

# PROPOSAL GUIDELINES: PILOT STUDIES

---

This document contains an [Overview](#), [Budget Guidelines](#), an [Application Checklist](#), and a [Narrative Template](#) for Pilot studies. Please read this document carefully before submitting your proposal.

## OVERVIEW

**Submission instructions:** To apply, please submit an application via our online portal, WizeHive. Instructions and links to the applications can be found below, under “Application Checklist”. Complete proposals will be due **Tuesday, June 3, 11:59 PM US Eastern Time via WizeHive**. Please review the RFP Overview and Proposal Guidelines on the [CVI RFP website](#) for details on each proposal type and a complete list of application questions.

In addition, **regional scholars** are also required to submit letters of interest (LOIs) by **Tuesday, April 22, 11:59 PM US Eastern Time** via our LOI form here ([Pilot LOI](#) and [Travel/Proposal Development](#)). Eligible applicants will receive an invitation to proceed with full proposal development in WizeHive. LOIs are only required for regional scholar applicants.

**Grant description:** Pilot grants are for studies with a clear research question, but for which the design and implementation requires further testing and pilot data. Pilots are not required to include randomized methodology as long as they test for the logistics or first stage results of a treatment/policy intervention using administrative data or surveys or build a monitoring system. The expectation is that these projects will ultimately develop into full-scale randomized evaluations. The maximum amount awarded for a pilot study is \$75,000. **You should apply as a pilot if the funded work lays the groundwork for a future randomized evaluation because it, e.g.:**

- tests the efficacy of an intervention or an evaluation design, and acquires data that is qualitative or quantitative in nature, e.g. measuring take up, and/or
- facilitates access to administrative data for designing or conducting an RCT. Examples of these activities include, but are not limited to, negotiating data use agreements, conducting exploratory data analysis and cleaning, or setting up technical access mechanisms.

In addition, pilot proposals should:

- have a very clear research question that assesses the feasibility of using a randomized evaluation to answer this question.
- **clearly articulate the conceptual and methodological distinction between the pilot study and any future follow-on studies, and what exactly the pilot will enable researchers to learn.** The narrative should include a **solid justification for why a pilot is needed, what will be learned, and what a future RCT informed by this**

**exploratory research could contribute to specific topics addressed in CVI's RFP Overview**, available on [CVI's RFP webpage](#).

**Please note:** As a general rule, CVI does not fund pure lab experiments. In very rare cases, a proposal may be considered if a lab-in-field experiment supplements an underlying randomized evaluation, or if the lab-in-field experiment has direct policy implications. For example, Edward Miguel and coauthors' [lab-in-field evaluation of ethnic bias in Kenya](#) was implemented during Kenya's national elections to understand how proximity to election dates might affect participants' ethnic biases.

**If your research design includes randomization to assess the impact of an intervention, please apply for full RCT funding.**

**Funding per Pilot award:** CVI limits pilot awards to \$75,000 or less.

**Timeline:** Funding requests should not extend beyond December 2027. We encourage applicants to be realistic when setting the projected period of performance/end date for their project.

On pilot/full project *start dates*, applicants should be aware that MIT takes **approximately 90 days to establish a subaward** from the date you submit all of your setup forms and IRB approvals. We can backdate the award to cover expenses from the Award Date or the date of IRB approval, whichever is later. If a project includes non-Human Subjects work prior to the IRB approval, please let us know following the award and, in some cases, we may be able to cover those costs (post-award, but pre-IRB) under the award.

The process MIT follows for pilot/full grants is thus:

1. The CVI Review Board sends an official award notification letter.
2. If not already submitted, J-PAL requests your institution's approval of the proposal (letter of transmission) and your institutional IRB approval.
  - a. In the case that IRB approval is not already in place when funding decisions are made, **proposed start dates should reflect time needed to get IRB approval** by the IRB of record, as well as time required to establish a reliance agreement and move forward in the subaward granting process.
3. MIT establishes a subaward to the institution to receive the award.
  - a. As detailed in our RFP Overview, MIT now requires that at least one project PI be employed by the organization receiving the subaward and funds, also known as the Institute to Receive the Award, or ITRA. **Please be mindful that MIT also requires that the IRB determination be held by the institution that enters into the subaward agreement with MIT** ([See here for further details and FAQ](#) on MIT's policy on subawards, ITRA, and IRB alignment).
4. Institute to receive award invoices MIT for expenses incurred for the project on a cost reimbursable basis.

