

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
Bureau of Justice Assistance



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 2016 Competitive Grant Announcement Applications Due: April 26, 2016

Eligibility

Eligible applicants for Purpose Area 1 are law enforcement agencies of states, units of local government, and federally recognized Indian tribal governments (as recognized by the Secretary of the Interior), prosecutor's offices, or a governmental non-law enforcement agency acting as fiscal agent for one of the previously listed types of eligible applicants.

Eligible applicants for Purpose Area 2 are limited to the lead applicant entities that received award funding under the FY 2015 SAKI Competitive Grant Announcement.

BJA welcomes applications that involve two or more entities that will carry out the funded Federal award activities; however, one eligible entity must be the applicant and the other(s) must be proposed as subrecipient(s). The applicant must be the entity with primary responsibility for administering the funding and managing the entire program. Only one application per lead applicant will be considered; however, a subrecipient may be part of multiple proposals.

Deadline

Applicants must register with [Grants.gov](#) prior to submitting an application. All applications are due to be submitted and in receipt of a successful validation message in Grants.gov by 11:59 p.m. eastern time on April 26, 2016.

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 email 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 800-851-3420; via TTY at 301-240-6310 (hearing impaired only); email grants@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-2016-8989

Release date: March 1, 2016

Contents

A. Program Description	4
Overview	4
Program-Specific Information	6
Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables	8
Evidence-Based Programs or Practices	16
B. Federal Award Information.....	16
Type of Award.....	17
Financial Management and System of Internal Controls.....	17
Budget Information.....	18
Cost Sharing or Matching Requirement.....	18
Pre-Agreement Cost (also known as Pre-award Cost) Approvals.....	18
Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver	18
Prior Approval, Planning, and Reporting of Conference/Meeting/Training Costs	19
Costs Associated with Language Assistance (if applicable)	19
C. Eligibility Information.....	19
Limit on Number of Application Submissions.....	19
D. Application and Submission Information	20
What an Application Should Include	20
How to Apply	28
Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues.....	31
E. Application Review Information.....	32
Selection Criteria.....	32
Review Process	36
F. Federal Award Administration Information	37
Federal Award Notices	37
Administrative, National Policy, and other Legal Requirements.....	37
General Information about Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements	38
G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s)	39
H. Other Information.....	39
Provide Feedback to OJP	39
Application Checklist	40

National Sexual Assault Kit Initiative (SAKI) (CFDA #16.833)

A. Program Description

Overview

The National Sexual Assault Kit Initiative (SAKI), administered by the Bureau of Justice Assistance (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 (SAK). Unsubmitted kits (SAKs that have not been submitted to a forensic laboratory for testing and analysis) and untested kits (those that have been submitted to forensic labs but are delayed for testing for longer than 30 days, for example, as a result of a backlog of work in the laboratory) are separate and distinct issues. **The focus of this solicitation is on those unsubmitted kits that have never been submitted to a forensic 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. In FY 2015, 20 SAKI-site based grants were awarded to jurisdictions across the country for a total of \$30,196,409.

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.¹ 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.² 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.

¹ <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/248680.pdf> and <http://www.houstonsakresearch.org/>

² Strom, Kevin J., Jeri Roper-Miller, Shelton Jones, Nathan Sikes, Mark Pope and Nicole Horstmann, The 2007 Survey of Law Enforcement Forensic Evidence Processing (pdf, 81 pages), Final Report, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, September 2009, 228415; and Harvard Kennedy School Webinar: Taking on the Challenge of Unsubmitted Sexual Assault Kits, October 31, 2014.

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.

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.³ 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. As many practitioners and advocates are also aware, DNA has not been collected from potentially thousands of convicted offenders across the United States (including sex offenders) due to the lack of coordinated DNA collections in some jurisdictions, as well as the frequent inability for rural and smaller municipalities to collect samples from offenders during processing. This directly impacts law enforcement’s ability to solve sexual assault cases (and other crimes) using DNA. One of the key components of SAKI is the successful investigation, suspect identification, and prosecution of the cases associated with the unsubmitted SAKs. CODIS is an extremely valuable tool for solving crimes but only if it is properly utilized and populated. In order to take full advantage of the power of DNA technology to solve cases resulting from the tested evidence in previously untested SAKS and provide long-awaited justice for sexual assault victims, jurisdictions are encouraged to increase their likelihood of receiving CODIS Hits by expanding the number of convicted offender samples in the database. The failure to collect, test, and upload DNA from eligible offenders reduces the likelihood of receiving CODIS Hits from the evidence contained in previously untested SAKS, results in crimes remaining unsolved, and further delays justice for victims and their families. Of equal importance, it is also likely that the risk of recidivism is increased in those instances where serial offenders are released from incarceration without ever being linked via DNA to other crimes. As such, funding to address this issue is available to jurisdictions under SAKI Purpose Area 2 in FY 2016.

