ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT & INSTITUTIONS

Request for Applications (RFA):

Randomized Controlled Trials to Evaluate Strategies to Enhance the Effectiveness of Public Institutions in Developing Countries

Release Date: August 22, 2017

The Economic Development and Institutions (EDI) initiative is calling for proposals for **pilot studies** (up to £22,000) and **full-scale randomized controlled trials** (no funding limit, but most awards up to £600,000) to rigorously test interventions and reforms to improve the effectiveness, accountability, and inclusiveness of public institutions in developing countries. Relevant interventions include incentives, information, or public sector recruitment/selection strategies to improve institutional performance and economic development outcomes, including private sector development.

For this round, the deadlines are:

Submission stage	Date	Time	Application Forms found at
Pre-proposal Form	Tuesday, October 17, 2017	5:00 PM U.S. Pacific Time	https://tinyurl.com/EDIRCTs2
Full Proposal	Tuesday, November 15, 2017	5:00 PM U.S. Pacific Time	See *Proposal Guidelines* and *Application Checklist,* below

This RFA outlines both the research areas of interest for this funding opportunity and the requirements for submitting an application[1].

To submit a proposal for consideration:

1. Please submit a pre-proposal form (at https://tinyurl.com/EDIRCTs2) no later than **5pm U.S. Pacific Time, Tuesday, October 17, 2017**.
2. Please complete the application requirements included in this document and email to edi@berkeley.edu by no later than **5pm U.S. Pacific Time, Tuesday, November 15, 2017**

[1] This is an open and public procurement to be advertised widely on the EDI and CEGA websites along with other forums. ***All applicants are, however, at a minimum expected to already have experience leading the design and execution of randomized controlled trials in developing countries.***

UKaid from the British people

EDI Program Background

In 2015, the UK Department for International Development (DFID) launched Economic Development and Institutions (EDI), a comprehensive research program which aims to "produce a body of evidence and insights into what practicable actions produce institutional changes that improve economic outcomes and increase growth."

EDI is implemented in collaboration with a consortium of organizations, led by Oxford Policy Management and including the Paris School of Economics, University of Namur, and Aide à la Décision Economique.

A core component of EDI is a series of research competitions, designed to build a portfolio of linked randomized controlled trials (RCTs) that will test key institutional reforms designed to support sustainable economic development throughout the developing world[2]. EDI specifically seeks to support cutting-edge RCTs that both inform their local institutional contexts and have high-potential for external validity[3]. The Center for Effective Global Action (CEGA) at UC-Berkeley is leading efforts related to EDI's RCT portfolio.

The pressing need to improve the responsiveness and functionality of the institutions which condition the path of economic development has motivated numerous governments and donors to actively support governance-promoting activities – from citizen information campaigns, to bureaucrat incentives and enhanced personnel policies. Other reforms seek to strengthen the institutions that shape private investment and the business environment.

However, too few of these initiatives have been linked to rigorous evaluations that allow stakeholders to identify what specifically is effective and show how a model might be replicated or improved. Moreover, few of the evaluations that do exist have been designed to generate conclusions beyond the specific contexts within which they were implemented.

Geographical Focus

Specific countries of interest for this procurement include those prioritized by DFID (32 countries across Africa, Asia, and the Middle East) and other countries where study results will have implications in these contexts. EDI asks applicants proposing work outside the referenced 32 countries to provide a justification of how their findings could be translated to inform institutional contexts within DFID's geographic priorities.

Topical Focus

To identify the focus areas for this RFA, CEGA reviewed the current state of knowledge on institutions and state capacity interventions and identified a series of open research questions. CEGA Scientific Directors Ernesto Dal Bó and Fred Finan co-authored this review, entitled "At the Intersection: A Review of Institutions in Economic Development", (referred to here as the "EDI Review Paper". All applicants are strongly encouraged to review the relevant portions of this document prior to submitting proposals. A short summary of the EDI Review Paper's open research questions are included in **Appendix 6**.

[2] EDI tentatively anticipates releasing an additional request for applications in Spring 2018.

[3] For more information on external validity and "linkages" see the section "Addressing External Validity" and Appendix 5.

The conceptual framework outlined in the EDI Review Paper serves as the basis for this research competition. Relevant institutional themes from the EDI Review Paper include: **tax collection; business formalization; bureaucratic effectiveness; political representation; transparency and accountability; public service delivery; judicial systems and dispute resolution.**

EDI will aim to develop a strong portfolio of projects that collectively address the overall purpose of the program, but within that objective does not seek to prioritize proposals from any specific area of this framework and welcomes applications focused on a diverse range of issues.

EDI also seeks to cluster the studies it funds within the contexts of either political and/or legal institutions. Several examples of these institutions are included (but not limited to those) below. While these illustrations primarily focus on established, state institutions, and on their ultimate impact on economic development, EDI will welcome applications which propose to explore the connection between formal institutions and informal arrangements, in both the production and governance spheres, as well as the forces that drive changes in that connection.

> **Political Institutions:** Government ministries; Legislative bodies; Municipal governments; Local councils; Revenue collection authorities; Organizations supporting the delivery of public services
>
> **Legal Institutions:** Court systems; Police forces; Enforcement agencies; Paralegal services; Mediation services; State inspectors; Regulatory agencies.

EDI will also consider funding randomized evaluations of policy reforms or government programs that implement one or more of the following strategies to improve institutional performance:

- Financial or non-financial **incentives** (e.g. to enhance performance or compliance, to encourage citizen engagement, enhance entrepreneurship and private sector operations, etc.)
- Access, sharing or distribution of **information** (e.g. to increase mutual transparency among all economic actors, public and private, monitor performance, etc.)
- Public official or employee **selection** (e.g. to improve recruitment, appointment, or election of bureaucrats, political leaders, and/or judicial officials)

If a researcher has any questions about whether a project is eligible, please contact edi@berkeley.edu.

Projects are expected to be of high quality, with clear operational relevance and impact on policy and reform debates and initiatives in low income countries. A strong emphasis will be placed on supporting projects with potential for policy engagement during the design and implementation of the research, not simply upon dissemination of final results. Projects are strongly encouraged to partner with or plan to directly engage in-country government officials and/or non-governmental organizations that have direct involvement in the reform under analysis or potential to be influenced by a study's findings. Governmental partnerships, in particular, will help ensure that these important stakeholders are "bought-in" and engaged with the studies EDI funds. This emphasis on policy engagement is reflected in the evaluation criteria beginning on page 8 of this RFA.

