

**The U. S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS)
Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO)
Fiscal Year 2024 Nonprofit Security Grant Program**

Appendix A: Evaluation Criteria and Scoring

SAA Reviewers will score applications based on specific criteria aligned to the NSGP's intent. The table below details the specific criteria aligned to each of the IJ requirements, and the maximum number of points an application can receive for each criterion. The SAA Reviewers will score applications based on specific criteria aligned to the IJ requirements. Each question will be scored based on the complexity within the requirement.

Investment Justification Requirement	Criteria	Score	Explanation
Applicant Information Section			
Did the subapplicant provide all the required information in the Applicant Information Section?	The subapplicant should provide all information as it is applicable in the informational section.	Yes	The subapplicant did provide all the required information.
		No	The subapplicant did not provide all the required information.
Background Information Section			
Did the subapplicant 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 and other extremist attacks?	Subapplicants must describe their organization, its mission/purpose, the symbolic value of the building/organization, and how these factors may make it the target of an attack.	0	The subapplicant did not provide a description of the organization including the symbolic value of the site as a highly recognized institution that renders the site a possible target of terrorism or other extremist attacks.
		1	The subapplicant provided a poor description of the organization including the symbolic value of the site as a highly recognized institution that renders the site a possible target of terrorism or other extremist attacks.
		2	The subapplicant provided an adequate description of the organization including the symbolic value of the site as a highly recognized institution that renders the site a possible target of terrorism or other extremist attacks.
		3	The subapplicant provided a full, clear, and effective description of the organization including the symbolic value of the site as a highly recognized institution that renders the site a possible target of terrorism or other extremist attacks.
Did the subapplicant provide a description of their nonprofit organization to include	Subapplicants must clearly describe their individual organization's previous	0	The subapplicant did not provide a description of the organization that included any role in responding to or

Investment Justification Requirement	Criteria	Score	Explanation
any role in responding to or recovering from events that integrate nonprofit preparedness with broader state/local preparedness efforts?	or existing role in response to or in recovery efforts to terrorist or other extremist attacks. This should tie into the broader preparedness efforts of state and/or local government.		recovering from events that integrate nonprofit preparedness with broader state/local efforts.
		1	The subapplicant provided some description of the organization that included any role in responding to or recovering from events that integrate nonprofit preparedness with broader state/local efforts.
		2	The subapplicant provides a full, clear, and effective description of the organization that included any role in responding to or recovering from events that integrate nonprofit preparedness with broader state/local efforts.
Risk			
Did the subapplicant discuss specific threats or attacks against the nonprofit organization or closely related organization?	To substantiate the subapplicant’s risk to a terrorist or other extremist attack, subapplicants may describe incidents that have occurred at or threats that have been made to their organization. Subapplicants may also draw from incidents that have occurred at closely related/similar organizations either domestically or internationally; the subapplicant should make the connection that they are at risk for the same reasons. Local crimes such as burglary,	0	The subapplicant does not discuss specific threats or attacks against the organization or a closely related organization.
		1	The subapplicant provided minimal discussion of threats or attacks against the organization or a closely related organization.
		2	The subapplicant provided poor discussion of threats or attacks against the organization or a closely related organization.
		3	The subapplicant provided adequate discussion of threats or attacks against the organization or a closely related organization.
		4	The subapplicant provided good discussion of threats or

Investment Justification Requirement	Criteria	Score	Explanation
	theft, or vandalism without a terrorism, extremism, or hate-related nexus may provide contextual justification for NSGP funding.	5	attacks against the organization or a closely related organization. The subapplicant provided multiple, detailed, and specific threats or attacks against the organization or a closely related organization.
In considering the vulnerabilities, how well did the subapplicant describe the organization's susceptibility to destruction, incapacitation, or exploitation by a terrorist or other extremist attack?	Subapplicants must provide a clear description of findings from a completed vulnerability assessment.	0	The subapplicant did not discuss or describe the organization's susceptibility to attack.
		1	The subapplicant provided minimal description of the organization's susceptibility to attack.
		2	The subapplicant provided poor description of the organization's susceptibility to attack.
		3	The subapplicant provided adequate description of the organization's susceptibility to attack.
		4	The subapplicant provided good description of the organization's susceptibility to attack.
		5	The subapplicant provided clear, relevant, and compelling description of the organization's susceptibility.
In considering potential consequences, how well did the subapplicant address potential negative effects on the organization's asset, system, and/or network if damaged, destroyed, or disrupted by a terrorist or other extremist attack?	Subapplicants should describe how an attack would impact them, the community served, and if possible/applicable, beyond the immediate individuals served (nearby critical infrastructure, businesses,	0	The subapplicant did not discuss or describe the potential negative consequences the organization may face.
		1	The subapplicant provided minimal description of the potential negative consequences the organization may face.

