

TDI claims or WC. What are the most appropriate eligibility criteria (such as time off work, type of condition, type of employment) to identify such individuals? What kinds of “triggers” would work for the population as a mechanism for enrollment into the project?

14. Are there specific functional risk assessment instruments that you recommend using for this project? What are the benefits and limitations of those instruments? How might they be used to identify the target population here or form the basis for an RTW plan?

15. Are there aspects of your state’s TDI, paid leave, FMLA, WC, or other state programs that would pose particular advantages or challenges for identifying workers who might benefit from an intervention like the one discussed above? Are there aspects of these programs that would pose particular advantages or challenges for collecting data on treatments, services, and outcomes for a project like this?

16. Should the target population be limited to individuals with certain types of medical conditions, such as musculoskeletal conditions and chronic health conditions? Why or why not?

17. How should project service areas be defined? For example, should demonstrations be carried out state-wide, in specific counties, regions, or local communities? Would these service areas have a large enough target population for evaluation purposes?

18. What types of entities would be the most beneficial to consider partnering with to provide the COHE-style services, and why? Examples could include large health-care systems, collections of small health care provider offices, private self-insured employers with in-house disability management, vocational rehabilitation providers, accountable or managed care organizations, federally qualified community health centers, community based organizations, and urgent care centers.

III. Eligible Applicants

19. What types of state government entities are the most logical or well-positioned to serve as the primary applicant and fiscal agent? What is the best way to organize the structure of a demonstration like the one described above in your state? What structure would best enable effective leadership, responsibility, and accountability for the project? Would a single agency be the natural lead for the project?

20. Similar state functions may be housed in different agencies, depending on the state. Should key functions be required, rather than specific agencies?

If so, what functions should be required?

21. Should groups of states be allowed to jointly apply? Why or why not?

22. Could a non-state (*i.e.*, county or local government) or non-governmental (*i.e.*, non-profit or private organization) entity serve as the primary applicant and fiscal agent? If so, what characteristics should be required of such entities? Would this be preferable to a state governmental agency serving in this role? Why or why not?

23. The COHE model in Washington operates within a monopolistic WC system, which allows for centralized participant controls, service management, and data collection. Would states with other WC models, such as privately managed and competitive WC markets, be able to feasibly implement a similar model, particularly with regard to data collection? If so, how? Would states with short-term or temporary disability insurance programs or states with mandatory paid sick leave be able to do so, and how? In other words, should grant applicants be limited to states with specific characteristics, and why or why not?

24. What partners, public or private, should be required or encouraged as part of the demonstration project? What other entities might be beneficial as collaborators? In what ways could they assist?

IV. Evaluation and Design Issues

25. Are there research questions, not specified above, that could be answered through the evaluation which would improve understanding of ways to better serve and increase employment and labor force participation of individuals with work disabilities?

26. What entity would be most successful in recruiting participants who have a qualifying injury or health condition (that makes them at risk for leaving the labor force)? Examples could include an insurance company, state TDI or WC insurance providers, an employer, or a health care provider.

27. Do health systems and/or health care providers utilize risk predictors to target specific types of services? If so, which predictors are used, and for which services? Are any employment- or SAW/RTW-related?

28. If a cluster-randomized design is used for an experimental impact evaluation, how could the unit of randomization be defined and operationalized within various types of grantee sites? Are there other evaluation designs (randomized or not) that would be more feasible (*e.g.* quasi-experimental design)? If so, how could

a potential comparison group be identified? If other randomized designs are recommended, what are potential units for random assignment and points at which assignment would occur?

Rights to Materials Submitted

By submitting material in response to this notice, you agree to grant us a worldwide, royalty-free, perpetual, irrevocable, nonexclusive license to use the material, and to post it publicly. Further, you agree that you own, have a valid license, or are otherwise authorized to provide the material to us. You should not provide any material you consider confidential or proprietary in response to this notice. We will not provide any compensation for material submitted in response to this notice.

Jennifer Sheehy,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Disability Employment Policy.

[FR Doc. 2017-20338 Filed 9-28-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

Notice to LSC Grantees of Application Process for Subgranting 2017–2018 Pro Bono Innovation Fund and Technology Initiative Grant Funds

AGENCY: Legal Services Corporation.

ACTION: Notice of application dates and format for LSC Technology Initiative Grants and Pro Bono Innovation Fund subgrant applications.

SUMMARY: The Legal Services Corporation (LSC) announces the submission dates for applications for subgrants under its Technology Initiative Grants and its Pro Bono Innovation Fund grants starting after October 30, 2017. LSC is also providing information about the location of subgrant application forms and directions.

DATES: See **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section for application dates.

ADDRESSES: Legal Services Corporation—Office of Compliance and Enforcement, 3333 K Street NW., Third Floor, Washington, DC 20007–3522.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Office of Compliance and Enforcement by email at subgrants@lsc.gov, or visit the LSC Web site at <http://www.lsc.gov/grants-grantee-resources/grantee-guidance/how-apply-subgrant>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: LSC revised its subgrant rule, 45 CFR part 1627, effective April 1, 2017. The revised rule requires LSC to publish, on an annual basis, “notice of the requirements concerning the format and

contents of the [subgrant] application annually in the **Federal Register** and on its Web site.” 45 CFR 1627.4(b). This Notice and the publication of the Subgrant Application Forms on LSC’s Web site satisfies § 1627.4(b)’s notice requirement for the Technology Initiative Grant and Pro Bono Innovation Fund grant programs. Only current or prospective LSC grantees may apply.

