

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 the implementation of a national Census of Medical Examiners and Coroners' Office (CMEC), as part of its Law Enforcement Statistics portfolio. As the primary source for criminal justice statistics in the United States, BJS is responsible for the collection, analysis, publication, and dissemination of statistical information on the operations of criminal justice systems at all levels of government. The CMEC furthers the Department's mission by providing insight into the nation's medicolegal death investigation (MDI) system process and infrastructure, to identify trends and challenges. This system is a critical operation in the criminal justice and public safety systems that contributes to the investigation of all suspicious or violent deaths, determines whether to pursue criminal investigations surrounding deaths, and acts as an early warning system in stances of increased mortality related to drug overdoses, biological or chemical terrorism.

Census of Medical Examiners and Coroners' Offices

Applications Due: July 24, 2017

Eligibility

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

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

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

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

Deadline

Applicants must register with [Grants.gov](https://www.grants.gov) prior to submitting an application. All applications are due by 11:59 p.m. eastern time on July 24, 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.

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](https://www.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** in order to request approval to submit its application after the deadline. Additional information on reporting technical issues appears under “Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues” in the [How to Apply](#) section.

For assistance with any other requirements of this solicitation, contact Connor Brooks, BJS Statistician, by telephone at 202-307-0765 or by email at AskBJS@usdoj.gov. Include “CMEC” in the subject line.

Grants.gov number assigned to this solicitation: BJS-2017-12660

Release date: June 23, 2017

Contents

A. Program Description.....	4
Overview	4
Project-Specific Information.....	4
Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables	5
Evidence-Based Programs or Practices.....	11
B. Federal Award Information.....	12
Type of Award.....	12
Financial Management and System of Internal Controls	12
Budget Information.....	14
Cost Sharing or Match Requirement.....	14
Pre-Agreement Costs (also known as Pre-Award Costs).....	14
Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver.....	15
Prior Approval, Planning, and Reporting of Conference/Meeting/Training Costs	15
Costs Associated with Language Assistance (if applicable).....	16
C. Eligibility Information	16
D. Application and Submission Information	16
What an Application Should Include.....	16
How to Apply.....	30
E. Application Review Information.....	34
Review Criteria.....	34
Review Process	35
F. Federal Award Administration Information.....	36
Federal Award Notices	36
Administrative, National Policy, and Other Legal Requirements	37
General Information about Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements.....	38
G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s).....	39
H. Other Information	39
Freedom of Information Act and Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552 and 5 U.S.C. 552a).....	39
Provide Feedback to OJP.....	40
Application Checklist.....	41

Census of Medical Examiners and Coroners' Offices (CFDA #16.734)

A. Program Description

Overview

The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS), in collaboration with the National Institute of Justice, seeks applications for the administration of the 2018 Census of Medical Examiners and Coroners' Offices (CMEC). The new census will obtain and update information about operations, workload (including backlogs), staffing, training, policies, and procedures of approximately 2,400 medical examiners and coroners' (ME/C) offices that are responsible for providing medicolegal death investigation (MDI) services to America's criminal justice system. Among other responsibilities articulated below, the recipient of funds will act as the data collection agent, update the roster of ME/C offices, revise and update the previous data collection instrument as necessary, administer the 2018 census, and transmit final deliverables and data files to BJS.

Statutory Authority: BJS is authorized to issue this solicitation under 42 U.S.C. § 3732(c)(4).

Project-Specific Information

Since 2002, BJS has regularly conducted two surveys that have informed forensic science: the [Census of Publicly Funded Forensic Crime Laboratories](#) (OMB # 1121-0269) and the [CMEC](#) (OMB # 1121-0296). BJS conducted the last CMEC in 2004. This census investigated the administration, expenditures, workload, records and evidence retention policies, and resources of the approximately 2,000 ME/C offices operating in the United States. It also gathered information on administrative characteristics of ME/C offices, including the type of office (e.g., coroner or medical examiner), staffing levels and titles (e.g., forensic pathologists, specialists, or support personnel), and size and type of jurisdiction the office served.

This iteration of the CMEC will be a 24-month project that provides an updated overview and understanding of the MDI system to help identify trends and challenges for the death investigation process and infrastructure.

Each year, ME/C offices investigate about 500,000 deaths and these deaths are generally sudden and unexpected, have no attending physician, or are suspicious or violent. This includes thousands of homicides and suicides, which eventually place demands on investigative operations in local law enforcement agencies. ME/Cs support public safety and the criminal justice system by providing death investigation services, including death scene investigations, medical investigations, reviews of medical records, medicolegal autopsies, determination of the cause and manner of death, and completion of the certificate of death. These activities inform decisions to pursue criminal investigations surrounding death and include providing testimony in courts as expert medical witnesses. Additionally, it is important to accurately report the nature and number of drug overdoses. Not only do ME/Cs maintain records on mortality rates related to drug overdoses, they also are key to determining toxicity or infection that may be related to biological or chemical terrorism. As an operation within the criminal justice system, the MDI system is critical to understanding drug and violent crime related deaths. BJS seeks to

understand the administrative and functional capacities of the ME/C offices. To meet these needs, the CMEC will capture information on—

- staffing, including employee training, certification, and qualifications; resources, including budget, IT, examination capabilities (including toxicology, specialized laboratories and technologies, and additional needs)
- workload, including number of referrals, accepted cases, and types of cases, autopsies, and backlogs
- policies and procedures in investigating potentially criminal deaths
- policies and procedures for offices functions, including disposition of remains, unidentified decedents, utilization of criminal databases, (e.g. CODIS, NCIC, NVDRS, NamUS), information sharing with other offices, coding standards, and accreditation.

