



The [U.S. Department of Justice](#) (DOJ), [Office of Justice Programs](#) (OJP), [Bureau of Justice Assistance](#) (BJA) in partnership with the [National Institute of Justice](#) (NIJ) is seeking applications for the Sentinel Events Initiative Demonstration Project: Technical Assistance (TA) Provider. This program furthers the Department's mission by assisting state and local jurisdictions to improve the functioning of the criminal justice system by including and sponsoring TA as part of a larger research effort to provide objective, independent, evidence-based knowledge and tools to meet the challenges of crime and justice.

FY 2017 BJA Sentinel Events Initiative Demonstration Project: Technical Assistance Provider

Applications Due: July 27, 2017

Eligibility

In general, BJA is authorized to make grants to, or enter into contracts or cooperative agreements with, states (including territories), units of local government, federally recognized Indian tribal governments that perform law enforcement functions (as determined by the Secretary of the Interior), nonprofit and for-profit organizations (including tribal nonprofit and for-profit organizations), institutions of higher education (including tribal institutions of higher education), and certain qualified individuals. For-profit organizations (as well as other recipients) must forgo any profit or management fee. Foreign governments, foreign organizations, and foreign colleges and universities are not eligible to apply. Applicants are encouraged to submit an application that demonstrates a thorough understanding of the complex technical assistance needs of jurisdictions attempting to establish an all-stakeholder review mechanism for the purposes of learning from error and preventing reoccurrence. Applications should also demonstrate the capacity to build and sustain partnerships within the criminal justice system.

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 as subrecipients ("subgrantees").¹ The applicant must be the entity that would have primary responsibility for carrying out the award, including administering 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.

Deadline

Applicants must register with [Grants.gov](#) prior to submitting an application. All applications are due by 11:59 p.m. eastern time on July 27, 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

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

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 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.

An applicant that experiences unforeseen Grants.gov technical issues beyond its control that prevent it from submitting its application by the deadline must email the contact identified below **within 24 hours after the application deadline** in order to request approval to submit its application after the deadline. Additional information on reporting technical issues appears under "Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues" in the [How to Apply](#) section.

For assistance with any other requirements of this solicitation, contact the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS) Response Center: toll-free at 1-800-851-3420; via TTY at 301-240-6310 (hearing impaired only); email 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. General information on applying for BJA awards can be found at <https://www.bja.gov/funding.aspx> and for NIJ awards at www.nij.gov/funding/Pages/welcome.aspx. Answers to frequently asked questions that may assist applicants are posted at www.nij.gov/funding/Pages/faqs.aspx.

Grants.gov number assigned to this solicitation: BJA-2017-12387

Release date: June 20, 2017

Contents

A. Program Description.....	4
Overview.....	4
Program-Specific Information	5
B. Federal Award Information.....	11
Type of Award	11
Financial Management and System of Internal Controls	11
Budget Information	12
Cost Sharing or Match Requirement	12
Pre-Agreement Costs (also known as Pre-award Costs).....	12
Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver	12
Prior Approval, Planning, and Reporting of Conference/Meeting/Training Costs	13
Costs Associated with Language Assistance (if applicable)	13
C. Eligibility Information	13
D. Application and Submission Information	14
What an Application Should Include	14
How to Apply	28
E. Application Review Information.....	31
Review Criteria	31
Review Process.....	33
F. Federal Award Administration Information.....	34
Federal Award Notices.....	34
Administrative, National Policy, and Other Legal Requirements	35
General Information about Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements	36
G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s).....	36
H. Other Information	36
Freedom of Information Act and Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552 and 5 U.S.C. 552a)	36
Provide Feedback to OJP	37
Application Checklist.....	38

FY 2017 BJA Sentinel Events Initiative Demonstration Project: Technical Assistance Provider

(CFDA No. 16.560)

A. Program Description

Overview

BJA provides leadership and services in grant administration and criminal justice policy development for local, state, and tribal justice entities. With this solicitation, BJA seeks applications for a Technical Assistance Provider (“TA Provider”) to assist in the establishment and facilitation of national-level technical assistance to approximately 20 to 25 demonstration sites in furtherance of the Sentinel Events Initiative (SEI). SEI is an effort led by the National Institute of Justice—the US Department of Justice’s research, development, and evaluation agency—to explore whether an all-stakeholder, forward-looking, non-blaming review of unanticipated events that signal an underlying system weakness in criminal justice can be used to understand areas of system risk and weaknesses, reduce the occurrence of these outcomes, increase safety, and augment the criminal justice system’s ability to fulfill its mission. Drawing heavily from similar successful efforts in the fields of medicine and transportation, this scientific inquiry aims to determine a) whether sentinel event reviews (SERs) can be implemented and routinized in a criminal justice context, b) whether these reviews can inform policy and practice improvements to mitigate the risk of analogous errors or weaknesses in the future, c) whether changes in policy and practice maximize the criminal justice system’s ability to meet its mission of reducing crime, protecting the public, and advancing the administration of justice, and d) whether these reviews are sustainable over time.

The nationwide SEI demonstration project will result in the development, implementation, and routinization of non-blaming, forward-looking, multi-stakeholder reviews at the jurisdictional level.² The purpose of these reviews is to identify systemic weaknesses that contributed to an unanticipated event that signals an underlying system weakness outcome, and to generate solutions that will prevent this outcome from reoccurring, with the ultimate goal of maximizing the criminal justice system’s ability to fulfill its mission. By identifying and strengthening latent weaknesses, it is anticipated that these reviews will support system improvements in such crucial areas as law enforcement, criminal justice practitioner safety, effective prosecution, and the fair administration of justice across the U.S.

