

Center for Strategic and International Studies

TRANSCRIPT

Event

Federal Statistics For Economic Security
“Statistical System Innovation”

DATE

Thursday, November 6, 2025 at 1:00 p.m. ET

FEATURING

Calandra Cruickshank

CEO and Founder, StateBook International

Amy O’Hara

Professor, Massive Data Institute, and Executive Director of the Federal Statistical Research Data Center, McCourt School for Public Policy, Georgetown University

Robert Sheets

Fellow, U.S. Chamber of Commerce Foundation

CSIS EXPERTS

Andrew Reamer

Research Professor, George Washington University; Senior Associate (Non-resident), Economic Security and Technology Department, CSIS

Transcript By

Superior Transcriptions LLC

www.superiortranscriptions.com

Andrew Reamer: Good afternoon, everybody. I'm Andrew Reamer, non-resident scholar with CSIS, research professor, George Washington University. This is the show and tell portion of the program. The topic is innovation in the statistical system. We're going to hear from three presenters regarding innovations in statistics, in particular the development of new relationships between public and private data providers.

So, with us we have Amy O'Hara, who's a research professor at the Massive Data Institute, and the executive director of the Federal Statistical Research Data Center at the McCourt School for Public Policy at Georgetown. Calandra Cruickshank is CEO and founder of StateBook International, a location intelligence company providing strategic insights powered by data science to inform the optimal locations for investment across industries. So that was a free infomercial there. (Laughter.) And Bob Sheets, who is with us from Chicago, who's a fellow with the U.S. Chamber of Commerce Foundation, a former colleague of mine at George Washington University, the Institute of Public Policy. And Bob focuses on federal and state economic and workforce development policy and labor market information.

So, what we're going to do is have seven, eight minutes of presentations by each of these. Bob and Calandra have slides. Amy doesn't. She would, and she can explain why, because of the government shutdown. And then we'll open it up to questions about what you just heard from them, because my expectation is you haven't – you haven't heard of any of these efforts. Bob's going to talk about the efforts of the chamber foundation to create new relationships between the federal statistical agencies, state employment agencies, and the private sector. Calandra's is going to talk about the data products that her firm provides that integrate federal and non-federal data, state data, and private data. And Amy is going to talk about work that she is doing as a professor regarding the development of new methods, innovative methods, regarding federal statistics.

So, with that, we'll start with Bob Sheets, who has a slide show. And, Bob, take it away.

Bob Sheets: Thanks, Andrew. And thanks so much for the opportunity to participate on the panel today, and the opportunity to share information on two chamber – U.S. Chamber of Commerce Foundation projects led by Jason Tyszko, who couldn't join today. And we hope that – we will share this information on two projects that we hope will have implications for your discussion on

improving federal statistical system, especially the collection of employer administrative records, lowering costs, improving data quality and timeliness, which I think are some of the topics that were in previous discussions today.

The first project I was going to talk about is JEDx. It's the Jobs and Employment Data Exchange project, which I'll focus most on today. And this started in 2021 and has continued to today with support from the Gates, Strade Education, and Sloan Foundations. And then a new project that was launched in August, called the New Data Paradigm project that builds on JEDx, but takes a larger perspective on the collection, management, and use of both education and workforce data. So those are the two projects I'll be talking about today.

So, first of all, on JEDx, what is that? Assuming many of you have never heard that acronym, or know about the project, but it's been a project focused on public-private standards-based – it's a project that focuses on the consistent sharing and use of data on jobs, employment. And when I use – we use the word “standards,” what we're talking about are both data standards, which in this case, like data model and definitions, but also technology standards. And we'll be talking about those as well. And when we talk about public-private, JEDx is founded on the idea of collaboration between the public and private sectors with voluntary consensus standards organizations. In this case, for JEDx, it's the HR Open Standards Consortia, which is one of the leading global standards bodies for employer HR data. And it is dedicated to standardization for the sharing of data internal – especially internal to the employer.

