

“Currently under 30-day Review—Open for Public Comments” or by using the search function. Direct written comments and/or suggestions regarding the items contained in this notice to the Attention: CDC Desk Officer, Office of Management and Budget, 725 17th Street NW, Washington, DC 20503 or by fax to (202) 395–5806. Provide written comments within 30 days of notice publication.

Proposed Project

Food safety knowledge, attitude, and practices survey of correctional workers—New—National Center for Emerging and Zoonotic Infectious Diseases (NCEZID), Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC).

Background and Brief Description

In 2017, an analysis of Foodborne Disease Outbreak Surveillance System (FDOSS) epidemiology data demonstrated a disproportionately high burden of foodborne outbreaks and outbreak-associated illnesses in correctional settings compared to other settings (Marlow et al., Am J Public Health 2017). The CDC is developing training programs to reduce foodborne illness in correctional facilities. However, CDC has little understanding of current training and overall food safety culture among individuals working in correctional settings. This survey will allow for the collection of baseline knowledge, attitudes, and

practices (KAP) of correctional staff working in a variety of U.S. correctional facilities (including federal, state, tribal, local and private facilities). The survey will assess overall food infrastructure, food safety training, and the receptiveness of correctional staff to being a part of food safety at their facilities. The plan will be to repeat the survey two years later to support interim evaluation of CDC programs.

CDC requests OMB approval for an estimated 2,500 annual burden hours to conduct a KAP survey of correctional workers. There is no cost to respondents other than their time to participate.

ESTIMATED ANNUALIZED BURDEN HOURS

Type of respondents	Form name	Number of respondents	Number of responses per respondent	Average burden per response (in hours)
Correctional workers .....	KAP survey of correctional workers .....	5,000	1	0.5

Jeffrey M. Zirger,  
Lead, Information Collection Review Office,  
Office of Public Health Ethics and  
Regulations, Office of Science, Centers for  
Disease Control and Prevention.  
[FR Doc. 2023–26084 Filed 11–24–23; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 4163–18–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND  
HUMAN SERVICES

Administration for Children and  
Families

Request for Information: Temporary  
Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)  
Implementation of Sections 302 and  
304 of the Fiscal Responsibility Act of  
2023

AGENCY: Office of Family Assistance,  
Administration for Children and  
Families, U.S. Department of Health and  
Human Services.

ACTION: Request for information (RFI).

SUMMARY: The Administration for  
Children and Families (ACF), in the  
U.S. Department of Health and Human  
Services (HHS), invites public  
comments on the possibilities for design  
and implementation of the new pilot  
program and work outcomes measures  
of the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023  
(FRA), in the Temporary Assistance for  
Needy Families (TANF) program. The  
FRA requires HHS to carry out a pilot  
program for up to five states to promote  
accountability by measuring  
employment and earnings outcomes as

well as additional indicators of family  
stability and well-being for TANF  
recipients. In addition, it requires all  
states to report the information  
necessary to calculate certain statutory  
work outcomes measures. ACF seeks  
input from partners to help understand  
some of the options, opportunities, and  
potential challenges associated with the  
development and implementation of the  
pilot program and the reporting of new  
statutory work outcomes measures  
applicable to all states.

DATES: Comments are due January 11,  
2024.

ADDRESSES: Submit responses to  
TANFquestions@acf.hhs.gov. Please  
include “TANF FRA” in the subject line  
of the email.

Guidance for Submitting Comments

- To ensure that your comments are clearly understood and properly contextualized, please identify the specific question or section of this notice that your comments address, as well as your experience or role that informs your response.
- You are encouraged to comment on any issues or concerns you believe are relevant or appropriate for our consideration and to submit written data, facts, and views addressing this subject, including but not limited to the questions below.
- You do not need to answer all questions listed—only the question(s) for which you have relevant information. The written RFI response should address ONLY the topics for

which the respondent has knowledge or expertise.

