

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention



The [U.S. Department of Justice](#) (DOJ), [Office of Justice Programs](#) (OJP), [Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention](#) (OJJDP) is seeking applications for funding under the fiscal year (FY) 2017 National Incidence Studies of Missing Children Reported to Law Enforcement program. This program will implement a data collection on child victims of stranger abductions (i.e., “stereotypical kidnappings”) known to law enforcement agencies, and develop and test strategies to collect information from law enforcement agencies on parental abductions and other types of missing episodes involving children. This program furthers the Department’s mission by supporting efforts designed to measure the size and nature of key aspects of the nation’s missing children problem.

OJJDP FY 2017 National Incidence Studies of Missing Children Reported to Law Enforcement

Applications Due: May 3, 2017

Eligibility

Eligible applicants are limited to states (including territories), units of local government,¹ federally recognized tribal governments as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, nonprofit² and for-profit organizations (including tribal nonprofit and for-profit organizations), and institutions of higher education (including tribal institutions of higher education). For-profit organizations (as well as other recipients) must forgo any profit or management fee.

OJJDP welcomes applications under which two or more entities would carry out the federal award; however, only one entity may be the applicant. Any others must be proposed as subrecipients (“subgrantees”).³ The applicant must be the entity that would have primary responsibility for carrying out the award, including administering funding and managing the entire project, including monitoring and appropriately managing any subawards (“subgrants”).

¹ A “unit of local government” means—

(a) Any city, county, township, town, borough, parish, village, or other general purpose political subdivision of a state.

(b) Any law enforcement district or judicial enforcement district that—

(i) Is established under applicable state law, and

(ii) Has the authority to, in a manner independent of other state entities, establish a budget and impose taxes.

(c) For the purposes of assistance eligibility, any agency of the government of the District of Columbia or the federal government that performs law enforcement functions in and for—

(i) The District of Columbia, or

(ii) Any Trust Territory of the United States.

² See ojp.gov/funding/Explore/SolicitationRequirements/OrganizationalRequirements.htm#NPO for additional information on demonstrating nonprofit status.

³ For additional information on subawards, see “Budget and Associated Documentation” under [Section D. Application and Submission Information](#).

Under this solicitation, an applicant entity may submit more than one unique application in response to the solicitation. An entity may be proposed as a subrecipient (“subgrantee”) in more than one application.

Deadline

Applicants must register with Grants.gov prior to submitting an application. All applications are due by 11:59 p.m. eastern time (ET) on May 3, 2017.

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

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

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

Contact Information

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

An applicant that experiences unforeseen Grants.gov technical issues beyond its control that prevent it from submitting its application by the deadline must email the National Criminal Justice Reference Service Response Center (Response Center) at grants@ncjrs.gov **within 24 hours after the application deadline** in order to request approval to submit its application after the deadline. Additional information on reporting technical issues appears under “Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues” in the [How To Apply](#) section.

For assistance with any other requirements of this solicitation, contact the Response Center by telephone at 800–851–3420 or TTY: 301–240–6310 (hearing impaired only), by email at grants@ncjrs.gov, or by [web chat](#). Response Center hours of operation are 10 a.m. to 6 p.m. ET, Monday through Friday, and 10 a.m. to 8 p.m. ET on the solicitation close date. Answers to frequently asked questions that may assist applicants are posted at www.ojjdp.gov/grants/solicitations/FY2017/FAQ/NISMCRLE.pdf.

Grants.gov number assigned to this solicitation: OJJDP-2017-10987

Release date: March 17, 2017

Contents

A. Program Description	4
Overview	4
Program-Specific Information	4
Goals, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products	6
Scope of Work.....	7
B. Federal Award Information.....	17
Type of Award	17
Financial Management and System of Internal Controls.....	18
Budget Information	18
Cost Sharing or Match Requirement.....	19
Preagreement Costs (also known as Preaward Costs).....	19
Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver.....	19
Prior Approval, Planning, and Reporting of Conference/Meeting/Training Costs	20
Costs Associated With Language Assistance (if applicable)	20
C. Eligibility Information.....	20
D. Application and Submission Information	20
What an Application Should Include	20
How To Apply	35
E. Application Review Information.....	38
Review Criteria	38
Review Process.....	40
F. Federal Award Administration Information	41
Federal Award Notices	41
Administrative, National Policy, and Other Legal Requirements	41
General Information About Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements	43
G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s)	43
H. Other Information.....	43
Freedom of Information Act and Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552 and 5 U.S.C. 552a)	43
Provide Feedback to OJP.....	44
Application Checklist	45

OJJDP FY 2017 National Incidence Studies of Missing Children Reported to Law Enforcement

CFDA #16.543

A. Program Description

Overview

OJJDP is seeking applications to implement a data collection on child victims of stereotypical kidnappings⁴ known to law enforcement agencies, and to develop and pilot test instruments and sampling methods to collect information from law enforcement agencies on parental abductions and other types of missing episodes involving children.

Statutory Authority: Any awards under this solicitation would be made under statutory authority provided by a full-year appropriations act for FY 2017. As of the writing of this solicitation, the Department of Justice is operating under a short-term “Continuing Resolution;” no full-year appropriation for the Department has been enacted for FY 2017.

Program-Specific Information

In response to the 1984 Missing Children’s Assistance Act, OJJDP developed the National Incidence Studies of Missing, Abducted, Runaway, and Thrownaway Children (NISMART), which was designed to provide a comprehensive picture of the size and nature of the nation’s missing children problem. OJJDP has conducted NISMART approximately once per decade since the inception of the Act: [NISMART-1](#) was conducted in 1988, [NISMART-2](#) in 1999, and [NISMART-3](#) in 2011. The collections conceptualized the problem of missing children, provided critical information about the relative frequency and types of episodes involving missing children, and informed the development of policies and interventions aimed to reduce the problem.

NISMART identified and collected information on five types of abduction episodes involving children: those who were abducted by a family member, were abducted by a nonfamily perpetrator (including stereotypical kidnappings), had run away or were thrown away, were missing because they were lost or injured, and were missing for benign reasons (i.e., misunderstandings). NISMART-2 and NISMART-3 also used standardized definitions to distinguish children who were missing from their caretakers (“caretaker missing children”) and

⁴ Stereotypical kidnappings, as defined by NISMART, are cases in which a child (ages 0 to 17) was taken by a stranger or slight acquaintance, moved at least 20 feet or held for at least 1 hour, and one or more of the following serious circumstances applied: the child was kept overnight or longer, killed, taken 50 miles or more, held for ransom, or the perpetrator intended to keep the child permanently. A “slight acquaintance” is defined as a nonfamily perpetrator whose name is unknown to the child or family prior to the abduction and whom the child or family did not know well enough to speak to, a recent acquaintance whom the child or family have known for less than 6 months, or someone the family or child have known for longer than 6 months but have seen less than once a month.

children who were caretaker missing and were reported to an agency for help in locating them (“reported missing children”) with the goal of providing unified estimates of missing children.⁵ Most recently, NISMART-3 consisted of four complementary studies: two household surveys (adult and youth), a juvenile facilities survey, and a law enforcement survey. The NISMART-3 household surveys encountered considerable challenges related to cost and efficiency as a result of the large samples of households required to identify a representative sample of cases.⁶ In addition, sharply declining response rates between NISMART-2 and NISMART-3 have raised questions about the ongoing use of household surveys for estimating the numbers of episode and missing children.⁷

In contrast, the NISMART-3 Law Enforcement Survey (LES-3), designed to measure the national incidence of stereotypical kidnappings, was successful in achieving relatively high response rates.⁸ The LES-3 obtained a sample of stereotypical kidnapping cases through a survey of all law enforcement agencies located in a sample of counties. The LES-3 sampled 433 counties from a national list of counties by clustering small adjacent counties and using a stratified probability-proportional-to-size design so that the largest counties were in the sample with certainty and smaller counties had a lower chance of being selected. Within the sampled counties, all identified law enforcement agencies, a total of 4,644, were surveyed. Data collection occurred in two phases. In the first phase, the sampled law enforcement agencies were sent a mail survey that asked whether they investigated any stereotypical kidnappings in their jurisdiction between October 1, 2010, and September 30, 2011. The response rate for the mail survey was 86 percent. In the second phase, extensive telephone interviews were conducted with investigating officers to obtain details of the cases reported in the mail survey. Interviews were completed for 91 percent of the targeted cases. The interviews were evaluated and coded to identify the cases that met the study definition and reference period inclusion criteria. Weights were created for each agency and case to allow for the national estimation of the number and characteristics of victims and perpetrators of stereotypical kidnappings in 2011.

