



The [U.S. Department of Justice](#) (DOJ), [Office of Justice Programs](#) (OJP), [National Institute of Justice](#) (NIJ) is seeking applications for funding for research into the optimal use of advanced video technology for crime control and prevention. This program furthers the Department's mission by sponsoring research to provide objective, independent, evidence-based knowledge and tools to meet the challenges of crime and justice, particularly at the state and local levels.

Optimizing the Use of Video Technology to Improve Criminal Justice Outcomes

Eligibility

In general, NIJ is authorized to make grants to, or enter into contracts or cooperative agreements with, States (including territories), units of local government (including federally recognized Indian tribal governments as determined by the Secretary of the Interior), nonprofit and for-profit organizations (including tribal nonprofit or for-profit organizations), institutions of higher education (including tribal institutions of higher education), and certain qualified individuals. For-profit organizations must agree to forgo any profit or management fee. Foreign governments, foreign organizations, and foreign institutions of higher education are not eligible to apply.

NIJ welcomes applications that involve two or more entities, however, one eligible entity must be the applicant and the other(s) must be proposed as subrecipient(s). The applicant must be the entity with primary responsibility for conducting and leading the project.

NIJ may elect to make awards for applications submitted under this solicitation in future fiscal years, dependent on the merit of the applications and on the availability of appropriations.

Deadline

Applicants must register with [Grants.gov](#) prior to submitting an application. (See "How to Apply," page 24.) All applications are due by 11:59 p.m. eastern time on April 28, 2014. (See "Deadlines: Registration and Application," page 3.)

All applicants are encouraged to read this [Important Notice: Applying for Grants in Grants.gov](#).

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 e-mail to support@grants.gov. The [Grants.gov](#) Support Hotline hours of operation are 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, except federal holidays.

Applicants that experience unforeseen Grants.gov technical issues beyond their control that prevent them from submitting their application by the deadline must e-mail the NIJ contact identified below **within 24 hours after the application deadline** and request approval to submit their application.

For assistance with any other requirements of this solicitation, contact ST-Research@ojp.usdoj.gov. General information on applying for NIJ awards can be found at www.nij.gov/funding/Pages/welcome.aspx. Answers to frequently asked questions that may assist applicants are posted at www.nij.gov/funding/Pages/faqs.aspx.

Grants.gov number assigned to this announcement: NIJ-2014-3723

Release Date: February 6, 2014

SL001080

Contents

Overview	3
Deadlines: Registration and Application	3
Eligibility	3
Program-Specific Information	3
Performance Measures	12
What an Application Should Include	13
Information to Complete the Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424)	13
Project Abstract	13
Program Narrative	14
Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative	17
Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable)	18
Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable)	18
Additional Attachments	19
Accounting System and Financial Capability Questionnaire (if applicable)	21
Selection Criteria	21
Review Process	22
Additional Requirements	23
How to Apply	25
Provide Feedback to OJP	27
Application Checklist	29

Optimizing the Use of Video Technology to Improve Criminal Justice Outcomes

(CFDA No. 16.560)

Overview

With this solicitation, NIJ seeks proposals from research organizations partnered with state, local, or tribal criminal justice agencies for funding for research to identify, implement, and evaluate those applications of video cameras and advanced video analysis software that provide optimum crime control and prevention outcomes. NIJ is most interested in receiving proposals involving the integration of video technology into policing strategies, most particularly those involving quantitative data analysis methods. NIJ will also consider proposals dealing with criminal courts and correctional environments.

Authorizing Legislation: Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (sections 201 and 202); the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (sections 231-233); and 28 U.S.C. 530C.

Deadlines: Registration and Application

Applicants must register with Grants.gov prior to submitting an application. OJP encourages applicants to **register several weeks before** the application submission deadline. In addition, OJP urges applicants to submit applications 72 hours prior to the application due date. The deadline to apply for funding under this announcement is 11:59 p.m. eastern time on April 28, 2014. See “How to Apply” on page 24 for details.

Eligibility

Refer to the title page for eligibility under this program.

Program-Specific Information

Background

NIJ’s Science and Technology (S&T) program sponsors research, development, test, and evaluation efforts to improve the safety and effectiveness of the tools and technologies used by criminal justice agencies. Although federal agencies are part of its constituency, NIJ’s primary focus is on the needs of state and local agencies.

Video cameras have become so prevalent for public safety, crime control and prevention, security, and monitoring applications that it is difficult to envision a future without video surveillance technology embedded throughout both public and private environments. Video passively recorded can be played back later to provide forensic information of great value, capturing incidents of criminal activity or generating leads to identify suspects, witnesses, or persons of interest that can accelerate criminal investigations. Video streams can also be

actively monitored where personnel watch activity in real-time on video screens and make decisions to respond or act based on what is observed. Media reports indicate that video systems can have a dramatic and positive impact in reducing both violent incidents and operating costs at correctional institutions and improve the quality of subsequent prosecution of violent offenses.¹

A pair of reports published in 2011 on the use of video for crime control and prevention examined the use of video technology by law enforcement in Baltimore, MD, Chicago, IL, and Washington, DC, and the outcomes as a result of different policies and practices.^{2,3} Video systems, especially when paired with active monitoring, were calculated to have a positive impact on crime that yielded monetized benefits to society that outweighed the costs of installation and use of the technology. Differences in deployed systems, practices, and policies among the jurisdictions examined demonstrated however that a variety of outcomes may result depending on how video technology is utilized. As video technology continues to mature and diffuse into the marketplace, large-scale networks will become more affordable and more sophisticated tools will become available to public safety and criminal justice agencies to consider as a part of their overall operational strategies.⁴

Understanding the true impact of video systems to prevent and reduce crime requires a complex perspective that encompasses technology, human factors, criminal justice practice and policy, relevant case law, public acceptance, and other possible dimensions. If active monitoring is to be used to detect suspicious activity in public spaces, how is a video system to be implemented as a part of an overall policing strategy in a way that leads to the best possible outcomes within the legal contexts for use of such technology by law enforcement? In a series of cases dealing with the Fourth Amendment, the Supreme Court of the United States has considered the character of the neighborhood to be one factor in finding “reasonable suspicion”

¹ William Jackson, “A picture worth 200 guards: Jail installs HD video, violence drops 90 percent,” *GCN*, January 11, 2013, <http://gcn.com/articles/2013/01/11/jail-installs-hd-video-violence-drops-90-percent.aspx>. The Oklahoma County Sheriff’s Office installed a high definition video system in the Oklahoma County Detention Center in 2009 and has since seen a reduction in violent incidents drop to about 30 incidents a month rather than 300 in a population of about 2,900 detainees. Reports indicate that the facility has been able avoid \$10 million a year in costs for hiring new detention officers and that prosecutors are able to present better quality evidence in court.