- Wherever possible, please provide credible data and specific examples to support your views. If you cite academic or other studies, they should be publicly available to be considered.
- All submissions are public records and may be published on [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov). Do NOT submit sensitive, confidential, or personally identifiable information.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

1.0 Background

1.1 Pilot Program

Section 302 of the FRA authorizes a pilot program under which HHS may select up to five states to test alternative performance metrics in the TANF program. Section 302 of the FRA provides that for the duration of the pilot projects, the work participation requirements shall not apply to the pilot states and instead, participating states will comply with agreed upon performance measures and benchmarks. In lieu of the work participation rate (WPR), state performance will be measured by (A) the percentage of work-eligible individuals who are employed during the 2nd quarter after exiting the TANF program; (B) the level of earnings of those individuals in the 2nd and 4th quarters after exit; and (C) other indicators of family stability and well-being as established by HHS. States that fail to meet agreed upon performance benchmarks for these measures will be required to enter into a plan with HHS

to either achieve the level of performance or adjust the benchmarks. In the event neither is accomplished, the state will no longer be permitted to participate in the pilot. The pilots will be in effect for six years, with the first year being used to establish baseline data.

Since TANF was enacted in 1996, the chief measure of program performance has been the requirement that states meet WPR targets. The WPR measure the extent to which states engage families receiving TANF cash assistance in certain work activities for a specified number of hours each week each month during a fiscal year. A state must meet an overall (or “all families”) and a two-parent work participation requirement or face a potential financial penalty. The WPR targets are 50 percent for all families and 90 percent for two-parent families, but a state’s individual targets equal the statutory rates adjusted downward by the number of percentage points by which the caseload has fallen since a base year for reasons other than changes in eligibility rules.

Over time, states, members of Congress, and others have advocated for moving TANF beyond solely relying on the WPR as a means of defining the success of states in supporting TANF recipients in entering employment and gaining the skills they need for economic stability. Many have also noted that the WPR is a process measure rather than an outcome measure, as it measures only a state’s ability to engage individuals in specified countable activities that lack research to support their connection to long term employment outcomes.<sup>1</sup>

While this performance standard structure has remained largely unchanged since 1996, in recent years there has been an increasing interest in alternative methods of measuring state performance in TANF and other human services programs.<sup>2</sup> The FRA authorized pilots to test alternatives to the WPR.

As an alternative to the WPR, states participating in the pilots would be measured against negotiated benchmarks for work outcomes and other indicators of family stability and well-being. The pilots will provide an important opportunity for selected states to demonstrate different approaches to measuring their performance in assisting families with low incomes. We encourage states to think about strategies for promoting and

measuring economic success and family stabilization. ACF is interested in learning more about the opportunities that the pilot program presents for states. ACF is committed to a successful pilot program, one that results in useful information for policymakers and leads to a more effective TANF program that further benefits American families.

## 1.2 Work Outcomes Measures

Section 304 of the FRA requires all states to collect and submit “the information necessary” to determine four indicators of performance. These are:

- *Employment in the Second Quarter after Exit:* The percentage of individuals who were work-eligible individuals as of the time of exit from the program, who are in unsubsidized employment during the second quarter after the exit;
- *Employment Retention:* The percentage of individuals who were work-eligible individuals who were in unsubsidized employment in the second quarter after the exit, who are also in unsubsidized employment during the fourth quarter after the exit;
- *Median Earnings:* The median earnings of individuals who were work-eligible individuals as of the time of exit from the program, who are in unsubsidized employment during the second quarter after the exit; and
- *High School Attainment:* The percentage of individuals who have not attained 24 years of age, are attending high school or enrolled in an equivalency program, and are work-eligible individuals or were work-eligible individuals as of the time of exit from the program, who obtain a high school degree or its recognized equivalent while receiving assistance under the State program funded under this part or within 1 year after the exit.

Section 304 specifies that to ensure nationwide comparability of data, HHS shall issue regulations governing reporting of the performance indicators after it consults with the Secretary of Labor and with states. This RFI is one of the ways HHS is consulting with states.