Addressing External Validity: RCT *Linkages*

EDI is exploring new ways to prospectively link together independent research studies, with the aim of enhancing the external validity of findings. As such, EDI expects applicants to outline a "linkage strategy" that ties their research to existing work or extends the validity of their findings to new/broader contexts. This "linkage" requirement will be implemented in a flexible manner that acknowledges the need for researchers to produce novel and unique findings and does not diminish the quality of their work. EDI will not prescribe a specific mechanism for achieving external validity, though in select cases the EDI Scientific Committee may offer research teams suggestions of promising opportunities to pursue such "linkages" once decisions have been made, to ensure fairness across applicants. As part of their proposals, researchers are asked to identify the best option for their specific study. Suggestions and additional guidance on 'linkage' are provided in **Appendix 5**. Applications for pilot awards are not required to include a strategy for forming linkages. If a researcher has any questions about whether a project is eligible, please contact edi@berkeley.edu.

Proposal Guidelines: Pilots and Full-Scale Studies

EDI will consider **pilot** and **full-scale** research applications, as follows. Prior to submitting a proposal, **all applicants should submit a Pre-Proposal Form**. You should select whether your proposal should be considered a Pilot ("A.," below) or Full-Scale RCT ("B.," below) and prepare your application according to the relevant guidelines provided in this document in order for your application to be scored appropriately. EDI encourages submission of pilot projects prior to full scale applications and is expecting to release a third RFA in spring 2018.

Pre-Proposal Form

All applicants will be required to submit a Pre-Proposal Form due **Tuesday, October 17, 2017**. The chief purpose of the Pre-Proposal Form is to help the EDI Secretariat anticipate the likely volume of submissions and organize the review process accordingly. **Please note that applicants should proceed with the development of their proposal materials immediately after submitting a Pre-Proposal Form and not wait for feedback or an invitation to proceed.** Please find a link to the short pre-proposal form here (https://tinyurl.com/EDIRCTs2), and a visual example of the live form in the **Appendix 3**.

A. Pilot Study: Proposal Guidelines

EDI will accept pilot proposals that have a very clear research question and lay the groundwork for a full-scale project. Pilot proposals are not expected to fully elaborate on their project design. In contrast to full proposals - which require a strong partnership commitment with implementing organizations, a fully developed method of randomization, clear outcome measures, power calculations, a linkage strategy and a scale-up plan—a pilot proposal should be at earlier stages of development.

At least one of the following must be true:

- The viability of the intervention has not yet been demonstrated under "real world" conditions,
- The design and implementation of an evaluation requires further testing, pilot data, and/or partnership development.

Pilot proposals must 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.

Pilot studies can:

- be qualitative or quantitative in nature,
- serve as a diagnostic to reveal barriers to reforms or institutional effectiveness
- test the efficacy of an intervention or an evaluation design
- acquire pilot data, and/or
- identify a scale-up partner.

***Funding per pilot award*:** limited to £22,000 or less. Often pilots can achieve their intended outcomes with £8,500 or less, so be sure that the proposed budget matches the proposed scope of work as reviewers score based on "value for money." Please see a description of VFM and its implications for successful EDI research teams in Attachment C, and further guidance on co-funding cost-sharing arrangements within the Budget Guidelines on page 10 of this RFA.

Timeline: Applicants may request funds to support costs beginning in **April 2018**. There is no specific end date required for pilots, although these studies usually take place over the course of one year or less. Ultimately, the length of a pilot depends on the project design and related outcomes of interest.

Linkages: Given pilots focus on proof of concept, applications for pilot awards are *not required* to articulate a strategy for forming "linkages" to encourage external validity. However, pilot applications will still be required to describe how their proposed pilot aligns with the EDI Review Paper. Pilot proposals will be reviewed more favorably if they identify opportunities and willingness to engage in "linkage" activities should the study be expanded to a full-scale RCT.

As part of the application process, applicants should submit a narrative, **not to exceed five pages**. **Pilot application narratives must address all of the following[4]:**

Problem Statement and Research Questions • What institutions-related development challenge does the proposed research attempt to address? And, how is it relevant to economic development? Clearly state the problem that motivates the research, including evidence of the problem. • Succinctly list, and briefly describe the research questions you seek to address.
Unique Contribution to Literature • Pilot proposals must include a brief literature review, and specifically explain the project's potential to provide a unique scientific contribution if fully-developed. • What knowledge gap are you addressing, and how will it advance the field? Be sure to clearly articulate the distinction between the pilot research contribution and any follow-on research you anticipate that could constitute a full-scale study. • When possible and relevant, relate to questions and issues addressed in the EDI Review Paper and the broader framework of the Economic Development & Institutions program.

[4] The narrative does not need to be structured in the order given, but all components should be included.

Study Design • Clearly explain how the intervention you will pilot is designed to address the Problem Statement and Research Questions in the proposed context. • Describe the intervention and the proposed strategy for implementation for this pilot. • Clearly identify alternative approaches, and justify why this approach should be piloted in the particular context.
Research Outcome • Describe specifically what we can expect to learn from this pilot study. Will it pilot an intervention? Will it provide qualitative data to inform intervention design? • In what specific ways will the pilot prepare researchers for a full research project?
Target population • What population does the intervention attempt to impact?
Partners • Describe your partner(s) for implementation and (potential, future) scale-up.
Timeline • Clearly outline your expected timeline on a month to month basis, demonstrating the sequencing of activities. (GANNT charts or other table-based timeline descriptions are acceptable).

B. Full-Scale Study: Proposal Guidelines

Full-scale studies are at a more mature stage of development. Applicants must demonstrate:

a) a clear research question;
b) a robust research design;
c) a feasible implementation plan;
d) a strong partnership commitment from implementing organizations, preferably government or public sector agencies;
e) potential for significant scale-up of research findings;
f) well-defined research instruments;
g) sample size estimates;
h) a "linkage strategy" describing your approach to overcoming limitations to external validity

Funding per full-scale study award: There is no funding cap for full-scale projects, but EDI anticipates that most awards for full-scale studies will not exceed £600,000. Applications for higher amounts are permissible and welcomed (as appropriate), but applicants should be sure to justify the costs. Successful proposals will demonstrate strong **value for money**. Selection committee members will evaluate each proposal based on this guiding principle (for details, review the Evaluation Criteria beginning on page 8 of this RFA, and see a description of VFM and its implications for successful EDI research teams in Attachment C). Please also see further guidance on co-funding and cost-sharing arrangements within the Budget Guidelines on page 10 of this RFA.

