5. The Subgroup also proposes that OMB provide guidance to Federal agencies that race/ethnicity coding procedures be documented and made publicly available, as this would allow greater transparency and promote further consistency in Federal data collections.

6. The Subgroup proposes further clarifying the standards to indicate the classification is not intended to be genetically based, nor based on skin color. Rather, the goal of standards is to provide guidelines for the Federal measurement of race/ethnicity as a social construct and therefore inform public policy decisions.

(b) Request for Public Comment: The Subgroup also considered whether referring to Black or African American as the “principal minority race” is still relevant, meaningful, accurate, and acceptable. Given that many of the groups classified as racial and ethnic minorities have experienced institutionalized or State-sanctioned discrimination as well as social disadvantage and oppression, many consider it to be important to continue identifying the principal minority group in Federal data collections and reporting systems. However, it is not clear if the referent groups should change given changing demographics.

1. Should Hispanic or Latino be among the groups considered among “principal minorities”? Would alternative terms be more salient (e.g., “principal minority race/ethnicity”)? Hispanic or Latino usually is considered an ethnicity while “minority” is usually used when referencing race.

The overall goal of the standards’ review is to ensure the quality of information that is used to inform Federal policy, without imposing undue burden on the public. Comments are requested on any aspect of the Working Group’s proposals. When evaluating the proposals, readers may wish to refer to the set of general principles used by Working Group members to govern its review (enumerated in Section 1 of the Working Group’s interim report)—a process that has attempted to balance statistical issues, data needs, and social concerns. We recognize these principles may in some cases represent competing goals for the standards. For example, having categories that are comprehensive in the coverage of our Nation’s diverse population (Principle 4) and that would facilitate self-identification (Principle 2) may not be operationally feasible in terms of the burden that would be placed upon respondents and the public and private costs that would be associated with implementation (Principle 8).

D. Conclusion

This Notice affords a second opportunity for the public to comment on the interim progress of the Working Group. None of the proposals has been adopted and no interim decisions have been made concerning them. OMB can modify or reject any of the proposals, and OMB has the option of making no changes. The report and its proposals are published in this Notice because OMB believes that they are worthy of public discussion, and OMB’s decision will benefit from obtaining the public’s views on the recommendations. OMB plans to announce its decision in spring 2017 so that revisions, if any, can be reflected in preparations for the 2020 Census.

Dominic J. Mancini,
Acting Administrator, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Grant Miller at miller@nitrd.gov or (703) 292–4873.

DATES: The JET meetings are held on the third Tuesday of each month (January 2017–December 2017, 12:00 a.m.–2:00 p.m., at the National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230. Please note that public seating for these meetings is limited and is available on a first-come, first-served basis. WebEx and/or Teleconference participation is available for each meeting. Please reference the JET Web site for updates. Further information about the NITRD may be found at: http://www.nitrd.gov/.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On December 27, 2016, the National Science Foundation published a notice in the Federal Register of a permit application received. The permit was issued on January 26, 2017 to: Daniel McGrath, Permit No. 2017–037.