U.S. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

+ + + + +

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INNOVATION AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP (NACIE)

+ + + + +

MEETING

+ + + + +

THURSDAY
OCTOBER 6, 2016

+ + + + +

The Council met in the Department of Commerce Library, 1401 Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC, at 2:00 p.m., Melissa Bradley and Stephen Tang, Co-Chairs, presiding.

PRESENT:

MELISSA BRADLEY, AU Center for Innovation in the Capital, Co-Chair

STEPHEN TANG, University City Science Center, Co-Chair

REBECCA BAGLEY, University of Pittsburgh ESTHER BALDWIN, Intel

BRIAN BARTHOLOMEUSZ, TomKat Center for

Sustainable Energy at Stanford University HEATHER BOESCH, IDEO

TREY BOWLES III, The Dallas Innovation Alliance;
The Dallas Entrepreneur Center

KATHRYN FINNEY, digitalundivided

SCOTT FREDERICK, New Enterprise Associates KARA GOLDIN, Hint Inc.

ORIN HERSKOWITZ, Columbia Technology Ventures, Columbia University

NEAL R. GROSS

RICHARD JOHNSON, Kentucky Science and Technology Corporation

JOSEPH KAPP, Eastern WV Community & Technical College; Behavioral Business, LLC

DAVID KENNEY, Oregon BEST

PRADEEP KHOSLA, University of California, San Diego

MARIE LYNCH, Skills for Chicagoland's Future MIKE NEMETH, S3 Planning

MARIBEL PEREZ WADSWORTH, Gannett Company Inc. ANDREW REAMER, George Washington University

EMILY REICHERT, Greentown Labs

JOSEPH SCHOCKEN, Broadmark Capital, LLC

SUE GRIFFITH SMITH, Ivy Tech Community College

WHITNEY SMITH, JPMorgan Chase

TIFFANY STEVENSON, Sephora USA, Inc.

ERIC TOONE, Duke University

TIFFANY WILSON, Global Center for Medical Innovation

CHAD WOMACK, UNCF

ANDREW YANG, Venture for America

ALSO PRESENT:

JOSHUA MANDELL, Senior Adviser for Innovation and Competitiveness

CRAIG BUERSTATTE, Office of Innovation and Entrepreneurship

ANDRIA FISANICH, Office of Innovation and Entrepreneurship

CHAVARRIA HARRIS, Office of Innovation and Entrepreneurship

JULIE LENZER, Office of Innovation and Entrepreneurship

ERIC SMITH, Office of Innovation and Entrepreneurship

CONTENTS

NACIE 3.0 Kick-Off: Welcoming Remarks and Introductions	, 4
Round Table Report-Outs	
NACIE 2.0 Lessons Learned Panel	44
Summary and Next Steps	5 C
Public Comments	06
Closing Remarks 2	06
Adiourn 21	\cap \circ

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

2:00 p.m.

MR. **BUERSTATTE:** All right, folks. Welcome, thank you for coming. This is our first and official, at this point, Federal Advisory Committee meeting for the National Council on Innovation and Entrepreneurship. is all, we've got 28 members here at the moment. I know we have two that have sent their regrets due to unexpected travel issues and one due to illness, but it is super exciting to see everyone's faces at the same table. I know this morning, we had some special events around D.C. with some roundtables and got to engage a number of policy leaders in various offices in the innovation and entrepreneurship and Hill space.

I'm sure many of you are probably trying to catch your breath, it was pretty overwhelming, a lot of maybe more questions raised than answers, and that's okay. The good news is, we have two full years here, so this is a marathon. A marathon, not a sprint. And I was catching up with Kara before

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the session here and she was expressing how anxious she is as an entrepreneur to, as she put it, to get stuff done, GSD as we say -- she did, yes.

(Laughter.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. BUERSTATTE: Kara used another word, which is a great opportunity for me to say, this is a Federal Advisory Committee and this is open to the public.

(Laughter.)

MR. **BUERSTATTE:** So, yes, we are actually, as a Federal Advisory Committee, we do record these meetings, the official ones, and it's a great opportunity for us to convey to the public what we're up to, what we're thinking about. have had some amazing folks come and attend and plant some, give us some new ideas and give us some quidance and what to consider and where to go. don't be surprised if we are joined by the public, virtually or in person later today. So, we will also break for a private administrative session later today.

But going back to what I was saying

about questions and maybe being a little overwhelmed, one of my favorite stories is, I think it was early February or March, our second NACIE meeting, those of you who were here yesterday heard both Secretaries, Secretary Pritzker and Assistant Secretary Jay Williams talk about the infamous snow day. And Bruce Tuchman's managerial philosophy on the storming, forming, norming process.

I tell you what happened that day on the snow day, it was miserable for the staff. We were pivoting left and right trying to find a space to make this meeting happen. There was, I don't know, five or six inches of snow in D.C., which, yes, it's a big deal here, and Steve Case opened up his office at Revolution to host us and folks showed up with salt and snow, wet jeans, snow all over their clothes, really, really -- frankly, we were a little grimy, we were a little sweaty, and we were a little tired.

And it was an absolute perfect atmosphere for us to talk about innovation and entrepreneurship. We could not have prescribed a

better solution to storming and forming that team. Those that carried over, Steve, I know you're shaking your head there, it was a phenomenal recipe for us to build the relationships and really dig into some interesting opportunities. When we were later at happy hour, still wet, cold, and tired, many folks had to get connecting flights into extra cities to get here, that was another special experience. We were able to talk about what brought us here, how we got here, where we came from.

And that's important, because you all are a congress of innovation and entrepreneurship folks representative of the nation. So, we have our U.S. Representatives, but we look at you as the congress for innovation and entrepreneurship, which is really special. If you think about all the bios that you reviewed and the experiences represented at this table, it's really something So, my challenge to you all and to us and special. to OIE as a team, let's make sure we don't waste that. This is so much opportunity here, we need

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

to ensure that we take advantage of it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

So, to ensure that we do it, I want to keep things simple, keep it simple stupid, KISS, and each of you should have a notecard in your folders, this thing right here. So, if you haven't looked at this yet, no sweat, we just handed them out. Those of you who were here yesterday might be starting to feel some of these goals already. Number one, know your roles, resources, and expectations. These are four simple goals that we would like to achieve by the time you're leaving tomorrow at noon.

So, the next 24 hours, we want to be deliberate and intentional about our conversations, our questions, and our engagements to make sure there's clarity and confidence around these four goals. Having a little bit of technical difficulty. No worries. So, know your roles, resources, and expectations. Roles, talking about being deliberate and intentional, last night, we had a really fun mixer. I enjoyed getting to know a lot of you last night, as well

as, I hope, some of you got to know some of, not just OIE, but some of the other government colleagues. So, our SBA friends, Treasury, and others. Those types of relationships are great resources.

And we'll hear pretty soon from the 2.0 carry-overs about some more resources and what they found worked and what they were able to pull and leverage during their experience to get things And, of course, expectations, if we're not walking away tomorrow with, if you as an individual are not walking away tomorrow with a pretty good warm and fuzzy about what's happening next, we're short, we're falling short. There's a lot to do. Again, we've got two years and it will take some time to figure it out. But ask questions, engage your peers, engage the five veterans that we have on the 3.0 council to figure out what you need to be doing to help the 29 others here succeed and make an impact.

Two is pretty straightforward, identify an initiative that you'll champion. We

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

heard from -- those, again, that were here yesterday, I think the 2.0 members were very clear about why some of their initiative succeeded and where some struggled. We'll talk more later, but I know this morning, there was some clear ideas and some clear questions raised. And I think what's funny is you'll find that those people that were raising those questions and those ideas are oftentimes the one who are going to raise their hands and volunteer to be those champions.

So, from my group, I have an idea already who's going to rise up and be that champion. So, if you're not clear already, make sure you get onboard with something by tomorrow so you can help the team. Number three, come together as team. We just came off of lunch, hopefully you've got some new friends by now. If you don't, I'm friendly.

(Laughter.)

MR. BUERSTATTE: I'm always willing to talk. But no, seriously, I'm curious, who here has made a new relationship that you think is going to benefit your organization or you personally?

That's pretty awesome. I was talking with Steve and Melissa before we kicked off here and we've got 30 people here and, Assistant Secretary Jay Williams talked about it yesterday, in every organization, no matter if it's in academia, nonprofit, government, business, it's not the product, it's not the technology, it's not the real estate that drives the organization, but it's the people.

So, we've got 30 people here and we've got 30 relationships to build and we are only as strong as our team and our bonds. So, I want to emphasize that today and as we move forward throughout the day and we have dinner tonight, I really, really want to encourage you to go out, be brave, make a new friend, build a new relationship. Our 2.0 vets will talk about it, it was hugely beneficial throughout the last two years. As team became tighter, our efficient, we became more effective.

And last, but not least, since so many of you raised your hands, I'm guessing that you're

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

already seeing the value in this experience, but the more value that you see, I know the more you will commit to this. And, again, we've got 30 amazing professionals committed to serving over the next two years. I'm in wonder of the opportunities ahead, I am certain that we're going to create some awesome things.

