



The [U.S. Department of Justice](#) (DOJ), [Office of Justice Programs](#) (OJP), [Bureau of Justice Assistance](#) (BJA) is seeking applications for the Smart Prosecution Initiative. This program furthers the Department's mission by assisting state and local jurisdictions in preventing and reducing crime.

Smart Prosecution Initiative

FY 2017 Competitive Grant Announcement

Applications Due: January 26, 2017

Eligibility

Eligible applicants are limited to state and local prosecutorial agencies, federally recognized Indian tribal governments (as determined by the Secretary of the Interior) that perform prosecutorial functions, or governmental non-prosecutorial agencies acting as a fiscal agent for one of the previous applicant types.

BJA welcomes applications under which two or more entities would carry out the federal award; however, only one entity may be the applicant. Any others must be proposed subrecipients ("subgrantees").¹ The applicant must be the entity that would have primary responsibility for carrying out the award, including administering the funding and managing the entire project. Under this solicitation, only one application by any particular applicant entity will be considered. An entity may, however, be proposed as a subrecipient ("subgrantee") in more than one application.

BJA may elect to fund applications submitted under this FY 2017 solicitation in future fiscal years, dependent on, among other considerations, the merit of the applications and on the availability of appropriations.

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 January 26, 2017.

To be considered timely, an application must be submitted by the application deadline using Grants.gov, and the applicant must have received a validation message from Grants.gov that indicates successful and timely submission. OJP urges applicants to submit applications at least 72 hours prior to the application due date, in order to allow time for the applicant to receive

¹ For additional information on subawards, see "Budget and Associated Documentation" under [Section D. Application and Submission Information](#).

validation messages or rejection notifications from Grants.gov, and to correct in a timely fashion any problems that may have caused a rejection notification.

OJP encourages all applicants 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 email to support@grants.gov. The [Grants.gov](#) Support Hotline operates 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, except on federal holidays.

For assistance with any unforeseen Grants.gov technical issues beyond an applicant's control that prevent it from submitting its application by the deadline, or 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.

Additional information on reporting technical issues appears under "Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues" in the [How to Apply](#) section.

Grants.gov number assigned to this announcement: BJA-2017-11222

Release date: December 8, 2016

Contents

A. Program Description	4
Overview	4
Program-Specific Information	4
Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables	6
Evidence-Based Programs or Practices.....	7
B. Federal Award Information	8
Type of Award.....	8
Financial Management and System of Internal Controls	8
Budget Information.....	9
Cost Sharing or Match Requirement.....	9
Pre-Agreement Costs (also known as Pre-award Costs)	9
Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver.....	10
Prior Approval, Planning, and Reporting of Conference/Meeting/Training Costs	10
Costs Associated with Language Assistance (if applicable).....	10
C. Eligibility Information.....	11
D. Application and Submission Information	11
What an Application Should Include.....	11
How To Apply.....	22
E. Application Review Information	25
Review Criteria.....	25
Review Process	27
F. Federal Award Administration Information	29
Federal Award Notices	29
Administrative, National Policy, and other Legal Requirements.....	29
General Information about Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements.....	30
G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s)	30
H. Other Information.....	31
Freedom of Information Act and Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552 and 5 U.S.C. 552a).....	31
Provide Feedback to OJP.....	31
Application Checklist.....	32

Smart Prosecution Initiative (CFDA #16.825)

A. Program Description

Overview

BJA's "Smart Suite" of programs invest in the development of practitioner-researcher partnerships that use data, evidence, and innovation to create strategies and interventions that are effective and economical. This data-driven approach enables jurisdictions to understand the full nature and extent of the crime challenges they are facing and to target resources to the highest priorities. The Smart Suite of programs, which includes the Smart Prosecution Initiative, represents a strategic approach that brings more "science" into criminal justice operations by leveraging innovative applications of analysis, technology, and evidence-based practices with the goal of improving performance and effectiveness while containing costs.

As part of BJA's Smart Suite, the FY 2017 Smart Prosecution Initiative seeks to build upon analysis-driven, promising practices and evidence-based prosecution by encouraging state, local, and tribal prosecutorial agencies to develop effective, economical, and innovative responses to crime within their jurisdictions. Funding for this initiative is available through the FY 2017 appropriation to "enhance prosecutorial decision-making."

Statutory Authority: This program is typically funded under the annual Department of Justice appropriation to "enhance prosecutorial decision-making." Any awards under this solicitation would be made under statutory authority provided by a full-year appropriations act for FY 2017. As of the writing of this solicitation, the Department of Justice is operating under a short-term "Continuing Resolution;" no full-year appropriation for the Department has been enacted for FY 2017.

Program-Specific Information

Smart Prosecution seeks to encourage exploration of new solutions to public safety concerns, as well as internal operations and organizational structure, while employing research partners at the problem definition stage through assessment of strategies and solutions. Some creative solutions developed by prosecutors around the country include changing how their organizations prioritize cases, using zone/geographic prosecution, using crime analysis tools to reduce gun violence, crime prevention through environmental design, drug-free and prostitute-free zones, restorative justice, community courts, truancy abatement, diversion programs, crime analysis, and cyber-crime strategies to improve public safety. Prosecutors are becoming partnership builders who bring the police, the community, and other criminal justice and local agencies together to find ways they can work together to solve problems in their jurisdictions.

Examples of previous Smart Prosecution programs include:

- In San Diego (CA), a coalition of criminal justice partners led by the City Attorney's Office is developing the San Diego Community Court, a new post-plea diversion initiative designed to provide accountability, early intervention, and swift consequences for eligible misdemeanor offenders.

- In Kings County (NY), the District Attorney’s Office is creating a comprehensive approach to adolescent and young adult prosecution including a Young Adult Court to handle defendants up to age 24.
- In St. Louis (MO), the Circuit Attorney is implementing GunStat, a strategy to reduce gun crime whereby all criminal justice agencies collaborate in the investigation and prosecution of gun cases. In addition, the office will establish a diversion program targeting felony defendants most likely to carry a weapon illegally as those likely to reoffend or to perpetuate gun violence.
- In Baltimore (MD), the Office of the State’s Attorney is developing an automated evidence-based risk assessment to evaluate defendants charged at Central Booking, make evidence-based release recommendations, and identify defendants for diversion and alternative to incarceration programs.
- In San Francisco (CA), the District Attorney’s Office is establishing a Crime Strategies and Intelligence Unit.

