

NWX-US DEPT OF COMMERCE

**Moderator: Michael Monroe
September 16, 2016
6:43 pm CT**

Man: Good morning we are getting ready to start. But before that (Barbara) has a request.

(Barbara): Well this is the first time that we have tried this email system to make it possible to do stuff at the time. And as often is the case when you first implement a system it doesn't work 100% perfectly. And this is no exception.

So last night for the people who sent emails through CSAC email the only ones I received were from (Sunshine), (Dan) and (Allison). And later that evening (Noel) sent me his.

I just got (Krishna)'s resent and the strong recommendation is everyone who has sent me anything resend it now over CSAC and the IT people are going to help to try to make sure I actually got it.

And so we are first trying to clear that up before we do anything else. And it is a process and hopefully by the spring meeting this all will be absolutely perfect. So send me your stuff now.

I will look right now. Ken Simonson great. And there are four. Is one of them that summarizes it (unintelligible)?

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Barbara): Brainstorming write up? Okay great.

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Harry Lee): Good morning this is (Harry Lee). We apologize for the inconvenience. Please make sure that the addressee is CSACchair@gmail.com. Thank you.

(Tommy Wright): (Tommy). If I remember correctly, (Barbara) is waiting here for four more people. (Krishna).

(Barbara): I have got (Krishna).

(Tommy Wright): (Unintelligible)

(Barbara): (Bob) did you sent me? Let me see if I got it. I didn't get anything from you (Bob). I got (Noel) last night.

Man: Yes (unintelligible) so it is only (Bob) I think.

(Barbara): I got it. I got that yes. That is what I got. I see what I got. I got nothing from (Bob). I got nothing from (Bob).

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Barbara): Well maybe we go ahead and start.

(Tommy Wright): Good morning. Welcome back to the meeting of the Census Bureau's Scientific Advisory Committee.

Yesterday was packed with details in which we talked about various important topics at the Census Bureau including the economic programs, the 20/20 Census Big Data, disclosure avoidance and brainstorming session on Census data products.

In fact the meeting was so packed we will have to forego the usual who said that quiz today. I did not take – see somebody is already disappointed. So let's not make this...

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Tommy Wright): I know. But particularly during the economic (unintelligible) I just was so absorbed in the presentations that I was just overwhelmed. All right.

If anyone intends to give public comment and who has not done so please provide your name at the registration desk. Remember to state your name and speak directly into the microphone.

If you travel remember you travel reimbursement materials. For committee members needing to ride the bus to the hotel. The bus leaves the Census Bureau at 4:15 today in front of the building as yesterday. The bus will make a stop at 4:45 at the Ronald Reagan National Airport and 5:15 at the hotel.

If you need a taxi please also check at the desk. Remember to please turn in your badges and federal guidelines, refreshments are for committee members only. (Barbara)?

(Barbara): Hi folks. I think we had a very productive meeting yesterday and it was really interesting. There were a lot of exciting things that have happened in many areas.

I think our general procedure for figuring out how we can actually get recommendations by the end of the meeting with a few technical glitches is working.

And I look forward to what we are going to hear today and to us actually finishing up the recommendations. You have all been very nice, cooperative and hardworking and I am I sure the Census Bureau really appreciates that.

Also we had a great dinner last night for those of us who went. We really appreciate that Director Thompson joined us and we had a very nice conversation. So thanks to everybody.

(Tommy Wright): First topic today is on the commission on evidence based policy making. To present is Shelly Wilkie Martinez, Executive Director of the Commission on Evidence Based policy making. She will tell us what this is.

Shelly Wilkie Martinez: Good morning. Thank you (Tommy). Can folks hear me okay? Am I close enough to the mike?

It's great to be with you this morning. And as (Tommy) said I have been with the Commission just actually for a short time and my goal today is to tell you a little bit about what it is and what it is doing.

And because I think you will be very interested in and find it very relevant to your interests I am also going to spend a little time telling you how you can

provide what some of the opportunities are for you to provide input to the work of the commission.

So I guess I am alone with the clicker okay. Oh I went the wrong way didn't I? There we go okay. So we are calling ourselves CEP for short just so we don't have to say the mouthful every time.

But the Commission is a result of some legislation. Some of you may have heard of it. It kind of bounced around for about a year and a half.

The story goes that then the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee in the House, Paul Ryan and Senator Patty Murray from State of Washington as some of you know were kind of the chief negotiators on the big budget deal in Washington a few years ago.

And during one of their breaks from their budget negotiations they begin to discuss other kind of bipartisan activities that they could sponsor and facilitate with the general idea of how to make government work better.

So one of the ideas they came up with through that initial conversation and some consultation with others was to sponsor a commission that would focus on how to build and use evidence about government programs and policies.

So this legislation is from its very origin the result of a bipartisan interest by some of our congressional leaders in making government work better. And fortunately the executive branch was brought into those conversations fairly early. And it became a very productive conversation over the course of the year.

The bill was ultimately passed and signed this spring. And really I think at its core what the Commission was set up to do is to start with the assumption that data is an essential and important input to evidence and evidence is an important and essential input to making government work well.

And that boasts administrative data which we usually (unintelligible) program data of the government and survey data are both valuable inputs to evidence building. And are particularly valuable when they are combined together.

So I would say data are really at the core of the Commission's focus. And sort of there is a premise in the legislation that better improved access to those data by those who produce evidence, researchers and evaluators is something that the commission should figure out how to optimize is one of the words in the bill.

So one of the things that is kind of neat about the Commission was a fairly elaborate process I would say or sort of an unusual process by which the commissioners were identified. We have 15 and this is all according to the law.

The president was to appoint three on this slide you will see across the top, the three folks that he appointed. And then what we call the four corners of the Congress. The leaders of the House, Senate, Democrat and Republican each named three.

There were really three kinds of expertise that were specified in the law. The first category I am going to use sort of colloquial terms not the exact language of the bill. But basically folks you would think of as sort of the data and research experts.

So folks like economists. Folks like program evaluators. Folks who actually work with data with one category. A second category were folks who actually knew or had experience with program administration. You know what it means to actually run a government program.

And the third type of expertise was in the field we would generally think of as privacy. People who know how to work with sensitive and protect sensitive data and so forth.

So you will see by design the president was to choose the chair. That is a name that is probably familiar to many of you, Katharine Abraham.

For those who don't know is someone who served as Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics twice. Also a member of the President's Council of Economic Advisors. And is currently a professor at the University of Maryland.

Another person selected by the President was to be the Director of OMB or designee. And Allison Orris is an Associated Administrator at OMB and is the one federal representative on the commission.

I know is taking very seriously her charge to try her best to represent the entire federal government's interest from statistical agencies to program evaluation offices to perform as management offices and so forth.

And then of course you will see the third selection from the executive branch was Paul Ohm. And similarly throughout the list you will see quite a few names that you may recognize. It has been noted there are quite a few economists on our Commission.

But there is a good variety of other background as well. Ron Haskins who is our Co-Chair with the Brookings Institution. Some of you may know him from many years working for the Congress.

One of the architects of the wealth reform legislation back in day and he has continued to work in the area of anti-poverty programs.

So when we take questions maybe you can ask me if you have questions on any of the other members. You will see obviously (Bob)'s name down at the bottom. (Bob) is obviously someone who you all probably know. We are delighted to have him on the Commission as well.

So lots and lots of experts in relevant topics. We are excited to have all of them on the Commission. And it did take a while to get them on board. I should mention that the legislation specifically gives a timeline – actually I have a slide on that so I will wait a second.

Okay so getting into a few of the specifics of what the bill says and requires of the Commission. We are really to consider as I mentioned how to use the building blocks of data and statistics and evaluation to build evidence of federal policies and programs and how to strengthen the capacity of the government both to build that evidence and to use the evidence.

So some of the key things that we know we will be focusing on. One is there is an explicit recognition that administrative data because they are already collected data of the government hold promise for our work.

So how can we unlock their potential further? And I having come from the fiscal system really like the fact that there is also a recognition that survey and

statistical program data are also really valuable. And that the integration the two can often be more informative than either alone.

There is an emphasis in the bill on this idea of infrastructure and capacity. We believe that that refers not only to federal capacity but based on others who are part of the process.

If you do work in the human services space people often note that some of the very interesting data lives at the state level or sort of important data. So we know that capacity and infrastructure at the state level potentially other places as well will be relevant to the discussion.

There is a big emphasis on the legislation on data security and data protection. So sort of infrastructure around protecting data is obviously an important focus as well.

One of I think the things that the things that this will be challenging just because it can be its own commission. It is such a big topic. It is this idea of how you really ensure that evaluation and evidence is embedded in program design.

How you kind of close the feedback loop from sort of evaluating your program to actually informing its design and then trying out the new design and so on. So that is one of the concepts embedded in the bill as well.

This last one here I think you may have heard from some folks at Census about. The bill requires the commission to consider whether a federal data clearing house and this is the term that is used in the bill. Whether a data clearing house should be established and if so what its optimal arrangement should look like.

We take this to – first of all, the bill doesn't define clearing house. This is probably one of the biggest conceptual challenges for the Commission is to figure out what that is.

It has been variously described as sort of a place where data might reside. Where metadata might reside. Where services might reside and so forth. Certainly this idea of a clearing house is a big part of what we will focus on at the Commission.

We have a limited amount of time to do this work. We are 6 months into an 18 month life. Most of the first 6 months was spent appointing commissioners, identifying staff, getting ourselves organized to get going.

We had our first meeting in late July. Our second meeting was last Friday, September the 9th. And basically we will be spending the period between now and August both kind of fact gathering and analyzing and synthesizing some of the information that we have and then going into a deliberative phase.

I should mention that it is very clear in the legislation and from talking to our congressional sponsors that the range of things the Commission might recommend include legislative changes, policy changes, all sorts – so the whole gamut, things about resources and so forth.

So we take seriously the fact that we will make time to deliberate. The legislation requires us to have 3/4 of the Commission in agreement about any recommendation that we make.

And then we have time at the end to issue a final report which is to go to the President and to the leaders of the Congress.

So this slide I wish I had time to update this because we have some new information just this week. One of the things I should have mentioned, the legislation Commission is an independent entity but it is administratively housed at the Census Bureau.

I wish Sean was still in the room for me to say thank you. The Census Bureau has been a very gracious host. So we are sitting here in (unintelligible) with Census and BEA folks.

We are benefitting from the Census Bureau's IT and other infrastructures to help us so we don't have to be our own completely independent agency. So Census has helped us launch a Web site that is actually live now. It is www.cep.gov.

I suggest that you take a look there if you want to do a few things. One is if you like to get on our mailing list so that you know about upcoming meetings and things that we are working on.

A second is that we do have several opportunities for individuals and organizations to provide ideas to the Commission of things we should study, things we should recommend.

The biggest one right now is a request for comment that was issued in the federal register this week. That went live a day or so ago and will be up for 60 days. There was a set of questions in that request for comment. You are welcome to answer one of them or all of them or any combination that you choose.

The questions really do come out of the legislation in terms of all the things that we are to consider. I would really encourage the professional associations to view that as one opportunity to provide input on behalf of your constituencies.

We really wanted to cast a wide net with this process to make sure that everyone got to learn who we are and give input.

Another opportunity that will be coming up very soon is a public hearing. We will have more than one but we have a public hearing on October 21st. That will be literally an opportunity for anybody to come and spend a few minutes telling the commission what is on their mind related to our charge.

And folks can obviously provide longer written documents. But we hope to give anyone who is interested at least a few minutes to come and talk with us. That will be here in DC and we anticipate doing some public hearings in other parts of the country a little bit later on.

So I think I will stop there. Yes so I think I will just stop and maybe take questions. Thank you.

(Barbara): Questions? Comments? Very, very interesting. Questions? Comments?
(Tommy)?

(Tommy Wright): I am not a member of the committee but point of information. One could guess that the reason for this is to be more efficient with taxpayers' money. One could also guess that big data and data seems to be a good word around. But is explicit language in the legislation saying why this is being done now?

I assume that one could also guess that when each program is instituted there is some evaluation tacked on by Congress. But those are three guesses but I am – is there explicit language in the law?

Shelly Wilkie Martinez: I say yes and no. Unlike some laws there is not a lengthy preamble. Sometimes you get bills that say because this, because this, therefore you should do this. There is not a preamble to this particular bill.

But as I said, this bill was developed over some time and I think with quite a bit of discussion among the various parties. So and I was able to be part of some of those.

So I know from the congressional folks that they benefited from consulting with some of our academic colleagues. And I think simply ask the question what are ways we can – what are some bipartisan ways we can make government work better?

And I think they heard from almost every researcher that they talked to that accessing data can be time consuming and inefficient and expensive and there are legal barriers, et cetera.

And just this whole idea of we can – we can agree on a very bipartisan sense if we have better access to the (unintelligible) ingredients of evidence building that we can better inform programs. So I do believe that that was at the heart.

I should say there is a recognition both in the law and I think in the way the executive branch so far has interpreted this that evidence is a broad concept that is certainly inclusive of program evaluation but is broader.

Certainly includes some of the federal statistical systems, descriptive statistical products. It includes the whole spectrum of research and so forth.

So I think that wide net really speaks to this issue of, you know, often it takes a lot of different kinds of study and a lot of different kinds of evidence to inform a policy or program sufficiently that we really feel like we have kind of learned everything we wanted to learn. That is sort of an ongoing process.

So I think this is necessarily kind of a broad, you know, umbrella for both the academic research community and in federal folks who do work in this area.

(Barbara): Other comments or questions? (Irma)?

(Irma): Thanks Shelly. I was really glad to hear that you mentioned that the legislation includes the ability to make legislative changes. One of the issues that many researchers have for a long time wanting to do is to link survey data to administrative records.

And then make those data available for researchers outside the federal agencies. And I think that is where the biggest value – well that is my personal opinion but that is one of the ways in which this Commission really advance our ability to get data sets that would be more valuable than either administrative data or survey data alone.

So I was very glad to hear you mention that this recognition that some of these efforts may lead to recommendations for legislative changes.

And the other thing is great that you are reaching out and trying to get as much input as possible. And I guess I would encourage everybody here to make sure that you get it back to your agencies to I guess not just

organizations responding but individual researchers as well. So I was really happy about that.

(Barbara): (Sunshine)?

(Sunshine): Also glad to see this work. I guess one fear I have is it is so big that is it possible to do anything that has an actual impact as opposed to a set of recommendations that, you know, require a lot of moving pieces and a lot of budget.

And so I wondered if you – I mean I don't want to put you on the spot to say like are there specific next steps that you think might be feasible to actually move us towards, you know, some of the potentially longer term recommendations?

And are you focusing on recommendations to agencies? Legislative recommendations? Recommendations that maybe are low cost? I guess is there anything that we can kind of anticipate in terms of shorter term, you know, outcomes from the committee?

Shelly Wilkie Martinez: So one of the things I am getting good at when people ask me a question that implies sort of something that they think we should do is I will take that as a recommendation rather than answering your question.

Because it is true that I will say both of our co-chairs are putting a real premium on sort of a collaborative process with commissioners and that includes really agreeing on a plan of work together. And we are not quite there in terms of the entire plan of work.

We have done quite a bit together as a commission and we will do more over the next month or so. So we anticipate being able to lay out kind of the rest of our time together in a public way before too long. But it would be premature to get ahead of the commissioners and that is something I am real conscious of.

But having said that I think we have – I definitely think the commissioners are very interested. I have heard some of our commissioners use the word concrete a lot. I think there is an interest in being specific and relevant in recommendations.

I think there is also recognition that, you know, time permitting and we will have to figure out how far we get. We may operate on more than one level. Maybe short-term, long-term and more specific and more conceptual. But that there is a lot of ground to cover and we might have more to contribute in some areas than others.

I do want to underscore between the 15 commissioners and the staff there is a lot of expertise. So there are some things that we know quite a bit about and we will use the public comment process and other comment processes to kind of fill in gaps where we don't know.

