



The [U.S. Department of Justice](#) (DOJ), [Office of Justice Programs](#) (OJP), [Bureau of Justice Assistance](#) (BJA) is seeking applications for funding to support national training and technical assistance (TTA) for jurisdictions engaged in comprehensive response system improvement related to the issue of unsubmitted sexual assault kits (SAKs). This program supports the Department's mission by improving: (1) state and local jurisdictions' capacities to respond to violent crime; and (2) the functioning of the criminal justice system through the investigation and prosecution of cases resulting from SAK evidence and the collection of lawfully owed DNA.

The Sexual Assault Kit Initiative: National Training and Technical Assistance Program FY 2019 Competitive Grant Announcement Applications Due: April 30, 2019

Eligibility

Eligible applicants are for-profit organizations, nonprofit organizations (including tribal nonprofit or for-profit organizations), faith-based and community organizations, institutions of higher education (including tribal institutions of higher education), and consortiums with demonstrated experience providing national and local-level training and technical assistance. All recipients and their subrecipients (including any for-profit organizations) must forgo any profit or management fee.

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 the funding and managing the entire program.

BJA may elect to fund applications submitted under this fiscal year (FY) 2019 solicitation in future fiscal years, dependent on, among other considerations, the merit of the applications and on the availability of appropriations.

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

Deadline

Applicants must register with [Grants.gov](https://www.grants.gov) at <https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/home.html> prior to submitting an application. All applications are due by 11:59 p.m. eastern time on April 30, 2019.

To be considered timely, an applicant must submit the application by the deadline using Grants.gov, and the applicant must have received a validation message from Grants.gov that indicates successful and timely submission. OJP urges applicants to submit applications at least 72 hours prior to the application due date, 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, 606-545-5035, at <https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/support.html>, or at 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** 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 unforeseen Grants.gov technical issues beyond an applicant's control that prevent it from submitting its application by the deadline, or any other requirement of this solicitation, contact the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS) Response Center: toll-free at 800-851-3420; via TTY at 301-240-6310 (hearing impaired only); email grants@ncjrs.gov; fax to 301-240-5830; or web chat at <https://webcontact.ncjrs.gov/ncjchat/chat.jsp>. The NCJRS Response Center hours of operation are 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. eastern time, Monday through Friday, and 10:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. eastern time on the solicitation close date.

Grants.gov number assigned to this solicitation: BJA-2019-15229

Release date: February 28, 2019

Contents

- A. Program Description 4
 - Overview 4
 - Program-specific Information 4
 - Objectives and Deliverables 6
 - Evidence-based Programs or Practices 11
 - Information Regarding Potential Evaluation of Programs or Activities 11
- B. Federal Award Information 12
 - Financial Management and System of Internal Controls 12
 - Budget Information 13
 - Cost Sharing or Match Requirement 13
 - Pre-award Costs (also known as Pre-agreement Costs) 13
 - Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver 13
 - Costs Associated with Language Assistance (if applicable) 14
- C. Eligibility Information 15
- D. Application and Submission Information 15
 - What an Application Should Include 15
 - How to Apply 27
- E. Application Review Information 31
 - Review Criteria 31
 - Review Process 32
- F. Federal Award Administration Information 34
 - Federal Award Notices 34
 - Administrative, National Policy, and other Legal Requirements 34
- 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 36
 - Appendix A: Performance Measures Table 38
 - Appendix B: Application Checklist 42

The Sexual Assault Kit Initiative: FY 2019 National Training and Technical Assistance Program (CFDA #16.833)

A. Program Description

Overview

The overall goal of the SAKI National TTA Program is to build state and local capacities to address violent crime associated with unsubmitted SAKs by supporting the needs of SAKI sites and, as resources allow, other jurisdictions engaged in community-based sexual assault reform. The purpose of this announcement is to select one national TTA provider to deliver a wide range of TTA services to SAKI site-based grantees and to translate lessons to the field. Given the complexity and diversity of the tasks, applicants are strongly urged to partner with other relevant providers in developing the application. The TTA services should include, but are not limited to, training and educational sessions developed and conducted by relevant subject experts; technical assistance on SAK-related issues, including inventorying, testing, and tracking SAKs; onsite and remote assistance, including training related to investigation and prosecution of cases using the evidence in these SAKs; creation and reporting of performance metrics; TTA related to the collection of lawfully owed DNA; and supporting the SAKI sites to engage in multidisciplinary coordination, investigation, prosecution, and victim advocacy, engagement, and support in connection with evidence and cases resulting from the testing process.

This grant announcement **does not** solicit applications from individual jurisdictions to fund local SAKI projects.

Statutory Authority:

Any awards under this solicitation would be made under statutory authority provided by a full-year appropriations act for FY 2019. As of the writing of this solicitation, no full-year appropriation for the Department has been enacted for FY 2019.

Program-specific Information

SAKI² is a competitive grant program that provides funding to support multidisciplinary community response teams to inventory, track, and test previously unsubmitted SAKs (as defined below); produce necessary protocols and policies in support of improved coordination and collaboration among laboratories, police, prosecutors, and victim services providers to enhance the overall investigation and prosecution of cold, active, and future sexual assault cases; provide resources to address the sexual assault investigations and prosecutions that result from evidence and Combined DNA Index System (CODIS) hits produced by tested SAKs; enhance case outcomes by supporting the use of data through collection of lawfully owed DNA and entry of cases related to serial, violent offenders into the FBI's Violent Criminal Apprehension Program (ViCAP) national database; and optimize victim notification protocols and services.

In addition to addressing unsubmitted SAKs, SAKI includes support to address partially tested SAKs (SAKs that have never been submitted to a forensic lab for testing with CODIS-eligible methodologies). This program is not directed at untested kits that have been submitted to forensic

² <https://www.bja.gov/funding/SAKI19.pdf>

labs for testing with CODIS-eligible DNA methodologies but are delayed for longer than 30 days, e.g., as a result of a backlog of work in the laboratory. These are separate and distinct issues, and a separate program supports laboratory backlogs and capacity.³

Under SAKI, BJA is finding that a significant number of violent serial offenders are linked to these SAKs. Not only are these offenders committing sexual assaults, they are also frequently responsible for homicides and other violent offenses. Many of these offenders are still actively committing violent crimes and pose a serious public safety threat. The overarching goal of SAKI TTA is to support law enforcement with the investigation of future, new, active, and old inactive cases in order to solve and reduce violent crimes. A resounding theme from law enforcement is that funding is critically needed to support cold case units at the state and local levels in order to achieve SAKI's goal. However, despite the overwhelming need, many law enforcement agencies (LEAs) are currently unable to sustain a cold case unit due to staffing and financial constraints. As a result, hundreds of thousands of cases are not investigated (the FBI estimates that there are over 240,000 unsolved homicides since the 1980s).

Law enforcement's inability to work cold cases not only prevents solving these crimes and providing answers to families, but often means that the same perpetrators will go on to commit similar violent offenses. Therefore, effective in FY 2019, the scope of SAKI National TTA will be expanded to include all cold cases, especially homicides, to help meet the needs of the field. This expanded scope will build on existing infrastructure and momentum created under SAKI to address non-sexual assault cold cases, which currently have limited available resources. The inclusion of all violent crime cold cases under SAKI TTA will ensure that LEAs with cold case backlogs have access to forensic testing, crime analysis, subject experts, technical resources, training and education, and support to implement/sustain local or state cold case units.