² Nancy G. La Vigne, Samantha S. Lowry, Joshua A. Markman, and Allison M. Dwyer, *Evaluating the Use of Public Surveillance Cameras for Crime Control and Prevention*, report by the Urban Institute submitted under 2007-CK-WX-K006 to the COPS Office, September 2011, <http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/412403-Evaluating-the-Use-of-Public-Surveillance-Cameras-for-Crime-Control-and-Prevention.pdf>.

³ Nancy G. La Vigne, Samantha S. Lowry, Allison M. Dwyer, and Joshua A. Markman, *Using Public Surveillance Systems for Crime Control and Prevention: A Practical Guide for Law Enforcement and Their Municipal Partners*, report by the Urban Institute submitted under 2007-CK-WX-K006 to the COPS Office, September 2011, <http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/412402-Using-Public-Surveillance-Systems-for-Crime-Control-and-Prevention-A-Practical-Guide.pdf>.

⁴ William Jackson, “Force multiplier: PSIM leverages video surveillance networks in Baltimore,” *GCN*, August 23, 2013, <http://gcn.com/articles/2013/08/23/baltimore-psim.aspx>. The CitiWatch system in Baltimore is a public-private partnership that integrates over 600 cameras and can incorporate non-city data sources, including some owned by private organizations. CitiWatch can access to other cameras from the Maryland State Highway Administration, the Baltimore City Department of Transportation, the Maryland Transit Administration, and other government agencies operating in the city.

to stop someone.⁵ In *Illinois v. Wardlow*, the Court concluded that the type of human activity observed in that case—unprovoked flight—in a location considered “high crime” constituted a sufficient basis to conclude reasonable suspicion.⁶ In *United States v. Jones*, another case dealing with the Fourth Amendment as it pertained to the use of a global positioning system (GPS) in a criminal investigation, the Court offered some thinking about the dynamic nature of the expectation of privacy and how technology may affect those expectations by the public.⁷ The Court noted that they had not deviated from the understanding that mere visual observation does not constitute a search⁸ and that relatively short-term monitoring of a person’s movements on public streets accords with expectations of privacy that our society has recognized as reasonable.⁹

This stimulates a number of questions surrounding the use of video as a tool to detect suspicious activity in public spaces. What constitutes suspicious activity in an area considered high-crime versus another area considered generally safe? What about the case of a jurisdiction-wide (e.g., citywide, countywide, statewide, etc.) video network that spans both high-crime areas and areas considered generally safe? A variety of courts have levied different definitions of ‘high crime’, which has revealed similar but site-specific descriptions based on the crimes occurring locally.¹⁰ No universal definition of high-crime exists, although it is worth considering whether video could provide a means to quantitatively compare the human activity in multiple areas considered high crime from numerous cities based on differing definitions. What sort of video metrology tools would need to exist to do that, and would this be of value to the criminal justice community and the public?

While active monitoring has been shown to be efficacious under the right circumstances, further examination of the decision-making process by human monitors regarding how activity in video is evaluated and how the resulting information propagates through the criminal justice enterprise would help better isolate specific aspects of the process that are most beneficial. Automated software tools developed in recent years may help public safety agencies, law enforcement, correctional institutions, and court security personnel leverage investments in video networks to augment their capabilities to help officers detect emerging incidents.¹¹ Basic research into visual awareness shows that human response to visual stimuli and categorization of objects and scenery involve complex cognitive mechanisms related to attention, perception, and memory.¹² Furthermore, sustained attention on a cognitively demanding task for several hours leads to

⁵ Andrew Guthrie Ferguson and Damien Bernache, “The ‘High-Crime Area’ Question: Requiring Verifiable and Quantifiable Evidence for Fourth Amendment Reasonable Suspicion Analysis,” *American University Law Review*, 57 (August 2008): 1587.

⁶ *Illinois v. Wardlow* (Wardlow III), 528 U.S. 119 (2000).

⁷ *United States v. Jones*, No. 10-1259, slip op. at 10, 565 U.S. ____ (2012) (Alito, J., concurring).

⁸ *United States v. Jones*, No. 10-1259, slip op. at 11, 565 U.S. ____ (2012).

⁹ *United States v. Jones*, No. 10-1259, slip op. at 13, 565 U.S. ____ (2012) (Alito, J., concurring).

¹⁰ *United States v. Baskin*, 401 F.3d 788, 791, 793 (7th Cir. 2005); *State v. Biehl*, No. 22054, 2004 WL 2806340, at 5 (Ohio Ct. App. Dec. 8, 2004); *Cunningham v. State*, 884 So. 2d 1121, 1122 (Fla. Dist. Ct. App. 2004); *State v. Donnell*, 239 N.W.2d 575, 578 (Iowa 1976); *People v. Davis*, 815 N.E.2d 92, 98-99 (Ill. Ct. App. 2004); *United States v. Rogers*, No. Crim. 10-10313, 2005 WL 478001, at 1 (D. Mass. Mar. 1, 2005). These court cases are discussed in the law review article by Ferguson and Bernache.

¹¹ Ming-Ching Chang, Weina Ge, Nils Krahnstoeber, Ting Yu, Ser Nam Lim, and Xiaoming Liu, *Advanced Behavior Recognition in Crowded Environments*, final report for award 2009-SQ-B9-K013 submitted to the National Institute of Justice, January 2013, <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/240575.pdf>.

¹² Marvin M. Chun and Jeremy M. Wolfe, “Visual Attention,” in *Blackwell Handbook of Sensation and Perception*, ed. E. Bruce Goldstein (Oxford, UK; Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2005).

mental fatigue, manifesting as deteriorated performance, distracted attention, and other overt signals.¹³ This reinforces the notion that manual real-time monitoring of numerous, simultaneous video feeds by human beings for extended periods of time may not likely be the optimum implementation of video technology for public safety applications.

The use of computational analytical systems that can process the visual information encoded in video signals suggests a role for advanced technology to help law enforcement and correctional agents to detect emerging incidents. The National Institute of Justice has funded a number of projects over the last several years to explore computational analytical capabilities for video systems that could have an impact in both the law enforcement and criminal justice correctional domains.^{14,15,16,17} NIJ has also funded projects to explore the impact of closed-circuit television (CCTV) systems on crime.¹⁸ For example, the impact of video technology on crime deterrence and enforcement outcomes in Newark, NJ varied depending on practical aspects such as usage context and coupling proactive CCTV monitoring with directed patrol units.¹⁹ Future research could address a number of key questions, such as: Are video systems in use today optimally configured to visually capture human activity for further analysis?^{20, 21} How is human activity

¹³ There is a research community examining these issues at a fundamental level. For example, see Léon G. Faber, Natasha M. Maurits, and Monicque M. Lorist, "Mental Fatigue Affects Visual Selective Attention," *PLoS One* 7, no. 10 (2012): e47803; Maarten A.S. Boksem, Theo F. Meijman, and Monicque M. Lorist, "Effects of mental fatigue on attention: An ERP study," *Cognitive Brain Research* 25 (2005): 107–116.

