

(3) Reject the application for failure to meet the applicable selection criteria at a sufficiently high level to justify an award of funds, or for other reason which the Administrator deems compelling, as provided in the documentation of the funding decision.

(g) *Notification of disposition.* The Administrator will notify the applicant in writing of the disposition of the application. A signed Grant/Cooperative Agreement form will be issued to notify the applicant of an approved project application.

(h) *Effective date of approved grant.* Federal financial assistance is normally available only with respect to obligations incurred subsequent to the effective date of an approved assistance project. The effective date of the project will be set forth in the Grant/Cooperative Agreement form. Recipients may be reimbursed for costs resulting from obligations incurred before the effective date of the assistance award, if such costs are authorized by the Administrator in the notification of assistance award or subsequently in writing, and otherwise would be allowable as costs of the assistance award under applicable guidelines, regulations, and award terms and conditions.

Subpart B—Peer Review

§ 34.100 Purpose and applicability.

(a) This subpart of the regulation implements section 262(d)(2) of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended. This provision requires that projects funded as new or continuation programs selected for categorical assistance awards under part C—National Programs shall be reviewed before selection and thereafter as appropriate through a formal peer review process. Such process must utilize experts (other than officials and employees of the Department of Justice) in fields related to the technical and/or subject matter of the proposed program.

(b) This subpart of the regulation applies to all applications for grants, cooperative agreements, and other assistance awards selected by the Administrator, OJJDP, for funding under part C—National Programs that are being considered for competitive and non-

competitive (including continuation) awards to begin new project periods, except as provided in the exceptions to applicability set forth below.

§ 34.101 Exceptions to applicability.

The assistance and procurement contract situations specified in § 34.2 (c), (d), (e), (f), and (g) of subpart A of this part are considered by OJJDP to be outside the scope of the section 262(d) peer review requirement as set forth in this subpart.

§ 34.102 Peer review procedures.

The OJJDP peer review process is contained in an OJJDP “Peer Review Guideline,” developed in consultation with the Directors and other appropriate officials of the National Science Foundation and the National Institute of Mental Health. In addition to specifying substantive and procedural matters related to the peer review process, the “Guideline” addresses such issues as standards of conduct, conflict of interest, compensation of peer reviewers, etc. The “Guideline” describes a process that evolves in accordance with experience and opportunities to effect improvements. The peer review process for all part C—National Programs assistance awards subject to this regulation will be conducted in a manner consistent with this subpart as implemented in the “Peer Review Guideline”.

§ 34.103 Definition.

Peer review means the technical and programmatic evaluation by a group of experts (other than officers and employees of the Department of Justice) qualified by training and experience to give expert advice, based on selection criteria established under subpart A of this part, in a program announcement, or as established by the Administrator, on the technical and programmatic merit of assistance.

§ 34.104 Use of peer review.

(a) *Peer review for competitive and non-competitive applications.* (1) For competitive applications, each program announcement will indicate the program specific peer review procedures and selection criteria to be followed in peer review for that program. In the case of

§ 34.105

competitive programs for which a large number of applications is expected, preapplications (concept papers) may be required. Preapplications will be reviewed by qualified OJJDP staff to eliminate those pre-applications which fail to meet minimum program requirements, as specified in a program announcement, or clearly lack sufficient merit to qualify as potential candidates for funding consideration. The Administrator may subject both pre-applications and formal applications to the peer review process.

(2) For noncompetitive applications, the general selection criteria set forth under subpart A of this part may be supplemented by program specific selection criteria for the particular part C program. Applicants for noncompetitive continuation awards will be fully informed of any additional specific criteria in writing.

(b) When formal applications are required in response to a program announcement, an initial review will be conducted by qualified OJJDP staff, in order to eliminate from peer review consideration applications which do not meet minimum program requirements. Such requirements will be specified in the program announcement. Applications determined to be qualified and eligible for further consideration will then be considered under the peer review process.

(c) Ratings will be in the form of numerical scores assigned by individual peer reviewers as illustrated in the OJJDP "Peer Review Guideline." The results of peer review under a competitive program will be a relative aggregate ranking of applications in the form of "Summary Ratings." The results of peer review for a noncompetitive new or continuation project will be in the form of numerical scores based on criteria established by the Administrator.

(d) Peer review recommendations, in conjunction with the results of internal review and any necessary supplementary review, will assist the Administrator's consideration of competitive, noncompetitive, applications and selection of applications for funding.

(e) Peer review recommendations are advisory only and are binding on the Administrator only as provided by sec-

28 CFR Ch. I (7-1-10 Edition)

tion 262(d)(B)(i) for noncompetitive assistance awards to programs determined through peer review not to be of such outstanding merit that an award without competition is justified. In such case, the determination of whether to issue a competitive program announcement will be subject to the exercise of the Administrator's discretion.

§ 34.105 Peer review methods.

(a) For both competitive and noncompetitive applications, peer review will normally consist of written comments provided in response to the general selection criteria established under subpart A of this part and any program specific selection criteria identified in the program announcement or otherwise established by the Administrator, together with the assignment of numerical values. Peer review may be conducted at meetings with peer reviewers held under OJJDP oversight, through mail reviews, or a combination of both. When advisable, site visits may also be employed. The method of peer review anticipated for each announced competitive program, including the evaluation criteria to be used by peer reviewers, will be specified in each program announcement.

(b) When peer review is conducted through meetings, peer review panelists will be gathered together for instruction by OJJDP, including review of the OJJDP "Peer Review Guideline". OJJDP will oversee the conduct of individual and group review sessions, as appropriate. When time or other factors preclude the convening of a peer review panel, mail reviews will be used. For competitive programs, mail reviews will be used only where the Administrator makes a written determination of necessity.

§ 34.106 Number of peer reviewers.

The number of peer reviewers will vary by program (as affected by the volume of applications anticipated or received). OJJDP will select a minimum of three peer reviewers (qualified individuals who are not officers or employees of the Department of Justice) for each program or project review in order to ensure a diversity of backgrounds and perspectives. In no case