So, with that said, keep your notecards, be deliberate, be intentional, think about the questions and the relationships you need to be asking and building for the next 24 At this point, that's all I have. hours. talked about four goals, keep it simple stupid, and So, I'd like to open it up to Melissa, that's it. who helped lead the ecosystem roundtable earlier this morning. Melissa?

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: So, we have some folks that are going to share out, but I want to say that we had a very lively discussion. For context, we were joined by leaders from OSTP. Julie was our OIE representative and we also had a member of the Vice President's team, who I will

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

say, literally just listened, which was amazing.

And the idea was to really understand where the opportunities arise for us.

I think one of the things that I walked all away from that session was that we are entrepreneurs or entrepreneurial and we are now in the opportunity recognition phase and we've got lots of ideas and lots of opportunity and the question will be, what are the businesses or the business units that we create to actually move forward? And so, we were very fortunate to have Tom and Julie and Laura talk about tools that we should all have at our disposal to be successful, raise some questions for us, and also shared some ideas that I will preface really reflect OSTP's priorities, but could have some overlap with where we are. So, I'm going to ask Orin to start with the tools.

MR. HERSKOWITZ: Sure. So, Orin Herskowitz, for those of you I haven't met, I'm from Columbia.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Orin, real quick, thank

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

you for introducing yourself. I just want to ask everyone else to do that please, actually, that was great. We have got 30 people here and I know you all haven't met, so rather than doing a long round robin, as you ask questions and as you engage, please introduce yourself, tell us where you're from and what you're working on.

MR. HERSKOWITZ: Okay. So, I'll add the what I'm working on part. Do you mean what I'm working on right now or do you mean --

(Laughter.)

MR. BUERSTATTE: What are you doing up at Columbia, Orin?

MR. HERSKOWITZ: Okay. I'll put Columbia University, I won't go through the whole spiel from this morning, but I run the tech transfer office for Columbia. What that means is we help the researchers at the university when they have an invention, which happens around 350, 400 times a year for us. We help turn that into patents and licenses, which we do about 100 times a year to industry. And startups, we had 25 or so startups

based on Columbia patents in each of the last two years. I also run three technology accelerators. One in clean energy, one in medical devices, and one in media. And, anyway, back --

MR. BUERSTATTE: Thank you.

MR. HERSKOWITZ: -- to the story. we heard from OSTP. They mentioned a couple of different initiatives that they've been working on, including the Tech Inclusion Pledge, which was passed around, I'm not sure if the other group got that, which is a pledge signed by a number of companies to try and make their workforce reflect America's workforce. The Startup in a Day Pledge, which was signed by a number of cities, over here that said they're going to pledge that within a year they will make it so that entrepreneurs can get startups going within 24 hours. So that means streamlining the licensing, zoning, application process, so a startup, whether that's a food startup or a tech startup, can get going in 24 hours from the city's perspective.

And then, something that was very

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	exciting for me, the International Entrepreneurs
2	Rule, which we talked about a little bit yesterday,
3	programs that are proposed, but not yet passed, I
4	think. I'm looking at Craig for that. The
5	International Entrepreneurs, where
6	MR. BUERSTATTE: Oh, you're talking
7	about so that is in proposal format, the
8	President and the Administration have proposed it,
9	and you heard, I wasn't in the meeting, so I'm
LO	curious where the update is. I know it's moving
L1	forward.
L2	MR. HERSKOWITZ: Colleagues who were in
L3	the meeting this morning?
L4	MR. BUERSTATTE: I actually, real
L5	quick, I'd like to introduce Josh Mandell, Senior
L6	Advisor to the Secretary.
L7	MR. HERSKOWITZ: Great. Please.
L8	MR. BUERSTATTE: Josh, please?
L9	MR. MANDELL: So, the Entrepreneurs Rule
20	is open for public comment as a proposed rule. The
21	comment period stops on October 17. It's on an
22	expedited timeline. The Department of Homeland

Security is looking very closely at public comments for this, there's about 200 online and it's actually interesting to read. As of now, it's got overwhelming support. I actually would encourage you all as Americans to comment on that publicly. And then, the timeline is, we'll probably take about a month to absorb those comments, make any edits to the rule, and ideally we'll have started by December.

DHS estimates that approximately 3,000, more and more entrepreneurs are already here, they're coming to the United States to take advantage of the program, just in the first year, and that will multiply exponentially over the course of the program also. So, in the absence of comprehensive immigration reform, when it comes to startups and entrepreneurs, this is the closest thing this Administration is going to get to making that happen. So, that's where we're at.

MR. HERSKOWITZ: Great. So, they left us with four questions and four thoughts, which I guess maybe go into the things we could work on,

but I recognize these are OSTP's initiatives, not necessarily the same as what Commerce would be interested in. The four questions they had were, a better understanding of what's driving the decline of business dynamism. Apparently there's some stats that back up the fact that business has been less dynamic, so understanding what's driving that decline.

The economic inclusion and diversity question, how to make that stronger. How to build innovation ecosystems outside of the New York, Massachusetts, and the Bay area, as they called it, the Rise of the Rest. And the fourth was the one I was most excited about, innovation outside of software and tech. So, basically, how to increase the translation of environment, therapeutics, diagnostic, material, advanced manufacturing. The four to-dos, I guess, were an idea around -- CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: OSTP ideas.

MR. HERSKOWITZ: Sorry, OSTP ideas, were could we do a race to top on entrepreneurship? So something similar to what they did on education,

trying to make it just easier across the country 1 for getting permitting and licensing done. Could 2 3 there be more experimentation on the regulatory front, similar to what the FAA did with drones? So, 4 setting aside certain regions of the country where 5 6 there could be relaxed regulation in order to 7 experiment and get some sort of, I quess, testing done on new ways of handling of regulation. 8 Could the research universities really 9 10 drive -- could the university presidents focus more 11 big donor resources into entrepreneurship 12 opposed to naming buildings, doing basic research or financing student financial aid or others? 13 know that would be a controversial topic back at 14 Columbia, but --15 16 CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: In addition to. (Laughter.) 17 MR. HERSKOWITZ: Okay. So, assuming a 18 19 new donor falls out of the sky who wants to give 20 \$10 million, easy question. And then, the last one 21 was, how to best get the word out and leverage the

International Entrepreneur Rule, if that does

pass. In particular, he mentioned, could universities use their H1B visa, the high number of H1B visas they could get, to possibly bring in entrepreneurs and residents who would qualify for the role and by absorbing the lower limits of the grant funding that you need to get to qualify for the rule, which I think is \$100,000, could this be a gateway for international entrepreneurs?

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: Great, thank you. My name is Melissa Bradley, I run the AU Center for Innovation in the Capital. I'm honored to be a co-chair with Steven. In my role, I am responsible for entrepreneurial activities on campus, including events, incubator and our venture fund, off campus, and then I'm responsible experiential opportunities for our students and we run a partnership with the city to help 500 minority businesses scale over the next three years.

I'll add one more thing and then I'll open it up, maybe to Rebecca, Emily, or anyone else.

I think what was interesting was to hear these opportunities, but also to hear what we can do

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

between now and tomorrow. And we talked about a series of tools that I think, even having worked in the Administration, I have the privilege to be a political appointee under 44, we have some tools that I think are important because we don't know what the transition is going to be and so, some may be more important or more relevant at various times.

first So, the is the budget recognizing that there's opportunity an identify new items for the budget, but also ask for increased dollars. And having worked with the Social Innovation Fund, I will say it's a very powerful tool that, even when things are officially crossed off, there are ways for outside forces to get the dollars back. The second was leveraging existing authority. We've had some challenges of getting new policies done, but recognizing, for example, Kathryn raised and we had a robust conversation on the use of prize authority that the SBA was able to utilize since they are not a grant making authority, but recognizing limitations of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

contracting.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

talked about personnel. While we're going to be having a transition, there are many folks that I think will still remain and helping, because the transition will go well into the spring. But also, I saw it as people who'll be leaving that we could be able to tap as resources and come back and talk to us since we can certainly A coalition building, I convene on our own. watched people be surprised when Tom said the only power that people in the White House really have are coalition building, right, and sharing new ideas with other agencies, but being able to bring folks together and recognizing the clout and gravitas that people are willing to fly.

And then, to be able to have that clout of the White House and being able to sponsor, how can we really leverage that? There is legislation that we hope we -- an active group going on the Hill sometime soon. And then, there's new approaches. And he kind of held out a teaser that says he has a paper of 25 approaches, but he shared these things

like prize authority. He also talked about what has been happening at the White House around open source data and the like. And so, he said he would share some of those.

But I think it's important as we go off and think about what are we going to do and our group talked about keeping momentum going, that we have an opportunity of what we can do in the next 100 days while we still have people here who now know who we are and then, what is our stake for the first 100 days of the new administration? There is no doubt that Julie and Craig and others will promote our relevance, but if we can do that for ourselves, that'll be extremely important. So, it was a great session. I ask Rebecca or Emily to add to that, please.

