PROPOSAL GUIDELINES: IGI

This document contains an Overview, Budget Guidelines, an Application Checklist, a Narrative Template and the Evaluation Criteria for IGI. Please read this document carefully before submitting your proposal.

OVERVIEW

Submission instructions: All applicants must first submit the required **letter of interest** in WizeHive, our grant management system (GMS) **by March 13, 11:59 AM (noon) US ET.** Successful applicants will receive an invitation to proceed with their full proposal materials. Applicants whose proposals are confirmed to be eligible are requested to submit **full proposals by April 21, 11:59 AM (noon) US ET.** The link to submit the LOI on WizeHive is here: https://j-pal.wizehive.app/program/igi-scaling

IGI proposals must be based on direct evidence from one or more randomized evaluations, at least one of which should have been conducted by a J-PAL affiliate or invited researcher and/or funded by a J-PAL initiative.

1. Details on the one or more randomized evaluations on which the project is based must be provided in writing to the Review Board in one of the following formats, rank-ordered with the most preferred format noted first:
   a. Peer-reviewed published paper.
   b. Working paper that was released publicly at least six months before the date on which a project proposal is submitted to a J-PAL initiative for funding and/or the date on which a J-PAL office initiates a request to relevant decision-makers for approval to provide substantive scale support.
   c. Working paper that is meaningfully publicly available.
   d. Working paper not yet meaningfully publicly available.
   e. Any other document in any format.

2. Regardless of format, the written document should provide sufficient detail on the design and results of the one or more randomized evaluations on which the project is based to enable the relevant decision-makers to understand and assess the quality and strength of the evidence base underpinning the proposed scale project, including both internal and external validity. Contents that would be useful for the relevant decision makers to make their decisions include:
   a. Description of context, intervention, RCT design, and data sources.
   b. Balance tables.
   c. First-stage regression results (if the design requires a strong first stage).

d.   Intention to treat (ITT) regression results for at least one primary outcome, robust to different specifications, including standard errors for construction of confidence intervals.

e.   Checks for and responses to any threats to randomization: differential attrition, spillovers, etc.

f.   Interpretation of results - An assessment of and considerations relevant to the generalizability of the evidence to the context in which the proposed project is to take place.

g.   Policy implications/recommendations.

PROPOSAL TYPES & AWARD SIZES

Adapt

Up to approximately $75,000, suggested period of performance: one year.

This type of support is for projects where the government partner has identified the potential evidence-informed solution, but more work needs to be done before they can pilot a scalable version of it. These grants can be used to support the government partner in designing and adapting evidence-informed programs, policies, or delivery mechanisms to their context and systems so that they are ready to begin piloting it. This can include collecting data about the nature and extent of a problem to determine whether potential solutions are relevant to the context (i.e., conducting a needs assessment or scoping/feasibility study).

Policy Pilot

Between $100,000–200,000, suggested period of performance: two to three years.

This type of support is for projects where the partner is ready to pilot the evidence-informed solution but would like technical support in either setting up a pilot, making sure it maintains fidelity to the evidence in terms of the program features that drove positive impacts, and/or monitoring pilot implementation quality. These grants can be used to support the government partner in piloting a scalable version of an evidence-based solution, including: preparing for the pilot (training, program manuals, etc.), conducting process evaluations to monitor implementation quality, conducting path-to-scale research (including RCTs to evaluate interventions previously tested at a smaller scale or replication trials that test previously-evaluated interventions in new contexts), analyzing pilot results and if successful, helping the partner to make a case for further scale.

Scale

Up to approximately $300,000, suggested period of performance: three to four years.

This type of support is for projects where the partner has already piloted a version of the evidence-informed solution in their context (either in a randomized evaluation or policy pilot) or elsewhere, with sufficient justification that the solution has been responsibly adapted and contextualized. Based on previous results, the government partner would like to move forward

with a scale-up and would like technical support in expanding the program more widely. This grant can support a range of activities that can include but are not limited to: conducting analysis to help them secure key approvals for the scale-up, ensuring implementation and rollout protocols maintain fidelity to the evidence in terms of the key program features that drove positive impacts, at-scale RCTs, and/or setting up low-cost partner-owned monitoring systems for programs at scale to report periodic progress to key decision-makers.

Project Costing Exercise (*primarily for Policy Pilot and Scale awards and projects associated with planned or ongoing randomized evaluations*)*:* J-PAL grantees are requested to collect and share detailed program cost data following the [J-PAL Costing Guidelines](#). **The [Narrative Template](#) includes details on what to include in your proposal narrative.**

> **Motivation:** The goal of this exercise in each proposal is to ensure that the research team has plans from the outset to collect cost data for all "ingredients" needed to implement a program or intervention, excluding the costs of evaluating the impact of that program. In policy outreach activities, J-PAL has found that policymakers often ask how much a program or intervention costs, and collecting detailed cost data allows for cost-effectiveness analysis. This can assist policymakers when they are choosing how to allocate resources between different programs, or deciding to replicate or scale up a program that is demonstrated to be effective[1].

