Meeting 3 Actions and Notes/Parking Lot
December 18, 2020

Next Meeting: January 22, 2020 (9 AM - Noon (EDT)) -- Federal Statistical System Leaders' and Evaluation and Performance Officer Presentations

Meeting Agenda:
1. The Use of Data for Evidence-Making: International Lessons Learned (Julia Lane (New York University))
2. State Perspectives (Anna Hui (Missouri), Elisabeth Kovacs (South Carolina), Christin Lotz (Tennessee), and Kim Murnieks (Ohio)
3. Local Perspectives (Laila Alequresh (Dallas, TX), and David Park (National League of Cities))

I. The Use of Data for Evidence-Making: International Lessons Learned (Julia Lane (New York University))

Dr. Lane shared insights and lessons learned from experiences with data infrastructure, policy, governance, and access in the United Kingdom, Germany, and New Zealand and the relevance to the United States.
(See presentation at bea.gov/evidence under Meetings tab.)

Committee Deliberations:
→ **Need For Value Propositions For Both The Public And The "Investors"/Data Stewards:** With US sensitivities and suspicion of government on the gathering and use of data, the need to engage carefully with attention to data privacy and anonymity, especially when linking data sets; integration and linking data become easier when these concerns are actively resolved and value is demonstrated.
→ **Develop A Fault-Tolerant, Future-Oriented System To Sustain Progress:** Reflection on the experience in Canada where Provinces invested in the strategic use of administrative data and then may have lost support when the most pressing questions became less relevant to public policy; discussion of media spotlight on privacy challenges potentially playing a role in losing support; need to build a system and processes that can fail and then recover and build back in a different way
→ **Valuable Early Experience In Intra- and Intergovernmental Data and Access Sharing Across States, Municipalities, And Federal Agencies:** The need to recognize that there is a significant challenge in sharing data and access across governmental entities -- states, cities, federal agencies, and others; getting buy-in across all these entities is critical. There have been some early successes in resolving the technical issues across states and some cross-state, data-sharing agreements that have been signed; the need not to try to create these systems all at once -- start with a few targets/states and build trust;

concerns about the potential for some bad actors in the research community that could sow distrust and the potential for public embarrassment.

→ **Need For Guidance On Decision-Making, Especially In The Tradeoffs Between Data Accuracy And Data Timeliness:** The performance management community needs both accurate and timely data sets to track initiatives and see if they are achieving outcomes - - examples of receiving accurate data, but not frequently enough; in international examples, statisticians focused more on accuracy than timeliness; need to be able to re-balance for timeliness depending on the need; encouragement for the Committee to address broad measures of value and how and when to best make decisions; example of the Census pulse data for less accurate, but faster data, and the continual learning needed and transparency in what the actors were measuring.

→ **International Examples From Cross-Government Information Sharing And User Community Experiences:** User communities in international examples were limited to government users and external researchers; example of Germany leading cross-government information sharing of financial data (government federal banks could not share data across borders) driven from 2008 financial meltdown with G20 countries building research data centers; sharing metadata in an automated process.

II. State Perspectives (Anna Hui (Missouri), Elisabeth Kovacs (South Carolina), Christin Lotz (Tennessee), and Kim Murnieks (Ohio))

(See presentation at bea.gov/evidence under Meetings tab.)
Each presenter shared the wide variety in state government by reflecting on how their states are organized regarding data sharing and access, how they are using evidence in budgets and public policy, and the key challenges in their states and overall.

