



Peace & Recovery Initiative

Call for Proposals

October 2025

Acknowledgments

Thank you to UK International Development for funding the Governance, Crime, and Conflict Initiative, a partnership between Innovations for Poverty Action and the Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty Action Lab of which the Peace & Recovery Initiative is a part. Thank you as well to all of the practitioners from organizations working to support conflict- and violence-affected populations, researchers, donors, policymakers, and IPA staff who provided input into our research and learning priorities.

Disclaimer

Funding for this Call for Proposals is made possible by UK International Development through the Governance, Crime, and Conflict Initiative, managed by Innovations for Poverty Action and the Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty Action Lab. The enclosed information does not necessarily reflect the opinions of the UK Government.

Photo

Glenna Gordon for IPA, [Community meeting in Sierra Leone](#), 2011.

Copyright

Copyright 2025 Innovations for Poverty Action. This publication is available as a PDF on the Innovations for Poverty Action website under a Creative Commons license that allows copying and distributing the publication, only in its entirety, as long as it is attributed to Innovations for Poverty Action and used for noncommercial educational or public policy purposes. Photographs may not be used separately from the publication.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments	2
Disclaimer	2
Photo	2
Copyright	2
Table of Contents	3
I. Overview	1
II. Motivation & Background	1
III. Scope	2
IV. Research and Learning Priorities	4
Research Areas	5
Understanding and preventing individual-level participation in violence	5
Understanding, combating, and reintegrating non-state armed groups	5
Reducing prejudice and building horizontal social cohesion	6
Strengthening household and community resilience	7
Building institutions, resolving disputes, and delivering justice	7
Addressing root causes and preventing future crises	8
Measurement and Design	9
V. Project Types	10
VI. Achieving Impact	12
VII. Funding Criteria	12
Evaluation Criteria	12
Additional Considerations	13
Researcher Qualifications	14
VIII. Timeline and Application Process	14
Dates for Round X	14
Off-cycle Proposals	14
Application Instructions	14
IX. Related Initiatives	15
X. Contact	16
XI. About IPA	16
Annex: Research Resources	17
Literature Reviews and Reports	17
Research Implementation Resources	18
Ethics Resources	19

I. Overview

By 2030, it is estimated that two-thirds of the world's population living in extreme poverty will reside in states affected by fragility, conflict, and violence, yet rigorous evidence on how to build peace and stability in conflict- and crisis-affected contexts is still limited. In response, Innovations for Poverty Action (IPA) is actively working to fill these evidence gaps. Through the Peace & Recovery Initiative (PRI), supported by UK International Development, IPA aims to improve outcomes for conflict- and crisis-affected populations by building the evidence base on reducing violence and fragility, promoting peace, and preventing, managing, and recovering from crises.

This document covers the aims, research and learning priorities, and types of research funded by PRI through these calls. The fund supports generalizable, rigorous impact evaluations and related research, as well as bolsters the infrastructure available for research. PRI prioritizes studies that develop, illustrate, or test fundamental theories of peace, violence, and recovery, especially ones that are highly policy-relevant, challenge common beliefs, pioneer innovative interventions, and produce evidence where little currently exists.

PRI's tenth call for proposals is now open. PRI accepts proposals for rigorous impact evaluations, pilots, exploratory studies, infrastructure, and public goods projects, and evidence use and policy outreach support. More information on our research priorities and project types can be found in sections IV and V, below. **Mandatory expressions of interest are due November 14, 2025 and proposals are due January 16, 2026.**

II. Motivation & Background

Since IPA's Peace & Recovery Initiative was launched in 2017, the [displaced population globally](#) has nearly doubled due to violence and conflict, [yearly deaths in armed conflict](#) have risen significantly, and the number of [state-based conflicts](#) is now at its highest since 1946. During this time, policy dialogue has increasingly recognized that more resources must go towards preventing conflicts and humanitarian crises, as demonstrated by the popularization of the Humanitarian-Development- Peace Nexus, or the “triple nexus,” as a concept. That said, funding for “peace” is [vastly outpaced by need](#), indicating that the promise of prevention is far from realized.

While the number of impact evaluations on what works and does not work to build peace and stability in conflict- and violence-affected contexts has [grown in the past decade](#), there is much more we need to know on many topics before we can confidently recommend “good buys” or “[best bets](#)” to cost-effectively improve conflict-related outcomes, as [is possible in other sectors](#).

The fact that there is still relatively little evidence on “peace and recovery,” compared to other sectors, is for a good reason: designing and implementing impact evaluations in crisis-affected contexts can be very challenging. Insecurity forces organizations to adapt quickly, causing programs to rapidly move from design to implementation to adaptation. Vulnerable and mobile populations, like refugees and internally displaced persons (IDPs), may not complete the programs they are enrolled in or may be hard to track and resurvey. Implementing organizations often have questions about the ethics of randomization or research in fragile settings. Administrative data is frequently rare or unreliable. Many conflict- and violence-affected contexts do not have strong research infrastructure, increasing study costs. In part due to these challenges, much of the impact evaluation research in crisis-affected contexts only measures effects shortly after the intervention or has small samples of participants.

