ATAI Request for Proposals:

Studies of Agricultural Technology Adoption and Impact

Fall 2017

Release Date: September 5, 2017

ATAI is calling for proposals from J-PAL and CEGA affiliates (and select others[1]) to conduct randomized evaluations that either test strategies to increase agricultural technology adoption, or identify the impact of agricultural technologies that have already demonstrated a significant level of take-up among smallholders in Sub-Saharan Africa or South Asia. Appropriate technology adoption is defined as the take-up and use of a technology that proves utility-enhancing, profitable, and/or welfare-increasing for smallholder farmers and others along the agriculture value chain.

For this round of grants, ATAI is accepting the following categories of proposals:

- **Pilot studies** (see an overview and related Guidelines below)
- **Full-Scale Adoption RCTs** (see an overview and related Guidelines below)
- **Full-Scale Impact RCTs** (see an overview and related Guidelines below)
- **"Top Up" proposals** to directly supplement previous ATAI research successes. These grants will extend the research and policy contributions of previously funded ATAI work, whether still ongoing or previously completed (see more details and related Guidelines below)

For all proposal applications the deadlines are:

Submission stage	Date	Time	Application Form found at
Pre-Proposal Form (Expression of Interest)	**Tuesday, October 31, 2017**	5:00 PM U.S. Pacific time	https://tinyurl.com/Fall2017ATAI
Full Proposal	**Tuesday, December 19, 2017**	5:00 PM U.S. Pacific time	See materials required, templates included in Appendices

For this Fall 2017 round, ATAI expects to award approximately $1 million in research grants.

To submit a proposal for consideration: (see full application instructions, here)

1. **Please submit a brief pre-proposal form at https://tinyurl.com/Fall2017ATAI no later than Tuesday, October 31, 2017.**
2. **Please complete the application requirements included in this document and email to atai@povertyactionlab.org by no later than 5pm U.S. Pacific Time, Tuesday, December 19, 2017.**

---

[1]Select non-affiliate faculty who have been nominated, approved, and notified of their eligibility to submit proposals.
Note: This request for proposals has been sent to intended recipients who are eligible to apply for ATAI research grants. ***Please do not circulate externally, given this restriction****. If you have questions regarding your eligibility to participate, we welcome you to inquire by emailing us at atai@povertyactionlab.org.*

(Click here to return to the beginning of this document)

Table of Contents

Background

The Agricultural Technology Adoption Initiative (ATAI) began in 2009 as a mechanism for coordinating research and policy outreach on the adoption of agricultural innovations by smallholders in Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia. To date, ATAI has invested in 48 unique studies led by researchers in the J-PAL and CEGA networks, awarding over US $10 million across 11 rounds of competitive grant-making thanks to generous support from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, UK Aid from the British people, and an anonymous donor. The initiative has funded both randomized evaluations and small-scale pilots leading to randomized studies. **Collectively, these projects seek to reveal the barriers to adoption facing low-income farmers, to test novel strategies for enabling appropriate technology adoption, and to understand the resulting impacts.**

ATAI launched the program by reviewing literature on key market inefficiencies smallholder farmers face and analyzing evidence gaps. This process identified seven specific market inefficiencies that constrain agricultural technology adoption, where additional evidence could be particularly useful to policy and development programs: externalities; input and output markets; land; labor; credit; risk; and information. This comprehensive review is entitled *"Market Inefficiencies and the Adoption of Agricultural Technologies in Developing Countries"* (also referred to as the *ATAI Review Paper* and last updated in 2013). ATAI uses this document to drive its research competitions, to encourage cutting-edge experimental research that addresses these evidence gaps. In 2016, ATAI leadership released "Emerging Insights," an evidence synthesis series based on the latest experimental research, many of which are ATAI-funded studies, clustered around four of the seven original market inefficiencies identified by the program (credit and savings, risk, information, and input/output markets). These "Emerging Insights" demonstrate ATAI's contribution to the evidence base, while pointing toward outstanding evidence gaps to encourage new experimental research in these areas (see these emphasized areas in the "Topical Focus" section, below).

(Click here to return to the beginning of this document)

Geographical Focus

ATAI's primary geographical focus is Sub-Saharan Africa. ATAI network researchers are encouraged to submit proposals for research conducted in the focus region, in partnership with local implementing organizations. At its discretion, the ATAI Board **may consider projects in the South Asia region**. **For any project outside of Africa, it is critical that the authors provide a convincing argument of the project's viability in, and practical transferability to, a Sub-Saharan African context and implementing partner.** Specifically, the proposal must address the institutional, financial, and administrative implications of the project's adaptation to Sub-Saharan Africa. The proposal also must address the adaptation of the intervention to institutional, financial, and administrative conditions in a specific Sub-Saharan African context, though the sufficient quality of a proposal is the foremost concern.

Topical Focus

ATAI would like to highlight several specific issues for investigation in this RFP. ATAI will view favorably studies that evaluate more difficult adoption and impact questions, questions of key importance to large-scale program and policy partners, and those that have received less research attention.

In 2016, ATAI released an Emerging Insights series synthesizing key findings from evidence to date related to credit and savings, risk, information, and input/output market inefficiencies with highlighted opportunities for future research of interest. **Applicants should refer to relevant content from these ATAI Emerging Insights evidence syntheses, including the following "emphasized" areas for research** (not presented in order of priority):

Credit and Savings (link to full summary here)

- Lending products using **flexible collateral** (e.g. leasing) that encourage loan take-up while providing well-timed access capital
- Products (e.g. credit, savings, storage, etc.) based on **timing in the agricultural cycle**: financial products which account for seasonal fluctuations in farmer liquidity, optimal investment in inputs, and crop and input prices.
- Institutions that can bolster **information about borrowers**, facilitating dynamic incentives to improve credit market performance where social guarantees of repayment are undermined by aggregate risks.

