

Meeting 13 Notes and Actions
October 22, 2021

Next Meeting: November 19, 2021 (9 AM - Noon (EDT))

Meeting Agenda

1. Meeting Introduction, Agenda Review, and Reminders – Emilda Rivers and Alyssa Holdren
2. Report Outline, Background and Vision – Avi Alpert
3. Subcommittee Report: Legislation and Regulations – Nicholas Hart and Christine Heflin
4. Subcommittee Report: Governance, Transparency, and Accountability – Charles Cutshall and Julia Lane
5. Subcommittee Report: Government Data for Evidence-Building – Anna Hui and Kenneth Troske
6. Subcommittee Report: Other Services/Capacity-Building Opportunities – Kimberly Murnieks and Matthew Soldner
7. Subcommittee Report: Technical Infrastructure – Amy O’Hara and David Park
8. Year 2 Roadmap – Avi Alpert
9. Next Steps and Action Items with Committee Discussion – Emilda Rivers

1. 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, recapping where the drafting and review process for the Year 1 report, and giving a few reminders.

Recap of report process

- The full draft of the report went out to Committee members on Friday, October 15.
- At that point, members were asked to review the report with an eye toward deal-breakers or items they couldn’t put their names to and to raise those concerns (along with specific suggestions for new text) by the end of the day on Wednesday, October 20. Thanks to members who flagged items of major concern—the Committee will talk about some of those items during the meeting. And the rest will be handled as through the editing process.
- In addition, on Monday, October 18, the Coordinating Committee reviewed a list of items that could be harmonized across subcommittee sections and otherwise reference or linked to the other things the Committee has heard about (like the Evidence Act). The Coordinating Committee developed a strategy for acknowledging these overlaps and connections without drastically editing the recommendations that had been approved by the subcommittees.
- During today’s meeting, the Committee will discuss specific items raised by individual members and at the Coordinating Committee, including reviewing a sentence to describe the “structure” of a National Secure Data Services (NSDS) (and laying out next steps for fleshing out NSDS as a “place”) and approving recommendations to come from the Committee at large.

Reminders

- **Non-negotiables.** The October 29 deadline for the Year 1 report is quickly approaching. And the Chair is fully committed to delivering a report that features well-formed findings, actionable recommendations, and an action plan for what we will accomplish in Year 2. Again, these are the non-negotiables.
- **Phased approach.** The Chair reminded everyone that the Committee is taking a phased approach to gather information, weigh options, build findings, and make recommendations.
 - So, it's okay to focus on findings this year.
 - And it's okay to present recommendations coming out of subcommittees that haven't been fully integrated and synthesized with each other—if the report flags these items as such.
 - And, when things aren't ripe, the Committee shouldn't force full Committee recommendations.
- **Full Committee recommendations.** There are places where the Committee can—and should—make specific recommendations backed by the Committee at large. The Committee should not miss out on these opportunities. As the Chair mentioned last time, there are a couple driving forces behind this:
 - First, the Committee's build out of a National Secure Data Service must fit with what already exists. As noted in the executive summary of the report, the NSDS will be an important component of the broader evidence-building ecosystem. As such, the NSDS will build on the framework established under the Evidence Act and advanced in the Federal Data Strategy.
 - The Committee has an opportunity, right now, to inform OMB policy development. Some members have noted that OMB hasn't finished writing regulations around implementation of the Evidence Act. That makes it hard to understand their full potential for defining the policy framework under which NSDS will operate. And it makes it hard to envision how NSDS as a “place” or a “service” fully fits in. But that also means we can inform OMB's policy development work with our findings—our questions, our ideas, and our recommendations.
 - So, the Committee will discuss and agree on a set of recommendations coming from the full Committee. The goal is to present actionable, relevant, and timely recommendations to OMB, covering high-priority items that (1) provide the building blocks for the Committee's work in Year 2 and (2) support the next steps for establishing and operationalizing a successful NSDS.
- **Year 2 plans.** The Committee must be clear about its plans for Year 2.
 - The Committee spent its first year on fact finding to develop an overarching vision for a National Secure Data Service and lay out the contours of what is required to realize that vision from the perspectives of five focus areas. The Year 2 agenda will focus on the needed steps to operationalize the NSDS and that vision.

