INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING
The Department of Homeland Security (DHS)
Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) *Template*
Program Evaluation of the "Three Cities" CVE Initiatives

NOTE: If you are going to apply for this funding opportunity and have not obtained a Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number and/or are not currently registered in the System for Award Management (SAM), please take immediate action to obtain a DUNS Number, if applicable, and then to register immediately in SAM . It may take 4 weeks or more after you submit your SAM registration before your registration is active in SAM, then an additional 24 hours for Grants.gov to recognize your information. Information on obtaining a DUNS number and registering in SAM is available from Grants.gov at: http://www.grants.gov/documents/19/18243/SAM_New_Grantee_Registration.pdf/8bf1c182-8d35-47e0-99e2-a263fa3d9005

A. Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) Description

Issued By
U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS), Science & Technology Directorate, Resilient Systems Division

Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) Number
97.108

CFDA Title
Homeland Security Research, Testing, Evaluation and Demonstration of Technologies

Notice of Funding Opportunity Title

Program Evaluation of the "Three Cities" CVE initiatives

NOFO Number
DHS-ST-15-108-RSD-00001

Authorizing Authority for Program
6 U.S.C. 188(b)(C)

Appropriation Authority for Program
P. L. 114-4, Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015, Title IV, Science and Technology, Research, Development, Acquisition and Operations.

Program Type

New

Program Overview, Objectives, and Priorities

1.0 Introduction

1.1 The Resilient Systems Division; Human Behavior and Identification Branch applies the social and behavioral sciences to improve the detection, analysis, and understanding of threats posed by individuals, groups, and radical movements in an effort to support the preparedness, response and recovery of communities impacted by catastrophic events; and to advance national security by integrating scientifically derived knowledge into homeland security policies and technologies.

1.2 Among those threats is violent extremism. The need to counter violent extremism (CVE) is described in a number of strategy documents within the national, departmental, directorate, and divisional levels such as the 2015 National Security Strategy, 2014 Quadrennial Homeland Security Review, and Strategic Implementation Plan (SIP) for Empowering Local Partners to Prevent Violent Extremism in the U.S., and the DHS S&T Visionary Goals. Furthermore, the President's Strategic Implementation Plan (SIP) notes that the plan "represents the first time the United States Government has outlined an approach to address ideologically inspired violent extremism in the Homeland." It further notes that the U.S. Government "will first develop key benchmarks to guide our initial assessment. Where possible, we will also work to develop indicators of impact to supplement these performance measures, which will tell us whether our activities are having the intended effects with respect to an objective or sub-objective. As we implement our activities, future evaluations will shift away from benchmark performance measures towards impact assessments." (SIP; 2011).

1.3 Since publication of the SIP, the White House has coordinated the development of CVE pilot programs in three major U.S. cities (Greater Boston, Los Angeles, and Minneapolis-St. Paul; hereafter "the Three Cities CVE initiatives"). However, the effectiveness of those pilot programs remains unexplored, and—therefore—unknown. DHS S&T has identified CVE as a key DHS programmatic goal. This work will be conducted by engaging experts in the areas of program evaluation and CVE, engaging key stakeholders, and focusing the evaluation designs to deliver information that is useful both to front-line CVE-related practitioners and policy makers: the ultimate aims of which are threefold.

1.3.1 To improve the CVE-related activities of the "Three Cities" CVE initiatives.
1.3.1.1 Including, but not limited to, safeguarding civil liberties.

1.3.2 To provide policy makers with information necessary to decide what, if any, aspects of the "Three Cities" CVE initiatives seem worthy of implementation in other U.S. cities.

1.3.2.1 Including, but not limited to, discovery of both desirable and undesirable unintended consequences of those initiatives.

1.3.3 To reduce the threat of ideologically-motivated violence in the United States.

2.0 Project Description/Scope

2.1 During the base period of performance, Awardees will rely on the National Strategy and the Strategic Implementation Plan as they conduct both formative evaluations and impact evaluations of Federal (including DHS), State, and local components of one of the "Three Cities" CVE initiatives. At the time of application, awardees will specify upon which of the following three cities their evaluations will focus: Greater Boston, Los Angeles, or Minneapolis-St. Paul. The program evaluation of the "Three Cities" CVE initiatives includes five complementary Technical Topic Areas (TTAs):

2.1.1 TTA #1, Coordination and Development of Progress Measures, and Outcome Measures
2.1.2 TTA #2, Formative Evaluation
2.1.3 TTA #3, Findings and Data from Formative Evaluation
2.1.4 TTA #4, Impact evaluation
2.1.5 TTA #5, Findings and Data from Impact Evaluation

2.2 TTA #1 aims to coordinate with awardees from the other two of the "Three Cities" CVE initiatives, to employ common measures of progress and outcomes, as feasible. TTA #2 will require a formative evaluation[1] of each city's CVE initiative, to prepare it for the subsequent impact evaluation.[2] TTA #3 will require an evaluation report of formative evaluation, including methods, results, and appendices containing all measurement instruments. TTA #4 will require an impact evaluation of each city's CVE initiative and identify areas for improvement: to elucidate their effects on CVE. TTA #5 will require an evaluation report of the impact evaluation, including methods, results, and appendices containing all measurement instruments and determine findings.

2.3 Each TTA is discussed in detail below and specific objectives for each TTA are

[1] Formative evaluation shall mean an evaluation that takes place prior to an impact evaluation, with the aim of improving the evaluated program's design and performance, via systematic evaluation of the program's processes, its theory(ies) of change, and the informational needs of the program's key stakeholders.
[2] Impact evaluation shall mean an evaluation of the positive and negative, primary and secondary, long-term effects produced by a program: directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.

also provided. Of particular note, it is anticipated that both metrics and analysis techniques to measure the development progress will evolve during the project.

DHS S&T will use findings from this research, alongside data collected elsewhere, to provide a comprehensive set of best practices for CVE at all levels of government. This initiative will meet two DHS lines of effort in CVE. First, the findings will aid in identifying effective efforts to counter the threat of violent extremism by supporting the evaluation of current CVE programs. Additionally, the program will encourage and enable our partners to counter violent extremism by enhancing community understanding of the threat and effective measures to counter violent extremism.

3.0 Technical Topic Areas

3.1 TTA #1: Coordination and Development of Progress Measures, and Outcome Measures

3.1.1 The provision of the coordination and development of progress and outcome measures would require the identification and engagement of primary intended users (PIUs) of the evaluation, including specification of those users' informational needs, and their intended users of the evaluation. The development of these measures should focus both on the formative and impact evaluations, including articulation of the program's theory (or theories) of change, and depiction (logic model) of the program showing the intended relationships between inputs, outputs, and outcomes.

3.1.2 Objective 1: Responses to this announcement should detail an approach to coordinate with Awardees from the other two (of three) the "Three Cities" CVE initiatives, and DHS S&T RSD, to employ common measures, as feasible, including the development of comparable progress measures, and outcome measures. This should include an approach to identify and engage PIUs of the evaluation, including specification of those users' informational needs, and their intended uses of the evaluation. Progress measures and outcome measures are due ***4 months from award date***.

3.2 TTA #2: Formative Evaluation

3.2.1 To prepare for the impact evaluation (the primary objective of the "Three Cities" CVE initiatives program evaluation) a formative evaluation will be conducted to help PIUs define what constitutes success. The formative evaluation will also define measurements to lay the ground work for the subsequent impact evaluation.

3.2.2 Objective 1: Focus the evaluation, including articulation of the program's theory (or theories) of change, and depiction (i.e., logic model) of the program, showing the intended relationships between its

inputs, outputs, and outcomes. The Awardee shall tailor the evaluation to the specific program and purpose of the evaluation, in consultation with the other Awardees, and DHS RSD.

3.2.3 Objective 2: Evaluation design, including measures of programmatic activities and outcomes. The Awardee will account for the focus of the evaluation in order to determine an appropriate evaluation strategy that is well-suited for the specific program. As feasible and cost effective, the impact evaluation shall employ experimental (or quasi-experimental) methods, unless RSD approves another approach.

3.2.4 Objective 3: Identify, assess and collect data. As part of the design stage, the Awardee shall assess the quality of available data, along with obstacles to, and the risks to, data acquisition. The normal expectation from the Government is that both quantitative and qualitative data may be relevant to the conduct of an evaluation, and—as feasible—both types of data shall be employed in the evaluations. Data of only one of those two types shall be used only if justified to the satisfaction of DHS RSD. To reduce costs, Awardee's data collection shall utilize preexisting data, to the extent feasible. To the extent that privacy and other rules permit, data will be stored in a form that will allow DHS S&T to reuse it in any follow-on or future work without recompense.

