The U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), Office of Justice Programs (OJP), Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) is seeking applications for funding to address the issue of unsubmitted sexual assault kits (SAKs) at law enforcement agencies. This program furthers the Department’s mission by improving state and local jurisdictions’ response to violent crime and improving the functioning of the criminal justice system.

National Sexual Assault Kit Initiative (SAKI) FY 2015 Competitive Grant Announcement

Eligibility
Eligible applicants are state, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies, prosecutor’s offices, or a governmental non-law enforcement agency acting as fiscal agent for the applicant.

BJA welcomes applications that involve two or more entities; however, one eligible entity must be the applicant and the others must be proposed as subrecipients. The lead applicant must be a state, local, or tribal law enforcement agency, prosecutor’s office, or a governmental non-law enforcement agency acting as fiscal agent for the applicant and the entity with primary responsibility for administering the funding and managing the entire program. Only one application per lead applicant will be considered; however, subrecipients may be part of multiple proposals.

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 May 7, 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-2015-4115

Release date: March 9, 2015
### Contents

A. Program Description .................................................................................................................. 4  
   Overview ................................................................................................................................. 4  
   Program-Specific Information ................................................................................................. 5  
   Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables ...................................................................................... 7  
   Evidence-Based Programs or Practices .................................................................................. 10  

B. Federal Award Information .................................................................................................... 11  
   Type of Award ......................................................................................................................... 11  
   Financial Management and System of Internal Controls ....................................................... 11  
   Budget Information ............................................................................................................... 12  
   Cost Sharing or Match Requirement ...................................................................................... 12  
   Pre-Agreement Cost Approvals ............................................................................................. 12  
   Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver .......................... 12  
   Prior Approval, Planning, and Reporting of Conference/Meeting/Training Costs ............... 13  
   Costs Associated with Language Assistance (if applicable) ................................................ 13  

C. Eligibility Information .......................................................................................................... 13  
   Cost Sharing or Match Requirement ...................................................................................... 13  
   Limit on Number of Application Submissions ....................................................................... 13  

D. Application and Submission Information ............................................................................. 13  
   What an Application Should Include .................................................................................... 13  
   How to Apply .......................................................................................................................... 23  

E. Application Review Information ............................................................................................ 26  
   Selection Criteria ................................................................................................................... 26  
   Review Process ....................................................................................................................... 28  

F. Federal Award Administration Information .......................................................................... 29  
   Federal Award Notices .......................................................................................................... 29  
   Administrative, National Policy, and other Legal Requirements .......................................... 29  
   General Information about Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements .......................... 30  

G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s) .................................................................................. 31  

H. Other Information ................................................................................................................ 31  
   Provide Feedback to OJP ......................................................................................................... 31  

Application Checklist ................................................................................................................ 32
National Sexual Assault Kit Initiative (SAKI) (CFDA #16.833)

A. Program Description

Overview
The National Sexual Assault Kit Initiative (SAKI), administered by BJA, provides funding through a competitive grant program to support multidisciplinary community response teams engaged in the comprehensive reform of jurisdictions’ approaches to sexual assault cases resulting from evidence found in previously unsubmitted sexual assault kits (SAKs). Unsubmitted kits (those in police custody that have never been submitted to a crime laboratory for testing) and untested kits (those that have been submitted to crime labs but are delayed for testing for longer than 30 days, e.g., as a result of a backlog of work in the laboratory) are separate and distinct issues. The focus of this effort is on those unsubmitted kits that have never been submitted to a crime laboratory.

The goal of the SAKI is the creation of a coordinated community response that ensures just resolution to these cases whenever possible through a victim-centered approach, as well as to build jurisdictions’ capacity to prevent the development of conditions that lead to high numbers of unsubmitted SAKs in the future. This holistic program provides jurisdictions with resources to address their unsubmitted SAK issue, including support to inventory, test, and track SAKs; create and report performance metrics; access necessary training to increase effectiveness in addressing the complex issues associated with these cases and engage in multidisciplinary policy development, implementation, and coordination; and improve practices related to investigation, prosecution, and victim engagement and support in connection with evidence and cases resulting from the testing process.

