



## **Survey to Look at the Potential of Creating a Centralized Repository of Information on Non-U.S. Based NGOs**

### **International Giving Service Provider Results October 2006**

Survey conducted by:



Funded by:



# Table of Contents

Overview .....	1
Service Provider Profile .....	2
Q1. Organization name.....	2
Q4. Which type of philanthropic service provider describes your organization? .....	3
Q5. Please describe your organizational structure.....	3
Client Profile .....	4
Q6. How many of the following types of your clients are making grants directly to non-U.S. based NGOs?.....	4
Q7. Approximately how many total grants from U.S.-based grantmakers did you process in 2005 to: ..	5
Q8. Approximately how many different non-U.S. based NGOs received grants from your clients in 2005? .....	5
Q9. What is the approximate current percentage of annual change in your clients' grantmaking directly to non-U.S. based NGOs? .....	6
Q10. In which countries have your clients typically made the most grants to non-U.S. based NGOs?...	6
Q11. To which non-U.S. based NGOs have your clients typically made the most grants? .....	7
Determining NGO Eligibility .....	8
Q12. What comments and feedback have you received from non-U.S. based NGOs concerning grant eligibility requirements and USA Patriot Act vetting process? What have been their most commonly expressed concerns? .....	8
Q13. What percent of non-U.S. based NGOs . . . ..	9
Q14. Which set of rules do you typically use to determine non-U.S. based NGO eligibility .....	9
Q15. Which documents do you currently require non-U.S. based NGOs to provide to qualify for equivalency determination (ED)?.....	10
Q16. Please describe any additional documents that you require for equivalency determination (ED). 10	
Q17. Approximately what percent of your clients use your standard equivalency determination (ED) process to identify eligible non-U.S. based NGOs? .....	11
Q18. Which documents do you require non-U.S. based NGOs to provide to qualify for expenditure responsibility (ER)?.....	11
Q19. Please describe any additional documents that you require for expenditure responsibility (ER).. 12	
Q20. Approximately what percent of your clients use your standard expenditure responsibility (ER) process to identify eligible non-U.S. based NGOs? .....	12
Q21. What information do you require non-U.S. based NGOs to provide to comply with U.S. anti-terrorist and money laundering requirements? .....	13
Q22. What additional information that you require for anti-terrorist vetting? .....	13
Q23. Which of the following do you do to vet non-U.S. based NGOs for compliance with Executive Order 13224, the USA Patriot Act and the Treasury Department's Voluntary Anti-Terrorist Financing Guidelines?.....	14
Q24. Do you conduct regular independent verification of the validity and authenticity of ED or ER information provided by non-U.S. based NGOs?.....	15
Q25. Please describe any additional steps that you take to vet non-U.S. based NGOs.....	15
Q26. When is non-U.S. based NGO organization and contact data that you've collected vetted using your anti-terrorist OFAC list checking process or service?.....	16
Q27. Do either eligibility or anti-terrorist of money laundering vetting standards differ for non-U.S. based NGOs for any of the following reasons? .....	17
Q28. Do you and/or your field office staff or a service provider provide any of the following assistance to non-U.S. based NGOs to help them to become eligible to receive grants?.....	18

