ACDEB
Advisory Committee on Data
for Evidence Building

Meeting 12 Notes and Actions
September 17, 2021

Next Meeting: October 22, 2021 (9 AM - Noon (EDT))

Meeting Agenda:

1. Meeting Introduction, Agenda Review, and Reminders – Emilda Rivers and Alyssa Holdren

2. Taking Stock: The Vision, Decision-Making Process, and Year 1 Report Expectations – Emilda Rivers

3. Subcommittee Report: Legislation and Regulations with Committee Discussion – Nicholas Hart and Christine Heflin

4. Subcommittee Report: Governance, Transparency, and Accountability with Committee Discussion – Charles Cutshall and Julia Lane

5. Subcommittee Report: Government Data for Evidence-Building with Committee Discussion – Anna Hui and Kenneth Troske

6. Subcommittee Report: Other Services/Capacity-Building Opportunities with Committee Discussion – Kimberly Murnieks and Matthew Soldner

7. Subcommittee Report: Technical Infrastructure with Committee Discussion – Amy O'Hara and David Park

8. Next Steps and Action Items with Committee Discussion – Emilda Rivers

Meeting Introduction, Agenda Review, and Reminders – Emilda Rivers and Alyssa Holdren

Emilda Rivers, ACDEB Chair, began by providing an overview of the day's agenda and an update of activities since the August meeting.

- **Virtual site visits:** We're continuing our virtual site visits. So far, we've held four site visits—with USDA, South Carolina's Revenue and Fiscal Affairs Office, the Coleridge Initiative, and FSRDCs— and we have two more on the books.

- **Project Inventory:** We're continuing to update the Project Inventory. Keep those project ideas coming our way—they serve as a great baseline for exploring lessons learned, developing recommendations, and showing us where there are gaps to fill.

- **Year 1 report:** We have begun drafting sections of the Year 1 report—and there have been lots of questions about the timelines and deliverables. I will touch on this more in my presentation, but let me say for the record, our deadline for delivering the report to OMB is October 29, and we will meet this deadline.

Alyssa Holdren, ACDEB Designated Federal Officer, gave brief housekeeping/logistics remarks.

Taking Stock: The Vision, Decision-Making Process, and Year 1 Report Expectations – Emilda Rivers

The Vision: Insights from the Federal Statistical System

- As ACDEB members we do not need to *concur* on the need for an NSDS.

- There are barriers/challenges the Evidence Act have addressed, but we haven't yet been able to fully benefit from the Act (mostly because regs are still being developed).

- The Evidence Act began building NSDS within the existing system.

- CEP asserted that NSDS should be part of the CIPSEA ecosystem.

- So, is our job to blow up a broken system? No—with the Evidence Act, Congress just reaffirmed and expanded its responsibilities and authorities—and we are to build on top of it.

- We have an opportunity to inform OMB policy development.

- We have an opportunity to inform future partnerships.

Data Ecosystem with Evidence Act Responsibilities

- There's so much already in motion within the federal statistical system that NSDS is meant to build on—the infrastructure mandated by the Evidence Act, including the legal authority under CIPSEA, as well as ongoing efforts to develop a standard application process, a data protection toolkit, and a data quality framework. Not to mention the wealth of recent, ongoing, and planned projects that statistical agencies are exploring on data sharing, access, linkages, and privacy-protecting technologies.

Vision Document: Highlights

- A couple weeks ago, the Coordinating Committee circulated a vision document. This document was a starting point meant to synthesize the big ideas that have been brewing around an NSDS, spur conversation, and surface concerns.
    - Lays out the case for why the United States needs a data service,
    - Describes the framework for a data service (a philosophy, a place or place(s), and a service),
    - Acknowledges that NSDS must be sufficiently resourced,
    - Lists potential functions of a data service (such as data linkage, access, and innovation)
    - Provides a few examples of projects that could be addressed by an operational service (like work on equity, workforce and education, and COVID-19), and
    - Notes high-level next steps and recommendations.