Despite these challenges, PRI has supported [over 80 new studies since 2017](#), increasing the rigorous evidence base on several understudied topics related to peace and recovery. For instance, PRI supported many of the first rigorous evaluations of social cohesion and livelihoods programming for refugees and IDPs, some of the first representative panels of displaced populations, and new research on humanitarian response. This has crowded in funding from the IKEA Foundation and UK International Development for new initiatives focused on [displaced livelihoods](#) and [humanitarian protection](#).

Going forward, we aim to continue to support some of the most innovative and generalizable research in the study of peace and conflict, build the infrastructure for research on these topics, and encourage policymakers and practitioners to apply the results to their work.

III. Scope

The initiative is focused on prevention, mitigation, responses to, and recovery strategies for most forms of social and political violence as well as humanitarian emergencies. This includes projects taking place in the context of:

- International conflicts and civil wars
- State-supported violence and repression, from mass killings to police brutality
- Violent and nonviolent collective action, including riots, protests, and strikes
- Intergroup violence, including ethnic and sectarian violence
- Organized crime
- Terrorism and violent extremism
- “Recovery” responses after violence or destruction from conflict, climate shocks, and other natural disasters

We will continue to prioritize studies that help to develop, illustrate, or test fundamental theories of peace, violence, and recovery. We are particularly interested in projects that:

- Illustrate or test foundational theories of peace and recovery that have limited evidence.** We believe that studies pursuing “basic science,” while at the same time answering important policy questions, will have the greatest policy impacts and academic contribution in the long run. For instance, PRI supported a study to test the degree to which economic or personal motivations [drive individual participation in armed groups](#) in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC). Alternatively, a study on [rural land disputes](#) in Liberia shows how interventions can foster skills and norms that reduce the information asymmetries, commitment problems, and bargaining breakdowns that lead to interpersonal violence. PRI also funded several of the first evaluations of intergroup contact in conflict-affected settings, including a study of mixed [Christian-Muslim soccer leagues in Iraq](#), and a broader set of studies focused on building [social cohesion in divided societies](#).
- Challenge commonly held beliefs amongst scholars, policymakers, and practitioners, or test frequently implemented programs’ theories of change.** For example, a study in Sierra Leone found that [reconciliation dialogues](#) implemented 10 years after the end of the civil war still reinstated social capital, challenging the idea that communities simply self-heal. Alternatively, a study in Cali, Colombia, found that [militarized policing](#), popular amongst many policymakers in Latin America, did not reduce the prevalence of crimes, even when the soldiers were physically present. Finally, a [study of cognitive behavioral therapy](#) among high-risk youth in Liberia found that self-control and social identity are not only drivers of interpersonal violence but also that these skills and identities are malleable in adults. This program produced long-lasting changes, with results holding 10 years later.
- Pioneer new research or measurement techniques, especially when they would likely be adopted by other researchers.** This could include new data collection tools, behavioral measurement, methods of measuring spillovers, and survey modules. For instance, Salma Mousa’s study of mixed [Christian-Muslim soccer leagues in Iraq](#) pushed the boundaries of social cohesion measurement by collecting novel behavioral outcomes, such as patronizing an out-group-owned business and signing up for a mixed-soccer team in a future league. Alternatively, Betsy Levy Paluck and coauthors used an anti-violence program in high schools to [study how social norm change moves through a social network](#). Note, however, that new data and measurement are not necessary for funding, and are usually not sufficient. They will strengthen proposals where most needed or relevant.
- Measure violence, conflict, or related outcomes as dependent variables.** While we will continue to fund studies on recovery from conflict and crisis, we are interested in supporting more evaluations of interventions that reduce future crime, violence, conflict, or participation in armed or criminal groups. This could include studies of security responses to reduce crime, like this study that found that [community policing had no impact on crime incidence in Uganda](#), evaluations of efforts to reduce participation in

violence, such as an ongoing [evaluation of anti-gang recruitment interventions](#) in Medellin, or evaluations of interventions that build social cohesion to reduce future conflict, such as a study of [an empathy-building curriculum](#) for Syrian refugee and Turkish host children in Turkey that reduced peer violence.

