

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 using the **relevant application link from the [RFP webpage](#), and following the [Applicant Instructions](#)**. Complete proposals will be due **December 15, 2025 at 5:00 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 **November 5, 2025 at 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.

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. [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 [Application 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:

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 CVI RFP Overview, attached to the RFP landing page , 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? The CVI Review Board rewards innovation, generalizability, and theoretical grounding in proposals.
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?
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? What changes could the researchers make to improve the design? For full study proposals, are there sufficiently detailed power calculations?
Project viability	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?
Research ethics	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 the RFP landing page , for a more in-depth discussion on research ethics.
Value of research	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.**¹

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) and Principal Investigator (PI) Alignment:**
 - The ITRA must employ the PI formally named in the award. This formally-named PI will be the researcher responsible for the subaward agreement, as authorized by the Letter of Transmission. The formally-named PI must be:
 - An employee of the ITRA
 - PI named in the Letter of Transmission
 - The main PI named in the IRB approval and IRB application
- **Institutional Review Board (IRB) Requirements:**
 - The IRB is held by the institution that enters into the subaward agreement with MIT. The IRB must have [IORG](#) status and [FWA](#), or
 - If the institution does not have its own IRB, the institution must engage the services of a commercial IRB or third party IRB to review and provide oversight for the research activities.
- 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.

¹ 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.).
- *Purchase of Assets:* Purchase of assets is not allowed with this funding. Assets are items such as laptops, computers, tablets, cell and satellite phones, monitoring devices, other devices/technology, etc. If you are uncertain, please contact your grant administrator before including any assets in the budget. You may include rentals of these assets in your budget.
- 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

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 [Application 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. If any of your letters are not in English, please upload a version translated to English.
 - 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.

APPLICATION 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.
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 better understand and support our research network. 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 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 better understand and support our research network. 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 to J-PAL*** - 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 [Initiative] 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]
- a. *[Logic-based if response is "Yes, I have submitted or plan to submit this proposal to another initiative"]* Please include the following:
- 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?

- iii. 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
 - b. *[Logic-based if response is "Yes, I have submitted this proposal previously to this initiative"]*
Please include the following:
 - i. 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)
 - ii. Are the PI team, context, and research question the same as in the previously submitted or soon to be submitted proposal?
 - iii. 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
 - iv. If the proposal you submitted previously was not funded, could you briefly explain if/how you responded to the feedback?
 - c. *[Logic Based - if either "Yes" response is selected]* **Details about Past and Future Submissions*** [350 words max]
15. **Funding Amount** - Amount of requested funding in USD.
16. **National Location** - In which country or countries will your research or travel take place?

Narrative

17. **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. [200 words max]
18. **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]
19. **The Policy Problem** - Provide a summary of the policy problem that motivates this research, explaining its importance and how it aligns with the research priorities in the RFP Overview. Save finer details of the intervention for the Intervention Details question below. Describe the knowledge gap your project addresses, how it will advance the field, and why the research is valuable. Support your case with descriptive data, a brief literature review, or other evidence of the problem in this setting. 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. [500 words]

20. **Intervention Details** - Describe the intervention or treatment to be evaluated in the full RCT if this pilot is successful. While the final intervention design to be evaluated in a full RCT may differ from the pilot, please provide enough detail about the planned intervention for the committee to assess its potential. Please name the implementing partner(s), specify the target population and describe how the intervention will affect specific outcomes of interest that will be measured in the study. [400 words]
21. **Pilot Evaluation Design** - Provide a brief description of the pilot evaluation design. While a pilot itself does not need to be a randomized trial, it should be designed to provide the information needed to design a randomized trial that can be implemented effectively. What information is needed to show that a good trial can be run will vary by study.
- Describe what information you aim to gather through this pilot and how the activities proposed will help fill key design or implementation gaps.
 - Describe how the proposed activities inform the relevance and design of a potential follow-on proposal for a full RCT.
 - Please also discuss anticipated treatment groups, data collection and measurement plans, key outcomes, and your theory of change.
 - 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?
- [600 words]
22. **Timeline** - Please write out a timeline with key project activities. [250 words max]
23. **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. [200 words max]
24. **Local Researcher Involvement** - Please describe how the project involves researchers local to the project context. [200 words max]
25. **Gender Analysis and Reporting** - Does the proposal address any gender issues? For example, have you taken into account how gender considerations could affect the outcomes of the intervention? 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]
26. **Preliminary Power Calculations** - If the pilot is a “mini-RCT,” please provide power calculations for the pilot itself. [250 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>.