Vision Document: Affirmations and Assertions

- We concur with the Evidence Act Commission that the United States needs to establish a National Secure Data Service.

- We acknowledge that an NSDS should be a philosophy, a place, and a service.

- We recognize that, for a data service to be successful in the federal government, legislative direction is preferred to provide appropriate authority, direction, and scope for NSDS.

- We recommend that NSDS prioritize the identification of the value of data and evidence, secure linkage activities, the facilitation of secure data access and analysis, the use of privacy enhancements while maintaining the value of the data, and transparent approaches as core functions.

- After considering these options, I'm proposing that we take a multi-pronged approach to shape the vision—everyone should provide their feedback on the vision document AND we should use our existing subcommittee structure to have facilitated, in-depth discussions around key points.

Vision: Next Steps

- The Coordinating Committee should meet as soon as possible to come to agreement on a few high-level statements—like those from the vision document or others that they deem to be of primary importance. Moving forward, I will be chairing this group to help build consensus and coordinate efforts that cut across the focus areas. We will then circulate these core statements with the full Committee.

- The goal is to gain unanimity, as feasible; where not feasible, each subcommittee will identify key objections and lay out options for moving forward.

- The Coordinating Committee will reconvene to take stock, discuss objections, consider options, and update the statements. Then, these statements will be re-circulated with the full Committee.

- If unanimous consent is not an option, then we can move forward with a critical mass of agreement.

- Then, we will fold these statements into the vision document and establish them as the underpinnings of our ongoing work.

Decision-making Process: Considerations

- How we move forward on sculpting the vision and gaining consensus around these key ideas can serve as a model for how we'll approach other Committee decisions.

- Our goal should be agreement among members AND actionable recommendations.

- There are a few things to keep in mind: (1) Everyone can't be an expert on everything—that's why ACDEB was formed the way it was, (2) most members will have levels of agreement on various items—from "I don't have a strong opinion" to "This is my hill to die on," and (3) those must-haves and deal-breakers will be different for each member.

- I'd also like to give you a bit of context around decision-making for the Commission on Evidence-Based Policymaking and for this Committee. Was consensus required for the CEP report? No. Is it required for the ACDEB report? No. That being said, the Commission was able to put out a consensus report that represented agreement on all recommendations from all members. BUT…ACDEB is not the Commission. We have twice as many members, with a very different makeup, and we're now getting into the nitty-gritty on many of the items the Commission recommended.

Decision-making Process: Principles

- Throughout each phase of the decision-making process (in subcommittees and with the full Committee), there should be plenty of opportunities to discuss items and incorporate feedback.

- We can approach agreement by means of objection (rather than approval) by asking members to express objections on items you can't live with/couldn't put your names to.

- Based on these objections, we should develop options for moving forward. Then, go back through the discussion/feedback process to try to gain unanimity. If there are still objections, then decide as a group what the critical mass of consensus is to move forward.

- Finally, use the Year 1 report to explain the reasoning behind each recommendation/action step, essentially grounding the recommendations in "findings."

Year 1 Report: Expectations

- Our deadline to deliver the Year 1 report to OMB is October 29.

- On the lack of a U.S. Chief Statistician in the role of Chair, while this role is very important to the work of the statistical system, our ability to make progress in this Committee doesn't depend on a Chief Statistician.

- From the start, we had a massive amount of information to learn and share.

- We're also taking a phased approach to gather information, weigh options, build findings, and make recommendations.

- It's okay to focus on findings this year. Where things aren't ripe, we shouldn't force recommendations. There are places where we can—and should—make specific recommendations. Let's not miss out on these opportunities.

- Finally, our plans for Year 2. If any item needs further development, we should lay out the next steps that will help us form a recommendation.

Committee Feedback/Discussions:

- No one seems to be saying that we're blowing up system; need better coordination between federal statistical system and state/local systems; need to get a better conversation going within and across levels of government; statistical system is key to build on.