- To accomplish this, the Committee must take a holistic approach to synthesizing, integrating, and building on the Year 1 recommendations—both those the full Committee recommendations and those from the subcommittees. This includes investigating specific topics more deeply, documenting findings in those areas, and drafting actionable recommendations for review and approval by the full Committee.
- **Possible flow basis.** And, finally, all the Committee’s work doesn’t have to come out in the Year 1 or Year 2 reports. The Committee can decide to release additional findings, action steps, and recommendations on a flow basis between these two mandated deliverables.

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

2. Report Outline, Vision and Background – Avi Alpert

Avi Alpert, the Committee’s rapporteur, presented the report outline, laid out ground rules for the facilitated discussion, and walked the Committee through several statements and recommendations for full Committee approval. Each of those items, and the related Committee discussion is presented here.

NSDS “structure” sentence

Suggested wording

As a place, NSDS will be a legally recognized entity that functions within the larger ecosystem, with hardware, software, and administrative infrastructure and capacity that allows it to meet its mission. The NSDS will be structured as a quasi- or non-governmental entity that is sponsored by a federal statistical agency and will have the following attributes: transparency and trust, accessibility, independence, legal authority to protect privacy and confidentiality, legal authority to collect data from agencies, scalable functionality, sustainability, oversight and accountability, and intergovernmental support.

Committee feedback/discussion

- Member noted some members believe that the Committee expressed clearly that it agreed with the view that is expressed in the existing sentence, and there has been a lot of discussion focused on the Hart-Potok report, under the impression that consensus was that the Committee would match ideas under the report (e.g., proposing NSDS as an FFRDC at NSF NCSES); as written, the sentence conveys the feelings of the Committee.
- Other members disagreed with assertion that everyone agrees with Hart-Potok report. Members raised concerns about wanting more information about FFRDCs.
- Member objected to the specification at this point that NSDS will be “quasi- or non-governmental” since the Committee is still looking at the structure. It is premature to specify anything about the structure. Suggests that the sentence read: “NSDS will have the following attributes...”
- Member asked whether Committee still recognized the relationship to a federal statistical agency. This may not necessarily be a “sponsorship.”
- There was a suggestion to change “will be structured” to “could be structured.” There were no objections to this suggestion.

- Chair made a strong recommendation to focus on attributes, not just think about the Hart-Potok report (which is an external reference). The Committee should not just take the Hart-Potok framework—it is good to focus on attributes right now, and these attributes may or may not align with the Hart-Potok report. The rapporteur reminded the Committee that there will be more definitive language in the final report (and most likely before).
- On legal authority attributes
 - Member asked whether “legal authority” should be “legal requirement” to protect “privacy and confidentiality.”
 - Member suggested that attributes four and five on legal authorities go together (as was done in the Governance section of the report); could also use word “requirement” for both.
 - Member reminded the group that it’s about producing value for evidence building.
 - Member noted that, from an evaluation perspective, it’s important to support research; suggestion to add “and match data.” Another member wasn’t sure about adding “and match” to the sentence. What does this achieve? This addresses specific problem for evidence building, attempting to override narrow interpretations of Title 13, Title 26, Title 42, and Title 7.
 - Member noted that there is a recommendation from the Legislation and Regulations subcommittee about addressing Evidence Commission recommendations; could add an explicit bullet to subcommittee’s recommendations.
 - Member noted that word “match” can be a lightning rod in this context as this is tied to benefits determinations; entire premise built on assumption that NSDS will have data that folks can match against. The Committee is having an ongoing conversation about whether NSDS will host data to match to other data sets. Suggestion to use the word “link” instead of “match.”