Q29. How long does it typically take for a non-U.S. based NGO to complete the process and become eligible to receive a grant?.....	19
Q30. How often do you require non-U.S. based NGOs to verify or resubmit updated compliance and contact information?.....	20
Q31. What online resources and services do you find most helpful in researching and vetting non-U.S. based NGOs and why? .....	20
Q32. Do you receive and review equivalency determination (ED) and/or expenditure responsibility (ER) documents and supporting materials from non-U.S. based NGOs in different languages?.....	21
Q33. Do you provide any additional research services on some/all non-U.S. based NGOs? .....	21
Q34. Does your equivalency determination (ED) and/or expenditure responsibility (ER) process currently permit sharing of compliance information among different grantmakers who support the same non-U.S. based NGO? .....	22
Q35. With the consent of your clients and each non-U.S. based NGO, would you provide copies of compliance documents to the centralized repository?.....	22
<b>Operations and Information Systems .....</b>	<b>23</b>
Q36. How many of your staff members are dedicated to non-U.S. based NGO eligibility determination and anti-terrorist vetting? .....	23
Q37. Given your experience working with key contacts in different non-U.S. based NGOs, what is your assessment of their level of access and proficiency using online Web-based systems (not just e-mail) to complete and submit online forms and to upload file attachments?.....	23
Q38. If a repository is established, how should current and historical non-U.S. based NGO information be provided? .....	24
Q39. Which specialized compliance services and watch list service(s) do you use to vet non-U.S. based NGOs? .....	25
Q40. How does this online watch list service connect to your in-house system? .....	26
Q41. Do you currently have an online Web-based portal in production that U.S. based NONPROFITS use to review and submit nonprofit eligibility and/or anti-terrorist compliance certification forms and documents?.....	26
Q42. Do you currently have an online Web-based portal in production that NON-U.S. based NGOs use to review and submit eligibility and/or anti-terrorist compliance forms and certification documents? ..	27
<b>Joining and Supporting the Repository .....</b>	<b>28</b>
Q43. How would you describe your overall interest and support of a centralized repository of non-U.S. based NGOs?.....	28
Q44. What would be the major challenges and obstacles for establishing and maintaining a centralized repository of non-U.S. based NGO information?.....	29
Please include additional clarifying comments about you interest and support of a repository.....	29
<b>Hosting and Maintaining the System .....</b>	<b>30</b>
Q45. Which of the following types of organizations would you consider as best qualified and positioned to host and maintain a centralized repository of non-U.S. based NGO information?.....	30
Q46. If a central repository were established, then what are the key criteria that should be used in selecting an organization to develop, host and maintain information about non-U.S. based NGOs? ....	31
<b>Cost of Developing and Maintaining a Centralized Database.....</b>	<b>32</b>
Q47. What would you estimate is the range of all startup costs to develop and implement a secure centralized online repository and portal of non-U.S. based NGO information? What are the key assumptions and variables? .....	32
Q48. What would you estimate is the range of the annual cost to operate and maintain a centralized online repository and portal of non-U.S. based NGO information? What are the key assumptions and variables?.....	33

## Overview

**Background.** The Council on Foundations, the Foundation Center, GuideStar and Independent Sector have collaborated to explore the usefulness and practicality of creating a centralized repository of information about nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) based outside the United States. A centralized repository of information about foreign NGOs could be used to determine that they are the equivalent of a U.S. public charity or have already been vetted to meet U.S. anti-terrorism requirements.

In this study we wanted to learn if such a repository could make international grantmaking by U.S. foundations more efficient, less costly and less onerous for funders, grant recipients and philanthropic service providers. With generous support from the GE Foundation, the four organizations have engaged Martin Schneiderman with Information Age Associates to design and conduct the study.

This is one of three surveys that was conducted of:

- § International grantmakers
- § NGO Leaders
- § International giving service providers

**Duration.** The survey was conducted in September and October 2006.

**Survey participants.** All of the major U.S. based international grantmaking service providers were identified, contacted and invited to participate in this research project.

Survey results include only those submissions that were substantially complete and multiple responses from the same service provider were consolidated.

**Interviews.** In addition to participating in this survey we met with each of the participating service providers either in person or by phone for two hour interviews.

**Result presentation.** Typos have been corrected for clarity. The most frequent responses are shown in **bold**. Selected comments and suggestions that were most relevant to the focus of this feasibility study are underlined.

**Confidentiality of information.** As described to all survey participants, the published survey results include aggregated responses and tabulated results. All text responses have been included verbatim except for references to organization names in narrative text which have been replaced with XXXXX.

Due of the relatively small number of respondents in this particular survey the order of responses to questions has been randomized.

**Project results.** This research's project's overall findings and recommendations will be published and disseminated in early 2007.

## Service Provider Profile

### Q1. Organization name

CAFAmerica

Civil Society Systems (GuideStar International)

CreateHope

Foundation Source

Global Impact

GuideStar

JK Group, Inc.

United Way International

NOTE : Q2. Survey Respondent's Name and Q3. E-mail Address were confidential and therefore not presented.

