

Open Philanthropy Regranting Challenge - Round 1 Application

Instructions to candidates

Submission instructions

The deadline for submissions is Tuesday May 31, 2022 (23.00 Pacific Time).

When you have completed the application form, please email it to regranting.help@openphilanthropy.org with "SUBMISSION" in the subject line. We will acknowledge receipt of your submission within two working days.

Clarifications and help

Please email regranting.help@openphilanthropy.org with any questions you have about the Regranting Challenge. We want candidates to make the best possible applications and can support you to do this.

A note on word limits

The Round 1 application has been designed to protect the time of candidates while providing enough information for Open Philanthropy to make informed decisions about progression to the final round.

For these reasons, we ask that candidates limit their total responses to 5,000 words. To give candidates flexibility, there are no hard limits to the response to any individual questions.

There are three main sections: general grantmaking, deep dives into two grants, and optional questions. We expect roughly one third of your words should be on general grantmaking, and two thirds on the deep dives.

Some questions ask for links, numbers, or attachments - we will not include responses to these questions in the 5,000 word limit.

Administrative questions

These questions are repeated from the expression of interest form in case any details have changed.

- Please provide an email address for the primary point of contact for the Regranting Challenge

We will send confirmation that your application has been received to this address. We will also contact this address with a decision on progression to the final application round.

- What name should we use for the primary point of contact for the Regranting Challenge?
- What is the applying program/organization?

Awareness of access to program leadership and grantees in final round

Please write "Yes" or otherwise acknowledge that you have understood the time investment we expect to require of finalists.

- The final round of the application process in the Regranting Challenge will consist of a written submission about your plans for incremental funding as well as video or phone discussions with leadership (we expect roughly 3 hours total in most cases) of the applying programs and taking references with a small number of your grantees. Please confirm that you are aware of this process and happy to proceed with the time investment that would be needed if you are selected as a finalist.

General grantmaking

- Who are the target beneficiaries of the work you fund?

In this question, we are interested in understanding the end beneficiaries of the work you fund (e.g. people living with a particular health problem) rather than the nature of your grantees (e.g. medical researchers looking into that health problem)

- How do you think about the units of impact of your grantmaking?

We would like to understand the outcomes you are interested in (e.g. tonnes of CO2-equivalent emissions averted, lives saved, increases in personal incomes, people reached by a program) whether these are easily measurable and identifiable or not.

- Within your current portfolio of grantmaking, how do you decide which priorities receive the most funding, which ones you expand, and which ones you wind down? What decision-making criteria do you use?
- Who are the key decision makers on your team? What are their roles with respect to the program's funding decisions?

We are just looking for names and links to public bios if available. We are interested in who has practical decision making power, rather than legal decision making authority. If (for example) your board or CEO formally approves grants but rarely or never declines the recommendations of the applying program's leadership, you don't need to include them here.

- What is your expected grantmaking budget for the next three calendar years?

Please list your expected grantmaking budget before any contribution from the Open Philanthropy Regranting Challenge, noting any sources of uncertainty.

- Please provide a list of your ten largest grants in the past three years including the name of the grantee and your level of funding, and what portion of your total 3-year funding these ten grants represent. Additionally, if you have a public grants database, please provide a link to it below

Feel free to combine multiple grants made to the same grantee if they were processed as part of the same grantmaking decision.

For your public grants database, please note any basic instructions we should be aware of (e.g. if you are applying as part of a larger foundation, how to identify only the grants of the applying program)

- Please provide a breakdown of your total grantmaking budget for the past three years by the geography of the intended beneficiaries

This does not need to be precise. We are primarily interested in understanding the extent to which your funding is focused on people in low and lower middle income countries, or people living in extreme poverty.

If this type of breakdown does not make sense for the work you do, please just note that and move on. (We mostly expect that to apply in the case of organizations focused on preventing climate change.)

- (Optional) Please provide any other breakdowns of your total grantmaking budget for the past three years which you think illustrate your activity

This does not need to be precise. Examples of appropriate breakdowns include: type of grantee activity funded (e.g. service delivery vs research and development), thematic giving area within your foundation / program area.

Grant deep dives

Please think about two grants (or series of grants to the same grantee) which your program has made in the past five years and which you consider to be among your best grants.

We are looking for examples that illustrate your approach to grantmaking and which you think represent high expected impact. Please pick grants that help us understand how your work has contributed (or could be on track to contribute) to one or more of our goals (improving human health, economic development, addressing climate change)

Grant 1

- Please provide a short summary of the grant including the name of the grantee, the level of funding provided (over what time period) and the work which the grant enabled
- Please provide a link to the grantee's website (if they have one), and a link to any existing grant writeup which you have made publicly available

If your grant writeup is not available publicly but you wish to share it with us, please attach it with your submission.