¹⁴ NIJ has funded several awards to GE Global Research to conduct research in this area, such as *High-quality 3-D Facial Images from Surveillance Video*, 2005-IJ-CX-K060; *Active 3-D Face Capture*, 2006-IJ-CX-K045; *Site-Adaptive Face Recognition at a Distance*, 2007-DE-BX-K191; *Automated Detection and Prevention of Disorderly and Criminal Activities*, 2007-RG-CX-K015; *Advanced Behavior Recognition in Crowded Environments, Phase I*, 2009-SQ-B9-K013; *Advanced Behavior Recognition in Crowded Environments, Phase II*, 2011-IJ-CX-K004.

¹⁵ University of Houston, *Learning Models for Predictive Behavioral Intent and Activity Analysis in Wide Area Video Surveillance*, 2009-MU-MU-K004.

¹⁶ University of Southern California, *Janus - Multi Source Event Collection System for Effective Surveillance of Criminal Activity*, 2011-IJ-CX-K054.

¹⁷ ManTech Corporation, *Sensors, Surveillance, and Biometric Technologies Center of Excellence*, 2010-IJ-CX-K024. The NLECTC Sensors, Surveillance, and Biometrics Center of Excellence is performing third-party testing and evaluation of the basic functionality of the GE system delivered under award 2009-SQ-B9-K013.

¹⁸ Temple University, *Can video surveillance reduce crime? Quantifying the size and geographic extent of CCTV's impact*, 2009-IJ-CX-0012.

¹⁹ Rutgers University, *Detection of Crime, Resource Deployment, and Predictors of Success: A Proposed Multi-Level Analysis of CCTV in Newark, NJ*, 2010-IJ-CX-0026.

²⁰ Jerry Ratcliffe, *Video Surveillance of Public Places*, Problem-Oriented Guides for Police, Response Guide No. 4, submitted under 2003-CK-WX-0087 to the COPS Office, originally published February 2006, updated August 2011, <http://www.popcenter.org/Responses/pdfs/videosurveillance.pdf>. In the discussion of where cameras should be located on page 27, the following concerns are raised: "If caution is not exercised, it's possible cameras can be placed in locations that more reflect the vagaries of local politics and public misconceptions about fear of crime rather than actual crime hot spots. If schemes are orchestrated and primarily directed by local authorities, there is a risk police can be excluded from the crucial design stage, including the placement of cameras. If the system's measure of effectiveness is to reduce crime, then camera locations that are not primarily driven by the crime distribution are unlikely to demonstrate any significant crime reduction benefits."

²¹ The Scientific Working Group on Imaging Technology (SWGIT) and the Facial Identification Scientific Working Group (FISWG) have developed guidance documents on different aspects of imaging

measured and quantified? Would emerging software analytics improve criminal justice outcomes? What are the unique challenges associated with processing video data from a distributed video network? If video analytics are to be used in a policing strategy to detect suspicious activity, how are such systems to be implemented in a way that comports with existing policies, practices, law, and expectations of privacy?

Finally, it is important to emphasize that analytical tools are there to assist the practitioner to make decisions and that the right balance between using automated systems and manual monitoring in real-world, operational environments should be considered. How could video analytic algorithms be tuned to enhance active monitoring? Such a hybrid approach may yield the best outcomes as analytical tools may relieve the potential cognitive strain that active monitoring may induce and allow the practitioner to focus attention on important details rather than all the details. Determining the ultimate impact of this technology on criminal justice outcomes will also help clarify what the expected return on investment of this technology is and what sort of metrics are most appropriate to measure that. The previous research on the three metropolitan police jurisdictions of Baltimore, Chicago, and Washington, DC examined this,²² but additional refinement of the cost-benefit analysis would be instructive with more guided research and evaluation design.

Goals, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products

Overall, prior research on the impact of video cameras on crime has been on in situ systems, which may or may not have been consciously placed to support a particular policing strategy. Studying the impact of a “system in the wild” on crime may not provide the most complete picture of the potential of this complex technology in reducing and controlling crime.

The goal of this research is to provide a better understanding of that potential by making resources available to implement and evaluate the impact on crime control and prevention of a video camera system employing advanced video analytic software effectively integrated into an advanced policing strategy in actual operation with a law enforcement agency. Design and implementation of the video network should take into account selection and optimization of the viewsheds through discrete camera selection and placement, video data management strategies, and other relevant factors.²³ Video analytic software of interest include technologies that can detect static items or dynamic events; such as objects, persons, or activities, that would be of operational use to law enforcement agencies.

The successful applicant will propose innovative approaches that emphasize forward thinking and scientific methodologies regarding the design and implementation of law enforcement video networks and the impact on criminal justice outcomes through the use of rigorous analysis and quantifiable measures. Collaboration among criminal justice practitioners, technology researchers, and social scientists is encouraged to determine the best ways to test, evaluate, and integrate cameras and analytical tools into law enforcement and other criminal justice video systems, and to measure the impact and efficacy on outcomes. Researchers and practitioners

technology and its use in the context of criminal justice practice, which can be found at their respective websites <https://www.swgit.org> and <https://www.fiswg.org>.

²² Nancy G. La Vigne et al., *Evaluating the Use of Public Surveillance Cameras for Crime Control and Prevention*. See Reference 2.

²³ Jerry Ratcliffe, *Video Surveillance of Public Places*. See Reference 20.

should be prepared to work together to ensure the technical approaches fit within the practical bounds of realistic criminal justice strategies. Ideally, the successful applicant should include executed agreements with participating law enforcement agencies with its proposal. At a minimum, applicants should include letters of intent from those agencies.

Applicants should address the cost to upgrade or install a public safety video system and to experiment with different physical configurations of the camera network. Proposals should also include video system design criteria and demonstrate an overall understanding of how cameras should be positioned to maximize the viewsheds to capture human activity in public spaces. The proposed use of video analytical software is encouraged to compare against approaches such as manual monitoring. Proposed technical approaches should address how to measure the ability to capture incident activity from video, convert incident activity information into useable intelligence for law enforcement, measure the impact on crime, and measure the ease of integration into an overall policing strategy.

Costs associated with installing and operating a video system may be nontrivial, so applicants are encouraged to explore supplemental sources of funding such as cost sharing that could be appropriately combined with NIJ's investment of federal funds. For example, it is reported that Baltimore spent an estimated \$8.1M (in 2009 dollars) on its video system, with initial start-up costs alone of just under \$5.5M distributed over several areas of the city over a number of years. The system acquired entailed over 500 cameras fed into a centralized control room that can support live monitoring 24 hours a day. A smaller system with fewer cameras brings the estimate down but costs could still be significant.