MS. BAGLEY: So, I'm Rebecca Bagley.

I'm the Vice Chancellor for Economic Partnerships

at the University of Pittsburgh. I'm responsible

for creating an economic development strategy for

the University, which we have done, and for driving

external opportunities into that strategy. So,

one of the conversations that we wanted to capture and just talk back to the group around was around the Tech Inclusion Pledge. So, it was a pledge for companies and they're really driving more and more companies to sign up for this Tech Inclusion Pledge, which basically asks them to have a workforce that reflects what the American people look like and asks them to invest, publish data, and recruit and retain those people that, again, reflect the population of the U.S.

And so, one of the big conversations we had, well, are companies really in a position or have the tools to be able to do that? So, there's a lot of people working on that, whether it's pre-12 or educational systems, access to opportunity, disconnected populations, inclusion. So, I think that my experience has been that companies don't really understand the multi-generational ways that you can impact this issue, bring more people of diversity into the workforce.

And so, we just discussed a potential opportunity and it dovetails into one of the white

1	papers that was written by NACIE 2.0 as well around
2	here's a group of people that have taken a pledge,
3	they are saying they could employ, create a
4	network, I'm saying they could potentially fund
5	opportunities and why not figure out how to connect
6	those things together so that we can actually bring
7	a network that can help them execute over a longer
8	term? So, that was one of the conversations we
9	wanted to just iterate back to the group, because
10	it was pretty robust. And I don't know if Kathryn
11	wants to add anything, but she was obviously active
12	in that conversation since she does this every day.
13	MS. FINNEY: No, you said enough.
14	MS. BAGLEY: Okay.
15	(Laughter.)
16	DR. REICHERT: So, Emily Reichert, I run
17	a clean technology incubator in Boston. And we
18	support 54 startup companies and they are solving
19	the world's biggest energy and environmental
20	challenges.
21	MR. BUERSTATTE: Emily, can you
22	DR. REICHERT: So, it's a lot of fun.

MR. BUERSTATTE: -- get a little bit closer there? Thank you.

DR. REICHERT: Sorry about that. just wanted to -- I said I was going to add color commentary to what we did. And so, I guess, these have already really covered Sorry, I'm still not speaking into everything. But I guess I just wanted to the microphone. highlight a couple of things that really stood out And that is, I think everyone in the room for me. I think resonated with the idea of making sure we do something as a result of this experience. not necessarily come up with just ideas or doing research, but really something needs to come out Sorry, all righty. So, something needs of this. to come out of this.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Yes.

DR. REICHERT: How's that? So, two things in particular that resonated with me is understanding that what we need to hand off at the end of this to an OSTP or whatever agency is a set of really concrete action steps. Not just ideas,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

not identifying a problem, but what specifically do we need to do about that problem? And then the other thing that really resonated with me, and you just actually brought it up, is the idea of using the government and particularly the power of the White House as a convening force to bring minds together.

And I thought that's also very powerful for what we're trying to do and I can imagine that the topics and the projects we're about to come up with, each one of those being a place where we bring together the experts who do the thinking and then that leads to a much more informed outcome of our recommendations. So, now that you've heard at least part of what I said, that's, I think, it for me. But it was a good spirited discussion and great to hear from the OSTP people and all the folks in the room. Anyone else from the group?

MR. BUERSTATTE: Real quick if there's any, we do need to transition to the skills piece, but I certainly want to offer up a quick period for any questions from those that weren't in the

1	ecosystem session. And for a scheduling note, we
2	will have time tomorrow during the design and
3	thinking session to really dig into these ideas and
4	issues in much more depth. So, while I hate to say
5	wait until tomorrow
6	(Laughter.)
7	MR. BUERSTATTE: That was, again being
8	intentional, was deliberate. We didn't want to
9	overwhelm everyone with 100 ideas and 100 questions
10	all on Day One. So, any yes, Melissa?
11	CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: I just wanted to say
12	that, although we were in different groups,
13	hopefully what you heard was that we were probably
14	had some parallel conversations, that there's an
15	interconnectedness between workforce and
16	entrepreneurship.
17	MS. BALDWIN: I'll wait.
18	(Laughter.)
19	MR. BUERSTATTE: Thank you, Esther.
20	Steve, please?
21	CO-CHAIR TANG: Good afternoon,
22	everyone. I am Steve Tang and I have the honor of

co-chairing NACIE 3.0 with Melissa. I'm also one of five, as Craig termed, carry-overs, I think we'll have to find a better term for that -- (Laughter.)

CO-CHAIR TANG: 2.0. -from NACIE Hangovers, right. Hanger-oners or something like that. You'll hear from the other four shortly. My day job is I'm the President of the University City Science Center in Philadelphia. We are the nation's oldest and largest urban research park. 53 years, we've been the innovation and entrepreneurship hub for Greater Philadelphia. We are uniquely a shareholder owned organization with 31 shareholders, all universities nonprofits across the Greater Philadelphia area.

And the reason that I'm so passionate about what we're doing here today is we are working on elements of inclusion and access to our mission in innovation and entrepreneurship, not only for the existing shareholders and stakeholders, but also the surrounding neighborhoods in Philadelphia, which are deeply impoverished. So,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

with that, let me just make a few comments about the employer driven skills roundtable. We heard from some senior folks from both the Department of Commerce and the Department of Labor, as well as the National Economic Council.

Our discussion, I think, was a little bit different than, Melissa, yours entrepreneurial ecosystems discussion. This was less about fomenting ideas and more, I think, about calibrating the various resources and missions that exist at the federal government. And so, it may be obvious to those of you that work more closely in workforce development, but the distinction between what the Department of Labor does and the Department of Commerce does is this, the Commerce mission is really on the employer side and the Labor side is really on the employee side.

Having said that, I think if you listened to the discussion yesterday from the NACIE 2.0 report-outs, what you would have found is that there is scant data from either side about issues that are emerging that quantify the skill gaps that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

we all, I think, intuitively or experientially have in our day jobs. So, this was a good session, I think, in understanding the breadth and the depth of the challenge from the policy side, from the National Economic Council, and from the Commerce and the Labor side.

The other thing which I will note is, and this is really an experience based on 2.0, is that this is a difficult subject to directly intersect with what you talked about in the other group, the entrepreneurial ecosystem. And I think the illustration in front of you, the Skills for Business graphic, is a good one to understand that. So, the breadth of the Department of Commerce manufacturing and economic development data, cyber security, foreign direct investment is influenced innovation greatly by and entrepreneurship. However, the specifics of this group, this NACIE group, are housed in the economic development area.

So, I think you have to think about the narrower mission and the broader mission of innovation and entrepreneurship as it relates to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the work here at NACIE 3.0. I would also call your attention to Secretary Pritzker's call to arms yesterday, which not only included complete something in 100 days, but also remember the elements of inclusion and data in what we're doing here, okay? So, with that in mind, I'm going to turn it over to Joe Kapp to give a summary and then Joe I think can engage others from the group.

MR. KAPP: Sure. Thank you very much. My name is Joe Kapp. I'm with Eastern West Virginia Community and Technical College. kind of here representing a number of different I work very closely with the National Association for Community College Entrepreneurship. It's an organization representing about 300 community colleges that specific focus on entrepreneurship. I also am here representing folks in Appalachia coal mining communities and the opportunities that we have there for workforce development.

And another hat, from a diversity and inclusion perspective, is representing LGBT

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

communities, homeless LGBT youth through nonprofit that Ι started. Ι а serial am entrepreneur and, after selling my business, began working with community colleges specifically to find out how we can use the footprint of community colleges to drive entrepreneurship. Most people know and realize that community colleges focus on workforce development and academics, so adding the entrepreneurial leg of the stool is opportunity, I think, for us because community colleges are really broad across the United States.

The skills development conversation was really fascinating. We spoke about the need from an employer perspective and the lack of skills that many employers feel like employees maybe are lacking and how we qo ahead and create innovating training opportunities for training, for employees. And particularly, looking at new education models. So, what can be done around apprenticeships coding boot and camps opportunities to potentially look at how we can use federal government funding in order to be able to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

support some of those new models, which may be moving away from some of the historic sort of purely four year models of higher education and institutions.

We spoke about also the Workforce Innovation Opportunity Act and the upgrading of those rules and how we may be able to play and participate in some additional aspects with regard to that. And specifically how government can support employers in the education and the training of their employees. One of the biggest pieces was data modernization and how there are repositories of data across various entities within the federal government that relate to workforce development.

And this chart kind of goes through those different pieces in terms of where they may reside. And part of that is also just the integration and the effectiveness across various agencies within EDA and really across how the funds are being allocated for economic development within the federal government. Finally, there was a little bit of a discussion that I sort of raised

is that, during the course of all of our conversations, there had been a presumption of access to broadband and internet, and I think it's important to recognize that a number of folks, if you've done any work in rural communities, that's still an issue.

