

procedures while reducing burden on taxpayers. By identifying issues early and providing practical, taxpayer-centered recommendations, TAP helps the IRS avoid costly rework, improve clarity and usability, and strengthen voluntary compliance. In turn, this collaboration builds public trust by demonstrating the IRS's commitment to listening to taxpayers and continuously improving customer service, which is foundational to effective tax administration.

The TAP serves the public interest by providing an independent, transparent, and structured forum through which taxpayers can directly influence how IRS programs and services are designed and delivered. Composed of dedicated volunteers from across the country, including an international member, TAP supports the IRS mission of delivering top-quality service and helping taxpayers understand and meet their tax responsibilities by elevating grassroots issues and offering practical, taxpayer-centered recommendations. TAP members prioritize, research, document, and submit referrals to IRS program owners and collaborate on assigned projects, ensuring real-world taxpayer perspectives are incorporated into critical tax administration decisions. TAP has submitted more than 3,000 recommendations from grassroots taxpayers, which is a remarkable record for a volunteer advisory panel.

In 2024, TAP submitted 37 referrals with 380 recommendations, and in 2025, members submitted 20 referrals with 188 recommendations. Our members have conducted over 1,300 outreach activities and have dedicated over 8,000 hours of their personal time reaching over 150,000 taxpayers from December 2023 through November 2025.

Recently, the Government of Accountability Office (GAO) requested that our TAP members be part of a focus group related to in-person services provided by the IRS. The focus group is part of an open audit with the IRS Taxpayer Services division. Questions being asked of our members are shared below.

What are the challenges, if any, associated with IRS's in-person services?

What suggestions, if any, would you offer to improve the quality of IRS's in-person services?

What factors do you think are most important for IRS to consider in making decisions about the future of in-person services, including where they are located and what types of services are offered?

Some of the TAP notable accomplishments include:

- Involved in evaluating the clarity and accuracy of public facing tax product Form 8915-F, Qualified Disaster Retirement Plan Distributions and Repayments. The committee determined the form, and instructions did not effectively communicate complex guidance. The recommendations submitted in this referral to the IRS provided clarity, readability as it relates to public understanding, and reduction of burden.
- Procedural changes to the way the IRS handles 3rd party authorization and verification of taxpayers in with identity issues.
- Completely re-wrote the Form 709, United States Gift (and Generation-Skipping Transfer) Tax Return.
- Members were asked to participate in an IRS Taxpayer First focus group on the topic of service. The members influenced a process change within the IRS tollfree lines by introducing call back technology.
- Produced substantive recommendations to clarify taxpayer rights related to Form 8821.
- The members' advocacy led to influencing asynchronous communication options, and contributions to clearer installment agreement notices that strengthened taxpayers' understanding of their right to appeal.

These outcomes would not be possible without TAP's existence. By representing diverse, real-life taxpayer experiences and elevating them to IRS leadership, TAP enhances fairness, transparency, government efficiency, and customer service—strengthening public trust and voluntary compliance, which are foundational to an effective and credible tax system.

Saul M. Hernandez.

Acting Director, Taxpayer Advocacy Panel Program Office.

[FR Doc. 2026-04608 Filed 3-9-26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4831-GV-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed Collection; Comment Request; Social Impact Partnerships To Pay for Results Act (SIPRA) Program Review

AGENCY: Departmental Offices, U.S. Department of the Treasury.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of the Treasury, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent

burden, invites the general public and other federal agencies to comment on the proposed information collections listed below, in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. Treasury has completed two rounds of funding for the SIPRA program through two releases of a Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO). Treasury invites comments on the revisions to the FY26 NOFO to improve the efficacy and efficiency of the application review process.

DATES: Written comments must be received on May 11, 2026.

ADDRESSES: Direct all comments to Matthew Cook, SIPRA Program Director, Office of Economic Policy, at SIPRA@treasury.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Copies of the submissions may be obtained from Matthew Cook by emailing SIPRA@treasury.gov, calling (202) 927-5331, or viewing the entire information collection request at www.reginfo.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed Collection; Comment Request; Social Impact Partnerships to Pay for Results Act (SIPRA) Program Review.

OMB Control Number: 1505-0260.

Type of Review: Revision of a currently approved collection.

Description: SIPRA, enacted February 9, 2018, amends Title XX of the Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 1397 *et seq.*, to provide \$100 million in funding to implement social impact partnership projects (projects) and feasibility studies for such projects. SIPRA authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to enter into award agreements with state or local governments for projects or feasibility studies. Treasury, in consultation with other federal agencies, administers the SIPRA program. SIPRA authorizes Treasury to conduct a request for proposals for projects, make award determinations, and enter into project award agreements.

Although Treasury asked applicants to use the SF-424 and SF-425 families of common forms for their applications and reports, Treasury also solicited additional detailed information from applicants to effectively and efficiently assess and evaluate whether applications for projects comply with statutory requirements. This request includes only the burden for this additional information. The burden for the SF-424 forms is covered under OMB Control Numbers 4040-0004, 4040-0006, 4040-0007, 4040-0008, 4040-

0009, 4040–0010, and 4040–0013. The burden for the SF–425 form is covered under OMB Control Number 4040–0014. The additional information includes the following components:

- *SAM.gov* registration;
- Project Narrative, to include an Executive Summary;
- Project Narrative Attachments, to include project budget, narrative statement addressing partnership agreements, an estimate of the value to the federal government of the interventions being proposed in the project, partner qualifications, independent evaluator qualifications, evaluation design plan, independent evaluator contract, outcome valuation, legal compliance, and (optional) additional supporting documentation such as a preexisting feasibility study;
- Treasury Office of Civil Rights and Equal Employment Opportunity Assurances and Certifications, Terms and Conditions, and Compliance Data;
- Additional documentation related to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act;
- Copy of application proposing privileged or confidential information to be redacted;
- Administrative Reporting, including an Annual Performance Report, Evaluation Progress Reports, and Final Evaluation Report; and
- Records Retention requirements.

Treasury has released two Notice of Funding Opportunities (NOFOs) since 2018. The first in January 2019 and the second in November 2023. Treasury is now planning to release a third round of funding in FY26. The potential FY26 NOFO is available in full for the public's review.

Use of the Data

The information collected under this NOFO: (1) Identifies eligible recipients and activities; (2) helps identify which applications sufficiently address all statutory requirements and which proposed projects are the most competitive; (3) determines the appropriate amount of funding; (4) allows evaluation of compliance with SIPPRa and Federal laws and policies on grants (*e.g.*, Office of Management and Budget's Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards 2 CFR part 200 (herein OMB Uniform Guidance); Title VI of the Civil Rights Act); (5) tracks recipients' progress; and (6) collects statutorily mandated reports prepared by recipients' contracted independent evaluators. Other required sections in the NOFO are the following:

- The application Executive Summary will assist Treasury and the Interagency Council in streamlining the

processing of applications and optimizing the eligibility phase of application review. The application standard forms, Project Narrative, and Project Narrative attachment components of the grant application are intended to provide Treasury with the information necessary to properly evaluate and assess whether applications include statutorily mandated information. Additionally, certain components of the application, in particular the evaluation design plan and outcome valuation, will enable the Interagency Council to determine whether to make statutorily mandated certifications regarding the proposed projects.

- *SAM.gov* registration is required under the OMB Uniform Guidance.
- To comply with the OMB Uniform Guidance performance and financial monitoring and reporting requirements, 2 CFR 200.328–200.330, Treasury intends to require biannual performance and annual financial report from grant recipients. SIPPRa also requires that recipients submit progress reports prepared by an independent evaluator on a periodic basis and before the scheduled time of outcome payments. 42 U.S.C. 1397n–4(d). SIPPRa also requires that recipients submit a final report prepared by an independent evaluator within six months of a project's completion. 42 U.S.C. 1397n–4(e). Per the statute, Treasury will use these reports to determine if outcome payments are warranted.

- Treasury intends to require recipients under this NOFO to comply with the OMB Uniform Guidance's record retention requirement, 2 CFR 200.334, which requires them to maintain records for three years after grant close-out.

- SIPPRa established a Commission on Social Impact Partnerships (Commission) whose principal obligation is to make recommendations to Treasury regarding the funding of SIPPRa projects and feasibility studies. 42 U.S.C. 1397n–6. The Commission is subject to the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA), which generally requires that documents made available to the Commission be made available for public inspection and copying. 5 U.S.C. app. section 10(b). Treasury may provide to the Commission all complete applications received under this NOFA from eligible applicants and would make all such applications available for public inspection and copying. However, FACA also provides that trade secrets and commercial or financial information that is privileged or confidential (confidential business information)

under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) need not be made publicly available. 5 U.S.C. 552(b)(4). To assist Treasury in complying with FACA's public disclosure requirements while protecting confidential business information in accordance with FOIA, Treasury requests applicants to propose redactions of confidential business information. An applicant may omit pages for which it does not propose any redactions. Treasury expects to review the redactions proposed by each applicant.

- Applicants must provide qualifications of key project personnel and partners. Applicants may voluntarily provide curriculum vitae for key project personnel and partners, but the application will not require that personally identifiable information (PII) is collected.

Planned Revisions to the Data Collection

For several reasons, Treasury revised the third SIPPRa NOFO relative to the first two. Treasury believes that the revisions will increase the number of applications it receives, reduce the burden on applicants and stakeholders, improve the quality of applications, reduce application review time, and enhance the success of projects. Treasury is interested in receiving comments on applicants' experiences with the application process under the FY24 NOFO or the FY19 NOFO and suggestions on revisions Treasury should consider in the next NOFO to make the application and application review process more user-friendly and efficient. Treasury has a draft of the next NOFO available for the public's review. The most significant revisions Treasury made in the next NOFO are addressed below.

- Treasury returned the outcome valuation methodology to budget impact analysis (BIA) instead of benefit-cost analysis. Treasury made this change because after testing both approaches, Treasury determined that BIA is a better methodology to allow Treasury to observe value to the federal government, as required by statute, and is more efficient to implement for social impact partnerships. Treasury is interested in the public's view regarding whether there are alternative approaches to savings and value that would be preferable in place of this approach, and why those approaches are consistent with SIPPRa statute.

- Treasury continues to ascertain how to make the application and the application review process more efficient for all parties. Treasury invites suggestions and specific strategies that

Treasury may incorporate into the next NOFO that will increase administrative efficiencies to the extent permitted under the statute and other federal laws and regulations. In the current draft, language has been simplified and clarified to attempt to ease applicant burden. In particular, Treasury has introduced language to allow applicants to apply with processes instead of particular partners due to procurement constraints.