Timeline: Applicants may request funding to support costs between **April, 2018 – August 31, 2020 (Approximately 2.5 years)**.

Linkages: All full-scale applications must articulate a plan to support the external validity of their research. Please reference **Appendix 5** for more details. **For the purposes of proposal development, researchers should describe their "linkage strategy" in an appendix to their application, which should not to exceed one-page.** This appendix will not be counted as part of the page limitations for the overall application.

To submit an application for a full-scale research proposal, **applicants should submit a narrative, not to exceed seven pages, which must include all of the items in the following table[5]:**

Full-Scale Proposal Requirements Table

Problem Statement	• What development challenge does the proposed research attempt to address? Clearly state the problem that motivates the research, including evidence of the problem and the hypothesized relationship to sub-optimal functioning or efficiency of local institutions. • Identify how addressing this problem could encourage economic growth and/or public welfare. Clearly describe the magnitude and character of the welfare problem to be researched in the study context. • Succinctly list, and briefly describe the research questions you seek to address. Include the hypotheses that underpin your proposed intervention/solution.
Intervention: Program or Institutional Reform	• Describe the intervention and the proposed strategy for implementation. Clearly explain how the intervention you will evaluate is designed to address the problem statement in the proposed context. • Discuss how this approach compares to other approaches tackling this problem in this or other contexts to indicate why this approach is appropriate for rigorous evaluation in this context. • Do you expect these impacts to vary across geographic region, population, or context? Where else is this approach used, or where else do you see the approach showing promise, if shown to be effective?
Unique Contribution to Literature	• Proposals must include a brief literature review, and explain the project's unique scientific contribution to the global evidence base. • What knowledge gap are you addressing, and how will it advance the field? • Where possible, relate to questions/issues addressed in the EDI Review Paper
Target population	• What population does the intervention attempt to impact? • How large is the population that could benefit if the intervention were scaled up? • How, if at all, will the intervention—or broader implications of the research—improve the lives of marginalized persons (low-income, women and socially excluded groups)?
Evaluation Design	• What are the units of randomization and analysis (e.g. individual, household, village, sub-district, etc.)? • What is the method of randomization (e.g. lottery, phase-in, encouragement, etc.)? • Is this part of a larger or ongoing evaluation? • What are the intermediate and final outcome indicators? How will these be measured? • When will you take measurements, and how frequently? • What are the foreseeable threats to the internal validity of this study? (e.g. compliance, attrition, spillovers, etc.)?
Power Calculations	• Please describe your power calculations (effect size, take up/compliance, variance, clusters, observations per cluster, *rho*). We strongly encourage applicants to be very detailed in the presentation of power calculations. • What is the minimum detectable effect size? Why do you believe this is an appropriate size? • What data and assumptions did you use for these estimates?

5 The narrative does not need to be structured in the order given, but all components should be included.

Partners	● Describe your partner(s) for implementation and scale-up. Applicants should identify both implementing partners (those involved in the evaluation itself) and scaling partners (those involved in scale-up of successful interventions). These may be the same organization, or two different sets of organizations. ● Investigators are strongly encouraged to seek cost-sharing from partners to demonstrate demand for the research findings. ● Provide evidence that your partner organization has appropriate staffing and resources to participate in this study
Policy Relevance and Potential Scalability	● Will the study help policymakers better understand and address institutions-related development challenges? ● Is there indication that partners or involved stakeholders would be interested for evidence to inform their decision making? ● How will other implementers become aware of the results of this evaluation? Outline a detailed dissemination plan to engage policymakers from the outset and that goes beyond the usual presentations and meetings targeted at an academic audience.
Timeline	● Clearly outline your expected timeline on a quarterly basis, demonstrating the sequencing of activities (GANNT charts or other table-based timeline descriptions are acceptable).

Evaluation Criteria

Pre-Proposal Form

Pre-proposal forms will be used to support the organization of the proposal review process by providing EDI an indication of the quantity and subject matter of forthcoming pilot and full-scale funding applications. However, to support the development of competitive proposals, EDI also reserves the right to advise pre-proposal research submissions (in rare circumstances) not to proceed to submitting a full proposal if there are significant reservations at this stage. These determination would only be made in instances where there is inappropriate alignment with topical or geographic focus areas, and/or insufficient research experience of applicant researchers and the program would like to save applicants their effort preparing application materials given the severe unlikeliness of being selected for funding. **Applicants should not wait for feedback and should proceed directly with preparing their full application materials by the final submission deadline.**

Pilot and Full-Scale Applications

Referees will score each proposal by the seven criteria listed in the Evaluation Criteria table below using a ranking system from 1 (very poor) to 5 (excellent) and will provide a 1-2 sentence justification for each score.

To be funded, the proposal must be practical and feasible. Low scores on technical and/or logistical viability criteria may prevent projects from being funded regardless of scores on other dimensions. *External Validity, "linkage potential*" (7) will only be considered for full-scale proposals; applications for pilot awards are not required to articulate a strategy for forming linkages and will not be evaluated on this criteria. However, strong applications will describe how their proposed pilot aligns with the EDI Review Paper and holds potential to address external validity challenges if expanded as a full-scale study.