- **Produce evidence where little exists, especially where little experimental work has been done.** The past decade has seen a growth in the number of randomized evaluations and panel surveys in areas with active or recent conflicts or [contexts affected by displacement](#), many of which were supported by PRI. That said, there are still contexts and topics with little micro-level evidence, let alone experimental work. This includes topics such as countering violent extremism, protests and non-violent social movements, peace processes, alternative dispute resolution, reintegration of former combatants, climate security, and transitional justice.
- **Contribute to “infrastructure and public goods” development to make conducting research on conflict easier.** For instance, PRI supported the development of a [public WhatsApp surveying tool](#) that allows for easier surveying and tracking of highly mobile populations. Alternatively, in Nigeria, PRI supported two evaluations to collect policy-relevant insights on [irregular migration](#), in partnership with the UK Cabinet Office, and [farmer-herder dialogues](#), in partnership with Search for Common Ground. Support for these projects led IPA to establish a permanent [country office in Nigeria](#), providing the infrastructure for further research and policy engagement in the country, including on conflict and displacement. We welcome proposals for “infrastructure and public goods” projects that build the research infrastructure to make producing this evidence easier in the future.

IV. Research and Learning Priorities

This section provides a list of indicative research areas and questions related to peace and recovery that proposals may address. Rather than simply framing their study within this incomplete list of questions, which may also be combined and are not mutually exclusive, we encourage applicants to link their research to questions that they believe are of fundamental importance to our understanding of crime, violence, conflict, displacement, other disasters, and recovery from these shocks. As illustrated by many of the questions listed, we welcome research on the complementarities between interventions, ways to optimize the sequence of interventions, or learnings that will help prioritize resource allocation given limited budgets.

We also recognize that a majority of the questions below focus on interventions and impact. Questions asked in exploratory work and infrastructure and public goods projects, in particular, may be at a slightly earlier stage, more descriptive, or methodological in nature. We encourage researchers submitting these types of proposals to consider how their work may inform future impact evaluations that could address the questions below.

Research Areas

Understanding and preventing individual-level participation in violence

A range of factors may lead someone to participate in violence or collective action.

Understanding these can better inform programming to both prevent individuals from participating in future violence and rehabilitate those with violent pasts. The bulk of existing evidence focuses on how economic incentives (wages, employment, etc.) affect individual decisions to participate in violence. While we welcome further research on economic incentives, we especially encourage research along less explored lines. Questions could include:

- How can interventions address the **material and nonmaterial incentives** that contribute to participation in crime and violence? This could include research on:
 - Psychological factors and behavioral motivations
 - Feelings of exclusion and marginalization
 - Economic opportunities (e.g., in labor markets)
 - Social norms, as well as social networks and relationships
 - Injustice, rights, and political representation
 - Governance and the provision of public goods
 - Opportunities and connections to criminal networks (and interventions that are designed to alter or break those connections)
 - The role of groups (including but not limited to the provision of material and nonmaterial club goods, the role of social networks, and the role of group dynamics and social norms)
- What “**violence vaccines**” can help prevent violence among the highest-risk demographics? What kinds of interventions can disrupt cycles of violence and reduce participation in violence in later life? Interventions could include:
 - Psychotherapy and behavior change interventions, such as cognitive behavioral therapy
 - Social-emotional skills development in children
 - Social norms messaging
 - Economic programs, such as cash transfers, vocational training, or employment
- Can **social media and other technology** be adapted or leveraged to prevent recruitment or encourage disengagement?
- What are effective ways of **reintegrating violent offenders**, members of armed groups, and/or former prisoners into society and preventing recidivism?

Understanding, combating, and reintegrating non-state armed groups

Internal armed conflicts involving non-state armed groups have emerged as both the most [common form of armed conflict](#) and the leading driver in the rise of violent armed conflict globally. Gangs, insurgencies, and other armed groups increasingly exploit social fragmentation,

operating in areas with low state capacity and trust in government institutions, and often emerging as rivals to local governments in security, service, and justice provision. We welcome research on how to reduce recruitment, financing, and governance by these armed groups; how to respond to them without violent crackdowns; and how to incentivize their transition to sanctioned political, social, and economic activity. Questions could include:

- What are the **determinants for participating in armed groups** (e.g., ideology, religion, economic motivations, etc.)?
- How do **armed groups govern, finance, radicalize, and recruit**, and how can they be countered?
- How can **armed groups' economic returns to crime, violence, and conflict** be interrupted or reduced?
- What programs can incentivize recruited members at various ranks to **disengage from armed groups**, or reduce their incentives or ability to commit violence (e.g., through income support, government services, or interventions that address social and political ideologies)? How can the **credible commitment problem** be overcome?
- What is the impact of **disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration programming**? How does it interact with other conflict response strategies?
- How can armed groups' **incentives to perpetrate war crimes and civilian abuse**—including child recruitment, sexual violence, the use (and clearing) of landmines, and other civilian harms—be reduced?
- How can **civilian collaboration with legitimate authorities** be increased? How can civilian cooperation with armed groups be decreased?
- How can **trust be (re)built in the state** in areas where its reach is limited and non-state actors have emerged as alternatives for providing services and dispute resolution?

