published in error and should not have appeared in the **Federal Register**.

[FR Doc. C1–2026–22802 Filed 11–10–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 0099–10–D

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

FY27 Social Impact Partnerships To Pay for Results Act Notice of Funding Opportunity

1. Basic Information

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

B. Funding Opportunity Title. FY27 Social Impact Partnerships to Pay for Results Act Notice of Funding Opportunity.

C. Announcement Type: Initial announcement.

D. Funding Opportunity Number: UST–SIPPRA–2027–003.

E. Assistance List Number: 21.017.

F. Funding Details. Treasury has made up to $11.8 million available for projects under this NOFO. Treasury may revise the amount available under this NOFO if additional SIPPRA funds become available during the application period.

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. After an Applicant receives a Notice of Award, Treasury will require the Applicant to complete all necessary final documents, including the project plan, partnership agreements, evaluation design, and outcome valuation, within nine months of receiving the Notice of Award.

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 *sippra@treasury.gov* or 202–821–5030.

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. See Section 4.A.10. Interjurisdictional Applications for a description of the requirements for interjurisdictional applications. 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 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. See Section 3.C.d. Independent Evaluation Activities for a discussion of evaluation activities. 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

[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/sippra-pay-for-results.*

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

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.

Additional possible outcomes outside of those listed in statute include:

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

Workforce development projects may affect eligible outcomes other than those directly related to work and earnings.

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. 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 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 are 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.

For purposes of this section, ''federal revenue'' means revenues or governmental receipts collected by the federal government from the public through its sovereign power to tax or

[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/.*

[7] *See* 42 U.S.C. 1397n–2(c)(1)(B).

[8] See 42 U.S.C. 1397n–1(b).

otherwise compel payment. Federal revenue may include individual income taxes, corporate income taxes, social insurance taxes, excise taxes, customs duties, estate and gift taxes, regulatory fees, compulsory user charges, court fines, certain license fees, remittances from the Federal Reserve, and other fees or fines, as applicable. Applicants should include only federal revenue expected to be generated by the target population during the valuation period and should identify the data source and assumptions used to estimate that amount.

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 SIPPRA 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 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.

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.

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 SIPPRA 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.

While state and local outlays and revenues will not be incorporated into the calculation of value to the federal government, applicants may provide separate state or local outcome payments alongside federal outcome payments, if applicable. Such payments will not increase the federal outcome payment cap.

C. Evaluation Methodology

This section addresses the evaluation design and research methodologies.

[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.

a. Evaluation Design Plan

The Applicant must provide an evaluation design plan summary 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 summary. The summary should provide information demonstrating that the proposed evaluation will be designed to determine whether the outcomes were achieved as a result of the intervention.

After the Applicant is awarded, the Awardee must, in coordination with the independent evaluator, develop a final evaluation design plan. The full evaluation design plan requirements are available in Appendix III. Elements of the evaluation design plan will be posted on Treasury's website.

b. Evaluation Requirements

The SIPPRA 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.[10] 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.

The application must clearly explain why randomization is not feasible. For example, reasons that randomization is not feasible could include:

- The program is not sufficiently oversubscribed to support random assignment with an adequate sample size.
- The cost, operational complexity, or administrative burden of implementing random assignment would be disproportionate to the expected benefits of that evaluation design.
- The structure, timing, setting, or delivery model of the project would make random assignment difficult to administer without materially disrupting implementation.

If randomization is not feasible, the Applicant must 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 SIPPRA 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 SIPPRA 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 SIPPRA 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, 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

[10] 42 U.S.C. 1397n–4(c).

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

• *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) Correlational research with strong statistical controls for selection bias and for discerning the influence of internal factors;

(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, SIPPRA 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. See Section 4.A.g.(9) Requirements for Applications with Partners Not Yet Selected for the minimum requirements for documenting a process.

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 15 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 the program's actions will lead to the intended outcomes including any assumed intermediate outcomes not being measured.

• *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 4.A.g.(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:

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.