- Helpful to level-set before moving into requirements; trying to get a handle on dates and deliverables; from evaluation background, there are questions about fitting into statistical system; evidence building is not just about statistical work.

- Had reaction similar to Emilda's when reading vision document; kind of made it sound like the statistical system is in crisis; need to handle this when editing document; we have amazing federal/state/local systems; key is that they're not accessible for research or access is limited; there are inconsistencies that make data difficult to use.

- Echo sentiment that there was nothing in the vision document that was intentional about criticizing the statistical system; intent was to be realistic and honest about the gaps that exist.

- Remind everyone that we spent a significant amount of time on the value proposition; presumption of accessibility is not a silver bullet; does doing things that are exclusively statistical

hit the value proposition; need to solve problems now; is NSDS beyond statistical purposes that meets the needs for everyone?

- The whole first section of the vision document creates a strawman that ignores the great progress made at all levels of government since the CEP. It walks some of that back in later sections, but that is an issue.

(See presentation at bea.gov/evidence under Meetings tab.)

Subcommittee Report: Legislation and Regulations with Committee Discussion – Nicholas Hart and Christine Heflin

Subcommittee Members: Nicholas Hart, Christine Heflin, Gregory Fortelny, Edward Kaouk, Ted Kwartler, Christin Lotz, Todd Richardson, Mayank Varia

The co-chairs for the Legislation and Regulations subcommittee provided a report of the focus area's progress to date on their recommendations.

- **ACDEB Recommendation #1** – Evidence Act Rules: The OMB Director should take immediate steps to issue guidance and regulations required or expected under the Evidence Act, with input from the Advisory Committee on Data for Evidence Building. These include:
  - Notice of Proposed Rulemaking under CIPSEA Sec. 3581 for the Presumption of Accessibility to administrative data.
  - Notice of Proposed Rulemaking Under CIPSEA Sec. 3582 for expanding access to CIPSEA data assets.
  - Notice of Proposed Rulemaking under CIPSEA Sec. 3563 on responsibilities for statistical agencies and public trust.
  - Implementation guidance for the OPEN Government Data Act, including how agencies should implement "open data by default," data inventories, and data sensitivity considerations. This guidance should also provide increased clarity on interagency, and intergovernmental data sharing responsibilities and expectations.

- **ACDEB Recommendation #2** – Evidence Commission Proposals: The OMB Director should develop legislative proposals for Congress or regulatory actions to consider in implementing the remaining Evidence Commission recommendations, in consultation with the Advisory Committee on Data for Evidence Building, including the following:
  - Recommendation 2-6 from the CEP encouraged expanded access to income and earnings data already acquired by federal agencies in order to facilitate evidence-building activities. Expanded access under legislation to the National Directory of New Hires for research and evaluation is one low-burden, high-value strategy for advancing access to priority data assets.
  - Recommendation 3-2 from the CEP encouraged innovation for privacy-preserving technologies. A legislative proposal to test and pilot emerging approaches such as multi-party computation would support scale and future adoption of new approaches for

protecting data, which could include consideration of safe harbor provisions for those testing new approaches.

- **ACDEB Recommendation #3** – Model MOU: The OMB Director, working in consultation with the Interagency Council on Statistical Policy, the Chief Data Officer Council, and the Federal Privacy Council, should facilitate the creation of updated model language for Memoranda of Understanding [or a shared standard for data sharing] to facilitate data sharing and linkage projects and reduce the number of MOUs required to conduct regular evaluations of programs and policies.

- **ACDEB Recommendation #4** -- SORNs: The OMB Director, working in consultation with the Federal Privacy Council and other relevant officials, should develop standard language for modifying Systems of Record Notices under the Privacy Act to facilitate secondary uses of administrative data when permissible by law and necessary for evidence-building activities.

- **ACDEB Recommendation #5** -- Guidance: The OMB Director should issue a detailed memorandum to agency heads clarifying expectations that agencies use existing authorities and flexibilities to facilitate data sharing and use.

- **ACDEB Recommendation #6** – Chief Statistician: The OMB Director should take immediate steps to designate a full-time Chief Statistician of the United States.