Reducing prejudice and building horizontal social cohesion

Reducing prejudice and building social cohesion across religious, ethnic, and cultural divides is assumed to be key to preventing violence, creating pro-social norms, treating exposure to conflict, and building inclusive societies. Research on social cohesion in fragile settings has generally shown small, positive effects, but often just for program participants ([3ie, 2021](#)). We welcome future research that evaluates novel or refined approaches that attempt to augment positive impacts, reduce unintended negative consequences, and increase spillovers. Questions could include:

- What is the role of **local civil society organizations and grassroots movements** in promoting social cohesion and building peace?
- What are the specific mechanisms through which **intergroup contact interventions** can influence social integration, attitudes, and behaviors between groups? Are there types of intergroup contact that create deeper horizontal linkages? Do impacts on attitudes need time to develop? Do impacts hold over time?

- What factors facilitate the **social integration of displaced persons into host communities**, including the role of social networks, education programs, and community-based initiatives?
- What **institutional or group-based interventions** can build social cohesion?
- How can individual-level interventions have **community-level spillover effects**?
- Can our strategies for reducing prejudice based on ethnicity or religion be **extended to reducing prejudice towards former fighters**?
- What is the **role of media and communication technologies** in influencing intergroup dynamics and promoting social cohesion?
- How can social cohesion programming be designed to positively **change attitudes, in addition to behaviors, and create spillovers**?
- What are the impacts of **other development programs and policies** on social cohesion and attitudes towards outgroups? Can other types of development programming be adapted to promote social cohesion?

Strengthening household and community resilience

A core goal of many programs in fragile settings is to ensure that households and communities can weather future conflict, climate, and other negative shocks. It is often assumed that economic development interventions necessarily build this resilience, and may also contribute to conflict and violence prevention. We welcome research that probes these assumptions.

Questions could include:

- How can early warning efforts inform response and the **pre-positioning of aid**? Can well-timed response and pre-positioning reduce future conflict, famine, and other crises?
- What is the impact of **building community resilience** to negative shocks, including climate shocks, on reducing local disputes?
- What are the impacts of delivering **livelihoods and economic development interventions** on promoting peace in fragile or conflict-affected contexts? What spillovers do such programs have?
- Can **peacebuilding and conflict prevention programs** help build resilience and prevent or mitigate the effects of negative shocks on conflict?
- Do peacebuilding programs create better conditions for **educational and labor market participation**?

Building institutions, resolving disputes, and delivering justice

Building and strengthening both formal and informal institutions that can provide services, resolve disputes, deliver justice, and establish social order is important to building stability and peace. While institutional reforms may be difficult to study using field experiments, we encourage innovative attempts at studying these topics in fragile and conflict-affected states. Studies in sectors other than security and justice (e.g., health, education, governance, etc.) will

be considered when violence, conflict, or political instability fundamentally changes the nature of the problem. In particular, we will fund studies in related sectors that may not be able to secure funding elsewhere because of the violent context, have violence as a dependent variable, or address a question of fundamental importance to the study of peace and recovery. Questions could include:

- How can interventions **strengthen the perceived legitimacy** of the state to respond to crime, violence, and conflict? How can the capacity of the state to respond to these challenges be strengthened?
- What interventions **improve trust** in state institutions? Are institutions that are more inclusive of women and minorities perceived as more trustworthy, accountable, or legitimate?
- What **judicial effectiveness improvements** can be made to increase the cost of engaging in crime and violence, and augment citizens' perceptions of the justice system?
- How can **formal and informal institutions** that promote peaceful bargaining be strengthened?
- What is the impact of programming intended to strengthen **democratic consolidation** on conflict-related outcomes?
- To what extent can interventions like body-worn cameras, cognitive behavioral therapy, citizen accountability systems, or training build more capable and **accountable security forces**, and reduce police and military violence and killings? Do these interventions improve citizens' perceptions of their safety?
- What is the impact of **penitentiary policies** on the coordination and spread of violence? What programs can disrupt criminal networks that may be coordinated from prisons?
- What interventions can **strengthen prosecution processes, reduce bureaucratic requirements, and address slow or corrupt judges**, all of which may reduce the cost of committing crimes, violence, and homicides?
- How can regulatory policies and platform-based innovations **protect freedom of expression** and **prevent misinformation**?
- What are the impacts of **reconciliation and transitional justice** on social healing and peacebuilding?
- What is the impact of **international efforts**, such as peacekeeping or the international legal order, on conflict or violence in a given context?
- How can institutions **create accountability for violence** committed against vulnerable groups?