In addition to activities funded under the award associated with this solicitation, planning and development of the 2018 CMEC should be informed by informational resources, including but not limited to—

1. [Medical Examiners and Coroners' Offices, 2004](#) (NCJ 2167156, BJS web, June 2007), a BJS report derived from the previous iteration of the CMEC, the corresponding [survey instrument](#), and BJS's series on [Publicly Funded Forensic Crime Laboratories](#).
2. [Preliminary Report on America's Medicolegal Offices](#) (2004) published for the National Institute of Justice Forensic Summit by the National Association of Medical Examiners (NAME), which is a voluntary, professional organization that accredits ME/C offices. NAME described the need for increased standardization, enhanced training, and greater staffing for the MDI system.
3. The National Research Council's [Strengthening Forensic Science in the United States: A Path Forward](#) (2009) outlines the use of databases, such as National Crime Information Center Unidentified and Missing Person and the National Missing and Unidentified Persons System (NamUs), by ME/C offices for unidentified decedents of which there are about 13,000 per year. The report also details the need for more standardization in training, accreditation of offices, greater access to needed technology, and staffing and funding issues.
4. 2016 reports published by White House's National Science and Technology Council: [Strengthening the Medicolegal Death-Investigation System: Improving Data Systems](#) and [Strengthening the Medicolegal Death-Investigation System: Accreditation and Certification a Path Forward](#).
5. Coordination with applicable professional organizations and stakeholder community. This may include organizations who accredit offices and certify practitioners, professional associations, or academic institutions with experience in the MDI field.
6. Academic and practitioner research in the field of forensic science and MDI.

Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables

ME/C offices are inextricably linked to the investigation of suspicious and violent deaths, investigating roughly 500,000 occurrences every year. The recipient of funds will administer the 2018 CMEC, the goal of which are to 1) generate statistics that will help develop a detailed understanding of the U.S. MDI system. 2) gather information that will help address training, staffing, or jurisdictional coverage needs in the MDI system, and 3) further develop the

understanding of the relationship between law enforcement agencies and ME/C offices. Subject areas covered by the census will include, but are not limited to—

- administrative characteristics of ME/C offices (e.g., type of office, structure, staffing, training, population served, resources, and caseload)
- policies related to data, records, and evidence retention
- how ME/C offices handle investigations involving unidentified or unclaimed decedents
- levels and methods of interaction with law enforcement agencies covering shared jurisdiction
- major changes in the ME/C system since the previous census.

Consistent with the use of a cooperative agreement, BJS will have direct oversight and involvement with the successful applicant in implementing the program. This will not involve day-to-day project management.

The applicant should briefly describe how they would accomplish each deliverable in the time frame specified and estimate the costs associated with each. This should include (1) the specific strategies or innovative approaches that would be conducted to meet each outcome, (2) the capabilities and demonstration of the expertise that will enable them to meet each outcome, and (3) cost estimates for performing the work. The application should describe the applicant's knowledge of the challenges and complexities associated with (1) developing the survey instrumentation, (2) developing a comprehensive census frame of ME/C, (3) achieving adequate response rates to minimize bias in the national estimates and the proposed approaches to collecting data, (4) developing and testing the survey instrument, and (5) disseminating the findings.

Applications should include a statement describing key trends and challenges with the MDI system and how the CMEC survey may address these. The recipient of funds will complete all work associated with successfully fielding and delivering data for the CMEC according to BJS's established time frames.

Key target dates for the 2018 version of the CMEC:

- Reference year of collection: FY 2018 (October 1, 2017–September 30, 2018)
- Award begins Q4 2017 (October–December 2017)
- Expert panel meeting(s) occurs before February 2018
- Cognitive testing occurs in Q2 2018 (April–June 2018)
- Universe frame completed in Q3 2018 (July–September 2018)
- Data collection begins in Q4 2018 (October–December 2018)
- Data collection concludes by end of Q2 (2019) (April–June 2019)
- Final data received by end of Q3 2019 (September 2019)

CMEC Objectives and Deliverables

1. Project Management. Develop and maintain a project schedule with specific tasks, timetables, and discrete project phases.

- 1.1. Within the first month of the project, the award recipient will attend a kickoff meeting with BJS to discuss proposed tasks. The recipient of funds will then develop and propose, for BJS approval, a detailed timetable outlining the completion dates for each task, the delivery date for each deliverable and status report, and the dates for scheduled meetings.

1.2. Maintain regular communication with BJS through regular meetings and status reports.

1.2.1. Through the course of the project, the award recipient will provide monthly progress reports to the BJS project manager, which detail project status, expenditures, response rates, collection issues, and other items affecting the project. BJS will provide a project progress report template. (See Section F: Federal Award Administration Information—[General Information about Post-Federal Reporting Requirements](#).)

1.2.2. During data collection, provide reports on the status of sample collection and paradata, such as response rates and field costs.

1.2.3. Conduct biweekly calls with BJS discussing project tasks and deliverables. Applicant will provide agendas and minutes for every meeting.