For example, we're – and we're also building on best practices for how employers and HR technology service providers actually organize, define, and share. The general idea is, let's start from a better understanding on the innovations on the private side on how this is done. As many of you probably know, in any sort of government reporting many times that requires an HR system – employer HR systems, who may be diverse systems, to share data to compile reports. For example, payroll data, time and attendance, general HR, applicant tracking systems. These are generally types of HR systems that hold data that have to be integrated to produce reports internally for employers but also reports to government. So, what we're trying to do is build on some of those leaders in that area for this project – for the JEDx project.

So that kind of gives you a sense of what is JEDx. JEDx has historically – is our – JEDx is a broader perspective – a broader

project on improving the sharing of data for a variety of use cases, including government reporting but also how employers share data with their – with their talent partners, like education and training partners and others, like job description, job posting data as well, but also for the issuing of LERs, which has been a focus of the Chamber Foundation for quite a few years. And those are individually controlled and verifiable digital records on individuals' formal and informal learning and employment. But, again, I'll talk about that a little bit later, but, again, the focus of my discussion today is on government reporting.

So, it is focused on improving government reporting, starting with state UI and related federal programs that produce some of the most widely used statistical series for jobs, wages by industry, and by occupation. We are doing this through three strategies. Again, we're talking about data standardization. There was a lot of discussion earlier today about harmonization but improving data standardization across federal and state statistical – I mean, federal and state collection systems, which could include program data collection – for example, UI, new hire, the upcoming data collection for Medicaid – so data collected for program administration as well as statistical reporting. We're focused on the need for data standardization across – think about how it is for employers to respond to data requests based upon different definitions of what's being asked and how they map it back to how they hold that data. So, we're talking about public-private data standardization.

The second one is on modernizing government reporting, moving toward the use of API integration. As I mentioned before, the leading practices in employers is data integration through APIs that allow you to connect payroll, time and attendance, general HR data together. The leading practices are through API integration based upon data standards. And so, what we're trying to do is extend that to modernize – imagine now we extend that so the sharing partner is with the government agency as well. So, can we take those leading practices and modernize government reporting through the use of public-private API standards? And, again, we've done a JEDx API prototype based upon standards developed in cooperation with HR Open Standards Consortium.

The third strategy is on consolidation. I think Andrew did a great report with JEDx, with Steve Saxton on the number of federal and state collection systems that employers need to respond to, and all the differences. And what we've learned in doing surveys now with employers, in cooperation with SHRM, is that the number one issue in the JEDx value proposition employers embrace is fewer reports,

consolidate reports in a standardized way to modernize reporting, but fewer reports which will reduce cost, improve data quality and timeliness.

Again, which I mentioned before, is we are talking about the use of the data also for public and private – I want to emphasize – public and private workforce analytics and government program administration. And, again, I just mentioned we have more – we want to ensure that when employers share data with government we want to encourage that they do it consistently with the data they share with partners about job needs and as well as issuing LERs so we have consistent sharing of data across the three different use cases, including government reporting.

When I talked about the three strategies, I'd like to just provide some examples. When we look about the need for data standardization, it is for critical building blocks of a lot of federal statistical – I mean, a lot of collection systems. And again, probably the number – one of the biggest moves in innovations in the state UI, including Bryan's team in South Carolina, is adding job information to UI wage – to UI wage records. Again, states have different approaches. And also, the definitions for guidance for those things are different with federal data collection. Work location. Think about the implications of remote work. And we have two different approaches for work location and collection systems. One is tying the individual to an establishment, which allows for industry coding and location of where somebody reports to receive guidance from. But also, primary work location, where somebody actually carries out that work.

We have issues around different definitions of hours. We have people that talk about hours totally paid versus only hours that were actually worked. Different definitions of that. Then there's differences in how you define compensation. In the UI world it's total wages. But, again, compensation is different. So, we see, in JEDx we've been working on different standardization approaches for some of these basic building blocks that are important in moving the strategy on standardization forward.

Dr. Reamer: Bob, just in the interest of time, can you just wrap up in a couple minutes?

