candidate education non-partisan, we got a lawyer involved at very clear, this is what mean to be non-partisan. And then in 3

swing states: Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, we gave folks a couple hundred thousand dollars each to do specifically outreach to all candidates for office in specific, they carved those states out, important areas they wanted to focus on. So that meant that whoever got elected got at least a chance to have a briefing no matter who your audience is politically, this is the winning issue for you. And you can run on this issue and you can talk about it and you can be for it and it'll help you win office. And so that's an example of using our money right up to the line but not crossing it.

We have time for I think just one or two more questions, there are a couple of hands, so let's take these two folks, oh, it's you Eugene, I almost quoted you earlier. This is Eugene Kim who helped lead Wikipedia's strategy and he's done some work with us at Monitor. I was going to quote you on this leadership thing on, that networks are duocracies. Step forward and do.

Question: Thank You. So I have 2 questions. My first question is about the system mapping process. So, you talked about the catalyzing affect that the system map had on the people who participated in that process, so I'm curious about the affect the map has had on the people who have come afterwards. And I'm also curious about whether or not actually continuing to develop that map is part of your process. My second question is actually a response to something you said Heather about the whole Kumbaya affect. I'm curious as a network do you ever find situations where there is an organization in the network who sees someone else taking a, playing a certain role, and saying so you know we can actually do this better than they can. And actually coming in as competitors vs. moving from away from that space and avoiding redundancy.

Rick Reed: Both those are great questions. Basically, the whole map, the complete map, I would say after the bloom of the [fort](#) going from a dozen to forty, that the complete map has fallen off of our radar and the simplified map of these four inner-related elements for electricity and then that same kind of a process in transportation led us to three things as well. So there aren't again an infinite number of things if you're interested in reducing the carbon footprint of transportation, turns out you map it out, it refines down to three. And so we've used the methodology to continue

to focus on what are high leverage places to intervene. So that's how we used it. In terms of continuing it, I'm really of mixed minds about it. In basically mixed minds only because it really is a huge investment of time and I don't know if we genuinely have a constituency who has the appetite to spend that time at this point. We got so much clarity on sort of mission, goal, objective focus, I think personally I have got a huge appetite for it and I can see it having some salience but I'm not sure the network, there's enough of an audience. That's a great question. You know, it happens, what you're describing actually happens, and we see it through, our pooled fun is called the action fund, a global strategic action fund. And so we see people, we develop a RFP, and we send it out state-based, based on what the advocates tell us is ready for prime time, and we get a responses and sometimes they are in competition. The good news is, in the room, as we're evaluating those grants, and if we don't have it in the room, we actually import it in. we either bring him on the phone or we invite someone to our meetings where reviewing them, and people are members of the advocacy community. So it's not just foundations and their experience, it's people who have had experience with people shoulder to shoulder in the trenches, and they know who's who and how different organization operate. That level of intelligence helps us. We've had literally proposals where we've looked and gone, there's 5 organizations on this, what are they doing here? Pull them out. We want to fund this but we're pulling this organization out or wow, there's 3 organizations on here and they say they've got this division of labor, but that doesn't quite make sense. If you look at who's really good at what, why are they saying they're going to do the youth work, that doesn't make sense. We need to get these other organizations who are good at youth work, and give them that part of the money. So in that way, it works. There's a different element. We have gone beyond the environmental community and we've reached out to include in the network, faith and youth, by intention. Intentionally, reached out to those communities. But the other kind of competition we see is the environmental community all agreeing yes, ofcourse they should be included but we want to be first among others. Meaning we want to get our money and then if there's money left over, sure give it to these other constituencies, and to deal with that we've actually had to segregate out an earmark specific funding for faith and youth so that there's enough funding there to get them to do things. Or to power their efforts.

So we're actually out of time, it's 8.30, and what we will say is that I'm sure Rick and I both going to be happy to stick around and answer any further questions. Noah, if you wouldn't mind, we've got the copies of the case study here. We can just pass them out or folks can come up and grab one. We've also got another case study as I said, it was by using the internet to scale more traditional non profit service model. And all of our contact info is up here, we'd love to hear from you. If you have stories to share, we'd love to blog about them on our blog, workingwikily, we'd like to thank everyone for coming, and we're happy to stick around