

Scope of Work: IDinsight review of AMF monitoring

Context and project history

[Against Malaria Foundation](#) (AMF) provides funding and distribution support for insecticide-treated net (ITN) campaigns in low- and middle-income countries, and is one of GiveWell's Top Charities. To monitor its reach at scale, AMF regularly conducts coverage monitoring surveys following distributions. These coverage estimates are used for AMF's own programmatic decision-making as well as enabling GiveWell to estimate the number of people AMF is reaching through its distributions.

GiveWell has long had questions about the rigor of AMF's monitoring and whether it could be improved or triangulated with external data collection. In 2023, IDinsight developed a concept note for a three-phase project to address these questions, with phases two and three entailing in-country data collection in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC).

We've since changed course, as the original project was designed at a time when GiveWell knew much less about AMF's monitoring processes than we do now. In the intervening period, GiveWell has conducted a deep-dive investigation into a funding opportunity for ITN campaigns in DRC in 2025 and 2026, resulting in a \$41m grant to AMF to carry out these campaigns. Throughout the course of this latest investigation, we learned a lot more about what AMF does to track nets throughout the chain of delivery, how they work with partners to verify distribution data, and their methodology for doing so.

Throughout that process, we learned things that assuaged some concerns and things that we saw as cause for concern. On balance, we feel more confident in AMF's processes than we did at the start of the investigation, and we no longer think the broad original scope of the IDinsight project is necessary. Instead, GiveWell and IDinsight have agreed to keep this engagement to the initial 10-week "Phase 1" and modify the scope away from a broad-based review, instead zeroing-in on the priority areas we identified in the investigation, outlined below.

Revised scope of work

Workstream 1: Automated checks and analyses to bolster confidence in distribution data

- *Context:* The platform that AMF and its partners use (ODK) records ITN distributors' geolocation and timestamps their activity in the app. Despite having access to this metadata, AMF indicated that they don't currently use it to check distribution data.
- AMF has put together a document outlining a series of proposed checks to run on the data, and we'd like IDinsight to review these, give recommendations on prioritization, additional checks/ways to leverage the technology already in use, and how to implement these.

Workstream 2: PDM-0 methodology

- *Context:* AMF conducts a verification exercise on the distribution data, whereby 5% of households are randomly selected for backcheck. However, because this requires in-field randomization (which we think leaves too much room for enumerator discretion re: which households to visit), we have limited confidence in that exercise as a check on the distribution data. After talking with AMF (and other stakeholders), it seemed that changing the methodology for this verification exercise was not feasible. Instead, GiveWell and AMF have agreed to add a randomized post-distribution coverage survey, called PDM-0 (Post-Distribution Monitoring - zero month). This would be centrally randomized like their existing PDMs (PDM-9, PDM-18, and PDM-27), using the household distribution list as a sampling frame, but would take place right after a distribution instead of 9, 18, and 27 months after.
- AMF has put together a document proposing a methodology for the PDM-0s and outlining key questions to consider. Instead of using the exact same methodology as the other PDMs, we'd like IDinsight's input on tweaking the methodology to serve the PDM-0's unique purpose. We'd like IDinsight to weigh in on what to cut, what to add, whether processes should be modified, etc.

Workstream 3 [lower priority]: Pairing rates between distribution and verification data

- *Context:* The verification exercise mentioned above (whereby 5% of households are randomly selected for backcheck) doesn't use the distribution data as a sampling frame. This means that enumerators don't have household lists to go off of, and selected households must have their data from the backcheck retrospectively paired with their data from the distribution. AMF has told us that the pairing rate (i.e. the share of households whose distribution and backcheck data gets successfully matched) is around 10% based on strict matching of HH head name, and that fuzzy matching only tends to get their match rate to 30-40%.
- We think IDinsight may have ideas for innovative, easy-to-implement ways to improve household matching in the absence of unique identifiers. This is a lower priority area for us, but if AMF does succeed in substantially improving pairing rates, it would give them and us a stronger signal on data quality.
- Note that this is an ancillary workstream that we'd only ask IDinsight to turn to if the first two workstreams are completed with ample time to spare.

We expect this work to entail primarily: review of AMF and GiveWell documents, review of (de-identified) AMF data and data collection instruments, and conversations with GiveWell and with AMF. In the event that we jointly decide to start on workstream 3, AMF may seek permission to share a subset of non-deidentified data for IDinsight's input on fuzzy matching methods. Exact deliverables can be defined together in initial conversations between GiveWell, IDinsight, and AMF, but we expect they'll include some form of written recommendations for data checks/analyses, as well as for PDM-0s. These may not necessarily be in the form of a polished report, as we're happy for these to take whatever format is most helpful for AMF.