BJA believes that several core elements must be in place to support a successful Smart Prosecution Initiative project. These include strong executive support for the project within the prosecutor’s office; sophisticated problem and data analysis efforts; the incorporation of the research partner in all aspects of the initiative; and a commitment to making organizational and operational changes to sustain the strategies found to be successful as measured by the project’s evaluation. In addition, experiences of current and former Smart Prosecution sites highlight the pressing need to engage members of their communities as allies in preventing and reducing crime. Under Smart Prosecution, prosecutors are strongly encouraged to establish innovative and effective working relationships with citizens and community leaders to gain support for their proposed initiatives. Agencies are also expected to leverage data from other criminal justice entities—such as parole, probation, corrections, the judiciary, and law enforcement agencies—to aid in their activities.

To ensure their initiative’s effectiveness, current Smart Prosecution grantees work closely with BJA and BJA’s competitively funded training and technical assistance partner to participate in information sharing sessions, facilitate peer-to-peer exchanges of information, access subject matter expertise that is relevant to specific Smart Prosecution projects, and produce reports on the lessons learned from the Smart Prosecution community. In addition, all Smart Prosecution grantees are required to produce a project action plan in collaboration with BJA and its training and technical assistance partner.

As prosecutors implement innovative, best practices, or evidence-based approaches to address the goals listed below, there is a need to evaluate their efforts. Applicants must devote at least 20 percent of the project budget to support the evaluation component of their initiative. The provision of appropriate resources for the selected research partner is crucial to project success, as they are expected to play a critical role in the project’s data collection and analysis, problem assessment, strategy development, and evaluation processes. The research partner must be identified by name and institutional affiliation in the application and can be an independent consultant or located in an academic institution; a state Statistical Analysis Center; or a research organization. The research partner should have demonstrated expertise conducting the type of work proposed.

For more information on Smart Prosecution and details on individual site activities, go to www.smartprosecution.org. This web site provides information and resources to BJA Smart Prosecution agency participants and to the nation’s prosecution community.

For additional information about identifying and working with a research partner, please see <http://www.psnmsu.com/documents/ResearchPartnerQ&A.pdf>.

Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables

The goal of Smart Prosecution is to develop a body of knowledge about data-driven strategies—innovative, best practice, or evidenced-based—as they are implemented by prosecutors. BJA is seeking applications from state, local, or tribal prosecutor agencies interested in testing data-driven approaches that address one or more of the three goals listed below. Smart Prosecution applicants will identify a problem to be addressed and enlist an independent research partner to help evaluate the effectiveness of their Smart Prosecution Effort. **Smart Prosecution applications require a research partner/organization as part of the application.**

To help achieve these important outcomes, Smart Prosecution grantees will work closely with BJA and BJA's training and technical assistance (TTA) provider, to assist agencies with incorporating innovative or evidence-based prosecution strategies as a fundamental element in ensuring public safety. The training and technical assistance provider will work directly with BJA in hosting grantee meetings, facilitating peer-to-peer exchanges of information, administering targeted subject matter expertise that is relevant to specific Smart Prosecution sites, and producing reports on the lessons learned from the Smart Prosecution community.

The implemented strategies will address one or more of the following goals:

- Promoting fair, impartial, and expeditious pursuit of justice;
- Ensuring safe communities; and
- Promoting integrity in the prosecution profession and effective coordination in the criminal justice system.

This program's required deliverables are:

- An action plan that is produced by the grantee agency at the outset of each project, which includes the project's problem analysis, logic model, summary of strategies and intended outcomes, and research base for proposed strategies. The action plan is envisioned as a product of collaboration among the supervision agency, research partner, and technical assistance provider. For more information about the required action plan, see page 8.
- Periodic reports, presentations, briefings for the task force/implementation team that complement performance data collected and show continued deployment of the problem-solving process.
- A final analysis report of the project's implementation and outcomes produced by the research partner and submitted to BJA at the conclusion of the project.

Applicants will:

- Describe the innovative, data-driven approach to be implemented.

- Enlist a qualified² research partner³ to evaluate the effectiveness of the approach.
- Identify a specific prosecution problem to address.
- Develop a prevention/mitigation/response strategy to address the problem.
- Evaluate the initiative.
- Assess and report the results to BJA, who will make the results publicly available.

The evaluation design must include outcome measures capable of informing a credible assessment of the effectiveness of the intervention(s). Applications absent such measures will not be awarded.

The proposed projects should present strategies that hold promise for replication and testing by other jurisdictions.

The Goals, Objectives and Deliverables are directly related to the performance measures set out in the table in [Section D. Application and Submission Information](#), under "Program Narrative."

Evidence-Based Programs or Practices

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

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

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

² The involvement of a research partner is indispensable to a successful Smart Prosecution project, and it is important that prosecutorial agencies consider the following when choosing partner candidates or organizations for the position.

- Policy, program, action research or organization evaluation experience, preferably in prosecution or in the justice system, is highly recommended.
- Previous experience working with prosecutorial agencies and/or organizations.
- Candidates should be experienced in several different data collection methodologies, and in both quantitative and qualitative research methods. It is preferable that they have several years of evaluation research experience and have experience with oral and written presentations of research results.
- Research partners should be able to conduct scientifically rigorous evaluations and be well versed in evaluation methods.

³ As defined in this solicitation, the research partner can be an independent consultant, or located in an academic institution, a state Statistical Analysis Center, or a research organization. The research partner should have demonstrated expertise conducting the type of work proposed. For more information related to research partner qualifications and selection, please see the elements listed under the selection criteria for capabilities and competencies on page 26 of this solicitation as well as the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) provided at the following link <http://www.psnmsu.com/documents/ResearchPartnerQ&A.pdf>

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 three awards of up to \$425,000 each for an estimated total of \$1.275 million for a 24-month period of performance, beginning on October 1, 2017.

BJA may, in certain cases, provide additional funding in future years to awards under this solicitation, through supplemental awards. In making decisions regarding supplemental awards, OJP will consider, among other factors, the availability of appropriations, OJP's strategic priorities, and OJP's assessment of both the management of the award (for example, timeliness and quality of progress reports), and 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.

Award Special Condition

Once awarded, each grant award will have in place a special condition withholding all but \$150,000, which will allow grantees to establish an action plan within 180 days of the date of this initial funding release.

