IGI Spring 2023 RFP

Proposal Application Form and Instructions

INSTRUCTIONS

Proposals for IGI funding consist of (i) basic contact and logistical information; (ii) a proposal narrative; (iii) a budget; and (iv) letters of support. Please note that full proposals are due by **11:59 pm ET on June 30, 2023**. Applicants are **required to submit a letter of interest by 11:59 pm ET on May 19** before submitting a full proposal.

Please note: J-PAL initiatives, including IGI, have transitioned to using an online portal system for all proposal submissions and reviews, as well as for grantee reporting. All registration and application instructions can be found on IGI's webpage. The IGI team will notify you via our online portal once we have received your letter of interest and you are clear to submit a full proposal. In the interim, to facilitate your proposal development, we have provided reference documents, like this one, that outline in detail all required information that applicants will be asked to provide when submitting a proposal to IGI. You are welcome to begin drafting your proposal materials using these forms, as the fields and content included in these reference documents will be required in the portal system. Please do not complete or submit these reference documents to IGI for consideration.

Questions? Please reach out to igi@povertyactionlab.org.

COVERSHEET AND NARRATIVE

SECTION: COVERSHEET

Please note that all fields are required.

TITLE OF PROPOSAL	COUNTRY

J-PAL AFFILIATED OR IGI INVITED RESEARCHER(S)

INSTITUTION TO RECEIVE FUNDS (J-PAL REGIONAL OFFICE, IPA COUNTRY OFFICE, OR ANOTHER RESEARCH OR NGO PARTNER)*

NON-J-PAL CO-PI(s) (Institutional Affiliation)

☐	*By checking this box, all J-PAL affiliates and IGI invited researchers who are co-PIs on this project certify that they will be active, engaged, and responsive PIs dedicated to guaranteeing the quality control on all aspects of this project; and that their participation in this project is not merely to provide access to J-PAL resources and funding to anyone else working on this project who is neither a J-PAL affiliate nor IGI invited researcher.*

GOVERNMENT AND IMPLEMENTING PARTNER(S)	CONTACT (NAME, EMAIL, PHONE)

CO-FUNDER(S)	FUNDED AWARD (PI, Project Title, Amount)

Have you submitted this or a related proposal to any other J-PAL funding initiative?

☐ Yes ☐ No	If yes, which initiative and when?

IGI FUNDING REQUEST

Focus Area: Livelihood interventions ☐ Cash transfers ☐ Health ☐

Cross-cutting theme(s):

Technology and data-enabled delivery and monitoring ☐ Implementation Science ☐ Cost Analysis ☐

Award Type: Adapt (up to $75,000) ☐ Policy Pilot (up to $200,000) ☐ Scale (up to $300,000) ☐

Note: In responding to the following items, please refer to section 3 of the RFP overview for guidance on funding amounts and suggested grant timelines.

Requested	$	Total co-funded	$

GRANT PERIOD

Start date: (yyyy-mm-dd)		End date: (yyyy-mm-dd)	
Institution to receive award*		Contact for contracting issues	

Some projects will not be conducting research involving human subjects. However, if this project will involve research on human subjects, please fill out the two boxes below.

IRB OF RECORD		IRB CONTACT	
We are also in touch with other funders and occasionally share proposals that are relevant to their interests. If you **do not** want this proposal shared with them, please check this box: ☐			

* Please indicate the institution that will actually receive the grant funds. 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 institutions, please provide a comment detailing why in your proposal narrative.

SECTION: NARRATIVE

Instructions: Before proceeding, please consult IGI's RFP Overview and Annex I below to confirm that your project meets the required evidence base for scaling projects. Please include a short response to each of the following sub-sections. Questions with asterisks (*) will be required

Abstract: Please summarize the partnership to adapt, pilot, and/or scale an evidence-informed innovation with a specific government partner(s). This will be added to IGI's webpage if the project receives funding. *[*suggested answer format: 150 - 200 words*]

The problem and opportunity: A summary of the context and policy problem/opportunity that the government partner has identified that motivates the partnership and a description of how this proposal will address the problem. * [*suggested answer format: Up to 250 words*]

The innovation and underlying evidence: The innovation the government 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 IGI's three 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* [*suggested answer format: Up to 350 words*]

IGI outcomes: Which of the three IGI focus areas does this project under? *[*Select one: Livelihood interventions, cash transfers, health*]

Existing evidence: Please upload the corresponding written document(s) on which your scaling proposal is based. Additional information on required documentation is outlined in Annex I. 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. **[*Upload*]

Depth of impact and Cost-Effectiveness: Please include a brief note on the effect size(s) found in the previous RCT(s) of this innovation 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* [*suggested answer format: up to 500 words*]

Locally grounded: Please include a clear rationale for why the innovation 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 innovation. Specify which aspects of the existing evidence are or are not likely to generalize given the proposed implementer, context, and delivery model(s). * [*suggested answer format: up to 500 words*]

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*]

- *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.
- *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)
- *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?