- Under the FY24 NOFO, Treasury provided applicants five months from the date of NOFA publication to submit their applications. Treasury is interested in learning whether prospective applicants favor a shorter window of time to submit their applications, which would leave more time for project implementation, or conversely, if they favor a longer application timeframe (e.g., six—nine months), which would give applicants more time to submit their applications, but less time for project implementation. The statute does not permit Treasury to obligate funds beyond February 2028. The deadline to submit applications is expected to occur in early 2027.

- The evaluation design section has been heavily edited to make it easier to understand and develop. Treasury is interested in learning whether these changes have sufficiently addressed questions, and it would welcome comments on how long it will take to complete these evaluation design plans.

- Treasury is planning to prioritize projects that affect specific outcomes instead of weighing all outcomes equally. Treasury is interested in feedback on how this will affect whether potential applicants will apply. Treasury is also interested in whether the language of the NOFO is consistent with the goals of programs that would achieve these outcomes, and if not, what changes would it make it more likely to appeal to these programs.

Form: None.

Affected Public: State, Local, or Tribal Governments.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 25.

Frequency of Response: Once, on occasion.

Estimated Total Number of Annual Responses: 25.

Estimated Time per Response: 240 hours.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 6,000 hours.

Request for Comments: Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and included in the request for Office of Management and Budget approval. All comments will become a matter of public record.

Comments are invited on: (a) whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of technology; and (e) estimates of capital or start-up costs and costs of operation, maintenance, and purchase of services required to provide information.

Authority: 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*

Rachel Miller,
Executive Secretary.

1. Basic Information

A. Federal Agency. Office of Economic Policy, United States Department of the Treasury.

B. Funding Opportunity Title. FY26 Social Impact Partnerships to Pay for Results Act Notice of Funding Opportunity.

C. Announcement Type. Initial announcement.

D. Funding Opportunity Number. UST-SIPPRA-XXX-XXX.

E. Assistance List Number. 21.017.

F. Funding Details. Treasury has made up to \$11.8 million available for projects under this NOFO.

G. Key Dates. Applicants have five months to submit an application. Treasury intends to make an award decision no later than six months after applications are received.

H. Executive Summary. The Department of the Treasury ("Treasury") is issuing this Notice of Funding Opportunity ("NOFO") to invite applications from State and local governments for awards under the Social Impact Partnerships to Pay for Results Act ("the SIPPRA statute"). An award recipient ("Awardee") will receive payment if a specified outcome of the social impact partnership project is achieved as determined by the project's independent evaluator. The payment to the Awardee must be less than or equal to the value of the outcome to the federal government over a period not exceeding ten years from the start of the project. Awards made under this NOFO will be administered by Treasury or by another federal agency with expertise in the social benefits addressed in the proposed project. Treasury expects to award up to approximately \$10.2 million in competitive project grants under this

NOFO. State and local governments receiving project grants will be eligible to receive a separate grant for up to 15 percent of the project grant amount to pay for all or a portion of the cost of a statutorily required independent evaluation, which will be paid regardless of whether outcomes have been met. Treasury expects up to approximately \$1.6 million to be available to pay for the costs of independent evaluations under this NOFO.

I. Agency contact information. Please contact Matthew Cook, SIPPRA Director, at sippa@treasury.gov or 202–821–5700.

2. Eligibility

The SIPPRA statute provides that only States, including the District of Columbia, each commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States; federally recognized Indian tribes; and local governments are eligible applicants ("Applicant"); applications from any other entity will not be reviewed.¹ See 2 CFR part 200 for definitions of State, local government, or federally recognized Indian tribe.² Multiple agencies within a state or local government are eligible to apply, or interjurisdictional groups of state or local governments may apply together. In both cases, a lead Applicant must be identified. Each agency must have its own UEI number.

There is no cost sharing required.

3. Program Description

In 2018, Congress appropriated \$100 million to Treasury to implement the SIPPRA program. The program funds social impact projects based on achieving results.³ Treasury has offered two previous funding opportunities for pay for results projects.⁴ Under this NOFO, Treasury announces the availability of \$10.2 million for awards to implement a pay for results project.

The SIPPRA statute requires that each project achieve one or more specific, measurable outcomes that benefit society and reduce governmental outlays (i.e., provide "savings"). Identifying suitable outcomes that meet SIPPRA requirements is a critical first step for any potential Applicant considering the SIPPRA program.

Under the pay for results model, the government makes a payment only if an

¹ 42 U.S.C. 1397n–1, 1397n–12(6).

² <https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-2/subtitle-A/chapter-II/part-200/subpart-A/subject-group-ECFR2a6a0087862fd2c/section-200.1>.

³ For more information, see the program web page at <https://home.treasury.gov/services/social-impact-partnerships/sippa-pay-for-results>.

⁴ SIPPRA—Pay for Results | U.S. Department of the Treasury.

evaluation (explained in Section 3.C, Evaluation Methodology) demonstrates that the project caused the agreed-upon outcomes. Applicants must use non-federal funds to cover the initial costs of the project.

The outcome payment will not be more than the value of the outcome to the government over a maximum period of ten years from the start of the project. Applicants can propose one or more outcomes and may receive separate payments at different times for each one achieved, depending on the project design and payment requests.

The Applicant must procure an independent evaluator to confirm the project achieved the agreed-upon outcomes. Treasury will have a separate agreement with the Awardee to pay for evaluation activities. This separate agreement cannot exceed 15 percent of the total funding awarded to the Awardee. Treasury will fund this award even if the project does not meet its goals. This separate award can only be used for evaluation activities and not for other project costs. The evaluator must be objective and must not have any financial or other connections to the project that could create a potential conflict of interest.

The independent evaluator must determine whether the project achieved the expected outcome(s) following the evaluation design plan (see Section 3.C, Evaluation Methodology). If Treasury determines that the evaluation shows the applicant was successful, the federal government will make a payment or payments to the Awardee based on the agreed-upon payment schedule. Treasury will not make a payment to the Awardee if the independent evaluator has violated the terms of the award.

Eligible outcomes for an approved project are set out in Section 2052(b) of the SIPPRa statute. The SIPPRa statute provides a nonexclusive list of types of eligible projects. One-fifth of the projects in this list are types of workforce development projects, yet only one workforce development project has thus far been funded. Under this NOFO, Applicants proposing workforce development projects will be given particular consideration to help ensure that an appropriate range of subject matters are covered by SIPPRa projects and that the statutorily highlighted outcomes related to workforce development are appropriately funded. Examples of workforce development outcomes listed in the SIPPRa statute include:

- Increasing work and earnings by individuals in the United States who are unemployed for more than 6 consecutive months.

- Increasing employment and earnings of individuals who have attained 16 years of age but not 25 years of age.

- Increasing employment among individuals receiving Federal disability benefits.

- Improving the employment and well-being of returning United States military members.

Additional possible outcomes outside of those listed in statute include:

- Increasing work and earnings by individuals in the United States who are not participating in the labor force for more than 6 consecutive months.

- Increasing the persistence in paid, self-sufficient employment for individuals who have exited a federally funded public workforce program in the last six months.

- Increasing the number of individuals in the United States who participate in a registered apprenticeship while co-enrolled in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) or Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program.

Treasury does not expect to provide further funding opportunities under the current SIPPRa appropriation.

A. Limitations

a. Directly Benefit Children

The SIPPRa statute requires that “[n]ot less than 50 percent of all Federal payments made to carry out agreements under this section shall be used for initiatives that directly benefit children.”⁵ Treasury has met this requirement through the first two rounds of funding but must still collect information to show the overall percent of funding that directly benefits children, as defined further under Section 4.A.f.(9), Whether the project will directly benefit children.

B. Outcome Valuation Methodology

To determine the value to the federal government, Applicants must provide a budget impact analysis (BIA) as the outcome valuation methodology.⁶ BIA is a financial evaluation technique that estimates the anticipated changes in spending (savings) and revenue resulting from the proposed project.

⁵ 42 U.S.C. 1397n–2(f).

⁶ Examples of budget impact analysis may be found in appendices of Congressional Budget Office publications. See, e.g., The Effects of Potential Cuts in SNAP Spending on Households With Different Amounts of Income (2015), <https://www.cbo.gov/publication/49978>; Possible Higher Spending Paths for Veterans’ Benefits (2018), <https://www.cbo.gov/publication/44995>. An additional reference to calculate federal outlays and revenues is available from the National Bureau of Economic Research TAXSIM at <http://users.nber.org/~taxsim/>.

Reliance on BIA as the outcome valuation methodology is a change from the FY24 NOFA, which used Benefit Cost Analysis (BCA) as the outcome valuation methodology. Having used both BCA and BIA in past funding rounds, Treasury has determined that BIA is simpler to implement and better captures the value to the federal government of the project.

The statute requires the federal payment for each specified outcome to be less than or equal to the value of the outcome to the federal government over a specified period we refer to as the “valuation period.” The valuation period is selected by the Applicant but may extend for no more than ten years after the start of the intervention.⁷ See Section 4.A.f.(3), the project timeline, for a definition of valuation period.

The applicant must also select a period during which it will conduct outcome tracking for the project. We refer to the period beginning with the start of the intervention through the last day of outcome tracking as the “period of performance.” In some cases, the outcome tracking may continue beyond the intervention period; in other cases, the intervention period and period of performance may be the same. The period of performance must end by September 2032. After the period of performance, if an outcome has been met, Treasury will provide payment based on the demonstrated value of the outcome to the federal government over the entire valuation period, which may extend beyond the period of performance in order to show the projected value of an outcome for up to 10 years. For that reason, payment may be made before the end of the valuation period. The valuation period is simply a time limiting function of the BIA calculation process.

For each specified outcome, the Applicant must provide the estimated savings and value over the valuation period and the period of performance.

Over the course of the period of performance, the project must provide savings to the State or local government or to the federal government, in the form of reduced outlays.⁸

For the purposes of payment, the Applicant must only include estimates of federal savings and revenue. If the project is expected to affect state and local savings or revenue, those estimates must be presented, but *will not* be included in the outcome payment cap.

For applicants who plan to use savings from Medicaid or CHIP, see Appendix II: Integration of Managed

⁷ See 42 U.S.C. 1397n–2(c)(1)(B).

⁸ See 42 U.S.C. 1397n–1(b).

Care Information/Data for the integration of managed care information/data. This information is required to certify such changes in spending.

The following shows the steps of the calculation of BIA. Applicants must document the underlying literature, assumptions, and justifications for how the intervention will achieve the estimated savings and value in each step of the BIA calculation. The estimates must be derived from the existing research or data on the topic with clear citations for reviewers. The Applicant must detail how the existing research can be reasonably applied to their approach (*e.g.* why effect sizes from a project in Denver is relevant for the target population in Boise).