Required deliverables: (1) A written timeline for the entire project (all tasks) with the design and project tasks fully specified, (2) progress reports due within 15 business days after the end of each month or at a time determined mutually between BJS and the applicant, and (3) meeting agenda and minutes for biweekly calls.

2. Instrumentation. Assess the adequacy of the previous CMEC data collection and revisions of the instrument or methodology as necessary.

2.1. Conduct an assessment of the quality of data derived from the previous instrument.

The award recipient will review the previous data collection methodology to assess what worked well and what areas could use improvement. This includes any item nonresponse or low response rates from offices. The final report for this collection may be found on the [BJS website](#).

Required deliverables: Report assessing the 2004 CMEC instrument with recommendations.

2.2. Convene a panel of experts to review and revise previous questions as needed.

Practitioners and subject matter experts will review the validity of the instrument's questions and provide guidance on technical terminology to articulate what information is being sought. The review should include, but is not limited to, emerging trends or issues not reflected in the previous instrument and should consider the variation of medical definitions. Among preliminary areas of interest suggested for review are the following:

- professional affiliations or accreditation of offices or staff
- extent of standardization in data collection and coding
- use of or contribution to other databases
- policies regarding the acceptance or referrals of cases, with specific reference to toxicology
- identification of other agencies or organizations used to coordinate death investigations, such as law enforcement agencies, prescription drug

monitoring programs, public or private forensic science service providers (e.g., crime labs).

Required deliverables: (1) Identify participants and convening an expert panel meeting, (2) minutes from expert panel meeting, and (3) draft instrument based on expert panel feedback and assessment of 2004 CMEC.

2.3. Creation of a primarily web-based survey instrument with mail, email, and telephone options.

2.3.1. The award recipient will develop a secure web portal through which respondents may complete the 2018 CMEC. At a minimum, this web tool should—

- be designed with a user-friendly interface that minimizes respondent burden and provides simple modes of data submission
- provide respondents with instructions and the key content areas of the instrument
- allow respondents to download a copy of the paper version for reference
- allow respondents to easily save information when they cannot complete the questionnaire in one sitting
- provide a summary of answers for verification to respondents before final submission
- provide a final summary of answers for respondents' own records
- be able to easily export all data elements in a variety of formats (e.g., Excel, CSV, TSV, XML)
- ensure privacy of submitted questionnaires
- be designed to enhance item response rate.

2.3.2. The award recipient will provide user-testing documentation of the web portal prior to the administration of the instrument and allow BJS to fully test and provide feedback of the web survey prior to launch.

Required deliverables: (1) Webpage and fully programmed online version of the 2018 CMEC, (2) testing documentation of online instrument, and (3) hardcopy version of the 2018 CMEC.

2.4. Develop and implement a cognitive testing plan and assist BJS in preparation of OMB generic clearance if testing is needed beyond nine respondents.

The award recipient will conduct pretests of the revised instrument to assess how it performs, clarity of questions, ease with which respondents fill the form, and other design considerations.

Required deliverables: (1) Cognitive testing protocols, (2) list of cognitive testing respondents and plan for recruitment, and (3) draft OMB generic memo.

3. Universe/Frame Development. Construct the 2018 CMEC universe.

The 2004 CMEC Directory and the recently completed Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) report will be available to the award recipient. The award recipient will use the directory and list of agencies from the CDC to build a census frame and contact list. The recipient of funds will use other methods to determine if all eligible agencies are accounted for and if agencies are still eligible. Applicants should propose methods to identify appropriate ME/C staff who may serve as respondents and to confirm current contact information.

Required deliverables: Complete CMEC universe list with up-to-date contact information and primary points of contact.

4. OMB Clearance. In collaboration with BJS, prepare the OMB package to obtain approval to conduct the 2018 CMEC.²

The recipient of funds will prepare and provide to BJS draft materials for OMB clearance for the project. These materials include 30- and 60-day notices, form 83i, supporting statement, justification memorandum, and copies of all survey documents, including, but not limited to, questionnaires, instructions, follow-up documents, telephone scripts, and—if needed—a plan for a nonresponse bias study. BJS will provide sample documents as needed. Applicants should plan on a period of 7 months to obtain clearance, which includes BJS internal review.

Required deliverables: Draft materials for OMB submission.

5. Census Administration and Data Collection Procedure. Effectively administer the 2018 version of the CMEC.

5.1. Develop a census administration plan.

The recipient of funds should provide a detailed plan on the survey protocols to be implemented, including quality control procedures, administration techniques to achieve a goal of a 90% response rate within a 7-month data collection period, and multiple survey administration modes. The recipient of funds will develop the proposed data edits, data conversion, nonresponse adjustment procedures, and data documentation for review by BJS. Data edits and processing should be documented thoroughly for verification.

5.2. Carry out an effective outreach and communication program.

The award recipient will be responsible for maximizing response rates. The application submitted should include a plan for effective and efficient outreach and communication. This may include reaching out to stakeholders in the practitioner community; using practitioners to assist with the understanding of local systems' communicating with local entities prior to dispersing the instrument to determine the best contacts; and plans for pre-notification, ongoing communication, and final reporting to the respondents.

²Pursuant to the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 - 44 U.S.C. chapter 35; see 5 CFR Part 1320.

