METHOD EVALUATION

Fieldwork, Sponsor Recruitment and Partnership Development

Phase 1 Start-Up Planning • Draft 04 • 15 November 2026

01 Purpose

Evaluate four methods of identifying community project opportunities, recruiting Project Sponsors and developing partnerships during Project Earth's start-up phase. The evaluation seeks scalable outreach, trusted local relationships, verified opportunities and affordable early operations without assuming that the Founder can personally visit every location.

02 Scope and definitions

A Project Sponsor is the person or organisation formally appointed to a defined project role. Identifying a potential project or introducing a contact does not itself establish Sponsor status. Other partners—including community organisations, universities, NGOs, technical specialists and institutional funders—may require different outreach approaches.

Pre-initiation outreach may be unpaid, expenses-supported, stipended or paid against verified milestones. Following project initiation, an appointed Project Sponsor may earn income from the 8% Sponsor allocation within the approved project cost model, subject to agreed scope, performance and payment conditions. This is not an automatic finder's fee.

01 — Founder-led fieldwork

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
• Vision alignment	• Limited geographic coverage
• Direct relationships	• Travel expense
• Rapid early decisions	• Single-person dependency
• First-hand project knowledge	• Restricted follow-up capacity
OPPORTUNITIES	**THREATS**
• Establish pilot methods	• Travel disruption
• Document fieldwork	• Availability constraints
• Recruit local successors	• Slow expansion
• Build founding trust	• Founder bottleneck

Incentive considerations: Founder living and travel allowances; prioritise creating a replicable network rather than rewarding lead volume.

02 — Volunteer-led fieldwork

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
• Low direct labour cost	• Variable availability
• Broad potential reach	• Uneven reporting
• Diverse skills	• Training requirements
• Community participation	• Limited continuity
OPPORTUNITIES	**THREATS**
• University networks	• Volunteer turnover
• Professional volunteers	• Weak due diligence
• Diaspora connections	• Misrepresentation
• Retired specialists	• Unfinished follow-up

Incentive considerations: Unpaid participation, expenses, training or agreed stipends; ensure continuity and lawful engagement terms.

03 — Locally led fieldwork

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
• Local language and knowledge	• Variable technical capacity
• Reduced travel needs	• Uneven digital access
• Community participation	• Training and supervision
• Long-term continuity	• Competing local interests
OPPORTUNITIES	**THREATS**
• Permanent regional networks	• Elite capture
• Local leadership	• Political interference
• Overlooked opportunities	• Biased selection
• Local employment	• Conflicts of interest

Incentive considerations: Expense support, modest retainers or verified milestone payments may bridge the period before Sponsor income.

04 — Agency-led fieldwork

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
• Existing networks	• Higher direct cost
• Professional personnel	• Slower contracting
• Established systems	• Less direct control
• Multi-region access	• Competing priorities
OPPORTUNITIES	**THREATS**
• NGO and university alliances	• Intermediary costs
• Specialist consultancies	• Funding competition
• Rapid geographic coverage	• Ownership disputes
• Institutional access	• Weak accountability

Incentive considerations: Pro bono partnerships, cost reimbursement, fixed contracts or independently verified milestone fees.

03 Comparative assessment

Preliminary qualitative judgment; these are hypotheses for testing, not measured results. Higher values indicate more favourable performance.

Criterion	Founder	Volunteer	Local	Agency
Start-up affordability	2	5	4	2
Geographic scalability	1	4	5	5

Community knowledge	3	2	5	4
Direct Project Earth control	5	2	3	3
Continuity	2	2	5	4
Speed of initial mobilisation	5	3	3	4

04 Incentive evaluation

Unpaid: Minimal direct cost, but commitment and continuity may be uncertain.

Expenses reimbursed: Reduces barriers while limiting financial exposure; receipts and limits required.

Stipend or retainer: Improves availability but creates recurring obligations before projects generate income.

Verified milestone payment: Can reward useful progress, but must not incentivise low-quality submissions or unsuitable projects.

Post-initiation Sponsor income: The 8% Sponsor allocation creates a potential longer-term income pathway after formal appointment and project initiation; it is not guaranteed during prospecting.

05 Proposed staged method

• Establishment: Founder demonstrates the process, tests reporting templates and builds initial trusted relationships.

• Early expansion: locally based representatives continue outreach and follow-up, supported by selected volunteers.

• Multiple regions: agencies and institutional partners are engaged selectively where their verified reach or expertise justifies cost.

