

Questions and Answers for
Reducing Unnecessary and Prolonged Pretrial Detention
Roundtable Discussion
INL/KM SFOP0009532
Date: May 5, 2023

Question 1:

What is INL looking for in the partner organization and how do we go about choosing a partner for the evaluation side?

INL Response:

INL is looking for organizations or academic researchers who have a track record of evaluation with experimental methods and interventions in legal systems. It is important to work with the partner organization on the design of the intervention and on how the intervention is implemented.

Question 2:

Is INL open to proposals that focus on a particular demographic group or specific demographic populations? For example, like focusing on women and women 's prisons as opposed to the general prison system.

INL Response:

One of the goals is to generalize and replicate these pilot programs to other countries, but we defer to the applicant when it comes to gathering data with respect to members of marginalized communities. There may be some considerations with respect to “do no harm”, so INL would be interested in hearing from the applicant about any safeguards in in that regard.

Question 3:

Are you able to share existing information on the extent of the problem across different countries or focus countries as we prepare our proposals? Are there specifics in terms of the regions that need to be piloted or are we at liberty to select how many regions or cities to pilot an intervention?

INL Response:

INL will not provide existing or additional information on a particular country or region. Applicants should propose one or two countries and specify why they would be best suited for making an impact on pretrial detention, with relevant background analysis.

Question 4:

There is a risk analysis noted as a piece under the proposal narrative and then there is also a separate project risk analysis document as part of the bigger package. What is the difference between the two?

INL Response:

INL is requesting two documents related to risk assessments. One highlights organizational risks and safeguards, and the other one in the narrative is focused on risks identified during implementation (e.g. risks involving members of marginalized communities). The applicant should demonstrate that it has constructed its approach with “do no harm” principles in mind.

Question 5:

Is there a preference to proposing one or two locations with respect to the scale and depth of interventions?

INL Response:

No, there is no preference. It will vary among the applications. INL defers to the applicants whether multiple locations or a deeper, country-specific focus are the better option.

Question 6:

Would you prefer a traditional academic literature review or incorporate citations as we talk about the background and then also about the scope of the literature review? Should we look at evidence that supports the proposed interventions that we're looking at or go more broadly and do an overall review on pretrial detention?

INL Response:

It is useful to have citations. General preference is to have the literature review focused on interventions. Literature that demonstrates how successful interventions can be contextualized in another country is important.

Question 7:

You started off by saying there are three overarching goals of this project. I only see two written in the NOFO and so I was wondering if you could just repeat or confirm again. Can you reiterate the 3 goals?

INL Response:

- Intervening in 1-2 pilot countries to prevent misuse of pretrial detention
- Testing the effectiveness of intervention at a very rigorous level
- Generating data, evidence, and guidance of best practices to replicate

Question 8:

What kind of evidence should we attach to the application to demonstrate that the organization has talked with state institutions about implementing the intervention?

INL Response:

There is no requirement in NOFO for this currently, although it is useful to have support of state institutions generally. If an applicant is proposing to work with the host government on a particular issue or a particular intervention, then demonstrating an ability to partner with them is important.

Question 9:

Page 9 of the NOFO states that applicants are only allowed to submit one proposal per organization. Can INL please confirm whether the same organization can join more than one consortium? In addition, can a prime applicant join another consortium as a sub partner?

INL Response:

Organizations can only submit one (1) proposal as the prime applicant. The prime applicant can join another consortium as a sub-partner. The same organization cannot join more than one consortium.

Question 10:

Could INL please confirm that the unit of analysis for the impact evaluation should be the individual pretrial detainee?

INL Response:

Individual pre-trial detainee is the unit of analysis that we had in mind when drafting the NOFO given its focus on DEIA and requirement for a rigorous evaluation. The individual level is the unit of analysis most utilized in empirical research on pre-trial detention that we reviewed and is also

aligned with the primary and secondary outcomes of interest specified in the NOFO. The unit of analysis may vary for certain types of interventions if it allows for a rigorous evaluation strategy (experimental, quasi-experimental, etc.) that can measure treatment effects for different types of groups, specifically marginalized groups. However, given the level of funding available for the project, it might be challenging or not possible to randomize over higher units of analysis. The project does require data collection data at higher units of analysis for the descriptive analysis report.