The action plan must:

- Describe the problem and the data that led to its identification.
- Include a logic model that identifies the solution(s) to be tested and projects result(s).
- Include an impact evaluation plan.
- Ensure that a research partner is included, as well as a contract, agreement, memoranda of understanding or other similar legal instrument that clearly delineates the roles and responsibilities of the research partner. This document should clearly establish the authority of the research partner to access relevant agency data, interview subject personnel, and monitor agency operations that are relevant to the evaluation of the initiative.
- Demonstrate executive support and commitment of agency resources to the project.
- Include letters of commitment from external agencies or organizations that are expected to participate in the project.

The remaining funds will be released to each grantee only after BJA approves an acceptable action plan. BJA's Smart Prosecution TTA provider will assist sites in producing their action plan and submitting it for BJA review.

Type of Award

BJA expects that any award under this solicitation will be made in the form of a grant. See [Administrative, National Policy, and Other Legal Requirements](#), under [Section F. Federal Award Administration Information](#), for a brief discussion of important statutes, regulations, and award conditions that apply to many (or in some cases, all) OJP grants.

Financial Management and System of Internal Controls

Award recipients and subrecipients (including recipients or subrecipients that are pass-through entities⁴) must, as described in the Part 200 Uniform Requirements⁵ as 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 applicable Federal, state, local, and tribal laws regarding privacy and obligations of confidentiality.

To help ensure that applicants understand applicable administrative requirements and cost principles, OJP encourages prospective applicants to enroll, at no charge, in the DOJ Grants Financial Management Online Training, available [here](#).

Budget Information

Cost Sharing or Match Requirement

This solicitation does not require a match. However, if a successful application proposes a voluntary match amount, and OJP approves the budget, the total match amount incorporated into the approved budget becomes mandatory and subject to audit.

Pre-Agreement Costs (also known as Pre-award Costs)

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. All such costs incurred prior to award and prior

⁴ For purposes of this solicitation, the phrase “pass-through entity” includes any recipient or subrecipient that provides a subaward (“subgrant”) to a subrecipient (“subgrantee”) to carry out part of the funded award or program.

⁵ The “Part 200 Uniform Requirements” means the DOJ regulation at 2 C.F.R Part 2800, which adopts (with certain modifications) the provisions of 2 C.F.R. Part 200.

to approval of the costs are incurred at the sole risk of the applicant. (Generally, no applicant should incur project costs *before* submitting an application requesting federal funding for those costs.) Should there be extenuating circumstances that make it appropriate for OJP to consider approving pre-agreement costs, the applicant may contact the point of contact listed on the title page of this solicitation for the requirements concerning written requests for approval. If approved in advance by OJP, award funds may be used for pre-agreement costs, consistent with the recipient's approved budget and applicable cost principles. See the section on Costs Requiring Prior Approval in the [DOJ Grants 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.⁶ 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 the applicant submits a waiver request and justification with the application, the applicant should anticipate that OJP will request the applicant to adjust and resubmit the budget.

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

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

OJP strongly encourages applicants that propose to use award funds for any conference-, meeting-, or training-related activity to review carefully—before submitting an application—the OJP policy and guidance on conference approval, planning, and reporting available at www.ojp.gov/financialguide/DOJ/PostawardRequirements/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)

⁶ 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.

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 "Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2016 Awards" in the [OJP Funding Resource Center](#).

C. Eligibility Information

For additional eligibility information, see title page.

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

D. Application and Submission Information

What an Application Should Include

This section describes in detail what an application should include. An applicant should anticipate that if it fails to submit an application that contains all of the specified elements, it may negatively affect the review of its application; and, should a decision be made to make an award, it may result in the inclusion of award conditions that preclude the recipient from accessing or using award funds until the recipient satisfies the conditions and OJP makes the funds available.

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

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

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

The SF-424 is a required standard form used as a cover sheet for submission of pre-applications, applications, and related information. Grants.gov and OJP's Grants Management System (GMS) take information from the applicant's profile to populate the

fields on this form. When selecting "type of applicant," if the applicant is a for-profit entity, select "For-Profit Organization" or "Small Business" (as applicable).

To avoid processing delays, applicants must include an accurate legal name on their SF-424. Current OJP award recipients, when completing the field for "Legal Name," should use the same legal name that appears on the prior year award document which is also the legal name stored in OJP's financial system. On the SF-424, enter the Legal Name in box 5 and Employer Identification Number (EIN) in box 6 exactly as it appears on the prior year award document. Applicants with current awards must ensure that their GMS profile is current. If it isn't, they should submit a Grant Adjustment Notice updating the information on their GMS profile prior to applying under this solicitation.

New applicants should enter the Official Legal Name and address of the applicant entity in box 5 and the EIN in box 6 of the SF-424. Applicants must attach official legal documents to their applications (e.g., articles of incorporation, 501C3, etc.) to confirm the legal name, address, and EIN entered into the SF-424.

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

2. Project Abstract

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

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

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

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

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

In the project abstract template, each applicant is asked to indicate whether it gives OJP permission to share the applicant's project abstract (including contact information for individuals) with the public. Granting (or failing to grant) this permission will not affect OJP's funding decisions. Moreover, if the application is not funded, providing permission will not ensure that OJP will share the abstract information, nor will it assure 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 Criteria 1-5 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 narrative⁷:

- 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

OJP will require each successful applicant to submit specific performance measures data as part of its reporting under the award (see “General Information about Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements” in [Section F. Federal Award Administration Information](#)). The performance measures correlate to the goals, objectives, and deliverables identified under "Goals, Objective, and Deliverables" in [Section A. Program Description](#).

The application should describe the applicant's plan for collection of all of the performance measures data listed in the table below under “Data Recipient Provides,” should it receive funding.

Objective	Catalog ID	Performance Measure(s)	Data Grantee Provides
Identify and address a new solution to a specific public safety concern, internal operation or organizational structure, using an analysis-driven/innovative approach.	269	Percent of program goals and objectives completed that are directly linked to grant funding and address a specific problem	Number of program tasks that were completed during the reporting period that are directly linked to grant funding (Task: a grant activity defined in application project plan)
	163	Number of new solutions employed	Number of total program tasks (complete or incomplete) that are directly linked to grant funding Number of new solutions employed during the current reporting period

⁷ For information on subawards (including the details on proposed subawards that should be included in the application), see "Budget and Associated Documentation" under [Section D. Application and Submission Information](#).