• Mature network: Project Earth retains approval, due diligence, financial oversight and common data standards while fieldwork is decentralised.

06 Pilot design and controls

Test the methods in comparable locations or projects, recording: outreach hours, travel and fees, qualified Sponsor candidates, verified community endorsements, viable project briefs, partner introductions, follow-up completion and continuing activity after 90 days. Report separately on Sponsor recruitment and institutional partner recruitment.

Use a common progression: opportunity recorded → community interest verified → Sponsor/partner assessed → preliminary feasibility reviewed → project accepted into

development pipeline. Any milestone payment should follow independent verification. Require conflict-of-interest declarations, consent-based records, safeguarding, local legal compliance and clear authority limits.

07 Preliminary conclusion and decisions required

A hybrid approach appears preferable: Founder-led establishment, locally led continuity, volunteers for additional reach and agencies where specialist capacity offers value. This remains a working hypothesis until pilot evidence establishes cost per qualified Sponsor, cost per viable project and sustained conversion rates.

Decisions still required: pre-initiation incentive budgets and eligibility; Sponsor appointment and vesting/payment conditions for the 8% allocation; pilot locations; minimum due diligence; who approves milestone payments; and monthly recruitment targets linked to the Founder Travel Plan and Project Mix forecasts.

08 Established project and Sponsor targets

The following figures are transcribed from Founder Travel Projections with Project Mix, Annex 07 (12 November 2026). These are annual organisation-wide planning targets, not Founder-only assignments. Whole-project counts round each project-size tier separately.

Measure	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4+
Small funded projects (A$50,000)	6	13	21	28
Medium funded projects (A$200,000)	3	7	11	14
Large funded projects (A$750,000)	1	2	3	4
Total funded projects	10	22	35	46
Project leads at 50% conversion	20	44	70	92
Sponsor prospects at 50% conversion	20	44	70	92

The source assumes one appointed Project Sponsor per funded project, with separate 50% conversion assumptions for project leads and Sponsor prospects. These are unverified planning assumptions, not measured performance. Earlier destination/monthly

registers retain 18 / 42 / 66 / 92 leads and Sponsor prospects; the annex updates these to 20 / 44 / 70 / 92 without redistributing destination allocations.

09 Implications for R&D and grassroots fieldwork

The initial requirement is 10 funded projects and 10 appointed Sponsors in Year 1. The evaluation should therefore test the minimum credible research, outreach, traveller and local-partner network capable of delivering that target, rather than assuming a large volume of conversions is necessary.

Priority research pathways: (1) underserved communities; (2) established NGO environments, including Nepal; (3) longer-term disaster recovery rather than emergency relief; and (4) capital-constrained settlements where residents have initiative or skills but lack materials, equipment, finance or technical support.

Before fieldwork, desktop R&D should identify prospective locations, evidence of need, existing local initiatives, potential community partners, governance constraints, travel costs and safety conditions. Field visits should validate community priorities and relationships; desktop research alone does not establish consent or Sponsor suitability.

Project Earth Travel is a proposed fifth fieldwork model. Independent travellers could receive researched field briefs, practical travel guidance, verified introductions, check-in procedures and a process for reporting findings. Travellers facilitate introductions; communities originate and determine projects. Influencers, including Kristian Hansen as a prospective outreach contact, may help recruit travellers and raise awareness; no partnership or performance outcome is assumed.

Conversion sensitivity: if only 25% of qualified project leads ultimately fund, Year 1 would require 40 project leads rather than 20; if 75% convert, approximately 14 leads would be required. The same sensitivity applies separately to Sponsor prospects. Actual pilot evidence should replace assumed conversion rates before fieldwork budgets are fixed.

Decision criterion: compare the total cost, time and reliability of progressing one researched location to a verified local Sponsor relationship and ultimately to a funded project. Record failed and deferred opportunities as well as successes.

10 Strategic headquarters location evaluation

Purpose. Evaluate the most effective long-term global headquarters for Project Earth independently of Founder visa eligibility, personal residence arrangements or visa-linked funding constraints. The decision must support the current grassroots project development model while preserving options for an eventual regulated microfinance institution.

10.1 Three operating horizons

- Start-up: R&D, outreach, traveller support, Sponsor recruitment, technical project management and financial oversight.

- Growth: Multi-country project portfolios, partnerships, escrow/payment controls, financial expertise and regional delivery hubs.
- Long term: A possible regulated impact-investment or financial institution. Detailed banking structures, products and licensing are reserved for a separate future study; they are not a basis for selecting the current HQ.