> **Principles and expectations:** While a rigorous cost-effectiveness analysis requires very granular data, J-PAL will provide grantees a basic cost collection template, alongside basic reporting templates, which helps researchers gather the figures for the various cost categories. The template includes a sheet to assist with calculation of a "total program cost," and a sheet to calculate high-level cost figures that are of greatest interest to policymakers. **Your proposal should help us understand the potential for a very rough, back-of-the-envelope cost-effectiveness calculation.** When planning your cost data collection and approach to cost-effectiveness analysis, you should consider not only the costs of any inputs offered to participants (e.g. seeds, equipment, etc.), but also the costs of facilities and utilities, implementation staff, transport, and any other costs required to conduct the program. You may find it useful to consider the following questions when constructing your plan to collect relevant cost data:
> - Are there costs in identifying the participant populations? (e.g. costs of doing a census, distributing flyers or other marketing materials, or holding information sessions necessary to implement the program.)
> - Are there training costs for program staff implementing the intervention?
> - Are there costs borne by participants (consider opportunity costs, subsidized components of the program, etc.)
> - Are there activities that are reduced in size or discontinued as a result of this intervention being introduced? These might indicate cost savings from this intervention.

---

[1] For more information on comparative cost-effectiveness analysis, see: https://www.povertyactionlab.org/resource/conducting-cost-effectiveness-analysis-cea. If you have feedback on this exercise, the template, or the underlying rationale, please submit feedback [online.](#)

- Are there implementation monitoring costs involved, necessary to track progress or ensure compliance with plans to achieve effective implementation?

BUDGET GUIDELINES

It is your responsibility that your budget follows your host institution's policies for costs, and **you must submit a letter from the institution to receive the award that states that they have reviewed your proposal and accepted your budget.[2]**

Guidelines for completing IGI's proposal budget: Please submit a detailed project budget using the IGI Budget Template provided on the RFP website. To reduce processing time, please keep the following in mind:

- **Institute to Receive Award (ITRA) Requirements**: Pilots are provided under an award from MIT to the grantee's host institution. PLEASE NOTE: MIT now requires that at least one project PI be employed by the organization receiving the subaward and funds.
- **IRB Requirements:** MIT requires that the IRB determination must be held by the institution that enters into the subaward agreement with MIT. The PI at the ITRA must be listed as the main PI on the IRB. If the institution does not have its own IRB, the institution must engage the services of a commercial IRB to review and provide oversight for the research activities. Heartland and Solutions provide review of international research and satisfy J-PAL's IRB requirements; fees can be found on their respective websites. Further information about this MIT policy can be found here and here. Please consult with J-PAL regarding including the cost of this commercial entity in the project budget.
  - J-PAL requires that the reviewing IRB have IRB Organization (IORG) status with the US Office of Human Protections. You can look up the IORG status of an IRB here.
- Please refer to the Award Requirements and Setup Process document available on the RFP website to review all of the Initiative's award requirements in detail as part of preparing your submission.
- Only projects with co-funding should complete both Excel sheets in the template, i.e. both "Total Project Budget" AND "Initiative Budget" (i.e. what you're requesting from the Initiative) in the budget template. **If the project has other funders, the proposal should clearly explain the marginal contribution of the requested funds from the Initiative.**
- **Applications must include a brief budget narrative document detailing the major costs within the budget in addition to the Excel template.**
  - **We also strongly encourage applicants to include budget notes in the column provided in the budget template, specifying input costs for line items within the budget.** Travel costs should include a breakdown of how many

---

[2] If the organization allows you to submit your proposal without such a letter (due to time constraints or some other reason), please describe this in the notes section. Please note that this applies to all projects, including those going through J-PAL and IPA offices. You should contact them in advance to make sure you are aware of their policies for proposal review and give them enough time to meet the proposal deadline.

trips are planned, the estimated cost per trip, number of people on a given trip, etc. Any computer/equipment purchases should include a breakdown of what is being purchased (e.g., how many laptops), as well as the project staff that will be assigned to the equipment.

- Applicants should review J-PAL best practices on questionnaire design and data collection/management in the [J-PAL Research Protocol Checklist](), to ensure they have budgeted for expenses associated with piloting and surveyor training, survey translation, field spot checks, and back checking.
- **Awards are paid on a cost-reimbursable basis.** However, MIT may agree to advance payments via a milestone payment structure to Institutes to Receive Award that are based in low- and middle-income countries on a case-by-case basis if requested by the research team. Please note that preparing an advance payment model requires additional time and additional coordination between MIT and the Institute to Receive Award.

Allowable Direct and Indirect Costs
- **Please note that J-PAL Initiatives do not cover PI salaries with the exception of PIs who completed a PhD and are based at an academic institution in a middle- or low- income country.** Pilots may cover up to $8,000 per LMIC researcher PI/co-PI, but the total budgeted amount for LMIC researcher PI time should not exceed 25% of the total budget.
- **Project Implementation Costs: For full research projects, implementation costs are expected to be borne by the project partners.** However, under some circumstances, initiatives can fund implementation costs where it is a marginal addition to an existing program to offset costs from an experiment (e.g., adding an additional treatment arm or the costs of an encouragement design). These types of costs might include travel, small participant incentives, and/or texting fees.
  - Proposals requesting funds for implementation are **required to explain why the implementer cannot bear the costs in the budget narrative and must also justify the input costs** (e.g., if texting fees are requested as an implementation cost, the budget narrative should include a breakdown of how many texts are planned, the estimated cost per texts, number of people on a given campaign, etc.).
- Universities in high-income countries (according to the [World Bank classification]()) can charge up to 10% in indirect costs, applied to total direct costs.
- Non-university non-profits from any location and universities from mid- or low-income countries may charge up to 15% in indirect costs, applied to total direct costs.
- We understand that the cap on overhead or indirect costs under this initiative is low and that grantees may have reasonable project support costs included in budgets as direct costs. Such costs should be reasonable and explained in the budget narrative.
- Unallowable costs include those labeled as "incidental," "miscellaneous," or "contingency." Any costs for rent should be explained in the budget narrative.
- J-PAL will only reimburse the lowest available economy/cabin/coach flights. Please review [J-PAL's travel reimbursement policies]() before completing your budget.

