

FY 2011 NONPROFIT SECURITY GRANT PROGRAM (NSGP)

Investment Justification Scoring Worksheet

FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2011 NONPROFIT SECURITY GRANT PROGRAM (NSGP) INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION SCORING WORKSHEET	
State	<input style="width: 90%;" type="text"/>
Urban Area	<input style="width: 90%;" type="text"/>
Name of the Nonprofit Organization	<input style="width: 90%;" type="text"/>
FY 2011 NSGP Federal Funding Request	<input style="width: 90%;" type="text"/>
Scoring Legend	
Did Not	The applicant provided no response
Poor	The applicant's response is incomplete and does not address all of the required information
Partial	The applicant's response is complete but minimally addresses all of the required information
Adequate	The applicant's response is complete and moderately addresses all of the required information
Thorough	The applicant's response is complete and fully addresses all of the required information
I. Applicant Information (Unscored)	
1. Did the applicant provide all of the required information?	
No	The applicant did not provide all of the required information
Yes	The applicant did provide all of the required information
<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="checkbox"/>	<input style="width: 90%;" type="text"/>
II. Background (Total of 2 possible points)	
2. Did the applicant provide a description of their nonprofit organization to include:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Membership and community served ▪ Integration of nonprofit preparedness with broader State and local preparedness efforts to include coordination with the Citizen Corps Council ▪ Symbolic value of the site as a highly recognized national or historical institution that renders the site as a possible target of terrorism ▪ Any role in responding to or recovering from terrorist attacks 	
0 = The applicant did not provide any of the required information regarding their nonprofit organization	
1 = The applicant provided some of the required information regarding their nonprofit organization	
2 = The applicant provided all of the required information regarding their nonprofit organization	
Score	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="checkbox"/> <input style="width: 90%;" type="text"/>
III. Risk (Total of 12 possible points)	
3. In considering threat, how well did the applicant address findings from previously conducted risk assessments, police reports, and/or insurance claims?	
0 = The applicant did not address findings from previously conducted risk assessments, police reports, and/or insurance claims	
1 = The applicant poorly addressed findings from previously conducted risk assessments, police reports, and/or insurance claims	
2 = The applicant partially addressed findings from previously conducted risk assessments, police reports, and/or insurance claims	
3 = The applicant adequately addressed findings from previously conducted risk assessments, police reports, and/or insurance claims	
4 = The applicant thoroughly addressed findings from previously conducted risk assessments, police reports, and/or insurance claims	
Score	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="checkbox"/> <input style="width: 90%;" type="text"/>

FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2011 NONPROFIT SECURITY GRANT PROGRAM (NSGP)
INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION SCORING WORKSHEET

4. In considering vulnerabilities, how well did the applicant address the organization's susceptibility to destruction, incapacitation, or exploitation by a terrorist attack?

- 0 = The applicant **did not** address the organization's susceptibility to destruction, incapacitation, or exploitation by a terrorist attack
- 1 = The applicant **poorly** addressed the organization's susceptibility to destruction, incapacitation, or exploitation by a terrorist attack
- 2 = The applicant **partially** addressed the organization's susceptibility to destruction, incapacitation, or exploitation by a terrorist attack
- 3 = The applicant **adequately** addressed the organization's susceptibility to destruction, incapacitation, or exploitation by a terrorist attack
- 4 = The applicant **thoroughly** addressed the organization's susceptibility to destruction, incapacitation, or exploitation by a terrorist attack

Score

5. In considering potential consequences, how well did the applicant address potential negative effects on the organization's asset, system, and/or network if damaged, destroyed, or disrupted by a terrorist attack?

- 0 = The applicant **did not** address potential negative effects on the organization's asset, system, and/or network if damaged, destroyed, or disrupted by a terrorist attack
- 1 = The applicant **poorly** addressed potential negative effects on the organization's asset, system, and/or network if damaged, destroyed, or disrupted by a terrorist attack
- 2 = The applicant **partially** addressed potential negative effects on the organization's asset, system, and/or network if damaged, destroyed, or disrupted by a terrorist attack
- 3 = The applicant **adequately** addressed potential negative effects on the organization's asset, system, and/or network if damaged, destroyed, or disrupted by a terrorist attack
- 4 = The applicant **thoroughly** addressed potential negative effects on the organization's asset, system, and/or network if damaged, destroyed, or disrupted by a terrorist attack

Score

IV. Target Hardening (Total of 8 possible points)

6. Did the applicant describe how the proposed target hardening activity will mitigate the identified risk(s)?

- 0 = The applicant **did not** provide a description of how the proposed target hardening activity will mitigate the identified risk(s)
- 1 = The applicant provided a **poor** description of how the proposed target hardening activity will mitigate the identified risk(s)
- 2 = The applicant provided a **partial** description of how the proposed target hardening activity will mitigate the identified risk(s)
- 3 = The applicant provided an **adequate** description of how the proposed target hardening activity will mitigate the identified risk(s)
- 4 = The applicant provided a **thorough** description of how the proposed target hardening activity will mitigate the identified risk(s)

Score

7. Did the applicant's proposed target hardening activity focus on the prevention of and/or protection against the risk of a terrorist attack?