For additional information on the importance of lawfully owed offender DNA collections:

- <http://www.justice.gov/ag/fact-sheet-legislation-advance-justice-through-dna-technology>
- <http://www.michigan.gov/corrections/0,4551,7-119--264812--,00.html>
- <http://dpdbeat.com/2014/10/28/dna-efforts-by-sor-solve-cold-case/>
- <http://www.forensicmag.com/articles/2015/01/cold-hit-new-technology-reveals-old-evidence>
- <http://schubertforda.com/wp-content/uploads/CDAA-Secrets-from-the-Grave.pdf>
- https://www.torranceca.gov/TPD/Documents/TPD_Press_Release_90-16713_Cold_Case.pdf

³ Ritter, Nancy. (2011) The Road Ahead: Unanalyzed Evidence in Sexual Assault Cases. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.

Funding under this solicitation is intended to help agencies address all of the above 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.

Funding for this initiative is anticipated under the Department of Justice Appropriations Act, 2016 (Public Law 114-113).

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; provide resources to comprehensively address the sexual assault investigations and prosecutions that result from evidence and CODIS Hits produced by tested SAKs; and support and optimize victim notification protocols and services.

For purposes of this program the following are defined:

- A. **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.
- B. **Unsubmitted SAK:** SAKs that have not been submitted to a forensic laboratory for testing and analysis.
- C. **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.
- D. **Tracking:** The monitoring and accounting of SAKs through the course, or path, of their movement from collection through final disposition.
- E. **Reporting:** The task of delivering a written, detailed report to the appropriate entity within the prescribed time period and with the applicable data provided.
- F. **Lawfully owed offender DNA:** A DNA sample from a qualifying offender who should have their sample in CODIS (based on the type and time of the offense in relation to applicable state law), but from whom a sample has never been collected or submitted to a lab for testing.

Based on the findings emerging from both the Detroit and Houston NIJ research projects and the recommendations of subject-matter experts (SME), BJA has implemented 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, victim advocates (both system and community-based), and victim treatment providers. (Some jurisdictions may already have Sexual Assault Response Teams [SART] in place that 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. The site coordinator must also demonstrate a willingness and commitment to institutionalize systems, policies, and protocols developed by the working group to address the backlog of unsubmitted sexual assault kits and prevent the problem from reoccurring.

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 who previously received grant awards under the National Sexual Assault Kit Initiative FY 2015 Competitive Grant Announcement are eligible to apply for funding under both purpose areas included in this solicitation. However, such applicants will need to clearly justify the need for additional funding support and clearly detail how additional funding will enhance or expand their ability to address the issues associated with unsubmitted SAKs in their jurisdiction. FY 2015 SAKI grantee applicants must also summarize progress and deliverables achieved under their current SAKI grant to date.

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 2017. 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, and to help provide resolution for victims when possible. There is broad consensus that this must be accomplished through a comprehensive 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, conduct research on outcomes in sexual assault cases, and increase collection of offender DNA for CODIS upload purposes (in full adherence to the laws in the jurisdiction), that may lead to the identification of serious and serial sex offenders.

PURPOSE AREA 1: Comprehensive Approach to Unsubmitted Sexual Assault Kits. Competition ID: BJA-2016-9334

Applications are solicited from a state, local, or tribal law enforcement agency, prosecutor's office, or a governmental non-law enforcement agency who can demonstrate their ability and commitment to implementing the comprehensive BJA model to address the issues that underlie the problem of unsubmitted SAKs including:

1. The performance of an inventory of all unsubmitted SAKs in the jurisdictions as described above.

2. 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:
 - a. Eliminate or reduce the existing number of unsubmitted SAKs through increased testing initiatives, and effect changes in practice, protocol, and organizational culture necessary to prevent the issue from reoccurring in the future.
 - b. 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 responses 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.
 - c. Implement and/or establish evidence-based, victim-centered protocols and policies that address SAK evidence collection, testing, and tracking and victim engagement, notification, and support, including implementation of the National Protocol for Sexual Assault Medical Forensic Examinations (SAFE Protocol). Address the potential trauma to victims in reopening historic sexual assault cases to prevent revictimization. Protocols should address the root causes that led to the sites' unsubmitted kit accumulation. Grantees are also encouraged to refer to the Justice Department's recently released guidance on 'Identifying and Preventing Gender Bias in Law Enforcement Response to Sexual Assault and Domestic Violence' (<https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/justice-department-issues-guidance-identifying-and-preventing-gender-bias-law-enforcement>).
 - d. 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.
 - e. Establish or implement processes that prioritize the investigation and adjudication of the SAKI cases.
 - f. 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.
 - g. 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.
 - h. 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.

- i. 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 award 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). The site coordinator must also demonstrate a willingness and commitment to institutionalize systems, policies and protocols developed by the working group to address the backlog of unsubmitted sexual assault kits and prevent the problem from reoccurring.

