

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 collection agent to administer the 2018 National Survey of Victim Service Providers through a cooperative agreement. This project furthers the Department's mission by identifying the most pressing challenges confronting the justice system in supporting and providing assistance to victims and by providing information in support of innovative strategies for dealing with these challenges.

National Survey of Victim Service Providers (NSVSP)

Applications Due: June 15, 2017

Eligibility

Eligible applicants are national, regional, state, or local public and private entities, for-profit and nonprofit organizations, "(including tribal nonprofit and for-profit organizations)" faith-based and community organizations, 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.

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](#) prior to submitting an application. All applications are due by 11:59 p.m. eastern time on June 15, 2017.

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

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

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

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

Contact Information

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

An applicant that experiences unforeseen Grants.gov technical issues beyond its control that prevent it from submitting its application by the deadline must email the 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 Barbara Oudekerk, Statistician and Project Manager, by telephone at 202-307-0765, or by email at askbjs@usdoj.gov. Include “NSVSP17” in the subject line.

Grants.gov number assigned to this solicitation: BJS-2017-11460

Release date: May 15, 2017

Contents

A. Program Description	4
Overview	4
Project-Specific Information	4
Goals and Objectives	7
Deliverables	10
B. Federal Award Information.....	11
Type of Award.....	11
Financial Management and System of Internal Controls.....	12
Budget Information.....	12
Cost Sharing or Match Requirement	12
Pre-Agreement Costs (also known as Pre-award Costs).....	12
Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver	13
Prior Approval, Planning, and Reporting of Conference/Meeting/Training Costs	13
Costs Associated with Language Assistance (if applicable)	14
C. Eligibility Information.....	14
D. Application and Submission Information	14
What an Application Should Include	14
How to Apply.....	27
E. Application Review Information.....	30
Review Criteria.....	30
Review Process	31
F. Federal Award Administration Information	33
Federal Award Notices	33
Administrative, National Policy, and Other Legal Requirements.....	33
General Information about Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements	34
G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s)	34
H. Other Information.....	35
Freedom of Information Act and Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552 and 5 U.S.C. 552a).....	35
Provide Feedback to OJP	35
Application Checklist.....	36

National Survey of Victim Service Providers (NSVSP) (CFDA#16.734)

A. Program Description

Overview

The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) is seeking an applicant to administer the 2018 National Survey of Victim Service Providers (NSVSP). The NSVSP is part of BJS's larger [Victim Services Statistical Research Program](#), an effort to develop a statistical infrastructure around victim services and address major gaps in our knowledge about the availability and use of services to support victims of crime or abuse. As a follow-up to the National Census of Victim Service Providers (NCVSP) (see survey instruments on [Funding](#) page), the NSVSP will collect more detailed information on services provided, staffing, and organizational constraints from a representative sample of victim service providers (VSPs).

Statutory Authority: Under section 302 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, 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. This solicitation is also authorized under 42 U.S.C. § 10603(c)(1)(A).

Project-Specific Information

Prior to the 1980s, crime control policy paid little attention to victims of crime. This changed in the 1980s with the creation of the Office for Victims of Crime (OVC) and other efforts to make victims whole and to take their suffering into account in criminal justice policy and practice. OVC funds a broad array of services for victims of crime, including compensation. In the 1990s, OVC was joined by the Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) in supporting service provision for victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking. For more than two decades, these programs have built and maintained the service infrastructure necessary to assist victims. During this period, little attention was paid to the statistical and research infrastructure necessary to identify areas in need of services and to demonstrate the delivery and effectiveness of that service infrastructure. The general purpose research and statistical agencies within the DOJ—the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) and BJS—have conducted research and collected statistics relevant to crime victims. However, these activities have provided limited data on victim help-seeking and efforts geared toward victim assistance. In addition, much of the work has been narrow in scope, often focused only on victims' perspectives, particular types of victimization, and specific subgroups of victims and conducted at local levels.

OVC's release of Vision 21 highlighted the need to build a national research and statistical infrastructure on victims of crime and victim service provision that is commensurate with the service infrastructure built over the past 20 years.² This will afford the victim services field the ability to provide more effective assistance to crime victims and inform national funding, policies,

²Office for Victims of Crime (2013). Vision 21: Transforming Victim Services Final Report. Available at <https://ovc.ncjrs.gov/vision21/>.

and programming designed to support the victim services field. In response to this need and with funding and collaboration from OVC, BJS initiated the Victim Services Statistical Research Program aimed at developing better data on victim services both from victims directly and from victim service providers.

Most of what is known about victims' use of services nationally comes from victims' reports in the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS). This is a large nationally representative survey of the noninstitutionalized residential population that collects information on victims, offenders, the social context of the crime, the harms resulting from crime, and the victim response. For most of its history, the NCVS has included only victims of common law crime (i.e., property crimes including household burglary, motor vehicle theft, and theft; and violent crimes including rape and sexual assault, robbery, aggravated assault, and simple assault). More recently, the survey has included supplements on other types of crime, including identity theft and stalking. While the NCVS gathers information on victims and the crimes they experience, the survey has not been used to collect more information on victim services and victims' decisions to seek those services. In the 30-year history of the survey, only one report has been released that focuses solely on victim services use.³ Much more can be done with the NCVS to collect additional data on victims' help-seeking behaviors and the services they receive, and efforts are underway to include new items in the current NCVS instrument redesign.

