

Table Reference
Merit Reviews/Noncompetitive Justifications

| Grant Types | | Minimum # of Technical/ Merit Reviews | Noncompetitive Justification Yes or No |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|--|
| Definitions of grant types and funds are found in the DOC Manual, Chapter 6. | | | |
| New application: | discretionary competitive | 3 | No |
| | discretionary noncompetitive | 3 | Yes |
| | discretionary, congressionally directed, noncompetitive (Soft earmark)* | 3 | Yes (Matrix table) |
| | nondiscretionary, congressionally mandated (Hard earmark) | 1 | Yes. Matrix table & reference to Appropriation language. |
| | nondiscretionary limited by statute (Section 404s) | 1 | No** |
| Institutional Awards - competed ♦ | | 3 | No |

| | | |
|--|------|----|
| ▲ Continuation amendment (multiple project years) - multi year release of funds for ongoing project description: | N/A* | No |
|--|------|----|

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|-----------------------|
| ♣ Renewal (one-year project period): | discretionary noncompetitive. Note: Ed to check on 3 reviews if for the same work. | 3 | Yes |
| | discretionary, congressionally directed (recurring soft earmark)* | 3 | Yes (Matrix table) |
| | nondiscretionary limited by statute (e.g., Section 404s, CZM etc.) | 1 | No** |

* FY07 – OMB memo directs agencies that no earmarks should be awarded unless statutorily authorized. Congressionally directed is not an option for FY07 soft earmark awards. There are two choices for new earmarks or recurring earmarks. 1) They will have to be issued as non-competitive awards or 2) submitted as competitive actions under the Broad Agency Announcement (BAA).

**Requires allocation/apportionment table listing out all recipients and approximate award amounts and justification for apportionment by appropriate Federal official.

*Requires a program officer certification that all work is progressing satisfactorily: a) certify receipt of acceptable progress report(s), and b) state that it is in the Government's best interest to support the continuation of the project. If project description changes from prior year funding or different tasks are added, then those new additions under the continuation must be reviewed as a new action.

♦ Institutional Award. If funding one proposal, which was reviewed at the beginning of the competition/award, it does not require a further review and it would be a simple release of funds. If separate proposals come in during the year (umbrella structure) then each proposal may require a review by FPO and GMD/OGC.

▲ Continuation – or multi-year. An amendment that provides continued funding within the approved award period (between 2-5 years). Unlike a renewal, a continuation does not extend the award period; rather, it provides additional funding within an already existing award period. Continuations amendments are used with multi-year awards.

♣ Renewal. An amendment that extends the award period and funding period, while adding additional funds to the award (i.e., adding funds and time one year at a time to an existing award number).