MAYA BUENAVENTURA, ROLAND NEIL, KARA JIA, SARAH B. HUNTER

Details of an Evaluation of Pima County's Bureau of Justice Assistance Fiscal Year 2021 Second Chance Act Pay for Success Initiative

Annex

This publication has completed RAND's research quality-assurance process but was not professionally copyedited.

For more information on this publication, visit **www.rand.org/t/RRA4745-1**.

About RAND

RAND is a research organization that develops solutions to public policy challenges to help make communities throughout the world safer and more secure, healthier and more prosperous. RAND is nonprofit, nonpartisan, and committed to the public interest. To learn more about RAND, visit www.rand.org.

Research Integrity

Our mission to help improve policy and decisionmaking through research and analysis is enabled through our core values of quality and objectivity and our unwavering commitment to the highest level of integrity and ethical behavior. To help ensure our research and analysis are rigorous, objective, and nonpartisan, we subject our research publications to a robust and exacting quality-assurance process; avoid both the appearance and reality of financial and other conflicts of interest through staff training, project screening, and a policy of mandatory disclosure; and pursue transparency in our research engagements through our commitment to the open publication of our research findings and recommendations, disclosure of the source of funding of published research, and policies to ensure intellectual independence. For more information, visit www.rand.org/about/research-integrity.

RAND's publications do not necessarily reflect the opinions of its research clients and sponsors.

Published by the RAND Corporation, Santa Monica, Calif.
© 2026 RAND Corporation
RAND® is a registered trademark.

Limited Print and Electronic Distribution Rights

This publication and trademark(s) contained herein are protected by law. This representation of RAND intellectual property is provided for noncommercial use only. Unauthorized posting of this publication online is prohibited; linking directly to its webpage on rand.org is encouraged. Permission is required from RAND to reproduce, or reuse in another form, any of its research products for commercial purposes. For information on reprint and reuse permissions, visit www.rand.org/about/publishing/permissions.

RR-A4745-2

About This Annex

This annex presents supplementary detail to RAND's evaluation of Pima County's Bureau of Justice Assistance fiscal year 2021 Second Chance Act Pay for Success Initiative (SCA-PFS), a permanent supportive housing program that aims to address the interconnected challenges of homelessness, behavioral health conditions, and repeated incarceration in Pima County, Arizona. The evaluation builds on lessons from RAND's 2019–2021 pilot study and examines the program's evolution under a performance-based contracting model supported by the Bureau of Justice Assistance. The evaluation draws on linked administrative data from multiple county agencies and program partners, enabling detailed analysis of participant characteristics, service utilization, and outcomes.

The main report is available at www.rand.org/t/RRA4745-1.

RAND Education, Employment, and Infrastructure

This work was conducted in the Infrastructure and Justice Program of RAND Education, Employment, and Infrastructure, a division of RAND that aims to improve educational opportunity, economic prosperity, and civic life for all. For more information, visit www.rand.org/eei or email EEI@rand.org.

Funding

This project was supported by Grant No. 15PBJA-21-GG-04016-PFSH awarded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance. The Bureau of Justice Assistance is a component of the Department of Justice's Office of Justice Programs, which also includes the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the National Institute of Justice, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, the Office for Victims of Crime, and the SMART Office. Points of view or opinions in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Contents

About This Annex 3
Tables 5
Appendix A. Comparison of Full Participant Sample to Subsample 6
Appendix B. Details on Cost Data Sources and Estimation 8
Appendix C: Disaggregated Outcome Analysis 10
Appendix D. Summary of Pay for Success and Permanent Supportive Housing Programs Reviewed 12

Tables

Table A.1. Comparison of Characteristics of the Full Sample to those of Two Subsets.....6
Table B.1. Cost Data by Criminal Justice Entity.....9
Table C.1. Number of Participants Experiencing Outcomes in Pre- and Post-Enrollment Periods 10
Table C.2. Number of Criminal Justice Events in Pre- and Post-Enrollment Periods 10
Table C.3. Average Cost of Outcomes Per Participant in Pre- and Post-Enrollment Periods.....11
Table D.1. Overview of Programs Included in the Literature Review.....13

Appendix A. Comparison of Full Participant Sample to Subsample

In Chapter 4, data on 126 participants who enrolled between Q1 2023 and Q2 2025 is used. In Chapter 5, the focus is on a subset—the 86 participants who enrolled between Q1 2023 and Q2 2024, since those are the participants for which we obtained at least a year of post-enrollment outcome data. Table A.1 shows this subset (called Subset 1 in the table and shown in the second numerical column) has very similar characteristics to the full sample (which is presented in the first numerical column). Also, the age range (21 to 65) and average age (37) of the subsample is identical to the full sample.