3.2.5 Objective 4: Conduct a formative evaluation of the city's CVE initiatives, to prepare it for the subsequent impact evaluation. Key deliverables shall be due ***10 months after award***.

3.3 TTA #3: Findings and Data from Formative Evaluation

3.3.1 At the conclusion of the initial formative evaluation, Awardees are expected to have drawn actionable definitions of success and measurements metrics to be applied during the impact evaluation. Finding shall be accompanied by a detailed description of methods, results, and measurement instruments for review.

3.3.2 Objective 1: To be responsive to this TTA, applicants should describe their technical approach to analyze the data, using appropriate statistical and qualitative methods, to assess performance of formative evaluation of the city's CVE initiatives, to prepare for the subsequent impact evaluation.

3.3.3 Objective 2: To demonstrate results, Awardees will share findings with primary intended users—including, but not limited to, managers of the evaluated entities, to the program manager(s) of the component agency, and to DHS RSD —via reports and presentations. Awardees shall generate a main written report, and provide accompanying

presentation slides, that set forth the research goals, explain the research strategies, describe the research the methods (including description of the design as implemented, the data used, and the analyses), the results of the analysis, including, as appropriate, tables, and key statistical outputs, along with a discussion of the study's strengths and limitations, and recommendations for actions. The report will also include a brief executive summary and, as appropriate, statistical tables, summaries of the qualitative data, and appendices containing all measurement instruments. The basis for the recommendations, their rationales and the data behind them will be explained within these reports and presentations. Up to five such presentations, of up to 90 minutes in length, may be required by RSD.

3.3.4 Objective 3: Awardee shall be responsible for creation of a plan to disseminate all research findings pursuant to this formative evaluation, and that dissemination plan shall be made part of the award application. That plan shall provide for all deliverables to be made freely available, at a minimum, to managers of the evaluated entities, to the program manager(s) of the component agency, and to DHS RSD. Additionally, the dissemination plan should identify other key stakeholders (both governmental and non-governmental) who shall be offered the products resulting from this award, including a statement regarding the types of products that shall be made available to those stakeholders. Awardees are expected to deliver an evaluation report of formative evaluation, including methods, results, and appendices containing all measurement instruments. The evaluated entities will benefit by being able to demonstrate success through independent research. Other localities interested in advancing CVE programming will benefit by having access to a repository of effective programs. Additionally, copies of all data files, and accompanying codebooks, shall be submitted both to the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data (NACJD), hosted by the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR; at the University of Michigan), and DHS RSD. The evaluation report, presentation slides, and data files, from the formative evaluation will be due ***12 months after award.***

3.4 TTA #4: Impact Evaluation

3.4.1 The impact evaluation is the primary objective of this project. Using the methods, measurements, and definitions of success from the formative evaluation findings the Awardee will conduct an impact evaluation of CVE initiatives in their respective city. This impact

evaluation will aim to answer fundamental questions regarding areas for improvement, effects on CVE, and impact assessments.

3.4.2 Objective 1: To be responsive to this TTA, applicants should identify an approach to conduct an impact evaluation of the city's CVE initiatives, and identify areas for improvement: to elucidate their effects on CVE. Such impact evaluation shall employ a mixed method design, including experimental, and/or quasi-experimental, methods.

3.4.3 Objective 2: Identify, assess and collect data. As part of the design stage, the Awardee shall assess the quality of available data, along with obstacles to, and the risks to, data acquisition. The normal expectation from the Government is that both quantitative and qualitative data may be relevant to the conduct of an evaluation, and—as feasible—both types of data shall be employed in the evaluations. Data of only one of those two types shall be used only if justified to the satisfaction of DHS RSD. To reduce costs, Awardee's data collection shall utilize preexisting data, to the extent feasible. To the extent that privacy and other rules permit, data will be stored in a form that will allow DHS S&T to reuse it in any follow-on or future work without recompense

3.4.4 Objective 3: Conduct a formative evaluation of the city's CVE initiatives, to prepare it for the subsequent impact evaluation. Key deliverables include emergent findings brief, and others, as requested by RSD beginning ***20 months after award.***

3.5 TTA #5: Findings and Data from Impact Evaluation

3.5.1 At the conclusion of the impact evaluation, Awardees are expected to reach and justify operationally relevant conclusions that identify strengths and weaknesses in the respective city's CVE initiatives. The findings expressed in this TTA will be instrumental in influencing future approaches to CVE initiatives in the United States. Due to the high demand for scientifically sound CVE program evaluations Awardees should expect to deliver multiple briefings addressing the basis for recommendations, and the rationale and data behind the findings from the impact evaluation.

3.5.2 Objective 1: Awardees will reach, and justify, operationally relevant conclusions that identify strengths and weaknesses in the city's CVE initiatives, as operationally relevant. Awardees will also be responsible for tying the evaluations' conclusions to policy relevant objectives and will make recommendations to capitalize upon those strengths and mitigate those weaknesses. Awardees shall make arguments for causality between program activities and their outcomes. Specifically, Awardees shall present the following:

i. Evidence that outcomes varied reliably;
ii. Identification of the most likely alternative explanations;
iii. Evidence in favor of causal explanations, and that casts doubt on alternative explanations;

3.5.3 Additionally, Awardees shall discuss the role of social policy agencies toward improving the city's CVE initiatives. Given that a broad range of CVE program components are affected by policy decisions, the recommendations for such agencies, toward CVE, should be made explicit. An evaluation report, presentation slides, and data files from the impact evaluation are ***due 24 months after award.***

3.5.4 Objective 2: Awardees will be responsible for ***a follow-up meta-evaluation within 3-6 months following the main report.*** Awardees shall compose and submit to DHS RSD, a follow-up report detailing both their insights from the evaluation experience, and an assessment of the usefulness of the evaluation, based on whether PIUs use the evaluation as intended. Meta-evaluation permits Awardees and PIUs (including DHS RSD) to enhance their learning from their experience, and to assess the usefulness of the evaluation. This entails Awardees following-up with PIUs to gain their feedback, including feedback regarding any unintended consequences of the evaluation. Such meta-evaluation is intended to develop both a body of CVE evaluation knowledge, and CVE evaluation expertise: both of which can enhance the quality of subsequent CVE program evaluations. This is an especially important practice for a field as new, and critical, as CVE evaluation.

3.5.5 Objective 3: Awardee shall be responsible for creation of a plan to disseminate all research findings pursuant to this impact evaluation, and that dissemination plan shall be made part of the award application. That plan shall provide for all deliverables to be made freely available, at a minimum, at a minimum, to managers of the evaluated entities, to the program manager(s) of the component agency, and to DHS RSD. Additionally, the dissemination plan should identify other key stakeholders (both governmental and non-governmental) who shall be offered the products resulting from this award, including a statement regarding the types of products that shall be made available to those stakeholders. Additionally, copies of all data files, and accompanying codebooks, shall be submitted both to the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data (NACJD), hosted by the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR; at the University of Michigan), and DHS RSD. The evaluation report, presentation slides, and data files from the formative evaluation will be due by the conclusion of the award timeframe.

4.0 Example Project Structure

4.1 Performance/Delivery Period

4.1.1 The Program Evaluation of the "Three Cities" CVE initiatives is structured into five distinct TTAs that aim to holistically reach, and justify operationally relevant conclusions that identify the strengths and weaknesses in the city's CVE initiatives. These findings will be instrumental in future development of similar programs, policies, or initiatives relating to CVE.

4.1.2 The Period of Performance for this award performance is 30 months, which includes 24 months for research and 3-6 months for follow-up meta-evaluation

4.1.3 The awardee shall be responsible for submitting, as part of the full proposal, a listing of deliverables and a schedule for their delivery, associated with this effort. The example schedules below are for illustrative and recommendation purposes only, and may be used as a guide, at the applicant's discretion.