- **ACDEB Recommendation #7** – Standard-Setting Procedures: The OMB Director and Chief Statistician of the United States should leverage existing authority under the Paperwork Reduction Act to establish a clear procedure for public and stakeholder engagement on areas for development and use of future data standards for information shared in intergovernmental, intra-agency, or interagency contexts.
  - Standard-setting procedures—used for race/ethnicity; need to look at careful attention to the process when there are inter-agency implications.
  - Committee will continue this discussion in Year 2.

- **ACDEB Recommendation #8** – NSDS Authorization: The Congress should advance a legislative proposal to establish the legal expectation and authority for creation of a National Secure Data Service.
  - OMB guidance would be very helpful here; would be good for OMB to nudge agencies to be more open to data sharing.
  - People focus on core duties, and the culture is about the protection of data; need more resources to help with evidence-building.
  - Need to think about how long it takes to process a data access request; need FTEs and help with these requests.

- **ACDEB Recommendation #9** – Appropriations Requests: The OMB Director should include specific requests for increased funding to support implementation of the Federal Data Strategy priorities and Foundations for Evidence-based Policymaking Act requirements in the FY 2023 President's Budget request to Congress.

- **ACDEB Recommendation #10** – Funding Flexibilities: The OMB Director should propose legislative flexibilities for facilitating set-asides for data infrastructure and analysis activities, recognizing these activities are core functions of government.

Committee Feedback/Discussions:

- Does this committee have funds to conduct pilots
    - Thought the recommendation was for NSDS to have funds to conduct such pilots, but it would be great if such funding could be provided through OMB before NSDS is fully operational.
    - There is no direct funding; main mechanism is our recommendations; there are opportunities to connect with agencies; don't let lack of direct funding hinder recommendations and opportunities
- Missing recommendation on resources for OMB
    - One of the reasons things take a long time is because no resources are provided with work in law
    - Chief Statistician could help, but there aren't enough folks doing the work; need to recommend resources to support doing
    - Legislative language can be useful; suggest in Year 1 that this needs to happen and then in Year 2 identify specific areas of change
    - All the statistical agencies devote significant resources to research; goal is not primarily to protect data; balance access and privacy; think about how to expand this capacity across all data producers and all levels of government; not protecting data at expense of getting it out there to the public
    - In summary text, recognized need for resources; happy to circulate full document
    - Should Chief Statistician be elevated in OMB structure? One reason it gets starved for resources; may want to look at if it should be at a different place in the organizational chart.
    - Acknowledging and recommending the need for more dedicated resources for OMB's effort. It is easy to put it all on OMB when we all feel the resource pinch, so let's promote more dedicated resources at all.
    - One of the recommended of the CEP report was exactly this, the Office of the Chief Statistician should be upgraded.

(See presentation at bea.gov/evidence under Meetings tab.)

Subcommittee Report: Governance, Transparency, and Accountability with Committee Discussion – Charles Cutshall and Julia Lane

Members: Charlie Cutshall, Julia Lane, Otis Brown, Shawn Davis, Gregory Fortelny, Ted Kwartler, Brian Moyer, Kimberly Murnieks, Christina Yancey

The co-chairs for the Governance, Transparency, and Accountability subcommittee provided a report of the focus area's progress to date. They discussed what has happened and what is currently happening to build out NSDS.

- Recommendation: The NSDS should be a private-public partnership with oversight from federal statistical agencies and an advisory board, as well as input from the Interagency Council on Statistical Policy (ICSP).