Cost-Effectiveness potential: Considering any existing evidence on cost effectiveness previously described, please provide your assessment of the cost effectiveness potential 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. * [*suggested answer format: 250 words*]

The activities: Please describe the proposed activities that IGI will fund and how they will contribute to achieving the end goal along with a clear timeline and concrete milestones throughout that timeline. Milestones should represent key decisions, outputs, changes in conditions, etc. that will help you know whether your work is on track to catalyzing the end goal you aspire for. Applications seeking to apply evidence in a new context should include a formal scoping process to diagnose the problem and determine whether past evidence is relevant, as well as a process for adapting, piloting, and monitoring the innovation in the new context before scaling. [*suggested answer format: 750 words*]

The partnership: A brief history of the partnership, the government partner's involvement in project activities, any in-kind or financial support they have committed or provided to the project, and the roles the main contacts (that you indicated on the Partner Organization tab) will play over the course of the project. We asked you to add this information on the Partner Organization tab and want you to use this space to elaborate on those relationships. Please note whether they are likely to be transferred during the project. Include the dates of upcoming elections and/or administration changes and discuss whether these are likely to affect the project and what steps you have taken or will take to ensure continuity of the work in the event of a transfer and/or other changes. [*suggested answer format: 350 words*]

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? [*suggested answer format: 350 words*]

- 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.
- 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?
- 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.

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. Describe what efforts you will make to collect implementation costs and document implementation and scale-up processes so these can benefit other policymakers and researchers and staff at J-PAL. 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?) *[*suggested answer format: 350 words*]

Timeline: Please provide a clear project timeline including short-term markers of success; a Gantt chart is preferred. *

Cross-Cutting Themes: How does your project incorporate IGI's cross-cutting themes technology and data-enabled program delivery, implementation science, and cost analysis? How does incorporating these themes enhance the scalability, reach, or likelihood of success, or lower cost of the intervention or cost to IGI, of the project? * *[suggested answer format: 150 words]*

Randomized evaluations (if applicable): Funding randomized evaluations is not IGI's main goal. However, we recognize that in some cases rigorous evidence of effectiveness at scale is a critical input for a government's scale-up decision. In these cases, IGI allows proposals that include partial funding for randomized evaluations. If your project includes a randomized evaluation that is intended to inform scale decisions, whether the evaluation is to be funded by IGI or another funder, please provide the following additional information in addition to the relevant preceding items: *
- Target population and context
- Evaluation design
- Power calculations
- Whether the research proposal addresses gender issues in any way including analysis disaggregated by gender. (note that funded projects will be required to report on gender-disaggregated data)
- Data publication plans

Additional information (optional): Please discuss any other criteria that will be used by IGI to evaluate this proposal, if not already addressed in the narrative. You can use this space to elaborate on how your project incorporates IGI's cross-cutting themes and how incorporating these themes enhance the scalability, reach, or likelihood of success, or lower cost of the intervention or cost to IGI, of the project. For off-cycle proposals, please explain any time constraints the project faces and reasons for requesting expedited review. [*suggested answer format: 400 words*]

Potential risks: Please answer the following questions below in detail.* [*suggested answer format: up to 250 words*]
- Are there any technical, logistical, or political obstacles and risks that might threaten the completion of the project (for example, implementation capacity, government authorization, or other funding)? Does this potential scale-up present any unintended opportunities for corruption or misuse of funds? How do you plan to monitor and prevent/address both of these types of risks throughout the project?
- Are there any COVID-related risks to the feasibility of the project? How will your team prepare for and mitigate these risks?
- Are there any potential unintended consequences of this project or potential scale-up for program participants and if so, what are they? What proactive measures has your team taken to assess, monitor, and mitigate/prevent any such potential risks?
- Please discuss, if applicable, any ethical considerations that you feel warrant discussion but are not covered by your existing or planned IRB review.