Addressing root causes and preventing future crises

A fundamental concern of policymakers and practitioners working in crisis-affected contexts is how to predict and prevent future conflict and humanitarian crises. While the interventions

described in the sections above may have prevention as a goal, there is a broader set of questions and interventions around early warning, preparedness, adaptation, and prevention with little evidence. Questions include:

- How can **early warning signs** of violence, armed conflict, climate shocks, and humanitarian crises be identified?
- In countries at high risk of climate hazards or natural disasters, how can the **climate-related drivers of conflict** be addressed, and how can interventions overcome the **conflict-related barriers to climate adaptation**? Can climate resilience strategies be embedded within peacebuilding programming to ease tensions over scarce resources?
- Can **reducing genuine sources of intergroup competition** (e.g., severe poverty, droughts, economic shocks, etc.) have positive externalities on intergroup relations?
- What is the relative contribution of addressing the **structural roots of conflict vs. individual-level prejudice reduction** in terms of their contributions to peacebuilding?
- Can involving **women, local leaders, and community members** in peacebuilding efforts augment impacts? What is the impact of efforts to involve these groups in formal peace processes and the implementation of peace agreements, like track III dialogues? How can peacebuilding programming be designed to avoid elite capture?
- How can **peace-building elements be effectively integrated** into broader development or humanitarian programs? What adaptations are needed? What are the impacts of such integration on reducing violence, building resilience, and promoting peace? What program combinations are most effective?
- How can peacebuilding programs be **scaled impactfully and cost-effectively**, given that many programs are intensive or focused on individuals?
- What are the impacts of **withdrawing or downscaling** development programs or humanitarian assistance on conflict dynamics?

Measurement and Design

Given the vulnerability of crisis-affected populations, the limited impact evaluation research, and the challenges of doing research in crisis-affected contexts, thoughtful research design and measurement are necessary when researching the above topic areas. To that end, we encourage research teams to consider the following when designing impact evaluations and/or “infrastructure and public goods” studies:

- How can the many challenges associated with **identifying and surveying** vulnerable populations be overcome? Are certain groups excluded from standard sampling strategies? How can evaluators effectively keep in touch with populations on the move or hard-to-reach populations in violent contexts?

- For displaced populations, what are the demographics of individuals or households who move, and how does this impact **program targeting**? Do whole families move together? How do the demographics of those who flee change over time?
- What **behavioral changes** might we expect to see from interventions, and how can evaluations be designed to measure these in addition to self-reported attitudes?
- What innovative **measurement strategies** (survey questions, modules, indicators, survey tools, etc.) can make research in crisis-affected contexts more accurate? What can innovative measurement allow us to learn that we were unable to before?
- How can advancements in **data science and technology** (e.g., machine learning, satellite imagery, and Artificial Intelligence) be leveraged to help us better measure impact or analyze results?
- What are the **disaggregated effects** of bundled interventions? We encourage the use of factorial designs to pinpoint which program components are driving impact.
- What are the **differential impacts** of interventions on different groups and vulnerable populations? For impact evaluations, we encourage measuring impacts for all groups that may experience the intervention differently, and disaggregating by gender, age, ability, location, displacement status, etc., when appropriate.
- What are the **long-term effects** of interventions on economic, social, and psychosocial outcomes? How can projects be designed to measure outcomes over time, and include meaningful intermediate measures?
- In addition to fulfilling the standard ethics requirements for human subjects research, what additional **ethical considerations** should projects implement, in particular when working with highly vulnerable sub-groups? How can projects better integrate referral pathways into surveys when working with violence- and trauma-affected populations?

V. Project Types

The Peace & Recovery will consider proposals for the following types of projects. Please choose the grant type that best represents your project stage.

- **Exploratory grants:** These grants are to develop preliminary research ideas, contributing to the development of proposals for pilots or full impact evaluations in future rounds. Activities may include travel, relationship development, descriptive or observational analysis, and data development or collection. These grants are primarily earmarked for junior faculty, PhD students, and other researchers who do not have other sources of funding for travel and exploratory work. Researchers with different profiles may also apply, but we encourage contacting us to assess eligibility. (Maximum award: \$10,000)
- **Pilot studies:** These grants are intended to lay the groundwork for future impact evaluations. They are for studies with clear research questions, identified interventions,

and established partnerships, but which require substantial upfront investments in design, measurement, and/or implementation before a full impact evaluation can be designed and a full study proposal can be submitted. Activities could include A/B testing, testing intervention uptake to refine power calculations, developing new measurement strategies or instruments, analysis of existing data, piloting survey questions, refining the research logistics with the partner to make sure the research and program can be delivered as planned, and/or new data development or collection. Please note that these awards are for piloting research, not the intervention. (Maximum award: \$75,000)

- **Full studies:** These grants are for impact evaluations that assess the causal effects of an intervention, program, or policy. Projects must have a clear research question, committed implementing partner(s), well-defined research designs, and statistical power estimates. While most of the impact evaluations funded will be randomized evaluations, studies that use rigorous quasi-experimental methods will be considered when a randomized evaluation is not possible. We will also consider requests for supplementary funding for ongoing studies, or funding to measure the long-term impacts of completed studies. (Maximum award: \$500,000)
- **Infrastructure and public goods creation:** These grants are for the creation of data or tools that can support several research projects or types of analyses, often ultimately supporting the design or implementation of future impact evaluations. Examples of this 'infrastructure' include the creation or development of panel datasets, administrative datasets, surveying or analytical software, measurement strategies, and similar assets. Projects will represent a 'public good' for the research community and/or policy and practice stakeholders. We will particularly welcome proposals that address barriers to research in hard-to-reach or under-researched contexts, or on under-researched topics. (Maximum award: \$250,000)
- **Evidence use and policy outreach support:** These grants are for supporting the development of relationships with policymakers, take-up and dissemination of evidence, sharing and analysis of administrative data, and exploration of potential impact evaluations. The funding could be used to embed a research staff member in an organization, produce preliminary scoping exercises to ensure interventions are context-appropriate, host matchmaking events, or other activities that achieve similar aims. (Maximum award: \$25,000)

