ACDEB
Advisory Committee on Data for Evidence Building

Meeting 18 Notes and Actions

July 22, 2022

Next Meeting: ACDEB Meeting 19: September 23, 2022

Meeting Agenda:

1. Meeting Introduction, Agenda Review, and Reminders

2. Year 2 Report: Expectations, Timeline, and Deliverables with Committee Discussion

3. Facilitated Discussion: Resources and Funding

4. Facilitated Discussion: Governance, Transparency, and Accountability

5. Facilitated Discussion: Technical Infrastructure

6. Recommendations Summary with Committee Discussion

7. Next Steps and Action Items with Committee Discussion

I. **Meeting Introduction, Agenda Review, and Reminders** – Emilda Rivers, ACDEB Chair and Alyssa Holdren, ACDEB DFO

   a. Today's meeting marks a major milestone as we round out our work to draft recommendations ahead of the October deadline for the Year 2 report.

   b. Subcommittees have been gathering information, developing findings, drafting recommendations, and soliciting feedback; through this process, we've identified three topics for further discussion with the larger group:

      i. Resources and Funding:

         1. An area of widespread interest and deep discussion across the Committee; instead of having each subcommittee draft resources and funding recommendations (and then trying to blend them together), the support team gathered information from across the Committee and worked with a few members to develop a set of findings and recommendations.

         2. Thanks to the Government Data subcommittee for workshopping these ideas and Nick Hart for providing extensive comments on the draft. Today, the full Committee will have the opportunity to review and respond to this material.

      ii. Governance:

         1. The Committee has reviewed several drafts of findings and recommendations from the Governance, Transparency, and Accountability subcommittee.

2. Short report-out from the Governance subcommittee; then, the support team will guide the Committee through a set of discussion questions to gain clarity on big ideas and highlight areas where there may be outstanding issues, gaps, or interdependencies with other subcommittees.

    iii. Technical Infrastructure:

        1. This group has been working up to the deadline to filter information from a vast number of outside experts into recommendations. Today, we will make sure all members can provide feedback on these late-breaking items.

  c. As time allows, I will present recommendations from the other subcommittees in the emerging Year 2 report framework.

    i. Presentations are posted to the ACDEB website (additional information, critical findings and evidence).

  d. Alyssa Holdren, ACDEB DFO, reviewed ground rules for member and public comments and questions.

    i. Asking members to tag comments either as items to discuss in this meeting or as items to discuss later/offline follow-up.

II. **Year 2 Report: Expectations, Timeline, and Deliverables with Committee Discussion** – Emilda Rivers, ACDEB Chair

  a. Goal: "To seize every opportunity to deliver timely, actionable, and relevant recommendations, fully supported by detailed and nuanced findings that reflect the knowledge and expertise the Committee has been sharing, packaged together in a cohesive and balanced Year 2 report."

    i. Take a moment to acknowledge that this is a lot to achieve; while we're pulling from a diverse pool of expertise, our knowledge doesn't cover every area or aspect even with the help of many outside experts, and the evidence ecosystem continues to evolve around us in ways that have implications for the work we're doing.

    ii. "Timely, actionable, and relevant recommendations":

        1. Markers by which the Chair has been gauging our progress as a Committee

        2. "Timely": recommendations connect to the here and now, which means advice on things like the forthcoming CIPSEA recommendations, building on the ongoing work of actors in the

ecosystem, and tying into evolving NSDS legislative action and the budget process

3. "Actionable": being very concrete on who recommendations are directed toward, how they might achieve them, and spelling out priorities for near-term to long-term. Without priorities, it's too easy to see this as a vision for the future that may never be obtained; we must provide stepping stones to bridge the here and now to the target state.

4. "Relevant": the Committee's charter is to advise OMB on Title III of the Evidence Act (CIPSEA 2018). Each recommendation must be rooted in this framework: must clearly state how each piece builds on and connects with roles, responsibilities, and requirements of the law, which states CIPSEA is the foundation.

5. Each recommendation in the Year 2 report will meet these standards; items that aren't timely, relevant, and actionable are at risk of being removed in the drafting process.

iii. "Detailed and nuanced findings":

1. The Committee has heard from many experts over the last 18+ months, and this information gathering has been instrumental in informing our recommendations.

2. Armed with our own expertise and information from outside sources, we'll own our recommendations. The Committee will demonstrate how we apply our own perspectives to draw more nuanced conclusions from all our sources of information.

3. It's important for the Committee not to recommend others' recommendations as our own or use another group's work as the sole justification for a recommendation. Instead, we'll use outside inputs appropriately as examples or models.