10.2 Initial locations for comparative research

Location	Strategic hypothesis	Principal issue to test
Barcelona, Spain	European institutional access; established HQ concept	Costs, talent, regulation and global reach
Milan, Italy	Financial and commercial networks	Value over Barcelona and operating costs
Singapore	International financial expertise and Asian access	High costs, regulatory fit and licensing
Nairobi, Kenya	Development proximity and regional fintech ecosystem	Global HQ suitability versus regional hub
Kathmandu, Nepal	NGO networks and grassroots field access	Field hub suitability versus global HQ
Bali, Indonesia	Digital operations and implementation-team alignment	Operating centre versus legal/financial HQ
London, UK	Global philanthropy, international law, finance and nonprofit networks	High costs; test institutional access against operating expenditure
Manchester, UK	Lower-cost UK talent base with university and professional networks	International connectivity and donor access versus London
New York, USA	Major foundations, philanthropic capital and global institutional networks	High operating costs, compliance and staff recruitment
Washington, DC, USA	International development NGOs, grantmakers and public-policy networks	Partnership relevance without adopting debt-financed development
San Francisco Bay Area, USA	Technology, digital platforms and impact-investment ecosystem	Costs, geographic distance and fit for project procurement
Boston, USA	Universities, research institutions and philanthropic networks	Institutional access, cost and international fieldwork connectivity

UK and USA candidates are included for comparative evaluation; London and New York were previously considered for representative roles. No candidate is preselected, and future regulated financial activities are a separate jurisdictional decision.

10.3 Evaluation criteria

Proposed research weights: access to philanthropic and impact-investment capital partners 25%; procurement, engineering, legal and financial talent 20%; regulatory predictability and institutional governance 20%; international connectivity 15%; operating costs and recruitment 10%; access to field regions 10%. These are hypotheses, not a completed assessment.

10.4 Banking structure is a separate decision

Project Earth may ultimately develop a separately regulated investment or financial institution. This document records that strategic horizon only. Detailed financial products, banking structures and regulatory analysis are deferred to a later dedicated study.

10.5 Decision approach

Shortlist HQ locations on their capacity to support global philanthropic capital mobilisation, international tendering, financial controls, professional recruitment and regional delivery. Do not allow an untested future banking structure or Founder visa considerations to determine the choice.

Status: candidate locations and weights are hypotheses for research. No city is ranked as the preferred headquarters at this stage.

11 Grassroots mobilisation and outreach

Core premise: Project Earth should support community-initiated projects rather than impose projects from above. The immediate obstacle is not solely project management capacity: potential Sponsors may be unaware of the opportunity, find the model difficult to understand, or be reluctant to rely on unfamiliar foreign organisations. Fiji field observations show promising introductions but no established evidence yet of durable Sponsor relationships.

Separate outreach channels (how prospective people hear about Project Earth) from fieldwork models (who develops relationships and opportunities). Measure qualified relationships and viable opportunities, not followers, impressions or raw leads.

Outreach channel	Purpose	Evidence to measure
Travel creators / influencers, including Kristian Hansen	Explain Project Earth Travel and attract interested travellers and prospective local Sponsors	Qualified applications, verified introductions, follow-through and total cost
Community and diaspora networks	Reach trusted local people and existing initiatives	Community-led enquiries, credible local referrals
NGOs and professional associations	Find delivery partners, specialist volunteers and institutional contacts	Suitable partners and viable joint opportunities

Social media, website and field stories	Build awareness and explain Sponsor responsibilities	Comprehension, applications and conversion
Traveller referrals and word of mouth	Grow an independent, repeatable grassroots network	Active referrals and continuing relationships

11.1 Traveller-led fieldwork: fifth method

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
Independent geographic reach; travel already planned by participants; varied networks and field observations	Uneven skill and availability; weak continuity after departure; potential misunderstanding of local authority
OPPORTUNITIES	**THREATS**
A new supported form of travel; traveller-to-traveller guidance; local Sponsor introductions; cumulative field knowledge	Safety and insurance gaps; visa or permission problems; unreliable introductions; extractive or intrusive engagement

Travellers are connectors, not presumptive Sponsors. A locally accountable Sponsor should normally maintain continuity. Project Earth Travel should provide research briefs, practical travel tips, cultural orientation, vetted introductions where possible, check-ins, escalation procedures and handover templates. It must not promise emergency response capacity it does not possess. Publish a living Project Earth Field Guide, beginning with candid Fiji field lessons: ease of meeting people, limited language barrier, expensive transport, and the need to build trust over time.