The above measures are similar to some of the performance accountability measures required under the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act of 2014 (WIOA).<sup>3</sup> The FRA does not specify which data sources should be used for the above measures. For the first three measures, ACF is considering requiring states to submit Social Security Numbers (SSN) of all work-eligible individuals who left TANF in a given

quarter and ACF would then match those SSNs with quarterly wage records in the National Directory of New Hires (NDNH).<sup>4</sup> ACF would then use the matched results to compute the first three work outcomes measures on behalf of states. This approach would allow for standardized measures and would not require states to initiate new data sharing agreements at the state level. ACF is interested in learning about alternative data sources, such as unemployment insurance quarterly wage records contained in the State Wage Interchange System (SWIS),<sup>5</sup> as well as data sources that could be used to supplement standardized measures. Under WIOA, states are allowed to submit “other information as is necessary to measure the progress of those participants through methods other than quarterly wage record information” if quarterly wage records are not available for a participant.<sup>6</sup> ACF has matched individual TANF case records with NDNH wage records since FY 2002 for the High Performance Bonus measures, and later for performance measures that are reported as part of the Congressional Budget Justification,<sup>7</sup> but ACF has not calculated a high school attainment measure and so is looking for information about potential data sources and key considerations. Other areas include how to operationally define TANF exiters, which are defined in the statute as those who “cease[] to receive assistance under the program funded by this part.” However, many studies have defined an “exit” from TANF in different ways, taking churn into account; TANF “leavers” studies from the early 2000s often defined a “leaver” as someone who has left cash assistance for at least two months, while WIOA defines a “common exit” as a participant not receiving Department of Labor-administered services for at least 90 days.<sup>8</sup>

These work outcomes measures are intended to assist federal—and state—policymakers in better understanding

<sup>4</sup> See <https://www.acf.hhs.gov/css/training-technical-assistance/overview-national-directory-new-hires>.

<sup>5</sup> See <https://www.dol.gov/agencies/eta/performance/swis>.

<sup>6</sup> See [https://www.dol.gov/sites/dolgov/files/ETA/advisories/TEGL/2017/TEGL\\_26-16\\_Acc.pdf](https://www.dol.gov/sites/dolgov/files/ETA/advisories/TEGL/2017/TEGL_26-16_Acc.pdf).

<sup>7</sup> See TANF-ACF-PI-2002-01 (FY 2002 TANF High Performance Bonus (HPB): New Reporting Requirements) <https://www.acf.hhs.gov/ofa/policy-guidance/tanf-acf-pi-2002-01-fy-2002-tanf-high-performance-bonus-hpb-new-reporting>; FY 2024 Congressional Budget Justification, p. 338 <https://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/documents/olab/fy-2024-congressional-justification.pdf>.

<sup>8</sup> See <https://aspe.hhs.gov/tanf-leavers-applicants-caseload-studies> and <https://www.dol.gov/agencies/eta/performance/definitions>.

<sup>1</sup> See <https://www.acf.hhs.gov/opre/report/measuring-employment-outcomes-tanf>.

<sup>2</sup> See p.19 <https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/R/R45966>; <https://www.acf.hhs.gov/opre/report/measuring-employment-outcomes-tanf>.

<sup>3</sup> See <https://www.dol.gov/agencies/eta/performance/performance-indicators>.

the effectiveness of TANF programs in promoting successful employment and credential attainment. As with the pilots, the work outcomes measures may inform future improvements to the TANF program. ACF is interested in hearing from states their thoughts on operationalizing these new measures including the potential administrative cost and burden involved.

## 2.0 Request for Information.

Through this RFI, ACF is soliciting input and information from a broad array of stakeholders on how best to design and implement the FRA pilot program and the new work outcomes measures.

This RFI is for information and planning purposes only and should not be construed as a solicitation or as an obligation on the part of ACF or HHS.

We ask respondents to address the following questions. You do not need to address every question and should focus on those for which you have relevant expertise or experience. In your response, please provide a brief description of yourself or your organization.

## 3.0 Key Questions—Pilot Program

3.1 What are the most important criteria a state should meet for selection into the pilot program, and why? Are there a minimum set of requirements a state should meet to be eligible for a pilot? If so, which ones? Are there aspects of state TANF programs that may increase their likelihood of success as a pilot? Are there aspects of state TANF programs that may impede their likelihood of success as a pilot? For example, if the benefit amounts or caseloads are low, full family sanction and family cap policies exist, etc. Is there particular past experience or past performance achievement that might be predictive of states' ability to successfully carry out a pilot?