In June 2016, OJJDP published survey findings from the LES-3, which included the following:⁹

- An estimated 105 children were victims of stereotypical kidnappings in 2011, virtually the same as the 1997 estimate. Most kidnappings involved the use of force or threats, and about three in five victims were sexually assaulted, abused, or exploited.
- Victims were, most commonly, ages 12 to 17, girls, white, and living in situations other than with two biological or adoptive parents. Half of all stereotypical kidnappings in 2011 were sexually motivated crimes against adolescent girls.
- Most perpetrators of stereotypical kidnappings in 2011 were male, ages 18 to 35, and white or black in equal proportions. About 70 percent were unemployed, and roughly half had problems with drugs or alcohol.

⁵ Sedlak, A.J., Finkelhor, D., Hammer, H., and Schultz, D.J. 2002. *National Estimates of Missing Children: An Overview*. Juvenile Justice Bulletin. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

⁶ Sedlak, A.J., Finkelhor, D., and Brick, J.M. Forthcoming. *National Estimates of Missing Children: Updated Findings From a Survey of Parents and Other Primary Caretakers*. Juvenile Justice Bulletin. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

⁷ For example, the NISMART-2 overall response rate for the adult household survey was 61%, more than four times greater than the NISMART-3 rate of 15%.

⁸ Lounsbury, K., Wolak, J., and Broene, P. 2015. *Law Enforcement Study (LES-3) Technical Report*. Rockville, MD: Rockville Institute.

⁹ Wolak, J., Finkelhor, D., and Sedlak, A.J. 2016. *Child Victims of Stereotypical Kidnappings Known to Law Enforcement in 2011*. Juvenile Justice Bulletin. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

- Fewer stereotypical kidnappings ended in homicide in 2011 than in 1997 (8 percent versus 40 percent). Most kidnappers were not violent at first contact with victims; instead, they lured almost 70 percent of victims through deception or nonthreatening pretexts.
- Kidnappings involving 92 percent of child victims in 2011 ended in recovering the child alive, compared with 57 percent of victims in 1997.
- The estimates of child victims being detained overnight in 2011 were three times the estimates in 1997 (80 percent versus 26 percent).
- Technologies, such as cell phones and the Internet, helped law enforcement solve crimes involving two-thirds of the victims.

As a result of the relative success of the LES-3 in yielding high response rates, OJJDP supported research (see [Law Enforcement Survey Redesign: Planning Papers and Draft Instruments](#)) to develop a preliminary plan and revised instrument, the Law Enforcement Survey on Stereotypical Kidnappings (LES-SK), to enhance the existing survey for future use.¹⁰ The research also explored how similar instruments and sampling methods might be applied to the collection of information from law enforcement agencies on parental abductions and other types of missing episodes involving children. Under the current solicitation, OJJDP is seeking to build on this research and past NISMART surveys to improve the measurement and available information on missing children reported to law enforcement agencies. Methodological reports and redesign planning papers referenced in this solicitation can be found on the [NISMART-3](#) study page.

Goals, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products

The goals of this solicitation are to position OJJDP to produce accurate and timely national statistics that will produce data on missing children triennially and to contribute to the field's understanding of the extent and nature of key aspects of the nation's missing children problem. The primary objectives of the solicitation are to (1) implement a data collection that produces accurate and reliable national estimates of child victims of stereotypical kidnappings known to law enforcement agencies, (2) develop and pilot test instruments and sampling methods to collect information from law enforcement agencies on parental abductions and other types of missing episodes involving children, and (3) produce statistical products, methodological reports, and other research reports for dissemination to the public.

OJJDP is funding and managing this project; however, key staff from the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) will serve as senior technical advisors. Consistent with the use of a cooperative agreement, OJJDP and BJS will have substantial involvement in the project. The successful applicant will work in close collaboration with OJJDP and BJS with respect to review and approval of all major project decisions and deliverables (see Administrative, National Policy, and Other Legal Requirements on page 41 for more information about cooperative agreements).

The scope of work below describes the tasks and subtasks necessary for the successful applicant to meet the solicitation goals and objectives, including the main project deliverables and target end dates. (Note that the target dates are advisory, and the applicant is free to propose modifications based on their experience in conducting similar collections.) The applicant should briefly describe how they would accomplish each task and deliverable, develop a schedule for each task, and estimate the associated costs. More specifically, this should

¹⁰ Sedlak, A.J., Finkelhor, D., Brick, J.M., and Wolak, J. 2016. *Law Enforcement Survey Redesign: Planning Papers and Draft Instruments*. Rockville, MD: Rockville Institute.

include (1) a description of the specific strategies and approaches that would be conducted to meet each outcome; (2) a description of the capabilities and demonstration of the expertise that will enable them to successfully meet each outcome; (3) a schedule to identify start dates for each task and subtask, and completion dates for all deliverables; and (4) cost estimates for performing the work. The application should fully describe the applicant's knowledge of the challenges and complexities associated with developing and testing survey instruments; designing samples; achieving adequate response rates to minimize bias in the national estimates; and assessing the need for and conducting nonresponse bias analyses, imputing for item missing data, and weighting sample data to produce national estimates.

Scope of Work

Task 1. Project Management

Subtask 1.1. Post-award meeting and project schedule. Within 1 month of the award, the recipient's project director and key staff will attend a post-award meeting with the assigned OJJDP grant manager and social science analyst, and other key OJJDP and BJS staff at the OJP offices in Washington, DC. The initial meeting should focus on a review of the overall project goals and tasks, and discuss areas of concern related to the proposed project plan, project schedule, staffing plan, and other management requirements. This meeting will also provide an opportunity for OJJDP staff to share project experience and materials from prior NISMART administrations with the recipient.

Within 2 weeks of the post-award meeting, the recipient should submit an updated version of the project plan and project schedule to OJJDP for review, comment, and approval. After OJJDP has agreed to the revised project plan and project schedule, all work is expected to be completed as scheduled unless OJJDP is consulted and approves any changes.

Subtask 1.2. Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval. DOJ regulations require that an IRB review and approve federally supported research involving human subjects and that recipients of OJP funding submit an OJP Privacy Certificate.

The recipient will obtain approval from an IRB for the LES-SK instrument and survey, including the pilot testing and full data collection protocols. The recipient will provide OJJDP with copies of all IRB submissions and final certification letters. OJJDP approval of the final IRB materials and OJP Privacy Certificate will be required prior to commencing research activities under Task 2.

The recipient will obtain approval from an IRB for the research, development, and testing activities enumerated under Task 3. The recipient will provide OJJDP with copies of all IRB submissions and final certification letters. OJJDP approval of the final IRB materials and OJP Privacy Certificate will be required prior to commencing research activities under Task 3.

Subtask 1.3. Project calls and meetings. The recipient will establish a routine method for updating OJJDP and BJS on the status of the project, which will include at least one conference call every 2 weeks. The recipient will work with OJJDP to develop the agendas for these calls. The OJJDP Social Science Analyst and the recipient will establish other regular communication vehicles as needed. Stakeholder meeting(s) as directed by OJJDP (see Subtask 2.1 and Subtask 3.1) will be required for experts and

other stakeholders to review the content and development of survey instruments. The recipient will also participate in a wrap-up meeting at the end of the project to present findings and recommendations to OJJDP and BJS.

Subtask 1.4. Semiannual progress reports. The recipient will submit to the OJJDP grant manager a detailed progress report every 6 months that includes the information in [Section F. Federal Award Administration Information](#) and describes the status of the project, methodological and implementation issues, progress toward the project goals, and any other relevant issues to the project's completion; and a final progress report at the conclusion of the award period, summarizing this information throughout the award.

