

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



The [U.S. Department of Justice](#) (DOJ), [Office of Justice Programs](#) (OJP), [Bureau of Justice Statistics](#) (BJS) is seeking applications for a new program to assess the feasibility of collecting state and local criminal and civil court data from publicly available sources to support national estimates of state and local court activity. Federal and tribal courts are outside of the scope of this project. The project will be funded in two stages: an assessment and pilot test, and the data collection and analysis. As the primary source for criminal justice statistics in the United States, BJS is responsible for collecting, analyzing, publishing, and disseminating statistical information on crime, criminal offenders, victims of crime, and the operations of criminal justice systems at all levels of government. This program furthers the Department's mission by identifying publicly available sources of court data, assessing data coverage, providing innovative data collection strategies, and provide accurate statistics regarding criminal cases processed in state courts.

Analysis of Publicly Available Court Data (APACD)

Applications Due: June 12, 2018

Eligibility

Eligible applicants are national, regional, state, or local public and private entities, including for-profit and nonprofit organizations (including tribal for-profit and nonprofit organizations); faith-based and community organizations; institutions of higher education (including tribal institutions of higher education); federally recognized Indian tribal governments (as determined by the Secretary of the Interior); and units of local government that support initiatives to improve the functioning of the criminal justice system.

All recipients and subrecipients (including any for-profit organization) must forgo any profit or management fee.

BJS welcomes applications under which two or more entities would carry out the federal award; however, only one entity may be the applicant. Any others must be proposed as subrecipients (subgrantees).¹ The applicant must be the entity that would have primary responsibility for carrying out the award, including administering the funding and managing the entire project.

Deadline

Applicants must register with Grants.gov at <https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/register.html> prior to submitting an application. All applications are due by 11:59 p.m. eastern time on June 12, 2018.

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

To be considered timely, an application must be submitted by the application deadline using Grants.gov, and the applicant must have received a validation message from Grants.gov that indicates successful and timely submission. OJP urges applicants to submit applications at least 72 hours prior to the application due date to allow time for the applicant to receive validation messages or rejection notifications from Grants.gov, and to correct in a timely fashion any problems that may have caused a rejection notification.

OJP encourages all applicants to read this [Important Notice: Applying for Grants in Grants.gov](#).

For additional information, see [How to Apply](#) in Section D. Application and Submission Information.

Contact Information

For technical assistance with submitting an application, contact the Grants.gov Customer Support Hotline at 800-518-4726, 606-545-5035, at <https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/support.html>, or at support@grants.gov. The Grants.gov Support Hotline operates 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, except on federal holidays.

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

For assistance with any other requirements of this solicitation, contact Suzanne M. Strong, BJS Statistician and Project Manager, by telephone at 202-307-0765 or by email at askbjs@usdoj.gov. Include APACD18 in the subject line.

Grants.gov number assigned to this solicitation: BJS-2018-14149

Release date: April 27, 2018

Contents

A. Program Description	4
Overview	4
Project-Specific Information	5
Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables.....	7
Information Regarding Potential Evaluation of Programs and Activities.....	14
B. Federal Award Information.....	14
Type of Award.....	15
Financial Management and System of Internal Controls.....	15
Budget Information.....	17
Cost Sharing or Matching Requirement.....	17
Pre-agreement Costs (also known as Pre-award Costs)	17
Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver	18
Prior Approval, Planning, and Reporting of Conference/Meeting/Training Costs	18
Costs Associated with Language Assistance (if applicable)	18
C. Eligibility Information.....	19
D. Application and Submission Information	19
What an Application Should Include	19
How To Apply.....	32
E. Application Review Information.....	36
Review Criteria.....	36
Review Process	37
F. Federal Award Administration Information	39
Federal Award Notices	39
Administrative, National Policy, and Other Legal Requirements	39
General Information about Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements	40
G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s)	41
H. Other Information.....	41
Freedom of Information Act and Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552 and 5 U.S.C. 552a).....	41
Provide Feedback to OJP	41
Appendix A: Performance Measures Table	43
Appendix B: Application Checklist	47

Analysis of Publicly Available Court Data (APACD) (CFDA # 16.734)

A. Program Description

Overview

The Analysis of Publicly Available Court Data (APACD) aims to—

- assess the availability of publicly available state and local court records
- conduct a pilot study to collect these publicly available data
- complete a full data collection
- analyze, report, and disseminate the data.

The recipient of funds will assess a range of publicly available court data resources, beginning with existing state court data extracts and state court records websites. Then, the recipient of funds will progress to other potential public data sources, such as state court online repositories, publicly available court docket calendars, and state sentencing commission data repositories. The recipient of funds will evaluate the viability and cost of using such data to support the production of national estimates of court activity and recommend a nationally representative sampling strategy for such an effort. The goal is to produce a report that *at a minimum*, replicates the [Felony Sentences in State Courts](#) report series. BJS also expects to collect, analyze, and report on data on case filing. Applicants should become familiar with [Felony Sentences in State Courts, 2006 - Statistical Tables](#) and the data elements necessary to produce a similar report.

At the end of the initial phase of the project, the recipient of funds will provide BJS with an assessment of the availability of state and local criminal and civil court case-level data in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The core of this work requires the recipient of funds to—

- focus on the laws regarding access to court records
- use innovative methods to gather and process publicly available court records
- assess whether the number of states with publicly available court records are sufficient to generate—
 - national estimates
 - content and quality of publicly available court records
 - information gaps incurred using publicly available records and alternate sources of data necessary to fill the information gaps
 - approaches to minimize response burden if alternate sources are required
 - a pilot test to document the relative effort for the selected methods of data collection and processing
 - a nationally representative sampling strategy based on publicly available data to produce detailed national estimates of court activity.

BJS will consider the initial pilot and assessment reports and determine whether to supplement funds to allow the recipient of funds to collect data as described. If supplemented, the recipient of funds will conduct the full data collection, complete data cleaning and processing, deliver data files to BJS, and collaborate with BJS to report the data. The proposed research team should

include persons who (1) understand state court structure and its impact on data availability; (2) are able to gather publicly available data in a cost-effective and timely manner; (3) are able to identify alternate sources of data, if necessary; and (4) have the capacity to collect, clean, standardize, and merge data, if the effort is supplemented to do so.

Statutory Authority: Under section 302 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act (34 U.S.C. § 10132 (c)), BJS is authorized to “make grants to or enter into cooperative agreements or contracts with public agencies, institutions of higher education, private organizations, or private individuals” for purposes of collecting and analyzing criminal justice statistics.

Under 34 U.S.C. § 10132 (c)(3), the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) is authorized to “collect and analyze data that will serve as a continuous and comparable national social indication of the prevalence, incidence, rates, extent, distribution, and attributes of crime, juvenile delinquency, civil disputes, and other statistical factors related to crime, civil disputes, and delinquency, in support of national, state, tribal, and local justice policy and decision making.”

Project-Specific Information

For many years, BJS maintained two criminal state court data collections, the National Judicial Reporting Program (NJRP) and the State Court Processing Statistics (SCPS), and one state civil court data collection, the Civil Justice Survey of State Courts (CJSSC). Data were collected manually and required persons to travel to the courts, pull the sampled files, and complete the data collection by hand. These collections were suspended between 2006 and 2009 and have not been restarted, chiefly due to the cost, leaving a significant gap in data in these areas ever since. Applicants should familiarize themselves with these earlier data collections and the methodologies used.

A fundamental indicator of crime in the United States is how many people are sentenced to felonies each year, so this data is necessary to more fully understanding crime in this country. The NJRP collected data on felony case sentencing from a representative sample of felony courts in 300 counties biennially from 1983 to 2006, and BJS reported findings in the *Felony Sentences in State Courts* series. Beginning in 1988 as the National Pretrial Reporting Program, the SCPS sampled felony cases filed in state courts in 40 of the 75 most populous counties in the United States. Cases were followed from filing to disposition (and often sentencing) and provided data for the *Felony Defendants in Large Urban Counties* reports, among others.² In 2008, BJS released a solicitation to investigate the possibility of a SCPS redesign to produce nationally representative statistics. The resulting recommendations for collecting SCPS data at the national level were too costly for BJS to implement, and the SCPS was suspended after the 2009 collection. The redesign was extended to the NJRP, which culminated in a final pilot [report and recommendations](#).