Project Area (TTA)	**Example Task Description**	**Example Key Deliverable**	**Example Due Date**
TTA #1 Coordination and Development of progress measures, and outcome measures	Coordinate with Awardees from the other two of the "Three Cities" CVE initiatives, to employ common measures, as feasible.	Progress measures and outcome measures.	4 months after award
TTA #2 Formative evaluation	Conduct a formative evaluation of the city's CVE initiatives, to prepare it for the subsequent impact evaluation	Emergent findings brief, and others, as requested by RSD.	10 months after award

TTA #3 Findings and data	Evaluation report of formative evaluation, including methods, results, and appendices containing all measurement instruments. Additionally, copies of the data files shall be submitted in SPSS format, to DHS RSD.	Evaluation report, presentation slides, and data files, from the formative evaluation.	12 months after award
TTA #4 Impact evaluation	Conduct an impact evaluation of the city's CVE initiatives, and identify areas for improvement: to elucidate their effects on CVE. Such impact evaluation shall employ a mixed-method design, including experimental, and/or quasi-experimental, methods	Emergent findings brief, and others, as requested by RSD.	Beginning 20 months after award
TTA #5 Findings and data	A. Evaluation report of impact evaluation, including methods, results, and appendices containing all measurement instruments. Additionally, copies of the data files shall be submitted in SPSS format, to DHS RSD. B. Follow-up meta evaluation detailing insights from the evaluation experience, and an assessment of the usefulness of the evaluation, based on whether PIUs use the evaluation as intended.	Evaluation report, presentation slides, and data files, from the impact evaluation.	A. 24 months after award B. 27-30 months after award

Request for Proposals

In fiscal year (FY) 2015, a total of up to $1.1 million in Federal funding is available for the entirety of the "Three Cities" CVE initiatives evaluations over a 30 month period of performance to complete all awards. (Subject to availability of funds)

B. Federal Award Information

Award Amounts, Important Dates, and Extensions

Available Funding for the NOFO:	**Up to $500,000 per award, and up to $1,100,000 for all awards included in program (subject to the availability of funds). Funds will be awarded in 12-month increments.**
Projected number of Awards:	**3 (three) awards.**
Period of Performance:	**Up to 30 months.**

Any period over 30 months is an "extension." Extensions to the period of performance are allowable. Please refer to Section H. Additional Information – Extension, for more information regarding what steps recipients must follow and what information must be included in the justification for such request to be considered.

Projected Period of Performance Start Date(s): ***09/30/2015***

Projected Period of Performance End Date(s): ***03/30/2018***

First Budget Period Dates: **09/30/2015 - 03/30/2018**

Funding Instrument: Discretionary – Competitive - Cooperative Agreement

DHS Substantial Involvement

The "Program evaluation of the "Three Cities" CVE initiatives program requires substantial DHS involvement with awardee to include:

•DHS and recipient collaborate or jointly participate in the development of work plans and modifications thereto, disapproving and approving sub-projects, and coordinating standards development activities.

•Highly prescriptive DHS requirements prior to award, limiting recipient's discretion with respect to scope of services offered, coupled with close DHS monitoring and operational involvement during performance over and above the normal exercise of Federal stewardship responsibilities, to ensure compliance with these requirements.

Additionally, DHS responsibilities under the cooperative agreement, in addition to the usual monitoring and technical assistance, include the following:

1. Providing technical assistance, including oversight of the selection of eligible research participants (in participating jurisdictions), and providing technical assistance workshops.

2. Assisting in the establishment of interagency partnerships, collaborations, consultations, and cooperation, within the Federal government, that might be necessary for carrying out the project.

3. Conducting periodic programmatic reviews of progress and products, including quarterly reviews.

4. Oversight of the development of training materials, the provision of training, the coordination of self-certification activities, and any evaluations thereof

5. Attending and participating in applicable meetings initiated by federal, state, and local stakeholders, including meetings with program staff of the evaluated entities, their subcommittees, and working groups, as applicable. RSD subject matter experts may periodically attend, participate in such meetings, and advise the local program managers.

C. Eligibility Information

Eligible Applicants

For-profit organizations other than small businesses

Nonprofits with 501(c)(3) IRS status, other than institution of higher education
Nonprofits without 501(c)(3) IRS status, other than institution of higher education
Private institutions of higher education
Public and State controlled institutions of higher education
Small businesses

Eligibility Criteria

To be eligible for this program, must meet the below requirements.

1. Applicants must not be a Government organization. At the time of application, applicants that propose to become the PM must have at least three years of experience performing program evaluations.
2. National laboratory employees may participate in planning, conducting, and analyzing the activities directed by the applicant, but may not direct projects on behalf of the applicant organization.
3. The standards organization may provide funds through its assistance agreement with DHS to an FFRDC for project-specific, non-federal research personnel, supplies, equipment, facilities, data, and other expenses directly related to activities under this cooperative agreement.
4. Federal agencies may not apply. Federal employees are not eligible to serve in a principal leadership role on a grant or cooperative agreement, and may not receive salaries or in other ways augment their agency's appropriations through awards made by this program.
    a. Nonetheless, federal employees may interact substantively with awardees in the form of cooperation.
    b. Cooperation involves consulting on the planning, management, and coordination of standards organization and/or information sharing and analysis organization activities, sharing or comparing information, indicators, samples, equipment, facilities, data, models, or other support during the conduct of the standards development and related activities in which the interaction is substantial and requires the award of a cooperative agreement, rather than a grant.
    c. Substantial involvement occurs when the collaboration or cooperation of a federal employee or facility is necessary to achieving the overall goals of the activities supported by this cooperative agreement.

Other Eligibility Criteria

DHS will not consider applications that do not adhere to one or more of the following requirements:

1. **Deadlines.** DHS will not accept late applications. Without exception, applications must be received by Grants.gov on or before the deadline in this announcement or they will not be considered.

2. **Application relevance.** Applications that do not address the purpose of this announcement will not be considered.

3. **Compliance and completeness.** Applications must substantially comply with the application submission instructions and requirements in this announcement or they will not be considered.

4. **Funding limits.** Applications exceeding the funding limits will not be considered.

5. **Proof of non-profit status.** The applicant and any proposed sub-awardee must provide documentation of non-profit and/or public status. Any of the following constitutes acceptable proof of non-profit status:

- A reference to the applicant organization's listing in the Internal Revenue Service's (IRS) most recent list of tax-exempt organizations described in section 501(c)(3) of the IRS Code.
- A copy of a currently valid IRS tax exemption certificate.
- A statement from a State taxing body, State attorney general, or other appropriate State official certifying that the applicant organization has a non-profit status and that none of the net earnings accrue to any private shareholders or individuals.
- A certified copy of the organization's certificate of incorporation or similar document that clearly establishes non-profit status.
- Any of the items in the subparagraphs immediately above for a State or national parent organization and a statement signed by the parent organization that the applicant organization is a local non-profit affiliate.
- A signed statement on official letterhead by an official authorized to apply for grant funds on behalf of the public entity shall suffice.

In addition, DHS will not consider **multiple applications** from a single organization serving as the lead. If more than one application is submitted by a single organization as the lead, the later in time will be considered, unless the later application clearly indicates a unique role for that organization, other than as lead for this activity.

Non-Responsive Applications

Your application will be rejected if:

1. Form SF-424 – Application for Federal Assistance is missing.
2. Form SF-424A – Budget is missing.
3. Form SF-424B – Assurances - Non-Construction Programs is missing.
4. The applicant's Authorized Organization Representative (AOR) is not registered with the System for Award Management (SAM).
5. The application does not include a Budget Narrative.
6. The application does not include a Project Abstract.
7. The Project Narrative is missing.

Maintenance of Effort

There is no maintenance of effort requirement for this program. Requests for funds under this announcement shall not be used to take the place of activities described in the application that are currently supported with other funding. Also, grant funds shall not be used to support activities that are a normal part of the organization's operations.

Cost Share or Match

There is no cost share or match requirement for this program.

D. Application and Submission Information

Submission Dates and Other Key Dates and Times

NOFO Posted to Grants.gov:	**08/24/2015 06:00:00 PM EST**
Application Submission Deadline:	**09/20/2015 11:59:59 PM EST**
Daylight savings time	
Anticipated Funding Selection Date:	**09/28/2015**
Anticipated Award Date:	**09/30/2015**

NOTE: The application must be received in Grants.gov by the date and time listed above. If an application is received after the deadline, it will not be considered. Applicants will receive a confirmation from Grants.gov once the application is successfully submitted.

All applications are time stamped by the Grants.gov system when submitted and recipients are notified accordingly. The federal office will download all applications that are received by the deadline date and time as indicated on the NOFO.

Other Key Dates

Event	Suggested Deadline For Completion
Obtaining DUNS Number	**09/18/2015**
Obtaining a valid EIN	**09/18/2015**
Updating SAM registration	**09/18/2015**

Address to Request Application Package

Applications will be processed through the Grants.gov portal. Application forms and instructions are available at Grants.gov. To access these materials, go to http://www.grants.gov , select "Applicants" then "Apply for Grants," read the registration requirements and register if necessary (**Allow up to four weeks after you submit before your registration is active in SAM, then an additional 24 hours for Grants.gov to recognize your information)**. In order to obtain the application package select "Download a Grant Application Package." Enter the CFDA and/or the funding opportunity number located on the cover of this NOFO, select "Download Package," and then follow the prompts to download the application package.

