

recipients, other than States that are required to use Part 92 procedures, must justify any anticipated procurement action that is expected to be awarded without competition and exceed the simplified acquisition threshold fixed at 41 U.S.C. 403(11) currently set at \$100,000. Recipients might be required to make available to ACF pre-award review and procurement documents, such as request for proposals or invitations for bids, independent cost estimates, etc.

Note: Whenever the applicant intends to delegate part of the project to another agency, the applicant must provide a detailed budget and budget narrative for each delegate agency, by agency title, along with the required supporting information referred to in these instructions.

Other

Enter the total of all other costs. Such costs, where applicable and appropriate, may include but are not limited to insurance, food, medical and dental costs (non-contractual), professional services costs, space and equipment rentals, printing and publication, computer use, training costs, such as tuition and stipends, staff development costs, and administrative costs.

Justification: Provide computations, a narrative description and a justification for each cost under this category.

Indirect Charges

Description: Total amount of indirect costs. This category should be used only when the applicant currently has an indirect cost rate approved by the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) or another cognizant Federal agency.

Justification: An applicant that will charge indirect costs to the grant must enclose a copy of the current rate agreement. If the applicant organization is in the process of initially developing or renegotiating a rate, it should immediately upon notification that an award will be made, develop a tentative indirect cost rate proposal based on its most recently completed fiscal year in accordance with the principles set forth in the cognizant agency's guidelines for establishing indirect cost rates, and submit it to the cognizant agency. Applicants awaiting approval of their indirect cost proposals may also request indirect costs. It should be noted that when an indirect cost rate is requested, those costs included in the indirect cost pool should not also be charged as direct costs to the grant. Also, if the applicant is requesting a rate which is less than what is allowed under the program, the authorized representative of the applicant organization must

submit a signed acknowledgment that the applicant is accepting a lower rate than allowed.

Program Income

Description: The estimated amount of income, if any, expected to be generated from this project.

Justification: Describe the nature, source and anticipated use of program income in the budget or refer to the pages in the application that contain this information.

Total Direct Charges, Total Indirect Charges, Total Project Costs

Self-explanatory.

Evaluation Criteria

1. **Approach**—(25 points) The applicant provides a clear explanation of a feasible, appropriate, and complete plan for establishing subsidized employment opportunities for refugee participants, including evidence of subsequent permanent employment. The proposed activities and timeframes are reasonable and feasible. The applicant has described the planning and/or consultation efforts undertaken. The applicant identifies local employers who have made commitments to the project and describes them (e.g., number and types of jobs, supportive services and training, qualifications, and salary levels, etc.) The applicant includes a description of the proposed plan for recruitment and for selecting refugees for participation. There is a clear description of the availability and planned use of other community services and resources for refugee employment. The strategy and plan are likely to achieve proposed results and lead to increased permanent employment opportunities for refugees.

2. **Results or Benefits Expected**—(20 points) The outcomes and benefits proposed are reasonable and reflect the objectives of this announcement. The applicant clearly identifies the results and benefits to be derived for refugees and their families as well as for the community. Proposed outcomes are measurable and achievable within the grant project period, and the proposed monitoring, information collection, and documentation are appropriately designed to assess project performance.

3. **Organizational Profiles**—(20 points) Applicant organization and staff and partner organizations are well qualified and have demonstrated the capability to implement and manage new programs, to recruit and work with the refugee population, and to manage employment programs for refugees. The administrative and management features of the project, including a plan for fiscal

and programmatic management of each activity and planning activities, are described in detail with proposed start-up times, ongoing timelines, major milestones or benchmarks, a component/project organization chart, and a staffing chart. The qualifications of project staff are documented. The applicant has provided a copy of its most recent audit report. If appropriate, written agreements between grantees and sub-grantees or other cooperating entities, detailing work to be performed, remuneration, and other terms and conditions that structure or define the relationship to this project, are provided.

4. **Budget and Budget Justification**—(20 points) The budget and narrative justification are reasonable, clearly presented, and cost-effective in relation to the proposed activities and anticipated results. The methodologies for estimating the number of refugee participants are reasonable. The projected cost per job placement is reasonable.

5. **Objectives and Need for Assistance**—(15 points) The applicant identifies and documents the characteristics of the refugee population and/or community to be assisted and clearly describes the need for subsidized employment for this population. Indicators of the need for assistance and of low rates of assimilation may include reliance on public assistance, incomes below 200 percent of the Federal poverty level, and low rates of employment, education, access to financial institutions, and car and home ownership.

Part III: The Review Process

Intergovernmental Review

This program is covered under Executive Order 12372, "Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs," and 45 CFR part 100, "Intergovernmental Review of Department of Health and Human Services Programs and Activities." Under the Order, States may design their own processes for reviewing and commenting on proposed federal assistance under covered programs.

All States and Territories except Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, Connecticut, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Palau, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, and Wyoming have elected not to participate in the Executive Order process. Applicants from these twenty-six jurisdictions need take no action