	321	Number of evidence-based practices deployed	Number of evidence-based practices deployed over the life of the grant
Enhance prosecutorial knowledge of effective strategies and tactics for crime problems or criminogenic circumstances.	440	Number of engagements with the TTA partner	During the reporting period, the number TTA engagements: A. Telephonic Technical Assistance B. Onsite Visits/Technical Assistance C. In-Person Training Sessions D. Web-based Training Sessions
Support and sustain evidence-based prosecution and public safety strategies.	630	Percent of prosecutors involved in the initiative using data analysis	Number of prosecutors involved in the initiative during the reporting period.
	243	Number of partnerships established with other criminal justice organizations or agencies	Number of prosecutors using data analysis Number of formal agreements signed with new research partnerships during the reporting period (e.g. MOUs, LOAs, other formal agreements)
	261	Number of public/community briefings or trainings promoting evidence-based practices	Number of new partnerships formed with other criminal justice organizations or agencies during the reporting period Number of briefings or outreach to the public/community about evidence based practices
	146	Number of research partner engagements	Type of briefings or outreach to the public/community about evidence -based practices During the reporting period, number of times staff engaged in the initiative met with the research partner Describe the activities that the research partner is conducting

Note on Project Evaluations

An applicant that proposes to use award funds 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.” Each applicant should provide sufficient information for OJP to determine whether the particular project it proposes would either intentionally or unintentionally collect and/or

use information in such a way that it meets the DOJ definition of research that appears at 28 C.F.R. Part 46 (“Protection of Human Subjects”).

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 for purposes of human subjects protection, applicants should consult the decision tree in the “Research and the protection of human subjects” section of the [“Requirements related to Research”](#) web page of the "Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2016," available through the [OJP Funding Resource Center](#). Every prospective applicant whose application may propose a research or statistical component also should review the “Data Privacy and Confidentiality Requirements” section on that web page.

e. Sustainment

4. Budget and Associated Documentation

a. Budget Detail Worksheet

A sample Budget Detail Worksheet can be found at www.ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/BudgetDetailWorksheet.pdf. An applicant that submit its 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 [DOJ Grants Financial Guide](#).

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).

An applicant should demonstrate in its budget narratives how it will maximize cost effectiveness of award 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 clearly 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 those costs are necessary 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 describe costs year.

c. Information on Proposed Subawards (if any), as well as on Proposed Procurement Contracts (if any)

Applicants for OJP awards typically may propose to make "subawards." Applicants also may propose to enter into procurement "contracts" under the award.

Whether—for purposes of federal grants administrative requirements—a particular agreement between a recipient and a third party will be considered a "subaward" or instead considered a procurement "contract" under the award is determined by federal rules and applicable OJP guidance. It is an important distinction, in part because the federal administrative rules and requirements that apply to "subawards" and to procurement "contracts" under awards differ markedly.

In general, the central question is the relationship between what the third-party will do under its agreement with the recipient and what the recipient has committed (to OJP) to do under its award to further a public purpose (e.g., services the recipient will provide, products it will develop or modify, research or evaluation it will conduct). If a third party will provide some of the services the recipient has committed (to OJP) to provide, will develop or modify all or part of a product the recipient has committed (to OJP) to develop or modify, or will conduct part of the research or evaluation the recipient has committed (to OJP) to conduct, OJP will consider the agreement with the third party a subaward for purposes of federal grants administrative requirements.

This will be true **even if** the recipient, for internal or other non-federal purposes, labels or treats its agreement as a procurement, a contract, or a procurement contract. Neither the title nor the structure of an agreement determines whether the agreement -- for purposes of federal grants administrative requirements -- is a "subaward" or is instead a procurement "contract" under an award.

Additional guidance on the circumstances under which (for purposes of federal grants administrative requirements) an agreement constitutes a subaward as opposed to a procurement contract under an award, is available (along with other resources) on the [OJP Part 200 Uniform Requirements](#) web page.

1. Information on proposed subawards

A recipient of an OJP award may not make subawards ("subgrants") unless the recipient has specific federal authorization to do so. Unless an applicable statute or DOJ regulation specifically authorizes (or requires) subawards, a recipient must have authorization from OJP before it may make a subaward.

A particular subaward may be authorized by OJP because the recipient included a sufficiently-detailed description and justification of the proposed subaward in the application as approved by OJP. If, however, a particular subaward is not authorized by federal statute or regulation, and is not sufficiently described and justified in the application as approved by OJP, the recipient will be required, post-award, to request and obtain written authorization from OJP before it may make the subaward.

If an applicant proposes to make one or more subawards to carry out the federal award and program, the applicant should-- (1) identify (if known) the proposed subrecipient(s), (2) describe in detail what each subrecipient will do to carry out the federal award and

federal program, and (3) provide a justification for the subaward(s), with details on pertinent matters such as special qualifications and areas of expertise. Pertinent information on subawards should appear not only in the Program Narrative, but also in the Budget Detail Worksheet and budget narrative.

2. Information on proposed procurement contracts (with specific justification for proposed noncompetitive contracts over \$150,000)

Unlike a recipient contemplating a subaward, a recipient of an OJP award generally does not need specific prior federal authorization to enter into an agreement that -- for purposes of federal grants administrative requirements -- is considered a procurement contract, **provided that** (1) the recipient uses its own documented procurement procedures and (2) those procedures conform to applicable federal law, including the Procurement Standards of the (DOJ) Part 200 Uniform Requirements (as set out at 2 C.F.R. 200.317 - 200.326). The Budget Detail Worksheet and budget narrative should identify proposed procurement contracts. (As discussed above, subawards must be identified and described separately from procurement contracts.)

The Procurement Standards in the Part 200 Uniform Requirements, however, reflect a general expectation that agreements that (for purposes of federal grants administrative requirements) constitute procurement "contracts" under awards will be entered into on the basis of full and open competition. If a proposed procurement contract would exceed the simplified acquisition threshold -- currently, \$150,000 -- a recipient of an OJP award may not proceed without competition unless and until the recipient receives specific advance authorization from OJP to use a non-competitive approach for the procurement.