Grant Application Package - Enter the CFDA and/or the funding opportunity number located on the cover of this NOFO, select "Download Package," and then follow the prompts to download the application package.

Applications will be processed through the Grants.gov portal. If you experience difficulties accessing information or have any questions, please call Grants.gov customer support at 1-800-518-4726.

The Telephone Device for the Deaf (TDD) and/or Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) number available for this Announcement is: 1-800-518-4726 (Grants.gov Help Desk).

To request a hardcopy of the full NOFO, please email or fax a request to:

Janet Bailey
Grants Officer
Janet.Bailey@hq.dhs.gov
Phone: 202-447-0362

Content and Form of Application Submission

Content and Form of Application Submission
Applicants must submit all required forms and required documents listed in this section. See the Grants.gov Applicant User Guide for instructions on how to attach forms and documents. Applicant should ensure that the final submitted application package includes all required forms and documents. Applicants should avoid the use of special characters in attachment file names.

REQUIRED FORMS

Complete the required forms in accordance with the application instructions on Grants.gov. If submitting any information that is deemed proprietary, privileged or confidential commercial or financial, please denote the beginning and ending of such information with asterisks (***).

1. Form SF-424 – Application for Federal Assistance

This form must be completed within the application package on Grants.gov. You must download and install Adobe Reader in order to view this form. Applicants are only required to complete fields which are highlighted.

2. Form SF-424A – Budget

This form must be completed within the application package on Grants.gov. You must download and install Adobe Reader in order to view this form. Applicants are only required to complete fields which are highlighted. Provide budget amounts by object class (personnel, fringe benefits, travel, etc.). Include all five years of budget amounts in Section E. Funds may be requested as long as the item and amount are necessary to perform the proposed work and are not precluded by the cost principles or program funding restrictions.

3. Certifications/Assurances

These forms must be completed within the application package on Grants.gov. You must download and install Adobe Reader in order to view these forms. Applicants must submit:

a. **Form SF-424B – Assurances** – **Non-Construction Programs**; and

b. **Certification Regarding Lobbying**. If paragraph two of the certification applies, then complete and submit the SF-LLL Disclosure of Lobbying which is provided as an optional form in the application package.

By signing and submitting an application under this announcement, the applicant is providing: Certification Regarding Drug-Free Workplace Requirements; Certification

Regarding Debarment, Suspension, and Other Responsibility Matters – Primary Covered Transactions; and Certification that the applicant is not delinquent on any federal debt.

REQUIRED DOCUMENTS

Project Information

a. Project Abstract (3 single-spaced page maximum)

Provide the information below in a separate document, suitable for public dissemination. The project abstract must not include any proprietary/confidential information. Attach the Project Abstract to the application package.[3]

General Information	
1.	**Organization legal name**
2.	**Organization legal address** (Number and street, city, state, zip code)
3.	**Head of the organization** (Name, title, address, phone number, email address)
4.	**Authorized official**, the person at the organization authorized to sign to receive award (Name, title, address, phone number, email address)
5.	**Grant project manager**, the person who will manage the operations of the grant project and will serve as project manager primary point of contact (Name, title, address, phone number, email address)
6.	**Type of organization** (e.g., non-profit, small business, private, public and state controlled institutions of higher education, etc.)
7.	**Project description** (200 words or less) Provide a brief summary of the following: • The organization's experience coordinating and conducting program evaluations and impact assessments. • Proposed grant project activities and outcomes.

[3] See the Grants.gov Applicant User Guide for instructions on how to attach forms and documents. The "Attachment" Section begins on page 88 of the Applicant User Guide.

8.	**Total federal funding requested** (Up to $1,200,000 / $400,000 per award)
9.	**Congressional district** (based on the legal address of the applicant organization)
10.	**Number of full-time equivalents (FTEs)** Indicate the number of intended grant- funded FTEs. Include part-time work as percentages of FTEs. Include any grant-funded sub-awardee FTEs.

Tips: Write for a general audience and avoid use of scientific/technical jargon to the extent possible. Please define any technical terminology that is discipline-specific and include a list of any acronyms used. Be concise and direct in descriptions.

b. Project Narrative (<u>30</u> double-spaced page maximum)

Provide a response for each item in the chart below following the order listed. Items 5.a. – 5.c. below are the **mandatory headings** that must be included in the Project Narrative. An application that is missing one or more of the three required headings will be deemed **non-responsive** and will not be reviewed. The items and attachments listed in each section are required, and any item or attachment that is omitted will result in points deducted.

<u>Format Requirements</u>

- **You must follow the order specified below,**
- Include the title "Project Narrative" at the top of the first page.
- Ensure that the application can be printed on 8 ½" x 11" single-sided paper.
- Use double-spacing.
- Font size must be at least 12 point, preferably Times New Roman font.
- Margins must be at least one (1) inch at the top, bottom, left and right of the paper.
- Project narrative pages must be numbered "1" of "XX."
- Pages should be numbered consecutively and are limited to a total of **30 pages**.
- Do not include any marks from the "Track Changes" tool in your word processing program.
- Attach the completed Project Narrative to the application package.

Project Narrative Items
a. Program Evaluation Development (18 page max)
Experience and Expertise
Describe: • Your non-governmental organization, leadership and management, and the organization's experience/ ability to engage and work across the broad community of organizations engaged in sharing information related to Countering Violent Extremism programs and initiatives. • Your organization's recent **experience developing metrics for success and evaluation frameworks for social programs** Indicate dates, total years of experience, the community served and relevant outcome of your activities. • You plan for engaging with the NGOs and government actors necessary to complete this effort. • Describe your background with CVE or related activities.
TTA #1: Coordination and Development of Progress Measures, and Outcome Measures

Propose a plan to coordinate and develop progress measures, and outcome measures.

- The provision of the coordination and development of progress and outcome measures would require the identification and engagement of primary intended users (PIUs) of the evaluation, including specification of those users' informational needs, and their intended users of the evaluation. The development of these measures should focus both on the formative and impact evaluations, including articulation of the program's theory (or theories) of change, and depiction (logic model) of the program showing the intended relationships between inputs, outputs, and outcomes.

- Objective 1: Responses to this announcement should detail an approach to coordinate with Awardees from the other two (of three) of the "Three Cities" CVE initiatives, and DHS RSD, to employ common measures, as feasible, including the development of comparable progress measures, and outcome measures. This should include an approach to identify and engage primary intended users (PIUs) of the evaluation, including specification of those users' informational needs, and their intended uses of the evaluation. Progress measures and outcome measures are due ***4 months from award date***.

b. TTA#2 Formative Evaluation **(7 page max)**

Please describe:

- To prepare for the impact evaluation (the primary objective of the "Three Cities" CVE initiatives program evaluation) a formative evaluation will be conducted to help PIUs define what constitutes success. The formative evaluation will also define measurements to lay the ground work for the subsequent impact evaluation.

- Objective 1: Focus the evaluation, including articulation of the program's theory (or theories) of change, and depiction (i.e., logic model) of the program, showing the intended relationships between its inputs, outputs, and outcomes. The Awardee shall tailor the evaluation to the specific program and purpose of the evaluation, in consultation with the other Awardees, and DHS RSD.

- Objective 2: Evaluation design, including measures of programmatic activities and outcomes. The Awardee will account for the focus of the evaluation in order to determine an appropriate evaluation strategy that is well-suited for the specific program. As feasible and cost effective, the impact evaluation shall employ experimental (or quasi-experimental) methods, unless RSD approves another approach.

- Objective 3: Identify, assess and collect data. As part of the design stage, the Awardee shall assess the quality of available data, along with obstacles to, and the risks to, data acquisition. The normal expectation from the Government is that both quantitative and qualitative data may be relevant to the conduct of an evaluation, and—as feasible—both types of data shall be employed in the evaluations. Data of only one of those two types shall be used only if justified to the satisfaction of DHS RSD. To reduce costs, Awardee's data collection shall utilize preexisting data, to the extent feasible. To the extent that privacy and other rules permit, data will be stored in a form that will allow DHS S&T to reuse it in any follow-on or future work without recompense.

