APPLICATION QUESTIONS AND REVIEW CRITERIA: IGI

This document provides a preview of the IGI Letter of Interest and Application questions. It also includes the Evaluation Criteria that the IGI Review Board uses to assess proposals.

APPLICATION QUESTIONS PREVIEW

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

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. **Organization Name of Eligible Researcher** - Please enter the organization where the eligible researcher is employed.
4. **Organization Type**
5. **Country Where Organization is Based or Headquartered**
6. **Team Members & Roles** - Please add all project team members and indicate their role(s) below.
7. **Non J-PAL Co-PI(s) -** Please identify the non J-PAL co-PI(s), the organization name(s), and email address(es)
8. **PI Certification**
   - 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.
   - I certify that all eligible researchers are up to date on reporting for all existing grants, across all J-PAL initiatives.
9. **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.
10. **Full Title of Proposal** [30 words max]
11. **National Location** - In which country or countries will your research or travel take place?

12. **Award Type**: Please state the award type (adapt/ policy pilot/ full scale-up) that you plan to apply for.

13. **Funding Amount To be Requested:** Please state the funding amount you plan to request (this can be an estimate/ tentative figure at this stage).

14. **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

15. **Past and Future Submissions** - Have you submitted or do you plan to submit this proposal or a related proposal to any other J-PAL Initiative RFP, including in any previous IGI round of funding? [Yes, I have submitted or plan to submit this proposal to another initiative/Yes, I have submitted this proposal previously to this initiative/No, I have not submitted or do not plan to submit this proposal to another initiative]

    [If response is "Yes, I have submitted or plan to submit this proposal to another initiative"] Please include the following [350 words]:
    - Initiative(s), year/season of RFP, and the name of the LOI/proposal you submitted or plan to submit. (e.g., GI Spring 2019 Using Mobile Phones to Improve Service Delivery).
    - Are the PI team, context, and research question the same as in the previously submitted or soon to be submitted proposal?
    - If this proposal is for a similar project, but would be using funds for something different, please explain the difference in terms of what research you're going to be conducting and how you're using the budget.

    [If response is "Yes, I have submitted this proposal previously to this initiative"] Please include the following [350 words]:
    - Year/season of RFP, and the name of the LOI/proposal you submitted or plan to submit. (e.g., GI Spring 2019 Using Mobile Phones to Improve Service Delivery).
    - Are the PI team, context, and research question the same as in the previously submitted or soon to be submitted proposal?
    - If this proposal is for a similar project, but would be using funds for something different, please explain the difference in terms of what research you're going to be conducting and how you're using the budget.

    If the proposal you submitted previously was not funded, could you briefly explain if/how you responded to the feedback?

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 . [350 words max]

17. **RCT Evidence -** Please provide a brief summary of the RCT evidence on the intervention(s) in your project to date. [250 words max]

- Include the title and full URL (if possible) of the key paper(s) on which your project 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 publicly available.
- Describe how the project builds on the RCT evidence and the interventions that were evaluated. For example: (i) the project uses findings from the RCT(s) to pilot a scalable version of the intervention, or (ii) the project builds on findings from the RCT(s) to conduct a new path-to-scale RCT etc.

18. **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]

19. **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

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 funding priorities, as described in the RFP materials [250 words max]

22. **AI Technology Type: Does the intervention use AI (including machine learning, heterogeneous treatment targeting, generative AI, etc.)?*** If Yes, specifically indicate the AI technology type. [No, Yes: Supervised learning; Yes: Heterogeneous treatment targeting; Yes: Large language models (LLMs) (e.g., GPT, Claude, PaLM, etc.] *(not being mapped to SF)*
    - *[If above response is Large Language models (LLMs)]* **If you selected that it is based on LLMs, please also answer all of the following:**
      1) Which LLM is being used and why?
      2) Will a qualified human (e.g., teacher, healthcare worker, extension agent) review and verify the AI's output before this output is used?
      3) If yes, please describe their role and qualifications. If no human in the loop is present, explain why the intervention is still unlikely to cause harm even if the LLM's output is inaccurate. [200 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. **Final 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. If funded, this abstract will be posted on our website, so please ensure the description is suitable for a public audience. [400 words max]
8. **The Policy Problem** - Provide a summary of the policy problem and opportunity that the government partner has identified that motivates the partnership, and a description of how this proposal will address the problem. [400 words max]
9. **The Innovation, Underlying Evidence, and Responsiveness of Innovation to the Policy Problem in your Context:** Please describe the innovation the [government, nonprofit, private sector, etc.] partner aims to adapt, pilot, or scale. Please include [2,000 words max]:
   a. A summary of existing experimental evidence, including key outcomes and effect sizes from previous RCTs, and whether those effects were economically meaningful.
   b. A clear rationale for why the intervention is well-suited to the local policy problem, including relevant descriptive data and features of the local systems or institutions that support its use.
   c. Describe the population(s) that the scale-up attempts to impact? What characteristics do they have?
   d. Your expectations for how the intervention might perform in this context, and why, citing differences or similarities in setting, population, or delivery.
   e. Describe any existing evidence of the cost-effectiveness of the innovation as previously delivered in an experimental or other setting.