Ultimately, this funding will help agencies resolve more cases (cold and active), thereby increasing both public safety by preventing future crimes and providing long-awaited answers for survivors and/or their families. SAKI site-based grantees will leverage the TTA to plan and implement strategies to inventory, test, and track unsubmitted SAKs; launch coordinated community-based sexual assault system enhancements; and engage relevant community stakeholders in the process. The national TTA provider will leverage existing TTA resources available through BJA's sakitta.org website, OJP, and DOJ's Office on Violence Against Women (OVW), in addition to creating additional TTA tools to fill existing resource gaps.

There are currently 51 SAKI grantee sites, including 22 statewide sites, 1 multicounty site, 9 county-level sites, and 19 city-level sites. BJA will likely make competitive awards (through a separate solicitation) to approximately 24 local jurisdictions in FY 2019 (either to new or existing SAKI sites). Additional site-based awards may also be made in the future, dependent on the availability of appropriations.

The SAKI National TTA Program will provide direct assistance to the SAKI grantee sites. It will also provide targeted TTA in support of their initiatives and to other non-SAKI-funded jurisdictions engaged in system improvement efforts as resources allow. Given the complex, multidisciplinary nature of the TTA required to support SAKI projects (i.e., expertise in health care, forensic science, policing, prosecution, and victim services), applicants are encouraged to establish formalized partnerships or consortia with one or more qualified expert

³ For more information on resources related to untested kits, see: <http://nij.gov/topics/forensics/evidence/dna/pages/welcome.aspx>.

organizations in support of a comprehensive TTA program. Such partnerships should provide ready access to high quality TTA in all the areas covered by this solicitation and SAKI, and applicants should leverage the expertise of these experts in their approaches.

New Purpose Areas:

Other violent crimes

Under this award, funds are also allocated to funding for DNA testing of violent cold case crime evidence (including homicides, attempted homicides, kidnappings, and missing and unidentified persons associated with suspicious circumstances). The SAKI national TTA provider would work directly with the more advanced SAKI sites (approximately 7–10 sites) that have tested the majority of their previously unsubmitted SAKs, have received CODIS hits, and have entered cases into ViCAP.

This new TTA purpose area will allow these advanced sites to expand their efforts to combat additional violent crimes and identify serial offenders. The national TTA provider will make a subaward or contract to a forensic DNA vendor via a competitive request for proposal process for at least \$250,000. SAKI sites receiving TTA under this purpose area can submit requests for DNA testing using this funding source. All requests must be reviewed and approved by BJA.

SAKI sites receiving TTA under this new purpose area will have to complete an inventory of backlogged cold case evidence, track said evidence, and develop a comprehensive approach to addressing the resolution of all cases in the backlog. The SAKI national TTA provider will ensure the sites receive training on cold case investigations, and conduct research on the outcomes in cold cases.

Objectives and Deliverables

The objectives of the SAKI National TTA Program are to:

- Assist SAKI sites in implementing evidence-based activities to address existing challenges related to unsubmitted SAKs and to enhance the sexual assault response.⁴
- Engage proactively with SAKI grantees to monitor their progress toward achieving program goals by addressing challenges and identifying solutions.
- Communicate regularly with BJA to assess the impact of TTA services on SAKI program goals and individual sites' progress.
- Provide TTA to other jurisdictions interested in improving their response to sexual assault through evidence-based practices.
- In collaboration with OJP and stakeholder organizations, assist in the development, implementation, and dissemination of best practices, policies, and protocols for addressing systemic failures that lead to large numbers of untested kits and preventing those failures from reoccurring in the future. This includes customized sustainability plans for each SAKI site.
- Assist advanced SAKI sites with the investigation of other violent cold case crimes as outlined above.

⁴ The TTA provider will be expected to provide assistance to **all** SAKI sites regardless of the fiscal year in which the awards were made.

Forensic Training to Ensure Conviction Integrity

Effective FY 2019, the SAKI TTA provider will also be required to develop and deliver forensic-based training for attorneys (prosecution and defense) in an effort to ensure prosecutors and defense counsel trying violent crime cases, including death penalty cases, have the knowledge and tools to effectively understand and present forensic evidence in the cases. The training should also seek to ensure conviction integrity and prevent wrongful convictions related to forensic evidence. Trainings are to be made readily available to attorneys working death penalty cases, as well as those working other violent crime cases.

Funding in the amount of up to \$600,000 is to be allocated towards delivering a combination of annual regional in-person trainings and webinars on the following topics:

- Crime scene to court room basics for attorneys- optimal evidence collection and preservation, chain of custody issues.
- DNA 101- sources of DNA, mixture analysis, statistics, methodologies- STRs, Y-STRs, familial DNA searches, phenotyping, genealogy.
- Working with state and/or private labs- understanding forensic testing capabilities, workflows, importance of triaging evidence and testing requests.
- DNA report interpretation and expert witness testimony
- Eye witness testimony
- Ballistics
- Fingerprints
- Blood spatter analysis

Specifically, the TTA provider will be expected to:

- Complete three annual in-person regional trainings.
- Complete 6 webinars annually.
- Host additional webinars on emerging topics related to capital case litigation and forensics as requested by BJA.
- Create an online toolkit module of forensic resources for practitioners.
- Develop a standard training curriculum that more thoroughly supports take-home resources and consistent content in core forensic disciplines.

The overall goal of this training is to assist the field in addressing violent crime, particularly capital litigation, and to mitigate the risk of error and wrongful conviction by enabling attorneys to fully understand and apply the forensic evidence, with a particular focus on areas where forensic science is not clear or has been improperly applied.

Applicants should clearly address how they will provide the following deliverables:

- Provide ongoing TTA (both remote and onsite) to the SAKI site-based grantees throughout the duration of their BJA grant awards, and, as resources allow, provide SAKI TTA to non-grantee jurisdictions when requested. Specifically, BJA seeks:
 - Instruction for law enforcement personnel regarding the benefits and use of forensic evidence, including protocols for sending cases to the lab for analysis and receiving and handling the forensic evidence results.
 - Training for law enforcement, first responders, victim advocates, and other relevant stakeholders in relation to sexual assault evidence collection, DNA technology, victim and trauma response, and other related topics to improve the quality and outcomes of sexual assault investigations, prosecutions, and victim experiences.

