

## Appendix A: Evaluation Criteria and Scoring

SAA Reviewers will score applications based on specific criteria aligned to the NSGP-NSS'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   |
|---|--|-------|---|
| <b>Applicant Information Section</b>  |  |       |   |
| 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 <b>did</b> provide all the required information.   |
|   |  | No    | The subapplicant <b>did not</b> provide all the required information.   |
| <b>Background Information Section</b>   |  |       |   |
| Did the subapplicant provide a description of their organization or the consortium to include symbolic value as a highly recognized national or historical institution or significant institution within the community that renders the subapplicant as a possible target of terrorism and other extremist attacks? | Subapplicants must describe their organization or the consortium, its mission/purpose, the symbolic value of the building(s)/organization(s), and how these factors may make it the target of an attack. | 0     | The subapplicant <b>did not provide a description</b> of the organization or the consortium including the symbolic value as a highly recognized institution that renders the subapplicant a possible target of terrorism or other extremist attacks.    |
|   |  | 1     | The subapplicant <b>provided a poor description</b> of the organization or the consortium including the symbolic value as a highly recognized institution that renders the subapplicant a possible target of terrorism or other extremist attacks.      |
|   |  | 2     | The subapplicant <b>provided an adequate description</b> of the organization or the consortium including the symbolic value as a highly recognized institution that renders the subapplicant a possible target of terrorism or other extremist attacks. |

| Investment Justification Requirement  | Criteria   | Score | Explanation  |
|---|--|-------|--|
|   |  | 3     | The subapplicant <b>provided a full, clear, and effective description</b> of the organization or the consortium including the symbolic value as a highly recognized institution that renders the subapplicant a possible target of terrorism or other extremist attacks. |
| Did the subapplicant provide a description of their organization or consortium to include any role in responding to or recovering from events that integrate organization preparedness with broader state/local preparedness efforts? | Subapplicants must clearly describe their individual organization's or consortium's previous 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. | 0     | The subapplicant <b>did not provide a description</b> of the organization or consortium that included any role in responding to or recovering from events that integrate nonprofit preparedness with broader state/local efforts.  |
|   |  | 1     | The subapplicant <b>provided some description</b> of the organization or consortium that included any role in responding to or recovering from events that integrate nonprofit preparedness with broader state/local efforts.  |
|   |  | 2     | The subapplicant <b>provides a full, clear, and effective description</b> of the organization or consortium that included any role in responding to or recovering from events that integrate nonprofit preparedness with broader state/local efforts.                    |
| <b>Risk</b>   |  |       |  |
| Did the subapplicant self-identify as facing heightened threat resulting from the Israel-Hamas war?   |  | No    | The subapplicant <b>does not self-identify</b> as facing heightened threat resulting from the Israel-Hamas war.  |
|   |  | Yes   | The subapplicant <b>self-identifies</b> as facing heightened threat resulting  |

| Investment Justification Requirement   | Criteria   | Score | Explanation  |
|--|--|-------|--|
|  |  |       | from the Israel-Hamas war.   |
| Did the subapplicant discuss specific threats or attacks against the organization, a closely related organization, or organizations within the consortium? | 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 or organizations within the consortium. 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, theft, or vandalism without a terrorism, extremism, or hate-related nexus may provide contextual justification for NSGP-NSS funding. | 0     | The subapplicant <b>does not discuss specific</b> threats or attacks against the organization, a closely related organization, or organizations within the consortium.                 |
|  |  | 1     | The subapplicant <b>provided minimal discussion of</b> threats or attacks against the organization, a closely related organization, or organizations within the consortium.            |
|  |  | 2     | The subapplicant <b>provided poor discussion of</b> threats or attacks against the organization, a closely related organization, or organizations within the consortium.               |
|  |  | 3     | The subapplicant <b>provided adequate discussion of</b> threats or attacks against the organization, a closely related organization, or organizations within the consortium.           |
|  |  | 4     | The subapplicant <b>provided good discussion of</b> threats or attacks against the organization, a closely related organization, or organizations within the consortium.               |
|  |  | 5     | The subapplicant <b>provided multiple, detailed, and specific</b> threats or attacks against the organization, a closely related organization, or organizations within the consortium. |
| In considering the vulnerabilities, how well did the subapplicant describe   | Subapplicants must provide a clear description of findings from a  | 0     | The subapplicant <b>did not discuss or describe</b> the organization’s or the consortium’s susceptibility to   |

| Investment Justification Requirement  | Criteria  | Score | Explanation  |
|---|---|-------|--|
| the organization or the consortium's susceptibility to destruction, incapacitation, or exploitation by a terrorist or other extremist attack?   | completed vulnerability assessment(s).  |       | attack.  |
|   |   | 1     | The subapplicant <b>provided minimal description</b> of the organization's or the consortium's susceptibility to attack.             |
|   |   | 2     | The subapplicant <b>provided poor description</b> of the organization's or the consortium's susceptibility to attack.                |
|   |   | 3     | The subapplicant <b>provided adequate description</b> of the organization's or the consortium's susceptibility to attack.            |
|   |   | 4     | The subapplicant <b>provided good description</b> of the organization's or the consortium's susceptibility to attack.                |
| In considering potential consequences, how well did the subapplicant address potential negative effects on the organization's or consortium'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, transportation, schools, etc.). | 0     | The subapplicant <b>did not discuss or describe</b> the potential negative consequences the organization or consortium may face.     |
|   |   | 1     | The subapplicant <b>provided minimal description</b> of the potential negative consequences the organization or consortium may face. |
|   |   | 2     | The subapplicant <b>provided poor description</b> of the potential negative consequences the   |