The CJSSC used a sampling methodology similar to the SCPS, but included an additional sample of counties designed to represent the remainder of the United States (46 of the largest 75 counties, and 110 smaller counties representing the rest of the nation). The CJSSC collected records regarding tort, contract, and real property cases disposed in state courts. The sampled courts provided counts of jury trials, bench trials, and other dispositions (e.g., summary judgment, settlements, transfers to other courts, and dismissals). The CJSSC was suspended after the 2005 collection, mainly due to the costs.

² SCPS followed felony case filings for 12 months and homicide cases for 24 months.

Since these data collections have been suspended, there has been an increase in computerized case management systems, the expansion of state open records access laws, and the work of state justice agencies to prepare publicly available data. Those changes have led BJS to believe that BJS may be able to leverage those changes to collect data that will allow for detailed estimates of attributes of criminal and civil cases processed by state courts. BJS would prefer to minimize the burden of requesting state courts to prepare special data extracts. Some state courts prepare annual data extracts for researchers and the media. BJS would consider these extracts publicly available, although they require coordination and payment to obtain these prepared extracts. For states without existing prepared extracts, BJS would like to examine the feasibility of accessing data these courts already provide to the public through court websites or annual reports.

The first phase of the APACD is a developmental effort to evaluate the availability, quality, and representativeness of publicly available state and local court data in the United States; determine gaps in publicly available data and suitable alternative sources of data to fill them; conduct a pilot test to collect, clean, and standardize publicly available data; and propose a nationally representative sampling plan to collect court data to support the production of national estimates of court activity. Because this phase of work is developmental, applicants should consider assessing data availability at all levels of courts (e.g., municipal or limited jurisdiction, general jurisdiction, single-tiered, and appellate courts) and the collection of criminal misdemeanor, felony, and limited civil court data.³ This solicitation specifically excludes the collection of juvenile court data.

The second phase of the APACD includes a pilot test of the data collection methods recommended in the first phase. The third and fourth phases are dependent upon successful completion of the first two phases and may require supplemental funding. The third phase is a complete data collection, and the fourth phase is data analysis and reporting.

The recipient of funds will—

- (1) document the laws and policies in each state regarding court records access
- (2) assess the availability of publicly available court data by state
- (3) assess the quality of publicly available court data in terms of the completeness and coverage of case types, data elements, and case events
- (4) determine the appropriate method of collecting publicly available data
- (5) determine data gaps not filled by publicly available data
- (6) examine alternate sources of data for each state for the gaps in publicly available data
- (7) determine appropriate sampling options for collecting nationally representative court data
- (8) conduct a pilot test of the collection of publicly available data from up to 10 states
- (9) provide an assessment of the costs and burden associated with collecting these data, based on the results of the pilot test
- (10) collect and deliver the data to BJS
- (11) work with BJS statisticians to analyze the data and prepare a report.

³ BJS's authorizing statute (34 U.S.C. § 10132) mandates that BJS compile statistics "concerning all aspects of criminal justice and related aspects of civil justice." BJS will guide the successful applicant when determining which types of civil cases to examine.

Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables

Note: BJS will hold two teleconferences for eligible applicants to ask questions about this solicitation. The first teleconference will take place on Thursday, May 10, 2018, from, 1:00 p.m. to 2:00 p.m. EST. The number to dial is 415-655-0003, and the meeting access code is 640 674 575. For additional information about the planned teleconferences, email askbjs@usdoj.gov and include "APACD18" in the subject line.

BJS views the project as having four distinct, successive phases: (1) initial assessment of publicly available data, (2) pilot test, (3) data collection, and (4) data analysis and reporting. The first two phases will be funded initially, with phases three and four funded in a future project supplement. The progression through each phase depends on the results of the prior phase. Based on the project goals detailed above, the APACD has the following objectives:

Objective 1: Document laws and rules governing state court records access

In the first step in phase one, the recipient of funds will determine which states have laws pertaining to open records and that restrict access to state court records. This step requires an analysis of state laws and administrative guidelines or court rules to determine: (1) conditions for accessing court records, (2) restrictions on accessing court records, (3) court reporting requirements to publicly available resources, and (4) the rules/protocol for accessing court records for research purposes.

Objective 2: Determine the extent of publicly available, online, case-level state court data

In the second step in phase one, the recipient of funds will determine the availability of publicly available state court data. This work will document which states have (1) existing data extracts; (2) free access to statewide online court case records; (3) statewide online case-level court data, but restrict access to these data (e.g., through a cost to access, the need to purchase and download specialized software, limited access to certain types of court records, or limiting access to attorneys only); and (4) no statewide online court data. For those states without publicly available statewide court data, the recipient of funds will identify which counties within each state have free publicly available court data online, online data with restricted access, or no data available online.

The availability of case-level data should be further detailed by the types of courts with available online data (e.g., single-tiered, limited jurisdiction, general jurisdiction, and appellate courts), types of case-level data available from these courts (e.g., misdemeanor, felony, and civil), and the case status of the online case-level data (open cases, closed cases, or both). In the end, this geographical analysis will provide a high-level overview of publicly available court data across the United States.

Objective 2.1: Adjust the scope of the project based on an assessment of publicly available case-level data

In this third step of phase one, the recipient of funds will use the knowledge developed to date to prepare a report that assesses the coverage and utility of publicly available data across the United States. Based on this report, the recipient of funds and BJS will determine the focus on

subsequent project activities. For example, if there appears to be sufficient data from extracts and online data to support national estimates of cases processed in general jurisdiction and civil courts, but not in municipal courts, then the scope of future work might exclude municipal courts.

Objective 2.2. Assess the case-level data quality available online

The fourth step of phase one assesses the contents of freely available data for courts that have been identified as possibly having sufficient data to generate national estimates. For example, if the decision made above includes a focus on criminal courts, the recipient of funds will determine what data elements are available for criminal cases, such as defendant demographics (e.g., age, race, gender, citizenship status), legal representation, date of offense, date of arrest/summons, date charges were filed in court, type of charge (felony or misdemeanor), pretrial detention and release, hearing dates and outcomes, disposition, sentencing, length of sentence, location of sentence (e.g., jail, prison, alternative confinement such as house arrest), length of probation, conditions of probation, restitution, participation in problem-solving or court diversion program, and any court costs or fees ordered. The recipient of funds should use the data elements necessary to produce a report similar to [*Felony Sentences in State Courts, 2006 - Statistical Tables*](#) as a guide.

If the decision made above includes a focus on civil cases, the recipient of funds will determine if the online data on civil cases include such items as plaintiff and defendant demographics, legal representation, date of filing, filing fees associated with the case, date of incident, type of civil case (e.g., tort, contract, or real property), hearing dates and outcomes, type and amount of relief sought (monetary damages, punitive damages, or other relief), type of relief ordered, case disposition, type and amount of relief ordered, and any court costs or fees assessed to parties at the end of the case.⁴

For those jurisdictions with restricted access and/or costs to access court data, the recipient of funds and BJS will request Office of Management and Budget (OMB) clearance to contact these states to learn about the jurisdiction's procedures to allow data access or to reduce access costs. The recipient of funds will document the procedures necessary to access data in each state and an approximation of the cost to acquire access to each state's data. The recipient of funds and BJS will then decide if it is feasible to work in these states and will consider the costs of that effort and the gains in coverage by including restricted access states. For those states where the work is deemed feasible, the recipient of funds will conduct a similar effort to that used in states where data were freely available for assessment.