An applicant that (at the time of its application) intends -- without competition -- to enter into a procurement "contract" that would exceed \$150,000 should include a detailed justification that explains to OJP why, in the particular circumstances, it is appropriate to proceed without competition. Various considerations that may be pertinent to the justification are outlined in the [DOJ Grants Financial Guide](#).

d. Pre-Agreement Cost

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

5. Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable)

Indirect costs may be charged to an award only if:

- (a) The recipient has a current (that is, unexpired), federally approved indirect cost rate;
or
- (b) The recipient 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).

An applicant with a current (that is, unexpired) federally-approved indirect cost rate is to attach a copy of the indirect cost rate agreement to the application. An applicant that does not have a current federally-approved rate may request one through its cognizant federal agency, which will review all documentation and approve a rate for the applicant entity, or, if the applicant's accounting system permits, applicants may propose to allocate costs in the direct cost categories.

For assistance with identifying the appropriate cognizant federal agency for indirect costs, please contact the OCFO Customer Service Center at 1-800-458-0786 or at ask.ocfo@usdoj.gov. If DOJ is the cognizant federal agency, applicants may obtain information needed to submit an indirect cost rate proposal at <http://www.ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/IndirectCosts.pdf>.

Certain OJP recipients have the option of electing to use the “de minimis” indirect cost rate. An applicant that is eligible to use the “de minimis” rate that wishes to use the “de minimis” rate should attach written documentation to the application that advises OJP of both-- (1) the applicant’s eligibility to use the “de minimis” rate, and (2) its election to do so. If an eligible applicant elects the “de minimis” rate, costs must be consistently charged as either indirect or direct costs, but may not be double charged or inconsistently charged as both. The “de minimis” rate may no longer be used once an approved federally-negotiated indirect cost rate is in place. (No entity that ever has had a federally-approved negotiated indirect cost rate is eligible to use the “de minimis” rate.)

6. Tribal Authorizing Resolution

A tribe, tribal organization, or third party that proposes to provide direct services or assistance to residents on tribal lands should include in its application a resolution, letter, affidavit, or other documentation, as appropriate, that demonstrates (as a legal matter) that the applicant has the requisite authorization from the tribe(s) to implement the proposed project on tribal lands. In those instances when an organization or consortium of tribes applies for an award 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 award. 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.

An applicant unable to submit an application that includes a fully-executed (i.e., signed) copy of appropriate legal documentation, as described above, consistent with the applicable tribe’s governance structure, should, at a minimum, submit an unsigned, draft version of such legal documentation as part of its application (except for cases in which, with respect to a tribal consortium applicant, consortium bylaws allow action without the support of all consortium member tribes). If selected for funding, BJA will make use of and access to funds contingent on receipt of the fully-executed legal documentation.

7. Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire (including applicant disclosure of high-risk status)

Every applicant (other than an individual applying in his/her personal capacity) is to download, complete, and submit the [OJP Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire](#), as part of its application.

Among other things, the form requires each applicant to disclose whether it currently is designated “high risk” by a federal grant-making agency outside of DOJ. For purposes of this disclosure, high risk includes any status under which a federal awarding agency provides additional oversight due to the applicant’s past performance, or other programmatic or financial concerns with the applicant. If an applicant is designated high risk by another federal awarding agency, the applicant must provide the following information:

- The federal awarding agency that currently designates the applicant high risk
- The date the applicant was designated high risk
- The high-risk point of contact at that federal awarding agency (name, phone number, and email address)
- The reasons for the high-risk status, as set out by the federal awarding agency

OJP seeks this information to help ensure appropriate federal oversight of OJP awards. An applicant that is considered “high-risk” by another federal awarding agency is not automatically disqualified from receiving an OJP award. OJP may, however, consider the information in award decisions, and may impose additional OJP oversight of any award under this solicitation (including through the conditions that accompany the award document).

8. Disclosure of Lobbying Activities

Each applicant must complete and submit this information. An applicant that expends any funds for lobbying activities is to provide all of the information requested on the form Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (SF-LLL). An applicant that does not expend any funds for lobbying activities is to enter “N/A” in the text boxes for item 10 (“a. Name and Address of Lobbying Registrant” and “b. Individuals Performing Services”).

9. Additional Attachments

a. Timeline

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

b. Position Descriptions and Resumes

Include position descriptions and resumes for key project personnel.

c. Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications

Each applicant is to disclose whether it has (or is proposed as a subrecipient under) any pending applications for federally-funded grants or cooperative agreements that (1) include requests for funding to support the same project being proposed in the application under this solicitation, and (2) would cover any identical cost items outlined in the budget submitted to OJP as part of the application under this solicitation. The applicant is to disclose applications made directly to federal awarding agencies, and also applications for subawards of federal funds (e.g., applications to State agencies that will subaward (“subgrant”) 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.

Each applicant that has one or more pending applications as described above is 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 federal or State funding agency.

Federal or State Funding Agency	Solicitation Name/Project Name	Name/Phone/E-mail for Point of Contact at Federal or State 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

Each applicant should include the table as a separate attachment to its application. The file should be named “Disclosure of Pending Applications.” The applicant Legal Name on the application must match the entity named on the disclosure of pending applications statement.

Any applicant that does not have any pending applications as described above is to submit, as a separate attachment, a statement to this effect: “[Applicant Name on SF-424] does not have (and is not proposed as a subrecipient under) any pending applications submitted within the last 12 months for federally-funded grants or cooperative agreements (or for subawards under federal grants or cooperative agreements) that request funding to support the same project being proposed in this application to OJP and that would cover any identical cost items outlined in the budget submitted as part of in this application.”

d. Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity

If an application proposes research (including research and development) and/or evaluation, the applicant must demonstrate research/evaluation independence and integrity, including appropriate safeguards, before it may receive award funds. The applicant must demonstrate independence and integrity regarding both this proposed research and/or evaluation, and any current or prior related projects.

Each application should include an attachment that addresses **both** i. and ii. below.

- i. For purposes of this solicitation, each applicant is to document research and evaluation independence and integrity by including one of the following two items:
 - a. A specific assurance that the applicant has reviewed its application to identify any actual or potential apparent conflicts of interest (including through review of pertinent information on the principal investigator, any co-principal investigators, and any subrecipients), and that the applicant has identified no such conflicts of interest – whether personal or financial or organizational (including on the part of the applicant entity or on the part of staff, investigators, or subrecipients) – that could affect the independence or integrity of the research, including the design, conduct, and reporting of the research.