The TA Provider will assist in the establishment and facilitation of these multi-stakeholder review panels, and provide ad hoc support for such processes as interviews of relevant parties and negotiation of information-sharing agreements. In addition, the provider will complete a process evaluation to identify promising practices and common challenges to implementation. The TA Provider will be instrumental in establishing and facilitating the reviews at the local level, building on this work to identify promising practices and shared challenges across sites. This

² Given the systemic approach of this work, it is expected that the technical assistance will be with key partners across the jurisdiction versus working with one agency.

effort will build on several years of program development and inquiry at NIJ, including the completion of three pilot efforts in 2014. More details about this work is outlined below.

BJA and NIJ seek applications from applicants with demonstrated experience developing, facilitating, and supporting through technical assistance the negotiation and implementation of multi-stakeholder partnerships at the local level (to include community partners) and sustaining partner participation throughout, preferably working with criminal justice and research partners. BJA and NIJ are also interested in proposals from applicants who have worked in other complex social systems such as public health. All applicants should demonstrate: a working knowledge of learning from error concepts; experience negotiating multi-stakeholder partnerships and sustaining partner participation throughout (including navigation of such issues as confidentiality and information-sharing); experience providing technical assistance as part of research and demonstrations of models; and experience facilitating multi-stakeholder reviews of complex and occasionally adversarial issues.

Statutory Authority: Any awards under this solicitation would be made under statutory authority provided by the BJA-2017-12387 program, authorized by the Omnibus Crime Control & Safe Streets Act of 1968, 42 U.S.C. 3721-3723, and the Wrongful Conviction Review program, Public Law 115–31, 131b Stat. 135,203.

Project-Specific Information

Currently, criminal justice agencies in the United States lack consistent mechanisms by which to learn from error and prevent their reoccurrence. Often times, inquiries into unanticipated events that signal an underlying system weakness focus on whether there is an identifiable individual who can be blamed and subsequently punished for the error or failure. Little to no effort is made to understand why an individual chose specific courses of action or failed to catch and correct an error when positioned to do so. The context in which these decisions were made and the impact of other elements and actors in the system on these decisions are similarly ignored or not well understood.

NIJ's SEI is built on the belief that when adverse events occur in a complex social system, it is rarely the result of one person's mistake. Rather, multiple small errors—which include both intentional action and failure to identify and correct an error when possible—combine and are exacerbated by underlying weaknesses in the system such as system policies and procedures. In order to truly understand the causes of an unanticipated event that signals an underlying system weakness, the criminal justice system must shift its focus from blame to continuous risk assessment and system improvement, where all individuals who contributed to an event are empowered to share information across silos with the goal of forward-looking understanding and prevention rather than retrospective liability. NIJ anticipates that this program, which will enhance our understanding of how adverse events occur within the justice system, will highlight system improvements that could, for example, support effective prosecution or reduce the potential for harm to law enforcement officers. While the impacts of these reviews in criminal justice must still be studied, if the effects on the criminal justice system mirror the effects experienced in other industries, we expect to see an increase in system safety, and an improvement in the system's ability to fulfill its mission of reducing crime, protecting the public, and advancing the administration of justice in the U.S.

Examples of such sentinel events in criminal justice include, but are not limited to:

- The premature release from prison of a person who subsequently reoffends and/or commits a violent crime

- Ambush shootings of police officers
- Suicide by police, i.e., [suicide](#) method in which a [suicidal individual](#) intentionally provokes a lethal response from a public safety or [law enforcement officer](#)
- A violent crime committed by a person who should have been detained or deported for immigration violations
- In-custody deaths, self-harm, and suicide in prisons
- Incidents such as physical encounters with individuals suffering from mental illness
- Suicides by individuals working in the criminal justice system
- Violations of an individual's right to a speedy trial
- Ineffective assistance of counsel and/or lack of access to sufficient legal assistance
- The wrongful arrest or conviction of an innocent person, or the unsuccessful prosecution of an individual for a violent criminal offense which had all the witness and evidentiary elements to be successful but did not result in a conviction; and the subsequent need for Conviction Integrity reviews of Prosecutors' offices
- Unreasonable delays in forensic evidence processing
- A police-citizen encounter that unexpectedly turns violent and other use-of-force
- Forensic lab misconduct or failures of forensic evidence (e.g., laboratory error or failure to correctly use forensic evidence in court to detriment of a successful prosecution).

This includes actual and “near miss” events where an unanticipated event that signals an underlying system weakness may have occurred but for extraordinary actions of an individual and/or a last-minute identification of the impending error by an individual or system process.

Reviews of these instances, or “sentinel event reviews,” may provide critical information about system weaknesses and how best to maximize the ability of the criminal justice system to fulfill its mission. It is important to note that while many of these errors and unanticipated events that signal an underlying system weakness occur largely within a single criminal justice stakeholder group, multiple system actors often contribute to the eventual error occurrence. Accordingly, SERs must include multiple system actors to understand and address the varied and intersecting contributing factors to an error's occurrence.

Scientific Exploration of SERs in U.S. Criminal Justice

As DOJ's research, development, and evaluation agency, NIJ's interest in sentinel events is largely focused on exploring the following lines of scientific inquiry:

- Whether SERs can be implemented and routinized in a criminal justice context
- Whether these reviews will inform policy and practice improvements to mitigate the risk of analogous errors or weaknesses in the future
- The extent to which changes in policy and practice maximize the criminal justice system's ability to meet its mission of reducing crime, protecting the public, and advancing the administration of justice
- Whether these reviews are sustainable over time

While SERs have been implemented with demonstrable success in increasing safety and advancing fulfillment of mission in such fields as transportation, medicine, and industry, there are extremely limited examples of all-stakeholder, non-blaming, forward-looking reviews of sentinel events in criminal justice. Accordingly, NIJ and BJA are seeking to build demonstration sites that implement the approach NIJ seeks to evaluate. NIJ is partnering with BJA to identify a TA Provider to assist jurisdictions willing to engage in this scientific exploration, as well as collaborate on translating the lessons learned to its partners and the criminal justice field.

