

Notices regarding the solicitation “Strengthening the Medical Examiner-Coroner System Program”

January 27, 2017: Answers to questions have been posted. To assist applicants in completing their proposals, NIJ has made the answers to questions received available for this funding opportunity. Visit <https://nij.gov/funding/pages/solicitation-qa.aspx#NIJ-2017-11566> for questions and answers to help prepare your application.

The original solicitation document begins on the next page.



The [U.S. Department of Justice](#) (DOJ), [Office of Justice Programs](#) (OJP), [National Institute of Justice](#) (NIJ) is seeking applications to strengthen the medical examiner-coroner system. This program furthers the Department's mission by providing resources to improve medicolegal death investigations (MDI) in the United States.

Strengthening the Medical Examiner-Coroner System Program

Applications Due: March 20, 2017

Eligibility

Eligible applicants are agencies directly involved in medicolegal death investigations as part of their normal business, such as medical examiner offices and coroner offices — States (including territories), units of local government, federally recognized Indian tribal governments (as determined by the Secretary of the Interior) that perform law enforcement functions, non-profit and for-profit organizations (including tribal non-profit and for-profit organizations), institutions of higher education (including tribal institutions of higher education), and certain qualified individuals. For-profit organizations (as well as other recipients) must forgo any profit or management fee including tribal institutions of higher education).

Eligible applicants for [Purpose Area 1, Forensic Pathology Fellowships](#), are limited to entities with programs that should meet or exceed the Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education (ACGME)¹ or its international equivalent's requirements.

Eligible applicants for [Purpose Area 2, Medical Examiner-Coroner Office Accreditation](#), are limited to domestic medical examiner and coroner offices actively seeking accreditation through an independent accrediting organization, such as the National Association of Medical Examiners (NAME) and the International Association of Coroners and Medical Examiners (IACME), or other appropriate accrediting bodies.

NIJ 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").² The applicant must be the entity that would have primary responsibility for carrying out the award, including administering the funding and managing the entire program.

NIJ may elect to fund applications submitted under this FY 2017 solicitation in future fiscal years, dependent on, among other considerations, the merit of the applications and on the availability of appropriations.

¹ [ACGME Program Requirements for Graduate Medical Education in Forensic Pathology, 2016](#).

² For additional information on subawards, see "Budget and Associated Documentation" under [Section D. Application and Submission Information](#).

Deadline

Applicants must register with Grants.gov prior to submitting an application. All applications are due by 11:59 p.m. eastern time on March 20, 2017.

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

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

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

Contact Information

For technical assistance with submitting an application, contact the Grants.gov Customer Support Hotline at 800-518-4726 or 606-545-5035, or via email to support@grants.gov. The Grants.gov 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 NIJ contact identified below **within 24 hours after the application deadline** in order to request approval to submit its application after the deadline. Additional information on reporting technical issues appears under “Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues” in the How to Apply section.

For assistance with any other requirements of this solicitation, contact the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS) Response Center: toll-free at 1-800-851-3420; via TTY at 301-240-6310 (hearing impaired only); email grants@ncjrs.gov; fax to 301-240-5830; or web chat at <https://webcontact.ncjrs.gov/ncjchat/chat.jsp>. The NCJRS Response Center hours of operation are 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. eastern time, Monday through Friday, and 10:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. eastern time on the solicitation close date. General information on applying for NIJ awards can be found at www.nij.gov/funding/Pages/welcome.aspx. Answers to frequently asked questions that may assist applicants are posted at www.nij.gov/funding/Pages/faqs.aspx

Grants.gov number assigned to this solicitation: NIJ-2017-11566

Release date: January 9, 2017

Contents

A. Program Description	4
Overview	4
Program-Specific Information	4
Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables	5
Evidence-Based Programs or Practices	7
B. Federal Award Information	7
Type of Award	8
Financial Management and System of Internal Controls	8
Budget Information	9
Cost Sharing or Match Requirement	9
Pre-Agreement Costs (also known as Pre-award Costs)	9
Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver	9
Prior Approval, Planning, and Reporting of Conference/Meeting/Training Costs	10
Costs Associated with Language Assistance (if applicable)	10
C. Eligibility Information	10
D. Application and Submission Information	10
What an Application Should Include	10
How to Apply	28
E. Application Review Information	32
Review Criteria for Purpose Area 1 – Forensic Pathology Fellowships	32
Review Criteria for Purpose Area 2 – Medical Examiner-Coroner Office Accreditation	34
Review Process	36
F. Federal Award Administration Information	38
Federal Award Notices	38
Administrative, National Policy, and Other Legal Requirements	38
General Information about Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements	39
G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s)	39
H. Other Information	39
Freedom of Information Act and Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552 and 5 U.S.C. 552a)	39
Provide Feedback to OJP	40
Application Checklist	41

Strengthening the Medical Examiner-Coroner System Program

CFDA No. 16.560

A. Program Description

Overview

With this solicitation, NIJ seeks proposals to strengthen the medical examiner/coroner (ME/C) system in the United States. Through this program, NIJ will support grants in two focus areas by:

- (1) supporting forensic pathology fellowships; and
- (2) providing resources necessary to achieve accreditation.