12 Research and development before fieldwork

Desktop R&D should identify promising locations and existing local initiatives before any assignment. Research identifies where support might be useful; communities decide whether to initiate a project. Fieldwork verifies priorities, consent, local leadership and feasibility. Research alone cannot establish these conditions.

Discovery pathway	R&D focus	Fieldwork question
Underserved communities	Service and infrastructure gaps; existing local leadership	Is the need community-recognised and locally supported?
Established NGO environments (e.g., Nepal)	Active organisations, delivery capacity, unmet funding or technical needs	Can Project Earth add value without duplicating work?
Long-term disaster recovery	Unresolved rebuilding and livelihood needs after immediate relief	Are land, authority, recovery plans and community priorities settled?
Capital-constrained settlements	Existing skills, labour and initiative blocked by materials, equipment or capital	What minimum additional support unlocks progress?

A field brief should record evidence and source reliability, community contacts and permissions, known local organisations, access and cost, risks, unanswered questions and traveller responsibilities. Do not publish sensitive community contacts or locations without

consent. A location can be rejected, deferred or referred elsewhere; discovery is not a commitment to fund.

13 Project targets and conversion implications

Retain the established Annex 07 whole-tier targets in Section 08: 10, 22, 35 and 46 funded projects per year, with separate Sponsor prospect and project lead conversion assumptions. These are organisation-wide targets, not obligations for each traveller. The earlier destination register uses different rounded totals; do not silently combine the two series.

Year 1 needs 10 funded projects and, under the planning assumption of one Sponsor per project, 10 appointed Sponsors. At 50% project lead conversion, the target is 20 project leads; at 25%, 40; at 75%, about 14. The same conversion must not automatically be assumed for traveller enquiries, NGO partnerships or Sponsor appointments. Test the actual funnel by pathway.

Evaluate each channel and fieldwork method by cost and time per qualified local Sponsor relationship, cost per viable project, reliability of follow-up, community endorsement, and eventual funded project value. A small high-quality network may be more effective than high-volume promotion.

14 Procurement capacity, funding and HQ implications

Project Earth intends to progress from smaller grassroots projects to progressively larger and more complex international procurement and project-delivery assignments. Its differentiator is not exporting development debt to beneficiary communities. Essential community infrastructure should remain supported by non-debt contributions; income-producing community enterprises may later attract investment capital under separately evaluated structures.

Institutional capability should grow in feasibility, technical scopes, transparent tendering, bidder qualification, contract administration, quality assurance, financial controls, audit, safeguarding and international partnership management. Procurement capacity should be evaluated by verified competence and completed performance, not by aspirational contract size.

Partnership research should prioritise philanthropic foundations, major donors, grant-makers, community and diaspora capital, and appropriate impact investors—not assume development-bank lending is Project Earth’s preferred financing model. Investor returns, where contemplated, must arise from suitable productive activity rather than debt obligations imposed on communities for essential infrastructure.

HQ selection should reflect access to global philanthropy and responsible investment partners, procurement and engineering expertise, governance and legal services, international travel and regional operations. A distributed structure (global HQ, digital base,

regional field support and delivery teams) should be compared against centralisation. Founder visa financing is excluded from the strategic comparison.

Future financial institution: record only the ambition to offer investors an alternative with modest potential returns and demonstrable community benefit. Detailed banking, licensing, investment-product and governance design is expressly reserved for a later study. No return, capital protection or liquidity is guaranteed in this evaluation.

15 Evaluation decisions and next evidence

The recommended next test is a limited R&D-led pilot: research candidate locations, test influencer/community/NGO outreach, deploy supported travellers selectively, and measure conversion into durable local Sponsor relationships and viable projects. Compare founder, volunteer, local, agency and traveller methods against the same criteria, while recognising different project environments. Do not rank HQ candidates or assert a winning method without verified cost and outcome evidence.

16 Headquarters location SWOT assessments

Preliminary hypotheses for comparison, not verified rankings or legal/regulatory advice.