Table A.1. Comparison of Characteristics of the Full Sample to those of Two Subsets

Variable	Value	Full Sample: Enrollees between Q1 2022 and Q2 2024	Subset 1: Enrollees between Q1 2023 and Q2 2024	Subset 2: Enrollees between Q1 2022 and Q2 2024 who moved into PSH by Q2 2025
Gender	Man	70 (56)	48 (56)	19 (44)
	Woman	55 (44)	37 (43)	24 (56)
	Transgender	1 (1)	1 (1)	0 (0)
Race	White	91 (72)	59 (69)	28 (65)
	Black	16 (13)	13 (15)	6 (14)
	American Indian, Alaska Native, or Indigenous	10 (8)	8 (9)	3 (7)
	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	2 (2)	2 (2)	2 (5)
	Multiracial	7 (6)	4 (5)	4 (9)
Ethnicity	Hispanic	51 (40)	29 (34)	20 (47)
	Non-Hispanic	75 (60)	57 (66)	23 (53)
Household type	Adult-Child Household	7 (6)	1 (1)	3 (7)
	No Children	119 (94)	85 (99)	40 (93)
Total		126	86	43

Note: Percentages are in brackets and are calculated within sample type (i.e., the full sample and subsamples). They may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Chapter 4 shows that 43 of the 126 enrollees between Q1 2022 and Q2 2024 obtained PSH by Q2 2025 (including those who then moved out of PSH). Table A.1 also includes information on the characteristics of that subset (called Subset 2 and shown in the third numerical column), to facilitate a comparison with the full sample of enrollees (in the first numerical column). The mean age of those who moved into PSH was 36 and the range was 23 to 50 years old. Overall,

the subset of enrollees who moved into PSH were similar in the characteristics examined. Those who moved into PSH were slightly less likely to be White, were slightly more likely to be Hispanic, and were somewhat more likely to be female, though given the small sample sizes involved it is quite possible these are chance differences.

Appendix B. Details on Cost Data Sources and Estimation

Table B.1 contains the estimated costs, by criminal justice agency and service/outcome, used in analyses in Chapter 7. The way we arrived at these cost estimates varies by agency. For Pima County Pretrial Services, we were provided with data on the average cost by service type per day per defendant—except enhanced supervision, which was not operative during the period the agency examined to estimate costs. Therefore, we assume the average cost of enhanced supervision is $4.21 per day. The pilot study reported an average cost per day of $3.00 for a nearly even mix of standard and enhanced supervision cases.[1] Assuming this cost did not change much since, that implies the typical enhanced supervision case is about $4.21 per day, since half of that plus $1.79 (the standard supervision cost per day) is $3.00. For a given service provided, we estimated the cost by multiplying the corresponding daily rate by the number of days that service was provided.

For Pima County Public Defense Services, we were unable to obtain updated cost data. As such, we use the cost data from that was provided for the pilot study but adjusted for inflation.[2] Specifically, the pilot study indicates the average cost in 2021 was $1,520 per felony case, $418 per misdemeanor case, and $1,106 per probation case. For the years we study, we multiply those 2021 costs by the change in the Consumer Price Index since 2021.

The Tucson Public Defender's Office provided data on the average cost per case by fiscal year, for the period covering our entire outcome analysis. We treat these average costs per case as our estimates of the cost per case for our participants.

For Pima County Sheriff's Department, we use data by fiscal year on the fee charged for booking, which applies once to all bookings, and the daily fee, which applies to custodial bookings every day the person is incarcerated. We have these costs for the fiscal years that cover our entire outcome analysis. Importantly, these are the fees charged to the agencies that use the PCSD for bookings, which may not be the same thing as either the marginal or average cost of jailing an individual for a day. We do not have the data to determine how these fees are used, but it is possible that a reduction in fees charged to agencies would not be matched by a corresponding reduction in jail expenditures.

[1] McBain et al., 2021, at p. 38.

[2] McBain et al., 2021, at p. 38.

