The U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), Office of Justice Programs (OJP), Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) is seeking applications for the Smart Policing Initiative. This program furthers the Department’s mission by assisting state and local jurisdictions in reducing crime and improving the functioning of the criminal justice system, specifically through support for evidence-based policing.

Smart Policing Initiative
FY 2017 Competitive Grant Announcement
Applications Due: January 26, 2017

Eligibility

Eligible applicants are limited to state, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies, as well as governmental non-law enforcement agencies, or tribal consortia consisting of two or more federally recognized Indian tribes (including tribal consortia operated as nonprofit organizations) acting as a fiscal agent for one or more law enforcement agencies.

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

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

Deadline

Applicants must register with Grants.gov prior to submitting an application. All applications are due by 11:59 p.m. eastern time on January 26, 2017.

To be considered timely, an application must be submitted by the application deadline using Grants.gov, and the applicant must have received a validation message from Grants.gov that

¹ For additional information on subawards, see “Budget and Associated Documentation” under Section D, Application and Submission Information.
indicates successful and timely submission. OJP urges applicants to submit applications at least 72 hours prior to the application due date, in order to allow time for the applicant to receive validation messages or rejection notifications from Grants.gov, and to correct in a timely fashion any problems that may have caused a rejection notification.

OJP encourages all applicants to read this Important Notice: Applying for Grants in Grants.gov.

For additional information, see How To Apply in Section D. Application and Submission Information.

Contact Information

For technical assistance with submitting an application, contact the Grants.gov Customer Support Hotline at 800-518-4726 or 606-545-5035, or via email to support@grants.gov. The Grants.gov Support Hotline operates 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, except on federal holidays.

An applicant that experiences unforeseen Grants.gov technical issues beyond its control that prevent it from submitting its application by the deadline may email the contact identified below within 24 hours after the application deadline to request approval to submit its application. Additional information on reporting technical issues appears under “Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues” in the How to Apply section.

For assistance with any other requirements of this solicitation, contact the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS) Response Center: toll-free at 800-851-3420; via TTY at 301-240-6310 (hearing impaired only); email grants@ncjrs.gov; fax to 301-240-5830; or web chat at https://webcontact.ncjrs.gov/ncjchat/chat.jsp. The NCJRS Response Center hours of operation are 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. eastern time, Monday through Friday, and 10:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. eastern time on the solicitation close date.

Grants.gov number assigned to this announcement: BJA-2017-11403

Release date: December 7, 2016
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A. Program Description

Overview
BJA’s “Smart Suite” of programs invest in the development of practitioner-researcher partnerships that use data, evidence, and innovation to create strategies and interventions that are effective and economical. This data-driven approach enables jurisdictions to understand the full nature and extent of the crime challenges they are facing and to target resources to the highest priorities. The Smart Suite of programs, which includes the Smart Policing Initiative (SPI), represents a strategic approach that brings more “science” into criminal justice operations by leveraging innovative applications of analysis, technology, and evidence-based practices with the goal of improving performance and effectiveness while containing costs. Jurisdictions that receive funding through a Smart Suite Program are eligible and encouraged to attend BJA’s Smart Suite Academy, which provides expert instruction to grantees on how to establish successful practitioner-researcher partnerships.

As part of BJA’s Smart Suite, the fiscal year (FY) 2017 SPI grant program seeks to build upon analysis-driven, evidence-based policing by encouraging state, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies to develop effective and innovative responses to crime within their jurisdictions. Recipients of funding under this grant program will test promising practices and implement evidence-based interventions to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of police agencies’ processes and procedures and establish sustainable partnerships with researchers to evaluate their effectiveness. All awards are subject to the availability of appropriated funds and to any modifications or additional requirements that may be imposed by law.

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

Program-Specific Information
The nation’s current policing environment is prompting law enforcement agencies across the country to change the tactics and strategies they use to respond to pressing and chronic public safety issues. Concurrently, many law enforcement agencies are confronting increases in crime and violence within their jurisdictions, and are doing so with limited resources. To successfully confront these challenges, jurisdictions require problem-solving approaches that are data-driven, evidence-based, effective, and efficient. Promising approaches—which are defined as having the potential to reduce crime, increase case closure rates and agency efficiency, and improve relationships with communities served—must be evaluated and the results shared with the law enforcement community to increase the field’s understanding and use of evidence-based crime reduction methods. The goal of SPI is to identify, support, and test these promising tactics, practices, and strategies as well as explore new, unique solutions to public safety problems. SPI documents the resulting empirically tested best practices and lessons learned, and widely disseminates them to the policing community to encourage the adoption of innovative and effective policing strategies nationwide.
Through SPI, BJA provides resources, training, and technical assistance to enable police agencies to identify and define their most pressing crime problems and institute lasting cultural and organizational changes that foster reliance on and effective use of evidence-based practices, data, and technology to address those problems. Applicants to SPI must enlist a specific individual or team of individuals to serve as the law enforcement agency’s research partner to inform and evaluate their proposed intervention, as well as use the SARA (Scanning, Analysis, Response, and Assessment) model to identify and analyze their selected law enforcement challenge and formulate their response. Since 2009, BJA has awarded SPI grants to 51 law enforcement agencies throughout the United States under national competitive solicitations. These agencies were selected to create a portfolio that is diverse in terms of organizational size, as well as the type of crime problems, or agency challenges they proposed to address.