3.2 What factors might influence a state's decision whether to pursue participation in the pilot program?

3.3 What technical assistance or supports would be helpful for states and service providers in designing and implementing pilots? What obstacles do you foresee and how can ACF provide assistance to overcome or manage them?

3.4 What indicators of family stability and well-being, including alternative measures related to employment, for families participating in TANF should we consider measuring as part of the pilot? For example, should pilots include measures related to family poverty, interactions with the child welfare system, or other indicators related to child well-being? Please

explain your reasoning. What data source(s) would be of most utility in tracking your recommended indicators? For example, if a state is interested in measuring job quality as an indicator of family well-being, would a state be able to measure that by tracking jobs with benefits such as a paid leave or employer contribution retirement plans? Should family income be included as a measure of family stability and well-being and, if so, what are the important components, who should be included, and what would be the most reliable and practical sources of data? Should any indicators be measured for all low-income families, irrespective of TANF participation, to evaluate whether a state's TANF program is successfully serving these families (e.g., the share of families living in deep poverty, taking into account all sources of income)?

3.5 What factors (e.g., demographic, economic, policy, programmatic) should be considered when establishing performance benchmarks? In your experience, what are the most important factors and variables to take into consideration when developing statistical adjustment models for performance benchmarks?

3.6 What information should be collected about the pilots to help evaluate and explain their level of success? Is there information HHS should collect to help determine how a successful pilot program may be replicated in a different state? Should the pilot program undergo a formal evaluation? If so, what form should it take? Please provide your reasoning.

3.7 At what point(s) in the continuum of participation in a program should work and family well-being indicators be measured (e.g., while a family is still receiving assistance, upon exit, two quarters after exit, a year after exit)?

3.8 What characteristics among pilot states (e.g., programmatic, geographic, economic, demographic) would be most helpful in providing useful and scalable results for TANF administrators and policymakers? What level of diversity among pilot sites (e.g., geographic, size, location) would be most helpful in providing relevant results across states?

3.9 In what ways should equity be considered when implementing a pilot? Are there tools or resources needed to promote equity in pilot design, implementation, and evaluation? What factors or data points would you consider important to ensuring equity (avoiding disparate impacts) in the implementation of work and family well-being measures as part of the pilot? How do we ensure that the individual experiences of families that receive

TANF cash assistance are considered in the pilot design, implementation, and evaluation?

3.10 Are there similar past pilot efforts (federal, state, local) from which HHS should draw lessons learned in setting up this pilot project?

3.11 Are there any other questions or issues related to the pilots for which you wish to provide comments?

## 4.0 Key Questions—Work Outcomes Measures

4.1 In your experience, what data sources on employment and earnings are most accurate and practical for work outcomes measures similar to those required by the FRA? What do you see as advantages and limitations of matching with the National Directory of New Hires (NDNH) at the federal level, as compared to the State Wage Interchange System (SWIS) or other alternatives? We are particularly interested in understanding the costs, timing, administrative burden, and reliability of different data sources.

4.2 If given the opportunity, do you believe state agencies would have the interest and capacity to voluntarily submit supplemental wage information (similar to WIOA<sup>9</sup>) in addition to information needed for a match with the NDNH? If so, would states be more likely to submit supplemental individual-level data or aggregated outcomes measures using an alternative data source? We are interested in the rationale behind the preferred approach.

4.3 In your experience, what data sources are most accurate and practical for high school degree or secondary school diploma equivalency attainment? Is it feasible to reliably determine high school completion or secondary school diploma equivalency attainment for current and former TANF recipients using survey data? Please share the nature of your experience.

4.4 When thinking about exit from the TANF program, what are the most important considerations? In what manner, if any, should the issue of "churn" be addressed? (That is, those cases that cycle off for short periods of time due to causes such as administrative errors, delays in redetermination, or sanctions.)

4.5 We are interested in understanding the timelines involved in reliably reporting and calculating outcome measures. What operational issues affect the timing and availability of data for the work outcomes measures, including TANF caseload, employment

<sup>9</sup> See <https://www.dol.gov/agencies/eta/advisories/training-and-employment-guidance-letter-no-26-16>.

and earnings, and education data? For example, what is the earliest turnaround time for reliably reporting that a TANF case has closed? What are the timelines involved in matching and working with employment and earnings data and education data?

