

**Questions and Answers**  
**Evidence-Based Prevention and Response to Gender-Based Violence**  
**INL/KM Funding Opportunity DFOP0010778**  
**May 13, 2024**

**Question 1:**

The NOFO lists priority countries, will applicants who propose work in any of these countries be given additional points over those who propose work in a country not on the priority list?

**INL Response:**

These are countries INL works with that have been identified as potential partners. The focus for the project is to implement the proposed intervention in one country, either listed in the NOFO or another suggested by the applicant.

**Question 2:**

Would INL be willing to extend the project duration time beyond the listed 24 to 30 months implementation length to maybe three or three and ½ years? In our experience that is the period where you start showing effects of the implementation.

**INL Response:**

If your application is selected, then that will be discussed internally between the Grants Officer and the Program Officer.

**Question 3:**

Do you need a partner organization in the country of choice, and can the partner organization be an advocacy group, not necessarily law enforcement?

**INL Response:**

Applicants are strongly encouraged to collaborate with an organization that complements their core skill set, with one organization taking the lead on project implementation and the other taking the lead on project evaluation to ensure objective analysis at a high level of scientific rigor. That does not need to be an organization in the host country.

**Question 4:**

Is there interest or expectations of a specific type of evaluation, for example, like experimental or nonexperimental, semi experimental or process evaluation? And is there any preference for a type of data and also for a type of data collection, meaning like field data or administrative data?

**INL Response:**

INL is open to proposals that include a range of impact evaluation types. INL is open to experimental, quasi-experimental, and non-experimental with a preference given to evaluations that can generate the rigorous empirical evidence on the effectiveness of the proposed intervention(s). However, proposals are judged as a whole based on the technical evaluation criteria listed in the NOFO. Regardless of impact evaluation type, proposals should clearly outline the evaluation plan in detail as directed in the NOFO.

**Question 5:**

Can you list the countries from the NOFO?

**INL Response:**

Priority Region/Countries are global, with one focus country. Possible countries include but are not limited to: Armenia, Georgia, Guatemala, Kosovo, Liberia, Mongolia, Morocco, Pakistan, and Panama.

**Question 6:**

As the general public is the target audience for the deliverable, is translation of the deliverable into multiple languages required or recommended for use in other countries outside of the target country identified?

**INL Response:**

No, you will not need to translate the deliverable into multiple languages.

**Question 7:**

Are there criteria that would potentially disqualify a country from funding consideration?

**INL Response:**

INL is able to work with the following countries for this project including:

|                                  |                          |                              |                        |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|
| Albania                          | Central African Republic | Georgia                      | Montenegro             |
| Algeria                          | Chad                     | Ghana                        | Morocco                |
| Angola                           | Colombia                 | Grenada                      | Mozambique             |
| Argentina                        | Comoros                  | Guatemala                    | Namibia                |
| Armenia                          | Congo (Brazzaville)      | Guinea-Bissau                | Nepal                  |
| Bangladesh                       | Congo (Kinshasa)         | Madagascar                   | Nigeria                |
| Belize                           | Costa Rica               | Malawi                       | Pakistan               |
| Benin                            | Côte d'Ivoire            | Malaysia                     | Palau                  |
| Bhutan                           | Djibouti                 | Maldives                     | Papua New Guinea<br>*+ |
| Bolivia                          | Dominica                 | Marshall Islands             | Paraguay               |
| Bosnia and Herzegovina           | Dominican Republic       | Mauritania                   | Peru                   |
| Botswana                         | Ecuador                  | Mauritius                    | Philippines            |
| Brazil                           | Egypt                    | Mexico                       | Rwanda                 |
| Bulgaria                         | El Salvador              | Micronesia, Federated States | Saint Lucia            |
| Cabo Verde                       | Equatorial Guinea        | Moldova                      |                        |
| Cameroon                         | Fiji                     | Mongolia                     |                        |
| Saint Vincent and the Grenadines | Turkmenistan             |                              |                        |
| Samoa                            | Tuvalu                   |                              |                        |
| Sao Tome and Principe            | Uganda                   |                              |                        |