This will build on NIJ's years of exploration into sentinel events and their potential to effect positive change in the criminal justice system. Applicants should demonstrate a working knowledge of the sentinel events approach and the theories on which it is built, as well as the lessons learned from NIJ's scientific exploration thus far:

Stakeholder Roundtable: In May of 2013, NIJ convened a roundtable of criminal justice and other experts to discuss the potential applicability of a sentinel events approach to expand the ability of the criminal justice system to fulfill its mission. The proceedings from the roundtable are available here: <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/243586.pdf>. The roundtable also inspired a collection of essays by multiple criminal justice stakeholders exploring the applicability and utility of SERs in their field. The collection, *Mending Justice*, is available here: <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/247141.pdf>.

Pilot Effort: In 2014, NIJ oversaw the successful implementation of one-time SERs in three different jurisdictions. Each jurisdiction nominated a single case and brought together multiple criminal justice stakeholders to conduct comprehensive reviews. Though each pilot site faced distinct challenges, each was able to conduct a review and identify and advance suggestions for policy and practice improvement and safety enhancements. The lessons learned from these efforts will greatly inform BJA and NIJ's approach to the demonstration project, and are available in [Paving the Way: Lessons Learned in Sentinel Event Reviews](#).

Social Science Research Portfolio: Beginning in 2014, NIJ has sponsored social science research projects to explore questions related to SER feasibility and impact, and provide greater understanding of the context for these reviews. Some projects have also included the establishment of SER mechanisms with a focus on specific types of criminal justice events. A summary of ongoing social science research is available here: www.nij.gov/topics/justice-system/Pages/sentinel-events.aspx.

Practitioner Publications: A key component of advancing the sentinel events approach has been to socialize the concept among criminal justice stakeholders and communities, to better understand both the field's receptivity to the approach and how the program can be built to mitigate common challenges and concerns. Applicants are encouraged to review publications both on the applicability of the approach in criminal justice and the evolution of the approach in such fields as medicine and aviation. Suggested publications include but are not limited to:

- ["Testing a Concept and Beyond: Can the Criminal Justice System Adopt a Nonblaming Practice?"](#) Nancy Ritter, *NIJ Journal*, 276, December 2015
- ["NIJ's Sentinel Events Initiative: Looking Back to Look Forward."](#) James Doyle, *NIJ Journal*, 273, March 2014.
- ["The Wrong Patient."](#) Mark Chassin and Elise Becher, *Annals of Internal Medicine*, Volume 136, Number 11, June 2002
- ["Learning from Error in American Criminal Justice,"](#) James M. Doyle, *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, Volume 100, No. 1, 2010.
- ["Paving the Way: Lessons Learned in Sentinel Event Reviews,"](#) Katherine Darke Schmitt, et al., National Institute of Justice (2015).

Community Stakeholder Convening: NIJ has also explored how best to empower communities to inform and participate in the SER process at the jurisdictional level. If these reviews are truly to be "all-stakeholder," they must allow for robust participation from community

members—both those directly impacted by the sentinel event at hand and those who live in communities affected by sentinel events in criminal justice. Additionally, NIJ has seen significant interest in the potential for the SER process to facilitate essential conversations between criminal justice systems and the communities they serve, possibly leading to increased community trust in the criminal justice system and increased ability of the criminal justice system to fulfill its public safety objectives.

“Secondary Victim” Convening: NIJ also convened a working group of individuals who could be considered additional victims. For example, in a situation where law enforcement is responding to an incident involving an individual suffering from mental illness and law enforcement has no choice but to use deadly force, the resulting harm could encompass the decedent’s family, the community, and the officer who had to pull the trigger. Attendees included individuals who were wrongfully convicted, individuals who lost family members to a police shooting, and criminal justice practitioners who inadvertently contributed to the occurrence of sentinel events to explore how best to identify, support, and integrate individuals who have experienced harm through an unanticipated event that signals an underlying system weakness in criminal justice. This group also explored the value of SERs in facilitating disclosure and apology, and the vital role that may play in healing and recovery.

Strategic Plan: Earlier this year, NIJ released a Strategic Research Plan for the Sentinel Events Initiative, detailing short- and long-term goals for program development, including the forthcoming demonstration project. Applicants are especially encouraged to review this plan in advance of generating their application. The Strategic Research Plan is available here: <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/250472.pdf>.

For more information on NIJ’s Sentinel Events Initiative, visit www.nij.gov, keyword: “Sentinel Events.”

Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables

The SEI Demonstration TA Provider—in close collaboration with BJA and NIJ—shall identify, develop, and facilitate technical assistance to 20 to 25 demonstration sites across the country. BJA and NIJ will work with the selected TA Provider to implement a standing SER process at each site for their jurisdiction’s criminal justice system. The TA Provider will also conduct a process evaluation across all sites to determine promising practices and critical needs for implementing SERs on a large scale. 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."

Required Deliverables

This program’s required deliverables include:

- Developing program guidelines and supporting materials for all SER sites, including:
 - Essential elements of SERs (minimum number and composition of partners, etc.) and mechanism to capture intentional deviation from essential elements if necessary
 - Standard operating procedures for implementing and facilitating SERs
 - Guidance for community empowerment and inclusion in the SER process
 - Media guidance and considerations for public framing of review process
 - Data collection and information-sharing procedures for the review process
 - Primers on the sentinel event concept and the theories that support it
 - Templates for review findings, program and policy improvements, etc.