Required deliverables: (1) A written schedule for the entire project with the design and all project tasks fully specified, (2) all IRB materials and the OJP Privacy Certificate, and (3) progress reports due within 30 calendar days after the end of each reporting period.

Task 2. Law Enforcement Survey on Stereotypical Kidnappings (LES-SK)

Subtask 2.1. Instrumentation. The recipient will work with OJJDP and BJS to refine or adapt the LES-SK (proposed in the report *Law Enforcement Survey Redesign: Planning Papers and Draft Instruments*). The recipient will make recommendations on the optimal mode(s) of data collection considering the survey cost, length of the data collection period(s), respondent burden, and anticipated response rates.

The recipient will organize a 1-day (or longer) expert panel meeting to be held within the first 4 months of the project period start date. The list of expert panel members will be developed with OJJDP's assistance, and OJJDP will have final approval of the list. For budgeting purposes, the applicant should assume the expert panel will include 12 nonfederal members. The application should include proposed names and/or characteristics of expert panel members, including representatives of federal agencies interested in this topic area. The goal of the meeting will be to refine the LES-SK content and to discuss the feasibility of the items, wording of questions, and mode(s) of data collection. OJJDP and BJS will work with the recipient to ensure that the final survey items are constructed so that core estimates from the LES-SK can be compared to estimates from past NISMART law enforcement surveys. The final questionnaires will be approved by OJJDP and BJS prior to pilot testing.

The instrument should, at a minimum, be sufficient to address national estimates of the number of children who are victims of abduction by strangers based on reports to law enforcement. In addition to measuring the incidence of stereotypical kidnappings, OJJDP is interested in determining how it has changed over time, how it varies by demographic subgroup and other child characteristics, and what other factors related to the episode and/or perpetrator(s) are critical to understanding the problem and context of missing children. Measurement goals include, but are not limited to:

Demographic information of victim/child:

- Gender.
- Race/ethnicity.
- Age.
- Sexual orientation, gender expression, and gender identity (if known).

- Family structure/living situation (one or both parents, relative, foster home, facility/institution, etc.).

Abduction episode characteristics:

- When episode occurred.
- Who reported to law enforcement.
- Duration of episode.
- Characteristics related to location (location prior, mode of transportation, location held).
- Identity/number/gender/age/motivation of perpetrator(s):
 - If family member, characteristics of incident (relationship with child, etc.).
 - If known to victim, characteristics of incident (duration of acquaintance, use of technology, etc.).
- How episode occurred (use of force, threats, persuasion, concealment, use of technology).
- Use of technology by police to aid recovery.
- Additional crime elements (sexual assault, physical assault, robbery, weapons, ransom).
- Episode outcomes (returned alive, killed, not recovered).
- Other episode characteristics.

The LES-SK instrument should be finalized for testing within 30 days of the expert panel meeting.

Required deliverables: (1) Expert panel meeting to discuss LES-SK instrument items and (2) revised and final versions of LES-SK instrument(s), including screen shots for web-based data collection, as appropriate.

Subtask 2.2. Sampling. The recipient will develop an appropriate sampling strategy building on the methods used in past NISMART law enforcement surveys (see *Law Enforcement Study (LES-3) Technical Report*). The recipient will work collaboratively with OJJDP and BJS to finalize the sample design, taking into consideration how prior sampling plans performed including their limitations, challenges, and strengths. The recipient will work with BJS to determine the utility of the BJS Law Enforcement Agency Roster to identify a sample of eligible law enforcement agencies.

The recipient should document any possible coverage bias associated with the proposed sampling frame and strategies. The recipient should consider the costs and benefits of proposed sampling strategies and data collection approaches to determine the optimal approach.

Note that the stereotypical kidnapping estimates produced in the NISMART-2 and NISMART-3 law enforcement surveys had large confidence intervals. The recipient should explore the trade-offs of precision and cost with respect to increasing the sample size.

The sampling design and list of selected agencies should be delivered within 30 days of the expert panel meeting.

Required deliverables: Report containing the proposed sample design and list of selected law enforcement agencies.

Subtask 2.3. Pilot test plans. The recipient will develop and propose to OJJDP and BJS a plan to pilot test the proposed LES-SK instrument and data collection protocol. This draft report will contain a detailed plan for the proposed method to conduct the pilot testing, along with descriptions of any possible alternative methods and their anticipated benefits and drawbacks with respect to cost and response rates. OJJDP and BJS will review and comment on the proposed plan within 2 weeks of delivery. The recipient will incorporate these comments and prepare a final plan to pilot test the proposed LES-SK instrument and data collection protocol.

The final pilot testing plan for the LES-SK should be delivered by month 5 of the project period.

Required deliverables: Draft and final pilot testing plans for the LES-SK.

Subtask 2.4. OMB clearance for pilot testing. OJJDP intends to obtain a generic clearance from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under which any necessary pilot testing conducted under Subtask 2.3 could occur. The recipient will work with OJJDP and BJS to complete the necessary OMB package requirements and application process to secure the generic clearance for the LES-SK pilot test.

Applicants should plan on a period of 2 months to obtain generic clearance, which includes OJJDP internal review. OMB generic clearance for pilot testing must be obtained by month 5.

Required deliverables: All draft materials to support the OMB generic clearance package for the LES-SK pilot testing.

Subtask 2.5. Survey pilot testing. The recipient will implement the approved pilot testing plan as agreed on in Subtask 2.3. Following completion of the pilot testing, the recipient will produce a report to:

- Evaluate the strengths and challenges of the research design and its individual components to meet its objectives.
- Conduct an item response analysis to identify questions that may be problematic or unnecessary.
- Propose revisions to the instrument and the data collection protocol based on responses to the pilot survey.

The report will be delivered within 30 days of completing the pilot test.

Based on the pilot test results, the recipient will provide a detailed plan for the full administration of the LES-SK for OJJDP and BJS review. This draft plan will include all survey protocols to be implemented, including quality control procedures, and administration techniques to ensure data quality and completeness to minimize bias in the estimates. The plan should describe how the protocols and procedures will minimize costs and bias and achieve response rates that match or exceed the rates achieved in the LES-3. OJJDP and BJS will review the draft plan and send comments within 2 weeks

of delivery. The recipient will address any concerns raised in this review and prepare a final plan to administer the full LES-SK.

The LES-SK administration plan will be delivered within 60 days of the pilot testing (estimated month 9).

Required deliverables: (1) Report on the results of the pilot test and (2) draft and final administration plans for the full LES-SK, including any staff training materials.

Subtask 2.6. OMB clearance for full survey administration. The full OMB clearance package will be required for the LES-SK administration (Subtask 2.7). The recipient will prepare and provide to OJJDP draft materials for OMB clearance for the project. These materials include the 30- and 60-day notices; form 83i; parts A and B of the supporting statement (including a plan, if needed, for nonresponse bias assessment and adjustments); a justification memorandum; and copies of all survey documents, including but not limited to questionnaires, all instructions and followup documents, and any telephone scripts. OJJDP will provide sample documents as needed. Applicants should plan on a period of 7 months to obtain full clearance, which includes OJJDP internal review. OMB clearance must be obtained by month 12.

Required deliverables: All draft materials to support the full OMB clearance for the LES-SK collection.

Subtask 2.7. Survey administration. The recipient will implement the full LES-SK and complete data collection by month 18.

OJJDP's primary goals for the survey are a high response rate in conjunction with minimizing bias in attaining national representation. The recipient should have a system in place to verify the consistency and accuracy of completed surveys, and to monitor nonresponse throughout the process to minimize nonresponse bias. The recipient will provide OJJDP with ongoing status updates of the progress of survey administration that include summary reports that provide information about the status of the collection, including the overall response rate, response rate for selected subsets, assessment of nonresponse bias, and other information to be determined in conjunction with OJJDP and BJS.

Required deliverables: (1) Summary reports, delivered biweekly, during the data collection period to describe and assess response rates, data quality, and potential for nonresponse bias and (2) ad hoc reports, as needed, to describe any problems with data collection activities and corresponding remedial action.