5.3. Ensure high quality data collection procedures.

The recipient of funds will verify the consistency, accuracy, and nonresponse of completed surveys, and should conduct verification throughout the process to minimize nonresponse bias. The recipient of funds should present a plan to BJS describing nonresponse bias and data quality procedures and develop a system that provides BJS with ongoing, real-time status of the survey administration's progress. The summary reports should provide information about the status of the collection, including the overall response rate, response rate for selected subsets (such as all strata in the sample design), assessment of nonresponse bias, and additional information to be determined with the BJS project manager. The CMEC has a target response rate of 90%. BJS expects the recipient of funds to minimize bias in unit and item response rates, subject to cost and timeliness constraints. Applicants should provide a statement of the approach(es) they will take to identify and minimize bias, including a discussion of nonresponse bias analysis plans if unit nonresponse rates fall below 80% and imputation procedures for missing items.

Required deliverables: (1) Written documentation of data processing procedures and data cleaning; (2) unit and item nonresponse follow-up procedures; (3) data quality tracking and follow-up procedures; (4) plans for outreach to stakeholder and practitioner communities; (5) interim tracking files in SPSS; (6) field progress reports of any problems with data collection activities and corresponding remedial action along with a written report of findings from the survey administration, including unweighted counts, based on data; (7) weekly unit and item response rate reports; (8) preliminary raw data at 50%, 75%, and 90% response rate in SPSS; and (9) syntax documenting all modifications to the raw data file.

6. Final Verification and Dataset. Deliver final data package and codebook materials.

6.1. Final verification procedures.

Final verification procedures should be conducted prior to delivering a final dataset to BJS. Any data issues must be reported to BJS for resolution. The recipient of funds will provide a justified approach to addressing item-specific missing or incomplete data, including any proposed data allocation, imputations, or nonresponse adjustments.

6.2. Final dataset and codebook delivery.

The award recipient will deliver a final data file with complete documentation per the criteria for submitting data to the NACJD at the Interuniversity Consortium for Political and Social Research at the University of Michigan. Documentation should describe the performance of the census, any weighting or imputation conducted, and codes that identify aspects of data quality from the collection (such as missing data and imputed values) that allow users to appropriately analyze data.

Required deliverables: (1) Documentation of any data challenges, (2) final cleaned electronic version of dataset consistent with NACJD requirements, (3) codebook documentation.

7. Reports and Dissemination of Findings. Produce final documentation and results.

7.1. Nonresponse bias study.

The recipient of funds will conduct and report on a bias assessment for unit and item nonresponse. Such analysis will include recommendations for any required weighting or imputation to account for the extent of identified nonresponse bias.

7.2. End of the study technical report.

The final summary should include an assessment of overall response rates, item response rates, and nonresponse error. The summary should also include any lessons learned, challenges, and solutions encountered in data collection and processing. The recipient will also prepare a draft report of summary tables for publication by BJS.

7.3. Main BJS report data findings.

The recipient of funds will work with BJS to create primary public report according to BJS publication standards. Applicant should assist with data analyses and provide tables, figures, and a write-up of the study methodology.

Required deliverables: (1) Nonresponse bias report if response rate requirements are not met, (2) end of the study technical report, and (3) data tables and draft content for BJS publication.

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

Evidence-Based Programs or Practices

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

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

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

B. Federal Award Information

BJJ expects to make one (1) award of up to \$1 million, covering up to a 24-month period of performance to begin October 1, 2017.

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

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

Type of Award

BJJ expects that any award made under this solicitation will be 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 entities³) must, as described in the Part 200 Uniform Requirements⁴ as set out at 2 C.F.R. 200.303:

- (a) Establish and maintain effective internal control over the Federal award that provides reasonable assurance that [the recipient (and any subrecipient)] is managing the Federal award in compliance with Federal statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of the Federal award. These internal controls should be in compliance with guidance in "Standards for Internal Control in the Federal Government" issued by the Comptroller General of the United States and the "Internal Control Integrated Framework", issued by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission (COSO).
- (b) Comply with Federal statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of the Federal awards.
- (c) Evaluate and monitor [the recipient's (and any subrecipient's)] compliance with statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of Federal awards.
- (d) Take prompt action when instances of noncompliance are identified, including noncompliance identified in audit findings.

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

⁴The "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.

(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](#).

Information System Security and Privacy Requirements

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

Recipients and subrecipients who operate as BJS data collection agents that collect, receive, handle, maintain, transfer, process, store, or disseminate directly identifiable information (e.g., names, SSNs, last known address, or FBI, state, or DOC ID numbers) in conjunction with the BJS-funded activities must have the appropriate administrative, physical, and technical safeguards in place to ensure that information systems are adequately secured and protected against unauthorized disclosure. Applicants must specify in the Privacy Certificate all of the specific controls used to safeguard directly identifiable information against unauthorized disclosure.