- Why do you consider this grant a good grant?

We expect this question to have the longest response.

When we at Open Philanthropy evaluate our own grant making, we think about the expected impact of the grant on an outcome we care about (e.g. the number of lives saved, increases in average incomes, tonnes of CO2-equivalent emissions averted).

A grant's impact does not need to have happened yet and can include impact expected to occur after the grant period. For example, in our (fictional) example, a vaccine has been developed and is undergoing Phase II trials - it has not saved any lives outside of the trial context. The impact of this grant is estimated by considering the (future) impact if the vaccine reaches widespread adoption, weighted by the chance of reaching widespread adoption. Similarly, we recognize that many excellent grants made in the previous five years will not yet have reached their full impact.

When considering the impact of a grant, we try to think about it in counterfactual terms: we consider the extent to which the work would have otherwise gone without funding, how the funding enabled something which otherwise would not have happened, and how things might have gone differently if the work funded did not happen.

As a guideline, if your grant is focused on climate change, we'd like to understand what you think the impact of the grant is in terms of tonnes of CO2-equivalent emissions. If your grant is focused on human health or economic development, we'd ideally like to understand how many people your grant affected / is on track to affect and by how much.

We recognize that this approach to thinking about impact may have blindspots. We understand that you might not think about the impact of your grantmaking in this way. If you do not think about your grantmaking in this way, or if there are additional ways you think about impact, we are interested in understanding why you think the grant you have chosen represents a good grant, however you wish to explain it.

Grant 2

- Please provide a short summary of the grant including the name of the grantee, the level of funding provided (over what time period) and the work which the grant enabled
- Please provide a link to the grantee's website (if they have one), and a link to any existing grant writeup which you have made publicly available

If your grant writeup is not available publicly but you wish to share it with us, please attach it with your submission.

- Why do you consider this grant a good grant?

We expect this question to have the longest response.

When we at Open Philanthropy evaluate our own grant making, we think about the expected impact of the grant on an outcome we care about (e.g. the number of lives saved, increases in average incomes, tonnes of CO2-equivalent emissions averted).

A grant's impact does not need to have happened yet and can include impact expected to occur after the grant period. For example, in our (fictional) example, a vaccine has been developed and is undergoing Phase II trials - it has not saved any lives outside of the trial context. The impact of this grant is estimated by considering the (future) impact if the vaccine reaches widespread adoption, weighted by the chance of reaching widespread adoption. Similarly, we recognize that many excellent grants made in the previous five years will not yet have reached their full impact.

When considering the impact of a grant, we try to think about it in counterfactual terms: we consider the extent to which the work would have otherwise gone without funding, how the funding enabled something which otherwise would not have happened, and how things might have gone differently if the work funded did not happen.

As a guideline, if your grant is focused on climate change, we'd like to understand what you think the impact of the grant is in terms of tonnes of CO2-equivalent emissions. If your grant is focused on human health or economic development, we'd ideally like to understand how many people your grant affected / is on track to affect and by how much.

We recognize that this approach to thinking about impact may have blindspots. We understand that you might not think about the impact of your grantmaking in this way. If you do not think about your grantmaking in this way, or if there are additional ways you think about impact, we are interested in understanding why you think the grant you have chosen represents a good grant, however you wish to explain it.

Combined question

- What portion of all of your program's positive impact over the last five years do you think the two above grants represent?

We recognize this is a difficult question, and it may entail providing a wide range, very rough estimates or even just an intuition. Please feel free to include any supporting explanation you think would be helpful for us.

We are not looking for a particular answer. We can imagine a high-impact portfolio in which a small number of enormous successes account for a substantial share of the total impact and compensate for a large number of less successful projects. Likewise, we can imagine a high-impact portfolio in which, after adjusting for grant size, impact is more evenly distributed.

Optional questions

- (Optional) Please attach any already-prepared materials you have on hand that you think would be helpful for us in evaluating your application, particularly any impact evaluations

We ask that you do not put together new materials for this application, but we welcome anything you have on hand (e.g., board updates, internal analysis, grant writeups) that can help us learn more about your work. We are particularly interested in any impact evaluations you have on hand. We will treat all materials as sensitive.

Please do not share more than eight documents. These are not subject to the word limit, but we will not read anything that we think was created or customized for this application.

- (Optional) Is there anything important you would like to add that you weren't able to cover in the expression of interest form or above? This could include ways you think your program / foundation has impact beyond your grantmaking, such as contributing to an important shift in your field that has an impact on health, economic development, or climate change, or anything else you would like to share.

It is absolutely fine to leave this space blank.