- Model Memoranda of Understanding and other necessary partnership documents
- Intensive, onsite technical assistance to 20–25 SER sites using the program guidelines and materials
- Regular reports on ongoing implementation efforts, and adjustments to any of the above guidance based on real-time lessons learned
- A final report and analysis of the SER process across all sites, including process evaluation, documentation of promising practices, considerations for broad implementation, and suggestions for mitigating challenges and concerns moving forward.

NIJ and BJA will work closely with the TA Provider and other NIJ partners to organize and facilitate an all-site kick-off meeting to educate sites on SER theories, tenants, and lessons learned to date, as well as periodic peer-to-peer convenings. NIJ will fund the meeting planning and agenda development, as well as logistics costs through a separate mechanism, and applicants should not include convening/conference action items or costs in their application (other than a reasonable amount of staff time to support agenda and speaker development and preparation).

Awardee Tasks and Activities

In close collaboration with BJA and NIJ, applicant tasks will include:

- Generate and coordinate process for selection of sites including criteria for selection of prospective sites, and creation and tracking of process and metrics for assessing site applications
- Develop all guidance and support materials to assist SEI sites, consistent with the deliverables
- Assisting all of the SER sites in establishment of standing SERs, including the negotiation of partnership agreements as well as information-sharing and confidentiality agreements
- Assist sites in establishment of all relevant processes (ensuring minimum requirements of participation are met), including selection of cases/near misses for review and essential partners for participation
- Navigate partner concerns and work to ensure continued participation throughout review process
- Facilitate and support regular meetings or calls with NIJ and BJA staff to review progress in the program
- Manage the hiring and deployment of several regional site coordinators to serve as in-person facilitators and project managers at multiple demonstration sites, as well as assist with the process evaluation
- Monitor implementation processes across all sites and troubleshoot as-needed, and routinely update materials to reflect real-time lessons learned
- Develop metrics for process evaluation and ensure necessary data is collected throughout
- Conduct process evaluation, and generate report of evaluation, promising practices, common challenges, and lessons learned

Required local structure of reviews: While this is still an exploratory effort, there are basic minimum elements that must be shared across all demonstration sites. Most important is the makeup of the review team, which must represent a robust cross-section of the criminal justice

system and community stakeholders in that jurisdiction. Standing review teams must be composed of leadership and line staff from at least four criminal justice stakeholder agencies such as but not limited to:

- Law enforcement
- Courts
- Prosecution
- Defense
- Corrections
- Crime Labs

Relevant information and input from additional stakeholders must be sought and integrated into the review process for each case. These stakeholders may also be integrated into the standing review team if appropriate. These stakeholders include but are not limited to:

- Community representatives
- Victim advocates
- Persons harmed through the criminal justice system such as “second victims” like law enforcement who used within-policy deadly force against an individual suffering from mental illness, and exonerees

Desired Qualifications

BJA and NIJ seek proposals from applicants with demonstrated experience developing, facilitating, and encouraging multi-stakeholder partnerships at the local level (to include community partners), preferably with experience working with criminal justice partners. The agencies are also interested in proposals from applicants who have worked in other complex social systems such as public health. All applicants should also demonstrate:

- A working knowledge of learning from error concepts
- Experience negotiating multi-stakeholder partnerships and sustaining partner participation throughout (including navigation of such issues as confidentiality and information-sharing)
- Experience facilitating multi-stakeholder reviews of complex and occasionally adversarial issues
- Experience implementing programs with measurable fidelity across multiple sites
- Experience conducting process evaluations and generating reports designed for practitioner use
- Ability to monitor/administer federal funding
- Strong problem-solving, communication, and people skills

Project team must include individual(s) with demonstrated experience managing a nationwide project of this scale, as well as individual(s) with demonstrated experience conducting a process evaluation of an analogous program. If an application fails to include a research partner for this purpose, the application may be rejected for that reason alone.

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."

B. Federal Award Information

BJA expects to make up to one award of up to \$1,500,000 for a 36-month project period beginning January 1, 2018. There may be an opportunity for an extended project period and supplemental funding, depending on performance, project progress, and funding availability.

To allow time for (among other things) any necessary post-award review and financial clearance by OJP of the proposed budget (and for any associated responses or other actions that may be required of the recipient), applicants should propose an award start date of January 1, 2018.

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

Type of Award

BJA expects that any award under this solicitation will be made in the form of a cooperative agreement, which is a type of award that provides for OJP to have substantial involvement in carrying out award activities. See [Administrative, National Policy, and Other Legal Requirements](#), under [Section F. Federal Award Administration Information](#), for a brief discussion of what may constitute substantial federal involvement. As discussed [later in the solicitation](#), important rules (including limitations) apply to any conference/meeting/training costs under cooperative agreements.

Please note: Any recipient of an award under this solicitation will be required to comply with DOJ regulations on confidentiality and protection of human subjects. See “Requirements related to Research” under [“Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2017 Awards”](#) in the [OJP Funding Resource Center](#).

Financial Management and System of Internal Controls

Award recipients and subrecipients (including recipients or subrecipients that are pass-through entities³) must, as described in the Part 200 Uniform Requirements⁴ 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.

³ For purposes of this solicitation, the phrase “pass-through entity” includes any recipient or subrecipient that provides a subaward (“subgrant”) to carry out part of the funded award or program.

⁴ 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.

- (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 match amount, and OJP approves the budget, the total match 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 federal 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 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, a recipient may not use federal funds to pay total cash compensation (salary plus cash bonuses) to any employee of the recipient at a rate that exceeds 110% 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.⁵ The 2017 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. (Non-federal funds used for any such additional compensation will not be considered matching funds, where match requirements apply.) If only a portion of an employee's time is charged to an OJP award, the maximum allowable compensation is equal to the percentage of time worked times the maximum salary limitation.

