

Selection: I generated 5 random numbers in the range (1, 38), 10 in (1, 282), 5 in (1, 191) using a program Mathematica. Then I selected the charities numbered by a list in <http://www.givewell.org/international/technical/criteria#Narrowingthefield>, corresponding to the random numbers I obtained from the program.

Category 1 ("Qualified for further investigation")

1. Roberto Clemente-Santa Ana Clinic, inc (<http://www.nicaclinic.org/>)
 - 1) Hours needed to review this charity: About 4 hours
 - 2) Documents
 - 2-1) Downloaded/Clicked:
 - IRS Form 990
 - From the web page of the charity: About us, "click here to see the map":There is no link; Articles of Incorporation; Clinic Management; Testimonials; Volunteer (Special Programs; Individual donations; Corporate sponsorship; Estate Giving; Thank you 2010); Publications; Donations; Contact us; FAQ; Photo Gallery
 - From Google: Annual report 2009; Make a Difference - Please Help the Roberto Clemente-Santa Ana Health Clinic (Published in "International Living", written by Julia C.Guth, Executive Director)
 - 2-2) Review mainly based on: Annual report 2009
 - 3) Criteria Review
 - There is explicit discussion for neither of the evaluation nor of the information collected. For the evaluation, the number of treated patients (which should not be considered as an "impact" by the GiveWell's standards) as well as the number of touched people by healthcare programs (including campaigns) are given as a standard for the evaluation. On information side, it is implicitly obvious that the information is collected and analyzed mainly by the charity itself.
 - There is no evidence for the actual impact. There is an evidence that (a) medical treatments are administered appropriately: The statistics of patients. However, as stated above, a) GiveWell doesn't admit the number of treated patients as an "impact"; b) In case of the healthcare program, there is no evidence that b-1) the kids have used the toothbrushes and toothpastes appropriately and consistently b-2) the campaign changed the behavior over the long term: It is stated that one campaign targeted for the 2,500 people in the area and the program reduced the number of malaria and dengue cases in that area, however, without how much.
 - 4) Conclusion

It does meet the heuristic 2, for "Surgery-correctable" conditions, as indicated by GiveWell. It does not meet the heuristic 1, as indicated by GiveWell.
 - 5) Additional thoughts
 - In case of charities providing medical services in not-easily-reachable region, the criteria concerning to the "program selection" might be more relevant than those of M&E: Should the number of potential charities grow too large, it might be helpful to sort the charities out and set the priorities to be reviewed correspondingly?

- In case of charities providing medical services, what is most important to be monitored and evaluated might be, transparent usage of funds rather than the actual impact of the program and the discussions on the evaluation of actual impacts, for it is not an unrealistic assumption, that the treated patients by the professional medical staffs have improved their health conditions. Or, suppose that, the ways to evaluate the actual impact were discussed (on the charity's documents) towards the conclusion, that it will be either very difficult (such as clinics) or very expensive, should the actual impact of program play a role as the criteria 1?

Suppose that there is a potential donor, who considers, say, medical treatments, as a human right (believing that improving human rights -for instance, getting treated itself- will "change the life for better"), and still wants to go for, as much as, proven/cost-effectiveness/scalable/transparent.

- In case of the charity at hand, the usages of (additional) funds are notably transparent: Could it not be important enough to be a (less important) heuristic?

2. Global Elimination of Maternal and Neonatal Tetanus (MNT)

(http://www.who.int/immunization_monitoring/diseases/MNTE_initiative/en/index.htm)

1) Hours needed to review this charity: About 2

2) Documents

2-1) Downloaded/Clicked

- No IRS Form 990

- No annual report

- From GiveWell link: "Main site" in the table of

<http://www.givewell.org/international/technical/criteria#Narrowingthefield>; "Program" link; "M&E" link:"The page is not found";

- From the website of the charity: All links under the "Table of content"; Under "The strategies", under the article "Achieving the elimination", "WHO Position paper on Tetanus" document link, "making pregnancy safer" link, and "The number of reported Neonatal Tetanus and Tetanus cases are summarized here" link.

2-2) Review mainly based on: The web page "The strategies", "Validating MNT elimination", "Progress towards global MNT elimination", "Programmatic update", and "Programmatic update Continued"

3) Criteria Review

- Sources of information are denoted explicitly.