APPLICATION CHECKLIST

Please complete all sections in WizeHive by the full proposal deadline. You must upload several documents to complete your full proposal. All templates for these documents are provided at the [RFP website](#) and listed below.

1. **Proposal Narrative:** Guidance pertaining to the narrative prompts is included in the [Narrative Template](#) below. As part of the proposal narrative, you will be required to upload a research timeline.
2. **Proposal Budget**: Carefully review the Budget Guidelines in this document, then use the IGI Budget Template (available on the [RFP website](#)), which must be completed in its entirety and saved as a single Excel file with the title: [PI Last Name, First Name][Budget].xls(x).
3. **Budget Narrative:** Detail the major costs within the budget, referring to the Budget Guidelines above, in a Word document with the title [PI Last Name, First Name][Budget Narrative].doc(x). This document is required in addition to the Proposal Budget -- i.e. notes included in the Excel sheet do not suffice.
4. **Letter(s) of Support**: Please obtain a letter of support from the following, each saved as a single PDF file with the title [PI Last Name, First Name] [Name of Organization Letter of Support].pdf:
   - **Letter of Support from Implementing Partner:** All projects are required to provide a letter of support from the government and any other implementing partners. Such letters should state:
     ○ The support for the activities proposed
     ○ How the partner plans to use the results of the research or other activities to support specific scaling decisions and strengthen policymaking. Any details about the potential reach of the scaled-up program.
     ○ How the partner sees a long-term partnership with J-PAL to be valuable.
     ○ What costs will be shared by the partner and an initial total budget amount (if exact costs are not available, then a broad commitment to pay for implementation or other costs is sufficient)
     ○ Willingness to share program implementation cost data with the project for the purpose of conducting program cost analysis.
     ○ **Note:** We understand that in some cases it may not be feasible or appropriate to have the partner include all of the items above in their letter. In such cases, please secure a more general letter of support and address the remaining points in your proposal narrative.
   - **Scale-Up Partner Letter of Support:** Applicants must also include letters of support from potential scale-up partners (if different from the implementing partner)
   - **Letter of Transmission:** Scaling grants are required to provide a letter or document stating approval of the proposal materials and budget from each proposed institute to receive award (ITRA). Please note that MIT policy states that the project PI needs to be at the ITRA and that the ITRA should provide the IRB (either using the

Institute's IRB or a third party IRB). The Project PI must be the PI on the IRB.

- **J-PAL Affiliate or Invited Researcher Letter of Support:** Please submit a letter of support from a J-PAL affiliate or invited researcher. The template is available on the [RFP website.](#)
- **Letter of Support from Relevant Regional Office:**
  - <u>Submitting this letter is compulsory for project countries where there is a J-PAL office responsible for the country.</u> Please follow the relevant instructions below:
    - If the applicant is not itself a J-PAL office: A letter from the relevant regional J-PAL office that has responsibility for the project country. Please email the Executive Director from the relevant J-PAL office **at least 3 weeks in advance of the RFP deadline** to ensure that the office has enough time to produce their letter of support, which requires a thorough review of the proposal and budget. The J-PAL regional office can use the template for their letter of support available on the [RFP website.](#) J-PAL offices may be able to provide support in facilitating connections to policymakers, researchers, supporting key policy partnerships, and implementing technical assistance. If this is something you are interested in, please discuss it with the relevant J-PAL Executive Director as part of your J-PAL office letter of support to discuss what kind of support may be available. Any relevant J-PAL office support should be included in the project budget.
    - If a J-PAL office is the applicant: IGI still requires the J-PAL Executive Director from the applying office to submit a letter of support to signal their support and capacity for the project.
  - <u>If there is no J-PAL office in the region, (e.g. none of J-PAL's six regional offices cover China), you do not need a letter of support from a J-PAL office.</u> However, since one of the primary goals of IGI is building long-term relationships between researchers and governments, the hurdle to get funding from IGI will be higher in such cases where there are no J-PAL offices to help institutionalize the relationship with the government partner. Therefore, the proposal should be sure to state clearly how the project will help inform policy and institutionalize the relationship with the government beyond this specific project.

5. **Existing/Underlying Evidence** - Please upload the corresponding written document(s) about the existing/underlying evidence on which your scaling proposal is based. Additional information on required documentation is outlined in the RFP Overview available on the [RFP website.](#) Note: All IGI projects must be based on evidence from one or more randomized evaluations, at least one of which should have been conducted by a J-PAL affiliate or invited researcher and/or funded by a J-PAL initiative and the results of which must be available in writing (preferably in the public domain).

NARRATIVE TEMPLATE

WizeHive will require you to address the below prompts. The text provided below each bolded subsection helps provide guidance on what the IGI Board is looking for to effectively evaluate your proposal.

