



The [U.S. Department of Justice](#) (DOJ), [Office of Justice Programs](#) (OJP), [Bureau of Justice Assistance](#) (BJA) is seeking applications for funding under the Smart Defense Initiative, a grant program designed to improve public defense delivery systems at the state and local level. This program furthers the Department's mission by ensuring the fair administration of justice.

Smart Defense Initiative Answering Gideon's Call: Improving Public Defense Delivery Systems FY 2015 Competitive Grant Announcement

Eligibility

Eligible applicants are state or local government agencies, independent boards or commissions, state or local public defender organizations, and other organizations, including nonprofit organizations (including tribal nonprofit organizations).

BJA may elect to make awards for applications submitted under this solicitation in future fiscal years, dependent on the merit of the applications and on the availability of appropriations.

For additional eligibility information, see Section [C. Eligibility Information](#).

Deadline

Applicants must register with [Grants.gov](#) prior to submitting an application. All applications are due to be submitted and in receipt of a successful validation message in Grants.gov by 11:59 p.m. eastern time on April 22, 2015.

All applicants are encouraged to read this [Important Notice: Applying for Grants in Grants.gov](#).

For additional information, see [How to Apply](#) in section [D. Application and Submission Information](#).

Contact Information

For technical assistance with submitting an application, contact the Grants.gov Customer Support Hotline at 800-518-4726 or 606-545-5035, or via e-mail to support@grants.gov. The [Grants.gov](#) Support Hotline hours of operation are 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, except federal holidays.

Applicants that experience unforeseen Grants.gov technical issues beyond their control that prevent them from submitting their application by the deadline must e-mail the BJA contact

identified below **within 24 hours after the application deadline** and request approval to submit their application. Additional information on reporting technical issues is found under “Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues” in the [How to Apply](#) section.

For assistance with any other requirement of this solicitation, contact the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS) Response Center: toll-free at 1-800-851-3420; via TTY at 301-240-6310 (hearing impaired only); email responsecenter@ncjrs.gov; fax to 301-240-5830; or web chat at <https://webcontact.ncjrs.gov/ncjchat/chat.jsp>. The NCJRS Response Center hours of operation are 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. eastern time, Monday through Friday, and 10:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. eastern time on the solicitation close date.

Grants.gov number assigned to this announcement: BJA-2015-4080

Release date: February 23, 2015

Contents

A. Program Description	4
Overview	4
Program-Specific Information	4
Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables	5
Evidence-Based Programs or Practices	6
B. Federal Award Information	6
Type of Award	7
Financial Management and System of Internal Controls	7
Budget Information	7
Cost Sharing or Match Requirement	7
Pre-Agreement Cost Approvals	8
Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver	8
Prior Approval, Planning, and Reporting of Conference/Meeting/Training Costs	8
Costs Associated with Language Assistance (if applicable)	9
C. Eligibility Information	9
Limit on Number of Application Submissions	9
D. Application and Submission Information	9
What an Application Should Include	9
How to Apply	18
E. Application Review Information	20
Selection Criteria	20
Review Process	22
F. Federal Award Administration Information	23
Federal Award Notices	23
Administrative, National Policy, and other Legal Requirements	23
General Information about Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements	24
G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s)	24
H. Other Information	25
Provide Feedback to OJP	25
Application Checklist	26

Smart Defense Initiative Answering Gideon's Call: Improving Public Defense Delivery Systems (CFDA #16.817)

A. Program Description

Overview

The Smart Defense Initiative, administered by BJA, is part of BJA's "Smart Suite" of criminal justice programs including Smart Pretrial, Smart Policing, Smart Supervision, and Smart Prosecution. BJA established the Smart Suite over 5 years ago with the creation of the Smart Policing Initiative. The Smart Suite supports criminal justice professionals in building evidence-based, data-driven criminal justice strategies that are effective, efficient, and economical. BJA's smart programs represent a strategic approach that brings more "science" into criminal justice operations by leveraging innovative applications of analysis, technology, and evidence-based practices.

In many states, the public defense delivery system is in crisis, with too many defendants lacking access to quality advice and representation. In addition to being a matter of constitutional concern, this void can contribute to over-incarceration, reduced confidence in the justice system, and other inequities. Without quality effective representation, a defendant may not be treated fairly, may not understand the process, and may not get the benefit of available alternatives to incarceration for first-time or low-level offenses. Additionally, if these issues are not addressed, victims are ill-served and the criminal justice system's shared goals of justice and public safety go unmet.

To help jurisdictions strengthen state and local public defense delivery systems, BJA is releasing this competitive grant announcement. Under Smart Defense, BJA is seeking applicants who are interested in developing innovative, data-driven approaches to improve their public defense delivery systems guided by the [Ten Principles of a Public Defense Delivery System](#). This program is funded under the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 (Pub. L. No. 113-76).

Program-Specific Information

DOJ has long recognized the importance of quality public defense to a fair justice system. Today, despite the decades that have gone by since the landmark decision in *Gideon v. Wainwright*, and the important decisions that have followed recognizing the right to counsel in juvenile and misdemeanor cases, *Gideon* has yet to be fully realized.

The purpose of this program is to improve the quality of public defense delivery systems guided by the [Ten Principles of a Public Defense Delivery System](#), promulgated by the American Bar Association (ABA) in 2002. The ABA Ten Principles of a Public Defense Delivery System (the ABA Ten Principles) represent fundamental building blocks for implementing quality legal representation for indigent criminal defendants. Released in 2002, the ABA Ten Principles list the American Bar Association's recommendations for government officials and other parties who are charged with improving public defense delivery systems. These principles address defenders' appropriate function, workload, resources, training, and quality, and have been

recognized by the Attorney General “as [an] essential guidepost for ensuring that our indigent defense efforts are as effective- and as efficient – as possible.”

Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables

The goal of this initiative is to ensure that no person faces the loss of liberty without first having the aid of a lawyer with the time, ability, and resources to present an effective defense. The objectives are to enhance a state or local jurisdiction’s ability to provide quality representation to indigent defendants, promote innovation and promote innovative strategies that incorporate the ABA Ten Principles. **Smart Defense applications require a research partner/organization as part of the application. This means applicants must enlist a research partner/organization with criminal justice experience to assist in data analysis and problem identification, description, and definition; participate in strategy development; and provide ongoing assessment of the strategy and program impact.**

BJA is soliciting applications that:

- Describe the innovative, data-driven approach to be implemented.
- Enlist a local research partner from the accredited criminal justice/social science community to evaluate the effectiveness of the approach.
- Identify gaps to be addressed by **one or more of the four ABA Ten Principles listed directly below.***
- Develop a program design that outlines strategies, using a thoughtful and thorough analytical approach, to overcome the problem and/or situation to be addressed.
- Develop performance measures for the initiative.
- Assess and report the results to BJA, who will make the results publicly available.