Risk (link to full summary here)

- Research that can help clarify whether the risk-mitigating arrangements of groups, better index design approaches, or other strategies can effectively **resolve basis risk**.
- Additional research on **risk-protective seeds and technology** (e.g. irrigation pumps, or other technologies reducing rain-fed reliance) to achieve the benefits of insurance to the farmers while decreasing, not increasing, **aggregate exposure of the agricultural system to risk**.
- **Meso-level insurance** (e.g. targeting financial institutions or governments as clients), focusing on the supply side and providing insurance to institutions that are exposed to weather risk.
- Use of **free insurance as a form of social protection**, and whether this can achieve a multiplier effect by releasing farmers' constraints.

Input & Output Markets (link to full summary here)

- RCTs that can identify if/how **market shallowness** may be a significant constraint to productive investment
- **Contract farming arrangements**, to understand how enforceable contracts between farmers and purchasers may improve supply chains, with benefits to farmers and/or traders
- The role of **quality in pricing across the supply chain**, to understand how crop quality information may get passed along the value chain, and whether higher quality outputs are rewarded

(Click here to return to the beginning of this document)

- The role of **infrastructure**, and whether inadequate infrastructure that hampers access to markets is a primary barrier to agricultural technology adoption

Information (link to full summary here)

- Information provision in the context of the adoption of novel technology
- Whether and how information and training could be more efficient using **information networks for targeting**
- Mechanisms that generate and/or provide **information tailored more precisely** to individual farmers' contexts (e.g. soil quality, precision agriculture)

We also encourage researchers to propose studies for areas where there is less evidence accumulation to date, particularly on **land** and **labor** market inefficiencies, and **externalities** as discussed in the ATAI Review Paper, which remains a useful reference point for explaining how to increase technology take-up (as a first stage to evaluating technology impact). These dynamic documents help track what we know—and don't know—about agricultural technology adoption in the developing world.

The following provides some potential additional guidance on topics of interest:

PILOTS, ADOPTION or IMPACT studies	IMPACT study-specific
• **Supply chains** (e.g. contract design, quality assurance, pass-through of prices) • Technologies that consider environmental sustainability or **"climate smart" agriculture,** potentially studying **externalities** • **Rural labor markets** • Interventions that address **behavior** in addition to market constraints (e.g. behavioral marketing) • Technologies with **"hidden traits"**; that is, those for which benefits are not always or immediately seen (e.g. weather-resistant crops, crop quality-enhancement, bio-fortified seeds, etc.). • **Land-related inefficiencies** • **Post-harvest technologies** • **Heterogeneity of adoption and impacts**, given sufficiently rigorous design and statistical power	• Does adoption of a technology result in unanticipated effects and/or negative **externalities**? E.g. are behavioral changes that improve the environment offset by other, negative compensatory behavior changes? • For new technologies that are theoretically profitable, are there additional costs or inputs required by the farmer (e.g. in the form of **labor or complementary technologies**)? Do the potential gains from these technologies (in yields or income) sufficiently offset the costs of additional inputs? For example, could measure income or expenditure rather than of yield on one crop, which may hide substitution in farming practices. • What is the effect of technology adoption on **market prices**? • Do higher crop yields lead to improved **nutrition** or investments in **human capital formation**?

IMPACT-specific

ATAI will prioritize studies (a) that investigate the impact of technologies with significant potential to benefit low-income, smallholder farmers at scale; and (b) for which the existing and emergent body of evidence is most deficient. Specifically, we are interested in studies testing interventions with large enough sample sizes for precise impact estimates and strong evidence that adoption currently is (or is likely to be) high. We are interested in understanding a variety of impacts, and there are many potential channels through which technology adoption can achieve impact.

In the following table are some broad impact categories and examples of potential outcome variables:

Economy and Labor Market, Input and Output markets	• Household and community labor distribution and time use • Local employment levels, characteristics, and wages • Local prices of farm outputs and essential goods • Economic networks and integration, market linkages • In- and out-migration.

(Click here to return to the beginning of this document)

Crop Yields and Farm-level productivity, Consumption, Income, and Income Distribution	• Overall and crop-specific farm output • Individual and household income, consumption, and/or assets • Land ownership or tenure • Distributional effects of welfare outcomes
Health and Nutrition	• Anthropometric indicators such as height and weight • Hemoglobin sampling (ex: testing for micronutrient levels)
Household Investments	• Human capital (health and education) • Land and agricultural productivity (e.g. crop diversification, water management, housing or storage improvements, etc.)
Natural environment	• Soil and water quality • Forest cover and biomass • Natural resource management practices
Gender	• Intra-household distributional effects, changes in bargaining power or time use • Gender-based attitudes, bias, and behavior
Social Impacts	• Information-sharing and changes in social networks • Social attitudes and decision-making • Civic engagement

Proposal Guidelines: Pilots, Adoption, Impact, and "Top Up" Studies

ATAI will consider **Pilot, Full-Scale Adoption, Full-Scale Impact, and "Top Up"** research applications, as follows. You should select which of the following four options your project should be classified as, and prepare your application according to the relevant guidelines provided in this document in order for your application can be scored appropriately.

Both "Pilots" and full-scale "Adoption" RCTs test strategies promoting *adoption,* meaning they **emphasize technology take-up as the final outcome.** In comparison, "Impact" RCTs focus on the welfare, market, or environmental *impacts* of technologies once adopted by smallholder farmers. "Impact" study proposals must clear this higher bar by

- **Providing evidence of sufficient take-up of the technology to adequately power the study of impact.** This could be in the form of results from a previous or ongoing ATAI adoption study, though other evidence is acceptable, provided it is from the same technology for which you propose to measure impact.
- **Proposing a larger study design that will track final outcomes and improve our knowledge of agricultural technology.**

ATAI will also consider funding proposals that, for example, "top up" an ongoing adoption trial to measure outcomes not captured in the original study. Examples of eligible "top up" requests are described in the Guidelines in section C., below.

(Click here to return to the beginning of this document)

A. Pilot Study: Proposal Guidelines

ATAI will accept pilot proposals that have a very clear research question and lay the groundwork for a full project[2]. 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, and a scale-up plan—a pilot proposal should be at earlier stages of development.