In recognition that research in some locations or with some populations is more costly, on a case-by-case basis we will consider budgets over the above award maximums that provide appropriate justification.

VI. Achieving Impact

This initiative will be successful if the knowledge generated through supported studies is used to inform changes in research, policy, and practice on peace and recovery. Examples of impactful studies include those that challenge the conventional wisdom on a subject, especially the theoretical priors that academics, policymakers, and practitioners typically bring to problems; those that inform changes to the studied programs; those that probe the mechanisms underpinning programs; those that generate evidence on under-researched contexts or topics; and those that identify scalable solutions.

To that end, in addition to publishing an academic journal article and presenting in academic forums, we expect grantees to engage meaningfully with their implementing partners, publish non-technical research summaries and briefs with actionable policy recommendations, participate in broader dissemination events convened by IPA, and engage in dialogues with policymakers or practitioners supporting or designing similar programs. PRI staff will support grantees with many of these activities.

All supported impact evaluations will be required to collect cost data that can be used for cost-effectiveness analysis, following IPA's costing guidelines and provided templates. Cost-effectiveness analysis can assist policymakers when choosing how to allocate resources between different programs, or deciding to replicate or scale up a program that is demonstrated to be effective. Projects demonstrating positive impacts on the outcomes of interest will be required to make cost-effectiveness data publicly available, and all evaluations will be required to make the per-unit cost of programs public.

VII. Funding Criteria

Evaluation Criteria

Proposals are reviewed by a rotating group of academic researchers and, in some cases, policy reviewers. Projects are assessed against five equally weighted evaluation criteria:

Academic contribution	Does the study address PRI's priority research areas? Does the study make a significant contribution toward advancing knowledge in the field? How does the study compare with the existing body of research, and how does it contribute? Is the research designed to probe mechanisms (i.e., how an intervention has an impact)? Does it answer new questions, evaluate new interventions, or introduce novel methods or measures? Does the research strategy provide a bridge between a practical experiment and underlying academic theories?
------------------------------	---

Policy relevance	Is there demand from policymakers or practitioners for more/better information to influence their decisions in this area? Will results from the intervention have generalizable implications? How will the “lessons learned” have relevance beyond this case? What is the estimated cost of the intervention? Does the intervention scale?
Technical design	Does the research design appropriately answer the questions outlined in the proposal? Are there threats that could compromise the validity of results? If so, does the proposal sufficiently address those threats? For full study proposals, are designs powered to detect results?
Project viability	Is the relationship with the implementing partner strong and likely to endure through the entire study? What is the credibility and policy influence of the implementing partner? Does the implementing partner have committed or prospective sources of funding for the intervention? What is the implementing partner’s prior experience implementing this type of program? Are there any other logistical or political obstacles that might threaten the completion of the study, such as government authorization or Human Subjects review? For pilots, do researchers describe how piloting activities would inform a full-scale impact evaluation? For infrastructure and public goods projects, do researchers describe how the project could contribute to further research and future impact evaluations? Does the research team have a track record of implementing successful projects similar to the one being proposed?
Value for money	Is the cost of the study commensurate with the value of expected contributions to science and policy? Does the study leverage funding from other sources?

Additional Considerations

When reviewing proposals, staff and researchers will also consider:

- Ethics:** Reviewers will consider whether there is any risk of harm to research participants and staff, what the proposed risk mitigation strategies are, and how the possible benefits of the research compare to the possible harms. Projects are required to have secured all necessary research approvals from all relevant local, national, and international ethics committees before beginning fieldwork. Given the particular vulnerability of many people in the contexts PRI focuses on, we ask applicants to elaborate on the ethical considerations underpinning their work in addition to fulfilling IPA’s regular IRB review requirements, with a particular focus on the safety and security of research participants and staff. We ask that researchers keep the best interests of the target population in mind throughout all stages of their research activities.
- Team Diversity:** PRI welcomes proposals from diverse research teams. We highly encourage proposals from teams with researchers or other research team members

(research associates, managers, enumerators, etc.) from the countries where the project will take place and/or with lived experiences related to the topic. We also encourage prospective applicants to work across disciplines.

Researcher Qualifications

PRI accepts proposals from research teams with at least one team member whose primary affiliation is with a university. The team must demonstrate experience in field research and impact evaluations, and have relevant sector expertise.

