



Assumptions and evidence

1 Assumptions:

- Researcher skills, time and available information are sufficient to make recommendations worth following **M**
- We can continue to find promising new ideas over time i.e. the pool of shovel-ready ideas is not exhausted **H**

Evidence:

- Corroboration of several of our recommendations by GiveWell¹ and OpenPhilanthropy²
- Strong track record of CE's incubated charities (which isn't diminishing over time)

2 Assumptions:

- At least ~20 of the ~3000 applicants we receive per year are a good fit for charity entrepreneurship **H**
- We can continue to find promising new applicants over time, i.e. the talent pool is not exhausted **M**

3 Assumptions:

- Our vetting process accurately identifies the most suitable applicants for charity entrepreneurship **H**
- Selected co-founders wouldn't have had a greater impact otherwise **H**

Evidence: Our scores of applicants during the vetting process are 0.7 correlated with internal estimates of charity impact (although these may be biased).

4 Assumptions:

- Our new pace of running two Incubation Programs per year, of equal or higher quality, is sustainable, even as we runs new types of programs (e.g. The Foundation Program) **H**

Relative confidence: **Low** **Mid** **High**

Links: [\(1\)](#), [\(2\)](#), [\(3\)](#), [\(4\)](#), [\(5\)](#), [\(6\)](#), [\(7\)](#), [\(8\)](#)

5 Assumptions:

- The funding landscape can support ~10 new charities per year across a range of cause areas, even in economic downturns **M**
- CE's reputation is strong enough that sufficient funders with good judgement to want to join the network **H**

Evidence: 83% of applications funded in last 3 programs (94% of applications to found CE recommended charity ideas). Avg: \$120k

6 Assumptions:

- Recommended ideas are diverse enough for founders with different preferences to find one they're excited to launch **M**
- Facilitation leads to strong combinations of co-founders & ideas
- Teaching equips participants with the knowledge & support they need to make smart launch plans and succeed in the field **L**

Evidence: 62% of participants founded after the last 3 programs **M**

7 Assumptions:

- The seed network only funds co-founder teams with high expected counterfactual impact **H**
- Funded co-founder teams follow through on launching a charity **H**

8 Assumptions:

- Charities can get funded through the 'valley of death' **M**
- Organizations and co-founders don't succumb to value drift **M**

Evidence: We believe ~40% of our charities are field-leading in cost-effectiveness (i.e. comparable to GiveWell charities or top animal charities), based on:

- (a) Our internal assessments of their cost-effectiveness
- (b) Their own public M&E results
- (c) The endorsement of savvy funders, e.g. GiveWell → Fortify Health³; OpenPhilanthropy → 8 CE charities⁴; Founder's Pledge → FEM, LEEP & Suvita⁵; Mulago → Suvita⁶
- (d) 11 external evaluations of LEEP, FEM, FWI & Suvita, by orgs like Rethink Priorities and Animal Charity Evaluators (11/11 are positive, but only a few have been made public)^{7,8}

External evaluations are planned for 2024.