Evaluation Criteria Table

1. Technical Merit (scored 1-5 based on the prompts at right)	• Is the research design appropriate and well-articulated? • Will the study be able to answer proposed questions? What are potential threats to the viability and validity of the study? Does the proposal sufficiently address those threats? • Are the indicators and sample size estimates appropriate, given the outcomes to be measured? ***(for full-scale studies)***
2. ***Logistical Viability*** (scored 1-5 based on the prompts at right)	• Does the proposal address logistical or political obstacles that might threaten completion of the study (for example, government authorization or funding)? • Are you convinced that the implementing and/or scale-up partners are appropriate for the project? ***(for Pilots, that they have*** **good potential** ***to be appropriate)*** • Is there evidence of a strong relationship that is likely to endure through the entire study? Is there evidence of buy-in (e.g. cost-sharing) from the implementing or scale-up partners? ***(for full-scale studies)***
3. Appropriateness (scored 1-5 based on the prompts at right)	*Technical:* • Is it clear that an institutional gap or barrier restricts the progress of the population targeted by intervention? • What is the evidence suggesting that the policy reform and/or intervention(s) could address an important institution-related development challenge? Is the policy reform appropriate for the setting and target population? • Are the stated problems and proposed solution consistent with EDI's stated research priorities and broad program objectives? **All proposals will be evaluated by their ability to address the issues emphasized in the EDI Review Paper.**
4. Innovation (scored 1-5 based on the prompts at right)	• Does the study have promise to make a significant contribution toward development of the evidence base on the ability of institutional reforms to enhance key functions and drive inclusive economic growth? • Does it answer new and more difficult questions, or introduce novel methods, measures or interventions? • Does the proposed study account for potential behavioral changes, negative externalities and/or unanticipated effects that may offset hypothesized welfare gains from the treatment?
5. Policy Potential (scored 1-5 based on the prompts at right)	• Will the study help policymakers better understand and address institution- related development challenge? • Is the strategy or intervention plausibly cost-effective? • Is there indication that partners or involved stakeholders would be interested for evidence to inform their decision making? • How does this intervention compare with other potential or existing solutions? • Is the program appropriate for scale-up, and are there both scale-up partners and a plan?
6. Value for Money (scored 1-5 based on the prompts at right)	• Does the study conform to typical costs for RCTs? • Is the budget reasonable and consistent with the work plan described in the narrative application? Have the applicants thoroughly considered options for cost-savings and efficiencies? • Have the applicants identified currently pending and secured co-funding commitments? Does the budget adequately address how EDI resources would be used in conjunction with secured or immediately pending co-funding? Is there a unique value-add for any EDI resources allocated to the project?
7. External validity "linkage potential" (scored 1-5 based on the prompts at right)	*(only full-scale RCTs will be evaluated on this criterion, not pilots)* • Does the proposal effectively to address challenges associated with external validity in a manner that does not diminish the quality of the research? • Is it plausible that the results of this evaluation will have wider implications and will the "lessons learned" have relevance beyond this test case?

Budget Guidelines

It is your responsibility that the budget you submit is correct and follows your host 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 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 Organization). Please note that this applies to all projects, including those going through the regional offices of The Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty Action Lab and Innovations for Poverty Action. 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.

Completing a proposal budget: Guidelines

- Given the ultimate funding source is from the UK Department for International Development, all budget figures must be presented in British Pounds (GBP).
- Exchange rate risk is borne by the receiving institution, and invoice payments will be based on the exchange rate at the time of processing each payment.
- 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.

Please submit with your application a Budget Justification Narrative that describes budgeted costs, and responses to the following budget guidelines:

Declaring secured and immediately pending co-funding:

- **If there is co-funding for the project, you must complete both the "Total Project Budget" and the "EDI Budget" in the budget template.** More details are provided in the Excel template. All applicants are required in their Proposal Cover Sheet (Appendix 1 of this RFA) to clearly indicate secured or immediately pending co-funding opportunities.
- We ask that you exclude from co-funding declarations any funding for which you have not yet drafted or submitted an application, although you may be planning to do so.
- Please clearly indicate which, if any, co-funding source funds from DFID or DFID-supported programs.
- DFID needs to confirm that EDI only funds distinct and unique aspects of projects, which are currently uncovered by existing donors. Demonstrating the unique value-addition of EDI funds is particularly important when projects already have or are anticipating co-funding resources from within DFID or DFID-funded programs.
- Applicants should not expect that EDI will cover co-funding listed in the application that is ultimately unsuccessful with other funding sources. **The applicant must clearly outline their contingency plan to successfully and meaningfully carry out the proposed research if pending co-funding is unsuccessful.** This is necessary to demonstrate to reviewers that the research as proposed is not contingent on external, pending decisions.

Demonstrating Value for Money:

- DFID's approach to Value for money (VFM) is about 'maximising the value of each pound spent'. 'Maximising the value of each pound spent' means getting the maximum benefit over time from the resources available. Correspondingly, the most important measures of VFM relate to cost-effectiveness—the ratio of total outcomes to total costs.
- Research Teams should be mindful that it is their responsibility to ensure VFM throughout the project. This requires control of costs, careful management of personnel inputs with robust quality assurance principles, and actively and quickly intervening to manage consulting inputs to ensure VFM.
- For more information on the definition of VFM as it applies to the EDI program, and what will be expected of successful EDI research teams, please see Attachment C.

Project Implementation Costs

- For full research projects, implementation costs are expected to be borne by the project partners. However, under some circumstances where implementation costs are significantly increased due to the research design, for example a randomized encouragement design, EDI may consider funding implementation.
- Proposals requesting funds for implementation are required to explain why the implementer cannot bear the costs.

Indirect Costs: overhead charges (i.e. indirect costs) for proposal budgets under this RFA have a ceiling of 15 percent of total direct costs.

Assets:

- Note that any assets funded under this opportunity will be subject to DFID policies on maintenance of an asset register, and compliance with annual inspection a disposal policies.
- DFID defines assets as: *"any equipment and supplies purchased from program funds that meet both of the following criteria: (1) they have a useful life of more than one year; and (2) the purchase price or development cost of the asset is in excess of £500 or equivalent in local currency. The value might be for a group of assets rather than each individual asset when it comes to what are known as "attractive" assets such as mobile phones, laptops, satellite phones etc."*
- Note that any computer/equipment purchases in proposal budgets 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.

Unallowable costs include:

- Costs labelled as "incidental", "miscellaneous", or "contingency" and rent, unless a separate project office is to be covered specifically for this effort.
- Any business, first class or non-economy class travel is not permitted.

Proposal Evaluation Process

The proposal review process has been designed to ensure that all funded studies are methodologically sound and capable of identifying the causal impact of an intervention that can be isolated from other confounding factors. EDI uses a blinded review process to assess the quality and appropriateness of all proposals. This review is carried out by a panel of researchers in the CEGA and EDI networks who do not have a conflict of interest. These reviewers will judge applications based solely on the quality of the documents submitted.

Applications require a signed declaration of non-canvassing and non-collusive behavior (see Application checklist on pg. 16): The certification form to sign and submit with the other required application materials is provided in **Appendix 2** below. EDI requires this certification which declares that research teams have not engaged in collusive behavior during the preparation of this application. The specific terms are included in the required form, which must be submitted in the package of application materials, signed by the principal investigator listed on the application.