Given aspects of the Initiative review are blinded, **please refrain from using identifying language in your proposal narrative, e.g. we encourage you to use the grammatical third person when citing (co-)PIs' work.**

Letter of Interest Questions

1. **Eligible Researcher(s)** - Please identify the researcher who is eligible for J-PAL Initiative funding. This may be the principal PI or any eligible co-PI.
2. **PI Eligibility Category** - Indicate how the researcher(s) is (are) eligible for J-PAL Initiative funding.
3. **Non J-PAL Co-PI(s) -** Please identify the non J-PAL co-PI(s), the organization name(s), and email address(es)
4. **Organization Name of Eligible Researcher** - Please enter the organization where the eligible researcher is employed.
5. **Organization Type**
6. **Country Where Organization is Based or Headquartered**
7. **Organization Website**
8. **PI Certification**
   a. I certify that any listed eligible researchers have agreed to be active, engaged, and responsive PIs or advisors on this project. Eligible researchers who are involved have confirmed they will be dedicated to guaranteeing quality control on all aspects of this research and that their participation is not merely to provide access to resources and funding to other project team members who would otherwise be ineligible.
   b. I certify that all eligible researchers are up to date on reporting for all existing grants, across all J-PAL initiatives.
9. **Team Members & Roles** - Please add all project team members and indicate their role(s) below.
10. **Demographic Information** - J-PAL is collecting information about all project teams, including demographic information, to better understand and support our research network. Applicants should be prepared to answer demographic information on all co-PIs.
11. **Full Title of Proposal** [30 words max]
12. **National Location** - In which country or countries will your research or travel take place?
13. **Award Type and Funding Amount To be Requested**: Please state the award type (adapt/ policy pilot/ full scale-up) that you plan to apply for. Please also state the

funding amount you plan to request (this can be an estimate/ tentative figure at this stage).

14. **Past and Future Submissions** - Have you submitted or do you plan to submit this LOI and proposal to any other J-PAL Initiative RFP, including in any previous IGI round of funding?

    a. **Details about Past and Future Submissions** - If you answered yes above, please state which initiative(s), year/season of RFP, and the name of the LOI/proposal you submitted or plan to submit. Example: IGI Spring 2019 Using Mobile Phones to Improve Service Delivery. Are the PI team, context, and research question the same as in the previously submitted proposal? Please explain whether the project received funding and what type of funding it received (Travel/Proposal Development, Pilot, RCT, Scale). Additionally, please explain how the project has progressed since it was last submitted to the initiative, and explain how you addressed the feedback that was provided with your last submission. [350 words max]

15. **Do you plan to request IGI funding to fund a randomized evaluation in full or in part?** Please select from the following options - Yes/ No/ To be determined

16. **Scaling Abstract** - Please provide a brief description of the project. Comment on the evidence-informed intervention(s) (policies, programs, processes, delivery mechanisms, etc.) you hope to adapt to a new context, conduct a policy pilot of, or support the scaling of. Please provide a brief summary of the experimental evidence on this intervention to date. Additionally, include the name (and, if possible, the full URL) to the key paper(s) on which your proposal is based. This may include published and/or working papers. If a paper is not currently publicly available, please indicate when it is expected to be available in the public domain. [500 words max]

17. **Additional information on the specific government partner(s)** - Please provide as much detail as possible at this stage about the individual(s), team(s), or unit(s) with which you are partnering, identifying at a minimum the specific department(s)/ministries within the government. We welcome any additional context you are able to provide on the relationship with the government partner. [350 words max]

18. **Proposal Sector(s)** - Please indicate which sector(s) your proposal relates to; as described in the RFP materials - Agriculture/ Education/ Energy, Environment and Climate Change/ Crime, Violence, and Conflict/ Finance/ Firms/ Gender/ Health/ Labor Markets/ Political Economy and Governance/ Social Protection/ Other

19. **Fit for earmarked funding pools** - Does your project relate to any of IGI's earmarked funding pools, as described in the RFP materials? If yes, please write down the name of the earmarked funding pool (1. Boosting income at scale through livelihoods interventions; 2. Improving the reach, quality, and take-up of health services and products). If not, please write "Not Applicable"

20. **Cross cutting theme(s)** - Please indicate which of IGI's cross cutting theme(s) your proposal relates to, if any. These are described in detail in the RFP materials - Technology and data-enabled program delivery and monitoring/ Implementation Science/ Cost Analysis

21. **Initiative Alignment** - Please briefly describe how the project aligns with the initiative's research focus areas and/or cross-cutting themes, as described in the RFP materials [250 words max]

22. **Impact of US foreign aid freeze:** The continuity of some projects has been affected by the recent freeze in US aid. Has your project lost US foreign aid, affecting its continuity? If yes, for each award please list following:
    a. The name of the funding agency
    b. The project name
    c. The total amount awarded
    d. The percentage of funding not disbursed due to the funding freeze
    e. If available, a full URL to the publicly accessible project page.
    f. Describe how you would carry out project activities if awarded IGI funding. If you have not been affected by the US foreign aid freeze, please write "Not Applicable." [350 words max]
23. **Time-sensitive funding requirements:** IGI expects to release funding in June 2025. Does your project have an urgent need for funding before June 2025? If yes, please explain why and specify your preferred timeline for receiving a funding decision. If not, please write "Not Applicable." [250 words max]

Application Questions

1. **Which type of funding are you applying for?** - Please select from the following options - Adapt/ Policy Pilot/ Full Scale-up
2. **Funding Amount** - Amount of requested funding in USD.
3. **Proposed Period of Performance Project Start Date** - What is the proposed start date for this J-PAL grant's subaward activities?
4. **Proposed Period of Performance Project End Date** - What is the proposed end date for this J-PAL grant's subaward activities?
5. **Existing Research Project** - Are you applying to fund additional research as part of an existing research project previously funded by J-PAL (e.g., a second proposal development grant continuing from a prior proposal development grant, a pilot grant building on a travel/proposal development, a full RCT building on a pilot, etc.)? - Yes/ No. If Yes, please provide the title and/or J-PAL grant number of your previously funded project.
6. **Change of Scaling Focus Areas and/or Cross-Cutting Themes** - Tell us if your focus areas or themes have changed since submitting your Letter of Interest by adding this information here. [250 words max]
7. **Policy Motivation** - Provide a summary of the policy problem that motivates this scale-up and how it fits with the topics outlined in the RFP materials. [500 words max]
8. **The Innovation and Underlying Evidence** - Please describe the innovation the [government, nonprofit] partner will explore adapting, piloting, and/or scaling as well as a brief summary of the experimental evidence on this innovation to date in one or more of the initiative's focus areas and how it could potentially benefit people living in poverty. Innovations can be new programs or changes to existing programs, processes, technologies, or delivery systems. If your project includes a randomized evaluation that is intended to inform scale decisions, please also provide a description of the research activities, treatment, or intervention [750 words max]