- Objective 4: Conduct a formative evaluation of the city's CVE initiatives, to prepare it for the subsequent impact evaluation. Key deliverables shall be due ***10 months after award***.

c. TTA #3: Findings and Data from Formative Evaluation

Please Describe:

- At the conclusion of the initial formative evaluation, Awardees are expected to have drawn actionable definitions of success and measurements metrics to be applied during the impact evaluation. Finding and data from the formative evaluation will be reported to DHS RSD with a detailed description of methods, results, and measurement instruments for review.

- Objective 1: To be responsive to this TTA, applicants should describe their technical approach to analyze the data, using appropriate statistical and qualitative methods, to assess performance of formative evaluation of the city's CVE initiatives, to prepare for the subsequent impact evaluation. Awardees are expected to deliver an evaluation report of formative evaluation, including methods, results, and appendices containing all measurement instruments in addition to copies of the data files that shall be submitted in SPSS format, to DHS RSD. Evaluation report, presentation slides, and data files, from the formative evaluation will be due ***12 months after award.***

- Objective 2: To demonstrate results, awardees will share findings with primary intended users via reports and presentations. Awardees shall generate a main written report, and provide accompanying presentation slides, that set forth the research goals, explains the research strategies, describes the research the methods (including description of the design as implemented, the data used, and the analyses), the results of the analysis, including, as appropriate, tables, and key statistical outputs, along with a discussion of the study's strengths and limitations, and recommendations for actions. The report will also include a brief executive summary and, as appropriate, statistical tables, summaries of the qualitative data, and appendices containing all measurement instruments. This report will be made available, at a minimum, to the program manager(s) of the component agency, the leaders of the program being evaluated, and to RSD, as part of the awardee's dissemination plan (see § 3.3.4 & 3.5.5). . The basis for the recommendations, their rationales and the data behind them will be explained by the Awardee to the responsible program manager(s) and any relevant stakeholders or other potential users that have been identified by the program manager. Up to five such briefings of up to 90 minutes in length may be required by RSD.

- Awardee shall be responsible for creation of a plan to disseminate all research findings pursuant to this formative evaluation, and that dissemination plan shall be made part of the award application. That plan shall provide for all deliverables to be made freely available, at a minimum, to the program manager(s) of the component agency, and to RSD. Additionally, the dissemination plan should identify other key stakeholders (both governmental and non-governmental) who shall be offered the products resulting from this award, including a statement regarding the types of products that shall be made available to those stakeholders.

-

a. TTA #4: Impact Evaluation

- The impact evaluation is the primary objective of this project. Using the methods, measurements, and definitions of success from the formative evaluation findings the Awardee will conduct an impact evaluation of CVE initiatives in their respective city. This impact evaluation will aim to answer fundamental questions regarding areas for improvement, effects on CVE, and impact assessments.

- Objective 1: To be responsive to this TTA, applicants should identify an approach to conduct an impact evaluation of the city's CVE initiatives, and identify areas for improvement: to elucidate their effects on CVE. Such impact evaluation shall employ a mixed method design, including experimental, and/or quasi-experimental, methods.

- Objective 2: Identify, assess, and collect data. As part of the design stage, the Awardee shall assess the quality of available data, along with obstacles to, and the risks to, data acquisition. The normal expectation from the Government is that both quantitative and qualitative data may be relevant to the conduct of an evaluation, and—as feasible—both types of data shall be employed in the evaluations. Data of only one of those two types shall be used only if justified to the satisfaction of DHS RSD. To reduce costs, Awardee's data collection shall utilize preexisting data, to the extent feasible. To the extent that privacy and other rules permit, data will be stored in a form that will allow DHS S&T to reuse it in any follow-on or future work without recompense

- Objective 3: Conduct a formative evaluation of the city's CVE initiatives, to prepare it for the subsequent impact evaluation. Key deliverables include emergent findings brief, and others, as requested by RSD beginning ***20 months after award.***

b. TTA #5: Findings and Data from Impact Evaluation

- At the conclusion of the impact evaluation, Awardees are expected to reach and justify operationally relevant conclusions that identify strengths and weaknesses in the respective city's CVE initiatives. The findings expressed in this TTA will be instrumental in influencing future approaches to CVE initiatives in the United States. Due to the high demand for scientifically sound CVE program evaluations Awardees should expect to deliver multiple briefings addressing the basis for recommendations, and the rationale and data behind the findings from the impact evaluation.

- Objective 1: Awardees will reach, and justify, operationally relevant conclusions that identify strengths and weaknesses in the city's CVE initiatives, as operationally relevant. Awardees will also be responsible for tying the evaluations' conclusions to policy relevant objectives and will make recommendations to capitalize upon those strengths and mitigate those weaknesses. Awardees shall make arguments for causality between program activities and their outcomes. Specifically, Awardees shall present the following:
  - Evidence that outcomes varied reliably;
  - Identification of the most likely alternative explanations;
  - Evidence in favor of causal explanations, and that casts doubt on alternative explanations;
- Additionally, Awardees shall discuss the role of social policy agencies toward improving the city's CVE initiatives. Given that a broad range of CVE program components are affected by policy decisions, the recommendations for such agencies, toward CVE, should be made explicit. An evaluation report, presentation slides, and data files from the impact evaluation are ***due 24 months after award.***

- Objective 2: Awardees will be responsible for ***a follow-up meta-evaluation within 3-6 months following the main report.*** Awardees shall compose and submit to DHS RSD, a follow-up report detailing both their insights from the evaluation experience, and an assessment of the usefulness of the evaluation, based on whether PIUs use the evaluation as intended. Meta-evaluation permits Awardees and PIUs (including DHS RSD) to enhance their learning from their experience, and to assess the usefulness of the evaluation. This entails Awardees following-up with PIUs to gain their feedback, including feedback regarding any unintended consequences of the evaluation. Such meta-evaluation is intended to develop both a body of CVE evaluation knowledge, and CVE evaluation expertise: both of which can enhance the quality of subsequent CVE program evaluations. This is an especially important practice for a field as new, and critical, as CVE evaluation.

- Awardee shall be responsible for creation of a plan to disseminate all research findings pursuant to this impact evaluation, and that dissemination plan shall be made part of the award application. That plan shall provide for all deliverables to be made freely available, at a minimum, to the program manager(s) of the component agency, and to RSD. Additionally, the dissemination plan should identify other key stakeholders (both governmental and non-governmental) who shall be offered the products resulting from this award, including a statement regarding the types of products that shall be made available to those stakeholders.

Personnel

- Describe **the staffing structure** for the proposed standards organization. Provide a list of key personnel for the program. Key personnel include the grant project manager(s) and subject matter expert(s).
- For each person, provide the following information, preferably in a table format:
  - ✓ Name, or indicate if the position is vacant. If the position is vacant, provide a separate position description and target start date;
  - ✓ Title and brief position description;
  - ✓ Whether the position is paid or volunteer;
  - ✓ FTE charged to the grant; and
  - ✓ Relevant experience, qualifications and training. *Each staff member, whether a volunteer or paid, must have at least two year of cybersecurity experience in an operations or administrative role.*

Sample Staff Table

Name	Title and Position Description	Paid or Volunteer	FTE charged to grant	Relevant experience, qualifications and training
Jim Smith	CVE Evaluations Program Manager – provides operations management	Paid	0.3 FTE	3 years of experience with program evaluation services

Other Project Information

Applicants must complete the "Other Project Information" Items 1-6 on the form which include information regarding use of proprietary information, environmental impacts, historic place designation, international collaborators, etc.

Budget Narrative (Double-spaced, no page limit)

Attach your budget narrative to the application package.

Include costs for the each of five performance years. Separate the first performance year costs and each following performance year's costs. Show a total of all requested federal grant funds. This total should match the total listed on the project abstract. Budget categories **b – i** below should add up to this total.