Dr. Sheets: Yeah. This will be the last answer. And then we've done a pilot test in cooperation with many different partners for actually testing the collection using an API, along with the standardized data package, with partners, again, from South Carolina, Arkansas, and BLS. And if

I can just say that next – we’re just promoting continuing JEDx and the New Data Paradigm project, which is a broader discussion. And just for more information you can – these are some links for more information. Thank you, Andrew.

Dr. Reamer: Thank you, Bob. And we’ll be back to you with questions.

Calandra. And can we put up Calandra’s slides, please?

Calandra Cruickshank: Hi, everyone. I’m Calandra Cruickshank. And I’m founder and CEO of StateBook International, which is a location intelligence company. And we actually have developed a patented platform that aggregates federal data and state and private data, and does the work of harmonizing it, and synthesizing it, and geocoding it, and figuring out how to trend across data points when, you know, 50 percent of the Census tracts shape files can change in every given year as populations grow and shrink and so forth. And what we do, we’ve heard a lot today about breaking down data silos and the importance of that, and the importance of interagency data sharing, and so forth.

So, what we do is we actually aggregate the data across all different federal agencies, the Census, of course, BLS, BEA, Transportation, Energy, Education, Health, Housing, NOAA, FEMA, FAA, Tax Foundation, and many others. So, this is just a sampling. And we have harmonized it in a platform that makes the data searchable, comparable, and filterable across the entire United States. We originally built the platform for corporate site selection, helping Fortune 500 companies figure out where they were going to move their next headquarters, or open a new manufacturing facility, and so forth. And quickly realized that economic development organizations were the other side of that coin.

And so, we built a platform that allows both of them to use the data for economic development, business attraction, retention, expansion, economic strategy and planning, and so forth. And we’ve come to realize that the data is market and sector agnostic. So, it’s taking all of these different disparate data sets and combining different data points in different ways for insights for each sector. And, well, just on the other side of that, you see we have over 74.2 billion data points across the United States. And in part that’s because we have the data at a variety of different geography levels. So, we keep it for nationwide, for every state, MSA, county, city, Census tract, and block group, and wherever the data exists at those levels, and then congressional district and school district. And we’re in the process of adding ZIP codes.

So, you can look at the data for any region across all of the different federal agencies and so forth, as well as private data. And what we've done is we've developed what we call microsites for every one of those geography levels. So, you can go do a search across different parameters that are of importance to your project and find the locations that are optimal for those particular projects. And then you can do a deep dive into any geography level that you're interested in. And we map the data. All of our data is fully interactive. So, it's mapped in GIS mapping. It's configurable. It's tables, charts, graphs. You can compare geographies. There's a lot of interactivity and customization. And it's all fully exportable, so you can add those visualizations to your grant applications, or reports, or what have you.

And I thought it might be helpful to share a couple of quick use case examples. So here you're looking at FEMA National Risk Index in Washington, D.C. You can identify a particular Census tract as an example that is high risk. And then you can go in and say, OK, we know very often people in poverty live in high risk areas. And so, what percent of that population is in poverty? What is the age of housing stock in that area? And what percent of it might not be up to current building codes, and if hardened that could make the area more resilient? You could identify how many people might need translation services to know what to do in a disaster event, because they don't speak English. And you could identify how many first responders or healthcare providers might be available in the area to respond to a disaster and then identify which industries are in the area that might be impacted, and what infrastructure such as bridges, dams, power lines, airports, et cetera, might be impacted.

And then one other example I wanted to share actually, was at the onset of COVID we did a project with Moody's Analytics. They came to us and said that their midsize bank clients were in a panic over what impact COVID would have on their real estate loan portfolio. And so, we took their portfolio data in, their real estate loan portfolio data, and worked a lot of magic with that – but that's not in these screenshots because a lot of that was proprietary. But what we did that I can share was that we took their portfolio, mapped it, and then we were able to show them, for example, you know, what was the income and age of different people in the area of their multifamily – in this case, multifamily unit. And then, looking at the income, looking at education attainment.

Very importantly, we looked at what percent of the population around that multifamily unit was employed in retail and hospitality,

so might have been unemployed or furloughed at that moment, versus how many people were employed in finance or, you know, management, so probably could work from home and still had an income. So very quickly the bank knew, before the developers even knew, that that developer was going to be coming to them for a workout on that loan, because some percentage of people were, you know, not going to be able to continue to pay their rent because they were furloughed, or what have you.

