

**Meeting 2 Actions and Notes/Parking Lot
November 20, 2020**

Next Meeting: December 18, 2020 (9 AM - Noon (EDT))

Task	Responsibility	Status	Schedule
1. <i>Complete Future State Inputs</i> -- Committee members who did not get a chance are invited to provide their future state descriptions. Provide input at https://docs.google.com/document/d/1MDmJY5Y3IDSPzNEUS1H5OhkNPWa7esL8lj82P0tHVA/edit?userstoinvite=emkcola%40gmail.com&ts=5fb6da35&actionButton=1	ACDEB Members	In Process	By 12/18/20 Meeting
2. <i>Provide Input and Revisions to Public Input Subcommittee Document and Questions for Federal Register Notice</i>	ACDEB Members	Done	11/24/20
3. <i>Draft-to-final Federal Register Notice for Public Input Questions</i> -- Complete revisions to Public Input Subcommittee document for internal review and approval (e.g., Counsel, Public Affairs); anticipate publishing Federal Register notice in late December/ January and 60-day timeline for responses; plan for public comment intake	Lucas Hitt. Lonna Morrow, James Plante	In Process	Mid-December for BEA review draft
4. <i>Email on Presentations/ Discussions for 3rd Committee Meeting on December 18, 2020 on International, State, and Local Perspectives at</i> - Outreach to presenters: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • International (Julia Lane) • State (Christin Lotz, Elizabeth Kovacs, Kimberly Murnieks, Anna Hui) • Local (Laila Alequresh, David Park) <p>Recommend state and local presenters organize a preparatory work group; offer Peter Bonner's help facilitating at the work group and 3rd Meeting, 12/18/20</p>	Lucas Hitt Select Committee Members		12/1/20
5. <i>Begin Preparation for Presenters at 4th Committee Meeting on January 18th 2021</i> -- Confirm topics, identify presenters: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Federal Statistical System Perspectives • Evaluation Perspectives 	Internal Team		Draft: 12/2/20 Final: 12/4/20
6. <i>Complete Action Items and Parking Lot/Notes for Meeting 2 and Distribute to Participants</i>	Peter Bonner	Done	Draft: 11/27/20 Final: 12/1/20

I. Committee Members' Future State Aspirations Discussion (Peter Bonner)

Committee reviewed the initial input regarding the Future State ("North Star") for the Committee's work (see [Future State GoogleDoc](#))

The Future State input will be living document the Committee will return to so that they can test the deliberations in each meeting against their aspirations for the Future State of this work.

Future State Areas of Convergence in Committee Member Input

- "One-Stop Shop" for evidence building, data sharing, and policy decision making
- Consensus on interoperability, transparency, security, consistency, confidence
- Resolution of privacy and access tensions

Future State Areas of Divergence in Committee Member Input

- Standardization/ Experimentation Emphasis
 - Standardization in a single robust system of record -- access to data in a standardized workflow controlled with access governance; this still allows for experimentation by the users in exploratory analysis of the users
 - Standards in security and access to administrative data; differences between single versus distributed repositories
 - Standard and predictable operating procedures, standard templates and underpinning of linking data so it is predictable, know it is going to work; not every decision requires a customized approach
 - Provide Standard so they can set a path for state and local governments to follow the same path for ease of access and consistency of data
 - Careful not to spend all the time on the process rather than why doing it -- start with value propositions (the why) and then governance and processes (the how)
 - Standardization suggests a data bureaucracy that will make it difficult to get the data online -- need to protect the data to expand access; be careful of too much procedure
 - Need for repeatable process but needs to change with emerging needs and changing conditions -- not too malleable leading to fragility -- efficient, sustainable versus adaptable; need use cases to bring clarity to this
 - State and local: public demanding more transparency and access to determine availability of their data; need to give the public the awareness of how the data will be used to serve their purposes; need standardization, SOPs -- but need to make data available and make it easy for the states
- Centralization/Decentralization Emphasis
 - Expand use of data by focusing on narratives for the public -- processes so that they are easily accessible by non-standard users of the data; not just the experts; option from everyone at that point of need
 - Has to be decentralized to be effective; example of COVID with emerging data sets -- need standards to guide data access and development (Weather Service example of centralization in early 20th century and its movement to decentralized data gathering and reporting improving forecasts and communication)