Committee Deliberations:

→ **Use Of Evidence In State Budget Processes And For Other Needs:** Demonstrate how states are using building budgets and prioritizing spending; use of evidence to "tell the story" with legislators; acknowledge that legislators are motivated by other needs as well; importance of moving away from gathering data only for compliance and reporting purposes and toward evidence building

→ **Enabling State Dashboards To Show Federal Data:** Experience using state dashboards for unemployment data and two-way street sharing with local governments as well

→ **Need For A Common Schema or Data Structure For State Governments As Well As Federal:** Need for this arose in experience with CDO work on inventory; confirmation from states that this is very important and not close to a common schema at this time; *strong opinions on ACDEB helping with this and the Data Service focusing on it*

→ **State Needs From ACDEB:** Create greater consistency and commonality in privacy and security requirements and laws for ease of use within and across states; reduce federal

restrictions on data sharing; also need for standardized reporting frameworks and incentives for federal agencies to come together to do this

→ **Concern Allaying Fears From Other Agencies Within The State Regarding Privacy, Perceived vs. Actual Limitation, and Budget Drivers:** Need to bring other agencies into the conversations and elicit their feedback, especially on legislation, telling the story behind the utility of the evidence and its helpfulness in targeting resources and funding; example of using evidence to target education and training resources to the parts of the state that need it most; use of statutory frameworks for this (the Evaluation Officers will raise the data standards challenge in their ACDEB January presentation)

Important links shared by presenters and other Committee members
From Christin Lotz -- Tennessee's budget info and evidence forms:
https://www.tn.gov/finance/fa/fa-budget-information/budget-instructions-and-forms.html
from Anna Hui: https://oa.mo.gov/budget-explorer, https://showmestrong.mo.gov/data/
from Kimberly Murnieks: DataOhio https://data.ohio.gov/wps/portal/gov/data/ Ohio Checkbook https://checkbook.ohio.gov/
from Matthew Soldner: standards efforts across government: https://ceds.ed.gov/default.aspx)

III. Local Perspectives (Laila Alequresh (Dallas, TX), and David Park (National League of Cities))

(See presentation at bea.gov/evidence under Meetings tab.)
David and Laila shared their insights regarding the wide differences in size, scope, scale, and governance for local governments with examples of their differing capabilities regarding data and evidence and highlighting the challenges that these differences engender .

Committee Deliberations
→ **Awareness Of Tradeoffs When Considering Data Standards, Particularly Regarding Access:** Local governments do not have the capacity to do all the things in data standards that may be desired as well as in service delivery; need for accelerating local government workforce skill sets, especially virtual delivery
→ **Need For Full Partnership Between Local, State, Federal, And Other Government Entities:** Local government relationships are too often one way and top down; need for full partnership for data gathering and sharing
→ **Using Statistical Data (Already Developed for Compliance and Reporting) For Making Better Decisions:** Making statistical data anonymous to preserve privacy; local government challenges in capacity, skill sets, knowledge; challenges in few unified systems; need to develop standards, systems, and protocols; need for programmatic and outreach efforts to different stakeholders (build personas to understand needs)
→ **Potential Use Of Metropolitan Planning Organizations To Augment Skill Sets:** MPOs have analytic capacity and capabilities that could help local governments, bringing

experience integrating and linking different data sets (e.g., providing leading indicators of economic growth through local government trends data)

→ **Suggestion For ACDEB To Recommend Funding for Local Government Consulting Assistance and Clearinghouse To Provide Help:** Ability for local governments to borrow skill sets where needed, conduct a bit of ad hoc analysis, or be directed to a best practice; foster a data academy to build skills with curriculum and learning materials, practice on legacy data sets to conduct useful analyses then train-the-trainer to scale up; create cohorts of cities of similar size and abilities to develop communities of practitioners

Important links shared by presenters and other Committee members
From Laila Alequresh -- Dashboards:
https://public.tableau.com/profile/cityofdallasdtxinnovationteam/vizhome/CityofDallasCOVID-19Dashboard/Dashboard1#!/

IV. Conclusion
The Committee closed by highlighting the planned topics to cover in the next information gathering meetings.

January
Federal Statistical System Representatives
Federal Evaluation Officers and Performance Officers

February
Federal Chief Data Officers
External Researchers

March
Privacy & Confidentiality Issues and Technologies
Data Ethics
Public Comment Discussion