Research supported by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) on unsubmitted SAKs at pilot sites in Detroit, Michigan and Houston, Texas supports the value of testing unsubmitted SAKs in solving sexual assault cases. It has also highlighted the complexity of the issue. Unsubmitted SAKs in the custody of law enforcement agencies can be attributed to a wide range of factors, including poor evidence tracking, outdated and ineffective investigation practices, misunderstanding of crime lab case acceptance policies, and lack of understanding among law enforcement about the value of testing kits in various types of cases. This recent research identified the need for more trained investigative and prosecutorial resources to deal with the increased number of investigations and prosecutions resulting from testing a high number of previously unsubmitted SAKs, as well as the importance of linking victims to needed services. Thus, the critical needs around this issue extend well beyond testing kits and increasing crime lab capacity; this program also addresses the investigative and prosecutorial aspects of sexual assault cases resulting from the testing and enhancing provision of victim services.

---

1 Comprehensive findings from these studies are forthcoming.
There is currently no reliable estimate for the number of unsubmitted kits in the custody of law enforcement agencies nationwide. As noted in a 2011 NIJ Special Report, the problem in assessing the scope is complicated by the fact that some police departments may have deficient evidence tracking, storage, and retention policies, protocols, and facilities. Furthermore, unsubmitted SAKs may be located in places other than police evidence rooms, including hospitals, clinics, rape crisis centers, and unofficial evidence retention locations.

In addition, many law enforcement agencies encounter data sharing obstacles when exchanging information about Combined DNA Index System (CODIS) “hits” among police, prosecutors, and crime labs in a seamless and real time manner.

Funding under this solicitation is intended to help agencies address these challenges and reduce the number of unsubmitted SAKs in their jurisdiction, while achieving the long-term goal of improving the criminal justice response to cases of sexual assault.

This initiative is funded by the Department of Justice Appropriations Act, 2015 (P.L. 113-235).

**Program-Specific Information**

SAKI is a competitive grant program that will provide funding to government entities within state, local, and tribal jurisdictions to inventory, track, and test previously unsubmitted SAKs (excluding SAKs that have already been submitted to the crime laboratory); produce necessary protocols and policies in support of improved coordination and collaboration among laboratories, police, prosecutors, and victim service providers in response to this emergent evidence and casework; resources to comprehensively address the sexual assault investigations and prosecutions that result from evidence and CODIS hits produced by tested SAKs; as well as to support and optimize victim notification protocols and services.

For purposes of this program the following are defined:

- **Sexual Assault Kit (SAK):** A set of items used by medical personnel for the preservation of physical evidence collected from a person, living or deceased, following an allegation or suspicion of sexual assault.

- **Unsubmitted SAK:** SAKs that have not been submitted to a forensic laboratory for testing and analysis.

- **Inventory:** A detailed and descriptive list of articles or items (for purposes of this solicitation, SAKs) containing information such as, but not limited to: item identifiers, quantity, and location of the item.

- **Tracking:** The monitoring and accounting of SAKs through the course, or path, of their movement from collection through final disposition.

- **Reporting:** The task of delivering a written, detailed report to the appropriate entity within the prescribed time period and with the applicable data provided.

Based on the findings emerging from both the Detroit and Houston NIJ research projects and the recommendations of subject-matter experts (SMEs), BJA is implementing a national

---

response model to address the issue of unsubmitted SAKs. The essential elements of a comprehensive model to address the issues that underlie the problem of unsubmitted SAKs are as follows (hereafter referred to as the BJA model):

1. The performance of an inventory of all unsubmitted SAKs in the jurisdiction’s possession (excluding SAKs already submitted to the crime lab) regardless of where they are stored (police evidence facility, hospital, and other relevant locations) and the tracking of their progress from testing through final adjudication.

2. The creation of a regularly convened multidisciplinary working group for each site to address and identify the individual-level, organizational-level, and systemic factors that lead to high numbers of unsubmitted SAKs in the jurisdiction and development of a comprehensive strategy to address the issue. This working group should be comprised of law enforcement (including superior officers and officers that respond to and investigate sexual assault complaints), forensic medical personnel (including sexual assault forensic examiners), forensic laboratory personnel, prosecutors, and victim advocates (both system and community-based). [Some jurisdictions may already have Sexual Assault Response Teams (SARTS) in place which could form the basis of the working group].

3. A designated “site coordinator” who will serve as the central point of contact for the site team. This individual will be responsible for fostering and coordinating communication among the team members and ensuring that the team is meeting its milestones.