Objective 2.3: Find alternate data sources for data not obtainable from publicly available sources

Important information may not be found in the publicly available data in some states. Consequently, in this fifth step of phase one of the project, the recipient of funds will explore alternative data sources to cover any meaningful information gaps. The recipient of funds will document the cost, access, and burden to the alternative sources. Possible sources of case-level court data include contacting the courts themselves, county or state court archives, data

⁴ A particular challenge in the civil area is record sealing, particularly in terms of settlement agreements. If civil data are collected, the recipient of funds should assess the extent of sealed records or agreements to determine if any bias is introduced by variations in state (and potentially local) practice.

repositories, and sentencing commissions. The recipient of funds and BJS will request OMB clearance to contact alternate sources for data. These agencies may require a Memorandum of Understanding or data use agreement to collect and provide data. The recipient of funds will document the level of effort required to access, obtain, and reimburse agencies for these data.

Objective 3. Develop an appropriate nationally representative sampling plan

In the sixth step of phase one, knowing the availability, coverage, and quality of publicly available data, the recipient of funds will present (if possible) a nationally representative sampling plan(s) that would support the production of national estimates of court activity at the case level using publicly available data. The recipient of funds will critique the effectiveness of each plan and detail the potential costs, information gaps, data access issues, and time necessary to complete the data collection of all proposed sampling approaches.

Objective 4. Conduct a pilot test to collect data from publicly available sources

In the second phase, the recipient of funds will test the collection of data from publicly available state court sources, including data extracts, freely available websites, and restricted access websites, among other potential sources. The number of states selected will depend largely on the assessments conducted in objectives 2-2.3. The recipient of funds should budget for data collection from approximately 10 sources and the work to clean and standardize the collected data into usable files that are comparable across jurisdictions.

Objective 5. If approved and funded by BJS, collect and deliver data to BJS

In the third phase, BJS will review the reports prepared by the project team outlining the availability and representativeness of publicly accessible data, any supplemental data sources necessary to generate nationally representative statistics, pilot test results, and a nationally representative sampling plan. If the reports indicate a successful venture and BJS approves the plan, BJS may seek to supplement the award to collect, clean, standardize, and deliver data to BJS.

Objective 6. Work with BJS to analyze the collected data.

In the fourth phase, BJS and the recipient of funds will collaborate on the most suitable analyses to produce a report similar to *Felony Sentences in State Courts* series.

Project Deliverables

BJS realizes that the timeline outlined below is aggressive; however, BJS also understands that there is a significant gap in state court data. Applicants should review the timeline carefully, and propose appropriate staffing for each deliverable.

- 1. Attend a kickoff meeting and develop a final timeline and task plan (Deliverable 1, due within 1 month of award).** A kickoff meeting will be held at BJS's offices in Washington, DC within the first month of the project period. During the meeting, project staff will review all phases of the work and finalize a comprehensive timeline and task plan that outlines the major deliverables of the project with expected completion dates. BJS expects to monitor the cooperative agreement closely to ensure that the project team stays as close to the timeline and task plan as possible. BJS will develop a monthly

reporting template for the recipient of funds to complete and deliver monthly, reporting the progress on each task, the time spent by staff on each task, and the amount of the budget used to complete each task. BJS usually conducts biweekly teleconferences to check in on project progress, but may institute weekly check-ins, as necessary. Within 2 weeks of the kickoff meeting, the recipient of funds will deliver the revised timeline and task plan to BJS reflecting all decisions made at the kickoff meeting. The plan will build on the one presented in the application and will reflect (1) any changes to the project's goals, objectives, and deliverables that may have developed since the application was written and (2) any revisions to the proposed work plan that may have occurred in the period between the application and the award of the cooperative agreement. The revised timeline and task plan is a starting point for this cooperative agreement and may be revised several times throughout the project period.

- 2. Prepare an analysis of state laws and guidelines regulating access to criminal and civil court records.** The first phase of the project is to identify state laws and administrative guidelines that control access to court records. The project team must document the state laws and administrative guidelines that control access to court records in each state, including whether court records are considered public documents. State laws and administrative guidelines should be reviewed for (1) access to court records, (2) restrictions to accessing court records, (3) state court reporting requirements, and (4) the rules/protocol for accessing court records for research purposes. The assessment should be presented in a report to BJS entitled *State Laws and Administrative Guidelines Regulating Access to Court Records (Deliverable 2, due within 2 months of award)*. This report may or may not be published, depending on the contents of the report and BJS's preference
- 3. Complete initial assessment of availability of statewide case-level data.** Publicly available data should be assessed on two dimensions: the availability of statewide data and the types of cases available online. Specifically, states will be categorized as (1) completely statewide without restrictions, (2) completely statewide but with restrictions, (3) statewide with some exceptions (e.g., certain counties not part of the system) and available without restrictions, (4) statewide with some exceptions and access to the system is restricted, or (5) no statewide data available. The recipient of funds should identify the source of available data for each state and online sources, and should determine the websites with easier access to data and those that are more difficult to access data.

For states with unrestricted access (categories 1 and 3 above), the recipient of funds will document the availability of (1) the levels of court with data available through existing data extracts or available online (e.g., single tiered, limited jurisdiction, general jurisdiction, or appellate courts); (2) case types available online (e.g., felony or misdemeanor for criminal cases, tort, contract, real property, or civil family for civil cases); and (3) case status (e.g., open cases available, closed cases available, or both). States with data extracts may have associated costs for accessing the extracts. The recipient of funds should include monies in the budget to pay for data extracts and access to the restricted online websites. For states with restricted access (categories 2 and 4 above), the recipient of funds will document as much as possible about the systems. For example, the recipient of funds should be able to determine the levels of court and types of cases available online in category 2. For category 4, the recipient of

funds should be able to provide a description of the court structure in the state and to assess whether county-level records are available online.

This assessment will result in an interim report to BJS entitled *Initial Assessment of Publicly Available Court Data (Deliverable 3, due within 4 months of award)*. This report could be in a written format, a spreadsheet format, or a combination of written and spreadsheet formats.

4. **Adjust the scope of the project to maximize the coverage of publicly available data.** Based on the *Initial Assessment of Publicly Available Court Data*, the recipient of funds and BJS will make any adjustments to the scope of the project to maximize the coverage of court data. For example, if the *Initial Assessment* showed that limited jurisdiction court data is less available than general jurisdiction courts, then the scope could be restricted to general jurisdiction courts. BJS will make the final decision. These decisions will be documented in a project memorandum (**Deliverable 4, due within 6 months of award**) that captures any adjustments to scope and the rationale. BJS will assess the progress of the award at the six month marker, and determine any adjustments to the project necessary to keep the project on schedule.
5. **Develop a list of key data elements and review publicly available online records for states and counties with open access to case-level data.** After any adjustments to the scope of the project, the recipient of funds will work with BJS to develop a list of key elements to assess publicly available statewide court case-level websites. This information could include the availability of (1) case party information (e.g., plaintiff and defendant), (2) case party demographics (e.g., age, race, gender, citizenship status), (3) attorney information, (4) filing events, (5) hearing events, (6) court findings or dispositions, (7) sentencing outcomes, and (8) post-disposition events (e.g., appeals, violations of probation).

Criminal data should be assessed in terms of availability of arrest, citation, or summons information; original charges filed by prosecution; the type of charge, such as a misdemeanor, felony, or traffic; date of offense; date of important hearings (arraignment, bail, disposition, sentencing); pretrial release and detention information; bail information; deferred prosecution information (e.g., case will be dismissed only on completion of special conditions); case disposition information (including not guilty findings or dismissals, court and jury trials, and pleas); charge disposition information (including amendments to original arrest charges); sentencing information (including length of sentence and whether the sentence was to a jail or a prison); alternative sentencing options (e.g., drug court, house arrest); and probation information, restitution, and fines ordered. If collected, civil data should be assessed in terms of the type of case (tort, real property, or contract); incident at issue; type of relief requested (monetary damages, punitive damages); dates of important hearings; date and type of disposition; and relief ordered. These lists of criminal and civil data elements will be reviewed and approved by BJS (**Deliverable 5, due within 8 months of award**).

6. **Prepare and deliver an interim *Data Assessment of Freely Publicly Available State Court Data* report.** Once the key data elements are identified for all cases, the project team will document the availability of the elements for jurisdictions with publicly available case-level court data. Data should be tracked for all 50 states and the District of Columbia to the extent that they are freely and publicly available. This work should

culminate in an interim *Data Assessment of Publicly Available State Court Data* report. The report could be written, a spreadsheet, dataset (preferably SAS or STATA), or combination of any of those modes as approved by BJS (**Deliverable 6, due within 10 months of award**).