At least one of the following must be true:

a) the profitability of technology has not yet been demonstrated under "real world" conditions,
b) the design and implementation of an evaluation requires further testing, pilot data, and/or partnership development.

Pilot proposals must clearly articulate:

1. The conceptual and methodological distinction between the pilot study and any future follow-on studies; and
2. What exactly the pilot will enable researchers to learn.

***Funding per Pilot award*:** limited to $50,000 or less.

Timeline: There is no specific timeline requirement for pilots, although in the past these studies have usually taken place over the course of one agricultural cycle. Ultimately this will depend on the project design and related outcomes of interest.

Pilot studies can

- be qualitative or quantitative in nature,
- serve as a diagnostic to reveal barriers to technology adoption
- explore the potential profitability of a technology that has not yet been demonstrated under "real world" conditions
- test the efficacy of an intervention or an evaluation design
- acquire pilot data, and/or
- identify a scale-up partner.

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

Problem statement ● What adoption barriers does the proposed research attempt to address? ● Which profitable technologies are experiencing a low level of take-up? ● Clearly state the problem that motivates the research, including evidence of the problem, and succinctly describe the questions you seek to address.
Unique Contribution to Literature ● Pilot proposals must include a brief literature review, and 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

[2] ATAI is actively pursuing program renewal. Applicants for pilot awards should be aware that no specific future competition is scheduled at this time. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to reach out to atai@povertyactionlab.org.

(Click here to return to the beginning of this document)

distinction between the pilot research and any follow-on research you anticipate that could constitute a full-scale Adoption study. ● When possible and relevant, relate to questions and issues addressed in the ATAI Review Paper and the ATAI Emerging Insights series synthesizing evidence on credit and savings, risk, information, and input/output markets.
Description of treatment(s) ● Clearly explain how farmers interact with the technology of interest, and how you will develop a strategy to identify and overcome adoption constraints. ● If available, describe the intervention that you plan to test, or the strategy you will use to identify barriers to adoption. ● Identify specific questions that have yet to be addressed, but that will be elaborated through the pilot.
Research Outcome ● Describe, *specifically*, what researchers can be expected to learn from this pilot study. Will the study demonstrate profitability of a technology? 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 scale-up.

Graduate students applying for pilot funding are required to include a letter of support from a J-PAL affiliate or invited researcher adviser. The letter should indicate the adviser's willingness to remain involved in a supervisory role throughout the lifetime of the project.

B. Full-scale Studies

Adoption Study: Proposal Guidelines

These grants are for studies at a more mature stage of development that evaluate strategies to increase agricultural technology adoption. 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
e) potential for significant scale-up of research findings
f) well-defined research instruments, and
g) sample size estimates.

See the left-hand column of the following table outlining detailed proposal narrative requirements.

Funding per Full-scale Adoption Study Award: There is no funding cap for these grants, however in the past awards have ranged between $90,000 and $400,000 (with an average of $260,000 per award).

Timeline*:* Funding requests should not extend beyond February 2021 at the latest.

(Click here to return to the beginning of this document)

Impact Study: Proposal Guidelines

Impact studies should be designed to test scalable, cost-effective interventions that improve the welfare of low-income, smallholder farmers through the channel of technology adoption.

There are two ways to approach an "impact studies" proposal:

1. **New Projects:** Researchers are invited to submit proposals for new studies that are designed, from the outset, to measure both technology adoption ***and*** the impacts of technology adoption. **Under this approach, it is absolutely imperative that the proposal demonstrates solid evidence of the technology's adoption in the local context, including relevant institutional, economic, and socio-cultural conditions.** This evidence can come from observational studies or field trials, but it **must be robust and ample enough to predict the level of adoption required to successfully power the impact evaluation.**
2. **Project Extensions:** ATAI will accept proposals for extensions or add-ons to ongoing experiments, provided that the (early) results document a high level of adoption of the technology being studied. Extensions of current evaluations (including those funded by ATAI) allow us to leverage investments in studies that have already randomized the allocation of interventions. Extensions may fund the collection of health and nutrition outcome indicators, household investment and consumption modules, additional rounds of longer-term follow up surveys, or an expansion of sample size (to provide enough power to estimate impact). An existing project does not have to be currently funded by ATAI to be eligible. Again, such requests must be strongly justified, with detailed evidence that technology uptake is adequate to detect impacts.

Funding per Full-Scale Impact Study Award: There is no funding cap for these grants, however, past awards have ranged between $200,000 and $1.2 million, with a median of approximately $340,000). Note that there is a total of $1 million to award during this round of funding. The budget size should accurately reflect the scope of work proposed.

To submit an application for a full-scale research proposal, whether Adoption or Impact, applicants should submit a narrative, **not to exceed five pages**, which ***must*** **include all of the items in the following table:** [3]

	ADOPTION Proposal Requirements	**IMPACT Proposal Requirements**
Problem Statement	**ADOPTION** ● What adoption barriers does the proposed research attempt to address? ● Which profitable technologies are not being taken up? ● Demonstrate both the profitability of the technology to smallholders and the perceived adoption gap. ● Are market failures leading to inefficient or missed investments? ● Are behavioral challenges preventing adoption? ● Clearly state the problem that motivates the	**IMPACT** ● Clearly describe the magnitude and character of the welfare problem to be researched in the study context. ● Does the proposed research attempt to measure outcomes that would not be captured by an adoption study? Which outcomes does the proposed research address and why? ● How might the failure to adopt relevant technologies negatively impact welfare?