Following peer review, EDI holds a decisions meeting to discuss projects, review comments, and make determinations. Committee members with a conflict of interest must recuse themselves from this process. All proposals will be categorized as either: (1) unconditionally approved; (2) conditionally approved with minor revisions or clarifications required; (3) request for revise and resubmit; or (4) not approved.

Officials from DFID hold veto power over the recommendations of the EDI selection committee. After receiving the recommendations of the selection committee, DFID will review applications. **This process may include engagement with the DFID country offices where the study proposes to take place. DFID country office reviews may, as a result, require interaction and additional information from the applicants prior to final decisionmaking.**

Anticipated Timeline for Submission and Notification

Date	Milestone
Monday, August 22, 2017	Request for Proposals Released
Tuesday, October 17, 2017	**Pre-Proposal Forms due**
Tuesday, November 15, 2017	**Proposal Submission Deadline**
Week of January 22, 2018	Review Process Concludes
Week of January 29, 2018	EDI Decisions Committee Meeting, preferred bidder selections
Week of February 5, 2018	Notification letters sent to preferred bidder applicants

Requests for Additional Information

Within 10 working days after an applicant receives notice that EDI will not fund its application, the unsuccessful applicants may send a written request for additional information. Additional information will be provided at the discretion of the Chair of the Scientific Committee for EDI's RCT portfolio, with all communications being routed through the Secretariat for EDI's Research Area 3. Specifically, information will only be provided with respect to the strengths and weaknesses of the application in terms of the published review criteria. Information comparing the application to others received during this funding round will not be provided.

Right to cancel, clarify or vary the process

Please note that EDI shall not be committed to any course of action as a result of:

- issuing this RFA or any invitation to participate in the selection process ;
- communicating with an Applicant or an Applicant's representatives in respect of this selection exercise; or
- any other communication between EDI (whether directly or by its agents or representatives) and any other party.

By taking part in this competitive exercise, Applicants accept that OPM on behalf of EDI, shall not be bound to accept any Proposal and reserves the right not to conclude an agreement for some or all of the services for which Applicants are invited. EDI reserves the right to amend, add to or withdraw all or any part of this RFA at any time during the selection exercise

Grievances

EDI aims to use fair, open, and transparent practices for the proposal development and evaluation process. If you have complaints about this competition, please contact edi@berkeley.edu. We will seek to address all complaints in a detailed and timely fashion. If you are unsatisfied with the response you receive, please indicate so to your EDI liaison and the program will consult with the appropriate parties within the consortium and coordinate a review of any grievance in accordance with the policies of CEGA and OPM. EDI will then respond to your complaint within 60 calendars days.

Award Requirements and Process

If your proposal is accepted for award, the funding will be provided under an award from Oxford Policy Management to your host institution. All sub-contracts and payments thereunder will be made in British pounds (GBP) sterling. Foreign exchange risk (e.g. due to inflation or depreciation) must be borne by the recipient receiving the sub-contract.

Once the project has been short-listed by the selection committee, OPM will conduct an in-depth financial review, which can take up to three weeks after the selection committee meeting. OPM has the right to request clarifications or reductions in budgets and will inform the research teams once they have completed this process.

OPM will then request the host institution to complete a packet of due diligence forms prior to issuing the sub-contract (please see examples of these forms included on the EDI website at "Attachment A"). The due diligence requirements are in line with DFID's policies and therefore need to be completed prior to contracting. In some cases these forms will have already been completed by the host institution, if OPM has other ongoing contracts with the host institution. The notification letter will state whether these forms have already been completed from previous partnerships, or whether they will need to be completed as a first step in the process, in which case they are requested from the host institution as early as possible to facilitate contracting.

Once the host-institution has passed the due diligence requirements, OPM will issue a sub-contract (please see an example of an OPM sub-contract template included on the EDI website at "Attachment B"). We encourage you to share this with administrators at your host organization has early as possible. Please note that EDI is an innovative research program, with OPM as the contract holder appointed by DFID to deliver the program, and is not a "business-as-usual" grant making operation.

IRB

It is **strongly recommended** that before the announcement of EDI funding decisions, applicants secure approval from the host institution's Institutional Review Board (IRB) for any human subjects protocol required to implement your project. **OPM requires proof of IRB approval prior to processing any EDI award that involves Human Subjects.**

We aim to complete the contracting process **within 90 days** after funding determinations. 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 award and we may in some cases be able to cover those costs (post-award, but pre-IRB) under the award.

Trial Registration

Before starting field work, full-scale projects must register their RCT with the AEA RCT Registry (http://www.socialscienceregistry.org). Registration includes 18 required fields (such as your name and a small subset of your IRB requirements), and the entire process should take less than 20 minutes if all documentation is in order. There is also the opportunity to include more information, including power calculations and an optional pre-analysis plan. EDI will reach out to researchers during the process of establishing the sub award and ask for confirmation of registration. For questions and support with the registry, please contact the EDI Secretariat at (edi@berkeley.edu)

Start-Up Report

Selected research teams will be required to submit a short start-up report as a subcontract deliverable, which details the early activities of the initiative, any changes to project design, or linkage opportunities identified. Specific submission deadlines will be determined based on the length of the initiative, but typically these will be submitted 90 days after the project start date.

Bi-annual Progress Reports and Final Technical and Financial Reports

Researchers should provide concise bi-annual progress narrative and financial reports, using short templates provided by the EDI Secretariat. EDI requires a final technical report and a final financial report within 60 days of completion of the award period. Note that for DFID auditing purposes, financial reports will be required to report on all spending. These details will be explicitly outlined in reporting templates.

Draft Working Paper

Researchers selected to receive funding for full-scale studies are required to submit at least one working paper with preliminary observations from their EDI-funded projects within 12 months of completing field work. In support of this process, EDI has assembled a Scientific Committee to provide research team's with initial feedback and peer review comments. Working papers submitted to EDI will be used to enhance cross-fertilization and mutual learning across the program's consortium. All research outputs will be reviewed by members of Scientific Committee to help enhance the quality of the study per the goals of the EDI program. Selected research teams will participate in this process with the Scientific Committee.