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

1. Performing a comprehensive inventory of unsubmitted SAKs and establishment of the necessary policies and protocols to establish an all-inclusive SAK testing strategy.
2. Testing of SAKs, to include outsourcing kits for testing and technical review of data/results, as well as tracking and reporting of performance metrics.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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/victim treatment providers to engage in victim-centered notification, communication, and support activities.
7. 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.

8. 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.
9. The renovation of existing SAK storage facilities (e.g., installing temperature/humidity controls) to ensure optimal preservation of evidence. Funding for this component must not exceed \$200,000.
10. Developing evidence collection, retention, victim notification, and other protocols needed to optimize data sharing, case investigation, prosecution, and victim support.
11. 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.
12. 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.
13. Supporting Crime Analysis activities and resources to help identify perpetrators. Funding may be used for overtime of existing departmental crime analysts to support SAKI-related investigations, or fee for service/outsourcing of crime analysis. Crime analysis activities under this program must be performed for the primary purpose of suspect identification. For example, investigations may benefit, when DNA profiles of single or serial offenders yield no CODIS Hits, by using crime analysis to leverage the non-forensic information that is available (such as suspect physical description, geographical locations of the sexual assaults, and timeline of serial or related offenses) that could help identify the suspect(s).

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: 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 eliminate 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:

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

PURPOSE AREA 2: Collection of Lawfully Owed DNA from Convicted Offenders to Assist with Sexual Assault Investigations and Prosecutions. Competition ID: BJA-2016-9335

Applicants to this purpose area must have received funding as lead applicants under the National SAKI FY 2015 Competitive Grant Announcement, and must clearly demonstrate that their jurisdiction has previously addressed, or is currently effectively addressing, the major issues associated with unsubmitted SAKs.

Applications are solicited from eligible entities to support activities associated with the collection of lawfully owed DNA samples (i.e., a DNA sample from a qualifying offender who should have their sample in CODIS [based on the type and time of the offense in relation to applicable state law], but from whom a sample has never been collected or submitted to a lab for testing). DNA collection must be targeted toward offenders who have a likelihood of being linked to cases associated with the jurisdiction's previously unsubmitted SAKs. For example, such offenders

may have prior convictions for sex offenses or may have sex-related crimes documented in their criminal history. Upon completing the census of convicted offenders from whom DNA has not been collected, grantees should review each offender's criminal history and prioritize collection from any offenders previously arrested, convicted or the subject of investigation for crimes related to sexual assault. The goal of this purpose area is to enable the appropriate law enforcement and correctional authorities in existing SAKI sites to plan and implement coordinated DNA collections of lawfully owed samples, testing, and CODIS uploads in accordance with applicable state law and for the purpose of resolving sexual assault cases associated with previously unsubmitted SAKs. An expanded DNA database serves the public's interest by enabling law enforcement to better identify convicted violent and sex offenders who are involved in unsolved crimes, and who may reoffend after release.⁴ Typically, eligible convicted offenders from whom DNA can lawfully be collected include those arrested, facing charges, or convicted of Murder, Sexual Abuse, or Kidnapping and other qualifying state offenses (The DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000: H.R. 4640, 42 U.S.C. 14135 et seq). While it is crucial that unsubmitted SAKs are tested and all eligible profiles uploaded to CODIS, cases will remain unsolved unless the evidence profiles can be matched against an offender's profile. The absence of lawfully owed DNA samples in CODIS will likely result in missed opportunities to identify the perpetrators of crimes, including sexual assaults. For example, Michigan demonstrated the importance of lawfully owed DNA collections in 2011 when they collected samples from 5,000 prisoners who had slipped through the cracks. As a result, subsequent DNA hits in CODIS were linked to 74 crimes, including five murders, 23 rapes, and three armed robberies (refer to page 5 for additional information on this and similar offender DNA collection efforts).

BJA views the collection of lawfully owed DNA from convicted offenders as Phase 2 of a comprehensive approach to addressing sexual assault. As such, Purpose Area 2 should be undertaken after the jurisdiction has made significant progress in Phase 1 including eliminating its backlog of unsubmitted SAKs, and other significant policy and programmatic improvements.

Specifically, applicants must provide documentation that a certified inventory as defined in this solicitation has been completed and the testing of previously unsubmitted kits identified as part of their SAKI project has been completed or is near completion.

Applications to this purpose area must clearly demonstrate that the jurisdiction requires resources to support collections of lawfully owed DNA from convicted offenders to facilitate the resolution of unsolved sexual assault cases linked to previously unsubmitted/untested SAKs. Applicants' proposed plans under this purpose area must include the following elements:

⁴ The focus of this program differs from NIJ's DNA Capacity Enhancement and Backlog Reduction Program which funds States and units of local government with existing crime laboratories that conduct DNA analysis to process, record, screen, and analyze forensic DNA and/or DNA database samples, and to increase the capacity of public forensic DNA and DNA database laboratories to process more DNA samples, thereby helping to reduce the number of forensic DNA and DNA database samples awaiting analysis. SAKI Purpose Area 2 addresses the identification, collection, and DNA profiling of samples from convicted offenders who should have samples in CODIS, but from whom samples have never been collected or submitted to a lab for testing.

