CARLY D. TRACHTMAN

Contact Information	c.trachtman@cgiar.org carlytrachtman.net +1 (202) 862-5693

Current Position	Associate Research Fellow International Food Policy Research Institute Markets, Trade, and Institutions Unit

Education	**UC Berkeley**	Ph.D. in Agricultural and Resource Economics	2022
	UC Berkeley	M.S. in Agricultural and Resource Economics	2018
	Lafayette College	B.A. in Economics and Mathematics, with Honors in Economics	2016

Prior Employment	**UC Berkeley**, Graduate Student Researcher (Drs. Ligon, Berck, Zilberman, Sadoulet, de Janvry)	2016 - 2020
	Lafayette College, Undergraduate Researcher (Dr. David Stifel)	2014 - 2015

Teaching	**UC Berkeley**	Master of Development Practice, *Math Camp,* (served as Instructor of Record)	2021
	UC Berkeley	Department of ARE, *Introductory Applied Econometrics,* Jeremy Magruder	2019
	UC Berkeley	Department of ARE, *Economic Development,* (served as Instructor of Record)	2019
	UC Berkeley	Department of ARE, *Economic Development,* Marco Gonzalez-Navarro	2018
	Lafayette College	Department of Math, *Differential Calc. & Econ. Modelling,* Thomas Yuster	2016
	Lafayette College	Department of Economics, *Intermediate Microeconomics,* Ute Schumacher	2014

Grants, Fellowships, and Awards	2021	ARE Summer Grant ($3,000), Certificate of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education
	2020	CEGA Targeting Aid Better Grant ($58,000; with Sena Agyepong, Angela Owusu-Ansah, and Ethan Ligon), CEGA EASST Grant ($15,000; with Ethan Ligon and Muthoni Ng'ang'a), Sacheti Family Fellowship ($1,000) Teaching Effectiveness Award ($500), Outstanding Graduate Student Instructor Award
	2017	CEGA Digital Credit Observatory grants ($66,500; with Ethan Ligon, and Ketki Sheth)
	Earlier	Phi Beta Kappa, Lafayette College Department of Economics Award for Scholastic Excellence

Languages	English (native), Spanish (advanced)

Talks	2023	CSAE Conference, AAEA Annual Meeting, WiEM Conference
	2022	Forum Kajian Pembangunan, PacDev, OARES, NEUDC, IFPRI-RISE, CGIAR Gender Science Exchange
	2021	SEEDEC, NEUDC, UC Berkeley, Lafayette College, ESA Job Market Seminar Series, IPA Annual Researcher Gathering, University of San Francisco
	2019	NEUDC, PacDev, AERE, WEAI, 10th Annual Conference on Industrial Organization and the Food Industry

Refereeing	*Journal of Development Economics, World Development, National Science Foundation (NSF) grant, Private Enterprise Development in Low-Income Countries (PEDL) grant*

Activities	2022 - 2023	Applied Microeconomics & Development Seminar Committee; CSQIEP Mentorship Program
	2020 - 2021	Co-President, Economists for Equity at Berkeley; ARE Undergraduate Outreach Committee
	2019 - 2020	ARE Student Admissions Committee; Women in Economics at Berkeley Leadership Committee
	2018 - 2019	Development Lunch Seminar Student Organizer, EASST Mentor

Selected Publications

"Introducing quality certification in staple food markets in Sub-Saharan Africa: A review of evidence" with Gashaw Abate, Tanguy Bernard, Alain de Janvry, and Elisabeth Sadoulet. *Food Policy*, 2021. [Text]

"Urban Networks and Targeting: Evidence from Liberia" with Lori Beaman, Niall Keleher, and Jeremy Magruder; *American Economic Association Papers and Proceedings*, 2021. [Text]

"Recycling Policies, Behavior and Convenience: Survey Evidence from the CalRecycle Program." with Peter Berck, Marshall Blundell, Gabriel Englander, Samantha Gold, Shelley He, Janet Horsager, Scott Kaplan, Molly Sears, Andrew Stevens, Carly Trachtman, Rebecca Taylor, and Sofia B. Villas-Boas; *Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy,* 2021. [Text]

"What explains low adoption of digital payment technologies? Evidence from small-scale merchants in Jaipur, India." with Ethan Ligon, Badal Malick, and Ketki Sheth; *PLoS ONE,* 2019. [Text]

"Food markets' structural empirical analysis: a review of methods and topics." with Celine Bonnet, Molly Sears, and Sofia Villas-Boas; *European Review of Agricultural Economics,* 2018. [Text]

Research Papers

"Reduce, Reuse, Redeem: Deposit-Refund Recycling Programs in the Presence of Alternatives" with Peter Berck, Molly Sears, Rebecca Taylor, and Sofia Villas-Boas. *Revise and Resubmit at Ecological Economics* [Text]

Abstract.
Understanding how consumers make recycling decisions is crucial in crafting sustainable recycling policies. We estimate consumer preferences and willingness to pay for current beverage container recycling methods, including curbside pick-up services, drop-off at government-subsidized recycling centers, and drop-off at non-subsidized centers. Using a representative online and telephone survey of California households, we estimate a revealed preference discrete choice model that identifies the key attributes explaining consumers' beverage container disposal decisions, including the ability to receive a deposit refund (paid to consumers only if they recycle at drop-off centers) and the effort associated with bringing recyclable materials to recycling centers. Additionally, we use counterfactual policy analysis to show that increasing the refund amount increases overall household recycling rates. Infra–marginal households who are on the boundary between taking containers to recycling centers and recycling using curbside pick-up, namely white and households with higher educational attainment, see the largest changes in consumer surplus generated by increasing refund payments. Conversely, we show that eliminating government-subsidized drop-off centers does not significantly alter consumer surplus for any major demographic group, and has little impact on whether a household chooses to recycle.