OR

- b. A specific description of actual or potential apparent conflicts of interest that the applicant has identified – including through review of pertinent information on the principal investigator, any co-principal investigators, and any subrecipients – that could affect the independence or integrity of the research, including the design, conduct, or reporting of the research. These conflicts may be personal (e.g., on the part of investigators or other staff), financial, or organizational (related to the applicant or any subrecipient entity). Some examples of potential investigator (or other personal) conflict situations are 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 would not be given an award 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), because the organization in such an instance might 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, each applicant is to address 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 actual or potential apparent conflicts of interest (personal, financial, or organizational) exist, then the applicant should provide a brief narrative explanation of how and why it reached that conclusion. The applicant also is to include an explanation of the specific processes and procedures that the applicant has in place, or will put in place, to identify and prevent (or, at the very least, mitigate) any such conflicts of interest pertinent to the funded project during the period of performance. Documentation that may be helpful in this regard may include organizational codes of ethics/conduct and policies regarding organizational, personal, and financial conflicts of interest. There is no guarantee that the plan, if any, will be accepted as proposed.

OR

- b. If the applicant has identified actual or potential apparent conflicts of interest (personal, financial, or organizational) that could affect the independence and integrity of the research, including the design, conduct, or reporting of the research, the applicant must is to provide a specific and robust mitigation plan to address each of those conflicts. At a minimum, the applicant is expected to explain the specific processes and procedures that the applicant has in place, or will put in place, to identify and eliminate (or, at the very least, mitigate) any such conflicts of interest pertinent to the funded project during the period of performance. Documentation that may be helpful in this regard

may include organizational codes of ethics/conduct and policies regarding organizational, personal, and financial conflicts of interest. There is no guarantee that the plan, if any, will be accepted as proposed.

OJP will assess research and evaluation independence and integrity based on considerations such as the adequacy of the applicant’s efforts to identify factors that could affect the objectivity or integrity of the proposed staff and/or the applicant entity (and any subrecipients) 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.

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**, which operates 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, except on 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 of registration and a user password. OJP encourages applicants to **register several weeks before** the application submission deadline. In addition, OJP urges applicants to submit applications at least 72 hours prior to the application due date, in order to allow time for the applicant 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.

OJP 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.

Browser Information: Grants.gov was built to be compatible with Internet Explorer. For technical assistance with Google Chrome, or another browser, contact Grants.gov Customer Support.

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 that all required documents are attached in either Grants.gov 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. Grants.gov is designed to forward successfully submitted applications to OJP’s Grants Management System (GMS).

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 “&” format.		

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:

Every applicant entity must comply with all applicable System for Award Management (SAM) and unique entity identifier (currently, a Data Universal Numbering System ["DUNS"] number) requirements. If an applicant entity has not fully complied with applicable SAM and unique identifier requirements by the time OJP makes award decisions, OJP may determine that the applicant is not qualified to receive an award and may use that determination as a basis for making the award to a different applicant.

An individual who wishes to apply in his/her personal capacity should search Grants.gov for funding opportunities for which individuals are eligible to apply. Use the Funding Opportunity Number (FON) to register. (An applicant applying as an individual must comply with all applicable Grants.gov individual registration requirements.)

Complete the registration form at <https://apply07.grants.gov/apply/IndCPRegister> to create a username and password for Grants.gov. (An applicant applying as an individual should complete all steps except 1, 2 and 4.)

1. Acquire a unique entity identifier (“DUNS” number). In general, the Office of Management and Budget requires every applicant for a federal award (other than an individual) to include a "unique entity identifier" in each application, including an application for a supplemental award. Currently, a DUNS number is the required unique entity identifier.

A DUNS number is a unique nine-digit identification number provided by the commercial company Dun and Bradstreet. This unique entity identifier is used for tracking purposes, and to validate address and point of contact information for applicants, recipients, and subrecipients. It will be used throughout the life cycle of an OJP award. 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. An applicant must be registered in SAM to successfully register in Grants.gov. Each applicant must **update or renew its SAM registration at least annually** to maintain an active status. SAM registration and renewal can take as long as 10 business days to complete.

An application 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 <http://www.grants.gov/web/grants/applicants/individual-registration.html>.
- 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 16.825, titled "Smart Prosecution Initiative," and the funding opportunity number is BJA-2017-11222.
- 6. Submit a valid application consistent with this solicitation by following the directions in Grants.gov.** Within 24–48 hours after submitting the electronic application, the applicant should receive two notifications from Grants.gov. The first will confirm the receipt of the application and the second will state whether the application has been successfully validated, or rejected due to errors, with an explanation. It is possible to first receive a message indicating that the application is received and then receive a rejection notice a few minutes or hours later. Submitting well ahead of the deadline provides time to correct the problem(s) that caused the rejection. **Important:** OJP urges applicants to submit applications **at least 72 hours prior** to the application due date to allow time to receive validation messages or rejection notifications from Grants.gov, and to correct in a timely fashion any problems that may have caused a rejection notification. 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 January 26, 2017.

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, OJP 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

An applicant that experiences unforeseen Grants.gov technical issues beyond its control that prevent it from submitting its application by the deadline may 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. The applicant may email the BJA contact identified in the Contact Information section on page two **within 24 hours after the application deadline** to request approval to submit its application after the deadline. The applicant's email must describe the technical difficulties, and must 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 to submit a late application. After OJP reviews the applicant's request, 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 untimely application submission was due to the applicant's failure to follow all required procedures, OJP will deny the applicant's request to submit its application.

The following conditions generally are 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

Review Criteria

Applications that meet basic minimum requirements will be evaluated by peer reviewers using the following review criteria, with the different weight given to each based on the percentage value listed after each individual criteria. For example, the first criteria, "Statement of the Problem," is worth 20 percent of the entire score in the application review process.

1. Statement of the Problem (20 percent)

- a) Provide Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) and/or population served data and describe the crime challenges of the jurisdiction.
- b) Identify the specific crime problem the jurisdiction seeks to address.
- c) Identify the challenges related to the problem that the jurisdiction seeks to address.
- d) Describe the process used to assess or determine the nature of the crime or type of problem.
- e) Describe any existing partnerships with the academic/research community.
- f) Provide an overview of current agency structure and, if applicable, include discussion of how the agency currently incorporates evidence-based practice into prosecutorial practice.