9. **Target Population and Context** - What population(s) will the scale-up attempt to impact? What characteristics do they have? Do you have any comments on the target population and context's alignment with the initiative's priorities? [350 words max]

10. **Depth of Impact** - Please include a brief note on the effect size(s) found in the previous RCT(s) of this intervention for these and any other relevant outcome areas, whether they were economically significant, and whether you expect the effect size to be similar in magnitude, lower, or higher in this context and why. Please also describe any existing evidence of the cost-effectiveness of the innovation as previously delivered in an experimental or other setting. For cash transfer proposals only, please also discuss the USD amount of additional benefits the average program participant could receive if the cash transfer program is improved or expanded and explain the basis for and assumptions underlying your estimate. [400 words max]

11. **Locally Grounded** - Please include a clear rationale for why the intervention may be relevant or appropriate for the proposed context and/or institution. When possible, please include descriptive statistics about the nature and extent of the problem and aspects of local systems and institutions that make it amenable to the intervention. Specify which aspects of the existing evidence are or are not likely to generalize given the proposed implementer, context, and delivery model(s). [300 words max]

12. **Scale-up potential** - A summary of how the partner plans to use the IGI-funded technical assistance in specific decisions about expanding or scaling an evidenced-informed innovation. Please comment on the following: [suggested answer format: 1000 words]
    a. Breadth of impact - If the government decides to/succeeds in scaling the innovation, how many people could it potentially reach and when? What is the average income level of the target population? You may wish to consider the following in responding to this question: (a) Your team's estimate of potential reach in the geography you see as relevant (b) Indications from your government partner about potential scale (c) The total size of the population of beneficiaries in the country/state who could benefit from this innovation/policy/program.
    b. Informing government decisions - Please provide a summary of the specific government decisions the IGI-funded technical assistance is intended to inform around piloting and/or scaling an evidenced-informed innovation. Be as specific as possible, and refer to any discussions with your government partner on how the partner intends for this work to inform such decisions (including the government commitment to use the results of an RCT in a scale- up decision)
    c. Likelihood of success - Please include your subjective assessment of how likely this innovation is to eventually be adopted at scale by the government. You should state this answer in terms of "X to Y% likely to happen" and provide your rationale for this assessment. What are the main factors that could prevent this innovation from scaling and how do you plan to address them?"

13. **The Activities** - List the proposed activities and how they will contribute to the end goal along with a clear timeline and concrete milestones. Milestones should represent key decisions, outputs, changes, etc. that will demonstrate whether your work is on track. Applications applying evidence in a new context should diagnose the problem and determine if past evidence is relevant. Applicants should state how they will adapt, pilot, and monitor the innovation in the new context before scaling. [750 words max]

14. **Timeline** - Please upload a Gantt chart of the timeline with the key project activities.
15. **Scaling/Implementing Partners** - Please provide a brief description of the scaling/implementing partner(s) and the partner's proposed involvement in project activities any in-kind or financial support they have committed or provided to the project. [250 words max]
16. **The Institutionalization of the Partnership** - Do you hope to make this a long-term partnership or is it already part of one? If the key contact is transferred, are there other stakeholders who are equally invested? Are you planning to enter into an institutional MoU? Include the dates of upcoming elections and/or administration changes and discuss whether these are likely to affect the project. [500 words max]
    a. Since building partnerships with decision-makers requires on-the-ground presence, does the project have necessary institutional support of the regional J-PAL office and/or an on-the-ground research or implementing partner such as an IPA country office, university, and/or NGO? An important goal of IGI is to foster institutional partnerships between J-PAL and governments. If this project is taking place in a country that has a J-PAL or an IPA office but these organizations are not the host/receiving institutions, please provide a comment detailing why.
    b. What is the level of J-PAL affiliate or IGI invited researcher involvement in terms of providing high-level leadership, guidance, and advice to staff and policy partners?
    c. J-PAL offices may be able to provide support in facilitating connections to policymakers, researchers, supporting key policy partnerships, and implementing technical assistance. If this is something you are interested in, please discuss it with the relevant J-PAL Executive Director. Any relevant J-PAL office support should be included in the project budget.
17. **Implementation and cost documentation** - IGI-funded projects are typically required to collect and report (i) policy or program cost data sufficient to conduct a cost-effectiveness analysis, and (ii) implementation and scale processes sufficient to inform how a policy or program is implemented so it could be adopted at scale in a new context. Please comment on what efforts you will make to collect implementation costs and document implementation details and scale-up processes so these can benefit other policymakers and researchers and staff at J-PAL (including plans to leverage the use of existing administrative data systems or technology to collect data through phone or online surveys?). [350 words max]
18. **Potential cost-effectiveness** - Considering any existing evidence on cost-effectiveness, please provide your assessment of the potential cost-effectiveness of the innovation if delivered at scale. You may wish to consider the theory of change of the innovation and other data to inform how effectiveness may change at scale and any expected economies of scale that have a bearing on marginal cost per beneficiary. Please include any existing cost-effectiveness estimates if available. [250 words max]
19. **Cross-Cutting Themes** - How does incorporating some or all of IGI's cross-cutting themes (technology and data-enabled program delivery, implementation science, and cost analysis) enhance the scalability, reach, or likelihood of success of the project? How does incorporating some or all of IGI's cross-cutting themes lower the cost of the intervention or cost to IGI? [150 words max]