| Investment Justification Requirement  | Criteria  | Score | Explanation  |
|---|---|-------|--|
|   |   |       | organization or consortium may face.   |
|   |   | 3     | The subapplicant <b>provided adequate description</b> of the potential negative consequences the organization or consortium may face.  |
|   |   | 4     | The subapplicant <b>provided good description</b> of the potential negative consequences the organization or consortium may face.  |
|   |   | 5     | The subapplicant <b>provided a clear, relevant, and compelling description</b> of the potential negative consequences the organization or consortium may face.                           |
| <b>Facility Hardening</b>   |   |       |  |
| 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 <b>does not propose</b> facility hardening or the proposals do not mitigate identified risk(s) and/or vulnerabilities.  |
|   |   | 1     | Proposed activities, projects, or equipment <b>may provide minimal</b> facility hardening <b>or are only minimally related</b> to some of the identified risk(s) and/or vulnerabilities. |
|   |   | 2     | Proposed facility hardening activities, projects, or equipment <b>would likely mitigate</b> identified risk(s) and/or vulnerabilities.   |
|   |   | 3     | Proposed facility hardening activities, projects, or equipment are <b>clearly aligned with and effectively</b>   |

| Investment Justification Requirement  | Criteria  | Score | Explanation  |
|---|---|-------|--|
|   |   |       | <b>mitigate</b> the identified risk(s) and/or vulnerabilities.   |
| 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 <b>do not focus</b> on the prevention of and/or protection against the risk of terrorist or other extremist attacks.                        |
|   |   | 1     | The proposed facility hardening activities <b>are somewhat focused</b> on the prevention of and/or protection against the risk of terrorist or other extremist attacks.                |
|   |   | 2     | The proposed facility hardening activities <b>are adequately focused</b> on the prevention of and/or protection against the risk of terrorist or other extremist attacks.              |
|   |   | 3     | The proposed facility hardening activities <b>are clearly and effectively focused</b> 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     | <b>No vulnerabilities are listed</b> and/or the proposed equipment, activities, or projects <b>do not address listed vulnerabilities.</b>  |
|   |   | 1     | The proposed equipment/activities/projects <b>are somewhat reasonable</b> to address the listed vulnerability.   |
|   |   | 2     | The proposed equipment/activities/projects <b>are mostly reasonable</b> to address the listed  |

| Investment Justification Requirement  | Criteria  | Score | Explanation  |
|---|---|-------|--|
|   |   | 3     | vulnerability.<br>The proposed equipment/activities/projects <b>effectively address</b> the listed vulnerability.                  |
| <b>Milestones</b>   |   |       |  |
| How well did the subapplicant describe the milestones and the associated key activities that lead to the milestone event over the NSGP-NSS period of performance? | The subapplicant should describe the milestones needed to accomplish the goals of the NSGP-NSS funding and should include the key activities that will be necessary to accomplish those milestones.   | 0     | The subapplicant <b>did not provide</b> information on milestones and associated key activities.                                   |
|   |   | 1     | The subapplicant <b>provided some description</b> of milestone events and the associated key activities over the NSGP-NSS POP.     |
|   |   | 2     | The subapplicant <b>provided adequate description</b> of milestone events and the associated key activities over the NSGP-NSS POP. |
|   |   | 3     | The subapplicant <b>fully and effectively described</b> milestone events and the associated key activities over the NSGP-NSS POP.  |
| Did the subapplicant include milestones and associated key activities that are feasible over the NSGP-NSS 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 <b>did not include</b> milestones and key activities that are feasible over the NSGP-NSS POP.                     |
|   |   | 1     | The subapplicant included milestones and key activities that are <b>somewhat feasible</b> over the NSGP-NSS POP.                   |
|   |   | 2     | The subapplicant included milestones and key activities that <b>are feasible</b> over the NSGP-NSS POP.                            |
| <b>Project Management</b>   |   |       |  |
| How well did the subapplicant justify the effectiveness of the  | Brief description of the project manager(s) and level of experience.  | 0     | The subapplicant <b>did not justify</b> the effectiveness of the proposed management   |

| Investment Justification Requirement  | Criteria   | Score | Explanation  |
|---|--|-------|--|
| proposed management team's roles and responsibilities and the governance structure to support implementation of the Investment? |  |       | team or the structure in place to support the implementation.  |
|   |  | 1     | The subapplicant <b>somewhat justified</b> the effectiveness of the proposed management team and the structure in place to the support implementation. |
|   |  | 2     | The subapplicant <b>fully justified</b> the effectiveness of the proposed management team and the structure in place to the support implementation.    |
| <b>Impact</b>   |  |       |  |
| 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 <b>did not describe</b> the outcomes and/or outputs that would indicate the Investment was successful.                                |
|   |  | 1     | The subapplicant <b>provided minimal information</b> on the outcomes and/or outputs that would indicate the Investment was successful.                 |
|   |  | 2     | The subapplicant <b>provided some information</b> on the outcomes and/or outputs that would indicate the Investment was successful.                    |
|   |  | 3     | The subapplicant <b>provided an adequate discussion</b> of the outcomes and/or outputs that would indicate the Investment was successful.              |
|   |  | 4     | The subapplicant <b>provided a full and detailed description</b> of the outcomes and/or outputs that would indicate the Investment was successful.     |