Practitioners should partner with academics with track records implementing similar research to apply for funding. IPA is available to support matchmaking with researchers. Please fill out [this form](#) or contact peace@poverty-action.org for more information.

For further eligibility information, please see our [Application Instructions](#).

VIII. Timeline and Application Process

Dates for Round X

- **October 14, 2025:** Call for Proposals released
- **November 14, 2025:** Mandatory Expression of Interest (EOI) deadline
- **January 16, 2026:** Full proposal deadline
- **March 2026:** Results released

Off-cycle Proposals

While most of the funding will be disbursed through scheduled funding rounds, we understand that some research projects face significant time constraints and need to receive funding before the end of a regular funding round to make use of an unanticipated opportunity (e.g., a newly announced policy change that will go into effect soon, creating an opportunity for an evaluation) or to meet urgent, short-term funding needs. The maximum amount awarded to off-cycle proposals is \$75,000. We encourage researchers in such situations to reach out directly to peace@poverty-action.org.

Application Instructions

Please find our application instructions [here](#), with more information on eligibility, research management expectations, submission procedures, and grant terms.

IX. Related Initiatives

Please do not submit the same proposal to more than one IPA or Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty Action Lab (J-PAL) initiative at a time. When applying to PRI, consider whether your proposal may be better suited for one of the following initiatives, which often cover similar geographies and also emphasize supporting innovation and basic research that maximizes generalizability and policy relevance.

PRI and J-PAL's Crime and Violence Initiative (CVI) have particular overlap, although CVI has a much greater emphasis on crime and criminal justice issues, and PRI has a stronger focus on peacebuilding, humanitarian crises, and recovery.

IPA's funding is open to all academic researchers, whereas J-PAL's funding is restricted to J-PAL affiliates, invited researchers, and, in some cases, Low- and Middle-Income Countries (LMIC) based scholars. If you are uncertain about which initiative to apply to, please email peace@poverty-action.org.

J-PAL Crime and Violence Initiative (CVI): CVI fosters experimental research on crime and social and political violence. Crime and violence can hinder economic development and urban growth, and exacerbate governance challenges by fostering corruption and draining public sector resources. Given the wide reach of these adverse effects, the initiative funds evaluations that focus on preventing, mitigating, and responding to the effects of crime and violence. (Limited to J-PAL affiliates, invited researchers, and [LMIC-based scholars](#))

J-PAL Governance Initiative (GI): GI funds randomized impact evaluations of programs designed to improve participation in the political and policy process, reduce leakages in public programs, and improve state capacity. GI's research priorities are identified in the [Governance Initiative Review Paper](#) or its [Executive Summary](#). (Limited to J-PAL affiliates and invited researchers)

IPA and J-PAL Displaced Livelihoods Initiative (DLI): DLI funds proposals to design, pilot, evaluate, build research infrastructure, and scale interventions that can effectively support sustainable livelihoods for displaced populations and host communities.

IPA and J-PAL Humanitarian Protection Initiative (HPI): HPI supports research to generate rigorous evidence through funding proposals to design, pilot, and evaluate solutions to effectively improve protection programs and outcomes in humanitarian settings, including the prevention of sexual- and gender-based violence; addressing the psychological effects of abuse and distress; promoting the recognition, respect, and uptake of rights; and mitigating conflict escalation while fostering restraint among armed actors. (Limited to J-PAL affiliates, invited researchers, and [LMIC-based scholars](#))

X. Contact

Please direct all inquiries to peace@poverty-action.org.

XI. About IPA

[Innovations for Poverty Action](#) is a research and policy nonprofit that creates and shares evidence while equipping decision-makers to use evidence to reduce poverty. With a long-term presence in 17 countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, and evaluations in 30+ more countries, IPA leads the field of development in cutting-edge research quality, innovation, and impact. In recent decades, trillions of dollars have been spent on programs designed to reduce global poverty, but clear evidence about which programs succeed is rare, and when evidence does exist, decision-makers often do not know about it. IPA exists to bring together leading researchers and these decision-makers to ensure that the evidence we create leads to tangible impacts on the world. Since our founding in 2002, IPA has worked with over 600 leading academics to conduct over 900 evaluations in over 50 countries. This research has informed hundreds of successful programs that now impact millions of individuals worldwide.

Annex: Research Resources

The resources below were identified in consultations with researchers, practitioners, and policymakers, or through IPA's work, as valuable resources for applicants to consider when researching peace- and recovery-related topics. The list is by no means exhaustive.

