

Comment from Peter Davidson

December 7, 2018

NIST has expressed one minor but meaningful concern about the ACUS recommendation on Public-Private Partnerships, to be presented at next week's Plenary Session. We have no issues with the recommendation itself.

It is my understanding that you, Peter and Henry Wixon have agreed that the following language could replace the existing Footnote 1:

^[1] This Guide focuses on P3s that relate to social welfare topics, such as health, labor, education, and diplomacy as opposed to, for example, infrastructure P3s and research and development (R&D) P3s, because social welfare topics are areas of expertise for agencies involved in the working group. Readers who are interested in infrastructure P3s should also consult, among other sources, U.S. Dep't. of Treas., *Expanding the Market for Infrastructure Public-Private Partnerships: Alternative Risk and Profit Sharing Approaches to Align Sponsor and Investor Interests* (Apr. 2015). Those interested in R&D P3s should also consult, among other sources, "The History of Public/Private Partnerships," in, Link, Albert N., *Public/Private Partnerships: Innovation Strategies and Policy Alternatives*, Springer (2006).

In the interest of accuracy, I hereby respectfully request that you make that change prior to the Plenary.