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

Program-Specific Information

The National Science and Technology Council's Fast-Track Action Committee on Strengthening the Medicolegal-Death-Investigation System's (FTAC-SMDIS) report titled [*Strengthening the Medicolegal-Death-Investigation System: Improving Data Systems*](#) notes that death investigations performed by ME/C offices are vital to criminal justice by investigating violent deaths. Of the estimated 2.6 million deaths annually, ME/C offices investigate nearly 500,000 cases in approximately 2,400 jurisdictions. FTAC-SMDIS found that the ME/C community lacks adequate personnel and resources to address the country's medicolegal death investigation (MDI) needs. In addition, FTAC-SMDIS reports that there are systemic issues with death investigation data quality and infrastructure, inadequate facilities, and inconsistent expertise levels.³ Other reports such as the 2009 National Academy of Sciences Report, [*Strengthening Forensic Science in the United States: A Path Forward*](#) have also asserted a need to address deficient facilities, equipment, staffing, education, and training for MDI.

Strengthening the Medical Examiner-Coroner System is a competitive program designed to support the enhancement of MDI services and increase the supply of forensic pathologists nationwide. NIJ is seeking proposals in two purpose areas:

[Purpose Area 1: Forensic Pathology Fellowships](#)

[Purpose Area 2: Medical Examiner-Coroner Office Accreditation](#)

³ White House National Science and Technology Council report on Strengthening the Medicolegal Death Investigation System: Improving Data Systems. September 2016.
https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/ostp/NSTC/strengthening_the_medicolegal_death_investigation_system_final.pdf.

Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables

The goals of the Strengthening the Medical Examiner-Coroner System program are to:

- 1) increase the supply of qualified forensic pathology practitioners; and
- 2) strengthen the quality and consistency of ME/C services.

Proposals are expected to *clearly* identify the purpose area to which they are applying.

Purpose Area 1: Forensic Pathology Fellowships

Competition ID: NIJ-2017-12060

Background: There is an extreme shortage of board-certified forensic pathologists in the United States,⁴ as underscored in the 2009 report by the National Academies of Sciences on strengthening forensic science in the United States.⁵ This call was reaffirmed by several recent reports developed through national initiatives dedicated to improve the quality and practice of forensic sciences. Both the National Commission on Forensic Science⁶ and the Office of Science and Technology Policy, Fast-Track Action Committee on Strengthening the Medicolegal Death Investigation System⁷ recommended investments in workforce development initiatives for forensic pathologists in order to increase their quantity and thereby support the medicolegal death investigation needs of our nation.⁸

Board-certified forensic pathologists are physicians who have completed, at a minimum, four years of medical school and three-to-four years of medical specialty training in anatomical pathology or anatomical and clinical pathology, followed by an accredited fellowship year in forensic pathology. Forensic pathology fellowships provide specialized training in autopsies and death scene investigations under direct supervision by a board-certified forensic pathologist, as well as general training in courtroom testimony, criminalistics, anthropology, odontology, toxicology, research techniques, and other forensic science-related specialties.⁹

Through this funding opportunity, applications are being solicited from institutions with ACGME-accredited forensic pathology fellowship programs to recruit quality candidates who have completed all necessary medical education and pathology residency requirements. This

⁴ National Commission on Forensic Science *Increasing the Number, Retention, and Quality of Board-Certified Forensic Pathologists*, August 2015 <https://www.justice.gov/ncfs/file/641646/download>.

⁵ National Research Council. *Strengthening Forensic Science in the United States: A Path Forward*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, 2009. doi:10.17226/12589. <https://www.nap.edu/catalog/12589/strengthening-forensic-science-in-the-united-states-a-path-forward>.

⁶ DOJ National Commission on Forensic Science. <https://www.justice.gov/ncfs>.

⁷ Views on Increasing the Number, Retention, and Quality of Board-Certified Forensic Pathologists. DOJ National Commission on Forensic Science. August 11, 2015. <https://www.justice.gov/ncfs/file/787356/download>.

⁸ White House National Science and Technology Council report on Strengthening the Medicolegal Death Investigation System: Improving Data Systems. September 2016. https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/ostp/NSTC/strengthening_the_medicolegal_death_investigation_system_final.pdf.

⁹ National Research Council, 256.

program will strengthen the ME/C system by increasing the number and quality of board-certified forensic pathologists.

Agencies that are awarded funds under this purpose area will be required to provide information to NIJ, generally in the form of semi-annual progress reports, throughout the duration of the award. These reports should describe all relevant progress, including any issues encountered and/or successes achieved. Awardees are encouraged to report to NIJ any additional information about the fellowship program that may assist NIJ to better serve the MDI community.

Purpose Area 2: Medical Examiner-Coroner Office Accreditation

Competition ID: NIJ-2017-12061

Background: Accreditation provides an independent measure of quality assurance by assessing that an office maintains written policies and procedures, and adequate staff, equipment, training, and suitable physical facilities to produce a forensically-documented, accurate, and credible death investigation product.^{10,11} The National Association of Medical Examiners (NAME)¹² and the International Association of Coroners and Medical Examiners (IACME)¹³ are examples of accrediting bodies that publish professional standards on procedures for conducting autopsies and medicolegal death investigations.

Through this funding opportunity, applications are being solicited from ME/C agencies seeking accreditation through an appropriate ME/C accrediting agency. This program will strengthen the quality of ME/C services in the United States by ensuring that agencies performing postmortem examinations are in compliance with industry and professional standards and performance criteria.