- Training to improve investigative and prosecutorial practices when forensic sexual assault evidence is available.
- Training to optimize victim notification protocols and techniques as well as follow-up support for victims.
- Development and delivery of an academy-style training specifically for police chiefs and other senior level officials within the criminal justice system who will ultimately be responsible for the overall success of SAKI in their jurisdictions and the sustainability of improved policies and procedures once their grant periods end. This training should focus on the importance and value of testing SAKs and investigating sexual assault cases in a timely manner, the violent and serial nature of associated offenders and public safety considerations, and the economic impact of unsubmitted SAKs.
- Technical assistance to identify challenges related to outsourcing, reviewing technical data and CODIS uploads of results produced by private labs, current in-house standard operating procedures that contribute to deficiencies in the DNA screening and testing process, and identifying solutions to promote greater efficiency. Such assistance should include support for public labs' implementation of sustainable, automated, and streamlined SAK processing procedures to ensure long-term capacity and efficiency.
- Training and technical assistance related to the collection and entry of lawfully owed DNA into CODIS and the related investigation and prosecution of cases identified through these efforts.
- Technical assistance to identify additional funding resources that can be leveraged to further reduce or eliminate the number of untested SAKs in a jurisdiction.
- TTA to enable or enhance the SAK inventory, testing, tracking, and case management processes, to include technical assistance in accessing and implementing evidence tracking and case management technology.
- Technical assistance to establish specialized cold case or sexual assault investigation units, or response teams, focused on the coordinated community response to unsubmitted SAKs and the investigations resulting from increased testing.
- Model protocols, policies, and memoranda of understanding templates that assist sites in establishing and sustaining effective management structures and partnerships in support of their SAKI projects, and proactive dissemination of these model guidance to grantees, other stakeholders, and the criminal justice field at large.
- Special assessments of the sexual assault units (SAUs) in SAKI sites. A SAU assessment is a review of the sexual assault investigative process within and outside a law enforcement agency's domain. Assessments are to be carried out by SAKI national TTA staff with significant experience in sexual assault investigations, both as supervisors and as investigators of current and cold case sexual assaults. The assessment method is to have three components: (1) a review of sexual assault policies and procedures, (2) in-person interviews with key staff including all sexual assault investigators, and (3) a systematic review of sexual assault cases. A final report must be produced that provides recommendations for law enforcement leadership and identifies available resources to address specific needs. The TTA provider should plan to complete at least three special assessments each year of the grant period.
- Assisting SAKI sites that have research or analysis capabilities or are interested in adding these functions. Activities will include hosting forums, developing recommended practices and guidelines, compiling and disseminating results and papers on SAK-related topics, and conducting webinars and meetings that showcase the role of research and analysis in SAKI.

- Ensuring that advanced SAKI sites with cold case backlogs have access to forensic testing, crime analysis, subject experts, technical resources, training and education, and support to implement/sustain local or state cold case units.
- Recruit, maintain, and use a cadre of subject experts to assist agencies with technical assistance needs; schedule and organize training venues; market trainings and recruit participants; administer and oversee implementation of the trainings; and coordinate TTA and subject expert activities with BJA's National Training and Technical Assistance Center (NTTAC) and other TTA resources housed within OJP and OVW. The subject experts should have experience in the following areas:
 - **Law enforcement:** Identifying investigative steps to take after a CODIS hit, prioritizing multiple CODIS hits, writing policy and procedure on investigative standards, collecting and handling evidence, suspect interview/interrogation skills, and managing investigations.
 - **Prosecution:** Overcoming challenges associated with cold case prosecutions, training on witness preparation and questioning, and presenting sexual assault evidence at trial.
 - **Sexual assault nurse examiners (SANE):** Identifying needs, gaps, and challenges in the local SANE program and identifying the role of a SANE in sexual assault cases.
 - **Crime laboratory:** Linking criminal laboratory information management systems with investigations and prosecutions, understanding serological and DNA analysis and emerging DNA technologies (including phenotyping and forensic genealogy), knowledge of lean six sigma principals to help improve laboratory efficiency, and prioritizing cold case evidence.
 - **Victim advocacy:** Support and training on cold case notification policy, advocacy training programs, and the roles and responsibilities of the victim advocate.
 - **Attorneys/Legal Experts** who can assist sites with the collection of lawfully owed DNA samples from convicted offenders/arrestees.
- Have a process or strategy to leverage the expertise and experience needed to best meet SAKI site-based grantees' needs when said expertise is not present within the SAKI national TTA provider's organization.
- Ensure each SAKI site-based grantee's (and, as resources allow, other jurisdictions') accountability and transparency as it relates to sexual assault response, evidence collection, and analysis by providing guidance on how to properly account for the number of SAKs that remain in their possession; track the processing of SAKs through the criminal justice system; and produce best practices and model policies for inventorying, tracking, and maintaining accountability for SAKs.
- Develop uniform TTA request and response protocols for all active SAKI grantees as well as non-grantee agencies seeking assistance. Provide education and proactive, comprehensive, user-friendly TTA via teleconferencing, peer-to-peer consultations, onsite assistance, web-based assistance, and follow-up TTA as required by phone and/or e-mail.
- Assist BJA with ongoing assessments of SAKI sites' progress and outcomes by holding monthly calls with grantee agencies; assisting them with the development, validation, and submission of performance metrics to BJA; and producing in-depth and ongoing analysis of data related to SAKI grantee performance measures and programmatic activity that provides information on the initiative's strengths and weaknesses, changes in policies and protocols,

and resulting effect on practice; identified perpetrators; patterns of serial sexual offenses; victim participation; and other elements as required by BJA.

- Assign at least one subject expert liaison to each SAKI grantee to monitor and report on TTA needs, including a summary of the findings for the grantee and recommended next steps to improve program performance. The awarded SAKI national TTA provider must provide follow-up information to BJA regarding the grantee's implementation of the recommendations that were provided.
- Support and routinely update the official SAKI TTA website (sakitta.org) which houses model policies, protocols, research, publications, best practices, training materials, and other relevant web-based resources. The website serves as a one-stop-shop for information on SAK collection, storage, inventorying, testing, tracking, and best practices in terms of investigation, prosecution, victim advocacy, victim notification and support, and related topics as agreed to by the SAKI national TTA provider and BJA. The applicant should plan to build on the existing tool versus creating a new website.
- Support and update the official SAKI TTA social media accounts, including Facebook and Twitter pages. The social media pages are intended to highlight the latest SAKI news and resources and to drive traffic to sakitta.org. The SAKI social media pages will also increase the reach and influence of the initiative by bringing SAKI to a wider audience of practitioners and stakeholders.
- Develop publications and a comprehensive resource kit for jurisdictions interested in implementing evidence-based activities to inventory and reduce the number of unsubmitted SAKs in their possession, and engage in comprehensive community-based sexual assault response reform to improve the overall investigation and prosecution of sexual assault cases. These information resources must identify common obstacles and lessons learned by sites in this process, provide guidance to overcoming such challenges to comprehensive reform, and be actively disseminated to SAKI sites and (as resources allow) other jurisdictions as requested. Specific information may include, but is not limited to:
 - Primary reasons for untested SAKs at the sites
 - Information about the criminal behavior of sexual assault perpetrators indicated by testing results from sites
 - Cost estimates for SAKI activities based on experiences of the sites
 - Types of protocols previously absent and subsequently developed through the initiative
 - The SAK testing and follow-up investigation process, including case outcomes
 - Model approaches to victim notification, victim advocacy, and engagement in cases involving previously unsubmitted SAKs
- Assist BJA in conducting national and/or regional meetings or other educational sessions for existing grantees and other agencies during the 36-month project period, and attend national meetings, conferences, and other events to highlight the initiative and disseminate available resources. Annual trainings must include:
 - The SAKI Assembly of Cities
 - SAKI State Wide Working Group Meeting
 - Advanced Cold Case Investigation and Prosecution Workshop
- Review site inventory results and certifications, and provide assistance to BJA and SAKI sites as needed in relation to the SAK inventory and certification process.