Table B.1. Cost Data by Criminal Justice Entity

Entity	Description			
Pima County Pretrial Services	Standard Supervision	Enhanced Supervision	STEPs Diversion	Jail Population Review Releases
	$1.79	$4.21	$2.42	$5.57
Pima County Public Defense Services	Year	Felony	Misdemeanor	Probation
	2022	$1656.80	$455.62	$1205.54
	2023	$1702.40	$468.16	$1238.72
	2024	$1748.00	$480.70	$1271.90
	2025	N/A	$493.24	N/A
Tucson Public Defender's Office	Fiscal Year		Average Cost per Case	
	FY 2021/2022		$327.00	
	FY 2022/2023		$235.68	
	FY 2023/2024		$417.00	
	FY 2024/2025		$371.00	
Pima County Sheriff's Department	Fiscal Year	Booking Fee	Daily Fee	
	FY 2021/2022	$422.73	$123.90	
	FY 2022/2023	$401.17	$107.43	
	FY 2023/2024	$396.30	$107.81	
	FY 2024/2025	$495.94	$125.09	

Note: N/A = Not applicable because no participants experienced the outcome during that period.

Appendix C: Disaggregated Outcome Analysis

Chapter 5 presents changes in outcomes grouped by criminal justice entity. However, participants experienced more than one type of outcome for these all entities except the Tucson Public Defender's Office, which only provided misdemeanor public defense. Tables C.1-C.3 present the analogous results to Tables 5.1-5.3 but disaggregated by specific outcomes.

Table C.1. Number of Participants Experiencing Outcomes in Pre- and Post-Enrollment Periods

	Participants Experiencing Outcomes			
Outcome	**Pre-Enrollment**	**Post-Enrollment**	**Difference**	**p-value**
Pima County Pretrial Services				
Standard Supervision	22 (26%)	4 (5%)	-18 (-82%)	<0.01
Enhanced Supervision	24 (28%)	4 (5%)	-20 (-83%)	<0.01
STEP Diversion	6 (7%)	2 (2%)	-4 (-67%)	0.65
Jail Population Review	0 (0%)	2 (2%)	2 (N/A)	1.00
Pima County Public Defense Services				
Felony	45 (52%)	20 (23%)	-25 (-56%)	<0.01
Misdemeanor	9 (10%)	7 (8%)	-2 (-22%)	1.00
Probation	25 (29%)	8 (9%)	-17 (-68%)	0.01
Tucson Public Defender's Office				
Public Defense	21 (24%)	17 (20%)	-4 (-19%)	1,00
Pima County Sheriff's Department				
Custodial Booking	78 (91%)	43 (50%)	-35 (-45%)	<0.01
Non-custodial Booking	10 (12%)	7 (8%)	-3 (-30%)	1.00
Total	80 (93%)	52 (60%)	-28 (-35%)	<0.01

Note: p-values are from paired Wilcoxon signed-rank tests at the individual level and are adjusted for multiple comparisons using the Holm method. This table presents information for individuals enrolled into the program between January 1, 2023, and June 30, 2024 (n = 86).

Table C.2. Number of Criminal Justice Events in Pre- and Post-Enrollment Periods

	Number of Outcomes			
Outcome	**Pre-Enrollment**	**Post-Enrollment**	**Difference**	**p-value**
Pima County Pretrial Services				
Standard Supervision	23	4	-19 (-83%)	<0.01
Enhanced Supervision	37	4	-33 (-89%)	<0.01
STEP Diversion	6	3	-3 (-50%)	1.00
Jail Population Review	0	2	2 (N/A)	1.00

Outcome	Number of Outcomes		Difference	p-value
	Pre-Enrollment	Post-Enrollment		
Pima County Public Defense Services				
Felony	87	34	-53 (-61%)	<0.01
Misdemeanor	19	17	-2 (-11%)	1.00
Probation	30	9	-21 (-70%)	0.01
Tucson Public Defender's Office				
Public Defense	63	40	-23 (-37%)	0.42
Pima County Sheriff's Department				
Custodial Booking	166	65	-101 (-61%)	<0.01
Non-custodial Booking	12	9	-3 (-25%)	1.00
Total	443	187	-256 (-58%)	<0.01

Note: p-values are from paired Wilcoxon signed-rank tests at the individual level and are adjusted for multiple comparisons using the Holm method. This table presents information for individuals enrolled into the program between January 1, 2023, and June 30, 2024 (n = 86).