**Proposal Narrative:** The [Narrative Template](#), below, includes details on what to include in your proposal narrative.

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

<b>CVI strategic priority</b>	Does this research embody CVI's guiding principles? Does this study fall within the scope of CVI's research priorities? Is the study based in the initiative focus countries? Refer to the CVI RFP Overview, attached to <a href="#">the RFP landing page</a> , for additional details on CVI's thematic and geographic priorities.
<b>Academic contribution</b>	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? Is there academic relevance? How does the study compare with the existing body of research? Does the research strategy provide a bridge between a practical experiment and underlying economic theories? The CVI Review Board rewards innovation, generalizability, and theoretical grounding in proposals.
<b>Policy relevance</b>	Does the study address questions crucial to understanding pressing issues on crime and violence in developing countries? Will results from the intervention have broader implications? How, if at all, will the "lessons learned" have relevance beyond this test case? Is there demand from policy makers for more/better information to influence their decisions in this area? Is there potential for the implementing partner to scale up this intervention?
<b>Technical design</b>	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? What changes could the researchers make to improve the design? For full study proposals, are there sufficiently detailed power calculations?
<b>Project viability</b>	Is the relationship with the implementing partner strong and likely to endure through the entire study? What is the credibility and policy influence of the implementing partner? Are there any other logistical or political obstacles that might threaten the completion of the study, for example, government authorization or Human Subjects review? For pilots, do researchers describe how piloting activities would inform a full-scale randomized evaluation?
<b>Research ethics</b>	Are the risks of unintended negative consequences for program participants, staff and/or community members minimal? Has the team taken proactive measures to assess, monitor, and mitigate/prevent any such potential risks?  Please refer to the "Designing responsible research projects" section of the CVI RFP Overview, attached to <a href="#">the RFP landing page</a> , for a more in-depth discussion on research ethics.
<b>Value of research</b>	Is the cost of the study commensurate with the value of expected lessons learned? Does the study leverage funding from other sources?

## 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.**<sup>1</sup>

**Guidelines for completing a *Pilot proposal budget*:** Please submit a detailed project budget using the [Pilot Budget Template](#) provided [at the RFP release page](#). 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. 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, including an FAQ](#). 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.](#)
- 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 CVI) in the budget template. **If the project has other funders, the proposal should clearly explain the marginal contribution of the requested funds from CVI.**
- **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 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

- **Awards are normally 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.
- Funding awarded by CVI is conditional on continued support from our own core donors. If CVI's scheduled funding is reduced, CVI may need to reduce or cancel your award.

#### *Allowable Direct and Indirect Costs*

- **Please note that CVI does 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.** J-PAL funds the costs of the evaluation, not the intervention. However, under some circumstances, CVI 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.

## **APPLICATION CHECKLIST**

To apply to this RFP, please submit an application via our online portal, WizeHive, using the following links:

- [Travel and Proposal Development Grant](#)
- [Pilot](#)

- [Full RCT](#)

Complete proposals will be due **Tuesday, June 3, 11:59 PM US Eastern Time via WizeHive**. Please review the RFP Overview and Proposal Guidelines on the [CVI RFP website](#) for details on each proposal type and the complete list of application questions.

In addition, **regional scholars** are also required to submit letters of interest (LOIs) by **Wednesday, September 11, 5:00 PM US Eastern Time** via our LOI form here ([Pilot LOI and Travel/Proposal Development](#)). Eligible applicants will receive an invitation to proceed with full proposal development in WizeHive. LOIs are only required for regional scholar applicants.

For more details about how to navigate WizeHive, please see [these instructions](#).