⁵ OJP does not apply this limitation on the use of award funds to the nonprofit organizations listed in Appendix VIII to 2 C.F.R. Part 200.

The Assistant Attorney General for OJP may exercise discretion to waive, on an individual basis, this limitation on compensation rates allowable under an award. An applicant that requests a waiver should include a detailed justification in the budget narrative of its application. An applicant that does not submit a waiver request and justification with its application should anticipate that OJP will require the applicant to adjust and resubmit the budget.

The justification should address—in the context of the work the individual would do under the award—the particular qualifications and expertise of the individual, the uniqueness of a service the individual will provide, the individual's specific knowledge of the proposed program or project, and a statement that explains whether and how the individual's salary under the award would be commensurate with the regular and customary rate for an individual with his/her qualifications and expertise, and for the work he/she would do under the award.

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

OJP strongly encourages every applicant that proposes to use award funds for any conference-, meeting-, or training-related activity (or similar event) to review carefully—before submitting an application—the OJP policy and guidance on approval, planning, and reporting of such events, available at www.ojp.gov/financialguide/DOJ/PostawardRequirements/chapter3.10a.htm. OJP policy and guidance (1) encourage minimization of conference, meeting, and training costs; (2) require prior written approval (which may affect project timelines) of most conference, meeting, and training costs for cooperative agreement recipients and of some conference, meeting, and training costs for grant recipients; and (3) set cost limits, which include a general prohibition of all food and beverage costs.

As noted above, NIJ will fund the meeting planning, logistics costs, and agenda development for a kick-off meeting and other periodic meetings. Applicants should not include convening/conference action items or costs in their application (other than a reasonable amount of staff time to support agenda and speaker development and preparation).

Costs Associated with Language Assistance (if applicable)

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

For additional information, see the "Civil Rights Compliance" section under "[Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2017 Awards](#)" in the [OJP Funding Resource Center](#).

C. Eligibility Information

For eligibility information, see the 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 résumés/curriculum vitae of key personnel. All applicants must include a research partner and methodology for the process evaluation. An applicant may combine the Budget Narrative and the Budget Detail Worksheet in one document. However, if an applicant submits only one budget document, it must contain **both** narrative and detail information. Please review the “Note on File Names and File Types” under [How to Apply](#) to be sure applications are submitted in permitted formats.

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

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

The SF-424 is a required standard form used as a cover sheet for submission of pre-applications, applications, and related information. Grants.gov and 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, an applicant must include an accurate legal name on its 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. An applicant with a current, active award must ensure that its GMS profile is current. If the profile is not current, the applicant should submit a Grant Adjustment Notice updating the information on its GMS profile prior to applying under this solicitation.

A new applicant entity 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. An applicant must attach official legal documents to its application (e.g., articles of incorporation, 501(c)(3), etc.) to confirm the legal name, address, and EIN entered into the SF-424.

Intergovernmental Review: This solicitation ("funding opportunity") **is not** subject to [Executive Order 12372](#). (In completing the SF-424, an applicant is to answer question 19 by selecting the response 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 250–400 words. 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 the form's standard 12-point font (with 1-inch margins)

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

Project abstracts should follow the detailed template (including the detailed instructions as to content) available at ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/ProjectAbstractTemplate.pdf

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

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 section of the application should not exceed 20 pages double-spaced in 12-point font with 1-inch margins. If included in the main body of the program narrative, tables, charts, figures, and other illustrations count toward the 20-page limit for the narrative section. The project abstract, table of contents, appendices, and government forms do not count toward the 20-page limit.

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 narrative⁶:

a. Title Page (not counted against the 20-page program narrative limit).

The title page should include the title of the project, submission date, funding opportunity number, and the name and complete contact information (that is, address, telephone number, and email address) for both the applicant and the principal investigator.

b. Table of Contents and Figures (not counted against the 20-page program narrative limit).

c. Main Body

The main body of the program narrative should describe the proposed project in depth. The following sections should be included as part of the program narrative:

- Statement of the Problem
- Project Design and Implementation, to include plans for process evaluation
- Capabilities/Competencies
- Plan for Collecting the Data Required for this Solicitation's Performance Measures (see below)

Within these sections, the narrative should address:

- Purpose, goals, and objectives
- Review of relevant literature
- Detailed description of research design and methods for process evaluation
- Management plan and organization

d. Required Appendices are listed on page 24 under Additional Attachments. These appendices are not counted against the 20-page program narrative limit.

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, Objectives, and Deliverables" in [Section A. Program Description](#).

⁶ 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](#).

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.

Post award recipients will be required to submit performance metric data semi-annually through BJA’s online Training and Technical Assistance Reporting Portal. More information on reporting requirements can be found at: www.bjatrainng.org/working-with-nttac/providers.

Below are the performance measures for this solicitation:

Objectives	Catalog ID	Performance Measure	Data Recipient Provides
Objective 1: Support the development, implementation, and testing of tools including materials that support and inform the Sentinel Events Review (SER) process in targeted jurisdictions, including lessons learned from initial engagements process to translate lessons learned from targeted jurisdictions.	144	Number of curricula developed	Number of curricula: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developed; • Pilot tested; • Revised after being pilot tested
	520	Number of curricula that were pilot tested	
	521	Percentage of curricula that were revised after pilot testing	
Objective 2: Support the development, implementation, and sustainment of comprehensive, evidence-based, SER assessments and system enhancements designed to prevent future sentinel events targeted jurisdictions through technical assistance.	12	Percentage of requesting agencies who rated services as satisfactory or better	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of onsite visits completed; • Number of reports submitted to requesting agencies after onsite visits; • Number of requesting agencies who completed an evaluation of services; • Number of agencies who rated the services a satisfactory or better (in terms of timeliness and quality); • Number of follow-ups with requesting agencies completed 6 months after onsite visit; • Number of agencies that were planning to implement at least one or more
	11	Percentage of requesting agencies that were planning to implement one or more recommendations	
	246	Percentage of peer visitors that were planning to implement one or more policies or practices 6 months after	