- Ways to evaluate the impacts of program are discussed.

- The actual impact of the program as a form of outcome is quantified appropriately.

4) Conclusion

It meets the heuristic 1 as indicated in the list of GiveWell, and it might meet the heuristic 2 in contrast to what is indicated in the list of GiveWell, for they achieve their goals mainly by "Expanding immunization coverage". (Although, it is not clear how the program's whole budget is distributed.)

3. Safe Injection Global Network (SIGN) (http://www.who.int/injection_safety/sign/en/)

- 1) Hours needed: About 0.5
- 2) Documents
 - 2-1) Downloaded/Clicked
 - From GiveWell link: “Main site” in the table of <http://www.givewell.org/international/technical/criteria#Narrowingthefield>; “Program” link;
 - From the charity website: “Learn more about injection safety”; “SIGN 09 meeting report”
 - 2-2) Review mainly based on: “Main site” in the table of <http://www.givewell.org/international/technical/criteria#Narrowingthefield>; “Program” link;
- 3) Criteria Review
 - No M&E is published.
 - The priority programs selected by GiveWell does not include safe injection. Discussions on the Copenhagen Consensus as well as Millions Saved from GiveWell do not indicate the relevance of the safe injection program.
- 4) Conclusion

It does not meet the heuristic 2 in contrast to what is indicated by GiveWell.

4. Fred Hollows Foundation (<http://www.hollows.org/>)

- 1) Hours needed: About 3
- 2) Documents
 - 2-1) Downloaded/Clicked:
 - No IRS Form 990
 - From GiveWell link: “Main site”
 - From charity website (Australian): Under “About us”, “Our Achievements”, “Annual reports and strategic framework”;
 - Annual report 2009
 - 2-2) Review mainly based on: Annual reports and strategic framework
- 3) Criteria Review
 - Sources of information as well as ways of evaluation are not discussed.
 - Among others, number of sight-saving as well as screening is reported. (which can be counted as “actual impact”s.)
- 4) Conclusion

It does meet the heuristic 2 as indicated by GiveWell. The M&E does not meet the GiveWell's heuristic 1, as indicated by GiveWell.
- 5) Additional thoughts:
 - See above 1.5).
 - The source of information is clearly the statistics collected by the charity itself. Can we trust the information? On the other hand, is it worth enough to investigate to prove its credibility?

5. Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition (GAIN) (<http://www.gainhealth.org/>)

- 1) Hours needed: About 4
- 2) Documents:
 - 2-1) Downloaded/Clicked:

- IRS Form 990
- From GiveWell link: "Main site"
- From charity website: Under "About GAIN", "Financial statements", Under "Performance", "Performance Measurement", "Media & Resources", "Organization", Under "Partnerships", "Academia/Research", "Non-governmental Organizations", "International Organizations", "Governments", "Non-governmental Organizations", "Business", Under "Media & Resources", "Reports & Publications", "Fact Sheets"
- Annual report 08/09, financial statements, Fact_sheet_Asia_for_screen_Sept_2010.pdf
- 2-2) Review mainly based on: All web pages under "Performance", financial statements and annual report 2009
- 3) Criteria Review
 - There is no detailed information about the program selection criteria (malnutrition) on GiveWell. However, the cost-effectiveness of programs to reduce malnutrition as a form of the vitamin and mineral supplementation and fortification is verified by Copenhagen Consensus.
 - References for the information are denoted explicitly for the statistics from external sources. (Mostly for the numbers "before" the program.) For those from internal sources, it is discussed in the annual report "Performance Measurement and Research".
 - Ways to evaluate the impacts of program are discussed. (See Under "Performance", "Performance Measurement Framework" and annual report p.21, "Performance Measurement and Research")
 - The actual impact of the program is quantified appropriately. (Under "Performance", "Results")
- 4) Conclusion

It does meet the heuristic 2 as indicated by GiveWell. The M&E does meet the GiveWell's heuristic 1 in contrast what is indicated by GiveWell.
- 5) Additional thoughts
 - Their M&E report is outstanding. However, they have investigated also 8% of the annual budget in order to perform measurement & research programs. Apparently, more budget means (in general) better performance. However, suppose that a charity spends 20% of the annual budget to the M&E and produces an excellent report. Should GiveWell still review this charity? Is there a standard for it?