- Provide guidance on addressing statute of limitations issues; testing protocols; investigation practices; policies and procedures related to previously closed cases that are subsequently reopened as a result of new evidence obtained through the SAK testing process; and other issues as required by BJA and the SAKI sites.

The SAKI national TTA provider also will be required to participate in BJA's GrantStat for specified grantees. Through GrantStat, BJA management and staff examine the performance of the grant programs funded by BJA by tracking grantee or program performance along several key indicators. GrantStat calls for the collection and analysis of performance data and other relevant grant-level information that enables BJA as well as our partners to be held accountable for the grantees and programs performance as measured against the program's goals and objectives.

The Objectives and Deliverables are directly related to the performance measures that demonstrate the results of the work completed, as discussed in [Section D. Application and Submission Information](#), under Program Narrative.

Evidence-based Programs or Practices

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

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

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

The OJP CrimeSolutions.gov website at <https://www.crimesolutions.gov> is one resource that applicants may use to find information about evidence-based programs in criminal justice, juvenile justice, and crime victim services.

Information Regarding Potential Evaluation of Programs and Activities

The Department of Justice has prioritized the use of evidence-based programming and deems it critical to continue to build and expand the evidence informing criminal and juvenile justice programs to reach the highest level of rigor possible. Therefore, applicants should note that the Office of Justice Programs may conduct or support an evaluation of the programs and activities funded under this solicitation. Recipients and sub-recipients will be expected to cooperate with program-related assessments or evaluation efforts, including through the collection and provision of information or data requested by OJP (or its designee) for the assessment or evaluation of any activities and/or outcomes of those activities funded under this solicitation. The information or data requested may be in addition to any other financial or performance data already required under this program.

B. Federal Award Information

BJA expects to make up to one award of up to \$6,600,000 for a 36-month period of performance, to begin on October 1, 2019. Of this amount, \$1,000,000 will focus on cold case investigations related to other violent crime cold cases and making DNA testing available. \$600,000 will focus on Forensic Training to Ensure Conviction Integrity

BJA may, in certain cases, provide additional funding in future years to the award made under this solicitation, through a continuation award. In making decisions regarding continuation awards, OJP will consider, among other factors, the availability of appropriations, when the program or project was last competed, OJP's strategic priorities, and OJP's assessment of both the management of the award (for example, timeliness and quality of progress reports), and the progress of the work funded under the award.

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

Type of Award

BJA expects to make any award under this solicitation 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.

Financial Management and System of Internal Controls

Award recipients and subrecipients (including recipients or subrecipients that are pass-through entities⁵) must, as described in the Part 200 Uniform Requirements⁶ 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.

⁵ For purposes of this solicitation, the phrase "pass-through entity" includes any recipient or subrecipient that provides a subaward ("subgrant") to a subrecipient (subgrantee) to carry out part of the funded award or program. Additional information on proposed subawards is listed under [What an Application Should Include](#).

⁶ 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 the applicable administrative requirements and cost principles, OJP encourages prospective applicants to enroll, at no charge, in the DOJ Grants Financial Management Online Training, available at <https://onlinegfmt.training.ojp.gov>. This training is required for all OJP award recipients.

Also, applicants should be aware that OJP collects information from applicants on their financial management and systems of internal controls (among other information) which is used to make award decisions. Under [Section D. Application and Submission Information](#), applicants may access and review a questionnaire—the [OJP Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire](#)—that OJP requires **all** applicants (other than an individual applying in his/her personal capacity) to download, complete, and submit as part of the application.

Budget Information

Cost Sharing or Match Requirement

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

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

Pre-agreement costs are costs incurred by the applicant prior to the start date of the period of performance of the 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 at <https://ojp.gov/financialguide/DOJ/index.htm> 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 percent of the maximum annual salary payable to a member of the federal government's Senior Executive Service (SES) at an agency with a Certified SES

Performance Appraisal System for that year.⁷ The 2019 salary table for SES employees is available on the Office of Personnel Management website at <https://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/pay-leave/salaries-wages/salary-tables/19Tables/exec/html/ES.aspx>. 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.

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 and DOJ policy and guidance on approval, planning, and reporting of such events, available at <https://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, as well as 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.

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 2018 Awards](#)" in the OJP Funding Resource Center at <https://ojp.gov/funding/index.htm>.

⁷ 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.

C. Eligibility Information

For eligibility information, see title page.

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

D. Application and Submission Information

What an Application Should Include

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

Moreover, an applicant should anticipate that an application that OJP determines is nonresponsive to the scope of the solicitation, or that OJP determines does not include the application elements that BJA has designated to be critical, will neither proceed to peer review, nor receive further consideration. For this solicitation, BJA has designated the following application elements as critical: Program Narrative, Budget Detail Worksheet, Budget Narrative, and Time and Task Plan.

NOTE: OJP has combined the Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative in a single document collectively referred to as the Budget Detail Worksheet. See “Budget Information and Associated Documentation” below for more information about the Budget Detail Worksheet and where it can be accessed.

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

Please review the “Note on File Names and File Types” under [How To Apply](#) to be sure applications are submitted in permitted formats.

1. 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. On the SF-424, current OJP award recipients, when completing the field for “Legal Name” (box 8a), 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.) Also, current recipients should enter the Employer Identification Number (EIN) in box 8b exactly as it appears on the prior year award document. An applicant with a current, active award(s) 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 its official legal name in box 8a, its address in box 8d, its EIN in box 8b, and its Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number in box 8c of the SF-424. A new applicant entity should attach official legal documents to its application (e.g., articles of incorporation, 501(c)(3) status documentation, organizational letterhead) to confirm the legal name, address, and EIN entered into the SF-424. OJP will use the System for Award Management (SAM) to confirm the legal name and DUNS number entered in the SF-424; therefore, an applicant should ensure that the information entered in the SF-424 matches its current registration in SAM. See the [How To Apply](#) section for more information on SAM and DUNS numbers.

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 400 words or less. Project abstracts should be:

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

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

3. Program Narrative

The program narrative must respond to the [Review Criteria](#) in the order given. Applications are peer reviewed and scored on answers to the Review Criteria.

The program narrative should be double-spaced, using a standard 12-point font (Times New Roman is preferred) with 1-inch margins, and should not exceed 15 pages. Number pages “1 of 15,” “2 of 15,” etc.

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

The following sections should be included as part of the program narrative⁸:

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

⁸ 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](#).

OJP will require each successful applicant to submit regular performance data that demonstrate the results of the work carried out under the award (see “General Information about Post-federal Award Reporting Requirements” in [Section F. Federal Award Administration Information](#)). The performance data directly relate to the objectives and deliverables identified under "Objectives and Deliverables" in [Section A. Program Description](#).

Performance measures for this solicitation are listed in [Appendix A: Performance Measures Table](#).

Applicants should visit OJP’s performance measurement page at www.ojp.gov/performance for an overview of performance measurement activities at OJP.