Step 1: Estimate Target Population Baseline

A. Estimate Total Amount of Federal Outlays Expended on Target Population During the Valuation Period in Dollars (Includes Cost of All Federal Programs Used by Target Population)

The Applicant must document existing federal outlays that support the target population during the valuation period. This includes, but is not limited to, programs such as the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC), Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), Medicaid, and other relevant federal anti-poverty initiatives. This section will establish a baseline by estimating the total federal resources currently allocated to the target population in the absence of the proposed intervention. The Applicant must document the existing federal outlays over the period of performance and the valuation period.

B. Estimate Total Amount of Federal Revenue Generated by Target Population During the Valuation Period, in Dollars, if Applicable

The Applicant must estimate the total amount of federal revenue generated by the target population during the valuation period. The Applicant must estimate the existing federal revenues over the period of performance and the valuation period.

Step 2: Estimate Project Intervention Impact

C. Estimate How Much the Total Amount of Federal Outlays Expended on the Target Population Will Change as a Direct Result of the SIPRA Intervention

The Applicant must document how federal outlays will change due to achieving the outcome targets as a result

of the intervention. The outcome valuation must include increases in costs due to intended or unintended impacts of the intervention. The Applicant must carefully consider how the project intervention may cause the substitution of benefits delivered through one social program for another. Specifically, the Applicant must consider how the intervention will affect eligibility for other federal programs and how this will affect the change in outlays. For example, an intervention that increases employment could decrease participation in government assistance programs while increasing eligibility for reimbursable employment-based tax credits. Both the decrease in assistance outlays and the increase in refundable tax credit expenditures are changes in government outlays resulting from the project intervention and must be considered.⁹

In estimating the project intervention's effect on the outlays of a government program, the Applicant must carefully consider the funding structure of the program and spillover effects. For instance, if the program has more eligible individuals than funding available for services, such that when one individual is removed from the program another eligible individual replaces that individual, then it is unlikely that there is a reduction in outlays. There may also be spillover effects of providing this training to the target population to participants outside of the target population. For example, a job training program may cause the displacement of workers currently employed resulting in lower wages and higher benefit uptake for those individuals.

The Applicant must clearly show the intervention effect over the period of performance and the valuation period.

For applicants who plan to use savings from Medicaid or CHIP, see Appendix II: Integration of Managed Care Information/Data for the integration of managed care information/data. This information is required to certify such changes in spending.

D. Estimate How Much Total Federal Taxes Paid by Target Population Will Change as a Result of the Intervention

The Applicant must document how the federal taxes will change if the project reaches the assumed outcome target. Applicants must take into account tax credits and deductions

⁹ If the intervention's results would make the Awardee eligible for other federal payments during the intervention period, the estimated cost of those payments must be included in the BIA.

when estimating changes to federal taxes paid by the target population. The changes in federal tax revenues should be shown over the period of performance and the valuation period. Changes in federal tax revenues are not required for a project to be funded.

Step 3: Estimate Value of the Intervention to the Federal Government

The Applicant must measure the difference between the baseline and impact estimates. The Applicant must detail the savings (post-intervention federal outlays (C) minus baseline federal outlays (A)) and the change in revenues (post-intervention federal revenues (D) minus baseline federal revenues (B)). The "value to the federal government" is calculated as the sum of the savings plus the change in revenues. Treasury will pay no more than the value estimated in this step. As a formula, this is:

$$\text{Value} = \text{Change in Spending} + \text{Change in Revenue} = (C - A) + (D - B)$$

Applicants must include the estimated total savings, estimated savings per project participant, and estimated savings per dollar spent on the intervention. Applicants must also provide the estimated total savings over the period of performance and the valuation period.

The Applicant must also include the estimated value, estimated value per project participant, and estimated value per dollar spent on the intervention over the valuation period. Applicants must provide the estimated total value over the period of performance and the valuation period.

a. Outcome Valuation Spreadsheet

Applicants must document and submit their estimates of baseline federal revenues and outlays and estimated changes to federal revenues and outlays as a direct result of each proposed intervention in a spreadsheet so that the analyses can be replicated.¹⁰

The spreadsheet must include all formulas used and describe all data sources, such as related literature, assumptions, and justifications, used to arrive at the estimates of the changes in federal revenues and outlays as a direct result of the proposed intervention.

The estimates in the spreadsheet must include the annual and cumulative net effect of each intervention on federal revenues and outlays overall, per dollar of intervention, and per participant over the period of performance and the valuation period.

¹⁰ A tool to assist grantees in their calculations will be available on Treasury's SIPRA website.

The estimates of baseline federal outlays and revenues and the estimated federal outlays and revenues after the intervention must be rounded to the nearest hundred, rounding up any number that ends in a number greater than \$50 to the nearest \$100.

b. State and Local Outlays and Revenues

As required by SIPRA statute, if the project's outcome target will result in changes to the state or local outlays and revenues, the Applicant is required to submit these estimates. They should be presented in a similar manner to the federal savings and value calculation explained above. However, these estimates *will not* be incorporated into the value to the federal government calculation. Treasury will use these estimates as a part of the scoring rubric (see Section 6.B, Review Criteria), and they will be presented alongside the federal estimates when selecting the final awardees.

If the investor (see Section 4.A.g.(3), Partner Qualifications for a description of investor) is a state or local government, the program costs must be included in the assessment of state and local outlays and revenues.

C. Evaluation Methodology

This section addresses the evaluation design and research methodologies.

a. Evaluation Design Plan

The Applicant must provide an evaluation design plan that includes a range of information related to design, implementation, statistics, and data. The full list of requirements is available in Section 4.A.g(4), Evaluation design plan.

The evaluation design plan may evolve during a project's early implementation period (approximately the first 12–18 months) to ensure proper measurement of project outcomes. However, outcome goals may not change without prior approval from Treasury or the administering federal agency. Grantees must submit the evaluation design plan to Treasury or the administering federal agency once it is finalized. Elements of the evaluation design plan will be posted on the Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships (Interagency Council) website.

b. Evaluation Requirements

The SIPRA statute requires the Awardee demonstrate that outcomes “have been achieved as a result of the intervention.” The evaluation must use rigorous methods that can reliably show this direct link. These methods are either experimental designs with

random assignment or other strong, evidence-based research methods approved by the Interagency Council when random assignment is not feasible.¹¹ These other approaches are commonly called quasi-experimental designs. The main goal of the project's independent evaluation is to determine how strongly the project can say that it caused the observed outcomes and not something else.

Randomized controlled trials (RCTs) are generally considered to be the most rigorous type of experimental design. In RCTs, a sample is randomly split into two groups—treatment and control. One group will receive the intervention and the other will continue as normal. Because people are randomly assigned to these groups, RCTs help minimize the chance that any differences in outcomes we see are due to other factors, rather than the project itself.

If randomization is not feasible, Treasury will also accept other reliable, evidence-based research methodologies often called quasi-experimental designs. These methods compare the outcomes of the group receiving the project to a similar group that did not. While they do not use random assignment, these designs use careful planning and analysis to create a comparison group that is as similar as possible to the project group. Applicants that cannot implement an RCT study will not be deemed less competitive or penalized for implementing a quasi-experimental design. These methods include regression discontinuity design, difference-in-differences, and propensity score matching, among others.

However, the application must clearly explain why randomization is not feasible and show how the Applicant plans to control for other factors without using random assignment. This could include who was selected for the project, other policies that were in place, changes in the economy, or other factors that might have influenced the results. The Applicant shall also describe how the services received by the project group will be different from what the comparison group receives.

A key part of both types of evaluations will be showing that the results are likely due to a causal effect and not chance. This is often done using a concept called statistical significance. The evaluation needs to show that the difference in outcomes between the project group and the comparison group is unlikely to have happened randomly. For purposes of the SIPRA program, the result will be considered statistically

significant if the null hypothesis falls outside of the 80 percent confidence interval. The choice of how to best calculate standard errors and confidence intervals is left to the independent evaluator, who must follow best practices based on the identification strategy submitted in the application.

Applicants may use classical statistical analysis or Bayesian statistical analysis. For applicants using Bayesian statistical analysis, the appropriate Bayesian tests must be used to show the equivalent of classical statistical significance at the 80 percent level. Additionally, applicants using Bayesian statistical analysis must conduct prior sensitivity analysis to ensure any causal result is not due only to an overly strong assumption (a dominant prior) in the prior distribution. Applicants using this approach must use high-quality experimental or quasi-experimental evidence to justify the prior distribution.

c. Evidence Standard

The SIPRA statute requires Treasury to consider the likelihood, based on evidence provided in the application and other evidence, that the partnership will achieve the specified outcomes. This proof must come from well-designed studies that use experiments or other reliable methods to show that the approach causes the desired results and well-conducted studies with many participants in different settings that also show the approach works.

The level of improvement the project estimates it will achieve must be based on existing research.

For each project application, a Subject Matter Expert Panel (“Panel”) will determine the strength of the evidence provided. Projects with strong or moderate evidence are generally the best fit for the SIPRA program, but all applications will be considered.

- Strong evidence means that the evidence base can support causal conclusions for the specific program proposed by the applicant with the highest level of confidence. The evidence must support causal conclusions (*i.e.*, studies with high internal validity) and include enough of the range of participants and settings to support scaling up to the state, regional, or national level (*i.e.*, studies with high external validity). Examples include:

- (1) More than one well-designed and well-implemented experimental study or well-designed and well-implemented quasi-experimental study that supports the effectiveness of the practice, strategy, or program; or
- (2) One large, well-designed and well-implemented randomized controlled,

¹¹ 42 U.S.C. 1397n–4(c).

multi-site trial that supports the effectiveness of the practice, strategy, or program.

- Moderate evidence means that there is a reasonably developed evidence base that can support causal conclusions. There must be evidence from previous studies on the program, the designs of which can support causal conclusions (*i.e.*, studies with high internal validity) but have limited generalizability (*i.e.*, moderate external validity). This also can include studies for which the reverse is true—studies that only support moderate causal conclusions but have broad general applicability. The following would constitute moderate evidence:

(1) At least one well-designed and well-implemented experimental or quasi-experimental study supporting the effectiveness of the practice strategy, or program, with small sample sizes or other conditions of implementation or analysis that limit generalizability; or

(2) At least one well-designed and well-implemented experimental or quasi-experimental study that does not demonstrate equivalence between the intervention and comparison groups at program entry but that has no other major flaws related to internal validity; or

(3) Correlational research with strong statistical controls for selection bias and for discerning the influence of internal factors.

- Preliminary evidence means that the evidence base can support conclusions about the program's contribution to observed outcomes. The evidence base must consist of at least one non-experimental study. A study that demonstrates improvement in program beneficiaries over time on one or more intended outcomes OR an implementation (process evaluation) study used to learn about and improve program operations would constitute preliminary evidence. Examples of research that meet the standards include:

(1) outcome studies that track program beneficiaries through a service pipeline and measure beneficiaries' responses at the end of the program;

(2) pre- and post-test research that determines whether beneficiaries have improved on an intended outcome; or

(3) rigorous implementation studies.

d. Independent Evaluation Activities

By statute, SIPRA projects must have evaluations conducted by independent evaluators.