To qualify for SAKI funding, applicants must propose to implement a comprehensive sexual assault response program plan that includes all three elements of the BJA model as outlined above.

Applicants will be required to track inventoried SAKs throughout the course of the award as part of their programmatic reporting requirements. Specifically, it will be expected that agencies will utilize an automated information technology system to track each SAK using an assigned unique identifier. The applicant must also identify the date upon which the state, tribe, or unit of local government would be barred by the applicable statute of limitations from prosecuting the offender.

A 2-day workshop for all grant recipient sites will take place in Washington, DC in FY 2016. All key site team personnel will be expected to attend. The workshop will focus on the elements of a successful project and key issues around DNA and unsubmitted SAK evidence.

Applicants must clearly delineate the amount of funding requested for SAK testing and associated review and certification activities. As this grant program is intended to assist jurisdictions in developing a comprehensive approach to the issue of unsubmitted SAKs and sexual assault case response, BJA does not anticipate funding projects that propose allocating more than 50 percent of their grant funds to SAK testing.

State or local crime laboratories can, and should, partner with the law enforcement agency or prosecutors’ office who serves as the lead applicant, but are not eligible to be lead applicants for this award since the BJA funding is intended for a comprehensive holistic approach. Crime labs seeking funding solely for DNA backlog elimination resources are encouraged to apply for the applicable grants managed by NIJ.
All DNA analyses conducted as a result of this program must be performed by a laboratory (government-owned or fee-for-service) that is accredited and currently undergoes external audits not less than once every 2 years. These audits must demonstrate that the laboratory maintains compliance with the DNA Quality Assurance Standards established by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. All eligible DNA profiles obtained with funding under this program must be entered into CODIS and, where applicable, uploaded to the National DNA Index System (NDIS).

BJA suggests that no profiles generated during the testing portion of this program be entered into any non-governmental DNA database.

All DNA analyses conducted and profiles generated during the testing portion of this program must be maintained pursuant to all applicable federal privacy requirements, including those described in 42 U.S.C. § 14132(b)(3).

Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables
The goal of this grant program is to address the growing number of unsubmitted SAKs in law enforcement custody. There is broad consensus that this must be accomplished through an integrative approach to the problem. Grant funding may be used to inventory the existing numbers of unsubmitted SAKs, test these kits, and assign designated personnel to pursue new investigative leads and prosecutions and to support victims throughout the investigation and prosecution process. Grants may also be used to develop evidence-tracking systems, train law enforcement on sexual assault investigations, and conduct research on outcomes in sexual assault cases.

It is required that all grant recipients will utilize a comprehensive model to address the issues that underlie the problem of unsubmitted SAKs including:

- The performance of an inventory of all unsubmitted SAKs in the jurisdictions as described above.
- The creation of a regularly convened multidisciplinary working group as described above. The objective of this working group is to enact systemic changes, programmatic activities, and deliverables that:
  - Eliminate or reduce the existing number of unsubmitted SAKs through increased and strategic testing initiative, and effect changes in practice, protocol, and organizational culture necessary to prevent the issue from reoccurring in the future.
  - Improve training, to include cross-disciplinary training among group members to ensure all participants/disciplines are prepared to respond to the evidence emerging from unsubmitted SAKs in a victim-centered manner and improve the quality of response to future reports of sexual assault. Such training should include instruction on the probative value of forensic evidence typically contained in SAKs, including its utility in developing investigatory leads, identifying suspects, and increasing the likelihood of successful prosecution of the case.
  - Establish evidence-based, victim-centered protocols and policies that address SAK evidence collection, testing, and tracking and victim engagement, notification, and support.
  - Identify and allocate resources (laboratory review, investigatory, prosecutorial, and advocacy) required to produce and follow up on all valid evidence resulting from the testing process.
Establish or implement processes that prioritize the investigation and adjudication of the SAKI cases.

Establish evidence tracking, case management, and victim notification mechanisms that enhance accountability, transparency, and information sharing among different system actors as well as victims’ access to their case status. These systems must enhance the jurisdiction’s ability to manage and monitor the progress of kits through the evidence collection and testing process, provide enhanced case management capabilities that assist in case assignment, tiered supervisory review, and electronic case tracking through disposition of cases associated with kits and provide victims with access to information about their cases.