"How much do our neighbors really know?: The limits of community-based targeting" (Job Market Paper) with Yudistira Hendra Permana and Gumilang Aryo Sahadewo [Text]

Abstract.
A classical motivation for using information provided by the local community to target social benefits in developing countries is that community members may have more current, dynamic welfare information about others than a centralized program implementer. However, there is little direct evidence supporting this claim, which mostly relies on correlations between community-provided information and survey-collected welfare metrics. To understand what information community members have and use in targeting, we conduct lab-in-the-field experiments with 300 families in Purworejo, Central Java. Participants individually ranked other community members based on specific welfare benchmarks (consumption, neediness, and assets) and also completed targeting tasks. We find that community-held welfare information is distinct from information captured using standard survey methods, and seems to reflect longer-term fixed attributes, rather than dynamic welfare information. Accordingly, community members use longer-term wealth information to predict dynamic welfare and to target social benefits. Moreover, we find that community information about more dynamic measures does not outperform simple proxy means test scores in predicting more dynamic survey welfare metrics. These findings suggest that community-based targeting methods may be useful in identifying long-term poverty, but are less useful in identifying acute short-term distress.

Research Papers (continued)

"Better Together?: An investigation of the gains from collaborative decision-making in community-based targeting" with Yudistira Hendra Permana and Gumilang Aryo Sahadewo [Text]
Abstract.

Community-based targeting (CBT), a targeting method in which local community members provide policymakers with welfare information about other households, is commonly used to identify social program beneficiaries throughout the developing world. CBT exercises are often performed collaboratively by multiple community members, such that the members can combine their knowledge to provide more accurate welfare information. This paper investigates whether there are indeed gains in targeting accuracy associated with implementing collaborative CBT exercises, as opposed to procedures where individuals make decisions independently. Leveraging both primary and secondary data from field experiments in Indonesia, I compare observations of the same individuals making both collaborative and independent targeting decisions. I find that on average there are positive but negligible targeting accuracy gains from collaborative targeting. I then ask whether local leaders or community-nominated informants can target as accurately as if the community had performed a collaborative exercise. I find some evidence that leaders and community-nominated informants know and are able to rank more other households, but that they target no more similarly to the community nor more accurately on average. These results suggest that policymakers should think carefully before asking community members to invest valuable time in participating in CBT exercises.

"Understanding Value Chain Structure and Functionality: The Domestic Onion Value Chain in Senegal" with Abdoulaye Cissé, Alain de Janvry, Elizabeth Sadoulet, and Mame Mor Syll Anta. [Text]
Abstract.

As food systems in developing countries transition from only serving local populations to serving consumers in urban centers nationally and abroad, both more and less complex value chain pathways often exist simultaneously. These pathways, which we define as unique sequences of actor types that transfer goods from producers to final consumers, may differ widely in their participants and functionalities. Hence policies aimed at upgrading "value chains" in general may miss important interactions and heterogeneity between pathways. In this paper, we suggest a framework for characterizing value chains as systems of pathways, which could be useful when designing value chain interventions. We apply this framework to study the onion value chain in Senegal, characterizing the differences in flexibility, inclusiveness, and functionality between pathways.

Research in Progress

"Understanding Gender-Specific Constraints to Agricultural Technology: Evidence from Cassava Farming in Kenya." with Ethan Ligon, Michael Murigi, and Muthoni Ng'ang'a.
Abstract.

Female subsistence farmers in developing countries often have lower adoption rates of agricultural technologies. These lower adoption rates may be due to lack of physical or informational access to new technologies, among other explanations. In this study, we consider these two classes of explanations of low technology use among females, and consider the relative impacts of interventions designed to combat each. We consider the technology of improved cassava in Murang'a County, Kenya, a more climate-resistant maize substitute. Using a randomized control trial with a 2x2 matrix treatment design, we test the effects on cassava adoption by female farmers of two interventions: delivering cassava seeds directly to female farmers at their homes (improved access), and hiring female "lead farmers," to diffuse information about cassava seeds (improved information access), as well as explore complementarities between these interventions.

"Interventions to Accelerate Varietal Turnover: Production vs. Consumption Oriented Approaches" with Gashaw Abate, Prakashan Chellattan Veettil, Beliyou Haile, Julius Juma, Berber Kramer, Catherine Ragasa, Bjorn van Campenhout (and others)
Abstract.

Smallholder producers throughout the developing world commonly grow old seed varieties, despite the availability of newer alternatives. One common explanation is that it can be risky for farmers to experiment with new varieties, as newer varieties are often more expensive, and farmers may be unsure of how such varieties will perform on their land. However, smallholder farmers are also often the main consumers of their production, and hence they might face additional consumption-related risks when choosing to grow a new variety (i.e. the risk that they dislike the taste/cooking quality of the new variety). In this project we compare interventions that address production-side risks (free seed trial packs) and consumption-side risks (free samples of crops produced) to adoption of new varieties. Specifically, we compare the effects of these interventions using a randomized control trial with a 2x2 matrix treatment design, where farmers either receive the seed trial packs, the sample crops, both or neither. We carry-out this design across five different countries (Ethiopia, India, Kenya, Nigeria, and Uganda) considering different crops in each setting.