Examples of previous SPI project outcomes are as follows:

- In Boston, Massachusetts, the Boston Police Department (BPD) engaged in a problem-oriented policing process to improve its homicide investigation processes and practices that resulted in a significant increase in its homicide clearance rate.
- In Los Angeles, California, the Los Angeles Police Department responded to a rise in violent crime by establishing a Community Safety Operations Center (CSOC) and strategically deploying crime analysts, investigators, and officers to the most violent areas of the city.
- In Palm Beach County, Florida, strategic efforts to respond to robbery victimization and cultivate trust and collaboration with the county’s Guatemalan immigrant community resulted in increased trust and satisfaction with police as well as decreases in robbery victimization.
- In Phoenix, Arizona, police officers who used body-worn cameras (BWC) experienced a significant reduction in citizen complaints, and BWC use was found to increase the likelihood of domestic violence incidents being charged and successfully prosecuted.
- In Kansas City, Missouri, the Kansas City Police Department planned and implemented a comprehensive focused deterrence strategy, which was associated with a 40 percent decrease in homicides and 19 percent decrease in gun-related aggravated assaults.

BJA believes that several core elements must be in place to support a successful Smart Policing Initiative project. These include strong executive support for the project within the law enforcement agency; sophisticated problem and data analysis efforts; the incorporation of the research partner in all aspects of the initiative; the regular dissemination of information and updates about the SPI project’s progress within the law enforcement agency to increase knowledge of the value of research and evidenced-based practices at all levels of the organization; and a commitment to making organizational and operational changes to sustain the strategies found to be successful as measured by the project’s evaluation. In addition, experiences of current and former SPI sites highlight the pressing need to engage members of their communities as allies in preventing and reducing crime. Under SPI, police agencies are strongly encouraged to establish innovative and effective working relationships with citizens and community leaders to gain support for their proposed policing initiatives. Agencies are also expected to leverage data from other criminal justice entities—such as corrections, parole, probation, and prosecution agencies—to inform their investigative activities and aid in the identification of criminal networks that impact public safety. Should an SPI project’s evaluation measure that a given intervention or strategy is effective, BJA expects the SPI-supported law
enforcement agency to sustain those successful practices and approaches after the federal funding support of the SPI project ends.

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

The involvement of a research partner is indispensable to a successful SPI project, and it is important that law enforcement agencies consider the following when choosing partner candidates or organizations for the position. Deviation from these specifications will require justification before an SPI grant award is made. Research partners should have:

- Policy, program, action research, or organization evaluation experience, preferably in policing or in the justice system.
- Previous experience working with police agencies and/or organizations.
- Experience in several different data collection methodologies, and in both quantitative and qualitative research methods. It is preferable that they have several years of evaluation research experience and have experience with oral and written presentations of research results.
- Extensive knowledge of evaluation methods.

Applicants are expected to devote at least 20 percent of the project budget to support the evaluation component of their initiative. The provision of appropriate resources for the selected research partner is crucial to project success, as they are expected to play a critical role in the project’s data collection and analysis, problem assessment, strategy development, and evaluation processes. The research partner must be identified by name(s) and institutional affiliation in the application, and can be an independent consultant or located in an academic institution, a state Statistical Analysis Center, or a research organization. The research partner should have demonstrated expertise conducting the type of work proposed.

Applicants should note that BJA may give priority selection consideration to those jurisdictions that have not received SPI funding support in previous fiscal years.

For more information on SPI and the Smart Suite, go to https://www.bja.gov/programs/crppe/index.html. Information on SPI agency participants and resources may also be found at www.smartpolicinginitiative.com. For additional information about identifying and working with a research partner, please see http://www.psnmsu.com/documents/ResearchPartnerQ&A.pdf

**Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables**
The purpose of SPI is to support state, local, and tribal jurisdictions’ implementation and evaluation of unique approaches to chronic crime problems, emerging crime problems, or barriers to police agencies’ ability to address such problems. BJA is seeking innovative applications from state, local, or tribal law enforcement agencies (or other governmental agencies serving as fiscal agents) that propose to:
• Test, establish and/or expand innovative new ideas and evidence-based programming in police agencies to increase their ability to effectively and sustainably prevent and respond to crime.
• Establish sustainable research partnerships that are integrated into the strategic and tactical operations of police agencies.
• Foster effective and consistent collaborations within police agencies, with external agencies, and with the communities in which they serve to increase public safety.
• Use technology, intelligence, and data in innovative ways that enable police agencies to focus resources on the people and places associated with high concentrations of criminal behavior and crime.
• Advance the state of policing practice and science for the benefit of the entire field through dissemination of promising practices and evaluation findings.

This program’s required deliverables are:

• An action plan that is produced by the grantee agency at the outset of each project, which includes the project’s problem analysis, logic model, summary of strategies and intended outcomes, and research base for proposed strategies. The action plan is envisioned as a product of collaboration among the supervision agency, research partner, and technical assistance provider. For more information about the required action plan, see page 10.
• Periodic reports, presentations, briefings for the task force/implementation team that complement performance data collected and show continued deployment of the problem-solving process.
• A final analysis report of the project’s implementation and outcomes produced by the law enforcement agency’s research partner and submitted to BJA at the conclusion of the project.

BJA encourages all applicants to consider the Final Report of the President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing when developing innovative programs, which may be found here.

Applicants may submit an application under one of the following purpose areas:

**PURPOSE AREA 1: SMART POLICING INNOVATION. Competition ID: BJA-2017-11404**

Applications are solicited from state, local, or tribal law enforcement agencies interested in developing innovative, data-driven approaches to challenges currently confronting law enforcement agencies. Applicants will:

• Describe the innovative, data-driven approach to be implemented.
• Enlist a qualified research partner to evaluate the effectiveness of the approach.
• Identify a specific policing issue to address.
• Develop a prevention/mitigation/response strategy to address the problem.

---

2 As defined in this solicitation, the research partner can be an independent consultant, or located in an academic institution, a state Statistical Analysis Center, or a research organization. The research partner should have demonstrated expertise conducting the type of work proposed. For more information related to research partner qualifications and selection, please see the elements listed under the selection criteria for capabilities and competencies on page 30 of this solicitation as well as the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) provided at the following link: [http://www.psnmsu.com/documents/ResearchPartnerQ&A.pdf](http://www.psnmsu.com/documents/ResearchPartnerQ&A.pdf)
• Evaluate the initiative.
• Assess and report the results to BJA, who will make the results publicly available.