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

(Click here to return to the beginning of this document)

	research, and succinctly describe the hypothesis that underpins your proposed intervention/solution.	• Demonstrate the known adoption rate of the technology and the hypothesized pathway and scope for impact on smallholder farmers.
Technology Impact and Profitability	**ADOPTION** • Outline available evidence of the technology's impacts on yields, profits, household income, employment, health, environmental sustainability, or other productivity/welfare outcomes. • Include information from test plots, pilot studies, or expert opinion. • How reliable is the evidence of technology impact? • Do you expect these impacts to vary across geographic region, population, or context? • If the research question does not focus on adoption of a specific technology (i.e. the intervention is applicable to several technologies), list those for which you are measuring "adoption," and others for which the intervention is relevant.	**IMPACT** • Proposals **must** clearly describe evidence of the technology's take-up in the study context and demonstrate the robustness of the stated evidence (including a description of any heterogeneities in adoption). • Discuss any existing (or preliminary) evidence of the technology's impacts on yields, profits, household income, employment, health, environmental sustainability, or other productivity/welfare outcomes. Include information from test plots, pilot studies, or expert opinion. How reliable is the evidence of technology impact? • Do you expect these impacts to vary across geographic region, population, or context?
Unique Contribution to Literature	**for both ADOPTION or IMPACT** • Proposals must include a brief literature review, and explain the project's unique scientific contribution. • What knowledge gap are you addressing, and how will it advance the field? • Where possible, relate to questions/issues addressed in the ATAI Review Paper and the ATAI Emerging Insights series synthesizing evidence on credit and savings, risk, information, and input/output markets	
Target population	**ADOPTION** • What population does the intervention attempt to impact? Is it a specific region or demographic group, or people involved in a specific sector? • Do other populations face the same conditions as your target group, and could they potentially benefit from the innovation(s) evaluated here? • 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)? • Try to capture the farmer's perspective, context, and environment in this component of the narrative.	**IMPACT** • Which population does the intervention attempt to impact? Is it a specific region or demographic group, or people involved in a specific economic sector? Do other populations face the same welfare conditions as the target group, and could they potentially benefit from the adopted technologies? • What is the hypothesis for how adoption of this technology will improve the lives of the most *marginalized* persons (e.g. low-income, women, and socially excluded groups)? • Try to capture the farmer's perspective, context, and environment in this component of the narrative.

(Click here to return to the beginning of this document)

Gender Dynamics	**ADOPTION** ● How does this project address social, financial, or other barriers to technology adoption by women and girls? ● Describe how gender and intra-household dynamics play a role in technology adoption in this case. If gender is not relevant, please provide a justification.	**IMPACT** ● In what specific ways does this project investigate social, economic, and/or other outcomes for women and girls? ● Clearly describe conditions for women and girls in the study context and how gender and intra-household dynamics play a role in the adoption or impacts of the relevant technology.
Description of treatment(s)	**ADOPTION** ● Describe the intervention that you will test, and explain how farmers interact both with the technology and with the proposed adoption strategy. ● How does the intervention address constraints, or otherwise shed light on the adoption puzzle? ● How will it impact farming households? ● Does your treatment promote a newly introduced technology, or does it seek to achieve better uptake of an existing, widely available technology? ● Include preliminary or pilot data available in support of your hypotheses, models and/or theories of change.	**IMPACT** ● Describe the intervention that the project will test, and explain how farmers interact with the technology.
Evaluation Design	**for both ADOPTION and IMPACT** ● What are the units of randomization and analysis (e.g. individual, household, village, 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? How does this map to crop cycles, if applicable? ● What are the foreseeable threats to the internal validity of this study? (e.g. compliance, attrition, spillovers, etc.)?	
Power Calculations	**for both ADOPTION and IMPACT** ● 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?	
Capacity Development	**for both ADOPTION and IMPACT** ● ATAI does expect proposals to include a research capacity-building component. However, we discourage the use of grant money for general workshops on evaluation methods. Instead, capacity building should be part of the practice of the evaluation itself; there should be learning-by-doing and apprenticeship of developing country collaborators. ● We particularly encourage support for the training of local post-graduate students, through hands-on participation in evaluation design and analysis.	

(Click here to return to the beginning of this document)

Partners	**For both ADOPTION and IMPACT** ● 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.	
Other Funding Sources	**for both ADOPTION and IMPACT:** If the project is supported with other funds (co-funding), describe how you will use these funds, and how they complement the activities to be funded by ATAI.	
Potential Cost-Effectiveness	**for both ADOPTION and IMPACT** ● What is the expected magnitude of the intervention's impact on welfare, per dollar spent? For example, what increases in profitability or nutrition do you expect to result from the adoption of high-yield varieties, or the consumption of nutrient-fortified grains, respectively? ● How will you measure the cost of the intervention (excluding evaluation costs) per person, household or other targeted unit? Consider those costs accrued by farmers, and those accrued by the implementer.	
Policy Relevance	**ADOPTION** ● Do the results of this evaluation have wider implications? ● How, if at all, will the "lessons learned" have relevance beyond this test case? ● Will the study help policymakers better understand the characteristics or dynamics of certain barriers? ● Will it shed light on strategies to overcome market failures and behavioral constraints more broadly?	**IMPACT** ● Do the results of this evaluation have wider policy implications? ● How will the "lessons learned" have relevance beyond this test case? ● How will the study help policymakers better understand how to improve individual, household, community, and environmental welfare, particularly for marginalized persons and/or geographies.
Scalability	**for both ADOPTION and IMPACT** ● Provide compelling evidence that the scaling partner has capacity to reach large numbers of smallholders. This partner should be headquartered in Africa (and/or South Asia) and should be integrally involved in research planning and take-up of the results. ● Which other implementers are likely to incorporate this intervention into their operations, if proven successful? ● How will other implementers become aware of the results of this evaluation? Outline a detailed dissemination plan that goes beyond the usual presentations and meetings.	