And reach out to experts where we don't know as much. So I think that does permit us to kind of move fairly quickly. I think that was by design.

But to your point. I think, you know, we will be quickly cataloguing comments to see if there are things that we haven't thought about or things we have been thinking about in a little different way than others. So this process is – this next 60 days is a really relevant time for us.

(Barbara): Other questions or comments? (Jack)?

(Jack): Thank you Shelly. I am often accused of hearing what I want to hear and I liked a lot of what I heard but I just wanted to clarify to see if I have really heard what you said.

So if I thought I heard you right, you know, everything is evidence based which should lead you to how a program should work. And you said to actually design the program so that when it is done you can measure did you get the results that you expected?

Shelly Wilkie Martinez: The way I understand the legislation both words that are there and the conversations is that at least in my mind I am a visual person. So I picture sort of a lifecycle with feedback. So I really do think the legislation is speaking to all phases of that which I think is a challenge because as (Sunshine) mentioned, that is a lot.

To both think about the data, sort of the process of creating the evidence, using the evidence and then figuring out kind of the feedback loop. But I do believe the legislation speaks to all of that and we do have commissioners with interests in sort of every point along that lifecycle.

Now that doesn't necessarily mean there is as much to say in some areas than others. I think we are very humbled by the fact that there are whole fields of public administration that spend a lot of time thinking about things like how you institutionalize evidence in a program.

So I think there is a keen interest in that reinventing the wheel or trying to say something profound where we don't know as much. But yes I think it is that whole cycle.

Man: The (Shucart) cycle right? The plan do check act because then you can find out where you are and you can update the program. I think it makes sense.

And if the result of the data means that there is data for researchers because the data you are going to design the program is on measuring some specific things probably. But there may be some additional data to find unknown opportunities. Great.

Shelly Wilkie Martinez: And I would say, I like to use the word policies and programs because I do think that much of the academic research tends to be in policy areas. It may not necessarily be program specific. And it is quite clear to me that both of those are really in scope.

(Barbara): Other comments? Questions? Well I guess she was just really clear. And I think everyone finds this very interesting. Maybe we can move on ahead of schedule.

Shocking huh? Well if no one screams about that then we can – I don't think you will. We can go on for Tori Velkoff's presentation on update on the American Community Survey.

Tori Velkoff: Good morning. So I have to get my props in order. (Sara) will you – do I click forward? There I am.

So I am Tori Velkoff. I am the Acting Chief of the American Community Survey. I just want to thank you for letting me come and give you some updates. I always want to thank the CSAC working group on research who helped us this summer come up with this plan.

And I want to note that yesterday was our one year data release so I know Tuesday was incoming poverty but really yesterday was when you got the good stuff. Because you could go down below the national level. Too bad Enrique is not here to hear me say that.

So we are always looking for ways to improve our survey, meet our data user needs better and reduce respondents burden. To that and I am going to talk about two things this morning.

Addressing respondent concerns, our agility and action stuff and then talk about recent stakeholder engagements and our research ideas as we move forward.

So in June of 2015, we put out a report called, Agility in Action and that really was a roadmap for us for how we were going to move forward and move the needle on the survey.

We had some negative feedback from people. We heard that respondent burden was high. So we created this report and then we followed the report to come up with things that we would do with the survey.

Some of the things that we focused on were reducing follow up contacts to that and in June of 2016 we implemented some stopping rules for our (cappy) operation. We also were looking for ways to improve survey materials and the way we ask questions.

To that end we actually in July updated our internet instrument. We also were looking at how we could get data from other sources and I am going to talk more about that later. And also looking at if we could remove questions or ask them less frequently.

We have actually updated it, Agility and Action and we are calling it, Agility in Action 1.2. It will go up next week. So in that we have kind of outlined our accomplishments over the last year.

And there were a lot of accomplishments. I can say that because I wasn't the chief of the ACSO. The people did a great job of moving forward.

And also I forgot to mention, I have several colleagues here with me who will answer the tough questions if we get tough questions.

So we are looking at ways to improve survey materials and the way we ask questions. To that end we did a content test in 2016. We tested several different questions and I will just list a few of them. Health insurance, telephone, computer and internet, relationship, race and Hispanic origin, number of weeks work.

And we worked with our other federal colleagues to come up with the proposed working changes. And then we did the data collection from March through June of 2016.

And then we began to analyze the results. So the results should come out over the next year or so. And let me remind you that our content test is an independent sample. So it is not production cases. It is about 70,000 samples.

The questions if we decide to change any questions will be implemented in the 2019 ACS.

We have also been doing cognitive testing on questions that are difficult or sensitive to the respondents and we have been testing those with a contract.

We completed the cognitive testing this June and we are now working on the analysis of the results.

And the questions, some of the questions that we tested were residents one year ago, year of entry, year of naturalization and place of work address.

So as we move forward there are still things leftover from Agility 1.2 at we are working on. One is doing feasibility reports of using administrative records in our survey.

So last year we did several reports. One looking at telephone. One looking at year of build. One looking at income and one looking at condominium fees to see if there were administrative records that we could use for those topics and those are all published on our Web site.

We decided that for telephone and condominium fees there really is not an administrative data source that we can use for those and they are not high burden questions. So we kind of put them on the back burner.

We are going to focus on housing statistics and income and I will talk more about that in a bit.

But this year we are going to continue to look at other administrative records and whether we can use them and we will be focusing on 10 year property value, real estate and taxes.

We are also working to raise awareness about data uses. To that end we are having a Webinar in October where we are going to spotlight some of our tools and some of our videos. And if we have time I will show you one of the videos at the end after the discussion.

And we also are planning our next data users' group conference in 2017. So this is a conference where we ask people to come in and talk about how they use the ACS data. And we have had two in the past. They have been really great so we are hoping that this one will be great as well.

And then we also, I think you have heard about this so far but we have a respondent advocate whose job is to deal with people who are unhappy. And Tim Olsen was our first respondent advocate. We are now on our third. His name is Tom Edwards. He is not in town otherwise he would be here.

But he is the guy who takes the phone calls from the respondent who is at their wits end and talks them down. And he does an excellent job of that. He really does a good job of flipping people.

So you have an angry respondent wondering why they have to do this. And he will listen for about 10 minutes and then he will finally, you know, talk about how important it is and kind of your civic duty. And by the end he flips them. And I think Tim that was your experience as well right?

Tom also goes down to the Hill and talks to staffers and tries to educate them on the importance of the American Community Survey data. We have I think you know a tool called, My Congressional District and I think it is on most congressmen's or women's Web pages.

But that doesn't mean that that person is always a supporter of the ACS. So we are really trying to go down and talk about how great our data are and how useful.

And Tom also helps us come up with ideas for improvements for the respondent experience. And Tom and several of staff from ASCO and I went to all the phone centers or the call centers and listened to the telephone interviewers and heard feedback from them.

They are the people that are asking the questions that are hard to ask and so they have good ideas about well could you ask it this way? Or could you instead of this do this? So I think that we will have some movement from the suggestions we got from those visits.

We also said that we were going to start to engage more with subject matter experts. And to that end the National Academies of Sciences Committee for National Statistics or CNSTAT created or organized a public workshop. I know some of you were there so thank you for attending. That was in March.

And then they also planned for us four closed meetings over the course of the spring. One on matrix sampling, one on administrative records. One on group quarters questionnaire and one on communication and messaging. And those were excellent.

The workshop is excellent and those four meetings were really excellent because we had very frank and open discussions about what we could and could not do.

People were not shy about telling us what we should do. And it was a great exchange and that is really what is going to – how we are going to focus our work over the next year or two based a lot on the conversations that we had in those meetings.

I do need to say that for our first closed meeting it was on matrix sampling and I think within the first 30 minutes the experts had basically said it is too complicated.

I don't know why you are thinking about it and moved on to talking to us about other things which was kind of a relief. Because we were thinking it was going to be very complicated to implement as well. So that is the kind of exchange we were having. That is a bad idea. Go this way. So it was very helpful.

And so we – because we love the name so much we are going to publish Agility and Action 2.0 which will outline our research agenda. And that is really what I want to talk to you about today is our research agenda.

Here are kind of the themes of what we are going to be looking at. Some ideas are more developed than others. We did talk to the working group earlier in the summer and we got some great feedback from them. So thank you working group for talking to us.

Obviously we can't do everything so we want to share this with you so you can help us prioritize and say yes that is important or no maybe that is lower priority. We tried to do that internally and we are very bad at saying no. We like to do everything.

So if you hear something as I go through this and you think that is just stupid, please tell me. I am sure you won't say stupid.

So the very first one is understanding respondent perceptions of burden. We heard this at every single meeting. What does that mean? You say you want to reduce respondent burden. What is respondent burden?

How are you measuring it? Is it the number of questions? Is it how long it takes to answer a question? You know really what are you guys talking about? And when I say we heard it at every meeting. We heard it at every single meeting. Regardless of what the topic of the meeting was.

So we thought that this could be a low list kind of. Not that hard to do some of the work for this. The first thing we want to do is a literature review of how other surveys have conceptualized and measured respondent burden.

Then we want to do some focus groups with people who have responded to the survey and those who haven't responded. I think we might hear interesting things from both groups of people.

And after that we would like to develop and test the series of questions that we could put on one of our method panels and actually measure respondent burden.

So I don't know if you realize but we have method panels every month that are part of production. There are about 12,000 addresses and we can use those to test things.

So we thought we would add some questions to the survey and ask people kind of what it is. Did you find it burdensome? You know we will come up with better questions than that. But to have some measure.

And finally the last thing is just a very simple thing. You know we do get comments from unhappy respondents and we haven't really analyzed those. Are they clustered in a certain part of the country? Are there themes?

You know do they hate – we know they hate the income question. Is that what is pushing people over the edge? So we are going to look at that.

The next area of research is modifying the modes and the design of the ACS. I am not sure if you guys are aware but right now our (caddy) operation is almost as expensive as our (cappy) operation and that is kind of not an efficient way to run a survey.

So we are looking for ways that we can enhance the cost benefit of (caddy). So for example, are there certain cases that we think would be more likely to be successful in (caddy) and can we send those to (caddy)? Can we implement more adaptive stopping rules to reduce call attempts?

We are also planning to go and visit a state of the art phone center to see kind of what a really state of the art phone center looks like. Because, you know, frankly ours are not state of the art. And I think that Tim and I have had this conversation that to be successful we need to start looking at things like that.

We also are looking at the feasibility of creating an abbreviated questionnaire for respondents who are reluctant to respond. So some people just are not ever going to respond to the entire survey. So could we give them a shortened version?

We want to do this in a way that it doesn't impact any particular questions so we are trying to come up with a way to randomly determine the questions that would be asked. So it wouldn't be that the (cappy) interviewer would know, oh you know if I go to the shortened version I don't have to ask income.

It would be, you know, sometimes you have to ask income. Sometimes you have to ask marital history.

This is also very complex to implement. So this is kind of one of our not high priorities but more like a medium priority.

And finally, some people start to fill out the ACS on the internet and they drop off. We are looking into seeing how many people do that and what information do we have?

And can we give that to our (caddy) phone centers? To say, hey you know you started this self-survey. Can we help you finish? That might, you know, push some people to finish the survey.

So we are also looking very closely at how we can use administrative records in our survey. The first thing we plan to do is to look at administrative records and to create a simulated one year and five year data product for housing related characteristics.

So property tax, property value, year belt and acreage and we are working on that right now. We are planning to do the same thing with income. We don't have all of the IRS data in-house that we need to do this. We have a lot of it so we plan to also create a one year and a five year product income estimate space on administrative records.

If we do go to using the IRS data for income we still want to ask an income question. And, you know, part of the reason for that is it would be a very simple kind of check box thing maybe.

Like do you have income from this, this or this? And if we do that we have the opportunity to perhaps add some non-cash income which we don't currently

collect and that would be really useful for the people who work on our supplemental poverty measure.

And we also are doing the scoping exercise of what we would have to do to change the production of the ACS if we did go to using administrative records.

So a survey instrument that works right now. If we are suddenly not using or asking the income question what impact does that have? How do we have to change our system?

This is a very short one. Only one bullet. We are looking at exploring adaptive design. We want to evaluate if there is a way we can target internet versus mail in the first mailing.

So the way our mailing works right now, our first mailing goes out and we invite you to participate via the internet. And then we send you a letter a couple days later or a week later saying, hey you know you haven't participated yet. We would like you to participate on the internet.

And then our third mailing goes out and we actually give you a questionnaire. A paper questionnaire that says, hey we noticed you haven't filled it out. Here is a paper questionnaire.

There are places in the country that just don't have good internet access. So maybe we should be sending them a paper questionnaire first rather than inviting them to respond via the internet. So we are looking into that. And I know that the 2020 Census is also doing this.

This is the really fun meeting. So enhancing respondent mail materials. At this meeting we had people who were from the advertising field. So that was kind of fun to have them look at our mail material and say, wow you should change that.

And did I bring – I did bring – no I didn't bring it. I was going to bring you a packet to show you kind of what our letters look like. But they are not particularly nice or friendly or inviting. So we heard a lot about that.

So we have come up with some strategies. The first is that we need to – we don't currently have but we should have a strategic framework for every single mailing piece and what its purpose is so we are going to do that.

And then we are going to test additional mailing or changing the mailing. And we are calling this the Dillman test. Because Don Dillman was at that meeting and then he came to visit us at (unintelligible) and he really helped us come up with some ideas about how we could change our mail material.

The first was to revise the why we ask brochure that we include in the initial mail packages. Right now it is like 8 point font so anyone over the age of 40 can't read it. But it has got a lot of really good information so how we can make that more inviting to respondents?

Then Don also came up with a way to revise our first page of our questionnaire which is kind of like we are doing this survey because of this. And this is how you can respond. So it is a little nicer than the dart here still update.

And then we are going to change the fifth mailing from a postcard to a letter again with enough information for respondents to log in and complete the survey online.

And as I said, revising all of the wording on the postcards and letters Don helped us quite a bit. And it will be interesting to see if that really pushes up response rate. Because of course that is our goal right? We want our response rates to go up.

The other suggestion we heard at that meeting is you should just scrap everything you have and start from scratch. And so we are calling this the from scratch project.

We have letters that we probably, you know, copied from the last time we did a survey forever. So instead of tweaking them and trying to make them better just put them all over in the corner and start from scratch. And if you were going to design a mailing package system this is what you would look – what you would do.

That one is going to take us a little longer. I think we are testing in August. Is that right (Tony)? The Dillman test. But to start from scratch will take us a little bit longer and we would have to probably involve some external people for that.

We are also looking at improving our messaging and our communication. So we do not have the budget that the 2020 has to advertise obviously. So we are trying to be creative. We are coming up with a strategy for how we communicate.

We are also – I am going to go to the third bullet for a second. We are looking at strategies for how we conduct the ACS during the 2020 census because we don't want people to be confused. And we also know that we get a bump when the 2020 advertising is out there ACS bumps up.

So we are looking to see how we can – how we the ACS can benefit from the Census brand. And we heard that a lot from the experts. That you know no one knows what the ACS is but everyone knows what the Census Bureau is. So brand yourself as a Census Bureau product.

And then finally we are piloting the use of targeted digital advertising and that is, you know, when you are online and you are shopping for a pair of shoes and then you go to another Web site but those shoes pop up over there and you can see them.

That is digital targeted advertising and we are going to do that with sample cases. We are not going to be advertising the ACS. We are going to be advertising the Census Bureau and I just wanted to show you we have three different videos. They are only 30 seconds long.

So I just want to kind of give you an idea of what these ads are going to look like. And we will be doing this I think we have moved it to doing it in the January/February panel. And it will go through self-enumeration and through (caddy) I think.

((VIDEO)).

Man: We are the Census Bureau. We count what matters to you and your community everyday not just every 10 years. We measure change. In our jobs, schools, infrastructure, healthcare and more.

So if you receive a survey from the Census Bureau please participate right away. Your family, your friends, your neighbors, your community are counting on you.