Applications for subgrants of Technology Initiative Grant and Pro Bono Innovation Fund grant funds with starting dates after October 30 must be submitted at least 45 days in advance of the subgrant’s proposed effective date. 45 CFR 1627.4(b)(2). LSC grantees may subgrant up to \$20,000 in LSC funds without submitting an application for prior approval. 45 CFR 1627.4(b). All subgrants of LSC funds, however, are subject to LSC’s regulations, guidelines, and instructions.

Subgrant applications must be submitted at <https://lscgrants.lsc.gov>. Applicants may access the application under the “Subgrants” heading on their “LSC Grants” home page. Applicants may initiate an application by selecting “Initiate Subgrant Application.” Applicants must then provide the information requested in the LSC Grants data fields, located in the Subrecipient Profile, Subgrant Summary, and Subrecipient Budget screens, and upload the following documents:

- A draft Subgrant Agreement (with the required terms provided in the Technology Initiative Grants and Pro Bono Innovation Fund Subgrant Agreement Template (“Template”));
- Responses to Technology Initiative Grants and Pro Bono Innovation Fund Subgrant Inquiries;
- The subrecipient’s accounting manual (or letter indicating that the subrecipient does not have one and why);
- The subrecipient’s most recent audited financial statement (or letter indicating that the subrecipient does not have one and why);
- The subrecipient’s most recent Form 990 filed with the Internal Revenue Service (or letter indicating that the subrecipient does not have one and why);
- The subrecipient’s current fidelity bond policy (or letter indicating that the subrecipient does not have one and why);
- The subrecipient’s conflict of interest policy (or letter indicating that the subrecipient does not have one and why); and
- The subrecipient’s whistleblower policy (or letter indicating that the

subrecipient does not have one and why).

Technology Initiative Grants and Pro Bono Innovation Fund Subgrant Agreement Template and Inquiries are available on LSC’s Web site at <http://www.lsc.gov/grants-grantee-resources/grantee-guidance/how-apply-subgrant>. LSC encourages applicants to use the Template provided to draft their subgrant agreement(s). If the applicant does not use the Template, the proposed agreement must include, at a minimum, the substance of the provisions in the Template. LSC recommends that applicants pay careful attention to the terms included in, and instructions on, the Template. Several of the terms have been modified from previous years and new terms have been added.

Once submitted, LSC will evaluate the application and provide applicants with instructions on any needed modifications to the information, documents, or Draft Agreement provided with the application. The applicant must then upload a final and signed subgrant agreement through LSC Grants. This can be done by selecting “Upload Signed Agreement” to the right of the application “Status” under the “Subgrant” heading on an applicant’s LSC Grants home page.

As required by 45 CFR 1627.4(b)(3), LSC will inform applicants of its decision to disapprove, approve, or request modifications to the subgrant no later than the subgrant’s proposed effective date.

Dated: September 25, 2017.

Stefanie K. Davis,
Assistant General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 2017–20865 Filed 9–28–17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7050–01–P

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Copyright Royalty Board

[Docket No. 17–CRB–0011–SD (2015)]

Distribution of 2015 Satellite Royalty Funds

AGENCY: Copyright Royalty Board (CRB), Library of Congress.

ACTION: Notice requesting reply comments.

SUMMARY: The Copyright Royalty Judges solicit reply comments on a motion of Allocation Phase claimants for partial distribution of 2015 satellite royalty funds.

DATES: Reply comments are due on or before October 30, 2017. Surreplies from original commenters are due on or before November 8, 2017.

ADDRESSES: You may make replies and surreplies, identified by docket number 17–CRB–0011–SD (2015), by any of the following methods:

CRB’s electronic filing application: Submit comments online in eCRB at <https://app.crb.gov/>.

U.S. mail: Copyright Royalty Board, P.O. Box 70977, Washington, DC 20024–0977; or

Overnight service (only USPS Express Mail is acceptable): Copyright Royalty Board, P.O. Box 70977, Washington, DC 20024–0977; or

Commercial courier: Address package to: Copyright Royalty Board, Library of Congress, James Madison Memorial Building, LM–403, 101 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20559–6000. Deliver to: Congressional Courier Acceptance Site, 2nd Street NE. and D Street NE., Washington, DC; or

Hand delivery: Library of Congress, James Madison Memorial Building, LM–401, 101 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20559–6000.

Instructions: Unless submitting online, commenters must submit an original, five paper copies, and an electronic version on a CD. All submissions must include the CRB’s name and docket number. All submissions will be posted without change to eCRB on <https://www.crb.gov> including any personal information provided.

Docket: For access to the docket to read background documents or comments received, go to eCRB, the Copyright Royalty Board’s electronic filing and case management system, at <https://app.crb.gov/> and search for docket number 17–CRB–0011–SD (2015). For documents not yet uploaded to eCRB (because it is a new system), go to the agency Web site at <https://www.crb.gov/> or contact the CRB Program Specialist.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Anita Blaine, CRB Program Specialist, by telephone at (202) 707–7658 or email at crb@loc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On February 17, 2017, representatives of all the Allocation Phase claimant categories (formerly “Phase I”) ¹ filed with the Judges a motion requesting a partial distribution amounting to 60% of the 2015 satellite royalty funds pursuant to section 801(b)(3)(C) of the Copyright Act. 17 U.S.C. 801(b)(3)(C). That section requires that, before ruling on the

¹ The “Allocation Phase Claimants” are Program Suppliers, Joint Sports Claimants, Broadcaster Claimants Group, Music Claimants (represented by American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers, Broadcast Music, Inc., and SESAC, Inc.), and Devotional Claimants.