

FW: MACOBO malaria net beneficiary lists

Rob Mather <rmather@againstmalaria.com>

Mon, Nov 7, 2011 at 6:42 PM

To: Natalie Stone <natalie@givewell.org> Cc: Holden Karnofsky <Holden@givewell.org>

Dear Natalie-

Comments below. The in-country lead for the distribution partner gave us cause for concern as to whether the nets had been distributed as planned. We organised an independent survey of the distribution area, without the distribution partner's knowledge, so we could understand what happened to the nets. The results led us to conclude the nets were distributed as they should have been, albeit with some changes that were understandable. We were dealing with an in-country individual who was a poor communicator and, as some of his out of country colleagues were not as aware of the distribution details as they should have been, this raised the red flag.

If I can help further, please let me now.

Rgds

Rob

Robert Mather

Founder, AMF Dir: <u>+44 (0)20 7371 8735</u> Fax: <u>+44 20 7371 8745</u> Mob: <u>+44 (0)7711 263 725</u> Email: rmather@againstmalaria.com

Skype: robmather

Against Malaria Foundation

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

From: Natalie Stone [mailto:natalie@givewell.org] Sent: 07 November 2011 22:27 To: Rob Mather Cc: Holden Karnofsky Subject: Re: FW: MACOBO malaria net beneficiary lists

Hi Rob,

Thanks for this. Could you give us a bit of background on this verification exercise? Specifically, I'm thinking:

• What brought this about, i.e. what was the impetus behind arranging this and who initiated it?

The delay in sending us the required post-distribution information meant we could not be sure the nets were distributed as expected, or at least it raised concerns. We therefore asked an independent doctor to organise a review of the distribution.

• Who are the people on the supervision team? What is their connection to AMF and the distribution partner?

The lead was Dr Susannah York, a doctor working at the closest major hospital. She had no connection with AMF, prior to us contacting her, or the distribution partner.

Why was this distribution selected for this verification? (It's the distribution described at http://www.againstmalaria.com/Distribution_TopLevel.aspx?ProposalID=145, correct?)

See the first answer. Usually we receive very timely reports, and along with conversations with the distribution partner, both those in-country and those outside, allows us to have a high degree of confidence that an effective and as- intended distribution has occurred. With the delay and continual chasing – over many weeks – for the required post-distribution information from this group we became concerned. Question marks and confusion over the data sent to us when it did arrive, a lack of certainty form those out of country but involved with the distribution partner as to what quantities of nets actually went where and when all combined to give us doubt – and certainly we had no proof positive – that what was meant to have happened, did indeed happen. We contacted a responsible individual who would not arouse undue 'suspicion' if they were to carry out a survey of the area and talk in detail to community leaders to establish what happened to the nets. A risk in these situations, if there is misappropriation of nets, is those involved can be rafty at foiling an independent check so we acted in a way that ensured we could have confidence that what Dr Woodd would find was a reliable assessment of the distribution.

[Quoted text hidden]