- 7. Determine the extent of case-level data that are limited or unavailable, and propose alternate data sources (Deliverable 7).** With the assistance of the recipient of funds, BJS will prepare a generic OMB clearance package to permit the recipient of funds to contact state (or county) court leaders in states with restricted or no public access to court records. The project team and court leaders will discuss access to court records, including the potential for reduced cost, allowing researchers access to data, or other potential solutions to the restricted data.

Restricted access includes jurisdictions where the online source requires payment to search the site, allows only attorneys access to case-level data, or excludes certain counties from an otherwise statewide website. No case-level access includes states where the recipient of funds has determined that there is no publicly available case-level data.

The project team will document access issues for restricted- and no-access sources. The project team will document the conversations with data providers that limit or do not make sources publicly available in an interim *Data Assessment of Restricted Access State Court Data* report (**Deliverable 7, due within 12 months of award**). The report could be written, a spreadsheet, a dataset (preferably SAS or STATA), or a combination of any of those modes should be proposed by the recipient of funds and approved by BJS. The report will propose any further revisions to the scope that were made by the project team and BJS in the memorandum prepared as **Deliverable 4**. BJS will assess the progress of the award at the twelve month marker, and determine any adjustments to the project necessary to keep the project on schedule.

- 8. Conduct a pilot test to determine the level of effort required to collect and clean publicly available data.** The recipient of funds should budget time and money to conduct a pilot test of collecting data from publicly available sources to better estimate the time and level of effort to collect, clean, and standardize data. Data can be collected in a variety of ways, and the recipient of funds should determine the most cost-effective methods during objectives 1-7. The pilot test includes collection, cleaning, and standardizing data. The recipient of funds should include time and budget for a limited data collection of up to 10 sources, including pre-existing data extracts, collection from freely available websites and collection from restricted access websites, among other potential sources. The recipient of funds and BJS will determine how to frame the pilot test to allow for the best understanding of the time, effort, and cost of accessing, collecting, cleaning, and standardizing data from different publicly available sources. The results of the pilot test will be included in the pilot report, which will include an updated data dictionary and data mapping from the original data sources to the pilot data file (**Deliverable 8, due within 18 months of award**). BJS may publish this report. This report must meet BJS publication standards, which will be provided to the recipient of funds.
- 9. Develop a nationally representative sampling plan and propose methods to produce national estimates of court activity using publicly available, restricted,**

and alternative data sources. At the end of the initial phase of the project, the recipient of funds will evaluate the feasibility of various nationally representative sampling plans to generate national estimates of court activity, given the knowledge gained in the assessment of publicly available case-level court data at the state and county levels.

Within each proposed data collection plan, the recipient of funds will detail how data can and should be accessed. For states with publicly available data online, data could be accessed in a number of ways, including acquiring an already existing data extract, web scraping of all data, intentional sampling and scraping of certain data, or intentional sampling and completing data collection forms by hand, to name a few examples. Online web scraping requires extensive programming knowledge and has associated costs. The recipient of funds will use the information gathered in the pilot to estimate the time, level of effort, and cost to collect data from publicly available and restricted access websites. Intentional sampling requires staff to first identify the targeted cases and then enter data into a database either by web scraping or reading online records and entering data by hand.

The recipient of funds will evaluate each collection procedure and estimate the level of effort and costs associated with each. In this report, after detailing possible options, the recipient of funds will recommend a preferred data collection plan for generating national estimates of court activity and the reasons for this decision. This report will be published as *Sampling Plan for Publicly Available Court Data*. The report must meet BJS publication standards, which will be provided to the recipient of funds (**Deliverable 9, due within 18 months of award**). BJS will assess the progress of the award at the eighteen month marker, and determine any adjustments to the project necessary to keep the project on schedule.

10. Data collection and delivery of datasets, if project is supplemented. BJS will evaluate the pilot report, coverage of publicly available data and alternate data sources, cost of the collection, and sampling plans to generate nationally representative statistics. If the plan is feasible, BJS may supplement the award for an additional project period. All data collected in the project will be delivered to BJS, with any appropriate weighting and imputation. More than one version of the data files may be required. Any data file will be accompanied with a detailed data dictionary, and mapping from original data sources to the final data file (**Deliverable 10, due within 30 months of award**).

11. Analyze data and co-author resulting report, if project is supplemented. The recipient of funds will collaborate with BJS to analyze data. The recipient of funds and BJS will prepare a publication proposal, tables, and publish a BJS report that, at a minimum, replicates the *Felony Sentences in State Courts* report series (**Deliverable 11, due within 36 months of award**). The published report must meet BJS publication standards, which will be provided to the recipient of funds.

Applicants should describe in the project narrative how data collected as part of the BJS-funded activities will be delivered to BJS, including in what format and at what anticipated frequency. Upon award, award recipients will be required to, following consultation with and direction by the BJS Program Manager, provide the specific data structure documentation to BJS as a final deliverable. At minimum, the data documentation structure must include the expected names, formats, and allowable values for each data element. The data structure documentation is a

required final deliverable and shall be subject to review and approval by BJS's Technology and Data Management Unit.

Award recipients and subrecipients that collect, receive, handle, maintain, transfer, process, store, or disseminate directly identifiable information (e.g., names, SSNs, last known address, or FBI, state, or DOC identification (ID numbers) in conjunction with the BJS-funded activities must

- Maintain a Security Program Management Plan that prescribes the reporting of and response to security incidents involving directly identifiable information including, but not limited to, system compromise, unauthorized access from both internal and external parties, data leakage, and loss of technology assets. This policy shall be in accordance with the OMB and Department of Commerce Cybersecurity Policy, Presidential Directives, and [National Institute of Standards and Technology](#) (NIST) best practices
- Complete data security and confidentiality training(s), as applicable
- Provide BJS with a signed copy of their Security Program Management Plan within 90 days of accepting the award, and with all updated versions throughout the life of the project period
- Notify BJS within one hour of any security incidents that impact a [Federal Information Security Modernization Act](#) (FISMA)-defined information system used to support award activities.

To ensure that applicants understand the applicable information system security and privacy requirements, BJS encourages prospective applicants to review the relevant provisions of the BJS Data Protection Guidelines, which summarize the federal statutes, regulations, and other authorities that govern BJS data and data collected and maintained under BJS's authority. The guidelines are available [here](#).

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

Information Regarding Potential Evaluation of Programs and Activities

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

B. Federal Award Information

BJS expects to make one award of up to \$2,000,000 for a total project period of 36 months, to begin on October 1, 2018. The project period and award funds are expected to cover deliverables 1-11.

The budget submitted in response to this solicitation should present costs associated with the award for deliverables 1-11. The applicant should also submit a timeline outlining major tasks and deliverables for the full 36 month project.

BJS intends the APACD to proceed in four distinct phases, each with one or more deliverables. The failure to meet the deliverables associated with each phase may stop the project. That is BJS expects that the recipient of funds will meet all targets or have justifiable delays for each phase of the project, otherwise, BJS may choose to administratively close the project. BJS encourages applicants to structure the application—the narrative, budget narrative, and budget worksheet—to clearly identify and describe each phase and step and its associated deliverable. BJS is particularly interested in applicants demonstrating the capability to carry out all 4 phases of the project.

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

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

Type of Award

BJS expects to make any award under this solicitation in the form of a cooperative agreement, which is a type of award that provides for OJP to have substantial involvement in carrying out award activities. See [Administrative, National Policy, and Other Legal Requirements](#), under [Section F. Federal Award Administration Information](#), for a brief discussion of what may constitute substantial federal involvement.