*BJA is soliciting applicants to address one or more of the following ABA Ten Principles:

- **Independence**—*Principle One: The public defense function, including the selection, funding and payment of defense counsel, is independent.*
- **Authority to set standards (e.g., caseloads) and no retribution for enforcing them**—*Principle Five: Defense counsel's workload is controlled to permit the rendering of quality representation.*
- **Early entry**—*Principle Three: Clients are screened for eligibility, and defense counsel is assigned and notified of appointment, as soon as feasible after clients' arrest detention, or request for counsel.*
- **Supervision and evaluation**—*Principle Ten: Defense counsel is supervised and systematically reviewed for quality and efficiency according to nationally and locally adopted standards.*

Examples of allowable activities/deliverables include, but are not limited to:

1. Establishment of independent board responsible for assigning, oversight, and financing public defense delivery systems;
2. Creation of a process to ensure that only highly qualified lawyers are approved for the public defense rosters, which includes process to remove unqualified lawyers;

3. Creation/implementation and oversight of model contracts for assigned counsel;
4. Adoption or creation of written income eligibility guidelines that includes well-designed screening;
5. Creation of supervision programs that continuously monitors the workloads of lawyers;
6. Adoption of a process that matches cases to attorneys based upon attorney experience and training, and case complexity and severity;
7. Creation of robust supervision and review process for public defense providers;
8. Development of a data driven communication strategy to inform policy decisions; and
9. Development and implementation of case management systems for public defense delivery systems.

To help achieve these important outcomes, Smart Defense grantees will work closely with BJA and its training and technical assistance (TTA) partner, who is being solicited under a different FY 2015 competitive grant announcement, to assist agencies incorporate innovative and/or evidence-based defense strategies and principles as a fundamental element in ensuring the fair administration of justice. The TTA partner will work directly with BJA in hosting grantee meetings, facilitating peer-to-peer exchanges of information, administering targeted subject matter expertise that is relevant to specific Smart Defense sites and producing reports on the lessons learned from the Smart Defense community.

Evidence-Based Programs or Practices

OJP strongly emphasizes the use of data and evidence in policy making and program development in criminal justice, juvenile justice, and crime victim services. OJP is committed to:

- Improving the quantity and quality of evidence OJP generates
- Integrating evidence into program, practice, and policy decisions within OJP and the field
- Improving the translation of evidence into practice

OJP considers programs and practices to be evidence-based when their effectiveness has been demonstrated by causal evidence, generally obtained through one or more outcome evaluations. Causal evidence documents a relationship between an activity or intervention (including technology) and its intended outcome, including measuring the direction and size of a change, and the extent to which a change may be attributed to the activity or intervention. Causal evidence depends on the use of scientific methods to rule out, to the extent possible, alternative explanations for the documented change. The strength of causal evidence, based on the factors described above, will influence the degree to which OJP considers a program or practice to be evidence-based. The [OJP CrimeSolutions.gov](http://OJP.CrimeSolutions.gov) web site is one resource that applicants may use to find information about evidence-based programs in criminal justice, juvenile justice, and crime victim services.

B. Federal Award Information

Depending on availability of funds, BJA estimates that it will make up to five awards of up to \$400,000 each for a 24-month project period, beginning on October 1, 2015.

BJA may, in certain cases, provide supplemental funding in future years to awards under this solicitation. Important considerations in decisions regarding supplemental funding include, among other factors, the availability of funding, strategic priorities, assessment of the quality of

the management of the award (for example, timeliness and quality of progress reports), and assessment of the progress of the work funded under the award.

All awards are subject to the availability of appropriated funds and to any modifications or additional requirements that may be imposed by law.

Type of Award¹

BJA expects that it will make any award from this solicitation in the form of a grant.

Financial Management and System of Internal Controls

If selected for funding, the award recipient must:

(a) Establish and maintain effective internal control over the federal award that provides reasonable assurance that the non-federal entity is managing the federal award in compliance with federal statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of the federal award. These internal controls should be in compliance with guidance in “Standards for Internal Control in the Federal Government” issued by the Comptroller General of the United States and the “Internal Control Integrated Framework”, issued by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission (COSO).

(b) Comply with federal statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of the federal awards.

(c) Evaluate and monitor the non-federal entity's compliance with statute, regulations and the terms and conditions of Federal awards.

(d) Take prompt action when instances of noncompliance are identified including noncompliance identified in audit findings.

(e) Take reasonable measures to safeguard protected personally identifiable information and other information the federal awarding agency or pass-through entity designates as sensitive or the non-federal entity considers sensitive consistent with applicable federal, state, and local laws regarding privacy and obligations of confidentiality.

In order to better understand administrative requirements and cost principles, award applicants are encouraged to enroll, at no charge, in the Department of Justice Grants Financial Management Online Training available [here](#).

Budget Information

Applicants should budget travel and lodging expenses for a four-person team, including a research partner to attend two 2-day meetings during the 24-month period. The meetings may be held in the Washington, D.C. area or other like regions of the country.

Cost Sharing or Match Requirement

This solicitation does not require a match. However, if a successful application proposes a voluntary match amount, and OJP approves the budget, the total match amount incorporated

¹ See *generally* 31 U.S.C. §§ 6301-6305 (defines and describes various forms of federal assistance relationships, including grants and cooperative agreements (a type of grant)).

into the approved budget becomes mandatory and subject to audit.

Pre-Agreement Cost Approvals

OJP does not typically approve pre-agreement costs; an applicant must request and obtain the prior written approval of OJP for all such costs. If approved, pre-agreement costs could be paid from grant funds consistent with a grantee's approved budget, and under applicable cost standards. However, all such costs prior to award and prior to approval of the costs are incurred at the sole risk of an applicant. Generally, no applicant should incur project costs *before* submitting an application requesting federal funding for those costs. Should there be extenuating circumstances that appear to be appropriate for OJP's consideration as pre-agreement costs, the applicant should contact the point of contact listed on the title page of this announcement for details on the requirements for submitting a written request for approval. See the section on Costs Requiring Prior Approval in the [Financial Guide](#), for more information.

Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver

With respect to any award of more than \$250,000 made under this solicitation, recipients may not use federal funds to pay total cash compensation (salary plus cash bonuses) to any employee of the award recipient at a rate that exceeds 110 percent of the maximum annual salary payable to a member of the Federal Government's Senior Executive Service (SES) at an agency with a Certified SES Performance Appraisal System for that year.² The 2015 salary table for SES employees is available on the Office of Personnel Management [web site](#). Note: A recipient may compensate an employee at a greater rate, provided the amount in excess of this compensation limitation is paid with non-federal funds. (Any such additional compensation will not be considered matching funds where match requirements apply.)