- **Census of Convicted Offenders:** Applicants must commit to the performance of a census to identify eligible convicted offenders who could be linked with the jurisdiction's previously unsubmitted SAKs and who should have samples in CODIS, but from whom samples have never been collected or submitted to a lab for testing. Determining if the convicted offender has a qualifying event that will allow his or her DNA profile to be uploaded to CODIS hinges on when the offender was convicted, for what charge, and whether a DNA sample was required from the offender on the date of conviction. Collection of DNA from offenders under the SAKI program must be done in accordance with state law, and grantees must identify an attorney from the Attorney General's Office, District Attorney's office, or Criminal Justice Agency familiar with the state's DNA collection laws to provide legal advice for the Phase 2 project. If the grantee also wishes to upload DNA from deceased offenders to CODIS, it will need to cross-reference conviction information from the time of the inmates' or parolees' death with the law at the time of their death, and a court order may be required.
- The census may cover the site's specific jurisdiction, the state, or other defined area, but the scope and process of the census must be detailed as follows:
 - Applicants must identify the specific and appropriate agency that will conduct the census. This agency may be the state level Department of Corrections/Bureau of Prisons, Crime Laboratory, State or Local Criminal Justice Agency or other entity with the appropriate authority, expertise and data access.
 - Applicants must provide an estimated timeframe for the completion of the census, as well as describe how the agencies will coordinate their participation in this DNA collection initiative.
 - Applicants must also describe the census methods that will be used to collect this information, the data resources that will be used to inform the census, and the demographic and offense related data to be collected as part of the census process.
- In coordination with a legal advisor, sites must formulate a DNA collection plan that will target the collection of DNA from convicted offenders who have a high likelihood of being linked to cases associated with the jurisdiction's unsubmitted SAKs. As stated above, sites should prioritize collection from offenders previously arrested, convicted or the subject of investigation for crimes related to sexual assault, and from whom 'owed' DNA samples have not been collected. The DNA collection plan should further describe how the site will prioritize collection efforts among offenders in prisons and jails, offenders under community supervision, offenders residing in the community with no supervision, and in rare cases, deceased offenders who might be linked to cases associated with previously unsubmitted SAKs. The plan should also describe the process for ensuring that the collection of DNA from each individual is authorized under existing law.
 - Applicants must describe any existing protocols, or describe plans for developing a protocol, for: notifying victims if and when lawfully owed DNA collected from convicted offenders identifies a potential suspect or links their case to others, and providing support and services to victims.
- **Identification of the SAKI Offender DNA Collection Coordinator:** The applicant must designate a specific individual as the SAKI Offender DNA Collection Coordinator and

describe how this individual will work with the existing SAKI working group to ensure coordination of efforts, plan and perform DNA collections from convicted offenders to inform investigations and prosecutions of cases resulting from evidence provided by previously unsubmitted SAKs, and access criminal records and other sensitive law enforcement records. The Project Coordinator will be responsible for overseeing all aspects of the project, including the census of convicted offenders; coordination with SAKI investigators to prioritize offender DNA collections; coordination of offender DNA testing and CODIS upload; monitoring law enforcement agencies' adherence to protocol(s) related to victim notification; coordinating victim services, tracking status of CODIS Hits and subsequent investigations and prosecutions that result; and reporting performance measures to BJA.

Applications under this category should include data related to the site's current SAKI project to date, including number of SAKI-related CODIS Hits in relation to number of CODIS-eligible profiles uploaded to CODIS in total from tested SAKs, as well as information related to indictments/prosecutions associated with the SAKI project activities. Please note that eligible applicants for Purpose Area 2 are not excluded from also applying to Purpose Area 1 under this solicitation.

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

- Complete a census and develop a comprehensive list of convicted offenders who should have DNA in CODIS (in accordance with state law). This task must be completed within the first 12 months of the grant award, and applicants must provide letters of support from the applicable agencies in their jurisdiction that demonstrates a commitment to provide the aforementioned information and, where appropriate, assist with the DNA collection process.
- Develop policies and procedures for lawfully owed DNA collections, as well as additional policies and procedures to ensure that qualifying offenders in their jurisdiction have their DNA collected and uploaded to CODIS in the future.
- Establish the memoranda of understanding, subcontracts, or other required agreements with relevant participant agencies and organizations to execute the lawfully owed DNA collection initiative.
- Collect, test, and upload to CODIS, lawfully owed DNA samples from those convicted offenders who are confirmed as not in CODIS and who could be connected with the applicant's unsubmitted and untested SAKs, including offenders currently incarcerated, collection from parolees, and testing of autopsy samples and exhumations as needed for deceased offenders (with proper court orders/authorizations).
- Support of training, travel, and overtime for relevant personnel related to the collection and testing of offender DNA samples. For example, such costs might include those associated with travel to prisons throughout the state, or travel to collect DNA from parolees.
- Support modification of SAKI evidence tracking system for offender samples collected under Purpose Area 2. It is expected that applicants may need to modify existing SAKI evidence

tracking systems for the purposes of tracking the collection, testing, CODIS upload, CODIS Hits, subsequent investigations/prosecutions under Purpose Area 2. Applicants must detail the necessary modifications that will be made to their tracking systems and the estimated cost and timeframe for completion.