#### Q4. Which type of philanthropic service provider describes your organization?

	#	Percent
Philanthropic service bureau	1	12%
Grants management software or service provider	2	25%
Workplace giving service provider	2	25%
Donor Advised Fund	1	12%
Repository of data about U.S. nonprofits	2	25%
Repository of data about non-U.S. nonprofits	2	25%
Other, please specify	2	25%

Other, please specify:

1 Charitable organization, 501 (c) (3)

2 Public Charity

#### Q5. Please describe your organizational structure.

	#	Percent
For-profit privately owned company	3	<b>38%</b>
U.S.-based nonprofit	3	<b>38%</b>
Non-U.S. based nonprofit	2	25%
For-profit publicly owned company	0	0%
Other, please specify	0	0%
Total	8	100%

## Client Profile

### Q6. How many of the following types of your clients are making grants directly to non-U.S. based NGOs?

Independent Grantmaking Foundations = 1  
Family Foundations = 2

Corporate Foundations = 20  
Corporate Contribution Program = 20

Family Foundations = 15  
Corporate Foundations = 45  
Corporate Contribution Program = 15  
Community Foundations = 5

XXXXXX clients use us as intermediary for int'l grants

Corporate Foundations = 20%

Corporate Foundations = 10  
Corporate Contribution Program = 5  
Grantmaking Public Charity = 1

	#
Corporate Foundations *	75
Corporate Contribution Program	40
Family Foundations	17
Community Foundations	5
Independent Grantmaking Foundations	1
Grantmaking Public Charity	1
Total	139

\* Does not include one service provider that reported a percent of all U.S and international grants vs. a number

**Q7. Approximately how many total grants from U.S.-based grantmakers did you process in 2005 to:**

Non-U.S. based NGOs (NOT including U.S. based regranting organizations) = 300  
 U.S. based nonprofit organizations that do international regranting = 200

Non-U.S. based NGOs (NOT including U.S. based regranting organizations) = 20%  
 U.S. based nonprofit organizations that do international regranting = unknown

Non-U.S. based NGOs (NOT including U.S. based regranting organizations) = 3

Non-U.S. based NGOs (NOT including U.S. based regranting organizations) = 1,793  
 U.S. based nonprofit organizations that do international regranting = n/a

Non-U.S. based NGOs (NOT including U.S. based regranting organizations) = 600

Non-U.S. based NGOs (NOT including U.S. based regranting organizations) = 1  
 U.S. based nonprofit organizations that do international regranting = 30

	#
Non-U.S. based NGOs (NOT including U.S. based regranting organizations)	2,697 *
U.S. based nonprofit organizations that do international REGRANTING	230
Total	2,927

\* Does not include one service provider that reported a percent of all U.S and international grants vs. a number

**Q8. Approximately how many different non-U.S. based NGOs received grants from your clients in 2005?**

4

150

Unknown

20% of total distributions; amount unknown

600

20

713

Q9. What is the approximate current percentage of annual change in your clients' grantmaking directly to non-U.S. based NGOs?

	#	Percent
Increasing over 10% per year	3	<b>50%</b>
Increasing 1%-10% per year	2	<b>33%</b>
No change	1	17%
Decreasing 1%-10% per year	0	0%
Decreasing over 10% per year	0	0%
Total	6	100%

Q10. In which countries have your clients typically made the most grants to non-U.S. based NGOs?

1 Singapore  
UK  
West Indies  
Russia  
Brazil

2 Canada  
England  
Hong Kong  
Singapore  
Spain  
Columbia

3 Unknown

4 Canada  
Australia  
UK  
Germany  
Brazil  
Mexico  
Argentina

5 Brazil  
Mexico  
Philippines  
South Africa  
Taiwan  
China  
India  
Indonesia  
Canada  
Singapore  
Korea  
Hong Kong

6 Last year XXXXX made over 1500 grants to 73 countries around the world.

Q11. To which non-U.S. based NGOs have your clients typically made the most grants?

1 Unknown

2 Confidential

3 ACJ, Brazil

PBSP, Philippines

UW, Taiwan

Learning Society, Singapore

Yayasan Mitra Mandiri, Indonesia

UW Mumbai, India;

4 Last year XXXXX made over 1500 grants to 713 charities in 73 countries around the world.

## Determining NGO Eligibility

Q12. What comments and feedback have you received from non-U.S. based NGOs concerning grant eligibility requirements and USA Patriot Act vetting process? What have been their most commonly expressed concerns?

