Meeting 19 Notes and Actions

09/23/2022

Next (Final) Meeting: ACDEB Meeting 20: October 21, 2022

Meeting Agenda:

1. Meeting Introduction, Agenda Review, and Reminders

2. Year 2 Report: Overview of Report Framework and Major Changes Since July Meeting

3. Facilitated Discussion: Outstanding Report Items and Options

4. Facilitated Discussion: Committee Reflections and the Next Chapter for Advancing the Data Evolution

5. Facilitated Discussion: Outreach and Stakeholder Engagement

6. Next Steps and Action Items with Committee Discussion

I. **Meeting Introduction, Agenda Review, and Reminders** – Emilda Rivers, ACDEB Chair and Alyssa Holdren, ACDEB Designated Federal Officer (DFO)

    a. Emilda presents general introductory remarks, including congratulating Matt Soldner and Shelly Martinez on winning Datum Awards. This is the last public meeting before delivering the report to OMB on October 14.

    b. Alyssa provides ground rules and reminders for the meeting.

II. **Year 2 Report: Overview of Report Framework and Major Changes Since July Meeting** – Emilda Rivers and Support Team

    a. Emilda reminds members of the overall goal and baseline assumptions for the report and presents the shifts in the report framework since the July meeting.

    b. **Committee Feedback/Discussion**

        i. No Comments

    c. **Wrap-up**

III. **Facilitated Discussion: Outstanding Report Items and Options** – Meagan Tydings

    a. Meagan facilitates a discussion revolving around four outstanding items for the report:

        i. Data Inventories, Data Catalogs, and the Role for the NSDS

        ii. Relationship between SAP and NSDS

        iii. NSDS Oversight and Advice

    iv. Funding and Resources

b. **Committee Feedback and Discussion**

    i. **Data Inventories, Data Catalogs, and Role for the NSDS**

        1. Should the term "data inventory" be replaced with "data catalog?"

            a. *Mayank—Do we need to mention that some data will be sensitive?*

            b. *Amy—We need to be more concerned with restricted data. Will data concierge direct users to data that is already publicly available?*

                i. *Barry—Yes.*

                ii. *Matt—The hope is that the concierge will direct the user to the publicly available data.*

            c. *Chris—Brings up the idea that we (as a government) build layers on existing things. We should use the phrase "data catalog" and suggests we merge all existing federal data catalogs under the NSDS*

                i. *Amy—This is impossible.*

            d. *Barry—We don't need to house data catalog in NSDS, but the data service can help users access data and data inventories; should not have copies of things everywhere. NSDS can reference data inventories that already exist.*

            e. *Greg—It seems problematic to have yet another list of data items, especially since federal agencies have to have their own lists.*

            f. *Richard—The concierge should have knowledge of existing lists and can help make them more useful.*

            g. *Amy—NSDS won't be able to successfully be the data epicenter if this is done in an automated system… too many different definitions of things. Would be a challenge for even skilled employees working on this.*

            h. *Ken—People should be able to go to NSDS then be told where to go to find things. Lists, etc. do not have to reside at NSDS.*

            i. *Matt—What Richard said is the basic main vision of what is expected of the data concierge.*

    j. *Barry—Maybe the recommendation should be that NSDS can recommend standards for data catalogs. For integration of catalogs.*

        i. *Matt agrees.*

    k. *Nick—Agrees with Barry's point and echoes Amy regarding the creation of more burden on agencies.*

    l. *Chris—If data.gov is universally criticized, then maybe it should be discontinued, and funding should be used for something more effective.*

    m. *Shawn—Concierge should be available to researchers before applications for data to avoid wasting time.*

  ii. **Relationship between SAP and NSDS**

    1. Is SAP part of NSDS or separate?

      a. *Amy—We need to tighten up things to specifically mention data that are relevant to NSDS, not all government data.*

      b. *Amy—Should reach out to folks already looking at functionality of SAP.*

      c. *Greg—We are trying to create a single solution for most things. For some research questions, this will inevitably be more burdensome than may currently be available or what could be available in the future. Don't think we want to force users down a more burdensome path if an alternative exists.*

      d. *Barry—We might be asking the wrong question here... We don't need to discuss the "how," need to discuss the "what." How can we take the good of the SAP and apply it to the front door to the NSDS; SAP is a start, not a finish.*