The application should demonstrate the applicant’s understanding of the performance data reporting requirements for this grant program and detail how the applicant will gather the required data should it receive funding.

Please note that applicants are **not** required to submit performance data with the application. Performance measures information is included as an alert that successful applicants will be required to submit performance data as part of the reporting requirements under an award.

Note on Project Evaluations

An applicant that proposes to use award funds through this solicitation to conduct project evaluations should be aware that certain project evaluations (such as systematic investigations designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge) may constitute “research” for purposes of applicable DOJ human subjects protection regulations. However, project evaluations that are intended only to generate internal improvements to a program or service, or are conducted only to meet OJP’s performance measure data reporting requirements, likely do not constitute “research.” Each applicant should provide sufficient information for OJP to determine whether the particular project it proposes would either intentionally or unintentionally collect and/or use information in such a way that it meets the DOJ definition of research that appears at 28 C.F.R. Part 46 (“Protection of Human Subjects”).

“Research,” for purposes of human subjects protection for OJP-funded programs, is defined as “a systematic investigation, including research development, testing and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge.” 28 C.F.R. 46.102(d).

For additional information on determining whether a proposed activity would constitute research for purposes of human subjects protection, applicants should consult the decision tree in the “Research and the protection of human subjects” section of the “Requirements related to Research” webpage of the ["Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2018 Awards,"](#) available through the OJP Funding Resource Center at <https://ojp.gov/funding/index.htm>.

Every prospective applicant whose application may propose a research or statistical component also should review the “Data Privacy and Confidentiality Requirements” section on that webpage.

4. Budget and Associated Documentation

The Budget Detail Worksheet and the Budget Narrative are now combined in a single document collectively referred to as the Budget Detail Worksheet. The Budget Detail Worksheet is a user-friendly, fillable, Microsoft Excel-based document designed to calculate totals. Additionally, the Excel workbook contains worksheets for multiple budget years that can be completed as necessary. **All applicants should use the Excel version when completing the proposed budget in an application, except in cases where the applicant does not have access to Microsoft Excel or experiences technical difficulties.** If an applicant does not have access to Microsoft Excel or experiences technical difficulties with the Excel version, then the applicant should use the 508-compliant accessible Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) version.

Both versions of the Budget Detail Worksheet can be accessed at <https://ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Forms/BudgetDetailWorksheet.htm>.

a. Budget Detail Worksheet

The Budget Detail Worksheet should provide the detailed computation for each budget line item, listing the total cost of each and showing how it was calculated by the applicant. For example, costs for personnel should show the annual salary rate and the percentage of time devoted to the project for each employee paid with grant funds. The Budget Detail Worksheet should present a complete itemization of all proposed costs.

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

b. Budget Narrative

Applicants should budget for hosting three 2-day SAKI grantee meetings during the 36-month period. The meetings will be held in the Washington, DC, area.

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 objectives 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) and 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 an action—for federal grants administrative purposes—is a subaward or procurement contract is a critical distinction as significantly different rules apply to subawards and procurement contracts. If a recipient enters into an agreement that is a subaward of an OJP award, specific rules apply—many of which are set by federal statutes, DOJ regulations; others by award conditions. These rules place particular responsibilities on an OJP recipient for any subawards the OJP recipient may make. The rules determine much of what the written subaward agreement itself must require or provide. The rules also determine much of what an OJP recipient must do both before and after it makes a subaward. If a recipient enters into an agreement that is a procurement contract under an OJP award, a substantially different set of federal rules applies.

OJP has developed the following guidance documents to help clarify the differences between subawards and procurement contracts under an OJP award and outline the compliance and reporting requirements for each. This information can be accessed at <https://ojp.gov/training/training.htm>.

- [Subawards under OJP Awards and Procurement Contracts under Awards: A Toolkit for OJP Recipients.](#)
- [Checklist to Determine Subrecipient or Contractor Classification.](#)
- [Sole Source Justification Fact Sheet and Sole Source Review Checklist.](#)

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. The substance of the relationship will be given greater consideration than the form of agreement between the recipient and the third party.

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 Program Narrative, Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative as approved by OJP. If, however, a particular subaward is not authorized by federal statute or regulation, and is not 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 \$250,000)

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. All noncompetitive (sole source) procurement contracts must meet the OJP requirements outlined at <https://ojp.gov/training/subawards-procurement.htm>. If a proposed procurement contract would exceed the Simplified Acquisition Threshold—currently, \$250,000—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 \$250,000 should include a detailed justification that explains to OJP why, in the particular circumstances, it is appropriate to proceed without competition.

If the applicant receives an award, sole source procurements that do not exceed the Simplified Acquisition Threshold (currently \$250,000) must have written justification for the noncompetitive procurement action maintained in the procurement file. If a procurement file does not have the documentation that meets the criteria outlined in 2 C.F.R. 200, the procurement expenditures may not be allowable. Sole source procurement over the \$250,000 Simplified Acquisition Threshold must have prior approval from OJP using a Sole Source Grant Adjustment Notice (GAN). Written documentation justifying the noncompetitive procurement must be submitted with the GAN and maintained in the procurement file.

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 (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 (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 Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO) Customer Service Center at 1–800–458–0786 or at ask.ocfo@usdoj.gov. If DOJ is the cognizant federal agency, applicants may obtain information needed to submit an indirect cost rate proposal at <https://www.ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/IndirectCosts.pdf>.

Certain OJP recipients have the option of electing to use the “de minimis” indirect cost rate. An applicant that is eligible to use the “de minimis” rate that wishes to use the “de minimis” rate should attach written documentation to the application that advises OJP of both—(1) the applicant’s eligibility to use the “de minimis” rate, and (2) its election to do so. If an eligible applicant elects the “de minimis” rate, costs must be consistently charged as either indirect or direct costs, but may not be double charged or inconsistently charged as both. The “de minimis” rate may no longer be used once an approved federally negotiated indirect cost rate is in place. (No entity that ever has had a federally approved negotiated indirect cost rate is eligible to use the “de minimis” rate.) For the “de minimis” rate requirements (including information on eligibility to elect to use the rate), see the Part 200 Uniform Requirements, at 2 C.F.R. 200.414(f).

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.

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

Every OJP applicant (other than an individual applying in his or her personal capacity) is required to download, complete, and submit the OJP Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire (Questionnaire) at <https://ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/FinancialCapability.pdf> as part of its application. The Questionnaire helps OJP assess the financial management and internal control systems, and the associated potential risks of an applicant as part of the pre-award risk assessment process.

The Questionnaire should only be completed by financial staff most familiar with the applicant’s

systems, policies, and procedures in order to ensure that the correct responses are recorded and submitted to OJP. The responses on the Questionnaire directly impact the pre-award risk assessment and should accurately reflect the applicant's financial management and internal control system at the time of the application. The pre-award risk assessment is only one of multiple factors and criteria used in determining funding. However, a pre-award risk assessment that indicates that an applicant poses a higher risk to OJP may affect the funding decision and/or result in additional reporting requirements, monitoring, special conditions, withholding of award funds, or other additional award requirements.