The NCVS, however, cannot be our only source of data on victims of crime and the services they receive. A number of important population groups are omitted by design from the survey, including children age 11 or younger and institutionalized populations, such as the elderly in nursing homes and prisoners. Many crimes are relatively rare, and as a result, the victims of these rare crimes cannot be identified in any sample of reasonable size. The same rare event problem affects statistics on type of service—reliable estimates cannot be provided because not enough persons in the sample receive certain types of service. In addition, for some important types of crimes (e.g., human trafficking), a household survey may not be the best source for information on the crime and its consequences. In these cases, victim survey data must be supplemented and complemented by administrative data from police and victim service agencies, if we are to have a more complete picture of victims, including the services they receive and do not receive.

VSPs are an important and untapped source of information on victims of crime and the services available to them. VSPs know about the victims who receive help and can describe the unmet demand for their services. These agencies know how victims are referred to them (e.g., police, hospitals, or other sources), the services they sought and received, the cost of those services, the source that funded service delivery, and possibly the outcome of any service provided. Knowing whether VSPs are adequately staffed, funded, and resourced to meet the needs of victims is essential for describing what is being done for victims of crime and what is not being done, as well as what is effective and what is not effective. VSPs are the most reliable source from which to collect this type of information. Therefore, as a critical part of the Victim Services Statistical Research Program, BJS initiated a two-phase national data collection system to collect information directly from VSPs.

The first phase of BJS's national VSP collection, the NCVSP, is underway.⁴ The goals of the first NCVSP are twofold: (1) to develop and validate a national roster of active VSPs, and (2) to

³Langton, L. (2011). Use of victim service agencies by victims of serious violent crime, 1993-2009. Available at <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/uvsavsvc9309.pdf>.

⁴For more information, visit the project website at: <http://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=tp&tid=98>.

develop an understanding of the broad range of entities that provide victim services as their primary function or through specific programs or personnel, including how they are structured, the types of services they offer, the types of crime victims they serve, the size of their staff, and funding sources and sustainability.

Since 2012, BJS and the larger project team have worked to create a national de-duplicated roster of all types of entities serving victims (~30,000). This first national roster was created by aggregating and de-duplicating information from federal grantees receiving victim services funding (e.g., from OVC, OVW), the National Center for Victims of Crime membership list, and entities identified through canvassing for VSP lists in all states. This work was challenging because no national, comprehensive list of all VSPs existed. The victim services field encompasses a wide variety of entities, from criminal justice organizations to hospitals to campus organizations to the full spectrum of community-based organizations, ranging from brick and mortar domestic violence shelters to less formal support groups. Many of the existing VSP lists were outdated, or included only certain types of providers, for example, providers from particular geographical regions, providing services for specific types of crimes (e.g., domestic violence), or providers serving particular subgroups of victims (e.g., child victims).

In addition, because no uniform definition of VSP existed, a first step was to develop a method for defining entities as VSPs. Any organizations or entities with named programs or dedicated staff that provided services to victims of crime or abuse in the past six months were considered VSPs. Victims of crime or abuse includes victims/survivors who are directly harmed or threatened by crimes and abuse(s), but also their family or household members or legal representatives. VSPs were grouped into the following categories:

- 1) *Primary function*: Entities that serve victims of crime or abuse as their primary function or mission (e.g., domestic violence shelter or stalking resource center)
- 2) *Dedicated programming*: Entities that do more than serve victims of crime or abuse, but that have dedicated staff or programs specifically for serving victims (e.g., hospitals, law enforcement agencies, or a YMCA that has a specific program for victims)
- 3) *No dedicated programming*: Entities that do more than serve victims of crime or abuse and have no dedicated staff or programs for serving victims (e.g., homeless shelters or law enforcement agencies without specific staff or programs for victims).

The goal for the NCVSP was to generate a validated frame of all active VSPs serving victims as their primary function or through dedicated staff or programs for victims. There are many organizations that serve victims through the course of their regular activities (e.g., YMCAs, homeless shelters, or churches), but without dedicated programs or staff, these entities are likely not able to provide data on key topics of interest (e.g., staffing, funding, or number of victims served) comparable to that provided by other VSPs. For example, it would not make sense to compare the funding an entire law enforcement agency receives to the funding received by a domestic violence shelter. Moreover, there is no way to identify the universe of entities that provide services to victims on an ad hoc or informal basis.