Agencies that are awarded funds under this purpose area will be required to provide information to NIJ, generally in the form of semi-annual progress reports, throughout the duration of the award. NIJ is interested in, among other things, understanding the advantages and challenges with implementing an accreditation program, especially when resources and policies vary among jurisdictions. Reports should address progress made in achieving accreditation and, for example, costs, benefits, and other technical, administrative, policy, or legal gaps that support, sustain, or limit the achievement of accreditation.

¹⁰ Recommendation on the Accreditation of Medicolegal Death Investigation Offices. DOJ National Commission on Forensic Science. January 30, 2015. <https://www.justice.gov/ncfs/file/787236/download>.

¹¹ National Research Council. *Strengthening Forensic Science in the United States: A Path Forward*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, 2009. doi:10.17226/12589, p.258. <https://www.nap.edu/catalog/12589/strengthening-forensic-science-in-the-united-states-a-path-forward>.

¹² National Association of Medical Examiners. Inspection and Accreditation. <https://netforum.avectra.com/eweb/DynamicPage.aspx?Site=name&WebCode=Accred> (Last accessed October 4, 2016).

¹³ International Association of Coroners and Medical Examiners. Accreditation. <http://www.theiacme.com/accreditation> (Last accessed October 4, 2016).

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

Evidence-Based Programs or Practices

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

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

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

B. Federal Award Information

Total funding for this solicitation and the number of awards made will depend on the availability of funds, the quality of the applications, and other pertinent factors. NIJ expects to award up to \$4 million under the FY 2017 Strengthening the Medical Examiner-Coroner System Program to institutions that administer an accredited forensic pathology fellowship program, and to state and local ME/C offices actively seeking accreditation. NIJ expects to make up to ten (10) one-year forensic pathology fellowship awards of \$100,000 each under [Purpose Area 1](#) of this solicitation. Funds may be used toward a salary/stipend for the fellow and related costs that may include fringe benefits (if applicable), at the applicant institution's discretion. Up to \$25,000, of the \$100,000, may be used for other related direct or indirect costs. Related costs may include any combination of the fellow's fees, project costs, professional society membership fees, or conference travel, among other allowable expenses incurred during the award period of performance. Under [Purpose Area 2](#), NIJ expects to make awards to support ME/C office accreditation with an estimated total amount awarded up to \$3,000,000. NIJ expects to make awards for a 24-month period of performance, to begin on January 1, 2018.

NIJ may elect to make multiple awards to a single host institution, and, in certain cases, provide additional funding in future years to awards made under this solicitation, through supplemental awards. In making decisions regarding supplemental awards, OJP will consider, among other factors, the availability of appropriations, OJP's strategic priorities, and OJP's assessment of

both the management of the award (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

NIJ expects that any award under this solicitation will be made in the form of a grant. See [Administrative, National Policy, and Other Legal Requirements](#), under [Section F. Federal Award Administration Information](#), for a brief discussion of important statutes, regulations, and award conditions that apply to many (or in some cases, all) OJP grants.

Financial Management and System of Internal Controls

Award recipients and subrecipients (including recipients or subrecipients that are pass-through entities¹⁴) must, as described in the Part 200 Uniform Requirements¹⁵ 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.

¹⁴ For purposes of this solicitation, the phrase “pass-through entity” includes any recipient or subrecipient that provides a subaward (“subgrant”) to a subrecipient (“subgrantee”) to carry out part of the funded award or program.

¹⁵ 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.

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

Budget Information

Cost Sharing or Match Requirement

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

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

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

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

Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver

With respect to any award of more than \$250,000 made under this solicitation, a recipient may not use federal funds to pay total cash compensation (salary plus cash bonuses) to any employee of the recipient at a rate that exceeds 110% of the maximum annual salary payable to a member of the federal government's Senior Executive Service (SES) at an agency with a Certified SES Performance Appraisal System for that year.¹⁶ 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 non-federal funds. (Non-federal funds used for any such additional compensation will not be considered matching funds, where match requirements apply.) If only a portion of an employee's time is charged to an OJP award, the maximum allowable compensation is equal to the percentage of time worked times the maximum salary limitation.

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

¹⁶ 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.

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

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

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

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 Awards” in the [OJP Funding Resource Center](#).

C. Eligibility Information

For eligibility information, see the title page.

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

D. Application and Submission Information

What an Application Should Include

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

Moreover, an applicant should anticipate that an application that OJP determines is nonresponsive to the scope of the solicitation, or that OJP determines does not include the application elements that NIJ has designated to be critical, will neither proceed to peer review, nor receive further consideration. For this solicitation, NIJ has designated the following application elements as critical: Program Narrative, Budget Detail Worksheet, Budget Narrative, and resumes/curriculum vitae of key personnel. An applicant may combine the Budget Narrative and the Budget Detail Worksheet in one document. However, if an applicant submits only one budget document, it must contain **both** narrative and detail information. Please review the “Note on File Names and File Types” under [How to Apply](#) (below) to be sure applications are submitted in permitted formats.

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

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

The SF-424 is a required standard form used as a cover sheet for submission of pre-applications, applications, and related information. Grants.gov and 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 a current, active award(s) must ensure that its GMS profile is current. If the profile is not current, the applicant should submit a Grant Adjustment Notice 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, 501C3, etc.) to confirm the legal name, address, and EIN entered into the SF-424.

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

2. Project Abstract

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

As a separate attachment, the project abstract will **not** count against the 15-page limit for the program narrative.