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

- Follow the [DOJ IT Security Rules of Behavior for General Users](#), which pertain to the use, security, and acceptable level of risk for DOJ systems and applications
- Assess and secure information systems in accordance with the [Federal Information Security Modernization Act](#) (FISMA) (Pub. L. No. 107-347), which appears as Title III of the [E-Government Act of 2002](#) (Pub. L. No. 107-347)
- Adhere to [National Institute of Standards and Technology](#) (NIST) guidelines to categorize the sensitivity of all data collected or maintained on behalf of BJS;
- Once the system has been categorized, secure data in accordance with the Risk Management Framework specified in [NIST SP 800-37 rev. 1](#)
- Employ adequate controls to ensure data are not comingled with any other dataset or product without the express written consent of BJS
- Reduce the volume of directly identifiable information collected, used, or retained to the minimum necessary
- Limit access to identifiable data to only those individuals who must have such access;
- Limit use of identifiable data to only the purposes for which it was approved
- Log all computer-readable data extracts from databases holding sensitive information and ensure each extract including sensitive data has been erased within 90 days, or its use is still required
- Ensure all contracts involving the processing and storage of personally identifiable information comply with DOJ policies on remote access and security incident reporting

- Employ formal sanctions for anyone failing to comply with DOJ policy and procedures, in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

Recipients and subrecipients that use a FISMA-defined information system to support award activities must maintain a Security Program Management Plan that prescribes the reporting of and response to security incidents involving directly identifiable information including, but not limited to, system compromise, unauthorized access from both internal and external parties, data leakage, and loss of technology assets. This policy shall be in accordance with the OMB and Department of Commerce Cybersecurity Policy, Presidential Directives, and NIST best practices. If applicable, recipient and subrecipients shall provide BJS with a signed copy of their Security Program Management Plan within 90 days of accepting the award, and with all updated versions throughout the life of the project period. Recipients and subrecipients shall notify BJS within one hour of any security incidents that impacts the FISMA-defined information systems used to support award activities.

Upon award, recipients and subrecipients shall provide BJS with a written certification that all staff resources who have access to the FISMA-defined information systems used to collect, receive, handle, maintain, transfer, process, store, or disseminate data files, reports, working papers, or other products in support of the project have completed annual Cybersecurity Awareness Training. Recipients and subrecipients are required to provide BJS with an updated certification when staff resources change.

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

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

Budget Information

Proposals that will not be funded would—

- primarily purchase equipment, materials, or supplies. A budget may include these items if they are absolutely necessary to carry out the proposed program and are thoroughly justified as demonstrated in the application.
- not respond to this specific solicitation.

Cost Sharing or Match Requirement

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

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

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

OJP does **not** typically approve pre-agreement costs; an applicant must request and obtain the prior written approval of OJP for all such costs. All such costs incurred prior to award and prior to approval of the costs are incurred at the sole risk of the applicant. (Generally, no applicant

should incur project costs *before* submitting an application requesting federal funding for those costs.) Should there be extenuating circumstances that make it appropriate for OJP to consider approving pre-agreement costs, the applicant may contact the point of contact listed on the title page of this solicitation for the requirements concerning written requests for approval. If approved in advance by OJP, award funds may be used for pre-agreement costs, consistent with the recipient's approved budget and applicable cost principles. See the section on Costs Requiring Prior Approval in the [DOJ Grants Financial Guide](#) for more information.

Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver

With respect to any award of more than \$250,000 made under this solicitation, a recipient may not use federal funds to pay total cash compensation (salary plus cash bonuses) to any employee of the recipient at a rate that exceeds 110% of the maximum annual salary payable to a member of the federal government's Senior Executive Service (SES) at an agency with a Certified SES Performance Appraisal System for that year.⁵ The 2017 salary table for SES employees is available at the Office of Personnel Management [website](#). Note: A recipient may compensate an employee at a greater rate, provided the amount in excess of this compensation limitation is paid with 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 Director of BJS may exercise discretion to waive, on an individual basis, this limitation on compensation rates allowable under an award. An applicant that requests a waiver should include a detailed justification in the budget narrative of its application. An applicant that does not submit a waiver request and justification with its application should anticipate that OJP will require the applicant to adjust and resubmit the budget.

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

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

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

⁵OJP 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.

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. 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 will not proceed to peer review or receive further consideration should OJP determine that it is nonresponsive to the scope of the solicitation or does not include the application elements that BJS has designated as critical. For this solicitation, BJS has designated the following application elements as critical: Program Narrative, Budget Detail Worksheet, Budget Narrative, and the résumés/curriculum vitae of key project personnel. An applicant may combine the Budget Narrative and the Budget Detail Worksheet in one document. If an applicant submits only one budget document, it must contain **both** narrative and detail information. Please review the “Note on File Names and File Types” under [How to Apply](#) to ensure 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 a current active award(s) must ensure that its GMS profile is current. If the profile is not current, the applicant should submit a Grant Adjustment Notice to update 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)) 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 must answer question 19 by selecting the response that the “Program is not covered by E.O. 12372.”)

2. Project Abstract

The project abstract is an important part of the application, and serves as an introduction to the proposed project. BJS uses the project abstract for a number of purposes, including the possible assignment of the application to an appropriate review panel. If the application is funded, the project abstract typically will become public information and be used to describe the project.

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 section should describe how the applicant will address the project's goals and objectives, meet the deliverables, and address the selection criteria. The narrative should present a clear understanding of BJS, its mission, the CMEC, and the strengths and limitations of the previous collections and statistical products.