        i. *Nick—Completely agree with Barry.*

      e. *Matt—NSDS should be the umbrella that all the other items are under.*

      f. *Chris-- Argue for simplicity; SAP has a head start; NSDS should be in charge of it but evolve it; answer is that NSDS is the first stop*

  iii. BREAK

  iv. **NSDS Oversight and Advice**

1. How NSDS will be overseen and who will advise it?

    a. *Amy—Are we envisioning what we expect or what the future holds? 2 phases? Here and no, then ideal future? What is the operating entity?*

    b. *Charlie—The operating entity is the center of the constellation. Oversees and develops satellite projects through a constellation of entities.*

    c. *Nick—The committee should take a more aspirational lens. Don't need to be so specific for the operation on Day 1. As an advisory body, we can advise. Do not have to give a step-by-step. Can we pull up a level and not get too bogged down in the weeds?*

    d. *Charlie—NSDS is a unique and aspirational service; opportunity to explore technologies; need broader ecosystem to provide meaningful input; reservations associated with using data assets on the part of data owners; they want oversight to ensure public trust; data owners/data stewards have input and oversight; governance structure acknowledges data owners exist at all levels; for this to be a sound foundation, be inclusive of broader ecosystem; everyone has a voice—not just an ad-hoc opportunity but a meaningful way and can say no; will not move forward; bullet points suggest a short-term and long-term vision; in short-term, broader ecosystem has input into this; ad-hoc advisory groups give that opportunity that allows legal change to acknowledge voice of feds and non-feds; meaningful input.*

    e. *Brian—Echoing what Nick and Charlie both said… perhaps we should have more aspirational, open-ended language. Rather than nailing this down specifically.*

    f. *Kim—Agrees with Charlie that there is an importance to connecting with state and local governments.*

    g. *Chris—Agrees that it should be a bit less in the weeds.*

    h. *Kim—Stresses the importance of working with state and local in the long-term.*

v. **Funding and Resources**

1. Designated funding stream for Federal Evidence-Building Activities

a. *Nick—Explaining the basic idea of the "Interagency Fund." In resource section, asked to lean in strongly; recognition that a lot of agencies have not invested in Evidence Act implementation activities; shared fund to allow for flexibilities to sprinkle resources across the federal government; identify needs and share resources; there are capacity gaps and there may be priorities that should be funded to help fill gaps; not saying every way to create this; instead say that OMB should design this; setting a direction*

b. *Amy—Wondering if this is to pay for pilot projects or fund NSDS activities.*

    i. *Nick—The intent would be for it to be its own account.*

2. Resources for State, Territorial, Local, and Tribal Governments

a. *Nick—The $1 billion is more of a number that represents "big investment." This is an idea that is already floating around Capitol Hill.*

b. *Len and Amy—There shouldn't be an explicit number in our recommendation. Not without the proper research into an amount.*

c. *Barry and Nick—Should this be more explicit in the actual recommendation and not just in the supporting write-up? Should we include language that ensures that this doesn't substitute funding for shifting money from somewhere else?*

    i. *Members agree.*

d. *Len—We can task OMB with figuring out a value that can be requested in a budget.*

c. Emilda summarizes discussion and next steps.

IV. Facilitated Discussion: Committee Reflections and Next Chapter—Alyssa Holdren

a. Alyssa facilitates a discussion regarding reflections and next steps

    i. Lessons Learned, Challenges, and Opportunities

    ii. Items for Further Exploration, Next Chapter

b. **Committee Feedback and Discussion**

    i. **Lessons Learned, Challenges, and Opportunities**

        1. See meeting slides for questions asked

a. *Amy—A lesson learned is that there is so much going on under the surface at the federal level. A challenge has been keeping the committee focused on state and local capacity-building needs.*

b. *Emilda—How to articulate everything that's being done to be inclusive; diverse viewpoints are critical; data for the public good (not just the few).*

c. *Amy—Love desire for more engagement; right now, 5-6 Federal Register notices for folks to respond; if pathway to engagement is FRN, then not going to get engagement.*