- Attributes around best practices for governance, transparency, and accountability
  - Transparency and trust (including disclosure risk)
  - Legal authority to protect privacy and confidentiality (should be within CIPSEA ecosystem)
  - Independence
  - Legal authority to collect and maintain data
    - There are various opinions on concept of a data warehouse; Committee will explore this more fully in Year 2
    - With value proposition for state/local governments, what is the value of states having to provide data over and over again? Could argue that there's value with maintaining these data
    - ACDEB virtual site visits have featured entities who are maintaining some data for an extended period.
  - Scalable functionality (must grow to meet demand, governance must be flexible, ability to increase capacity)
  - Sustainability (funding and resourcing beyond congressional funding)
  - Oversight and accountability (have an independent board and ensure data are being used for appropriate purposes, authorized users/purposes)
  - Intergovernmental support (provide resource/space not tied to a single mission/data space, work across government)
  - Access and use (enhance while protecting privacy)

- Recommendation: Identify best practices around governance, accountability, and transparency by examining specific use cases and considering the following attributes as a framework.

- Recommended use cases:
  - Education and Workforce – Example: States invest millions of dollars in education and training to create high wage jobs for their citizens. Yet the returns on those investments can only be measured and analyzed if the graduates stay in the state.

- o Health Statistics – Example: (1) National Center for Health Statistics and (1) State of California

Committee Feedback/Discussions:

- What's the thinking about nesting the NSDS inside NCSES? Why would it not be its own CIPSEA entity?

- Agree with slide on independence and that it's critical that NSDS is totally independent; notion of CIPSEA entity makes sense; unsure about the need to nest within NCSES or its own agency.
  - o Independence is really important; like the idea of being somewhere like NSF
  - o Not sure at this point that there's not enough information to make a definitive statement; premature to talk about how this will work exactly

- Would be helpful to think of the through specific use cases and build out recommendations
  - o Look at using use case on racial disparities and federal programs.
  - o Take first "do no harm" perspective

- There is not consensus about the CEP's recommendation that "NSDS should not be a data warehouse" and wondering where is the right (sub)committee to achieve common understanding on this topic? Where is the best forum to continue this discussion?
  - o Seen through field trips that there is a value proposition with maintaining some data for an extended period
  - o CEP concern was that data would always be collected and maintained; however, don't get the sense that this is the vision
  - o There are specific use cases where data assets could be stored within NSDS with appropriate approval, oversight, and use
  - o With respect to governance, if data will reside in NSDS, must manage access and use to the data over time; data owners and stewards need to know how the data are being used and protected
  - o Getting this out for larger conversation; we should think about this

- There's a need for a coordinating function; need to think about how FFRDC would support a primary coordinating function with a research function; this has not been their role (coordinating) in the past; need to think about state/local/federal coordination; facilitate and promote research and advances; seems to solve two problems with one solution

- Will handle these conversations with the subcommittees; tackle these questions and provide feedback

(See presentation at bea.gov/evidence under Meetings tab.)

Subcommittee Report: Government Data for Evidence-Building with Committee Discussion — Anna Hui and Kenneth Troske

Members: Members: Anna Hui, Kenneth Troske, Laila Alequresh, Richard Allen, Leonard Burman, Christine Heflin, Elisabeth Kovacs, Christin Lotz, Brian Moyer

The co-chairs for the Government Data for Evidence-Building subcommittee provided a report of the focus area's progress to date.

- Thinking about recent field trips—South Carolina Integrated Data Center and Coleridge Initiative—there appears to be ongoing efforts to build data services/centers and improve evidence in a number of states.

- Except for the efforts of Coleridge, and some other initiatives, there appears to be minimal coordination around these efforts.

- Coordination between the federal government and the states is almost nonexistent, and states continue to struggle to get federal agencies to share data that state and local governments provide to federal agencies.

Recommendations:
- OMB explore avenues for supporting consistent application of federal data collection activities
- Identify areas where additional OMB guidance is needed and encourage publishing best practices for federal, state, and local levels.
- Extend mandates for sharing data to include that federal agencies must share data back to participating states
- Pilot program that involves the transfer of state data to federal government built around unemployment insurance data. This would involve coordination between the federal and state governments
- Focus on capacity building particularly developing programmatic and data science skills
- Create some case studies of ongoing research that is designed to answer a question that is important to several actors, utilizing both federal as well as state data from a number of different states
- Should one important role of Secure Data service be coordination between state data center efforts and between states and the federal government?