4.6 What factors (e.g., demographic, economic, policy, programmatic) should be considered for presenting the work outcomes measures in context? Are there variables such as state economic conditions that may impact state outcomes and are outside a state TANF program's control?

4.7 In what ways should equity be considered when implementing work outcome measures? What are the advantages of and/or possible difficulties associated with reporting data disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, age, disability, other demographic characteristics, or geography to enable equity analyses around work outcomes?<sup>10</sup>

4.8 What technical assistance or supports would be helpful for collecting data for work outcomes? What obstacles do you foresee and how can ACF and its partners provide assistance to overcome or manage those barriers?

4.9 Please describe the characteristics of successful partnerships between the public workforce system and the TANF system that support the collection of data for the work outcomes measures required by the FRA?

4.10 Please describe the specific steps for a state to begin collecting and reporting data and their estimated duration. For example, please estimate the timeframe for system changes to generate a list of SSNs of work-eligible individuals who left TANF in a given quarter.

4.11 Are there any other questions or issues related to the work outcomes measures for which you wish to provide comments?

4.12 HHS has determined that tribes are NOT required to report work outcomes measures as laid out in the Fiscal Responsibility Act. However, OFA is committed to supporting Tribal TANF programs that wish to voluntarily measure work outcomes for their

caseloads. As we explore this possibility, what factors do we need to better understand? What training or technical assistance could support Tribal TANF programs interested in measuring work outcomes?

*Authority:* Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023.

**Ann Flagg,**

*Director, Office of Family Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 2023–26100 Filed 11–22–23; 11:15 am]

**BILLING CODE 4184–36–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

### Food and Drug Administration

[Docket No. FDA–2023–N–1554]

#### Agency Information Collection Activities; Submission for Office of Management and Budget Review; Comment Request; Qualitative Feedback on Agency Service Delivery

**AGENCY:** Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Food and Drug Administration (FDA, Agency, or we) is announcing that a proposed collection of information has been submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and clearance under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

**DATES:** Submit written comments (including recommendations) on the collection of information by December 27, 2023.

**ADDRESSES:** To ensure that comments on the information collection are received, OMB recommends that written comments be submitted to <https://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAMain>. Find this particular information collection by selecting “Currently under Review—Open for Public Comments” or by using the search function. The OMB control number for this information collection is 0910–0697. Also include the FDA docket number found in brackets in the heading of this document.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

JonnaLynn Capezzuto, Office of Operations, Food and Drug Administration, Three White Flint North, 10A–12M, 11601 Landsdown St.,

North Bethesda, MD 20852, 301–796–3794, [PRASStaff@fda.hhs.gov](mailto:PRASStaff@fda.hhs.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In compliance with 44 U.S.C. 3507, FDA has submitted the following proposed collection of information to OMB for review and clearance.

#### Qualitative Feedback on Agency Service Delivery

*OMB Control Number 0910–0697—Extension*

FDA will garner qualitative customer and stakeholder feedback using a variety of methods in order to gain useful insights into customer or stakeholder perceptions, experiences, and expectations; provide an early warning of issues with service; or focus attention on areas where communication, training, or changes in operations might improve delivery of products or services. These collections will allow for ongoing, collaborative, and actionable communications between the Agency and its customers and stakeholders. It will also allow feedback to contribute directly to the improvement of program management.

Feedback collected under this generic clearance will provide useful information, but it will not yield data that can be generalized to the overall population. This type of generic clearance for qualitative information will not be used for quantitative information collections that are designed to yield reliably actionable results, such as monitoring trends over time or documenting program performance.

Respondents to this collection of information cover a broad range of customers and stakeholders who have specific characteristics related to certain products or services regulated by FDA. These stakeholders include members of the general public, healthcare professionals, industry, and others who have experience with a product under FDA's jurisdiction.

In the **Federal Register** of May 25, 2023 (88 FR 33889), FDA published a 60-day notice requesting public comment on the proposed collection of information. One comment was received but it was outside the scope of the PRA.

FDA estimates the burden of this collection of information as follows:

<sup>10</sup> See <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/eo13985-vision-for-equitable-data.pdf>.