Communication Outputs and Program activities

The EDI team has a communications team dedicated to disseminating research outputs. Research teams that receive funding from EDI are required to collaborate with this team from time-to-time and provide source content and approval for EDI-generated communications outputs including; policy briefs, video interviews, blog articles, and/or presentations. Attendance at applicable EDI-related workshops, seminars and conferences is strongly encouraged and any travel costs incurred in relation to the attendance of these events will be covered by the EDI program. EDI has also developed specific branding guidelines for all research under the program. For more information on branding, please see the policy outlined in “Attachment A” on the EDI website.

Data Publication

Researchers are reminded that the terms of their award will detail the intellectual property of all outputs, giving DFID an irrevocable worldwide license to use all material produced through research, while allowing researchers to retain all intellectual property rights over that material. All outputs from EDI research will be global public goods. All primary data collection funded by EDI will be anonymized and made publicly available on a selected data repository in accordance with DFID’s Research Open and Enhanced Access Policy. For more information please see the policy outlined in “Attachment A” on the EDI website.

Standards of Ethical Conduct

All recipients of EDI awards must make a shared commitment to the ethical conduct of all activities carried out as part of the program. This includes adherence to all the laws and regulations of the countries where EDI research is to take place. EDI encourages all selected research teams to take time to thoroughly review the legal requirements of their host countries prior to implementation of research activities. Moreover, participants in the EDI program are expected to maintain the highest levels of integrity and intellectual honesty, with specific regard for research involving human subjects. As noted above, EDI researchers must secure approval from their host institution’s Institutional Review Board for any human subjects protocol required to implement your project. Similarly, as a generator and user of data, EDI is committed to compliance with all applicable laws related to confidentiality, privacy, and ownership of this information. Recipients of EDI funds are expected to familiarize themselves with the applicable and relevant laws, policies, directives, and agreements related to the access, use, protection, and disclosure of data generated or used as part of the program. Finally, EDI prohibits its researchers from engaging in any effort to change the findings of their studies, fabricate data, misrepresent results, use the ideas or writings of others without proper citation or consent, or otherwise engage in acts of research misconduct. Please contact edi@berkeley.edu should you have any questions.

Application Instructions: Checklist

Carefully review the Proposal Application Guidelines in this document. Each application should follow the instructions for either a Pilot Study or a Full-Scale Study.

Applicants must submit completed versions of all of the following documents by the submission deadline. No information and/or documents from applicants will be accepted or considered after the closing date unless otherwise requested by the EDI Secretariat.

Pre-Proposal: Submit the required form at https://tinyurl.com/EDIRCTs2 by **Tuesday, Oct. 17, 2017**

Summary of Materials for final submission of Pilot or Full-Scale applications:

- **Cover Sheet** (see Appendix 1): This document must be completed in its entirety;
- **Proposal Abstract:** In 3-5 sentences, describe your research question and the context of your evaluation. The abstract should include:
  - A brief statement of the institutional problem you seek to address
  - The related key research question(s)
  - The intervention you will use in the experiment
- **Proposal Narrative:** This document must not exceed seven pages in length (not to exceed five pages in the case of pilot applications).
  - It must address all of the items discussed in the relevant Proposal Application Guidelines table, above
  - Should be written in Calibri font, Size 11 and may be single spaced
  - Should be saved as a single Word file including the cover letter, abstract, and proposal narrative, with the title: [PI Last Name, First Name] [Topic Name].doc(x).
  - For Full-Scale applications, an appendix (not to exceed one page) describing the project's "linkage strategy" must be included with your application
- **Proposal Budget (see Appendix 4):** This document must be completed in its entirety and saved as a single Excel file with the title: [PI Last Name, First Name][Budget].xls(x). Download the excel template on the RFA release page here
- **Budget Justification Narrative:** Refer to the Budget Guidelines in this document for the details of what to include to justify costs, value for money, and indicate co-funding.
- **Letter(s) of Support**: Please obtain letters of support from the following, each saved as as a single PDF file with the title: [PI Last Name, First Name] [Name of Organization Letter of Support].pdf:
  - all implementing partners
  - the host institution, declaring approval of application materials
- **Signed Declaration of Non-canvassing and Non-collusive Application:** Please complete this form (see Appendix 2), have it signed by the principal investigator on the application, and include it as an attachment with the other application materials.
- **Submit an email** with all of the above attachments to the EDI Secretariat at edi@berkeley.edu. In the subject line, please write: *EDI Round 2 Proposal: [PI Last Name, First Name]*

Deadline for final application submission:

5pm U.S. Pacific time, Wednesday, November 15, 2017

Appendix 1: EDI Proposal Cover Sheet -- Round 2

This is an application for a **(check one box):** ☐ **Pilot Study** **or** ☐ **Full-Scale Study**			
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR		**CONTACT (Email, Phone)**	
CO-INVESTIGATOR(S)		**CONTACT (Email, Phone)**	
PI ADMINISTRATIVE CONTACT *(optional, e.g. Research Manager)*		**CONTACT (Email, Phone)**	
TITLE OF PROPOSAL		**COUNTRY**	
PARTNER ORGANIZATION(S) *(add additional in an appendix)*		**CONTACT (Name, Email, Phone)**	
SECURED OR SUBMITTED APPLICATIONS: CO-FUNDING FOR THESE RESEARCH ACTIVITES OR RELATED WORK			
FUNDING SOURCE: *(add additional in an appendix)* *List **Organization, Program,** check box **if funding from DFID***		**AWARD*: identify* *secured* *or* *submitted, PI, Project Title, Amount***	
☐			
☐			
Have you submitted this or a related proposal to **any other DFID funded programs?**		Have you submitted this or a related proposal to **any other CEGA research initiative?**	
☐ Yes If yes, when? and what program? ☐ No		☐ Yes If yes, when? ☐ No Initiative:	
EDI FUNDING REQUEST			
REQUESTED	£	**TOTAL <u>SECURED</u> CO-FUNDING**	£
PROPOSED START DATE: (yyyy-mm-dd)	*(earliest is 2017-04-01)*	**PROPOSED END DATE:** (yyyy-mm-dd)	*(latest is 2020-08-31)*
INSTITUTION TO RECEIVE AWARD		**CONTACT AT HOST INSTITUTION FOR CONTRACTING ISSUES (Name, Email)**	

Appendix 2: *Declaration of Non-Canvassing and Non-Collusive Application*

The essence of the public procurement process is that EDI shall receive bona fide competitive Proposals from all Applicants.