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

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

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

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

3. Program Narrative

The program narrative section of the application should not exceed 15 double-spaced pages in 12-point font with 1-inch margins. If included in the main body of the program narrative, tables, charts, figures, and other illustrations count toward the 15-page limit for the narrative section. The project abstract, table of contents, appendices, and government forms do not count toward the 15-page limit.

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

- a. Title Page (not counted against the 15-page program narrative limit)

The title page should include the title of the project, submission date, funding opportunity number, name and complete contact information (that is, address, telephone number, and e-mail address) for the applicant organization and purpose area ([Purpose Area 1: Forensic Pathology Fellowships](#) or [Purpose Area 2: Medical Examiner-Coroner Office Accreditation](#)).

b. Main Body

The main body of the program narrative should describe the proposed project in depth, and how funds will be used to improve ME/C services and strengthen the ME/C system in the United States. The following sections should be included as part of the program narrative:¹⁷

- Statement of the Problem.
 - Explain the importance of the problem or critical barrier to progress in the field that the proposed project addresses.
 - Explain the criminal justice significance of the problem.
- Project Design and Implementation.
 - Describe the overall strategy, methodology, and plan of activities to accomplish the specific aims of the project.
- Potential Impact.
 - Explain the criminal justice significance of the proposed project.
 - Explain how the application will strengthen the ME/C system and improve ME/C services.
- Capabilities and Competencies.
 - Describe each senior/key personnel's role in the project and why the individual is well-suited for that role.
- Plan for Collecting the Data Required for this Solicitation's Performance Measures.

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

NIJ does not require applicants to submit performance measures data with their application. Performance measures are included as an alert that NIJ will require successful applicants to submit specific data as part of their reporting requirements. For this application, applicants should indicate an understanding of these requirements and discuss how they will gather the required data. The application should describe the

¹⁷ For information on subawards (including the details on proposed subawards that should be included in the application), see "Budget and Associated Documentation" under [Section D. Application and Submission Information](#).

applicant's plan for collection of all of the performance measures data listed in the table below under "Data Recipient Provides," should it receive funding.

Performance Measures for Purpose Area 1: NIJ Forensic Pathology Fellowships:

Objective	Performance Measure(s)	Description	Data Recipient Provides
<p>Increase the capacity of ME/C services through the addition of qualified pathologists.</p>	<p>Percent increase of services provided.</p>	<p>The number of ME/C fellowship participants who completed fellowship training.</p>	<p>The number of participants who completed fellowship training.</p> <p>The number of overall fellowship participants.</p> <p>The number of fellowship participants funded through NIJ's Strengthening the Medical Examiner-Coroner System Program funding.</p>
		<p>Percentage of death investigations performed by fellows through grant funds.</p>	<p>Number of deaths investigated six (6) months prior to award start date.</p> <p>Number of deaths investigated during the reporting period.</p> <p>Total number of deaths investigated during the entire project.</p>
		<p>Percentage of autopsies performed by fellows through grant funds.</p>	<p>Number of autopsies performed during the six (6) month period prior to the award start date.</p> <p>Number of autopsies performed during each reporting period.</p> <p>Total number of autopsies performed during the entire project.</p>
		<p>Percent decrease of backlogs.</p>	<p>Reduction in the average number of days from date of death to the delivery of an autopsy report.</p>

		Percent reduction in the number of backlogged death investigation cases.	report during each reporting period. Average number of days to produce a autopsy report at the end of the project period.
	Quality of management as measured by such factors as whether significant project milestones were achieved, reporting and other deadlines were met, and costs remained within approved limits. Relevance to the needs of the field as measured by whether the project's substantive scope did not deviate from the funded proposal or any subsequent agency-approved modifications to the scope.		Quarterly financial reports, semi-annual and final progress reports of the work performed under the NIJ award, and, if applicable, an annual audit report.

In addition to the performance metrics, awardees will be required to provide to NIJ details about the impact and progress of the fellowship program in a narrative report. The agency should include any details about the number of fellowship applications prior to implementing the NIJ program and any changes noted in the number of fellowship applications received. Outreach efforts to increase the fellowship applicant pool as well as the results of these efforts should also be described.

Performance Measures for Purpose Area 2: Medical Examiner-Coroner Office Accreditation:

Objective	Performance Measure(s)	Description	Data Recipient Provides
To strengthen the quality of medical examiner-coroner services in the United States.	Increase in the number of accredited ME/C agencies.	Percentage of agencies/organizations that are accredited with Strengthening the Medical Examiner-Coroner System Program funding.	
	Percent increase in the number of certified individuals.	Percent of certified individuals.	Number of analysts. Number of certified analysts. Number of analysts seeking certification with Strengthening the Medical Examiner-

			Coroner System Program funding.
	<p>Quality of management as measured by such factors as whether significant project milestones were achieved, reporting and other deadlines were met, and costs remained within approved limits.</p> <p>Relevance to the needs of the field as measured by whether the project's substantive scope did not deviate from the funded proposal or any subsequent agency-approved modifications to the scope.</p>		<p>Quarterly financial reports, semi-annual and final progress reports of the work performed under the NIJ award, and, if applicable, an annual audit report.</p>
		Percentage of death investigations performed through grant funds.	<p>Number of deaths investigated six (6) months prior to award start date.</p> <p>Number of deaths investigated during the reporting period.</p> <p>Total number of deaths investigated during the entire project.</p>
		Percentage of autopsies performed through grant funds.	<p>Number of autopsies performed during the six (6) month period prior to the award start date.</p> <p>Number of autopsies performed during each reporting period.</p> <p>Total number of autopsies performed during the entire project.</p>
	Percent decrease of backlogs.	Reduction in the average number of days from date of death to the delivery of an autopsy report.	Average number of days to produce a final autopsy report prior to award start date.