Please review the template application materials below, including the list of questions you will be asked to answer. **All templates for these documents are provided at the [RFP release webpage](#) 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 [Pilot Budget Template provided at the RFP release webpage](#), 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:
  - a. A letter/document stating the proposed grant host institution's approval of the proposal materials.
  - b. Letters from each implementing partner, indicating the details of their commitment to partner on the pilot (*strongly encouraged; required only for full RCTs*)
  - c. **PhD graduate students applying as the primary PI are required to include a letter of support from a J-PAL affiliate or invited researcher adviser on their thesis committee.**
    - a. The letter should indicate the adviser's willingness to remain involved in a supervisory role over the project's lifetime.
    - b. Letters can be sent separately by advisers via the forthcoming online portal or included in the applicant's submission packet.
    - c. Graduate students with a J-PAL affiliate or invited researcher adviser who does not reside at the student's host university must also include a formal

letter of confirmation from the student's department head confirming that the adviser is a member of the student's official thesis committee.

## NARRATIVE TEMPLATE

This template is intended to give researchers a sense of the questions they will be asked to address in the online WizeHive portal. Regional scholars must first complete the LOI form, as described in the instructions above.

Exact wording and sequencing of questions is subject to change.

### Important Information

1. **Primary Eligible Researcher** - Please identify one researcher who is eligible for J-PAL Initiative funding. This may be the principal PI or any eligible co-PI. Only details for one primary eligible researcher are required in cases where there's more than one eligible researcher. Other PIs who are eligible can be added as co-PIs.
2. **PI Eligibility Category** - Indicate how the researcher is eligible for J-PAL Initiative funding.
3. **PhD Student Applicants** - If you are a PhD student, please indicate the J-PAL affiliate or invited researcher who serves or will serve as an advisor on your dissertation committee.
4. **Organization Name of Eligible Researcher** - Please tell us the name of the organization the eligible researcher (i.e., the professor or PhD student) is affiliated with.
5. **Organization Type** - As a reminder, researchers must be based at a university to be eligible. If you have questions, please contact the initiative team at [cvi@povertyactionlab.org](mailto:cvi@povertyactionlab.org).
6. **Organization Website of Eligible Researcher**
7. **Country Where Organization is Based or Headquartered**
8. **Team Members & Roles** - Please add all your project team members and indicate their role(s) on the project/application below. If you do not have any other team members please add yourself below as applicant and Primary PI.  
Role options are: Applicant; Primary PI; Co-PI; Research Lead at Implementing Organization; Reporting Contact; Secondary Reporting Contact; IRB Contact; Finance Contact; Collaborator; Contact for Contracting (e.g., grant manager or research administrator); Other (please specify role or title).  
If you are the applicant and a PI (or another role), indicate so by adding yourself as an applicant and then again as a PI. As the applicant, you will be receiving all notifications related to this application. For each team member please provide: First Name, Last Name, Role or Title, Email Address
9. **PI Certification** [accept certification to proceed]

- 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.
  - c. I certify that, if I receive award funding, I will submit all necessary materials for award setup within six months from the date of award notice, barring any extenuating circumstances.
10. **Demographic Information** - J-PAL is collecting information about all project teams, including demographic information, to support our efforts to promote diversity in our research network and funding opportunities. As the applicant, please send the language and [link](#) included below to all PIs/Co-PIs on your proposal research team. Provide your proposal name and each member's role (as you listed them on the application) when you send out the blurb. Completion of this step is required for all primary investigators on your research team. If you have any technical problems with completing this step please email [help@povertyactionlab.org](mailto:help@povertyactionlab.org) or the initiative team directly.