Table C.3. Average Cost of Outcomes Per Participant in Pre- and Post-Enrollment Periods

Outcome	Average Cost Per Participant		Difference	p-value
	Pre-Enrollment	Post-Enrollment		
Pima County Pretrial Services				
Standard Supervision	$54.16	$5.62	-$48.54 (-90%)	0.01
Enhanced Supervision	$144.95	$12.87	-$132.08 (-91%)	<0.01
STEP Diversion	$13.51	$3.66	-$9.85 (-73%)	1.00
Jail Population Review	$0.00	$3.30	$3.30 (N/A)	1.00
Pima County Public Defense Services				
Felony	$1,697.27	$681.00	-$1,016.28 (-60%)	0.01
Misdemeanor	$103.43	$93.13	-$10.30 (-10%)	1.00
Probation	$424.01	$131.18	-$292.83 (-69%)	0.24
Tucson Public Defender's Office				
Public Defense	$194.86	$182.34	-$12.51 (-6%)	1.00
Pima County Sheriff's Department				
Custodial Booking	$7,761.54	$4,501.41	-$3,260.13 (-42%)	<0.01
Non-custodial Booking	$56.06	$42.80	-$13.26 (-24%)	1.00
Total	$10,449.79	$5,657.31	-$4,792.48 (-46%)	<0.01

Note: p-values are from paired Wilcoxon signed-rank tests at the individual level and are adjusted for multiple comparisons using the Holm method. This table presents information for individuals enrolled into the program between January 1, 2023, and June 30, 2024 (n = 86).

Appendix D. Summary of Pay for Success and Permanent Supportive Housing Programs Reviewed

The information in this appendix supports the comparative analysis presented in Chapter 8. This appendix provides a detailed summary of the 11 Pay for Success (PFS), Social Impact Bond (SIB), and outcomes-based housing programs included in RAND's literature review. Programs were included if they met all four of the following criteria:

1. Used a Pay for Success (PFS) or Social Impact Bond (SIB) financing model.
2. Served individuals experiencing homelessness, housing instability, or recent involvement with the criminal justice system.
3. Incorporated measurable outcomes related to recidivism reduction, jail diversion, housing stability, or other indicators of improved social well-being as a basis for repayment.
4. Was implemented and has publicly available details on the outcome metrics and payment structures actually used for repayment.

The table below (Table D.1) presents key characteristics of each program, including financing model, target population, primary outcome domains, and evaluation design.

Table D.1. Overview of Programs Included in the Literature Review

Program	Start Year	Jurisdiction	Population	Intervention	Study Design	Outcome Metrics Linked to Repayment (Outcome Period)	Outcome Payment Structure
Denver Supportive Housing SIB[3]	2016	Denver, CO	724 adults experiencing chronic homelessness and frequent arrests	Permanent supportive housing	RCT	• Reduction in jail bed days • Housing stability • (3 years following randomization)	• Housing Stability: Payment = (Total days in housing – days in jail) of all participants × $15.12/day • Tiered payments based on % difference in jail days between treatment and control group, with <20%, [20%, 30%), [30%, 65%), and ≥65% yielding $0, $160,000, (30 x $160,000) + $38,000/ % point above 30%, and max total payment $6,130,000, respectively
Denver Housing to Health (H2H)[4]	2022	Denver, CO	250+ adults experiencing homelessness with high arrests and Medicaid costs	Permanent supportive housing	RCT, DiD	• 365 total adjusted days in housing (annual) • Reduction in jail bed days (2 and 4 years post-randomization) • Net reduction in Medicaid expenditures (end of project, 2029)	• Housing Stability: Payment = (Total days in housing – days in jail) of all participants × $19.25/day. • Jail Bed Days: Payment = Per-participant reduction in jail days for treatment vs. control group, measured at 2 and 4 years post-randomization (treatment-on-the-treated analysis). • Medicaid Expenditures: Payment = Net reduction in Medicaid claims for treatment vs. control group, calculated using difference-in-differences analysis at project end (SIPPRA/Treasury payment).

[3] Gillespie et al., 2021b; Sarah Gillespie, Devlin Hanson, Josh Leopold, and Alyse D. Oneto, *Costs and Offsets of Providing Supportive Housing to Break the Homelessness-Jail Cycle: Findings from the Denver Supportive Housing Social Impact Bond Initiative*, Washington, DC: Urban Institute, July 2021a; Batko et al., 2023; Rayanne Hawkins, Mayookha Mitra-Majumdar, David McClure, and Ellen Paddock, *Using Pay for Success in Criminal Justice Projects: Lessons Learned from PFS Project Stakeholders, Policy Analysis, and Landscape Analysis*, Washington, DC: Urban Institute, November 2017.