In addition to the questions presented in the Background section above, some questions that applicants should also consider when developing proposals include the following: What are the various camera network configurations and use models that can be effectively integrated into a policing strategy? What are the most appropriate metrics to use to demonstrate efficacy of a video system integrated into criminal justice practice? What is the overall (holistic) efficacy of each configuration and use model? Which network configurations and use models lead to the biggest impact on public safety, crime control and prevention, and why? What is the overall cost (lifecycle cost) and return on investment of this technology?

Applicants should prepare to structure their project in phases to include critical design reviews that will involve NIJ staff. For example, a review may occur prior to implementing the video network to ensure that the hardware and software acquisition decisions are in line with the goals and objectives of the project before major purchasing decisions are made. Another review may occur after adequate data have been collected to assess the initial performance of the system and research design.

Applicants interested in submitting proposals for research optimizing the use of video technology in courts or correctional environments may also apply. While necessarily differing from those dealing with the integration of video technology into policing strategies, such proposals are also expected to reflect innovative approaches that emphasize forward thinking and scientific methodologies regarding the design and implementation of video technology and its evaluation through the use of rigorous analysis and quantifiable measures.

NIJ anticipates that this research will involve minimal, if any, technology development, other than that involved in integrating software and cameras.

Deliverables and Expected Scholarly Products

In addition to required data sets, a draft and final summary overview of research results, interim and final progress and financial reports,²⁴ NIJ expects scholarly products to result from each award under this solicitation, taking the form of one or more published, peer-reviewed, scientific journal articles, and/or (if appropriate) law review journal articles, book chapter(s) or book(s) in the academic press, technological prototypes, patented inventions, or similar scientific products.

Important Notice Regarding Scholarly Products Expected to Result from All NIJ Research, Development, and Evaluation Grant Awards

To help ensure that NIJ's grant-funded research, development, and evaluation awards produce scholarly products of the highest possible quality, NIJ has implemented certain changes in its Fiscal Year 2014 solicitations. Accordingly, NIJ **strongly encourages** applicants to read this solicitation in its entirety and pay particular attention to NIJ's expectations in the "Goals, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products" section, above, and to the "Performance Measures" section, below. Namely, NIJ has changed requirements regarding project technical deliverables and increased expectations regarding grantee publication of scholarly products. These changes will also be reflected in the special conditions attached to awards beginning in FY2014.

Amount and Length of Awards

NIJ anticipates that up to a total of \$2 million may become available for one award under this solicitation. From the total amount, NIJ anticipates that it will make one award for a project period of 12 to 18 months.

The preceding funding and time constraints notwithstanding, applications should be crafted to reflect the funding and time that is necessary to achieve the goals and objectives of this solicitation based on the applicant's proposed technical approach.

To allow time for, among other things, any necessary post-award review, modification, and clearance by OJP of the proposed budget, applicants should propose an award start date of January 1, 2015.

If the applicant is proposing a project that reasonably could be conducted in discrete phases, with each phase resulting in completion of one or more significant, defined milestones, then NIJ strongly recommends that the applicant structure the application – specifically including the narrative, expected scholarly products, timelines/milestones, and budget detail worksheet and budget narrative – to clearly set out each phase. (This is particularly the case if the applicant proposes a project that will exceed – in cost or length of project period – the amount or length anticipated for an individual award (or awards) under this solicitation.) Given limitations on the availability to NIJ of funds for research, development, and evaluation awards, this information will assist NIJ in considering whether partial funding of proposals that would not receive full

²⁴ See "Additional Requirements" section of this solicitation, below, for additional information.

funding would be productive. (If NIJ elects to fund only certain phases of a proposed project in FY 2014, the expected scholarly products from the partial-funding award may, in some cases, vary from those described above.)

NIJ may, in certain cases, provide supplemental funding in future years to awards under its research, development, and evaluation solicitations. Important considerations in decisions regarding supplemental funding include, among other factors, the availability of funding, strategic priorities, NIJ's assessment of the quality of the management of the award (for example, timeliness and quality of progress reports), and NIJ's assessment of the progress of the work funded under the award.

Applicants should be aware that the total period of an award, including one that receives a funding supplement or a no-cost extension, ordinarily will not exceed three years.

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

NIJ anticipates that any award under this solicitation will be made in the form of a cooperative agreement, which is a particular type of grant used if NIJ expects to have ongoing substantial involvement in award activities.

As discussed later in the solicitation, important rules (including limitations) apply to any conference/meeting/training costs under cooperative agreements.

Evaluation Research

If an application includes an evaluation research component (or consists entirely of evaluation research), the application is expected to propose the use of random selection and assignment of participants to experimental and control conditions, if feasible. Applications that include evaluation research but do not propose the use of randomization should explain clearly why randomization is not feasible, and should propose a strong quasi-experimental design that can address the risk of selection bias.

Also, applications that include evaluation research are expected to consider seriously the incorporation of cost/benefit analysis. NIJ views cost/benefit analysis as an effective way to communicate and disseminate findings from evaluation research and best serve our criminal justice constituents.

Please note: Any recipient of an award under this solicitation will be required to comply with Department of Justice regulations on confidentiality and human subjects' protection. See "Other Requirements for OJP Applications" at www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/other_requirements.htm.

Budget Information

What will not be funded:

- Proposals primarily to purchase equipment, materials, or supplies. (A budget may include these items if they are necessary to conduct research, development, demonstration, evaluation, or analysis.)

- Proposals that are not responsive to this specific solicitation.

Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver

With respect to any award of more than \$250,000 made under this solicitation, recipients may not use federal funds to pay total cash compensation (salary plus cash bonuses) to any employee of the award 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.²⁵ The 2014 salary table for SES employees is available at www.opm.gov/salary-tables. Note: A recipient may compensate an employee at a greater rate, provided the amount in excess of this compensation limitation is paid with non-federal funds. (Any such additional compensation will not be considered matching funds where match requirements apply.)

The Director of the National Institute of Justice may exercise discretion to waive, on an individual basis, the limitation on compensation rates allowable under an award. An applicant requesting a waiver should include a detailed justification in the budget narrative of the application. Unless the applicant submits a waiver request and justification with the application, the applicant should anticipate that OJP will request the applicant to adjust and resubmit the budget.

The justification should include the particular qualifications and expertise of the individual, the uniqueness of the service the individual will provide, the individual's specific knowledge of the program or project being undertaken with award funds, and a statement explaining that the individual's salary is commensurate with the regular and customary rate for an individual with his/her qualifications and expertise, and for the work to be done.

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

OJP strongly encourages applicants that propose to use award funds for any conference-, meeting-, or training-related activity to review carefully – before submitting an application – the OJP policy and guidance on “conference” approval, planning, and reporting available at www.ojp.gov/funding/confcost.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 such costs for cooperative agreement recipients and of some such costs for grant recipients; and (3) set cost limits, including a general prohibition of all food and beverage costs.