Off-cycle proposals: (required for off-cycle proposals) Please explain the time constraints the project faces and the reasons for requesting expedited review. [*suggested answer format: 250 words*]

BUDGET
Instructions: Please submit a detailed project budget using the Excel template available online. To reduce the processing time, please follow these instructions for designing and submitting your budget: *
1. If the funds requested are only a part of the total project budget, then please complete both the "Total Project Budget" and the "IGI Budget" in the budget template.
2. Awards are normally paid on a cost-reimbursable basis.

3. Universities in high-income countries, defined as OECD member countries, can charge up to 10% in indirect costs, applied to total direct costs. Independent non-profits from any location and universities from middle- or low-income countries may charge up to 15% in indirect costs, applied to total direct costs.
4. All applications must include budget notes in the column provided in the budget template, specifying the costs within the budget. For example, Travel Costs should include a breakdown of how many trips are planned, the estimated cost per trip, etc. Field costs that are detailed clearly in the budget (e.g., # of respondents times $/respondent = total $) do not require additional justification in the budget notes section.
5. Please denote costs by the calendar year in which expenditures are taking place, not by fiscal year or year from project start date.
6. Any computer/equipment purchases should include a breakdown of what is being purchased, e.g. how many laptops and the project staff that will be assigned to the equipment.
7. We understand that the cap on overhead or indirect costs under this Initiative is low and that awardees may have reasonable project support costs included in budgets as direct costs. Such costs should be reasonable and explained in the budget narrative.
8. Unallowable costs include: costs labeled as "incidental," "miscellaneous," or "contingency," and rent, unless a separate project office is to be covered specifically for this effort.
9. Grants should not cover PI time, with some narrow exceptions for PIs based in LMICs.
10. It is your responsibility that the budget you submit is correct and follows your receiving institution's policies for costs. As part of your proposal, a letter from the receiving institution of the award is required to show that they have reviewed your proposal and accept your budget. If the institution allows you to submit your proposal without such a letter (due to time constraints or some other reason), please note this on the Proposal Cover Sheet (under the box for Receiving Institution).
11. Please note that this applies to all receiving institutions including regional J-PAL offices and IPA country offices. You should contact them in advance to make sure you are aware of their policies for proposal review and that you give them enough time to meet the proposal deadline; we suggest allowing a 3-4 week turnaround.

LETTERS OF SUPPORT

Instructions: Please provide the following letters of support along with the proposal. Letters of support are not a mere formality but rather should indicate a well-thought-out partnership between the J-PAL affiliate or IGI invited researcher, the J-PAL office, the policy/implementing partner(s), and other partners.*

(i) **Government and Implementing Partners:** 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.

    f. **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.

(ii) **Receiving Institution:** A letter from the receiving institution of the award is required to show that they have reviewed your proposal and accept your budget. If the organization allows you to submit your proposal without such a letter (due to time constraints or some other reason), please note this on the Proposal Cover Sheet (under the box for Receiving Institution).

(iii) **Relevant J-PAL Regional Office:** [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 deadlin**e to ensure that the office has enough time to produce their letter of support, which requires a

thorough review of the proposal and budget. J-PAL regional offices can use the template for their letter of support [available online](#).

    a. 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.

    b. **Note:** If a J-PAL office is the receiving institution, they only need to submit a letter as the receiving institution (described on the Budget Tab). 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.

(iv)   **J-PAL Affiliated and/or Invited Researcher:** The J-PAL affiliated and/or invited researcher can complete this short [Researcher Letter of Support form](#) and submit it along with the rest of your application.

ANNEX I: J-PAL REQUIREMENTS ON EVIDENCE BASE FOR CONSIDERING PROPOSALS FOR SCALING PROJECTS

Scaling proposals applying to IGI must be based on **direct evidence** from one or more **randomized evaluations,**[1] 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 IGI Review Board in one of the following **formats**, rank-ordered with most preferred format noted first:

    i.   Peer-reviewed published paper

.

[1] Many scale projects are based on an evidence base that is broader than one randomized evaluation. See, for example, the [Evidence to Policy case studies](#) on J-PAL's website.

ii. Working paper that was released publicly at least six months prior[2] to 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.

iii. Working paper that is meaningfully publicly available[3]

iv. Working paper not yet meaningfully publicly available

2. 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:

i. Description of context, intervention, RCT design, and data sources

ii. Balance tables

iii. First stage regression results (if design requires strong first stage)

iv. ITT regression results for at least one primary outcome, robust to different specifications, including standard errors for construction of confidence intervals

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

vi. Interpretation of results

.