((END VIDEO)).

Tori Velkoff: So this is the next ad. They're all designed for different population groups.

((VIDEO)).

Woman: Today in America there will be 321 million good mornings. Almost 11,000 grand entrances, 130,000 opening bells and over 140 million journeys home. And the U.S. Census Bureau knows the value behind every number.

We count what matters and it all starts with you. If you see the survey from the Census Bureau please respond right away.

((END VIDEO)).

Tori Velkoff: So are just some examples of the ads. They are short. Those are 30 minute ads – 30 seconds, 30 minutes that would be a lot, a big ask. But we have 15 second and 30 seconds and another minute one.

So they will show up on, you know, on people's computers who are in sample. And we are hoping that that will give us a boost in our response rates. We will see.

And finally the last thing that we are working on is our group quarters. The first thing we are going to do is we are going to conduct a pilot test of the

modified definitions of student housing. So we have broken student housing out into two different – university owned housing.

(Jennifer) you need to explain this for me again.

Okay so I have got it right. So university owned is, you know, University of Michigan owns this housing. However, there are also privately owned student housing where people typically pay by the bed.

So not like, you know, we share an apartment and we just all split the rent but it is actually you pay for this bed in that apartment. That will be part of the 2020 GQ definition as well. So we want to test it.

We are also (Barbara) you will be happy to hear looking at our data products that we produce for GQ because currently we don't really produce a lot. And so I think that we can put out more. We can put out more by type and we can go to lower levels of geography. So we are working on that.

And we are also looking to see if we can use administrative records for some types of institutional GQ. So nursing homes and prisons are other administrative records that we can use rather than going out to those types of facilities.

That is what I have. I don't know if you want to stop for questions or we want to go straight to (Bob)?

(Barbara): I think it would probably be best if (Bob) gave his presentation and then we had a discussion of all that. Is that okay (Bob)? But thank you so much Tori. I know a lot about the ACS and I found that interesting.

(Bob): Okay thank you for inviting me to do this and Tori thanks for that presentation it was wonderful. And so what I wanted to report on here is on our working group that we wanted to put together and were asked to put together back in the spring.

So which we have been doing. We have been meeting a number of different times over the last few months. And talking about a limited set of issues that Tori talked about today.

So some of those we have gone into a little more depth with. Some of those issues that she raised today in terms of the research agenda and looking forward we haven't deal with at all. So we won't comment much on those.

But on the few that we have I think the presentation Tori gave the directions that they are going are fantastic. We all think that these are really, really fruitful evidence of research that they are taking on.

It is systematic. It is asking good questions and so forth and so I don't know if we have had anything to do with that. I doubt it. But maybe a little bit and so I think it is great to hear.

So I won't go on long here. We were asked as a working group to consider issues of respondent burden. That was kind of our main charge. Just a little bit, the members of this group are (Barbara), (Noel), (unintelligible), myself. We have met I think six times between the spring and now mostly by conference call.

One thing I did want to mention is unfortunately aside from I think (Barbara) going to one of the national academy meetings that was it. We weren't involved in those meetings – okay so the conference and one of those.

So we had really quite limited involvement in that process. So a lot of these ideas that are coming out of that process were things that we had heard very little about.

So we are still waiting on reading the report coming out of that. So we haven't seen that report yet and I am sure that will help us get up to speed as well some of the ideas here.

Okay probably the thing that we have talked about the most is the idea that Tori raised in her presentation about defining and measuring respondent burden.

We raised this a little bit in the update that I gave in April on this. It was one of our key topics on our last conference call in August.

As Tori mentioned, I think we have largely, the Census Bureau largely thought about this as the length of time it takes to answer each question. The length of time it takes to answer the overall survey with the bit devoted to cognitive burden sensitivity and so forth.

There is also, you know, they have used some data based on a survey of field interviewers in 2014 to get at some of those perceptions. But at the same time I think we encouraged Tori and the ACS folks and they have heard this a number of times as well. To really get at this concept of respondent burden.

But I think we wanted to push them and thinking about this more broadly in terms of overall survey experience. Because we are not just talking about time here but a broader sense of what it is like to get the calls, to get the survey, to go to through these questions and so forth.

So we also again think more research is needed to know exactly what this concept is. Not only respondent burden but overall experience. And how it might be assessed. The ideas that they have come up to assess respondent burden and overall experience are really good ones.

I have looked at some of the questions. We have talked with them about this. About using potential questions from other surveys. If there was a consumer expenditure survey that had a nice set of questions on respondent burden that could be borrowed and tweaked for the ACS -- the focus groups that she mentioned today.

And I think really important what we've talked about a bit is trying to assess the survey experience among non-respondents because here we're talking about, for the most part, no time and no questions. But at the same time that's a really important group of people who are not answering this at all.

So trying to get their sense too of what this interaction has been like is I think critically important. It's built into their design. So I think what they're doing here is going to be really useful and really good.

You know, in the end I think, you know, some of my thinking along this way is, you know, maybe this is trying to come up with solutions for a problem that doesn't exist. But at the same time I think if we learn a lot about burdened and overall experience of this survey that would be important to know if there isn't much of a problem.

Clearly the Respondent Advocates Office is getting the vocal to people, but we're talking about a couple hundred a year out of the millions who answer

this survey. So the numbers there are not high at all, but at the same time it's a very important and vocal set of people who they're hearing from.

So that may not assess very well kind of the survey experience and respondent burden that the ACS is getting. So I think again this is a really great way to move forward.

Okay so very briefly on the matrix sampling, this is something we delved into a bit early on. I think most of our reaction was similar to what you experienced. I won't go into further depth here.

A lot of issues about the complexity, about sample size reductions, about what this will do with small areas. I think we were largely skeptical and glad to see that this wasn't being moved forward with.

Use of administrative records – I think they've been doing some great work on looking at the kinds of areas where they could or where they could potentially use administrative records to help with the ACS questions to reduced respondent burden and to improve – potentially improve data quality at the same time.

So I think that's, you know, that's really great. We've had some discussions about, you know, it's going to be very difficult to know exactly when and how to use the administrative records and the survey responses at the same time. There's a lot of work ahead in this area. I think everybody recognizes that.

Much comparative work on survey responses versus administrative records. The implementation will be really challenging along these lines. But I think the reports they've done so far, especially based on income, there's a lot of promise there using records from the IRS.

That's especially for people 65 and above. I think there's great potential there. And even for younger people as well. I think they've got close to 90% of records available.

So I think there's a lot of potential here. I think the difficulties are going to be in this implementation. The research that comes out of this initiative over the next year or two will be really important.

I think we'd like to get some sense too of how this is going to see the data that are being produced and to be able to weigh in on this effort. But again, this is really great. As Tori mentioned, some of the other phone service, condominiums and so forth is not really going to go anywhere. And that's fine.

Okay, the other research areas, I won't – these are things Tori raised. I'm not going to mention much here because these are the things we haven't gone into much at all with your group. We're waiting for the report to read that.

And I think from the National Academies. And one exception is that we're really great to hear the work on the group quarters. (Erma), (Barbara) and myself were part of that working group early on a couple years ago that made some recommendations right along the lines that you're pursuing here in terms of the administrative records and the presence in the nursing homes potentially filling in for what are really limited data right now.

Producing more – in the end producing more data availability for users. So I think the roads you are heading on there are also great and drawing on some of the things that we and others have recommended there.

So last just looking ahead, so couldn't agree more to endorse your research work on respondent burden and overall experience. This is super important no matter how it comes out.

If we uncover a lot of problems. If we uncover very few problems. Where do they exist? Where are the problems? I think that's going to be a fantastic strategy.

The administrative records I think it is really challenging. I think you're right to say that I won't call the first bullet point (true), but it's clearly that kind of place to start here.

Administrative records and research work is ongoing. But it's going to be very difficult. We have to decide kind of the implementation there. So again, I think our group would be really willing to help you look at that data and see what's going on there.

We'll look forward to reading the reports that – actually I said 2.0, but I guess 1.2 or something but.

Woman: 1.2, you know, tells you what we did in the last year, 2.0 is the future, so.

Man: Okay, okay. And to weigh in on both of those things. I think those would be really helpful to us. And you know that. And then we'll continue to talk. And it's been a wonderful experience to work together. All of the presentations they've been going to us over the phone have been great.

And our discussions have been very fruitful. Been very happy and hopefully making even small impacts. So I think a broader discussion would be great. Okay thank you.

Woman: Do you want to argue with anything (Bob) said?

Woman: No thank you very much (Bob). Those were great comments. Right, and I do want to – can I pose a question? Because (Bob) brought up a good point about, you know, how do you evaluate the administrative records.

And if you think about income, for example, it is likely that our income estimate from the IRS will be different than the income estimate that we from the ACS.

And you might think, and I would probably argue that the IRS's data might be higher quality. And I think (Noel) might argue with me about this, but – so it's going to be different, right.

We have income that, you know, that was a big story this week. Income went up. If we change our income estimate because we're now using administrative records that will need to be communicated in a way, you know, well ahead of time explaining what we're doing, et cetera.

But, you know, one of my income buddies said no, no it will be great if they're exactly the same. I'm like I don't think so. We impede income – a lot of income. So I don't think we want them to be exactly the same. But if they're different, how do we educate people on that difference and why they're different? And that's where we could use additional help.

Woman: I'm sorry. On the administrative records, and I mean it sounds like you definitely are thinking of this. But this question of how that might also change the survey because it's not just a matter of saying okay, we can get income from another source so we can take it off the questionnaire. But some of the

things that people have been playing around with is asking for verification of information that you have on someone, right.

And so then there's this question of like how does that influence privacy concerns? And so, you know, depending on the particular item that you're thinking of using administrative records for, depending on the source. I could imagine you would never want to say hey, so the IRS says that you have this income. You know, is that number right?

On the other hand, you know, thinking about it from the standpoint of not just filling in missing data, but also how it could ultimately end up with more validate I think is a big struggle.

And my other question on, maybe related to this, is just there's clearly been a lot of thought and effort at the ACS in thinking about many of the same issues that 2020 is dealing with.

And so I wondered about, you know, that link between the two and where, you know, the ACS has been online. And has there been research on, you know, from user experience and so on that can inform as the 2020 is trying to roll things out. So would love to just hear a little bit about the link between census products.

Woman: Yes let me start on that. So for the 2020 program we have used a lot of the strategy for engaging and notifying the public and responding. In fact, the Internet push strategy that we are using for 2020 was really the American Community Survey design.

In fielding the 2020 program and looking at who was calling in the most, we then modified the strategy to do an initial Internet choice, send a paper

questionnaire to, you know, older Americans, blocks where we're going to have maybe some language challenges and strategizing.

And now ACS is looking at those results and thinking about that as they look at their response improvement strategies. So I think we are trying to leverage where we can help each other. And then as we progress, you know, using the ACS to test future things as we go to 2030. Ken.

(Ken Larinson). First, I was very glad to hear you mention distinguishing between dormitory and student apartments. This has really become a gross niche in the real estate industry.

I had spoken a couple of times at a conference that has gone from 70 attendees nine years ago to over 800 attendees all focused on building and operating rental units specifically for students. So I think that's a great example of how census is keeping up with changes in the economy.

On the issue of using IRS information to identify income, I think there are tremendous problems with that. I've been hearing for 15 years or longer about attempts to share, I think the PC term now is synchronize data between IRS census and BLS.

Not only is there a very significant statutory hurdle, but I think for your purposes, definitional and timing problems are pretty much insurmountable. But you want to know what is the income of this household unit that you have defined in a way that may be quite different from what the tax law says.

The latest tax return, even if the IRS could provide you the information on a timely basis, and they can't even put their own statistics of income together

without a huge lag. But that may not be the time period that you need to survey for.

And then most important I think is the concern or suspicion among the public about private information getting out. And if you're having to link to IRS information through a social security number that's kind of a third category of information sharing that becomes very problematic. That not only do people not want their tax information shown, but they don't want the social security number disseminated any more widely than it is.

Woman: So thank you for those comments. Just first of all, we don't link the social security. We put a PIC on it, which stands for protected information key. So we don't deal with social security numbers when we're matching.

But you raised some good points, right that the ACS income over the last 12 months. So if you're asking that in December, you're getting a different answer than somebody in January. But we think, you know, the conversation we had at the expert group meeting, we think that maybe people are just giving us their last year's income anyway because it's, you know, you know what you made last year right because you filled out your taxes.

So maybe that's in the people's heads. And you're right about the lag. So can we get the data from the IRS in time to use it to release our data, you know, in that timely way that we do.

There's also a thing that we haven't talked about. (Bob) said that the IRS covered, you know, like what, 90% of adults. So it doesn't cover everybody. And the people that it doesn't cover are probably very different than the people that it covers. And so we have to think about that as well. So thank you.

Man: I think the filing rate is something like 83%. So that's well below what you're aiming for. And of course, the unit cover may have changed, family members added or changed.

Woman: Right.

Man: But even if you say oh, we don't know your social security number. The respondent isn't likely to believe that. And so the more that people think that the IRS information is being shared, I think the less likely they are to file taxes. And that is a huge problem for the country.

Woman: I don't think that we would say on the survey that we are going to go – like Canada does, right. Canada just goes right to their tax records. And they did at some point on the survey ask if you could do that.

We're not going to say on...

Man: (John) knows. He'll know exactly (unintelligible) Canada right?

Man: So the Canadians asked in earlier censuses. In the current census they just say that to reduce burden we're going to get those data that we can get from other administrative sources directly.

Woman: Right. And I don't think that we have envisioned that we would, you know, if we still have an income question with checkboxes, I don't think we're going to say we're going to really verify this with your tax records. I mean that's now I've been thinking of it. So I think that hopefully won't be a concern.

Man: Can I make one more comment? There actually is a decent body of research now, which has my name on it that shows that at the high end, the administrative records are doing a better job of capturing an accurate estimate of the household income.

I don't think those are surprising things. And at the low end, it's the survey data that does a better job of capturing income. And I think some careful attention to how the multiple sources would be used is sort of this research indicates that that's really going to be a challenge.

And I hope that all parts of the Census Bureau can help you with addressing that challenge.

Woman: (Dan) and then (Andrew).

(Dan Adkins): (Dan Adkins). I wanted to make a comment about (Bob), your comment about not having any connection to the National Academy Study or actually it's done through the National Research Council, which is an arm of the academy.

So it's too late now, but I just wanted to say that in the future, if people think that there should be involvement, it's not inappropriate to be proactive in contacting the cognizant program officers at the academies and saying, you know, we'd like to make input to this process.

It's also the case that the academy - NRC is also looking for reviewers of these various consensus reports. And that's not in a pre-ad hoc way where they send out - usually send out email to members of the academy and say, you know, tell us names of people who would be suitable.

So if you – if you're more interested in being involved in that process, and that actually is a good way to get recognition, it might ultimately result in your being invited to be a member.

At Michigan our research vice president sends out these things and says if you want to be involved, you know, we'll be glad to nominate you. So I think, you know, it's not such a closed process that would be inappropriate or arrogant to call up and say, you know, we'd like to make some input to these things.

Man: Thank you (Dan). From my perspective I simply didn't know that the meetings were ongoing.

Woman: Did you have something to say about that Tori?

Woman: Only to say, you know, of course participation would have been welcome. I wasn't the Chief of ATSO when that was set up, but I know that we selected experts – very we. And I say in a sense that they I think picked who would come.

So – but of course we would always welcome CSAC participants in anything we do with the academy.

Man: Yes. There's all this concern about conflicts of interest. So possibly someone who was a member of this committee would not have been picked as a member of that committee because of that potential conflict. But that's still not to say that you couldn't make input.

And the right person to contact would be the program officer there that's managing the process. I mean I could help facilitate that if that ever occurred in the future.

Man: So with respect to the academy, we don't pick the members of the academy. It's supposed to be, you know, independent there. We engage them to come up with a body of good experts that can give us advice, but we don't tell them who to put on there.