- 0 = The applicant's target hardening activity **did not** focus on the prevention of and/or protection against the risk of a terrorist attack
- 1 = The applicant's target hardening activity **poorly** focused on the prevention of and/or protection against the risk of a terrorist attack
- 2 = The applicant's target hardening activity **partially** focused on the prevention of and/or protection against the risk of a terrorist attack
- 3 = The applicant's target hardening activity **adequately** focused on the prevention of and/or protection against the risk of a terrorist attack
- 4 = The applicant's target hardening activity **thoroughly** focused on the prevention of and/or protection against the risk of a terrorist attack

Score

FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2011 NONPROFIT SECURITY GRANT PROGRAM (NSGP)
INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION SCORING WORKSHEET

V. Milestones (Total of 9 possible points)

8. Did the applicant provide specific milestones that present a clear sequence of events that will allow the Investment to reach its objectives during the FY 2011 NSGP period of performance?

0 = No, the applicant **did not** provide specific milestones that present a clear sequence of events that will allow the Investment to reach its objectives during the FY 2011 NSGP period of performance (**please proceed to question 13**)

1 = Yes, the applicant **did** provide specific milestones that present a clear sequence of events that will allow the Investment to reach its objectives during the FY 2011 NSGP period of performance (**please proceed to question 11**)

9. How well do the milestones collectively present a clear sequence of events that effectively build upon each other and would allow the applicants to reach its intended objectives during the FY 2011 NSGP period of performance?

0 = The milestones identified **do not** present a clear sequence of events that effectively build upon each other and would allow the applicant to reach its intended objectives during the FY 2011 NSGP period of performance

1 = The milestones present a **poorly** defined sequence of events that effectively build upon each other and would allow the applicant to reach its intended objectives during the FY 2011 NSGP period of performance

2 = The milestones present a **partially** defined sequence of events that effectively build upon each other and would allow the applicant to reach its intended objectives during the FY 2011 NSGP period of performance

3 = The milestones present a **adequately** defined sequence of events that effectively build upon each other and would allow the applicant to reach its intended objectives during the FY 2011 NSGP period of performance

4 = The milestones present a **thoroughly** defined sequence of events that effectively build upon each other and would allow the applicant to reach its intended objectives during the FY 2011 NSGP period of performance

Score

10. How well did the applicant describe the milestones as well as associated key activities that lead to the milestone event over the FY 2011 NSGP period of performance?

0 = The applicant **did not** provide a description of milestones and associated activities that lead to the milestone event over the FY 2011 NSGP period of performance

1 = The applicant provided a **poor** description of milestones and associated activities that lead to the milestone event over the FY 2011 NSGP period of performance

2 = The applicant provided a **partial** description of milestones and associated activities that lead to the milestone event over the FY 2011 NSGP period of performance

3 = The applicant provided an **adequate** description of milestones and associated activities that lead to the milestone event over the FY 2011 NSGP period of performance

4 = The applicant provided a **thorough** description of milestones and associated activities that lead to the milestone event over the FY 2011 NSGP period of performance

Score

VI. Project Management (Total of 5 possible points)

11. Has the applicant described, at high-level, the roles and responsibilities of the management team, governance structures, and subject matter expertise required in managing the Investment?

0 = No, the applicant **did not** describe the management team's roles and responsibilities, governance structure, or subject matter expertise required to manage the Investment

1 = Yes, the applicant **did** describe the management team's roles and responsibilities, governance structure, and subject matter expertise required to manage the Investment

Score

FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2011 NONPROFIT SECURITY GRANT PROGRAM (NSGP)
INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION SCORING WORKSHEET

12. How well did the applicant justify the effectiveness of the proposed management team's roles and responsibilities and governance structure to support the implementation of the Investment?

- 0 = The applicant **did not** justify the effectiveness of the proposed management team's roles and responsibilities and governance structure to support the implementation of the Investment
- 1 = The applicant **poorly** justified the effectiveness of the proposed management team's roles and responsibilities and governance structure to support the implementation of the Investment
- 2 = The applicant **partially** justified the effectiveness of the proposed management team's roles and responsibilities and governance structure to support the implementation of the Investment
- 3 = The applicant **adequately** justified the effectiveness of the proposed management team's roles and responsibilities and governance structure to support the implementation of the Investment
- 4 = The applicant **thoroughly** justified the effectiveness of the proposed management team's roles and responsibilities and governance structure to support the implementation of the Investment

Score

VII. Impact (Total of 4 possible points)

13. Did the applicant provide a brief description of how outcomes will mitigate risk outlined in the Background and Risk sections of the Investment Justification?

- 0 = The applicant **did not** provide a brief description of how outcomes will mitigate risk outlined in the Background and Risk sections of the Investment Justification
- 1 = The applicant **poorly** provided a brief description of how outcomes will mitigate risk outlined in the Background and Risk sections of the Investment Justification
- 2 = The applicant **partially** provided a brief description of how outcomes will mitigate risk outlined in the Background and Risk sections of the Investment Justification
- 3 = The applicant **adequately** provided a brief description of how outcomes will mitigate risk outlined in the Background and Risk sections of the Investment Justification
- 4 = The applicant **thoroughly** provided a brief description of how outcomes will mitigate risk outlined in the Background and Risk sections of the Investment Justification

Score

VII. Optional Cost Match (Unscored)

14. Did the applicant choose to participate in the FY 2011 NSGP optional cash or in-kind cost match? (Note: The participation in the optional cost match will not have an impact on the scoring process or the amount of funding awarded under FY 2011 NSGP)

- No** = The applicant **did not** choose to participate in the FY 2011 NSGP optional cash or in-kind cost match
- Yes** = The applicant **did** choose to participate in the FY 2011 NSGP optional cash or in-kind cost match

Total Score

Total Investment Justification Score:

Based on a possible score of **40**, this Investment Justification scored a:

0