Leverage the data gathered from the comprehensive testing process to improve the understanding of the nature and extent of the sexual assault problem in the community, and inform the creation of policy and programmatic interventions needed to respond.

Strengthen advocacy resources, within the police agency and/or the community based advocacy organizations. This may include the creation of an advocate position within the police agency dedicated to victim engagement and notification who can work with investigators as they pursue leads associated with evidence from previously unsubmitted SAKs. It would also include enhancing the crisis center’s capacity to serve an increased number of victims with the unique advocacy and justice needs that arise when previously unsubmitted SAKs are tested.

Identify a designated “site coordinator” who will serve as the central point of contact for the site team. This individual will be responsible for fostering and coordinating communication among the team members and ensuring that the team is meeting its milestones. Additionally, this person must work on a regular basis with the BJA training and technical assistance (TTA) provider assigned to the site. (BJA will also be awarding funding for the SAKI National TTA Program, which will provide direct assistance to jurisdictions that receive funding through the SAKI program and provide targeted TTA in support of their initiatives as well as other jurisdictions engaged in reform efforts as resources allow).

Applicants may request funds to support the outlined deliverables in support of the following project activities:

- Performing a comprehensive inventory of unsubmitted SAKs and establishment of the necessary policies and protocols to establish an all-inclusive SAK testing strategy.

- Testing of SAKs, to include outsourcing kits for testing and technical review of data/results, as well as tracking and reporting of performance metrics.

- Identifying the challenges related to outsourcing, technical review of data and CODIS uploads of results produced by private labs, current in-house standard operating procedures that contribute to deficiencies in the DNA screening and testing process, and determine solutions to promote greater efficiency.

- Providing additional assistance (not including laboratory equipment) that should include support for public labs’ implementation of sustainable automated and streamlined SAK processing procedures to ensure long-term capacity and efficiency.
- Establishing a regularly convened multidisciplinary working group to identify the individual-level, organizational-level, and systemic factors that lead to high numbers of unsubmitted SAKs in the jurisdiction. Development of a comprehensive strategy to address the issue and to implement the elements of the comprehensive model for sexual assault response reform.

- Supporting personnel costs, including hiring and overtime, to allow adequate follow up for investigations and prosecutions that result from evidence related to testing SAKs. This may include the establishment of cold case or sexual assault investigation units, and the hiring of specialized victim advocates to engage in victim-centered notification, communication, and support activities.

- Purchasing of SAK/evidence tracking systems, case management systems, or other technology (not including laboratory equipment) to enhance investigation/prosecution capacity in relation to these cases as part of a holistic approach, and training on the new systems.

- Training in relation to sexual assault evidence collection, DNA technology, victimization and trauma response, and other related topics to improve the quality and outcomes of sexual assault investigations and prosecutions.

- Developing evidence collection, retention, victim notification, and other protocols needed to optimize data sharing, case investigation, prosecution, and victim support.

- Enhancing victim services and support for past and current victims of sexual assault, as well as the provision of mechanisms through which victims can easily access updated information about the status of their SAK or associated investigation and/or prosecution.

Addressing the issue of expiration of statute of limitations on SAKs in their custody; testing protocols; investigation practices; and policies and procedures related to previously closed cases that are subsequently reopened as a result of new evidence obtained through the SAK testing process.

To qualify for SAKI funding, applicants must propose to implement a comprehensive sexual assault response reform program plan that includes all three elements of the BJA model: 1. Inventory, 2. Creation of a Multidisciplinary Working Group, and 3. Designated Site Coordinator. Funds may be requested to support the three major elements if required, or, for specific and discrete elements as determined by the needs of the applicant’s jurisdiction. However, regardless of the proposed use of funds, applicants must describe how their project will include all three of the BJA model’s elements in their program plan.

If an unsubmitted SAK inventory has already been completed by the applicant jurisdiction, the applicant must provide information regarding the results of their inventory in their proposal and request funding support for the tracking, multidisciplinary team and the site coordinator as necessary. If applicants have already completed an inventory of existing unsubmitted SAKs, certification of this inventory will be required prior to the release of additional funds. This certification requirement may be met through the inclusion of a certification letter signed by the applicant’s chief executive officer. The certification letter should detail the results of the inventory and be included as an attachment with the application.
Award recipients must, on a monthly basis, report the number of SAKs reviewed and catalogued by working group members, including local, state, federal, and tribal law enforcement partners to BJA. It is expected that the inventory will be completed within the first 6 months of the grant being awarded. SAKI grantees will also be encouraged to make their aggregate inventory and tracking data available to the public to increase the transparency of their SAK testing and disposition processes.