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) posted at <https://ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/Disclosure.pdf>. An applicant that does not expend any funds for lobbying activities is to enter "N/A" in the text boxes for item 10 ("a. Name and Address of Lobbying Registrant" and "b. Individuals Performing Services").

9. Additional Attachments

a. Timeline

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

b. Position Descriptions and Résumés

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

c. Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications

Each applicant is to disclose whether it has (or is proposed as a subrecipient under) any pending applications for federally funded grants or cooperative agreements that (1) include requests for funding to support the same project being proposed in the application under

this solicitation, and (2) would cover any identical cost items outlined in the budget submitted to OJP as part of the application under this solicitation. The applicant is to disclose applications made directly to federal awarding agencies, and also applications for subawards of federal funds (e.g., applications to state agencies that will subaward (“subgrant”) federal funds).

OJP seeks this information to help avoid 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 Office)	COPS Hiring Program	Jane Doe, 202/000-0000; jane.doe@usdoj.gov
Health and 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’s Legal Name on the application must match the entity named on the disclosure of pending applications statement.

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

d. Applicant Disclosure and Justification – DOJ High Risk Grantees⁹

An applicant that is designated as a DOJ High Risk Grantee is to submit in GMS, as a separate attachment to its application, information that OJP will use, among other pertinent information, to determine whether it will consider or select the application for an award under this solicitation. The file should be named "DOJ High Risk Grantee Applicant Disclosure and Justification." (See, also, Application Review Information, for a brief discussion of how such information may be considered in the application review process.)

OJP constantly seeks to optimize its investments in criminal- and juvenile justice-focused programs and activities, increase program effectiveness, and maximize the return – and program impact – from limited programmatic resources. Therefore, OJP may remove from consideration or not select for award a "DOJ High Risk Grantee" applicant that is determined to pose a substantial risk of program implementation failure. In making such determinations, OJP will consider one or more of the following factors: the applicant's lack of sufficient progress in addressing required corrective actions necessary for removal of the DOJ High Risk Grantee designation; the nature and severity of the issues leading to or accompanying the applicant's DOJ High Risk Grantee designation; or the applicant's expected ability to manage grant funds and achieve grant goals and objectives.

In this attachment, the applicant is to provide any additional information or justification – especially with regard to corrective actions yet to be implemented (as of the application date) – that may help demonstrate how the applicant has addressed or otherwise mitigated such uncorrected matters, such that any negative impact on the proposed program and its implementation would be immaterial or would be significantly reduced or eliminated. (To the extent that the applicant believes that any of the information provided pursuant to this disclosure may be confidential in nature, the applicant should specifically identify it.)

e. 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 the research and/or evaluation project proposed in response to the solicitation, and any current or prior related projects.

Each application that proposes research and/or evaluation should include an attachment that addresses **both** i. and ii. below.

- i. The 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) —

⁹ A "DOJ High Risk Grantee" is a recipient that has received a DOJ High-Risk designation based on a documented history of unsatisfactory performance, financial instability, management system or other internal control deficiencies, or noncompliance with award terms and conditions on prior awards, or that is otherwise not responsible.

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, the 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 specific personal or organizational conflicts of interest in its proposal during this review, the applicant must propose a specific and robust mitigation plan to address conflicts noted above. At a minimum, the plan must include specific processes and procedures that the applicant will put in place to eliminate (or, at the very least, mitigate) potential personal or financial conflicts of interest on the part of its staff, consultants, and/or subrecipients for this particular project, should that be necessary during the grant period.

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

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

f. 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 (IRS) regulations with regard to its compensation decisions.

Each applicant nonprofit organization must state at the time of its application (question 9c in the "OJP Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire" located at <http://ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/FinancialCapability.pdf> and 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 IRS 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).

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 <https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/support.html>.

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 at <https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/manage-subscriptions.html>. 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. Attachments are also labeled to describe the file being attached (e.g., Project Narrative, Budget Narrative, Other, etc.) Please ensure that all required documents are attached in the correct Grants.gov category and are labeled correctly. Do not embed “mandatory” attachments within another file.

An applicant must use the **Add Attachment** button to attach a file to its application. Do not click the paperclip icon to attach files. This action will not attach the files to the application. After adding an attachment, select the **View Attachment** button to confirm you attached the correct file. To remove the file, select the **Delete Attachment** button.

An application can be checked for errors via the **Check Application** button on the **Forms** tab of the **Manage Workspace** page. The button is active if the set of forms in the workspace matches those

required in the application package. If you receive a **Cross-Form Errors** message after clicking the **Check Application** button, refer to the Cross-Form Errors help article for more detailed information about this validation error.

Note on File Names and File Types: Grants.gov only permits the use of certain specific characters in the 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 “&#amp;” 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:

Unique Entity Identifier (DUNS Number) and System for Award Management (SAM)

Every applicant entity must comply with all applicable SAM and unique entity identifier (currently, a DUNS number) requirements. SAM is the repository for certain standard information about federal financial assistance applicants, recipients, and subrecipients. A DUNS number is a unique nine-digit identification number provided by the commercial company Dun and Bradstreet. More detailed information about SAM and the DUNS number is in the numbered sections below.

If an applicant entity has not fully complied with the 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.

Registration and Submission Steps

- 1. Acquire a unique entity identifier (currently, a DUNS number).** 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.

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 <https://www.dnb.com/>. A DUNS number is usually received within 2 business days.

2. Acquire or maintain registration with SAM. Any applicant for an OJP award creating a new entity registration (or updating or renewing a registration) in SAM.gov must submit an original, signed notarized letter appointing the authorized Entity Administrator within thirty (30) days of the registration activation. **Notarized letters must be submitted via U.S. Postal Service Mail.** Read the Alert at sam.gov/SAM/ to learn more about what is required in the notarized letter, and read the *Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)* at www.gsa.gov/samupdate to learn more about this process change. All applicants for OJP awards (other than individuals) must maintain current registrations in the SAM database. Applicants will need the authorizing official of the organization and an Employer Identification Number (EIN). Information about SAM registration procedures can be accessed at sam.gov/SAM/.

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.

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://www.grants.gov/web/grants/applicants/organization-registration.html>.
4. **Acquire confirmation for the AOR from the E-Business Point of Contact (E-Biz POC).** The E-Biz POC at the applicant organization must log into Grants.gov to confirm the applicant organization's AOR. The E-Biz POC will need the Marketing Partner Identification Number (MPIN) password obtained when registering with SAM to complete this step. Note that an organization can have more than one AOR.
5. **Search for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov.** Use the following identifying information when searching for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov. The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance number for this solicitation is 16.833, titled "National Sexual Assault Kit Initiative," and the funding opportunity number is BJA-2019-15229.
6. **Access Funding Opportunity and Application Package from Grants.gov.** Select "Apply for Grants" under the "Applicants" column. Enter your email address to be notified of any changes to the opportunity package before the closing date. Click the Workspace icon to use Grants.gov Workspace.
7. **Submit a valid application consistent with this solicitation by following the directions in Grants.gov.** To preview the application prior to (or after) submitting, go to the **View Application** tab in Workspace. For additional information, review the [View Application Tab](#) help article and [Attachments Tab](#) help article.

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 April 30, 2019.