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–424A 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. See Section 4.A.g(9) Requirements for Applications With Partners Not Yet Selected. 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 summary*: Provide an evaluation design plan summary by following the following guidelines. Limit this to 3 pages or fewer. The summary should provide information demonstrating that the proposed evaluation will be designed to determine whether the outcomes were achieved as a result of the intervention.

The summary must address the following six topics:

i. *Outcome metrics and data sources.* Identify the outcome metric or metrics that will be used to determine whether the project achieved its outcome goals. For each metric, identify the data source, data owner, expected outcome target or payment threshold, and why the metric is an independent, objective indicator of impact that is not subject to manipulation by the service provider, intermediary, investors, or other project partners.

ii. *Evaluation design and comparison group.* Identify the proposed evaluation design, such as a randomized controlled trial, regression discontinuity design, difference-in-differences design, matched comparison design, or another rigorous methodology. Describe the treatment group, the control or comparison group, how each group will be formed, and the expected difference in services received by each group. Briefly explain how the design will support causal conclusions.

iii. *Randomization feasibility.* State whether random assignment is feasible. If random assignment is feasible, briefly describe how it would occur. If random assignment is not feasible, explain why and identify the strongest feasible alternative evaluation method.

iv. *Preliminary power calculation.* Provide a preliminary power calculation for each primary outcome or payment metric. Identify the expected treatment and control or comparison group sizes, the expected effect the intervention is designed to achieve, and whether the proposed sample is large enough to detect that effect. Briefly state the main assumptions that affect the calculation, such as attrition, missing data, take-up, clustering, or repeated observations.

v. *Data access.* Identify the data needed to conduct the evaluation, including data needed to measure outcomes, construct the treatment and control or comparison groups, and assess baseline characteristics. State the status of access to each major data source, including whether data-use agreements, memoranda of understanding, consent forms, or other approvals are in place or will be needed. If federal administrative data are required, identify the federal data source, expected access pathway, and any known gaps or risks.

vi. *Main risks to the evaluation.* Identify the most important risks to the evaluation's ability to produce credible causal estimates, such as insufficient sample size, missing data, attrition, weak service contrast, contamination, changes in policy or service availability, implementation challenges, or inability to access required data. Briefly describe how the Applicant and independent evaluator expect to mitigate these risks.

At the application stage, Applicants are not required to provide final regression equations, final covariate specifications, minimum detectable impact estimates, final hypothesis testing procedures, or a full implementation evaluation protocol. If selected for an award, the Awardee must submit a full Evaluation Design Plan after award, in the form and timeline required by Treasury. See Appendix III for a description of what will be required in the final evaluation design plan.

(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 in other program evaluations. Provide specific examples and experiences 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.[11]

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. See Section 4.A.g.(9) Requirements for Applications With Partners Not Yet Selected.

(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 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) *Requirements for Applications With Partners Not Yet Selected:* An Applicant that has selected a service provider, intermediary, independent evaluator, or other project partner at the time of submission must provide the partner-specific information required elsewhere in this NOFO. If applicable procurement or partner-selection requirements prevent the Applicant from selecting a partner before submission, the Applicant may identify that partner as ''to be determined'' and submit a process application for that role.

For each partner not yet selected, the process application must describe the proposed scope of work, estimated budget or contract value, expected agreement type, and the procurement or selection process the Applicant will use. At a minimum, the process application must include:

(a) The procurement or selection timeline, including major steps, required approvals, and the expected date for selecting the partner and executing an agreement;

(b) The selection criteria, including any relative weights or priority factors, and how those criteria will assess the partner's qualifications, experience, capacity, and ability to perform the proposed role;

(c) The official, body, or committee with decision-making authority, and the roles of any reviewers, procurement staff, or evaluation committee members;

(d) Safeguards for full and open competition, impartial review, and conflicts of interest, including any justification required for a noncompetitive procurement;

(e) For an independent evaluator, the required qualifications, including independence from the Applicant's implementation partners and experience conducting rigorous impact and implementation evaluations using the proposed data and methods;

(f) For a service provider, intermediary, or other implementation partner, the minimum qualifications needed to deliver the proposed intervention model with fidelity and at the scale described in the application; and

(g) The Applicant's plan for maintaining continuity between the proposed intervention model, theory of change, evaluation design, payment terms, data-sharing approach, and the partners ultimately selected.