2. Project Design and Implementation (30 percent)

- a) Describe the development of the strategy to address the problem based on a thoughtful and thorough analysis, including how a researcher was used to develop the strategy.
- b) Describe specifically how the project will accomplish expected outcomes by providing the objectives and the performance measures applicable to the project. Include a comprehensive timeline that identifies milestones, numerically lists deliverables, and identifies the person who is responsible for each activity (as an attachment).
- c) Describe the qualifications of the Smart Prosecution research partner and the researcher's prior experience conducting "action research," program evaluation, and his/her prior work with criminal justice partners and prosecutors.
- d) Describe the roles and responsibilities of the research partner in the Smart Prosecution Initiative and how the role of the research partner is integrated into the applicant's proposed strategy. At a minimum, the research partner should: assist in the analysis of the problem; participate in solution development; provide ongoing analysis, monitoring, and evaluation of the solutions' impact; and prepare a final report that thoroughly assesses the results of the project.
- e) Describe and provide evidence of the types and quality of data sources available to the agency to conduct appropriate analysis. For example:
 - Does the agency have access to multiple sources of data (both internal and external to the agency) specific to the identified problem?
 - Does the agency have the ability to integrate data from different sources?

3. Capabilities and Competencies (25 percent)

Discuss organizational capabilities and competencies that will enable the applicant to successfully implement the proposed program or project. Identify personnel who are critical to the project's successful implementation and discuss their roles, responsibilities, and qualifications.

Describe the level of agency executive support for the project, as well as the nature and extent of involvement of senior staff in the project.

Describe the qualifications of the Smart Prosecution research partner and the prior experience of the researcher with "action research." Specifically, the application should describe their experience with such activities as:

- Developing logic models, collecting and analyzing criminal justice and public safety data, and using data to identify criminal justice and public safety related problems.
- Working collaboratively with prosecutorial agencies to overcome barriers to research-driven problem solving, as well as identifying and proposing proven strategies/interventions to address problems.
- Documenting program operations and processes, assessing implementation fidelity, making recommendations for program improvement, and measuring program outcomes and using data to determine program effectiveness.
- Regularly presenting findings and conclusions both orally and in written form to prosecutorial professionals team, developing "real-time" products and resources

for strategic decision-making, and working with prosecutorial agencies to develop a sustainability plan.

- Communicating with a wide variety of public sector, private, and community-based individuals.

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

Describe the process and methods for evaluating project performance, to include a description of 1) the impact and outcome evaluation methodology and research design, as developed through the research partnership, that will provide findings related to the implementation and outcomes of the selected project strategy; and 2) the process and methods for collecting required performance metrics and submission of these metrics to BJA in accordance with the requirements of this solicitation.

For both of the aforementioned data collection and evaluation processes, applicants must identify who will collect the data, who is responsible for performance and outcome measurement, and how the information will be used to guide and evaluate the impact of the program. Describe the process to accurately report implementation and outcome findings.

5. Sustainment (5 percent)

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

6. Budget (10 percent)

Provide a proposed budget and Budget narrative that are complete, cost effective, and allowable (e.g., reasonable, allowable, and necessary for project activities). Budget narratives should demonstrate how applicants will maximize cost effectiveness of grant expenditures. Budget narratives should demonstrate cost effectiveness in relation to potential alternatives and the goals of the project.⁸

Applicants should budget travel/lodging expenses for four-person teams of agency and research partner representatives to attend three 2-day meetings during the 24-month project period, including the Smart Suite Academy. The meetings may be held in the Washington, D.C. area or other regions of the country.

Applicants should allocate at least 20 percent of the project budget to support the research and evaluation components of their initiative.

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 an application meets basic minimum requirements and should proceed to further consideration, OJP screens applications

⁸ 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.

for compliance with those requirements. Although specific requirements may vary, the following are common requirements applicable to all solicitations for funding under OJP programs:

- The application must be submitted by an eligible type of applicant
- The application must request funding within programmatic funding constraints (if applicable)
- The application must be responsive to the scope of the solicitation
- The application must include all items designated as “critical elements”
- The applicant must not be identified in SAM as excluded from receiving federal awards

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

Peer review panels will evaluate, score, and rate applications that meet basic minimum requirements. BJA may use internal peer reviewers, external peer reviewers, or a combination, to assess applications on technical merit using the solicitation's review 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. Peer reviewers' ratings and any resulting recommendations are advisory only, although reviewer views are considered carefully. Other important considerations for OJP include underserved populations, geographic diversity, strategic priorities, and available funding, as well as the extent to which the budget detail worksheet and budget narrative accurately explain project costs that are reasonable, necessary, and otherwise allowable under federal law and applicable federal cost principles.

Pursuant to the Part 200 Uniform Requirements, before award decisions are made, OJP also reviews information related to the degree of risk posed by applicants. Among other things to help assess whether an applicant that has one or more prior federal awards has a satisfactory record with respect to performance, integrity, and business ethics, OJP checks whether the applicant is listed in SAM as excluded from receiving a federal award. If OJP anticipates that an award will exceed \$150,000 in federal funds, OJP also must review and consider any information about the applicant that appears in the non-public segment of the integrity and performance system accessible through SAM (currently, the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System; "FAPIIS").

Important note on FAPIIS: An applicant, at its option, may review and comment on any information about itself that currently appears in FAPIIS and was entered by a federal awarding agency. OJP will consider any such comments by the applicant, in addition to the other information in FAPIIS, in its assessment of the risk posed by applicants

The evaluation of risks goes beyond information in SAM, however. OJP itself has in place a framework for evaluating risks posed by applicants for competitive awards. OJP takes into account information pertinent to matters such as—

1. Applicant financial stability and fiscal integrity
2. Quality of the management systems of the applicant, and the applicant's ability to meet prescribed management standards, including those outlined in the DOJ Grants Financial Guide

3. Applicant's history of performance under OJP and other DOJ awards (including compliance with reporting requirements and award conditions), as well as awards from other federal agencies
4. Reports and findings from audits of the applicant, including audits under the Part 200 Uniform Requirements
5. Applicant's ability to comply with statutory and regulatory requirements, and to effectively implement other award requirements.