C. "Top Up" Funding on existing ATAI studies: Proposal Guidelines

ATAI invites our research network to apply for a top-up grant focused on strengthening the scope of their existing ATAI-funded research, and/or translating their ATAI-supported research for scale-up. **Proposals should provide clear results from their funded work to date, and should be absolutely clear about what the top up money will allow us to learn.** Proposals will be evaluated not on the merits of the funded work to date, but on the value of the "top up" research proposed and the amount of funds requested. The following outlines examples of eligible "top up" proposal funding requests:

a) Project Extensions: Extensions of evaluations allow us to leverage investments in studies that have already randomized the allocation of interventions. Proposals must justify their extensions with detailed (though perhaps early) results documenting a high-level of technology adoption to adequately detect impacts. Extensions may fund

(Click here to return to the beginning of this document)

i. data collection and analysis to measure yields and/or profits (e.g. incorporating new surveys, satellite data, or other proposed approaches)
ii. the collection of health and nutrition or environmental outcome indicators, household investment and consumption modules, and/or protocols that illuminate the heterogeneity of impacts by gender or soil fertility (e.g. proposals could request funding for soil testing)
iii. additional rounds of follow-up surveys to detect longer-term impacts, or
iv. an expansion of sample size (to provide enough power to estimate impact).

b) Moving toward scale: proposals may outline rigorous evaluation activities that, for example, support the replication of a successfully adopted approach at broader scale, and/or evaluate business models for delivery/scale-up of the innovation;

c) Other: if you have an idea for top-up funding that does not fit the above, you may reach out to atai@povertyactionlab.org to discuss eligibility with ATAI staff. Ultimately, the purpose of proposals for top up funding should be to supplement ATAI-funded research in rigorous ways that enhance their research and/or policy contributions.

Funding per award: Proposals may submit budgets roughly within the range of $20,000 - $400,000. The budget size should accurately reflect the scope of work proposed.

To submit an application for a "top up" proposal, applicants should submit a narrative, **not to exceed three pages**, which includes:

1. a clear research question
2. a robust research design, well-defined research instruments, and sample size estimates
3. a feasible implementation plan,
4. a strong partnership commitment from implementing organizations involved in proposed activities
5. a clear outline of activities that will be conducted to produce research and/or policy outputs and spend funds by the end date, no later than February 2021
6. potential for direct policy impact and/or significant scale-up of research findings

Project Costing Exercise – See the template for Full Research Proposal submissions (Appendix 3).

ATAI grantees are requested to collect and share detailed program cost data. In policy outreach activities, J-PAL and CEGA have found that policymakers often ask how much a program or intervention costs, and collecting detailed cost data allows for cost-effectiveness analysis. While a rigorous cost-effectiveness analysis requires very granular data, J-PAL will provide grantees a basic cost collection template, alongside basic reporting templates, which helps researchers gather the figures for the various cost categories. The template includes a sheet to assist with calculation of a "total program cost," and a sheet to calculate high-level cost figures that are of greatest interest to policymakers, allowing for a very rough, back-of-the-envelope cost-effectiveness calculation. This can assist policymakers when they are choosing how to allocate resources between different programs, or deciding to replicate or scale up a program that has demonstrated to be effective[4].

[4] For more information on comparative cost-effectiveness analysis, see: http://www.povertyactionlab.org/publication/cost-effectiveness. If you have feedback on this exercise, the template, or the underlying rationale, please submit feedback online at:

(Click here to return to the beginning of this document)

The goal of planning for this exercise is to ensure that the research team has plans from the outset to collect costs data for all "ingredients" needed to implement a program or intervention, excluding the costs of evaluating the impact of that program. When planning your cost data collection and approach to cost-effectiveness analysis, you should consider not only the costs of any inputs offered to participants (e.g. seeds, equipment, etc.), but also the costs of facilities and utilities, implementation staff, transport, and any other costs required to conduct the program. You may find it useful to consider the following questions when constructing your plan to collect relevant cost data:

- Are there costs in identifying the participant populations? (*This could include the costs of doing a census, distributing flyers or other marketing materials, or holding information sessions necessary to implement the program.)*
- Are there training costs for program staff implementing the intervention?
- Are there costs borne by participants *(consider opportunity costs, subsidized components of the program, etc.)*
- Are there activities that are reduced in size or discontinued as a result of this intervention being introduced? These might indicate cost savings from this intervention.
- Are there implementation monitoring costs involved, necessary to track progress or ensure compliance with plans to achieve effective implementation?

Project Costing: Proposal Requirements

The ATAI board would like to see the research team's plan for how they will gather, interpret and share program implementation cost data. **For full-scale studies, please provide a half-page appendix with your application that outlines the approach you will take to collecting and reporting costing data for the intervention you are evaluating[5].** Potential questions to consider include:

- Which elements will be considered costs of implementation, and which elements will be considered evaluation costs?[6]
- What types of cost data do you anticipate collecting?
- When during the data collection process would you collect each of these types of data, and how?
- How will you partner with those organizations and staff responsible for implementing the intervention to understand and report the associated costs in these identified categories?
- Report any challenges you anticipate facing in collecting or reporting this data. How would you plan to address these challenges to make the cost-effectiveness analysis exercise most valuable in the context of your research, given the goals of the exercise outlined above?

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1D8BXQm9YTXt34pbkOH9QAF2zbmBuS_ocvGlVOiW9Vd8/viewform.

[5] This appendix will not be counted towards the page limit of the application. The template is provided as Appendix 3 in this document

[6] We acknowledge that it can be a challenge to distinguish implementation costs from evaluation costs, and see the value in making a plan during the proposal phase to identify and address the challenges and potential opportunities for effectively determining the full costs of the program/intervention in question. Please use this section to outline the rationale of your approach to cost-effectiveness analysis.

(Click here to return to the beginning of this document)

Evaluation Criteria

In this round of grantmaking, referees in a two-stage blinded review will score each proposal by the five criteria listed in the table below using a ranking system from *1* (very poor) to *9* (excellent) and will provide a 1-2 sentence justification for each score.

To be funded, the proposal must be practically feasible. Low scores on viability criterion may prevent projects from being funded regardless of scores on other dimensions. Therefore, **above all else, the proposal must score highly on the technical and logistical viability criteria.**

Evaluation Criteria Table

Viability	*Technical*: ● 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)*** ● Will outcomes be measurable within the proposed study period, both overall and for marginalized subgroups? ***(for full-scale studies)*** ● Have the proposal and power calculations convincingly demonstrated a sufficient rate of technology adoption and a large enough sample to detect the impacts to be measured?[7] ***(for IMPACT studies)***
	Logistical: ● Does the proposal address agronomic, logistical, or political obstacles that might threaten completion of the study (for example, government authorization or funding)? ● Is there evidence of capacity development for local researchers and implementers? ● 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? ***(for full-scale studies)*** ● Is there evidence of buy-in (e.g. cost-sharing) from the implementing or scale-up partners? ***(for full-scale studies)***

[7] A fundamental criterion for IMPACT eligibility will be whether the sample size and demonstrated rates of technology adoption (in the study context) are sufficiently large to detect welfare impacts. Researchers should apply for funding only if they can convincingly demonstrate adoption rates that generate the statistical power required to detect both short- ***and*** medium-run development impacts.

