

GiveWell update on GiveDirectly, requested data and questions

Here are the types of data that we're looking for:

1. **Choosing locations:** Data considered in choosing locations
2. **Census:** Data from initial village census
3. **Enrollment database:** Data from enrollment, back-checking, auditing, phone check-in prior to transfer, ID checks
4. **Village meeting:** Confirmation of village meetings, including information that came out of those meetings (e.g., questions asked, etc.)
5. **Transfers sent:** Record of transfers sent, e.g. "M-PESA transfer history"
6. **Follow-up surveys:** Data from follow-up phone surveys; for spending data, we'd ideally like to see the amount spent in different categories, rather than the number of recipients who reported spending in different categories
7. **Updated financials**

You have already sent us aggregated data from follow-up phone surveys for Nike and Siaya, as well as updated financials for all ongoing transfer cohorts - thanks again for getting those together for us.

Below I've outlined the questions that we have and the additional data we'd like for each transfer set. **It would be incredibly helpful if you could provide:**

- Answers to questions
- Requested data; OR if data is not available, a note about why (e.g., x was not a part of the process during y transfer); OR if data is not *yet* available, a note about the expected timeline for that part of the process. It's fine if these are rough timelines – we are happy to keep them confidential and plan to use them mainly so that we know when to check back in.

If you have questions on any of this, please don't hesitate to let me know.

- 1) **Rarieda RCT:** (Note: if you can't share this data because it's part of the ongoing RCT and can't be made public yet, we understand – please just let us know.)

Data requested:

- a) Enrollment database for RCT treatment groups **See “RCT Enrollment DB”**
- b) Enrollment database for RCT control group, enrolled post-RCT **We are in the process of topping up the \$300 treatment group first (more detail below) and will initiate transfers to control group when top-ups are finished.**
- c) Transfers sent to "top-up" original \$300 treatment group (we know this is in progress and will therefore be incomplete) **See “RCT \$700 Top-ups Only”**
- d) Transfers sent to control group recipients (we know this data will be incomplete) **See above**
- e) Follow-up survey data (we know this data will be incomplete) **See “Rarieda Top-up Verification (short)”. To date, we have only conducted an abbreviated survey (completed in early April) to confirm that recipients**

received March lump-sum and did not have any major problems. We will do extended follow-up survey after they receive second lump-sum in May.

Questions:

- f) Were all of the transfers to the \$1000 treatment group completed before the RCT concluded? If not, how many were outstanding and have they been completed since? **89.9% of \$1K households had received full transfer by end of RCT (January 1, 2013)**
- g) Can you confirm that the \$700 "top-ups" are being sent in two installments of \$350 each, one which was sent in March and the other scheduled for May? **Yes, unless households had registration problems (name mismatch or SIM not registered), in which case transfer schedule is pushed up. We successfully sent first lump-sum to ~87% of \$300 group in March and are working to bring the rest on-line.**
- h) How many households were there in the control group for the RCT? How many of these will now receive \$1000 transfers? What is the status and expected timeline of this transfer set? **There were roughly 500 control households in treatment villages; we plan to transfer \$1K to all of them but haven't made a decision yet on timing.**

2) Siaya

Data requested:

- a) Transfers sent (we know that this may be slightly incomplete) **See "Siaya Transfer History"**
- b) Disaggregated data from follow up surveys (the last set of disaggregated data we received was "20121122 Siaya verification.xls," which does not appear to include data from the second round of transfers and surveys). **See "Disaggregated Siaya Follow-up Data." Note we have done some data cleaning here since the last share, e.g. replacing values entered as text with numeric. We also called back households marked as having problems (e.g. conflict) to document the incidents and in a few cases found they misunderstood the question (e.g. reported conflict in another household) so recoded.**

Questions:

- c) What is the expected timeline for the last 9% of transfer funds to be sent? **198/199 recipients will have received both transfers by the first week of May 2013 (we have not been able to locate recipient no. 199 for registration but are still trying)**

3) Nike

Data requested:

- a) Enrollment database for both treatment groups **See "Nike Enrollment DB"**
- b) Transfers sent to both groups **See "Nike Transfer History" –column A indicates whether recipient is in 10-month group (1) or 5-month group (2)**
- c) Disaggregated data from follow up surveys **See "Disaggregated Nike Follow-up Data" –These data are through March 2013 transfer**

Questions:

- a) What is the size and schedule of transfer installments for Nike recipients? **There are 77 girls in the treatment group – 38 are scheduled to receive \$1K (split into 10 monthly installments), and 39 are scheduled to receive \$500 (split into 5 monthly installments).**
- b) According to "20130318 GiveDirectly & GiveWell – distribution.pptx," 39.8% of transfer funds have been sent. How does that break down between the two treatment groups (\$500 and \$1000)? **To date, we have sent ~\$35K to Nike girls; ~\$19K has been sent to \$1000 arm and ~\$16K to \$500 arm. (Note: these figures are updated from March because we sent another round of transfers in early April)**
- c) What is the expected timeline for completion? **See “Nike RCT Timeline” for data + figures on timeline. In summary, we expect ~90% of girls to have finished their transfer cycle by first week of September 2013 (14 months after they were enrolled)**

2) Google

Data requested:

