

**From:** Rob Mather  
**Sent:** 14 October 2018 18:49  
**To:** Crispin, Natalie; Isabel Arjmand; Nicole Zok  
**Cc:** Austin, Julian (AMF); Sherratt, Peter (AMF)  
**Subject:** Guinea - Establishing the net gap

Dear Natalie and team,

Please find attached material that relates to our identifying the funding gap in Guinea as requested. I have included a summary that covers the key steps we went through to a) understand the funding gap; b) reduce the funding gap; and c) ultimately agree to fill the new funding gap of \$7.1m = 3.86m nets.

This summary is included as this was more than a process of 'receiving funding need + commitment numbers' but involved a review of key assumptions and initial decisions to, ultimately, establish a new level of funding gap.

If we sent you just the overall country funding process spreadsheet it would not capture that process that led to some important ways in which AMF added value here.

May I suggest a 20-25 minute call to go through the material here to help you easily understand the process and progress made here, and answer any questions?

Warm rgds,  
Rob

=====

Attached

Overall Country Funding spreadsheet

Summary of savings from AMF's intervention (savings chronology, that goes with 'Post analysis' narrative below)

Detailed funding gap spreadsheet – district level requirements and other funding partners' commitments

Net Need Calculation (spreadsheet showing range of populations and scenarios)

Timeline

07Feb18 – Guinea PNLG approaches AMF and asks if we can help fund a \$16.3m campaign gap (\$36.7m total cost, \$20.4m committed)

13Feb18 – AMF contacts GF Guinea team to understand the funding situation

13Feb18 – GF responds and net gap discussions start

Over the following weeks AMF requested and received the following information

- estimated population (drives overall net need and major factor in campaign cost)
- overall country funding situation (via spreadsheet)
- funding commitments from other partners (direct approach to partners)
- malaria prevalence information
- net need by province

AMF reviewed population estimate - agreed with PNLP an approach that removed the risk of a population over-estimate leading to too many nets in-country. This new approach involves: sufficient time (8 weeks) between household registration data received by AMF and distribution starting to allow household data collected on paper to be put in electronic form, reviewed for errors, a final registration total established, and a second shipment of nets (to add to the '90% of the initial estimate' sent in a first shipment) to be sent and reach the country in time for distribution to take place during the scheduled distribution phase.

#### Post analysis, recommendations from AMF to PNLP and GF

##### 1. Population estimate

**Initial decision:** Initial funding request on basis of 14.4 million with population estimates between 11m and 16m.

**AMF recommendation:** Plan on basis of 13.2m population

**Rationale:** More likely estimate of population

**Outcome:** Accepted

**Implication:** Lowered overall funding need and net gap by \$2.96m (Funding gap down to \$13.34m)

##### 2. Conakry nets

**Initial decision:** Full coverage of Conakry (capital of Guinea), 1.1m nets required

**AMF recommendation:** Targeted distribution to higher malaria areas, 500,000 nets reqd.

**Rationale:** Conakry has a malaria parasitology level of 2% vs 7% to 30+% in other parts of the country and with gaps elsewhere should not be allocated nets before all other (more malarious) areas receive nets; not all areas of Conakry need to receive nets.

**Outcome:** Accepted

**Implication:** Lowered net gap by 0.8m nets. Saving of  $0.866m \times \$3.82 = \$3.31m$ . (Funding gap down to \$10.03m)

##### 3. No 20% buffer for AMF nets

**Initial decision:** 20% buffer for all provinces

**AMF recommendation:** No buffer for AMF-funded provinces but commitment from AMF to fund as many nets as indicated by actual registration data (as long as it is judged reliable)

**Rationale:** The population estimates are so unreliable that shipping nets against estimates has the significant risk of over-funding nets. The right quantity of nets as indicated by actual registration data can be shipped in time for distribution

**Outcome:** Accepted

**Implication:** Removed risk of overfunding nets. Removed 0.8m nets from the immediate budget. Saving of  $0.8m \times \$3.82 = \$3.01m$ . (Funding gap down to \$7.02m)

**Note:** There is the potential for more nets to be needed if reliable registration data indicates it is needed. If it were to be 20% of the estimated need the following funds would have to be added: by AMF (for nets)  $0.8 \times \$1.85 = \$1.48m$ , and GF (for non-net costs)  $0.8 \times \$1.69 = \$1.35m$ . AMF has this funding ringfenced and available. [REDACTED]

##### 4. Net size

**Initial decision:** 180x190x180cms (WxLxH)

**AMF Recommendation:** 180x190x160cms (WxLxH) – one of the standard sizes of nets

**Rationale:** No clear justification for these oversized (overheight) nets; more expensive to produce (+9%); limits flexibility in production for topping up net need vs having standard sized net

**Outcome:** Accepted

**Implication:** \$0.25 (12% - \$1.88 vs \$2.13) reduction in net costs. For AMF-funded nets a saving of 3.86m x \$0.25 = \$965,000. GF and PMI still establishing if they can change their order to go with the standard sized nets. Potential further saving: 3.36m x \$0.25 = \$840,000. (Funding gap down to \$5.23m)

[REDACTED]

### 3. Individual net packaging

**Initial decision:** Individual packaging for nets

**AMF Recommendation:** No individual packaging of nets, bulk bales of 50 nets

**Rationale:** No logistics imperative for individual packaging; reduces cost (1.8%); environmental benefit from doing away with 4 to 8 million individual items of plastic

**Outcome:** Accepted

**Implication:** \$0.03 (1.6% - \$1.85 vs \$1.88) reduction in net costs. For AMF-funded nets a saving of 3.86m x \$0.03 = \$115,800. GF and PMI still establishing if they can change their order to go with no individual bags. Potential further saving: 3.36m x \$0.03 = \$100,800. (Funding gap down to \$5.01m)

[REDACTED]

Savings realised: Potentially \$11.29m (from an initial budget of \$36.7m). Of which: \$9.28 from 2.4m fewer nets; \$1.08m of savings locked in for AMF nets as a result of nets now being less expensive; potential for \$0.94m reduction for GF/PMI/OMVS nets.

Initial funding gap: \$16.3m. Reductions of \$9.2m. New funding gap, \$7.14m. Possible 'add back' cost of \$2.83m if predicted (20%) buffer nets are required. Funding gap reduced by 56% currently; expected worst case if \$2.3m required and no savings for GF+PMI on net costs, \$6.4m saving or funding gap reduced by 40%.

Funding gap being filled by AMF: \$7.14m

23Aug18 – Agreement signed between AMF and PNLP

Rob Mather  
Founder/CEO, Against Malaria Foundation (AMF)

[REDACTED]

Against Malaria Foundation  
[GiveWell - Top ranked charity \(2012, 2013, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018\)](#)  
[The Life You Can Save - Top ranked charity \(since 2012\)](#)  
[Giving What We Can - Top ranked charity \(since 2012\)](#)