Subtask 2.8. Post-survey adjustments. The recipient will develop and submit plans for data edits and data documentation for OJJDP and BJS review and approval. Data edits and processing should be documented thoroughly for verification. The recipient will conduct item and unit nonresponse analyses, and assess response patterns to determine the reliability and validity of the reported data. The recipient will provide documentation on nonresponse adjustment strategies, including all item imputation and unit weights necessary to produce national-level estimates and for standard error calculations.

The draft methodological report for the LES-SK should be delivered within 90 days of the completion of the data collection.

Required deliverables: (1) Written documentation of data processing procedures and data editing and cleaning; (2) draft and final plans for nonresponse adjustment, item imputation, and unit weighting; and (3) a draft methodological report for the LES-SK survey.

Subtask 2.9. Statistical tables. The recipient will produce and provide OJJDP with a set of up to 30 statistical tables, with corresponding tables of confidence intervals presenting the key findings of the LES-SK data collection, within 90 days of the completion of the data collection.

Required deliverables: Statistical tables and tables of confidence intervals on LES-SK findings.

Subtask 2.10. Final verification and data set. Final verification procedures should be conducted prior to delivering a final data set to OJJDP. Any data issues must be reported to OJJDP for resolution.

The recipient will produce a final data file and codebook documentation following specifications used by the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data (NACJD) and standards issued by the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research. The recipient will also provide supporting documentation, including a detailed codebook. Documentation should also describe the sampling plan, performance of the sample, description of imputation and weighting procedures, and codes that identify aspects of data quality from the collection (such as missing data and imputed values) that allow users to appropriately analyze the data.

Final data sets, documentation, and a codebook should be provided 90 days prior to the end of the project period.

Required deliverables: (1) Data documentation and codebook and (2) final cleaned electronic versions of all data sets consistent with NACJD requirements.

Task 3. Research and Development on Family Abductions and Other Missing Episodes

Subtask 3.1. Review, assessment, and development. The recipient will review the NISMART-3 survey instruments and methodological reports (see *Law Enforcement Study (LES-3) Technical Report* and *Adult Household Survey Technical Report*) and those developed following NISMART-3 (see *Law Enforcement Survey Redesign: Planning Papers and Draft Instruments*) to identify efficient and effective strategies to collect information on family abductions and other missing children episodes reported to law enforcement agencies. The collection(s) should, at a minimum, be sufficient to support the following national estimates required by the legislative mandate based on reports to law enforcement agencies:

- The actual number of children reported missing each year.
- The number of children who are the victims of parental kidnappings/family abductions.
- The number of missing children who are recovered each year.

As with the data collection on stereotypical kidnappings, OJJDP is interested in learning how child victims of family abductions and missing children more generally vary by demographic subgroup and other child characteristics, and what other factors related to the episodes are critical to understanding the problem and context of missing children.

The recipient should critically assess and prepare a report that recommends design options and alternatives, including but not limited to the following elements:

- Universe frame and sampling design.
- Data collection mode(s) and design.
- A draft of the proposed survey instrument(s) with (1) items that reflect the recipient's assessment of the critical information needed to produce national statistics on the incidence of family abductions, missing children, and recoveries known to law enforcement and (2) the demographic and other child, perpetrator, and episode characteristics needed to provide meaningful context to the data.
- Initial options for testing survey instrument(s) and data collection mode(s).
- Plans for analytic approaches.

The recipient will deliver a complete draft of this report to OJJDP and BJS for review and approval by month 24.

The recipient will organize a 1-day (or longer) expert panel meeting to be held within 2 months of the report submission. OJJDP expects the panel will generally include the same set of experts identified under Subtask 2.1. The goal of the meeting will be to review the report; refine the content of the instrument(s); and assess the feasibility of the items, wording of questions, and mode(s) of data collection. Once completed, the revised report will be the basis for pilot testing.

Required deliverables: (1) Draft and final reports on designs, including draft instruments and protocols, for collecting information from law enforcement agencies on parental abductions and other types of missing episodes involving children and (2) expert panel meeting to discuss instrument items and mode(s) of data collection.

Subtask 3.2. Pilot test plans. The specific scope and scale of the pilot testing will depend on the design approved under Subtask 3.1. Any pilot testing must include a test of the full proposed survey instrument(s). The recipient will work with OJJDP and BJS to identify the extent of pilot testing necessary to assess the law enforcement survey(s) and design for collecting information on family abductions and other missing children episodes reported to law enforcement agencies.

The recipient will recommend one or more research designs for pilot testing and a means for conducting the pilot tests. The draft plan for pilot testing will be submitted in a report for OJJDP and BJS review and approval. The plan will describe the details of the proposed alternative methods and thoroughly justify and support the recommendations by discussing the benefits and drawbacks of the proposed methods compared to others. It will include a plan for cognitive followup with respondents, including a cost estimate for implementing the recommended alternatives on a national scale. The plan will also discuss how the proposed strategies will achieve acceptable response rates and minimize the potential for nonresponse bias. In particular, the plan will describe in detail methods for identifying the appropriate law enforcement agency staff who can serve as

respondents. A budget and timeline for completing the pilot testing in an efficient manner will also be included.

OJJDP and BJS will review the draft plan and send comments within 2 weeks of delivery. The recipient will then deliver a final plan incorporating and addressing these comments.

The final pilot testing plan for the supplemental law enforcement survey(s) should be delivered by month 27 of the project period.

Required deliverables: Draft and final plans for pilot testing the supplemental law enforcement survey(s).

Subtask 3.3. OMB clearance for pilot testing. Once OJJDP and BJS approve the pilot testing plan, OJJDP intends to obtain a generic clearance from OMB under which the pilot testing conducted under Subtask 3.4 could occur. The recipient will work with OJJDP and BJS to complete the necessary OMB package requirements and application process to secure the generic clearance.

Applicants should plan on a period of 2 months to obtain generic clearance, which includes OJJDP internal review. OMB generic clearance for pilot testing the supplemental law enforcement survey(s) must be obtained by month 29.

Required deliverables: All draft materials to support the OMB generic clearance for pilot testing the supplemental law enforcement survey(s).

Subtask 3.4. Pilot testing. The recipient will implement the approved pilot testing plan with cognitive interviews as agreed on in Subtask 3.2. Following completion of the pilot testing, the recipient will produce a report to:

- Evaluate the strengths and challenges of the research designs and their individual components to meet their objectives.
- Conduct an item response analysis to identify questions that may be problematic or unnecessary.
- Propose revisions to the instrument and the data collection protocol based on responses to the pilot survey.

The evaluation of the pilot test and its findings will be delivered in a report within 30 days of completion of the pilot test.

Based on the pilot test results, the recipient will provide a detailed plan for the full administration of the supplemental law enforcement survey(s) for OJJDP and BJS review. This draft plan will include all survey protocols to be implemented, including quality control procedures and administration techniques to ensure data quality and completeness to minimize bias in the estimates. The plan should describe how the protocols and procedures will minimize costs and bias and achieve high response rates. OJJDP and BJS will review the draft plan and send comments within 2 weeks of delivery. The recipient will address any concerns raised in this review and prepare a final plan to administer the supplemental law enforcement survey(s) to support the national estimate measurement objectives described in Subtask 3.1.

The supplemental law enforcement survey(s) administration plan will be delivered by month 34 of the project period.

Required deliverables: (1) Draft and final reports on findings from the pilot test, including all observations, notes, and lessons learned from the field and respondents and (2) draft and final administration plans for the full LES-SK, including any staff training materials.

Task 4. Dissemination of Findings

The recipient will prepare practitioner-friendly overview documents highlighting the project's goals and objectives, as OJJDP requires.

The recipient will produce practitioner-friendly interim and final reports highlighting the project's findings, as OJJDP requires, to be disseminated at OJJDP's discretion. (Refer to *OJJDP News @ a Glance*, OJJDP bulletins, and other similar OJJDP publications for examples of the type of practitioner documents that may be requested: www.ojjdp.gov/enews/enews.html.)