[2] This timeframe ensures there is greater certainty that results do not change following initial public release.

[3] Meaning the working paper can be found via a relatively straightforward online search, is on the researcher's website and/or online CV, and is not in an obscure or otherwise difficult-to-find, but literally public, site.

> vii. An assessment of and considerations relevant to the generalizability of the evidence to the context in which the proposed project is to take place[5]
> viii. Policy implications/recommendations

ANNEX II: EVALUATION CRITERIA

For all scaling applications, IGI will consider the following general criteria in making funding decisions:

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?
Overall Recommendation for Funding	**Scoring:** Strongly Recommended =4	Do you recommend this proposal for funding given your overall review?

	Recommended =3 Weakly Recommended =2 Do not fund =1	

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?

ANNEX III: ADMINISTRATIVE NOTES
PAYMENTS AND SUBAWARDS

If your proposal is accepted for award, the funds will be provided under a subaward from MIT to the "Institute to Receive Award" indicated on your coversheet. Once J-PAL receives all your forms and IRB approvals, and submits the request to MIT, it takes an average of 60 days for MIT to issue the subaward contract. We can backdate the award to cover expenses from the Award Date or the date of IRB approval (if applicable), whichever is later. This will require, in addition to your proposal, budget, and letters of support:

1. Formal submission approval of the proposal from your institution to the IGI. This approval should be provided in your proposal to the IGI along with other letters of support. Please follow the MIT approved language for the Letter of Transmission as follows: a. Example language for Letter of Transmission when there is a PI at the institution to receive award (ITRA): (On ITRA letterhead) is pleased to support the proposal and will plan on carrying out the work in accordance with the submitted budget. The PI will serve as Principal Investigator for this work. In this role, he/she is responsible for the implementation of this project in accordance with this proposal and with appropriate research and data protection practices. Please contact him/her with any concerns which may arise related to project implementation. b. Example language for Letter of Transmission when there is no PI at the ITRA: (On ITRA letterhead) is pleased to support the proposal and submitted budget. The PI takes full responsibility for the appropriate and responsible conduct of the proposed research activities related to the scope of work for this project under the academic direction of the co-PIs: Please contact me with any concerns which may arise related to project implementation.

2. A 1-2-page summary of the research being conducted, written for a general audience

3. IRB approvals or exemption for your project if it involves Human Subjects research. MIT requires proof of IRB approval prior to executing the award with your institution and releasing funding if your project involves Human Subjects Research.

4. If your selected Institute to Receive the Award has not had contracts with MIT previously, they will need to complete a number of additional steps before any contract can be negotiated between MIT and your Institute to Receive the Award. Steps include completing a SAM.gov registration, a New International Supplier registration form and a Subrecipient questionnaire. Additionally, MIT might require additional documents including the Institute to Receive the Award's financial audits. These steps can take some time to complete so please start this process early.

CODE OF CONDUCT

Since J-PAL is part of MIT, everyone who is associated with J-PAL, including researchers worldwide receiving grants from J-PAL initiatives, are considered part of the broader MIT community. Therefore, it is our hope and expectation that they will adhere to MIT's community-wide policies that are available [here](). A part of MIT's broader policies, this section, titled "Relations and Responsibilities Within the MIT Community," contains specific provisions regarding personal conduct, harassment, discrimination and retaliation, violence against community members, and substance use. Please take some time to review these.

Because almost all researchers we work with are also part of other university communities, they may also be subject to their host universities' policies and procedures. Many of these policies may be very similar to the MIT policies above. Finally, many researchers are separately affiliated with other academic associations and organizations, including the American Economic Association, and they should continue to abide by the codes of conduct established by the associations and organizations to which they belong. The AEA's code of conduct is available here.

If anyone wishes to report that a researcher has violated MIT community policies, they should consult the individuals and offices identified in the relevant policies linked above. In addition, all violations can be directly reported to any of the following J-PAL contacts for further action: (i) Global Executive Director; (ii) any of the regional Executive Directors; (iii) Cindy Smith (Global Director of Finance and Operations); or (iv) Anna Omura (Global Senior Manager of Finance and Operations).