A pilot test was conducted between August 2015 and January 2016 with 725 entities from the initially generated roster to determine the completeness and accuracy of the roster and the ability to obtain high response rates from all types of entities. Findings justified the need for a complete enumeration of all entities on the roster, rather than simply using the roster as a national sampling frame. The information on the roster was outdated, such that approximately 35% of entities screened out of the survey because they did not provide services to victims of crime or abuse in the past 6 months. In addition, there was often little information provided

about the entities beyond their organizational name; for example, it was not always known whether they had received federal funding in the past year, what types of victims they served, or where the agencies were located (e.g., in the community, campus, law enforcement). Encouragingly, however, the survey was well received. About 86% of eligible entities completed all critical sections of the survey, and 91% completed at least part of the survey.

Data collection for the full NCVSP began in October 2016 and is expected to be completed in late spring 2017. The NCVSP was administered to just fewer than 30,000 entities. If results from the pilot test generalize to the full roster, we expect approximately 35% to screen out (or 10,500 screen outs) leaving approximately 19,500 active VSPs. In the pilot, about 54% of providers were serving victims as their primary function whereas 46% of providers were serving victims through dedicated staff or programs (e.g., within a law enforcement agency or homeless shelter). The NCVSP will provide a complete and accurate picture of the VSP field that can be used to construct a representative sample for phase two of BJS's national collection, the NSVSP.

Under this award, the NSVSP will be administered approximately 1 year after the NCVSP. The NSVSP is designed to collect more detailed information than is feasible through a large collection like the NCVSP, including types of resources available to victims and the gaps in services; the qualifications, training, and job functions of VSP staff; costs of providing services to victims; and the technological infrastructure of VSPs. Together, the NCVSP and NSVSP will provide the first national picture of the victim services field, yielding much needed information about the field's size, structure, and scope.

Goals and Objectives

The goal of this solicitation is to select a data collection agent that will support BJS in the administration of phase two of BJS's national VSP collection: (1) finalizing the NSVSP instrument; (2) selecting a sample of approximately 4,000 to 6,000 VSPs, giving consideration to the ability to produce national estimates, including at least some subnational estimates (e.g., major cities, highest populated states), and appropriate stratification of the sample; and (3) administration of the NSVSP to the selected sample. The NSVSP will provide detailed data on the organization, function, resources, and organizational constraints of the broad range of entities providing services to victims of crime and abuse.

Once selected, the recipient of funds will obtain—

- Access to the sampling frame for the NSVSP (i.e., the NCVSP data file). The data file will include basic characteristics about VSPs that can be used to develop a sampling strategy, explained in more detail below see attached NCVSP instrument). With funding from this award, the successful applicant will work with BJS to develop a strategy for sampling VSPs to produce national and subnational estimates.
- A draft NSVSP instrument. BJS anticipates cognitively testing the instrument in spring 2017, prior to this award. More details about the instrument are provided below.

The recipient of funds will host an expert panel meeting and finalize the NSVSP instrument based on feedback from the experts; possibly cognitively testing the survey (depending on the extent of the changes); administer the survey; and produce a cleaned public-use data file and corresponding codebook.

More specifically, in collaboration with BJS through this cooperative agreement, the recipient of funds will complete the following specific tasks:

(1) Organize and convene an in-person expert panel meeting. An expert panel and project information committee (PIC) have been involved throughout the development and administration of the NCVSP and the initial drafting of the NSVSP instrument. Upon receiving the award, the data collector will evaluate the panel and PIC and, if necessary, identify members with additional types of expertise to serve on these groups. The PIC is comprised of more than 50 victim service umbrella organizations and professional associations. To date, the PIC has provided valuable input on definitional issues, data administration considerations, and outreach methods necessary for the development of a first national data collection on VSPs. Communication with PIC has been conducted via calls, email, and webinars. The group does not convene in-person.

A smaller (13 member) expert panel convened twice in-person at BJS to participate in key decisions about the development and administration of the NCVSP. A list of the current expert panel members is available on the [BJS NCVSP project website](#). BJS expects the panel to continue to consist of 12 to 14 experts with diverse experience in the victim services field covering all major areas of the NSVSP, including: types of VSPs, types of services, crime types, and VSP staffing and funding. The recipient of funds will assist BJS in determining which members would like to continue their service on the panel and fill vacant positions. The recipient of funds will then work with BJS to organize and convene an expert panel meeting to review the draft NSVSP instrument and cognitive testing results (from the testing in spring 2017), discuss potential sampling strategies, and review the data collection plan. The recipient of funds should budget for travel and honorariums for approximately 12 to 14 experts. In addition to the experts serving on the panel, approximately 6 to 8 local federal staff from BJS, OVC, NIJ, and OVW will be invited to attend, depending on the location of the meeting. The recipient of funds will continue to communicate with the expert panel and PIC throughout the administration of the NSVSP.

(2) Revise and finalize the NSVSP instrument, which might involve cognitive testing.