f. If your project includes a randomized evaluation intended to inform scale decisions, please provide a rationale for why the randomized evaluation is needed.

g. You can upload corresponding written document(s) about the existing/underlying evidence in the "Letters of Support and Additional Materials" section.

10. **Scale-Up Potential:** Summarize how the government partner plans to use the technical assistance in specific decisions about expanding or scaling an evidenced-informed innovation. Please comment on the following [500 words max]:

a. Reach: If the partner 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. Government Decisions: What specific decisions will this technical assistance support (for example, piloting in a new area, scaling up nationally, or improving how a program is delivered)? What has your partner said about how they plan to use the results from this work?

c. Likelihood of success: How likely is it that the government will adopt this innovation at scale? Please give your best estimate (e.g., "50–70% likely") and explain your reasoning. What might get in the way of scaling, and how are you planning to address those risks?

11. **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. If you have a Gantt chart, please upload it in the last section of the application, under "Additional Attachments." [300 words max]

12. **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]

13. **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.

14. **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]

15. **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]

16. **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: What population(s) does the intervention in the RCT attempt to impact? What characteristics do they have? Do you have any comments on this population's alignment with the initiative's priorities? [250 words max]:

c. Power calculations: Please provide detailed, convincing, and well-justified power calculations for any impacts that the research team plans to measure if your project includes a randomized evaluation. [250 words max]

17. **Implications on Equity and Social Inclusion** - Please provide a comment on whether the scale proposal addresses equity or social inclusion. 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 what reasons (if any) there are to expect that the intervention(s) studied may have disproportionate benefits for disadvantaged groups. [200 words max]

18. **Local researcher involvement** - Please describe how the project involves researchers local to the project context. [200 words max]

19. **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. [200 words max]

20. **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? [200 words max]

c. 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? [200 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, children or broader communities if the treatment might have spillover or downstream effects beyond the study sample)

    d. 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? [200 words max]

21. **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.

22. **Local Research Partner/Local Partner:** If your project takes place in a country that has a J-PAL office but that office is not a partner, please explain why you chose not to work with them. Your answer will help us understand how J-PAL offices can better respond to the needs of PIs. If a J-PAL office is a partner, please write its name below. If your project is in a country without a J-PAL office, please write "N/A."

23. **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.

24. **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]

25. **Institutional Review Board (IRB) of Record** - Provide the name of the IRB of Record below.

26. **Is this IRB of Record IORG certified?** [Yes;No]

27. **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]

28. **Implementation and cost documentation** - IGI-funded projects are required to collect and report (i) policy or program cost data following the [J-PAL Costing Guidelines](#) 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 read these guidelines carefully and confirm "Yes" that, if funded, you will complete this deliverable in accordance with these guidelines. For more information on comparative cost-effectiveness analysis, see our [CEA website](#). If you have feedback on this exercise, the template, or the underlying rationale, please submit to our team [online](#). [30 words max]

29. **Data Publication** - IGI grantees are required to publish data related to funded evaluations collected in an open-access, online database at the end of the evaluation. Please confirm "Yes" or "No" that you plan to publish your project data. Researchers may request an exemption (which J-PAL has the discretion to deny) for legal, ethical, or proprietary reasons. Please see [J-PAL's Data and Code Availability Policy](#) for more information about data publication. [30 words max]

30. **Institute to Receive Award (ITRA)** - Please indicate the institution that will receive the grant funds.

31. **Contact at Institute to Receive Award (ITRA) -** Please provide contact information for the person who will be in charge of the contract at the ITRA.[First Name; Last Name; Role or Title; Email Address; up to 1 contact]

32. **Unique Entity ID*** - Does your ITRA have a Unique Entity ID (UEI) from the website SAM.gov? Please note that, if your proposal is awarded funding, all subawardees of MIT require a UEI from SAM.gov.
    a. Yes, my ITRA has a UEI
    b. No, my ITRA does not have a UEI
    c. I am not sure

33. **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.

34. **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.

35. **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.

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

37. **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.

38. **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.

39. **Letter of Support from Relevant Regional Office** -

    a. <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:

        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. <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.

40. **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).

41. **Additional attachments** - Please attach any relevant materials discussed in your answers to the previous questions.

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	a. 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?