

Nonprofit Security Grant Program Scoring Matrix

Reviewers should use this document as a reference when scoring applications under the Nonprofit Security Grant Program (NSGP).

I – Applicant Information				
Question	Criteria	Score	Explanations	
1	Did the applicant provide all the required information in the Applicant Information Section?	The applicant should provide all information as it is applicable in the informational section.	Yes	The applicant did provide all the required information.
			No	The applicant did not provide all the required information.
II - Background				
Question	Criteria	Score	Explanations	
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?	Applicants 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 applicant 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.
			1	The applicant 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.
			2	The applicant 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.
			3	The applicant 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.
3	Did the applicant provide a description of their nonprofit organization to include any role in responding to or recovering from events that integrate nonprofit preparedness with broader state/local preparedness efforts?	Applicants must clearly describe their individual organization's previous or existing role in response to or in recovery efforts to terrorist attacks. This should tie into the broader preparedness efforts of state and/or local government.	0	The applicant did not provide a description of the organization that included any role in responding to or recovering from events that integrate nonprofit preparedness with broader state/local efforts.
			1	The applicant 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 applicant provided 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.

III - Risk

Question	Criteria	Score	Explanations
<p>4 Did the applicant discuss specific threats or attacks against the nonprofit organization or closely related organization?</p>	<p>To substantiate the applicant's risk to a terrorist attack, applicants may describe incidents that have occurred at or threats that have been made to their organization. Applicants may also draw from incidents that have occurred at closely related/similar organizations either domestically or internationally; the applicant should make the connection that they are at risk for the same reasons. Local crimes such as burglary, theft, or vandalism without a terrorism or hate-related nexus may provide context justification for NSGP funding.</p>	0	The applicant did not discuss specific threats or attacks against the organization or a closely related organization.
		1	The applicant provided minimal discussion of threats or attacks against the organization or a closely related organization.
		2	The applicant provided poor discussion of threats or attacks against the organization or a closely related organization.
		3	The applicant provided adequate discussion of threats or attacks against the organization or a closely related organization.
		4	The applicant provided good discussion of threats or attacks against the organization or a closely related organization.
		5	The applicant provided multiple, detailed, and specific threats or attacks against the organization or a closely related organization.
<p>5 In considering vulnerabilities, how well did the applicant describe the organization's susceptibility to destruction, incapacitation, or exploitation by a terrorist attack?</p>	<p>Applicants must provide a clear description of findings from a completed vulnerability assessment.</p>	0	The applicant did not discuss or describe the organization's susceptibility to attack.
		1	The applicant provided minimal description of the organization's susceptibility to attack.
		2	The applicant provided poor description of the organization's susceptibility to attack.
		3	The applicant provided adequate description of the organization's susceptibility to attack.
		4	The applicant provided good description of the organization's susceptibility to attack.
		5	The applicant provided clear, relevant, and compelling description of the organization's susceptibility.
<p>6 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?</p>	<p>Applicants should describe how an attack would impact them, the community served, and if possible/applicable, beyond the immediate individuals served (nearby critical infrastructure, businesses, transportation, schools, etc.).</p>	0	The applicant did not discuss or describe the potential negative consequences the organization may face.
		1	The applicant provided minimal description of the potential negative consequences the organization may face.
		2	The applicant provided poor description of the potential negative consequences the organization may face.
		3	The applicant provided adequate description of the potential negative consequences the organization may face.
		4	The applicant provided good description of the potential negative consequences the organization may face.
		5	The applicant provided a clear, relevant, and compelling description of the potential negative consequences the organization may face.

IV – Facility Hardening

Question	Criteria	Score	Explanations	
7	How well does the applicant describe the proposed facility hardening activities, projects, and/or equipment and relate their proposals to the vulnerabilities described in Question 6?	In narrative form in Section IV-A, applicants 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 the vulnerability assessment in Section III (Question 6).	0	The applicant did 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.
8	Did the applicant's proposed facility hardening activity focus on the prevention of and/or protection against the risk of a terrorist attack?	The proposed activities, projects, and equipment should directly tie to the prevention of and/or protection against the risk of terrorist attack.	0	The proposed facility hardening activities do not focus on the prevention of and/or protection against the risk of terrorist attack.
			1	The proposed facility hardening activities are somewhat focused on the prevention of and/or protection against the risk of terrorist attack.
			2	The proposed facility hardening activities are adequately focused on the prevention of and/or protection against the risk of terrorist attack.
			3	The proposed facility hardening activities are clearly and effectively focused on the prevention of and/or protection against the risk of terrorist attack.
9	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 in the Section IV-B table.	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 effectively address the listed vulnerability.

V – Milestones

Question	Criteria	Score	Explanations	
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?	The applicant 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 applicant did not provide information on milestones and associated key activities.
			1	The applicant provided some description of milestone events and the associated key activities over the NSGP POP.
			2	The applicant provided adequate description of milestone events and the associated key activities over the NSGP POP.
			3	The applicant fully and effectively described milestone events and the associated key activities over the NSGP POP.
11	Did the applicant 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 mo.), 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 applicant did not include milestones and key activities that are feasible over the NSGP POP.
			1	The applicant included milestones and key activities that are somewhat feasible over the NSGP POP.
			2	The applicant included milestones and key activities that are feasible over the NSGP POP.

VI – Project Management

Question	Criteria	Score	Explanations	
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?	Brief description of the project manager(s) and level of experience.	0	The applicant did not justify the effectiveness of the proposed management team or the structure in place to support implementation.
			1	The applicant somewhat justified the effectiveness of the proposed management team and the structure in place to support implementation.
			2	The applicant fully justified the effectiveness of the proposed management team and the structure in place to support implementation.

VII – Impact

Question	Criteria	Score	Explanations
13	How well did the applicant describe the outcomes/outputs that would indicate that the investment was successful?	Measurable outputs and outcomes should directly link to the vulnerabilities and consequences outline in Section III.	0 The applicant did not describe the outcomes and/or outputs that would indicate the investment was successful.
		1 The applicant provided minimal information on the outcomes and/or outputs that would indicate the investment was successful.	
		2 The applicant provided some information on the outcomes and/or outputs that would indicate the investment was successful.	
		3 The applicant provided an adequate discussion of the outcomes and/or outputs that would indicate the investment was successful.	
		4 The applicant provided a full and detailed description of the outcomes and/or outputs that would indicate the investment was successful.	