Question 11:

Can INL please clarify whether the section “Proposed Intervention” should include a description of all project activities, including the proposed intervention that will be tested, or only a description of the proposed intervention?

INL Response:

The NOFO states under Proposal Narrative / Proposed Intervention on page 10: “Describe the intervention(s) you propose and provide a literature review about where each proposed intervention has been attempted, findings about success or failure, and unanswered questions. Include a description of the theory of change: what are the expected results, and how do the activities lead to the expected results? (10-page limit)”

Question 12:

Can INL please provide more details about the literature review required as part of the Proposed Interventions section? Should applicants only focus on research evidence that supports the effectiveness of the proposed intervention or should they provide a broad, traditional academic literature review on the reduction of pretrial detention?

Is there a preferred format?

Could INL provide a recommended number of sources for the review?

INL Response:

- INL’s preferred focus is on research evidence for the proposed intervention.
- We do not need a broad literature review on reducing pretrial detention unless a broader introductory review is required to place into context on why the applicant is choosing a specific intervention as part of the project.
- Generally, the literature review in this application should clearly demonstrate that the intervention or interventions proposed are evidence-based and supported by peer-reviewed empirical research or high-quality evaluations of implemented interventions.

- In addition, it would be helpful if applicants briefly describe the insights from the literature on the adaptation of interventions across contexts. This section would make clear how the applicant would apply evidence-based insights on how to adapt an intervention successfully implemented in one context to a new context.
- Defer to the applicant but the number of sources would be based on the quality, contextual application of the interventions, and the rigor of the study.

Question 13:

Is the Risk Analysis required as part of the Proposal Narrative distinct from the Risk Analysis attachment? Would INL consider removing the Risk Analysis section from the Proposal Narrative to avoid duplication?

INL Response:

Q: Is the Risk Analysis required as part of the Proposal Narrative distinct from the Risk Analysis attachment?

A: Yes

Q: Would INL consider removing the Risk Analysis section from the Proposal Narrative to avoid duplication?

A: No

Explanation: The standard risk analysis based on the template tends to highlight organizational risks and safeguards, whereas the risk analysis requested as part of the narrative is focused on risks that may arise during implementation of the proposed intervention, including any risk towards marginalized groups. INL would like the applicant to demonstrate that it has constructed its approach with Do No Harm principles in mind.

Question 14:

Can INL please confirm that the current total page limit for the Proposal Narrative is 23.5 pages? Would INL consider increasing the page limit for the “Future Funding/Sustainability” section so the total limit is an even number?

INL Response:

The Future Funding/Sustainability section will be extended to a one-page limit. The total page limit for Proposal Narrative section is now 24 pages. The new page limit is now reflected in the revised NOFO posted on Grants.gov.

Question 15:

Given that this project is an impact evaluation with a required General Evaluation Plan section in the Proposal Narrative, would INL consider waiving the requirement to submit the Performance Monitoring Plan attachment and allow the successful applicant to finalize this document during Activity 1?

If not, could INL please clarify whether applicant should submit an Illustrative Performance Indicator Reference Sheet for a project indicator (e.g. number of detainees receiving pretrial services) or an evaluation indicator (e.g. % of detainees in the treatment group whose detention was XX days or less)?

INL Response:

Per the NOFO, these documents are required documents for INL grant proposals. INL cannot waive the requirements as stated in the NOFO as these are standard for all submissions. Applicants are welcome to include goals, objectives, activities, and illustrative indicators from the proposal narrative in the Change Map and Performance Indicator Reference Sheet (PIRS) if they see fit. Also, it is important to note that the Performance Monitoring Plan is intended to focus on monitoring of project activities as well as evaluation.

The PIRS can capture both monitoring and evaluation indicators based on the goals, objectives, activities in the Change Map. The purpose of the PIRS is to further elaborate on how indicators from the Change Map will be collected and reported.

Question 16:

Would INL consider extending the deadline so that applicants have additional time to incorporate information shared in the Q&A and online discussion session into their proposals?

INL Response:

The Deadline for submission of applications has been revised to **Friday, May 26, 2023, 11:59 PM** EST via Grants.gov. This is a one-time exception. The new date is now reflected in the revised NOFO posted on Grants.gov.