Costs Associated with Language Assistance (if applicable)

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

²⁵ This limitation on use of award funds does not apply to the non-profit organizations specifically named at Appendix C to 2 C.F.R. Part 230.

For additional information, see the "Civil Rights Compliance" section of the OJP "Other Requirements for OJP Applications" Web page at www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/other_requirements.htm.

Match Information

See "Cofunding" paragraph under "What an Application Should Include" (below).

Performance Measures

To assist the Department with fulfilling its responsibilities under the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA), Public Law 103-62, and the GPRA Modernization Act of 2010, Public Law 111-352, applicants that receive funding under this solicitation must provide data that measure the results of their work done under this solicitation. OJP will require any award recipient, post award, to provide the data requested in the "Data Grantee Provides" column so that OJP can calculate values for the "Performance Measures" column. (Submission of performance measures data is not required for the application.) Performance measures for this solicitation are as follows:

Objective	Performance Measure(s)	Data Grantee Provides
<p>Conduct research in science, technology, engineering, and/or mathematics having clear implications for criminal justice policy and practice in the United States.</p> <p>Conduct research in the social and behavioral sciences having clear implications for criminal justice policy and practice in the United States.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Relevance to the needs of the field as measured by whether the project's substantive scope did not deviate from the funded proposal or any subsequent agency-approved modifications to the scope. 2. Quality of the research as demonstrated by the scholarly products that result in whole or in part from work funded under the NIJ award (published, peer-reviewed, scientific journal articles, and/or (as appropriate for the funded project) law review journal articles, book chapter(s) or book(s) in the academic press, technological prototypes, patented inventions, or similar scientific products). 3. Quality of management as measured by such factors as whether significant project milestones were achieved, reporting and other deadlines were met, and costs remained within approved limits. 4. Number of technologies fielded as a result (in whole or in part) of work funded under the NIJ award. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quarterly financial reports, semi-annual and final progress reports, and a draft and final summary overview of the work performed under the NIJ award. 2. List of citation(s) to all scholarly products that resulted in whole or in part from work funded under the NIJ award. 3. If applicable, each data set that resulted in whole or in part from work funded under the NIJ award. 4. Description of all technologies fielded as a result (in whole or in part) of work funded under the NIJ award.

What an Application Should Include

Applicants should anticipate that if they fail to submit an application that contains all of the specified elements, it may affect negatively the review of the application; and, should a decision be made to make an award, it may result in the inclusion of special conditions that preclude the recipient from accessing or using award funds pending satisfaction of the conditions.

Moreover, applicants should anticipate that applications determined to be nonresponsive to the scope of the solicitation, or that do not include the application elements that NIJ has designated to be critical, will neither proceed to peer review nor receive further consideration. Under this solicitation, NIJ has designated the following application elements as critical: Program Narrative, Budget Detail Worksheet, Budget Narrative, and resumes/curriculum vitae of key personnel. For purposes of this solicitation, “key personnel” means the principal investigator, and any and all co-principal investigators.

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

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 OJP’s Grants Management System (GMS) take information from the applicant’s profile to populate the fields on this form. When selecting “type of applicant,” if the applicant is a for-profit entity, select “For-Profit Organization” or “Small Business” (as applicable).

2. Project Abstract

Applications should include a high-quality project abstract that summarizes the proposed project in 250-400 words. Project abstracts should be—

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

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

Project abstracts should follow the detailed template (including the detailed instructions as to content) available at www.nij.gov/funding/documents/nij-project-abstract-template.pdf.

The project abstract is a very important part of the application, and serves as an introduction to the proposed project. NIJ uses the project abstract for a number of purposes, including 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.

3. Program Narrative

The program narrative section of the application should not exceed 30 double spaced pages in 12-point font with 1-inch margins. If included in the main body of the program narrative, tables, charts, figures, and other illustrations count toward the 30-page limit for the narrative section. The project abstract, table of contents, appendices, and government forms do not count toward the 30-page limit.

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

The following sections should be included as part of the program narrative.²⁶

Program Narrative Guidelines:

a. **Title Page** (not counted against the 30-page program narrative limit).

The title page should include the title of the project, submission date, funding opportunity number, and the name and complete contact information (that is, address, telephone number, and e-mail address) for both the applicant organization and the principal investigator.

b. **Resubmit Response** (if applicable) (not counted against the 30-page program narrative limit).

If an applicant is resubmitting a proposal presented previously to NIJ, but not funded, the applicant should indicate this. A statement should be provided, no more than two pages, addressing: (1) the title, submission date, and NIJ-assigned application number of the previous proposal, and (2) a brief summary of revisions to the proposal, including responses to previous feedback received from NIJ.

c. **Table of Contents and Figures** (not counted against the 30-page program narrative limit).

d. **Main Body.**

The main body of the program narrative should describe the proposed project in depth. The following sections should be included as part of the program narrative:

²⁶ As noted earlier, if the proposed program or project reasonably could be conducted in discrete phases, with each phase resulting in completion of one or more significant, defined milestones, then NIJ strongly recommends that the applicant structure the application – specifically including the narrative, expected scholarly products, timelines/milestones, and budget detail worksheet and budget narrative – to set out each phase clearly. (In appropriate cases, the expected scholarly product(s) from a particular phase may vary from those described above.) See generally, “Goals, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products” under “Program-Specific Information,” above.

- Project Design and Implementation.
- Potential Impact.
- Capabilities/Competencies.

Within these sections, the narrative should address:

- Purpose, goals, and objectives.
- Review of relevant literature.
- Detailed description of research design and methods, such as research questions, hypotheses, description of sample, and analysis plan.
- Planned Scholarly Products (See “Goals, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products” under “Program-Specific Information,” above, for a discussion of expected scholarly products.)
- Implications for criminal justice policy and practice in the United States.
- Management plan and organization.
- Plan for Dissemination to Broader Audiences (if applicable to the proposed project). Applicants should identify plans (if any) to produce or to make available to broader interested audiences – such as criminal justice practitioners or policymakers – summary information from the planned scholarly products of the proposed project (such as summaries of articles in peer-reviewed scientific journals), in a form designed to be readily accessible and useful to those audiences. (Such dissemination might include, for example, trade press articles and webinars.)

e. **Appendices** (not counted against the 30-page narrative limit) include:

- Bibliography/references.
- Any tools/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 resumes of the principal investigator and any and all co-principal investigators. In addition, curriculum vitae, resumes, or biographical sketches of all other individuals (regardless of “investigator” status) who will be significantly involved in substantive aspects of the proposal (including, for example, individuals such as statisticians serving as consultants to conduct proposed data analysis).