The other thing I wanted to mention, I know Tori was very careful about this. But all this discussion about IRS data. We are right now doing research. And before we would actually do any kind of implementation, we would be negotiating very careful agreements with the IRS to protect the confidentiality of tax data and get the right usage.

And we're not at that point yet. So we're not actually implementing, just to be sure. We're doing research. I know Tori mentioned that.

(Andrew Stanwick): (Andrew Stanwick), thank you for your presentation and the comments as well. I just think this issue with administrative data is one of the most important things that we're all confronting.

And I want to be clear that we distinguish the various purposes for which these data could be used. I can think of three, and I'll list them in a particular order.

The first one, and this respects (Ken)'s point is if you can link to administrative sources of data, you can provide more information to the researchers. You don't necessarily have to do this in real time or in close time.

If I had tax records for the ACS 2010, I'd be using them now in my research. I would think that would be valuable. There's just this question of can you

improve the usefulness of the data by linking it to other data. Some of that data will be administrative.

There's a second one that's been discussed, which I don't think is going to be very high priority just because of the amount of research and study that's involved.

And I would call this future study design where we decide that we can reduce respondent burden by not asking a set of questions because we can get similar data somewhere else. Okay so others might view that as more of a high priority than I do. But that's the second piece of what we're talking about.

And then there's a third piece which we might call real time survey conduct, which is where the respondent or the interviewing software or person knows some information. That they're trying to do real time error correction of survey respondent provided data.

Like if you knew utility records or something like that then you might be able to prompt a little. Or an answer that was given about do you have phone service, you kind of might know they have phone service, and you're just checking it.

So those are three very different uses of administrative data. They have three different types of benefits that are of interest and concern to different stakeholders. And I think we should make some progress trying to outline in or recommendations possibly different streams where we're looking at these things. Thank you.

Woman: Tori do you have anything to say about that?

Tori Velkoff: No just thank you for those comments. And the other thing to add to your list is, you know, could we use it in our implementation, right, so.

Woman: Well first I wanted to say it was a great presentation. And you were very interesting and engaging. It was interesting. And it's also wonderful to see how much agility there is in the work that you're doing. And I also appreciated all the other comments about administrative data and some of the research that's ongoing.

I was interested in the messaging and communication. And obviously, you know, there's lots of new digital tools, right. And you're looking into those. You mentioned targeted digital advertising. And I – there's a couple different kinds.

And I suspect you might be doing something different than what you described. And so I wondered there's the kind where you're looking at a pair of shoes, right, and then the shoes pop up later on. But there's also the kind where literally you just identify a demographic that you're targeting, right.

And they have not based on any previous behavior. And I imagine you – I would encourage you to look into that as well because that might be better than – and broader than just who's already looked at the survey perhaps.

Woman: So let me – I am not the expert in this, but let me explain it as I understand it. And then (Nancy) will go oh because (Nancy) thinks this is the oh factor or the icky factor.

We're actually going to have – we are targeting people who are in sample. We're not targeting demographics. So those ads will go – we will have information on, you know, how I access the Internet.

And I happen to fall – my address falls in sample. And they know that I get on the Internet, you know, through my computer. We are targeting that way. So it is actually targeting people who are in sample.

And I'm looking back. Is there anyone else who – so it's not – because we don't have a big enough budget to target demographics, right. We're not the 2020. We have a very small budget. So this is a way to make sure that people who are in our sample are going to see these ads.

It doesn't mean they're going to look at them, but they will show up on their computer because we know that they're in sample. So that's the oh factor or the – it's no oh. You don't say oh. What do you say? Creepy.

Right so it could be – right, so when we all heard about it the first time, because of course whatever we're trained, our culture is to protect confidentiality, et cetera. And this is still protecting confidentiality, but it's like oh, you're going to have some ads on those people's computers.

And then a week later they're going to get an ACS questionnaire. So somehow, you know, the government knows what, you know, knows enough about your Internet usage to find you.

So we are putting out – let me just say, we are putting out a federal register notices topic next week explaining exactly what we're doing. And we, you know, if we get a ton of comments back saying yes, don't do this. Then we will probably reconsider.

We also know that this is the first time we've done this, right. We've had digital advertising like you described for census tests. But this is the first time

we're really targeting. So we of course, in our plan have a cut off if it goes, you know, if it goes horribly wrong or people are completely upset, we'll stop, right.

Woman: How will you know if they're upset?

Woman: We won't unless they reach out to us. And so that means we don't know until it happens I guess. I mean I assume if people really were upset that it would probably go viral on us.

Man: We usually know when people are upset with us. It's not hard. They – sometimes they go to Congress and we get some letters. And sometimes they send me emails and sometimes – so it's pretty easy to know when people get upset with us.

Woman: So I guess I wonder if I could encourage you to be explicit in trying to study some opinion on this. It shouldn't be very expensive. But going back to the issue of trying to understand respondent experience, not just respondent burden that I think that you'd want to get ahead of this.

So, you know, my background is political, right. And so political targeting, this is an issue that has been discussed a lot. I would just know that companies like Google and Facebook are very concerned about backlash.

And so the shoes that follow you around, you know, as you go on the Internet that there is self-regulation on political advertising. So a candidate won't follow you around the Internet because of this creepy factor and this concern of backlash.

And so on the one hand, right, having just seen those ads I would say, you know, the creepy factor is less because even if you're doing very nuanced, you know exactly who you're targeting, you're not matching up.

And because, you know, you might – what you might find I think in the research, right, is that if you were to, you know, match demographically exactly the images within your ads, it's going to be more likely to kind of spark concerns where people are like this has moved over into creepy.

But your messages are pretty generic, so that it's really about a budget issue as opposed to a content targeting issue. And so maybe it won't be – but it just, I just think that you want a study.

I mean so in terms of the research on targeted advertising, people will say that they really hate it. Now, you know, marketing researchers will tell you, right, that it's very easy to say that you don't like it even when it's more effective. But it just seems like we're...

((Crosstalk)).

Woman: So maybe I can follow up with you offline about that. Thank you.

Woman: (Doug) and then (Noel).

(Doug Massy): (Doug Massy), just a point of information. What is the current response rate for the ACS and how is it trending?

Woman: Darn, I knew somebody would ask me this question and I don't have it at the tip of my finger. (Tony) or (Mark)? But it's going down, yes.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: So just for the people who couldn't hear, (Mark) said it was 96 point something. I know that for – when we implemented the (Cappy Stopping) rules (Doug) that the (Cappy) responds rates went down from like 89 – about two percentage points.

Woman: Can I just ask a quick follow up? What's the percentage who is on the Internet?

((Crosstalk)).

Woman: I think it's like 55% - 55% to 65% answer. Yes.

Woman: So (unintelligible) the survey or it's done on the Internet.

Woman: Yes...

((Crosstalk)).

Woman: And you get to 98% on (unintelligible) through the house.

Woman: Yes.

Woman: So what your goal is to really try to increase the self-response which is what the digital is targeting? Is that right?

Woman: Yes. Exactly.

Woman: So it's what, 40 – so it's not a very high response rate on the Internet for the overall survey. It's not 52%. The overall survey sounds more like 30% or maybe even less. If you tell me that 40% are self-responders and 50% of those are Internet.

Woman: Yes. I don't know the exact numbers (Erma), but we are trying to obviously increase self-response because it's the cheapest way for us to collect data.

Man: So we had a nice teleconference call with you (Laurie). It was – I think it was in August sometime. I seem to remember being at the joint statistical meetings and there was something very interesting that came up that is in your slides now about investigating the feasibility of an abbreviated questionnaire for reluctant respondents.

I notice it's not up on the looking ahead. I have a two-part question, but let me ask the first part. What have you put in place to move that forward where you're going to look at feasibility of an abbreviated questionnaire if people push back? How's that coming along I guess is the next – is my question?

Woman: Well so this is – this research is all at the very beginning stages, right. So we are now doing work plans and study plans, et cetera. So it's not far along yet. And as I said, for us it is a complicated thing to implement.

And so sometimes it's good to get a quick win so we may focus on other research before we start focusing on that research.

Man: So the next part is to really suggest that you fold that idea into another large bullet point that you had which is called adaptive design. And there that bullet point seemed to refer to just whether you do Internet or mail. And you adapt to the sort of person you think you're reaching, or that person pushes back and

then you adapt. But would that reduce – length of the questionnaire could be part of that adaptive design strategy.

You might brainstorm a little about, you know, all these things that we're talking about. Why people don't feel in more or are reluctant to fill in and turn the whole thing into, you know, a fairly complex adaptive design. But I think it's really important because initially the discussion was to go towards matrix sampling.

And I think the next panel probably said that's not a good idea. I think we, on our committee wanted to hear more about matrix sampling and wanted to hear about, you know, whether it's been peer reviewed in the literature and, you know, how mature it was and that type of thing.

So that's not on the cards anymore, but what is on the cards I suppose. And I looked at this idea of a shorter questionnaire for people who find it burdensome. And I thought that's a really nice idea.

And thought that's right down the ally of an adaptive design. But then I saw your idea of adaptive really meant Internet or mail. But in fact that could be expanded. That's my suggestion.

Woman: Thank you for that comment.

Woman: I went to the NAS conference and I went to the expert group meeting on group quarters. Following up on what Director (Thompson) said, I had to sort of swear, not really, on the pain of death or something that the expert group meeting was totally confidential. And I wasn't to breathe a word about what happened to anybody, including the working group on the ACS.

And I did not violate that, gang. And it was I must say – I can say this though, it was a very nice meeting and people did speak very frankly. I don't think that discloses anything to say that. But there were other suggestions that the earlier working group on ACS group quarters made.

And also that were brought up in the public NAS conference, so I think I can say something about that. And they – and I was just wondering whether these had been discarded or where they were at.

One thing was that for people in the old definition of group quarters, all of them including students in dormitories and military in barracks, they did not have the Internet option, which we thought was kind of dumb because these are computer savvy people. And I was wondering where that was at.

And also we suggested in these public settings that there be considerations, not just of administrative records for the – for people in prisons and old age homes and such that they be using administrative records. But also after having looked quite a bit at the group quarters stuff, the working group on group quarters and the ACS had recommended that there be strong consideration of changing the what ACS tries to collect for these institutionalized group quarters members to a much, much, much, much shorter set of questions.

And I was wondering of those things are being thought about, discarded, worked on, if you decided we're stupid or what?

Woman: No, of course we didn't decide you were stupid. (Jennifer) do you want to come up here with me and help me out with the questions – the answers to this. So it's a little more complicated.

What makes perfect sense to you about giving the Internet option to people in dorms and military barracks is not, from a product standpoint, as easy as it might seem. And I think that (Jennifer) can speak to that a bit.

(Jennifer Riker): Yes. I think in terms of the...

Man: Would you please state your name.

(Jennifer Riker): (Jennifer Riker), American Community Survey Office. So we talked a lot about the Internet option. And we, like the members of the working group, think that, you know, that's sort of a missed opportunity for those particular populations that would probably be very happy to use the Internet versus paper.

And it is a burden issue. One of the issues that we have to come up with is how to strategize delivering that option to them. Right now for the household population, when we give them the Internet option, we do that through a letter. And we mail them a letter and we give them an ID. And we give them instructions on how to go online.

Now for GQ residents that's very difficult because we only have an address for the GQ. We don't – we can't mail to the individual units within the GQ because we just don't have them in our address file.

So we might know that it's, you know, (Joe)'s dorm, but we don't have each of the individual rooms in that dorm listed. So how do we get that Internet option to them?

So right now the way we contact these populations is through personal visits. And we send field representatives out to the GQs and they select a sample of residents within the GQ.

If we're going to spend the resources that are necessary to send a field rep out to these buildings and to do the sampling, you know, from a cost perspective it's cheaper just to get the interview while we're there.

One of the concerns that we have in introducing the Internet is we could still send the FRs out there. Have them deliver postcards or whatever to the sample residents and allow them to do the Internet. But if they don't respond, then we have to go out there again to complete.

So we just have to figure out what is the best way to strategize. And we've talked, I mean (Judy Belton) who is the Branch Chief over the GQ, we talked many times about is there a cost effective strategy.

And so that's what we're looking into. So we have not discarded it. We would like to be able to provide that opportunity as well. We just have to figure out a cost effective way to do it since we can't mail to the individual beds or units within the GQs. But it's certainly something we are very interested in pursuing, but we don't have the design yet.

Woman: And what about the idea of even only trying to ask a much, much shorter set of questions to people or a lot of which you could get from administrative records probably, for people and institutionalized GQs?

(Jennifer Riker): I think that that will get wrapped up into our discussion of use of administrative records and that kind of thing. I think we're going to look at the institutional GQs as a whole and what is the best strategy.

Certainly we have the recommendation from the working group that we want to pursue as well. And we are just now starting our research program with – in terms of administrative records and what we can get through records versus having to go to the GQs. So I think all of that will come into play in that particular research effort.

Woman: I was just curious. Thank you.

Woman: Other questions, comment, reactions? Maybe we've again finished early.

((Crosstalk)).

Woman: No just an option. We have a not particularly short video. But it isn't a nice video from New Orleans and how they used ACS data. It's like six minutes, five minutes. So if you want...

Woman: We have time. Why don't you do it?

Woman: Okay so (Sara) could you show that video.

Woman: We like audio visual aids.

((VIDEO)).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: The New Orleans Fire Department had a fairly (passive) program. We've required the resident to call the fire house. And then a firefighter would come in and install a smoke alarm free of charge. People didn't really take advantage of that program.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: I reached out to Chief (O'Connell) and asked how we could help.

Man: (Unintelligible) but they came in and said look, we want to talk to you about it. And we think this would help.

Man: We developed a model using American Community survey data that identifies those census (blockers) most in need of smoke alarms.

Man: (How does that) least likely to have smoke alarms and most likely to have fatalities with fire.

Man: Then we looked at American Community survey data on where we have concentrations for the young and very old.

Man: People that are most likely to die in fires are very young, under the age of 5 or older, you know, over the age of 60.

Man: Poverty.

Man: Someone struggling to, you know, put food on their table, they're probably not (unintelligible).

Man: That data was contained in the American Community survey, which is available at a very, very discrete level.

Man: And that really allowed us to target the areas that were most likely to not have the smoke alarms and most likely to have a fatality from a fire.

Man: So we were able to pinpoint those areas most at risk for fire death.

Man: So we took it up a notch.

Man: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk)).

Man: (Unintelligible) we saved 11 in one fire because of this very low cost intervention. One of the big lessons from this project is that we were using data that was really all publically available and free like American Community survey.

Man: And using census data like that allowed them to come up with a really good target area.

Man: This model could really be (unintelligible). Any community can identify which neighborhoods are most in need of smoke alarms. The American Community survey was tremendously valuable to us and was really vital for this project.

Man: If you can prevent one person from losing their life, it makes this program worthwhile. Have a good day.

((END VIDEO)).

Woman: So thank you. Isn't that a great video? The American Community data saves lives. Thank you so much for letting me come and present to you. I really appreciate all the feedback.

I do want to mention that Monday the – that report four the public meetings will come out, but there won't be a report for the closed meetings. But you'll see that in Agility 2.0, okay. All right, so thank you.

Woman: When is Agility 2.0 going to come out?

Woman: We're working on it right now. Hopefully it will come out this fall. It definitely will come out this fall, not hopefully but.

Woman: Thanks for your presentation and thanks for all those really great videos. So this is over, but you're not on break yet folks. I have some other stuff to say to you.

Man: Just a quick question. So I thought that was great. And I'm sure if (Jack) were here he's say the geography portion of that was helpful as well. But how does somebody make the link? If I were a firefighter I never would have made a link to the – you know, how does that happen?

And similar to yesterday's conversation, how do you enable that where somebody says I've got a problem. And there's free data to handle it. I was curious how that happened?

Woman: I'm looking to (Allison). Do you know how that?