(Click here to return to the beginning of this document)

Significance	• **Are the stated problems and proposed solution consistent with ATAI research priorities?** All proposals will be evaluated by their ability to address adoption issues emphasized in the ATAI Review Paper and Emerging Insights evidence synthesis materials. **ADOPTION-specific** • Does the problem statement provide evidence of an important technology adoption gap? • Have the investigators identified plausible barriers and advanced a compelling, novel strategy for overcoming or relaxing these constraints? • Does the study address new questions that are crucial for understanding agricultural technology adoption, in the African context, for poor farmers? **IMPACT-specific** • Does the problem statement provide evidence of an important welfare outcome to be addressed in the study context? • For the technology of interest, has the proposal convincingly argued the evidence gap for the impacts of the technology once adopted? • Does the study address critical policy-relevant questions of how to harness technology for welfare gains, particularly for marginalized persons (e.g. low-income, women, and socially excluded groups) and in the African context? • Has the proposal established a plausible link between the adopted technology and the hypothesized channel for impact?
Appropriate-ness	**ADOPTION-specific** • For the technology of interest, are increases in productivity and profitability validated by scientific evidence? If so, for whom is the technology profitable? • What is the evidence suggesting that the technology and proposed intervention(s) are appropriate for the setting and target population? • Is it clear that the population targeted by the intervention suffers from low levels of adoption? • Is adoption likely to improve the welfare of smallholder farmers and marginalized persons (low-income, women, and socially excluded groups)? If so, why and how? • Does the project adequately address gender roles and intra-household dynamics? • If no specific technology is highlighted, is the adoption strategy appropriate for broad application?
Innovation	• Does the study have promise to make a significant contribution toward development of the evidence base on the impact of agricultural technology adoption, primarily in Sub-Saharan Africa, and specifically for smallholder farmers and marginalized persons? • 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 adoption? • Is there academic relevance?
Scalability	• Is the strategy or intervention cost-effective (i.e. what is the potential impact on welfare per dollar of the intervention, and will this be measured accurately)? • 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?

(Click here to return to the beginning of this document)

Budget Details

It is your responsibility that your budget follows your host institution's policies for costs. As part of your proposal, **you must submit a letter from the institution to receive the award that states 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 "Institution to receive grant funds" field). 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.

Guidelines for completing a proposal budget: Please submit a detailed project budget using the Excel template provided. To reduce processing time, please keep the following in mind when developing your budget:

- If there is co-funding for the project, you must complete both the "Total Project Budget" and "Initiative Budget" sheets in the budget template. If the project has other funders, the proposal should clearly explain the marginal contribution of the requested funds from ATAI.
- **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.
- **Applications must include a brief budget narrative** document detailing the major costs within the budget. For example, travel costs should include a breakdown of how many trips are planned, the estimated cost per trip, etc. If field costs are detailed in the budget template (number of field staff, roles, rates, etc.), they do not need further explanation in the budget narrative.
- Awards are normally paid on a cost-reimbursable basis.

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, ATAI may fund implementation. Proposals requesting funds for implementation are required to explain why the implementer cannot bear the costs.

Direct and Indirect Costs

- Universities in high-income countries (generally defined as the US, Canada, Western Europe, Japan, Korea, Singapore, Australia and New Zealand, Israel, and wealthy Middle Eastern countries) 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.

(Click here to return to the beginning of this document)

- 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.
- Please note that the ATAI Initiative does not cover PI salaries.
- Unallowable costs include those labeled as "incidental," "miscellaneous," or "contingency." Any costs for rent should be explained in the budget narrative.

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. A two-level, blinded peer review process is used by ATAI to assess the quality and appropriateness of all proposals. The first level of review is carried out by a panel of peer researchers in the J-PAL, CEGA, and ATAI networks who do not have a conflict of interest,[8] along with a small number of non-economist subject matter experts working in African agricultural development. The second level of review is carried out by the ATAI Board Members.

During the review process, applicants may be contacted by the ATAI Secretariat, on behalf of referees, for more detailed information on the proposal. Requests for more information can relate to any part of the proposal. If standardized questions are requested of multiple proposals, those questions will be presented to *all* proposals.

Following the two independent levels of review, the ATAI Board holds a meeting to discuss projects, review referee comments, and make final funding decisions. Board 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.

Timeline for Fall 2017: Submission and Notification

Date	Milestone
Tuesday, 5 September 2017	Request for Proposals Sent to Eligible Applicants
Tuesday, 31 October 2017	Pre-Proposal Form Due at https://tinyurl.com/Fall2017ATAI
Tuesday, 19 December 2017	**Proposal Submission Due**
Week of 19 February 2018	Review Process Concludes
Week of 26 February 2018	ATAI Board Meeting and Funding Decisions
Week of 5 March 2018	Decision letters sent to applicants

Award Requirements and Process

If your proposal is accepted for award, the funding will be provided under an award from MIT to your host institution. It is **strongly recommended** that before the announcement of ATAI awards, applicants secure approval from the host institution's Institutional Review Board (IRB) for any human subjects protocol required to implement your project. **MIT requires proof of IRB approval prior to processing any ATAI award that involves Human Subjects.**

[8] Please see ATAI Conflict of Interest Policy, Appendix 4.

(Click here to return to the beginning of this document)

The process MIT follows for processing ATAI awards is as follows:

1. The ATAI Board sends official award notification letter.
2. If not already submitted, you will need to provide formal institutional approval of the proposal and your institutional IRB approval.
3. In certain cases, approval from MIT's IRB will also be required; at a minimum MIT will cede IRB authority to the host Institution. We will assist with these processes.
4. J-PAL informs MIT contracts office of the award.
5. MIT establishes a subaward with your institution.