Certification of having completed an inventory must be provided, and mechanisms for meeting the reporting requirements clearly established, before funding is released for the remainder of the project activities.

The SAK working group must attempt to identify what contributed to, and continues to drive, the volume of unsubmitted SAKs, and work with all relevant entities to develop and implement new policies and procedures to combat the issues.

SAKI grant recipients will be expected to identify and maintain consistent, experienced, and committed leadership of their sexual assault response reform initiative, and do so through the appointment of a dedicated site coordinator in accordance with the aforementioned model. To produce the deliverables outlined in the model, the SAKI working group must meet regularly and include representatives of all essential agencies, organizations, and individuals necessary to effect the reforms necessary to improve system response to sexual assault. Successful applicants will provide for adequate administrative support for the working group. In addition to those outlined in the model, the working group activities and deliverables will also include:

- Development of methods and processes for the collection, analysis and sharing of critical programmatic data.
- Assessment of stakeholder training needs and provision of training as appropriate.
- Monitoring progress made in follow up investigators and prosecutions, when warranted.
- Close coordination and collaboration with BJA’s national TTA provider.

**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

BJA estimates that it will make up to 12 awards of up to $2 million for an estimated total of $24 million for a 3-year project period, beginning on October 1, 2015. As stated above, BJA does not anticipate funding projects that propose allocating more than 50 percent of their grant funds to SAK testing. However, BJA’s TTA provider will work with grant recipients to attempt to secure additional non-BJA funding for the SAK testing component, if needed.

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 Award

BJA expects that it will make any award from this solicitation in the form of a cooperative agreement, which is a particular type of grant used if BJA expects to have ongoing substantial involvement in award activities. Substantial involvement includes direct oversight and involvement with the grantee organization in implementation of the grant, but does not involve day-to-day project management. See Administrative, National Policy, and other Legal Requirements, under Section F. Federal Award Administration Information, for details regarding the federal involvement anticipated under an award from this solicitation.

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.

5 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)).
(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

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 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. 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.

6 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.
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](http://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.

**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](http://www.ojp.gov/financialguide/PostawardRequirements/chapter15page1.htm).

**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](http://www.ojp.gov/financialguide/PostawardRequirements/chapter15page1.htm).

**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, Budget Narrative, certification of and findings resulting from a completed unsubmitted SAK inventory, if applicable, and Letters of Commitment.

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 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Performance Measure(s)</th>
<th>Data Grantee Provides</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce the number of unsubmitted sexual assault kits (SAKs) by implementing a comprehensive, multidisciplinary plan to inventory, test, and track unsubmitted SAKs through to final adjudication</td>
<td>Number of SAKs inventoried</td>
<td>During the reporting period:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of unsubmitted SAKs identified</td>
<td>A. Number of SAKs inventoried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of previously tested SAKs</td>
<td>B. Of the number of SAKs inventoried, how many were:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of SAKs not requiring testing (e.g., those pertaining to previously adjudicated cases)</td>
<td>1) Identified as unsubmitted SAKs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of unsubmitted SAKS identified needing forensic DNA testing</td>
<td>2) Identified as previously tested SAKs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) Determined not to require testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a) if determined to not require testing, why?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Percentage of unsubmitted SAKs tested for DNA | A. Out of the unsubmitted SAKs, how many were:
   1) determined to need forensic DNA Testing
   2) sent out for DNA testing |
| Percent reduction in the number of unsubmitted SAKs requiring DNA testing | A. Number of DNA profiles from forensic analyses entered into CODIS from SAKs submitted for testing |
| Percent increase in the number of unsubmitted SAKs sent to a lab for DNA testing | B. Number of CODIS hits attributable to SAK submitted for testing |
| Percent of DNA profiles from SAK testing resulting in a CODIS match |  
| Percentage of DNA profiles resulting from SAK DNA testing entered into CODIS |

**Establish a multidisciplinary working group to identify the underlying factors that contribute to unsubmitted SAKs and devise a comprehensive plan to inventory, track, and maintain accountability for SAKs**