Another example, we took their hospitality portfolio and brought in Producer Price Index data, hotel – national hotel employment statistics, and other data to show how the national hotel industry was performing. And then they could compare that to the local hotels that they had loans against, and see what was happening for those particular properties. And then, very importantly, we bring in a lot of private data. So, in this case, we brought in mobility data from cellphone signals so that we could show people coming to this hotel before COVID, you know, came from these locations. And during COVID, at the height of COVID, they weren't traveling anymore, or what percent weren't, and why were they coming in or why were they staying home?

And so, one quick – I want to do a quick – we've talked about a lot of this already today so I'm not going to go through all of these. But I put together some of the federal data challenges that my company sees, working with government agencies, working with private companies out in the wild, if you will. Obviously, the federal data is not always accessible. It's available but not accessible to lay users. And so how do users need to use the data? Two minutes. OK.

I'm going to skip through a bunch of these because a lot of this has already been discussed by people much more intellectual on this stuff than I am. I will say, one of these I want to touch on is rural data collection. A lot of – there are a lot of challenges in rural data collection. And the sample sizes can be too small, and the margin of error can be very high. But there is also a myth that there isn't rural data. And we often surprise economic development organizations, people in Puerto Rico in economic development for example, that so much of the data actually is available. They just don't know how to find it.

And, actually, I want to touch super quickly on the trust piece, because I think there's been a lot of discussion about that today. And what we see is that one of the biggest problems with the federal data is that there is a communications issue. People don't – they're not in the weeds on this stuff and so they don't trust it because they don't

understand what some of those issues are around revisions, or margin of error, et cetera. Other challenges that we see, privacy and data sovereignty have been discussed quite a bit today, and very, very important. Leveraging private company data. So as a private company, I can tell you that our mandate is to maximize shareholder profits. And it's not – it's not always – it's not almost ever, actually, the in the public benefit, right?

So, I, personally, am in the process of restructuring my company to be a public benefit corporation, because this is very important to us and we want to have that dual mandate. But I think we could encourage a lot more of that. And I think the government should be very careful. There's been a lot of discussion on leaning on private companies. And I think we need to be very careful how we do that. AI and quantum computing are obviously changing everything, but we also have to be very careful, especially with AI, because there is so much hallucination. And people do not have the data to verify against it. And they get very articulate answers.

So I'll skip a couple of these and just say, as a final note, StateBook has partnered with former Secretary Don Graves and his Highland Creek Advisors to provide a much more holistic model, looking at all of this data across these silos, and providing evidence-based strategy and policy development with consulting, combined with capacity building on the ground, which is very unusual because how do you – how often do you hear of a community that does a study and then nothing happens because they don't have the capacity to implement, and then five, 10 years later they do the same study. So that's a very innovative piece. And then having the technology to track and benchmark actual impact delivered and story tell, to share best practices and share lessons learned, and so forth. So, with that, thank you so much.

Dr. Reamer: Thank you. (Applause.)

Amy.

Amy O'Hara: Yes. Is this on? Yes. OK. So, as Andrew mentioned, I don't have slides. I can tell you that earlier this summer the National Science Foundation put out a bunch of requests for solutions. And I can tell you that my team at Georgetown was awarded one of these. But with the government being closed, I can't talk about the specifics of what that project will entail. So instead, I will tell you hypothetically what the project might entail. (Laughter.)

So, this request for solutions was about ways to use administrative data to improve frames and employ new statistical methods for federal statistics. This is great. This is right up my alley. I used to work at Census. I led the administrative data unit. And I was, like, wow, this is really good. And they asked for explicitly some data solutions around the science and engineering workforce. And I felt that that was a little narrow. So instead of proposing to them some approaches that would give them a case study about that, I proposed, hypothetically, five case studies. And I'm going to tell you a bit about them because it will shed light on where I think the federal statistical system needs to go.