We aim to complete this process within 60 days of receiving all your 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 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, researchers 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. Grantees are required to submit proof of AEA registration with their three month Start-up Report. Please note that registration is only required for full-scale studies. For questions and support with the registry, please contact Keesler Welch (Keesler@mit.edu).

Annual Progress Reporting, Final Technical and Financial Reports

Grantees should provide brief annual progress narrative report biannual financial reports using templates provided to them by ATAI. If your project is awarded funding from January to June your annual narrative report will be due the first of September each year, if your project is funded from July to December your annual narrative report will be due the first of March each year. Biannual financial reports are due every six months from date the award letter was issued. The date an award letter is issued is considered the date of approval, these reports are required whether or not project activities have been delayed.

MIT requires a final technical report and a final financial report within 60 days of completion of the award period, and a final project report with preliminary results within a maximum of 4 months of completion of the award period. We will send you reminders and instructions about these reports. Upon completion of the project, you are required to submit any survey instruments used.

Implementation Cost Collection (see "Project Costing Exercise" section)

For full-scale studies, researchers are required to collect data on program costs associated with this evaluation, which may be used as an input to J-PAL and CEGA cost-effectiveness analyses (we will, of course, contact you before undertaking such an analysis). We will ask for costs on an annual basis, but only expect fully complete information at the end of the project. Your award includes $1,000 to defray expenses associated with collecting these data. ATAI will provide a costing template to collect this information. If implementing partners' program budgets (i.e. the organizations' costs to implement the

(Click here to return to the beginning of this document)

program or intervention, exclusive of research costs) are already available, please share those with us. As part of the first annual reporting cycle, we do require submission of the above costing template.

Data Publication

Researchers are required to submit data to J-PAL from their ATAI-funded projects within eighteen months of completing data collection. Data will be held by J-PAL under an embargo agreement. Each year thereafter, J-PAL will ask researchers whether the dataset has been made available. If there is no response, J-PAL will keep the embargo. On the fifth year following data collection, the presumption is that J-PAL will share the data. J-PAL will again ask the researcher if the dataset can be made public. If there is no response, the dataset will be made public. In cases in which the researcher requests a further extension, s/he will be asked to submit this request to the ATAI Board Officers for their approval. Further details outlining when a dataset should be published and which data should be published are available in J-PAL's Guidelines for Data Publication, adopted June 2015.

Working Paper "Publication"

Researchers are required to publish a publicly available working paper or other publication from their ATAI funded projects within 24 months of completing field work. This should be coordinated with the above data publication timeline and requirements, and ATAI will similarly request a link to the posted working paper on this timeline. If this information is not forthcoming, grantees will be required to provide a written justification.

Applicants are encouraged to budget for these grant conditions at the outset.

(Click here to return to the beginning of this document)

Application Instructions

Carefully review the *Proposal Application Guidelines* in this document. Each proposal should follow the instructions for either a Pilot Study, a Full-scale Adoption Study, a Full-Scale Impact Study, or a "Top Up" proposal. 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 ATAI Secretariat.

1. **Pre-Proposal Form:** Submit the form at https://tinyurl.com/Fall2017ATAI by Tuesday, October 31. This should take less than five to ten minutes to complete, signaling your intent to submit.
2. **Cover Sheet** (see Appendix 1): This document must be completed in its entirety;
3. **Proposal Abstract:** In 3-5 sentences, describe your research question and the context of your evaluation. This will be added to ATAI's website if the project receives funding. The abstract should include (i) the technology in question, (ii) the intervention used to encourage adoption (if relevant), and (iii) for impact studies, a description of the source or evidence of sufficient adoption of this technology to demonstrate sufficient power.
4. **Proposal Narrative**: This document
    a. ***must* not exceed five pages** in length (must not exceed 3 pages for "Top Up" proposals)
    b. ***must* address all of the items discussed in the relevant Proposal Application Guidelines, above** (either Pilot, Full-Scale Adoption Study, Full-scale Impact Study, or "Top Up")
    c. should be written in Calibri font, Size 11 and may be single spaced;
    d. should be saved as a single Word file including both the cover letter and proposal narrative, with the title: [PI Last Name, First Name] [Topic Name].doc(x).
5. **Proposal Budget** (see Appendix 2): This excel template must be completed in its entirety using the and saved as a single Excel file with the title: [PI Last Name, First Name][Budget].xls(x);
6. **Budget Narrative:** details the major costs within the budget. For example, travel costs should include a breakdown of how many trips are planned, the estimated cost per trip, etc. If field costs are detailed in the budget template (number of field staff, roles, rates, etc.), they do not need further explanation in the budget narrative.
7. **Project Costing Exercise (see Appendix 3): For Full-Scale Adoption and Impact studies,** you must include approximately a half page that outlines the proposed approach to collecting and reporting costing data for the intervention you are evaluating (*see guidelines, above*).
8. **Letter(s) of Support**: Please obtain a letter of support from the following, each saved as a single PDF file with the title [PI Last Name, First Name] [Name of Organization Letter of Support].pdf:
    a. a letter/document stating the host institution's approval of the proposal materials.
    b. letters from each implementing partner, indicating the details of their commitment to partner on the research, and (for full-scale studies,) their willingness to share relevant program cost data. Consider including letter(s) from any potential scale-up partner(s).
    c. Graduate students applying for pilot funding are required to include a letter of support from a researcher adviser eligible for this call (see the cover page of this document). The letter should indicate the adviser's willingness to remain involved in a supervisory role throughout the lifetime of the project.
9. **Submit an email** with all of the above attachments to the ATAI Secretariat at atai@povertyactionlab.org with the subject line: ATAI Fall 2017 Proposal: PI Last Name, First Name

Deadline for proposal submission:
5pm U.S. Pacific time, Tuesday, December 19, 2017

(Click here to return to the beginning of this document)

Appendix 1: ATAI Proposal Cover Sheet: Fall 2017

This is an application for a (check *one* of the four boxes):