4. Items for which the Committee doesn't find its own findings or adequate evidence may ultimately be cut.

iv. "Cohesive and balanced":

1. "Cohesive": reiterate the importance of the Year 1 report, which sets the baseline for what will show up in Year 2; we will not renegotiate the vision or the recommendations and priorities put forth by the full Committee in Year 1.

2. You can expect to see content that aligns with that vision and recommendations from Year 1 and the Chair will direct the support team to make those edits as necessary.

3. A lot of this comes down to synthesizing and integrating recommendations from different subcommittees into a common framework. Later, the Chair will walk through the emerging framework for the Year 2 report: where recommendations fit in and how they can be woven together. Items consistent with the existing Year 1 report and the emerging Year 2 framework are the items that will remain.

4. "Balanced": balancing expertise on this Committee, balancing outside inputs, balancing the amount of detail, being clear but not overly prescriptive

5. We have come a long way toward achieving our goal, but there is much more to accomplish before the report is due to OMB.

v. Process for the next few weeks: the window is closing for members to shift and shape the content of the Year 2 report; the time to hear from all voices on all issues is coming to a close.

vi. Soon, will shift to a context where the Chair will give direction to the support team on how to form the report; the Chair will determine what needs to be cut or woven based on the criteria discussed above.

b. Timeline and Upcoming Deliverables

i. This timeline is not a diversion or change in the process and is meant to make the process even clearer and more transparent.

ii. From now to August 1st: the support team will collect comments from members and will coordinate with subcommittees to incorporate updates into the framework for the Year 2 report.

iii. August 1st: this marks the critical moment when sections of the report will not "live" with subcommittees; material will no longer be edited by the subcommittees. Instead, the material will be synthesized and integrated by the support team under the Chair's direction and using the criteria laid out above. The support team has not and will not be working in a vacuum.

iv. August 1st to 8th: the Chair and support team will turn their attention to integration and synthesis of material, coordinating with members on items that need clarification and additional support.

v. August 8th: the support team will distribute the executive summary and introduction to the recommendations for Committee review.

4

vi. August 8th to September 2nd: the support team will continue to synthesize and integrate report content, including drafting supplemental boxes and developing charts and graphics; the team will also continue to solicit and incorporate feedback from members on select items and will coordinate with BEA staff responsible for copy editing and graphic design.

vii. September 2nd: the support team will provide a fully compiled, consistent, and cohesive draft of the Year 2 report to the Committee. There will be several opportunities between now and the October deadline to review.

viii. This timeline can also be found in the task tracker document included in each weekly update email.

ix. As we hit points in the timeline, the Chair will tell the support team to provide explicit instructions on what is and isn't up for discussion; with each draft and comment period, the Committee can expect items up for review to become more and more narrow.

x. This process is designed to ensure the Year 2 report is cohesive, consistent, and comprehensive; to provide ample time to pull everything together into a polished package; and to create even more transparency around the process.

c. And the ecosystem keeps evolving…

i. We will continue to monitor developments in the evidence ecosystem, especially those with direct impact on the Committee's work, and we will leave space in the Year 2 report to touch on late-breaking items (for example, NSDS legislation, federal budget, etc.).

ii. Doing this helps ensure recommendations are timely, actionable, and relevant, and stand the test of time no matter what happens in the immediate future or beyond.

III. **Facilitated Discussion: Resources and Funding** – ACDEB Support Team and Nicholas Hart, ACDEB Member

a. Resources and funding is a topic that has crossed all the subcommittees; today, we'll walk through the recommendations, give folks a chance to comment and provide feedback, and review comments and questions that have been provided about overarching themes.

b. Two main areas within the existing ecosystem: 1) resources for governments, both as data providers and users, and 2) resources for the NSDS that allow it to be an intermediary and a supporting entity for providers and users.

c. Adequate resources have to be available at all levels of government; NSDS has to be strategically positioned and resourced to make sure providers and users are able to harness the power of data throughout the ecosystem.

d. Resources and Funding: Federal Budget Request

    i. "In implementing the Evidence Act and the President's Memorandum on Scientific Integrity and Evidence-Based Policymaking to Agency Heads (January 27, 2021), the OMB Director and Agency Heads should allocate funds from their existing appropriations to adequately resource and support evidence-building activities in the current year. Because every agency has different budget amounts and needs, this allocation should be determined in consultation with the needs specified by the designated chief data officer, evaluation officer, and statistical official of each agency."

    ii. "In addition, the Committee strongly recommends that the OMB Director prioritize direct appropriations and funding flexibilities as part of the FY 2024 Budget formulation process and encourages all Agency Heads to prioritize Evidence Act implementation activities."

e. **Committee Feedback/Discussion**

    i. **Comment:** seems like this is what agencies are supposed to do already; worry we'll have a lot of good recommendations from Years 1 and 2, so wonder if we should spend the real estate here to tell agencies what they should already be doing.

    ii. **Comment:** trying to figure out if there would be some "teeth" to add to the recommendation itself; if there were some ways to make it harder for agencies to simply ignore them, even if the recommendation was just for OMB to look for ways to hold agencies accountable.