|                 |            |  |  |
|-----------------|------------|--|--|
| Senegal         | Ukraine    |  |  |
| Serbia          | Uruguay    |  |  |
| Sierra Leone    | Uzbekistan |  |  |
| Solomon Islands | Vanuatu    |  |  |
| South Africa    | Vietnam    |  |  |
| Suriname        | Zambia     |  |  |
| Swaziland       |            |  |  |
| Tajikistan      |            |  |  |
| Tanzania        |            |  |  |
| Thailand        |            |  |  |
| Timor-Leste     |            |  |  |
| Togo            |            |  |  |
| Tonga           |            |  |  |
| Tunisia         |            |  |  |
| Turkey          |            |  |  |

#### Question 8:

The overview section of the NOFO says that proposals should entail “design and implementation of one or more proposed interventions,” while the project vision is to “create or expand an intervention.” Can you please clarify if proposed interventions must be new?

#### INL Response:

Applicants are encouraged to identify new or existing GBV interventions to improve law enforcement responses to gender-based violence that are understood within the professional criminal justice community and/or have been demonstrated through academic

research, data, and evidence to have promising impact on gender-based violence prevention and response. For example, proposed interventions may include but are not limited to 1) existing interventions that have been deployed in developing contexts but for which strong evidence on effectiveness does not exist, 2) existing interventions that are supported by evidence in developed contexts but have not been empirically tested in developing contexts, 3) promising or piloted interventions with strong local evidence but minimal evidence on the scalability of the intervention, and 4) new interventions.

Proposals should describe the proposed intervention(s) and provide a literature review about where each proposed intervention has been attempted, findings about success or failure, and unanswered questions. Proposals should also describe in detail how the intervention type will be designed, adapted, and implemented in the proposed location(s).

#### Question 9:

According to the best practices and lessons learned guide (knowledge management products) do applicants need to include a workshop design to identify them according to criteria at this stage of the proposal design. Since I understand it is about to identify lessons learned and best practices of project implementation for escalation purposes. Do we need to specify a workshop to identify these lessons learned and best practices at this point of the proposal?

#### INL Response:

It is not necessary to include a workshop design activity in the proposal, but applicants are welcome to propose any activities that they envision undertaking to produce the best practices guide deliverable. Activities may include key informant interviews, workshops, or quantitative or qualitative analyses that aim to 1) identify factors that enabled or undermined successful project outcomes or 2) provide insight on the generalizability of the intervention(s) to different legal frameworks and social, political, and cultural contexts. Applicants do not need to specify the expected best practices or lessons learned in proposals.

#### Question 10:

Will the proposals including two or more countries be given a higher evaluation or is preferred over those proposals that only include one country?

#### INL Response:

**The focus for the project is to implement the proposed intervention in one country, either listed in the NOFO or another suggested by the applicant. INL identified countries that might be interested in this project, but applicants are not limited to these countries.**

**Question 11:**

**The focus for the project is to implement the proposed intervention in one of those countries you mentioned only?**

**INL Response:**

**The focus for the project is to implement the proposed intervention in one country, either listed in the NOFO or another suggested by the applicant. INL identified countries that might be interested in this project, but applicants are not limited to these countries.**

**Question 12:**

**With only one award to be made, how likely is it that you would consider an intervention in a country that isn't listed? Are there specific characteristics you are looking for in a country of focus? For instance, would Canada be considered if the intervention could be implemented more broadly?**

**INL Response:**

**The focus for the project is to implement the proposed intervention in one country, either listed in the NOFO or another suggested by the applicant. INL identified countries that might be interested in this project, but applicants are not limited to these countries. Please review the criteria in the NOFO and ensure that you are addressing the 1st and 2nd aspects of the project. Applicants are strongly encouraged to collaborate with an organization that complements their core skill set, with one organization taking the lead on project implementation and the other taking the lead on project evaluation to ensure objective analysis at a high level of scientific rigor. Canada is not a country with INL programming.**