- Percentage of project plan outcomes met
- Number of agencies/organizations participating on the SAK initiative working group
- Percent of agencies/organizations stakeholders who commit member participation formally through a Memorandum of Understanding
- Percent of other agencies/organizations stakeholders (not on the working group) who commit participation formally through a Memorandum of Understanding

**During the reporting period:**

- A. Number of project tasks to include but not limited:
  - Establishment of a regularly convening multidisciplinary working group
  - Appointment of a dedicated site coordinator
  - Assessment of stakeholder training needs
- B. Number of project tasks completed
- A. Number of agencies/organizations represented on the SAK initiative working group
- B. Number of agencies/organizations who commit their SAK initiative working group participation formally through a Memorandum of Understanding
- C. Types of personnel participating on the SAK working group, including but not limited to
  1. Law Enforcement Superior Officers
  2. Investigative Officers
  3. Sexual Assault Forensic Examiners
  4. Forensic Laboratory
  5. Prosecutors
  6. Victim Advocates
- A. Number of other (not on the working group) stakeholder agencies/organizations participating in the SAK initiative
- B. Number of formal agreements/partnerships established with other (not on the working group) stakeholders
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Area</th>
<th>Key Performance Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of new policies, procedures, strategies, or interventions developed to</td>
<td>Number of new policies, procedures, strategies, or interventions developed to maintain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maintain accountability of SAKs</td>
<td>accountability of SAKs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of new staff positions created</td>
<td>Number of new staff positions created</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the investigation and prosecution of SAK cases through the adoption of</td>
<td>Number of deliverables that meet expectations on the adoption of improved protocols,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improved protocols, technology, and management systems</td>
<td>technology, and management systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of deliverables that meet expectations</td>
<td>During the reporting period:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the investigation and prosecution of SAK cases through the adoption of</td>
<td>Number of deliverables that meet expectations, where applicable to include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improved protocols, technology, and management systems</td>
<td>• implementation of a new electronic tracking system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• training in relation to sexual assault evidence collection, DNA technology, victimization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and trauma response, other related topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop victim notification protocols and evaluate efficacy to enhance victim</td>
<td>Percent of victims contacted as a result of the SAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>services and support victims of sexual assault</td>
<td>Number of victims that agreed to actively participate in a new investigation resulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from the SAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of victim notification resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase the number of victim advocate partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of prosecuted cases resulting from previously untested kits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During the reporting period:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of victims contacted by an investigator as a result of the SAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of contacted victims that agreed to actively participate in a new investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>resulting from the SAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of resources developed for victims and providers (e.g. FAQ brochure and a packet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of community resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of victim advocate partners participating in the SAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of prosecuted cases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 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.

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.

   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, allowable, and necessary for project activities).

   A 2-day workshop for all grant recipient sites will take place in Washington, DC in FY 2016. All key site team personnel will be expected to attend. The workshop will focus on the elements of a successful project and key issues around DNA and unsubmitted SAK evidence.

   Each application must provide an estimate or confirmed number of SAKs requiring forensic DNA testing and approximate costs for testing process, to include actual testing costs, estimated expert testimony fees, and costs associated with review of outsourced lab data and CODIS upload. Applicants must clearly delineate the amount of funding requested for SAK DNA testing and associated review and certification activities. BJA does not anticipate funding projects that propose allocating more than 50 percent of their grant funds to SAK testing. However, BJA’s TTA provider will work with grantees to help secure additional non-BJA funding for the SAK testing component if needed.
Funds may be used to cover personnel costs, travel expenses for meetings and project activities, group meeting expenses, and preliminary DNA screening or analysis (as appropriate for the project, and as listed in the Goals, Objectives and Deliverables section in this solicitation). Applicants should build in funds for travel of the site coordinator and at least two other team members to meet with another SAKI grantee in a peer to peer learning exchange.