Financial Management and System of Internal Controls

Award recipients and subrecipients (including recipients or subrecipients that are pass-through entities⁵) must, as described in the Part 200 Uniform Requirements⁶ as set out at 2 C.F.R. 200.303:

- (a) Establish and maintain effective internal control over the federal award that provides reasonable assurance that [the recipient (and any subrecipient)] is managing the federal award in compliance with federal statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of the federal award. These internal controls should be in compliance with guidance in “Standards for Internal Control in the Federal Government” issued by the Comptroller General of the United States and the “Internal Control Integrated Framework”, issued by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission (COSO).

⁵ For purposes of this solicitation, the phrase “pass-through entity” includes any recipient or subrecipient that provides a subaward (subgrant) to a subrecipient (subgrantee) to carry out part of the funded award or program. Additional information on proposed subawards is listed under [What an Application Should Include](#), Section 4c of this solicitation.

⁶ The “Part 200 Uniform Requirements” means the DOJ regulation at 2 C.F.R. Part 2800, which adopts (with certain modifications) the provisions of 2 C.F.R. Part 200.

- (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 the applicable administrative requirements and cost principles, OJP encourages prospective applicants to enroll, at no charge, in the DOJ Grants Financial Management Online Training, available at <https://ojpfgm.webfirst.com/>. (This training is required for all OJP award recipients.)

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

Information System Security and Privacy Requirements

BJS award recipients and subrecipients are required to facilitate the privacy, security, confidentiality, integrity, and availability of computer systems, networks, and data in accordance with applicable federal and DOJ policies, procedures, and guidelines. Recipients and subrecipients may not release or disclose any data collected on behalf of BJS without prior written approval from BJS, or until the dataset has been released to the public. This includes, but is not limited to, data used in presentations at professional conferences and meetings, press releases, and/or grant applications.

Recipients and subrecipients who operate as BJS data collection agents that collect, receive, handle, maintain, transfer, process, store, or disseminate directly identifiable information at BJS's direction must have and maintain the appropriate administrative, physical, and technical safeguards in place to ensure that information systems are adequately secured and protected against unauthorized disclosure.

Specifically, BJS data collection agents are required to, as applicable—

- Follow the [DOJ IT Security Rules of Behavior for General Users](#), which pertain to the use, security, and acceptable level of risk for DOJ systems and applications
- Assess and secure information systems in accordance with [FISMA](#) (Pub.L. No. 107-347), which appears as Title III of the [E-Government Act of 2002](#) (Pub.L. No. 107-347)
- Adhere to [NIST](#) guidelines to categorize the sensitivity of all data collected or maintained on behalf of BJS

- Once the system has been categorized, secure data in accordance with the Risk Management Framework specified in [NIST SP 800-37 Rev. 1](#)
- Employ adequate controls to ensure data are not comingled with any other dataset or product without the express written consent of BJS
- Reduce the volume of directly identifiable information collected, used, or retained to the minimum necessary
- Limit access to identifiable data to only those individuals who must have such access
- Limit use of identifiable data to only the purposes for which it was approved
- Log all computer-readable data extracts from databases holding sensitive information and ensure each extract including sensitive data has been erased within 90 days, or its use is still required
- Ensure all contracts involving the processing and storage of personally identifiable information comply with DOJ policies on remote access and security incident reporting
- Complete data security and confidentiality trainings
- Employ formal sanctions for anyone failing to comply with DOJ policy and procedures, in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

Applicants are advised that OJP may audit the FISMA-defined information systems that are used by award recipients during the performance period to assess compliance with federal laws and regulations related to data management and security.

Budget Information

Cost Sharing or Matching Requirement

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

For additional information on cost sharing and match, see the DOJ Grants Financial Guide at <https://ojp.gov/financialguide/DOJ/PostawardRequirements/chapter3.3b.htm>.

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

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

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

Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver

With respect to any award of more than \$250,000 made under this solicitation, a recipient may not use federal funds to pay total cash compensation (salary plus cash bonuses) to any employee of the recipient at a rate that exceeds 110 percent of the maximum annual salary payable to a member of the federal government's Senior Executive Service (SES) at an agency with a Certified SES Performance Appraisal System for that year.⁷ The 2018 salary table for SES employees is available on the Office of Personnel Management website at <https://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/pay-leave/salaries-wages/salary-tables/18Tables/exec/html/ES.aspx>. Note: A recipient may compensate an employee at a greater rate, provided the amount in excess of this compensation limitation is paid with non-federal funds. (Non-federal funds used for any such additional compensation will not be considered matching funds, where match requirements apply.) If only a portion of an employee's time is charged to an OJP award, the maximum allowable compensation is equal to the percentage of time worked times the maximum salary limitation.

The Director of BJS 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 BJS will require the applicant to adjust and resubmit the budget.

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

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

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

Costs Associated with Language Assistance (if applicable)

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

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

For additional information, see the "Civil Rights Compliance" section under "[Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2018 Awards](#)" in the OJP Funding Resource Center at <https://ojp.gov/funding/index.htm>.

C. Eligibility Information

For eligibility information, see the title page.

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

D. Application and Submission Information

What an Application Should Include

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

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

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

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

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

1. 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. On the SF-424, current OJP award recipients, when completing the field for “Legal Name” (box 8a), should use the same legal name that appears on the prior year award document (which is also the legal name stored in OJP’s financial system.) Also, these recipients should enter the Employer Identification Number (EIN) in box 8b exactly as it appears on the prior year award document. An applicant with a current, active award(s) must ensure that its GMS profile is current. If the profile is not current, the applicant should submit a Grant Adjustment Notice updating the information on its GMS profile prior to applying under this solicitation.

A new applicant entity should enter its official legal name in box 8a, its address in box 8d, its EIN in box 8b, and its Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number in box 8c of the SF-424. A new applicant entity should attach official legal documents to its application (e.g., articles of incorporation, 501(c)(3) status documentation, organizational letterhead, etc.) to confirm the legal name, address, and EIN entered into the SF-424. OJP will use the System for Award Management (SAM) to confirm the legal name and DUNS number entered in the SF-424; therefore, an applicant should ensure that the information entered in the SF-424 matches its current registration in SAM. See the [How to Apply](#) section for more information on SAM and DUNS numbers.

Intergovernmental Review: This solicitation (“funding opportunity”) **is not** subject to [Executive Order 12372](#). (In completing the SF-424, an applicant is to answer question 19 by selecting the response that the “Program is not covered by E.O. 12372.”)

2. Project Abstract

Applications should include a high-quality project abstract that summarizes the proposed project in 400 words or less. The abstracts may be submitted as Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) or Microsoft Word files. Project abstracts should be—

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

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

3. Program Narrative

The program narrative should not exceed 30 double-spaced pages, using a standard 12-point font (Times New Roman preferred), with one-inch margins. Pages should be numbered. These limitations apply to tables and figures included within the narrative. The project abstract, table of contents, and government forms do not count toward the 30-page limit.

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

The following sections should be included as part of the program narrative:⁸

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

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

Applicants should visit OJP's performance measurement page at www.ojp.gov/performance for more information about OJP's performance measure reporting. Performance measures for this solicitation are listed in Appendix A: Performance Measures Table. Performance measures data should be submitted during quarterly reports, unless the performance measure is itself a deliverable.

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

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

- e. Appendices (not counted against the 30-page program narrative limit) include—
 - Bibliography or references.
 - Any tools, instruments, tables, charts, or graphs pertaining to the proposed project that are supplemental to such items included in the main body of the narrative.
 - Curriculum vitae or résumés of the principal investigator and any and all co-principal investigators. In addition, curriculum vitae, résumés or biographical sketches of individuals (regardless of investigator status) who will be significantly involved in substantive aspects of the proposal (including individuals such as research methodologists serving as consultants to develop sampling strategies; data experts familiar with gathering publicly available data, and experts with knowledge of court systems, with a particular focus on court records access).

⁸ For information on subawards (including the details on proposed subawards that should be included in the application), see "Budget and Associated Documentation" under [Section D. Application and Submission Information](#).