The federal government will fund up to 15 percent of the amount of the estimated project award (not including the cost of the evaluation) for

independent evaluation activities of the project, regardless of whether outcomes are met. The federal government will not pay for pre-award costs or the portion of an evaluator's contract contemplating evaluation work that is not completed in the event a project terminates earlier than expected.

Any activities reasonably related and necessary to the evaluation are eligible to be funded through this award. This includes paying for staff time, purchasing data access, or travel related to the project. The expected evaluation activities will need to be listed when finalizing the award.

e. Independent Evaluator

Treasury will assess the independence and experience of the evaluator. The Applicant is required to show the evaluator's experience in conducting rigorous evaluations of program effectiveness including RCTs or quasi-experimental methods on the intervention or similar interventions. Treasury may determine there is not sufficient independence or experience and request a change in the independent evaluator before making an award.

f. Agreement With Independent Evaluator

The agreement between the Awardee and the independent evaluator must address the following:

- An evaluation design and methodology that will return the causal effect of the program.

- Plan to obtain relevant datasets from various sources, for example, local agencies, state agencies, or other federal agencies, including the responsibilities of the grantee and evaluator in accomplishing this task;

- Design and coding of a management information system, as needed, that is tailored for research or evaluation, to track participants and obtain individual level data;

- Collection or assessment of individual-level data. The independent evaluator must work directly with the Applicant and other organizations to enter into one or more agreements for the access and use of the data. These agreements must include assuring data quality and adherence to all federal and state data privacy statutes and policies and data security standards;

- Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval or a plan to get IRB approval to ensure the protection of human subjects, to the extent applicable; and
- Submission of progress reports to Treasury, the Interagency Council, and the head of the relevant agency in accordance with the reporting requirements described in Section 8.B.b,

Evaluation Progress Reports and Section 8.B.c, Final Evaluation Report.

If the Applicant is unable to execute an agreement prior to the application deadline, Treasury will require the Applicant to detail how it will procure the evaluator in the application. This shall include a potential list of suitable evaluators, the steps for procuring the evaluator's contract (*e.g.*, approval by city council), and a reasonable timeframe for procuring the evaluator's contract. The process to procure the evaluator must detail how the Applicant will ensure it will meet statutory guidelines. If the Applicant is selected, it will be expected to finalize this agreement before the award will be finalized.

4. Application Contents and Format

A. Application Contents

Applications submitted in response to this NOFO must include the following:

(a) SF-424, Application for Federal Assistance;

(b) SF-424A, Budget Information for Non-Construction Programs (if applicable);

(c) SF-424C, Budget Information for Construction Programs (if applicable);

(d) SF-LLL, Disclosure of Lobbying Activities;

(e) *Grants.gov* Lobbying Form;

(f) Project Narrative

The project narrative (page limit is 20 pages) must include the following:

(1) A one-page executive summary that follows the format as laid out in Appendix I.

(2) The outcome goals of the project.

This section shall cite available research to explain how the project will achieve the specified outcome goals. This description must include the unmet need in the target population that the intervention is trying to fulfill. The Applicant must provide the highest outcome level that it reasonably expects to achieve. The Applicant may provide a reasonable estimated range that it expects to achieve, and the outcome payment cap will be set at the highest end of that range. This section must also include a theory of change and logic model for how the intervention will lead to these outcome goals building from the available research.

- *Theory of Change:* This explains the logical steps and the evidence-based reasoning behind why you believe the program's actions will lead to the intended outcomes.

- *Logic Model:* This visually maps out the project, showing the resources the Applicant will use, the activities, the immediate outputs, the short-term outcomes, and the long-term impacts. It

helps connect the project design to how the Applicant will measure and track progress.

The Applicant must also provide a summary of the value of the anticipated outcomes that is laid out in detail in section #7 of the project narrative attachments.

(3) The project timeline.

The project timeline must include an estimated duration for each phase of the project. Be sure to include the following periods:

1. Procurement and Ramp-Up Periods

- *Procurement Period:* The time needed to hire or contract with external partners, such as service providers, intermediaries, or evaluators.

- *Ramp-up Period:* The time required to prepare the project for implementation, which may include finalizing documents, hiring staff, creating data sharing agreements, and other administrative tasks. The ramp-up period concludes when the target population starts the intervention.

2. Key Project Timeframes

- *Intervention Period:* The period during which participants are actively involved in the project, from the first day they receive services to the last day they participate.

- *Period of Performance:* The timeframe from the start of the intervention period through the last day of outcome tracking. (In some cases, the outcome tracking may continue beyond the intervention period; in other cases, the intervention period and period of performance may be the same.)

- *Valuation Period:* The specific timeframe used to calculate the total financial value of a project's outcome to the federal government. This calculated value sets the cap on the maximum payment the federal government can make for that outcome.

(4) A description of each intervention in the project and a service delivery plan for delivering the intervention through a social impact partnership model.

The Applicant must provide details for how each of the chosen interventions will affect the target population. The outcome goals described above must be referenced for each of the interventions.

The service delivery plan must detail how the project will implement each intervention and include a discussion of how the project will incorporate feedback from the evaluation into its ongoing operations.

If procuring services is required, the Applicant must detail what the

procurement process will look like and how long that process typically takes.

If the Applicant does not have all funding secured at the time of application submission, the Applicant must provide a detailed fundraising plan to meet all funding requirements.

(5) The proposed payment terms.

This section must include the payment schedule, the methodology used to calculate outcome payments, and performance thresholds for defining success. These must be reasonably derived from the outcome valuation completed in Project Narrative Attachment #7. This section may include details as to how the Applicant plans to incorporate assumptions about value that is produced outside of the period of performance. The proposed payment terms must include the following:

- *Payment Schedule:* Propose a schedule for how and when payments will be made. An Applicant may propose a single payment at the end of the project or multiple payments throughout the project duration.

- *Payment Methodology:* Provide a clear formula for calculating payments, which may include potential tiers, bonuses, or penalties. This methodology must reference the evaluation design plan, including specific metrics used to measure outcomes, how the level of the outcome will be translated into value, and the independent verification process that will confirm outcomes.

- *Performance Thresholds:* Define measurable performance thresholds that will trigger payments, ranging from the minimum payment required to the maximum cap. The Panel will consider the extent to which robust payment structures incentivize desired outcomes through a well-defined methodology, schedule, and performance thresholds.

(6) The target population that will be served by the project.

This section must include a description of the target population and the criteria used to determine the eligibility of an individual for the project, including how the target population will be identified, how individuals will be referred to the project, how they will be enrolled in it, and the extent to which affected stakeholders will be engaged in the development and implementation of the project and evaluation.

(7) Social benefits.

The Applicant must also detail the expected social benefits to participants who receive the intervention and others who may be impacted.

(8) A description of whether and how the Applicant and service providers plan to sustain the intervention.

This section must include a description of whether and how the Applicant and service providers plan to sustain the intervention beyond the period of performance. The Applicant must detail the strategies for leveraging data and evidence generated from the project's activities to inform adaptation, continuation, or scaling of the project.

(9) Whether the project will directly benefit children.

This section must include a description of whether the project will directly benefit children. If so, the Applicant must specify how the project will benefit children and provide an estimate of the percentage of project participants who are expected to be children. Treasury will consider a project to "directly benefit children" if (1) the target population is children (aged 0–19 at the beginning of the intervention); or (2) the target population is parents of children or non-parental primary caregivers if the application presents strong evidence demonstrating a close logical, causal, and consequential relationship between the project's effect on parents or caregivers and the resulting positive effect on the parents' or caregivers' children. For projects where the target population is parents or primary caregivers, being a parent or primary caregiver must be part of the intervention's eligibility criteria in order to qualify as directly benefiting children. Portions of projects can directly benefit children without having the entire project directly benefit children. If a project directly benefits children, the Applicant must detail what percent of its value directly benefits children.

(g) Project Narrative Attachments

(1) *Project budget:* The Applicant must use SF-425A or SF-424C (for construction-related projects) to draft the programmatic budget, including amounts expected to be expended by partners. This is a complete estimate of how much will be spent over the course of the project. The Applicant must also provide a brief narrative for the budget, including descriptions of each line item. Please limit this narrative to 5 pages or fewer.

(2) *Partnership agreements:* The Applicant may provide an executed or draft partnership agreement between the Applicant and all project partners. If the Applicant must use a procurement process to select project partners, the Applicant may submit the process they will use to select the partners and verify that process meets the requirements listed below. This will include a timeline for how long this process will

take. The partnership agreement must address each of the following:

- i. Clearly defined roles and responsibilities of each partner;
- ii. A plan for sharing data among the partners, including a Memorandum of Understanding or Memorandum of Agreement, which may be conditioned on the award of a grant, that appropriately safeguards the privacy of individuals in the targeted population in accordance with applicable laws;
- iii. A representation that all project partners have reviewed an independent evaluation plan for the project and an agreement by all the partners to cooperate in the implementation of the evaluation plan as necessary; and
- iv. A payment arrangement between the applicant and project partners (including the intermediary and/or investors, as applicable), demonstrating that all partners understand that payment by the federal government is conditioned upon the independent evaluator's verification that the project's pre-determined outcome(s) and value generated have been met. This payment arrangement must include a plan and timeline describing each payment point that the project partners have agreed on, and the corresponding outcome targets that will be evaluated in the impact evaluation. Although the federal government generally will make payments to the grantee if the independent evaluator determines that the project achieved the specified outcome as a result of the intervention and the payment is less than or equal to the value of the outcome to the federal government, the federal government is not responsible for making payments to the Awardee's partners other than the independent evaluator.

(3) *Partner qualifications.* Please limit this to 5 pages or fewer. The Applicant must provide a description of the expertise of the project partners. If the Applicant must use a procurement process to select project partners, the Applicant may submit the process they will use to select the partners and how that process will ensure the partner has the necessary expertise.

- i. *Service provider.* Describe the expertise of each service provider that will administer the intervention, including a summary of the experience of the service provider in delivering the proposed intervention or a similar intervention, or demonstrating that service provider has the expertise necessary to deliver the proposed intervention. This description must include a discussion of the capacity of the service provider to deliver the intervention to the number of participants the State or local

government proposes to serve in the project.

- ii. *Intermediary.* Describe the intermediary's mission and goals; its experience and capacity for providing or facilitating the provision of the type of intervention proposed; information on whether the intermediary is already working with service providers that provide this intervention or an explanation of the capacity of the intermediary to begin working with service providers to provide the intervention; its experience working in a collaborative environment across government and non-governmental entities to implement evidence-based programs; its previous experience collaborating with public or private entities to implement evidence-based programs; its ability to raise or provide funding to cover operating costs, as applicable; its capacity and infrastructure to track outcomes and measure results, including its capacity to track and analyze program performance and assess program impact; its experience with performance-based awards or performance-based contracting and achieving milestones and targets; and an explanation of how the intermediary would monitor program success.