		they were observed at the visited site	recommendations 6 months after the onsite visit
526		Percentage of requesting agencies of other onsite services who rated the services provided as satisfactory or better	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of other onsite services provided; • Number of requesting agencies who completed an evaluation of other onsite services; • Number of agencies who rated the services a satisfactory or better
144		Number of publications developed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of publications/resources developed; Number of publications/ resources disseminated
145		Number of publications disseminated	
492		Percent of web sites developed and maintained	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of web sites developed; • Number of web sites maintained; • Number of visits to web sites during the current reporting period; • Number of visits to web sites during the previous reporting period
486		Percent of increase in the number of visits to web sites	
354		Percentage of information requests responded to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of information requests; • Number of information requests responded to

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 submits its budget in a different format should use the budget categories listed in the

sample budget worksheet. (An applicant should include in the budget work associated with satisfying data archiving requirements.) BJA expects applicants to provide a thorough narrative for each section of the Budget Detail Worksheet. The Budget Detail Worksheet should break out costs 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 narrative 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 budget 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 by 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 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 Costs

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 Customer Service Center at 1-800-458-0786 or at ask.ocfo@usdoj.gov. If DOJ is the cognizant federal agency, an applicant may obtain information needed to submit an indirect cost rate proposal at 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 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 (if applicable)

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 legal appropriate 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, OJP will make use of and access to award 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: In addition, the applicant must attach the following appendices:

- a. Bibliography/references
- b. Any tools/instruments, questionnaires, tables/charts/graphs, or maps pertaining to the proposed project that are supplemental to such items included in the main body of the narrative
- c. Curriculum vitae or résumés of key personnel, or if personnel are not identified then the job description and qualifications to be sought
- d. Proposed project time and task plan with key expected milestones and timelines
- e. Letters of cooperation/support or administrative agreements from organizations collaborating in the project
- f. Human Subjects Protection paperwork (documentation and forms related to Institutional Review Board (IRB) review). (See nij.gov/funding/humansubjects/Pages/welcome.aspx)
- g. Privacy Certificate (for further guidance go to nij.gov/funding/humansubjects/pages/confidentiality.aspx)
- h. Applicant Disclosure of potential conflicts of interest⁷

To assist OJP in assessing actual or apparent conflicts of interest (including such conflicts on the part of prospective reviewers of the application), a complete list of the individuals named or otherwise identified anywhere in the application (including in the budget or in any other attachment) who will or may work (or advise or consult) on the proposed project must be included. This applies to all such individuals, including, for example, individuals who are or would be employees of the applicant or employees of any proposed subrecipient entity, any individuals who themselves may be a subrecipient, and individuals who may (or will) work without compensation (such as advisory board members). This appendix to the program narrative is to include, for each listed individual: name, title, employer, any other potentially pertinent organizational affiliation(s), and the individual's proposed roles and responsibilities in carrying out the proposed project. If the application identifies any specific entities or organizations (other than the applicant) that will or may work (or advise or consult) on the proposed project, without also naming any associated individuals, the name of each such organization also should be included on this list. Applicants should use the “Proposed Project Staff, Affiliation, and Roles” form available at www.nij.gov/funding/documents/nij-project-staff-template.xlsx to provide this list.

If the application (including the budget) identifies any proposed non-competitive agreements that are or may be considered procurement "contracts" (rather than subawards) for purposes of federal grants administrative requirements, the applicant also must list the

⁷ Typically, the applicant is not the principal investigator. Rather, the applicant, most frequently, is the institution, organization, or company in which the principal investigator is employed.

entities with which the applicant proposes to contract. Applicants should provide this list as a separate sheet titled "Proposed non-competitive procurement contracts."

For information on distinctions — for purposes of federal grants administrative requirements — between subawards and procurement contracts under awards, see “Budget and Associated Documentation,” above.

i. 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 the identical cost items outlined in the budget submitted to OJP under this solicitation. The applicant is to disclose both 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/Email for Point of Contact at Federal or State Funding Agency
DOJ/ Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS)	COPS Hiring Program	Jane Doe, 202/000-0000; jane.doe@usdoj.gov
Health & Human Services/ Substance Abuse and 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 the identical cost items outlined in the budget submitted as part of this application.”

j. 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 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.

k. Disclosure of Process Related to Executive Compensation

An applicant that is a nonprofit organization may be required to make certain disclosures relating to the processes it uses to determine the compensation of its officers, directors, trustees, and key employees.

Under certain circumstances, a nonprofit organization that provides unreasonably high compensation to certain persons may subject both the organization's managers and those who receive the compensation to additional federal taxes. A rebuttable presumption of the reasonableness of a nonprofit organization's compensation arrangements, however, may be available if the nonprofit organization satisfied certain rules set out in Internal Revenue Service regulations with regard to its compensation decisions.

Each applicant nonprofit organization must state at the time of its application (in the "OJP Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire" mentioned earlier) whether or not the applicant entity believes (or asserts) that it currently satisfies the requirements of 26 C.F.R. 53.4958-6 (which relate to establishing or invoking a rebuttable presumption of reasonableness of compensation of certain individuals and entities).

A nonprofit organization that states in the questionnaire that it believes (or asserts) that it has satisfied the requirements of 26 C.F.R. 53.4958-6 must then disclose, in an attachment to its application (to be titled "Disclosure of Process related to Executive Compensation"), the process used by the applicant nonprofit organization to determine the compensation of its officers, directors, trustees, and key employees (together, "covered persons").