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:⁶

a. Statement of the Problem

- Applicants should demonstrate their knowledge of BJS and the CMEC, the mission of BJS, and research on the topic of MDI.
- Applicants should discuss the current state of the MDI system in the United States and important or emerging issues that the CMEC could address.

b. Project Design and Implementation

- Applicants must describe how they will achieve the goals and objectives outlined in this solicitation. This includes all aspects of the project: planning, reaching out to stakeholders, design plans, execution, progress monitoring, and project wrap up.
- Applicants should describe how their proposed project design will improve on the previous CMEC and how their design will contribute to the better understanding of the MDI system.
- Applicants should outline their estimation of costs for each phase of the project.

c. Capabilities and Competencies

The narrative should demonstrate the applicant's capabilities to complete the tasks in a timely manner. The applicant's discussion of capabilities and subject matter expertise should demonstrate—

- substantive expertise about law enforcement investigative practices, including death investigation operations
- experience in carrying out successful law enforcement-related data collections

⁶For 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](#).

- knowledge of BJS’s law enforcement statistics portfolio, including past work involving medical examiners, coroners, crime labs, and forensic services
- capacity to meet BJS data quality guidelines
- data management plan (DMP).

All BJS-funded research requires the development of a DMP that outlines data management activity throughout the agreement, including data collection, secure storage, and timely release of data and related products. Applications should include a preliminary DMP that explains—

- roles, rights, and responsibilities of project participants
- expected data and metadata
- data formats, organization, and dissemination approach
- data retention and release timelines
- data security according to federal regulations any Institutional Review Board requirements
- data archiving and future access.

d. Plan for Collecting 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](#).

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 Measures	Data Recipient Provides (Deliverable)
Provide quality project management	Percentage of deliverables completed on time Percentage of deliverables that meet expectations Percentage of meetings attended	Detailed timeline of project Monthly progress reports Meeting agenda and minutes for biweekly calls

Objective	Performance Measures	Data Recipient Provides (Deliverable)
Create 2018 CMEC Form based on revisions of 2004 form	Number of recommendations developed Percent of products tested Provide materials developed	Assessment of 2004 CMEC instrument Minutes report from panel meeting, including recommendations made by the panel regarding the 2004 CMEC Revise instrument based on panel feedback Cognitive testing protocols OMB memo for cognitive testing (if needed) Hard copy of 2018 CMEC
	Number of subject matter experts consulted	Listing of expert panel List of cognitive testing respondents
Develop web-based response system for CMEC respondents	Provide website developed Percent of products tested	Webpage and fully programmed online version of CMEC Testing documentation of webpage
Update and maintain CMEC universe	Percentage of deliverables completed on time Percentage of deliverables that meet expectations	Provide a complete CMEC universe list with primary POC information
Obtain OMB clearance	Percentage of deliverables completed on time Percentage of deliverables that meet expectations	Provide materials for OMB clearance
Administer the CMEC and collect data	Amount of outreach efforts to stakeholders Provide plan developed	Plans for outreach to stakeholder and practitioner community
	Achieve 90% census response rate, with goals of 90% item response rate on function items; 90% on detailed personnel items, and 90% response rate on budget items.	Weekly unit and item response rates
Administer the CMEC and collect data (continued)	Provide administration and data collection plan developed	Documentation of data processing procedures/cleaning Unit and item nonresponse follow-up procedures Data quality tracking procedures

Objective	Performance Measures	Data Recipient Provides (Deliverable)
	Percentage of deliverables completed on time Percentage of deliverables that meet expectations	Response tracking files in SPSS Progress reports of any data collection problems with plans for remedy with findings from survey administration, including unweighted counts Preliminary raw data files at 50%, 75%, and 90% response rates in SPSS file format Syntax documenting all modifications for raw data file
Deliver final CMEC dataset and verification	Percentage of deliverables completed on time Percentage of deliverables that meet expectations Provide quality records to repository	Documentation of data collection and any challenges Final, cleaned dataset consistent with NACJD requirements Codebook documentation

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. For the application, applicants should indicate an understanding of these requirements and discuss how they will gather the required data, should they receive funding.

Note on Project Evaluations

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

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

For additional information on determining whether a proposed activity would constitute research for purposes of human subjects protection, applicants should consult the decision tree in the “Research and the protection of human subjects” section of the [Requirements related to](#)

Research” webpage of the “Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2017,” available through the OJP Funding Resource Center. Every prospective applicant whose application may propose a research or statistical component also should review the “Data Privacy and Confidentiality Requirements” section.

e. Appendices

- Bibliography or references
- Any tools or instruments, questionnaires, tables, charts, graphs, or maps pertaining to the proposed project that are supplemental to such items included in the main body of the narrative
- Curriculum vitae or résumés of the principal investigator, all co-principal investigators, and all other individuals who will be significantly involved in substantive aspects of the project (e.g., subject matter experts acting as consultants)
- A privacy certificate and human subjects protection certification of compliance must be completed for each project proposed in an application
 - Privacy Certification. The Privacy certificate is a funding recipient’s certification of compliance with federal regulations requiring confidentiality of information identifiable to a private person, which is collected, analyzed, or otherwise used in connection with an OJP-funded research or statistical activity. The funding recipient’s Privacy Certificate includes a description of its policies and procedures to be followed to protect identifiable data. A model certificate is located at <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/bjsmpc.pdf>.
 - Human Subjects Protection Certification of Compliance. BJS requires the funding recipient to submit proper documentation to be used to determine that the research project meets the federal requirements for human subjects protections set forth in 28 CFR Part 46. A model certificate, describing the necessary information to be provided by the funding recipient, can be accessed at <https://www.bjs.gov/content/hscr.cfm>.
- List of any previous and current BJS awards to applicant organization and investigator(s), including BJS-assigned award numbers and a brief description of any scholarly products that resulted in whole or in part from the work funded under the BJS award(s).
- Letters of cooperation/support or administrative agreements from organizations collaborating in the project
- If applicable, list of other agencies, organizations, or funding sources to which this proposal has been submitted

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) and 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](#) webpage.