- iii. *Investor.* To the extent the Applicant intends to use investors and has not already identified and received commitments from them, the application must discuss the experience of the State or local government, intermediary, if any, or service provider in raising private and philanthropic capital to fund social service investments.

(4) *Evaluation design plan:* Provide an evaluation design plan by following the following guidelines. Please limit this to 10 pages or fewer.

Demonstrate a high-quality design by:

- (1) Explaining how the proposed evaluation is best suited for the project including an explanation for why randomization is not feasible (if applicable);
- (2) Documenting the project evaluation's research question(s), the data to be collected and analyzed, how data quality and integrity will be maintained (e.g., how attrition will be minimized), and specify overall and subgroup samples;
- (3) Describing how the project will be implemented with fidelity (e.g., how random assignment to treatment and control groups will be ensured);
- (4) Providing and justifying the selected evaluation strategy (i.e., RCT or quasi-experimental design);

(5) Explaining how the methodology will measure relevant unintended outcomes and/or negative impacts;

(6) Stating whether the design is likely to generate evidence that can support causal conclusions;

(7) Describing anticipated challenges, such as attrition, failed randomization, and oversubscription and plans to mitigate them; and

(8) Showing that the evaluation will be independent of the intervention.

Incorporate appropriate evaluation design by:

(9) Describing the metrics that will be used in the evaluation to determine whether the outcomes have been achieved as a result of the intervention including key outcomes and outcome targets; an explanation of how the metrics will be measured; and an explanation of how the metrics are independent, objective indicators of impact that are not subject to manipulation by the service provider, the intermediary, or investors, if any;

(10) Describing the statistical assumptions required to infer causal effects in the research design (e.g., absence of spillovers, identifying conditions for non-RCTs, etc.). Provide examples of how these assumptions could be violated;

(11) Proposing all important covariates that will be used in evaluation analysis, including how these measures will be operationalized, and the data used for them;

(12) Describing anticipated statistical and analytical methods (such as regression equations to be used), power calculations, and minimal detectable impacts for each proposed outcome. Please include the actual power and minimal detectable impact estimates for each proposed outcome;

(13) Describing what hypothesis testing procedure will be used (e.g., p-values), what hypotheses will be tested, and how the tests will be conducted (e.g., robust standard error estimators, etc.)

(14) Including the anticipated customized randomization plan if applicable;

(15) Describing an approach for coordinating all partners and required evaluation activities, including assisting the independent evaluator in collecting and accessing the necessary data, and include a timeline;

(16) Describing an approach for conducting an evaluation of program implementation, potentially using an implementation framework (e.g., the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research)

(5) *Independent evaluator qualifications:* Provide a summary

explaining the independence of the evaluator from the other entities involved in the project and the evaluator's experience in conducting rigorous evaluations of program effectiveness including, where available, well-implemented RCTs and quasi-experimental analyses on the intervention or similar interventions. When discussing experience, please note both personnel and organization experience. Applicants must address the following qualifications of the evaluator. Please limit this to 3 pages or fewer.

- i. Experience working with the datasets the project expects to use;
- ii. Prior work in conducting implementation and causal impact evaluation and how their past methodologies and evaluation design experience will be used in the proposed project. Please provide examples of evaluations that they have completed of similar size, scope and complexity;
- iii. Qualifications of the key personnel designing and overseeing the evaluation and ensuring its quality, including their education or training and type and years of experience;
- iv. Experience in managing similar evaluation protocols (e.g., type of sampling, data collection, analysis); and
- v. Experience dealing with unforeseen data or implementation issues.

(6) *Independent evaluator contract or agreement.* Provide a copy of the contract or agreement to be entered into between the State or local government and the independent evaluator. The contract or agreement must address the following information.

- i. Plan to obtain relevant datasets from various sources, for example, local agencies, state agencies, or other federal agencies, including the responsibilities of the grantee and evaluator in accomplishing this task;
- ii. Design and coding of a management information system, as needed, that is tailored for research or evaluation, to track participants and/or to obtain individual level data;
- iii. Collection or assessment of individual-level data. The independent evaluator must work directly with the Applicant and other organizations to enter into one or more agreements for the access and use of the data. These agreements must include assuring data quality and adherence to all federal and state data privacy statutes and policies and to all applicable data security standards;
- iv. Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval or a plan to get IRB approval

to ensure the protection of human subjects, to the extent applicable; and

v. Submission of progress reports to Treasury, the Interagency Council, and the head of the relevant agency in accordance with the reporting requirements described in Section 8.B.b, Evaluation Progress Reports and Section 8.B.c, Evaluation Final Report.

vi. A payment plan that details the annual payment schedule that aligns with the other requirements of the independent evaluator.

The selection of an independent evaluator is subject to the procurement requirements of the Uniform Guidance, including those related to competitive procurement.¹²

An independent evaluator's experience and independence are considered in the review process. If you are unable to submit the name and qualifications of the independent evaluator when you submit the application to Treasury, you may submit in the SIPPRA application a description of the process you will use to choose an independent evaluator. That process must include the requirements noted above that will be incorporated into the independent evaluator agreement.

(7) *Outcome valuation:* Provide an attachment detailing the outcome valuation of the anticipated outcomes, as described in Section 3.B, Outcome Valuation Methodology. Applicants must provide the estimated total value and savings, estimated value and savings per project participant, estimated value and savings per dollar spent on the intervention, as well as the methodology used by the Applicant in arriving at such estimates. Applicants must cite evidence that the reviewers can assess when deriving the savings and value. Treasury requires that the Applicant provide an unprotected spreadsheet that allows a reviewer to view and manipulate all underlying data. Please limit this to 10 pages or fewer.

(8) Legal compliance for projects that include construction (if applicable): Applicants proposing a project including a construction component must identify applicable State and federal environmental laws, regulations, policies, and required environmental documents. Applicants proposing a project including a transportation component must identify applicable federal, State, and local laws relating to that component, and required permitting and licensing documents. The applicant must identify laws

¹² There are specific circumstances in which noncompetitive procurement can be used. See 2 CFR 200.320(c).

applying to the population being served and verify that the project will be in compliance with those laws. The applicant must comply with applicable federal, State, and local privacy laws. The applicant must identify any approved waivers, including but not limited to environmental or transportation laws or regulations, required by the intervention design; if waivers are pending, the applicant must include documentation that it has sought the waiver and when approval is expected. Failure to obtain a necessary waiver may be grounds for termination of a grant.

(9) An application may contain additional supporting documentation as attachments, such as an existing feasibility study.

B. Application Format

The project application must be prepared using the following formatting and organizational guidelines:

1. Number all pages.
2. Be double-spaced, with text in a single column.
3. Be a standard 12-point font, such as Times New Roman.
4. Use 1-inch margins.
5. Not exceed 20 pages in length, excluding the table of contents, appendices, or attachments. See each individual attachment for page limits.
6. As appropriate, include graphics, charts, or lists to make the information easier to review.
7. If possible, provide website links to supporting documentation rather than copies of these supporting materials. It is important to ensure that the website links are currently active, accessible, and working. Non-working links may negatively affect the review of the application.
8. If supporting documents are submitted, applicants must clearly identify within the application the relevant portion of the application that each supporting document supports.
9. Use appropriately descriptive file names (e.g., "Application," "Budget Workbook," "Letter of Support") for all attachments.
10. All file names must be prefaced with the applicant's name or initials.

5. Submission Requirements and Deadlines

A. Submission Requirements

a. Request Application Package

Applicants must apply using *Grants.gov*. Applicants can find this opportunity and all application materials and instructions in the announcement at *Grants.gov* under number 21.017.

General information for registering and submitting applications through *Grants.gov* can be found at <https://www.grants.gov/register>. Once you have located the funding opportunity in *Grants.gov*, you can find the full application under the “Package” tab. It will include a series of required forms. Information on how to apply for grants can be found at <https://www.grants.gov/applicants/applicant-registration>.

Registration is a multi-step process that may take several weeks to complete before an application may be submitted. *Grants.gov* scheduled maintenance and outage times are announced on *Grants.gov*. The deadline will not be extended due to scheduled maintenance or outages. Applicants may incur significant risk by waiting to the last day to submit by *Grants.gov*. Only applications submitted through *Grants.gov* will be reviewed. Applications submitted through email or other methods will not be reviewed.

Applications may withdraw from consideration by providing written notice to SIPPRA@Treasury.gov at any time before an award is made.

b. Unique Entity Identifier and System for Award Management (SAM.gov)

The Applicant, if they do not have an exemption under § 25.110, must

(1) Be registered in *SAM.gov* before submitting an application;

(2) Maintain a current and active registration in *SAM.gov* at all times during which it has an active Federal award as a recipient or an application under consideration by a Federal agency. The applicant or recipient must review and update its information in *SAM.gov* annually from the date of

initial registration or subsequent updates to ensure it is current, accurate, and complete. If applicable, this includes identifying the applicant's or recipient's immediate and highest-level owner and subsidiaries, as well as providing information on all predecessors that have received a Federal award or contract within the last three years; and

(3) Include its UEI in each application it submits to the Federal agency.¹³

Treasury suggests finalizing a new registration or renewing an existing one at least one month before the application deadline to allow time to resolve any issues that may arise. Applicants must use their *SAM.gov*-registered legal name and address on all grant applications to Treasury. Treasury will not make an award if the Applicant has not complied with all applicable *SAM.gov* requirements.¹⁴ If the entity is currently registered in *SAM.gov*, the UEI has already been assigned and is viewable in *SAM.gov*.

c. Submission Instructions

Submission instructions may be found here: <https://www.grants.gov/applicants/grant-applications/how-to-apply-for-grants>.

Please contact Matthew Cook, SIPPRA Program Director, at SIPPRA@Treasury.gov if you have any issues.

d. Submission Dates and Times

Applications must be submitted between 9:00 a.m. Eastern Time on (one month after publication) and 9:00 p.m. Eastern Time on (five months after application). Applications must be submitted electronically through

Grants.gov. Mail, email, or facsimile (FAX) submissions will not be accepted.

All applications will be reviewed after the deadline has passed. If an applicant submits multiple versions of the same application, Treasury will review the most recent submission.

e. Intergovernmental Review

This funding opportunity is subject to Executive Order 12372, “Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs,” as amended by Executive Order 12416. Some States require that applicants contact their State's Single Point of Contact (SPOC) to comply with the State's SPOC process established pursuant to Executive Order 12372. Names and addresses of the SPOCs are listed on the Office of Management and Budget's homepage at <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/SPOC-4-13-20.pdf>. Applications from federally recognized Indian tribes are not subject to intergovernmental review.