Question 17:

Should the focus be on the general jail population, or more on women, ethnic minorities, and other marginalized groups?

INL is open to any proposals that can successfully accomplish all of the goals identified in the solicitation. One of the goals is to conduct interventions that reduce the overuse and misuse of pretrial detention, including against members of marginalized communities. Another goal is to

help INL, and other assistance providers generalize, scale, and adapt these pilot interventions at the national level and/or in other countries which may have different social and cultural contexts. We defer to the applicant when it comes to gathering data with respect to members of marginalized communities. There may be some considerations with respect to “do no harm”, so INL would be interested in hearing from the applicant about any safeguards in in that regard.

Question 18:

Can we include a sub-grant for an organization that is not officially registered yet in the local jurisdiction? It is in the process of registering as a non-governmental organization and may not be official by the time a proposal is submitted.

Applicants can include an organization that is not officially registered in their local jurisdiction, but no federal funds can be transferred until the proposed sub-grantee has completed their registration in the local jurisdiction and they have obtained a UEI (Unique Entity Identifier) as required in the 2 CFR 200.332.

Question 19:

Please confirm whether activities three and four listed in the NOFO are meant to run consecutively or concurrently. It states the collection of outcomes data is to occur for an additional 12 months after the implementation of the intervention. In order to understand the effect on the individuals who are going through the justice system that we're evaluating; we need some time to see it have effect.

The initial project implementation length is 24- 30 months. Activity 3 refers to the implementation of the pretrial detention intervention(s) and has a 12-to-15-month timeline. Activity 4 refers to the collection of monitoring and impact evaluation data and has a 12-month timeline. The collection of monitoring and evaluation data should begin concurrently with Activity 3 and proceed for a period of up to 12 months after the implementation of the intervention(s) ends. In total, Activity 4 can span 24-27 months if started concurrently with Activity 3. Applications should specify the timing of pre- and post-treatment data collection in their evaluation plans. Applications are also welcome to specify multiple post-treatment measurement points, if they see fit, as well as feasible strategies to measure sustainability outside of this proposed timeline.

Question 20:

The NOFO has goals and activities and no objectives, but the change map requires objectives. Should we fill out the change map without objectives according to the activities as they were presented in the NOFO? Or should we put those into an objective structure?

Applicants are responsible for defining goals, objectives, and activities in the Change Map for their proposed intervention(s). Applicants are expected to adapt and expand on the general

goals presented in the NOFO based on the specifics of their proposed intervention(s) and link them with indicators specified in their evaluation plan. Goals, objectives, and activities should focus on efforts to understand how prolonged pre-trial detention impacts marginalized communities and the proposed intervention(s) to reduce pre-trial detention. Change and Clarity standards for goals and objectives are presented in the “Design Work Aid” Appendix of the Change Map.

Question 21:

INL requires a rigorous evaluation and then in parentheses it says experimental and quasi experimental. Will you accept other types of methodologies that would be considered rigorous, but that maybe are not experimental or quasi experimental?

We will accept and consider other types of impact evaluations that do not include experimental or quasi-experimental methods. Applications will be evaluated comprehensively based on the technical criteria specified in the NOFO. Evaluation plans are required to specify the estimation strategy as well as data collection sources and processes. Applicants are encouraged to incorporate impact evaluation and data collection into the design and roll out of the proposed intervention(s).

Question 22:

A critical part of this project is a monitoring and evaluation of the intervention. In terms of the performance monitoring plan of the overall project, what should the performance monitoring plan include, since one of the elements of the project is actually monitoring and evaluation of the intervention?

Proposals require a general evaluation plan as part of the proposal narrative as well as a performance monitoring plan, which is comprised of a Change Map and Performance Indicator Reference Sheet (PIRS). As stated in the NOFO, the evaluation plan should focus on the impact evaluation strategy, key outcomes of interest, data sources, and estimation strategy. The Change Map captures the goals, objectives, activities, and indicators associated with the proposed intervention and evaluation plan, and the PIRS elaborates on how indicators will be collected and reported. Applicants are encouraged to include goals, objectives, activities, and indicators from the proposal narrative and general evaluation plan in the Change Map and PIRS. Project management activities that monitor implementation progress can be specified in the Timeline as a written schedule or GANTT chart.