		Percent reduction in the number of backlogged death investigation cases.	<p>Average number of days to produce a final autopsy report during each reporting period.</p> <p>Average number of days to produce an autopsy report at the end of the project period.</p>
	<p>Quality of management as measured by such factors as whether significant project milestones were achieved, reporting and other deadlines were met, and costs remained within approved limits.</p> <p>Relevance to the needs of the field as measured by whether the project's substantive scope did not deviate from the funded proposal or any subsequent agency-approved modifications to the scope.</p>		Quarterly financial reports, semi-annual and final progress reports of the work performed under the NIJ award, and, if applicable, an annual audit report.
			<p>Number of deaths certified as "undetermined" manner of death during the six (6) month period prior to the award start date.</p> <p>Number of deaths certified as "undetermined" manner of death performed during each reporting period.</p> <p>Total number of deaths certified as "undetermined" manner of death performed during the entire project.</p>
			Number of deaths certified as "undetermined" cause of death during the six

			<p>(6) month period prior to the award start date.</p> <p>Number of deaths certified as “undetermined” cause of death performed during each reporting period.</p> <p>Total number of deaths certified as “undetermined” cause of death performed during the entire project.</p>
--	--	--	---

In addition to the performance metrics, awardees under Purpose Area 2 will be required to provide to NIJ details about the impact and progress of the accreditation efforts in a narrative report. The report should include information on the level of effort provided towards accreditation processes and the progress made including the level of staffing and amount of time provided. Successes and pitfalls as well as any information NIJ can use towards the learning of ME/C accreditation processes, issues, and results should also be provided.

Note on Project Evaluations

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

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

For additional information on determining whether a proposed activity would constitute research for purposes of human subjects protection, applicants should consult the decision tree in the “Research and the protection of human subjects” section of the [“Requirements related to Research”](#) web page of the "Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements," available through the [OJP Funding Resource Center](#). Every prospective applicant whose application may propose a research or statistical component also should review the “Data Privacy and Confidentiality Requirements” section on that web page.

Appendices (not counted against the 15-page program narrative limit) include:

- a. Bibliography/references.
- b. Timelines and project plans with milestones.
- c. 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.
- d. For [Purpose Area 1](#): Forensic Pathology Fellowships: Forensic Pathology Fellowship Program Accreditation Documentation:
 - o Acceptable types of documentation of current accreditation include: an electronic (scanned) copy of the current accreditation certificate(s), a digital photograph of the current accreditation certificate(s), or a letter from the accrediting body that includes the certificate number. Additionally, if a certificate references another document that contains key information on the type or scope of the accreditation, provide a copy of that supplemental documentation. Independent accrediting or certifying organizations may include the Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education or other appropriate accrediting bodies.
- e. For [Purpose Area 2](#): Medical Examiner-Coroner Office Accreditation: Forensic Laboratory Accreditation Documentation:
 - o Acceptable types of documentation of current accreditation include: an electronic (scanned) copy of the current accreditation certificate(s), a digital photograph of the current accreditation certificate(s), or a letter from the accrediting body that includes the certificate number. Additionally, if a certificate references another document that contains key information on the type or scope of the accreditation, provide a copy of that supplemental documentation. Independent accrediting or certifying organizations may include the National Association of Medical Examiners (NAME) and the International Association of Coroners and Medical Examiners (IACME), or other appropriate accrediting bodies. If the office is not currently accredited, applicants may provide supporting documentation that demonstrate activities seeking achievement of accreditation.
- f. Organizational chart of the applicant agency and all proposed collaborators involved in the project. Include project-related staffing plans and narratives for each organizational chart, proposed new hires, and any anticipated staffing changes related to the Strengthening the Medical Examiner-Coroner System Program funding if received.
- g. Curriculum vitae or resumes of the all key personnel. In addition, curriculum vitae, resumes, or biographical sketches of all known others who will be significantly involved in substantive aspects of the project.
- h. List (to the extent known) of all proposed project staff members, including those affiliated with the applicant organization or any proposed subrecipients organization(s), any proposed consultant(s) and contractors (whether individuals or organizations), and any proposed members of an advisory board for the project (if applicable). The list should

include, for each individual and organization: name, title (if applicable), employer or other organizational affiliation, and roles and responsibilities proposed for the project. Applicants should use the “Proposed Project Staff, Affiliation, and Roles” form available at www.nij.gov/funding/documents/nij-project-staff-template.xlsx to provide this listing.

- i. List of any previous and current NIJ awards to applicant organization, including the NIJ-assigned award numbers and a brief description of any products that resulted in whole or in part from work funded under the NIJ award(s).
- j. Letters of cooperation/support or administrative agreements from organizations collaborating in the project, such as law enforcement and correctional agencies (if applicable).
- k. List of other agencies, organizations, or funding sources to which this proposal has been submitted (if applicable).