(Allison Plyer): (Unintelligible). There. So New Orleans – this is (Allison Plyer). New Orleans is really lucky because my organization has built a ton of data capacity locally. So a lot of the people that you saw in that video actually now work at City Hall but originally worked in my organization.

And there are organizations like ours that (Cathy Peditis) who's on our committee coordinates. They're called National Neighborhood Indicator Projects. And there's about 35 of them nationwide.

And so they do that kind of work in those communities as well. But obviously that's not every community. And so that's a challenge.

Man: That's the challenge is how to have this not happen by accident.

Woman: Right.

Man: You know, you happened to be there. You happened to know. You made the link. That's – I mean that's a great story.

((Crosstalk)).

Woman: So we're taking this video on the road kind of. So we're going to go to the National Association of Counties and show it there. I mean so we're going to start – so that's one way to start moving the needle, right. If you see that it worked New Orleans, you could do it for your own city so.

Man: Thank you.

Woman: Are there other topics other than smoke alarms where you could make videos and tell similar stories? And are you thinking about it?

Woman: Yes, yes and yes.

Woman: Like what?

Woman: I don't know exactly the examples right now, but we have – that's part of our communication strategy that I talked about. Coming up with a communication strategy for talking about how our data are used.

So we – I actually – she's not here today because she's in a mentor training, but I have an ADC who focuses, (Maria Meligan), just on communications. And she's excellent. And she's really pushing this forward with those videos.

Woman: Any other ACS questions, (Sunshine)?

Woman: Maybe this goes back to data products, but I would say that one of the things that ends up happening is that the capability to actually do the type of analysis necessary doesn't always exist within local governments.

And so one of the things that – at Duke that we have done is partnered with Durham, where you focus on schools to be able to do similar type of things. But anyway, working with universities is another way to try and make that met.

Woman: (Allison) and then (Ken).

(Allison Plyer): Yes I want to definitely echo what (Sunshine) said. And in fact some of the other NIP partners are based in universities. And it would be terrific to have universities in every community spend some of their great intellectual capital on some of these applied programs.

And I know that's not always what university folks are incentivized to do, which is unfortunate. And it's been hard in New Orleans to get some – we have seven universities. And it's been really hard to get them in on some of these applied approaches.

But you can – I mean like it's not a joke. It saves lives, right. And so if folks in universities could be part of that solution because there are universities in lots of places.

Woman: (Ken) and then (Erma).

Man: It's a heartwarming video. And I'd like to believe – I mean I'd love having something like this to show the value of ACS or any kind of data that government agencies are putting out. But I'm not enough of a statistician to know, but my suspicions are raised that this isn't done in a rigorous way to show that this kind of concentrated use of the data actually produced results you wouldn't have had otherwise.

And I wonder if we've had kind – not that I want to see a control group and see more fires in the area that didn't have it. But was the rigor behind this?

(Allison Plyer): And I, this is (Allison) again. I obviously didn't study their methods. I think in a place like New Orleans, and this would be true in lots of cities that when, you know, city governments are overtaxed, right, they have – it's really about efficient use of resources.

Like they couldn't do fire alarms everywhere. And so to be targeting what might not have been a perfect targeting, but it was as opposed to no targeting at all. You know, I think you don't necessarily have to do a control group to

know that like there is some value in that. I mean that could probably say something about that in terms of logistics, right.

So I mean I think that's the thing. When there's limited resources you have to figure out how to deploy them. And certainly using data is better than not, right.

Woman: (Erma).

Woman: Yes I wonder if you could like some of these. Isn't there some of kind of a census in the school program within the schools that better link high school kids who get involved in doing data analysis and I don't know, you know, with local governments?

And also whether you – I mean I thought the video – all the videos you showed were really good. And whether those will be on the ACS Website. But then maybe there could be a list of organizations where the local communities could connect like the neighborhood, whatever, the New Orleans organization and then the (SESA) agencies or something where the people could then find the resource in their local community who could help them using the data because I know most city governments or firefighters or police are not going to necessarily have the skills to do that.

Woman: Right. So part of our – I told you that we're going to have a data users conference in May of next year. And we were brainstorming about things for that meeting on Monday.

And we were thinking of having, you know, university professors come in and talk about how they use ACS data in their classrooms and how they make

their students, you know, figure out a research project and use it, but also, you know, targeting.

There's a – we have a strong network of census information centers, our state data centers, our FSTPE, they're all good partners, right. And so they all have examples of how they go and help communities that don't have the resources to do it themselves. So I think there's a lot of opportunity here for us to keep moving. (Nancy).

Woman: (Erma) I think you've really hit on something. So we are – we really just launched kind of a revamped year-long ongoing statistics in the schools program that's build on the census in the school's program from the 2010 census because there was such a positive response to that from the educational community, you know, K through 12.

And there's a lot of promise there. I mean one of the things that we're doing with high school students is kind of a data hackathon to get them to contribute addresses to the address list.

So they're there. They're smart. They're willing. We've got a curriculum now that we just rolled out, you know, for this school year. There's a lot of interest. So it's certainly I think getting the high schoolers involved in some of this. You know, you don't have to be – well some of them actually are probably a lot even better than me in working with some of this data. They're so good at it.

So it's definitely something that, you know, we can take and look at in the context of the statistics in the schools in the hackathons that we're doing and things like that because that format, like things that we've done with the city software development kids, City SDK for example to get local and geos

involved in using the ACS data and census data in their community for these kind of specific purposes.

Bringing in the high school kids to help with those kinds of efforts is a very promising think coming up.

Woman: I imagine that you've had some contact with (Bill Fry) over this stuff? He's done a lot of this kind of thing. Whoever is involved in this, if you haven't involved him, you should.

Man: So you can think of a myriad of different groups that ACS can help. One of the infographics that we have done is relative to veterans. And in particular where veterans live. And then where the VA facilities are located.

And it brings in the geographic information. So we do state maps. And then we also look at the characteristics of veterans in terms of income, disability status, employment status and all of those things.

We also have a tool that looks at migration patterns, people moving. Where did they live a year ago and where are they living now? We also have commuting patterns. So there's a myriad of information. And we actually are working on tools to make that data more accessible. So those are a couple of ideas that we've already been working on.

Woman: Anything else from the ACS? Well then I guess this session is actually done, but don't get up committee members. I still have some stuff to say to you. I haven't totally forgotten what I was going to say. Thanks Tori and thanks all the other ACS people.

Hi. (Jack) agreed to be the person who would write up thoughts on evidence-based policy making. So when we finish this, if people could gather who are interested could gather around (Jack) for about 10 minutes or so to help him figure out what to say about that. That would be good.

And I've been writing up the American Community survey stuff. I also want – I've been editing on what I've been getting from you folks and want to keep on editing before we do it. But also, (Jack) once you have something written up and from the people, if you could send me that and I'll try to incorporate that.

And maybe we get that stuff done before 10:50. Does that sound okay folks? Thank you for being so nice. So all of you flock around (Jack).

Man: Tell me, right, just one logistics question. There is public comment at 11, so I think we should...

((Crosstalk)).

Man: Right, so at the 10:50 break, please be in place by 11 o'clock.

Woman: We got to be back by 11 or we're going to get our heads chopped off or something.

Man: Thank you.

Man: Comment. Do we have anyone who would like to make a comment? If so please proceed to the microphone located in front of the audience seating. I don't see anyone. I also don't have anyone who has preregistered. I'm going to ask if there's anyone dialing in. The number's 888-790-2057, participant

code 856-1325. Callers will need to press zero. So, there are no comments. So, we're - (Barbara).

(Barbara): Hi, gang. The plan is at - hopefully this will all work. And you all be patient while doing the best we can. At 11:20 am -- just a little time -- I'm still editing English on this, and I'm not saying I'll be totally done.

What I think works with the very helpful IT people is the document I have which is slightly over six pages long single spaced with your comments and in it's Word, they tell me what can happen if it can be projected up, we can all go through. I can edit in real time. You can see it. And we can proceed.

And you can add stuff. You can say I got it wrong. And I think especially on the census update I don't think I totally worked out everything to not be redundant and that kind of stuff.

And maybe if we were able to as a group go through the whole thing, say twice that maybe then we'd have a final document. Does that sound all right? So, you can meditate or chat or whatever you want until 11:20 am. Okay. And hopefully this will work.

(Noah): We work a bit, then we lunch a bit, then we work a bit. Yes.

(Barbara): (Unintelligible).

(Noah): Yes.

(Barbara): Is lunch here?

(Noah): No. But that's all right. I just wondered.

(Barbara): (Unintelligible) when everyone's (unintelligible).

(Noah): Yes, yes, yes. Let's start because I have to leave.

(Barbara): (Unintelligible) start.

(Noah): Yes. I have to leave a bit early.

(Barbara): (Unintelligible) If we go through this twice, that might be enough. And then - and we'll eat lunch whenever it comes. It may emerge at some moment. And if we go through it twice and people say whatever they want and if they say that you can see what happens as I edit there, that it - maybe this is a way we could actually finish. That sound all right?

(Sunshine): A point of information. So, we have a long list of questions. I noticed that the last time we also had a long list of questions and they weren't always - and comments that were not necessarily recommendations.

And while we got very thoughtful feedback, it also took a very long time. And there are some it feels like are more pressing than others. So, for instance the creation of working groups to - like we want to jump in right away.

In some ways what we want is to be able to follow-up immediately and find individuals within the bureau who would be able to answer some of these questions. And I don't know if there's a way to...

(Barbara): Well, this is something maybe that maybe Director Thompson can tell us, because (unintelligible) he was saying to people - and he'll correct me if I'm wrong, I'm sure, that the working groups is the main way we do this.

But I understand it, there actually is a process for approval of working groups, which means things aren't instant. So, maybe we can do this and then maybe we do the presentation -- well, you can say whatever you want whenever you want, of course -- that we can have a discussion of what else is possible. Does that make sense?

And I don't know. Since working groups the main mechanism, but there is a formal process for approval of working groups. It doesn't happen overnight.

(Sunshine): And again for the 20-20 I think the idea is we don't care necessarily about a working group, but there's a couple of people on the committee for each of the topics where they could kind of deep dive immediately if we were connected with the right person.

(Barbara): I don't know.

(John): You could ask for expedited....

(Barbara): You want to turn on your thing?

(John): (Unintelligible) expedited (unintelligible). So, I mean a working group is the committee recommends - either the committee recommends or we recommend a working group on a topic be formed. And then if the committee recommends it, we approve it or don't approve it. But it doesn't take long to approve it.

(Barbara): It doesn't?

(John): No. I just say yes or no.

(Barbara): What do I know? Okay.

(John) And we can (unintelligible).

(Barbara): Oh okay. Well, maybe we'll be okay. And then but also then the Census Bureau, may have not have the same view as we do of what's urgent. So, you know, under these different parts, so why don't we - the first one makes a little more than a page.

(Andrew Stanwick): (Barbara), can you make that bigger on your screen, so it's also bigger on our screen?

(Barbara): How do I make it bigger here? What?

(Andrew Stanwick): Scroll all the way down to the bottom right.

(Barbara): Oh okay.

(Andrew Stanwick): (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

(Barbara): I can see this. Is that better? Okay. Okay. So, well, you can start reading and say whatever you want. How's that sound? It may be easier to see you on the screens in front of you.

(Sunshine): Again, just a question about process and so maybe (unintelligible)

(Barbara): Still trying to figure it out yet. Go ahead.

(Sunshine): Right. So, these economic program updates, (John), would you be able to just share... I mean, because we do have this really long list, will this be sent... Like how do our comments and recommendations, particularly given that they're not just, you know, bulleted we recommend this, how will this unfold in terms of a response?

(John): What the advisory committee has to do -- (Tommy), you can correct me if I'm wrong on this -- is the advisory committee makes recommendations in a public setting like this.

And then we get recommendations and we respond to the recommendations. So, what we're waiting for is if you deliberate and come up with some recommendations that you want to make then you can send them to us. You can also send us the documentation of the meeting which are your comments.

(Sunshine): Right. I guess what I'm trying to figure out is how best can we kind of divide and conquer in terms of getting some of the - that are questions as opposed to recommendations getting, you know... So, on the economic program updates, you know, should we explicitly say we would like the, you know, economic director to provide the following information.

(John): Yes. You can do that.

(Tommy Wright): (Tommy Wright). Just an additional comment since, (John), invited me to do. But substance of the content should be pretty much final at the end of this - by the end of this meeting. Now, there could be some cosmetic packaging following that and I expect that there might be.

But the essence of the recommendation should be in place pretty much - I'm looking at Tara. She's shaking her head. We've been in several meeting on this. Is that right? She's shaking her head up and down, yes.

(Barbara): As you'll see as we proceed, some of it is what the current state of the document is sort of commentary to help inform or nudge to a sense or steer in a particular direction. Some of it is we have the following specific questions. Some of it is we think the census bureau should do this, this, this and this. That make sense? And it varies on what the issue is.

(John): And as someone who's regularly asked to respond to these things it would be very helpful if you bolded or highlighted a specific recommendation.

(Barbara): There's some of that as we go on. Shall I go on?

(John): Yes.

(Barbara): I don't know what I'm doing either. I'm just making this up. (There)'s some more. Sorry once again.

(Sunshine): I wonder if - (Christian) if this is yours. I wonder if, again, and in terms of highlighting what is kind of a request for more information is there a way that we could either - you know, is the recommendation perhaps that there's a follow-up phone call scheduled with someone from the economic census after they've seen this list of questions. Would that be one way to kind of get some things actual because some of these are, again, they're kind of...

(John): No. We can have a meeting with you where we just provide information, but we don't have deliberations. If you're going to deliberate then that's got to be done in a public setting. So we've had a number of meetings with the (knack)

where we've provided background information and our people talked to them and provided.

But there's no deliberation if it's not a publicly announced meeting. But it's much easier to do a background call than it is to do a meeting, because we don't do a federal registry on this or anything. We just provide you information.

(Sunshine): And so my question would be for you is that the appropriate next step?

(Andrew Stanwick): Yes. I mean I guess probably my sense was looking over the questions and (unintelligible) that there were a lot of questions but many of which don't - it seems like the past process for delivering those questions to the census and letting them sort of their time scale produce answers probably works for most of these.

A lot of them are sort of very general questions, you know, like how are you guys thinking about the rise the share in economy or large retailers. Those are broad questions. And I think we could definitely schedule a call to have them walk through things.

But I also don't feel a tremendous amount of urgency to circumvent whatever the normal process is for these being sort of distributed down through channels to whoever is internally thinking about these things and then having those answers then flow back and come over to use in a document.

(Barbara): I also think...

(Andrew Stanwick): Other people might disagree.

(Barbara): I also think the comments on the economic programs are somewhat different than some of the other topics. We thought it was interesting I think generally. And we had some things you'd like to know more about their thinking. And that's why this is written this way.

And also, as we think about this - I'm not saying for anyone not to say anything they think. But we may have somewhat less of the reorganization issues the first through. And once you've seen how it's set up now you may have more comments on what you want reorganized or wiped out or who knows what the second time through. I think we may even end up with a third time through. Does that sound all right?

(Sunshine): So, what I'm hoping to accomplish here is that I think asking a question like what challenges does the Amazon distribution warehouse present is a request for a lot... Like if we were looking for a written request for that, right, that somebody's got write that, and that's asking for, you know, it isn't too much work.

It's asking for too much work, and I'm afraid it distracts from other things which is provide us with your regression results, right? And so what I, I, you know, I wonder if rather than a question mark at the end of that, that there's a list of thoughts that we have that we hope can be addressed through either a follow-up phone call or in, you know, our future. Does that make sense?

(Barbara): (Andrew).

(Andrew Stanwick): So reading through at least this through this first part on the economic census it's on the agenda because the timeline is running out for us to have any sort of input on it as it goes into the field.

We heard a nice presentation. It raised a lot of interesting questions. Many of those questions are just for academic interests. So, reading this page which is nicely put together we have no formal recommendations as far as I can tell. Okay. So the top line from that part of our meeting agenda is no formal recommendations.