Go to <https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/applicants/organization-registration.html> 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 at <https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/support.html> or the SAM Help Desk (Federal Service Desk) at <https://www.fsd.gov/fsd-gov/home.do> to report the technical issue and receive a tracking number. The applicant must email the contact 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 email must describe the technical difficulties, and must include a timeline of the applicant's submission efforts, the complete grant application, the applicant's DUNS number, and any Grants.gov Help Desk or SAM tracking number(s).

Note: 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 at <https://ojp.gov/funding/index.htm>.

E. Application Review Information

Review Criteria

Applications that meet basic minimum requirements will be evaluated by peer reviewers using the following five review criteria, with different weight given to each, based on the percentage value listed after each individual criterion. For example, “Statement of the Problem” is worth 15 percent of the entire score in the application review process.

1. Statement of the Problem (15 percent)

Provide an overview of the issue of unsubmitted sexual assault kits and the current challenges this issue poses for law enforcement agencies, forensic professionals, advocates, and victims of sexual assault. Describe generally the need for TTA among local jurisdictions in an effort to achieve reform as described in this grant announcement. Describe the role of a comprehensive, multidisciplinary response model in reducing the number of unsubmitted SAKs and improving response to sexual assault in jurisdictions across the nation. Describe the value of national databases such as CODIS and ViCAP and how entry of data and use of the databases can support this work.

2. Project Design and Implementation (40 percent)

Detail how the applicant will implement the deliverables listed in the [Program-specific Information](#) section. Describe how the applicant will identify, assess, and deliver TTA needs for SAKI grantee sites. Explain how the applicant will work with jurisdictions to establish and sustain a multidisciplinary, community-based approach to reforming sexual assault response practices. If the applicant proposes a formal partnership or TTA consortium with one or more external organizations, fully describe how this partnership will be implemented to provide a diverse array of TTA services and subject expertise as outlined in this solicitation. Identify methods to promote the results of the SAKI grantees.

3. Capabilities and Competencies (30 percent)

Fully describe the capabilities and competencies of the staff assigned to develop and deliver TTA nationwide as outlined under “Project Design and Implementation” above. The applicant must demonstrate experience in providing technical assistance on a range of forensic, investigative, prosecution, and victim services issues as they relate to crimes of sexual assault and unsubmitted SAKs. The applicant must demonstrate capacity to deliver TTA services on a national basis. If a formal partnership or TTA consortium with other entities is proposed to provide ready access to the required subject expertise in the aforementioned issues, describe the experience, subject expertise, and management competencies of each proposed partner organization. Describe how the applicant will leverage the expertise not only to provide services but also to identify and respond to emerging issues and the needs of the SAKI grantee sites.

4. Plan for Collecting the Data Required for this Solicitation’s Performance Measures (5 percent)

Describe the process for measuring project performance. Identify who will collect the data, who is responsible for performance measurement, and how the information will be used to guide and assess the program.

5. Budget (10 percent)

Provide a proposed budget for the entire project period that is complete, cost effective, and

allowable (e.g., reasonable, allocable, and necessary for project activities). The budget narrative should generally demonstrate how the applicant will maximize cost effectiveness of grant expenditures. The budget narrative should demonstrate cost effectiveness in relation to the objectives of the project.¹⁰

The applicant should budget for hosting three 2-day SAKI grantee meetings during the 36-month period. The meetings will be held in the Washington, DC, area.

The applicant should also budget for hosting the annual Advanced Cold Case Investigation and Prosecution Workshop and for supporting the annual Assembly of SAKI cities and the State Wide Working Group Meeting.

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.”

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

Peer review panels will evaluate, score, and rate applications that meet basic minimum requirements. BJA may use internal peer reviewers, external peer reviewers, or a combination, to assess applications on technical merit using the solicitation’s review criteria. An internal reviewer is a current DOJ employee who is well-versed or has expertise in the subject matter of this solicitation. An external peer reviewer is an expert in the subject matter of a given solicitation who is not a current DOJ employee. Peer reviewers’ ratings and any resulting recommendations are advisory only, although reviewer views are considered carefully.

Other important considerations for BJA include geographic diversity, strategic priorities, and available funding, as well as the extent to which the Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative accurately explain project costs that are reasonable, necessary, and otherwise allowable under federal law and applicable federal cost principles.

Pursuant to the Part 200 Uniform Requirements, before award decisions are made, OJP also

¹⁰ Generally speaking, a reasonable cost is a cost that, in its nature or amount, does not exceed that which would be incurred by a prudent person under the circumstances prevailing at the time the decision was made to incur the costs.

reviews information related to the degree of risk posed by the applicant. 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 \$250,000 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 the applicant.

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

Note on applicants with a “high risk” designation: Risks associated with DOJ High Risk Grantees, or applicants designated as “high risk” by a federal grant-making agency outside of DOJ, are taken into account during the review process, and each applicant with such “high risk” designations will be considered for funding on a case-by-case basis, depending on the nature and severity of the issues that led to the DOJ High Risk Grantee (or non-DOJ high risk) designation, status of progress in addressing corrective actions, and expected ability to manage grant funds and achieve grant goals and objectives. A “high risk” designated applicant is to submit disclosure and justification documentation consistent with the requirements specified, above, under “What an Application Should Include” in Section C. Application and Submission Information.

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, 2019. OJP sends award notifications by email through GMS to the individuals listed in the application as the point of contact and the authorizing official (E-Biz POC and AOR). The email notification includes detailed instructions on how to access and view the award documents, and steps to take in GMS to start the award acceptance process. GMS automatically issues the notifications at 9:00 p.m. eastern time on the award date.

For each successful applicant, an individual with the necessary authority to bind the applicant will be required to log in; execute a set of legal certifications and a set of legal assurances; designate a financial point of contact; thoroughly review the award, including all award conditions; and sign and accept the award. The award acceptance process requires a physical signature on the award document by the authorized representative. The fully executed award document must then be scanned and submitted 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 and regulations (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.

Awards under this solicitation will include a condition (the specific terms of which will govern the award) related to verification of employment eligibility. The condition will, generally speaking, require the recipient (and any subrecipient) that accepts the award to verify the employment eligibility of any individual hired under the award, consonant with 8 U.S.C. § 1324a(1).

Awards under this solicitation will include a condition (the specific terms of which will govern the award) related to competition requirements set forth at 2 C.F.R. § 200.319. The condition will, generally speaking, prohibit recipients (and any subrecipients) from procuring goods and services with award funds by means of any competition that disadvantages or excludes vendors on the basis of their having (or their having had) a prior or existing contractual relationship with the federal government.

Applicants should consult the "[Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2018 Awards](https://ojp.gov/funding/index.htm)," available in the OJP Funding Resource Center at <https://ojp.gov/funding/index.htm>. 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. (An applicant is not required to submit these documents as part of an application.)

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

The webpages accessible through the "[Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2018 Awards](https://ojp.gov/funding/index.htm)" 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 2019. Individual OJP awards typically also will include additional award conditions. Those additional conditions may relate to the particular statute or program, or solicitation under which the award is made; to the substance of the funded application; to the recipient's performance under other federal awards; to the recipient's legal status (e.g., as a for-profit entity); or to other pertinent considerations.