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 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 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 (i.e., 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 (i.e., unexpired) federally approved indirect cost rate must 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 <https://www.ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/IndirectCosts.pdf>.

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

6. Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable)

A tribe, tribal organization, or third party that proposes to provide direct services or assistance to residents on tribal lands should include in its application a resolution, letter, affidavit, or other documentation, as appropriate, that demonstrates (as a legal matter) that the applicant has the requisite authorization from the tribe(s) to implement the proposed project on tribal lands. In those instances when an organization or consortium of tribes applies for an award on behalf of a tribe or multiple specific tribes, the application should include appropriate legal documentation, as described above, from all tribes that would receive services or assistance under the award. A consortium of tribes for which existing

consortium bylaws allow action without support from all tribes in the consortium (i.e., without an authorizing resolution or comparable legal documentation from each tribal governing body) may submit, instead, a copy of its consortium bylaws with the application.

An applicant unable to submit an application that includes a fully executed (i.e., signed) copy of legal appropriate documentation, as described above, consistent with the applicable tribe's governance structure, should, at a minimum, submit an unsigned, draft version of such legal documentation as part of its application (except for cases in which, with respect to a tribal consortium applicant, consortium bylaws allow action without the support of all consortium member tribes). If selected for funding, OJP will make use of and access to award funds contingent on receipt of the fully executed legal documentation.

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

Every applicant (other than an individual applying in his/her personal capacity) must 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:

- federal awarding agency that currently designates the applicant high risk
- date the applicant was designated high risk
- high-risk POC at that federal awarding agency (name, phone number, and email address)
- 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 consider the information in award decisions, and may impose additional OJP oversight of any award under this solicitation (including through the conditions that accompany the award document).

8. Disclosure of Lobbying Activities

Each applicant must complete and submit this information. An applicant that expends any funds for lobbying activities must 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 must enter "N/A" in the text boxes for item 10 ("a. Name and Address of Lobbying Registrant" and "b. Individuals Performing Services").

9. Additional Attachments

a. Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications

Each applicant must 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 must 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 must 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 POC 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 must 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 must 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 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 must 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 must 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 least, mitigate) any such conflicts of interest pertinent to the funded project during the period of performance. Helpful documentation 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 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 may 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 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 9-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 may 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 may 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 may 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 <https://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 may 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 FON is BJS-2017-12660.
6. **Submit a valid application consistent with this solicitation by following the directions in Grants.gov.** Within 24–48 hours after submitting the electronic application, the applicant should receive two notifications from Grants.gov. The first will confirm the receipt of the application. The second will state whether the application has been validated and successfully submitted, or whether it has been rejected due to errors, with an explanation. It is possible to first receive a message indicating that the application is received, and then receive a rejection notice a few minutes or hours later. Submitting an application well ahead of the deadline provides time to correct the problem(s) that caused the rejection. **Important:** OJP urges each applicant to submit its application **at least 72 hours prior** to the application due date, to allow time to receive validation messages or rejection notifications from Grants.gov, and to correct in a timely fashion any problems that may have caused a rejection notification. Applications must be successfully submitted through Grants.gov by 11:59 p.m. eastern time on July 24, 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 page 2 **within 24 hours after the application deadline** to request approval to submit its application after the deadline. The applicant's email must describe the technical difficulties, and must include a timeline of the applicant's submission efforts, the complete grant application, the applicant's DUNS number, and any Grants.gov Help Desk or SAM tracking number(s).

Note: OJP does not automatically approve requests 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 may take as long as 10 business days to complete. The information transfer from SAM to Grants.gov may 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](#) webpage

E. Application Review Information

Review Criteria

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

1. Statement of the Problem (20%) – Understanding of the problem and its importance. The application should demonstrate knowledge of the issues and information needs surrounding ME/C and how this information could influence policy decisions.

2. Project Design and Implementation (30%) – The census project has multiple phases. Applications will be assessed according to the strength of descriptions about and plans to develop each deliverable. The application should include the criteria the applicant will use to identify the expert panel, the applicant's understanding of the expert panel's role, and plans to assess the information needs of MDI practitioners. The application should also include a reasonable time frame and staff commitment for producing each deliverable. The applicant should develop a detailed time/task plan showing the time periods for all subtasks, dates for major milestones and deliverables throughout the project, and levels of effort of key staff on all subtasks/deliverables.