Committee Feedback/Discussions:
- Question about UI pilot; sounds like Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) and what they're already doing or unlocking National Directory of New Hires (NDNH)? Or is this about the plumbing to share data?
  - Saw expanded use of claims data in tracking short-term movements in the economy, lots of crazy statements with claims data; need to understand the importance of the UI data and how to get closer to our goal; vision is LEHD on steroids.

- - - Talked about use of data for statistics for evidence building and evaluation; statistics are analysis that doesn't identify individuals; can be performance of organizations; use data to inform and improve operations—this is an appropriate use for these data; take a broad view of evidence building; NOT for regulatory (enforcement) use of data
  - There are some misconceptions about datasets that it's all real-time data (NDNH, claims data, wage data); these are on a regular schedule, and they lag; can't get the data or do analysis in real time; looking at claims info vs. wage records; have to set mechanisms that don't add burden to groups providing the data (e.g., small businesses); how can we better explain the process and understand what we can do with the data we're gathering
- It may be helpful for the subcommittees to share the same one or two use cases/pilots to not only help reduce the resources and funding needed, but it would also be great to have the same examples in the second-year report across the different subcommittee topic areas. Members enjoyed the Census FSRDC field trip and are curious if they may be able to run some of our practical use case pilots on their infrastructure or maybe we could also run some pilots using the backend of ResearchDataGov.

(See presentation at bea.gov/evidence under meetings tab).

Subcommittee Report: Other Services/Capacity-Building Opportunities with Committee Discussion— Kimberly Murnieks and Matthew Soldner

Members: Kimberly Murnieks, Matthew Soldner, Richard Allen, Leonard Burman, Shawn Davis, Barry Johnson, David Park, Todd Richardson

The co-chairs for the Other Services and Capacity-Building Opportunities subcommittee provided a report of the focus area's progress to date.

- The overarching purpose of this focus area is ensuring NSDS users—be they federal, state, local, or other authorized entities—can make the best possible use of the Service's potential for secure and privacy-protecting evidence building, regardless of their existing analytic capacity.
- Primary remit is making recommendations on providing technical assistance to qualified researchers.
- Secondary remit is making recommendations on approaches to communicating about the Service with citizens, policymakers at all levels of government, and researchers focused on the Service's potential value proposition for each.
- **Recommendation #1:** The technical assistance remit of an NSDS could include: completing administrative processes required to gain access to linkable administrative data; ingesting those data into an NSDS ecosystem; analyzing linked data in secure, privacy-preserving ways; privacy protection, including how to analyze the risk associated with releasing de-identified confidential data.
  - This work would likely be carried out by an NSDS-based "data concierge" that is supported by agency-based subject matter experts.

- o The concierge could also have a role in matchmaking stakeholders (with questions but who are lacking analytic capacity) to other researchers and building or maintaining networks, user communities, or coalitions.
- **Recommendation #2**: Communications functions at or about an NSDS should target a range of stakeholders including: the public; federal, state, and local policymakers in executive and legislative roles; data providers; researchers and other evidence-building partners; and advocates for data, transparency, and privacy.

Committee Feedback/Discussions:

- Have we considered an advisory board as a mechanism to make sure that more perspectives are included in preventing silos with the "data concierge" roles and services offered? How do we address equity/access issues? Is there a role for advisory board to have non-traditional stakeholders?
  - o This would be different than management/governing body and is an opportunity to bring in more voices.
  - o Intersects with overall Governance recommendations; advisory board could help with data concierge and communications
  - o This might be useful to think about regardless whether NSDS is nested within NCSES or is its own entity. Its mission is to serve multiple stakeholders that aren't the traditional statistical agencies; driven to meet needs of broader stakeholder community; need to think about what makes a successful NSDS; need to demonstrate value to stakeholders at subnational level
- FSRDC Administrators are concierges, not the academic users - they don't even share their code or research outputs reliably. Or did Academic Partners mean the RDC hosting sites? Please explore other models! NSDS will take a broader view than that; data concierges need to be curious. What about academic partners?
  - o Other models are integrated data systems as well as policy labs in specific topic domains or areas
  - o Will provide list of integrated data systems and policy labs to members
- How to build this user community?
  - o Data concierges are more like librarians within specific domains.
  - o Then, NSDS needs others to connect across domains and POCs at agencies to provide expertise on data assets themselves
- Need to define what these groups mean; need to say this covers all definitions of researchers, state/local govts, and think about non-traditional stakeholders and audiences; make sure communication is relevant across the board

