DRB minutes for Nov 13

5. 65,000 requirement. This item was moved up in the agenda to include (b) (6),
   representing ACSO special tabs. Discussion lasted 40 minutes.

It was pointed out that quality is already pretty bad at the 75,000 level for some
counts; we looked at the confidence intervals in a profile of an area with pop 100,000.
They are pretty big for the numbers shown, some parts of the profile were suppressed.
On the other hand, some numbers are clearly based on one sample case and are
shown. The quality rule being enforced doesn't act evenly from a confidentiality
perspective.

There are many common points with vastly different precedents. In special census
tabulations, we do profiles (omitting race hispanicity or applying a threshold for it?).
We use a set of thresholds motivated mostly to guarantee that we have an effective
swap going on in the data. Census profiles went out for all places. For profiles that
involved race/hisp we used a 50 unweighted threshold. In another instance (?) we
had a threshold of 300 interviewees. We have been very conservative with user
defined areas in the past.

What role do profiles based on one year have within the publication scheme?

In the end, the "3 sample cases from 3 different households" rule won out. This
means doing complementary suppressions both within tables and across geography
(implied tables if the geography is incomplete and complementaries when the profile
is available for some sum of tables. All user defined geography must use tract or
tract aggregates as its building block.

We will continue to see profile requests on a case by case basis, at least for the time
being. We will revise the ruling from last week on New York County to reflect the 3-
3 rule.

1. ST081 San Fernando Valley. This was approved under the new rule.

2. ST082 LA68. This was approved under the new rule, (b) (6) will look at the
   geography.

3. Metropolitan Area Exports. An addition to the table set and a new suppression
   pattern. This was approved.

4. ST075-5 (b) (6). This is almost PUMSable (unweighted numbers cant be
   derived) Rounding and state level should compensate for the unweighted column.

5. Preliminary discussion of the SIPP/IRS/SSA puf.