4. Budget and Associated Documentation

a. Budget Detail Worksheet

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

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

b. Budget Narrative

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. Information on proposed subawards

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

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

If an applicant proposes to make one or more subawards to carry out the federal award and program, the applicant should— (1) identify (if known) the proposed subrecipient(s),

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

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

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

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

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

d. Pre-Agreement Costs

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

5. Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable)

Indirect costs may be charged to an award only if:

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

An applicant with a current (that is, unexpired) federally-approved indirect cost rate is to attach a copy of the indirect cost rate agreement to the application. An applicant that does not have a current federally-approved rate may request one through its cognizant federal

agency, which will review all documentation and approve a rate for the applicant entity, or, if the applicant's accounting system permits, applicants may propose to allocate costs in the direct cost categories.

For assistance with identifying the appropriate cognizant federal agency for indirect costs, please contact the OCFO Customer Service Center at 1-800-458-0786 or at ask.ocfo@usdoj.gov. If DOJ is the cognizant federal agency, applicants may obtain information needed to submit an indirect cost rate proposal at <http://www.ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/IndirectCosts.pdf>.

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

6. Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable)

A tribe, tribal organization, or third party that proposes to provide direct services or assistance to residents on tribal lands should include in its application a resolution, letter, affidavit, or other documentation, as appropriate, that demonstrates (as a legal matter) that the applicant has the requisite authorization from the tribe(s) to implement the proposed project on tribal lands. In those instances when an organization or consortium of tribes applies for an award on behalf of a tribe or multiple specific tribes, the application should include appropriate legal documentation, as described above, from all tribes that would receive services or assistance under the award. A consortium of tribes for which existing consortium bylaws allow action without support from all tribes in the consortium (i.e., without an authorizing resolution or comparable legal documentation from each tribal governing body) may submit, instead, a copy of its consortium bylaws with the application.

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

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

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

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

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

8. Disclosure of Lobbying Activities

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

9. Additional Attachments

a. Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications

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

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

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

- The federal or State funding agency.
- The solicitation name/project name.

- The point of contact information at the applicable federal or State funding agency.

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

Each applicant should include the table as a separate attachment to its application. The file should be named “Disclosure of Pending Applications.” The applicant Legal Name on the application must match the entity named on the disclosure of pending applications statement.

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

b. Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity

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

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

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

such conflicts of interest – whether personal or financial or organizational (including on the part of the applicant entity or on the part of staff, investigators, or subrecipients) – that could affect the independence or integrity of the research, including the design, conduct, and reporting of the research.

OR

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

OR

- b. If the applicant has identified actual or potential apparent conflicts of interest (personal, financial, or organizational) that could affect the independence and

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

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

c. Disclosure of Process Related to Executive Compensation

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

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

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

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

At a minimum, the disclosure must describe in pertinent detail: (1) the composition of the body that reviews and approves compensation arrangements for covered persons; (2) the methods and practices used by the applicant nonprofit organization to ensure that no individual with a conflict of interest participates as a member of the body that reviews and approves a compensation arrangement for a covered person;

(3) the appropriate data as to comparability of compensation that is obtained in advance and relied upon by the body that reviews and approves compensation arrangements for covered persons; and (4) the written or electronic records that the applicant organization maintains as concurrent documentation of the decisions with respect to compensation of covered persons made by the body that reviews and approves such compensation arrangements, including records of deliberations and of the basis for decisions.

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

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

How to Apply

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

All applicants are required to complete the following steps:

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

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

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

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

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

DUNS number or apply online at www.dnb.com. A DUNS number is usually received within 1-2 business days.

- 2. Acquire registration with 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 <http://www.grants.gov/web/grants/applicants/individual-registration.html>.
- 4. Acquire confirmation for the AOR from the E-Business Point of Contact (E-Biz POC).** The E-Biz POC at the applicant organization must log into Grants.gov to confirm the applicant organization's AOR. The E-Biz POC will need the Marketing Partner Identification Number (MPIN) password obtained when registering with SAM to complete this step. Note that an organization can have more than one AOR.
- 5. Search for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov.** Use the following identifying information when searching for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov. The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance ("CFDA") number for this solicitation is 16.560, titled "National Institute of Justice Research, Evaluation, and Development Project Grants," and the funding opportunity number is NIJ-2017-11566.
- 6. Select the correct Competition ID.** Some OJP solicitations posted to Grants.gov contain multiple purpose areas, denoted by the individual Competition ID. If applying to a solicitation with multiple Competition IDs, select the appropriate Competition ID for the intended purpose area of the application.
 - [Purpose Area 1: Forensic Pathology Fellowships](#) — NIJ-2017-12060
 - [Purpose Area 2: Medical Examiner-Coroner Office Accreditation](#) — NIJ-2017-12061
- 7. Submit a valid application consistent with this solicitation by following the directions in Grants.gov.** Within 24–48 hours after submitting the electronic application, the applicant should receive two notifications from Grants.gov. The first will confirm the receipt of the

application. The second will state whether the application has been validated and successfully submitted, or whether it has been rejected due to errors, with an explanation. It is possible to first receive a message indicating that the application is received, and then receive a rejection notice a few minutes or hours later. Submitting an application well ahead of the deadline provides time to correct the problem(s) that caused the rejection. **Important:** OJP urges each applicant to submit its application **at least 72 hours prior** to the application due date, to allow time to receive validation messages or rejection notifications from Grants.gov, and to correct in a timely fashion any problems that may have caused a rejection notification. Applications must be successfully submitted through Grants.gov by 11:59 p.m. eastern time on March 20, 2017.