- List (to the extent known) of all proposed project staff members, including those affiliated with the applicant organization or any proposed subrecipient organization(s), any proposed consultant(s) and contractors (whether individuals or organizations), and any proposed members of an advisory board for the project (if applicable). The list should include, for each individual and organization: name, title (if applicable), employer or other organizational affiliation, and roles and responsibilities proposed for the project. Applicants should use the “Proposed Project Staff, Affiliation, and Roles” form available at www.nij.gov/funding/documents/nij-project-staff-template.xlsx to provide this listing.
- Proposed project timeline and expected milestones.
- Human Subjects Protection paperwork (documentation and forms related to Institutional Review Board (IRB) review).
(See www.nij.gov/funding/humansubjects/Pages/welcome.aspx) NOTE: Final IRB approval is not required at the time an application is submitted.
- Privacy Certificate (for further guidance go to www.nij.gov/funding/humansubjects/pages/confidentiality.aspx).
- List of any previous and current NIJ awards to applicant organization and investigator(s), including the NIJ-assigned award numbers and a brief description of any scholarly products that resulted in whole or in part from work funded under the NIJ award(s). (See “Goals, Objective, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products” under “Program-Specific Information,” above, for definition of “scholarly products.”)
- Letters of cooperation/support or administrative agreements from organizations collaborating in the project, such as law enforcement and correctional agencies (if applicable).
- List of other agencies, organizations, or funding sources to which this proposal has been submitted (if applicable).
- Data archiving plan. Applicants should anticipate that NIJ will require (through special award conditions, including a partial withholding of award funds) that data sets resulting in whole or in part from projects funded under this solicitation be submitted for archiving with the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data (NACJD). (For a detailed discussion of the information NIJ expects to find in a data archiving plan, see www.nij.gov/funding/data-resources-program/applying/Pages/data-archiving-strategies.aspx.)

Applications should include as an appendix a brief plan – labeled “Data Archiving Plan” – to comply with data archiving requirements. The plan should provide brief details about proposed data management and archiving, including submission to NIJ (through NACJD) of **all files and documentation** necessary to allow for future efforts by others to reproduce the project’s findings and/or to extend the scientific value of the data set through

secondary analysis. Pertinent files and documentation typically would include, among other things, qualitative and quantitative data produced, instrumentation and data collection forms, codebook(s), any specialized programming code necessary to reproduce all constructed measures and the original data analysis, description of necessary de-identification procedures, and (when required) a copy of the privacy certificate and informed consent protocols.

The plan should be one or two pages in length and include the level of effort associated with meeting archiving requirements.

Note that required data sets are to be submitted 90 days before the end of the project period.

4. Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative

a. Budget Detail Worksheet

A sample Budget Detail Worksheet can be found at www.ojp.gov/funding/forms/budget_detail.pdf. Applicants that submit their budget in a different format should include the budget categories listed in the sample budget worksheet. (Work associated with satisfying data archiving requirements should be reflected.)

For questions pertaining to budget and examples of allowable and unallowable costs, see the OJP Financial Guide at www.ojp.usdoj.gov/financialguide/index.htm.

b. Budget Narrative

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

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

The narrative should be sound mathematically, and correspond 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 they are relevant 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 be broken down by year.

c. Cofunding

An award made by NIJ under this solicitation may account for up to 100 percent of the total cost of the project. The application should indicate whether it is feasible for the applicant to contribute cash, facilities, or services as non-federal support for the project. The application should identify generally any such contributions that the applicant expects to make and the proposed budget should indicate in detail which items, if any, will be supported with non-federal contributions.

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.

d. Non-Competitive Procurement Contracts In Excess of Simplified Acquisition Threshold

If an applicant proposes to make one or more non-competitive procurements of products or services, where the non-competitive procurement will exceed the simplified acquisition threshold (also known as the small purchase threshold), which is currently set at \$150,000, the application should address the considerations outlined in the [OJP Financial Guide](#).

5. Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable)

Indirect costs are allowed only if the applicant has a federally approved indirect cost rate. (This requirement does not apply to units of local government.) Attach a copy of the federally approved indirect cost rate agreement to the application. Applicants that do not have an approved rate may request one through their cognizant federal agency, which will review all documentation and approve a rate for the applicant organization, or, if the applicant's accounting system permits, costs may be allocated in the direct cost categories. For assistance with identifying your cognizant agency, please contact the OJP Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO) Customer Service Center at 1-800-458-0786 or at ask.ocfo@usdoj.gov. If DOJ is the cognizant federal agency, applicants may obtain information needed to submit an indirect cost rate proposal at www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/pdfs/indirect_costs.pdf.

6. Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable)

Tribes, tribal organizations, or third parties proposing to provide direct services or assistance to residents on tribal lands should include in their applications a resolution, a letter, affidavit, or other documentation, as appropriate, that certifies that the applicant has the legal authority from the tribe(s) to implement the proposed project on tribal lands. In those instances when an organization or consortium of tribes applies for a grant 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 grant. A consortium of tribes for which existing consortium bylaws allow action without support from all tribes in the consortium (i.e., without an authorizing resolution or comparable legal documentation from each tribal governing body) may submit, instead, a copy of its consortium bylaws with the application.

7. Additional Attachments

a. Applicant disclosure of pending applications²⁷

Applicants are to disclose whether they have pending applications for federally funded grants or subgrants (including cooperative agreements) that include requests for funding to support the same project being proposed under this solicitation and will cover the identical cost items outlined in the budget narrative and worksheet in the application under this solicitation. The disclosure should include both direct applications for federal funding (e.g., applications to federal agencies) and indirect applications for such funding (e.g., applications to state agencies that will subaward 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.

Applicants that have pending applications as described above are to provide the following information about pending applications submitted within the last 12 months:

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

Federal or State Funding Agency	Solicitation Name/Project Name	Name/Phone/E-mail for Point of Contact at Funding Agency
DOJ/COPS	COPS Hiring Program	Jane Doe, 202/000-0000; jane.doe@usdoj.gov
HHS/ Substance Abuse & Mental Health Services Administration	Drug Free Communities Mentoring Program/ North County Youth Mentoring Program	John Doe, 202/000-0000; john.doe@hhs.gov

Applicants should include the table as a separate attachment, with the file name “Disclosure of Pending Applications,” to their application. Applicants that do not have pending applications as described above are to include a statement to this effect in the separate attachment page (e.g., “[Applicant Name on SF-424] does not have pending applications submitted within the last 12 months for federally funded grants or subgrants (including cooperative agreements) that include requests for funding to support the same

²⁷ Typically, the applicant is not the principal investigator; rather, the applicant, most frequently, is the institution, organization, or company in which the principal investigator is employed.

project being proposed under this solicitation and will cover the identical cost items outlined in the budget narrative and worksheet in the application under this solicitation.”).

b. Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity

If a proposal involves research and/or evaluation, regardless of the proposal’s other merits, in order to receive funds, the applicant must demonstrate research/evaluation independence, including appropriate safeguards to ensure research/evaluation objectivity and integrity.