- List (to the extent known) of all proposed project staff members, including those affiliated with the applicant organization or any proposed subrecipient organization(s), any proposed consultant(s) and contractors (whether individuals or organizations), and any proposed members of an advisory board for the project (if applicable). The list should include, for each individual and organization: name, title (if applicable), employer or other organizational affiliation, and roles and responsibilities proposed for the project.
- A detailed proposed project timeline with expected milestones and level of staff effort for each phase of work.
- List of any previous and current BJS awards to applicant organization and investigator(s), including the BJS-assigned award numbers and a brief description of any scholarly products that resulted in whole or in part from work funded under the BJS award(s).
- Letters of cooperation/support or administrative agreements from organizations collaborating in the project, such as universities, lawyers, court personnel, or other membership groups.
- List of other agencies, organizations, or funding source to which this proposal has been submitted (if applicable).

Note on Project Evaluations

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

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

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

4. Budget and Associated Documentation

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

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

a. Budget Detail Worksheet

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

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

b. Budget Narrative

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This will be true **even if** the recipient, for internal or other non-federal purposes, labels or treats its agreement as a procurement, a contract, or a procurement contract. Neither the title nor the structure of an agreement determines whether the agreement—for purposes of federal grants administrative requirements—is a *subaward* or is instead a procurement *contract* under an award. The substance of the relationship should be given greater consideration than the form of agreement between the recipient and the outside entity.

1. Information on proposed subawards

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

A particular subaward may be authorized by OJP because the recipient included a sufficiently-detailed description and justification of the proposed subaward in the Program Narrative, Budget Detail Worksheet, and Budget Narrative as approved by OJP. If, however, a particular subaward is not authorized by federal statute or

regulation, and is not approved by OJP, the recipient will be required, post-award, to request and obtain written authorization from OJP before it may make the subaward.

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

2. Information on proposed procurement contracts (with specific justification for proposed noncompetitive contracts of more than \$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. All noncompetitive (sole source) procurement contracts must meet the OJP requirements outlined at <https://ojp.gov/training/subawards-procurement.htm>. If a proposed procurement contract would exceed the simplified acquisition threshold—currently, \$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.

If the applicant receives an award, sole source procurements that do not exceed the Simplified Acquisition Threshold (currently \$150,000) must have written justification for the noncompetitive procurement action maintained in the procurement file. If a procurement file does not have the documentation that meets the criteria outlined in 2 C.F.R. 200, the procurement expenditures may not be allowable. Sole source procurement over the \$150,000 Simplified Acquisition Threshold must have prior approval from OJP using a Sole Source Grant Adjustment Notice (GAN). Written documentation justifying the noncompetitive procurement must be submitted with the GAN and maintained in the procurement file.

d. Pre-Agreement Costs

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

5. Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable)

Indirect costs may be charged to an award only if—

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

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

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

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

6. Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable)

A tribe, tribal organization, or third party that proposes to provide direct services or assistance to residents on tribal lands should include in its application a resolution, letter, affidavit, or other documentation, as appropriate, that demonstrates (as a legal matter) that the applicant has the requisite authorization from the tribe(s) to implement the proposed project on tribal lands. In those instances when an organization or consortium of tribes applies for an award on behalf of a tribe or multiple specific tribes, the application should include appropriate legal documentation, as described above, from all tribes that would receive services or assistance under the award. A consortium of tribes for which existing consortium bylaws allow action without support from all tribes in the consortium (i.e., without an authorizing resolution or comparable legal documentation from each tribal governing body) may submit, instead, a copy of its consortium bylaws with the application.

An applicant unable to submit an application that includes a fully executed (i.e., signed) copy of legal appropriate documentation, as described above, consistent with the applicable tribe’s governance structure, should, at a minimum, submit an unsigned, draft version of

such legal documentation as part of its application (except for cases in which, with respect to a tribal consortium applicant, consortium bylaws allow action without the support of all consortium member tribes). If selected for funding, OJP will make use of and access to award funds contingent on receipt of the fully executed legal documentation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

8. Disclosure of Lobbying Activities

Each applicant must complete and submit this information. An applicant that expends any funds for lobbying activities is to provide all of the information requested on the form

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

9. Additional Attachments

a. A Privacy Certificate and Human Subjects Protection Certification of Compliance must be completed for each project proposed in an application.

- **Privacy Certification.** The Privacy Certificate is a funding recipient’s certification of compliance with federal regulations requiring confidentiality of information identifiable to a private person, which is collected, analyzed, or otherwise used in connection with an OJP-funded research or statistical activity. The funding recipient’s Privacy Certificate includes a description of its policies and procedures to be followed to protect identifiable information. Applicants must specify in the Privacy Certificate the specific controls used to safeguard directly identifiable information against unauthorized disclosure. All project staff, including information technology personnel, subcontractors, and/or consultants, with access to identifiable data collected in conjunction with the BJS-funded activities are required to sign a Privacy Certificate to affirm their understanding of an agreement to comply with the terms of access and privacy requirements. Award recipients are responsible for maintaining an updated list of individuals with access to identifiable information and for ensuring that new staff who gain access to such information during the project period sign a Privacy Certificate. A model certificate is located at <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/bjsmpc.pdf>.
- **Human Subjects Protection Certification of Compliance.** BJS requires the funding recipient to submit proper documentation to be used to determine that the research project meets the federal requirements for human subjects protections set forth in 28 CFR Part 46. A model certificate, describing the necessary information to be provided by the funding recipient, is located at <https://www.bjs.gov/content/hscr.cfm>.

b. Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications

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

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

Each applicant that has one or more pending applications as described above is to provide the following information about pending applications submitted within the last 12 months:

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

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

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

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

c. 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.

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

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

OR

- b. A specific description of actual or potential apparent conflicts of interest that the applicant has identified – including through review of pertinent information on the principal investigator, any co-principal investigators, and any subrecipients – that could affect the independence or integrity of the research, including the design, conduct, or reporting of the research. These conflicts may be personal (e.g., on the part of investigators or other staff), financial, or organizational (related to the applicant or any subrecipient entity). Some examples of potential investigator (or other personal) conflict situations are those in which an investigator would be in a position to evaluate a spouse's work product (actual conflict), or an investigator would be in a position to evaluate the work of a former or current colleague (potential apparent conflict). With regard to potential organizational conflicts of interest, as one example, generally an organization would not be given an award to evaluate a project, if that organization had itself provided substantial prior technical assistance to that specific project or a location implementing the project (whether funded by OJP or other sources), because the organization in such an instance might appear to be evaluating the effectiveness of its own prior work. The key is whether a reasonable person understanding all of the facts would be able to have confidence that the results of any research or evaluation project are objective and reliable. Any outside personal or financial interest that casts doubt on that objectivity and reliability of an evaluation or research product is a problem and must be disclosed.
- ii. In addition, for purposes of this solicitation, each applicant is to address possible mitigation of research integrity concerns by including, at a minimum, one of the following two items:
 - a. If an applicant reasonably believes that no actual or potential apparent conflicts of interest (personal, financial, or organizational) exist, then the applicant should provide a brief narrative explanation of how and why it reached that conclusion. The applicant also is to include an explanation of the specific processes and procedures that the applicant has in place, or will put in place, to identify and prevent (or, at the very least, mitigate) any such conflicts of interest pertinent to the funded project during the period of performance. Documentation that may be helpful in this regard may include organizational codes of ethics/conduct and policies regarding organizational, personal, and financial conflicts of interest. There is no guarantee that the plan, if any, will be accepted as proposed.

OR

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

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

d. Disclosure of Process Related to Executive Compensation

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

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

Each applicant nonprofit organization must state at the time of its application (question 9c in the "OJP Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire" located at <https://ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/FinancialCapability.pdf> and mentioned earlier) whether or not the applicant entity believes (or asserts) that it currently satisfies the requirements of 26 C.F.R. 53.4958-6 (which relate to establishing or invoking a rebuttable presumption of reasonableness of compensation of certain individuals and entities).

A nonprofit organization that states in the questionnaire that it believes (or asserts) that it has satisfied the requirements of 26 C.F.R. 53.4958-6 must then disclose, in an attachment to its application (to be titled "Disclosure of Process Related to Executive Compensation"), the process used by the applicant nonprofit organization to

determine the compensation of its officers, directors, trustees, and key employees (together, "covered persons").