Literature Reviews and Reports

Evidence for Responding to Displacement: A Scoping Review of Rigorous Impact Evaluations (2023), IPA	This scoping review provides an overview of the small but growing evidence base from impact evaluations of programs for displaced populations, across 27 displacement-affected settings. These evaluations cover a range of topics and outcomes, including household welfare, food security, education, health, livelihoods, and social cohesion.
Governance, Crime, and Conflict Initiative Evidence Wrap-up (2021), J-PAL and IPA	This evidence review offers a broad review of the rigorous impact evaluations on reducing crime, violence, and conflict, and seeks to capture emerging insights from across studies.
Social Cohesion and Forced Displacement: A Synthesis of New Research (2022), World Bank Group)	This report synthesizes findings from a joint series of 26 working papers on forced displacement and social cohesion.
Strengthening Intergroup Social Cohesion in Fragile Situations (2021), International Initiative for Impact Evaluation	In this review, 3ie synthesizes evidence on programs that promote intergroup social cohesion as a means of supporting sustainable peace in fragile communities in low- and middle-income countries.
The Contact Hypothesis Re-evaluated (2018), Elizabeth Levy Paluck, Seth Green, Donald Green	This meta-analysis evaluates the state of research on the intergroup contact hypothesis from a policy perspective. IPA subsequently supported novel follow-up research on this hypothesis, such as this study on Christian-Muslim soccer leagues in Iraq by Salma Mousa. We expect contact proposals to meaningfully engage with this literature.
Learning from the Evidence on Forced Displacement (2023), World Bank	This recorded training program presented the latest socioeconomic evidence related to forced displacement.

Research Implementation Resources

Humanitarian Research Toolkit , International Rescue Committee	A toolkit for conducting research in fragile and conflict-affected contexts, comprising guidance, training documents, and other practical tools.
IPA Research Protocols , IPA	Every research project that IPA conducts or funds is required to follow the linked research protocols, or "Minimum Must Dos," in order to ensure that IPA produces high-quality research.
Low-cost, Automated WhatsApp Surveys , Immigration Policy Lab	This is a public survey tool for deploying surveys on WhatsApp, which has been used with hard-to-reach and highly mobile populations.
Repository of Measurement and Survey Design Resources , J-PAL	This repository provides a list of resources on measurement and survey design relating to various topics.
Resilience Index Measurement and Analysis , FAO	This tool estimates household resilience to food insecurity with a quantitative approach to establish a cause-and-effect relationship between resilience and its critical determinants.
Self-Reliance Index , Refugee Self-Reliance Initiative	This index is a tool for measuring the progress of refugee households toward self-reliance.
Social Capital and Social Cohesion Measurement for Community-Driven Development Operations , Mercy Corps, World Bank	This toolkit is designed to support the measurement of social capital and social cohesion, particularly in the context of evaluating Community-Driven Development programs in settings affected by fragility, conflict, migration, and forced displacement.
The World Bank-UNCR Joint Data Center on Forced Displacement's Microdata Library , JDC	This is a collection of datasets on displaced populations, often including links to the implemented questionnaires.
Building Inclusive Research Practices , Kaldor Centre for International Refugee Law, University of New South Wales, Asia Pacific Network of Refugees. Act for Peace	These guidelines aim to provide clear principles and strategies for individuals and organisations interested in co-produced research with refugees and other people with lived experience of displacement.

Ethics Resources

Data Responsibility in Humanitarian Action (2021), Inter-Agency Standing Committee	This operational guidance provides concrete steps to ensure that data is safe, ethical, and effectively managed in humanitarian action, laying out a set of principles and actions for data responsibility.
Ethical conduct of randomized evaluations (2022), J-PAL	This resource is intended as a practical guide for researchers to use when considering the ethics of a given research project.
Ethics for Humanitarian Innovation Toolkit (2024), ELRHA	This toolkit is designed to provide organizations, teams, and individuals with practical ethical resources to manage innovation responsibly and successfully.
Humanitarian Learning Agenda (2022), J-PAL	This learning agenda provides guidance on how randomized impact evaluations can be deployed in humanitarian settings and draws on examples from existing studies to inform avenues for future research.
IPV Field Research: When All the Questions Are Hard Questions (2020), IPA	Understanding how to keep vulnerable people safe from violence and trauma is critically important, yet violence research is fraught with challenges. This resource from IPA's Intimate Partner Violence Initiative shares some strategies from the initiative on conducting responsible and ethical IPV research.
The Ethical Contours of Research in Crisis Settings: Five Practical Considerations for Academic Institutional Review Boards and Researchers (2019), International Rescue Committee	This paper seeks to describe five issues particular to humanitarian settings that IRBs should consider and on which they should provide recommendations to overcome associated challenges: staged reviews of protocols in acute emergencies, flexible reviews of modification requests, addressing violence and the traumatic experiences of participants, difficulties in attaining meaningful informed consent among populations dependent on aid, and ensuring reviews are knowledgeable of populations' needs.
The Safe and Ethical Conduct of Violence Research (2018), IPA	This document provides a brief overview of the policies and best practices for ensuring the safe and ethical conduct of violence research at IPA. It is intended for principal investigators and research staff who are already familiar with the ethics of human subjects research but are interested in more specific guidance related to the collection of violence data.