Grantees will need to separately track the number of CODIS Hits that occur for offender DNA profiles collected under Purpose Area 2. The testing of offender samples may be outsourced to an accredited laboratory or tested by the grantee's local or state lab.

Grantees must also work with BJA's SAKI TTA provider who will provide guidance with regard to conducting a census of qualifying convicted offenders and performing lawfully owed DNA collections. The TTA provider will work with Purpose Area 2 grantees to compile and issue a final summary report pertaining to the outcomes achieved by each site grantee.

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 website 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 16 awards of up to \$2 million under Purpose Area 1, and up to 3 awards of up to \$1 million under Purpose Area 2 for an estimated total of \$35 million for a 3-year project period, beginning on October 1, 2016. As stated above, BJA does not anticipate funding projects that propose allocating more than 50 percent of their grant funds to SAK and/or convicted offender 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 Award⁵

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

Award recipients and subrecipients (including any recipient or subrecipient funded in response to this solicitation that is a pass-through entity⁶) must, as described in the Part 200 Uniform Requirements set out at 2 C.F.R. 200.303:

- (a) Establish and maintain effective internal control over the federal award that provides reasonable assurance that the recipient (and any subrecipient) 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 recipient’s (and any subrecipient’s) compliance with statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of federal awards.
- (d) Take prompt action when instances of noncompliance are identified, including noncompliance identified in audit findings.
- (e) Take reasonable measures to safeguard protected personally identifiable information and other information the federal awarding agency or pass-through entity designates as sensitive or the recipient (or any subrecipient) considers sensitive consistent with

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)).

⁶ For purposes of this solicitation (or program announcement), “pass-through entity” includes any entity eligible to receive funding as a recipient or subrecipient under this solicitation (or program announcement) that, if funded, may make a subaward(s) to a subrecipient(s) to carry out part of the funded program.

applicable federal, state, local, and tribal laws regarding privacy and obligations of confidentiality.

In order to better understand administrative requirements and cost principles, 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 Matching 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 (also known as Pre-award Cost) Approvals

Pre-agreement costs are costs incurred by the applicant prior to the start date of the period of performance of the grant award.

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.⁷ The 2016 salary table for SES employees is available at the Office of Personnel Management [website](#). 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.) For employees who charge only a portion of their time to an award, the allowable amount to be charged is equal to the percentage of time worked times the maximum salary limitation.

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

⁷ OJP does not apply this limitation on the use of award funds to the nonprofit organizations listed at Appendix VIII to 2 C.F.R. Part 200.

the applicant submits a waiver request and justification with the application, the applicant should anticipate that OJP will request the applicant to adjust and resubmit the budget.

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

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

OJP strongly encourages applicants that propose to use award funds for any conference-, meeting-, or training-related activity to review carefully—before submitting an application—the OJP policy and guidance on conference approval, planning, and reporting available at <http://ojp.gov/financialguide/DOJ/PostawardRequirements/chapter3.10a.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 conference, meeting, and training costs for cooperative agreement recipients and of some conference, meeting, and training 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](#).

C. Eligibility Information

For additional eligibility information, see title page.

For additional information on cost sharing or matching requirements, see [Section B. Federal Award Information](#).

Limit on Number of Application Submissions

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

D. Application and Submission Information

What an Application Should Include

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

Moreover, applicants should anticipate that applications that are determined to be nonresponsive to the scope of the solicitation, or that do not include the application elements that BJA has designated to be critical, will neither proceed to peer review nor receive further consideration. Under this solicitation, BJA has designated the following application elements as critical: Program Narrative, Budget Detail Worksheet, 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,” “Résumés”) for all attachments. Also, OJP recommends that applicants include résumés 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 the OJP 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 fewer. 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 applications submitted under this solicitation, but it may have the opportunity to share information with the public regarding unfunded applications, for example, through a listing on a web page 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 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 demonstrate program progress and success, as well as 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: Post award, recipients will be required to submit quarterly performance metrics through BJA’s online Performance Measurement Tool (PMT), located at www.bjaperformancetools.org. Applicants should review the complete list of BJA Sexual Assault Kit Initiative performance measures at: <http://bjaperformancetools.csrincorporated.com/help/BJASAKIMeasures.pdf>. The measures for Purpose Area 2 are similar in nature to those found in the link. However, BJA is developing specific measures that will be made available to award recipients.