New suggested sentence

As a place, NSDS will be a legally recognized entity that functions within the larger ecosystem, with hardware, software, and administrative infrastructure and capacity that allows it to meet its mission. The NSDS could be structured as a quasi- or non-governmental entity that is sponsored by a federal statistical agency and will have the following attributes: transparency and trust, accessibility, independence, legal requirement to protect privacy and confidentiality while exercising legal authority to collect and link data which produces value for evidence building, scalable functionality, sustainability, oversight and accountability, and intergovernmental support.

Committee feedback/discussion

- Member was not sure about adding extra words on value, noting that it is hard to judge this sentence outside of the broader report; these words are probably redundant but not against them being added if others feel strongly about including them. Another member wanted to keep the value for evidence building in the sentence.

- The Committee indicated that the support team should incorporate feedback from the meeting to edit the sentence in the context of the full report.

Committee recommendations

Recommendation #1: Evidence Act Regulations

Suggested wording

The OMB Director should take immediate steps to promulgate draft guidance and regulations required under the Evidence Act, including reviewing and incorporating the Committee’s preliminary advice provided in this report and engaging with the Committee as part of the comment process. These expected policies 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.

This guidance and regulations will provide necessary frameworks to inform the development of the NSDS and support evidence-based decision-making. The Committee will make additional recommendations to advance the implementation of the Evidence Act and to establish an NSDS in Year 2.

Committee feedback/discussion

- Member noted that it seems like first and last sentences are incompatible; intent is that Committee will make recommendations to inform the recommendations; is this clear? Part of ACDEB role to offer advice on these regulations as they’re being drafted.
- Other members didn’t see the sentences in conflict; first sentence is specific about regulatory guidance, and last sentence is about totality of the law—compatible with the first and a bit broader
- No changes incorporated

Recommendation #2: Chief Statistician

Suggested wording

The OMB Director should take immediate steps to designate a full-time Chief Statistician of the United States and elevate this position within OMB's organizational structure, in alignment with CEP recommendation 5-4.

Committee feedback/discussion: There were no objections from the Committee.

Recommendation #3: Standard-Setting Procedures

Suggested wording

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 future data standards for intergovernmental, interagency, or intra-agency data sets.

These procedures will be foundational to the development and implementation of standards and standardization for both the NSDS and stakeholders in the broader evidence-building ecosystem. The Committee will make additional recommendations on standards in Year 2.

Committee feedback/discussion: There were no objections from the Committee.

Recommendation #4: Appropriations Requests

Suggested wording

The OMB Director should include specific requests for increased funding to support implementation of the Federal Data Strategy priorities and Evidence Act requirements in the FY 2023 President's Budget request to Congress.

Committee feedback/discussion: A member strongly supported the recommendation; there were no objections from the Committee.

Recommendation #5: Value-driven pilot program

Suggested wording

The Committee recommends that the United States Chief Statistician, in concert with the Interagency Council on Statistical Policy, establishes a pilot program, with funding as needed, that demonstrates the value of data sharing and coordination, specifically with projects that highlight cross-functional, cross-agency, and cross-governmental topics. The Committee recommends projects on unemployment insurance data, education and workforce, and health as high priorities.

The pilot program will evaluate ways to ensure private information is protected while expanding research access. Projects should include federal agencies, states, and localities that already have well developed data systems and involve people who have experience in data sharing between federal, state, and local governments and have addressed such issues in the past. The program will start by building on projects already underway across the federal statistical system. The Committee will use this program to help inform its recommendations in Year 2.