20. **Randomized Evaluations and Intervention/Treatment Details (if applicable, for randomized evaluations)** - Unlike other J-PAL funding initiatives, knowledge creation and funding randomized evaluations is not IGI's main goal. However, we recognize that in some cases rigorous evidence of effectiveness at scale and in the same context is a critical input for a government's decision about whether and how to adopt a program or policy at scale. In these cases, IGI allows proposals that include partial funding for randomized evaluations. Grants can be used for path-to-scale research that builds on existing RCT evidence from completed (and ideally published) studies, such as RCTs at scale to evaluate interventions previously tested at a small scale, or replication trials that test previously-evaluated interventions in new contexts. If your project includes a randomized evaluation that is intended to inform scale decisions, please provide the additional information below:
    a. Description of the Research Activities, Treatment, or Intervention: Please provide a description of the research activities and evaluation design. Please include the randomization method, treatment groups, and describe any combinations of the interventions. Please include information about data collection and key outcomes: succinctly describe your data collection plan and key outcome measures of the study. Please include the data collection partner and your relationship with them. What are your intermediate and final outcomes? How will these be measured? When will you take measurements, and how frequently? If there are more than two treatment groups, please list them using numerals. [1000 words max]
    b. Target population and context [250 words max]
    c. Power calculations [250 words max]
21. **Implications on Equity and Social Inclusion** - Please provide a comment on whether the research proposal addresses equity or social inclusion, in any way. Topics of social inclusion include, but are not limited to, gender, income level, location, ethnicity, race, language, citizenship status, disability, and at the intersection of those factors. Explain whether and how the project design allows us to learn about baseline differences between and differential impacts on groups mentioned above. Explain what reasons (if any) there are to expect that the intervention(s) studied may have disproportionate benefits for disadvantaged groups. [300 words max]
22. **Local researcher involvement** - Please describe how the project involves researchers local to the project context. [200 words max]
23. **Gender Reporting** - Does the proposal disaggregate data and outcomes by gender? Pilot and RCT projects are required to report on gender-disaggregated impacts: Please briefly explain whether you will disaggregate gender impacts or why this would not be feasible. [250 words max]
24. **Validation and Test Accuracy Data** - Proposals that include Artificial Intelligence (AI) or any new specialized technology should include validation and test accuracy data in the proposal, showing that the technology successfully does what it intends. If applicable, please provide that validation and test accuracy data here, or attach it in the "additional attachments" section.
25. **Potential Risks:** To protect children, research participants, staff, and community members, to comply with donor requirements, and to maintain a strong reputation for ethical research, J-PAL wants researchers to think carefully about the risks their research projects could face and how they will address such risks. The below questions provide an

opportunity for researchers to do that. Successful applicants must provide updated answers in annual narrative reports only if there have been substantial changes since their proposal or last annual narrative report. Please answer the following questions below in detail:

    a. Completion - Are there any technical, logistical, ethical, or political obstacles and risks that might threaten the completion of the project (e.g., implementation capacity, government authorization, or other funding)? How do you plan to monitor and prevent/address these types of risks throughout the project? [200 words max]

    b. Implementing Partners - Please discuss any information about the implementing partner(s) that could pose ethical, reputational, or legal risks (e.g., child safeguarding, corruption or misuse of funds, etc). If applicable, what proactive measures have you taken or will you take to assess, monitor, and mitigate/prevent any such potential risks? [150 words max]

    c. Child Safeguarding - Particularly for projects working with children, what child safeguarding risks exist? [200 words max]

    d. Participants, Staff, Community Members - For each of the groups below, please describe any potential unintended consequences or risks of this project to them. What proactive measures have you taken or will you take to assess, monitor, and mitigate/prevent any such potential risks? [300 words max]
        i. Program and research participants
        ii. Staff (e.g., implementing partners, research assistants, enumerators)
        iii. Community members (e.g., untreated members of a household, untreated neighbors, or broader communities if the treatment might have spillover or downstream effects beyond the study sample)

    e. Contractual Limitations - Are there any contractual limitations on the ability of the researchers to report the results of the study? If so, what are those restrictions, and who are they from? [150 words max]

26. **Partnership Status** – Have you established communication with relevant stakeholders including but not limited to government agencies and implementing partners, for research collaboration? [Yes, No]

    a. **Name of Partner Organization** – If yes, indicate the name of the partner organization.

    b. **Role of Partner Organization** – If yes, indicate the role of the organization on this project. [Co-funder; Scale-up Partner; Other; Research Implementation Partner; Intervention Implementation Partner; Government Partner] If you selected "Other", please explain the role of your partner. If you are adding a co-funder as a partner, please add more details under the question "Co-funder Details" farther down.

    c. **Point of Contact Based at the Partner Organization** – If yes, please provide details about your point of contact at the partner organization. [First Name, Last Name, Role or Title, Email Address, Phone Number]

You can enter up to three partner organizations.