d. *Ken—Through this process, discovered that it's not enough to put something in law for it to be enacted; thought Evidence Act was strong but not implemented as quickly as hoped or as fully as hoped; gets back to the need to continually demonstrate the importance; need to show value at all levels and across the private and public sectors; applies across the ecosystem very broadly; supplement the law—not just enforcing; not I have to but I want to.*

e. *Elisabeth—Thank feds for allowing state/local stakeholders to chime in on this topic; participation on FACA—give kudos; not always that outsider lens; big lesson—all of the intricacies at the federal level; minutia at the fed and S/L level; biggest challenge—learning how this all works at the federal level; Federal Register is overwhelming; feels like running in quicksand; acronyms are also challenging; insights—being advocate at state level across state agencies to build evidence-based decisions and how this impacts up and down the data/evidence flow.*

ii. **Items for Further Exploration, Next Chapter**

1. See meeting slides for questions asked

a. *Kim—Navigating all the federal laws to use data to the most effect at S/L level; how to structure NSDS to help states/locals share data to make them more useful while protecting privacy and confidentiality.*

b. *Amy—Maybe FCSM can make a user-friendly index to help S/L navigate this; there's a sitting Committee.*

c. *Kim—That would be fantastic; as budget director, there's sometimes a methodology around what can be done; need to have something that's easy to understand.*

d. *Nick-- Regulations of Evidence Act are so critical and keys to success; to Karin (the U.S. Chief Statistician), push forward and get the regs out; also need guidance developed with CDOs on data governance and data inventories; not specifically role of Chief Stat, huge capability to nudge forward.*

e. *Ken—Expanding on comments made and agree with Nick; implementing Evidence Act would be a major component; working with folks in statistical agencies to push them to work together to make data widely available; move the Federal Statistical System forward to implement the "yes, unless" part of the Evidence Act.*

f. *Richard—How we identify Data Concierges and resource them appropriately will be a big challenge; often the same people who have the knowledge are responsible for multiple things; money won't solve this.*

g. *Brian—Most impactful over the next 6 months; take this and run water through the pipes; how does this work in practice? This is an evolution and will be a process; might not work out as envisioned; case studies are useful; that will build value proposition; feds work with S/L and see success.*

h. *Emilda—Next steps should have a level of accountability; aligning on thoughts for follow-up and opportunities to course correct; passion is not enough; laws are not enough; it's about the incentives and disincentives to join and demonstrate the value of data for the public good; outreach and stakeholder engagement a big part. Also thinking about how to have legal as partners along the way; the interpretation that moves to implementation rests with convos with legal advisors; next steps must be concrete about resource situation; this is where it's about implementing the law without funding and how to shift priorities.*

    iii. BREAK

V. Facilitated Discussion: Outreach and Stakeholder Engagement—Alyssa Holdren

    a. Alyssa facilitates a discussion regarding outreach and stakeholder engagement.

        i. Report Launch and Initial Feedback

    ii. Ongoing Stakeholder Engagement

b. **Committee Feedback and Discussion**

    i. Since both topics in this discussion are closely related, combining notes for both.

        1. *Amy—It would be valuable to have good metadata then use chatbots to help guide users. First level of customer service. Could a small amount of funds make this happen?*

        2. *Shawn—We should reach out to CISAs and privacy advocacy groups to get their thoughts on privacy.*

            a. *Mayank—Agrees and thinks there should be outreach to users of the sandbox.*

            b. *Amy—Stakeholder engagement will happen naturally as members go back to their communities as this sunsets.*

        3. *Emilda—Talk about ambassadors; members could be ambassadors in their own communities; moving into a more formal communications strategy, think about groups/officials in Evidence Act such as statistical agencies; acknowledge the federal statistical system has many different views as well; on formal side, entities represented by membership should be engage—awareness, engagement, and accountability; moving into implementation, important to engage— need both formal and informal mechanisms ; before the governance boards are established, where do they go; there's opportunities with ADC, SAP; not FRNs; hit major points.*

        4. *Nick—Discrete, deliverable steps are most effective for keeping the faith among the different data communities. Something Emilda can lead on.*

        5. *Matt—The comms recommendations suggested that the nsds.gov site should be developed well before the thing was real; there does need to be a place where the progress can be clearly documented.*

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

    a. See meeting slides for timeline.

    b. ADJOURN: 11:48am.

    c. Next (Final) Meeting: ACDEB Meeting 20: October 21, 2022