Committee feedback/discussion

- Member suggested to change sentence to “The program will start by building on projects already underway by federal, state, and local government agencies.” Another member noted that this change is compatible with actors in the first sentence. Members agreed with this suggestion.
- A member questioned the role of ICSP in this process. Another member noted that ICSP has been expanded to include programmatic agencies, and these agencies work closely with their state/local partners.
- Member expressed concern that the wording of the first sentence appears to be going back to the beginning—over the last few years, the federal government and its partners have already demonstrated the value of data sharing; need to highlight the need to accelerate, institutionalize, and make the use of data for evidence building a reality; this is about transforming capacity; sentence should be more ambitious. Other members agreed.
- On list of specific projects listed in first paragraph
 - Member noted a problem with last sentence in first paragraph that mentions specific topics; not sure this list of examples matches the full landscape; rather, it reflects the membership of the Committee. There was a suggestion to cut this sentence.
 - Member noted the Governance group came up with these examples because members are aware of pilot projects that could be worked on that demonstrate value; concern that there’s only a year left; because of time limits, need to prioritize use cases; want to build on what Committee members have subject matter expertise on; also fine with deleting sentence.
 - Idea is to narrow down projects and communicate the value of NSDS through high-value projects; Committee members have identified known data assets and projects already underway; group could identify other projects
 - Other members support including the recommended topic areas.
 - Rapporteur suggested changing “high priorities” to “timely priorities” to address these concerns.
 - Member suggested combining language of the last sentence of the first paragraph with the second to last sentence in the second paragraph
- A member noted that the Technical Subcommittee had a discussion yesterday about the term “pilot program” and not sure those recommendations were incorporated into the document. Another member indicated that these comments were incorporated for the next recommendation not this one.

New suggested text (first paragraph)

The Committee recommends that the United States Chief Statistician, in concert with the Interagency Council on Statistical Policy, establishes a pilot program, with funding as needed, that further

demonstrates the value of data sharing and coordination, specifically with projects that highlight cross-functional, cross-agency, and cross-governmental topics. The Committee suggests projects on unemployment insurance data, education and workforce, and health as timely priorities with ongoing research activities.

The Committee indicated that the support team should incorporate feedback from the meeting to edit the recommendation.

Recommendation #6: Privacy-Preserving Technologies Case Studies

Rapporteur presented current and suggested wording from Technical Infrastructure.

Suggested text (original)

The Committee recommends that the United States Chief Statistician, in concert with the Interagency Council on Statistical Policy, establishes a pilot program, with funding as needed, to advance the use of privacy preserving technologies, in alignment with CEP recommendation 3-2. The pilot program should feature applications of secure multiparty computing, if possible, including (1) privacy preserving record linkage and (2) private set intersection.

The pilot program will identify legal barriers to be overcome and technical requirements needed to foster the widespread use of these technologies. The program will leverage the Federal Committee on Statistical Methodology's Data Protection toolkit and will start by building on projects already underway across the federal statistical system.

The program should inform future coordination between federal, state, and local governments and help develop a framework for expanding engagements beyond the federal evidence building system. The Committee will use this program to help inform its recommendations in Year 2.

Suggested text (from Technical Infrastructure subcommittee)

The Committee recommends that the United States Chief Statistician, in concert with the Interagency Council on Statistical Policy, publishes case studies where privacy preserving technologies were employed, in alignment with CEP recommendation 3-2.

The case studies will identify legal barriers to be overcome and technical requirements needed to foster the widespread use of these technologies. The case studies will inform future coordination between federal, state, and local governments and help develop a framework for expanding engagements beyond the federal evidence building system. The Committee will use this program to help inform its recommendations in Year 2.

Committee Feedback/Discussion

- Member asked if privacy-preserving technologies include tiered access? Other members said "yes."
- Member suggested changing "program" in last paragraph to "report" or something similar.

Recommendation #7: Communications

Suggested text

The Committee recommends that the United States Chief Statistician, in concert with the Interagency Council on Statistical Policy, develops a comprehensive communication strategy about the benefits of a robust, privacy protecting NSDS. The strategy should be responsive to the interests of a wide 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.

The Committee will provide the initial outline for this communication strategy as part of its recommendations in Year 2.

