



Natalie Stone <nstone3@gmail.com>

GiveWell review of AMF

Rob Mather <rmather@againstmalaria.com>**Wed, Jun 29, 2011 at 3:39 PM**

To: Elie Hassenfeld <elie@givewell.org>

Cc: Holden Karnofsky <holden@givewell.org>, Natalie Stone <natalie@givewell.org>, Wendy Knight <wendy@givewell.org>

Hi Elie-

Here are the answers to your questions below.

Re Q1.

There are a number of ways we identify where there are large scale gaps in national distribution programs.

1. Initial (directional) information

a) Sources of collated numbers (eg AMP, ALMA)

We liaise with groups that collate statistics on net numbers. AMP's (Alliance for Malaria Prevention) weekly email is one such source as you correctly identify and ALMA's (African Leaders Malaria Alliance) monthly update is another. The numbers are not always up to date and do not always agree. However they are useful as a first alert that there is a gap in a national campaign. I have attached two emails that show you the sort of thing we receive.

b) Distribution Partners

Groups involved in distributions in particular countries may be the first to be aware there is a net gap and they may approach us by email or telephone.

c) Individuals/Advisors (to national campaigns)

Those involved in national campaigns have also approached us in the past to ask if we are in a position to help close a net gap. This may be a technical malaria advisor who has just come out of a meeting

where it has become apparent there is a gap in funding for nets for a near-term program.

We refer to this information as ‘directional’ as in all cases detailed information is then required to confirm there is a gap.

2. Confirmatory information

i) NMCP

We will typically approach the NMCP (National Malaria Control Program) directly and a) ask if there is a gap; b) ask for data on i) the population, number of nets required, number of nets previously distributed, number of nets considered to still be ‘usable nets’, number of nets required to achieve universal coverage (and all of the above on a regional/district basis) and ii) data on existing funding commitments so we can see who else is funding nets and at what level.

ii) Other major funders

We will contact the/any other, already involved funders so we understand their view on the need for nets- in the country. This is important as there may well be a difference of opinion that is still being resolved between the NMCP and major funders. For example, the NMCP might be looking for 7 million nets and the funders believe 5.5 million only are needed as they are unclear about assumptions about population figures, numbers of useful nets in place etc.

iii) Other knowledgeable parties in-country

This is typically other NGOs, specifically senior individuals within them, and malaria experts who have relevant, often program specific knowledge.

This stage is to allow us to confirm:

a) funds are still needed so it would be a sensible place to direct our resources

b) there would be agreement between all relevant parties (particularly the NMCP and the distribution partner/s) that the nets we fund would be distributed in a manner we would find acceptable ie adequate pre-distribution surveys take place if necessary and distribution and post-distribution elements are agreed.

After this, we would seek a formal Distribution Proposal to be completed and submitted.

If we compare this process with simply receiving a Distribution Proposal unsolicited, the additional work involved for us are the Initial Information and Confirmatory Information stages. As a guide, they add perhaps 2-3 months of elapsed time to the process while we await the necessary confirmations and relevant data and assurances are put in place. There is relatively little time involved from a resource perspective as short email exchanges and telephone conversations are the norm.

Re Q2.

Yes we certainly ask any existing funders why they are not adding, or if they might be able to add, more funds for nets. The usual answer is they have limited funds. This is consistent with what we know is the backdrop to funding for nets and malaria in general. This is the problem: lack of funding. As you will see in the attached ALMA document, there is a need for 50 million nets, to fill universal coverage programs, now.

Re Q3.

The same response as Q2: limited funds. Many causes are fighting for funds. I believe there is an exceptional case for funds currently going to other causes to be directed towards nets but the supporters of those other causes would disagree. It is our job, fighting for increased support for tackling malaria, to make the case and persuade donors more funds should be used to tackle malaria and particularly fund nets.

Re Q4.

