

FY 2010 NONPROFIT SECURITY GRANT PROGRAM

Investment Justification Scoring Worksheet

FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2010 NONPROFIT SECURITY GRANT PROGRAM (NSGP) INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION SCORING WORKSHEET

The FY 2010 NSGP Scoring Worksheet below will be used by the State Administrative Agency (SAA) to review and score FY 2010 NSGP applications consistent with the guidelines provided in the FY 2010 NSGP Investment Justification and Selection Criteria as well as ensure consistency with programmatic requirements. **SAA's will receive a separate, Excel-based FY 2010 NSGP Scoring Worksheet upon the release of the FY 2010 Nonprofit Security Grant Program Guidance and Application Kit.** Each applicant's final score along with the SAA's prioritization will be used to populate the Excel-based FY 2010 NSGP Prioritization of Investment Justifications, also provided to SAA's as a separate attachment, which will be used to determine the applicants that will advance to the Federal review process and make funding recommendations to the Secretary of Homeland Security.

State

Urban Area

Name of the Nonprofit Organization

FY 2010 NSGP Federal Funding Request

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

II. Background (Total of 2 possible points)

2. Did the applicant provide a description of their nonprofit organization to include:

- Membership and community served
- Involvement in their local Citizen Corps Council
- Symbolic value of the site(s) as a highly recognized national or historical institution that renders the site as a possible terrorism target
- Any role in responding to or recovering from terrorist attacks

- 0 = The applicant **did not** provided 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

III. Investment Heading (Unscored)

3. 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

IV. Baseline (Unscored)

4. Did the applicant indicate whether or not the nonprofit organization has received DHS or NSGP funding in the past, to include: funding source, funding amount, funding year, and the investment type?

- No** The applicant **did not** provide any of the required information
- Yes** The applicant **did** provided all of the required information

V. Risk (Total of 12 possible points)

5. 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

FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2010 NONPROFIT SECURITY GRANT PROGRAM (NSGP)
INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION SCORING WORKSHEET

- 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

6. 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

7. 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

VI. Target Hardening (Total of 8 possible points)

8. 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

9. 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

FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2010 NONPROFIT SECURITY GRANT PROGRAM (NSGP)
INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION SCORING WORKSHEET

4 = The applicant's target hardening activity **thoroughly** focused on the prevention of and/or protection against the risk of a terrorist attack

Score

VII. Milestones (Total of 9 possible points)

10. 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 2010 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 2010 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 2010 NSGP period of performance (please proceed to question 11)

11. 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 2010 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 2010 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 2010 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 2010 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 2010 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 2010 NSGP period of performance

Score

12. How well did the applicant describe the milestones as well as associated key activities that lead to the milestone event over the FY 2010 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 2010 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 2010 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 2010 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 2010 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 2010 NSGP period of performance

Score

VIII. Project Management (Total of 5 possible points)

13. 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

14. 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

FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2010 NONPROFIT SECURITY GRANT PROGRAM (NSGP)
INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION SCORING WORKSHEET

- 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

IX. Impact (Total of 4 possible points)

15. 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

X. Optional Cost Share (Unscored)

16. Did the applicant choose to participate in the FY 2010 NSGP optional cash or in-kind cost share? (Note: The participation in the optional cost share will not have an impact on the scoring process or the amount of funding awarded under FY 2010 NSGP)

- No** = The applicant **did not** choose to participate in the FY 2010 NSGP optional cash or in-kind cost share
- Yes** = The applicant **did** choose to participate in the FY 2010 NSGP optional cash or in-kind cost share

Total Score

Total Investment Justification Score:

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