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

Note: Application Versions

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

Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues

An applicant that experiences unforeseen Grants.gov technical issues beyond its control that prevent it from submitting its application by the deadline must contact the Grants.gov [Customer Support Hotline](#) or the [SAM Help Desk](#) (Federal Service Desk) to report the technical issue and receive a tracking number. The applicant must email the NIJ contact identified in the Contact Information section on the title page **within 24 hours after the application deadline** to request approval to submit its application after the deadline. The applicant's email must describe the technical difficulties, and must include a timeline of the applicant's submission efforts, the complete grant application, the applicant's DUNS number, and any Grants.gov Help Desk or SAM tracking number(s).

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

The following conditions generally are insufficient to justify late submissions:

- Failure to register in SAM or Grants.gov in sufficient time (SAM registration and renewal can take as long as 10 business days to complete. The information transfer from SAM to Grants.gov can take up to 48 hours.)
- Failure to follow Grants.gov instructions on how to register and apply as posted on its website.
- Failure to follow each instruction in the OJP solicitation.

- Technical issues with the applicant's computer or information technology environment, such as issues with firewalls or browser incompatibility.

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

E. Application Review Information

Review Criteria

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

Within these sections, the narrative should address:

- Purpose, goals, and objectives.
- Review of relevant literature.
- Any planned products (e.g. guidelines, protocols, and operational documents).
- Implications for criminal justice policy and practice in the United States.
- Management plan and organization.
- Any plans for disseminating information to broader audiences (if applicable to the proposed project).

Review Criteria for [Purpose Area 1 – Forensic Pathology Fellowships](#)

Statement of the Problem/Description of the Issue (Understanding of the problem and its importance) (15%)

1. Demonstrated understanding of the problem that exists in the ME/C system in the United States.
2. Demonstrated awareness of the current state of ME/C issues.
3. Impact of funding on the ME/C system and ME/C services in the United States.

Project Design and Implementation (Quality and technical merit) (15%)

1. Awareness of the state of ME/C system and ME/C services in the United States.
2. Soundness of methods and approach to addressing the stated objectives of the proposed project. The overall strategy should be well reasoned and appropriate to accomplish the goals of the project.
3. Feasibility of proposed project.

4. Awareness of pitfalls of the proposed project design and actions to minimize and/or mitigate them.
5. Innovation and creativity (when appropriate).

Expected Outcomes/Potential Impact (30%)

1. Description of the expected outcome(s) of the project. Anticipated forensic pathology fellowships to be completed and anticipated forensic pathology fellowship processes to be initiated and/or assisted through the program.
2. Potential for significantly improved understanding of the stated problem. If the goals of the project are achieved, how will scientific knowledge, technical capability, and/or MDI practice in the criminal justice system be improved?
3. What is the likelihood that the project will exert a sustained, powerful influence on the MDI field(s) as related to criminal justice?
4. Potential for innovative solution to address (all or a significant part of) the stated criminal/justice problem. How will successful completion change the concepts, methods, technologies, treatments, or services that drive MDI as it relates to criminal justice? How will a successful project address the identified ME/C problem and associated critical barriers to progress?
5. Potential to increase the awareness of best practices for the ME/C community.

Capabilities and Competencies (15%)

1. Qualifications and experience of proposed project staff (including all individuals and organizations identified in the application who will be significantly involved in substantive aspects of the proposal).
2. Demonstrated ability of the applicant organization to manage the effort.
3. Relationship between the capabilities/competencies of the proposed project staff (including the applicant organization) and the scope of the proposed project.
4. Strength of the environment (e.g., institutional and jurisdictional support, equipment and other physical resources, or collaborative arrangements) in which the work will be done and its contribution to the probability of success. Does the program meet or exceed AGCME-accredited forensic pathology fellowship requirements?
5. Affordability and cost-effectiveness of proposed approach.

Plan for Collecting the Data Required for this Solicitation's Performance Measures (Relevance to policy and practice) (15%)

1. Demonstrated plan for collection of the performance measure data as described in the solicitation.

Budget: Complete, Cost Effective, and Allowable (e.g., reasonable, allocable, and necessary for project activities). Budget narratives should demonstrate generally how applicants would maximize cost effectiveness of grant expenditures. Budget narratives should demonstrate cost effectiveness in relation to potential alternatives and the goals of the project.¹⁸ (10%)

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

Review Criteria for [Purpose Area 2 – Medical Examiner-Coroner Office Accreditation](#)

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

Statement of the Problem/Description of the Issue (Understanding of the problem and its importance) (15%)

1. Demonstrated understanding of the problem that exists in the ME/C system in the United States.
2. Demonstrated awareness of the current state of ME/C issues.
3. Impact of funding ME/C accreditation activities on the ME/C system and ME/C services in the United States.

Project Design and Implementation (Quality and technical merit) (15%)

1. Awareness of the state of ME/C accreditation on the ME/C system and ME/C services in the United States.
2. Soundness of methods and approach to addressing the stated objectives of the proposed project. The overall strategy should be well reasoned and appropriate to accomplish the goals of the project.
3. Feasibility of proposed project.
4. Awareness of pitfalls of the proposed project design and actions to minimize and/or mitigate them.
5. Innovation and creativity (when appropriate).

¹⁸ Generally speaking, a reasonable cost is a cost that, in its nature or amount, does not exceed that which would be incurred by a prudent person under the circumstances prevailing at the time the decision was made to incur the costs.