So, one of these, specifically the one about the science and engineering workforce, I knew what they wanted. I know what they do at NCSES. But I also – and they do a great job at looking at, you know, college graduates and then earned doctorates, things like that. But right now, the story is about non-degree credentials, and how the government is not doing a great job measuring that. And this ties in with a lot of what Bob has already told you that we need to get more information about what's really going on in the workforce, what employers are seeking.

And so, with a private sector partner with their private sector data, we are going to be looking into how better to impose the standards that would be using something called Campus API, that would let people have interoperability across these post-secondary institutions that are offering these non-degree credentials. And I think that that's a great way to step into this gap that we're in, where we're measuring the stuff that's easy to measure. You've already heard that today. So that's one of the case studies.

Another one is really kind of a method's wonky thing. It's how do we use paradata better? This is data about how we're collecting the data. Not metadata, which is data about the data. This is paradata. And so how are we using that to help inform the right way to deal with rising nonresponse or break offs in surveys? How are we going to design these collection methods of the future? So that's another example. A third one is taking advantage of the information you can gather in the wild.

So if you're driving through different parts of a city and you start to recognize that more of the street signs are not in English, can you collect that information, that organic information, and then turn it into usable data to inform how you're going to either collect data, do you need to be sending people fluent in other languages, or is it going to help you better identify where you might need to do over-

sampling if you're looking for certain populations? So, it's figuring out how you gather that information – private sector data, organic data – and fold it into the flow of the federal statistical system's data production system.

Another example is one with, hypothetically, partners at Northwestern University. They're already using their AI tools in health data, OK? Healthcare system data, EHRs, they have these very well-crafted embeddings that they're using. And I asked, could you take that approach and plunk it onto another domain? And they said, maybe. And so, for this, you needed to have a pile of other data. Well, the good news is, I've been working in civil justice data for a long time. And so, I do have a pile of data that they are going to test the methods that work, that we know work in health and health care, and applying that into civil justice data.

And to give you a sense of what that could look like, they're already using their AI approaches to say, given all of these different data points and patterns that we're able to observe, what do we believe the outcome is going to be for this patient? And I want to do that. What is the outcome going to be for this person in the eviction case, this person with multiple medical debt cases? Because that's what's in civil justice data. And it's just taking something that has already been proven and seeing how you can employ that in a related domain, which is exactly what our federal statistical agencies are going to need to do. You can't have all of them starting at square one. You need to figure out how you can take proven methods and employ them across the board.

Another case study. It seems like there are too many case studies. And there probably are. But you've got to try. You've got to start somewhere. And we're going to see what we can eke out of this. It's a short little period of performance, thank you NSF, 10 months. 10 months! Another case study is going to be about transportation surveys. You know, there's a way that the government does them, but are they using private sector data? Can they be using more private sector data? And that's what we're going to be probing on there. And so, we've got all of these different approaches that we're going to be testing out. And we're very excited, hoping that some of them can at least share that indication of what the government could be doing.

And it's not just that project. Since I left government, I've been trying to see if some of the work that I would hope agencies do, how you can get that done on the outside. And so, I'm currently working with a number of states to test and deploy privacy-enhancing

technologies. So, this is privacy preserving record linkage. It's secure multiparty computation. It's building synthetic data. It's applying differential privacy. And I'm doing this with red states and some blue states. But it is amazing. Whenever you say, what are you having trouble measuring? What are you having trouble releasing? And they come and they come and they tell you. And you say, well, you know, there's technology that can help you with that.

And a lot of times they think that it's beyond their reach or it's going to be expensive. And so being able to help them identify and understand open-source methods to apply these tools, that's where I've been spending my time. And I will mention one more. This was cooked up with Barry Johnson. He was one of my fellow committee members on the Advisory Committee on Data for Evidence Building. And Barry was on the Technical Infrastructure Subcommittee with me. And that group produced a report that had lots, like 42, recommendations. I joked that we got paid by the word.