6. Application Review Information

A. Threshold Criteria

Treasury will review all applications to determine if the applicant is a State or local government and submitted all required information in the requested format. An application received from an ineligible entity or for an ineligible project will be rejected. Incomplete applications may, at Treasury's discretion, receive further consideration. Treasury expects to afford applicants a reasonable opportunity to fix any such issues, as appropriate.

B. Review Criteria

SUBJECT MATTER REVIEW SCORING RUBRIC

Category	Subcategory	Points
I. Outcome Valuation	Savings to the federal, State, and local government	15
	Value to the federal government	10
	Payment terms	5
Subtotal		30
II. Likelihood of Achieving Outcomes	Evidence demonstrating intervention can be expected to achieve desired outcome.	15
	Project plan and service delivery plan	10
	Project budget	5
	Partnerships	10
Subtotal		40
III. Quality of Evaluation	Evaluation design and metrics	10
	Evaluator independence and experience	10
	Access to data	5
Subtotal		25
IV. Capacity and Commitment to Sustain the Intervention.		5
TOTAL		100

¹³ 2 CFR 25.200(b)(3).

¹⁴ For more information about SAM, see the information provided by the General Services

Administration at <https://sam.gov/content/about/this-site>.

i. Outcome Valuation

This section has three components: value to the federal government, estimates of state and local outlays and revenues, and the proposed payment terms. The magnitude of the estimated savings or value will not be a factor in the overall score of the application.

I. Savings to Federal, State, and Local Government

SIPPRAs statute requires Treasury to take into consideration the savings to the federal, State and local governments.¹⁵ The term “savings” refers to reduced outlays, whether by the federal or State or local government, as applicable, as a result of the project.¹⁶ There must be savings to the federal, State or local government, for a project to be funded through the SIPPRAs program.¹⁷ Increased revenues as a result of the intervention are not considered savings.

A Subject Matter Expert Review Panel (“Panel”) will ensure that the Applicant meets the threshold requirement of the presence of federal, State, or local savings. Then, the Panel will assess the quality of the methodology used by the Applicant to arrive at the estimates, how likely the Applicant is to achieve these savings, and the comprehensiveness of the estimated savings. Applicants will receive higher scores for comprehensive and well-justified estimates of savings.

Applicants must include the estimated total savings, estimated savings per project participant, and estimated savings per dollar spent on the intervention over the valuation period. Applicants must also provide the estimated total savings over the period of performance.

II. Value to the Federal Government

The federal payment to the State or local government for each specified outcome achieved as a result of the intervention must be less than or equal to the value of the outcome to the federal government over a period not exceeding ten years from the date implementation commences.¹⁸ Value calculated for the purpose of this NOFO is discussed in Section 3.B, Outcome Valuation Methodology.

The Panel will determine how likely the project is to achieve the value, how accurate the justification is that the proposed intervention will produce the value proposed by the Applicant, and the comprehensiveness of the

Applicant’s estimate. The Panel will also review the data and approach to ensure it can easily be replicated and that the data would be sufficient for the analysis. Applicants will receive higher scores for comprehensive and well-justified estimates of value.

Applicants must include the estimated total value, estimated value per project participant, and estimated value per dollar spent on the intervention over the valuation period.

III. Payment Terms

The Panel will evaluate proposed payment terms to ensure a clear link between the outcome valuation and potential payments. Applications must detail the payment schedule, the methodology for calculating outcome payments, and the performance thresholds triggering payment. Applicants may propose to have one payment at the end of the project or multiple payments throughout the duration of the project.

The terms shall specify the payment calculation formula (including potential tiers, bonuses, or penalties), reference the evaluation design plan (including the metrics used to measure outcomes, the baseline data, and the independent verification process), and clearly articulate how outcome achievement translates to payment using the outcome values over the valuation period. Clearly defined and measurable performance thresholds for the requested minimum payment to the outcome payment cap are required. Applicant will receive higher scores for more detailed and realistic payment terms.

ii. Likelihood of Achieving Outcomes

The SIPPRAs statute requires Treasury to consider the likelihood, based on evidence provided in the application and other evidence, that the State or local government in collaboration with the intermediary and the service providers will achieve the specified outcomes.¹⁹ Projects showing a greater likelihood of achieving outcomes will receive more points from the Panel as detailed below.

I. Evidence Demonstrating Intervention can be Expected To Achieve Desired Outcome

The Panel will assess Applicants’ compliance with the statutory requirement to provide evidence demonstrating that the intervention can be expected to produce the estimated changes in the chosen outcomes.²⁰ The Panel will evaluate the

comprehensiveness of the presented evidence (evidence that leaves no significant gaps or unanswered questions regarding the intervention’s rationale, design, feasibility, and expected outcomes) and categorize it as strong, moderate, or preliminary (see Section 3.C.c, Evidence Standard for definitions of evidence).

Panels will also assess the extent to which the theory of change and the logic model accurately represent the causal steps necessary to understand how the intervention will cause the change in outcomes in the participants.

II. Project and Service Delivery Plan

Each intervention must clearly detail the activities the program will take to improve the lives of its target population. The Panel will review the Applicant’s identified target population, outcome goals, proposed intervention(s), and description of the unmet need in the area where the intervention will be delivered or among the target population that will receive the intervention.^{21 22} The Panel will assess the thoroughness and comprehensiveness of the Applicant’s service delivery plan for delivering the intervention.

The Panel will review the criteria used to determine the eligibility of an individual for the project, including how the target population will be identified, how individuals will be referred to the project, and how they will be enrolled in it.²³ The Panel will also review the extent to which the target population and related community will be engaged in the development and implementation of the project and evaluation.

III. Project Budget

The Panel will assess the Applicant’s project budget.²⁴ The Panel will closely review the project’s total budget as well as the budget categories listed in each respective section. The Panel will ensure the project costs are reasonable and consistent with program objectives.

IV. Project Partners

The Panel will assess the assigned responsibilities and the qualifications of the partners. This will include an assessment of the Applicant’s description of the roles and responsibilities of each entity involved in the project, including, to the extent applicable, any State or local government entity, intermediary, service

¹⁵ See 42 U.S.C. 1397n–2(b)(4)–(5).

¹⁶ *Id.*

¹⁷ See 42 U.S.C. 1397n–1(b); 42 U.S.C 1397n–5(a)(8).

¹⁸ See 42 U.S.C. 1397n–2(c)(1)(B).

¹⁹ See 42 U.S.C. 1397n–2(b)(3).

²⁰ See 42 U.S.C. 1397n–1(c)(3), 1397n–2(c)(1)(D).

²¹ See 42 U.S.C. 1397n–1(c).

²² *Id.*

²³ *Id.*

²⁴ Budget Information for Non-Construction Programs (SF–424A).

provider, investor, or other stakeholder.²⁵ The Panel will assess the relevance and depth of expertise of each service provider and capacity of each service provider to deliver the intervention, as described by the applicant.²⁶ Likewise, the Panel will review the relevance and depth of experience of any project intermediary and the capacity of the intermediary to fill the roles assigned to it.

To the extent the Applicant intends to use investors and has not already identified and received commitments from them, the Panel will consider the experience of the State or local government, intermediary, or service provider in raising private and philanthropic capital to fund social service investments. While securing complete funding is not required at the time of application submission or when the period of performance begins, the Applicant must be able to provide a detailed overview of how and when it anticipates obtaining the investments needed to operate the program.

iii. Quality of Evaluation

I. Evaluation Design and Metrics

The SIPPR statute requires Treasury to consider the expected quality of the evaluation of the proposed intervention that the independent evaluator will conduct. The Panel will assess the project's evaluation design, including the rigor and strength of the design, its capacity to determine that the outcomes were achieved as a result of the intervention, the feasibility of implementing the evaluation, the quality and availability of the required data, and the Applicant's explanation of how the metrics used in the evaluation are independent, objective indicators of impact. The Panel will also determine whether randomization is feasible, and if not, the Panel will assess whether the reason provided by the Applicant is sufficient to allow an alternative evaluation. This assessment will be provided to the Interagency Council, which will make the final determination as to whether an evaluation method other than randomization is allowable.

II. Evaluator Independence and Experience

Panels will review the independence of the evaluator from the other entities involved in the project and the evaluator's experience in conducting rigorous evaluations of project effectiveness. Types of experience that will be reviewed include experience with the chosen evaluation design

method as applied to the intervention or similar interventions and the datasets the project expects to use, as well as experience conducting implementation and causal impact analyses, managing similar evaluation protocols, and dealing with unforeseen data or implementation issues in other program evaluations. The qualifications of the individuals designing and overseeing the evaluation and ensuring its quality, including their education or training and type and years of experience, will also be considered.

If the Applicant does not provide a letter of intent from an evaluator at the time of submission, the Applicant can detail the criteria to be used to select the evaluator through a procurement process. The criteria used to select the evaluator must be aligned with the information requested of the evaluator noted above.

III. Access to Data

Panels will assess whether the Applicant has sufficiently demonstrated that it has access to the correct data to assess the causal result of the intervention. The SIPPR statute requires that the Interagency Council certify that the independent evaluator has access to federal administrative data to conduct the independent evaluation.²⁷ If the Applicant requires federal administrative data, the Panel will assess whether it has access to all relevant data or whether there are gaps in their assumptions. This assessment will be provided to the Council, which will make the certification.

iv. Capacity and Commitment to Sustain the Intervention

The SIPPR statute requires Treasury to consider "the capacity and commitment of the State or local government to sustain the intervention, if appropriate and timely, and if the intervention is successful, beyond the period of the social impact partnership."²⁸ The Panel will consider the Applicant's submissions with respect to State or local government and service providers' plans to sustain the intervention. Although the primary focus will be on the period of performance, the Panel will provide additional points to applications that demonstrate a commitment from the State or local government and service providers and the availability of sufficient funding to extend the project, if appropriate, beyond the project period.

a. Review and Selection Process

The following is the review process for determining the award recipients. During the review process and risk assessment evaluation, Treasury may ask the Applicant to provide confirming or clarifying information. A request for confirmation or clarification does not guarantee an award. If the Applicant does not respond by the deadline to a request for information, Treasury may remove its application from consideration. Upon request, Treasury expects to provide feedback to unsuccessful applicants after grant awards have been announced.