Category 2 ("Eligible, but not qualified")

1. Lifewater International (<http://www.lifewater.org/>)
 - 1) Hours needed to review this charity: 1.5
 - 2) Documents
 - 2-1) Downloaded/Clicked:
 - IRS Form 990
 - Audited Report
 - From the charity website: Under "The Water Crisis", "Water", "Hygiene"; Under "About Us", "Overview", "Our History", "Financials", "Our Mission", "Strategy"; under "Strategy",

- “Measuring Success” and the link “Transformational Development Framework Diagram” therein, “Appropriate Technology”; under “What We Do”, “Programs”; under “Programs”, “Well Drilling”; “Project Maps”; under “Resources”, “Technical Library”, “Helpful Research”
- Annual reviews are available from the charity website. (“Media & Materials” under “Resources”)
 - From the GiveWell website: “Programs” link needs to be updated.
- 2-2) Review mainly based on: links under “The Water Crisis”, “Strategy”, “Programs”, “Resources” and the annual report 09/10.
- 3) Criteria Review
- Ways to evaluate the impacts of program are discussed.
 - Sources of information are denoted explicitly.
 - Actual impact, satisfying the GiveWell's criteria for the infrastructure projects, is not clear. There is neither any evidence that the infrastructure improvements are maintained over the long term, nor direct evidence of impacts by health measures, although studies indicating health improvements by clean water supply combined with hygienic practices and good sanitation are cited. Note that the Lifewater work not only for the former, but also for the latter.
- 4) Conclusion
- It meets neither the heuristic 1 nor the heuristic 2, as indicated by GiveWell.**

2. Elizabeth Glaser Pediatric AIDS Foundation (<http://www.pedaids.org/>)

1) Hours needed to review this charity: 1.5

2) Documents

2-1) Downloaded/Clicked:

- IRS Form 990
- From the charity website: Under “About us” “Mission Statement”, “The Foundation Today”; under “What We're Doing”, “Program Implementation”, links under it and “Research”; under “Publications”, “Fact Sheets and Issue Briefs”, “Technical Program Briefs, Reports and Publications”
- Annual reports are available from the charity website.
- “Performance-Based Financing: A Promising Strategy to Improve HIV Service Delivery” from the charity website.
- “Issue Brief”
- “2009 Financial Statements”
- From the GiveWell website: “Programs” should be updated.

2-2) Review mainly based on: Annual report 2009, “Issue Brief”

3) Criteria Review

- Ways to evaluate the impacts of program are not discussed in a transparent way.
- Sources of information are not denoted explicitly.
- The main assignment of the charity includes the “priority program” (PMTCT), but it is not clear how much of its funding is devoted for it.

4) Conclusion

It meets neither the heuristic 1 nor the heuristic 2, as indicated by GiveWell.

3. International Eye Foundation (<http://www.iefusa.org/>)

1) Hours needed to review this charity: 0.5

2) Documents

2-1) Downloaded/Clicked:

- IRS Form 990 (For 2009 available at the <http://nccsdataweb.urban.org/>, from the charity website available only for 2008.)
- From the charity website: Under “About”, “History”, “Mission”, “Funding”; “Resources”; All links under “Program”; under “News”, “IEF Around the globe”, “Archive”
- From GiveWell website: “Main site”, “Programs”
- Annual report for 2008-2009 downloaded from Google.

2-2) Review mainly based on: Annual report 2008-2009

3) Criteria Review

- Ways to evaluate the impacts of program are not discussed in a transparent way.
- The main assignment of the charity includes the “priority program” (River blindness), but it is not clear how much of its funding is devoted for it.

4) Conclusion

It meets neither the heuristic 1 nor the heuristic 2, as indicated by GiveWell.

4. Remote Area Medical (<http://www.ramusa.org/>)

1) Hours needed to review this charity: 0.25

2) Documents

2-1) Downloaded/Clicked:

- IRS Form 990
- From the charity website: Under “About RAM”, “Mission”, “History”; all links under “RAM Projects”; All links under “RAM Services”; under “Learn About RAM”, “Resources”, “Accomplishments”, “Foundation”, “Expeditions”; under “Contact RAM”, “Brochures”
- From the GiveWell website: “Main site”, “Programs”
- Annual report is not available.