For purposes of this solicitation, research and evaluation independence and integrity pertains to ensuring that the design, conduct, or reporting of research and evaluation funded by NIJ grants, cooperative agreements, or contracts will not be biased by any personal or financial conflict of interest on the part of the investigators responsible for the research and evaluation or on the part of the applicant organization. Conflicts can be either actual or apparent. Examples of potential investigator (or other personal) conflict situations may include 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 colleague (potential apparent conflict). With regard to potential organizational conflicts of interest, as one example, generally an organization could not be given a grant to evaluate a project if that organization had itself provided substantial prior technical assistance to that project, as the organization in such an instance would 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 is a problem.

In the attachment dealing with research and evaluation independence and integrity, the applicant should explain the process and procedures that the applicant has put in place to identify and eliminate (or, at the very least, mitigate) potential personal or financial conflicts of interest on the part of its staff, consultants, and/or subrecipients. It also should identify any potential organizational conflicts of interest on the part of the applicant with regard to the proposed research/evaluation. If the applicant reasonably believes that no potential personal or organizational conflicts of interest exist, then the applicant should provide a brief narrative explanation of how and why it reached that conclusion. Documentation that may be helpful in this regard could include organizational codes of ethics/conduct or policies regarding organizational, personal, and financial conflicts of interest.

For situations in which potential personal or organizational conflicts of interest exist, in the attachment, the applicant should identify the safeguards the applicant has or will put in place to eliminate, mitigate, or otherwise address those conflicts of interest.

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

8. Accounting System and Financial Capability Questionnaire (if applicable)

Any applicant (other than an individual) that is a non-governmental entity and that has not received any award from OJP within the past 3 years is to download, complete, and submit this [form](#).

Selection Criteria

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

Project Design and Implementation (Quality and technical merit) – 60%

1. Soundness of methods and analytic and technical approach to addressing the stated aim(s) of the proposed project.
2. Feasibility of proposed project.
3. Awareness of potential pitfalls of proposed project design and feasibility of proposed actions to minimize and/or mitigate them.

Potential Impact – 20%

Potential for a significant scientific or technical advance(s) that will improve criminal justice in the United States, such as—

- Potential for significantly improved understanding of the stated criminal justice problem.
- Potential for innovative solution to address (all or a significant part of) the stated criminal justice problem.

Capabilities/Competencies (Capabilities, demonstrated productivity, and experience of the applicant organization and proposed project staff) – 20%

1. Qualifications and experience of proposed project staff (that is, the principal investigator, any and all co-principal investigators, and all other individuals (and organizations) identified in the application (regardless of “investigator” status) who will be significantly involved in substantive aspects of the proposal).
2. Demonstrated ability of the applicant organization to manage the effort.
3. Relationship between the capabilities/competencies of the proposed project staff (including the applicant organization) and the scope of the proposed project.

Budget

Peer reviewers will consider and may comment on the following additional items in the context of scientific and technical merit.

1. Total cost of the project relative to the perceived benefit (cost effectiveness).
2. Appropriateness of the budget relative to the level of effort.
3. Use of existing resources to conserve costs.
4. Proposed budget alignment with proposed project activities.

Plan for Dissemination to Broader Audiences (if applicable to the proposed project)

Peer reviewers may comment – in the context of scientific and technical merit – on the proposed plan (if any) to produce or to make available to broader interested audiences, such as criminal justice practitioners or policymakers, summary information from the planned scholarly products of the project.

As discussed further under “Review Process,” below, award decisions will be made by the Director of NIJ, who may consider factors including, but not limited to, planned scholarly products, proposed budgets, past performance (including scholarly products) under prior NIJ and OJP awards.

Review Process

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

Peer reviewers will review the applications submitted under this solicitation that meet basic minimum requirements. NIJ may use internal peer reviewers, external peer reviewers, or a combination, to review the applications. 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. A peer review panel will evaluate, score, and rate applications that meet basic minimum requirements. Peer reviewers’ ratings and any resulting recommendations are advisory only. In addition to peer review ratings, considerations for award recommendations and decisions may include, but are not limited to, underserved populations, geographic diversity, strategic priorities, past performance, and available funding.

The Office of the Chief Financial Officer, in consultation with NIJ, reviews applications for potential discretionary awards to evaluate the fiscal integrity and financial capability of applicants, examines proposed costs to determine if the Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative accurately explain project costs, and determines whether costs are reasonable, necessary, and allowable under applicable federal cost principles and agency regulations.

All final award decisions will be made by the Director of NIJ, who may consider factors including, but not limited to, underserved populations, geographic diversity, strategic priorities, past performance, and available funding.

Additional Requirements

Applicants selected for awards must agree to comply with additional legal requirements upon acceptance of an award. OJP encourages applicants to review the information pertaining to these additional requirements prior to submitting an application. Additional information for each requirement can be found at www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/other_requirements.htm.

- Civil Rights Compliance
- Civil Rights Compliance Specific to State Administering Agencies
- Faith-Based and Other Community Organizations
- Confidentiality
- Research and the Protection of Human Subjects
- Anti-Lobbying Act
- Financial and Government Audit Requirements
- Reporting of Potential Fraud, Waste, and Abuse, and Similar Misconduct
- National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)
- DOJ Information Technology Standards (if applicable)
- Single Point of Contact Review
- Non-Supplanting of State or Local Funds
- Criminal Penalty for False Statements
- Compliance with [Office of Justice Programs Financial Guide](#)
- Suspension or Termination of Funding
- Non-profit Organizations
- For-profit Organizations
- Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA)
- Rights in Intellectual Property
- Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (FFATA)
- Awards in Excess of \$5,000,000 – Federal Taxes Certification Requirement

- Active SAM Registration
- Policy and Guidance for Approval, Planning, and Reporting of Conferences (including Meetings and Trainings)
- OJP Training Guiding Principles for Grantees and Subgrantees

As indicated earlier in this solicitation, NIJ expects scholarly products to result from any award under this solicitation. Please review the “Goals, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products” segment of the “Program-Specific Information” section of this solicitation, as well as the “Performance Measures” section.

In addition to the expectation of scholarly products, successful applicants under this solicitation will be required to submit the following deliverables regarding the work funded by the NIJ award:

Semi-Annual and Final Progress Reports

Applicants should anticipate that progress reports will be required to follow the non-budgetary components of the Research Performance Progress Report (RPPR) template/format. General information on RPPRs may be found at www.nsf.gov/bfa/dias/policy/rppr/. Future award and fund draw-downs may be withheld if reports are delinquent.

Quarterly and Final Financial Reports; Audit Reports

Quarterly and final financial status reports are required. If applicable, an annual audit report in accordance with Office of Management and Budget requirements must be submitted. Future award and fund draw-downs may be withheld if reports are delinquent.

Draft and Final Summary Overview of the Work Conducted under the Award

The overview is expected to provide an overall summary of the work under, and results of, the project funded by NIJ under this solicitation. Among other things, the summary overview should address the purpose of the project, project subjects (if applicable), project design and methods, data analysis, project findings, and implications for criminal justice policy and practice in the United States.