    Response: seems like in general there is an appetite amongst Committee members to beef up the recommendation and make it stronger.

    iii. **Comments for the record:**

        1. **Comment (from chat):** Direct appropriations and funding are critical. If simply telling an agency to fund these priorities, it's too easy to ignore when overall resources are tight.

        2. **Comment (from chat):** How are the recommendations different from what "ought" to be happening now? There don't appear to be any requirements/teeth to making sure they "prioritize" those activities.

        3. **Comment (from chat):** Can you just talk about the process of developing funding requests? I assume one of the first tasks of the NSDS will be to figure out how much each of the tasks we assign it will cost and over what time frame? Maybe this is obvious, but I think it may be important to say these estimates will be updated and expanded over time.

4. **Comment (from chat):** Why aren't we recommending a direct budget line here?

f. Resources and Funding: Federal Transparency

   i. "OMB should publish agency requests for funds in the budget formulation process as a matter of public record and to support transparency and accountability in evidence-based policymaking."

g. **Committee Feedback/Discussion**

   i. **Comment:** to comments about "teeth" and idea of transparency authority: effect is that it creates conversation about what the need is versus zero-sum game on resources; would push discussion of gap that truly exists in federal government and lack of resources we're investing in this new capacity for the Evidence Act.

   ii. **Comment (read aloud from chat):** the benefit of this depends on where the investment requests are being squashed—in the budget formulation process or at OMB. Great point.

   iii. **Comment:** the way this has been done for decades is the administration speaks as one voice; if proposals from agencies become public what that invites is where a lot of details are worked out to create a consistent message. The process is already awkward at a minimum and time-consuming, and we would be inserting another level of pre-decisional meetings. There is a great need for transparency on actual needs. Perhaps there could be some kind of recommendation that the Inspector General at some fixed frequency reviews resources dedicated to this and reports on where we are versus where we should be.

   iv. **Comment:** would it make more sense to include requirements around evidence-building in the strategic planning process, which is more transparent and requires regular sit-downs with OMB to focus on progress? Entities already produce learning agendas and evaluation plans, but those don't generally talk about budget resources going to CDOs, statistical officials, etc. to support those plans. Maybe being more explicit about resources to produce learning agendas and evaluation plans might help to raise the visibility of this resource issue.

   v. **Comment:** as someone who has been part of the strategic planning process for a number of cycles, the plan itself is at a high level of abstraction and goes nowhere near the level of specificity of resources required. Final plans and learning agendas are public, but there is not much visibility into the deliberation process, so not sure that's the best avenue. Feel some outside third party has to make observations about resources. Administration speaks

with one voice, so anything that would have the effect of exposing pre-decisional deliberations isn't likely to happen, but if there is a third party looking at resource allocation with regularity that isn't constrained, that could be very helpful.

vi. **Comment:** wanted to add that under the Evidence Act agencies are also required to produce capacity assessments and that might be another way of tying together strategic planning priorities and broader budgeting issues—intended to be made public, but in many cases only focused on evaluations.

vii. **Comments for the record:**

1. **Comment (from chat):** Yes, OMB Should be directing agencies to allocate resources.

2. **Comment (from chat):** Should this be an OMB memo generally, why is it getting tucked into our report?

3. **Comment (from chat):** Direct appropriation can also lead to interpretations that limits federal and state agencies from sharing data with related research which is the current situation and challenge that we see on the states' side.

4. **Comment (from chat):** The President's Budget request is frequently ignored by Congress, and that is a public document already.

5. **Comment (from chat):** Right now, the CDO/EO/SO has some voice in the budget submission (partially through the evidence submission). Without saying whether those voices are heard, an unintended consequence of this proposal might be that those ideas get "squashed" before submission to OMB.