And Barry and I recognized that these innovations were not going to happen with the set of resources and the set of objectives that the federal agencies already had. And so, we wondered what could be done with support from the outside. And with my partner, Ron Borzekowski, we cooked up this thing called the secure query system, which is going to enable people to bring cohorts of data that will be matched by IRS, in IRS, and produce preset statistics. So, this is not choose your own adventure but it's an example of how the statistical agencies can innovate with partnership from the outside to meet user needs.

And so, these are the things that I'm working on. I'm excited to talk about them. I think we need more of them. But I'm able to do this because I'm out there hustling money on the outside, OK? And you need people willing to do that and willing to test things. And some of those things are going to fail. Those five case studies, they are not all going to be winners. But I do hope that we learn a lot through them and figure out what the next tranche of projects, the next set of people willing to take those risks are going to be able to pull off.

Dr. Reamer:

Thank you. (Applause.) We have 12 minutes remaining. And I'm going to open it up for questions of the three presenters regarding what they just told you and what more information you'd like to know from them. Questions. Nobody has a question? OK, wow. Ron Borzekowski, yes. (Laughter.) Well, your name just got mentioned, and so I'm going to just kind of catalyze – why don't you take a mic and just riff off of what Amy just said. (Laughter.) I should have said more.

Q: Wow, that is – OK –

Audience member: Or you can sing a song. (Laughter.)

Q: You'd much, much rather have me riff than sing. (Laughter.) That is – that's a really tall order to riff off of Amy, but I can – I can do the following. I can second what Amy said. Which is, these things are hard – because I used to – OK, so I was – I was in the government for a very long time. Built a lot of data resources in the government. Now trying to do it from academia, going back towards the government, right? So, I think the idea of lots of experiments and lots of sort of hustle on the outside is what's needed. Because all of these are tied up – not as much – I mean, I think Bob may want to chime in on this. Some of this is getting data standards and aligning people and technical solutions.

I don't want to guess; that's 30 or 40 percent of the challenge. A lot of it is just getting organizations to see the vision, to align, to want to sign the data use agreement, to argue out the contracts, all right? So, all of those kinds of tasks, I don't know what they're – they're not administrative, they're not legal, they're the organizational hassles outside of the technology, are a lot of the impediments to pulling this off, at least from my experience in the private sector and in government. And it's hard. And I don't know if we have good solutions for that. I mean, the SQS has some ideas on how to do that in particular environments, but it seems that's the impediment to a lot of innovation.

Dr. Reamer: Thank you for responding. Ron's a friend, so I know I can just poke him. And so, we're going to continue with Rons. Ron Jarmin. So, the – (laughter) – Census is connected to each of these three efforts, in the sense that the Chamber Foundation is making use of employee wage records, Calandra's, Census are key – Census data are key. And what Amy's describing are methods that potentially are useful to – or, actually, are useful to the Census Bureau. So, you want to be a three-minute discussant here and just give your thoughts about what you just heard?

Q: Well, I too can't sing a song. So, for those of you in the other room, I said that Ron should – he could sing a song instead of respond. And all my jokes are probably off color. But so, you know, look, data standards are a great idea. And we've been wrestling with this at Census for years. But, again, it's just one of these things where, you

know, at the end of the day each organization that needs to standardize its data might not benefit enough from said standardization to make that investment, right? And so, you know, we're doing a lot more at Census right now, but it is all pretty internally focused and then sort of immediately externally focused. Like, how do we make our data visible to AI bots, and stuff like that.

So, I think – and certainly, like, the JEDx stuff, you know, because the – we want to plug right into that. That's a great example. But, I mean, there are so many different disparate uses and different domains, and people have different ideas of what standardization is supposed to be, you know, it's hard to get, you know, where the – sort of, you know, all the data can come together to do great things. You know, so I just think that it's – without some external force acting upon, you know, literally thousands of difference of organizations around the country – it's not just federal, state, and local governments, but it's companies as well – you know, it's hard to get to where we have this sort of special thing.

So, then that brings you back to, like, these fairly local use cases. So, the JEDx stuff, I think, is a great example of a group of people that use this one type of data, right? But there's still others that use that data that aren't involved in that effort. So, you know, this – it's always great to talk about these things. And I'm involved in lots of these conversations. But after a while you kind of get, you know, we've been talking about metadata and standards for my entire career. And so, anyway.