And so, when we talk about diversity and inclusion, there's still a digital divide that exists, and that folks within rural communities may not have access, students in those communities may not necessarily have access to the internet. And so, the ability to be able to kind of potentially additional drive conversations around t.he importance of broadband, education, So, I'm going to throw it over entrepreneurship. to David for a second to talk a little bit -- sorry, to Andrew, to talk a little bit about the data really got probably piece, because he's encyclopedic of knowledge of sort of the data issues that are going on.

DR. REAMER: Thanks, Joe. I'm Andrew Reamer. I'm a research professor at George

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Washington University in the Institute of Public Policy. And basically, I'm an academic entrepreneur, they give me an office and business cards and the opportunity to bring money into the University, in which I can get a piece of it to get paid and get health insurance.

(Laughter.)

DR. REAMER: And so, I can do anything I want as long as I don't get the University in trouble. So I can pick a theme and my theme is, federal policies that support U.S. economic competitiveness in global markets. And so, from that perspective, and my background is in regional economic development, I have interest in and knowledge about innovation, entrepreneurship, and workforce development, particularly in the realms of data, as Joe says. So, actually I get paid by my funders to know where the bodies are in the federal government in terms of the programs and the initiatives, there's so much going on.

And so, I offer myself as a seeing eye dog, I guess, to parts of the federal government.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

If there's a topic of interest to you, but you're not sure what's going on, I either know it or I'm one or two degrees of separation from figuring it out. So, please feel free. And I would like to post things on Slack, just as resources for people too. So, for instance, the Bureau of Economic Analysis has been charged by Congress with creating a small business satellite account.

And there's an opportunity, I think -Melissa, we talked about projects that we all want
to do, I think there are also some things where we
can, the government's already doing something, but
let's monitor them and if BEA is putting together
a new set of data on entrepreneurship, then let's
find out about it and give them some feedback.
That's not a full-blown go to Congress with
legislation thing, this is like, are they doing it
right and can we be helpful to them?

So, in the realm of workforce data, we heard this morning from some of the initiatives that the Commerce, Department of Labor, and the White House have been doing. Commerce, as we heard

yesterday and through NACIE 2.0, has been very interested in getting a better understanding of the contingent work economy, the gig economy. And so, the Census Bureau is now collecting 1099s from the IRS and is going to analyze them to better understand the nature of that kind of non-wage and salary work and to what extent it's the primary or supplementary in people's lives and kind of what the wave is, to what extent do people dip in and dip out of that 1099 work or it is the core of their work.

In addition, Commerce, through the Census Bureau, they have all the employee wage records of workers in the country. Every state has a UI employment system, every worker in that system has a wage record, because if you get laid off, they need to know how much to pay you. That's updated every quarter. Census gets uploaded every quarter from each of the states the UI wage records. And then Census is linking those records so you can follow people over time, what happened to people who worked in Nevada in 2007 in construction and

got laid off, where'd they end up? And also, just this past week, Julie -- where's Julie? No, not this one, from Texas.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Julie is unfortunately out for an unexpected illness right now.

DR. REAMER: Oh, okay. Julie Shaw from the University of Texas System just signed an agreement with the Census Bureau to give the Census Bureau their graduates of all their programs on 14 campuses over the last ten years and Census will match that up with these UI wage records to tell UT what happened to those people. So, what were the employment outcomes of individual degree programs across 14 campuses? And if this works well, Census wants to take this wider. So, again, this is an opportunity for this group to have input.

MR. BUERSTATTE: That's a great way to wrap it up, Andrew, and how you talked about providing a real case scenario, but actually since Julie's not here, maybe we can hear from Esther talking about the relevance and importance of data. And, Esther, would you mind sharing what we talked

about in the session and how Intel and how you used information on the ground to make decisions for your firm, which is important because I think it showcases Commerce's lens on employer led skill development.

MS. BALDWIN: Sure. There were a couple of things out of that session that really resonated with me. I'd be happy to share --

MR. BUERSTATTE: One minute, please.

MS. BALDWIN: Okay. So, the -- Kate McAdam shared what GE did and said how impressed she was that they actually went to the high schools and the universities when they were deciding where to invest. And I don't think that that's unique at all. I used to be on Intel's site selection team. It is a large virtual team that comes together and each person has something that they study. And we start with desk research and we have a long list of places that we do the research, desk research, and we narrow it down and then we go and visit those places.

And so, I actually did the workforce

research and went to the same high schools, universities, community colleges, but we also had people that were studying utilities, the load capacity at the airports. I know of one place that was selected because they were months ahead of a second city in having the capacity at the airport available. And it's actually moving countries competing to cities competing. was very excited to see that there's a new advisory board, the SelectUSA. I think that there's a big opportunity for NACIE collaborate with to SelectUSA to solve those problems that are workforce, housing, and transportation. It's never just workforce that I learned.

MR. BUERSTATTE: All right. I think it's a great nexus of data, economic development, and really with the lens of the business in mind and why it's important for us to think down at the community level, how can we enable the communities, with better information, better resources, to triage, if you will, the gaps so they can attract, build the right firms and right capacity within the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

region. So, I think that's a great way to wrap up. We've identified some interesting questions and opportunities and now, I'd like to transition into how can we work on these? What are we going to do about it? So, at this point in today's session, we'd like to focus on our NACIE veterans, not our carry-overs, our veterans --

(Laughter.)

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: We're getting better.

MR. BUERSTATTE: And we've got five, actually, unfortunately we have four here. Again, Julie is out unexpectedly, but hopefully we might see her tomorrow morning if all is well. But Julie Lenzer, I know, also a NACIE veteran as well. So, Julie, come on up. What we'd like to do is really a lively two-way dialog between the four NACIE veterans and those here at the table and figure out some of the best practices, what worked, what didn't, and how to go about this whole Federal Advisory Council thing. I think you all have seen enough now where you're probably starting to really

develop some specific questions. So, that's what this next hour is for. Hopefully we can get a lot of value out of it.

MS. LENZER: And if not, I'm fired. Oh, wait, I'm fired anyway. Okay, so nothing to lose here. Great.

(Laughter.)

MS. LENZER: So, to introduce, I think I've met most of you, I'm Julie Lenzer. I'm the current Director of the Office of Innovation and Entrepreneurship for another 105 days and I ran NACIE 2.0 along with, certainly not by myself, this incredible team that you will continue to have at your disposal going forward in NACIE 3.0. So, to kind of kick this off, what I'm going to do is I'm going to have you guys, because I'm going to guess that some of you have questions already in your head, whether you just got here of whether you've been here for the last day and a half.

So, I'm going to have you rapid-fire some of your questions to me right now, because at the end of the day, this is for you to get the

information that you need. And then, I'll kind of 1 pull them together, we'll talk to the other veteran 2 3 members, and then we'll have opportunity to do that again. So, if you have any 4 5 burning questions that you want to ask just right 6 off the bat, fire away. 7 MS. BALDWIN: I have one. MS. LENZER: Esther's ready, she had it, 8 she was going. 9 Yes? MS. BALDWIN: So, I've heard about the 10 groups that were formed in NACIE 2.0 and my question 11 12 is, was there any kind of a value chain that was 13 identified that says, for innovation and entrepreneurship, these are the pieces of the value 14 chain, like Tiffany's access to capital, the 15 16 workforce ready people, was that identified before 17 so that we could look at, what are the targets, what are the gaps? 18 19 MS. LENZER: Okay. Thank you. Any 20 other questions? We're not going to answer them 21 just yet. I'm sorry, you only get one. Okay?

Prioritize.

I'm just kidding.

MR. HERSKOWITZ: The first was the
balance for NACIE 3.0 between continuing work from
2.0, if you read the executive summary, every one
of them will say, we recommend 3.0 pursue this
further. So, are we sort of picking up where they
left off or starting new stuff? Two, if it is
starting new stuff, presumably it's to support the
agenda of the Secretary of Commerce, but since that
person won't be appointed for quite a few months
and then will need some time to hit the ground, how
do you recommend we spend the next eight months?
And the third is, there seems to be a,
And the third is, there seems to be a,
even just in NACIE 2.0, there seemed like there was
even just in NACIE 2.0, there seemed like there was
even just in NACIE 2.0, there seemed like there was a range of, like, we should there were some very
even just in NACIE 2.0, there seemed like there was a range of, like, we should there were some very tactical ones that we should fix, the SBIR program
even just in NACIE 2.0, there seemed like there was a range of, like, we should there were some very tactical ones that we should fix, the SBIR program and get it renewed, and there were some very big
even just in NACIE 2.0, there seemed like there was a range of, like, we should there were some very tactical ones that we should fix, the SBIR program and get it renewed, and there were some very big picture ones, like we should have more inclusion.
even just in NACIE 2.0, there seemed like there was a range of, like, we should there were some very tactical ones that we should fix, the SBIR program and get it renewed, and there were some very big picture ones, like we should have more inclusion. And so, how much of this is strategy and how much
even just in NACIE 2.0, there seemed like there was a range of, like, we should there were some very tactical ones that we should fix, the SBIR program and get it renewed, and there were some very big picture ones, like we should have more inclusion. And so, how much of this is strategy and how much of this is tactics and how do we balance those?