- Phase 1: Eligibility and Completeness Review
- Phase 2: Subject Matter Expert Panel Review
- Phase 3: Consistency Review
- Phase 4: Commission Recommendations
- Phase 5: Interagency Council Certification
- Phase 6: Treasury Determination

(1) Phase 1: Eligibility and Completeness Review

In the first review phase, Treasury will review all applications to determine eligibility and completeness, which will consist of a technical review to determine whether the applicant is a State or local government; whether the proposed project can qualify as a pay for results project; whether the proposed project qualifies as an eligible project as set forth in Section 2, Eligibility; and whether each of the application content requirements set forth in Section 5, Submission Requirements and Deadlines has been satisfied. Prospective applicants are encouraged to consult the SIPPR FAQs on Treasury's SIPPR website page to help them determine if their proposed project is suitable under the pay for results model.²⁹ An application received from an ineligible entity or for an ineligible project will be rejected. Incomplete applications may, at Treasury's discretion, receive further consideration. Treasury expects to afford applicants a reasonable opportunity to fix any such issues, as appropriate.

(2) Phase 2: Subject Matter Expert Panel Review

Treasury will assign complete applications submitted by eligible applicants to a panel of subject matter experts who will be selected based on their knowledge of the social benefits or

²⁵ *Id.*

²⁶ *Id.*

²⁷ 42 U.S.C. 1397n-5(a)(8).

²⁸ 42 U.S.C. 1397n-2(b)(7).

²⁹ Department of Treasury, SIPPR—Pay for Results, <https://home.treasury.gov/services/social-impact-partnerships/sippra-pay-for-results>.

problems, technical expertise in the type of intervention, experience working with the target population that is the subject of the application, or other considerations. Panelists will be selected from relevant federal agencies. Reviewers will be screened for conflicts of interest.

The Panel will review the applications based on the criteria laid out in Section 6, Application Review Information.

(3) Phase 3: Consistency Review

Following the Panel review, Treasury will review application scores for consistency among subject matter experts on each Panel and across Panels and rank the applications. After this review, the reviewer scores will be averaged to create a ranking that will be provided to the Commission on Social Impact Partnerships.

(4) Phase 4: Commission Recommendations

SIPRA statute establishes the Commission on Social Impact Partnerships (“the Commission”) whose principal obligation is to make recommendations to Treasury regarding the funding of SIPRA program projects and feasibility studies. The nine-member advisory commission established by the Act consists of a non-federal Chair appointed by the President and eight non-federal members chosen by congressional leaders based on expertise laid out in SIPRA statute.³⁰ The Commission will review eligible applications and make recommendations to Treasury.

(5) Phase 5: Interagency Council Certification

The Act establishes the Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships (“the Interagency Council”). This eleven-member body is chaired by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and its other members are representatives from the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Agriculture, Justice, Housing and Urban Development, Education, Veterans Affairs, and Treasury; the Social Security Administration; and the Corporation for National and Community Service. The Interagency Council’s responsibilities include certifying Federal savings, providing subject-matter expertise, and advising the Secretary of the Treasury.³¹

By statute,³² the Interagency Council will determine whether to certify the following:

- The evaluation design uses experimental designs using random assignment or other reliable, evidence-based research methodologies that allow for the strongest possible causal inferences when random assignment is not feasible.
- The State or local government and its evaluator has access to federal administrative data.
- The application contains rigorous, independent data and reliable, evidence-based research methodologies to support the conclusion that the project will yield savings to the State or local government or the federal government if the project outcomes are achieved.
- For proposed projects that expect to provide savings to the federal government, the project will yield a projected savings to the federal government if the project outcomes are achieved.

(6) Phase 6: Treasury Determination

Treasury, after consultation with the Interagency Council, will make a final determination regarding which projects to select. Treasury may also take into account considerations set out in Section 4 of Executive Order 14332, “Improving Oversight of Federal Grantmaking.” Treasury may also give particular consideration to applications that propose workforce development projects, consistent with SIPRA’s emphasis on workforce outcomes.

b. Risk Review

As required by 2 CFR.200.206, Treasury will review the risks posed by the applicants. Treasury will consider any information about an applicant that is in the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS) before making any award in excess of the simplified acquisition threshold (currently \$250,000) over the period of performance.³³

Further, as required by Appendix XII of the Uniform Guidance, non-federal entities (NFEs) are required to disclose

³² *Id.*

³³ Each applicant may review information in the designated integrity and performance systems accessible through *SAM.gov* and comment on any information about itself that a federal awarding agency previously entered and is currently in the designated integrity and performance system accessible through *SAM.gov*. Treasury will consider any comments by the applicant, in addition to other information in FAPIIS in making a judgment about the applicant’s integrity, business ethics, and record of performance under federal awards when completing the review of risk posed by applicants as described in the Uniform Guidance.

in FAPIIS any information about criminal, civil, and administrative proceedings, or affirm that there is no new information to provide.³⁴ This applies to NFEs for which the total value of active grants, cooperative agreements, and procurement contracts received from all federal awarding agencies exceeds \$10,000,000 for any period of time during the period of performance of an award or project. This means that Treasury may reject an application based on the information contained in FAPIIS even if the applicant otherwise achieves a high score under the 100-point scoring rubric discussed in Section 6.B, Review Criteria, above.

7. Award Notices

Before a grant is awarded, Treasury or the relevant federal agency may enter into negotiations with the applicant regarding program components, staffing and funding levels, and/or administrative systems in place to support grant implementation. If the negotiations do not result in a mutually acceptable submission, Treasury or the relevant federal agency may terminate the negotiations and decline to fund the award.

Treasury expects to announce the results of this competition by FY XX (to be determined). Any notice of selection prior to a Notice of Award (NoA) is not an authorization to begin performance. Treasury will provide successful applicants with a NoA that will set forth the amount of the award, the amount for the independent evaluation, and other pertinent information. The NoA is the official document issued to obligate funds and notify an applicant that an award has been made. The NoA will also include standard Terms and Conditions and any Special Award Conditions related to participation in the SIPRA program. A copy will also be sent to the electronic mail address listed on the SF-424. After Treasury issues a NoA, Treasury or the relevant federal agency will provide the Awardee a time period to finalize pertinent documents before starting the project.

Note that any communication between Treasury, the relevant federal agency, and applicants prior to the issuance of the NoA and prior to the execution of any award agreement is not authorization to begin performance on the project.

Unsuccessful applicants will be notified of their status by electronic mail to the applicant listed on the SF-424 as soon as practicable. Unsuccessful

³⁰ 42 U.S.C. 1397n-6.

³¹ 42 U.S.C. 1397n-5.

³⁴ See 2 CFR part 200, appendix XII.

applicants may apply under subsequent NOFOs, if any.

8. Post-Award Requirements and Administration

Applicants selected for awards must agree to comply with additional applicable legal requirements upon acceptance of an award. All grants are subject to the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB's) regulatory requirements for grants, as codified in the Uniform Guidance.

A. Administrative Program Requirements

Awards under this NOFO are subject to federal laws, regulations, and policies concerning grants. Below is a non-exhaustive list of requirements with which the applicant will need to comply:

1. Lobbying Restrictions at 31 CFR part 21.
2. Government-wide Debarment and Suspension Requirements at 31 CFR part 19.
3. Government-wide Requirements for Drug-Free Workplace at 31 CFR part 20.
4. Award Term for Trafficking in Persons at 2 CFR part 175.
5. Environmental Requirements.

Treasury approval of financial assistance is subject to compliance with applicable federal and State environmental requirements. As discussed under Section 4.A.g(8), Legal Compliance, the Applicant must identify the State and federal environmental laws, regulations, and policies that may apply to the project and the environmental documents that may be required under State and federal laws. Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (NEPA), project applications will be evaluated in accordance with Treasury's NEPA procedures. Grantees whose projects do not fall within Treasury's categorical exclusions will be required to assist Treasury in conducting an Environmental Assessment and an Environmental Impact Statement for the project, as applicable.

6. Non-Discrimination Laws and Regulations

All grantees, partners, and sub-recipients, if applicable, must comply with applicable non-discrimination statutes and regulations. These include but are not limited to: (a) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000–2000d7), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color of national origin, and Treasury's implementing regulations, 31 CFR part 22; (b) Title IX of the Education

Amendments of 1972, as amended (20 U.S.C. 1681–1683, and 1685–1686), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex, and Treasury's implementing regulation 31 CFR part 28; (c) Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S.C. 794), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability; (d) the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, as amended (20 U.S.C. 1400 *et seq.*); (e) the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended (42 U.S.C. 6101–6107), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of age, and Treasury's implementing regulations, 31 CFR part 23; (f) the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 (Pub. L. 92–255), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of drug abuse; (g) the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 (Pub. L. 91–616), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of alcohol abuse or alcoholism; (h) Section 523 and 527 of the Public Health Service Act of 1912 (42 U.S.C. 290dd–3 and 290ee–3), as amended, relating to confidentiality of alcohol and drug abuse patient records; and (i) Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3601 *et seq.*), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination in the sale, rental or financing of housing.

In implementing non-discrimination statutes and regulations, recipients must take into account applicable federal guidance, including the Department of Justice Memorandum of July 29, 2025, “Guidance for Recipients of Federal Funding Regarding Unlawful Discrimination.” This funding opportunity is subject to Executive Orders regarding anti-discrimination and federal rulemaking, to the extent applicable to the SIPRA program, including Executive Order 14151, “Ending Radical and Wasteful Government DEI Programs and Preferencing,” Executive Order 14281, “Restoring Equality of Opportunity and Meritocracy,” and Executive Order 14332 “Improving Oversight of Federal Grantmaking.”

7. Transparency Act Requirements

Applicants must ensure that they have the necessary processes and systems in place to comply with the reporting requirements of the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (Pub. L. 109–282, as amended by § 6202 of Pub. L. 110–252) (Transparency Act). All Applicants, except for those excepted from the Transparency Act, must ensure that they have the necessary processes and systems in place to comply with the

sub-award and executive total compensation reporting requirements of the Transparency Act, should they receive funding. Upon award, Applicants will receive detailed information on the reporting requirements of the Transparency Act, as described in 2 CFR part 170, Appendix A. No sub-award of an award made under this NOFO may be made to a sub-recipient that is subject to the terms of the Transparency Act unless that potential sub-recipient acquires and provides a Unique Entity Identifier.

8. Access To Records/Oversight

By accepting a project award under this NOFO, the Awardee agrees to make available to Treasury, the Comptroller General, agency Inspectors General, the administering agency, or any of their authorized representatives, all data and documents that might be needed, including contracts and agreements, regardless of whether outcomes are achieved and payment is received, in the Awardee's possession or available to the grantee. Awardees must also agree to provide timely and reasonable access to program operating personnel, project partners, and participants. This evaluation may make use of program management information system data, local administrative data, financial data, and program progress reports. It is critical that Awardees keep this information up to date and accurate for performance measurement, evaluation, and auditing purposes. Awardees may be required to: (1) provide access to pertinent documents; (2) host site visits; (3) facilitate interviews with grantee staff, partners and the independent evaluator; (4) attend grantee meetings; and (5) provide additional data. By accepting a project award under this NOFO, the Awardee also agrees to participate in a national cross-site evaluation in the event that the federal government conducts one.