We, the undersigned, hereby certify that this is a bona fide Proposal and we have not nor has any other member of our supply chain:

1. Entered into any agreement with any other person with the aim of preventing Proposals being made or as to the fixing or adjusting of the amount of any Proposal or the conditions on which any Proposal is made whether in respect of this RFA; or
2. Inform any other person, other than the EDI Secretariat of the amount or the approximate amount of the Proposal, except where the disclosure, in confidence, of the amount of the Proposal was necessary to obtain quotations for the preparation of the Proposal, insurance, performance bonds and/or contract guarantee bonds or for professional advice required for the preparation of the Proposal; or
3. Caused or induced any person to enter into such an agreement as is mentioned in Para 1 above; or
4. Committed any offence under the Prevention of Corruption Acts 1889 to 1916 or;
5. Offered or agreed to pay or give any sum of money, inducement or valuable consideration directly or indirectly to any person for doing or having done or causing to be done in relation to any other Proposal for this RFA; or
6. Canvassed any other persons in connection with this Proposal; or
7. Communicated directly with DFID, PSE, ADE, University of Namur, CEGA and OPM in work directly concerning this RFA, other than EDI Secretariat. This includes any aspect of the RFA (without limitation) for the purpose of soliciting information or the transfer of related personnel into the employment of the Applicant.
8. We also undertake that we shall not procure the doing of any of the acts mentioned in paragraphs 1 to 7 above before the hour and date specified for the return Proposal.

In this certificate, the word “person” includes any person, body or association, corporate or incorporate and “agreement” includes any arrangement whether formal or informal and whether legally binding or not.

Signed *X* ___________________________

Name _____________________________ Title________________________________

Appendix 3: Preview of Pre-Proposal Live Form

Fill out the live form at https://tinyurl.com/EDIRCTs2.

Preview of this online form:

ECONOMIC & DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTIONS

Economic Development and Institutions: RCT Pre-Proposal Form

Please submit this form as the first step in response to the Request For Applications (RFA): "Randomized Controlled Trials to Evaluate Strategies to Enhance the Effectiveness of Public Institutions in Developing Countries" from the Economic Development and Institutions (EDI) program (see more at http://edi.opml.co.uk/)

Submissions of this pre-proposal should be received by October 17th, 2017 if you plan to submit a proposal to EDI RCT grant-making due November 15th 2017.

This pre-proposal will help us ensure your proposal is suited for the topical focus of this funding opportunity, and that the research team has experience conducting randomized evaluations. This also streamlines the submission, review, and award process for everyone.

If you have questions, you may reach out to edi@berkeley.edu

* Required

Identification of Research Team

Name of Lead Researcher (Primary Principal Investigator) *

Please confirm that a separate member of your team is not also submitting a form so we can avoid duplicate submissions)

email of Lead Researcher (Primary PI) *

link to Lead Researcher's webpage (Administrators will look for a researcher's CV to confirm research experience conducting RCTs) *

***IF YOU DO NOT HAVE AN UPDATED WEBPAGE: Please indicate this here, and email CVs matching the names submitted on this form to edi@berkeley.edu

List any co-Investigators here:

links to any co-Investigator(s)' webpage(s)

***IF YOU DO NOT HAVE AN UPDATED WEBPAGE (as above): Please indicate this here, and email CVs matching the names submitted on this form to edi@berkeley.edu

Research Proposal Basics

In what country (or countries) will your study take place? *

Please refer to the Geographical Focus section of the RFA to understand the expectations from DFID

Which application type do you plan to submit? *

Please refer to the detailed Proposal Guidelines in the RFA to determine the best fit for your proposed research

- ○ Pilot
- ○ Full-scale RCT

Which institutional reform or intervention do you plan to evaluate? *

(Only 1-3 sentences, MAXIMUM please. This should simply provide us with an indication of what you're planning

Please state your research question(s) *

(Only 1-3 sentences MAXIMUM please)

Please list the partner organizations that will agree to be affiliated with the research

Government bodies, implementing organizations, etc.

Submit

Appendix 4: EDI Proposal Budget Template

see Excel template, downloadable from the RFA announcement page online, here.

Appendix 5: Addressing External Validity -- RCT “Linkages”

Efforts to enhance the external validity of a study’s findings are an increasingly common feature of randomized evaluations. Conducting research that produces far-ranging conclusions allows policymakers to make generalizations about the value of results in different contexts and provides insights into the basic mechanisms by which interventions may lead to change. Multiple models exist for supporting this type of external validity (see Banerjee et al 2015; Gertler et al 2015; Evidence in Governance and Politics “Metaketa Initiative”).

As a research community, we view this EDI call for proposals as an opportunity to experiment with the prospective design of “linked” studies. We intend to maintain flexibility in the ways studies achieve this goal; however, we do ask all applicants to describe how their study is designed to maximize the generalizability and/or external validity of findings (referred to in this RFA as a “linkage strategy”).

While a study’s potential for external validity will be a central evaluation criteria for funding decisions, EDI also acknowledges that this can require costly coordination, long-term planning, and complex partnerships. We also value the freedom required for individual researchers to be creative, produce novel findings, and maintain high standards for quality. Therefore we are not mandating a specific measurement instrument, a common intervention, or other fixed mechanism for achieving external validity. Instead, researchers are asked to select and articulate the best option for their specific study. EDI has generated some examples of “linkage strategies” that we would view favorably. Applicants are welcome to propose strategies not included below.

- **Incorporating conceptual reproduction of any randomized studies identified in the EDI Review Paper (or other RCTs considered by the applicant to be important to the proposed project):** Applicants should propose to reproduce specific studies in next contexts (i.e. with a new study sample) by making use of the questions, methods, or interventions from earlier work.
- **Designing a multi-site study that evaluates an intervention across different national or sub-national contexts:** Applicants may propose a study that tests a common intervention across multiple geographic or cultural contexts. Varying the intervention’s implementation strategy across different contexts is acceptable and may in fact reveal more generalizable mechanisms of impact.
- **Partnerships and/or coordination with studies in other contexts: Applicants may propose to collaborate with other researchers who already have funded projects and/or are applying to EDI for funding.** Options for collaboration could include:
    - Common outcomes and measures, or sharing a survey instrument

        - Using the same measures - for example, if studying personnel, same measures of personality (e.g., Big 5 personality, and econ parameters, e.g., Andreoni et al on δ,β,ρ)
    - Studying different interventions/alternatives that address a common outcome (e.g., tax collection, corruption, conflict resolution)
  - Common intervention strategies
    - Assessing similar strategies across multiple projects led by different investigators (e.g., if the PI is evaluating an information campaign to improve service delivery, she might collaborate with researchers who are already testing a similar intervention in a different country/context)