6. **Comment (from chat):** The Commerce EO is desperately underfunded. Early comment was about the quarterly performance review process in regard to strategic planning/eval plans, but the capacity assessment is a great idea.

h. Resources and Funding: OMB Staff

i. "The OMB Director should prioritize additional resources for OMB staff responsible for coordinating implementation of the Evidence Act Title 3 regulations, Title 2 guidance, Title 1 implementation activities, and other evidence-building priorities in the current fiscal year, for the FY 2023 appropriation and spending plan at OMB, and the FY 2024 Budget Request."

i. **Committee Feedback/Discussion**

i. **Comment:** want to stress the incredible importance of the work OMB is doing and really stress to the full Committee that OMB is underfunded for implementing the requirements of the Evidence Act; there is a desperate need for strong statements about this.

ii. **Comment:** want to make sure these are balanced so you don't have super-charged staff at OMB saying "do this" but then no resources in departments and agencies to actually follow through.

iii. **Comment:** would add importance of OMB displaying how management and budget sides could work better together on this; other point is being careful about creating bureaucratic requirements that push on evidence officials; could bring in program implementers as having a role (accountability on sponsors who hold the purse strings).

iv. **Comment for the record (from chat):** Capacity assessments are part of the strategic plan, which are inherently political documents and may be made to align to administration priorities. The Evidence Act doesn't create any particular independence for EOs to advocate for resources that might not otherwise be within the scope agencies are asked to work within.

j. Resources and Funding: Federal Resources for Government Data Providers and Users at Other Levels

    i. See slide for findings; no formal recommendation written yet

    ii. **Comment for the record (from chat):** Need human capital—AND technology—capacity increases

k. Resources and Funding: NSDS Direct and Discretionary Sources

    i. "NSDS core capabilities should be funded by direct spending, supported by additional discretionary funding as the service evolves."

    ii. **Comment for the record (from chat):** OMB with both the management and budget sides on board should enforce resource minimum standards for evidence building

l. Resources and Funding: NSDS Dynamic Funding Approaches

    i. "As data service capabilities and user demand for these services grow over time, the NSDS should explore sustainable and dynamic funding approaches, including Congressional appropriations, user fees for service, existing and new federal grant programs, repurposed agency funds, federal-state partnerships, private-sector support, and a shared services model."

m. Resources and Funding: NSDS Support for State and Local Governments

i. "The NSDS should strive to connect state, territorial, local, and tribal governments with the resources they need to develop more robust and flexible data systems and to invest in human capital and technical expertise to engage in value-added evidence building."

n. Resources and Funding: NSDS Project Sponsorship

i. "The NSDS, under the direction of its policy and governing bodies and in coordination with other key stakeholders, should regularly sponsor projects that demonstrate the value of streamlining data sharing and increasing coordination, specifically with projects that highlight cross-functional, cross-agency, and cross-governmental topics. To sponsor projects, the NSDS must have a direct appropriation to provide sufficient resources as a sponsor across multiple program areas that enables blending and braiding of funding."

o. Resources and Funding: NSDS Equitable Pricing Model

i. "Access to, and use of, NSDS services should be based on an equitable pricing model. When developing its pricing strategy, the NSDS should consider criteria like the following: (1) stakeholder ability to pay and (2) the "cost" of using the data, tied to a risk utility framework that reflects both the inherent privacy loss of using the data as well as the anticipated benefit of analysis."

p. **Committee Feedback/Discussion**

i. **Comment (from chat):** Earlier made a suggestion about report structure to separate NSDS focused work from general wish list about evidence; now understand from the discussion why it's essential to give voice to these concepts, but curious if there could be a separate section or chapter about things OMB could have been doing all along that is distinct from the work we've been doing.

Response: potentially restructuring things to look at NSDS versus general evidence items.

ii. **Comment:** one suggestion to take or leave is for the NAIRR task force the proposal is that the budget for AI activities goes to agencies and then they use those tagged funding lines to decide what they want to use for the NAIRR—that's a different model than this one, gives steering committee some "teeth," gives a clear incentive structure for the lead or supporting agency to be responsive.

iii. **Comment:** the competition for federal funding is fierce and evidence is competing with supply chain demands, etc.—we should consider reflecting in the recommendations that startup costs would not be continuing costs because efficiencies in the long run could save money.

iv. **Comment:** regarding startup funding, also want to introduce people to resources that already exist that they may not be aware of or may not feel ready/supported; part of the challenge with technical infrastructure is no one wants to talk about replacing existing infrastructure today, but its natural evolution as systems need to be replaced or new technologies emerge that become efficient, it depends if we're talking about the short run or the long run. Agree that startup costs will go down, but experience is that as more people become aware of the service, there will be more demand, so we can't guarantee variable costs; not an easy answer.

v. **Comments for the record:**

1. **Comment (from chat):** Consider federal spending to support evolution of data systems at the state level

2. **Comment (from chat):** The FSRDCs are NOT cost stable as they are. Partner institutions are paying the bills.