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

Note on Project Evaluations

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

Research, for the purposes of human subjects protections for OJP-funded programs, is defined as, “a systematic investigation, including research development, testing, and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge” 28 C.F.R. § 46.102(d). For additional information on determining whether a proposed activity would constitute research, see the decision tree to assist applicants on the “Research and the Protection of Human Subjects” section of the [OJP Funding Resource Center](http://ojp.gov/funding/Explore/SolicitationRequirements/EvidenceResearchEvaluationRequirements.htm) web page (<http://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 <http://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. The Budget Detail Worksheet should be broken down by year.

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

b. Budget Narrative

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

Applicants should demonstrate in their Budget Narratives how they will maximize cost effectiveness of grant expenditures. Budget Narratives should generally describe cost effectiveness in relation to potential alternatives and the goals of the project. For example, a Budget Narrative should detail why planned in-person meetings are necessary, or how technology and collaboration with outside organizations could be used to reduce costs, without compromising quality.

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

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

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

d. Pre-Agreement Cost Approvals

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

5. Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable)

Indirect costs are allowed only under the following circumstances:

- (a) The applicant has a current, federally approved indirect cost rate; or
- (b) The applicant is eligible to use and elects to use the “de minimis” indirect cost rate described in the Part 200 Uniform Requirements as set out at 2 C.F.R. 200.414(f).

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 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 <http://ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/IndirectCosts.pdf>.

In order to use the “de minimis” indirect rate, attach written documentation to the application that advises OJP of both the applicant’s eligibility (to use the “de minimis” rate) and its election. If the applicant elects the “de minimis” method, costs must be consistently charged as either indirect or direct costs, but may not be double charged or inconsistently charged as both. In addition, if this method is chosen then it must be used consistently for all federal awards until such time as you choose to negotiate a federally approved indirect cost rate.⁸

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. Disclosing 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

⁸ See 2 C.F.R. § 200.414(f).

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 to Purpose Area 1 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. Applicants applying under Purpose Area 2 must include a letter of support from the Department of Corrections/Bureau of Prisons, or Probation Office, Medical Examiner/Coroner (as applicable) or other agency in their jurisdiction/state whose participation will be required to successfully implement a lawfully owed convicted offender DNA collection initiative. 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 Résumés

Include position descriptions and résumés 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 Budget Detail Worksheet in the application under this solicitation. The disclosure should include both direct applications for federal funding (e.g., applications to federal agencies) and indirect applications for such funding (e.g., applications to state agencies that will subaward federal funds).

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

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

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

Federal or State Funding Agency	Solicitation Name/Project Name	Name/Phone/Email for Point of Contact at Funding Agency
DOJ/COPS	COPS Hiring Program	Jane Doe, 202/000-0000; jane.doe@usdoj.gov
HHS/ Substance Abuse & Mental Health Services Administration	Drug Free Communities Mentoring Program/ North County Youth Mentoring Program	John Doe, 202/000-0000; john.doe@hhs.gov

Applicants should include the table as a separate attachment to their application. The file should be named “Disclosure of Pending Applications.”

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 Budget Detail 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 subrecipients) 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 subrecipients 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 subrecipients) 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 subrecipients 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 subrecipients 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 limited to, the adequacy of the applicant's efforts to identify factors that could affect the objectivity or integrity of the proposed staff and/or the organization in carrying out the research, development, or evaluation activity; and the adequacy of the applicant's existing or proposed remedies to control any such factors.

9. Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire

In accordance with the Part 200 Uniform Requirements as set out at 2 C.F.R. 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 primary source 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 Attachments. Grants.gov has two categories of files for attachments: mandatory and optional. OJP receives all files attached in both categories. Please ensure all required documents are attached in the mandatory category.

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

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

Grants.gov is designed to forward successfully submitted applications to the OJP 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 organization until the applicant organization has complied with all applicable DUNS and SAM requirements. Individual applicants must comply with all Grants.gov 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.

Individual applicants should search Grants.gov for a funding opportunity for which individuals are eligible to apply. Use the Funding Opportunity Number (FON) to register. Complete the registration form at <https://apply07.grants.gov/apply/IndCPRegister> to create a username and password. Individual applicants should complete all steps except 1, 2, and 4.

- 1. Acquire a Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number.** In general, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) requires that all applicants (other than individuals) for federal funds include a DUNS number in their applications for a new award or a supplement to an existing award. A DUNS number is a unique nine-digit sequence recognized as the universal standard for identifying and differentiating entities receiving federal funds. The identifier is used for tracking purposes and to validate address and point of contact information for federal assistance applicants, recipients, and subrecipients. The DUNS number will be used throughout the grant life cycle. Obtaining a DUNS number is a free, one-time activity. Call Dun and Bradstreet at 866-705-5711 to obtain a DUNS number or apply online at www.dnb.com. A DUNS number is usually received within 1–2 business days.
- 2. Acquire registration with the System for Award Management (SAM).** SAM is the repository for standard information about federal financial assistance applicants, recipients, and subrecipients. OJP requires all applicants (other than individuals) for federal financial assistance to maintain current registrations in the SAM database. Applicants must be registered in SAM to successfully register in Grants.gov. Applicants must **update or renew their SAM registration annually** to maintain an active status. SAM registration and renewal can take as long as 10 business days to complete.