1	I've had, sidebar conversations, it's been raised
2	the question of how much we can interact with
3	elected officials, folks on the Hill, with our
4	idea. Not necessarily lobbying, but in educating
5	around what our ideas are.
6	MS. LENZER: Okay. Anybody else for
7	now? So, I'm going to say that some of those
8	questions are, I'm not sure that the NACIE members
9	can answer some of those, but we'll get to them.
10	So, if we don't get to them through the alumni
11	panel, we'll absolutely answer those questions.
12	And so, what I'm going to do to get us kicked off
13	is, I'm going to oh, we have one more. Yes, go
14	ahead.
15	DR. REICHERT: Two more actually. One
16	is, how do we contact each other? I know we've been
17	set up on a Slack group, but for those of us who
18	may not have that open every single day, I know
19	Heather does
20	MS. LENZER: You don't?
21	DR. REICHERT: because I saw it. No,
22	I don't. Do we get email addresses for everyone?

1 Like, how do we --Is everybody cool with LENZER: 2 3 sending out the contact list? Okay, that's done. DR. REICHERT: Okay, excellent. 4 MS. LENZER: If anybody has a problem 5 6 with it, let us know. 7 DR. REICHERT: That's what I was hoping The second thing is, in our group would happen. 8 on ecosystems, we spent a lot of time hearing about 9 OSTP's priorities and, I guess, I would love to 10 hear, and maybe it's from you, Julie, or Craig, how 11 12 does that map on to Commerce's priorities? Ιs there overlap? And just, help us think about that, 13 14 because we are now very, our group is now very grounded in OSTP priorities. 15 16 MS. LENZER: Yes. MS. BAGLEY: So, I apologize, I went to 17 the restroom, so if this was already said, is we 18 19 also, we're obviously appointed by the Secretary 20 of Commerce, there's going to be a White House, or 21 excuse me, a Presidential transition, and so, it

seems to me like we should have an eye towards a

transition team too and not -- Commerce, OSTP, like all of these different angles, sort of that transition team aspect and how to think about positioning thoughts for the transition team as the election is only a month from now.

MS. LENZER: Okay.

DR. REAMER: I had a question.

MS. LENZER: Yes, Andrew?

DR. REAMER: 2.0 had three working groups and what worked well with that and what didn't work well with that and what are the implications for how 3.0 structures itself?

MS. LENZER: So, I'm going to just really quickly, they had three sub-committees and this is a really strange point, and that's why we didn't do that again, because it was very confusing. So, the three sub-committees were entrepreneurship, innovation, and workforce, and we purposefully did not redo that. And I'm going to actually maybe ask the -- that's probably a good place to start with our existing members to talk about how that worked and didn't work. And so, I'm just going to --

Steve, he looks like he's ready to -- yes. If you haven't introduced yourself, by the way, NACIE 2.0 members, make sure you do that before you speak. But thanks, Steve, go ahead.

CO-CHAIR TANG: So I'll just start, because I think the issue of the value chain and the issue of the working groups are related. And I think what we've noticed is that by working with boundaries in the work groups, it prevented us from actually figuring out that value chain. And I'll let Tiffany speak about this, but I think the Capital Continuum actually resulted in the merger of the efforts between the innovation and the entrepreneurship team.

And I'll certainly let Marie talk about the workforce side of it, because I think that had an interesting evaluation as well. So, the lesson learned I think was, that's not a good starting point because it presumes too many internal constraints about the subject matter that doesn't allow us to figure out what the real value chain is. So, that's what I say about that. But,

Tiffany and Marie?

MS. WILSON: Yes. I think starting off, it was actually probably good in that first or I guess that first day, because -- right. Well, we were asking the same questions that all of you all were asking, right? And so, it enabled -- we had two hours to come together with people we had never seen or spoken with before and come up with recommendations or initiatives that we were going to focus on and present to the Secretary of Commerce. So, not like there was any pressure or anything.

But what it did was it enabled us to identify priorities and initiatives that we felt were very important in that space and prioritize those really quickly. And so, at least we had a handful of things with each subgroup. What happened then next, and we all had to sign up for whatever committee we wanted to be on, and for me, it was kind of this blend between innovation and entrepreneurship and I picked entrepreneurship, but then when we ended up in the snow day and they

mixed things up where they put certain aspects where they knew there would be overlap.

And so we started, Steve and David and Mike Burcham and I, talking about this whole Capital Continuum and SBIR, and they're very related. And so that kind of gave us some near term opportunities to work together on, we could have near team impact there, recognizing the Capital Continuum issue is a much larger issue and something that's kind of ongoing. So, it was kind of tactical and strategic. And a lot of overlap.

MS. LENZER: And I thank you very much. So, the snow day that we kept talking about was actually our second meeting in March. We had, I think that was when we got 15 inches of snow and D.C. was shut down for like two to three days, but 20 NACIE members somehow made it into town. The government was shut down for two days, we met at Steve Case's office, and that was like probably one of the best meetings we had, in that we adapted to that.

For you guys, because they had a chance

1	to really get to know each other and they saw the
2	commitment around the room, I mean, you guys can
3	talk to that more, but one of the things that we
4	did at that meeting is we had some of the
5	initiatives that, like, innovation had come up with
6	and we brought some of the workforce people. So
7	people who had nothing to do with that topic, we
8	had them come in and ask questions and start to
9	really blend. And I think that was one of the
10	points where you're talking about, it's like
11	totally different eyes on it. Marie, would you
12	like to add to that?
13	MS. LYNCH: Yes, just a couple of things.
14	First, we did not oh, sorry, it says introduce
15	myself.
16	MS. LENZER: Introduce yourself.
17	MS. LYNCH: Sorry. Marie Lynch, I'm the
18	CO of Skills for Chicagoland's Future. We are a
19	not for profit which works with companies to get
20	unemployed and under employed back to work. And
21	we also have our first expansion site in

Providence, Rhode Island. So, just a couple of

things. One, we did not have the benefit of being able to ask these questions. So, we had one person, we had Steve Case, who was kind of in and out, and we spent a lot of time just trying to -- we had the same questions you have.

So, another thing I'd say is, I was sharing with some folks at lunch that, because we were new and because the staff were new, we were trying to figure it out along the way and we lost some time that first year. And so, nobody asked this, but I'm going to offer it anyway, a piece of advice I would give us is Julie did a really smart thing about midway through where she stopped us and she asked me to facilitate a session to just have an honest conversation about what was working and what wasn't and kind of do a quick, old fashioned SWOT analysis.

And I always saw it as a turning point for us, because we were frustrated, because you had a bunch of people around the table who were doers, who executed, who were smart, who did things in their community, and we were struggling with some

of the same questions you're asking of, is it tactical, is it strategic, what's our path, what are the areas? And that was a big moment for us where we migrated, we kind of shed our frustrations and migrated to what can we practically get done? And I think that's also when we formally shed, I think it went longer than you thought, I think we actually formerly shed those three areas at that moment.

So, another thing I'd say on this is, I think that the things that really got done were when there was not one person, but a few people who were really passionate about it and there was a connection back to your own community. But, I'm going to put this but, I think one of the things we sometimes struggled with is there are occasionally folks who are really passionate about something which pertains to their work, but nobody And so, it feels a little bit like you're else. driving your own agenda at that table and not driving a broader agenda. So, if you can't find others who share that where there's a broader

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

benefit, it will die at some point, because there's not enough energy for it. And so, finding those things that you're passionate are good.

Secondly, I'd say another thing that was really successful is, I think that when we, at that midpoint we grabbed onto the concept of do these things benefit our communities? Are there things we can learn from one another, this work that we're going to do, that are going to benefit our communities? So, wearing the cap not just of I'm Marie Lynch, Skills for Chicagoland's Future, but I'm a representative of the City of Chicago and I really care a lot that our community thrives, and so, by working on this, it's going to help that.

Another thing I would say that I think we should pull back up is, during that moment at that year point, we actually wrote down criteria, and I would encourage us as a group to -- you don't have to, we don't have to replicate that criteria, but somebody was talking at lunch about, there's the lens of the things you want to work on, but you have to have a criteria to evaluate whether you want

to spend your time on that, otherwise you spend a lot of time and it's not worth it. And we had things on there like, does it result in impact? Is it measurable? Is it something we can complete within the two year time frame? And so, I think we should pull those back out as a starting point and ask ourselves as we think about what we want to have accomplished, what can we do?

The other thing I want to share, because this wasn't asked, but I think is a fair warning, is everybody here is some entrepreneurial level and gets things done, but we have to remember NACIE does not, we don't have a budget. We're not responsible for a budget, we don't have a budget to pull from. So, some of the things also died on the vine because we didn't have funding.

Now, that being said, we also had foundations around the table that when things got going, there was an opportunity to tap into some of them. When something was really good, we would have them there to say, maybe I'm interested or maybe I can shop that. Commerce certainly does an

amazing job of pulling together if we need somebody from Labor, if we need somebody from the White House, kind of that cross-functional piece, but it's important to have that budget piece in our head as we evaluate things.