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. Unsubmitted SAK Inventory Certification (if applicable):
   If an unsubmitted SAK inventory has already been completed by the applicant jurisdiction, the applicant must provide information regarding the results of their inventory in their proposal and request funding support for the tracking and testing of unsubmitted SAKs, the multidisciplinary team, and the site coordinator as necessary. This requirement may be met through the inclusion of a certification letter signed by the applicant’s chief executive officer. The certification letter should detail the results of the inventory and be included as an attachment with the application. If applicants have already completed an inventory of existing unsubmitted SAKs, certification of this inventory will be required prior to the release of additional funds.

b. Letters of Commitment
   Applicants must submit signed letters of commitment from the agency or agencies that possess unsubmitted SAKs, the crime laboratory that provides DNA services to the law enforcement agency (not required if outsourcing to a private lab), the prosecutor’s office, and a community-based victim services organization stating their commitment to the project as presented in the application. The letters must be included in the application to be considered for funding.

c. Applicant Disclosure of SAK Testing Projects
   All applicants must disclose all existing federal grant-funded SAK testing projects (including any funding the crime lab may receive from NIJ that may be used for the purposes of testing or processing of SAK evidence) and must explain why additional funding is necessary. Throughout the course of the project, applicants must continue to
document how the SAKI funding will be coordinated, tracked separately from any other funding (including NIJ's DNA Capacity Enhancement and Backlog Reduction Program), and not duplicate other current grant funded projects.

d. **Timeline**
Include a comprehensive timeline that identifies milestones, numerically listed deliverables, and who is responsible for each activity (provide title and agency). Please note, as applicable, that any inventory activity is expected to be completed within 6 months of the grant funding being made available to grantee agencies.

e. **Position Descriptions and Resumes**
Include position descriptions and resumes for key project personnel and multidisciplinary team members.

f. **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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal or State Funding Agency</th>
<th>Solicitation Name/Project Name</th>
<th>Name/Phone/E-mail for Point of Contact at Funding Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOJ/COPS</td>
<td>COPS Hiring Program</td>
<td>Jane Doe, 202/000-0000; <a href="mailto:jane.doe@usdoj.gov">jane.doe@usdoj.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHS/ Substance Abuse &amp; Mental Health Services Administration</td>
<td>Drug Free Communities Mentoring Program/ North County Youth Mentoring Program</td>
<td>John Doe, 202/000-0000; <a href="mailto:john.doe@hhs.gov">john.doe@hhs.gov</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.”).

g. 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.

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.

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

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](http://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](http://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](http://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 16.833, titled “National Sexual Assault Kit Initiative,” and the funding opportunity number is BJA-2015-4115.

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](http://www.sam.gov) 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](http://www.sam.gov).
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 2 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 five 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 15 percent of the entire score in the application review process.

1. Statement of the Problem (15 percent)
   Provide an overview of the current unsubmitted SAKs problem, and how the law enforcement agency intends to utilize grant funds to inventory, track, test previously unsubmitted SAKs, and implement the additional aspects of the comprehensive model. Describe generally the need for funding among local jurisdictions in an effort to achieve results as described in this grant announcement.

   As part of the application, provide information regarding the extent of unsubmitted evidence that has yet to be submitted to a crime laboratory in as great of detail as possible.

2. Project Design and Implementation (40 percent)
   Applicants must detail how they will address the three required elements of the BJA model in order to implement a holistic victim-centered approach to the current issues associated
with unsubmitted SAKs in their jurisdiction. This holistic project design must include detailed information on the applicant's plan to inventory, track, and test previously unsubmitted SAKs; produce necessary protocols and policies in support of improved coordination and collaboration among laboratories, police, prosecutors, and victim service providers in response to emergent evidence and casework; prioritize SAK testing and results, taking into consideration statute of limitations issues; and resources required to comprehensively address the sexual assault investigations and prosecutions that result from evidence and Combined DNA Index System (CODIS) hits produced by tested SAKs, as well as to support and optimize victim notification protocols and services.

Applicants must clearly detail the expected or established structure of the multidisciplinary team, include a list of key team members from each participating agency (one from each agency) and describe the role of each team member. Applicants should identify the lead agency for this effort and outline their role and the plan for coordination among agencies. The applicant must identify and delineate the role and activities of the site coordinator, who will serve as the central point of contact for the site team.

Applicants must detail how they implement the deliverables listed in the Program-Specific Information section. The applicant should detail how they will work with specific law enforcement entities, victim advocacy organizations, and other stakeholder groups within their jurisdiction to ensure new policies and procedures are implemented that prevent future reoccurrence of unsubmitted SAKs and that focus on a victim-centered approach to sexual assault evidence collection, testing, investigation, and prosecution.