Feel free to cut and paste this suggested language in an email to send to the PIs and Co-PIs on your team:

*J-PAL is collecting information about all project teams, including demographic information, to support J-PAL's efforts to promote diversity in the J-PAL research network and funding opportunities. J-PAL is requiring all PIs and Co-PIs on our research team to complete this short form. This data will only be accessible in disaggregated, identifiable form to select J-PAL staff. Aggregate, anonymized data will be used to report to key partners such as donors and may be included on our website.*

## **Project Details**

11. **Full Title of Proposal** [30 word max]
12. **Proposed Period of Performance Project Start Date** - What is the proposed start date for this J-PAL grant's subaward activities?
13. **Proposed Period of Performance Project End Date** - What is the proposed end date for this J-PAL grant's subaward activities?
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?
15. **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: 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 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 CVI, and explain how you addressed the feedback that was provided with your last submission. [350 words max]

16. **Funding Amount** - Amount of requested funding in USD.
17. **National Location** - In which country or countries will your research or travel take place?
18. **Timeline** - Please write out a timeline with key project activities. [250 words max]

## Narrative

19. **Abstract** - Write a study abstract, including the project description, research question, and intervention or treatment to be evaluated. Discuss the project's technical design, what is going to happen during the project, the practical value of your project, the conceptual value of your research, and the distributional implications of your work. Provide context about proposed partners and a timeline. Please note that this abstract will be added to the Initiative's webpage if the project receives funding. [250 words max]
20. **Research Focus Areas/Initiative Themes** - Please indicate which CVI focus areas or themes your proposal relates to; these are described in detail in the CVI RFP Overview on the RFP landing page. [choose from a dropdown list]
21. **Policy Motivation** - Provide a summary of the policy problem that motivates this research and how it fits with the topics outlined in the RFP materials. [250 words]
22. **Potential Policy Impact** - Please briefly describe the potential policy impact of this intervention (policies, programs, processes, or delivery mechanisms), including whether and how the project could inform policy or program design in this context or more broadly. How will it meet the needs of your partner? Demonstrate meaningful ex ante uncertainty about the results of the study, i.e., that given existing evidence there are both reasons to believe the intervention(s) studied are promising and also reasons to doubt whether they will achieve their goals. [250 words]
23. **Target Population and Context** - What population(s) does the intervention attempt to impact? What characteristics do they have? Do you have any comments on this population's alignment with the initiative's priorities? [350 words max]
24. **Intervention Details** - If applicable for your pilot, state how the intervention could potentially improve one or more of the initiative's priority outcomes and benefit people living in poverty. The intervention can be introducing new or making changes to existing programs, processes, technologies, or delivery systems. [300 words]
25. **Pilot Evaluation Design** - Please provide a brief description of the pilot evaluation design, and how it fits with the topics outlined in the RFP materials. If applicable, please include the randomization method, treatment groups (if there are more than two

treatment groups, please list them using numerals), 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? [500 words]

26. **Value of Research** - What knowledge gap does your project address, and how will it advance the field? Provide a brief literature review to highlight its novelty and make a compelling case for its value, citing prior evidence of promise or significant current or anticipated investment. You may attach a full reference list in the "Additional attachments" section.
27. **Mechanisms** - Through what mechanisms do you expect the pilot treatment to affect outcomes of interest? How will you test these mechanisms? What is the theorized causal relationship between the pilot intervention and the outcomes to be tested? [250 words max]
28. **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]
29. **Local Researcher Involvement** - Please describe how the project involves researchers local to the project context. [200 words max]
30. **Gender Implications and Analysis\*** - Does the proposal address any gender issues? For example, have you taken into account how gender considerations could affect the outcomes of the intervention? [250 words max]
31. **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]
32. **Preliminary Power Calculations** - If the pilot is a "mini-RCT," please provide power calculations for the pilot itself. [1000 words max]

Additionally, provide preliminary power calculations for the expected design of the eventual full-scale RCT. The power calculations should be detailed, convincing, and well-justified, e.g., based on assumptions from existing literature and/or what you learned from your travel/proposal development activities, for any impacts that the research team plans to measure.

Power calculations should quantitatively demonstrate that the study is well-powered enough to detect effects on the outcome(s) of interest that would be practically or conceptually meaningful.

Proposals should articulate which null hypotheses are relevant for this exercise and why (in particular, not assuming that the null of zero impact is necessarily the relevant one).