Selection of a partner after application submission must not materially weaken

[11] There are specific circumstances in which noncompetitive procurement can be used. *See* 2 CFR 200.320(c).

the proposed intervention, evaluation design, outcome valuation, payment structure, or compliance with this NOFO. Before Treasury finalizes an award, or at another time specified by Treasury, the Applicant must provide the selected partner's name, qualifications, role, executed or final proposed agreement, updated budget information, and documentation sufficient to show that the selection process was completed consistent with applicable Federal, State, local, and Tribal procurement requirements.

(10) I*nterjurisdictional Applications:* Two or more eligible Applicants may jointly propose a single project serving multiple jurisdictions. Each participating jurisdiction must submit an application. The applications may be substantially identical, but each application must identify all participating jurisdictions and describe the interjurisdictional partnership. Each participating jurisdiction or agency must have its own UEI.

The applications must describe how the participating jurisdictions will govern and implement the partnership, including the roles and responsibilities of each jurisdiction; how required application materials, reports, and other documentation will be submitted; how the independent evaluator will be selected, contracted with, and paid; how outcomes will be measured across jurisdictions; and how any outcome payments will be calculated, allocated, and paid.

The applications may propose that Treasury make separate outcome payments to each participating jurisdiction or that Treasury make outcome payments to one participating jurisdiction, which would then distribute funds to the other participating jurisdictions under the partnership's agreement. Treasury may request additional information or documentation before finalizing an award. If selected, each participating jurisdiction will be responsible for ensuring that all program requirements and award terms are met.

(11) 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 15 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.[12]

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.[13] 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 December 9, 2026 and 9:00 p.m. Eastern Time on April 6, 2027. 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.

[12] 2 CFR 25.200(b)(3).

[13] For more information about SAM, see the information provided by the General Services Administration at *https://sam.gov/content/about/this-site.*

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 Intergovernmental Review (SPOC List). 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

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

SIPPRA statute requires Treasury to take into consideration the savings to the federal, State and local governments.[14] The term ''savings'' refers to reduced outlays, whether by the federal or State or local government, as applicable, as a result of the project.[15] There must be savings to the federal, State or local government, for a project to be funded through the SIPPRA program.[16] 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. This will include an assessment of the answers to the questions in Appendix II: Integration of Managed Care Information/Data, if applicable.

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.[17] 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.

[14] *See* 42 U.S.C. 1397n–2(b)(4)–(5).

[15] *Id.*

[16] *See* 42 U.S.C. 1397n–1(b); 42 U.S.C 1397n–5(a)(8).

[17] *See* 42 U.S.C. 1397n–2(c)(1)(B).

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. The Applicant will receive a higher score for more detailed and realistic payment terms.

ii. Likelihood of Achieving Outcomes

The SIPPRA 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.[18] 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.[19] 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.[20] [21] 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.[22] 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.[23] 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 provider, investor, or other stakeholder.[24] 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.[25] 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 SIPPRA 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 summary, including the rigor and strength of the potential design, its capacity to determine that the outcomes were achieved as a result of the intervention, the feasibility of implementing the planned 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

[18] *See* 42 U.S.C. 1397n–2(b)(3).

[19] *See* 42 U.S.C. 1397n–1(c)(3), 1397n–2(c)(1)(D).

[20] *See* 42 U.S.C. 1397n–1(c).

[21] *Id.*

[22] *Id.*

[23] Budget Information for Non-Construction Programs (SF–424A).

[24] *Id.*

[25] *Id.*

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 is planning to access the correct data to assess the causal result of the intervention. The SIPPRA statute requires that the Interagency Council certify that the independent evaluator has access to federal administrative data to conduct the independent evaluation.[26] If the Applicant requires federal administrative data, the Panel will assess whether the independent evaluator can reasonably expect to be able to access 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 SIPPRA 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.'' [27] 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 SIPPRA FAQs on Treasury's SIPPRA website page to help them determine if their proposed project is suitable under the pay for results model.[28] 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 offer 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 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. Treasury estimates this will take two months depending on the number and quality of the applications.