MS. LENZER: Well, and I'll just add to that. And I hope we made this point clear on the orientation, that NACIE's an advisory board, you're not an implementation of programs. You make suggestions to the Secretary and with a compelling reason of why they should be implemented and then it's up to her or him, whoever it will be, to say, yes, and then to create the resources or to tell ESA to go do it or EDA to go do it.

And so, that's a good distinction, Marie, is that it gets a little -- because we are all doers and you're here because you're doers. But that was great. So, I don't know if we want to kind of continue on the kind of the advice or kind of like your, she had some key takeaways. I don't know if you guys have some of those that you want to share. Steve, go ahead. Whoever wants to

go. David? Make sure you introduce yourself.

MR. KENNEY: David Kenney, I'm the Executive Director at Oregon BEST in Portland. We're a nonprofit that helps commercialize clean technologies. I had I guess -- to build on the question strategic versus tactical the Secretary's and Commerce's priorities, I'll say one of the things that I expected that didn't happen was to hear the Secretary say, here are four things I want advice on. The Secretary really said, tell me what I should know or what I should be hearing from you all, you all are the experts.

And so, we never really got the, here's the Commerce priorities, which made it a little harder, frankly, for us, because we did sort of have to sort of search around in the dark for a while to figure that out. But it also allowed us to sort of as a group say, hey, these are some things going on. The other thing that she did though was also say, don't worry too much about what's in Commerce's sphere of influence.

The SBIR project, which I spent a lot

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

of my time working on, most of the SBIR program is
outside of Commerce, like almost all of it is
outside of Commerce. There's two very, very small
SBIR programs within Commerce and then the rest of
it is coordinated by SBA, which is not part of
Commerce, and then it exists in all these other
federal agencies. But we were sort of given the
encouragement to identify the things that will
support the broader initiatives across the federal
government. And she said, we'll work with Labor,
we'll work with Education, we'll work with the
other agencies if that makes sense, recognizing
that she can't implement stuff in any other agency,
obviously, but could bring the stakeholders
together. So, that was a valuable finding for me.
So, I would just say, this group can
decide, I think, and we didn't necessarily have the
set of recommendations from 1.0 the way that this
group now has some unfinished things or some next
steps recommended, but I think this group can
really decide if they want to, to do none of what

I think it would be a shame if we let

we did last.

it all stop, because there were so many great things, I think, that have some momentum. But I think it's really up to the group to decide which of those this particular group of people is excited about, and then also throw in some new ones.

So, I think it would be, to answer that question about balance, I think it's kind of up to us collectively as this new group, and I hope it's a mix. And to that end and I think coming back to the four goals, find something that you will champion, and I think as others said, you're going to spend time on this, find something that you actually are interested in and have expertise or areas of interest that you can apply to kind of dig into, because it is sort of unformed for a while, a lot of the projects, until we spend some time working on them together.

MS. LENZER: Thank you, David. And while you're passing that over, so, Orin, to your point, as far as like setting priorities based on the Secretary or new Secretary, Secretary Pritzker was always, we're the voice of business. We are

the voice of business in the government. And so, we're America's Innovation Agency. And those were the broad kind of lines that she painted. The next Secretary very well could come in and say, NACIE, I have these three things I want you to do. I mean, that's very much within the Secretary's purview. And so, we don't know. And so, we'll talk a little bit later about kind of then what do we do for the next six months, because we've been thinking a lot about that, and I don't want to take away from their time. But go ahead, Steve.

CO-CHAIR TANG: Yes. I want to touch on some of Orin's questions Whitney's questions, I think also Rebecca's. And just to carry that thought forward, I think we need to presume that we have an agenda that bubbles up from our experiences that's important, regardless of who the next President is going to be, regardless of who the next Secretary is going to be, and then all the positions throughout Commerce. That's the only way I think we can build momentum over 100 days to get there.

Orin, to your point, strategic versus tactical, I will make a strong case, and I'll be transparent about this, that we need to make sure the SBIR reauthorization gets done with the kinds of changes that we suggested. Now, it's up to me and those of you that believe that to convince everybody else that's what we want to work on, all That's back to Craig's point, we are like riaht? congress of innovation and entrepreneurship And besides that, there's nothing that here. compels us to do anything except work together and come to a consensus on what we want to do. So, that's the only presumption.

Whitney, to your question about lobbying, so, first and foremost, I think this will be reflected later in the ethics discussion, but correct me if I'm wrong, we may not lobby as NACIE members, okay? We may lobby as individuals, and some of us do that anyway through a variety of different methods. Everybody still there? Less than three, okay.

(Laughter.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	CO-CHAIR TANG: Okay. So in the case,
2	I would use the SBIR situation as a case study. And
3	so, when we are able to influence the language in
4	the bill for markup in the Senate, then several of
5	us actually deployed our resources to lobby Capitol
6	Hill as our day jobs, not as our NACIE role, to do
7	so. And that was a very interesting coalition that
8	David and Rohit and SSTI and my government
9	relations folks, including Sol Behar, who's
10	actually here today, brought together. So, there
11	is a mechanism to do so, but it's rather indirect.
12	And obviously, the folks from EDA cannot lobby
13	Congress either.
14	MS. LENZER: Nor can we ask you to lobby.
15	CO-CHAIR TANG: Right. So, we may
16	the way it typically worked in practice is, I would
17	say, hey, Julie, just to let you know, we're going
18	to be up on the Hill talking about these things,
19	just to let you know.
20	MS. LENZER: Right.
21	CO-CHAIR TANG: And she would say,
22	nothing, basically. So, that's the mechanism.

1	MS. LENZER: Which is hard.
2	(Laughter.)
3	CO-CHAIR TANG: I think there was a wink
4	or something like that that I got.
5	MS. LENZER: Esther, you had did you
6	have a question along those same lines?
7	MS. BALDWIN: Yes. Stephen, thank you
8	for explaining what the SBIR reauthorization was.
9	So, I don't know what the 2.0 projects are, is there
10	a list of what those projects are?
11	CO-CHAIR TANG: Yes.
12	MS. BALDWIN: Is there a list of the ones
13	that have not been continued? When they were
14	started, were there measurable milestones with a
15	date? And why weren't they finished?
16	MS. LENZER: So, yes, you were sent a
17	list of
18	CO-CHAIR TANG: Yes.
19	MS. LENZER: or it's on Slack,
20	actually
21	MS. BALDWIN: Okay.
22	MS. LENZER: if you've had a chance

to log into Slack. Yes, Emily's got it right there. And --

CO-CHAIR TANG: Right.

MS. LENZER: Yes. So, go ahead.

co-chair tang: No, I was just -- yes, so they're in there. And there are a variety of reasons why they were only taken as far as they were. Some of them were timing, some of them were the ability to campaign resources. But I would have to say, there were things that we covered which were not in that package, which were, I would think, very bold ideas. At one point, Rob Atkinson, who heads the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation, myself, and a few others, got this idea that we would present the repatriation of foreign profits, that \$4 trillion that's sitting offshore, to help fund innovation. Okay.

That wasn't in -- you didn't see that in there, because basically what we did with that is, we had the Secretary ask her folks for data analysis to analyze how that would actually happen. So, that's a big idea that didn't get action for

a variety of reasons. It's not to say it won't be brought up at some point and there won't be other bold ideas. So, I don't want to give you the impression that everything we did was in that document, because it wasn't. There was a selection process, which I think is part of what we're going to do tomorrow in the design thinking to get us started in terms of the creative process.

MS. LENZER: Marie, you had something

MS. LYNCH: One other piece that might help with the color on this is, so, Steve's talking about ideas that were good that didn't make that cut for that list. But there was also a whole bunch of things that were came at, that were tried or pushed on and we also dropped. Right? So I think that's an important piece. So, without going into details, I just want to give you an example of a couple -- why things were dropped.

There was a very strong prospective by some member from the business community and the HR front, had a follow-up conversation with Labor

else?

about an agenda item we wanted to push, and it became very apparent on the call that Labor was not, this was not going to go. And so, because there was other competing priorities, we said, you know what, we're in an uphill battle, there's nine months left, and we're done.

There was another one on employer driven training, which actually there was a ton of passion about, but really there were so many people already involved in it and we didn't have funding that it seemed like we just -- we assigned a representative just to kind of monitor it. So, just to -- I think at that point, I think we had the same question about, we looked at the 1.0 things to see if there was anything we wanted to take on. I think it's good to do that, but do know that the process of dropping things is important too. And

MS. LENZER: Sometimes saying no --

MS. LYNCH: Saying no is okay.

MS. LENZER: -- is a good thing.