Provide budget information in the order listed below. Budget detail is required for:

a. **Personnel**: Costs of employee salaries and wages. For each staff person, provide the name (if known), title, time commitment to the project as a percentage of a full-time equivalent (FTE), annual salary, and grant funded salary. Do not include the costs of consultants. Consultants are to be included under "Contractual."

b. **Fringe Benefits**: Costs of employee fringe benefits unless treated as part of an approved indirect cost rate. Provide the method used to calculate the proposed rate amount. If a fringe benefit has been negotiated with, or approved by, a cognizant federal agency, **attach a copy of the negotiated fringe benefit agreement**. If no rate agreement exists, provide a breakdown of the amounts and percentages that comprise fringe benefit costs such as health insurance, FICA, retirement insurance, taxes, etc. Identify the base for allocating these fringe benefit expenses. (Attach the agreement to the application package.)

c. **Travel**: Costs of project-related travel by employees of the applicant organization (do not include costs of sub-contractor or consultant travel). For each proposed trip, provide the purpose, number of travelers, travel origin and destination, number of days, and a breakdown of costs for airfare, lodging, meals, car rental, and incidentals. The basis for the airfare, lodging, meals, car rental, and incidentals must be provided, such as past trips, current quotations, Federal Travel Regulations, etc. Foreign travel is not permitted. The applicant must include costs for two staff members to attend a **mandatory** two-day grant recipient orientation training in Washington, D.C. the first year of the grant, and costs for one staff member to attend mandatory two-day training in Washington, D.C. the second through 5th year of the grant.

d. **Equipment**: Any article of nonexpendable, tangible personal property having a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost which equals or exceeds the lesser of (a) the capitalization level established by the organization for financial statement purposes, or (b) $500. For each type of equipment requested, provide a description of the equipment, the cost per unit, the number of units, the total cost, and a plan for use on the project, as well as use or disposal of the equipment after the project ends. An applicant organization that uses its own definition for equipment should provide a copy of its policy or section of its policy which includes the equipment definition.

NOTE 1: Acquisition cost means the net invoice unit price of an item of equipment, including the cost of any modifications, attachments, accessories, calibration and maintenance services, or auxiliary apparatus necessary to make it usable for the purpose for which it is acquired. Ancillary charges, such as taxes, duty, protective in-transit insurance, freight, and installation shall be included in or excluded from acquisition cost in accordance with the organization's regular written accounting practices.

NOTE 2: Prior to the purchase of equipment in the amount of $500 or more per unit cost, the Recipient must obtain the written approval from DHS. The Recipient shall maintain an annual inventory, which will include a brief description of the item, serial number and amount of purchase for equipment purchased with grant funds, or received under a grant, and having a $500 or more per unit cost. The inventory must also identify the sub-award under which the equipment was purchased. Maintenance and insurance will be the responsibility of the Recipient. Title of equipment will remain with the Recipient until closeout when disposition will be provided in writing by DHS within 120 days of submission of final reports.

e. **Supplies**: Costs of all tangible personal property other than that included in the equipment category. Specify general categories of supplies and their costs. Show computations and provide other information which supports the amount requested.

f. **Contractual**: Costs of all contracts for services and goods except for those that belong under other categories such as equipment, supplies, construction, etc. Include third party evaluation contracts (if applicable) and contracts with secondary recipient organizations.

Demonstrate that all procurement transactions will be conducted in a manner to provide, to the maximum extent practical, open and free competition. Identify proposed sub-contractor work and the cost of each sub-contractor. Provide a detailed budget for each sub-contractor that is expected to perform work estimated to be $25,000 or more, or 50% of the total work effort, whichever is less.

- Identify each planned subcontractor and its total proposed budget. Each subcontractor's budget and supporting detail should be included as part of the applicant's budget narrative.
- Provide the following information for each planned subcontract: a brief description of the work to be subcontracted; the number of quotes solicited and received, if applicable; the cost or price analysis performed by the applicant; names and addresses of the subcontractors tentatively selected and the basis for their selection; e.g., unique capabilities (for sole source subcontracts), low bidder, delivery schedule, technical competence; type of contract and estimated cost and fee or profit; and, affiliation with the applicant, if any.
- Recipient may be required to make pre-award review and procurement documents available to DHS, including request for proposals or invitations for bids, independent cost estimates, etc. This may include procurements expected to exceed the simplified acquisition threshold fixed at 41 USC 403(11) (currently set at $100,000) and expected to be awarded without competition or only one bid or offer is received in response to a solicitation.

- All required flow down provisions in the award must be included in any subcontract.

NOTE: Applicants may propose a sub-contract for specific tasks, such as hiring additional subject matter experts on a contractual basis. However, the applicant must demonstrate its ability to successfully manage all aspects of the grant- funded project, including financial management.

g. **Other Direct Costs**: Any other items proposed as direct costs. Provide an itemized list with costs, and state the basis for each proposed item.

h. **Indirect Costs**: **Attach a copy of the latest indirect cost rate agreement** negotiated with a cognizant federal agency. If the applicant is in the process of initially developing or renegotiating a rate, upon notification that an award will be made, it should immediately develop a tentative indirect cost rate proposal based on its most recently completed fiscal year, in accordance with the cognizant agency's guidelines for establishing indirect cost rates, and submit it to the cognizant agency. Applicants awaiting approval of their indirect cost proposals may also request indirect costs. When an indirect cost rate is requested, those costs included in the indirect cost pool should not also be charged as direct costs to the award. If the applicant is requesting a rate which is less than what is allowed under the program, the authorized representative of the applicant organization must submit a signed acknowledgement that the applicant is accepting a lower rate than allowed.

Any non-federal entity that has never received a negotiated indirect cost rate (except for those non-federal entities described in Appendix VII to Part 200 States and Local Government and Indian Tribe Indirect Cost Proposals, paragraph D.1.b) may elect to charge a de minimis rate of 10% of modified total direct costs (MTDC) which may be used indefinitely. As described in §200.403 Factors Affecting Allowability of Costs, costs must be consistently charged as either indirect or direct costs, but may not be double charged or inconsistently charged as both. If chosen, this methodology once elected must be used consistently for all federal awards until such time as a non-federal entity chooses to negotiate for a rate, which the non-federal entity may apply to do at any time. For more information, see 2 CFR Part 200.414.

c. Documentation of Non-profit and/or Public Status

The applicant must provide documentation of non-profit and/or public status. Any of the following constitutes acceptable proof of non-profit status:

- A reference to the applicant organization’s listing in the Internal Revenue Service’s (IRS) most recent list of tax-exempt organizations described in section 501(c)(3) of the IRS Code.

- A copy of a currently valid IRS tax exemption certificate.
- A statement from a State taxing body, State attorney general, or other appropriate State official certifying that the applicant organization has a non-profit status and that none of the net earnings accrue to any private shareholders or individuals.
- A certified copy of the organization's certificate of incorporation or similar document that clearly establishes non-profit status.
- Any of the items in the subparagraphs immediately above for a State or national parent organization and a statement signed by the parent organization that the applicant organization is a local non-profit affiliate.
- A signed statement on official letterhead by an official authorized to apply for grant funds on behalf of the public entity shall suffice.

Attach documentation of non-profit and/or public status to the application package.

Dun and Bradstreet Universal Numbering System (DUNS) Number, System for Award Management (SAM), and Authorized Organizational Representative (AOR)

DHS is participating in the Grants.gov Initiative that provides the Grant Community a single site to find and apply for grant funding opportunities; therefore, applicants with electronic access are to submit their applications electronically through http://www.grants.gov/web/grants/applicants/apply-for-grants.html. Before you can apply for a DHS grant at grants.gov, you must have a DUNS number and must be registered in the System for Awards Management (SAM).

The DUNS number must be included in the data entry field labeled "Organizational DUNS" on the SF-424 form. Instructions for obtaining a DUNS number can be found at the following website: http://www.grants.gov//web/grants/applicants/organization-registration/step-1-obtain-duns-number.html

System for Award Management

In addition to having a DUNS number, applicants applying electronically through Grants.gov must register with the federal System for Award Management (SAM). Step-by-step instructions for registering with SAM can be found here: http://www.grants.gov/web/grants/applicants/organization-registration/step-2-register-with-sam.html. All applicants must register with SAM in order to apply online. Failure to register with the SAM will result in your application being rejected by Grants.gov during the submissions process.

Please give yourself plenty of time before your grant application submission deadline to obtain a DUNS number and then to register in SAM. It may take 4 weeks or more after you submit your SAM registration before your registration is active in SAM, then an additional 24 hours for Grants.gov to recognize your information.

Authorized Organizational Representative

The next step in the registration process is creating a username and password with Grants.gov to become an Authorized Organizational Representative (AOR). AORs will need to know the DUNS number of the organization for which they will be submitting applications to complete this process. To read more detailed instructions for creating a profile on Grants.gov visit: http://www.grants.gov/web/grants/applicants/organization-registration/step-3-username-password.html.

AOR Authorization

After creating a profile on Grants.gov, the E-Biz Point of Contact (E-Biz POC) a representative from your organization who is the contact listed for SAM will receive an email to grant the AOR permission to submit applications on behalf of their organization. The E-Biz POC will then log in to Grants.gov and approves an applicant as the AOR, thereby giving him or her permission to submit applications. To learn more about AOR Authorization visit: **http://www.grants.gov/web/grants/applicants/organization-registration/step-4-aor-authorization.html.** To track an AOR status visit: **http://www.grants.gov/web/grants/applicants/organization-registration/step-5-track-aor-status.html.**

Applicants are, therefore, encouraged to register early. The registration process can take four weeks or more to be completed. Therefore, registration should be done in sufficient time to ensure it does not impact your ability to meet required submission deadlines. After you have been approved as an AOR you will be able to submit your application online.