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

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

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

How To Apply

Applicants must register in and submit applications through [Grants.gov](https://www.grants.gov), a primary source to find federal funding opportunities and apply for funding. Find complete instructions on how to register and submit an application at <https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/support.html>.

Applicants that experience technical difficulties during this process should call the Grants.gov Customer Support Hotline at **800-518-4726** or **606-545-5035**, which operates 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, except on federal holidays.

Important Grants.gov update. Grants.gov has updated its application tool. The legacy PDF application package has been phased out and was retired on December 31, 2017. Grants.gov Workspace is now the standard application method for applying for grants. OJP applicants should familiarize themselves with the Workspace option now. For complete information and instructions on using Workspace (and other changes), go to the Workspace Overview page at <https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/applicants/workspace-overview.html>.

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

OJP strongly encourages all prospective applicants to sign up for Grants.gov email notifications regarding this solicitation at <https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/manage-subscriptions.html>. If this solicitation is cancelled or modified, individuals who sign up with Grants.gov for updates will be automatically notified.

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

Note on Attachments: Grants.gov has two categories of files for attachments: “mandatory” and “optional.” OJP receives all files attached in both categories. Attachments are also labeled to describe the file being attached (e.g., Project Narrative, Budget Narrative, Other, etc.) Please ensure that all required documents are attached in the correct Grants.gov category and are labeled correctly. Do not embed “mandatory” attachments within another file.

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

Characters	Special Characters		
Upper case (A – Z)	Parenthesis ()	Curly braces { }	Square brackets []
Lower case (a – z)	Ampersand (&)*	Tilde (~)	Exclamation point (!)
Underscore (_)	Comma (,)	Semicolon (;)	Apostrophe (‘)
Hyphen (-)	At sign (@)	Number sign (#)	Dollar sign (\$)
Space	Percent sign (%)	Plus sign (+)	Equal sign (=)
Period (.)			

***When using the ampersand (&) in XML, applicants must use the “&” format.**

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

All applicants are required to complete the following steps:

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

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

If an applicant entity has not fully complied with the applicable SAM and unique identifier requirements by the time OJP makes award decisions, OJP may determine that the applicant is not qualified to receive an award and may use that determination as a basis for making the award to a different applicant.

Applying as an Individual

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.)

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

Registration and Submission Steps

- 1. Acquire a unique entity identifier (currently, a 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.

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

- 2. Acquire or maintain registration with SAM.** Any applicant for an OJP award creating a new entity registration in SAM.gov must provide an original, signed notarized letter stating that the applicant is the authorized Entity Administrator before the registration will be activated. To learn more about this process change, read the FAQs at <https://www.gsa.gov/about-us/organization/federal-acquisition-service/office-of-systems-management/integrated-award-environment-iae/sam-update>. Information about the notarized letter is posted at https://www.fsd.gov/fsd.gov/answer.do?sysparm_kbid=d2e67885db0d5f00b3257d321f96194b&sysparm_search=kb0013183.

All applicants for OJP awards (other than individuals) must maintain current registrations in the SAM database. Applicants will need the authorizing official of the organization and an Employer Identification Number (EIN). 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 (2 more weeks to acquire an EIN).

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

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

3. **Acquire an Authorized Organization Representative (AOR) and a Grants.gov username and password.** Complete the AOR profile on Grants.gov and create a username and password. An applicant entity's "unique entity identifier" (DUNS number) must be used to complete this step. For more information about the registration process for organizations and other entities, go to <https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/applicants/organization-registration.html>. Individuals registering with Grants.gov should go to www.grants.gov/web/grants/applicants/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 (CFDA) number for this solicitation is 16.734, titled "Special Data Collections and Statistical Studies," and the funding opportunity number is BJS-2018-14149.
6. **Access Funding Opportunity and Application Package from Grants.gov.** Select "Apply for Grants" under the "Applicants" column. Enter your email address to be notified of any changes to the opportunity package before the closing date. Click the Workspace icon to use Grants.gov Workspace.
7. **Submit a valid application consistent with this solicitation by following the directions in Grants.gov.** 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 June 12, 2018.

Go to <https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/applicants/organization-registration.html> for further details on DUNS numbers, SAM, and Grants.gov registration steps and timeframes.

Note: Application Versions

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

Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues

An applicant that experiences unforeseen Grants.gov technical issues beyond its control that prevent it from submitting its application by the deadline must contact the Grants.gov Customer Support Hotline at <https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/support.html> or the SAM Help Desk (Federal Service Desk) at <https://www.fsd.gov/fsd-gov/home.do> to report the technical issue and receive a tracking number. The applicant must email the BJS contact identified in the Contact Information section on the title page **within 24 hours after the application deadline** to request approval to submit its application after the deadline. The applicant's email must describe the technical difficulties, and must include a timeline of the applicant's submission efforts, the complete grant application, the applicant's DUNS number, and any Grants.gov Help Desk or SAM tracking number(s).

Note: OJP does not automatically approve requests to submit a late application. After OJP reviews the applicant's request, and contacts the Grants.gov or SAM Help Desks to verify the reported technical issues, OJP will inform the applicant whether the request to submit a late application has been approved or denied. If OJP determines that the untimely application submission was due to the applicant's failure to follow all required procedures, OJP will deny the applicant's request to submit its application.

The following conditions generally are insufficient to justify late submissions:

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

Notifications regarding known technical problems with Grants.gov, if any, are posted at the top of the OJP Funding Resource Center at <https://ojp.gov/funding/index.htm>.

E. Application Review Information

Review Criteria

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

1. Statement of the Problem (15%)
The application should demonstrate knowledge of the issues surrounding the collection of publically available court data, including how data management systems could affect online case records, how state court organization may affect online case access, and how state laws and court rules affect access to court data.
2. Project Design and Implementation (35%)
As described, this work has multiple phases, each dependent on the success of the prior phase. Applicants should outline their plan for deliverables 1-9 and preliminary plans for deliverables 10 and 11. Applicants should address how they will develop the information

for each deliverable and outline their understanding of the content and goals of each deliverable. The application should also include a reasonable time frame and levels of individual staff commitment for producing each deliverable and projected final delivery dates. Applicants should develop a detailed timeline and task plan showing the time period for all subtasks, dates for major milestones and deliverables throughout the project, and levels of effort of key staff on each subtask and deliverable.

3. Capabilities and Competencies (30%)

This work requires a team with knowledge of (1) statutory analysis and administrative court rules regarding data accessibility, (2) how variations in state legislation and court organization could affect data access, and (3) how best to access, retrieve, and store publicly available court data. Applicants should outline their capabilities and competencies with regards to all four phases of the projects, addressing deliverables 1-11. The work requires a team—

- that is knowledgeable about the nature and variability of court activity and the data elements needed to document key attributes of court cases
- with the ability to develop a nationally representative sampling strategy for court data that allows the production of statistically valid national estimates within an acceptable degree of precision.

The application should provide a clear description of the applicant's proposed organizational structure and plan for project management. The applicant should demonstrate the team's competencies in identifying key resources important to court data access. This includes identifying organizations, persons, and relevant literature sources. Finally, the applicant should demonstrate its knowledge and experience with retrieving raw information from publically available websites and converting this information into analytic databases.

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

5. Budget (15%)

Budget narratives should address the appropriateness of the budget relative to the level of effort described in the in the timeline and task plan. Budgets should be complete, cost effective, and allowable (e.g., reasonable, allocable, and necessary for project activities). Budget narratives should demonstrate cost effectiveness in relation to potential alternatives and the goals of the project.⁹ The budget should address all tasks associated with deliverables 1-11.

Review Process

OJP is committed to ensuring a fair and open process for making awards. BJS 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:

⁹ Generally speaking, a reasonable cost is a cost that, in its nature or amount, does not exceed that which would be incurred by a prudent person under the circumstances prevailing at the time the decision was made to incur the costs.

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

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

Peer review panels will evaluate, score, and rate applications that meet basic minimum requirements. BJS 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 BJS include geographic diversity, strategic priorities, and available funding, as well as the extent to which the Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative accurately explain project costs that are reasonable, necessary, and otherwise allowable under federal law and applicable federal cost principles.

