

Author Full Name : Sarah Priest**Received Date :** 10/11/2024 12:15 PM**Comments Received :**

Thank you for this opportunity to provide further comment.

I have attached just the new/latest edition Module 3 - Individual and Family Level section of the report with my comments added in RED as it pertains to each section.

My overall comment is that what is and will be most paramount is clear, well articulated definitions and trainings on what each Service or Outcome means exactly. Mistakes are common in interpreting what is meant by "Individual" - was it the householder who applied for utility assistance/received utility payment assistance that you count (1) for services - or do you count all household members here? Then for Outcomes (which you are now calling indicators) - when you ask for # of individuals who avoided utility shut-off or had service restored - is that the all household members - or just the responsible party named at the utility??? Clarity on if you are seeking as much direct correlation between services and outcomes as possible will also be good - and if so, re-ordering some topics (housing) would be helpful.

This updated report gives the nation a fresh starting point to be consistent with how and what we count. The next priority for OCS should be ensuring that supporting data systems and platforms that states and agencies use are well equipped to make the necessary changes and that the financial burden doesn't fall to the anti-poverty fighting agencies or states. A Verified compliant 'stamp/seal' something that venders would need to seek from the Federal government in order to be a contender in vying for state/agency business would also be nice.

Thanks for your consideration.