3. **Comment (from chat):** I can't speak for all programs, but a number of the ones I am familiar with allow grantees (such as states) to use a portion of the funds for program administration (including managing data). I don't think that is regularly happening. Recognizing that not all data are sourced from federal collections, it points to the underlying issues that when things are zero-sum, data/evidence does not get prioritized. We need to be clear about the funding mechanism, teeth, incentives, if we expect these recommendations to do anything.

4. **Comment (from chat):** I thought the blending/braiding language tried to get at that, but more teeth would be awesome.

q. **Wrap-up**

i. Thank you for the comments and suggestions; a great way to end where we started—this is complicated and has a lot of nuances.

ii. I'm hopeful in that the recommendations we've seen speak to parts of the ecosystem, the here and now, and the future state—what we're hearing is it needs some "teeth," clarity around evidence act Title III emphasis, and an NSDS emphasis. These points will be the basis of conversation for the Committee's thoughts; will continue to work on these recommendations.

iii. Saw tie-ins here for timely, actionable, and relevant recommendations. As it is complicated and complex, it's critical we speak to this in a way that shares these priorities with the people who can act on them.

iv. **Comments for the record:**

1. **Comment (from chat):** I would just encourage we make strong statements about the need for resources, recognizing we can't be specific about the numbers. There is a need for flexibility across agencies and no one right answer.

2. **Comment (from chat):** NSDS should track service demands and levels and important outcomes to show value add.

3. **Comment (from chat):** Recommend targeted line funding to states that support building/improving data infrastructure and data analytics human capital/capacity that explicitly supports federal and state/local use of data in program evaluation and policymaking beyond just the required program compliance reporting to federal agencies.

IV. **Facilitated Discussion: Governance, Transparency, and Accountability** – ACDEB Support Team, Charles Cutshall, ACDEB Member, and Julia Lane, ACDEB Member

    a. Process:

        i. This is a massive task, so our process involved reviewing the ACDEB presentations, thinking about the use cases and presentations from outside experts, and thinking about parallel activities with NAIRR (waiting for approval to reproduce table for report) and Potok-Hart report (a lot of the heavy lifting); this has been an iterative process and is a work in progress.

    b. Findings:

        i. Have a lot of findings—one obvious thing is that there is rich expertise embedded in the federal agencies, the use cases are illustrative of what can happen when federal/state/local groups come together, and the composition of this Committee reflects that understanding.

        ii. As we were thinking through how to approach this, we talked to a number of people who have experience thinking about governance and we leaned on principal-agent thinking.

        iii. The key to strong governance is a clear statement of mission and a clear set of metrics; have to have metrics be transparent and tie closely to the mission so that accountability is evident.

        iv. What is mission? to provide evidence that creates value but at the same time protects privacy; so, that value-risk framework is at the core of the Evidence Act and should be at the core of the governance structure.

        v. How to measure value and risk? Have to measure them separately but jointly determined. Learned from use cases the importance of value—charge of

NSDS must be this notion of being explicit about jointly determining value and risk.

   vi. Five Safes framework: value comes from access, and there are different modalities of access (secure remote access, PPTs, summary tabulations, etc.); have a framework within which to guide the governance structure of the NSDS

   vii. The NSDS must be innovative, transparent, and engage with constituencies.

   viii. As we looked through many of the options for infrastructure, we concurred on one option; we can't assume this Committee can set the groundwork for everything right away, so there needs to be a continuous process for evaluation tied to open and transparent measures.

c. Recommendations:

   i. NSDS should be a legally recognized entity that does five main things: coordinates groups to establish best practices around implementing access and confidentiality, serves as a model for those best practices, offers administrative infrastructure, catalyzes innovation, and clearly communicates to the public.

   ii. America's DataHub Consortium is not the NSDS itself but serves as the foundation for the NSDS.

d. Recommendations: Organizational Structure and Governance (diagram)

e. **Committee Feedback/Discussion:**

   i. **Response from Governance:** any/all comments are helpful—we spent a lot of time trying to figure out an organizational framework, and details of how the organizational structure will be set up are the last piece of the puzzle; we talked about value from the get-go and it goes to the core of what the NSDS is about, the question about how to define value goes to the core of the issue so it would be helpful for the Committee to weigh in on how it will be defined, mission and metrics.

   ii. **Comment (from chat):** Two gaps on org chart (slide 25): (1) Cybersecurity Advocate with an eye out for the threats that the statistical agency people ignore/downplay/underestimate, separate from any board or committee, possibly special advisor to the NCSES authorizing official in box at the top, with access to all boxes on proposed structure; and (2) Privacy Advocate, possibly an Inspector General level role, responsible for independent oversight of NSDS activities with audit and investigative authority. That way if data subjects, groups, agencies, etc. have an issue, there's someone to deal with it. Otherwise, such issues would go to the data supplying agencies, with

incomplete, uneven, or slow responses that could threaten the overall function and survival of NSDS. I am thinking of a TIGTA but privacy issue focused.

iii. **Comment:** Governance subcommittee did a great job; may have wording suggestions, but overall, it's what was discussed, it reads well, it's sensible. Suggest two possible additions to organizational chart: 1) cybersecurity advocate, need someone looking out for threats that statistical agencies may downplay or underestimate, need someone with an eye on the horizon with access to all boxes onscreen, and 2) a privacy advocate, more like an inspector general who observes how resources are used, responsible for independent oversight and audit authority.

