

**NONPROFIT SECURITY GRANT PROGRAM (NSGP)  
INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION SCORING WORKSHEET**

<b>State or Territory</b>	<input type="text"/>
<b>Urban Area (if applicable)</b>	<input type="text"/>
<b>Name of the Nonprofit Organization</b>	<input type="text"/>
<b>NSGP Federal Funding Request</b>	<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

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

NONPROFIT SECURITY GRANT PROGRAM (NSGP)  
INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION SCORING WORKSHEET

Score

**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 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 NSGP period of performance
- 1 = The applicant provided a poor description of milestones and associated activities that lead to the milestone event over the NSGP period of performance
- 2 = The applicant provided a partial description of milestones and associated activities that lead to the milestone event over the NSGP period of performance
- 3 = The applicant provided an adequate description of milestones and associated activities that lead to the milestone event over the NSGP period of performance
- 4 = The applicant provided a thorough description of milestones and associated activities that lead to the milestone event over the NSGP period of performance

Score

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: