Confirming the size of funding gaps, costs, budgets and activities

- Is the funding gap for the 75 bridges for the next fiscal year still $3.25 million? You had mentioned before that the full 75 bridges would be $5.25 million and that $2 million was secured already but that you were also talking to other funders. I wanted to see if you had secured any additional funding for these bridges since we last talked.
  - We haven’t secured any additional Rwanda restricted funding. However, we have continued to develop our pipelines across all three of our verticals. Below is the breakdown of funds secured (the ~$2M) and our pipeline at greater than 50% for each vertical that could be allocated to Rwanda.
    - Corporate: $600k secured, $650k at >50%
    - Individual: $200k secured, $200k at >50%
    - Institutional: $1.13M secured, $1M at >50%
    - Total: $1.93M secured, $1.85M at >50%

- In conversations, we’ve been talking about 97 bridges and 100 bridges in the treatment group. Can you confirm which it is?
  - 97 bridges. We have 72 remaining to build. The rest of your questions and budget numbers reflect the 72 bridges.

- Can you confirm the total cost per bridge, including both upfront costs of building the bridges and then maintenance?
  - I’ve attached a spreadsheet (Remaining Research Bridge Budget Analysis) with an average estimated bridge cost of $104k. Maintenance is the full responsibility of the District and they budget about $400/year for maintenance. I’ve included a project profile document where you can see this figure noted.

- Of those costs, can you confirm what share would be paid by the Rwandan government and what share would be paid by B2P or others?
  - Referencing the spreadsheet above (Remaining Research Bridge Budget analysis) you’ll see on average 70% paid by B2P and 30% paid by District for the upfront build of the bridge. All maintenance costs are covered by the District.

- Is it possible to share a budget for the remaining 75 bridges that includes a breakdown of costs?
  - I pulled a few different budgets/analyses for this so apologies for the disjointed spreadsheets.
  - Referencing the above spreadsheet (Remaining Research Bridge Budget Analysis) you will see the total budget for the FY22 additional bridges (15) and the costs for all bridges we submitted for FY23 (75). Of the 75 bridges we submitted for FY23 we will build 57, so I used average costs for those
bridges. The below summarizes the estimated costs for the remaining 72 bridges:

- Estimated B2P: $5.32M
- Estimated District: $2.26M
- Estimated Total: $7.58M

For detailed budget items I've included the project proposal documents for the first bridge on the list (Kanserege). There is a lot going on in here but let me draw your attention to the second tab (BOQ) which has the estimated costs broken down. I didn’t yet put a breakdown of costs together across all of the bridges as our experience is that different donors like to see this broken down differently. So after you have a look at the BOQ sheet let me know if/how’d you like to see the budget breakdown figures across the total program.

We had talked previously about the additional $650,000 in survey costs. If we’re in the scenario where there are 97 “treatment” bridges, rather than 150, does that change the need for additional survey costs? What activities would those surveys fund?

- From Research Team: Without the additional $650,000, the study is currently fully funded for four, yearly rounds of household level surveying, whereas prior to the reallocation of that amount to support bridge construction, there would have been sufficient funding for five rounds of surveying. That additional round of surveying would be beneficial with respect to observing impact on events that happen infrequently or changes that take longer to observe (e.g. nutritional status of children, changes in agricultural practices). We additionally discussed a number of ways on our last call additional funding could be impactful within the current study period, mainly ancillary data collection that serve the broader objective of identifying a set of indicators that could be applied across interventions to measure impact. One such activity is monthly market vendor surveys to monitor changes in the price of agricultural inputs and products. We are currently conducting this work at 70 markets serving 42 study sites with plans to expand to 100 markets serving 65 study sites. Another option we discussed is crop cuttings to more directly observe changes in agricultural practices, which would validate and strengthen the household-level surveying and market price data collection.

Is it possible to share a budget for those survey costs, including how much would be spent on surveys, personnel, etc.?