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

Applicants are strongly encouraged to focus on issues likely to be confronted by other law enforcement agencies in the United States. Examples of such issues include but are not limited to:

• Effective prevention and response approaches to prescription and/or illegal drug overdose and deaths.
• The use of predictive analytics and approaches to address crime.
• Innovative approaches to engaging youth in crime prevention and reduction efforts.
• Innovative roles for law enforcement agencies in offender reentry initiatives.
• Effective approaches to increasing analytical capacity and evidence-based programming within a law enforcement agency.
• Innovative approaches to reducing chronic violent crime in a specific community.
• Innovative approaches to using alternatives to arrest for low-risk offenders, or offenders with substance use or mental health disorders.
• Law enforcement-led initiatives to address quality-of-life issues in the community.
• Institutionalization of evidence-based policies, procedures, tactics, and strategies throughout a law enforcement organization.

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

PURPOSE AREA 2: RESPONDING TO PRECIPITOUS INCREASES IN CRIME. Competition ID: BJA-2017-11405

Applications are solicited from state, local, or tribal law enforcement agencies that are experiencing precipitous or extraordinary increases in crime, or in a type or types of crime within their jurisdictions, and propose to launch and test interventions that directly respond to these crime increases. Of particular interest to BJA are projects that propose to examine and respond to increases in violent crime and/or property crime. In order to be considered for an award under this purpose area, applicants must clearly identify how the applied-for funding will directly address a precipitous or extraordinary increase in crime or in a type or types of crime in the applicant’s own jurisdiction. Applicants will:

• Identify a crime or types of crime that have precipitously increased within the jurisdiction, identify the period of time during which the relevant category of crime increased, and provide evidence substantiating the claimed increase. Examples of such evidence include statistics, research findings, or other objective evidence as appropriate.
• Describe the evidence-based and data-driven approach to be implemented to halt the identified crime’s increase and drive its reduction.
• Enlist a qualified research partner to evaluate the effectiveness of the approach.
• Develop a comprehensive response strategy to reduce and prevent the identified crime.
• Evaluate the initiative.
• Assess and report the results to BJA, who will make the results publicly available.
The evaluation design must include outcome measures capable of informing a credible assessment of the effectiveness of the intervention(s). Applications not including such measures will not be awarded.

If an application fails to substantiate the crime increase occurred, the application may be rejected for that reason alone.

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

**Evidence-Based Programs or Practices**

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

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

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

For examples of research on police and crime reduction, view the George Mason University’s Evidence-Based Policing Matrix®, available at [http://cebcp.org/evidence-based-policing/the-matrix](http://cebcp.org/evidence-based-policing/the-matrix). The Matrix is a research-to-practice translation tool that categorizes and visualizes all experimental and quasi-experimental research on police and crime reduction.

**B. Federal Award Information**

BJA estimates that it will make up to seven awards of up to $700,000 each for an estimated total of $4.4 million for a 36-month period of performance, beginning on October 1, 2017, dependent on available appropriations.

BJA may, in certain cases, provide additional funding in future years to awards under this solicitation, through supplemental awards. In making decisions regarding supplemental awards, OJP will consider, among other factors, the availability of appropriations, OJP’s strategic priorities, and OJP’s assessment of both the management of the award (for example, timeliness and quality of progress reports), and the progress of the work funded under the award.
All awards are subject to the availability of appropriated funds and to any modifications or additional requirements that may be imposed by law.

**Award Special Condition**

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

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

The remaining funds will be released to each grantee only after BJA approves an acceptable action plan.

**Type of Award**

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

**Financial Management and System of Internal Controls**

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

---

3 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.

4 The "Part 200 Uniform Requirements" means the DOJ regulation at 2 C.F.R Part 2800, which adopts (with certain modifications) the provisions of 2 C.F.R. Part 200.
(b) Comply with Federal statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of the Federal awards.

(c) Evaluate and monitor [the recipient’s (and any subrecipient’s)] compliance with statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of Federal awards.

(d) Take prompt action when instances of noncompliance are identified including noncompliance identified in audit findings.

(e) Take reasonable measures to safeguard protected personally identifiable information and other information the Federal awarding agency or pass-through entity designates as sensitive or [the recipient (or any subrecipient)] considers sensitive consistent with applicable Federal, state, local, and tribal laws regarding privacy and obligations of confidentiality.

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

Budget Information

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

Pre-Agreement Costs (also known as Pre-award Costs)
Pre-agreement costs are costs incurred by the applicant prior to the start date of the period of performance of the grant award.

OJP does not typically approve pre-agreement costs; an applicant must request and obtain the prior written approval of OJP for all such costs. All such costs incurred prior to award and prior to approval of the costs are incurred at the sole risk of the applicant. (Generally, no applicant should incur project costs before submitting an application requesting federal funding for those costs.) Should there be extenuating circumstances that make it appropriate for OJP to consider approving pre-agreement costs, the applicant may contact the point of contact listed on the title page of this solicitation for the requirements concerning written requests for approval. If approved in advance by OJP, award funds may be used for pre-agreement costs, consistent with the recipient’s approved budget and applicable cost principles. See the section on Costs Requiring Prior Approval in the DOJ Grants Financial Guide for more information.

Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver
With respect to any award of more than $250,000 made under this solicitation, a recipient may not use federal funds to pay total cash compensation (salary plus cash bonuses) to any employee of the recipient at a rate that exceeds 110% of the maximum annual salary payable to a member of the federal government’s Senior Executive Service (SES) at an agency with a Certified SES Performance Appraisal System for that year.5 The 2017 salary table for SES employees is available at the Office of Personnel Management website. Note: A recipient may

5 OJP does not apply this limitation on the use of award funds to the nonprofit organizations listed in Appendix VIII to 2 C.F.R. Part 200.
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 to review carefully—before submitting an application—the OJP and DOJ policy and guidance on approval, planning, and reporting of such events available at www.ojp.gov/financialguide/DOJ/PostawardRequirements/chapter3.10a.htm. OJP policy and guidance (1) encourage minimization of conference, meeting, and training costs; (2) require prior written approval (which may affect project timelines) of most conference, meeting, and training costs for cooperative agreement recipients, 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 2017 Awards" in the OJP Funding Resource Center.