- **Participating in EDI's "Link Up" Activity:** EDI will host a harmonization workshop for funded researchers and their practitioner counterparts, creating an opportunity for teams to develop common survey instruments, measurement protocols, and standards across projects (as appropriate). Applicants can express their interest to participate in this session and describe areas of their project that could be harmonized with other research teams. More information on this convening will be released shortly and applicants should not immediately be concerned with considerations of timing

- **Linking within the EDI Program:** EDI works across a number of research activities of which the RCT component is only one. Therefore, there will be opportunities to collaborate with other research teams using different methodologies and approaches to investigate similar thematic areas for example qualitative case studies or theoretical studies. There is a strong emphasis on cross-fertilization and sharing lessons-learned within the program, which is enhanced through sharing working papers within 12 months of completing fieldwork.

Details on Application Requirements:

EDI requires researchers proposing full-scale studies to succinctly describe what "linkage" strategy is appropriate for their research. Linkage strategies should be added as an appendix to proposals and will not be counted against the page limitations referenced in the Proposal Guidelines section above. However, linkage strategy descriptions should be as concise as possible and ***no more than one-page in length***. Applications for pilot awards are not required to include a strategy for forming linkages. A proposal's linkage strategy will be evaluated based on potential to achieve external validity in a manner that does not diminish the quality of the individual research proposal. More details are provided in the "Evaluation Criteria" section of the RFA. If a researcher has any questions about this requirements, please contact edi@berkeley.edu.

Appendix 6: Summary of EDI's Open Research Questions

See the full EDI Review Paper at this link.

Political institutions:

Open questions on **Electoral Rules**:

- Which electoral rules most affect corruption?
- What is the optimal term length?
- Should there be term limits (in the extreme, should there be reelection at all)?
- Are rules that broaden representation inimical to accountability and competence?
- Endogenous institutions: how do institutions originate, and does their origin affect performance?

Open questions on **Information and Transparency**:

- Does transparency, by heightening accountability, improve public good provision?
- What makes information credible and usable to citizens?
- When does transparency lead to better political selection versus a reinforcement of harmful political strategies?

Open questions on **Political Norms**:

- What are the drivers and consequences of government legitimacy?
- How do political norms interact with formal institutions?
- What institutions can limit clientelism, patronage, and dynastic politics?
- What are the effects on political participation and accountability of specific cultural traits, such as trust, respect for others, and individualism versus collectivism?

Open questions on **State Capacity - Personnel**:

- What are the effects of non-financial incentives?
- When does performance pay lead to multi-tasking distortions?
- Do extrinsic incentives crowd out intrinsic motivation?
- When do top-down audit-based approaches work better than community monitoring?
- Can citizen feedback platforms promote political accountability and improve service delivery?

Open questions on **State Capacity - Financial Resources**:

- What areas of taxation are most affected by corruption?
- How much of the revenue gap in developing countries can be closed by incentivizing tax collectors?
- When do windfalls strengthen accountability and public sector productivity?
- Is third-party reporting more or less effective under weak legal institutions?

Legal institutions:

Open questions on **Rights** - emphasis on property, titling

- Are there instances where titling/formalization relaxes credit constraints?
- If complementary reforms are needed, what are key complementary reforms?
- Much literature on small firm informality, registration and tax regulations - but what are the regulatory barriers for firm growth from land titling and zoning?
- What are the social costs of formalizing informal firms?
- Is the informal economy a complement or a hindrance for its formal counterpart?

Open questions on **Awareness and Access**

- How do improved legal outcomes translate into improved welfare?
- Does broader legal access affect productive activities?
- Does a more extensive "rule of law" create aggregate (i.e., General Equilibrium) effects?
- Methodological challenge: separating effects on preferences versus expectations

Open questions on **Courts**

- How do career concerns affect judge incentives?
- Beyond judges, what is the role of staff and organizational support in producing timely outcomes, and how can they improve?
- What's the impact of judicial quality on economic activity?
- Would the extant results survive RCT study?

Open questions on **Quality of Enforcement**

- How much do improvements in enforcement generate just displacement in wrongdoing?
- Interactive effect of incentives to monitors and the monitored?
- Understanding the political economy of implementation across reforms pursuing a similar objective
- Taking into account incentive compatibility of public middle management, their discretion and information

Appendix 7: EDI Conflict of Interest Policy

The EDI Program is committed to avoiding conflict of interest when selecting research teams for funding. A blinded review and scoring process will allow the selection committee to assess the quality and appropriateness of all proposals. The Selection Committee, sourced from the EDI Program Directorate at the Scientific Committee for EDI's RCT portfolio, holds responsibility for the overall strategic direction of the RCT component, including the selection of proposals for funding. The following outlines the Conflict of Interest policy used by the Selection Committee.

Purpose

All those involved in the selection and decision making of funds in the EDI Program will strive to avoid any conflict of interest between the interests of the Program on the one hand, and personal, professional, and business interests on the other. This includes avoiding the perception of conflicts of interest as well as actual conflicts of interest. A conflict of interest in and of itself is not wrong and may not be unethical. However, those involved in the Selection Committees must take appropriate action to ensure disclosure of any actual, perceived or potential conflict of interest and, where appropriate, to work with the Directors of the Program to manage the conflict.

The purpose of this policy is to protect the integrity of the Program's decision-making process, to enable our stakeholders to have confidence in our integrity, and to protect the integrity and reputation of those involved in the Program. It is designed to protect the reputation of the individuals and organizations involved in the Program, assist the Program in achieving value for money and prevent fraud.

A selection committee member would have a conflict of interest if;

1. He/She intends to submit a proposal– either personally or as part of a consortium – to this RFA
2. He/She is related to or in a personal relationship with someone who is tendering for a contract to conduct an RCT study.
3. He/She directly mentors an applicant (i.e. is their PhD advisor)
4. He/She has a close professional relationship or dealings with an applicant (e.g. regular co-authorship on related research partnership)
5. He/She has a financial interest or other stake in an applicant organization that would bias their selection of research teams for funding.

EDI members will be considered "conflicted out" of decisions related to any of the instances cited above, but will not necessarily need to recuse themselves from participation in the Selection Committee for an entire funding round.