### 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
   - 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
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### IV. Target Hardening (Total of 14 possible points)

#### 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 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
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.

---

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.

---

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
### 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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Score: [Blank Box]

### 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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>The applicant did not discuss what outcomes/outputs indicate that the investment was successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The applicant poorly discussed what outcomes/outputs indicate that the investment was successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The applicant partially discussed what outcomes/outputs indicate that the investment was successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The applicant adequately discussed what outcomes/outputs indicate that the investment was successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The applicant thoroughly what outcomes/outputs indicate that the investment was successful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Score: [Blank Box]

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>The applicant did not provide a description of how the investment supports building or sustaining the identified Goal Core Capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The applicant provide a description of how the investment supports building or sustaining the identified Goal Core Capabilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Score: [Blank Box]

---

**Total Score**

**Total Investment Justification Score:**

Based on a possible score of **40**, this Investment Justification scored a: [Blank Box]