27. **Co-funder Details:** If you are adding co-funders, indicate the total amount of received or committed funding, the funded proposal or project title, and the name of the primary PI for the co-funded proposal or project.
28. **Interest in Co-Funding** - Are you interested in applying for co-funding from the Fund for Innovation in Development (FID), or other donors in J-PAL's network? Would you potentially like assistance from J-PAL staff in preparing a proposal to these donors? Please note that assistance will be provided on a case-by-case basis, but the first possible step is assessing interest. [150 words max]
29. **Human Subject Research** - Do you plan to conduct human subjects research during your scaling grant? According to US federal regulations, a human subject is a living individual about whom an investigator conducting research obtains 1) data through intervention or interaction with the individual (e.g., through an interview, focus group, or survey), or 2) identifiable private information (e.g., individual-level health or education data). If your project scope of work includes collecting this type of data, please select Yes. [Yes;No]
30. **Institutional Review Board (IRB) of Record** - Provide the name of the IRB of Record below.
31. **Is this IRB of Record IORG certified?** [Yes;No]
32. **Local Legal Requirements Certification** - All PIs and Co-PIs certify that they understand they must adhere to all local legal requirements, including obtaining local IRB approval and government research permits, where applicable. Do you agree? [Yes;No]
33. **Data Publication** - Please confirm you plan to publish data collected in an open-access, online database at the end of the evaluation. IGI strongly recommends data publication for all projects. Projects that receive IGI funding towards any aspect of a randomized evaluation must publish de-identified research data in an open access, online database at the end of the research period, in accordance with J-PAL's Data and Code Availability Policy. Even if the randomized evaluation is not funded by J-PAL, this requirement may also apply if the results of a planned or ongoing randomized evaluation are likely to play an important role in a government's decision to scale a program, policy, or innovation. In such cases, if your project is awarded IGI funding, then IGI will, during the grant finalization process, review the specific details of your proposal and determine on a case-by-case basis whether this requirement applies to your project. Please see J-PAL's Data and Code Availability Policy for more information about data publication: Data_code_availability_policy_2020.pdf
34. **Institute to Receive Award (ITRA)** - Please indicate the institution that will receive the grant funds.
35. **Budget Template/Upload** - From the [RFP website](), download and complete the RCT Budget Template. There are two tabs: one for the IGI budget and one for the Total Project Budget (i.e., the IGI budget plus any other sources of funding you may have). When done, please upload your completed budget in the field below. Please note that the

budget template is formatted specifically for this application. Do not remove the formatting, change any of the formatting, or create new columns.

36. **Budget Narrative Upload** - Please justify the expenses outlined in your budget in a Word document with the title [PI Last Name, First Name][Budget Narrative].doc(x), and upload it here. This document is required in addition to the Proposal Budget. Notes included in the Excel sheet of the budget do not suffice.

37. **Letter of Support from Implementing Partner** - All projects are required to provide a letter of support from the government and any other implementing partners. Such letters should state:
    a. The support for the activities proposed
    b. How the partner plans to use the results of the research or other activities to support specific scaling decisions and strengthen policymaking. Any details about the potential reach of the scaled-up program.
    c. How the partner sees a long-term partnership with J-PAL to be valuable.
    d. What costs will be shared by the partner and an initial total budget amount (if exact costs are not available, then a broad commitment to pay for implementation or other costs is sufficient)
    e. Willingness to share program implementation cost data with project for the purpose of conducting program cost analysis.

    Note: We understand that in some cases it may not be feasible or appropriate to have the partner include all of the items above in their letter. In such cases, please secure a more general letter of support and address the remaining points in your proposal narrative.

38. **Scale-Up Partner Letter of Support** - Applicants must also include letters of support from potential scale-up partners (if different from the implementing partner).

39. **Letter of Transmission** - Scaling grants are required to provide a letter or document stating approval of the proposal materials and budget from each proposed institute to receive award (ITRA). Please note that MIT policy states that the project PI needs to be at the ITRA and that the ITRA should provide the IRB (either using the Institute's IRB or a third party IRB). The Project PI must be the PI on the IRB.

40. **J-PAL Affiliate or Invited Researcher Letter of Support -** Please submit a letter of support from a J-PAL affiliate or invited researcher. The template is available on the [RFP website](#).

41. **Letter of Support from Relevant Regional Office** -
    a. Submitting this letter is compulsory for project countries where there is a J-PAL office responsible for the country. Please follow the relevant instructions below:
        i. If the applicant is not itself a J-PAL office: A letter from the relevant regional J-PAL office that has responsibility for the project country. Please email the Executive Director from the relevant J-PAL office **at least 3 weeks in advance of the RFP deadline** to ensure that the office has enough time to produce their letter of support, which requires a thorough review of the proposal and budget. The J-PAL regional office can use the

template for their letter of support available on the [RFP website](). J-PAL offices may be able to provide support in facilitating connections to policymakers, researchers, supporting key policy partnerships, and implementing technical assistance. If this is something you are interested in, please discuss it with the relevant J-PAL Executive Director as part of your J-PAL office letter of support to discuss what kind of support may be available. Any relevant J-PAL office support should be included in the project budget.

    ii. If a J-PAL office is the applicant: IGI still requires the J-PAL Executive Director from the applying office to submit a letter of support to signal their support and capacity for the project.

  b. If there is no J-PAL office in the region, (e.g. none of J-PAL's six regional offices cover China), you do not need a letter of support from a J-PAL office. However, since one of the primary goals of IGI is building long-term relationships between researchers and governments, the hurdle to get funding from IGI will be higher in such cases where there are no J-PAL offices to help institutionalize the relationship with the government partner. Therefore, the proposal should be sure to state clearly how the project will help inform policy and institutionalize the relationship with the government beyond this specific project.

42. **Existing/Underlying Evidence** - Please upload the corresponding written document(s) about the existing/underlying evidence on which your scaling proposal is based. Additional information on required documentation is outlined in the RFP Overview available on the [RFP website](). Note: All IGI projects must be based on evidence from one or more randomized evaluations, at least one of which should have been conducted by a J-PAL affiliate or invited researcher and/or funded by a J-PAL initiative and the results of which must be available in writing (preferably in the public domain).

43. **Additional attachments** - Please attach any relevant materials discussed in your answers to the previous questions, as well as letters of support, letters of transmission, your budget, your budget narrative, etc.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

When preparing your proposal narrative, please note that the IGI Review Board reviews proposals based on the following evaluation criteria:

Criterion	Scale Outstanding = 4 Good = 3 Pass = 2 Fail = 1	Guiding questions
The innovation		
Policy Relevance	1-4	Does the project address problems or opportunities that are important to the government partner, and, if addressed, could generate meaningful benefits to beneficiaries of the program, policy, process change, or innovation?
Locally Grounded Innovation	1-4	Did the proposal make a clear case for why the innovation may be relevant or appropriate for the proposed context based on descriptive data, knowledge of local systems and institutions, and existing evidence?
Scaling Potential	1-4	Is there potential for the partner to widely scale up the innovation in the future and does it have the potential to meaningfully improve the lives of people living in poverty? Has the government expressed strong commitment to move forward with implementing the policy or program at scale if the pilot is successful? How many people will the innovation reach at scale and over what timeframe?

Potential to Benefit People in Poverty	1-4	Did the proposed solution improve to an economically meaningful level the lives of people living in poverty in previous randomized evaluations? (Note that this criterion refers specifically to segments of the population living in poverty regardless of the project country's status as an LMIC) Does the proposal make a good case for why the scalable version has the potential to meaningfully benefit segments of the population living in poverty? What is the average income level of the target population and will the innovation contribute to meaningful improvements in their well-being?
Strength of Evidence	1-4	What is the strength of the existing evidence on the effectiveness of this type of innovation?
Cost Effectiveness	1-4	Does the proposal include convincing analysis that the innovation can be cost-effective at the proposed scale and at the intended future policy scale, drawing from any available cost-effectiveness estimates? Alternatively, does the proposal incorporate cost collection and analysis to inform a scaling decision in its activities?
Cross-Cutting Themes	1-4	Will the project address and generate useful insights about one or more of IGI's cross-cutting themes - technology- and data-enabled program delivery, implementation science, and cost analysis? What steps will the project take to gather program costs, document implementation and scale-up processes, and disseminate them so others may also benefit?
Ethical Concerns	1-4	Are the risks of unintended negative consequences for program participants minimal? Are there risks to non-participants? Are these risks minimal?

		Has the team taken proactive measures to assess, monitor, and mitigate/prevent any such potential risks?
The Partnership		
Commitment to Use Evidence in Decision-making	1-4	Is there demonstrated demand from the government partner to use evidence from the proposed technical assistance and/or past research to make a key decision about expanding the innovation? Is the government committing its own resources, especially finances, to this project? Does this government partner have a known track record of acting on evidence?
Viability of the Partnership	1-4	Is there a strong likelihood that the partnership will result in government adoption of the innovation at scale? Is the relationship with the partner(s) strong and likely to endure through the entire life of the project? Are there any logistical or political obstacles that might threaten the completion of the proposed activities, for example, government authorization or potential transfer of key decision-makers? Consider the following: Does the partnership have support from senior government officials and/or a formal partnership agreement/MoU? Does the team have the necessary authorizations and/or approvals for the project activities from the government, or are they likely to get them within a reasonable timeframe? Is the work in this proposal part of a multifaceted partnership involving other forms of and/or longer-term collaboration? Are there strong relationships at multiple levels (e.g., affiliate, staff of the applying organization, multiple levels of government, etc)?

		Has the government partner designated members of their team to work on this project and/or committed in-kind or financial resources to the project? Are there any upcoming elections or changes of key officials in the next 1-2 years that could adversely affect the partnership?
Locally Grounded Institutional Support	1-4	What institutional support is available (e.g. J-PAL regional office, IPA country office, other NGO and/or research partner, researchers based in the country/region)? If the project is taking place in a country with a J-PAL office or presence, including Brazil, Chile, Egypt, countries in the European Union, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Mexico, Morocco, South Africa, and the United States, is the applicant team collaborating or coordinating with the relevant J-PAL office?
Level of Affiliate Involvement	1-4	What is the level of involvement of a J-PAL affiliate or invited researcher, in terms of providing high-level leadership, guidance, and advice to project staff and policy partners? Does this level of involvement seem adequate to ensure careful application of evidence, especially where evidence is being adapted to a new context?

For ***randomized evaluation applications***, besides the above general criteria, the Review Board will consider the following additional criteria:

Need for additional research	● Does the proposal have a clear and convincing justification for why they need to do more research on this question and why the research that has already been done is insufficient to inform a scale-up decision?
Contribution	● Does the study make a significant contribution toward advancing knowledge in the field?

	● Does it answer new questions or introduce novel methods, measures, or interventions? ● How does the study compare with the existing body of research?
Value of research	● Is the cost of the study commensurate with the value of expected lessons learned?
Technical design	● Does the research design appropriately answer the questions outlined in the proposal? ● Are there threats that could compromise the validity of results? ● If so, does the proposal sufficiently address those threats?
Publishing data	● Will the data collected during the evaluation be made publicly available and when?
Gender and marginalized populations	● Given the importance of examining the gender implications of policies, as well as the differences related to socioeconomic status and other types of social marginalization, does the proposal expand on whether and how the project will address questions of gender and marginalization?