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

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

- 3. Acquire an Authorized Organization Representative (AOR) and a Grants.gov username and password.** Complete the AOR profile on Grants.gov and create a username and password. The applicant organization's DUNS number must be used to complete this step. For more information about the registration process for organizations, go to www.grants.gov/web/grants/register.html. Individuals registering with Grants.gov should go to <https://apply07.grants.gov/apply/IndCPRegister>.
- 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. The E-Biz POC will need the Marketing Partner Identification Number (MPIN) password obtained when registering with SAM to complete this step. 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-2016-8989.
- 6. Select the correct Competition ID.** Some OJP solicitations posted to Grants.gov contain multiple purpose areas, denoted by the individual Competition ID. If applying to a solicitation

with multiple Competition IDs, select the appropriate Competition ID for the intended purpose area of the application.

7. **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. All applications are due to be submitted and in receipt of a successful validation message in Grants.gov by 11:59 p.m. eastern time on April 26, 2016.
8. Click [here](#) for further details on DUNS, SAM, and Grants.gov registration steps and timeframes.

Note: Duplicate Applications

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

Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues

Applicants that experience unforeseen Grants.gov technical issues beyond their control that prevent them from submitting their application by the deadline must contact the Grants.gov [Customer Support Hotline](#) or the [SAM Help Desk](#) (Federal Service Desk) to report the technical issue and receive a tracking number. Then applicants must email 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 email 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. (SAM registration and renewal can take as long as 10 business days to complete. The information transfer from SAM to Grants.gov can take up to 48 hours.)

- Failure to follow Grants.gov instructions on how to register and apply as posted on its website.
- 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 <http://ojp.gov/funding/index.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.

- **Statement of the Problem (15 percent)**

For Purpose Area 1, 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.

For Purpose Area 2, provide an overview of the current need for lawfully owed DNA collections from qualifying offenders, and how the law enforcement agency intends to utilize grant funds to conduct a census, track, and test previously uncollected offender samples. Describe generally the need for funding among local jurisdictions in an effort to achieve results as described in this grant announcement. In particular, the applicant must describe the current issues associated with uncollected convicted offender samples impacting the ability to resolve untested SAK cases in their jurisdiction. Applicants must also describe any existing policies related to lawfully owed DNA collections, and detail partnerships necessary to ensure the initiative's success.

As part of the application, provide information regarding the extent of uncollected offender DNA samples in as great of detail as possible. Applicants must describe the existing legislation and policies governing the lawfully owed DNA collection process, and clearly describe how the project will adhere to and operate within the constraints of current state legislation: Applicants must also outline the categories of eligible convicted offenders from whom they could legally collect DNA for the purposes of CODIS upload.

Applicants must provide performance metrics or empirical data that illustrates this activity's anticipated positive impact on sexual assault case investigations and prosecutions in the jurisdiction, as well as documentation of the legislative and statutory authorities that will authorize and guide the project's implementation. Such information might include documentation of an existing time gap between the date of enactment of the jurisdictions' governing Convicted Offender DNA collection laws and the date on which the jurisdiction's unsubmitted SAKs were collected; a data-based estimate of the number of CODIS Hits projected as a result of lawfully owed DNA collection activities; performance data collected from their ongoing SAKI project that illustrates that a high number of SAKs have been tested but have yielded a low number of CODIS Hits; the estimated number of convicted offenders currently incarcerated, paroled or deceased, and from whom DNA has not been collected; and the number of CODIS-eligible profiles obtained from previously backlogged/unsubmitted SAKs and the number of CODIS Hits achieved as a result.

- **Project Design and Implementation (40 percent)**

For Purpose Area 1, 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.

For Purpose Area 2, applicants must briefly detail how they have addressed/are currently addressing the three required elements of the BJA SAKI model (Purpose Area 1) in order to implement a holistic victim-centered approach to the current issues associated with unsubmitted SAKs in their jurisdiction.

Applicants must detail the need for lawfully owed DNA collections in their jurisdiction and how such efforts would help increase the chances of providing resolution to unsolved sexual assault cases linked to previously unsubmitted/untested SAKs.

Applicants must detail how they will implement the deliverables listed in the Program-Specific Information section. The applicant should detail how they will work with specific law enforcement entities, Department of Corrections/Bureau of Prisons, and other stakeholder groups within their jurisdiction to ensure new policies and procedures are implemented that ensure timely collection and upload to CODIS of offender DNA samples, and that also prevent future reoccurrence of the problem.