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 take into account not only peer review ratings and [insert BPO] recommendations, but also other factors as indicated in this section.

F. Federal Award Administration Information

Federal Award Notices

Award notifications will be made by September 30, 2017. OJP sends award notifications 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 steps to take in GMS to start the award acceptance process. GMS automatically issues the notifications at 9:00 p.m. eastern time on the award date.

For each successful applicant, an individual with the necessary authority to bind the applicant will be required to log in; execute a set of legal certifications and a set of legal assurances; designate a financial point of contact; thoroughly review the award, including all award conditions; and 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 OJP-approved application, the recipient must comply with all award conditions, as well as all applicable requirements of federal statutes, regulations, and executive orders (including applicable requirements referred to in the assurances and certifications executed in connection with award acceptance). OJP strongly encourages prospective applicants to review information on post-award legal requirements and common OJP award conditions **prior** to submitting an application.

Applicants should consult the "[Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2016 Awards](#)," available in the [OJP Funding Resource Center](#). In addition, applicants should examine the following two legal documents, as each successful applicant must execute both documents before it may receive any award funds.

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

Applicants may view these documents in the Apply section of the [OJP Funding Resource Center](#).

The web pages accessible through the "[Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2016 Awards](#)" are intended to give applicants for OJP awards a general overview of important statutes, regulations, and award conditions that apply to many (or in some cases, all) OJP grants and cooperative agreements awarded in FY 2017. Individual OJP awards typically also will include additional award conditions. Those additional conditions may relate to the particular statute or program, or solicitation under which the award is made; to the substance of the funded application; to the recipient's performance under other federal awards; to the recipient's legal status (e.g., as a for-profit entity); or to other pertinent considerations.

General Information about Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements

In addition to the deliverables described in [Section A. Program Description](#), any recipient of an award under this solicitation will be required to submit the following reports and data.

Required reports. Recipients typically must submit quarterly financial reports, semi-annual progress reports, final financial and progress reports, and, if applicable, an annual audit report in accordance with Part 200 Uniform Requirements or specific award conditions. Future awards and fund drawdowns may be withheld if reports are delinquent. (In appropriate cases, OJP may require additional reports.)

Awards that exceed \$500,000 will include an additional condition that, under specific circumstances, will require the recipient to report (to FAPIIS) information on civil, criminal, and administrative proceedings connected with (or connected to the performance of) either the OJP award or any other grant, cooperative agreement, or procurement contract from the federal government. Additional information on this reporting requirement appears in the text of the award condition posted on the OJP web site at <http://ojp.gov/funding/FAPIIS.htm>.

Data on performance measures. In addition to required reports, an award recipient also must provide data that measure the results of the work done under the award. To demonstrate program progress and success, as well as to assist DOJ in 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, OJP will require any recipient, post award, to provide the data listed as "Data Recipient Provides" in the performance measures table in [Section D. Application and Submission Information](#), under "Program Narrative," so that OJP can calculate values for this solicitation's performance measures.

G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s)

For OJP Contact(s), see title page.

For contact information for Grants.gov, see title page.

H. Other Information

Freedom of Information Act and Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552 and 5 U.S.C. 552a)

All applications submitted to OJP (including all attachments to applications) are subject to the federal Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) and to the Privacy Act. By law, DOJ may withhold information that is responsive to a request pursuant to FOIA if DOJ determines that the responsive information either is protected under the Privacy Act or falls within the scope of one of nine statutory exemptions under FOIA. DOJ cannot agree in advance of a request pursuant to FOIA not to release some or all portions of an application.

In its review of records that are responsive to a FOIA request, OJP will withhold information in those records that plainly falls within the scope of the Privacy Act or one of the statutory exemptions under FOIA. (Some examples include certain types of information in budgets, and names and contact information for project staff other than certain key personnel.) In appropriate circumstances, OJP will request the views of the applicant/recipient that submitted a responsive document.

For example, if OJP receives a request pursuant to FOIA for an application submitted by a nonprofit or for-profit organization or an institution of higher education, or for an application that involves research, OJP typically will contact the applicant/recipient that submitted the application and ask it to identify -- quite precisely -- any particular information in the application that applicant/recipient believes falls under a FOIA exemption, the specific exemption it believes applies, and why. After considering the submission by the applicant/recipient, OJP makes an independent assessment regarding withholding information. OJP generally follows a similar process for requests pursuant to FOIA for applications that may contain law-enforcement sensitive 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 resume to ojppeerreview@lmsolas.com. The OJP Solicitation Feedback email account will not forward your resume. (Do not send your résumé to the OJP Solicitation Feedback email account.) **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 2017 Smart Prosecution Initiative

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 23)
- _____ Acquire or renew registration with SAM (see page 23)

To Register with Grants.gov:

- _____ Acquire AOR and Grants.gov username/password (see page 24)
- _____ Acquire AOR confirmation from the E-Biz POC (see page 24)

To Find Funding Opportunity:

- _____ Search for the Funding Opportunity on Grants.gov (see page 24)
- _____ Download Funding Opportunity and Application Package
- _____ Sign up for Grants.gov email notifications (optional) (see page 23)
- _____ 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

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 24)

If No Grants.gov Receipt, and Validation or Error Notifications are Received:

- _____ contact the NCJRS Response Center regarding experiencing technical difficulties (see page 2)

General Requirements:

- _____ Review the "[Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2016 Awards](#)" in the OJP Funding Resource Center.

Scope Requirement:

- _____ The federal amount requested is within the allowable limit(s) of \$425,000.

Eligibility Requirement:

- _____ Eligible applicants are limited to state, local, and tribal prosecutor agencies or a government agency or nonprofit organization as fiscal agent for the applicant.

What an Application Should Include:

- _____ Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424) (see page 11)
- _____ Project Abstract (see page 12)
- _____ *Program Narrative (see page 13)
- _____ *Budget Detail Worksheet (see page 15)
- _____ *Budget Narrative (see page 15)
- _____ Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable) (see page 17)
- _____ Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable) (see page 18)
- _____ Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire (see page 18)
- _____ Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (SF-LLL) (see page 19)

- _____ Additional Attachments
 - _____ Project Timeline (see page 19)
 - _____ *Position Descriptions and Resumes (see page 19)
 - _____ Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications (see page 19)
 - _____ Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity (see page 20)
- _____ Request and Justification of Employee Compensation Waiver (if applicable)
(see page 10)

* 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.