MS. LYNCH: Yes. And I think the last

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	thing is, just again, time. Two years goes by in
2	about a second. Especially when you don't have
3	direct authority to make anybody do anything.
4	(Laughter.)
5	MS. LENZER: Herding cats, I think has
6	been said.
7	MS. LYNCH: You have to be really honest.
8	MS. LENZER: Yes. Orin, you had another
9	question?
10	MR. HERSKOWITZ: So, we did get the list
11	of
12	MR. BUERSTATTE: Sorry, Orin, could you
13	speak into a mic, please?
14	MR. HERSKOWITZ: Sorry, my back doesn't
15	do well with
16	MS. LENZER: No, no worries.
17	MR. HERSKOWITZ: sitting for hours.
18	We got a list of things that did get passed along,
19	we didn't get the list of things that didn't. And
20	especially the ones from 1.0. So, we avoid
21	reinventing for instance, some mentioned that
22	in the SBIR, the final report was actually

1	apparently not as interesting, I can't remember if
2	it was the SBIR or not, someone said this morning
3	that the draft report was much better
4	MS. LENZER: It was the OSTP, when they
5	were talking about the brainstorming for 1.0, the
6	access to capital report.
7	MR. HERSKOWITZ: Oh, the access to
8	capital, right.
9	MS. LENZER: Yes. Had a bunch more
10	detail
11	MR. HERSKOWITZ: So that
12	MS. LENZER: in there that got
13	scrubbed out.
14	MR. HERSKOWITZ: the much detailed
15	version that got sanitize for the final report,
16	that the draft version was even better. And so,
17	if there was some way to get access to the list of
18	things that you guys were pushing on a string and
19	you just gave up, so that we don't reengage on that,
20	that would be awesome.
21	MR. BUERSTATTE: Real quick, Orin, let
22	me respond in a thought there, and it's related to

what you just said as well as on transition and what new priorities and the new administration might be. I think one of the reasons why I'm talking right now, I think, is a direct representation of the strategy that Commerce has deployed and OIE and EDA to establish continuity. We've built out OIE staff, we've asked five members from 2.0 to continue to serve, and we've built a wealth of institutional knowledge over the last two years to strategically transition.

So, I sense a little bit of concern about what might happen in the next six months, but I can promise you that we've been very smart and tactical about that to ensure that we're not reinventing the wheel. So, we also try to keep things as simple as possible for you guys. It's been a lot of information over the last 24 hours and we've still got another day to go. So, rather than focus on some of the ideas that were addressed and didn't go anywhere, trust me, we have that knowledge and we have that information and we can get that to you electronically or via conversation.

1	But we've been smart and tactical.
2	MR. FREDERICK: I'm Scott Frederick from
3	New Enterprise Associates, a venture capital firm.
4	I was struck by the language where you said
5	something was sanitized and I just want to make sure
6	I'm not over thinking. Was that sanitized by the
7	
8	MS. LENZER: No, no, no, I think it was
9	just
10	MR. FREDERICK: NACIE members?
11	MS. LENZER: No, no, it was more it
12	was the draft of the document and there were some
13	ideas that were just, in the interest of space, that
14	maybe didn't have consensus, so they
15	MR. FREDERICK: Dropped it.
16	MS. LENZER: Yes. No, it wasn't like
17	MR. FREDERICK: I just wanted to make
18	sure there wasn't
19	MS. LENZER: I could tell you, but I'd
20	have to kill you, kind of stuff. That wasn't it.
21	Go ahead, Andrew.
22	DR. REAMER: Two unrelated questions.

1	One is, to what extent does NACIE have the capacity
2	to ask for information from different parts of
3	Commerce? So, it was raised earlier, the falling
4	rate of business startups, and so it would be nice
5	to get some information, say, from the Office of
6	the Chief Economist, give us a little five page
7	briefing on
8	MS. LENZER: Absolutely. No, we can
9	help connect you with those folks
10	DR. REAMER: Okay, great.
11	MS. LENZER: to get that information
12	that we have, sure.
13	DR. REAMER: That's and the second
14	question has to do with the role of the chairs.
15	Could you, I guess, could you explain from OIE's
16	point of view, perspective, the role of the
17	co-chairs? And also I'd love to hear from the
18	co-chairs about their vision for their approach to
19	co-chairing us
20	MS. LENZER: Sure. And so
21	DR. REAMER: their aspirations.
22	MS. LENZER: we've learned about the

roles of co-chairs and so, this year -- last year we had three and they were each aligned with innovation, entrepreneurship and workforce. And this year, what we did is we pulled one from NACIE 2.0 and one from NACIE 3.0, that was the intention there. And the role, as we've explained it to them and I'll let them, I'll explain it and then they can tell me what they understand, is really to help us on the ground as your peer to facilitate, to help drive to actionable, because we can't, we're a small staff and, in fact, one of us is leaving soon, and so it's going to be even smaller.

And so, it's really helping to facilitate, ear to the ground, if there's something that you're pissed at the way we're doing it, you can tell the co-chairs and they can come to us. I mean, it's really no more than that. It's not -- the leadership of NACIE is really in the work groups, so those are the initiatives that are going to form and there's going to be work groups around those.

So, everyone here has an opportunity to

be a leader, they're just kind of assistant wranglers, not just, but, I mean, it's a very important thing, and chosen, Melissa for her experience and prior administration and this administration, understands kind of the levers, and then, Steve, as part of the work that he did on the SBIR and what he does in his day job and on NACIE 2.0. They just understand how to help us prioritize and things like that. So, I'll let you guys kind of tell me if I'm crazy.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: No, I mean, I said this morning in the breakout that I see my job as co-chair as a facilitator. I think, having served under Clinton and Obama, I have the sense of how to get things done and still know a lot of the career people that are here. I also take it, whether I'm co-chair or not, as a responsibility of somebody who's here in D.C. to be able to be here, to be present, to represent all of us, and to be able to share information back, because I get that it's not going to be easy.

Things happen in less than 24 hours in

D.C. and so, I see myself as being opportunistic on behalf of all of us so that we are present where we need to be as a group. And I see myself as an information chair. So, I want to encourage people to use Slack. I have figured it out thanks to my children.

(Laughter.)

of the biggest things, and Kathryn talked about and it came up in the meeting that we had around access to capital, I see my role as to help connect networks. The theme has been that all of us represent a lot of people and so, to the extent that I'm willing to give some time, I'm willing to leverage my research assistants, I'm willing to leverage my students to help us stay connected and have this have a multiplier effect, I see myself as a foot soldier for everybody here around this table.

CO-CHAIR TANG: And I absolutely agree with what you heard from Julie and from Melissa. What I would add to it is, I believe that to those

that much has been given, much is expected. And this group is an enormously talented qualified group and I think part of our roles as co-chair is to keep the energy and the enthusiasm high. Unless we engage you fully in this process and that you are enthusiastic about what we are doing, I don't think we have extracted the full value of this NACIE experience in total.

I think there may be times where we want to coax out those that are a little more quiet, there will be times where we want to edit those that are a little less quiet, and that stuff is going to happen. But it's all about your engagement and your energy here. And I think that we first and foremost have to listen carefully to what we hear and don't hear and try to rally you around that.

MS. LENZER: So, along those same lines, David, I'm curious about, how did you get the most out of the experience? So, from looking back, what did your -- what does good engagement look like and how do you get the most out of this?

MR. KENNEY: Well, I'll make a comment

1 || --

MS. LENZER: Go ahead.

MR. KENNEY: -- I think about that. I was going to comment on some of the work that gets done between the quarterly meetings, that I was thinking that would be helpful for some perspective on. And I think it very much relates to what we all get out of the experience, because there's a pretty structured agenda and, I mean, we get some work done in work groups during the two half days that we're together as NACIE, but the reality is, to actually move any of these projects forward requires some work outside of the meetings.

And I would say, as is everywhere else in life, you get out of it what you put into it. And there were definitely a couple of times where I was working on projects and we realized there was a meeting, another NACIE meeting, our quarterly meeting in three weeks and we really hadn't done much since the last one on a particular project and then we'd scramble. And other times when we'd lay them out, we'd say, well, let's make sure we talk

about this in the next two or three weeks after this meeting so that we can actually make some progress.

Ultimately, we'll work in smaller work groups around things that we care about and the staff is available. Each work group historically would have one of the staff assigned to support it and they're bandwidth constrained as well, but the clearer you can be, if you want to get a meeting scheduled, we can ask Craig and Eric and the team to, hey, can you help get the four of us together and I heard there National Academies report, could you find out more about that?

And Eric was great on our SBIR staff getting folks from the National Academies to come and do a conference call with us in the interim to explain what they were doing on SBIR so that we weren't reinventing the wheel and that we were able to build on that. So, it was sort of very informal, we didn't necessarily elect chairs, we just sort of, whoever felt like they had the time, we would just jump in, agree who was going to draft the next version, when we'd meet again. And so, there was

a lot of that kind of informal, but important work going on between the quarterly meetings in order to move our projects forward.

I wanted to also respond to something, Rebecca made a comment about transition team and, while I don't think we should get hung up on, like, are we going to be effective or not in the transition, I think we should just put our heads down and get some work done, but I also do agree that there's going to be a bunch of people who are of transition team for the part а next administration and it would be worth thinking about, this is where, again, the staff hopefully can really help us figure out who are key people that are going to be relevant to this group and ensure that we invite them to a meeting to talk to us or for us to talk to them.