The second thing we might have is specific requests for information. I think all of those would be of, you know, a more relaxed timeline and we would want people at the census to know that number one, we're interested in this. So, if you're working on something that you are in need of or desirous of input on there might be an opportunity here.

And, so, relative to what we have here, we have to call those things out specifically. And we could spend some time working on specifically what we ask with an eye toward minimizing unintended impacts on staff time. And then we can keep everything that we have here a verbiage underneath each one of those specific requests to just give a little bit more context about what we were thinking.

So, I think there's two things. Number one, for this part of the agenda no formal recommendations unless someone is teasing it out of this in a way I'm not. And then secondly, a list of requests for information either for academic or potentially committee future business.

(Barbara): That's very helpful. How about if after the economic program update thing, we say there are no specific recommendations in this area. However, we would like to have an informational call scheduled with someone in this area to provide information on these issues.

(Andrew Stanwick): Again, I'm not the expert on the procedure, but I don't feel like I need that. For at least some of these there's probably a table that they could point us to. And so, if it were just a written response that were distributed to committee members we could then investigate this.

And, you know, things that came up here we might have thought were really important in the moment, and then when we go back and do our own research as we normally would when we have a question, we might decide it's just not worth a whole lot of time. But this is....

(Barbara): Okay. Since we're not agitated about much here, how about then -- I'm just proposing different alternatives -- we say under economic program updates we have no specific recommendations, but here are some thoughts that we would like the economic programs to think about. Is that okay? Oh, turn on your thing.

(Andrew Stanwick): I understand. Okay. We're not helpful if we don't give them very specific questions like I would the - (E. Taylor) thing was mine. The gig economy I think was (Cat)'s.

All right. If you could just point us to materials or any specific things you've written about how census is thinking about the gig economy that would suffice. But those are the things we should be deliberating over as we propose these things. What do you think the next step is to help us better understand the issue?

So, I think we want to give them a lot of flexibility. And we never want to write something where they're encouraged to go out and give us more information than we actually wanted.

(Barbara): So, are there some parts of this, some paragraphs of this first part that we think should be removed?

(Andrew Stanwick): Possibly, but (unintelligible)...

(Barbara): Eliminated, whatever.

(Andrew Stanwick): Yes. But I think that means we go around the table and say, okay, who said this? What did you mean by it? And what would satisfy you?

(Barbara): And I guess I mean that - and I just put together what people sent me that... I mean some things like the it is impressive paragraph's just a nice thing to say to them and there's no problem like that. Do we think that the first two paragraphs need to stay if we're not asking for any specific response from this?

(Andrew Stanwick): I think we are asking for a specific response. We just need to be clear about what it is. The first question is; how does the census know that businesses are self-reporting accurately? I'm sure somebody in that directorate has spent a lot of time on exactly that question.

So, the answer would be, here are a couple of publications where we detail it. It would then be up to us skim, shall we say, those publications and see if there's anything where we can be helpful, or where we think more should be being done.

(Barbara): Okay. Then should it say -- I'm just trying various versions -- that we have no specific recommendations in this area. We make several observations and ask several questions. It would help, or we would appreciate or whatever - we

would request that people from the economic program refer us to anything they've written that could help answer these questions. Is that all right?

(Andrew Stanwick): Yes. I think that's valid certainly for everything in the economic programs update. But, again...

(Barbara): That's what I'm talking about.

(Andrew Stanwick): ...I only contributed one or two of these.

(Barbara): Yes. So, I will draft what I think we just said. Okay.

(Andrew Stanwick): And anyone should feel free to speak if they do have the specific recommendation that they sort of want and actually have them coming out of as opposed to material that already exists and sort of a pointer to that.

(Barbara): That okay? Okay. Okay. (Christian), is that okay? Okay. You folks are very good.

Moving right along. We get to big data. Why don't we start reading? Some of this is from (Noah). Some of it's from other people. A lot of stuff I stuck together from (unintelligible) different people what - and (Roberto).

(Noah): (Roberto) added his comments after the (unintelligible - after I copied him. Oh, and (Allison)'s involved as well.

(Barbara): And (Allison). I tried to put in everything everyone sent me, but I tried to get rid of redundancy. So, I can sort of move along as people lead if that's okay. Okay if I move on? I'm not sure yet. Can I keep going, so we can just get an idea of what this says? Of course.

(John): Seems like it just takes two touches to get it to go on. Most of the members of the economics program were at the November 2015 BEA Expert Panel on uses of big data and economic statistics. And I and heard (Trebelo Reganathan)'s excellent presentation, which has more than a few examples of some of the things - basically how to combine found data with survey data, attempts to make the case for the survey component much the way an article does. Subsequently regulate them.

And (Sharon Lore) made long presentations at the public seminar for CNSTAT in May of 2016. And those presentations were made available to the ECON directorate. If you would like to ask for any internal examples of applications of these ideas, I think that would probably advance this beyond the go-read-this-paper stage if you think that's appropriate.

(Noah): (John) at the very least it would be good to get a link to those presentations if they're available because the (Elliot) reference is old, you know, relatively speaking.

(John): I've been sending (Sarah) links as they come up. And I'll send her those. I will also note that (Sharon) told me that subsequent to the CNSTAT presentation, she and (Ragoo) wrote a joint paper that's under review at -- oh no. I'm not sure where it's under review.

But they were expecting to put a version, you know, in the pre-print sub place soon as they had the referees comments back. So, I'll ping them again to see if that's happened. That would be the place to go for a more final version or wrapped up version of their presentations at CNSTAT.

(Noah): That would be great.

(Barbara): So, if we're already aware of all this, can we get rid of this paragraph?

(Noah): No. I don't think so.

(Barbara): Okay. What do you want done?

(Noah): Oh, I'd like (John), which he just offered to do, kindly is to provide more recent references. But they might be web links or they might be ethical reports or hopefully from (Sharon) and (Reganathan)'s point of view to appear in press. So, (John), whatever you can help us out with there to make it more current, that'd be great.

(Tommy Wright): (Tommy Wright). As a point of information, I also attended that very fine lecture that John just mentioned. I'm also - one comment from (Sharon Lore) that designated a lot with me, a lot of the area probability sampling is built on using auxiliary data already. It's just every textbook is just one chapter after another.

Y is the variable of interest and X is the auxiliary variable? And you get ratio estimators, regression estimators. You use them to stratify. You use them to build a sampling frame. So, these things are - to a large extent they're very much a part of - they're kind of built in. This auxiliary information comes from lots of places.

And (Sharon Lore) made this comment so that it could be to (unintelligible). I guess (unintelligible) looking for examples at the bureau. They're just in my mind maybe almost common practice. Now, there are some things that stand out. But it's - in my mind I would say it's common practice.

(Barbara): I drafted a sentence to try to address what you were saying. What do you think about the last sentence that I added?

(Noah): So, that's more of a comment to our (super) committee. (John) will follow up. Perhaps even (Tommy). But anyhow, between the two of you we can (unintelligible).

(Barbara): So, I think they'll do it. But I think that, that kind of takes care of what you were saying.

(Noah): Yes. So, that paragraph's important because there's a sentence there that -I mean I could have been more direct, but I said it may even be the case that without the presence of survey data to non-survey data have very little value.

That was trying to be diplomatic. But it may be that. But there's an implication that comes out of the (Elliot) paper. And this idea of (Sharon Lore)'s simply reinforced. You need from her other probability survey in order to sort of build and use the non-survey data.

And Elliot's paper makes a point that those non-survey and survey results or data if you like sheer common covariates that's the way that you're able to improve survey estimates with non-survey data if they share a common covariance. And I mean that's - this is what you're talking about (Tommy).

(Barbara): Okay. Can we go on?

(John): It seems like you're trying to make a recommendation, something to the effect that the Census Bureau should consider or understand that unstructured data, non-probability data by itself isn't good enough for the purposes of the official of the statistics it produces. Isn't that what you're trying to say?

- (Noah): I agree. Yes. Yes. I was being, you know, a diplomatic.
- (John): (Unintelligible).
- (Noah): But maybe we should just come out and say it.
- (John): That's what you're trying to say. That's easy for us to respond to.
- (Noah): That needs to be said. Thank you, John, for allowing me to say that.
- (John): That's your recommendation that we - well, of something we should take into account. And so we can work that.
- (Noah): Right.
- (Sunshine): I second that recommendation.
- (Barbara): What??
- (Noah): That data, the sentence, it may be even the case that maybe it just - we need to drop that without the presence of survey data and non-survey. Web-scrape data may have very little value or the - if this committee believes that based on what we've discussed that they'd be willing to back that up, then we should say that.
- (Barbara): Why don't we say, without survey data non-survey web-scrape data has very little value and just be that direct.
- (Noah): We - yes. Yes. Yes.

(John): (Unintelligible).

(Noah): Yes. Yes.

(John): (Unintelligible).

(Noah): Right.

(John): Because I've heard him say that.

(Noah): Say that. Right.

(John): (Unintelligible) If you say we should consider in our research or work to produce the statistics, this factor - well, something actionable for us to act on.

(Barbara): So, what do you want it to say, (Noah), or anybody?

(Noah): All right, so, let me have a go at this. We would like the census bureau to investigate following statement or following hypothesis. Let's call it a hypothesis. We're trying to be scientists here.

(Barbara): (Unintelligible).

(Noah): And the following hypothesis is without survey data, non-survey web-scrape data have very little value.

(Barbara): I think too in a hypothesis; I think we know it's true.

(Noah): No. No. I mean that's the point. The actionable point is I think that's what John's getting at and that'd be my position too is a lot of people have said it, but it needs to be looked at or to investigate under what circumstances, right?

(John): I mean you can do stuff if you can see correlation. And if you see correlation, you can improve estimates. The real issue is, do you have bias that is upsetting your estimates. And that's the circumstance if it's tradeoff between bias and variance to your correlation.

(Sunshine): (Unintelligible) I wonder if rather than investigating a hypothesis, we feel comfortable with something along the lines of given the current state of scientific knowledge, you know, without further evidence web scraping is not sufficient for official statistics or something, you know, something that so it's flip it rather than investigating a hypothesis that is - given the current state of knowledge. And I don't know if that...

(Noah): Well, we have to make it action – so, we have to make it actionable. I'm hearing that and I agree totally. (Unintelligible).

(Sunshine): The Census Bureau could recognize in their work. Is that actionable enough? Our recommendation is that the Census Bureau recognizes in their current work that given the current state of scientific knowledge...

(Sunshine): I actually like much better what (Noel) said because it's actionable item, that the actually go and investigate something. The other one is just well recognize, but we don't really (unintelligible)...

(Noah): Well, I guess what I would do is there is that hypothesis. I believe it to be true. And then I'd investigate in a sense how true it is. There will be circumstances where you get value. And it comes down to a bias-variance tradeoff.

And when buyers can really hurt you and you don't know it, then things don't work. And so the issue is to understand and then explain to people the dangers.

And it's sort of - it's not like a binary thing. It's not like all or nothing. And that's why the notion of a hypothesis and then the investigation, you design, an experiment, perhaps start with a simulation study and then work your way into how that simulation study might inform, you know, some actual practical applications. That is certainly actionable.

(Barbara): So, it's what I wrote. Is this what you want, we recommend that the census do investigate whether without survey data non-survey easy web scrape data have value.

(Noah): I like that. I like that. We don't even mention the term hypothesis, but that's sort of what's going on in head.

(Barbara): (Unintelligible) investigate.

(Sunshine): I guess value, that's pretty small. Right, I guess my thinking was that it is not sufficient for official...

(Barbara): Have value...

(Sunshine): ...statistical use or something along those lines.

(Barbara): Or official statistical use.

(John): (Sharon) and (Ragoo) framed the whole discussion in terms of the bias-variance tradeoff. In particular, you can get no variance from an infinite web sample. But you have to calibrate the bias. And calibrating the bias involves relating what you've got in the web sample to a well-known frame and perhaps a sample from that frame that lets you estimate the weights.

And so I think from our point of view, if you think that investigating the bias-variance tradeoff is the right way to think about these tradeoffs then it might be a good idea to say that.

If you think that we ought to be thinking about the problem in a wholly different way, then I would say that. But I don't know if you need to say it in terms of hypothesis but we are thinking about it in terms of the bias variance tradeoff.

And so, if it's another way you would like us to think about it, say that. If you think that's a good way to think about it, say that - would be my observation.

(Noah): One friendly amendment, (Barbara), would be after the sentence which says, "Have value official statistical use." It's a - one approach would be to assist web scrape data - the use of web-scrape data through bias-variance tradeoff criteria. Right? I'd probably go in and sort of clean that up that a bit. It's not (unintelligible).

(Barbara): Okay. Shall I go on? Yes.

(Noah): So, once John sends through the references, that sentence about (Elliot) and demonstrates this with a simple example, that will be modified to account for the addition of those references, right?

(Barbara): What? Say that again.

(Noah): More references are on their way, so...

(Barbara): (Unintelligible) sentence.

(Noah): ...the wording about (Elliot)'s, he would - that reference would be one of I guess several that are in a list of references.

(Barbara): We'd like to finish this all by 2:30 pm today. So, do we leave that sentence in about the reference? What?

(Tommy Wright): Just a point of information, (Noah) was saying maybe insert something saying more examples may be coming (unintelligible).

(Barbara): Well, we already asked for it at the bottom. We already asked for that.

(Noah): All right. So then...

Barbara: (Unintelligible).

(Noah): ...reference... I don't know what this is under those circumstances. It certainly doesn't talk - it talks a little bit about bias-variance tradeoff. Let's just say is an early reference to be considered rather than demonstrates this. Sorry. Yes. Just (Elliot), (Emma) combining da, da, da, da, da. It's an early reference.

(Barbara): Fairly relevant reference.

(Noah): Right.

(Barbara): Is that okay now?

(Noah): Yes. So, we'd like links to applications of these. I'm not sure what these is, that point. Of the use of web scrape data.

(Barbara): Yes.

(Noah): Yes. I think that sort of hangs together (unintelligible).

(John): Can I clarify? Do you want those references right now, so you can put them in your recommendations (unintelligible)?

(Noah): That'll be really cool. So, (Barbara) just reminded me, and... (unintelligible).

(Barbara): I want this all finished by 2:30.

(Noah): ...that she wants this finished by 2:30. Yes. (Unintelligible).

(John): I'm just trying to be helpful. If you want them now, I can get them now.

(Noah): Yes, so, could you send them...

(Barbara): You can give them, but I don't have to put it in this. I don't think I have to put it in the document.

(John): Well, if you're not going to put them in there I'll send them to (unintelligible).

(Barbara): That would be great.

(Noah): (Unintelligible) point.

(John): That's okay?

(Barbara): I'm just being very...

(Noah): Yes. Thanks, (John). I think it'll come later. And because (Baber) (unintelligible) needs to clean it up. Yes.

(Barbara): Okay. Going on.

(Noah): Lunch is here.

(Barbara): What? Let's see how much more big data there is. Do you want to have lunch before we finish big data?

(Noah): Let's finish big data and then I have to go. So...

(Barbara): What time do you have to go?

(Noah): About when we finish big data.

(John): We're going to put that until the end.

(Barbara): Can we finish big data before we get lunch?

(Noah): Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. So, that's - that was my request.

(Barbara): I'm trying to make everybody happy.

(Noah): Yes. I think this will work.

(Barbara): He's leaving. See what you think.

(Andrew Stanwick): So, there's a sentence there about the training which makes perfect sense about, you know, that, that (unintelligible). So, I'm looking at the top full paragraph there. Then there's a question that says once they have the training, can the Census Bureau retain them. Well, you know, theoretically, yes. Some yes. Some no. But if the folks who wrote this think that this is really important, say we recommend that, you know...

(Barbara): (Unintelligible).

(Andrew Stanwick): ...Census Bureau try to retain these folks as best as possible or something like that. Otherwise, I think it's just a throwaway question.