The Assistant Attorney General for OJP may exercise discretion to waive, on an individual basis, the limitation on compensation rates allowable under an award. An applicant requesting a waiver should include a detailed justification in the budget narrative of the application. Unless the applicant submits a waiver request and justification with the application, the applicant should anticipate that OJP will request the applicant to adjust and resubmit the budget.

The justification should include the particular qualifications and expertise of the individual, the uniqueness of the service the individual will provide, the individual's specific knowledge of the program or project being undertaken with award funds, and a statement explaining that the individual's salary is commensurate with the regular and customary rate for an individual with his/her qualifications and expertise, and for the work to be done.

Prior Approval, Planning, and Reporting of Conference/Meeting/Training Costs

OJP strongly encourages applicants that propose to use award funds for any conference-, meeting-, or training-related activity to review carefully – before submitting an application – the OJP policy and guidance on conference approval, planning, and reporting available at www.ojp.gov/financialguide/PostawardRequirements/chapter15page1.htm. OJP policy and guidance (1) encourage minimization of conference, meeting, and training costs; (2) require prior written approval (which may affect project timelines) of most such costs for cooperative agreement recipients and of some such costs for grant recipients; and (3) set cost limits, including a general prohibition of all food and beverage costs.

² This limitation on use of award funds does not apply to the non-profit organizations specifically named at Appendix VIII to 2 C.F.R. part 200.

Costs Associated with Language Assistance (if applicable)

If an applicant proposes a program or activity that would deliver services or benefits to individuals, the costs of taking reasonable steps to provide meaningful access to those services or benefits for individuals with limited English proficiency may be allowable. Reasonable steps to provide meaningful access to services or benefits may include interpretation or translation services where appropriate.

For additional information, see the "Civil Rights Compliance" section under "Solicitation Requirements" in the [OJP Funding Resource Center](#).

C. Eligibility Information

For additional eligibility information, see Title page.

Cost Sharing or Match Requirement

For additional information on cost sharing and match requirement, see Section [B. Federal Award Information](#).

Limit on Number of Application Submissions

If an applicant submits multiple versions of the same application, BJA will review only the most recent system-validated version submitted. For more information on system-validated versions, see [How to Apply](#).

D. Application and Submission Information

What an Application Should Include

Applicants should anticipate that if they fail to submit an application that contains all of the specified elements, it may negatively affect the review of their application; and, should a decision be made to make an award, it may result in the inclusion of special conditions that preclude the recipient from accessing or using award funds pending satisfaction of the conditions.

Moreover, applicants should anticipate that applications that are determined to be nonresponsive to the scope of the solicitation, or that do not include the application elements that BJA has designated to be critical, will neither proceed to peer review nor receive further consideration. Under this solicitation, BJA has designated the following application elements as critical: Program Narrative, Budget Detail Worksheet, and Budget Narrative. Applicants may combine the Budget Narrative and the Budget Detail Worksheet in one document. However, if an applicant submits only one budget document, it must contain **both** narrative and detail information. Please review the "Note on File Names and File Types" under [How to Apply](#) to be sure applications are submitted in permitted formats.

OJP strongly recommends that applicants use appropriately descriptive file names (e.g., "Program Narrative," "Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative," "Timelines," "Memoranda of Understanding," "Resumes") for all attachments. Also, OJP recommends that applicants include resumes in a single file.

1. Information to Complete the Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424)

The SF-424 is a required standard form used as a cover sheet for submission of pre-applications, applications, and related information. Grants.gov and OJP's Grants Management System (GMS) take information from the applicant's profile to populate the fields on this form. When selecting "type of applicant," if the applicant is a for-profit entity, select "For-Profit Organization" or "Small Business" (as applicable).

Intergovernmental Review: This funding opportunity (program) **is not** subject to [Executive Order 12372](#). (In completing the SF-424, applicants are to make the appropriate selection in response to question 19 to indicate that the "Program is not covered by E.O. 12372.")

2. Project Abstract

Applications should include a high-quality project abstract that summarizes the proposed project in 400 words or less. Project abstracts should be—

- Written for a general public audience
- Submitted as a separate attachment with "Project Abstract" as part of its file name
- Single-spaced, using a standard 12-point font (Times New Roman) with 1-inch margins

As a separate attachment, the project abstract will **not** count against the page limit for the program narrative.

All project abstracts should follow the detailed template available at ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/ProjectAbstractTemplate.pdf.

Permission to Share Project Abstract with the Public: It is unlikely that BJA will be able to fund all promising applications submitted under this solicitation, but it may have the opportunity to share information with the public regarding promising but unfunded applications, for example, through a listing on a webpage available to the public. The intent of this public posting would be to allow other possible funders to become aware of such proposals.

In the project abstract template, applicants are asked to indicate whether they give OJP permission to share their project abstract (including contact information) with the public. Granting (or failing to grant) this permission will not affect OJP's funding decisions, and, if the application is not funded, granting permission will not guarantee that abstract information will be shared, nor will it guarantee funding from any other source.

Note: OJP may choose not to list a project that otherwise would have been included in a listing of promising but unfunded applications, should the abstract fail to meet the format and content requirements noted above and outlined in the project abstract template.

3. Program Narrative

The program narrative must respond to the [Selection Criteria](#) in the order given. Applications are peer reviewed and scored on answers to the Selection Criteria. The program narrative should be double-spaced, using standard 12-point font (Times New Roman is preferred) with 1-inch margins, and should not exceed 15 pages. Number pages "1 of 15", "2 of 15" etc.

If the program narrative fails to comply with these length-related restrictions, BJA may consider such noncompliance in peer review and in final award decisions.