☐ Pilot Study, ☐ Full-Scale Adoption Study, ☐ Full-Scale Impact Study, OR

This is a "Top Up" application extending an ATAI, or other J-PAL or CEGA award ☐ If yes:

Confirm Initiative/Funding Source (e.g. ATAI): _____

Funded Project Name: _____

Grant Award Start Date: _____ **Current Grant Period End Date: _____**

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR and INSTITUTIONAL AFFILIATION	**CONTACT (Email, Phone)**
CO-INVESTIGATOR(S) and INSTITUTIONAL AFFILIATION(S)	**CONTACT (Email, Phone)**
By checking the box at right, all J-PAL affiliates and initiative special invitees who are co-PIs on this project certify that they will be active, engaged and responsive PIs on this project dedicated to guaranteeing the quality control on all aspects of this research; and that their participation in this project is not merely to provide access to J-PAL resources and funding to anyone else working on this project who is neither a J-PAL affiliate, nor an initiative special invitee.	☐

TITLE OF PROPOSAL	**COUNTRY (*and State if in India*)**

PARTNER(S) ***(list any additional in Appendix)***	**CONTACT (Name, Email, Phone)**
CO-FUNDER(S) ***(list additional in Appendix)***	**FUNDED AWARD (PI, Project Title, Amount)**

Have you submitted this or a related proposal to **any previous ATAI round of funding?**	Have you submitted this or a related proposal to **any other J-PAL or CEGA research initiative?**
☐ Yes If yes, when? ☐ No	☐ Yes If yes, which initiative and when? ☐ No

ATAI FUNDING REQUEST			
REQUESTED	**$**	**TOTAL CO-FUNDED**	**$**
GRANT PERIOD START DATE: (yyyy-mm-dd)	*(earliest is 2018-05-01)*	**GRANT PERIOD END DATE:** (yyyy-mm-dd)	*(latest is 2021-02-28)*
INSTITUTION TO RECEIVE AWARD*		**CONTACT FOR CONTRACTING ISSUES (Name, Email)**	

(Click here to return to the beginning of this document)

Appendix 2: ATAI Proposal Budget (see Excel templates at the RFP release page)

Appendix 3: Project Costing Exercise – for Full-Scale Adoption and Impact Proposals

The ATAI board would like to see the research team's plan for how they will gather, interpret and share program implementation cost data. **Please provide a half-page appendix with your application that outlines the approach you will take to collecting and reporting costing data for the intervention you are evaluating[9].** For more information on the content guidelines for this section, please see the Project Costing Exercise section of the RFP. Potential questions to consider include:

- Which elements will be considered costs of implementation, and which elements will be considered evaluation costs?[10]
- What types of cost data do you anticipate collecting?
- When in the data collection process would you collect each of these types of data, and how?
- How will you partner with those organizations and staff responsible for implementing the intervention to understand and report the associated costs in these identified categories?
- Report any challenges you anticipate facing in collecting or reporting this data. How would you plan to address these challenges to make the cost-effectiveness analysis exercise most valuable in the context of your research, given the goals of the exercise outlined above?

[9] This appendix will not be counted towards the page limit of the application

[10] We acknowledge that it can be a challenge to distinguish implementation costs from evaluation costs, and see the value in making a plan during the proposal phase to identify and address the challenges and potential opportunities for effectively determining the full costs of the program/intervention in question. Please use this section to outline the rationale of your approach to cost-effectiveness analysis.

(Click here to return to the beginning of this document)

Appendix 4: ATAI Conflict of Interest Policy

A two-level, blinded peer review process is used by ATAI to assess the quality and appropriateness of all proposals. The first level of review is carried out by a panel of peer researchers in the J-PAL, CEGA, and ATAI networks. The second level of review is carried out by the ATAI Board Members. The ATAI Board comprises nine individuals from the J-PAL and CEGA networks with additional representation from external institutions. Board members have responsibility for the overall strategic direction of ATAI, to monitor projects' progress, and to select proposals for funding.

Peer Referees and Non-Officer Board Members

1. No individual named on a proposal application may serve as a peer or Board referee in the round in which his or her proposal is being reviewed.

2. No spouse, partner, or immediate family member of any individual named on a proposal application may serve as a peer or Board referee in the round in which the applicant's proposal is being reviewed.

3. Board members with a disqualifying conflict of interest may attend only the portion of the Board meeting that does *not* concern the ATAI grant-making process.

4. To replace Board members who have a conflict of interest, the ATAI Secretariat will recruit a number of auxiliary Board members, equivalent to the number of Board members with a conflict of interest, from the network of eligible ATAI applicants to score, discuss, and vote on proposals.

Current and Former Board Officers

At any given time, ATAI appoints three Board members to serve as "Officers," providing week-to-week oversight of the initiative. These individuals provide continuity and institutional knowledge for the program. Each Officer serves a renewable term of two years. In 2017, there are five current or former Board Officers. All of the above policies apply to this group, except when *fewer than two* of these five individuals are eligible to participate as referees (due to a conflict of interest under the policies stated above). In this case *only*, the following policy applies to individuals in this group:

1. When less than two current or former Board Officers are eligible to participate in scoring/discussing/and voting on proposals as all others are recused due to conflicts, the "least-conflicted" past or present Officer will be recruited to score, discuss, and vote on proposals. Least-conflicted is defined as the applicant with the lowest dollar amount requested.

2. When all current or former Board Officers are conflicted out, the two least-conflicted will be recruited to score, discuss, and vote on proposals.

3. If a conflicted current or former Board Officer is selected as a referee, the individual in question must recuse him/herself from review, discussion, and voting of the conflicted proposal(s).

General

1. Non-donor, non-partner academics must comprise a simple majority of the Board referees.

2. For the purpose of managing conflict of interest, ATAI proposals designed to study technology "***adoption***" will be considered under a separate review from those designed to study the "***impact***" of technologies adopted. The Conflict of Interest Policy will apply **separately** to each of these two reviews.

(Click here to return to the beginning of this document)