(Noah): Actually, I think it's pretty serious, the retention part. I believe (Ron German) said every young researcher who attended the courses - it might have been, (Tommy), at the last meeting...

(John): Yes. He did. Yes, he did say that.

(Noah): ...every young researcher was hired away after they attended the big data seminar.

(Tommy Wright): Well, not everyone. Just a point of information. So, four members from my division. And they're all extremely bright as is everyone in the division. And we only hire people that everybody else wants. And this added value. And it just reached a point where they left - all four, all four of them. The division.

Not all left the bureau, but they're seeking other opportunities. It's a point to consider.

(Barbara): Do we need to say retention strategies for these well-trained people need to be considered.

(Noah): I just think it needs to be there. It's not actionable, but it's something that if you want to be in the game you need the right qualities to do it.

(Barbara): We could just leave it over. There's nothing (unintelligible) do about it.

(Noah): And it has to be at the top of, you know, your acquiring strategies.

(Barbara): Shall we keep going?

(Noah): All right. I think it's all right as it is. There's no actionable thing there except they stay alert or start thinking seriously from a human resources point of view how such individuals could be retained.

(Sunshine): I would love it if it could be a statement like that as opposed to a question just because we're going to have lots of things that have question marks at the end that we actually do want the answer.

(Barbara): Okay. What do you want it to say? (Sunshine), (Noah), what do you want that to say instead of the two (unintelligible).

(Sunshine): Restate (unintelligible) question.

(Andrew Stanwick): We just - we stick to the Census Bureau. It should focus on retaining them post ops (unintelligible).

- (Noah): Once they have training - well, go ahead. Yes. That's fine.
- (Barbara): How's that? That okay? Okay.
- (Noah): Yes. No, that's... And this could be renewed. Oh no, I think it should say training and retention are key to the projects' long-term future.
- (Barbara): I was trying to get rid of as much as I could.
- (Noah): Yes. And that's fine -- in my view anyhow.
- (Barbara): I think this is - will be the end of big data. This is the last of big data.
- (Noah): Yes. So, the paragraph starting with, "Although they're not a long-term approach", I didn't write that. So, that's something else. I'm not sure where it should go (Barbara). That paragraph in the middle there, "Although they're not a long-term approach experimentation."
- (Barbra): Right. Maybe that should go after the other web scraping paragraph.
- (Noah): Well, I don't know who wrote that. Where did that come from?
- (Barbara): I don't remember.
- (Noah): It did not come from (Roberto). He just added a sentence.
- (Barbara): Any want to claim ownership, or can I get rid of it? Get rid of it. I'll get rid of it.

(Noah): Yes. I don't know where that came from.

(Barbara): (Unintelligible).

(Noah): The rest looks...

(Barbara): (Unintelligible).

(Noah): And it's not actionable (unintelligible).

(Barbara): It's not actionable, but we're saying nice things to them.

(Noah): Right.

(Barbara): (Unintelligible).

(Noah): (Unintelligible) okay.

(Sunshine): Do want an actual recommendation? The one that has the question mark in the middle, the, "Undertake an initiative to encourage jurisdictions, to standardize these definitions (unintelligible)." Is there...

(Noah): Sorry.

(Sunshine): ... something more specific?

(Noah): I was going to actionable, but then, you know, I actually have a slight conflict of interest. I was going to actionable the (unintelligible) statistical tools can potentially enhance the statistical pair of (unintelligible) undertaken by the Census Bureau. I was going to try to action that. But I said I...

(Barbara): What do you want it to say?

(Noah): ...I'm very interested in doing that. I think there's a lot of value and benefit.

(Barbara): You recommend...

(Noah): And we would recommend...

(Barbara): You recommend the Census Bureau continue efforts in this direction.

(Noah): Right. Right.

(Barbara): How's that? That okay? Are we done with big data? We can get lunch. And then we'll go onto census updates. I also want to eat. But okay.

(Sunshine): Slow down.

(Barbara): I'll slow down. I'll slow down. Yes. That's fine. (Unintelligible).

(John): I understand. But I'm not sure not sure where that 86% came from either. But - it is on.

(Tommy Wright): Yes. But mine wasn't.

(Andrew Stanwick): Can you say again what you just said what the denominator was I didn't...

(John): If the convention as the denominator is either the actual or the expected number of households to be enumerated. So, it's the whole - it's essentially

the universe and not the respondents or the - some subset of the full frame. It's either the expected frame or the actual frame.

(Andrew Stanwick): So, I put this one in there. The 86% is the number drawn from the presentations. It's the set of people who didn't self-respond, right to their... They did their test. And they claimed to consult administrative data.

(John): Right. And, again, for reasons that I'm not entirely clear on, the number that floats around the Census Bureau is that the expected (NRFU) enumeration by administrative records is on the order of 6 million households. And so what denominator...

(Barbara): (Unintelligible).

(John): ...goes with that to make - yet, the compliment of 86% is what I'm not clear on.

(Barbara): But as (Andrew) said I think almost quoting the presentation said that in 86% percent of the (NRFU) cases could not be resolved with administrative records. And we were discouraged. We wanted to know what this meant, what were they using.

(John): That's a clear enough question. I suggest that you clarify exactly the way you just clarified it for me.

(Sunshine): So, it might even to help to save Slide 20.

(John): Where is it at?

(Sunshine): It's Slide 20.

(Barbara): Slide 20 of the presentation, right?

(Sunshine) So, on some of these questions here there are some that are very explicit. You know, we would like an explanation of Slide 20, right?

And there are others that I think it would suffice to have if there is existing materials whether other presentations, white papers, or so on that we're requesting that more detailed information.

And so I don't know if others have - if we either want to organize them in that way or at the very least indicate which ones we're looking for, existing material, or additional material.

(Barbara): Is what I wrote about five okay now?

(Sunshine): Yes. I think you can cut - well...

(Barbara): What?

(Sunshine): So, well, number six, right? Is just for a further explanation of how Slide 11 - and that one was one as I suspected there's more than was presented in the slide.

(Barbara): Why don't I get rid of 6?

(Sunshine): Yes.

(Andrew Stanwick): I think you can also get rid of four. It's more a comment on they should've told us this in the presentation. But I followed up and it's not a mystery.

There's dramatically different demographic characteristics across the two areas. So, it's not relevant (unintelligible).

(Sunshine): A number of people brought this up, but you think I can (unintelligible).

(John): Well, I'm actually aware of very clear answers to the questions that you are asking. But I think that there's probably some benefit in having them asked and answered.

(Barbara): So, should I get rid of Four?

(Sunshine): Well, maybe...

(Andrew Stanwick): (Unintelligible) no.

(Sunshine): ...this is one where rather than why was this case we would appreciate additional white papers or material that is available about the 2016 test.

(Andrew Stanwick): (Unintelligible)

(Sunshine): And not just why this occurred but I think about the 2016.

(Barbara): Is that better?

Woman: I don't think it's only about why it disappeared. I would like to see more of the findings in general from the test, some of the details. They were very general.

(Sunshine): I actually have a specific recommendation perhaps or a request that maybe scheduling a follow-up call on the 2016 for those that are interested in learning more information.

(John): So, I'll try not to... I was hoping Ms. (Shereen) would come back. But my understanding of the public plan for the 2020 census is that it has publication checkpoints added where certain results that are being relied upon will be published in full.

I know that we have already been briefed on drafts of the - of exactly what you're asking for. So, there exists a detailed analysis of the 2016 test. And there exists a schedule for publishing that as a part of the ongoing plans of the 2020 census.

So, what I don't know because I'm not - I don't have those (unintelligible) charts memorized as exactly where 2020 is in the publication process. So, my expectation is asking for more detail on the 2020 test.

We'll get you guys a briefing on the paper that's in preparation about those test results which would be a lot more than you saw in the slide presentation.

(Barbara): Should we take it out if it's going to come out soon anyway? Should we take it out if it's going to come out soon anyway?

(Sunshine): Well, I guess the thing that I would, you know... If it's appropriate and this is where the beginning of the section started is if it is useful for us to know in order to make recommendations for what's to (unintelligible).

If 2016 they're saying it's not going to inform any decision still, you know, and what they ultimately are going to produce with this, you know, report or

analysis is - you know, it's done deal. But I would love to hear even before it's actually published if that is something that is - we are able to.

(Barbara): How about we say we would appreciate a briefing on this if there is opportunity for input to affect future decisions? What do you think? What do you think?

(Sunshine): I just did the full stop after the briefing, but...

(Barbara): We would appreciate a briefing on this, right? That okay? On the Census 2016 test, right? That's what we're saying, right?

(Sunshine): I guess I'm trying to figure out would we... Given that we don't know the state at which whatever official record is being produced will be available widely. Would it be more timely to request a briefing as opposed to just (unintelligible) material.

(Barbara): Is this what you want me to say? (Unintelligible).

(Sunshine): We're looking - I mean my view is, is I'd like to get whatever is most timely. And if they're not willing to share something that is

(Barbara) (Unintelligible).

(Sunshine): ...in production, right, that they might be willing to brief on it...

Woman: No, it's not...

(Sunshine): ...then that would be my preference.

Woman: ...available.

(Barbara): How's that? That okay?

(Sunshine): Is not - hang on... Would soon...

(Barbara): What do you want it to say? If reported, will not be available by when?

(Sunshine): First of year.

Woman: Well, I in some ways think the briefing might be more in person you say was the exchange, so that we could actually provide feedback. If we read the report, then we have to figure out if we actually have feedback to call them and organize something.

(Barbara): If it's just a briefing or information, we can ask informational questions, but we can't really make comments. If we want something where we're going to make comments, I think there has to be a national register notice and all that.

Woman: So, basically it's too late for us to make any recommendations based on the 2016 test then.

(Barbara): I think so.

(Sunshine): Right. But - and this gets to where ultimately what I am trying to tease out. What I would love to get sooner rather than later, right, but certainly before the next meeting is a timeline and what decisions can still be made.

And in particular, as we'll get to, with respect to user experience, what is the research being planned so that, you know, if it's too late to affect 2017, can

we get sufficient information so that we could actually make recommendations at the next meeting that will in fact have an impact on the 2018 test?

And so I think we have to be requesting things, you know, in between meetings so...

(Barbara): Do we want to leave the first sentence as it is and then say we would like to receive a timeline of when various decisions are going to be made regarding the 2020 Census. Is that what you're saying?

(Sunshine): Yes. I definitely would.

(Irma): And maybe there they can identify where the CSAC can provide inputs, and on what particular areas they would like us to keep them (informed) on. Because it seems like we have up these tests, but it's always too late to give us any feedback.

((Crosstalk)).

(Sunshine): So it's – we have a timeline for 2020, right? It's very bird-eye level. What I'm curious about is the 2018. It's done, right? But 2018 is, well, where we need to have influence, if I can give input.

What?

(Tom): It's called the End-to-End Test.

(Barbara): Okay. 2018 End-to-End Test.

How's that?

(Sunshine): So except I actually want all of those things still explicitly that we're requesting available papers and materials regarding the 2016 test, regarding the use of administrative records.

And you could probably do papers/slash materials, because if there's additional, you know, PowerPoints, that would be fine too, but I don't know if white papers are the standard or...

(Barbara): How's that?

How's that?

(Sunshine): I'm not sure we need the first "in this."

(Barbara): What?

(Sunshine): I'm not sure we need the first "in this" on four.

(Barbara): Oh, okay, I'll get rid of it then. Even more direct by the moment, which is probably good. Is that all right now?

(Sunshine): And then in some ways this is perhaps Point Number 1 as opposed to, you know, four down, order-wise.

(Barbara): Right. This is... I think we can get rid of 1 and make this one the first one.

(Sunshine): Yes.

(Irma): Also Number 3 mentions that administrative records, and now you could have administrative records Number 4. So you might be able to get rid of Number 3 as well.

(Sunshine): Right.

On Number 2, and I think others will see it as you scroll, we – the request for the specific letters and brochures used in 2016 is really part of a broader request about understanding what has been done with regard to user experience, but also knowledgeable about what is planned going forward. So I don't know if you want to incorporate that into a...

(Barbara): You mean 2 and 3 is what you're talking about?

(Sunshine): No. Number 3, I think, is now covered with the use of administrative records, so you could delete it.

(Barbara): Like, Number 1.

(Sunshine): Sorry, yes. So Number 3 is now part of Number 1.

(Barbara): Okay.

(Sunshine): Although — yes. I think it's covered.

Number 2 and Number 4, again, could be consolidated and, again, the request is to — well, there's both requests and — requests for more information, and if the Committee is comfortable with it, the specific recommendations.

So we – I don't know if you want to start with the specific recommendation. It might be somewhere further down. Right. So there's some material that you have down there about the user experience and doing lab testing, but again, I think all of this kind of goes together.

(Barbara): Are we still on the numbered things or are we...what? Below Number 4, I guess, it talks about user experience — testing of the online self-response.

(Tom): On the right. (Sunshine), it seems to me that the new Number 1 is different from the old Number 3. This says “administrative records in the 2020 Census.” The other one says “that were used in the ‘16 test.” They sound different.

(Sunshine): Maybe we can...

((Crosstalk)).

(Tom): I don't think we know what's going to be in the 2020.

(Irma): Well maybe you can say 2016, 2017 and 2018. Or at least 2016 and 2017, right?

(Sunshine): Oh, yes. So instead of – so about the 2016 Census test analysis and more details about the administrative records used. Then we might need an additional sentence that says, “We would also like more information about which administrative records are being considered for the 2020.”

(Barbara): Is that right now?

(Sunshine): Mm-hm.

So Number 3 could start with the general statement, “We request more background material about the user experience and the 2016 test.”

(Barbara): Is that okay?

(Sunshine): Yes. And I believe that we’ll be able to incorporate — so what I’m hoping we can have is also an explicit recommendation. I don’t know if you want it part of Number 3, or we have this section under Number 4.

(Barbara): What do you want me to do? All right, what do you want me to do?

(Sunshine): So scroll down. I forget what started the bullets or the numbering at this point.

(Barbara): The timeline.

(Sunshine): Well, requests for information. So that is a request for information. A specific recommendation is that the Census Bureau conduct user experience research on a small scale in the lab.

(Barbara): Where are you? I’m sorry.

(Irma): You can make like a list of recommendations below that request for information. Like have another subheading that says, “We also make the following recommendations.” And then have...

(Sunshine): So I think you could just take that paragraph that is underneath Number 4.

(Irma): Yes.

- (Sunshine): Start it with, “We recommend...” and move it to Point Number 3.
- (Irma): About subcontractors? Maybe we just have a list of recommendations.
- (Barbara): I’m lost about where you are.
- (Sunshine): So where the paragraph that starts “User experience testing, the online self-response to be happening in the lab, not only the major tests.” And so you could just make that sentence to start with “CSAC recommends that user experience testing be done.”
- (Barbara): Right. Is that okay?
- (Sunshine): So, again, I think it never hurts to reiterate the point. Perhaps after that “CSAC recommends” sentence, “The online interface will be the way that most Americans...”
- (Barbara): We have that later. We (can see if) and then move it up.
- (Sunshine): Okay.
- (Tom): The first sentence should be saying it should be done in the lab, not happening in the lab.
- (Irma): And there should be a “should” somewhere.
- (Barbara): Done in the lab. “Recommends that it be done.” So we still need the sentence about Young and Rubicon. Do we still need the sentence about Young and Rubicon?

(Sunshine): Sure. It could be put up into Number 3, because there's what's being done internally at the Census Bureau, but also if there is something that they are planning.

I guess the thing that I thought — and Barbara, you probably saw this as well — is that with the ACS message testing, it certainly had the flavor of they just said, “Marketing firm, run with it.”

And the kind of randomization that happened made it difficult, I thought, to clearly tease apart different aspects of the messaging, and I, you know, anyways, I just want to hear more about how – what the Census Bureau is doing internally, plus what Y&R will be bringing separately to the table.
Okay?

So I think perhaps people should weigh in. My thought would be, is that three small working groups...

(Barbara): (Unintelligible).

