GiveDirectly

April 2014

Agenda

1. We plan to **move at least ~$11M in the field** in FY2014

2. We are making solid progress against our **ambitious operational and research learning agenda**

3. **We are fully staffed**, having made several key field and domestic hires

4. Our **recent raise fully covers field and domestic expenses** at our target level of growth

5. We are continuing to push on **networking along several dimensions**

6. Feedback on GiveWell review process

GiveDirectly

1. Our current plan is to move ~$11M in Kenya and Uganda in FY14

	Kenya 1.2M campaign	Kenya scale-up	Uganda scale-up
No. recipients	1,200	6,500	2,000
Budget	1.4M	7.3M	2.3M
Timeline	• Feb: finalized enrollment • Apr: initiate transfers • Nov: complete transfers	• Mar: began enrollment • May: initiate transfers • July: complete transfers	• Apr: begin enrollment • Aug: initiate transfers • May: complete transfers
Village selection	Manual estimation of thatch-iron proportion using satellite imagery	Machine learning algorithm that estimates thatch-iron proportion at village level using satellite imagery	Parish-level census data with poverty measures, and mobile money coverage

GiveDirectly

2. We are generating important operational learnings by experimenting with many aspects of the model

Examples

┌ ─ ─ ┐ Detail to follow

Targeting	• Conducted saturation pilot (Ke) • Conducted community-based targeting pilot (Ke)
Recipient experience	• Augmented registration script to encourage planning and pre-empt adverse events (Ke) • Introduced visual spending "menu" during enrollment (Ke) • Conducting qualitative deep-dive on intra-household conflict to gain insight into improved adverse event mitigation strategies (Ke)
Payments	• Experimenting with flexible transfer timing (Ke) • Exploring biometric authentication pilot (Ug) • Experimenting with lump sum payments through proactive management of cash out (Ug) • Considering additional payment partners, e.g., Airtel/Warid (Ug)
Staff management	• Introduced Project Associate role to strengthen focus on productivity, QC and professional development and increase FD leverage (Ke) • Implementing rolling model with overlapping field teams (Ke) • Introducing competitive bonuses based on monthly target attainment, communication quality and data quality, and supervisor review (Ke)
Data management	• Built and implemented proprietary, web-based follow-up data collection tool (Ke) • Working on design of new MIS for enrollment and follow-up data management (Ke/Ug) • Exploring customer service platforms for follow-up/ call center management (Ke)

GiveDirectly

2. For example, upcoming work will be informed by recent experimentation on targeting

	Saturation	Community-based targeting
What we did	• "Saturated" 19 villages by giving to all households (excluding those in fully permanent houses) • Compared recipient experiences of conflict/tension, preferences, and instances of gaming to 18 villages that were treated with "thatch only" criteria	• Conducted village meetings to determine community preferences on eligibility criteria – housing materials were preferred • In a separate meeting, community split into groups and categorized households according to housing materials • Visited, verified, and registered all households categorized as eligible by saturation criteria from the groups
What we learned	• Conflict and tension were not significantly lower in saturation villages • Gaming did not significantly decrease • When faced with the same choice we make, the poor prioritize giving to the poorest • We therefore plan to use thatch only criteria for upcoming enrollment	• Thatch is a popular criteria with communities themselves • Breaking community into groups to cross-check one another is a good way to mitigate elite capture • Some people were still excluded, having been forgotten by their peers • Verifying community's recommendations – especially in cases of disagreement between groups -- is essential

GiveDirectly

2. In terms of research, behavioral and general equilibrium effects remain our top priorities; also now looking at gender

	Question	Who	Budget	Funding	Target start
a	**Behavioral:** What is the impact of transfer timing and social information/norms on on (1) long-term outcomes such as income and assets, (2) the process by which recipients make these choices, and (3) their aspirations for the future?	Anuj Shah, Sendhil Mullainathan (ideas42); IPA	0.6M	Fully funded by anonymous donor	TBD based on proposal
b	**General equilibrium effects:** How do cash transfers on a large scale affect the economic structure of local communities?	Ted Miguel (CEGA); IPA	5.5M	Proposed to awaiting final review	TBD based on proposal
c	**Intra-household bargaining dynamics**: (1) What is the overall effect of cash transfers on women's empowerment? (2) How can we design the UCT process for maximum possible benefit for women?	Simone Schaner (Dartmouth); IPA	1.3M	Proposed to in final discussions	ASAP

GiveDirectly

2. There are several other research topics we would like to investigate as we scale further

Examples

- Long-run household impacts

- Transfer size and lumpiness

- Returns by recipient income segment (i.e., more/less poor)

- Impacts for girls/young women (building on Nike pilot)

- Health impacts of cash transfers (e.g., targeted at women with children under 5)

GiveDirectly

6. We've observed meaningful improvements to the review process and would describe it today as very effective and efficient

- A big strength of the process is how we're able to cover a lot of complex ground by email. Email dialogue is structured, specific, and convenient (esp. for field team), and phone time is used well for clean-up and digging in. We also appreciate your deferring to individuals' communication preferences for email vs. phone.

- We're getting into a good cadence where once you have all the info/data on an issue, we close it off and don't revisit in next cycle unless needed. This is exactly as we'd hope - as you build your institutional knowledge about us, the process gets streamlined significantly on our end.

- We worried about how you'd interpret data that need a lot of context, like the hotline logs which don't tell the full story and require some cultural knowledge. We were happy with the level of discussion that happened around that and ultimately felt comfortable that it'd be presented accurately.

- You may want to consider pushing harder on analyzing costs as much as you do on benefits. Evaluating cost data from the field can be tough since it requires a lot of on-the-ground context. Yet this could be an important value-add you provide the sector in terms of transparency and could factor into comparative assessments of interventions and orgs.

GiveDirectly