Committee feedback/discussion

- On actors in first sentence
 - Member acknowledged that Chief Data Officers and Evaluation Officials have equities in these recommendations; should ICSP be the only group mentioned in lead-in to these recommendations?
 - Rapporteur noted that this wording is about who Committee is directing the report to
 - Member noted that Committee should look for opportunities to make connections to other groups; should be able to talk about the governance that exists with agencies under the Evidence Act; the background section of the report touches on this
 - Member clarified that goal is not linkage for the purpose of generating statistics; it's about actionable evidence building
 - Member asked why ICSP would lead communication strategy on this; statistical community is about staying back from making inferences from statistics; why is this their role?
 - Chair noted that ICSP supports coordination in its statutory role; coordination comes through Chief Statistician's Office and ICSP; ICSP is set up to advise OMB; important for that group to engage; this is a broader take on ICSP than what's been done before.
- On word "advocates" at the end of the paragraph
 - Member concerned that word "advocates" sounds like lobbying; maybe need to massage language here; should be communicating about specific projects and benefits and supporting efforts to advise; is this too promotional?
 - Another member responded that this is not a lobbying activity, and sentence is written in a safe way.
 - Member reiterated that "advocates" could be problematic; another member suggested changing "advocates" to something clearer

- Clarifying purpose of communications strategy
 - Member suggested to add “in producing high-value data and evidence” at the end of the first sentence; other members liked the idea of mentioning value here. Another member asked if value needs to be added to each recommendation.
 - Member noted that the goal is to get to the “meat” of what the Committee is suggesting; key actors must approach communications holistically (beyond just the benefits of NSDS); need to build social license and talk about the whole evidence-building process; big picture must part of the communication strategy; this is about transparency.
 - Member asked about the purpose of the communication recommendation—is it about privacy protections or what is being delivered on the public value? It seems like the recommendation is emphasizing too much on privacy aspects.
 - Rapporteur suggested to remove “privacy protecting” from sentence; not mention privacy or value and not restating everything again. There was lots of agreement from members.
 - Member suggested to add word “collaboration” to the recommendation; need to develop the strategy with the states and local governments to develop clear, unified voice.
 - Member suggested adding the word “education” to the first sentence, so that it reads “a comprehensive communication and education strategy.”

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

3. 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 greatest challenge and success and Year 2 plans.

Committee feedback/discussions: No comments from members or the public

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

4. 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 presented the focus area’s recommendations, greatest success and challenges, and Year 2 plans.

Committee feedback/discussions

- Member noted that, while probably not necessary to mention for Year 1 report, staffing NSDS could be a big challenge in the federal system. The kinds of people who would be optimal to work at NSDS are in very high demand and are very well paid in the private sector.
- Co-chair noted that Governance subcommittee talked about importance of coming together as a full Committee and getting clarity on what the larger group thinks is appropriate for NSDS structure.
- Chair mentioned that Committee is looking forward to digging into attributes and how Evidence Act authorities dovetail with governance; need to have the right perspective/framing for Year 2 discussion.
- Member noted that there may be an opportunity for “reverse engineering” by looking at existing legal authorities and then noting the attributes that make them successful.

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

5. 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 presented the focus area’s greatest success and challenges and Year 2 plans.

Committee feedback/discussions

- Member asked whether privacy-protecting technologies includes tiered access. Co-chair responded that technologies do include tiered access and that subcommittee is going to look at a couple examples that the Committee has been briefed on already, including FSRDCs, NCHS, and the work of other agencies and private sector organizations; subcommittee is looking forward to OMB guidance on privacy-preserving technologies.
- Member mentioned that Coleridge Initiative also has worked on tiered access and suggested to also look at access by governors’ offices and workforce boards to confidential summary tabulations; co-chair indicated that subcommittee will follow up on these examples and emphasized that the subcommittee is not creating an inventory of all examples but will choose specific case studies.
- Public comment asked if there is a sense about the security requirements of the NSDS. Will it be FedRAMP moderate? High? Even more secure? Co-chair noted that each tier of access will have appropriate levels of security. Member noted that it will be helpful to identify additional tiers of access that add value.
- Chair noted that CEP report outlined that NSDS would not be a warehouse and that it will be helpful to have more definition and meaning around attributes. Member noted that the idea of warehousing capabilities has been brought up many times by the Committee (including in this meeting); this will be a topic for further discussion In Year 2

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

6. 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 presented the focus area’s greatest success and challenges and Year 2 plans.