The NSVSP instrument is currently being developed, and will go through one round of cognitive testing prior to BJS making this award. The instrument is designed to be administered in approximately 30 to 40 minutes. Although BJS anticipates the instrument may be modified after convening the expert panel meeting, it is expected to address the following core topics:

- Victims served
 - Number of victims served in the past year, by sociodemographic characteristics
 - Number of victims served for specific types of crime or victimization
- Victim services
 - Types of services provided to victims, and variation by type of victimization
 - Gaps in services to victims
 - Length of services for victims
 - Common barriers to meeting victims' service needs
- Referrals
 - Frequency of referrals for services
 - Referral gaps in the community
- Staffing
 - Composition of staffing for different VSP types
 - VSP staff characteristics, training, salaries, and benefits

- Funding
 - Constraints
 - Sustainability
- Practices regarding
 - Outcome measures collected by VSPs
 - Outreach
 - Information sharing

The recipient of funds will be responsible for reviewing the instrument, implementing revisions based on the results from cognitive testing and the expert panel meeting, and ultimately finalizing the instrument before administering the survey. Depending on the type and extent of the changes made to the instrument after the expert panel meeting, it might need to go through a second round of cognitive testing.

- (3) **Assist BJS in developing viable sampling strategies.** There are multiple considerations to weigh in developing a sampling strategy, including how to stratify the sample and the costs and effort of potentially producing both national and subnational estimates.

From the NCVSP data (see attached NCVSP instrument), BJS will have descriptive information about VSPs that could be considered when designing the sample, for example:

- type of VSP (e.g., nonprofit or faith-based, government, hospital or health facility, campus-based, tribal entity, for-profit, informal entity)
- VSP structure (i.e., primary function is to serve victims versus entity services victims as one component of their mission through dedicated staff or programs, such as victim service staff working within law enforcement)
- number of victims served
- total amount of funding received per year for victim services
- types of crime services that were provided in the past year
- types of victims or crimes the organization serves according to their mission (e.g., agencies with a mission to serve domestic violence victims, child victims)
- geographical location.

The recipient of funds will work closely with BJS to evaluate various sampling design options. With BJS, the recipient will weigh assumptions underlying each design, and select the optimal design based on costs and the power to produce national and subnational estimates specified by BJS and verified as timely and important by the expert panel.

BJS anticipates investing in a large sample size of approximately 4,000 to 6,000 VSPs from the frame of approximately 20,000 VSPs, but the final sample size will be determined based on the results of a power analysis and cost estimates. The recipient will conduct power analyses, generate cost estimates for different design options, and after a design has been selected by BJS and the awardee, write up a draft of the subnational and national sampling and estimation plan. The recipient will then execute the selected design.

Administer the survey to a sample of about 4,000 to 6,000 VSPs, obtaining sufficient response rates (ideally 80% or higher) and tracking paradata during collection. The

recipient of funds will implement the NSVSP, which includes designing all study materials and formatting the survey for administration. Like the NCVSP, the survey will be web-based with an option for computer-assisted telephone interview (CATI) administration. In the pilot test for the NCVSP, 67% of VSPs completed the survey online, and 30% over the phone. Based on findings from the NCVSP, the recipient of funds will work with BJS to prepare and administer a nonresponse protocol that encourages the cost-effective, less burdensome web-based mode over CATI. Only 3% of VSPs completed a hardcopy of the NCVSP instrument in the pilot. Given that the hardcopy costs more and is more difficult to complete than the online or CATI versions, a paper version of the NSVSP will not be administered. A paper version of the NSVSP will be created only for documentation and dissemination purposes.

The recipient of funds will monitor the data collection costs and participation rates and produce biweekly paradata reports for BJS. Paradata might include number of contacts by mode (telephone, mail, email); phase within the nonresponse follow-up protocol; time it takes to complete the survey; and response rates overall and by VSP type.

- (4) *Develop and implement plans for weighting, imputation, and nonresponse bias analysis.*** The recipient of funds will develop these plans in conjunction with BJS and implement with approval. If response rates are under 80%, the recipient will conduct and write up a report summarizing findings on non-response bias.
- (5) *Clean and prepare the NSVSP data for analysis.*** The recipient of funds will prepare the data for analysis by cleaning and verifying the accuracy of all data, constructing variables needed for anticipated analyses, and developing a strategy for estimating sampling error. The recipient will also develop imputation strategies and generate post-stratification weights so that users can produce national and subnational estimates.
- (6) *Develop a public-use data file and codebook containing necessary documentation and variable information.*** BJS and the award recipient will work together to determine the information that will be included in the public-use data file, which is anticipated to include administration variables (organizational name and address, mode of survey completion, date of survey completion), all instrument item responses, and additional variables calculated for particular types of analysis. The award recipient will deliver to BJS a clean, verified data file and documentation necessary to replicate variables calculated included in the data file. The data will be delivered in a commonly used statistical software package (SPSS, SAS, or Stata). The data file and codebook will meet the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data (NACJD) standards and formatting requirements, and the awardee will work directly with the archive staff to answer questions and ensure that the data and documentation are sufficient.