Expected Outcomes/Potential Impact (30%)

1. Description of the expected outcome(s) of the project. Anticipated accreditation processes to be completed and anticipated accreditation processes to be initiated or assisted through the program.
2. Potential for significantly improved understanding of the stated problem. If the goals of the project are achieved, how will scientific knowledge, technical capability, and/or MDI practice be improved?
3. What is the likelihood that the project will exert a sustained, powerful influence on the MDI field(s) as related to criminal justice?
4. Potential for innovative solution to address (all or a significant part of) the stated criminal justice problem. How will successful completion change the concepts, methods, technologies, treatments, or services that drive MDI as it relates to criminal justice? How will a successful project address the identified ME/C problem and associated critical barriers to progress?
5. Potential to increase the awareness of best practices for the ME/C community.
6. Potential to improve the understanding of scientific rationale underpinning existing ME/C practices.
7. Potential for innovative protocols to increase the efficiency, accuracy, reliability or cost-effectiveness of medicolegal death investigations.

Capabilities and Competencies (15%)

1. Qualifications and experience of proposed project staff (including all individuals and organizations identified in the application who will be significantly involved in substantive aspects of the proposal).
2. Demonstrated ability of the applicant organization to manage the effort.
3. Relationship between the capabilities/competencies of the proposed project staff (including the applicant organization) and the scope of the proposed project.
4. Strength of the environment (e.g., institutional and jurisdictional support, equipment and other physical resources, or collaborative arrangements) in which the work will be done and its contribution to the probability of success.
5. Affordability and cost-effectiveness of proposed approach.

Plan for Collecting the Data Required for this Solicitation's Performance Measures (Relevance to policy and practice) (15%)

1. Demonstrated plan for collection of the performance measure data as described in the solicitation.

Budget: Complete, Cost Effective, and Allowable (e.g., reasonable, allocable, and necessary for project activities). Budget narratives should demonstrate generally how applicants would maximize cost effectiveness of grant expenditures. Budget narratives should demonstrate cost effectiveness in relation to potential alternatives and the goals of the project.¹⁹ (10%)

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

Review Process

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

Peer reviewers will review the applications submitted under this solicitation that meet basic minimum requirements. 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. NIJ 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

¹⁹ Generally speaking, a reasonable cost is a cost that, in its nature or amount, does not exceed that which would be incurred by a prudent person under the circumstances prevailing at the time the decision was made to incur the costs.

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

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

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

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

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

Absent explicit statutory authorization or written delegation of authority to the contrary, all final award decisions will be made by the Assistant Attorney General, who may take into account not only peer review ratings and NIJ recommendations, but also other factors as indicated in this section.

F. Federal Award Administration Information

Federal Award Notices

Award notifications will be made by September 30, 2017. OJP sends award notifications by email through GMS to the individuals listed in the application as the point of contact and the authorizing official (E-Biz POC and AOR). The email notification includes detailed instructions on how to access and view the award documents, and steps to take in GMS to start the award acceptance process. GMS automatically issues the notifications at 9:00 p.m. eastern time on the award date.

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

Administrative, National Policy, and Other Legal Requirements

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

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

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

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

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

General Information about Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements

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

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

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

Special reporting requirements may be required as appropriate.

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

G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s)

For questions directed to OJP, see NCJRS contact information on the title page.

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

H. Other Information

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

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

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

circumstances, OJP will request the views of the applicant/recipient that submitted a responsive document.

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

Provide Feedback to OJP

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

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

If you are interested in being a reviewer for other OJP grant applications, please email your résumé to 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

Strengthening the Medical Examiner-Coroner System Program

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 29)

_____ Acquire or renew registration with SAM (see page 30)

To Register with Grants.gov:

_____ Acquire AOR and Grants.gov username/password (see page 30)

_____ Acquire AOR confirmation from the E-Biz POC (see page 30)

To Find Funding Opportunity:

_____ Search for the Funding Opportunity on Grants.gov (see page 30)

_____ Select the correct Competition ID (see page 30)

_____ Download Funding Opportunity and Application Package (see page 30)

_____ Sign up for Grants.gov email [notifications](#) (optional) (see page 28)

_____ 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 10)

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 30)

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

_____ See NCJRS contact information on the title page

Overview of Post-Award Legal Requirements:

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

Scope Requirement:

_____ The federal amount requested is within the allowable limit(s) of \$100,000 per fellowship for Purpose 1.

Eligibility Requirement: Eligible applicants are States (including territories), units of local government, federally recognized Indian tribal governments (as determined by the Secretary of the Interior) that perform law enforcement functions, non-profit and for-profit organizations (including tribal non-profit and for-profit organizations), institutions of higher education (including tribal institutions of higher education), and certain qualified individuals.

What an Application Should Include:

_____ Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424) (see page 11)

_____ Project Abstract (see page 11)

_____	Program Narrative	(see page 12)
_____	Budget Detail Worksheet	(see page 20)
_____	Budget Narrative	(see page 20)
_____	Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable)	(see page 22)
_____	Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable)	(see page 23)
_____	Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire	(see page 23)
_____	Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (SF-LLL)	(see page 24)
_____	Additional Attachments	
_____	Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications	(see page 24)
_____	Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity	(see page 25)
_____	Disclosure of Process related to Executive Compensation	(see page 27)
_____	CVs/Resumes (critical element)	(see page 19)
_____	Request and Justification for Employee Compensation; Waiver (if applicable)	
	(see page 9)	