[4] Hanson et al., 2025; Sarah Gillespie, Devlin Hanson, and Alyse D. Oneto, *Scaling Supportive Housing as a Health Care Solution: Early Findings from the Denver Housing to Health Pay for Success Project*, Washington, DC: Urban Institute, May 2024; Hanson et al., July 2022.

Program	Start Year	Jurisdiction	Population	Intervention	Study Design	Outcome Metrics Linked to Repayment (Outcome Period)	Outcome Payment Structure
Just in Reach[5] Pay for Success	2017	Los Angeles County, CA	300 adults with high physical, mental, or substance use disorders who experienced multiple incarcerations and chronic homelessness in the past 3 years	Permanent supportive housing with intensive case management	Propensity-score matched comparison	• Housing retention (6 and 12 months) • Jail avoidance (2 years post-housing)	6- & 12-month housing retention payment per participant, 2-year jail avoidance (payment per participant for 0, 1, or 2 qualified returns to jail) **Note: Payments not tied to propensity score matched group**
Project Welcome Home[6]	2015	Santa Clara County, CA	Chronically homeless adults with high county service use	Permanent supportive housing	RCT	Months of continuous stable housing; milestones at 3, 6, 9, 12 months and each month after 12; up to 6 years	Graduated payments ($1,242, $1,863, $2,484, $6,831 for each of 3, 6, 9, 12 months; $1,035/month after year 1) **Note: Payments not tied to RCT**
Lane County PSH[7]	2018	Lane County, OR	125 adults returning from jail or prison with high service use	Permanent supportive housing	Individuals eligible for the program who did not receive a PSH slot served as the comparison group	• Housing stability (6, 12, 18 months) with target rate of 85% after 6 months and 78% after 12 months (with no reference to comparison group) • Lack of felony conviction (1, 2, 3 years) with target rate of 3% (with no reference to comparison group)	Payments were made for each participant who achieved specific milestones: housing stability at 6, 12, and 18 months, and no felony conviction at 1, 2, and 3 years. Each milestone triggered a set payment, and payments were made quarterly as participants reached them.

[5] Hunter et al., 2022; Hunter and Mercier, 2023; Batko et al., 2023; Hawkins et al., 2017.

[6] Raven et al., 2020; County of Santa Clara and Abode Services, 2015; Hawkins et al., 2017.

[7] Batko et al., 2023; Kelly Walsh, Nicole DuBois, Samantha Batko, Clare Salerno, Eleanor Noble, Akiva Liberman, and Mary Cunningham, *Evaluation of the HUD-DOJ Pay for Success Permanent Supportive Housing Demonstration: Year 3 Report*, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research, Urban Institute, May 2020; Akiva Liberman, Mary Cunningham, Sarah Gillespie, Samantha Batko, Matt Eldridge, Nicole DuBois, Alexandra Ricks, and Kelly Walsh, *Evaluation of the HUD-DOJ Pay for Success Permanent Supportive Housing Demonstration: Year 2 Report*, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research, Urban Institute, October 2019; Hawkins et al., 2017.

Program	Start Year	Jurisdiction	Population	Intervention	Study Design	Outcome Metrics Linked to Repayment (Outcome Period)	Outcome Payment Structure
Salt Lake County REACH[8]	2016	Salt Lake County, UT	225 high-risk, high-need probationers	Tailored therapy, short-term housing, case management	RCT	• Reduction in days incarcerated (4 yrs) with target rate of 35% reduction • Reduction in arrests (4 yrs) with target rate of 35% reduction • Improved employment quarters (2 yrs) with target rate of 25% improvement • Receive 200 hrs. treatment in 6 mo. with target rate of 66% enrollment	• Average $200 per day avoided • $250 per arrest avoided • $450 per quarter • $5,800 per successfully engaged participant
Homes Not Jail[9]	2016	Salt Lake County, UT	315 persistently homeless single adults (age 30+) with 90–364 days in shelter, jail, or on the streets, not eligible for other housing services	Rapid rehousing and case management	RCT	• Improvement on months without jail or shelter: accrued months over 2 years with target rate of 30% improvement • Successful graduation to permanent locations: graduations within 1 year of enrollment with target rate of 80% achieving outcome • Improvement in substance abuse treatment enrollments: accrued enrollments over 2 years with target rate of 100% improvement • Improvement in mental health treatment enrollments: accrued	• Average $3,500 per jail/shelter day avoided • $2,300 per graduation to permanent location • $5,000 per SUD enrollment • $5,000 per substance abuse and mental health treatments enrollment

[8] Utah Criminal Justice Center, 2024; Hawkins et al., 2017; Salt Lake County et al., 2016.