27. **AI Technology Type:** Does the intervention being studied use AI (including machine learning, heterogeneous treatment targeting, generative AI, etc.)?

28. **If you selected that it is based on LLMs, please also answer all of the following:**

- a. Which LLM is being used and why?
- b. Will a qualified human (e.g., teacher, healthcare worker, extension agent) review and verify the AI's output before this output is used?
- c. 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.

29. **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." [200 words max]

Potential Risks

Please answer the following questions below in detail:

30. **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]

31. **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]

32. **Child Safeguarding** - Particularly for projects working with children, what child safeguarding risks exist? [200 words max]
33. **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]
- Program and research participants
 - Staff (e.g., implementing partners, research assistants, enumerators)
 - 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)
34. **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

35. Institutional Review Board (IRB) Information

Please be mindful that MIT requires that either

- The IRB is held by the institution that enters into the subaward agreement with MIT. The IRB must have iOrg status and FWA (as described below). The PI at the ITRA must be listed as the main PI on the IRB, or
- If the institution does not have its own IRB, the institution must engage the services of a commercial IRB or third party IRB to review and provide oversight for the research activities.

For the IRB to be considered allowable, it must meet the following criteria as determined by MIT and J-PAL:

- IORG status** with the US Office of Human Protections. An IRB's status can be checked by consulting the database of IORGs [here](#).
- Federalwide Assurance (FWA)** with the US Office of Human Protections. Status can be checked by consulting the same database as above (link [here](#)).
- If the IRB is not at the ITRA, then a proof of payment or proof of affiliation is required. Affiliation can be proven with documentation outlining the contractual relationship between the two entities (ITRA and IRB). This proof is most commonly a proof of payment from the ITRA to the IRB. MIT will not accept an Interagency Agreement (IAA) as this documentation.

Approved commercial IRB solutions are [Heartland](#) and [Solutions](#). These IRBs provide review of international research and satisfy J-PAL's IRB requirements; fees can be found on their respective websites. Please ensure that you include the cost of the IRB in your project budget.

More information on ITRA/IRB/PI alignment and FAQs can be found [here](#).

36. Institutional Review Board (IRB) of Record

If the project has not received an IRB exemption and IRB review is required, please provide the current or expected IRB of record. IRB Requirements - If this proposal receives initiative funding, we will ask that you submit:

- a. All IRB approval(s) or exemption(s)
- b. All IRB-approved protocols
- c. Any IRB-approved consent forms

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

38. Is this IRB of Record IORG certified? Y/N.

39. 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.

40. 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>

41. Institute to Receive Award (ITRA) and Principal Investigator (PI) Alignment

The ITRA must employ the PI formally named in the award. This formally-named PI will be the researcher responsible for the subaward agreement, as authorized by the Letter of Transmission that is submitted at the Proposal and Award stages. The formally-named PI must be:

- a. An employee of the ITRA
- b. PI named in the Letter of Transmission
- c. The main PI named in the IRB approval and IRB application

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

43. 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]

44. **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.
- Yes, my ITRA has a UEI
 - No, my ITRA does not have a UEI
 - I am not sure

Budget

Note: Purchase of assets is not allowed with this funding. Assets are items such as laptops, computers, tablets, cell and satellite phones, monitoring devices, other devices/technology, etc. If you are uncertain, please contact your grant administrator before including any assets in the budget. You may include rentals of these assets in your budget.

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]
- 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.
 - If you are adding a co-funder as a partner, in the Partnership Details section please 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.
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.

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*
52. **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

53. **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]*
54. **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]*
55. **Additional Attachments** - Please attach any relevant materials discussed in your answers to the previous questions. *[Upload]*
56. *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]*
57. **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 CVI RFP overview 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?
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? What changes could the researchers make to improve the design? For full study proposals, are there sufficiently detailed power calculations?
Project viability	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?
Research ethics	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 for a more in-depth discussion on research ethics.
Value of research	Is the cost of the study commensurate with the value of expected lessons learned? Does the study leverage funding from other sources?