- a) Census **See “Google Enrollment DB”**
- b) Enrollment database (we know this may be missing those last 10 recipients) **See “Google Enrollment DB”**
- c) Village meetings **I went over the results of village meetings verbally with staff -- happy to get on the phone and provide qualitative feedback on how they went.**
- d) Transfers sent (we know that transfers are in progress and that this will therefore be incomplete) **See “Google Transfer History” (note: we have changed format)**
- e) Disaggregated data from follow-up surveys (we know that the surveys that were done were after initial transfers were abbreviated) **See “Disaggregated Google Followup Data (Token)”, “Disaggregated Google Followup Data (LS - short)”, and “Disaggregated Google Followup Data (LS - long)”**

Questions

- a) Were the villages for the Google transfers selected from the original list of 100 villages that was created for Siaya I? If not, how were they selected? **Yes**
- b) According to "20130318 GiveDirectly & GiveWell – distribution.pptx," 4.2% of transfer funds have been sent, which we understand to be only initial transfers. How many recipients does that represent who have now received transfers? **As of now, we have sent ~\$385K through Google campaign and have initiated 809 households (~95% of target 850)**
- c) What is the expected timeline for the 2 main transfer rounds for Google? **~85% of 850 recipients will receive their second and final lump-sum in August 2013. The remaining 15% who initiated process X number of months after January launch date later will receive their last transfer in August + X number of months.**

2) Future Kenya

Questions

- a) Is the transfer size and schedule going to remain at \$1000 provided in one small and two larger installments? **We will retain current transfer size + protocol as long as we continue enrolling households in rural Western Kenya. If we move to another region or initiate an urban pilot, we will re-assess both transfer size and disbursement schedule.**
- b) What is the expected timeline for choosing locations for future transfers in Kenya? **We will be conducting a 2M scale-up round starting in mid-June 2013 so will start thinking about location selection in May.**
- c) Will future locations in Kenya be chosen using a similar process as was used to select locations in Siaya? (How we understand this process: see "Selection of counties and villages" <http://www.givewell.org/international/top-charities/give-directly#GiveDirectlyprocess>) If not, how will locations be chosen? **Yes. Though if we decide to pilot an urban program, we will need to factor in other considerations (e.g. risk of political violence, crime rates etc.)**

3) Future Uganda

- a) Is the transfer size and schedule going to be the same in Uganda as in Kenya? **We are currently calibrating our Uganda protocol along both of these dimensions.**

***Transfer size:* National household survey data suggest consumption levels amongst eligible households (thatch + mud) in rural E. Uganda are similar to those of eligible households in rural W. Kenya. If this holds true after PPP adjustment we will likely stick with something close to \$1K / household.**

***Disbursement schedule:* We'll be assessing disbursement schedule on the basis of pilot results. We're focused on agent access, ease of cash-out, and cash management protocols at the mobile banking platforms we're piloting.**

- b) On our call, you mentioned that the process of setting up a subsidiary in Uganda would take about 2-3 months. Is this proceeding as expected? Do you have an estimated timeline for choosing locations for future transfers in Uganda? **We expect to be registered as an NGO by mid-to late June. We have already identified a district (Bukedea) and subcounty (Kidongole) in Eastern Uganda where we will be conducting our first campaign. Selection criteria included:**
 - **Poverty rates/density as per data from Ugandan National Bureau of Statistics**
 - **Security**
 - **Proximity to W. Kenya**
 - **Cell phone network coverage**
 - **Mobile money penetration**

4) Miscellaneous questions

- a) In "20130318 GiveDirectly & GiveWell – distribution.pptx," the F/U metrics (pg 3) are given as % of responses, not % of recipients, right? (For e.g., it's not that 1.9% of Nike recipients paid a bribe, but that Nike recipients reported having paid a bribe in 1.9% of survey responses). **Correct**
- b) Can you explain more about your experiments with mobile phone surveys? What kind of experimentation are you conducting? How much are you spending on this research and where did the money come from? **The Rarieda RCT project run by Johannes received a grant to extend data collection in a sub-sample of participants using phone-based data collection techniques among the original RCT sample. The grant is from USAID via the Policy Design and Evaluation Lab at UCSD for a total of \$30,200. See RCT/DILDemo Proposal.pdf for details.**
- c) In "201302 Nike Verification.pdf" and "201302 Siaya Verification.pdf," which have aggregated data from follow-up surveys, the denominators for most of the questions are not the same. Can you explain why the denominators vary slightly from question to question? (We're looking for a little context on why some questions may have been left out of certain surveys). **See (1) below**
This variation raised certain questions for us, which I've included below. If it is the case that these questions will be answered by disaggregated survey data that you can send, feel free to ignore them, or to push them off until a later date.

"201302 Nike Verification.pdf"

- (1) Why were many of the questions on bribery and tension/conflict left out of 2 of the surveys? What is your process for ensuring complete data collection? **Data end up missing because of 1) network problems resulting in call-drop, 2) recipients who have to leave abruptly due to family obligations, weather etc., and sometimes 3) staff data entry errors. I review the data as they come in and we try to phone back recipients if there are sizeable gaps; in the future we plan to code specific reasons for each missing value.**
- (2) If only 155 surveys reported that transfers were collected, how could recipients have been asked about regretted spending in 159 surveys? **The 155 refers to recipients who themselves collected the transfer; there are some cases where a relative is sent to collect the transfer and we code that as a different answer (this is rare – less than 10% of cases - but accounts for above discrepancy).**

"201302 Siaya Verification.pdf"

- (1) Why were the transfer-use questions only asked of 333 of the 342 recipients who reported collecting transfers? **There are two cases in which spending data aren't collected: recipients have not yet spent funds; or recipients do not remember break-down (this is usually very elderly recipients who have relatives purchase items on their behalf) .**

(2) Why were many of the questions on bribery and tension/conflict left out of 1-5 of the surveys? **See above answer**