Investment Justification Requirement	Criteria	Score	Explanation
	transportation, schools, etc.).	2	The subapplicant provided poor description of the potential negative consequences the organization may face.
		3	The subapplicant provided adequate description of the potential negative consequences the organization may face.
		4	The subapplicant provided good description of the potential negative consequences the organization may face.
		5	The subapplicant provided a clear, relevant, and compelling description of the potential negative consequences the organization may face.
Facility Hardening			
How well does the subapplicant describe the proposed facility hardening activities, projects, and/or equipment and relate their proposals to the vulnerabilities described in the “Risk” Section?	In narrative form, subapplicants must clearly explain what the proposed activities, projects, and/or equipment are, identify their estimated cost, and describe how they will mitigate or address vulnerabilities identified in their vulnerability assessment.	0	The subapplicant does not propose facility hardening or the proposals do not mitigate identified risk(s) and/or vulnerabilities.
		1	Proposed activities, projects, or equipment may provide minimal facility hardening or are only minimally related to some of the identified risk(s) and/or vulnerabilities.
		2	Proposed facility hardening activities, projects, or equipment would likely mitigate identified risk(s) and/or vulnerabilities.
		3	Proposed facility hardening activities, projects, or equipment are clearly aligned with and effectively mitigate the identified risk(s) and/or vulnerabilities.

Investment Justification Requirement	Criteria	Score	Explanation
Did the subapplicant's proposed facility hardening activity focus on the prevention of and/or protection against the risk of a terrorist or other extremist attack?	The proposed activities, projects, and equipment should directly tie to the prevention of and/or protection against the risk of terrorist or other extremist attacks.	0	The proposed facility hardening activities do not focus on the prevention of and/or protection against the risk of terrorist or other extremist attacks.
		1	The proposed facility hardening activities are somewhat focused on the prevention of and/or protection against the risk of terrorist or other extremist attacks.
		2	The proposed facility hardening activities are adequately focused on the prevention of and/or protection against the risk of terrorist or other extremist attacks.
		3	The proposed facility hardening activities are clearly and effectively focused on the prevention of and/or protection against the risk of terrorist or other extremist attacks.
Are all proposed equipment, activities, and/or projects tied to a vulnerability that it could reasonably address/mitigate?	The proposed equipment, activities, and/or projects should mitigate/address the vulnerability tied to it.	0	No vulnerabilities are listed and/or the proposed equipment, activities, or projects do not address listed vulnerabilities.
		1	The proposed equipment/activities/projects are somewhat reasonable to address the listed vulnerability.
		2	The proposed equipment/activities/projects are mostly reasonable to address the listed vulnerability.
		3	The proposed equipment/activities/projects

Investment Justification Requirement	Criteria	Score	Explanation
			effectively address the listed vulnerability.
Milestones			
How well did the subapplicant describe the milestones and the associated key activities that lead to the milestone event over the NSGP period of performance?	The subapplicant should describe the milestones needed to accomplish the goals of the NSGP funding and should include the key activities that will be necessary to accomplish those milestones.	0	The subapplicant did not provide information on milestones and associated key activities.
		1	The subapplicant provided some description of milestone events and the associated key activities over the NSGP POP.
		2	The subapplicant provided adequate description of milestone events and the associated key activities over the NSGP POP.
		3	The subapplicant fully and effectively described milestone events and the associated key activities over the NSGP POP.
Did the subapplicant include milestones and associated key activities that are feasible over the NSGP period of performance?	Milestones should be realistic, potentially include the entire period of performance (36 months), be inclusive of all proposed activities, and consider the Environmental Planning and Historic Preservation review process. Milestones should not exceed 36 months and should not begin prior to the Period of Performance	0	The subapplicant did not include milestones and key activities that are feasible over the NSGP POP.
		1	The subapplicant included milestones and key activities that are somewhat feasible over the NSGP POP.
		2	The subapplicant included milestones and key activities that are feasible over the NSGP POP.
Project Management			
How well did the subapplicant justify the effectiveness of the proposed management team's roles and responsibilities and the	Brief description of the project manager(s) and level of experience.	0	The subapplicant did not justify the effectiveness of the proposed management team or the structure in place to support the implementation.
		1	The subapplicant somewhat

Investment Justification Requirement	Criteria	Score	Explanation
governance structure to support implementation of the Investment?			justified the effectiveness of the proposed management team and the structure in place to the support implementation.
		2	The subapplicant fully justified the effectiveness of the proposed management team and the structure in place to the support implementation.
Impact			
How well did the subapplicant describe the outcomes/outputs that would indicate that the Investment was successful?	Measurable outputs and outcomes should directly link to the vulnerabilities and consequences outlined in the “Risk” Section.	0	The subapplicant did not describe the outcomes and/or outputs that would indicate the Investment was successful.
		1	The subapplicant provided minimal information on the outcomes and/or outputs that would indicate the Investment was successful.
		2	The subapplicant provided some information on the outcomes and/or outputs that would indicate the Investment was successful.
		3	The subapplicant provided an adequate discussion of the outcomes and/or outputs that would indicate the Investment was successful.
		4	The subapplicant provided a full and detailed description of the outcomes and/or outputs that would indicate the Investment was successful.