1 Confusion as to process and requirements

2 Not applicable

3 Overseas NGOs are very fearful of providing data on their organizations to any database that would be subject to the US Patriot Act or otherwise accessible by the US Government.

From our experiences with NGO representatives in more than 15 countries it appears to be a requirement that any such system be hosting outside the United States.

4 Continually providing same information to numerous entities; No unified requirements; Cumbersome

5 Too much paper work; we ask for their confidential information (financials; names of their partners); they do not understand why they should comply with US requirements

6 Concerned about administrative burden;  
Risk of persecution if data is disclosed;  
Inconsistency of requirements;  
Issues of Principle

### Q13. What percent of non-U.S. based NGOs . . .

<i>Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of total respondents selecting the option.</i>	0-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%
Successfully complete our eligibility and anti-terrorism vetting process and can receive grants.	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	<b>2</b> <b>33%</b>	<b>4</b> <b>67%</b>
Do not respond to nonprofit eligibility and/or USA Patriot Act information requests.	<b>6</b> <b>100%</b>	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
Provide incomplete information and are ineligible to receive grants.	<b>5</b> <b>83%</b>	<b>1</b> <b>17%</b>	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%

### Q14. Which set of rules do you typically use to determine non-U.S. based NGO eligibility

Equivalency Determination (ED) = 50%  
Expenditure Responsibility (ER) = 50%

Equivalency Determination (ED) = 100%

Equivalency Determination (ED) = Not applicable  
Expenditure Responsibility (ER) = Not applicable

Equivalency Determination (ED) = 100%

Equivalency Determination (ED) = 20%  
Expenditure Responsibility (ER) = 80%

Equivalency Determination (ED) = 50%  
Expenditure Responsibility (ER) = 50%

Equivalency Determination (ED) = 20%  
Expenditure Responsibility (ER) = 80%

**Q15. Which documents do you currently require non-U.S. based NGOs to provide to qualify for equivalency determination (ED)?**

	#	Percent
Detailed description of the purpose and principle activities both past and proposed	6	85%
Dated copy of nonprofit registration and number in its own country	6	85%
Registration number of nonprofit status in own country	6	85%
Organizing documents (e.g., articles of incorporation, constitution, charter certificate of incorporation, internal governing rules, and description of how assets will be distributed if operations cease)	5	71%
Detailed financial statements for prior years (preferably audited)	4	57%
Affidavit for Equivalency Determination (e.g., References to local laws or governing rules that prohibit assets or income being provided to individuals, for propaganda, lobbying, or other political activities)	2	28%
None - not applicable	1	14%

**Q16. Please describe any additional documents that you require for equivalency determination (ED).**

1 Not applicable

2 -Completed XXXXX Grant Eligibility Application  
-List of current trustees/directors

3 Our business revolves around work place giving rather than grantmaking which requires different level of ED/ER

4 Board List; Certification, confirming that they do not support terrorism or violence of any kind and have transparent financial practices

Q17. Approximately what percent of your clients use your standard equivalency determination (ED) process to identify eligible non-U.S. based NGOs?

	#	Percent
100%	0	0%
90%	1	17%
80%	0	0%
70% or less	4	<b>67%</b>
None	1	17%
Total	6	100%

Q18. Which documents do you require non-U.S. based NGOs to provide to qualify for expenditure responsibility (ER)?

	#	Percent
None - not applicable	4	<b>57%</b>
Submission prior year organization financial and activity	3	<b>42%</b>
Restrictions on regranting	3	<b>42%</b>
Prohibition of use of funds for propaganda, lobbying or other political activities or any non charitable activity	3	<b>42%</b>
Repayment of funds not used for the grant's purpose	2	28%

**Q19. Please describe any additional documents that you require for expenditure responsibility (ER).**

1 Also require names of all directors, officers and key employees, which we check against the multiple terror lists in compliance with The Patriot Act.