The following sections, which are part of the [Selection Criteria](#), should be included as part of the program narrative:

- a. Statement of the Problem
- b. Project Design and Implementation
- c. Capabilities and Competencies
- d. Plan for Collecting the Data Required for this Solicitation’s Performance Measures

To assist the Department with fulfilling its responsibilities under the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA), Public Law 103-62, and the GPRA Modernization Act of 2010, Public Law 111–352, applicants that receive funding under this solicitation must provide data that measure the results of their work done under this solicitation. OJP will require any award recipient, post award, to provide the data requested in the “Data Grantee Provides” column so that OJP can calculate values for the “Performance Measures” column. Performance measures for this solicitation are as follows:

Objective	Performance Measure(s)	Data Grantee Provides
Identify and address a new solution that is consistent with the ABA Ten Principles of a Public Defense Delivery System	Percent of program goals and objectives completed that are directly linked to grant funding and address one of the Ten Principles Number of new solutions employed Number of evidence-based practices deployed	Number of program tasks that were completed during the reporting period that are directly linked to grant funding (Task: a grant activity defined in application project plan) Number of total program tasks (complete or incomplete) that are directly linked to grant funding Number of new solutions employed during the current reporting period Number of evidence-based practices deployed over the life of the grant
Enhance public defender knowledge of effective public defense delivery system strategies for ensuring the fair administration of justice	Number of engagements with the TTA partner	During the reporting period, the number TTA engagements: A. Telephonic Technical Assistance B. Onsite Visits/Technical Assistance C. In-Person Training Sessions D. Web-based Training Sessions
Support and sustain evidence-based public defense delivery system strategies consistent with the ABA Ten Principles of a Defense Delivery System	Number of new written policies implemented [Principle 1]	Number of new policies implemented pertaining to Principle 1, to include policies governing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nonpartisan board oversee defender, assigned counsel, or contract system

	<p>Percent of clients found eligible for legal services [Principle 3]</p> <p>Percent of eligible indigent defense cases assigned an attorney [Principle 3]</p> <p>Average wait time (in days) between eligible client's detention or request for counsel and the appointment of counsel [Principle 3]</p> <p>Average caseload per public defender [Principle 5]</p> <p>Percent of cases systematically reviewed according to appropriate local or national standards for quality and efficient defense counsel [Principle 10]</p> <p>Number of research partner engagements</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Merit-based selection of chief defender and staff • Promote diversity in the recruitment of attorney staff <p>During the reporting period, total number of clients screened for eligibility</p> <p>During the reporting period, total number of clients found eligible</p> <p>Number of eligible indigent defense cases</p> <p>Number of eligible indigent defense cases assigned an attorney</p> <p>Of the total number of clients found eligible,</p> <p>Total number of days lapsed between eligible clients detention or request for counsel and the appointment of counsel</p> <p>During the reporting period, total number of new and ongoing defense cases that originate out of the office with the grant</p> <p>During the reporting period, total number of public defenders with an active caseload within the office with the grant</p> <p>During the reporting period, total number of cases</p> <p>During the reporting period, total number of cases systematically reviewed to assess the quality and efficiency of defense counsel</p> <p>During the reporting period, number of times staff engaged in the initiative met with the research partner</p> <p>Please describe the activities that the research partner is conducting</p>
--	---	--

BJA does not require applicants to submit performance measures data with their application. Performance measures are included as an alert that BJA will require successful applicants to submit specific data as part of their reporting requirements. For the application, applicants should indicate an understanding of these requirements and discuss how they will gather the required data, should they receive funding.

Note on Project Evaluations

Applicants that propose to use funds awarded through this solicitation to conduct project evaluations should be aware that certain project evaluations (such as systematic investigations designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge) may constitute “research” for purposes of applicable DOJ human subjects protection regulations. However, project evaluations that are intended only to generate internal improvements to a program or service, or are conducted only to meet OJP’s performance measure data reporting requirements likely do not constitute “research.” Applicants should provide sufficient information for OJP to determine whether the particular project they propose would either intentionally or unintentionally collect and/or use information in such a way that it meets the DOJ regulatory definition of research.

Research, for the purposes of human subjects protections for OJP-funded programs, is defined as, “a systematic investigation, including research development, testing, and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge” 28 C.F.R. § 46.102(d). For additional information on determining whether a proposed activity would constitute research, see the decision tree to assist applicants on the “Research and the Protection of Human Subjects” section of the [OJP Funding Resource Center](http://ojp.gov/funding/Explore/SolicitationRequirements/EvidenceResearchEvaluationRequirements.htm) web page (ojp.gov/funding/Explore/SolicitationRequirements/EvidenceResearchEvaluationRequirements.htm). Applicants whose proposals may involve a research or statistical component also should review the “Data Privacy and Confidentiality Requirements” section on that web page.

- e. Sustainability

4. Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative

a. Budget Detail Worksheet

A sample Budget Detail Worksheet can be found at www.ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/BudgetDetailWorksheet.pdf. Applicants that submit their budget in a different format should include the budget categories listed in the sample budget worksheet.

Applicants should budget travel and lodging expenses for a four-person team, including a research partner to attend two 2-day meetings during the 24-month period. The meetings may be held in the Washington, D.C. area or other like regions of the country.

For questions pertaining to budget and examples of allowable and unallowable costs, see the Financial Guide at www.ojp.gov/financialguide/index.htm.

b. Budget Narrative

The budget narrative should thoroughly and clearly describe every category of expense listed in the Budget Detail Worksheet. OJP expects proposed budgets to be complete, cost effective, and allowable (e.g., reasonable, allocable, and necessary for project activities).

Applicants should demonstrate in their budget narratives how they will maximize cost effectiveness of grant expenditures. Budget narratives should generally describe cost effectiveness in relation to potential alternatives and the goals of the project. For example, a budget narrative should detail why planned in-person meetings are

necessary, or how technology and collaboration with outside organizations could be used to reduce costs, without compromising quality.

The narrative should be mathematically sound and correspond with the information and figures provided in the Budget Detail Worksheet. The narrative should explain how the applicant estimated and calculated all costs, and how they are relevant to the completion of the proposed project. The narrative may include tables for clarification purposes but need not be in a spreadsheet format. As with the Budget Detail Worksheet, the Budget Narrative should be broken down by year.

c. Non-Competitive Procurement Contracts In Excess of Simplified Acquisition Threshold

If an applicant proposes to make one or more non-competitive procurements of products or services, where the non-competitive procurement will exceed the simplified acquisition threshold (also known as the small purchase threshold), which is currently set at \$150,000, the application should address the considerations outlined in the [Financial Guide](#).

d. Pre-Agreement Cost Approvals

For information on pre-agreement costs, see Section [B. Federal Award Information](#).

5. Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable)

Indirect costs are allowed only if the applicant has a current federally approved indirect cost rate. (This requirement does not apply to units of local government.) Attach a copy of the federally approved indirect cost rate agreement to the application. Applicants that do not have an approved rate may request one through their cognizant federal agency, which will review all documentation and approve a rate for the applicant organization, or, if the applicant's accounting system permits, costs may be allocated in the direct cost categories. For the definition of Cognizant Federal Agency, see the "Glossary of Terms" in the [Financial Guide](#). For assistance with identifying your cognizant agency, please contact the Customer Service Center at 1-800-458-0786 or at ask.ocfo@usdoj.gov. If DOJ is the cognizant federal agency, applicants may obtain information needed to submit an indirect cost rate proposal at www.ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/IndirectCosts.pdf.

6. Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable)

Tribes, tribal organizations, or third parties proposing to provide direct services or assistance to residents on tribal lands should include in their applications a resolution, a letter, affidavit, or other documentation, as appropriate, that certifies that the applicant has the legal authority from the tribe(s) to implement the proposed project on tribal lands. In those instances when an organization or consortium of tribes applies for a grant on behalf of a tribe or multiple specific tribes, the application should include appropriate legal documentation, as described above, from all tribes that would receive services or assistance under the grant. A consortium of tribes for which existing consortium bylaws allow action without support from all tribes in the consortium (i.e., without an authorizing resolution or comparable legal documentation from each tribal governing body) may submit, instead, a copy of its consortium bylaws with the application.

7. Applicant Disclosure of High Risk Status

Applicants are to disclose whether they are currently designated high risk by another federal grant making agency. This includes any status requiring additional oversight by the federal

agency due to past programmatic or financial concerns. If an applicant is designated high risk by another federal grant making agency, you must email the following information to OJPComplianceReporting@usdoj.gov at the time of application submission:

- The federal agency that currently designated the applicant as high risk
- Date the applicant was designated high risk
- The high risk point of contact name, phone number, and email address, from that federal agency
- Reasons for the high risk status

OJP seeks this information to ensure appropriate federal oversight of any grant award. Unlike the Excluded Parties List, this high risk information does not disqualify any organization from receiving an OJP award. However, additional grant oversight may be included, if necessary, in award documentation.

8. Additional Attachments

a. Timeline

Include a comprehensive timeline that identifies milestones, numerically listed deliverables, and who is responsible for each activity (provide title and agency).

b. Position Descriptions and Resumes

Include position descriptions and resumes for key project personnel, if known.

c. Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications

Applicants are to disclose whether they have pending applications for federally funded grants or subgrants (including cooperative agreements) that include requests for funding to support the same project being proposed under this solicitation and will cover the identical cost items outlined in the budget narrative and worksheet in the application under this solicitation. The disclosure should include both direct applications for federal funding (e.g., applications to federal agencies) and indirect applications for such funding (e.g., applications to State agencies that will subaward federal funds).

OJP seeks this information to help avoid any inappropriate duplication of funding. Leveraging multiple funding sources in a complementary manner to implement comprehensive programs or projects is encouraged and is not seen as inappropriate duplication.

Applicants that have pending applications as described above are to provide the following information about pending applications submitted within the last 12 months:

- The federal or state funding agency
- The solicitation name/project name
- The point of contact information at the applicable funding agency

Federal or State Funding Agency	Solicitation Name/Project Name	Name/Phone/E-mail for Point of Contact at Funding Agency
DOJ/COPS	COPS Hiring Program	Jane Doe, 202/000-0000; jane.doe@usdoj.gov

HHS/ Substance Abuse & Mental Health Services Administration	Drug Free Communities Mentoring Program/ North County Youth Mentoring Program	John Doe, 202/000-0000; john.doe@hhs.gov
--	---	--

Applicants should include the table as a separate attachment, with the file name “Disclosure of Pending Applications,” to their application. Applicants that do not have pending applications as described above are to include a statement to this effect in the separate attachment page (e.g., “[Applicant Name on SF-424] does not have pending applications submitted within the last 12 months for federally funded grants or subgrants (including cooperative agreements) that include requests for funding to support the same project being proposed under this solicitation and will cover the identical cost items outlined in the budget narrative and worksheet in the application under this solicitation.”).

d. Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity

If a proposal involves research and/or evaluation, regardless of the proposal’s other merits, in order to receive funds, the applicant must demonstrate research/evaluation independence, including appropriate safeguards to ensure research/evaluation objectivity and integrity, both in this proposal and as it may relate to the applicant’s other current or prior related projects. This documentation may be included as an attachment to the application which addresses BOTH i. and ii. below.

- i. For purposes of this solicitation, applicants must document research and evaluation independence and integrity by including, at a minimum, one of the following two items:
 - a. A specific assurance that the applicant has reviewed its proposal to identify any research integrity issues (including all principal investigators and sub-recipients) and it has concluded that the design, conduct, or reporting of research and evaluation funded by BJA grants, cooperative agreements, or contracts will not be biased by any personal or financial conflict of interest on the part of part of its staff, consultants, and/or sub-recipients responsible for the research and evaluation or on the part of the applicant organization;

OR

- b. A specific listing of actual or perceived conflicts of interest that the applicant has identified in relation to this proposal. These conflicts could be either personal (related to specific staff, consultants, and/or sub-recipients) or organizational (related to the applicant or any subgrantee organization). Examples of potential investigator (or other personal) conflict situations may include, but are not limited to, those in which an investigator would be in a position to evaluate a spouse’s work product (actual conflict), or an investigator would be in a position to evaluate the work of a former or current colleague (potential apparent conflict). With regard to potential organizational conflicts of interest, as one example, generally an organization could not be given a grant to evaluate a project if that organization had itself provided substantial prior technical assistance to that specific project or a location implementing the project (whether funded by OJP or other sources), as the organization in such an instance would appear to be evaluating the effectiveness of its own prior work. The key is whether a

reasonable person understanding all of the facts would be able to have confidence that the results of any research or evaluation project are objective and reliable. Any outside personal or financial interest that casts doubt on that objectivity and reliability of an evaluation or research product is a problem and must be disclosed.

- ii. In addition, for purposes of this solicitation applicants must address the issue of possible mitigation of research integrity concerns by including, at a minimum, one of the following two items:
 - a. If an applicant reasonably believes that no potential personal or organizational conflicts of interest exist, then the applicant should provide a brief narrative explanation of how and why it reached that conclusion. Applicants **MUST** also include an explanation of the specific processes and procedures that the applicant will put in place to identify and eliminate (or, at the very least, mitigate) potential personal or financial conflicts of interest on the part of its staff, consultants, and/or sub-recipients for this particular project, should that be necessary during the grant period. Documentation that may be helpful in this regard could include organizational codes of ethics/conduct or policies regarding organizational, personal, and financial conflicts of interest.

OR

- b. If the applicant has identified specific personal or organizational conflicts of interest in its proposal during this review, the applicant must propose a specific and robust mitigation plan to address conflicts noted above. At a minimum, the plan must include specific processes and procedures that the applicant will put in place to eliminate (or, at the very least, mitigate) potential personal or financial conflicts of interest on the part of its staff, consultants, and/or sub-recipients for this particular project, should that be necessary during the grant period. Documentation that may be helpful in this regard could include organizational codes of ethics/conduct or policies regarding organizational, personal, and financial conflicts of interest. There is no guarantee that the plan, if any, will be accepted as proposed.