At a minimum, the disclosure must describe in pertinent detail: (1) the composition of the body that reviews and approves compensation arrangements for covered persons; (2) the methods and practices used by the applicant nonprofit organization to ensure that no individual with a conflict of interest participates as a member of the body that reviews and approves a compensation arrangement for a covered person; (3) the appropriate data as to comparability of compensation that is obtained in advance and relied upon by the body that reviews and approves compensation arrangements for covered persons; and (4) the written or electronic records that the applicant organization maintains as concurrent documentation of the decisions with respect to compensation of covered persons made by the body that reviews and approves such compensation arrangements, including records of deliberations and of the basis for decisions.

For purposes of the required disclosure, the following terms and phrases have the meanings set out by the Internal Revenue Service for use in connection with 26 C.F.R. 53.4958-6: officers, directors, trustees, key employees, compensation, conflict of interest, appropriate data as to comparability, adequate documentation, and concurrent documentation.

Applicant nonprofit organizations should note that following receipt of an appropriate request, OJP may be authorized or required by law to make information submitted to satisfy this requirement available for public inspection. Also, a recipient may be required

to make a prompt supplemental disclosure after the award in certain circumstances (e.g., changes in the way the organization determines compensation).

I. Project Timeline and Task plan, Résumés, and Letters of Support

Attach a project timeline and task plan with each category of task, expected completion date, and responsible person or organization and identify the percentage of time that will be dedicated by the individuals responsible for the tasks; résumés for key positions; and letters of support that outline the partners’ responsibilities (if applicable).

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 file names of attachments. Valid file names may include only the characters shown in the table below. Grants.gov rejects any application that includes an attachment(s) with a file name that contains any characters not shown in the table below. Grants.gov forwards successfully-submitted applications to the OJP 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 certain standard information about federal financial assistance applicants, recipients, and subrecipients. All applicants for OJP awards (other than individuals) must 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 as long as 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. An applicant entity's "unique entity identifier" (DUNS number) must be used to complete this step. For more information about the registration process for organizations and other entities, go to <https://apply07.grants.gov/apply/OrcRegister>. 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 Federal Domestic Assistance ("CFDA") number for this solicitation is 16.560, titled "National Institute of Justice Research, Evaluation, and Development Project Grants," and the funding opportunity number is BJA-2017-12387.
- 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. The second will state whether the application has been validated and successfully submitted, or whether it has been 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 an application well ahead of the deadline provides time to correct the problem(s) that caused the rejection. **Important:** OJP urges each applicant to submit its application **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. Applications must be successfully submitted through Grants.gov by 11:59 p.m. eastern time on July 27, 2017.

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

Note: Application Versions

If an applicant submits multiple versions of the same application, OJP will review only the most recent system-validated version submitted.

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 must contact the [Grants.gov Customer Support Hotline](#) or the [SAM Help Desk](#) (Federal Service Desk) to report the technical issue and receive a tracking number. The applicant must email the NCJRS Response Center identified in

the Contact Information section on the title page **within 24 hours after the application deadline** to request approval to submit its application after the deadline. The applicant's e-mail 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: OJP 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 verify 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, such as issues with firewalls or browser incompatibility

Notifications regarding known technical problems with Grants.gov, if any, are posted at the top of the OJP [Funding Resource Center](#) web page.

E. Application Review Information

Review Criteria

Applications that meet basic minimum requirements will be evaluated by peer reviewers using the following review criteria.

Statement of the Problem (Understanding of the problem and its importance) – 20%

1. Demonstrate an understanding of the sentinel events approach and its application to criminal justice.
2. Describe generally both successes and challenges to implementing SERs.
3. Describe the challenges agencies may face in planning, implementing, and sustaining SERs; and describe the organizational changes required to support such strategies and areas of needed assistance.
4. Describe generally the need for technical assistance for multi-stakeholder SERs in an effort to achieve and enhance public safety and improve the criminal justice system.
5. Demonstrate an awareness of relevant literature in other fields and how it may apply in this context.

Project Design and Implementation (Quality and technical merit) – 35%

1. Describe proposed project design and demonstrate its responsiveness to and understanding of technical assistance needs and how best to meet them, including how the applicant will identify and assess technical assistance needs for the SER sites.
2. Describe the series of products your organization would develop to promote the goals of this project.
3. Describe the feasibility of the proposed project and how this approach will enhance likelihood of success, including proposed actions to minimize and/or mitigate risks for failure.
4. Describe the process evaluation design, including the soundness of the methodology and proposed metrics to be assessed.
5. Describe the management plan and demonstrated ability to oversee significant field work across all sites through regional site coordinators.

Capabilities and Competencies – 25%

1. Demonstrate your organization's experience offering technical assistance and developing educational resources related to multi-stakeholder efforts, including competencies and necessary qualifications of proposed staff to be assigned to the project.
2. List the interdisciplinary subject matter experts (SMEs), consultants, and/or partners with whom the organization plans to work to deliver technical assistance. For each consultant or partner, include a letter of commitment and a résumé as an attachment, and/or a summary description of qualifications for any staff, partners, or consultants not yet identified.
3. Demonstrate your organization's ability to conduct process evaluations and other relevant assessments of the implementation of the SER process in the 20-25 SER sites.
4. Describe the management structure and outline the organization's ability to conduct the individual activities through the organization's and staff's experience, and recruit and partner with individuals and other organizations with the expertise to enhance the organization's and staff's experience in developing and providing technical assistance.

Plan for Collecting the Data Required for this Solicitation's Performance Measures – 10%

Describe the process for measuring project performance, including meeting timelines and deliverables, and obtaining input and feedback from customers and stakeholders. Identify who will collect the data, who is responsible for performance measurement, how the data will be stored, how any personally identifiable information (PII) will be protected, and how the information will be used to guide the program. Describe the process to accurately report implementation findings.