2-2) Review mainly based on: The charity's homepage

3) Criteria Review

- Ways to evaluate the impacts of program are not discussed.
- Actual impact is not at all clear.
- The main activity does not include any of the “priority program”s.

4) Conclusion

It meets neither the heuristic 1 nor the heuristic 2, as indicated by GiveWell.

5. Sleeping Children Around the World (<http://www.scaw.org/>)

1) Hours needed to review this charity: 0.25

2) Documents

2-1) Downloaded/Clicked:

- No IRS Form 990 available
- From the charity website: “About Us” and “Our Finances” under it; “News & Blogs”; “Trip

- Reports”; “Downloads”, “Financial Statement” and “Information Leaflet” under it.
- Annual reports for 2009, 2010.
 - From the GiveWell website: “Main site”, “Programs”
- 2-2) Review mainly based on: Annual report for 2010.
- 3) Criteria Review
- Ways to evaluate the impacts of program are not discussed.
 - Actual impact is not clear.
 - The main activity does not include any of the “priority program”s.
- 4) Conclusion
- It meets neither the heuristic 1 nor the heuristic 2, as indicated by GiveWell.**

6. Gleaning for the World (<http://gftw.org/>)

- 1) Hours needed to review this charity: 0.25
- 2) Documents
- 2-1) Downloaded/Clicked:
- IRS Form 990
 - From the charity website: Under “Who We Are”, “Mission”; under “What We Do”, “For Humanitarian Organizations” and “For Business/Industry”; “Current Projects”; under “Resources”, “GFTW Financial Information” and “Download Forms”; under “News & Press”, “Press Release” and “In the News”
 - No annual reports available.
 - “Product Placement Procedure”
 - From the GiveWell website: “Programs” should be updated.
- 2-2) Review mainly based on: Annual report for 2010.
- 3) Criteria Review
- Ways to evaluate the impacts of program are not discussed.
 - Actual impact is not clear.
 - The main activity does not include any of the “priority program”s.
- 4) Conclusion
- It meets neither the heuristic 1 nor the heuristic 2, as indicated by GiveWell.**

7. Chad Relief Foundation (<http://www.chadrelief.org/>)

- 1) Hours needed to review this charity: 0.25
- 2) Documents
- 2-1) Downloaded/Clicked:
- IRS Form 990
 - From the charity website: “About Us”, “Fact Sheet”, “Our Projects”, “Contact Us”, “Mission Reports”
 - The 2008 and 2009 annual reports are not available on my laptop.
 - From the GiveWell website: “Main site” and “Programs” should be updated.
- 2-2) Review mainly based on: Charity website
- 3) Criteria Review
- Ways to evaluate the impacts of program are not discussed.

- Actual impact is not clear.
- Sources are not explicit.
- The main activity does not include any of the “priority program”s.

4) Conclusion

It meets neither the heuristic 1 nor the heuristic 2, as indicated by GiveWell.

8. Christian Relief Fund (<http://christianrelieffund.org/web/index.php>)

1) Hours needed to review this charity: 0.25

2) Documents

2-1) Downloaded/Clicked:

- IRS Form 990
- From the charity website: Under “About Us”, under “Who We Are”, “Our Mission and History”, “Financial Accountability”, “Annual Report” and “2009” under it; under “Sponsor a Child”, “Learn about sponsorship”
- 2009 Financial Statement
- From the GiveWell website: “Main site” and “Programs”

2-2) Review mainly based on: Charity website and the annual report for 2009.

3) Criteria Review

- Ways to evaluate the impacts of program are not discussed.
- The source of information was not denoted.
- Actual impact is not clear.
- The main activity does not include any of the “priority program”s.

4) Conclusion

It meets neither the heuristic 1 nor the heuristic 2, as indicated by GiveWell.

9. Freedom From Hunger (<http://www.freedomfromhunger.org/>)

1) Hours needed to review this charity: 4

2) Documents

2-1) Downloaded/Clicked:

- IRS Form 990
- From the charity website: Under “about us”, “Give with Confidence”, “Annual Reports and Financials”; under “worldwide programs”, all links; “news & events”; under “Resources” (linked from the annual report), “Articles”, “Research Reports”
- 2009 Financial Statement
- 2010 Annual report
- “Credit with Education” status report
- “Credit with Education” impact review no.1, no.2, no.5
- “Saving for Change” Impact stories
- “Findings from Microfinance Institutions Offering Health Services to Clients”
- From the GiveWell website: “Main website”

2-2) Review mainly based on: Charity website, the annual report for 2010, and “Credit with Education” impact review no.2.