Response: suggestions with NAIRR on cybersecurity and would like to incorporate some of that conversation into this structure; can include table from NAIRR, think about ethics, look at AURA governance example where governance committee is an audit committee.

iv. **Comment:** risk-utility framework is helpful to read through; as co-author of Hart-Potok, hope it's useful input to this work, but there is a lot more to think about, not intended to answer all questions; as we go forward, I'll stress that a lot of things will be a starting point, maybe a key question is what level of detail we want to weigh in on as a Committee, if these are the right boxes to stress, and what are the main themes?

v. **Comment (from chat):** About decisions on protected data and complexity of org structure, my experience in bureaucracy is that focus is key to success and effectiveness because you can spend a lot of time dialoguing, setting up briefings, resolving conflicts, etc.; understand the logic here, but it sets up a possible situation where focus is lost and time is spent sorting out who gets to call what shots—two possible ways of addressing that: 1) clarify roles (for example, where steering committee comes in vis-a-vis board of directors) and there may be an opportunity for simplification (for example, ICSP member with veto power on board of directors), and 2) more clarity of the project approval committee—when projects need approval, how would they interface with the owner organizations? Need to be clear that owners would have ultimate authority.

vi. **Comment:** to circle back to comment above, envisioned cybersecurity and privacy types of expertise would be on the science and technology board— are you suggesting that input needs to be outside of that board? For example, Evidence Commission suggested Chief Privacy Officer (not identical, but probably overlap)—are you suggesting core needs to have a CPO? In respect to oversight and audit piece, through contract that would be put in

place there would be agreed-upon KPIs, etc., transparency around whether or not managing entity was meeting expectations—interested in understanding independent audit fitting into organizational structure?

Response: suggesting something that exceeds roles embedded in committee, suggesting dedicated resources and personnel (not about the managing entity, but box above that). One attractive thing is that someone at NSF can always pull the plug—want the person who has that lever to be informed on cybersecurity and privacy (may need to be contracted out or not). To other question—need the right superstructure within NSF, so need someone who can efficiently assess if something meets federal government standards; roles go to the top box and inform the ultimate decision-maker.

vii. **Comment (read aloud from chat):** I'd like to be explicit in the recommendations that the NSDS would need to develop measures of value; I don't think frequency of use is a sufficient measure, there has to be some way to measure impact or perhaps to look at value to different stakeholders separately—maybe the use of data by state/local governments would be measured separately from use by academic researchers since the potential impacts are often very different. It's important to think about the right measures of value, and NSDS should help develop those. I would also like to hear more about the Project Approval Committee—how would this not add to the time for the approval process? Does this take the place of data owner approval? How do we make sure data owners have resources for support?

Response: suggestions from the Committee would be welcome.

viii. **Comment:** the conversation has been great; this is where it becomes important to have findings (for example, NAIRR to link to ACDEB recommendations). Must think about the pieces in the ecosystem to provide clear recommendations (something new? something existing?) and have findings that connect the dots (external reports, internal expertise); also, important to find the right level of detail (simple, but specific enough to have "teeth").

ix. **Comment:** a teaser to the upcoming Technical Infrastructure conversation, but weaving Governance and Technical Infrastructure could quickly unpack node idea.

Response: funding will determine the structure of the nodes; the approval process will touch on how nodes get selected or deselected.

x. **Comment (from chat):** Yes, this level of detail is desirable and necessary. Each of these elements are important because they play a role in ensuring that the NSDS—a national data service—has has a governance structure that intentionally and fairly reflects the vision, voice, and needs of the broader

ecosystem while at the same time ensuring accountability." There have been questions about a phased approach and how critical each component is—elements work together to ensure the vision and voice of the broader ecosystem has input; some things are easier than others, but each serves a specific function.

    xi. **Comments for the record:**

       1. **Comment (from chat):** I don't think it made it into the document, but I mentioned as a comment that it might be beneficial for the NSDS to have a partnership with CISA (Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency) and make use of its services.

       2. **Comment (from chat):** How are people getting paid? What do NSF lawyers say about pass-throughs, one-year or no year money, cost collection, etc.