3. Capabilities and Competencies (30%) – This work requires a team with knowledge of (1) the scope of work of ME/C and (2) how variations in organizational structures and practices at the state and local levels affect ME/C activities and caseloads. It also requires a team with the ability to develop nationally representative surveys capable of (1) measuring individual attributes, work environments, and workloads; and (2) collecting data from survey respondents. The applicant team should demonstrate its ability to (1) develop a comprehensive understanding of information needs of the ME/C field, (2) design and test survey instruments, and (3) develop a sampling plan to generate statistically sound national estimates with an acceptable degree of precision. The application should provide a clear description of the project's management and organization that supports successful completion of the project's milestones within expressed time frames. The applicant should demonstrate the team's competencies in identifying key resources to develop important topics for public defenders. This includes identifying organizations, persons, and relevant literature sources. Finally, the applicant must demonstrate methodological knowledge, including the development of nationally representative samples and how to effectively survey individuals.

4. Proposed 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 and cost effectiveness in

relation to potential alternatives and project goals.⁷ Peer reviewers will consider and may comment on the following additional items in the context of scientific and technical merit: (a) appropriateness of the budget relative to the level of effort; (b) use of existing resources to conserve costs; (c) proposed budget alignment with proposed project activities; and (d) the extent to which staff resources allocated in. and the budget are appropriate for the project tasks (i.e., appropriateness of budgeted items for achieving project goals).

5. Plan for Collecting Data Required for Performance Measures (5%)

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, achievable, and consistent with the solicitation.

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

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

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

Peer review panels will evaluate, score, and rate applications that meet basic minimum requirements. 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, available funding, and the extent to which the budget detail worksheet and budget narrative accurately explain project costs that are reasonable, necessary, and otherwise allowable under federal law and applicable federal cost principles.

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

⁷Generally 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.

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 (FAPIS)).

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

The evaluation of risks goes beyond information in SAM. 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 POC 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 award recipient, 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 POC; 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 award recipient 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 webpages 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 may have substantial involvement in matters, such as coordination efforts, site selection, and 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.

BJS awards under this type of solicitation will typically include a number of special conditions, including, among others, the following:

- The project will be funded as a cooperative agreement. The basis for using a cooperative agreement is BJS's substantial involvement in identifying priorities and providing information, guidance, and direction relative to the development of statistical studies and products. BJS will exercise general approval over the entire project subject to the recipient's rights to disclose and publish certain information after review and comment by BJS, as set forth in this solicitation.
- The award recipient will agree that no funds provided may be used to author or prepare reports, journal articles, speeches or studies, other publications, or presentations without the prior review and written approval of BJS, regardless of whether data used in the publications or other releases are publicly available.
- BJS will retain all rights to exclusive use of data until BJS releases the public use dataset, which will be available to the public via the Internet and at the NACJD at the University of Michigan. The award recipient will not be able to release or disclose any data collected through this cooperative agreement without prior written BJS approval or until the dataset has been released to the public. This includes, but is not limited to, presentations at professional conferences and meetings, press releases, or grant applications. Unauthorized release of data by the recipient or its associates may result in immediate commencement of termination or suspension proceedings in accordance with 28 CFR Part 18.
- BJS will retain exclusive rights to methodological information. Within certain limitations, BJS may grant the recipient exclusive use of any methodological findings derived from the project funded through this cooperative agreement. The recipient must have obtained prior review and written approval by BJS, including mutual agreement on the representation of BJS's methodologies, before disclosing methodological information or experiential findings derived from the project before the dataset is released. Any such disclosures of the recipient's or BJS's methodologies must be public in nature and contribute meaningfully to the development or advancement of social science research. Public disclosure may include, but is not limited to, presentations at professional conferences and meetings, articles appearing in widely distributed publications, and postings on the Internet or in similar outlets that constitute a broad public release of the methodological information. Unauthorized release of data by the recipient or its associates may result in immediate commencement of termination or suspension proceedings in accordance with 28 CFR Part 18.

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 website at <https://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 and assist DOJ in fulfilling its responsibilities under the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA), P.L. 103-62, and the GPRA Modernization Act of 2010, P.L. 111-352, OJP will require any recipient, post award, to provide data listed as “Data Recipient Provides” in the performance measures table in [Section D. Application and Submission Information](#), under “Program Narrative,” so that OJP may 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, 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 ojppeerreview@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 may be a peer reviewer in a competition in which you or your organization/entity has submitted an application.

Application Checklist

Census of Medical Examiners and Coroners' Offices

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 32)
- Acquire or renew registration with SAM (see page 32)

To Register with Grants.gov:

- Acquire AOR and Grants.gov username/password (see page 32)
- Acquire AOR confirmation from E-Biz POC (see page 32)
- Search for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov (see page 33)
- Download funding opportunity and application package (see page 33)
- Sign up for Grants.gov email [notifications](#) (optional) (see page 31)
- 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 15)

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 33)

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

- Contact BJS regarding experiencing technical difficulties (see page 33)

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 \$1,000,000.

Eligibility Requirement: (See the title page.)

What an Application Should Include:

- Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424) (see page 16)
- Project Abstract (see page 17)
- Program Narrative (see page 18)
- Budget Detail Worksheet (see page 22)
- Budget Narrative (see page 23)
- Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable) (see page 25)
- Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable) (see page 25)

_____	Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire	(see page 26)
_____	Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (SF-LLL)	(see page 26)
_____	Additional Attachments	
_____	Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications	(see page 27)
_____	Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity	(see page 28)
_____	Disclosure of Process related to Executive Compensation	(see page 29)
_____	Request and Justification for Employee Compensation; Waiver (if applicable)	(see page 15)