- Need to think through principles and policies that will help us (example of the National Statistical Service model) guide how we deal with emergent data; readiness to grab new data but in the privacy-sensitive way; may take too long to get to total accuracy
 - Need ways to assemble local data to provide dashboards, decision bases
 - State/local getting the data in, but difficult to be able to turn it over in real time -- still not automated enough -- need improvements in infrastructure development at the state/local level; bridge gaps in making data accessible
 - Leverage experience in federal CDO Council in providing enterprise analytics infrastructure to ingest data and get it out to the 19 agencies; address questions on impacts, but also had challenges on sharing information across agency lines -- lessons learned there
 - Parallel structures to standardization/centralization; consider OSHA model on required standards building to voluntary standards; risk tradeoffs with transparency and openness -- some will be more risk averse; use IRBs to certify protections similar to informed consent approaches
 - Beware of designing something to satisfy everyone; consider group of services not one thing that solves for all; infrastructure involving a group of services that solves multiple issues; not replacing the Federal Statistical System but a net improvement on the current system
 - Biggest hurdle is **interoperability** -- difficulty in gathering and reporting on COVID data; hard to develop a small, single set of standards; focus on single case studies and mutual learning from them
 - Federal Statistical System can bring examples, pilots, case studies and learn from those to look at solutions to the common process issues; consider hybrid system with common front end for existing data with an ability to bring together emergent data when we need to; got to think about the resource drain on the data providers as well
 - Common threads: security v. access, ease-of-entry v. risk acceptance, control v. self-managed chaos; where accept risk to derive value from the data
- Friction/Frictionless
- Centralization and standardization for what we don't want people to worry about or re-invent the wheel (e.g., standard on security through encryption); promote data privacy and data use transparency
 - (consider how Canada is managing friction/frictionless, privacy, standardization, etc.)

II. Technology Overview and Discussion -- Relevant Technologies (Amy O'Hara)

(See Relevant Technologies presentation by Amy O'Hara)

Committee Considerations:

- **Transparency on Technologies and Continuous Improvement:** Technology choices should be made public to audit implementation, make improvements, identify gaps; consider crowdsourcing methods to improve (IRS example) -- balance with difficulty of doing open source methods in the federal context
- **Privacy v. Utility:** Consider the privacy/utility tradeoff in application of technologies

- **Access to Data:** Reconsider the binary private/non-private access in favor of tiered access
- **Value Propositions:** Focus on the value prop to get people to participate (examples of failures where this was not accomplished)
 - Ensure delivery of value (in addition to the importance of the technologies) -- focus on utility and value propositions: timely, local, valuable, and useable
 - Many users may only need a limited number of variables to address (HUD examples) and small number of data points, but may need them longitudinally -- clarity around the value proposition for these users and data owners
- **Governance and Policy:** May need a board to oversee the data work, address issues of who can have access, who shouldn't have access — set up a structure for how these issues can be addressed
- **Data Ownership:** Consider shift attitudes toward data ownership from single transactions to continual ownership, transparency, and control; individuals want to take back their data; consider leveraging technology to continue to keep people close to their data with real-time consent and buy-in from the individuals and get permission more efficiently, effectively; move away from typical consent model in software updates
- **Data Sharing:** Address data access (organization-levels) and data access (individual levels) as a means of control
- **Centralized/Federated Approaches:** Keep an open mind between centralized and federated decisions on access, repositories, and standardization; people want to use the administrative data but that takes expertise and interactions with SMEs; there is a benefit to keeping the data where it is produced -- this goes beyond the privacy issue on data access
 - Potential for a hybrid model of centralized versus federated; example of USDA moving to the cloud and making this not an either/or; identify where experiments are happening and documenting the use cases; CDO Council data sharing work is connected to this
- **Data Ownership and Availability:** Need for guidance on a limited number of critical data sets that are already regularly collected by local and state governments; this would help these data collectors invest in the resources so that such data can be captured and transmitted effectively and efficiently
 - Need to keep data owners/originators close to their data/close to home; how does government audit that researchers are using the data for the stated purpose? Do IGs get involved in this? (model from the National Statistical Data Center and its Terms & Conditions on data use — e.g., tight monitoring over scope, cannot take/download the data and sell it)
 - Need for MOUs seems obvious (Committee's Evidence Act accountability for this)

- **NSDS:** Data Service will need money and legislation; need to invest in the data capacity at the agencies — fed., state, and local; distributed funding models need to be considered; need for sharing and partnering
 - Data Service as much of a philosophy; it will need to be decentralized at some level and interoperability optimized

III. Public Input Proposal and Discussion (Anna Hui)

Committee reviewed the draft document developed by the Subcommittee on Public Outreach. Committee members to provide any additional input by 11/24/20.