Barcelona, Spain

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
• Established HQ concept • European professional talent • International travel links	• Competition for specialist talent • Operating costs above some hubs • Distance from many field locations
OPPORTUNITIES	**THREATS**
• European philanthropy relationships • Procurement and governance team • Link to regional field hubs	• Cross-border compliance burden • Donor access may be weaker than London • Institutional growth may require other entities

Milan, Italy

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
• Commercial and financial networks • Engineering and design expertise • European transport connections	• Potentially high staffing costs • Not a proven PE operating base • Less direct grassroots proximity
OPPORTUNITIES	**THREATS**
• Private foundations and enterprises • Procurement specialists • European partnership development	• Complex compliance arrangements • Cost without proven donor advantage • Competition for funding partners

Singapore

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
• International finance capabilities • Strong Asia-Pacific connectivity • Professional services ecosystem	• High office and salary costs • Geographically distant from Africa • Strict financial regulatory environment
OPPORTUNITIES	**THREATS**
• Asia-Pacific capital partnerships • Procurement and treasury capacity • Regional financial-services hub	• High cost before sufficient scale • Licensing and compliance complexity • Risk of HQ being remote from communities

Nairobi, Kenya

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
• East African development networks • Regional professional workforce • Proximity to field opportunities	• Long-haul travel to Americas • Global donor access needs testing • Institutional capacity varies by sector
OPPORTUNITIES	**THREATS**
• African fieldwork coordination • Local procurement talent • Community partner networks	• Country and currency risks • Cross-border operational complexity • Risk of overconcentrating regional exposure

Kathmandu, Nepal

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
• Existing NGO and community networks • Direct fieldwork access • Potentially lower local costs	• Limited global finance concentration • International travel less convenient • Smaller specialist procurement pool
OPPORTUNITIES	**THREATS**
• NGO collaboration pilots • Research-led community projects • Himalayan regional field hub	• Natural-hazard exposure • Local permitting and logistics • HQ scale may exceed local ecosystem

Bali, Indonesia

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
• Proposed digital operating base • Alignment with Indonesia PM team • Potentially economical support operations	• Less direct access to global donors • Not a leading institutional finance centre • Travel and regulatory limitations
OPPORTUNITIES	**THREATS**
• Digital research and field support • Remote procurement administration • Asia-Pacific traveller network	• Cross-border legal complexity • Key-person dependency • Mismatch with future regulated finance

London, UK

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
• Major philanthropy and finance networks • International legal and procurement talent • Strong global air connectivity	• High employment and office costs • Expensive professional services • Distance from Asia-Pacific projects
OPPORTUNITIES	**THREATS**
• Institutional donor partnerships • International procurement HQ • Future investment structuring expertise	• Cost pressures on start-up budget • Competition for senior staff • Regulatory complexity for investment activity

Manchester, UK

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
• Universities and technical workforce • Potentially lower costs than London • UK legal and professional ecosystem	• Less concentrated donor networks • Some global travel via connections • Fewer international HQ counterparts
OPPORTUNITIES	**THREATS**
• Cost-efficient technical HQ • University research partnerships • UK philanthropy outreach	• Need for London-facing representation • Recruitment competition • Potentially weaker global profile

New York, USA

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
• Large philanthropic foundation ecosystem • Global finance and professional talent • International institutional networks	• Very high operating costs • US legal and compliance burden • Distance from Pacific fieldwork
OPPORTUNITIES	**THREATS**
• Major donor and investor outreach • International partnership building • Potential representative office	• Start-up costs exceed benefit • Complex cross-border operations • Funding relationships not guaranteed

Washington, DC, USA

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
• International NGO concentration • Policy and grantmaking networks • Development-sector expertise	• Less commercial finance concentration • US staffing and compliance costs • Institutional focus may skew approach
OPPORTUNITIES	**THREATS**
• Non-debt grant partnerships • Procurement and compliance expertise • NGO collaboration	• Pressure toward conventional models • Public-funding policy changes • Overreliance on institutional partners

San Francisco Bay Area, USA

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
• Technology and platform talent	• Exceptionally high costs
• Impact-investment networks	• Far from many project regions
• Digital innovation ecosystem	• Less procurement-focused ecosystem
OPPORTUNITIES	**THREATS**
• Traveller and Sponsor platform	• Technology focus distracts from delivery
• Digital fieldwork systems	• High talent turnover and cost
• Impact investor engagement	• Investment incentives may diverge

Boston, USA

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
• Universities and research expertise	• High operating costs
• Philanthropic and nonprofit networks	• Less direct global air access than NY
• Engineering and health-sector skills	• Smaller global finance cluster
OPPORTUNITIES	**THREATS**
• Research partnerships	• Academic partnerships slow to convert
• Technical project preparation	• High professional costs
• Impact measurement methods	• Limited grassroots proximity