3. **Capabilities and Competencies (25 percent)**
   Fully describe the capabilities and competencies of the staff assigned to achieve the program goals and deliverables, including the selected site coordinator. The applicant must demonstrate capacity to develop and implement new policies and procedures within their jurisdiction, and collaborate with various stakeholders from the forensic, law enforcement, and victim advocacy communities to improve law enforcement's management of, and response to, crimes of sexual assault.

   Applicants should identify and fully describe the qualifications of the site coordinator.

4. **Plan for Collecting the Data Required for this Solicitation’s Performance Measures (10 percent)**
   Describe the process for measuring project performance. Identify who will collect the data, who is responsible for performance measurement, and how the information will be used to guide and assess the program.

   Applicants should also describe the methods they will use for tracking and reporting required information regarding unsubmitted SAKs.

5. **Budget (10 percent)**
   Provide a proposed budget for the entire project period that is complete, cost effective, and allowable (e.g., reasonable, allocable, and necessary for project activities). Budget narratives should generally demonstrate how applicants will maximize cost effectiveness of
grant expenditures. Budget narratives should demonstrate cost effectiveness in relation to the goals of the project.  

Provide an estimate of the amount of funds that will be allocated for SAK testing to include: actual testing costs, estimated expert testimony fees, and costs associated with review of outsourced lab data and CODIS upload).

**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**.

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

---

7 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.
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 requirements\textsuperscript{8} 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.

As stated above, BJA anticipates that it will make any award from this solicitation in the form of a cooperative agreement. Cooperative agreement awards include standard “federal involvement” conditions that describe the general allocation of responsibility for execution of the funded program. Generally-stated, under cooperative agreement awards, responsibility for the day-to-day conduct of the funded project rests with the recipient in implementing the funded and approved proposal and budget, and the award terms and conditions. Responsibility for oversight and redirection of the project, if necessary, rests with BJA.

In addition to any “federal involvement” condition(s), OJP cooperative agreement awards include a special condition specifying certain reporting requirements required in connection with conferences, meetings, retreats, seminars, symposium, training activities, or similar events funded under the award, consistent with OJP policy and guidance on conference approval, planning, and reporting.

**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.

Award recipients must, on a monthly basis, report the number of SAKs reviewed and catalogued by working group members, including local, state, federal and tribal law enforcement partners to BJA. It is expected that the inventory will be completed within the first 6 months of the grant being awarded. SAKI grantees will also be encouraged to make their aggregate inventory and tracking data available to the public to increase the transparency of their SAK testing and disposition processes.

\textsuperscript{8} 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)).
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.

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 National Sexual Assault Kit Initiative (SAKI)

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 24)
_____ Acquire or renew registration with SAM (see page 25)

To Register with Grants.gov:
_____ Acquire AOR and Grants.gov username/password (see page 25)
_____ Acquire AOR confirmation from the E-Biz POC (see page 25)

To Find Funding Opportunity:
_____ Search for the Funding Opportunity on Grants.gov (see page 25)
_____ Download Funding Opportunity and Application Package (see page 25)
_____ Sign up for Grants.gov email notifications (optional) (see page 24)
_____ 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 25)

If no Grants.gov receipt, and validation or error notifications are received:
_____ contact the BJA Response Center regarding experiencing technical difficulties (see page 2)

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 $2 million.

Eligibility Requirement: Eligible applicants are state, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies, prosecutor’s offices, or a governmental non-law enforcement agency acting as fiscal agent for the applicant.

What an Application Should Include:

_____ Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424) (see page 14)
_____ Project Abstract (see page 14)
_____ *Program Narrative (see page 15)
_____ *Budget Detail Worksheet (see page 18)
_____ *Budget Narrative (see page 18)
_____ Employee Compensation Waiver request and justification (if applicable) (see page 12)
_____ Read OJP policy and guidance on conference approval, planning, and reporting available at ojp.gov/financialguide/PostawardRequirements/chapter15page1.htm (see page 13)
Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (SF-LLL) (see page 23)
Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable) (see page 19)
Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable) (see page 19)
Applicant Disclosure of High Risk Status (see page 20)
Additional Attachments
Unsubmitted SAK Inventory Certification (if applicable) (see page 20)
*Letters of Commitment (see page 20)
Applicant Disclosure of SAK Testing Projects (see page 20)
Timeline (see page 21)
Position Descriptions and Resumes (see page 21)
Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications (see page 21)
Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity (see page 22)
Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire (if applicable) (see page 23)

* Note: 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.