As stated above, BJA expects that it will make any award under this solicitation in the form of a cooperative agreement. Cooperative agreements include a condition in the award document that sets out the nature of the "substantial federal involvement" in carrying out the award and program. Generally stated, under OJP cooperative agreement awards, 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 substantive coordination of technical efforts and site selection, as well as review and approval of project work plans, research designs, data collection instruments, and major project-generated materials. In addition, OJP often indicates in the award terms and conditions that it may redirect the project if necessary.

In addition to an award condition that sets out the nature of the anticipated "substantial federal involvement" in the award, cooperative agreements awarded by OJP include an award condition that requires specific reporting in connection with conferences, meetings, retreats, seminars, symposia, training activities, or similar events funded under the award.

General Information about Post-federal Award Reporting Requirements

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

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

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

Data on performance measures. In addition to required reports, each award recipient also must provide data that measure the results of the work done under the award. To demonstrate program progress and success, as well as to assist DOJ in fulfilling its responsibilities under the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA), Public Law 103-62, and the GPRA Modernization Act of 2010, Public Law 111-352, OJP will require any award recipient, post award, to provide performance data as part of regular progress reporting. Successful applicants will be required to access OJP's performance measurement page at www.ojp.gov/performance for an overview of performance measurement activities at OJP. Performance measures are also listed as [Appendix A](#).

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 the applicant/recipient believes falls under a FOIA exemption, the specific exemption it believes applies, and why. After considering the submission by the applicant/recipient, OJP makes an independent assessment regarding withholding information. OJP generally follows a similar process for requests pursuant to FOIA for applications that may contain law-enforcement sensitive information.

Provide Feedback to OJP

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

IMPORTANT: This email is for feedback and suggestions only. OJP does **not** reply 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 email listed on the front of this 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 ojprsupport@usdoj.gov. (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 have submitted an application.

Appendix A: Performance Measures Table

Below are the performance measures for this solicitation:

Objectives	Performance Measure	Data Grantee Provides
Objective 1: Provide training to effectively reduce the number of untested and unsubmitted SAKs in a jurisdiction's custody and improve the quality of sexual assault investigations, prosecutions, and victim support by training investigators and prosecutors on topics related to forensics, victim engagement and response, and investigation and prosecution best practices.	Number of trainings conducted	Number of trainings (by type): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In-person • Web-based • CD/DVD • Peer-to-peer • Workshop
	Number of participants who attended the training	Number of individuals who: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attended the training (in-person) or started the training (web-based) • Completed the training • Completed an evaluation at the conclusion of the training • Completed an evaluation and rated the training as satisfactory or better • Completed the post-test with an improved score over their pre-test
	Percentage of participants who successfully completed the training	
	Percentage of participants who rated the training as satisfactory or better	
	Percentage of participants trained who subsequently demonstrated performance improvement	
Percentage of scholarship recipients surveyed who reported that the training provided information that could be utilized in their job	Number of individuals who: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Received a scholarship • Completed the training • Completed a survey at the 	

Objectives	Performance Measure	Data Grantee Provides
		conclusion of the training <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reported the training provided information that could be utilized in their job
	Number of curricula developed	Number of training curricula: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developed • Pilot tested • Revised after being pilot tested
	Number of curricula that were pilot tested	
	Percentage of curricula that were revised after pilot testing	
Objective 2: Provide technical assistance to SAKI grantees and other jurisdictions to reduce the number of unsubmitted and untested SAKs in their possession and facilitate comprehensive sexual assault response reform.	Percentage of requesting agencies that 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 that completed an evaluation of services • Number of agencies that rated the services as 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 recommendations 6 months after the onsite visit
Objective 3: Facilitate peer- to-peer exchanges to assist SAKI grantees and other jurisdictions in	Percentage of peer visitors who reported that the visit to the other	

Objectives	Performance Measure	Data Grantee Provides
implementing best practices in SAK testing and sexual assault response reform.	agency was useful in providing information on policies or practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of peer visitors who completed an evaluation • Number of peer visitors who reported that the visit was useful in providing information on policies or practices • Number of follow-ups with the requesting peer visitor completed 6 months after the peer-to-peer visit • Number of peer visitors who were planning to implement at least one or more recommendations 6 months after the onsite visit
	Percentage of peer visitors who were planning to implement one or more policies or practices 6 months after they were observed at the visited site	
	Percentage of requesting agencies of other onsite services that rated the services provided as satisfactory or better	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of other onsite services provided • Number of requesting agencies that completed an evaluation of other onsite services • Number of agencies that rated the services as satisfactory or better
Objective 4: Increase information provided to BJA and the criminal justice community.	Number of conferences or advisory/focus groups held	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of conferences or advisory/focus groups held • Number of conference or advisory/focus group attendees who completed an evaluation • Number of conference or advisory/focus group attendees who rated the advisory/focus
	Percentage of advisory/focus groups evaluated as satisfactory or better	

Objectives	Performance Measure	Data Grantee Provides
		group as satisfactory or better
	Number of publications developed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of publications/resources developed
	Number of publications disseminated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of publications/resources disseminated
	Percentage of websites developed and maintained	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of websites developed • Number of websites maintained
	Percentage increase in the number of visits to websites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of visits to websites during the current reporting period • Number of visits to websites during the previous reporting period
Percentage of information requests responded to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of information requests • Number of information requests responded to 	

Appendix B: Application Checklist
FY 2019 The Sexual Assault Kit Initiative: National Training and Technical Assistance

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

What an Applicant Should Do:

Prior to Registering in Grants.gov:

- _____ Acquire a DUNS Number (see page 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)
- _____ Access Funding Opportunity and Application Package (see page 30)
- _____ Sign up for Grants.gov email notifications (optional) (see page 21)
- _____ Read [Important Notice: Applying for Grants in Grants.gov](#)

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

- _____ (1) application has been received,
- _____ (2) application has either been successfully validated or rejected with errors (see page 30)

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

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

Overview of Post-Award Legal Requirements:

- _____ Review the ["Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2018 Awards"](#) in the OJP Funding Resource Center at <https://ojp.gov/funding/index.htm>.

Scope Requirement:

- _____ The federal amount requested is within the allowable limit(s) of \$6 million.

Eligibility Requirement: For-profit organizations, nonprofit organizations (including tribal nonprofit or for-profit organizations), faith-based and community organizations, institutions of higher education (including tribal institutions of higher education), and consortiums with demonstrated experience providing national and local-level training and technical assistance.

What an Application Should Include:

- _____ Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424) (see page 16)
- _____ Project Abstract (see page 17)
- _____ *Program Narrative (see page 17)
- _____ *Budget Detail Worksheet (see page 19)
- _____ *Budget Narrative (see page 19)
- _____ Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable) (see page 21)

- _____ Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable) (see page 22)
- _____ Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire (see page 22)
- _____ [Disclosure of Lobbying Activities \(SF-LLL\)](#) (see page 23)
- _____ Additional Attachments
 - _____ Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications (see page 23)
 - _____ Applicant Disclosure and Justification – DOJ High Risk Grantees (if applicable) (See page 24)
 - _____ Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity (see page 25)
 - _____ Disclosure of Process related to Executive Compensation (see page 27)

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