C. Eligibility Information

For eligibility information, see the title page.

For information on cost sharing or match requirements, see Section B. Federal Award Information.
D. Application and Submission Information

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

Moreover, an applicant should anticipate that an application that OJP determines to be 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, and Budget Narrative. An applicant may combine the Budget Narrative and the Budget Detail Worksheet in one document. However, if an applicant submits only one budget document, it must contain both narrative and detail information. Please review the “Note on File Names and File Types” under How to Apply (below) to be sure applications are submitted in permitted formats.

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

1. Information to Complete the Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424)
The SF-424 is a required standard form used as a cover sheet for submission of pre-applications, applications, and related information. Grants.gov and the OJP Grants Management System (GMS) take information from the applicant’s profile to populate the fields on this form. When selecting “type of applicant,” if the applicant is a for-profit entity, select “For-Profit Organization” or “Small Business” (as applicable).

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

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

Intergovernmental Review:
This solicitation (“funding opportunity”) is subject to Executive Order 12372. An applicant may find the names and addresses of State Single Points of Contact (SPOCs) at the following website: www.whitehouse.gov/omb/grants_spoc/. If the State appears on the
SPOC list, the applicant must contact the State SPOC to find out about, and comply with, the State’s process under E.O. 12372. In completing the SF-424, an applicant whose State appears on the SPOC list is to make the appropriate selection in response to question 19 once the applicant has complied with its State E.O. 12372 process. (An applicant whose State does not appear on the SPOC list should answer question 19 by selecting the response that the “Program is subject to E.O. 12372 but has not been selected by the State for review.”)

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

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

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

All project abstracts should follow the detailed template available at [ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/ProjectAbstractTemplate.pdf](http://ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/ProjectAbstractTemplate.pdf).

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

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

**Note:** OJP may choose not to list a project that otherwise would have been included in a listing of unfunded applications, should the abstract fail to meet the format and content requirements noted above and outlined in the project abstract template.

3. **Program Narrative**
The program narrative must respond to the solicitation (see Program-Specific Information on pages 4–6) and the Review Criteria (see pages 29–31) in the order given. 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 10 pages. Number pages “1 of 10,” “2 of 10,” etc.

If the program narrative fails to comply with these length-related restrictions, BJA may consider such noncompliance in peer review and in final award decisions.
The following sections should be included as part of the program narrative:

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

To demonstrate program progress and success, as well as to assist the Department with fulfilling its responsibilities under the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA), Public Law 103-62, and the GPRA Modernization Act of 2010, Public Law 111–352, applicants that receive funding under this solicitation must regularly provide data that measure the results of their work done under this solicitation. OJP will require any award recipient, post award, to submit quarterly performance metrics through BJA’s online Performance Measurement Tool (PMT), located at www.bjaperformancetools.org. The following measures are a sampling of the core performance measures for the Smart Policing Initiative, but applicants should examine the complete list at: https://www.bjaperformancetools.org/help/SPI_Questionnaire_Jun_16.pdf. The performance measures correlate to the goals, objectives, and deliverables identified under "Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables" in Section A. Program Description.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Catalog ID</th>
<th>Performance Measure(s)</th>
<th>Data Grantee Provides</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test, establish and/or expand innovative new ideas and evidence-based programming in police agencies to increase their ability to effectively and sustainably prevent and respond to crime.</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Percent of grantees adopting policies because of SPI</td>
<td>Baseline: Data provided by BJA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>List of policies/procedures adopted because of SPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Percent of grantees integrating SPI into their organization’s daily activities</td>
<td>Baseline: Data provided by BJA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>List of meetings, training, or other events where SPI was discussed/used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>393</td>
<td>Number of personnel who received training</td>
<td>Number of personnel who received training by training area and personnel type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline: Data provided by BJA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>512</td>
<td>Percent of grantees reporting positive impact of program</td>
<td>List of quantitative measures tracked to determine impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of grantees reporting a negative impact of program</td>
<td>Impact of response on problem area of focus (positive, negative, or neutral)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of grantees reporting a neutral impact of program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
| Establish sustainable research partnerships that are integrated into the strategic and tactical operations of police agencies. | 34 | Percent of grantees that are actively involved with their research partner | Baseline: Data provided by BJA
Research partner’s level of active involvement rated on a 1-5 scale
List of activities performed by research partner in support of the program |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>Percent change in number of reports/products provided by researcher</td>
<td>Number of products provided by research partner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 635 | Change in the number of analytical staff | Baseline: Number of personnel by type at start of SPI program
Number of crime analysts (full and part time) created/added
Number of crime analysts (full and part time) assigned to the program |
| Foster effective and consistent collaborations within police agencies, with external agencies, and with the communities in which they serve to increase public safety. | 243 | Change in number/type of working group partners | List of working group partners |
| 146 | Percent of grantees holding partnership meetings | Baseline: Data provided by BJA
Number of partnership meetings |
| 242 | Percent of grantees with partners that are actively involved in the program | Baseline: Data provided by BJA
Partner’s level of active involvement rated on a 1-5 scale |
| 141 | Percent of grantees that are involved in community events | Baseline: Data provided by BJA
List of community meetings, events, or outreach efforts |
| Use technology, intelligence, and data in innovative ways that enable police agencies to focus resources on the people and places associated with high concentrations of criminal behavior and crime. | 630 | Percent of grantees using data to inform project activities | Baseline: Data provided by BJA
List of data types used in analysis
List of project activities informed by data analysis |
| 611 | Percent of grantees utilizing evidence-based responses | Baseline: Data provided by BJA
List of evidence-based models supporting response activities |
| Advance the state of policing practice and science for the benefit of the entire field through dissemination of promising practices and evaluation findings. | 636 | Percent of grantees disseminating SPI products/information outside of organization | Baseline: Data provided by BJA
List of conferences attended by researcher
List of presentation made by researcher
List of intended future uses for completed assessment/evaluation |
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” web page of the "Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2017," available through the OJP Funding Resource Center. Every prospective applicant whose application may propose a research or statistical component also should review the “Data Privacy and Confidentiality Requirements” section on that web page.