**Question 13:**

**The NOFO notes that a risk analysis should be included as part of the proposal narrative on page 11. On page 12, it lists "Project Risk Analysis" as a separate document that should be submitted using INL's template. Can you kindly clarify if there is a difference between the risk analysis that should be included in the proposal narrative and the project risk analysis mentioned on page 12?**

**INL Response:**

There are two different documents, so you have to provide both. The risk analysis included in the proposal narrative is more focused on implementation risks of the intervention itself, and that is not captured in the standard template. The NOFO provides guidance on the larger standalone template, but for the narrative piece, there is a little more guidance about what to focus on, though they may overlap.

**Question 14:**

Is the performance monitoring plan for appendix A focused on monitoring the implementation, or is it related to the impact assessment?

**INL Response:**

There are two components of the project performance monitoring plan- the INL Change Map and Performance Indicator Reference Sheet (PIRS). The Change Map serves to document in very specific terms the results a project is trying to achieve (i.e., goals and objectives), key implementation steps needed to achieve the results (i.e., activities), and indicators to monitor progress (both for implementation and results). The PIRS collects additional information on indicators including definitions, disaggregations, targets, and data collection strategies. Due to the unique nature of this NOFO, applicants are encouraged to include intervention outcomes from the impact evaluation proposal and intervention implementation steps in the Change Map. The Change Map is focused on both the implementation and outcome of the intervention(s) and will allow INL to track and monitor the progress of the project. The impact assessment is focused strictly on the outcome of the intervention(s).

**Question 15:**

Ideally there would be one organization that focuses more on the evaluation side and another that focuses a bit more on the actual implementation of activities. Is the idea that the evaluation organization is also involved in the monitoring so they could capture some of like the changes in knowledge skills. Just thinking whether I am getting too involved in the implementation part or working too closely with the monitoring or the project team.

**INL Response:**

If the proposal includes a subcontract for evaluation activities, the level of cooperation between the implementing and evaluating organizations may vary by impact evaluation

type. For rigorous impact evaluations, close cooperation and coordination between the implementing and evaluating organizations is critical during design, implementation, and data collection stages of the project. Close cooperation is necessary in order to ensure the sequencing of project implementation, sample of participants, and data collection is consistent with the impact evaluation's estimation strategy. For quasi-experimental and non-experimental impact evaluation, the level of cooperation between implementing and evaluating organizations may differ and require lower levels of cooperation and coordination.

**Question 16:**

Many of the countries listed in the NOFO have existing justice-focused or survivor-supporting GBV programs. To ensure the evaluation of the proposed intervention is attributable just to INL programming under this activity, does INL have a preferred approach to evaluating impact of programming in a country with many activities in the sector?

**INL Response:**

If a country has existing GBV programs, proposals should outline a deconfliction plan to ensure the impact evaluation is able to generate high-quality evidence on intervention effectiveness. Rigorous impact evaluations are best suited to address noted concerns related to attributable impact with a well-designed estimation strategy that introduce randomization. Proposals may also take into account the subnational location of interventions and target populations to try to deconflict with other programming.

**Question 17:**

Are we eligible to participate in this proposal even though we are a for-profit organization with a social purpose. We've been told that as long as we are subject to section 501(c)(3) of the U.S. tax code or section 26 US 115 of the U.S. tax code, we could participate. We would not be the main supplier, but rather a subcontractor working to support another organization. In this case, is it possible for us to participate, or does this situation make us ineligible to participate as subcontractors?

**INL Response:**

Yes, for-profit organizations are eligible to participate as a sub-contractor.

**Question 18:**

**Please clarify if implementers who work primarily with survivors of GBV (as opposed to primarily with law enforcement) qualify for this opportunity, and how their experience will be evaluated by the technical evaluation committee.**

**INL Response:**

**Implementers who work primarily with survivors of GBV qualify for this opportunity. The technical evaluation committee will use the criteria outlined in the NOFO to evaluate all applications.**