An additional topic for discussion in the March 2022 Board meeting: We've noticed more energy and attention to effective altruism–related ideas recently, and we're thinking about the opportunities and risks that this development creates for us. In tomorrow's meeting, we'll set aside ~30 minutes to share our initial thinking and hear what observations and advice the Board has to offer.

For the meeting:
Please read the rest of this document for background. Tomorrow, we will give a brief verbal introduction, and then we'd like to go around the room and hear from each Board member what resonates or doesn't resonate, what you're observing, and what advice you have for GiveWell. We think you all are well-positioned to offer observations, ideas, and advice that will be helpful in thinking about where we should focus our attention. The thoughts you share can be brief; we'd love to hear your initial reactions to what we're sharing here, and we'll make note of what you all share so that we can reflect on it afterward. We can also discuss further in the meeting if that seems valuable.

This is a different format from our usual, very structured Q&A; we want to try it out to see whether it makes for interesting, valuable discussion, and depending on how it goes, we might set up similar types of discussions in the future.

Background:
We observe that effective altruism and GiveWell itself have grown substantially in the resources they directs and the reach of their ideas to newer audiences. You can see this in GiveWell's money moved growth (even excluding Open Philanthropy); in the success of FTX and its foundation, which is explicitly aligned with effective altruism; and in what's being shared by public intellectuals with wide reach, like Ezra Klein, Matt Yglesias, Tyler Cowen, and Our World in Data (e.g., this thread from its founder Max Roser). While effective altruism, GiveWell, and Open Philanthropy may have felt like niche ideas a few years ago, we are starting to pick up on early signs and a subjective feeling that effective altruism is becoming more a part of the discourse, and more practically, that GiveWell is increasingly being seen as an important entity in global health and development. If this is true, it means that there will be a new ecosystem of actors around GiveWell (as there are around the Gates Foundation, USAID, etc.), which includes detractors, supporters, imitators, competitors, complementary organizations, etc.

This is a non-exhaustive list, but we notice a few broad categories that might be important for us to consider and engage with:

1. Critics who are doubling down on their criticisms of GiveWell's approach as GiveWell gets larger and more powerful

2. Competitors (e.g., Sam Bankman-Fried of FTX has expressed interest in funding "alternative versions of . . . GiveWell")
3. Funders who see GiveWell as a scale-up funder and want to get leverage on their investments by creating a pipeline for GiveWell
4. Large institutional actors trying to pitch GiveWell on specific partnerships or to build closer relationships
5. Organizations that reference effective altruism in a cursory way, paying lip service to the ideas, but who don't seem deeply engaged

We'd love to hear from you on questions like:

- What are you noticing in this space? Are you seeing the attention/growth we're noticing?
- Should we have an explicit plan around responding to or engaging with the types of people and topics mentioned above? Should we passively keep tabs on aspects of this but hold off on engaging deeply for now?
- What opportunities and risks does this present in your mind that we should be considering?

No need to answer all these questions or exactly these questions—these are just meant to give a sense of the type of input we think would be useful.