Dr. O'Hara: Andrew, can I respond to a Ron?

Dr. Reamer: Please.

Dr. O'Hara: And then – where there have been standards that work, you look at Medicaid. And that's because the government said, you're going to use the Medicaid Statistical Information System. Here is what you have to use if you want money. Or you look at electronic health records. And you have the Affordable Care Act saying, you didn't like HL7, but now you have to like FHIR. Welcome to the new world, right? And so, where you've had – or even in some of the criminal justice data, you had the required reporting for the UCR, the Uniform Crime Reports, and now there's not even full adoption of NIBRS, which is the incident-based. And so, where you've seen people try to move forward it's because the government has either had a giant carrot or a giant stick, or both. And so, I'm really eager – I would love it if JEDx took hold. I love enhanced wage records. But it's really that adoption journey that people need to be on.

Dr. Sheets: Andrew, can I build on that?

Dr. Reamer: Yeah, actually, Bob I was going to call on you. So, yeah, go ahead.

Dr. Sheets: But thanks, Amy, for mentioning it. The HL7 example in health records is a great example. It's public-private collaboration with a voluntary consensus standards body, HL7. Which together created an unbelievable – and more public-private cooperation in implementation and use. So that is a great example. Love to see that applied, I guess, in the areas that we deal with on jobs and employment, with an entity like HR Open Standards Consortium, or with the federal agencies and states. So that's a great example on the HL7.

Dr. Reamer: Thank you, Bob. And the to follow up the question I had for you, request I have for you, is to just describe the interactions of the federal agencies in JEDx. To what extent have they been involved, and the nature of their involvement?

Dr. Sheets: Yeah. I think, as the last slide – I'm sorry I had to rush through that – but in our pilot phase we were able to bring together Bryan's group in South Carolina, along with Arkansas, and then Julie Hatch at BLS helped organize a BLS team to really work through an end-to-end data pipeline that took the data – the data standardization package that would allow consolidated reporting of state UI, and the two, again, surveys that are the basis for the Census – quarterly Census that is used widely for employment, wages, to demonstrate how we can take administrative records from state UI, enhanced with surveys – historically, surveys done in cooperation with the LMI units of states, and put those together along with the OEWS, which is the number-one source of data for occupation – or employment by occupation.

And so, we learned so much by working with those leading states and with the private sector partners of ADP and Finch, who are major HR integrators. So, when we put a team like that together around a very specific pilot project, everybody learns faster. And we get to solutions faster, and also for next steps. So, I just want to, again, thanks for all those partners that we learned so much from.

Dr. Reamer: Great. Thank you. So, I think we're going to close out. We got three minutes to the roundtables. Chris, you want to –

Dr. O'Hara: Jen had her hand up.

Dr. Reamer: Oh, I'm sorry.

Q: Jen. (Laughs.)

Dr. Reamer: Jen, sorry.

Q: Yeah, I had a question.

Hypothetically or actually, Amy, could you tell us more about the opportunity that was available for requests for solutions to support and inform the National Secure Data Service, including featuring shared services, including things like sharing open source tools for privacy-enhancing technology and data harmonization and relationship to the DCAT 3 metadata standard that was released? Thanks.

Dr. O'Hara: That's a very long question. My short answer is the NSF put out, through America's data hub consortium, which is the group that is figuring out how to begin doing demonstration projects to have a National Secure Data Service in the U.S. And they have accompanied, put out, I think eight or nine requests for solutions. In June we had basically three weeks to turn proposals around. And the work has to be completed by August 9, 2026 for all of them. So a short little period of performance.

But this was — across the board there were justice projects, health projects, some AI LLM type projects, and the entire thing is under that umbrella of what a National Secure Data Service should be, and it is to have solutions for governance, linkage, and privacy protection that will benefit all statistical agencies, as well as administrative agencies, should they want to avail themselves of those services. And key to that is having discoverability and consistency and interoperability, which is the metadata standard.

Dr. Reamer: Please join me in thanking our panel. (Applause.)

(END.)