The applicant must determine if the Offender DNA Collection Project Coordinator must be a sworn law enforcement officer, based upon agency operational and legislative requirements. This role could be filled by one of the existing SAKI working group members; if this is the case, the application must detail how the designated individual will perform all relevant SAKI-related tasks. Applicants must detail how the Offender DNA Collection Project Coordinator will work with the SAKI working group to identify convicted offenders from whom DNA should be collected.

In presenting their project's implementation plan, applicants must outline the current state legislation and policies governing lawfully owed DNA collection from convicted offenders, identify an individual who will act as the SAKI Offender DNA Collection Project Coordinator; and commit to conducting a comprehensive census of convicted offenders to inform their collection strategy as previously outlined in this announcement and as follows:

1. Modification of SAKI evidence tracking system for offender samples collected under Purpose Area 2.
 - a. It is expected that applicants modify their existing SAKI evidence tracking system for the purposes of tracking the collection, testing, CODIS upload, CODIS Hits, subsequent investigations/prosecutions under Purpose Area 2.
 - b. Applicants must detail the necessary modifications that will be made to their tracking systems and the estimated timeframe for completion.
 2. Timeline for performing census, collections, testing, and upload to CODIS.
 3. How resultant CODIS Hits will be handled and leads investigated, particularly those hits pertaining to evidence from SAKs tested under SAKI. Applicants must detail how the Project Coordinator will work with the SAKI working group to coordinate these efforts.
 4. How the Project Coordinator and the SAKI working group will develop new policies/procedures to ensure this problem does not occur again.
- **Capabilities and Competencies (25 percent)**
For Purpose Area 1, 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.

For Purpose Area 2, fully describe the capabilities and competencies of the staff assigned to achieve the program goals and deliverables, including the selected site Offender DNA Collection 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 corrections communities to improve law enforcement's ability to collect DNA from serious offenders and use of resulting information to help resolve cases associated with previously unsubmitted SAKs.

- **Plan for Collecting the Data Required for this Solicitation's Performance Measures (10 percent)**

For Purpose Area 1, 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.

For Purpose Area 2, 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 collected lawfully owed offender DNA samples.

- **Budget (10 percent)**

For both Purpose Areas, 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.⁹

For Purpose Area 1, 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.

For Purpose Area 2, provide an estimate of the amount of funds that will be allocated for offender DNA testing to include: actual testing costs, and costs associated with review of outsourced lab data and CODIS upload.

⁹ 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.

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 System for Award Management (SAM)

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
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 award recipients
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 sends award notification by email through GMS to the individuals listed in the application as the point of contact and the authorizing official (E-Biz POC and AOR). The email notification includes detailed instructions on how to access and view the award documents, and how to accept the award in GMS. GMS automatically issues the notifications at 9:00 p.m. eastern time on the award date (by September 30, 2016). 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 requirements¹⁰ 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 the [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 the Part 200 Uniform Requirements. 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

¹⁰ 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]).

tracking data available to the public to increase the transparency of their SAK testing and disposition processes.

G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s)

For Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s), see title page.

For contact information for Grants.gov, see 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 email 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 email 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 email your résumé to ojppeerreview@lmsolas.com. The OJP Solicitation Feedback email account will not forward your résumé. **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 2016 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 30)
- _____ Acquire or renew registration with SAM (see page 30)

To Register with Grants.gov:

- _____ Acquire AOR and Grants.gov username/password (see page 30)
- _____ Acquire AOR confirmation from the E-Biz POC (see page 30)

To Find Funding Opportunity:

- _____ Search for the Funding Opportunity on Grants.gov (see page 30)
- _____ Select the correct Competition ID (see page 30)
- _____ Download Funding Opportunity and Application Package
- _____ Sign up for Grants.gov [email](#) notifications (optional) (see page 29)
- _____ Read [Important Notice: Applying for Grants in Grants.gov](#)
- _____ Read OJP policy and guidance on conference approval, planning, and reporting available at ojp.gov/financialguide/DOJ/PostawardRequirements/chapter3.10a.htm (see page 19)

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 31)

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

- _____ contact the BJA Response Center regarding experiencing technical difficulties (see page 31)

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 20)
- _____ Project Abstract (see page 20)
- _____ *Program Narrative (see page 21)
- _____ *Budget Detail Worksheet (see page 22)
- _____ *Budget Narrative (see page 23)
- _____ Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable) (see page 23)
- _____ Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable) (see page 24)
- _____ Applicant Disclosure of High Risk Status (see page 24)
- _____ Additional Attachments
 - _____ Unsubmitted SAK Inventory Certification (if applicable) (see page 24)
 - _____ *Letters of Commitment (see page 25)
 - _____ Applicant Disclosure of SAK Testing Projects (see page 25)
 - _____ Timeline (see page 25)
 - _____ Position Descriptions and Résumés (see page 25)
 - _____ Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications (see page 25)
 - _____ Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity (see page 26)
- _____ Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire (see page 28)
- _____ Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (SF-LLL) (see page 28)
- _____ Employee Compensation Waiver request and justification (if applicable) (see page 18)

* **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.