Electronic Signature

Applications submitted through Grants.gov constitute a submission as electronically signed applications. The registration and account creation with Grants.gov with E-Biz POC approval, establishes an Authorized Organization Representative (AOR). When you submit the application through Grants.gov, the name of your AOR on file will be inserted into the signature line of the application. Applicants must register the individual who is able to make legally binding commitments for the applicant organization as the Authorized Organization Representative (AOR); this step is often missed and it is crucial for valid submissions.

If you experience difficulties accessing information or have any questions please call the grants.gov customer support hotline at (800) 518-4726 or email grants.gov at support@grants.gov.

The Federal awarding agency may not make a Federal award to an applicant until the applicant has complied with all applicable DUNS and SAM requirements and, if an applicant has not fully complied with the requirements by the time the Federal awarding agency is ready to make a Federal award, the Federal awarding agency may determine that the applicant is not qualified to receive a Federal award and use that determination as a basis for making a Federal award to another applicant.

Intergovernmental Review

An intergovernmental review may be required. Applicants must contact their State's Single Point of Contact (SPOC) to comply with the State's process under Executive Order 12372 (see *http://www.fws.gov/policy/library/rgeo12372.pdf*). Name and addresses of the SPOCs are maintained at the Office of Management and Budget's home page at *http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/grants_spoc* to ensure currency.

Funding Restrictions

Restrictions on Use of Award Funds

As well as any funding restrictions stated in the Budget Narrative section or any section within this document, the following are restrictions on use of award funds:

1. DHS cooperative agreement funds may only be used for the purpose set forth in the cooperative agreement, and must be consistent with the statutory authority for the award. Cooperative agreement funds and non-monetary support may not be used for matching contributions for other federal grants or cooperative agreements, lobbying, or intervention in federal regulatory or adjudicatory proceedings. Federal employees are prohibited from serving in any capacity (paid or unpaid) on any proposal submitted under this program. Federal employees may not receive funds under this award. In addition, federal funds may not be used to sue the Federal Government or any other government entity.

   DHS substantial programmatic involvement and performance/progress reviews may result in funding restrictions in conjunction with initial and annual continuation awards.

Management and Administration (M&A)

M&A is allowable by the primary recipient, if applicable.

Indirect (Facilities & Administrative (F&A) Costs

Indirect Costs are allowable for the grantee and any proposed sub-awardee (if applicable). The applicant must attach a copy of the latest indirect cost rate agreement negotiated with a cognizant federal agency. If the applicant is in the process of initially

developing or renegotiating a rate, upon notification that an award will be made, it should immediately develop a tentative indirect cost rate proposal based on its most recently completed fiscal year, in accordance with the cognizant agency's guidelines for establishing indirect cost rates, and submit it to the cognizant agency. Applicants awaiting approval of their indirect cost proposals may also request indirect costs. When an indirect cost rate is requested, those costs included in the indirect cost pool should not also be charged as direct costs to the award. If the applicant is requesting a rate which is less than what is allowed under the program, the authorized representative of the applicant organization must submit a signed acknowledgement that the applicant is accepting a lower rate than allowed.

Any non-Federal entity that has never received a negotiated indirect cost rate (except for those non-federal entities described in Appendix VII to Part 200 States and Local Government and Indian Tribe Indirect Cost Proposals, paragraph D.1.b) may elect to charge a de minimis rate of 10% of modified total direct costs (MTDC) which may be used indefinitely. As described in §200.403 Factors Affecting Allowability of Costs, costs must be consistently charged as either indirect or direct costs, but may not be double charged or inconsistently charged as both. If chosen, this methodology once elected must be used consistently for all federal awards until such time as a non-federal entity chooses to negotiate for a rate, which the non-federal entity may apply to do at any time. For more information, see 2 CFR Part 200.414.

Other Submission Requirements

To access application forms and instructions for this funding opportunity, go to Grants.gov click on the “Search Grants” tab. Enter the FOA Number located on the cover of this announcement. Click on the highlighted Funding Opportunity # that appears and then click on the various tabs to: read the Synopsis; review the Version History; read the Full Announcement; and, complete the Application Package. Please read the entire FOA Application Package carefully before preparing and submitting an application. Application must be submitted in electronic format only.

If you experience difficulties accessing information or have any questions please call the grants.gov customer support hotline at (800) 518-4726.

E. Application Review Information

Evaluation Criteria

DHS will use the following criteria to evaluate applications deemed eligible and responsive. Applicants can receive up to 100 points.

1. **Statement of applicant's capabilities/competencies** (relevant projects, experience, capacities), **and MOUs or letters of support with all stakeholders (both NGOs and Government actors) necessary to facilitate the evaluations (20 points).**
2. **Quality & Feasibility of Technical Approach (50 points).**
3. **Program Management Approach (20 points)**
4. **Cost Effectiveness, relative to anticipated results/products (10 points).**

Review and Selection Process

DHS will conduct an initial review of applications to determine the responsiveness of the application. If an applicant is determined to be ineligible (see Section C. Eligibility Information) or an application is determined to be non-responsive, DHS will notify the applicant. All responsive and eligible applications will be reviewed as described below:

1. DHS will assemble reviewers which may include both federal and non-federal reviewers to review the eligible applications. Reviews of submitted applications will be conducted either on site or by remote review.
2. Technical reviewers will review each eligible application against the evaluation criteria. The reviewers will assign a score and provide summary comments based on the evaluation criteria identified above.
3. An application may be selected for a post-review quality control and possible rescoring if it received significantly diverging scores and comments from reviewers.
4. An internal review panel consisting of DHS staff will review the highest ranked applications and make final funding recommendations. The internal review panel may take applications out of rank order in consideration of strategic program priorities, which are identified below.
5. DHS may perform an additional review of the applicant organization and any and/or its key personnel. This may include reviewing audit reports, publicly available materials and/or government databases and may have a bearing on

award outcome. DHS may request additional materials from the applicant as part of this review, including:

- The summary letter from the applicant's most recent audit report; and
- Documentation of previous grant award completion that includes the name of the grantor, amount awarded, and whether the grant recipient sufficiently completed the requirements of the grant award (e.g., a final close-out report, certification of grant award completion, etc.)

6. After the technical review and before making final funding decisions, DHS may contact the highest ranking applicants to seek clarification and to negotiate technical and programmatic aspects of the application. If an application includes a sub-awardee, DHS may request to speak with all parties included in the application to ensure sufficient planning and coordination has taken place prior to making an award.

7. **Confidentiality and Conflict of Interest**. Technical and cost proposals submitted under this funding opportunity will be protected from unauthorized disclosure in accordance with applicable laws and regulations. DHS may use one or more support contractors in the logistical processing of proposals. However, funding recommendations and final award decisions are solely the responsibility of DHS personnel.

   DHS screens all technical reviewers for potential conflicts of interest. To determine possible conflicts of interest, DHS requires potential reviewers to complete and sign conflicts of interest and nondisclosure forms. DHS will keep the names of submitting institutions and individuals as well as the substance of the applications confidential except to reviewers and DHS staff involved in the award process. DHS will destroy any unsuccessful applications after three years following the funding decision.

8. DHS strongly discourages, and will not consider, any materials submitted by or on behalf of the applicant (e.g., letters of support) other than those materials specifically requested in this notice of funding opportunity.

9. DHS will notify all applicants electronically of funding decisions. Unfunded applicants may send a written request to the Grants Officer, tamara.marshall-jone@hq.dhs.gov to receive a written summary of comments related to the evaluation criteria, along with the points awarded to the application for each of the evaluation criteria. DHS will send the written summary to the applicant within 60 days of the request. Additional information beyond that described here will not be provided.

Applications will be evaluated relative to the requirements of the funding opportunity announcement. Therefore, interested parties should be aware that evaluators will distinguish between what is required information and rationalizations, "brochuremanship," or extraneous information. Final consideration will, however, take into consideration additional information submitted that supports claims in proposals for this opportunity.

The Project Narrative evaluation will be conducted based on requirements outlined in Section A. of the funding opportunity announcement and set forth below. Section A provides the minimum requirements that the applicants must be able to meet for their applications to be considered responsive or acceptable.