Based on the content of the interim deliverables described above under Tasks 2 and 3, the recipient will prepare a methodology report that provides a detailed description of (1) sample design and outcomes; (2) data collection procedures and outcomes; (3) first- and second-stage response rates and the variation of response rates by characteristics; (4) editing and coding procedures; (5) assessment of reliability and validity; (6) nonresponse bias assessment, including types of nonresponse at the first and second stages of selection and the variation by characteristics; impact of unit and item nonresponse; methods of imputation and data quality; and other results from the nonresponse bias analysis; (7) weighting schemes for national-level estimation; (8) methods that may be used to generate standard errors; and (9) documentation of constructed variables (if any) used in the analyses.

A draft report will be delivered to OJJDP for review and comment within 6 months after the LES-SK data collection ends. A final report will be delivered prior to the completion of the required OJJDP bulletin.

The recipient will work closely with OJJDP and BJS to prepare an OJJDP bulletin detailing the findings from the LES-SK. The bulletin will contain tables similar to those in the previously published reports on stereotypical kidnappings. The recipient will ensure that measures are comparable. The report will examine any observed changes in victimization rates, by victim demographics and by type of incident, and explore factors that may account for these changes. Additional tables may be included to incorporate other measures and covariates of victimization.

As noted above, the recipient will be expected to submit to NACJD all data sets that result in whole or in part from the work funded by the award, along with associated files and any documentation necessary 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. For more information, see "Program Narrative" in [Section D. Application and Submission Information](#).

Required Data Sets and Associated Files and Documentation. Any recipient of an award under this solicitation will be expected to submit to the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data (NACJD) all data sets that result in whole or in part from the work funded by the award, along with associated files and any documentation necessary 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. For more information, see “Program Narrative” in [Section D. Application and Submission Information](#).

In addition to these deliverables (and the required reports and data on performance measures described in [Section F. Federal Award Administration Information](#)), OJJDP 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.

The Goals, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products are directly related to the performance measures set out in the table immediately below.

Performance Measures

Objective	Performance Measure(s)	Data Recipient Provides
<p>To produce accurate and timely national statistics that add in the reporting of data on missing children while also contributing to the field’s understanding of the key aspects of the nation’s missing children problem.</p>	<p>Number of deliverables that met the expectations of the project.</p>	<p>List of deliverables that resulted in whole or in part from work funded under the OJJDP award.</p> <p>Number of deliverables that meet OJJDP’s expectations for completeness, quality, and precision.</p> <p>A detailed project schedule and work plan.</p> <p>Documentation of approval from all appropriate Institutional Review Boards and the Office of Management and Budget.</p> <p>Quarterly financial reports, semiannual and final progress reports, and a draft and final summary overview of the work performed under the OJJDP award.</p> <p>Data disclosure analysis plans and implementation are completed on time and fully address disclosure risks.</p> <p>All documentation to NACJD that is fully compliant with archival standards,</p>

		complete, and requires minimal corrections upon submission.
	Percent of deliverables completed on time.	Number of deliverables. Number of deliverables completed on time.

Equitable Access to OJJDP-funded Programs

OJJDP promotes an unbiased juvenile justice system in which all youth are treated fairly and have equal access to the services and programs they need. Research indicates that failure to provide equitable treatment may perpetuate and exacerbate a cycle of arrest and incarceration that disproportionately impacts vulnerable youth. OJJDP may give priority consideration to applications that document the applicant’s capacity to serve all vulnerable youth. Such capacity may be documented by articulating a plan for meeting the needs of all youth or by demonstrating a record of such service. Applicants should also review the OJP Standard Assurances for information about the applicable nondiscrimination provisions.

B. Federal Award Information

OJJDP expects to make one award of up to \$1 million for a 3-year performance period, to begin on October 1, 2017.

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

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

Type of Award

OJJDP expects that any award under this solicitation will be made in the form of a cooperative agreement, which is a type of award that provides for OJP to have substantial involvement in carrying out award activities. See [Administrative, National Policy, and Other Legal Requirements](#), under [Section F. Federal Award Administration Information](#), for a brief discussion of what may constitute substantial federal involvement. As discussed [later in the solicitation](#), important rules (including limitations) apply to any conference/meeting/training costs under cooperative agreements.

Please note: Any recipient of an award under this solicitation will be required to comply with DOJ regulations on confidentiality and protection of human subjects. See “Requirements related to Research” under [“Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2017 Awards”](#) in the [OJP Funding Resource Center](#).

Financial Management and System of Internal Controls

Award recipients and subrecipients (including recipients or subrecipients that are pass-through entities¹¹) must, as described in the Part 200 Uniform Requirements¹² as set out at 2 C.F.R. 200.303:

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

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

Budget Information

What will not be funded:

- Applications 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).
- Applications that include funding for direct delivery or services.
- Applications that are not responsive to this specific solicitation.

¹¹ For purposes of this solicitation, the phrase “pass-through entity” includes any recipient or subrecipient that provides a subaward (“subgrant”) to carry out part of the funded award or program.

¹² The “Part 200 Uniform Requirements” means the DOJ regulation at 2 C.F.R. Part 2800, which adopts (with certain modifications) the provisions of 2 C.F.R. Part 200.

- Grantees may not use OJJDP funds for any biomedical or behavior control experimentation on individuals or any research involving such experimentation.

Cost Sharing or Match Requirement

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

Preagreement Costs (also known as Preaward Costs)

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

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

Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver

With respect to any award of more than \$250,000 made under this solicitation, a recipient may not use federal funds to pay total cash compensation (salary plus cash bonuses) to any employee of the recipient at a rate that exceeds 110 percent of the maximum annual salary payable to a member of the Federal Government's Senior Executive Service (SES) at an agency with a Certified SES Performance Appraisal System for that year.¹³ The 2017 salary table for SES employees is available at the Office of Personnel Management [website](#). Note: A recipient may compensate an employee at a greater rate, provided the amount in excess of this compensation limitation is paid with nonfederal funds. (Nonfederal funds used for any such additional compensation will not be considered matching funds, where match requirements apply.) If only a portion of an employee's time is charged to an OJP award, the maximum allowable compensation is equal to the percentage of time worked times the maximum salary limitation.

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

The justification should address—in the context of the work the individual would do under the award—the particular qualifications and expertise of the individual, the uniqueness of a service the individual will provide, the individual's specific knowledge of the proposed program or project, and a statement that explains whether and how the individual's salary under the award

¹³ OJP does not apply this limitation on the use of award funds to the nonprofit organizations listed in Appendix VIII to 2 C.F.R. Part 200.

would be commensurate with the regular and customary rate for an individual with his or her qualifications and expertise, and for the work he or she would do under the award.

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

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

Costs Associated With Language Assistance (if applicable)

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

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

C. Eligibility Information

For eligibility information, see the title page.

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

D. Application and Submission Information

What an Application Should Include

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

Moreover, an applicant should anticipate that an application that OJP determines is nonresponsive to the scope of the solicitation, or that OJP determines does not include the application elements that OJJDP has designated to be critical, will neither proceed to peer review nor receive further consideration. For this solicitation, OJJDP has designated the following application elements as critical: Program Narrative, Budget Detail Worksheet or Budget Narrative, and résumés/curriculum vitae of key personnel. (For purposes of this solicitation, "key personnel" means the principal investigator and any and all coprincipal

investigators.) An applicant may combine the Budget Narrative and the Budget Detail Worksheet in one document. Review the “Note on File Names and File Types” under [How To Apply](#) to be sure applications are submitted in permitted formats.

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

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

The SF-424 is a required standard form used as a cover sheet for submission of preapplications, 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).

To avoid processing delays, an applicant must include an accurate legal name on its SF-424. Current OJP award recipients, when completing the field for “Legal Name,” should use the same legal name that appears on the prior year award document, which is also the legal name stored in OJP’s financial system. On the SF-424, enter the legal name in box 5 and Employer Identification Number (EIN) in box 6 exactly as it appears on the prior year award document. An applicant with current, active awards must ensure that its GMS profile is current. If the profile is not current, the applicant should submit a Grant Adjustment Notice (GAN) updating the information on its GMS profile prior to applying under this solicitation.