2 Not applicable

3 NA

4 A completed XXXXX grantee report for all XXXXX grants received in the prior financial year

**Q20. Approximately what percent of your clients use your standard expenditure responsibility (ER) process to identify eligible non-U.S. based NGOs?**

	#	Percent
100%	0	0%
90%	1	17%
80%	0	0%
70% or less	2	<b>33%</b>
None	3	<b>50%</b>
Total	6	100%

**Q21. What information do you require non-U.S. based NGOs to provide to comply with U.S. anti-terrorist and money laundering requirements?**

	#	Percent
Names of officers	5	<b>100%</b>
Names of trustees/board members	5	<b>100%</b>
Signed statement that the organization does not and will not support terrorist activities	4	<b>80%</b>
Geographic areas in which the organization conducts activities	2	40%
List of all field office addresses and countries	1	20%
List of affiliates and subcontractors	2	40%
List of funders (government, foundation, corporate)	2	40%

**Q22. What additional information that you require for anti-terrorist vetting?**

- 1 Proprietary, but most of above and below required and checked
- 2 A completed and signed XXXXX Grant Eligibility Application
- 3 Not applicable

**Q23. Which of the following do you do to vet non-U.S. based NGOs for compliance with Executive Order 13224, the USA Patriot Act and the Treasury Department’s Voluntary Anti-Terrorist Financing Guidelines?**

	#	Percent
Check the organization name against the current OFAC watch list	5	<b>71%</b>
Check trustee/board member names against the current OFAC watch list	5	<b>71%</b>
Check officer and staff names against the current OFAC watch list	4	57%
Organization and contact names (as described above) are also checked against international watch lists (e.g. Interpol, EU, UN, World Bank)	4	57%
Other, please specify	3	42%
None of the above	0	0%

Other, please specify:

1 Also check other watch lists & internet news sites

2 Not applicable

3 Proprietary

Q24. Do you conduct regular independent verification of the validity and authenticity of ED or ER information provided by non-U.S. based NGOs?

	#	Percent
Always	1	14%
Most of the time	1	14%
Sometimes	2	<b>29%</b>
Rarely	1	14%
Never	2	<b>29%</b>

Q25. Please describe any additional steps that you take to vet non-U.S. based NGOs.

1 Review printed and internet based promotional material  
 Review potential sanctions against home country  
 NGO must sign XXXXX grant agreement.

2 Not applicable

3 Direct contact; partnership reliance; use of publicly available resources

Q26. When is non-U.S. based NGO organization and contact data that you've collected vetted using your anti-terrorist OFAC list checking process or service?

	#	Percent
Initial organization entry into the system	6	<b>85%</b>
Prior to each payment	4	<b>57%</b>
Other, please specify	3	42%
Initial consideration of a grant request	2	28%
Annually	1	14%
Monthly	0	0%
Quarterly	0	0%

Other, please specify:

- 1 Not applicable
- 2 Our program allows continual - real-time checks
- 3 Weekly watchlist search of all grantees on file

Q27. Do either eligibility or anti-terrorist of money laundering vetting standards differ for non-U.S. based NGOs for any of the following reasons?

	#	Percent
No different	4	<b>57%</b>
Other, please specify	1	14%
NGO country	1	14%
Amount of the grant	1	14%
Number/type of required documents	1	14%
Type of grantmaker	0	0%
Grant focus (e.g. environment vs. health and social services)	0	0%

Other, please specify:

1 Not applicable

Q28. Do you and/or your field office staff or a service provider provide any of the following assistance to non-U.S. based NGOs to help them to become eligible to receive grants?

	#	Percent
None	3	<b>42%</b>
Other, please specify	3	<b>42%</b>
Document translation services	2	<b>28%</b>
Administrative services	1	14%
Legal assistance	0	0%
Accounting services	0	0%
Fund raising assistance	0	0%
Proposal development assistance	0	0%

Other, please specify:

- 1 We refer some grantees to our member organizations
- 2 Not applicable
- 3 Translation and administrative occasionally

Q29. How long does it typically take for a non-U.S. based NGO to complete the process and become eligible to receive a grant?

	#	Percent
1-2 months	5	83%
3-4 months	0	0%
5-6 months	0	0%
Over 6 months	0	0%
Other, please specify	1	16%

Other, please specify:

1 Not applicable

**Q30. How often do you require non-U.S. based NGOs to verify or resubmit updated compliance and contact information?**

	#	Percent
Each new request or proposal	2	28%
Every 12 months	4	<b>57%</b>
Every 24 months	2	28%
Every 36 months	1	14%
Other, please specify	2	28%

Other, please specify:

- 1 Not applicable
- 2 4 years- eligibility depends on NGO's home country

**Q31. What online resources and services do you find most helpful in researching and vetting non-U.S. based NGOs and why?**

- 1 Bridger Insight for Patriot Act compliance monitoring because it consolidates all of the various watch lists into a single electronic searchable database.
- 2 Not applicable
- 3 Governmental sites: Canada, UK, Singapore
- 4 Local in-country NGO registration web-lists;
- 5 Worldcheck  
 Bridger Insight  
 OFAC website  
 USIG site  
 Provides instant information on charities, names, and country sanctions

**Q32. Do you receive and review equivalency determination (ED) and/or expenditure responsibility (ER) documents and supporting materials from non-U.S. based NGOs in different languages?**

	#	Percent
No	4	<b>67%</b>
Yes	2	33%

Which languages?

1 Not applicable

2 Spanish; Chinese; French; Russian and other Slavic languages, Japanese; Korean; Italian

3 No. We require English translations of governing documents and charitable registration documents, as well as copies in the original language.

**Q33. Do you provide any additional research services on some/all non-U.S. based NGOs?**

	#	Percent
None	4	<b>57%</b>
In-depth analysis of the NGO's operations and financial status (e.g., with the assistance of in-country staff)	2	28%
Research to determine the effectiveness of the NGO to accomplish their stated mission	2	28%
Other, please specify	1	14%
Strategic partnership with another service provider (e.g., KPMG)	0	0%

Other, please specify:

1 Not applicable

Q34. Does your equivalency determination (ED) and/or expenditure responsibility (ER) process currently permit sharing of compliance information among different grantmakers who support the same non-U.S. based NGO?

	#	Percent
No	5	<b>83%</b>
Yes	1	17%

Q35. With the consent of your clients and each non-U.S. based NGO, would you provide copies of compliance documents to the centralized repository?

	#	Percent
Yes	3	<b>75%</b>
No	1	25%

## Operations and Information Systems

Q36. How many of your staff members are dedicated to non-U.S. based NGO eligibility determination and anti-terrorist vetting?

	#	Percent
50% of a staff position	1	17%
1 staff position	0	0%
2-3 staff positions	2	<b>33%</b>
4 or more staff positions	3	<b>50%</b>
Total	6	100%

Q37. Given your experience working with key contacts in different non-U.S. based NGOs, what is your assessment of their level of access and proficiency using online Web-based systems (not just e-mail) to complete and submit online forms and to upload file attachments?

	#	Percent
Very High	0	0%
Good	3	<b>42%</b>
Fair	3	<b>42%</b>
Poor	2	28%
Very Poor	0	0%
Don't Know	1	14%

Q38. If a repository is established, how should current and historical non-U.S. based NGO information be provided?

<i>Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of total respondents selecting the option.</i>	Required	Highly Desirable	Desirable	Not Required
VIEW - Store electronic copies of all previously submitted NGO eligibility documents plus their organization and contact information online so that it can be easily accessed and referenced.	<b>6</b> <b>75%</b>	1 12%	1 12%	0 0%
DOWNLOAD - Capability to download all of a NGO's latest submitted nonprofit eligibility documents plus their organization and contact information.	<b>6</b> <b>75%</b>	1 12%	1 12%	0 0%
INTEGRATE - Automated link from your in-house grants management system to the centralized repository to view NGO information.	1 12%	<b>4</b> <b>50%</b>	0 0%	<b>3</b> <b>38%</b>

Q39. Which specialized compliance services and watch list service(s) do you use to vet non-U.S. based NGOs?

	#	Percent
ChoicePoint Bridger Insight	4	<b>57%</b>
Other, please specify	3	<b>42%</b>
U.S. Treasury Department OFAC watch list	2	28%
RDC (Regulatory Data Corporation)	1	14%
Attus OFACWatchDog™	0	0%
Oasis Group OFACSearch	0	0%

Other, please specify:

- 1 Proprietary
- 2 Not applicable
- 3 Many other watch lists

**Q40. How does this online watch list service connect to your in-house system?**

	#	Percent
Manually export data from grants management and then run automated check	2	<b>29%</b>
Manual review and check against published OFAC lists	2	<b>29%</b>
Other, please specify	2	<b>29%</b>
Fully integrated via an application programming interface (API)	1	14%
Total	7	100%

Other, please specify:

1 Not applicable

2 Proprietary

**Q41. Do you currently have an online Web-based portal in production that U.S. based NONPROFITS use to review and submit nonprofit eligibility and/or anti-terrorist compliance certification forms and documents?**

	#	Percent
Yes	4	<b>67%</b>
No	2	33%
Scheduled to launch in 2007	0	0%
Total	6	100%

Q42. Do you currently have an online Web-based portal in production that NON-U.S. based NGOs use to review and submit eligibility and/or anti-terrorist compliance forms and certification documents?