e. Sustainability Planning

4. Budget and Associated Documentation

a. Budget Detail Worksheet

A sample Budget Detail Worksheet can be found at http://ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/BudgetDetailWorksheet.pdf. An applicant that submits its budget in a different format should include the budget categories listed in the sample budget worksheet. The Budget Detail Worksheet should break out costs by year.

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

b. Budget Narrative

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. Information on proposed subawards

A recipient of an OJP award may not make subawards (“subgrants”) unless the recipient has specific federal authorization to do so. Unless an applicable statute or DOJ regulation specifically authorizes (or requires) subawards, a recipient must have authorization from OJP before it may make a subaward.
A particular subaward may be authorized by OJP because the recipient included a sufficiently-detailed description and justification of the proposed subaward in the application as approved by OJP. If, however, a particular subaward is not authorized by federal statute or regulation, and is not sufficiently described and justified in the application as approved by OJP, the recipient will be required, post-award, to request and obtain written authorization from OJP before it may make the subaward.

If an applicant proposes to make one or more subawards to carry out the federal award and program, the applicant should (1) identify (if known) the proposed subrecipient(s), (2) describe in detail what each subrecipient will do to carry out the federal award and federal program, and (3) provide a justification for the subaward(s), with details on pertinent matters such as special qualifications and areas of expertise. Pertinent information on subawards should appear not only in the Program Narrative, but also in the Budget Detail Worksheet and budget narrative.

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

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

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

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

d. Pre-Agreement Costs
For information on pre-agreement costs, see Section B. Federal Award Information.

5. Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable)
Indirect costs may be charged to an award only if:

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

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

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

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

6. **Tribal Authorizing Resolution (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* applicant (other than an individual applying in his/her personal capacity) is to download, complete, and submit the OJP Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire, as part of its application.

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

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

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

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

9. Additional Attachments

a. Timeline
Attach a project timeline that includes each project goal, related objective, activity, expected completion date, and responsible person or organization.

b. Letter of Support from Chief Executive of the Law Enforcement Agency
Attach a letter of support signed by the Chief Executive of the applicant law enforcement agency that states their support of the project.

c. Résumés
Attach the résumés of key project staff and the identified research partner(s).

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

OJP seeks this information to help avoid any inappropriate duplication of funding. Leveraging multiple funding sources in a complementary manner to implement comprehensive programs or projects is encouraged and is not seen as inappropriate duplication.
Each applicant that has one or more pending applications as described above is to provide the following information about pending applications submitted within the last 12 months:

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

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

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

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

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 this proposed research and/or evaluation, and any current or prior related projects.

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

i. For purposes of this solicitation, each applicant is to document research and evaluation independence and integrity by including one of the following two items:

a. A specific assurance that the applicant has reviewed its application to identify any actual or potential apparent conflicts of interest (including through review of pertinent information on the principal investigator, any co-principal investigators, and any subrecipients), and that the applicant has identified no such conflicts of interest – whether personal or financial or organizational
(including on the part of the applicant entity or on the part of staff, investigators, or subrecipients) – that could affect the independence or integrity of the research, including the design, conduct, and reporting of the research.

OR

b. A specific description of actual or potential apparent conflicts of interest that the applicant has identified – including through review of pertinent information on the principal investigator, any co-principal investigators, and any subrecipients – that could affect the independence or integrity of the research, including the design, conduct, or reporting of the research. These conflicts may be personal (e.g., on the part of investigators or other staff), financial, or organizational (related to the applicant or any subrecipient entity). Some examples of potential investigator (or other personal) conflict situations are those in which an investigator would be in a position to evaluate a spouse’s work product (actual conflict), or an investigator would be in a position to evaluate the work of a former or current colleague (potential apparent conflict). With regard to potential organizational conflicts of interest, as one example, generally an organization would not be given an award to evaluate a project, if that organization had itself provided substantial prior technical assistance to that specific project or a location implementing the project (whether funded by OJP or other sources), because the organization in such an instance might appear to be evaluating the effectiveness of its own prior work. The key is whether a reasonable person understanding all of the facts would be able to have confidence that the results of any research or evaluation project are objective and reliable. Any outside personal or financial interest that casts doubt on that objectivity and reliability of an evaluation or research product is a problem and must be disclosed.

ii. In addition, for purposes of this solicitation, each applicant is to address possible mitigation of research integrity concerns by including, at a minimum, one of the following two items:

a. If an applicant reasonably believes that no actual or potential apparent conflicts of interest (personal, financial, or organizational) exist, then the applicant should provide a brief narrative explanation of how and why it reached that conclusion. The applicant also is to include an explanation of the specific processes and procedures that the applicant has in place, or will put in place, to identify and prevent (or, at the very least, mitigate) any such conflicts of interest pertinent to the funded project during the period of performance. Documentation that may be helpful in this regard may include organizational codes of ethics/conduct and policies regarding organizational, personal, and financial conflicts of interest. There is no guarantee that the plan, if any, will be accepted as proposed.

OR

b. If the applicant has identified actual or potential apparent conflicts of interest (personal, financial, or organizational) that could affect the independence and integrity of the research, including the design, conduct, or reporting of the
research, the applicant must is to provide a specific and robust mitigation plan to address each of those conflicts. At a minimum, the applicant is expected to explain the specific processes and procedures that the applicant has in place, or will put in place, to identify and eliminate (or, at the very least, mitigate) any such conflicts of interest pertinent to the funded project during the period of performance. Documentation that may be helpful in this regard may include organizational codes of ethics/conduct and policies regarding organizational, personal, and financial conflicts of interest. There is no guarantee that the plan, if any, will be accepted as proposed.