Budget – 10%

Provide a proposed budget that is detailed, complete, cost effective, and allowable (e.g., reasonable, allocable, and necessary for project activities). Provide specific information for the following:

1. Coordinating and financially supporting the onsite technical assistance to the 20-25 SER sites. Financial support should at least cover the logistics, assessment activities, and subject matter experts.

2. Coordinating and offering support to the NIJ-sponsored training to the SER sites.
3. Developing a series of products to translate learning from the SER sites to the field.
4. Conducting a process evaluation of SER implementation across the 20-25 sites.

The Budget Narratives should generally 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.

Review Process

OJP is committed to ensuring a fair and open process for making awards. 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 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 the critical elements for this solicitation, 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 BJA include underserved populations, geographic diversity, strategic priorities, prior performance and available funding, as well as the planned scholarly products and 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. In addition, 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 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 scholarly products, and 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 BJA 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 login; 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 requires 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 2017 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 2017 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, 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.

As stated above, BJA expects any award under this solicitation to be a cooperative agreement. A cooperative agreement will include a condition in the award document that sets out the “substantial federal involvement” in carrying out the award and program. Generally speaking, under cooperative agreements with OJP, responsibility for the day-to-day conduct of the funded project rests with the recipient. OJP, however, may have substantial involvement in matters such as coordination efforts and site selection, as well as review and approval of work plans, research designs, data collection instruments, and major project-generated materials. In addition, OJP often indicates in the award condition that it may redirect the project if necessary.

In addition to a condition that sets out the “substantial federal involvement” in the award, cooperative agreements awarded by OJP include a condition that requires specific reporting in connection with conferences, meetings, retreats, seminars, symposium, training activities, or similar events funded under the award.

General Information about Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements

In addition to the deliverables and expected scholarly products 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 the Part 200 Uniform Requirements or specific award conditions. Applicants should anticipate that progress reports will be required to follow the non-budgetary components of the Research Performance Progress Report (RPPR) template/format. General information on RPPRs may be found at www.nsf.gov/bfa/dias/policy/rppr/. 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>.

Special reporting requirements may be required as appropriate.

Data on performance measures. In addition to required reports, each recipient of an award under this solicitation 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 with fulfilling its responsibilities under the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA), Public Law 103-62, and the GPRA Modernization Act of 2010, Public Law 111-352, 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 the title page.

For contact information for Grants.gov, see the 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, OJP encourages applicants to provide feedback on this solicitation, the application submission process, and/or the application review process. Provide feedback to OJPSolicitationFeedback@usdoj.gov.

IMPORTANT: This e-mail is for feedback and suggestions only. OJP does not send replies from this mailbox to messages it receives in this mailbox. Any prospective applicant that has specific questions on any program or technical aspect of the solicitation **must** use the appropriate telephone number or e-mail listed on the front of this solicitation document to obtain information. These contacts are provided to help ensure that prospective applicants can directly reach an individual who can address specific questions in a timely manner.

If you are interested in being a reviewer for other OJP grant applications, please email your résumé to ojpeerreview@lmsolas.com. (Do not send your résumé to the OJP Solicitation Feedback email account.) **Note:** Neither you nor anyone else from your organization or entity can be a peer reviewer in a competition in which you or your organization/entity has submitted an application.

Application Checklist

Sentinel Events Initiative Demonstration Project: Technical Assistance Provider

This application checklist has been created as an aid in developing an application.

What an Applicant Should Do:

Prior to Registering in Grants.gov:

- _____ Acquire a DUNS Number (see page 29)
- _____ Acquire or renew registration with SAM (see page 29)

To Register with Grants.gov:

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

To Find Funding Opportunity:

- _____ Search for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov (see page 30)
- _____ Download Funding Opportunity and Application Package (see page 30)
- _____ Sign up for Grants.gov [email](#) notifications (optional) (see page 28)
- _____ Read [Important Notice: Applying for Grants in Grants.gov](#)
- _____ Read OJP policy and guidance on conference approval, planning, and reporting available at ojp.gov/financialguide/DOJ/PostawardRequirements/chapter3.10a.htm (see page 13)

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 30)

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

- _____ Please refer to the section: Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues (see page 30)

Overview of Post-Award Legal Requirements:

- _____ Review the "[Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2017 Awards](#)" in the OJP Funding Resource Center.

Scope Requirement:

- _____ The federal amount requested is within the allowable limit(s) of \$1,500,000.

What an Application Should Include:

- _____ Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424) (see page 14)
- _____ Project Abstract (if applicable) (see page 15)
- _____ Program Narrative (critical element) (see page 15)
- _____ Budget Detail Worksheet (critical element) (see page 18)
- _____ Budget Narrative (critical element) (see page 19)
- _____ Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable) (see page 21)

_____	Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable)	(see page 21)
_____	Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire	(see page 11)
_____	Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (SF-LLL)	(see page 22)
_____	Additional Attachments	
_____	Bibliography/References	(see page 23)
_____	Tools/instruments, questionnaires, tables/charts, graphs, or maps pertaining to proposed project	(see page 23)
_____	Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications	(see page 24)
_____	Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity	(see page 25)
_____	Disclosure of Process related to Executive Compensation	(see page 27)
_____	CVs/Résumés (critical element)	(see page 28)
_____	Proposed project time and task plan	(see page 28)
_____	Letters of cooperation/support or administrative agreements	(see page 28)
_____	Human Subjects Protection paperwork	(see page 23)
_____	Privacy Certificate	(see page 23)
_____	Applicant Disclosure of potential conflicts of interest	(see page 23)
_____	Request and Justification for Employee Compensation; Waiver (if applicable)	(see page 12)