	#	Percent
Yes	3	<b>50%</b>
No	3	<b>50%</b>
Scheduled to launch in 2007	0	0%
Total	6	100%

## Joining and Supporting the Repository

Q43. How would you describe your overall interest and support of a centralized repository of non-U.S. based NGOs?

<i>Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of total respondents selecting the option.</i>	Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Agree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
The availability of a centralized repository of vetted non-U.S. based NGO information would be a significant benefit to U.S. philanthropy.	<b>6</b> 75%	0 0%	1 12%	0 0%	1 12%
We would favor establishing a centralized repository of non-U.S. based NGO information.	<b>5</b> 62%	1 12%	1 12%	0 0%	1 12%
We would probably become a member of the repository and use it instead of our existing non-U.S. based NGO vetting process.	<b>2</b> 33%	1 17%	1 17%	1 17%	1 17%
Any annual repository membership fee should be based on an appropriate sliding scale.	1 14%	<b>4</b> 57%	0 0%	0 0%	<b>2</b> 29%
We would encourage all non-U.S. based NGOs seeking grants from our client to submit their information to the central repository.	2 33%	1 17%	1 17%	1 17%	1 17%
The existence of a centralized repository would streamline the process of non-U.S. based NGOs becoming eligible to receive grants	<b>4</b> 50%	<b>2</b> 25%	0 0%	1 12%	1 12%
NGOs would prefer to submit their information to a centralized repository.	<b>3</b> 38%	<b>2</b> 25%	0 0%	0 0%	<b>3</b> 38%
We would be willing to share our non-U.S. based NGO eligibility information with a centralized repository	<b>2</b> 33%	1 17%	0 0%	1 17%	<b>2</b> 33%
The endorsement of a centralized repository by the Council on Foundations, The Foundation Center, GuideStar and Independent Sector would be a key factor in our deciding to use the system.	2 29%	1 14%	2 29%	0 0%	2 29%
An IRS letter ruling that would approve the centralized repository would be a key factor in our decision to become a member.	<b>2</b> 29%	<b>3</b> 43%	1 14%	0 0%	1 14%
Such a repository would be so beneficial that we would consider providing grant support.	0 0%	0 0%	<b>4</b> 67%	0 0%	2 33%

Q44. What would be the major challenges and obstacles for establishing and maintaining a centralized repository of non-U.S. based NGO information?

Please include additional clarifying comments about you interest and support of a repository.

1 Quality control and centralized standards

2 Cooperation among foundations is the major obstacle.

3 In response to question 44, beyond the costs and development challenges for building such a system, the major challenge would be to convince overseas NGOs that participating in such a repository would be in their best interests. Presumably one of the goals would be to expand US grantmaking beyond the population of existing recipients, so a communication campaign would need to be developed to convince them to provide data and documents to the system.

A second challenge to be overcome in building an optimal system would be the establishment of an accepted reporting and vetting standard. Such a standard would be necessary to truly streamline NGO requirements and to encourage the IRS and others to view the system in the best light.

4 Standards;  
Competing interests and needs of different stakeholders;  
Government approval/sign-off;  
Client support

5 Obstacles:

1. Privacy protection for non-public data
2. Verifying/validating the accuracy of the data so that it can be relied on for compliance purposes
3. Shielding providers of data from potential liability issues.

6 Challenges:

- Not all NGOs have internet access to send info to repository
- Huge resource to keep all repository NGO information current
- Would have to have all supporting documents translated into English to meet IRS regulations

## Hosting and Maintaining the System

Q45. Which of the following types of organizations would you consider as best qualified and positioned to host and maintain a centralized repository of non-U.S. based NGO information?