For more detailed information about power calculations, see this resource:

<https://www.povertyactionlab.org/resource/power-calculations>.

33. **Pathway to an RCT and Impact** - In the Pathway to an RCT and Impact question below, describe how results from this pilot would inform a future RCT? [500 words max]

1. Describe, specifically, what researchers and practitioners can expect to learn from this pilot study. Will it pilot an intervention? Will it provide qualitative data to inform intervention design?
2. How could the findings meet the needs of policymakers or development practitioners? Outline a specific plan for how you will share your findings and outputs with partners (e.g., data). How will the implementing partners and other stakeholders become aware of the findings and benefit from the data and other such outputs (e.g., descriptive statistics) generated from this pilot study?
3. In what specific ways will the pilot prepare researchers for a full RCT project? Outline the hypothesized pathway and scope for impact. Clearly establish a plausible and promising link between the proposed approach to be tested and the hypothesized channel for impact.
4. Do you expect these impacts to vary across geographic region, population, or context?
5. Indicate the reliability of existing evidence from pilot studies or relevant expert opinion in your research context.
6. Include preliminary or pilot data available in support of your hypotheses, models and/or theories of change.

34. **AI: 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. If not applicable, please write "N/A." [300 words max]

## Potential Risks

Please answer the following questions below in detail:

35. **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]
36. **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]
37. **Child Safeguarding** - Particularly for projects working with children, what child safeguarding risks exist? [200 words max]
38. **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]
  - a. Program and research participants
  - b. Staff (e.g., implementing partners, research assistants, enumerators)
  - c. 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)
39. **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]

### **Institutional Review Board and Institute to Receive Award**

**IRB Organization (IORG) Information** - Please be mindful that MIT requires that the IRB determination must be held by the institution that enters into the subaward agreement with MIT. 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. BRANY, Heartland, and HML all 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](#). Consult with J-PAL regarding including the cost of this commercial entity in the project budget. J-PAL also 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.](#)

**Institutional Review Board (IRB) of Record** - If the project has not received an IRB exemption and IRB review is required, please look up the current or expected IRB of record. IRB Requirements - If this proposal receives initiative funding, we will ask that you submit the following in the Additional Fields section:

- All IRB approval(s) or exemption(s)

- All IRB-approved protocols
  - Any IRB-approved consent forms
40. **Institutional Review Board (IRB) of Record** - Provide the name of the IRB of Record below
41. **Is this IRB of Record IORG certified?** Y/N.
42. **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? Y/N.
43. **Data Publication** - Please confirm you plan to publish data collected in an open-access, online database at the end of the evaluation. Data publication is required for projects funded by a J-PAL initiative, unless researchers request an exemption (which J-PAL has the discretion to deny) for legal, ethical, or proprietary reasons.
- a. Please see J-PAL's Data and Code Availability Policy for more information about data publication:  
<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1x-X5S9wxPge5vAg4htVHWfh-04VHAc8A/view>

**Institute to Receive Award (ITRA) Information** - PLEASE NOTE: MIT now requires that at least one project PI be employed by the organization receiving the subaward and funds. Please provide the name of the ITRA here. Please see this [memo](#) and [FAQs document](#) for more information.

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

## Budget

**Note:** Purchase of Assets - Should your proposal be successful, you may be required to remove any assets (i.e., laptops, tablets, etc.) from your budget. This is because of a donor's assets policy. Please create your budget with this in mind. Rentals of such items are allowed and the preferred way to address needs for assets like laptops.