Considerations in assessing research and evaluation independence and integrity will include, but are not be limited to, the adequacy of the applicant's efforts to identify factors that could affect the objectivity or integrity of the proposed staff and/or the organization in carrying out the research, development, or evaluation activity; and the adequacy of the applicant's existing or proposed remedies to control any such factors.

9. Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire

In accordance with [2 CFR 200.205](#), Federal agencies must have in place a framework for evaluating the risks posed by applicants before they receive a Federal award. To facilitate part of this risk evaluation, **all** applicants (other than an individual) are to download, complete, and submit this [form](#).

10. Disclosure of Lobbying Activities

All applicants must complete this information. Applicants that expend any funds for lobbying activities are to provide the detailed information requested on the form Disclosure of

Lobbying Activities (SF-LLL). Applicants that do not expend any funds for lobbying activities are to enter “N/A” in the text boxes for item 10 (“a. Name and Address of Lobbying Registrant” and “b. Individuals Performing Services”).

How to Apply

Applicants must register in, and submit applications through Grants.gov, a “one-stop storefront” to find federal funding opportunities and apply for funding. Find complete instructions on how to register and submit an application at www.Grants.gov. Applicants that experience technical difficulties during this process should call the Grants.gov Customer Support Hotline at **800-518-4726** or **606-545-5035**, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, except federal holidays. Registering with Grants.gov is a one-time process; however, **processing delays may occur, and it can take several weeks** for first-time registrants to receive confirmation and a user password. OJP encourages applicants to **register several weeks before** the application submission deadline. In addition, OJP urges applicants to submit applications 72 hours prior to the application due date to allow time to receive validation messages or rejection notifications from Grants.gov, and to correct in a timely fashion any problems that may have caused a rejection notification.

BJA strongly encourages all prospective applicants to sign up for Grants.gov email notifications regarding this solicitation. If this solicitation is cancelled or modified, individuals who sign up with Grants.gov for updates will be automatically notified.

Note on File Names and File Types: Grants.gov only permits the use of certain specific characters in names of attachment files. Valid file names may include only the characters shown in the table below. Grants.gov is designed to reject any application that includes an attachment(s) with a file name that contains any characters not shown in the table below.

Characters	Special Characters		
Upper case (A – Z)	Parenthesis ()	Curly braces { }	Square brackets []
Lower case (a – z)	Ampersand (&)	Tilde (~)	Exclamation point (!)
Underscore (_)	Comma (,)	Semicolon (;)	Apostrophe (')
Hyphen (-)	At sign (@)	Number sign (#)	Dollar sign (\$)
Space	Percent sign (%)	Plus sign (+)	Equal sign (=)
Period (.)	When using the ampersand (&) in XML, applicants must use the “&amp;” format.		

Grants.gov is designed to forward successfully submitted applications to OJP’s Grants Management System (GMS).

GMS does not accept executable file types as application attachments. These disallowed file types include, but are not limited to, the following extensions: “.com,” “.bat,” “.exe,” “.vbs,” “.cfg,” “.dat,” “.db,” “.dbf,” “.dll,” “.ini,” “.log,” “.ora,” “.sys,” and “.zip.” GMS may reject applications with files that use these extensions. It is important to allow time to change the type of file(s) if the application is rejected.

All applicants are required to complete the following steps:

OJP may not make a federal award to an applicant until the applicant has complied with all applicable DUNS and SAM requirements. If an applicant has not fully complied with the requirements by the time the federal awarding agency is ready to make a federal award, the

federal awarding agency may determine that the applicant is not qualified to receive a federal award and use that determination as a basis for making a federal award to another applicant.

- 1. Acquire a Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number.** In general, the Office of Management and Budget requires that all applicants (other than individuals) for federal funds include a DUNS number in their applications for a new award or a supplement to an existing award. A DUNS number is a unique nine-digit sequence recognized as the universal standard for identifying and differentiating entities receiving federal funds. The identifier is used for tracking purposes and to validate address and point of contact information for federal assistance applicants, recipients, and subrecipients. The DUNS number will be used throughout the grant life cycle. Obtaining a DUNS number is a free, one-time activity. Call Dun and Bradstreet at 866-705-5711 to obtain a DUNS number or apply online at www.dnb.com. A DUNS number is usually received within 1-2 business days.
- 2. Acquire registration with the System for Award Management (SAM).** SAM is the repository for standard information about federal financial assistance applicants, recipients, and subrecipients. OJP requires all applicants (other than individuals) for federal financial assistance to maintain current registrations in the SAM database. Applicants must be registered in SAM to successfully register in Grants.gov. Applicants must **update or renew their SAM registration annually** to maintain an active status.

Applications cannot be successfully submitted in Grants.gov until Grants.gov receives the SAM registration information. **The information transfer from SAM to Grants.gov can take up to 48 hours.** OJP recommends that the applicant register or renew registration with SAM as early as possible.

Information about SAM registration procedures can be accessed at www.sam.gov.

- 3. Acquire an Authorized Organization Representative (AOR) and a Grants.gov username and password.** Complete the AOR profile on Grants.gov and create a username and password. The applicant organization's DUNS number must be used to complete this step. For more information about the registration process, go to www.grants.gov/applicants/get_registered.jsp.
- 4. Acquire confirmation for the AOR from the E-Business Point of Contact (E-Biz POC).** The E-Biz POC at the applicant organization must log into Grants.gov to confirm the applicant organization's AOR. Note that an organization can have more than one AOR.
- 5. Search for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov.** Use the following identifying information when searching for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov. The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance number for this solicitation is 16.817, titled "Byrne Criminal Justice Innovation Program" and the funding opportunity number is BJA-2015-4080.
- 6. Submit a valid application consistent with this solicitation by following the directions in Grants.gov.** Within 24-48 hours after submitting the electronic application, the applicant should receive two notifications from Grants.gov. The first will confirm the receipt of the application and the second will state whether the application has been successfully validated, or rejected due to errors, with an explanation. It is possible to first receive a message indicating that the application is received and then receive a rejection notice a few minutes or hours later. Submitting well ahead of the deadline provides time to correct the

problem(s) that caused the rejection. **Important:** OJP urges applicants to submit applications **at least 72 hours prior** to the application due date to allow time to receive validation messages or rejection notifications from Grants.gov, and to correct in a timely fashion any problems that may have caused a rejection notification.

Click [here](#) for further details on DUNS, SAM, and Grants.gov registration steps and timeframes.

Note: Duplicate Applications

If an applicant submits multiple versions of the same application, BJA will review only the most recent system-validated version submitted. See Note on File Names and File Types under [How to Apply](#).

Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues

Applicants that experience unforeseen Grants.gov technical issues beyond their control that prevent them from submitting their application by the deadline must contact the Grants.gov [Customer Support Hotline](#) or the [SAM Help Desk](#) to report the technical issue and receive a tracking number. Then applicant must e-mail the BJA contact identified in the Contact Information section on page BJA **within 24 hours after the application deadline** and request approval to submit their application. The e-mail must describe the technical difficulties, and include a timeline of the applicant's submission efforts, the complete grant application, the applicant's DUNS number, and any Grants.gov Help Desk or SAM tracking number(s). **Note: BJA does not automatically approve requests.** After the program office reviews the submission, and contacts the Grants.gov or SAM Help Desks to validate the reported technical issues, OJP will inform the applicant whether the request to submit a late application has been approved or denied. If OJP determines that the applicant failed to follow all required procedures, which resulted in an untimely application submission, OJP will deny the applicant's request to submit their application.

The following conditions are generally insufficient to justify late submissions:

- Failure to register in SAM or Grants.gov in sufficient time
- Failure to follow Grants.gov instructions on how to register and apply as posted on its web site
- Failure to follow each instruction in the OJP solicitation
- Technical issues with the applicant's computer or information technology environment, including firewalls

Notifications regarding known technical problems with Grants.gov, if any, are posted at the top of the OJP funding web page at www.ojp.gov/funding/Explore/CurrentFundingOpportunities.htm.

E. Application Review Information

Selection Criteria

The following six selection criteria will be used by peer reviewers to evaluate each application, with different weight given to each based on the percentage value listed after each individual criteria. For example, the first criteria, "Statement of the Problem," is worth 20 percent of the entire score in the application review process.

1. Statement of the Problem (20 percent)

Describe the problem, gaps, and needs currently faced by the jurisdiction's public defense delivery system; providing detailed data to support the statement of the problem.

Describe any existing partnership with an academic community or research partner.

2. Program Design and Implementation (30 percent)

Outline the program design and implementation strategy, using at a minimum one of the four ABA ten principles listed on page 5 that the jurisdiction will employ to improve its ability to provide quality representation. Applicants must use a thoughtful and thorough analytical approach when developing the strategy and should detail how the research partner informs this strategy.

As part of the design and implementation, applicants should tie project activities/deliverables to goals and objectives, showing how the strategy will accomplish expected impacts/outcomes.

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the research partner in the Smart Defense Initiative and how they are integrated into the applicant's proposed strategy. At a minimum, the research partner should: assist in the analysis of the problem; participate in solution development; provide ongoing analysis, monitoring, and evaluation of the solution(s) impact; and prepare a final report that thoroughly assesses the results of the project.

In addition, the required timeline should identify each project activity, expected completion date, and responsible person or organization.

3. Capabilities and Competencies (25 percent)

Fully describe organizational capabilities to implement the project, including evidence of the types and quality of data sources available to the agency to conduct appropriate analysis.

For example:

- Does the agency have access to multiple sources of data (both internal and external to the agency) specific to the identified problem?
- Does the agency have the ability to integrate data from different sources?

Identify personnel who are critical to project implementation—describing their roles, responsibilities, and qualifications.

The involvement of a research partner is indispensable for this project. Research partners should be able to conduct "action research," be well versed in evaluation methods, and have experience working with the criminal justice system. Describe the following for the research partner:

- Describe previous experience working with criminal justice agencies or organizations, including policy, program, or organization evaluation experience. Justice system experience is required.
- Describe criminal justice research experience, including oral and written presentations of research results and data collection methodologies used. Include citations to previous evaluations conducted by the proposed researcher.

4. Plan for Collecting the Data Required for this Solicitation’s Performance Measures (10 percent)

Describe the process for measuring project performance; including who will collect and report the data, how the data will be stored, and how it will be used to guide and evaluate the impact of the program.

Describe how the program’s performance data will be shared with customers and stakeholders.

5. Sustainment (5 percent)

Describe how the Smart Defense strategy will be sustained when the federal grant ends.

6. Budget (10 percent)

Provide a proposed budget and budget narrative for the entire project that are complete, cost effective, and allowable (e.g., reasonable, allocable, and necessary for project activities). Budget narrative should demonstrate cost effectiveness in relation to the goals and objectives of the project.³

Applicants should budget travel and lodging expenses for a four-person team, including a research partner to attend two 2-day meetings during the 24-month period. The meetings may be held in the Washington, D.C. area or other like regions of the country.

Review Process

OJP is committed to ensuring a fair and open process for awarding grants. BJA reviews the application to make sure that the information presented is reasonable, understandable, measurable, and achievable, as well as consistent with the solicitation.

Peer reviewers will review the applications submitted under this solicitation that meet basic minimum requirements. For purposes of assessing whether applicants have met basic minimum requirements, OJP screens applications for compliance with specified program requirements to help determine which applications should proceed to further consideration for award. Although program requirements may vary, the following are common requirements applicable to all solicitations for funding under OJP grant programs:

- Applications must be submitted by an eligible type of applicant
- Applications must request funding within programmatic funding constraints (if applicable)
- Applications must be responsive to the scope of the solicitation
- Applications must include all items designated as “critical elements”
- Applicants will be checked against the General Services Administration’s Excluded Parties List

For a list of critical elements, see “What an Application Should Include” under [Section D. Application and Submission Information](#).

³ Generally speaking, a reasonable cost is a cost that, in its nature or amount, does not exceed that which would be incurred by a prudent person under the circumstances prevailing at the time the decision was made to incur the costs.

BJA may use internal peer reviewers, external peer reviewers, or a combination, to assess applications meeting basic minimum requirements on technical merit using the solicitation's selection criteria. An external peer reviewer is an expert in the subject matter of a given solicitation who is not a current DOJ employee. An internal reviewer is a current DOJ employee who is well-versed or has expertise in the subject matter of this solicitation. A peer review panel will evaluate, score, and rate applications that meet basic minimum requirements. Peer reviewers' ratings and any resulting recommendations are advisory only, although their views are considered carefully. In addition to peer review ratings, considerations for award recommendations and decisions may include, but are not limited to, underserved populations, geographic diversity, strategic priorities, past performance under prior BJA and OJP awards, and available funding.

OJP reviews applications for potential discretionary awards to evaluate the risks posed by applicants before they receive an award. This review may include but is not limited to the following:

1. Financial stability and fiscal integrity
2. Quality of management systems and ability to meet the management standards prescribed in the Financial Guide
3. History of performance
4. Reports and findings from audits
5. The applicant's ability to effectively implement statutory, regulatory, or other requirements imposed on non-federal entities
6. Proposed costs to determine if the Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative accurately explain project costs, and whether those costs are reasonable, necessary, and allowable under applicable federal cost principles and agency regulations

Absent explicit statutory authorization or written delegation of authority to the contrary, all final award decisions will be made by the Assistant Attorney General, who may consider factors including, but not limited to, peer review ratings, underserved populations, geographic diversity, strategic priorities, past performance under prior BJA and OJP awards, and available funding when making awards.

