

FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2017 NONPROFIT SECURITY GRANT PROGRAM (NSGP)  
INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION SCORING WORKSHEET

State	<input type="text"/>
Urban Area	<input type="text"/>
Name of the Nonprofit Organization	<input type="text"/>
FY 2017 NSGP Federal Funding Request	<input type="text"/>

*Scoring Legend*

<b>Did Not</b>	The applicant provided <b>no</b> response
<b>Poor</b>	The applicant's response is <b>incomplete</b> and <b>does not</b> address all of the required information
<b>Partial</b>	The applicant's response is <b>complete</b> but <b>minimally</b> addresses all of the required information
<b>Adequate</b>	The applicant's response is <b>complete</b> and <b>moderately</b> addresses all of the required information
<b>Thorough</b>	The applicant's response is <b>complete</b> and <b>fully</b> addresses all of the required information

*I. Applicant Information (Unscored)*

**1. Did the applicant provide all of the required information in the Applicant Information Section ?**

**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:**

- Symbolic value of the site as a highly recognized national or historical institution or significant institution within the community 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 a response to all 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. 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*

FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2017 NONPROFIT SECURITY GRANT PROGRAM (NSGP)  
INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION SCORING WORKSHEET

**4. In considering vulnerabilities, how well did the applicant describe 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 14 possible points)*

**6. How well does the proposed target hardening activity mitigate the identified risk(s) and/or vulnerabilities?**

- 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) 2017 NONPROFIT SECURITY GRANT PROGRAM (NSGP)  
INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION SCORING WORKSHEET

**8. Did the applicant propose projects that are allowable based on the priorities of the program?**

- 0 = The proposed projects are not allowable based on the priorities of the program
- 1 = The proposed projects are partially allowable and the unallowability will compromise the successful implementation of the project.
- 2 = The proposed projects are partially allowable but could be resolved with a minor modification to the proposed project
- 3 = The proposed projects are all allowable based on the priorities of the program.

Score

**9. Did the applicant propose projects that are feasible based on the priorities of the program?**

- 0 = The proposed projects are not feasible based on the priorities of the program
- 1 = The proposed projects could be feasible but require significant changes.
- 2 = The proposed projects could be feasible but require minor changes.
- 3 = The proposed projects are feasible based on the priorities of the program.

Score

*V. Milestones (Total of 4 possible points)*

**10. How well did the applicant describe the milestones and the associated key activities that lead to the milestone event over the FY 2017 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 2017 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 2017 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 2017 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 2017 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 2017 NSGP period of performance

Score

FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2017 NONPROFIT SECURITY GRANT PROGRAM (NSGP)  
INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION SCORING WORKSHEET

*VI. Project Management (Total of 3 possible points)*

**11. 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 **partially** 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 **adequately** 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 **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 5 possible points)*

**12. How well did the applicant describe the outcomes/outputs that would indicate that the investment was successful?**

- 0 = The applicant did not discuss what outcomes/outputs indicate that the investment was successful
- 1 = The applicant poorly discussed what outcomes/outputs indicate that the investment was successful
- 2 = The applicant partially discussed what outcomes/outputs indicate that the investment was successful
- 3 = The applicant adequately discussed what outcomes/outputs indicate that the investment was successful
- 4 = The applicant thoroughly what outcomes/outputs indicate that the investment was successful

Score

**13. Did the applicant describe how the investment supports building or sustaining the identified Goal Core Capabilities?**

- 0 = The applicant did not provide a description of how the investment supports building or sustaining the identified Goal Core Capabilities
- 1 = The applicant provide a description of how the investment supports building or sustaining the identified Goal Core Capabilities

Score

*Total Score*

**Total Investment Justification Score:**

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