45. **Budget Upload** - From the [RFP website](#), download and complete the pilot budget template. There are two tabs: one for the initiative-specific budget and one for the project budget (i.e., the initiative specific budget plus any other sources of funding you may have). When done, please reupload both attachments in the budget tab of the online application portal. Please note that these are formatted specifically for this application. Please do not remove the formatting, change any of the formatting, or create new columns.
46. **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 do not suffice. *[Upload]*

## Partnership Questions

47. **Partnership Status** - Have you established communication with relevant stakeholders including but not limited to government agencies and implementing partners, for research collaboration? [Y/N]
  - a. If this project takes place in a country that has a J-PAL office but it is not the host institution, please detail the reasoning in the Partner Description question below. Your answer will help us understand how J-PAL offices can be more competitive and better respond to the needs of PIs.
48. **Name of Partner Organization** - Indicate the name(s) of the partner organization.
49. **Role of Partner Organization** - Indicate the role of the organization on this project. If you are adding a co-funder as a partner, please add more details under the question "Co-funder Details" farther down.
50. **Partner Description** - Please provide a brief description of the partner(s), the partner's involvement in project activities, and any in-kind or financial support they have committed or provided to the project. Please include any potential partnership risks. [250 words max]
51. **Point of Contact Based at the Partner Organization** - Please provide details about your point of contact at the partner organization.
  - a. First Name\*
  - b. Last Name\*
  - c. Role or Title\*
  - d. Email Address\*
  - e. Phone Number\*
52. **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.
53. **[Co-funded projects only] Additional contribution of funds** - What is the additional contribution of these requested funds?
54. **Interest in Scaling Co-Funding** - In the "Interest in Scaling Co-Funding" box below, tell us if you are interested in applying for scaling 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.

## Letters of Support & Additional Materials

55. **Letter of Support from Implementing Partner** - Pilot projects are recommended to provide a letter of support from their implementing partner. This letter should indicate a willingness to work with the research team. *[Upload]*
56. **Letter of Transmission** - Pilot projects 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. *[Upload]*
57. **Additional Attachments** - Please attach any relevant materials discussed in your answers to the previous questions. *[Upload]*
58. *For PhD students only* - **J-PAL Affiliate or Invited Researcher Letter of Support** - PhD student applicants are required to submit a letter of support from a J-PAL affiliate or invited researcher who serves as an adviser on the applicant's dissertation committee. This letter should indicate the adviser's willingness to advise the student throughout the project's lifetime. Please note that in some cases, the adviser may be asked to add their name to the financial award and IRB documents. *[Upload]*
59. **Additional Information** - Please review CVI’s proposal evaluation criteria below, and provide additional discussion relevant to the evaluation criteria if not already addressed in the fields above.

## Evaluation criteria

CVI strategic priority	Does this research embody CVI’s guiding principles? Does this study fall within the scope of CVI’s research priorities? Is the study based in the initiative focus countries? Refer to the <a href="#">CVI RFP overview</a> for additional details on CVI’s thematic and geographic priorities.
Academic 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? Is there academic relevance? How does the study compare with the existing body of research? Does the research strategy provide a bridge between a practical experiment and underlying economic theories?
Policy relevance	Does the study address questions crucial to understanding pressing issues on crime and violence in developing countries? Will results from the intervention have broader implications? How, if at all, will the “lessons learned” have relevance beyond this test case? Is there demand from policy makers for more/better information to influence their decisions in this area? Is there potential for the implementing partner to scale up this intervention?

<p>Technical design</p>	<p>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? What changes could the researchers make to improve the design? For full study proposals, are there sufficiently detailed power calculations?</p>
<p>Project viability</p>	<p>Is the relationship with the implementing partner strong and likely to endure through the entire study? What is the credibility and policy influence of the implementing partner? Are there any other logistical or political obstacles that might threaten the completion of the study, for example, government authorization or Human Subjects review? For pilots, do researchers describe how piloting activities would inform a full-scale randomized evaluation?</p>
<p>Research ethics</p>	<p>Are the risks of unintended negative consequences for program participants, staff and/or community members minimal? Has the team taken proactive measures to assess, monitor, and mitigate/prevent any such potential risks?</p> <p>Please refer to the “Designing responsible research projects” section of the <a href="#">CVI RFP overview</a> for a more in-depth discussion on research ethics.</p>
<p>Value of research</p>	<p>Is the cost of the study commensurate with the value of expected lessons learned? Does the study leverage funding from other sources?</p>