9. Intellectual Property Rights

Intellectual property rights relating to the activities of the Awardee and all partners in the project, including the evaluator, intermediary, and service provider(s), are subject to 2 CFR 200.315.

10. Record Retention

Applicants must follow federal guidelines on record retention, which require Awardees to maintain all records pertaining to grant activities for a period of not less than three years from the time of final grant close-out.

11. Other Requirements

Awardees must comply with existing laws and regulations governing the subject area of the project and the relevant federal agency administering the project.

B. Reporting

Awardees must agree to meet the reporting requirements as listed below or as otherwise specified in the award agreement. Administrative reports must be submitted electronically to Treasury or to the relevant federal agency, as specified in the award agreement.

a. Performance Reports

Treasury or the relevant federal agency will require programmatic progress reports twice a year. A performance report form must be submitted within 30 days of June 30 and December 31 each year of the project. A final performance report is due 90 calendar days after the period of performance end date. Each report must summarize project activities, including the current stage of program implementation; progress towards achieving the outcome goals, including number of people served; significant milestones of the Awardee, intermediary, investors, if any, and evaluator; and related results of the project. It must thoroughly document the partnership activities and decision-making structure used to implement the pay for results model. These reports may be made publicly available. Upon award, Treasury or the administering federal agency will provide detailed formal guidance about the data and other information that is required to be collected and reported on either a regular basis or special request basis.

b. Evaluation Progress Reports

Not later than two years after a project has been approved and annually thereafter, the independent evaluator must submit a written report to the head of Treasury or the relevant federal agency and the Interagency Council summarizing the progress that has been made in achieving each outcome specified in the award agreement. Data in evaluation progress reports and final reports will be made available to all federal agencies represented on the Interagency Council, and data content requirements will be specified in the agreement between the grantee and the head of the relevant federal agency.

When an Awardee's intervention has achieved one or more outcomes, pre-defined outcome target(s) have been met, and the grantee wishes to receive an outcome payment in accordance with the outcome payment structure

originally proposed, the independent evaluator must submit a written report that includes the results of the evaluation conducted to determine whether an outcome payment must be made.

The report must explain the unique factors that contributed to achieving or failing to achieve the outcome in the context of the intervention. This must include, but is not limited to, any major change in policy or law that may have affected the project intervention, and the challenges faced in attempting to achieve the outcome. The report may also include information learned during the evaluation, including how to improve future service delivery or implementation.

The report must assess the degree to which the project was delivered as intended, including a discussion of how closely the project's theory and procedures aligned with actual project implementation. The report must include information related to the intervention model, including whether it has evolved and whether the intervention was delivered with fidelity to the plan. The report must detail how staffing, recruitment/identification and screening of participants, selection, and enrollment were different from what was expected at the outset.

The progress report must include an assessment by the independent evaluator of the value to the federal government as discussed and defined in Section 3.B, Outcome Valuation Methodology.

Treasury will submit these reports to the Interagency Council and to each committee of jurisdiction in the House of Representatives and Senate within 30 days of receipt.

c. Final Evaluation Report

Within six months of project completion, and no later than March 2033, the independent evaluator must submit a final report to the head of the relevant federal agency managing the award. The report must assess the effects of the intervention and include a discussion of the findings and implications, as well as a definitive statement about whether the predetermined outcomes have been met and whether the State or local government has fulfilled each obligation of the agreement. This must include information on the unique factors that contributed to the achievement or failure to achieve outcomes, including but not limited to any major change in policy or law that may have affected the project intervention, a description of the research methods (e.g., randomization of treatment and control groups, if

applicable), data, sample size and characteristics, measures, and other factors, as well as findings, including impacts—for exploratory and confirmatory, short and long-term, subgroup analyses, and other findings.

The report must also assess whether, and the degree to which, the project was delivered as intended. This must include a discussion of how closely the project's theory and intended procedures aligned with actual project implementation. This portion of the report must include information related to the intervention model, including whether it has evolved and whether the intervention was delivered with fidelity; staffing; recruitment/identification and screening of participants; selection and enrollment; and how the intervention was implemented. The report must also discuss information regarding the improved future delivery of this or similar interventions.³⁵

The report must also detail how the unique characteristics of the pay-for-results model assisted or hindered the implementation of the project. Potential questions include what the evaluators are learning about the feasibility/viability of the pay-for-results approach; whether the financing/managerial structure is incentivizing the right partners in the right ways; and challenges in implementing the pay-for-results model in areas such as project management, partner communication, dispute resolution, investor relations, and overseeing service provision.

The independent evaluator's final report for a project must include an assessment of the value to the federal government as discussed and defined in Section 3.B, Outcome Valuation Methodology. In calculating the value to the federal government of the completed outcome(s), the independent evaluator may only take into consideration the value from the outcome valuation.

Treasury will submit this report to the Interagency Council and to each committee of jurisdiction in the House of Representatives and Senate within 30 days of receipt. This report will be made publicly available.

Appendix I: Executive Summary

[Name of Applicant]
[Name of Project]

Project Award Requested Amount.	\$
Children/Non-Children	\$/\$
Requested Award as Percent of Overall Project Budget.	(XX%)
Award Period	XX 20XX–XX 20XX
Period of Performance	XX 20XX–XX 20XX
Independent Evaluator	XX
IE Award Requested Amount	\$XX

³⁵ 42 U.S.C. 1397n–4(e).

Independent Evaluation Date(s).	XX 20XX, etc.
------------------------------------	---------------

*Project Description:**Target Population and Eligibility Criteria
(including estimated number of participants):**Partners:**Evaluation Method:**Outcome Target(s):**Summary of Value to the Federal
Government:**Proposed Payment Terms:***9. Appendix II: Integration of Managed
Care Information/Data***For Applicants Who Plan To Use Savings
From Medicaid or CHIP: Integration of
Managed Care Information/Data*

Treasury anticipates that applicants may have projects affecting individuals who receive managed care services from Medicaid or CHIP. To ensure that the calculations of benefits from reduced health care spending in these contexts properly demonstrate that those benefits accrue to the federal government or other public payers rather than to managed care organizations, applicants proposing projects that include a managed health care component must include a section in their application entitled “Managed Health Care Information.” This section must include, at a minimum, answers to the following questions, as applicable:

- To what degree will participants in the intervention be covered by comprehensive, risk-based managed care during the period of the demonstration?
- For intervention participants covered by a managed care organization, how would savings accrue to the federal government rather than the entity taking on risk?
- What services, if any, will be carved out of managed care for this population?
- If multiple capitation rates are used, which rate cells (by eligibility group or other category) will be used for the SIPRA program project participants?
- With what frequency will capitation rates for the population covered by comprehensive, risk-based managed care be redetermined during the period of the SIPRA program project?
- How would this intervention lead to reduced capitation rates?
- While the level of impact cost and utilization data will have on a capitation rate will vary, if the anticipated intervention effect is small and/or the population impacted by the intervention makes up a relatively small proportion of the rate cell (or grouping of Medicaid beneficiaries with similar characteristics for the purposes of determining a capitation rate), it may be unlikely that the effect will be large enough to change the capitation rate, even if the cost and utilization reductions occur. Is the impact of the intervention effect (or impacted population size) meaningful relative to size of the managed care program?
- For the population covered by managed care, what proportion of individuals covered under the relevant rate cell(s) are participants in the intervention?

- Is the proportion sufficient to trigger changes in the capitation rate under current procedures? If not, please be specific about how you will work with the State Medicaid Agency to ensure cost and utilization changes among this population due to the intervention are captured and incorporated into adjustments to the capitation rate.

- Please clarify if you will have access to robust historical (e.g., at least 2 years) data to ensure that the comparison group is matched as well as possible to the actual cost or claims data to accurately assess federal savings through the evaluation.

- Please note that lags in realization of governmental savings in managed care contexts, relative to those in Fee for Service contexts, will not preclude consideration so long as the savings are realized within the ten-year time period and the BIA procedures discussed above are followed.

[FR Doc. 2026-04685 Filed 3-9-26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810-AK-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY**Reestablishment of the Federal
Advisory Committee on Insurance****AGENCY:** Department of the Treasury.**ACTION:** Notice of reestablishment of the Federal Advisory Committee on Insurance (FACI).

SUMMARY: The Treasury Department has determined that it is in the public interest to reestablish the FACI. A Charter for the FACI has been prepared and will be filed with Congress no earlier than seven (7) days following the date of publication of this notice.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Gudgel, Senior Regulatory Insurance Policy Analyst, Department of Treasury, (703) 362-2684.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) (5 U.S.C. 1001-1014), the Department of the Treasury (Department) intends to reestablish the FACI. Following the issuance of Executive Order 14217 “Commencing the Reduction of the Federal Bureaucracy” on February 19, 2025, Treasury leadership conducted a review of all the Department’s federal advisory committees and determined that it was in the public interest for the FACI to be reestablished following the lapse of its previous charter.

Objectives and Duties

The FACI’s purpose is to provide advice and recommendations to the Federal Insurance Office (FIO) regarding FIO’s duties and authorities, which include monitoring all aspects of the insurance industry, identifying issues or

gaps in regulation of insurers that could contribute to crisis in the insurance industry or U.S. financial system, and consulting with states regarding insurance matters of national importance. The FACI allows FIO to receive timely information and benefit from the knowledge and regulatory experience of state insurance regulators and state legislators, as well as the experience and perspective of industry and academic experts. The advice and recommendations may cover specific or general insurance topics, processes, studies and/or reports. FIO’s duties and authorities are set out in Subpart A of the Federal Insurance Office Act of 2010 (31 U.S.C. 313 *et seq.*), Title V of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, Public Law 111-203, 12 U.S.C. 5301 *et seq.* (July 21, 2010). The FACI will conduct its work at the direction of FIO. The Director of FIO (or designee), will determine what Treasury information will be disseminated to the FACI for its use or consideration.

The FACI shall be a continuing advisory committee with an initial two-year term, subject to two-year reauthorizations at the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury. Going forward, the FACI would serve as a unique forum allowing direct feedback from insurers, reinsurers, brokers, private equity firms, state insurance regulators, consumer advocates, and other insurance sector stakeholders on a range of topics.

The duties of the FACI shall be solely advisory and shall extend only to the submission of advice and recommendations to FIO, which shall be non-binding. No determination of fact or policy shall be made by the FACI.

Membership

The body of the FACI shall consist of up to 25 members. The Department shall assure that the FACI reflects balanced membership and includes a cross-section of members representative of the views of state and non-government persons having an interest in the duties and authorities of FIO, such as: (1) state and tribal insurance regulators, legislators, and/or other officials, (2) insurance industry experts such as insurers, reinsurers, and brokers, and (3) consumer advocates, academics, and/or experts in the issues facing insurance consumers, including underserved insurance communities and consumers.