3) Criteria Review

- Ways to evaluate the impacts of program are partly discussed.
- The source of information are denoted.
- Actual impact from "Credit with Education" is indicated, although it is not completely clear. The reason behind is, among others, that the micro-finance program is not the only project in which they are involved and often different programs (e.g. healthcare) run in combination. It is not clear how their budget is distributed. However, one of their main programs ("Credit with Education") at least reports that the program is causing improvements in client's income or income generation activity.
- The main activity does not include any of the "priority program"s.

4) Conclusion

It meets the heuristic 1, in contrast to determined by GiveWell.

5) Additional thoughts

- "Feeling solidarity" or "female empowerment" might be counted as a improvement in quality of life (in social life sector): Why using "standards of living" instead of "human development index" or other measures?
- How much of income improvements for how many per cent of clients are enough to be counted as "programs causing improvements"?

10. International Medical Corps (<http://www.internationalmedicalcorps.org/>)

1) Hours needed to review this charity: 1

2) Documents

2-1) Downloaded/Clicked:

- IRS Form 990
- From the charity website: Under "About", "Mission & History", "Financial Reports"; under "Our Programs", "Our Approach", "Program Priorities", and all links under it; under "News", "Feature Stories", "Media Coverage", "Press Release"
- 2009 Annual report
- Reports on "Emergency Response", "Health Capacity-building", and "Mental Health"
- From the GiveWell website: "Main site" and "Programs"

2-2) Review mainly based on: Charity website, the 2009 annual report

3) Criteria Review

- Ways to evaluate the impacts of program are not discussed.
- The source of information are not explicitly denoted.
- The main activity does not include any of the "priority program"s.

4) Conclusion

It meets neither the heuristic 1 nor the heuristic 2, as indicated by GiveWell.

Category 3 ("Ineligible")

1. Citizen Schools (<http://www.citizenschools.org/>)

1) Documents

- The main page of charity's website; under "About", "Model", "Locations"; under "Volunteer", "How It Works"

- 2) Criteria Review and Conclusion
 - The charity provides education services to children in low-income communities in the USA. **It is beyond the scope of the report**, for it does not focus on the developing-world aid.

2. Global Collaboration for Development of Pesticides for Public Health (GCDPP) (<http://www.who.int/whopes/gcdpp/en/>)
 - 1) Documents
 - The main page of charity's website
 - 2) Criteria Review and Conclusion
 - The charity provides advisory and consultancy on general usage of pesticides. **It is beyond the scope of the report**, for it does not provide direct aids.

3. Global Microbicide Project (GMP) (<http://www.gmp.org/>)
 - 1) Documents
 - The main page of charity's website
 - 2) Criteria Review and Conclusion
 - **The project has come to an end.**

4. International Partnership for Microbicides (IPM) (<http://www.ipmglobal.org/>)
 - 1) Documents
 - The main page of charity's website; “Our Work”; under “About IPM”, “How We Work”
 - 2) Criteria Review and Conclusion
 - The charity focuses on the management of resources and partnerships for the research on the developments and advocacy for the distribution of Microbicides. **It is beyond the scope of the report**, for it does not provide direct aids.

5. WHO Programme to Eliminate Sleeping Sickness
 - 1) Documents
 - A PDF file searched by Google, “WHO Programme to Eliminate Sleeping Sickness”
 - 2) Criteria Review and Conclusion
 - **There is no website.**

Summary and Reflection

By spot-checking of charities in each categories, we confirm that overall the criteria have been applied consistently and appropriately. In particular, we find that for 2 of 5 charities in the category 1 should be reconsidered, yet, in the category 2, there was only one such charity, and in the category 3, none.

Even though it was not the case with the charities covered by our spot-checking, we discuss that there might have been outstanding charities that have fallen outside the criteria; as a potential (minor) heuristic, we suggest transparency in usage of funds. We find that applying heuristic 1 as the main filter could bring the negative side effect of the M&E sector of a charity growing too big,

and it is likely needed to set some upper limit for its budget as a part of the heuristic 1. It might help to have more heuristics that can function as alternatives. Furthermore, we find that the ways of measuring impacts should be discussed more in detail.