OJP will assess research and evaluation independence and integrity based on considerations such as the adequacy of the applicant’s efforts to identify factors that could affect the objectivity or integrity of the proposed staff and/or the applicant entity (and any subrecipients) in carrying out the research, development, or evaluation activity; and the adequacy of the applicant’s existing or proposed remedies to control any such factors.

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 regulations with regard to its compensation decisions.

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

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

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

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

Applicant nonprofit organizations should note that following receipt of an appropriate request, OJP may be authorized or required by law to make information submitted to satisfy this requirement available for public inspection. Also, a recipient may be required to make a prompt supplemental disclosure after the award in certain circumstances (e.g., changes in the way the organization determines compensation).

How to Apply
Applicants must register in and submit applications through Grants.gov, a primary source to find federal funding opportunities and apply for funding. Find complete instructions on how to register and submit an application at [www.Grants.gov](http://www.Grants.gov). Applicants that experience technical difficulties during this process should call the Grants.gov Customer Support Hotline at 800-518-4726 or 606-545-5035, which operates 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, except on federal holidays.

Registering with Grants.gov is a one-time process; however, processing delays may occur, and it can take several weeks for first-time registrants to receive confirmation and a user password. OJP encourages applicants to register several weeks before the application submission deadline. In addition, OJP urges applicants to submit applications 72 hours prior to the application due date, in order to allow time for the applicant to receive validation messages or rejection notifications from Grants.gov, and to correct in a timely fashion any problems that may have caused a rejection notification.

OJP strongly encourages all prospective applicants to sign up for Grants.gov email notifications regarding this solicitation. If this solicitation is cancelled or modified, individuals who sign up with Grants.gov for updates will be automatically notified.

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

Note on Attachments. Grants.gov has two categories of files for attachments: mandatory and optional. OJP receives all files attached in both categories. Please ensure all required documents are attached in either Grants.gov category.

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

**GMS does not accept executable file types as application attachments.** These disallowed file types include, but are not limited to, the following extensions: " .com," " .bat," " .exe," " .vbs," " .cfg," " .dat," " .db," " .dbf," " .dll," " .ini," " .log," " .ora," " .sys," and " .zip." GMS may reject applications with files that use these extensions. It is important to allow time to change the type of file(s) if the application is rejected.

All applicants are required to complete the following steps:

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

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

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

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

   A DUNS number is a unique nine-digit identification number provided by the commercial company Dun and Bradstreet. This unique entity identifier is used for tracking purposes, and to validate address and point of contact information for applicants, recipients, and subrecipients. It will be used throughout the life cycle of an OJP award. Obtaining a DUNS number is a free, one-time activity. Call Dun and Bradstreet at 866-705-5711 to obtain a DUNS number or apply online at [www.dnb.com](http://www.dnb.com). A DUNS number is usually received within 1-2 business days.

2. **Acquire registration with the System for Award Management (SAM).** SAM is the repository for certain standard information about federal financial assistance applicants,
recipients, and subrecipients. All applicants for OJP awards (other than individuals) must maintain current registrations in the SAM database. An applicant must be registered in SAM to successfully register in Grants.gov. Each applicant must update or renew its SAM registration at least annually to maintain an active status. SAM registration and renewal can take as long as 10 business days to complete.

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

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

3. **Acquire an Authorized Organization Representative (AOR) and a Grants.gov username and password.** Complete the AOR profile on Grants.gov and create a username and password. 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 www.grants.gov/web/grants/register.html. Individuals registering with Grants.gov should go to http://www.grants.gov/web/grants/applicants/individual-registration.html.

4. **Acquire confirmation for the AOR from the E-Business Point of Contact (E-Biz POC).** The E-Biz POC at the applicant organization must log into Grants.gov to confirm the applicant organization’s AOR. The E-Biz POC will need the Marketing Partner Identification Number (MPIN) password obtained when registering with SAM to complete this step. Note that an organization can have more than one AOR.

5. **Search for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov.** Use the following identifying information when searching for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov. The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance number for this solicitation is 16.738, titled "Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program," and the funding opportunity number is BJA-2017-11403.

6. **Select the correct Competition ID.** Some OJP solicitations posted to Grants.gov contain multiple purpose areas, denoted by the individual Competition ID. If applying to a solicitation with multiple Competition IDs, select the appropriate Competition ID for the intended purpose area of the application.

   **Purpose Area 1** – BJA FY 17 Smart Policing Initiative: Smart Policing Innovation – Competition ID: BJA-2017-11404
   
   **Purpose Area 2** – BJA FY 17 Smart Policing Initiative: Responding to Precipitous Increases in Crime – Competition ID: BJA-2017-11405

7. **Submit a valid application consistent with this solicitation by following the directions in Grants.gov.** Within 24–48 hours after submitting the electronic application, the applicant should receive two notifications from Grants.gov. The first will confirm the receipt of the application. 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 January 26, 2017.

Click [here](#) for further details on DUNS, 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 may contact the Grants.gov Customer Support Hotline or the SAM Help Desk (Federal Service Desk) to report the technical issue and receive a tracking number. The applicant may email the BJA contact identified in the Contact Information section on page 2 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.** After OJP reviews the applicant’s request, and contacts the Grants.gov or SAM Help Desks to verify the reported technical issues, OJP will inform the applicant whether the request to submit a late application has been approved or denied. If OJP determines that the untimely application submission was due to the applicant’s failure to follow all required procedures, OJP will deny the applicant’s request to submit its application.