(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

SIPPRA statute establishes the Commission on Social Impact Partnerships (''the Commission'') whose principal obligation is to make recommendations to Treasury regarding the funding of SIPPRA 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 SIPPRA statute.[29] The Commission will review eligible applications and make recommendations to Treasury. Treasury estimates this process will take two months depending on the number and quality of the applications.

(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.[30]

By statute,[31] 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

[26] 42 U.S.C. 1397n–5(a)(8).

[27] 42 U.S.C. 1397n–2(b)(7).

[28] Department of Treasury, SIPPRA—Pay for Results, *https://home.treasury.gov/services/social-impact-partnerships/sippra-pay-for-results.*

[29] 42 U.S.C. 1397n–6.

[30] 42 U.S.C. 1397n–5.

[31] *Id.*

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.

Treasury estimates this will take two months depending on the number and quality of the applications. During this time, Treasury may reach out to Applicants to provide them with an opportunity to make corrections to their application in order for the Council to make a certification decision.

(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 SIPPRA'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 *SAM.gov* before making any award in excess of the simplified acquisition threshold (currently $350,000) over the period of performance.[32]

Further, as required by Appendix XII of the Uniform Guidance, non-federal entities (NFEs) are required to disclose in FAPIIS any information about criminal, civil, and administrative proceedings, or affirm that there is no new information to provide.[33] 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.

Treasury will also review the Applicant's information in the Do Not Pay system. Applicants listed in that system as not payable will not be eligible.

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 October 2027. 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 SIPPRA 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.

After an Applicant receives a Notice of Award, Treasury will require the Applicant to complete all necessary final documents, including the project plan, partnership agreements, evaluation design, and outcome valuation, within nine months of the Applicant and Treasury executing the Notice of Award. Treasury will approve the Applicant to begin the project after Treasury determines that these documents are complete and acceptable.

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 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.

[32] 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.

[33] *See* 2 CFR part 200, appendix XII.

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–2), 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 SIPPRA 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.[34]

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.

d. Paperwork Reduction Act

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. chapter 35), an agency may not conduct or sponsor and an individual is not required to respond to a collection of information, unless it displays a valid OMB control number. This program has been assigned the following control number: 1505–0260.

9. 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
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:

[34] 42 U.S.C. 1397n–4(e).

10. 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 SIPPRA 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 SIPPRA 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.

11. Appendix III: Post Award Evaluation Design Plan Requirements

Provide an evaluation design plan by following the following guidelines. Limit this to 10 pages.

Demonstrate a high-quality design by:

i. Explaining how the proposed evaluation is best suited for the project including an explanation for why randomization is not feasible (if applicable);

ii. 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;

iii. Describing how the project will be implemented with fidelity (*e.g.,* how random assignment to treatment and control groups will be ensured);

iv. Providing and justifying the selected evaluation strategy (*i.e.,* RCT or quasi-experimental design);

v. Explaining how the methodology will measure relevant unintended outcomes and/or negative impacts;

vi. Stating whether the design is likely to generate evidence that can support causal conclusions;

vii. Describing anticipated challenges, such as attrition, failed randomization, and oversubscription and plans to mitigate them; and

viii. Showing that the evaluation will be independent of the intervention.

Incorporate appropriate evaluation design by:

ix. 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;

x. 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;

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

xii. Describing anticipated statistical and analytical methods (such as regression equations to be used), power calculations, and minimal detectable impacts for each proposed outcome. Include the actual power and minimal detectable impact estimates for each proposed outcome. Where possible include statistical software code that illustrates how the tests will be run and the variables selected;

xiii. 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.)

xiv. Including the anticipated customized randomization plan if applicable;

xv. 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; and

xvi. Describing an approach that will track the costs of the program, and will generate a cost-effectiveness measure if successful.

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

Kathleen Shannon,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2026–22989 Filed 11–10–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810–AK–P