       3. **Comment (from chat):** Privacy and cybersecurity should be protected though the NSF government project management group/unit

       4. **Comment (from chat):** A CISO and a cybersecurity officer are both good suggestions, but separate because the CISO is down in the weeds about protecting the current NSDS infrastructure whereas I presume a cybersecurity officer would be more forward looking.

       5. **Comment (from chat):** The definition of "value" is also influenced based on perspective/role of evaluator of the measures of value

       6. **Comment (from chat):** Project review committee could make recommendations to organizations that own protected data; the recommendations would support a standard model for risk/value

       7. **Comment (from chat):** There are CISOs in the existing agencies however, are they innovative?

       8. **Comment (from chat):** We kicked off today's meeting saying recommendations need to be actionable, which was being described as being "very concrete"

f. **Wrap-up:**

    i. Thank you; think there are a few more things here that we didn't specifically address that we will take up later in the subcommittees and elsewhere to see how this is part of a larger discussion.

    ii. I'm encouraged by the comments raised in terms of connecting dots with what already exists—there are many pieces and the balance of

detail/specificity is hard to juggle, so I look forward to future conversations on clarity where needed and findings that keep us moving forward.

V. Facilitated Discussion: Technical Infrastructure Subcommittee Report: Technical Infrastructure – ACDEB Support Team, Amy O'Hara, ACDEB Member, and David Park, ACDEB Member

a. Today, walking through Technical Infrastructure recommendations: many are from the Year 1 report and we've spent Year 2 fortifying the justifications for including these and seeking examples in-use for options; Technical Infrastructure isn't saying "this is what NSDS should do" but instead saying "NSDS needs to have these capabilities and from our explorations here are examples for what could be considered" (likely through nodes discussed earlier).

b. Recommendations (themes):

  i. Data Accessibility: ties back to the earlier question of how to make sure when people request data this all happens efficiently; as a way of encouraging data accessibility, have discoverable metadata, request data access, track the approval process, and document the outcome—wraps around SAP.

  ii. Technical Assistance: ties in with fellow subcommittees but would focus on NSDS having technical solutions and infrastructure to support concierge services in supplying accurate information and providing usage metrics (ties in with importance of metrics Governance spoke to).

  iii. Data Integrity: central to Technical Infrastructure—making sure there are secure and responsible ways to access data and build evidence; ties to Governance discussion of ethics, safe inputs/outputs.

  iv. Data Auditability: ties to previous recommendation; ensures auditability and transparency, making sure you are monitoring provenance and usage of data sets in use (another one that connects to Five Safes from Governance). Making sure NSDS is a viable place to support open and reproducible science and would be great if NSDS was a way to support validation servers and synthetic sets—a way our findings illustrate what's going on today and describe ways NSDS could accelerate usefulness for evidence-building.

  v. Disclosure Limitation: another core aspect, heard from a number of core experts on this; has to do with NSDS supporting assessment of risk and utility, ways you could produce statistics you need while mitigating risks.

  vi. Data Linkage: heard a lot about privacy-preserving linkages being used in government and beyond; considering how different ways of doing record linkage could overcome barriers of today and reduce risk for ways linkages are currently being done; also ties in with data concierge service options.

vii. Knowledge Sharing: functional capability of communications (ties to Other Services); we want to make sure there are systems that can be used so it doesn't rely on word of mouth or institutional knowledge; making sure there are web-based communities of practice so you get more cross-pollination and break down domain barriers.

    1. **Comment:** thank you, these are substantive suggestions and will help a lot with the governance; two questions: 1) on concierge service, not sure but know with federal and state/local agencies, the notion of data stewardship so that agency data stewards can track access to and use of data and what's generated as a result is a technical suggestion—if that's something that could be invested in, that would be great, and 2) with record linkage and knowledge sharing, would be great if there could be an explicit callout to importance of quality of record linkage for vulnerable groups, some way of actively promoting access to understanding what linkages are doing and quality of outputs as a result—that should be part of the knowledge sharing.

    Response: agree; mapping back to numbered list, #1, making sure systems integrate in ways that are useful to data controllers.

    2. **Comment:** pulling back to governance, to extent that people working on data are creating value, data stewardship and access have to be conditioned on the value that is generated; incentive structure so the more you've contributed to the public good in the past the more access is likely to be granted in the future—can then build that into governance.

    3. **Response:** add that DEI and disparate impact comes into next recommendation you'll see in a second; good flag that it comes into communication function too.

viii. Innovation Sandbox: opportunity to support research and development for the entire ecosystem, must include some sort of sandbox for testing new and innovative technologies; ties to comment above about record linkage and current outcomes for equity; not overturning what people are currently doing but looking for a safe place to encourage better practices (measure bias, develop new methods of data joins).