(See presentation at bea.gov/evidence under meetings tab).

Subcommittee Report: Technical Infrastructure with Committee Discussion—Amy O'Hara and David Park

Members: Amy O'Hara, David Park, Otis Brown, Barry Johnson, Ted Kaouk, Elisabeth Kovacs, Mayank Varia, Christina Yancey

The co-chairs for the Technical Infrastructure subcommittee provided a report of the focus area's progress to date.

A National Secure Data Service must protect the privacy of data subjects by including:
- Technology to safely, securely, easily, and efficiently move data when it needs to be moved; to evaluate, analyze, and link data in situ; to support experiments or competitions to develop new methods that increase secure access to data; to support development of application of disclosure limitation techniques and multiple access models

- Infrastructure that allows data owners to share inventories and metadata

- Standards to make data more interoperable

- Capacity to link data from different sources reliably, whether in situ or in an enclave

- Tools to evaluate the quality of data

- Infrastructure to gather and review application for various tiers of access

- Tools for both complex/rigorous analysis and descriptive statistics/dashboard-like reports

- Functionality to support/automate safe release of data and to provide transparency in who is using data, what it is being used for, and what was learned and the impact

Hot Topics
- NSDS focus extends beyond federal (or federal statistical) agencies

- Privacy issues from the data providers' perspectives must be addressed

- NSDS should allow for developing aggregate outcomes without giving anybody in government access to private data

Committee Feedback/Discussions:
- There should be an outreach function and an annual report.

- What about data quality assurances? Would you all suggest that data quality assurances are focused on specific data elements? What about focusing on tiering data not just in terms of security, but also in terms of priority elements (such as linking variables)? Could we think about ways to tier standards around high value data? Could we start by focusing on linking high priority variables?
  - Nothing specific has been discussed, but we have been very aware of the burden of data quality checks/assurances on source agencies
  - Cautious about imposing specifics; also cautious about pulling data into NSDS without understanding programs/jurisdictional differences; going to be a multitude of uses and that tools and capabilities need to be available

- o Without standards having a home, need to figure this out in Coordinating Committee; for Year 1, put them on the table and unpack more later
- Virtual FSRDC scaling: Not sure which subcommittee this falls under—are we able to lean in on the virtual FSRDCs scaling?
  - o That was a fantastic part of the FSRDC field trip that didn't seem to come up today. We should incorporate observations about success/demand; could encourage scaling this and do it more rapidly; helping to contain costs and have more efficiencies.
  - o Current model is that each site pays its own Administrator and sets its own costs; currently, very high costs that you pay for linkages; need to normalize this cost structure; lab fees vary widely
  - o Committee should get more info on this.
- Should have something about capacity for virtual access; haven't talked about physical vs. virtual access
  - o Should explore options for virtual access (e.g., NORC, Census tracks IP address and when using data, computer is locked down)
  - o Explore recommendations about how to do this and what are the safeguards, ensuring that while folks are sitting at home, they are still be using data appropriately (even if breaches are inadvertent)
  - o The Census Bureau is going to come back with recommendations about scaling; dig into this more in Year 2

(See presentation at bea.gov/evidence under meetings tab).

VI. Next Steps

The subcommittees and Coordinating Committee will continue developing the material for the Year 1 report and laying out a path for Year 2. They will consider it as a phased approach, identifying obvious areas where the Committee can have actionable recommendations now and outlining what to focus on moving forward.