Pursuant to the Part 200 Uniform Requirements, before award decisions are made, OJP also reviews information related to the degree of risk posed by the applicant. Among other things to help assess whether an applicant that has one or more prior federal awards has a satisfactory record with respect to performance, integrity, and business ethics, OJP checks whether the applicant is listed in SAM as excluded from receiving a federal award.

In addition, if OJP anticipates that an award will exceed \$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, (FAPIS)).

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

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

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

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

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 BJS 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, 2018. 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 recipient of funds, 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 and submission of the fully executed award document to OJP.

Administrative, National Policy, and Other Legal Requirements

If selected for funding, in addition to implementing the funded project consistent with the OJP-approved application, the recipient must comply with all award conditions, as well as all applicable requirements of federal statutes, and regulations, (including applicable requirements referred to in the assurances and certifications executed in connection with award acceptance). OJP strongly encourages prospective applicants to review information on post-award legal requirements and common OJP award conditions **prior** to submitting an application.

Applicants should consult the "[Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2018 Awards](https://ojp.gov/funding/index.htm)," available in the OJP Funding Resource Center at <https://ojp.gov/funding/index.htm>. In addition, applicants should examine the following two legal documents, as each recipient of funds must execute both documents before it may receive any award funds. (An applicant is not required to submit these documents as part of an application.)

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

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

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

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

General Information about Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements

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

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

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

Data on performance measures. In addition to required reports, each award recipient also must provide data that measure the results of the work done under the award. To demonstrate

program progress and success, as well as to assist DOJ in fulfilling its responsibilities under the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA), Public Law 103-62, and the GPRA Modernization Act of 2010, Public Law 111-352, OJP will require any award recipient, post award, to provide performance data as part of regular progress reporting. Successful applicants will be required to access OJP's performance measurement page at www.ojp.gov/performance to view the specific reporting requirements for this grant program. Performance measures are also listed as an [Appendix A](#).

G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s)

For OJP contact(s), see the title page.

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

H. Other Information

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

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

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

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

Provide Feedback to OJP

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

IMPORTANT: This email is for feedback and suggestions only. OJP does **not** reply from this mailbox to messages it receives in this mailbox. Any prospective applicant that has specific

questions on any program or technical aspect of the solicitation **must** use the appropriate telephone number or email listed on the front of this document to obtain information. These contacts are provided to help ensure that prospective applicants can directly reach an individual who can address specific questions in a timely manner.

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

Appendix A: Performance Measures Table

Objective	Performance Measure(s)	Data Recipient Provides
<p>Phase 1: Examine the feasibility of accessing publically available state and local court data to provide detailed estimates of attributes of criminal and civil cases processed by state courts</p>	<p>Percentage of states that have automated state and local court data electronically accessible to the public</p> <p>Percentage of states that have automated state and local court data that are complete</p> <p>Number of deliverables completed on time as determined by BJS</p> <p>Number of deliverables that meet expectations as defined by BJS</p>	<p>The recipient of funds will review publicly available court records to determine whether court records are representative</p> <p>Specifically, deliverables 3, 6, 7, and 9 detailed in the solicitation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Number of states b) Number of states with laws regarding access to state and local court records c) Number of states with publicly available state and local court data that are automated and electronically (on-line) available d) Number of states with publicly available state and local court data that are complete and include coverage of case types, data elements, and case events <p>The recipient of funds should provide timely deliverables that meet the expectations outlined in the solicitation, to include, but not limited to-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Document each states laws and policies regarding court records access 2) Document the extent of publicly available, online, case-level start court data

Objective	Performance Measure(s)	Data Recipient Provides
	<p>Percentage of milestones and deadlines met as determined by BJS</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3) Method for collecting publicly available data 4) Document data gaps in publicly available data 5) Document alternative sources of data to fill data gaps 6) Report assessing the coverage and utility of publicly available data across the United States (Interim Data Assessment of Freely Publicly Available Court Data report). 7) Document the cost, access, and burden to alternative (non-publically available) data collection sources 8) Sampling plan with options for collecting nationally representative court data <p>Monthly progress reports matching BJS specifications (to include time spent on each task, percent complete for each task, staff assigned to each task, staff time allocated to each task, and related budget draw-downs)</p> <p>Quarterly progress reports reflecting activities in each area of the project</p> <p>Quarterly financial reports ensuring project funds are being used proportionately</p>

Objective	Performance Measure(s)	Data Recipient Provides
		Routine weekly or biweekly meetings with BJS staff to review project progress
Phase 2: Test the methodology for collection of data from publicly available sources to determine the time and level of effort to collect, clean, and standardize data.	<p>Successfully complete the data collection (pilot and eventual full collection, if supplemented) authorized as determined by BJS</p> <p>Percentage of raw data that is converted to standardized format</p> <p>Number of deliverables completed on time as determined by BJS</p> <p>Number of deliverables that meet expectations as defined by BJS</p>	<p>The recipient of funds will collect, review for quality and completeness, clean, standardize, and provide data to BJS as defined in the solicitation and subsequent documents resulting from Phase 1 of the initiative</p> <p>Data documentation, including data mapping, must accompany the file and subject to review and approval by BJS's Technology and Management Unit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Number of raw datasets b) Number of raw datasets converted to standardized format <p>Deliverables defined in the solicitation and data documentation to include but not limited to-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Pilot report, b) Coverage of publicly available data and alternate data sources, c) Cost of the collection, and d) Sampling plans to generate nationally representative statistics

Objective	Performance Measure(s)	Data Recipient Provides
Phase 3 & 4: Produce a final project report documenting the initiative and conclusions of the assessment of publicly available state and local court data.	Co-authored BJS report Final report with a comprehensive overview of project	Co-author a report with BJS The final report is a summary of the project and recommendations for future iterations of the project At the conclusion of the project, the recipient of funds will provide a final financial report

Appendix B: Application Checklist

Analysis of Publicly Available Court Data (APACD)

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

What an Applicant Should Do:

Prior to Registering in Grants.gov:

_____ Acquire a DUNS Number (see page 34)

_____ Acquire or renew registration with SAM (see page 34)

To Register with Grants.gov:

_____ Acquire AOR and Grants.gov username/password (see page 35)

_____ Acquire AOR confirmation from the E-Biz POC (see page 35)

To Find Funding Opportunity:

_____ Search for the Funding Opportunity on Grants.gov (see page 35)

_____ Select the correct Competition ID (see page 35)

_____ Access Funding Opportunity and Application Package (see page 35)

_____ Sign up for Grants.gov email [notifications](#) (optional) (see page 33)

_____ 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 18)

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 35)

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

_____ contact BJS regarding experiencing technical difficulties (see page 36)

Overview of Post-Award Legal Requirements:

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

Scope Requirement:

_____ The federal amount requested is within the allowable limit(s) of \$ 2,000,000.

Eligibility Requirement: Eligible applicants are national, regional, state, or local public and private entities, including for-profit and nonprofit organizations (including tribal for-profit and nonprofit organizations); faith-based and community organizations; institutions of higher education (including tribal institutions of higher education); federally recognized Indian tribal governments (as determined by the Secretary of the Interior); and units of local government that support initiatives to improve the functioning of the criminal justice system.

What an Application Should Include:

_____ Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424)	(see page 19)
_____ Project Abstract	(see page 20)
_____ Program Narrative	(see page 20)
_____ Additional requirements— <i>Appendices</i>	(see page 21)
_____ Budget Detail Worksheet	(see page 23)
_____ Budget Narrative	(see page 23)
_____ Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable)	(see page 26)
_____ Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable)	(see page 26)
_____ Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire	(see page 27)
_____ Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (SF-LLL)	(see page 27)
_____ Privacy Certification	
_____ Additional Attachments	(see page 28)
_____ Human Subjects Protection Certification of Compliance (if applicable)	(see page 28)
_____ Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications	(see page 28)
_____ Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity	(see page 29)
_____ Disclosure of Process Related to Executive Compensation	(see page 31)
_____ Request and Justification for Employee Compensation; Waiver (if applicable)	(see page 18)