A draft summary overview no longer than 10 pages long (double-spaced) is to be submitted 90 days prior to the end of the project period for NIJ review and comment.

Required Data Sets and Associated Files and Documentation

As discussed earlier, applicants should anticipate that NIJ will require any recipient of an award under this solicitation to submit to NACJD all data sets that result in whole or in part from the work funded by NIJ, along with associated files and any documentation necessary to allow for future efforts by others to reproduce the project’s findings and/or to extend the scientific value of the data set through secondary analysis. All data sets and necessary documentation are to be submitted 90 days prior to the end of the project period. For more information, see the “Program Narrative” section of “What an Application Must Include,” above.

How to Apply

Applicants must register in, and submit applications through Grants.gov, a “one-stop storefront” 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**, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, except federal holidays. Registering with Grants.gov is a one-time process; however, **processing delays may occur, and it can take several weeks** for first-time registrants to receive confirmation and a user password. OJP encourages applicants to **register several weeks before** the application submission deadline. In addition, OJP urges applicants to submit applications 72 hours prior to the application due date 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.

NIJ 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 notified.

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

Characters	Special Characters		
Upper case (A – Z)	Parenthesis ()	Curly braces { }	Square brackets []
Lower case (a – z)	Ampersand (&)	Tilde (~)	Exclamation point (!)
Number 0 – 9	Comma (,)	Semicolon (;)	Apostrophe (‘)
Underscore (_)	At sign (@)	Number sign (#)	Dollar sign (\$)
Hyphen (-)	Percent sign (%)	Plus sign (+)	Equal sign (=)
Space	When using the ampersand (&) in XML, applicants must use the “&#amp;” format.		
Period (.)			

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:

- 1. Acquire a Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number.** In general, the Office of Management and Budget requires that all applicants (other than individuals) for federal funds include a DUNS number in their applications for a new award or a supplement to an existing award. A DUNS number is a unique nine-digit sequence recognized as the universal standard for identifying and differentiating entities receiving federal funds. The

identifier is used for tracking purposes and to validate address and point of contact information for federal assistance applicants, recipients, and subrecipients. The DUNS number will be used throughout the grant life cycle. 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 the System for Award Management (SAM).** SAM is the repository for standard information about federal financial assistance applicants, recipients, and subrecipients. OJP requires all applicants (other than individuals) for federal financial assistance to maintain current registrations in the SAM database. Applicants must be registered in SAM to successfully register in Grants.gov. Applicants must **update or renew their SAM registration annually** to maintain an active status.

Applications cannot be successfully submitted in Grants.gov until Grants.gov receives the SAM registration information. The information transfer from SAM to Grants.gov can take up to 48 hours. OJP recommends that the applicant register or renew registration with SAM as early as possible.

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

- 3. Acquire an Authorized Organization Representative (AOR) and a Grants.gov username and password.** Complete the AOR profile on Grants.gov and create a username and password. The applicant organization's DUNS number must be used to complete this step. For more information about the registration process, go to www.grants.gov/web/grants/applicants.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. Note that an organization can have more than one AOR.
- 5. Search for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov.** Use the following identifying information when searching for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov. The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance number for this solicitation is 16.560, titled "National Institute of Justice Research, Evaluation, and Development Project Grants," and the funding opportunity number is NIJ–2014-3723.
- 6. Complete the Disclosure of Lobbying Activities.** All applicants must complete this information. Applicants that expend any funds for lobbying activities must provide the detailed information requested on the form *Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (SF-LLL)*. Applicants that do not expend any funds for lobbying activities should enter "N/A" in the required highlighted fields.
- 7. Submit a valid application consistent with this solicitation by following the directions in Grants.gov.** Within 24–48 hours after submitting the electronic application, the applicant should receive an e-mail validation message from Grants.gov. The message will state whether the application has been received and validated, or 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 well ahead of the deadline provides time to correct the problem(s) that caused the

rejection. **Important:** OJP urges applicants to submit applications **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.

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

Note: Duplicate Applications

If an applicant submits multiple versions of an application, NIJ will review only the most recent valid version submitted.

Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues

Applicants that experience unforeseen Grants.gov technical issues beyond their control that prevent them from submitting their application by the deadline must e-mail the NIJ contact identified in the Contact Information section on page 1 **within 24 hours after the application deadline** and request approval to submit their application. The e-mail must describe the technical difficulties, and 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: NIJ does not automatically approve requests.** After the program office reviews the submission, and contacts the Grants.gov or SAM Help Desks to validate 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 applicant failed to follow all required procedures, which resulted in an untimely application submission, OJP will deny the applicant's request to submit their application.

The following conditions generally are insufficient to justify late submissions:

- Failure to register in SAM or Grants.gov in sufficient time.
- 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, including firewalls.

Notifications regarding known technical problems with Grants.gov, if any, are posted at the top of the OJP funding Web page at www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/solicitations.htm.

Provide Feedback to OJP

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

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

If you are interested in being a reviewer for other OJP grant applications, please e-mail your resume to ojppeerreview@lmbps.com. The OJP Solicitation Feedback email account will not forward your resume. **Note:** Neither you nor anyone else from your organization can be a peer reviewer in a competition in which you or your organization has submitted an application.

Application Checklist

Optimizing the Use of Video Technology to Improve Criminal Justice Outcomes

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

What an Applicant Should Do:

Prior to Registering in Grants.gov:

- _____ Acquire a DUNS Number (see page 25)
- _____ Acquire or renew registration with SAM (see page 26)

To Register with Grants.gov:

- _____ Acquire AOR and Grants.gov username/password (see page 26)
- _____ Acquire AOR confirmation from the E-Biz POC (see page 26)

To Find Funding Opportunity:

- _____ Search for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov (see page 26)
- _____ Download Funding Opportunity and Application Package (see page 26)
- _____ Sign up for Grants.gov email notifications (optional) (see page 25)
- _____ Read [Important Notice: Applying for Grants in Grants.gov](#)

General Requirements:

- _____ Review "[Other Requirements](#)" webpage

What an Application Should Include:

- _____ Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424) (see page 13)
- _____ Abstract (see page 13)
- _____ Program Narrative (see page 14)
- _____ Appendices (see page 15)
- _____ Budget Detail Worksheet (see page 17)
- _____ Budget Narrative (see page 17)

- _____ Employee Compensation Waiver request and justification (if applicable) (see page 11)
- _____ Read OJP policy and guidance on "conference" approval, planning, and reporting available at www.ojp.gov/funding/confcost.htm (see page 11)

- _____ Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (SF-LLL) (see page 26)
- _____ Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable) (see page 18)
- _____ Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable) (see page 18)

- _____ Additional Attachments
 - _____ Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications (see page 19)
 - _____ Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity (see page 20)

- _____ Accounting System and Financial Capability Questionnaire (if applicable) (see page 21)