(Sunshine): ...about the 2020 would be useful. And what this would allow is once we have more background material for informational phone calls, and so on, so that by the next meeting, the people who have been on those working groups are able to bring a lot more background than I think we felt like we had this time with the 2020 updates.

So the three that we had discussed yesterday in our small group — one was on user experience. This would cover things like the online interface, the communication and messaging.

Then one would be on system integration and stress testing. So this would cover things like working across a variety of vendors, concerns about security, cyberattack.

And then the third would be on the use of administrative records and non-response follow-up.

You know, from what my understanding was, these are three kind of broad areas where people could really deep-dive in. What I don't, again, have a sense of is, you know, is – are things so set on administrative records that someone investing a lot of time to really get their hands dirty and learn about it, is that a waste of CSAC member time?

(Barbara): I've asked that kind of question — maybe I didn't ask it very well — in various settings. Which administrative records are being considered? What is going to be used? When a decision is going to be made, you go to administrative records? And I've never gotten anything which I considered a satisfactory answer.

(Tom): I suggest you request a briefing from the...

Man: The decisions are out there but I don't know, I can't remember exactly, but it's in our operational plan as to when we have to make decisions about administrative records.

(Sunshine): Well, what records were you thinking of?

(Barbara): Well, we asked them what records are being considered and all that to try to have some input into what records might be used, and I always have gotten extremely unsatisfying and vague answers. I don't either.

(Sunshine): Yes? (Andrew)?

(Andrew Stanwick): I always feel like we ask questions, and they are maybe a part of some other briefing. It always seems to come up. So perhaps this third working group, the use of administrative records, is relevant beyond non-response follow-up in the Decennial Census.

So I would suggest a working group focused on the ways in which administrative records are being used broadly across Census, and perhaps its first topic could be this one, since this one has a greater sense of urgency.

And I think the working group would get the briefing and the materials and then help this group formulate better responses than — you know, like we ask this question, and we never get a satisfactory answer, which, you know, it's colored through a lens of, you know, in the context of two days of meetings, we don't ever get — we don't ever feel like we have the right input here.

(Barbara): Well, should the third one be about use of administrative records?

(Sunshine): I'm in support of that.

(Tom): Can I ask a question? Are your briefings by Census and your working groups on the public record, or is it just this meeting that's on the public record?

(Barbara): Just this meeting. Working groups don't have to be on the public record.

(Tom): So I think you should request a briefing from the Decennial Statistical Studies Division on the planned uses of administrative records in the 2020 Census. I've seen several excellent briefings on the subject. They seem to answer the

questions that you've been asking here, and I don't see any reason why in a non-public setting that wouldn't be provided.

(Sunshine): Yes. I like that.

Man: I would like to leave the in-house address canvassing in there somewhere. Especially with the test coming up in 2016, I think it would be useful to get some insight on that.

(Barbara): Did you say including in-house address canvassing?

Man: Yes. What you just deleted.

(Tom): Could I make one further point on this subject? There was a public session at the 2016 JSM that included (Tom Newley)'s presentation on administrative records and several other extremely well-prepared talks on very specific aspects of the research underlying the 2020 Census.

And those are all on the record, and so I do not know whether their papers were cleared for the proceedings. Usually that doesn't happen, but their presentations were cleared, and they're in the program.

Man: (Tom), you're right. They've also been presented at the quarterly meetings for the (regular) several times.

(Barbara): Is this okay now?

(Sunshine): I would propose that we could then cut the "How is the Census evaluated; which records are useful?"

(Barbara): Let me check something further down. Just a second.

Yes?

(Tom): That question was actually answered.

(Barbara): Which one?

(Tom): About internet response from personal equipment at libraries.

(Barbara): Yes, we can get rid of that. This one, right?

(Sunshine): My sense would be they test for scalability and (peak) low (advantagement) would be captured within the working group and so could either be moved up there.

(Barbara): I'll get rid of it, if it's in there. And then this is a little bit more stuff you were saying, I think, (Sunshine), about the user experience and all that.

(Sunshine): Right. So I hate to lose these notes, because I think they're useful for the working committee, or the working group, but I'm not sure that it needs to be part of what is sent as official record.

(Barbara): So should I get read of the paragraph about the videos?

(Sunshine): Yes.

(Barbara): Okay.

(Sunshine): I mean, my own view is that non-ID option — I don't know, in terms of who asked this question, but part of that is the user interface as well. But the non-ID option...

(Barbara): Yes?

(Sunshine): I wasn't sure if maybe is it worth supporting — again, it's a tough question for the Census Bureau to answer. I wonder if do we want more information on that? Do we want just one of the working committees to...

(Barbara): I think (John) was saying something.

(John): It's not hard to answer for us. We really want to do this. And we realize that it's not widely used, but it is an opportunity to reach out to very mobile parts of the population, most of whom are non-white, that we might be able to get a self-response. So even though it's low, if we can get that percentage of that population to respond, we'd be really pleased.

(Barbara): I think this has been decided, so we can get rid of it.

((Crosstalk)).

(John): The only issue we had with non-ID, the big issue is the security issue. That's the big issue.

(Barbara): Okay.

(Sunshine): So I think that both of those last two — unless somebody objects — we could get rid of. The Census mobile units and then the MTV – MTV? Does that still exist?

(Barbara): Is it okay if I get rid of that (Allison)?

(Allison Plyer): And I'm not quite sure where it's going to show up again, honestly.

(Sunshine): True.

(Allison Plyer): I was thinking about that too, so then I thought, it could just be here and then...

(Sunshine): Okay. Fine. Yes, don't delete it. That's something to leave.

(Barbara): These are mainly the things people said in the meeting. I can keep going? Are we all right? What?

(John): I think you need to re-number.

(Barbara): No you don't, because 1 has 5 in front of it.

(John): Oh, I see. Okay.

(Tom): (Unintelligible).

(Barbara): What?

(Tom): It might be something we will through it all too...(Unintelligible).

(Barbara): Now on to disclosure avoidance. We mainly just said we liked it.

(Sunshine): Yes, and again this is maybe part of a bigger point or a bigger recommendation is that it was so useful to have (John)'s supplemental material available to us prior to the meeting.

(Barbara): I think I said something about that later that we'll get to, but if I didn't then remind me to come back, okay?

Let me just slow down and make sure — I may have dreamed that I did. Maybe I didn't. Okay, sorry. Okay. So maybe you should add where it says, "It would be desirable to have more of the presentations be backed up with materials such as this one was." Does that sound okay?

(Sunshine): And actually I don't know if this is maybe even something that (Sarah) or (Barbara) that you might be able to do is that, you know, I know that presentations kind of come in somewhat frantically, you know, right before the meeting.

But you know, (John) has been able to, you know, be able to point us to lots of background material that, again, would really enhance our ability to make this a productive meeting. And I wish there was somebody's eyes on some of the presentations in time to be able to request oftentimes what is material that probably already exists.

(Barbara): I think that's right.

(Sunshine): And so maybe one possibility would be that anytime we have a Census presenter that we, you know, follow up with the question of are there white papers or...

(Barbara): Well, we've asked for this before. And it hasn't always really happened. That there'd be the relevant documents put on the CSAC Web site, and it often hasn't happened. Can we go on? Who will boil the ocean? Want to clarify what that means?

((Crosstalk)).

(Barbara): Okay.

(Sunshine): I don't know if this an appropriate place, or maybe it's already in here with the ACS, but I would just say that it seems to me like the relationship between the fact that we have an ACS working group and then the relationship between CSAC and the ACS seems like a real model, in a lot of respects.

(Barbara): I think it's been working great. How's that? It's been great.

Here I collected together things people have said that didn't really fit under anything. The second thing is really important, and we've said that a million times – about two million times in discussion. And this was just my idea on the second paragraph, that in presentations, it take no more than 2/3 of the time. Yes, (Tom)?

(Tom): I support that.

(John): So if I remember right, and I may not, because I don't remember a lot of things, but I think we had specific recommendations along presentation lines maybe two meetings ago. Something like 15 minutes. And I thought that the agenda was supposed to reflect those – that timing of those.

(Barbara): Well, for things like the 2020 update, I don't think it could take 15 minutes. And I think it's – my opinion is reasonable that different topics have different amounts of time.

A few meetings ago, the presentations sometimes went on so long that there was hardly any time for the official discussion. So this was better than that. But the presentations often still took way, way too much time. That's why I was trying to put it into a percentage of the allocated time, which varies by topic. Does that make sense?

(Irma): (Barbara), can I add something?

(Barbara): Yes.

(Irma): I think in the past, I think also a few meetings ago, we recommended that in the end of the presentations, the staff would be very clear about where they want our input. And so it was interesting. For example, the economics, you know, they told us a lot where they'd been, and but with the remaining unresolved questions that they still had, that we could have provided input.

(Barbara): Why don't I put something in about that?

(Irma): Yes, that they should be very specific. Give us some idea, even in advance, that we could think about what ways it's that they're seeking our input.

(John): That's consistent with what the Data Users Advisory Committee does at BLS. They have generally shorter presentations, and every one of them ends with two or three questions for the discussant and the full committee to respond to. And presumably there are things that BLS really wants an answer to and will make use of.

- (Irma): That happened (unintelligible) three or four meetings ago at least once, but then things have disappeared again.
- (Barbara): We also suggest that each Census presenter make clear where he or she, at the end of the presentation. Make clear where he or she could benefit from Census CSAC input. Is that okay?
- (John): I think the “he or she” makes it too personalized. I think it’s the Agency or the Program.
- (Barbara): Okay. Where the Census. I didn’t want to use “they” as... “where the Census could benefit from CSAC input.” Is that okay?
- (John): (Barbara), I still think 2/3 is far too long.
- (Barbara): Half?
- (John): At most. I mean, if you got an hour session, that’s a 40-minute presentation. Maybe 10 or 15 minutes’ discussant. And two quick questions.
- (Barbara): Is that okay now? Half of the allotted time?
- (John): I would go less than that, personally, but...
- (Barbara): One-third?
- (John): Well, I think there’s a lot of content that we need to see before we can have the context to react to. So I wouldn’t necessarily put in a percentage. What I

would rather see is that if we're being given a whole mass of stuff, that it be broken into segments.

(Barbara): Okay. How about, "We recommend that the presentation generally take no more than 1/3 of the allotted time?" One problem was...

(Irma): But I would also say that the presentation focus is not 90% of the time on where they've been, but how where they've been informs the decisions that they need to make and where we can give input."

Because much of it is it's great to hear where you've been, and you've done great stuff, but okay, we can have no input to that process anymore. So how where you've been and where you've gotten now has put you in a critical position to try to plan for the future and ways that we can.

So more on emphasis in the presentation on the critical decisions that have to be made and less on telling us what they did for the past two years or year-and-a-half.

Highlight the accomplishments, because I think that's important to know, and I know that they would like to — and so highlight the accomplishments, and raise the issues that need further thinking or input.

(John): I agree with that, and I would just add that, you know, the recommendation I would make would either to only put in needle-moving bullets. You know, positive or negative, and summarize the, you know, significant accomplishments and significant challenges, you know, to wrap it up.

And if we are provided with materials ahead of time, you know, the deep dive can be done on our time, and then while we're here we can get into the issues and accomplishments and have more time to discuss.

(Barbara): What do you want me to change in terms of what's written out? Is that okay?

(John): I think it's all right. I was just agreeing with what (Irma) said.

(Barbara): So then, is the next paragraph not needed? I think we've already said it. Maybe we don't need this administrative data one, since you've already said that we want one.

(John): We should just be clear on which working groups we want. Should all three of them be so focused on the Decennial Census?

(Sunshine): One of them was, I thought, about administrative data more generally.

(John): It could be. But we would have to say that more explicitly than we did above.

(Sunshine): Perhaps you can just cut it above and...

(Barbara): Above where?

(Sunshine): Get rid of administrative records when it was under 2020, and instead, just move whatever point was made about the 2020 down here.

(Barbara): Okay. Two working groups here.

(Irma): But someone said they wanted to have the in-house address canvassing still included, and now that disappeared, right? Not the in-address canvassing; that was just going to be the administrative records.

(Barbara): How's that? How's that? Can we stretch for five minutes and then go through it again for anything we missed? Is that all right? Well, after, whatever. Come back refreshed, invigorated.

Oh, I wanted the return button. We don't have to be done until 3:30. I thought we would be done 2:30. We can go through and, yes, I got mixed up. Yes. I think we're doing okay. Especially if we only have to be done by 3:30. R-I-M-F-E-Y?

Woman: Yes.

(Barbara): As well as other (numerous). Okay?

Woman: Yes.

(Barbara): I'm very tired. I got up at 5:00 both days. I was determined that (to do it). And I wanted to get it done and not have to do editorial anything, because the legal aspect of what's just editorial get a little hazy.

This is the first part of economic programs. May I keep going? What?

((Crosstalk)).

(Barbara): Well, maybe so. I don't know if I can email – this is the way to email to all the members. All these people. I'm trying to figure out how to do it.

((Crosstalk)).

(Sunshine): We can start. Yes. We don't need it.

(Barbara): Tell me if there's things you want changed, and when I can move on. Keep going?

(Sunshine): Thank you.

(Barbara): It's okay. I can (unintelligible). Thank you. Sorry to bother you. And just keep going?

(Sunshine): Yes.

(Barbara): Okay? Flip through big data? Census Update. Okay, go on? Okay?

(Sunshine): So there's redundancy, I think, in this paragraph. CSAC recommends that user experience testing — that really is part of, so you just cut and paste that paragraph to the point about to, I believe, it's Number 3.

(Barbara): Oh, okay.

(Irma): Three is the responsibility...

(Sunshine): Oh, and this is the — see, I don't know who are recommendations to follow directly from the — oh, got you.

(Barbara): Yes, it's one we've moved...

((Crosstalk)).

(Barbara): Okay. Oh. I'll get rid of that.

(Sunshine): So this sentence it says, "Could follow up with 2016 online responders." I don't know if that – does that incomplete sentence make sense?

(Barbara): Wait, where are you?

(Sunshine): In the same Number 2. "What are perceptions about security? One possibility is to conduct a follow-up study."

(Barbara): Why are we doing this?

(Irma): And maybe you could integrate the last one, and include some feedback. Make a (notation) in the 2017 test.

(Barbara): Is that okay now? Shall we go on? Yes? Go on?

We're doing better than we thought we would. I'm sorry to have bothered you. Thank you so much. I think these A through E, I should indent farther.

Yes. I'm sorry. Is that better? It doesn't look as stupid. Well, it doesn't. Okay?

Makes it a little better English. You get an (essential sense of what). Okay?

No, I thought you needed more time to look at that. Do we need the last paragraph? I don't think it adds anything. Get rid of it?

(John): It was mine. You can let it go.

(Barbara): I wasn't trying to insult you.

(John): I don't feel insulted.

(Barbara): I'm glad. Are we done? We're done.

(John): Congratulations.

((Crosstalk)).

(Barbara): I may clap. So (John), where do I send this? It's all done.

((Crosstalk)).

(Barbara): I'm also going to send it to (Begley) email address. Oh, golly. (Unintelligible), can you help me with your email so I don't mess it up?

(Sunshine): (Unintelligible).

(Barbara): And then I need to attach the right file.

(Sunshine): I will copy all the CSAC members as soon as I receive it. When I know I've got good (unintelligible).

(Barbara): And I'll now open it to make sure it's the right — and there.

((Crosstalk)).

(Barbara): Thank you. What?

((Crosstalk)).

(Barbara): That's okay. Thank you, gang.

Man: I'd like to lead...

(Barbara): Oh, we have to do presentations.

(Irma): Do I have to do anything...

((Crosstalk)).

Man: No, no. There's a question, (Kristen)?

(Barbara): We don't have to do anything to present it more, do I?

Man: No. Thank you very much. The meeting is ended and thanks to everyone who did all the work behind the scenes. We're seeing some of them, but thank you very much and committeemen. Thank you.

END