Deliverables

During the first month of this project, the award recipient will organize the expert panel meeting. In collaboration with BJS, the recipient will deliver a list of expert panel and PIC members (*deliverable 1*) and an expert panel meeting agenda and materials (*deliverable 2*). After the expert panel meeting, the recipient will deliver a report summarizing the recommendations from the experts (*deliverable 3*). During this time, the recipient of funds will also be working with BJS to develop potential sample design options, and will draft a memo summarizing the results of power analyses, selected sample size, and selected stratification approach for producing national and subnational estimates (*deliverable 4*). The types of estimates that can be produced at a national and subnational level based on the developed sampling design will be presented to

the expert panel for feedback. If any modifications are made following the meeting, the awardee will write up the final sampling design (*deliverable 5*).

The NSVSP instrument development should be completed by the end of month 3 or 4, depending on whether the instrument needs to go through an additional round of cognitive testing. The award recipient will produce a summary of the modifications made to the NSVSP instrument (*deliverable 6*). The final instrument will be formatted for online administration and a CATI script will be created for administration over the telephone (*deliverables 7 and 8*). If cognitive testing is required, awardees will also draft the Office of Management Bureau (OMB) generic clearance protocol, a cognitive testing script, and a final cognitive testing report (*deliverables 9, 10, and 11*).

In month 5, working with BJS, the award recipient will draft all the administration materials, including the invitation letters, reminder letters, phone scripts, etc. (*deliverable 12*), as well as the full OMB clearance package for administration of the NSVSP (*deliverable 13*).

Data collection will begin in month 8 or 9 of the award, and the NSVSP is expected to be in the field for approximately 4 months. Over the course of data collection, the awardee will deliver biweekly production reports that include paradata monitoring indicators of cost and participation (*deliverable 14*). The awardee will produce plans for nonresponse bias analysis, weighting and imputation for BJS review and approval (*deliverables 15, 16, and 17*).

Once the plans have been approved and data collection completed the awardee will deliver a cleaned public-use data file that includes all final variables of interest and weights; documentation on the generation of the weights and plans for estimating standard error; and a final codebook in the format required for archiving at the NACJD (*deliverables 18, 19, and 20*).

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

B. Federal Award Information

BJS expects to make one award of up to \$1,250,000 for an 18-month period of performance, to begin on October 1, 2017.

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

Financial Management and System of Internal Controls

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

- (a) Establish and maintain effective internal control over the Federal award that provides reasonable assurance that [the recipient (and any subrecipient)] is managing the Federal award in compliance with Federal statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of the Federal award. These internal controls should be in compliance with guidance in “Standards for Internal Control in the Federal Government” issued by the Comptroller General of the United States and the “Internal Control Integrated Framework”, issued by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission (COSO).
- (b) Comply with Federal statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of the Federal awards.
- (c) Evaluate and monitor [the recipient’s (and any subrecipient’s)] compliance with statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of Federal awards.
- (d) Take prompt action when instances of noncompliance are identified including noncompliance identified in audit findings.
- (e) Take reasonable measures to safeguard protected personally identifiable information and other information the Federal awarding agency or pass-through entity designates as sensitive or [the recipient (or any subrecipient)] considers sensitive consistent with applicable Federal, state, local, and tribal laws regarding privacy and obligations of confidentiality.

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

Budget Information

Cost Sharing or Match Requirement

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

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

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

⁵For 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.

⁶The “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.

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

Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver

With respect to any award of more than \$250,000 made under this solicitation, a recipient may not use federal funds to pay total cash compensation (salary plus cash bonuses) to any employee of the recipient at a rate that exceeds 110% of the maximum annual salary payable to a member of the federal government's Senior Executive Service (SES) at an agency with a Certified SES Performance Appraisal System for that year.⁷ The 2017 salary table for SES employees is available at the Office of Personnel Management [website](#). Note: A recipient may compensate an employee at a greater rate, provided the amount in excess of this compensation limitation is paid with nonfederal funds. (Nonfederal funds used for any such additional compensation will not be considered matching funds, where match requirements apply.) If only a portion of an employee's time is charged to an OJP award, the maximum allowable compensation is equal to the percentage of time worked times the maximum salary limitation.

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

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

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

OJP strongly encourages every applicant that proposes to use award funds for any conference-, meeting-, or training-related activity (or similar event) to review carefully—before submitting an application—the OJP and DOJ policy and guidance on approval, planning, and reporting of such events, available at

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-related costs for cooperative agreement recipients, as well as some conference-,

⁷OJP 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.

meeting-, and training-related costs for grant recipients; and (3) set cost limits, which include a general prohibition of all food and beverage costs.

Costs Associated with Language Assistance (if applicable)

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

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

C. Eligibility Information

For eligibility information, see the title page.

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

D. Application and Submission Information

What an Application Should Include

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

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

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

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

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

To avoid processing delays, an applicant must include an accurate legal name on its SF-424. Current OJP award recipients, when completing the field for "Legal Name" should use the same legal name that appears on the prior year award document which is also the legal name stored in OJP's financial system. On the SF-424, enter the Legal Name in box 5 and Employer Identification Number (EIN) in box 6 exactly as it appears on the prior year award document. An applicant with current 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 the Official Legal Name and address of the applicant entity in box 5 and the EIN in box 6 of the SF-424. An applicant must attach official legal documents to its application (e.g., articles of incorporation, 501(c)(3), etc.) to confirm the legal name, address, and EIN entered into the SF-424.