Our plans are evolving and we expect to learn from experience and seek to achieve a reasonable, practical balance between our desire to have data that gives a high degree of confidence of net distribution, continued net use, net condition and malaria case data and not asking for an impractical level of surveys. Currently we ask for 50 households to be surveyed at 6, 18, 30 and 42 month intervals in each distribution sublocation. A distribution sublocation is typically of 5,000 nets so a survey is of 100-200 nets or 2-4% of the nets distributed. For a 100,000 net distribution this would mean 1,000 household being visited across 20 separate areas. We will aim for this same ratio.

For an increasing number of the distributions we are now involved in we require beneficiary list to be produced pre-distribution. This is relevant as it forms the basis of very good data both to provide assurance the nets will be distributed to the right people, and that it will be done so efficiently. Compare this to a cruder '2 new nets per household' policy that under-delivers to some and over-delivers to others. This has been a frequent approach in large scale campaigns, albeit it is not without its logic. I

have attached one set of beneficiary lists from a distribution in Kenya and the data (spreadsheet) from a beneficiary survey in Mali. The resulting distributions (both about to take place) will be highly targeted, even to the extent, in the Mali case, where they know which households need single nets only due to the presence of an elderly relative. The Kenya distribution is of 2,500 nets, the Mali one of 21,500 nets. The same approach, a pre-distribution beneficiary survey, is due to take place in Ntcheu District in Malawi across a population of 500,000. We are funding 230,000 nets for this area. In the Kenya and Mali distributions, the local communities, with organisation and leadership from a coordinating NGO, have carried out the surveys themselves. This will be the case in Malawi too. There are two ways these pre-distribution beneficiary lists are relevant to the issue of ensuring nets reach intended recipients and more, that they continue to be used. First, by engaging the communities in this way, there is a much greater involvement and understanding of what can be done to fight against malaria. I would phrase this as local communities starting to take ownership of the problem. The result is a much greater success rate in nets use and continued use. Second, you are much better able to get good post-distribution survey data because you know exactly who had nets and when.

A clarification on pictures. We require photos to be taken in each sublocation so we can report back to donors on what happened at the distribution. A sublocation might contain 15 villages. We do not expect photos to be taken at each village, just at one or some in that sublocation.

I hope this helps.

Rob

Robert Mather

Founder, AMF

Dir: [+44 \(0\)20 7371 8735](tel:+442073718735)

Fax: [+44 20 7371 8745](tel:+442073718745)

Mob: [+44 \(0\)7711 263 725](tel:+4407711263725)

Email: rmather@againstmalaria.com

Skype: robmather

Against Malaria Foundation

See where the nets go: www.AgainstMalaria.com/NetDelivery

From: Elie Hassenfeld [mailto:elie@givewell.org]

Sent: 24 June 2011 21:40

To: Rob Mather

Cc: Holden Karnofsky; Natalie Stone; Wendy Knight

Subject: Re: GiveWell review of AMF

Hi Rob,

Thanks -- all the below sounds good and we appreciate it.

Since it sounds like the bigger net distributions are going to be a bigger part of AMF's work going forward, I had two additional questions about them:

- **Q1.** My understanding of your process for identifying a large-scale need for nets is: (A) receiving weekly emails from / participating in calls with the Alliance for Malaria Prevention. This email identified Malawi as having a large gap in nets. (B) Discussions with Jason Peat of the Red Cross who distributes the AMF emails. (C) Call other major players who operate in the country (e.g., PSI or USAID). (D) At this point, you'd feel comfortable that the country needs nets and you'd approach individuals at the NMCP/MoH about an actual distribution. Is this correct?
 - **Q2.** Do you ever ask other players (e.g., PSI or USAID) why they're not filling the nets gap? **Q3.** Given that nets are so effective, why aren't other funders filling the gap?
- **Q4.** If possible, we'd like a better understanding of how you plan to determine whether the nets AMF supplies actually reach intended recipients. Clearly, a 250,000 net distribution is a large enough scale that pictures in each village won't be possible. Do you have plans for sampling / surveying to audit this? If so, how?

[Quoted text hidden]

5 attachments

 **noname.eml**
191K

 **noname.eml**
150K

 **noname.eml**
7205K

 **noname.eml**
305K

 **DP181-Kapsabet-Kenya-Pre-DistributionSurvey-Pt1-Jun11.pdf**
2343K