    1. **Comment:** flag to the support team that in the NAIRR these are referred to as test beds with explicit funding; can feed into ACDEB.

ix. Privacy Preserving Technologies: explored as a use case, spoke with many experts from within and outside government; suggest NSDS promote use of PPTs and work with the research community to develop efficient, scalable tools for users from all levels of government.

    c. **Comments for the record:**

        i. **Comment (from chat):** One of the Government Data recommendations that Communications subcommittee is also incorporating this insight into these different research efforts.

        ii. **Comment (from chat):** There is strong alignment between these recommendations and those from the other services subcommittee.

        iii. **Comment (from chat):** Technical assistance that helps connect the research efforts and data sets being utilized.

        iv. **Comment (from chat):** These are great and cover a lot of ground. I especially appreciate the PET rec #9 builds capacity without requirements/mandates.

    d. **Wrap-up**

        i. Overwhelmed at the amount of work and effort everyone has put in—so much more work to be done, but I can't thank you enough, and I look forward to the work yet to occur and interdependencies among items.

        ii. I'll emphasize the importance of findings that make these recommendations our own and am excited about where we are at this point.

VI. **Recommendations Summary with Committee Discussion** – Emilda Rivers, ACDEB Chair and ACDEB Co-Chairs

    a. Recommendations Framework for the Year 2 Report: recommendations start with the here and now, forthcoming regulations, and flow through to the vision for the NSDS.

    b. As a reminder, the full slide deck has been posted to ACDEB site and includes each of the draft recommendations submitted to date aligned to this framework.

    c. Recap the goal: will walk through some examples; I'm not blessing these recommendations as complete, but I am highlighting our progress and the potential to reach our objective.

        i. Recommendations Example: Timely, Actionable, and Relevant Recommendations: The Standard Application Process

            1. "Timely": example recommendation connects forthcoming regs to ongoing work in statistical system

            2. "Actionable": example recommendation describes "who" (OMB, ICSP, SAP PMO)

            3. "Relevant": developing the SAP is a responsibility for statistical agencies under the Evidence Act

ii. Recommendations Example: Detailed and Nuanced Findings

1. Findings: rooted in expertise and information-sharing of the Committee

iii. Recommendations Example: Cohesive and Balanced

1. Technical assistance recommendations show how there's work to be done to synthesize and integrate ideas across the subcommittees to develop a cohesive and balanced set of recommendations

d. Encouragement and reminder: we've come a very long way to achieving this goal, but a lot of work remains and I look forward to the next phase of the work to synthesize and integrate this information.

e. **Committee Feedback/Discussion**

i. **Question:** to take the concierge as an example: would the report have as a recommendation the idea of a concierge and use the Other Services' vision for what that would do, then report the Technical Infrastructure recommendation to support that, then Governance pieces that would govern that all in one section—is that the vision? Structured around components rather than each of the subcommittees?

Answer: yes, that's the goal in order to make the report as seamless as possible for people who need to read/digest it and for the public.

ii. **Comment:** as a follow-up, from the Technical Infrastructure group, in order to have the thematic presentation you referenced, NSDS will have operations and a lot of the Tech recommendations fit to that—a lot of work to try to articulate that.

Response: that was where I liked that the NAIRR budget is tagged to the agencies and there's a separate operational budget; then, requirements of agencies drive the structure of nodes. There might be some core infrastructure but competitions for research providers are around objectives—follow the money and metrics.

iii. **Comment:** on phases of implementation, to help the report be effective, suggest an overview that talks about phases—top priority as concierge, for example. About helping people focus and not get too into the weeds with details; help people keep the bigger picture in mind.

Response: thank you for that; something I've been stressing as well—a strategic framework with actionable and clear recommendations.

VII. **Next Steps and Action Items with Committee Discussion** – Emilda Rivers, ACDEB Chair

a. There's a flurry of activity happening between now and September 2nd. For the subcommittees, address any outstanding issues, fill remaining gaps, and coordinate on interdependencies by August 1st.

b. From August 1st, the support team will be working with Emilda to create a cohesive report—that's the conversation we've been having today.

c. Thank you to presenters, Committee members, and attendees; if you have additional comments/questions email evidence@bea.gov

d. September 23rd meeting will depend on our work over the next few weeks before we deliver the report to OMB on October 14th; we will address late-breaking shifts in the evidence ecosystem that may impact our work.

e. October's in-person meeting: be on the lookout for travel information and logistics.

f. Next Meeting: ACDEB Meeting 19: September 23, 2022