A new applicant entity should enter the Official Legal Name and address of the applicant entity in box 5 and the EIN in box 6 of the SF-424. An applicant must attach official legal documents to its application (e.g., articles of incorporation, 501(c)(3), etc.) to confirm the legal name, address, and EIN entered into the SF-424.

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

2. Project Abstract

The project abstract is a very important part of the application, and serves as an introduction to the proposed project. OJJDP 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.

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 (such as Times New Roman) with 1-inch margins.

The project abstract should describe—

- The purpose of the project, the problem to be investigated, and the anticipated relevance to juvenile justice policy, practice, and theory.
- The proposed approach to implement a data collection that produces accurate and reliable national estimates of child victims of stereotypical kidnappings known to law enforcement agencies, and to develop and pilot test instruments and sampling methods to collect information from law enforcement agencies on parental abductions and other types of missing episodes involving children, addressing each of the key activities identified in the “Goals, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products” section on pages 6–15.
- The expected key deliverables, including statistical products, methodological reports, and other research reports for dissemination to the public, identified in the “Goals, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products” section on pages 6–15.

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 <http://ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/ProjectAbstractTemplate.pdf>.

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

In the project abstract template, each applicant is asked to indicate whether it gives OJP permission to share the applicant’s project abstract (including contact information for individuals) with the public. Granting (or failing to grant) this permission will not affect OJP’s funding decisions. Moreover, if the application is not funded, providing permission will not ensure that OJP will share the abstract information, nor will it assure funding from any other source.

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

3. Program Narrative

Applicants must submit a program narrative that presents a detailed description of the purpose, goals, objectives, strategies, design, and management of the proposed program. The program narrative should be double-spaced with 1-inch margins, not exceeding 30 pages of 8½ by 11 inches, and use a standard 12-point font, preferably Times New Roman. Pages should be numbered “1 of 30,” etc. 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 tables, charts, figures, pictures, etc., including all captions, legends, keys, subtext, etc., may be single-spaced. The project abstract, table of contents, appendices, attachments, including bibliographical references, budget and budget narrative,

and government forms do not count toward the 30-page limit. If the program narrative fails to comply with these length-related restrictions, OJJDP may consider such noncompliance in peer review and in final award decisions.

The program narrative should address the following selection criteria: (1) statement of the problem; (2) goals, objectives, and performance measures; (3) program design and implementation; and (4) capabilities/competencies. The applicant should clearly delineate the connections between and among each of these sections. For example, the applicant should derive the goals and objectives directly from the problems to be addressed. Similarly, the project design section should clearly explain how the program's structure and activities will accomplish the goals and objectives identified in the previous section.

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

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 (i.e., address, telephone number, and email address) for both the applicant and the principal investigator.

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

If an applicant is resubmitting an application presented previously to OJJDP, 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 OJJDP-assigned application number of the previous application, and (2) a brief summary of revisions to the application, including responses to previous feedback received from OJJDP.

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:

- **Statement of the Problem and Research Questions.** The statement of the problem should address the challenges in this area. This includes the challenges in presenting findings that are inconsistent with widely held beliefs and practices. Applicants should also discuss current gaps in the data, including for particular justice sectors, for certain populations, and to answer questions relevant to current policy and practice needs and public interest. As part of this discussion, applicants should address any anticipated problems associated with carrying out the activities under this program and should propose potential solutions.

- **Project Design and Implementation.** Applicants should detail how the program will operate throughout the funding period and describe the strategies that they will use to achieve the goals and objectives stated in the “Goals, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products” section on pages 6–15.

Applicants should briefly describe how they would accomplish each task and deliverable, develop a schedule for each task, and estimate the associated costs. Specifically, this should include (1) a description of the specific strategies and approaches that would be conducted to meet each outcome; (2) a description of the capabilities and demonstration of the expertise that will enable them to successfully meet each outcome; (3) a schedule to identify start dates for each task and subtask, and completion dates for all deliverables; and (4) cost estimates for performing the work.

Timeline. Applicants should submit a realistic timeline or milestone chart that indicates major tasks associated with the goals and objectives of the project, assigns responsibility for each, and plots completion of each task by month or quarter for the duration of the award, using “Year 1,” “Month 1,” “Quarter 1,” etc., not calendar dates (see “Sample Project Timelines” at www.ojjdp.gov/grantees/timelines.html).

Applicants should submit the timeline as a separate attachment, as stipulated in “Appendixes” on page 26.

- **Potential Impact.** Applicants should describe the potential impact of the research and how it may inform or improve juvenile justice-related policy, practice, and theory in the United States. This includes a description of plans to disseminate to broader audiences.
- **Capabilities/Competencies.** This section should describe the experience and capability of the applicant organization and any contractors or subgrantees that the applicant will use to implement and manage this effort and its associated federal funding, highlighting any previous experience implementing projects of similar scope, design, and magnitude. Applicants should address:
 - Knowledge of the challenges and complexities associated with developing and testing survey instruments; designing samples; achieving adequate response rates to minimize bias in the national estimates; and assessing the need for and conducting nonresponse bias analyses, imputing for item missing data, and weighting sample data to produce national estimates.
 - Experience and capacity to complete rigorous data collection, analyses, and broad dissemination efforts for projects of similar scope and size.

- Experience and capacity to develop innovative strategies to enhance public accessibility and utility of complex data sets and related analyses.

Applicants should also highlight their experience, capability, and capacity to manage subawards, including details on their system for fiscal accountability. Management and staffing patterns should be clearly connected to the project design described in the previous section.

Applicants should describe the roles and responsibilities of project staff and explain the program's organizational structure and operations. Applicants should include a copy of an organizational chart showing how the organization operates, including who manages the finances; how the organization manages subawards, if there are any; and the management of the project proposed for funding.

Letters of Support/Memoranda of Understanding. If submitting a joint application, as described under Eligibility, page 1, applicants should provide signed and dated letters of support or memoranda of understanding for all key partners that include the following:

- Expression of support for the project and a statement of willingness to participate and collaborate in the project.
- Description of the partner's current role and responsibilities in the planning process and expected responsibilities when the project is operational.
- Estimate of the percentage of time that the partner will devote to the planning and operation of the project.

Letters of support may be addressed to the OJJDP Administrator. Only letters of support that are submitted by the due date and with the full application will be considered during the review process.

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.
- The deliverables, including planned scholarly products (see [Goals, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products](#) under [Program-Specific Information](#) for a discussion of expected scholarly products.)
- Implications for juvenile 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/juvenile 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. Appendixes (not counted against the 30-page program 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 résumés of the principal investigator and any and all coprincipal investigators. In addition, curriculum vitae, résumés, or biographical sketches of all other individuals (regardless of “investigator” status) who will be significantly involved in substantive aspects of the proposed project (including, for example, individuals such as statisticians used to conduct proposed data analysis).
- To assist OJP in assessing actual or apparent conflicts of interest (including such conflicts on the part of prospective reviewers of the application, a complete list of the individuals named or otherwise identified anywhere in the application (including in the budget or in any other attachment) who will or may work (or advise or consult) on the proposed research, development, or evaluation project. This applies to all such individuals, including, for example, individuals who are or would be employees of the applicant or employees of any proposed subrecipient entity, any individuals who themselves may be a subrecipient, and individuals who may (or will) work without compensation (such as advisory board members). This appendix to the program narrative must include, for each listed individual: name, title, employer, any other potentially pertinent organizational affiliation(s), and the individual's proposed roles and responsibilities in carrying out the proposed project. If the application identifies any specific entities or organizations (other than the applicant) that will or may work (or advise or consult) on the proposed project, without also naming any associated individuals, the name of each such organization also should be included on this list.

If the application (including the budget) identifies any proposed noncompetitive agreements that are or may be considered procurement "contracts" (rather than subawards) for purposes of federal grants administrative requirements, the applicant also must list the entities with which the applicant proposes to contract. Applicants should provide this list

as a separate sheet titled, "Proposed Noncompetitive Procurement Contracts."