<i>Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of total respondents selecting the option.</i>	Definitely Consider	Might Consider	Probably Would Not Consider	Definitely Would Not Consider	Don't Know
U.S. based non-profit organization that currently serves as an online repository of NGO information	<b>3</b> <b>38%</b>	<b>3</b> <b>38%</b>	1 12%	0 0%	1 12%
Non-U.S. based non-profit organization that currently serves as an online repository of NGO information	2 25%	2 25%	2 25%	1 12%	1 12%
Non-profit philanthropic service bureau	<b>2</b> <b>25%</b>	<b>4</b> <b>50%</b>	0 0%	0 0%	2 25%
For-profit philanthropic service bureau	0 0%	<b>3</b> <b>38%</b>	<b>4</b> <b>50%</b>	1 12%	0 0%
For-profit workplace giving service provider	0 0%	<b>3</b> <b>38%</b>	<b>3</b> <b>38%</b>	2 25%	0 0%
For-profit grants management application software and/or service provider	0 0%	<b>2</b> <b>25%</b>	<b>4</b> <b>50%</b>	2 25%	0 0%

Q46. If a central repository were established, then what are the key criteria that should be used in selecting an organization to develop, host and maintain information about non-U.S. based NGOs?

1 Experience in developing and hosting a reliable Web-based document and information retrieval site.

2 An organization with experience in developing and maintaining online information systems that serve not only the US grantmaking community, but more importantly the overseas NGO community.

Sensitivity to overseas NGOs' concerns about privacy, understanding of their capacity issues related to online data gathering, and a credible international presence will all be required to gain buy-in from the non-US NGO community.

3 Technology expertise and resources;  
experience in managing non-profit data and relations;  
experience managing corporate clients/business savvy;  
high privacy requirements

4 All three tasks need not necessarily be carried out by the same entity.

We suggest that the responsible entity should be a NGO, but that the standards for such a system (which needs to include not only a database but workflows for ensuring the integrity of the data that gets into the database) should be developed by a collaborative group of stakeholders.

5 An organization that would not profit based on the number of NGOs in the system or amount of info in the repository—i.e. a neutral party

## Cost of Developing and Maintaining a Centralized Database

Q47. What would you estimate is the range of all startup costs to develop and implement a secure centralized online repository and portal of non-U.S. based NGO information? What are the key assumptions and variables?

1 Don't know

2 Assuming that the repository could take advantage of an already developed infrastructure, it might be done for around \$250,000.

3 Startup time and costs will include:

Consultation with stakeholders and documentation of system requirements:

Time: 1 year

Cost: \$150,000

Software development, including database and application modules:

Time: 6 months

Cost: \$550,000

Hardware and Network infrastructure, including software licenses:

Cost: \$200,000

Total Development Time: 1.5 years

Total Development Cost: \$900,000

It is worth noting again that XXXXX has already developed a technology platform and reporting and display framework that could be modified to serve US grantmakers for less than \$100,000 in delivered in less than 4 months.

4 A large portion of our staff resources are expended in collecting and reviewing charity information and conducting due diligence. We truly would not provide a financial estimate, other than several hundred thousand dollars and upward.

5 Unknown

6 This is widely variable, depending upon the extent to which the data itself is available, especially in electronic format. That being said, the technical aspects of the development are not overly difficult; implementation to the "beta" stage (inclusive of hardware and technical development) is likely to be in the \$100 to \$200,000 range, with import or data entry of existing data adding \$5-\$50/NGO.

Q48. What would you estimate is the range of the annual cost to operate and maintain a centralized online repository and portal of non-U.S. based NGO information? What are the key assumptions and variables?

1 No idea

2 Depending on the volume of transactions, perhaps \$100,000 - \$200,000. Again, infrastructure is a wild card here.

3 Assuming a standard reporting framework for documents and data, the annual operating costs would include:

Network hosting, maintenance and hardware depreciation: \$150,000

Data management and application maintenance: \$150,000

Total annual cost: \$300,000

Again, XXXXX has developed a platform that will serve not only US grantmakers but various constituent groups from around the world. As a result, yearly maintenance costs will be distributed across many users and be a fraction of the cost for a standalone system.

4 Unknown

5 Assuming that all data is populated by users of the system, and that the system is operated within an existing infrastructure, the system could probably be maintained with 2 FTEs and 2 FTE equivalents, at a fully loaded cost of \$300-400,000 annually.

6 See #47

Rev 2