F. Federal Award Administration Information

Federal Award Notices

OJP award notification will be sent from GMS. Recipients will be required to log in; accept any outstanding assurances and certifications on the award; designate a financial point of contact; and review, sign, and accept the award. The award acceptance process involves physical signature of the award document by the authorized representative and the scanning of the fully-executed award document to OJP.

Administrative, National Policy, and other Legal Requirements

If selected for funding, in addition to implementing the funded project consistent with the agency-approved project proposal and budget, the recipient must comply with award terms and conditions, and other legal requirements, including but not limited to OMB, DOJ or other federal regulations which will be included in the award, incorporated into the award by reference, or are otherwise applicable to the award. OJP strongly encourages prospective applicants to review the information pertaining to these requirements **prior** to submitting an application. To assist

applicants and recipients in accessing and reviewing this information, OJP has placed pertinent information on its [Solicitation Requirements](#) page of the [OJP Funding Resource Center](#).

Please note in particular the following two forms, which applicants must accept in GMS prior to the receipt of any award funds, as each details legal requirements with which applicants must provide specific assurances and certifications of compliance. Applicants may view these forms in the Apply section of the [OJP Funding Resource Center](#) and are strongly encouraged to review and consider them carefully prior to making an application for OJP grant funds.

- [Certifications Regarding Lobbying; Debarment, Suspension and Other Responsibility Matters; and Drug-Free Workplace Requirements](#)
- [Standard Assurances](#)

Upon grant approval, OJP electronically transmits (via GMS) the award document to the prospective award recipient. In addition to other award information, the award document contains award terms and conditions that specify national policy requirements⁴ with which recipients of federal funding must comply; uniform administrative requirements, cost principles, and audit requirements; and program-specific terms and conditions required based on applicable program (statutory) authority or requirements set forth in OJP solicitations and program announcements, and other requirements which may be attached to appropriated funding. For example, certain efforts may call for special requirements, terms, or conditions relating to intellectual property, data/information-sharing or -access, or information security; or audit requirements, expenditures and milestones, or publications and/or press releases. OJP also may place additional terms and conditions on an award based on its risk assessment of the applicant, or for other reasons it determines necessary to fulfill the goals and objectives of the program.

Prospective applicants may access and review the text of mandatory conditions OJP includes in all OJP awards, as well as the text of certain other conditions, such as administrative conditions, via [Mandatory Award Terms and Conditions](#) page of the [OJP Funding Resource Center](#).

General Information about Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements

Recipients must submit quarterly financial reports, semi-annual progress reports, final financial and progress reports, and, if applicable, an annual audit report in accordance with 2 CFR Part 200. Future awards and fund drawdowns may be withheld if reports are delinquent.

Special Reporting requirements may be required by OJP depending on the statutory, legislative or administrative obligations of the recipient or the program.

G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s)

For additional Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s), see the Title page.

For additional contact information for Grants.gov, see the Title page. **Error! Reference source not found.**

⁴ See generally 2 C.F.R. 200.300 (provides a general description of national policy requirements typically applicable to recipients of federal awards, including the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (FFATA)).

H. Other Information

Provide Feedback to OJP

To assist OJP in improving its application and award processes, we encourage applicants to provide feedback on this solicitation, the application submission process, and/or the application review/peer review process. Provide feedback to OJPSolicitationFeedback@usdoj.gov.

IMPORTANT: This e-mail is for feedback and suggestions only. Replies are **not** sent from this mailbox. If you have specific questions on any program or technical aspect of the solicitation, **you must** directly contact the appropriate number or e-mail listed on the front of this solicitation document. These contacts are provided to help ensure that you can directly reach an individual who can address your specific questions in a timely manner.

If you are interested in being a reviewer for other OJP grant applications, please e-mail your resume to ojppeerreview@lmbps.com. The OJP Solicitation Feedback email account will not forward your resume. **Note:** Neither you nor anyone else from your organization can be a peer reviewer in a competition in which you or your organization have submitted an application.

Application Checklist
FY 2015 Smart Defense Initiative Answering Gideon's Call: Improving Public Defense Delivery Systems

This application checklist has been created to assist in developing an application.

What an Applicant Should Do:

Prior to Registering in Grants.gov:

- _____ Acquire a DUNS Number (see page 19)
- _____ Acquire or renew registration with SAM (see page 19)

To Register with Grants.gov:

- _____ Acquire AOR and Grants.gov username/password (see page 19)
- _____ Acquire AOR confirmation from the E-Biz POC (see page 19)

To Find Funding Opportunity:

- _____ Search for the Funding Opportunity on Grants.gov (see page 19)
- _____ Download Funding Opportunity and Application Package
- _____ Sign up for Grants.gov email notifications (optional) (see page 18)
- _____ Read [Important Notice: Applying for Grants in Grants.gov](#)

After application submission, receive Grants.gov email notifications that:

- _____ (1) application has been received,
- _____ (2) application has either been successfully validated or rejected with errors (see page 19)

If no Grants.gov receipt, and validation or error notifications are received:

- _____ contact the NCJRS Response Center regarding experiencing technical difficulties (see page 20)

General Requirements:

- _____ Review the [Solicitation Requirements](#) in the OJP Funding Resource Center.

Scope Requirement:

- _____ The federal amount requested is within the allowable limit(s) of \$400,000.

Eligibility Requirement: Eligible applicants are state or local government agencies, independent boards or commissions, state or local public defender organizations, and other organizations, including nonprofit organizations (including tribal nonprofit organizations).

What an Application Should Include:

- _____ Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424) (see page 10)
- _____ Project Abstract (see page 10)
- _____ *Program Narrative, including timeline and resumes (see page 10)
- _____ *Budget Detail Worksheet (see page 13)
- _____ *Budget Narrative (see page 13)
 - _____ Employee Compensation Waiver request and justification (if applicable) (see page 8)
 - _____ Read OJP policy and guidance on conference approval, planning, and reporting

available at oip.gov/financialguide/PostawardRequirements/chapter15page1.htm
(see page 8)

- _____ Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (SF-LLL) (see page 17)
- _____ Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable) (see page 14)
- _____ Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable) (see page 14)
- _____ Applicant Disclosure of High Risk Status (see page 14)
- _____ Additional Attachments
 - _____ Timeline (see page 15)
 - _____ Resumes (see page 15)
 - _____ Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications (see page 15)
 - _____ Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity (see page 16)
- _____ Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire (if applicable) (see page 17)

* These elements are the basic minimum requirements for applications. Applications that do not include these elements shall neither proceed to peer review nor receive further consideration by BJA.