For information on distinctions—for purposes of federal grants administrative requirements—between subawards and procurement contracts under awards, see "Budget and Associated Documentation," below.

- Proposed project timeline and expected milestones.
- A list of any previous and current OJJDP awards to the applicant and investigator(s), including the OJJDP-assigned award numbers and a brief description of any scholarly products that resulted in whole or in part from work funded under the OJJDP award(s). (See "Goals, Objectives, 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 application has been submitted (if applicable).
- Data archiving plan. Applicants should anticipate that OJJDP will require (through special award conditions, which may include 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 NACJD (see <https://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/content/NACJD/archiving/deposit-ojjdp-data.html>).

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 OJJDP (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 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 period of performance.

4. Budget and Associated Documentation

Applicants should provide a budget that (1) is complete, allowable, and cost effective in relation to the proposed activities; (2) shows the cost calculations demonstrating how they arrived at the total amount requested; and (3) provides a brief supporting narrative to link costs with project activities. The budget should cover the entire award period.

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

a. Budget Detail Worksheet

A sample Budget Detail Worksheet can be found at www.ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/BudgetDetailWorksheet.pdf. An applicant that submits its budget in a different format should use the budget categories listed in the sample budget worksheet. (An applicant should include in the budget work associated with satisfying data archiving requirements.) OJJDP expects applicants to provide a thorough narrative for each section of the Budget Detail Worksheet. The Budget Detail Worksheet should break out costs by year.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. Information on proposed subawards

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

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

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

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

Unlike a recipient contemplating a subaward, a recipient of an OJP award generally does not need specific prior federal authorization to enter into an agreement that—for purposes of federal grants administrative requirements—is considered a procurement contract, **provided that** (1) the recipient uses its own documented procurement procedures and (2) those procedures conform to applicable federal law, including the

Procurement Standards of the (DOJ) Part 200 Uniform Requirements (as set out at 2 C.F.R. 200.317 - 200.326). The Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative should identify proposed procurement contracts. (As discussed above, subawards must be identified and described separately from procurement contracts.)

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

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

d. Preagreement Costs

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

5. Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable)

Indirect costs may be charged to an award only if:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

7. Disclosure of Lobbying Activities

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

8. Additional Attachments

a. Applicant disclosure of pending applications¹⁴

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

¹⁴ 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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

b. Human Subjects and Privacy Certificate

Applicants may, but are not required to, submit Institutional Review Board (IRB) and Privacy Certificate paperwork at the time of application. Applicants selected for an award

will be required to submit all appropriate IRB and privacy documents prior to spending OJP funds for research-related activities.

DOJ regulations (28 C.F.R. Part 46) protect the human subjects of federally funded research. Part 46 requires that an Institutional Review Board, in accordance with the regulations, review and approve most research involving human subjects that any federal department or agency conducts or supports before an award recipient may expend federal funds for that research. Persons who participate in federally funded research must provide their informed consent and must be permitted to terminate their participation at any time. Funding recipients, before they will be allowed to spend OJP funds on any research activity involving human subjects, must submit appropriate documentation to OJP showing compliance with 28 C.F.R. Part 46 requirements, as requested by OJP.

DOJ regulations (28 C.F.R. Part 22) require recipients of OJP funding to submit a Privacy Certificate as a condition of approval of any grant application or contract proposal that contains a research or statistical component under which "information identifiable to a private person" will be collected, analyzed, used, or disclosed. The funding recipient's Privacy Certificate includes a description of its policies and procedures to be followed to protect the confidentiality of identifiable data (28 C.F.R. § 22.23). The Department's regulations provide, among other matters, that: "Research or statistical information identifiable to a private person may be used only for research or statistical purposes" (28 C.F.R. § 22.21). Moreover, any private person from whom information identifiable to a private person is collected or obtained (either orally or by means of written questionnaire or other document) must be advised that the information will only be used or disclosed for research or statistical purposes and that compliance with the request for information is voluntary and may be terminated at any time (28 C.F.R. § 22.27).

For more information see [“Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2017 Awards.”](#)

c. Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity

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

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

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

investigators, or subrecipients)—that could affect the independence or integrity of the research, including the design, conduct, and reporting of the research.

OR

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

OR

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

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

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

How To Apply

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

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

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

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

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

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

Characters	Special Characters		
Upper case (A – Z)	Parenthesis ()	Curly braces { }	Square brackets []
Lower case (a – z)	Ampersand (&)	Tilde (~)	Exclamation point (!)
Underscore (_)	Comma (,)	Semicolon (;)	Apostrophe (')
Hyphen (-)	At sign (@)	Number sign (#)	Dollar sign (\$)
Space	Percent sign (%)	Plus sign (+)	Equal sign (=)
Period (.)	When using the ampersand (&) in XML, applicants must use the “&#amp;#38;” format.		

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

All applicants are required to complete the following steps:

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

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

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

1. Acquire a unique entity identifier (currently, a DUNS number). In general, the Office of Management and Budget requires every applicant for a federal award (other than an individual) to include a "unique entity identifier" in each application, including an application for a supplemental award. Currently, a DUNS number is the required unique entity identifier.

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

2. Acquire registration with the System for Award Management (SAM). SAM is the repository for certain standard information about federal financial assistance applicants, recipients, and subrecipients. All applicants for OJP awards (other than individuals) must maintain current registrations in the SAM database. An applicant must be registered in SAM to successfully register in Grants.gov. Each applicant must **update or renew its SAM**

registration at least annually to maintain an active status. SAM registration and renewal can take as long as 10 business days to complete.

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

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

- 3. Acquire an Authorized Organization Representative (AOR) and a Grants.gov username and password.** Complete the AOR profile on Grants.gov and create a username and password. An applicant entity's "unique entity identifier" (DUNS number) must be used to complete this step. For more information about the registration process for organizations and other entities, go to <https://apply07.grants.gov/apply/OrcRegister>. Individuals registering with Grants.gov should go to www.grants.gov/web/grants/applicants/individual-registration.html.
- 4. Acquire confirmation for the AOR from the E-Business Point of Contact (E-Biz POC).** The E-Biz POC at the applicant organization must log into Grants.gov to "confirm" the applicant organization's AOR. The E-Biz POC will need the Marketing Partner Identification Number (MPIN) password obtained when registering with SAM to complete this step. Note that an organization can have more than one AOR.
- 5. Search for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov.** Use the following identifying information when searching for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov. The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number for this solicitation is 16.543, titled "Missing Children's Assistance," and the funding opportunity number is OJJDP-2017-10987.
- 6. Submit a valid application consistent with this solicitation by following the directions in Grants.gov.** Within 24–48 hours after submitting the electronic application, the applicant should receive two notifications from Grants.gov. The first will confirm the receipt of the application. The second will state whether the application has been validated and successfully submitted, or whether it has been rejected due to errors, with an explanation. It is possible to first receive a message indicating that the application is received, and then receive a rejection notice a few minutes or hours later. Submitting an application well ahead of the deadline provides time to correct the problem(s) that caused the rejection. **Important:** OJP urges each applicant to submit its application **at least 72 hours prior** to the application due date, to allow time to receive validation messages or rejection notifications from Grants.gov and to correct in a timely fashion any problems that may have caused a rejection notification. Applications must be successfully submitted through Grants.gov by 11:59 *p.m.* ET on May 3, 2107.

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

Note: Application Versions

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

Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues

An applicant that experiences unforeseen Grants.gov technical issues—beyond the applicant's control—which prevent the applicant from submitting the application by the deadline must contact the Grants.gov [Customer Support Hotline](#) or the [SAM Help Desk](#) (Federal Service Desk) to report the technical issue and receive a tracking number. The applicant must email the Response Center at grants@ncjrs.gov **within 24 hours after the application deadline** to request approval to submit the application after the deadline. The applicant's email must describe the technical difficulties and must include a timeline of the applicant's submission efforts, the complete grant application, the applicant's DUNS number, and any Grants.gov Help Desk or SAM tracking number(s).

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

The following conditions generally are insufficient to justify late submissions:

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

Notifications regarding known technical problems with Grants.gov, if any, are posted at the top of the OJP [Funding Resource Center](#) webpage.