- From Research Team: I’ve attached our summary budgets. We can provide more details if requested.
Confirming my understanding of what led to drops in funding for the Rwanda bridges that are part of the RCT

- My understanding is that there was both (1) reduced government funding due to covid (i.e., the government had to reallocate some funding from bridges to other programs) and (2) reduced philanthropic giving, especially from donors who had planned to pair their giving with travel to Rwanda. Is that correct?
  - Correct. As an example, for FY21 we had originally projected to build 40 bridges. However, the Rwandan government cut funding to the bridge program in order to serve immediate COVID needs. Through our discussions with them we agreed to reduce their contribution from 40% to 30% and were able to build 18 bridges during FY21.
  - See next question for reduced philanthropic giving

- How much did private donors reduce their giving? Was the drop in their giving roughly $3.25 million (the current gap)?
  - Our corporate program was highly impacted since giving is paired with travel. We had projected a raise of $2.85M across FY20 and FY21 but were only able to bring in $1.3M, mostly through remote engagement and future travel opportunities.
  - In terms of institutional giving impacts, one funder paused due diligence reducing FY22 funding by $1M. Another institutional funder reduced their funding in half, causing another $50k in loss. Beyond this, we saw an impact of stalled giving resulting from the pandemic with new funders not accepting new grantees into their portfolios, and existing funders not increasing their giving as projected, so that they could stabilize portfolio grantees who were in emergency situations and to respond to direct pandemic interventions.
  - For individual donors, a major gift campaign that was launched in Feb 2020 and was planned to cover $5M in funding for Rwanda, much of which was scheduled to mature in FY23 and FY24, had to be cancelled at the onset of the pandemic. It was neither possible, nor appropriate, to engage in donor cultivation during this time. We are only now starting to engage in major gift cultivation once again with our first post-pandemic event happening last week.

- If the decline in funding was less than the $3.25 million, does that mean some of the funding intended for Rwanda was diverted to other sites or that there were other factors driving that funding shortfall?
  - Actually, the loss has been far more than the $3.25M gap but through allocation of general operating funds we have continued to cover the Rwanda program as quickly and fully as we can, diverting resources from other areas. Additionally noting that we had to cut the research program down from 150 to 97 bridges.
• Has the government already committed to building the 97 bridges, or is there a chance the government will decide not to fund those bridges, even if B2P were able to raise the full $5.25 million from philanthropic funders?
  o The government has committed to building the 15 bridges this year and 60 bridges next year. The funding for the additional FY22 bridges (15) was allocated during the FY22 re-budgeting process in January. Additionally, the government has already allocated $1.1M for FY23 with the remaining amount for research bridges ($750k) to be allocated during the re-budgeting process next January. We are confident this reallocation will occur given the history this past year of budget reallocation.

• How much of a risk is there that there will be further funding shortfalls for these additional 75 bridges (assuming GiveWell recommends a grant of $3.25m)?
  o The primary risk is our corporate vertical ($600k secured, $600k at >50%) as a COVID event could again disrupt travel and would result in subsequent loss of funding.

Confirming timelines for bridge building and results

• Our understanding is that under the current plan (97 bridges), the trial would be complete in June/July 2023. Is that correct?
  o The bridges will be completed by July 2023 but survey activities will continue for another year.

• Our understanding is that if the program expanded to 150 bridges, the trial would be completed by December 2023. Is that correct?
  o If we secured the funding for those bridges in about the next 6 months we would finish building by December 2023. We have plans to increase our staffing and move up several bridge build timelines in order to achieve that level of building but substantial lead time is necessary.

• When will final results be available?
  o From Research Team: Final surveying will be complete in June 2024, with a summary report available by August 2024.

• When do you anticipate preliminary results would be available?
  o From Research Team: We’ll have the preliminary first pass of the analysis in August/September of this year (noting only 25 bridges will have moved to intervention by then), with a substantial update in August of next year after all the bridges are completed.