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

2. Project Abstract

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

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

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

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

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

In the project abstract template, each applicant is asked to indicate whether it gives OJP permission to share the applicant's project abstract (including contact information for

individuals) with the public. Granting (or failing to grant) this permission will not affect OJP's funding decisions. Moreover, if the application is not funded, providing permission will not ensure that OJP will share the abstract information, nor will it assure funding from any other source.

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

3. Program Narrative

This should describe the manner in which the applicant will address the goals and objectives and meet the deliverables for the project. The narrative should present a clear understanding the substantive and methodological issues associated with the work described in this solicitation.

The program narrative should not exceed 35 pages with line spacing of no less than 1.5 lines, with a standard 12-point font (e.g., Times New Roman, Arial) with no less than 1-inch margins all around. These limitations apply to tables and figures included within the narrative. The project abstract, table of contents, appendices, and government forms do not count toward the 35-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

Applicants should demonstrate a good understanding of the victim services literature and field, especially the diversity of the types of entities serving victims. The successful applicant will demonstrate a clear understanding of characteristics of VSPs that could be considered for sample stratification, such as staff size, budget, type of organization, and type of services provided. Applicants should also demonstrate a clear understanding of priority data needs for the victim services field.

b. Project Design and Implementation

Applicants should demonstrate their expertise in administration of national surveys, including a plan for convening an expert panel meeting, finalizing the NSVSP, and administering it to a large sample of VSPs. Applicants should also demonstrate expertise in sampling methodology and an understanding of how different sampling strategies will affect the quality and types of estimates that can be generated. Applicants should also discuss past experiences with analyzing nonresponse bias, generating weighting and imputation strategies, and cleaning and preparing data for analysis.

⁸For 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](#).

Applicants should append a reasonable project timeline with expected milestones and level of staff effort for each phase of the work that corresponds with the goals, objectives, and deliverables articulated in the solicitation. Applicants should build in time for an expert panel meeting, cognitive testing of the NSVSP, and OMB approvals.

c. Capabilities and Competencies

Applicants should demonstrate the capability to administer a survey of this size and scope, which will include designing all study materials (invitation letter, reminder materials, etc.), cognitively testing and finalizing the NSVSP instrument, formatting the survey for administration, developing and administering a nonresponse follow-up protocol, and drafting necessary OMB clearance packages. Applicants should also discuss their experiences obtaining high participation rates in past large-scale surveys, and describe nonresponse protocols and the statistical methods used to account for nonresponse.

d. Plan for Collecting the Data Required for this Solicitation’s Performance Measures

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

BJS does not require applicants to submit performance measures data with their application. Performance measures are included as an alert that BJS will require successful applicants to submit specific data as part of their reporting requirements. The application should describe the applicant's plan for collection of all of the performance measures data listed in the table below under “Data Recipient Provides,” should it receive funding.

Objective	Performance measure(s)	Data recipient provides
Finalize the NSVSP instrument	Provide type of agencies/organizations represented at the expert panel meeting	Type of agencies/organizations represented at the expert panel meeting.

	Number of deliverables completed in a timely manner based on agreed upon project schedule	<p>Agenda and materials for an expert panel meeting;</p> <p>A post-meeting report summarizing experts' feedback on sampling strategies, design implementation, and the NSVSP instrument;</p> <p>An OMB generic clearance for cognitive testing, if needed; Cognitive testing protocol for the NSVSP instrument and a testing report, if needed;</p> <p>Final NSVSP instrument.</p>
Administer the NSVSP to a nationally representative sample	Provide survey design and data collection plan that meets expectations and allows for generation of key estimates	A memo detailing national and subnational sampling designs and resulting key estimates.
	Overall response rate of 80% or better	<p>Number of individuals completed the NSVSP</p> <p>Number of individuals contacted</p>
	Collection of paradata for each potential respondent	Accurate and on-time biweekly paradata reports during data collection
	Number of deliverables completed on time and that meet expectations	<p>OMB clearance protocol;</p> <p>Survey administration materials;</p>
Develop plan for weighting, imputation, and nonresponse bias analysis	Successful implementation of plan with final data file	<p>Memo detailing plans for weighting, imputation, and nonresponse bias analysis</p> <p>If response rates are below 80%, report detailing findings from nonresponse bias analysis</p>
Prepare and deliver a public-use data file and documentation	Percent of respondent records in dataset that are complete and accurate	<p>Number of records in dataset that are complete and accurate</p> <p>Number of records in dataset</p>

	Number of deliverables completed on time, formatted correctly, and meet expectations	Codebook and other documentation on the public data file, including names, legitimate values, value labels, and calculations used to create the variables
--	--	---

- e. Appendices (**optional**, not counted against the 35 page limit), which might include:
- Bibliography or references.
 - Curriculum vitae or resumes of the principal investigator and any and all co-principal investigators. In addition, curriculum vitae, resumes, or biographical sketches of all other individuals (regardless of investigator status) who will be significantly involved in substantive aspects of the proposal (e.g., research methodologists serving as consultants to develop sampling strategies and experts with knowledge of children’s exposure to violence).
 - 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 the work.
 - 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 that 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 data. A model certificate is located at www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/bjsmpc.pdf.
 - 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).