[9] Salt Lake County et al., 2016; Hawkins et al., 2017; University of Utah College of Social Work, "$1.3 million to study the efficacy of evidence-based programs for homeless individuals and people in the criminal justice system," press release, March 18, 2019; Urban Institute, "Salt Lake County's Homes Not Jail Program," fact sheet, undated; Taylor W. Anderson, "County launches program aimed at tracking, reducing repeat criminal offending," *The Salt Lake Tribune*, May 25, 2017; Salt Lake County, "Salt Lake County launches two Pay for Success projects: Goal is to offer proven solutions to homelessness and repeat offenders," press release, December 19, 2016; Third Sector Capital Partners, Inc., "Salt Lake County Pay for Success Initiative," press release, undated.

Program	Start Year	Jurisdiction	Population	Intervention	Study Design	Outcome Metrics Linked to Repayment (Outcome Period)	Outcome Payment Structure
						enrollments over 2 years with target rate of 100% improvement	
Home for Good[10]	2020	Anchorage, AK	190 chronically homeless adults with high needs and frequent emergency/criminal justice system use	Permanent supportive housing	Pre-post service use comparison	• Housing stability (6-month periods over a 3-year project) • Stays in the safety center • Arrests • Fire department calls for Emergency Medical Services transport • Nights in emergency shelter	Payments based on % of months stably housed
Aspire Social Impact Bond[11]	2017	Adelaide, Australia (non-US)	575 adults experiencing chronic homelessness or were at risk of being discharged into homelessness from a correctional or health facility	Person centered case management, rapid rehousing, wraparound supports such as mental health support	Pre-post service use comparison	• Hospital bed days • Convictions • Crisis accommodation use • (3 years)	Minimum fixed 2% return first 4.75 years; variable 4.5–13% based on performance vs. targets

[10] Batko et al., 2023; Walsh et al., 2020; Hawkins et al., 2017; Annie Dear and Emily Bogan, "Alaska's First Pay for Success Program Helps People Experiencing Homelessness Get—And Stay—Stably Housed, Resulting in First Outcome Payment," *Social Finance*, August 24, 2021.

[11] Social Ventures Australia, "Aspire Social Impact Bond," Social Ventures Australia, undated-a; Social Ventures Australia, "A proven solution for countering chronic homelessness, Aspire will live on beyond the SIB," Social Ventures Australia, undated-b; Impact Investing Hub, "Case Study: Aspire Social Impact Bond," Impact Investing Hub, undated; Social Ventures Australia, *Aspire Social Impact Bond [payment structure summary]*, Social Ventures Australia, 2017; Coram et al., 2022.

Program	Start Year	Jurisdiction	Population	Intervention	Study Design	Outcome Metrics Linked to Repayment (Outcome Period)	Outcome Payment Structure
Peterborough Social Impact Bond (UK)[12]	2010	Peterborough, Cambridgeshire, England (non-US)	3 cohorts of 1,000 adult male offenders released from HMP Peterborough after <12-month sentences	Prerelease engagement and post-release case management for up to 12 months	Propensity-score matched comparison	• Reduction in frequency of reconvictions • (12 months)	10% reduction (cohort 1) or 7.5% reduction (3 combined cohorts) triggered payments; third cohort used fee for service
Back on Track Initiative[13]	2020	Belgium (non-US)	133 young adults (17–25) experiencing homelessness or recently released from prison	Sustainable housing accommodation	TBD	• Program completion (12 months per participant) with target rate of 113 participants • Rental agreement (within 3-year program period) with target rate of 85% participants • Legal income or start a training (within 3-year program period) with target rate of 40% participants • Reduction of recidivism compared to a reference rate (within 3-year program period) with target rate of 25% reduction	TBD

Note: N/A = Information not available or not reported; TBD = Information to be determined or expected to be provided in the future.
Sources:

[12] Disley et al., 2011; Disley et al., 2015; Ministry of Justice, *Social Impact Bond Payment by Results Pilot at HMP Peterborough: Final cohort results and learning exercise*, Ministry of Justice, undated; Social Finance, *Pioneered by Social Finance: The World's first Social Impact Bond (SIB)*, Social Finance, updated 2026.

[13] BNP Paribas, 2020.