The following conditions generally are insufficient to justify late submissions:

- Failure to register in SAM or Grants.gov in sufficient time. (SAM registration and renewal can take as long as 10 business days to complete. The information transfer from SAM to Grants.gov can take up to 48 hours.)
- Failure to follow Grants.gov instructions on how to register and apply as posted on its website.
- Failure to follow each instruction in the OJP solicitation.
- Technical issues with the applicant’s computer or information technology environment, such as issues with firewalls or browser incompatibility.

**Notifications regarding known technical problems with Grants.gov, if any, are posted at the top of the OJP Funding Resource Center web page.**
E. Application Review Information

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

1. Statement of the Problem (20 percent)
For both purpose areas: Provide Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) and/or population served data and describe the crime challenges of the jurisdiction. Identify the specific crime problem the jurisdiction seeks to address. Describe the process used to assess, analyze, or determine the nature of the crime or type of crime problem. Applicants may also describe any existing partnerships with the academic/research community.

For Purpose Area 2: Provide data that supports the applicant jurisdiction’s claim to be experiencing a precipitous or extraordinary increase in crime, or in a type or types of crime, as required by this solicitation.

2. Project Design and Implementation (20 percent)
Describe project activities that are linked to meaningful and measurable outcomes. BJA expects agencies to obtain an SPI result—a plausible, scientifically-based finding that their approach had an effect on the chronic crime problem and/or organizational effectiveness.

Describe specifically how the project will accomplish expected outcomes by providing the goals, objectives, and performance measures applicable to the project. Include a comprehensive timeline (as an attachment) that identifies milestones, numerically lists deliverables, and indicates who is responsible for each activity.

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the proposed research partner and how the research partner is integrated into the SPI strategy. At a minimum, the research partner should assist in problem description and definition; participate in solution development; provide ongoing analysis, monitoring, and assessment of the solution(s) impact; and prepare a final report that thoroughly assesses the results of the project.

Describe and provide evidence of the types and quality of data sources available to the agency to enable the research partner to conduct appropriate analysis. For example:

- Does the agency have access to multiple sources of data (both internal and external to the agency) specific to the identified problem?
- Does the agency have the ability to integrate data from different sources?

Describe the development of a prevention/mitigation strategy to address the problem based on careful, thorough analysis based on the SARA model.

Describe how information and updates about the SPI project will be disseminated within the applicant agency throughout the life of the project. This dissemination strategy’s objectives must include increasing knowledge and understanding of the value of research and evidenced-based practice at all levels of the law enforcement organization and facilitating the sustained adoption of strategies and practices that the project’s evaluation determines to be successful.
3. Capabilities and Competencies (20 percent)
Fully describe the applicant’s capabilities to implement the project and the competencies of the staff assigned to the project. In addition, describe and demonstrate crime and criminal intelligence analysis capacity.

- Describe previous law enforcement activities that include research partners and report the results of those efforts.
- Describe the level of agency executive support for the project, as well as the nature and extent of involvement of command staff in the project.
- Describe the qualifications of the Smart Policing research partner and the prior experience of the researcher with “action research.” Specifically, the application should describe their experience with such activities as:
  - Developing logic models, collecting and analyzing criminal justice and public safety data, and using data to identify criminal justice and public safety related problems.
  - Working collaboratively with law enforcement agencies to overcome barriers to research-driven problem solving, as well as identifying and proposing proven strategies/interventions to address problems.
  - Documenting program operations and processes, assessing implementation fidelity, making recommendations for program improvement, and measuring program outcomes and using data to determine program effectiveness.
  - Regularly presenting findings and conclusions both orally and in written form to law enforcement professionals, developing "real-time" products and resources for strategic decision-making, and working with law enforcement agencies to develop a sustainability plan.
  - Communicating with a wide variety of public sector, private, and community-based individuals.

4. Plan for Collecting and Analyzing the Data Required for this Solicitation’s Performance Measures and Project Evaluation Design (20 percent)
Describe the process and methods for evaluating project performance, to include a description of 1) the outcome evaluation methodology and research design, as developed through the research partnership, that will provide findings related to the implementation and outcomes of the selected project strategy; and 2) the process and methods for collecting required performance metrics and submission of these metrics to BJA in accordance with the requirements of this solicitation.

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

5. Budget (10 percent)
Provide a proposed budget and Budget Narrative that are complete, cost effective, and allowable (e.g., reasonable, allowable, and necessary for project activities). Budget Narratives should demonstrate generally how applicants will maximize cost effectiveness of grant
expenditures. Budget Narratives should demonstrate cost effectiveness in relation to potential alternatives and the goals of the project.⁷

Applicants should budget travel/lodging expenses for four-person teams of agency and research partner representatives to attend three 2-day meetings during the 36-month project period, including the Smart Suite Academy. The meetings may be held in the Washington, D.C. area or other regions of the country.

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

6. Sustainability Planning (10 percent)
Describe the plan for sustaining any innovations, crime reductions, organizational changes, research partnerships, and other collaborations established or achieved during the project, and which are measured to be successful by the project’s evaluation, once the federal funding support ends.

Review Process
OJP is committed to ensuring a fair and open process for awarding grants. BJA reviews the application to make sure that the information presented is reasonable, understandable, measurable, and achievable, as well as consistent with the solicitation.

Peer reviewers will review the applications submitted under this solicitation that meet basic minimum requirements. For purposes of assessing whether an application meets basic minimum requirements and should proceed to further consideration, OJP screens applications for compliance with those requirements. Although specific requirements may vary, the following are common requirements applicable to all solicitations for funding under OJP programs:

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

For a list of critical elements for this solicitation, see What an Application Should Include under Section D. Application and Submission Information.

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

⁷ Generally speaking, a reasonable cost is a cost that, in its nature or amount, does not exceed that which would be incurred by a prudent person under the circumstances prevailing at the time the decision was made to incur the costs.
strategic priorities, and available funding, as well as the extent to which the budget detail worksheet and budget narrative accurately explain project costs that are reasonable, necessary, and otherwise allowable under federal law and applicable federal cost principles.