4. Budget and Associated Documentation

a. Budget Detail Worksheet

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

For questions pertaining to budget and examples of allowable and unallowable costs, see the [DOJ Grants Financial Guide](#).

b. Budget Narrative

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. Information on proposed subawards

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

d. Pre-Agreement Costs

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

5. Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable)

Indirect costs may be charged to an award only if—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- The federal awarding agency that currently designates the applicant high risk
- The date the applicant was designated high risk

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

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

7. Disclosure of Lobbying Activities

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

8. Additional Attachments

a. Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications

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

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

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

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

Federal or State Funding Agency	Solicitation Name/Project Name	Name/Phone/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 Legal Name on the application must match the entity named on the disclosure of pending applications statement.

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

b. Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity

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

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

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

integrity of the research, including the design, conduct, and reporting of the research.

OR

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

OR

- b. If the applicant has identified actual or potential apparent conflicts of interest (personal, financial, or organizational) that could affect the independence and integrity of the research, including the design, conduct, or reporting of the research, the applicant must is to provide a specific and robust mitigation plan to address each of those conflicts. At a minimum, the applicant is

expected to explain the specific processes and procedures that the applicant has in place, or will put in place, to identify and eliminate (or, at the very least, mitigate) any such conflicts of interest pertinent to the funded project during the period of performance. Documentation that may be helpful in this regard may include organizational codes of ethics/conduct and policies regarding organizational, personal, and financial conflicts of interest. There is no guarantee that the plan, if any, will be accepted as proposed.

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

c. Disclosure of Process Related to Executive Compensation

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

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

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

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

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

applicant organization maintains as concurrent documentation of the decisions with respect to compensation of covered persons made by the body that reviews and approves such compensation arrangements, including records of deliberations and of the basis for decisions.

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

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

How to Apply

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

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

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

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

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

Note on File Names and File Types: Grants.gov only permits the use of certain specific characters in 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 (.)	Applicants must use the “&” format in place of the ampersand (&) when using XML format for documents.		

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

All applicants are required to complete the following steps:

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

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

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

- 1. Acquire a unique entity identifier (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.

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

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

An application cannot be successfully submitted in Grants.gov until Grants.gov receives the SAM registration information. Once the SAM registration/renewal is complete, **the information transfer from SAM to Grants.gov can take as long as 48 hours**. OJP recommends that the applicant register or renew registration with SAM as early as possible. Information about SAM registration procedures can be accessed at www.sam.gov.
- 3. Acquire an Authorized Organization Representative (AOR) and a Grants.gov username and password.** Complete the AOR profile on Grants.gov and create a username and password. An applicant entity's "unique entity identifier" (DUNS number) must be used to complete this step. For more information about the registration process for organizations and other entities, go to <https://apply07.grants.gov/apply/OrcRegister>. Individuals registering with Grants.gov should go to <http://www.grants.gov/web/grants/applicants/individual-registration.html>.
- 4. Acquire confirmation for the AOR from the E-Business Point of Contact (E-Biz POC).** The E-Biz POC at the applicant organization must log into Grants.gov to confirm the applicant organization's AOR. The E-Biz POC will need the Marketing Partner Identification Number (MPIN) password obtained when registering with SAM to complete this step. Note that an organization can have more than one AOR.
- 5. Search for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov.** Use the following identifying information when searching for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov. The Catalog 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-2017-11460.
- 6. Submit a valid application consistent with this solicitation by following the directions in Grants.gov.** Within 24–48 hours after submitting the electronic application, the applicant should receive two notifications from Grants.gov. The first will confirm the receipt of the application. The second will state whether the application has been validated and successfully submitted, or whether it has been rejected due to errors, with an explanation. It is possible to first receive a message indicating that the application is received, and then receive a rejection notice a few minutes or hours later. Submitting an application well ahead of the deadline provides time to correct the problem(s) that caused the rejection. **Important:** OJP urges each applicant to submit its application **at least 72 hours prior** to the application due date, to allow time to receive validation messages or rejection notifications from Grants.gov, and to correct in a timely fashion any problems that may have caused a rejection notification. Applications must be successfully submitted through Grants.gov by 11:59 p.m. eastern time on June 15, 2017.

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

Note: Application Versions

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

Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues

An applicant that experiences unforeseen Grants.gov technical issues beyond its control that prevent it from submitting its application by the deadline must contact the Grants.gov [Customer Support Hotline](#) or the [SAM Help Desk](#) (Federal Service Desk) to report the technical issue and receive a tracking number. The applicant must email the 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](#) web page.

E. Application Review Information

Review Criteria

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

1. Statement of the Problem/Description of the Issue (20%)

The statement of the problem should demonstrate familiarity with the key information needs of the victim services field, an understanding of the diverse VSP structures and missions, and the many definitional and methodological issues that arise when collecting statistical information from victim service providers. Successful applicants should be knowledgeable about past literature on victim services, including OVC's Vision 21 report.