Committee feedback/discussions

- Co-chair emphasized that it is important to have value proposition flow through recommendations and connect to state/local partners who need help for better collaboration.
- Member commented that, for performance management, agencies need granular and frequent data; these data are often state data; performance management community has a lot to gain from additional data sharing.
- Member offered to talk about own experiences coordinating with state partners.

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

7. 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 presented the focus area’s recommendations, greatest success and challenges, and Year 2 plans.

Committee feedback/discussions

- Co-chair noted appreciation for comments on the Committee’s broader communication recommendation and the importance of intentionally involving state and local partners in developing the communications strategy; need to send the right messages in the right way; any thoughts on communication challenges would be very helpful; appreciates public and Committee input on this.
- Member suggested looking at international experiences in communications and use of population-level administrative member; another member provided several examples from the international community.
- Member emphasized that communication is about value and legitimacy; there’s a larger issue about communicating the legitimacy of evidence, which is perhaps beyond the scope of this discussion but will be considered in Year 2.

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

8. Year 2 Roadmap –Avi Alpert

Avi Alpert, ACDEB rapporteur, presented an outline of the Committee’s plans and process for Year 2.

Committee feedback/discussions

- On topics that cut across subcommittees
 - Member noted that there has been a lot of discussion about overlap topics on similar issues and asked if the Coordinating Committee will be expected to handle this.
 - DFO talked about plans for reviewing subcommittee structure and goals for Year 1.
 - Chair noted that the goal is to handle interdependencies earlier in the process.
 - Member followed up by indicating that not all overlap is bad; Committee just needs to handle it better.
- On the need to see the roadmap through the end of Year 2
 - Member expressed desire to see all next steps through the end of Year 2; need fully stitched together report plan and parallel communications strategy; wants to see whole slate of requirements and those requirements mapped to a calendar; Committee should start with the end date and work backwards; for example, by late summer, subcommittees must have evidence/fact findings in hand. Member urged support team to map out the full calendar and consider member availability during summer and at the beginning of next fiscal year.
 - Chair noted that the current support team model is not sustainable; what is currently mapped out aligns with the Committee's work through the end of summer; excited that Committee shares common desire to avoid scramble at the end of next year.
- On hiring U.S. Chief Statistician
 - Member commented that a number of recommendations were about the U.S. Chief Statistician and asked if the Committee has thought about what happens if OMB fills this position in the next year; how would this change the plan for Year 2?
 - Chair noted that Committee needs to engage with OMB to get to a good point in the process early in Year 2; whether or not this communication is with a new Chief Statistician, Committee needs to build in communication with OMB into its process moving forward.
 - Support team member indicated that the goal of Dominic Mancini, Acting Chief Statistician of the United States, is to provide a response to the Committee's recommendations by January; he will consider what the Committee has said—this will be a serious effort.
 - Chair noted that Dom can also comment on recommendation about Chief Statistician.
 - Member emphasized that communication with OMB would help Committee to understand the landscape of what's to come.

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

9. Next Steps and Action Items – Emilda Rivers

Emilda Rivers, ACDEB Chair, presented next steps and action items for the Committee, including the following:

- **Report**
 - While the days are ticking down until the report is due, there is much work to be done. After the meeting, the support team will incorporate comments from today and submit an updated draft to the full Committee as well as to the BEA team responsible for copy-editing and formatting.
 - Next week, the support team will distribute a final version for review. While the team does not expect any major changes during the typesetting process, everyone will have one more opportunity to look through the report and flag any major inconsistencies or glaring issues. At that point, the support team/Chair will have to be very judicious about the comments incorporated—not altering wording unless absolutely necessary.
- **Preview next meeting:** On November 19, the Committee will reconvene for its first meeting in Year 2.