The applicant has the responsibility to provide information that clearly demonstrates its ability to satisfactorily respond to the requirements of the funding opportunity announcement.

a. Project Participants. Evaluators will assess if qualified participants are included and assess the impact of any additional participants.

b. Need for Assistance. Evaluators will assess the application for thoroughness and completeness documenting the need for assistance, existing capabilities and coordination. Evaluators will focus on innovativeness of approach including ability to meet deliverables.

DHS has developed an Objective Review Plan (ORP). The Objective Review Plan Evaluators will assign ratings for each applicant. The ORP will then meet to develop a group consensus rating for the criteria listed in the NOFO.

The ORP Chairperson will be responsible for incorporating the evaluation into the ORP Report, based on the final consensus ratings assigned by the ORP.

The DHS approving official shall review and consider evaluations from departments and agencies to inform the selection process. However, the DHS approving official is not required to develop a consensus government-wide view or to adopt a majority view. No one single factor or a single review is dispositive; rather, the totality of the information is to be considered by the approving official in his/her discretion.

F. Federal Award Administration Information

Notice of Award

DHS issues formal award notification documents following fulfillment of DHS Congressional notifications. All DHS grants and cooperative agreements are subject to the standard DHS Award Terms and Conditions, which are attached to this package.

A grant award will be executed by a DHS Grants Officer authorized to obligate DHS funding. Unsuccessful applicants will be contacted as well and will be encouraged to apply for future grant award programs. Announcements for future programs will be listed at http://www.grants.gov.

Administrative and National Policy Requirements

A complete list of Federal Financial Requirements is available at: http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/grants_forms.

All successful applicants for all DHS grant and cooperative agreements are required to comply with DHS Standard Administrative Terms and Conditions, which are available online at:
http://www.dhs.gov/publication/fy15-dhs-standard-terms-and-conditions

Before accepting the award the authorized official should carefully read the award package for instructions on administering the grant award and the terms and conditions associated with responsibilities under Federal Awards. Recipients must accept all conditions in this NOFO as well as any Special Terms and Conditions in the Notice of Award to receive an award under this program.

Acceptance of the award is denoted once first drawdown is a made.

Reporting

Federal Financial Reporting Requirements

The Federal Financial Reporting Form (FFR) is available here: http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/grants/approved_forms/SF-425.pdf, SF-425 *OMB #00348-0061*

1. Quarterly Federal Financial Reports. The Recipient shall submit a Federal Financial Report (SF425) to the DHS Grants Officer no later than 30 days after the end of each quarter. Reports are due October 30, January 31, April 30, and July 31. The report shall be emailed to DHS-GrantReports@hq.dhs.gov and include the grant program name and number in the subject line.

2. Final Federal Financial Report. The Recipient shall submit the final Federal Financial Report (SF425) to the DHS Grants Officer no later than 90 days after the end of the Project Period end date. The report shall be emailed to DHS-GrantReports@hq.dhs.gov and include the grant program name and number in the subject line.

3. Quarterly Federal Financial Reports (Cash Transaction). The Recipient shall submit the Federal Financial Report (SF425) Cash Transaction Report to the Department of Health and Human Services, Payment Management System. Quarterly Cash Transaction reports shall be

submitted no later than 1/30, 4/30, 7/30, and 10/30.

The Recipient shall be paid in advance using the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services/Payment Management System, provided it maintains or demonstrates the willingness and ability to maintain procedures to minimize the time elapsing between the transfer of the funds from the DHS and expenditure disbursement by the Recipient.

When these requirements are not met, the Recipient will be required to be on a reimbursement for costs incurred method.

Any overpayment of funds must be coordinated with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services/Payment Management System.

Program Performance Reporting Requirements

The recipient is required to submit the following performance reports:

1. Quarterly Performance Reports must be submitted to the DHS Grants Officer no later than 30 days after the end of each quarter. Reports are due October 30, January 31, April 30, and July 31. Reports shall be submitted via email to DHS-GrantReports@hq.dhs.gov (include the DHS grant number in the subject line of the email) and to ISAO@hq.dhs.gov.

Performance reports must provide information on the overall progress of the SO. These reports shall also include:

i. Summary reports on the SO's strategic vision and activities; SO management efforts; performance reports on each funded SO project, along with explanations of any changes from the initially approved work plan, discussion of progress for each milestone and explanations of why milestones were not reached, the performance metrics used; budget expenditures and changes; unanticipated problems and plans for addressing them; and information on how project outcomes will advance or impact current technologies or capabilities.

ii. Budget information categorized by both object class and project.

iii. If applicable, include a certification that no patentable inventions were created during the budget period.

iv. Updates to the SO's Information Protection Plan and Researcher Safety Plan as needed.

If the performance report contains any information that is deemed proprietary, the Recipient will denote the beginning and ending of such information with the following heading: ******PROPRIETARY INFORMATION******

2. Final Performance Report. The Recipient shall submit the Final Performance Report to the DHS Grants Officer no later than 90 days after the expiration of the Project Period (See Section I). The Final Performance Report must include an executive summary and final summary abstracts for each sub-project shall be emailed to DHS-GrantReports@hq.dhs.gov (include the grant program name and number in the subject line) and to ISAO@hq.dhs.gov.

Monitoring

DHS, through its authorized representatives, has the right, at all reasonable times, to make site visits to review project accomplishments and management control systems and to provide such technical assistance as may be required. During site visits, DHS will review grant recipients' files related to the grant-funded program.

As part of any monitoring and program evaluation activities, grant recipients must permit DHS, upon reasonable notice, to review grant-related records and to interview the organization's staff and clients regarding the program, and to respond in a timely and accurate manner to DHS requests for information relating to their grant program.

Close Out

Within 90 days after the end of the period of performance, or after an amendment has been issued to close out a grant, whichever comes first, recipients must submit a final FFR and final progress report detailing all accomplishments and a qualitative summary of the impact of those accomplishments throughout the period of performance.

If applicable, an inventory of all construction projects that used funds from this program has to be reported using the Real Property Status Report (Standard Form SF 429) available at *http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/grants/approved_forms/sf-429.pdf*.

After these reports have been reviewed and approved by CS&C, a close-out notice will be completed to close out the grant. The notice will indicate the period of performance as closed, list any remaining funds that will be deobligated, and address the requirement of maintaining the grant records for three years from the date of the final FFR.

The recipient is responsible for returning any funds that have been drawn down but remain as unliquidated on recipient financial records.

G. DHS Awarding Agency Contact Information

The **Grants Officer** is the DHS official that has the full authority to negotiate, administer and execute all terms and conditions of this Award in concurrence with the Program Officer.

Janet Bailey
Office of Procurement Operations (MGMT OPO)
Phone: (202) 447-0362
Email: Janet.Bailey@hq.dhs.gov

The **Program Officer** is the DHS staff member responsible for monitoring the completion of work and technical performance of the projects or activities described in the Program Narrative Statement.

Richard Legault, Ph.D.
Science and Technology Directorate
Resilient Systems Division
Phone: 202.254.6829
Email: Richard.Legault@hq.dhs.gov

H. Additional Information

1. Extensions

Applicants may request a no-cost extension in order to complete all project activities. The request must be submitted 60 days prior to the expiration of the performance period. Requests for extensions are subject to approval by DHS.

2. Prior Approval

The Recipient shall not, without the prior written approval of the DHS, request reimbursement, incur costs or obligate funds for any purpose pertaining to the operation of the project, program, or activities prior to the approved Budget Period.

3. Budget Revisions

a. Transfers of funds between direct cost categories in the approved budget when such cumulative transfers among those direct cost categories exceed ten percent of the total budget approved in this Award require prior written approval by the DHS Grants Officer.

b. The Recipient shall obtain prior written approval from the DHS Grants Officer for any budget revision that would result in the need for additional resources/funds.

c. The Recipient is not authorized at any time to transfer amounts budgeted for direct costs to the indirect costs line item or vice versa, without prior written approval of the DHS Grants Officer.

4. Post-award program income

In the event program income becomes available to the recipient post-award, it is the recipient's responsibility to notify the DHS Grants Officer to explain how that development occurred, as part of their request for guidance and/or approval. The Grants Officer will review approval requests for program income on a case-by-case basis; approval is not automatic. Consistent with the policy and processes outlined in 2 C.F.R. Part 200, pertinent guidance and options, as determined by the type of recipient and circumstances involved, may be approved by the Grant Officer. If approval is granted, an award modification will be issued with an explanatory note in the remarks section of the face page concerning guidance and/or options pertaining to the recipient's approved request. All instances of program income shall be listed in the progress and financial reports.