E. Application Review Information

Review Criteria

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

Statement of the Problem (Understanding of the problem and its importance) – 15%

1. Demonstrated understanding of the size and nature of the nation's missing children problem, the complexities of measuring the incidence of missing children, the importance of collecting such data, and how this information can be used to inform the development of policies and interventions aimed to reduce the problem.
2. Demonstrated awareness of the state of current research and data collection on missing children, including its limitations, challenges, and strengths.

Project Design and Implementation (Quality and technical merit) – 45%

1. Soundness of methods and analytic and technical approach to addressing the stated aim(s) of the proposed project, including all Tasks and Subtasks enumerated in the scope of work (pages 7–15).
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 – 15%

Potential for a significant scientific or technical advance(s) that will improve national estimates of missing children in the United States based on surveys of law enforcement agencies, such as:

1. Potential for significantly improved understanding of the size and nature of stereotypical kidnappings reported to law enforcement.
2. Potential for innovative solutions (i.e., instruments and sampling methods) to produce national estimates on parental abductions and other types of missing child episodes reported to law enforcement.

Capabilities/Competencies (Capabilities, demonstrated productivity, and experience of the applicant organization and proposed project staff) – 25%

1. Qualifications and experience of proposed project staff (i.e., the principal investigator, any and all coprincipal 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 proposed project).
2. Demonstrated experience and success in conducting similar law enforcement surveys, achieving high response rates, obtaining high-quality data, and collecting and maintaining data confidentiality.
3. Demonstrated experience and success in working with IRBs, research review committees, and OMB to conduct similar data collections efforts.
4. Demonstrated relationship between the capabilities/competencies of the proposed project staff (including the applicant organization) and the scope of the proposed project.

Budget

In addition, 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. Alignment of the proposed budget with proposed project activities.

Review Process

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

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

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

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

Peer review panels will evaluate, score, and rate applications that meet basic minimum requirements. OJJDP may use internal peer reviewers, external peer reviewers, or a combination, to assess applications on technical merit using the solicitation’s review criteria. An external peer reviewer is an expert in the subject matter of a given solicitation who is not a current DOJ employee. An internal reviewer is a current DOJ employee who is well-versed or has expertise in the subject matter of this solicitation. Peer reviewers’ ratings and any resulting recommendations are advisory only, although reviewer views are considered carefully. Other important considerations for OJJDP include underserved populations, geographic diversity, strategic priorities, and available funding, as well as the planned scholarly products and the extent to which the budget detail worksheet and budget narrative accurately explain project costs that are reasonable, necessary, and otherwise allowable under federal law and applicable federal cost principles.

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

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

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

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

All final award decisions will be made by the OJJDP Administrator, who may take into account not only peer review ratings and OJJDP recommendations, but also other factors as indicated in this section.

F. Federal Award Administration Information

Federal Award Notices

Award notifications will be made by September 30, 2017. OJP sends award notifications by email through GMS to the individuals listed in the application as the point of contact and the authorizing official (E-Biz POC and AOR). The email notification includes detailed instructions on how to access and view the award documents, and steps to take in GMS to start the award acceptance process. GMS automatically issues the notifications at 9 p.m. ET on the award date.

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

Administrative, National Policy, and Other Legal Requirements

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

on post-award legal requirements and common OJP award conditions **prior** to submitting an application.

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

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

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

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

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

OJJDP's role will include the following tasks:

- Reviewing and approving major work plans, including changes to such plans, and key decisions pertaining to project operations.
- Reviewing and approving major project-generated documents and materials used to provide project services.
- Providing guidance in significant project planning meetings and participating in project-sponsored training events or conferences.

In addition to a condition that sets out the "substantial federal involvement" in the award, cooperative agreements awarded by OJP include a condition that requires specific reporting in

connection with conferences, meetings, retreats, seminars, symposium, training activities, or similar events funded under the award.

General Information About Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements

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

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

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

Data on performance measures. In addition to required reports, each recipient of an award under this solicitation also must provide data that measure the results of the work done under the award. To demonstrate program progress and success, as well as to assist DOJ 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, OJP will require any recipient, post award, to provide the data listed as “Data Recipient Provides” in the performance measures table in [Section A. Program Description](#), under “Performance Measures,” so that OJP can calculate values for this solicitation’s performance measures.

G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s)

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

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

H. Other Information

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

All applications submitted to OJP (including all attachments to applications) are subject to the federal Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) and to the Privacy Act. By law, DOJ may withhold information that is responsive to a request pursuant to FOIA if DOJ determines that the responsive information either is protected under the Privacy Act or falls within the scope of one

of nine statutory exemptions under FOIA. DOJ cannot agree in advance of a request pursuant to FOIA not to release some or all portions of an application.

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

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

Provide Feedback to OJP

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

IMPORTANT: This email is for feedback and suggestions only. OJP does not send replies from this mailbox to messages it receives in this mailbox. Any prospective applicant that has specific questions on any program or technical aspect of the solicitation **must** use the appropriate telephone number or email listed on the front of this solicitation document to obtain information. These contacts are provided to help ensure that prospective applicants can directly reach an individual who can address specific questions in a timely manner.

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

Application Checklist

OJJDP FY 2017 National Incidence Studies of Missing Children Reported to Law Enforcement

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

What an Applicant Should Do:

Prior to Registering in Grants.gov:

- _____ Acquire a DUNS Number (see page 36)
- _____ Acquire or renew registration with SAM (see page 36)

To Register with Grants.gov:

- _____ Acquire AOR and Grants.gov username/password (see page 37)
- _____ Acquire AOR confirmation from the E-Biz POC (see page 37)

To Find Funding Opportunity:

- _____ Search for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov (see page 37)
- _____ Download Funding Opportunity and Application Package (see page 37)
- _____ Sign up for Grants.gov [email](#) notifications (optional) (see page 35)
- _____ Read [Important Notice: Applying for Grants in Grants.gov](#)
- _____ Read OJP policy and guidance on conference approval, planning, and reporting available at ojp.gov/financialguide/DOJ/PostawardRequirements/chapter3.10a.htm (see page 20)

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

- _____ (1) Application has been received
- _____ (2) Application has either been successfully validated or rejected with errors (see page 37)

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

- _____ Contact Grants.gov and/or SAM regarding technical difficulties. Refer to the section: Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues (see page 38)
- _____ Contact the Response Center at grants@ncjrs.gov to request to submit the application after the deadline because of unforeseen technical issues. Refer to the section: Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues (see page 38)

Overview of Post-Award Legal Requirements:

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

Scope Requirement:

- _____ The federal amount requested is within the allowable limit(s) of \$1 million.

Eligibility Requirement:

- _____ State, territory, unit of local government, federally recognized Indian tribal government.
- _____ Nonprofit or for-profit organization, including tribal nonprofit or for-profit organization.
- _____ Institution of higher education, including tribal institution of higher education.

What an Application Should Include:

- _____ Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424) (see page 21)
- _____ Project Abstract (if applicable) (see page 21)
- _____ Program Narrative (see page 22)
- _____ Budget Detail Worksheet (see page 28)
- _____ Budget Narrative (see page 28)
- _____ Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable) (see page 30)
- _____ Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire (see page 31)
- _____ [Disclosure of Lobbying Activities \(SF-LLL\)](#) (see page 31)

- _____ Appendixes (see page 26)
 - _____ Bibliography/references
 - _____ Tools/Instruments, questionnaires, tables/charts/graphs, or maps
 - _____ Curriculum vitae or resume of the principal investigator
 - _____ List of individuals named or otherwise identified anywhere in the application
 - _____ Proposed project timeline and expected milestones
 - _____ List of previous and current OJJDP awards
 - _____ Letters of cooperation/support
 - _____ List of cooperation/support or administrative agreements
 - _____ List of other agencies, organizations, or funding sources to which this application has been submitted
 - _____ Data archiving plan

- _____ Additional Attachments (see page 31)
 - _____ Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications
 - _____ Human Subjects and Privacy Certificate
 - _____ Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity

- _____ Request and Justification for Employee Compensation; Waiver (if applicable) (see page 19)