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

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

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

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

Absent explicit statutory authorization or written delegation of authority to the contrary, all final award decisions will be made by the Assistant Attorney General, who may take into account not only peer review ratings and BJA recommendations, but also other factors as indicated in this section.

### F. Federal Award Administration Information

**Federal Award Notices**

Award notifications will be made by September 30, 2017. OJP sends award notifications by email through GMS to the individuals listed in the application as the point of contact and the authorizing official (E-Biz POC and AOR). The email notification includes detailed instructions on how to access and view the award documents, and steps to take in GMS to start the award acceptance process. GMS automatically issues the notifications at 9:00 p.m. eastern time on the award date.
For each successful applicant, an individual with the necessary authority to bind the applicant will be required to 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 physical signature of the award document by the authorized representative and the scanning of the fully-executed award document to OJP.

**Administrative, National Policy, and Other Legal Requirements**

If selected for funding, in addition to implementing the funded project consistent with the agency-approved project proposal and budget, the recipient must comply with award terms and conditions, and other legal requirements, including but not limited to OMB, DOJ, or other federal regulations which will be included in the award, incorporated into the award by reference, or are otherwise applicable to the award. OJP strongly encourages prospective applicants to review the information pertaining to these requirements prior to submitting an application.

Applicants should consult the "Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2017 Awards," available in the OJP Funding Resource Center. In addition, applicants should examine the following two legal documents, as each successful applicant must execute both documents before it may receive any award funds.

- **Certifications Regarding Lobbying; Debarment, Suspension and Other Responsibility Matters; and Drug-Free Workplace Requirements**

- **Standard Assurances**

Applicants may view these documents in the Apply section of the OJP Funding Resource Center.

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

**General Information about Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements**

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

**Required reports.** Recipients typically must submit quarterly financial reports, semi-annual progress reports, final financial and progress reports, and, if applicable, an annual audit report in accordance with 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 web site at http://ojp.gov/funding/FAPIIS.htm.

Data on performance measures. In addition to required reports, an award recipient also must provide data that measure the results of the work done under the award. To demonstrate program progress and success, as well as to assist DOJ in fulfilling its responsibilities under the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA), Public Law 103-62, and the GPRA Modernization Act of 2010, Public Law 111–352, OJP will require any recipient, post award, to provide the data listed as “Data Recipient Provides” in the performance measures table in Section D. Application and Submission Information, under "Program Narrative," so that OJP can calculate values for this solicitation's performance measures.

G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s)

For OJP Contact(s), see title page.

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

H. Other Information


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

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

For example, if OJP receives a request pursuant to FOIA for an application submitted by a nonprofit or for-profit organization or an institution of higher education, or for an application that involves research, OJP typically will contact the applicant/recipient that submitted the application and ask it to identify -- quite precisely -- any particular information in the application that applicant/recipient believes falls under a FOIA exemption, the specific exemption it believes applies, and why. After considering the submission by the applicant/recipient, OJP makes an independent assessment regarding withholding information. OJP generally follows a similar
process for requests pursuant to FOIA for applications that may contain law-enforcement sensitive information.

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

**IMPORTANT:** This email is for feedback and suggestions only. Replies are not sent from this mailbox. If you have specific questions on any program or technical aspect of the solicitation, you must directly contact the appropriate number or email listed on the front of this solicitation document. These contacts are provided to help ensure that you can directly reach an individual who can address your specific questions in a timely manner.

If you are interested in being a reviewer for other OJP grant applications, please email your résumé to ojppeerreview@lmsolas.com. (Do not send your résumé to the OJP Solicitation Feedback email account.) **Note:** Neither you nor anyone else from your organization can be a peer reviewer in a competition in which you or your organization have submitted an application.
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 26)
_____ Acquire or renew registration with SAM (see page 26)

To Register with Grants.gov:
_____ Acquire AOR and Grants.gov username/password (see page 27)
_____ Acquire AOR confirmation from the E-Biz POC (see page 27)

To Find Funding Opportunity:
_____ Search for the Funding Opportunity on Grants.gov (see page 27)
_____ Select the correct Competition ID (see page 27)
_____ Download Funding Opportunity and Application Package
_____ Sign up for Grants.gov email notifications (optional) (see page 25)
_____ Read Important Notice: Applying for Grants in Grants.gov
_____ Read OJP policy and guidance on conference approval, planning, and reporting
   available at ojp.gov/financialguide/DOJ/PostawardRequirements/chapter3.10a.htm
   (see page 12)

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 22)

If no Grants.gov receipt, and validation or error notifications are received:
_____ contact the NCJRS Response Center regarding experiencing technical difficulties (see page 28)

General Requirements:

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

Scope Requirement:
_____ The federal amount requested is within the allowable limit(s) of $700,000.

Eligibility Requirement: Applicants are limited to state, local, and tribal law enforcement
   agencies, as well as governmental non-law enforcement agencies, or tribal consortia consisting
   of two or more federally recognized Indian tribes (including tribal consortia operated as nonprofit
   organizations) acting as a fiscal agent for one or more law enforcement agencies.
What an Application Should Include:

_____ Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424) (see page 13)
_____ Intergovernmental Review (see page 13)
_____ Project Abstract (see page 14)
_____ Program Narrative (see page 14)
_____ Budget Detail Worksheet (see page 17)
_____ Budget Narrative (see page 17)
_____ Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable) (see page 19)
_____ Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable) (see page 20)
_____ Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire (including High Risk) (see page 20)
_____ Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (SF-LLL) (see page 21)

_____ Additional Attachments
   _____ Timeline (see page 21)
   _____ Letter of Support from Chief Executive of the Law Enforcement Agency (see page 21)
   _____ Résumés (see page 21)
   _____ Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications (see page 21)
   _____ Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity (see page 22)
   _____ Disclosure of Process related to Executive Compensation (see page 24)

_____ Request and Justification for Employee Compensation Waiver (if applicable) (see page 11)