2. Project Design and Implementation (40%)

Key aspects of this work include finalizing the NSVSP instrument, developing a sampling strategy, and administering the NSVSP. Applicants should demonstrate that they understand challenges of conducting a sample-based survey of VSPs and provide potential solutions to these challenges. Applicants will be assessed based on their expertise and the strength of their proposed methods for designing a weighting strategy for producing national and subnational estimates for the diverse field of VSPs, their proposed plan for finalizing the NSVSP instrument, and their proposed timeline and method of administering the NSVSP to a nationally representative sample of VSPs.

3. Capabilities and Competencies (20%)

This work requires a team with substantive knowledge of victim services and experience in the development and use of large scale data collection systems. Applications will be assessed to determine the extent to which the team members have demonstrated knowledge and capabilities in each aspect of the design, including subject matter expertise related to victim service provision and research in the victim service field. A successful applicant must demonstrate methodological knowledge that includes appropriate knowledge of sampling, instrumentation, and procedures relevant to establishment surveys, and the ability to collect comprehensive, timely, and accurate data from a large sample of establishments.

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

The applicant should indicate an understanding of the performance measures required for this grant and confirm that the necessary measures will be provided.

5. Budget: complete, cost effective, and allowable (e.g., reasonable, allocable, and necessary for project activities) (15%)

Budget narratives should demonstrate generally how applicants will maximize cost effectiveness of grant expenditures. Budget narratives should demonstrate cost effectiveness in relation to potential alternatives and the goals of the project.⁹

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:

- The application must be submitted by an eligible type of applicant
- The application must request funding within programmatic funding constraints (if applicable)

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 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 OJP include underserved populations, geographic diversity, strategic priorities, and available funding, as well as the extent to which the budget detail worksheet and budget narrative accurately explain project costs that are reasonable, necessary, and otherwise allowable under federal law and applicable federal cost principles.

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

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

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

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

Absent explicit statutory authorization or written delegation of authority to the contrary, all final award decisions will be made by the Assistant Attorney General, who may take into account not only peer review ratings and 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, 2017. OJP sends award notifications by email through GMS to the individuals listed in the application as the point of contact and the authorizing official (E-Biz POC and AOR). The email notification includes detailed instructions on how to access and view the award documents, and steps to take in GMS to start the award acceptance process. GMS automatically issues the notifications at 9:00 p.m. eastern time on the award date.

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

Administrative, National Policy, and Other Legal Requirements

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

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

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

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

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

under other federal awards; to the recipient's legal status (e.g., as a for-profit entity); or to other pertinent considerations.

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

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

General Information about Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements

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

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

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

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

G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s)

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

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

H. Other Information

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

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

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

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

Provide Feedback to OJP

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

IMPORTANT: This 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 ojpeerreview@lmsolas.com. (Do not send your résumé to the OJP Solicitation Feedback email account.) **Note:** Neither you nor anyone else from your organization or entity can be a peer reviewer in a competition in which you or your organization/entity has submitted an application.

Application Checklist National Survey of Victim Service Providers (NSVSP)

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 28)
- _____ Acquire or renew registration with SAM (see page 29)

To Register with Grants.gov:

- _____ Acquire AOR and Grants.gov username/password (see page 29)
- _____ Acquire AOR confirmation from the E-Biz POC (see page 29)

To Find Funding Opportunity:

- _____ Search for the Funding Opportunity on Grants.gov (see page 29)
- _____ Download Funding Opportunity and Application Package (see page 29)
- _____ Sign up for Grants.gov email [notifications](#) (optional) (see page 27)
- _____ Read [Important Notice: Applying for Grants in Grants.gov](#)
- _____ Read OJP policy and guidance on conference approval, planning, and reporting available at [ojp.gov/financialguide/DOJ/PostawardRequirements/chapter3.10a.htm](#) (see page 13)

After Application Submission, Receive Grants.gov Email Notifications That:

- _____ (1) application has been received,
- _____ (2) application has either been successfully validated or rejected with errors (see page 29)

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

- _____ contact BJS regarding experiencing technical difficulties (see page 30)

Overview of Post-Award Legal Requirements:

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

Scope Requirement:

- _____ The federal amount requested is within the allowable limit(s) of 1,250,000.

Eligibility Requirement: See title page.

What an Application Should Include:

- _____ Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424) (see page 15)
- _____ Project Abstract (see page 15)
- _____ Program Narrative (see page 16)
- _____ Budget Detail Worksheet (see page 19)
- _____ Budget Narrative (see page 19)
- _____ Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable) (see page 22)

_____	Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire	(see page 22)
_____	Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (SF-LLL)	(see page 23)
_____	Additional Attachments	
_____	Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications	(see page 23)
_____	Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity	(see page 24)
_____	Disclosure of Process related to Executive Compensation	(see page 26)
_____	Request and Justification for Employee Compensation; Waiver (if applicable)	(see page 13)