And, again, maybe also engage some of the work groups, depending on what we all end up working on. And then, I don't know where all we're going with the conversation, so I'll just jump on a completely different topic. On the Slack front,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I've actually used Slack a little bit over the last year. And for those that haven't, I recommend the mobile version, because --

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: It's a lot easier.

MR. KENNEY: -- it's actually a lot easier and you can set up notifications. So, assuming that the traffic isn't crazy, you can actually get a notification on your phone just telling you every time somebody's made a comment and you can set up do not disturb hours so you don't get dings on your phone in the middle of the night. And that's an easier way to use Slack than assuming you have to remember to go to the web version. There's also a desktop app version that you can install that also will do notifications. But it, I think, will be a good tool for us to use.

MS. WILSON: So I think this goes to the whole question too about, we're all doers, how do we make stuff happen? And I think we're all leaders in our respective fields, we're all leaders in our community, and for those of you who were here yesterday may have heard me say, every time I left

one of these meetings, it was like a shot of adrenaline and ideas, that I didn't have to wait for policy to change, I didn't need to wait for something to come down from Commerce, that I could go back to Atlanta and implement whatever I thought would make sense. And I think through that, there became a lot of camaraderie.

Steve Tang and I have served on some steering committees and boards at University City Science Center, and so there's this dialog now with some of his team of how do we tie together Philly and Atlanta? I'm going out to meet Rohit in a few weeks in L.A. to talk about how we can support his companies. And it all ties to Capital Continuum issues and SBIR and best use of those funds. Even partnering with some different agencies.

So, through NACIE, I've been able to develop relationships with OSTP, with Vice President Biden's office, with NCI and the NIH, and there's some interesting things coming together there. And it didn't have to be from a kind of formal policy recommendation standpoint, just

seeing opportunities and gaps to make a difference and having the platform to get in and make that difference.

The other thing that kind of stemmed from this is, I think it was in our probably third NACIE meeting, upstairs, Julie we were Goonewardene and, it may have been Christine, and I were talking about, just over coffee, women in technology transfer issues and women technologists starting companies and there was some data that had come out of the number of patents with at least one woman's name on it in science and medicine has skyrocketed over the past ten years, that when I look around my community, I don't see any of those women involved in starting companies, why is that?

And so, going back to Atlanta and reaching across the Southeast region, kind of came up with some theories on that and just said, hey, what's going on in your university? Hey, what's going on in your academic center? And, as a result, we launched a Medtech Women group at the Southeastern Medical Device Association, which I'm

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

on the board, which is tying in a lot of EDA initiatives from inclusion and diversity and kind of two-fold.

One, how do we provide professional development opportunities for those women who are already in industry and are not in the C suite? Because there are no women in the C suite in medical device companies, maybe HR and compliance, but not anywhere else. And then, on the technologist side, so doctors, nurses, engineers who are coming up with these great new technologies, how do we provide them the mentoring, connectivity, and network to say, all right, if I have an idea, this is how I get that to market? Because there's a void right there in the scientific community.

And all of that really came over having coffee and just a chit chatty discussion with some of the colleagues and we just decided to kind of move forward with it. So, it's really, to your point David, it's kind of you get out of it what you put into it.

MS. LENZER: Do you want to add to that?

CO-CHAIR TANG: I just want to pick on David's comment about what happens between the meetings.

MS. LENZER: Okay.

CO-CHAIR TANG: And I think it will depend on what we're doing. I don't think any of us want to have conference calls just to have But it depends on what we're conference calls. When we got down to the rubber hitting the road for SBIR, Eric was strident in getting this group together and making sure we were moving I think one of the learnings that we had, ahead. and we talked about this, Melissa and Julie and I, last week, is that, it is helpful -- all of you have staff that work behind the scenes for you. enormously helpful for me to have Sol briefed at the time what was going on. So, I think we now have established, it's okay for you to bring, I think, let's see, one staff person?

MS. LENZER: However many people you want to pay to get to D.C. or wherever we're going, yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	CO-CHAIR TANG: Right. It's on you.
2	It's on you to do that. But I think it's enormously
3	helpful to have somebody from my team hearing the
4	full breadth of the discussion here in order for
5	us to go back and organize the resources that we
6	want to bring to the table to couple with the staff
7	here at OIE. So, I think we've legitimized that
8	now with NACIE 3.0.
9	MS. LENZER Yes.
10	CO-CHAIR TANG: And I think
11	MS. LENZER: Yes, if you have to help
12	
13	CO-CHAIR TANG: Right.
14	MS. LENZER: with some of the things,
15	yes, absolutely.
16	CO-CHAIR TANG: Yes. And I think that
17	will actually help us move quicker so now it doesn't
18	rely on us going back and briefing our staff and
19	them getting one version of the story and trying
20	to move from there. So, I think that's a good
21	development.
22	MS. LENZER: Marie's going to

MS. LYNCH: So just one small thing, you may have figured out by today sitting in the sessions that if you are an expert in innovation, the workforce language, the workforce words sound like a different language, right? And if you're an expert in workforce and you're listening to entrepreneurship, don't vou know what the acronyms, right? And so, I wanted to make a plug for, and Craiq knows I'm going to say this, but make a plug for doing a community exchange, doing a visit at one of the hometowns early in the tenure, because a couple things.

One, if done right and now that we have the roadmap for it, you get to do a deep dive and actually see and touch and feel at a location innovation, entrepreneurship, and workforce. And so, whatever area you're not good in, you can now visualize what's being talked about at the table. Second, it is just a tremendous way to get to know each other and to have a more casual relationship and to understand what we're all doing as we're reacting to and actually touching and feeling

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

something.

So, the lab aspect of it I think will
be really interesting, Craig. That will be
different for 3.0 than 2.0, because we can use it
also as an opportunity to get to know one another.
So I think that community exchange. And then,
finally, if you decide to host it, do not
underestimate, like everything in life, the more
you plan, the better the outcome. And so, it
really is about bringing together your civic
leaders and some of your best practices and
prepping them that it's okay to talk about what
doesn't work and what you need them to talk about
during the sessions. Because otherwise it just
becomes an infomercial, which is not effective
either. And so, please, if you're signing up,
know, dig a little bit, really understand what
you're signing yourself up for, but it is an
incredible opportunity.

MS. LENZER: Great. Brian, you had a question?

MR. BARTHOLOMEUSZ: Brian Bartholomeusz

at the TomKat Center. I've heard a number of people talk about, find something you're passionate about and run with it. And I'm assuming we're not going to work on 30 different things. It would be really interesting to understand what the guidelines of the process is, very quickly, in terms of how some of these ideas are selected or bubble up to the top.

MS. LENZER: Well, I think, and they said this earlier, it's going to be up to the group, because everything's done by consensus. I'm not — we don't set the rules for how you decide what you're going to work on. But you're right, 30 people with passion working on 30 different initiatives is probably not going to be what you want to do. And, in fact, Secretary Pritzker was very clear, she said, I'd rather have a few really high impact things that are done well, than 15 that are just done mediocre.

And so, it's just like picking out what you're going to do in your business or in your organization, it's like, how do you figure out

where to spend your time, knowing that you do have two years, that you have certain levers that the government, things that the government could actually do. And so, was that part of what we were going to talk about tomorrow at the -- I don't think so. I don't think so, but it's something we can certainly look to develop over the next two meetings.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Yes. Just a couple quick points that I think align with that question, There's two, maybe three typical scenarios Brian. that we've seen over the last two years where an opportunity arises. One is where we, the U.S. Government, have a specific question about a program or a policy that we're trying to address. We're not quite certain what it is, we're not quite certain how to deploy some funding, and it's very much a consultation experience. The other one, so that would be a push or well, a pull from us, I guess, but the other would be a push version where you all identify a gap in your own communities and in industries and organizations and say, you guys

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

aren't doing this and really should be thinking about it, and you push that to us as a new idea.

MS. LENZER: But preferably, you're working to get your colleagues around the idea too. So, it's about also building peer consensus around the problem and the opportunity.

CO-CHAIR TANG: And my last pitch on this, I think resources have been brought up in a number of different ways today and Steve talked about having staff support and I think that's a huge value. The value on U.S. Government on the staff side is where, can we get our colleagues, sometimes if required, our colleagues in various agencies and, whether it's SBA, Treasury, we met some last night, here across Commerce Bureaus, are they interested and do they have the bandwidth to move this forward as well? Our initiatives will touch so many different issues across government that it's important that there's buy-in across our side.

So, on the resource side, those resources have to be committed. And I think when we shopped it around, it was said earlier,

just not appetite for it. And Marie said it with the Department of Labor and it was just not the right timing for them. So, important to note.

MS. BALDWIN: I must have been asleep yesterday. The summaries yesterday are the 2.0 projects. Would it be fair to say that one of the first things that we should do is understand what finished is and disposition, yes or no, are we going to pick them up?

MS. LENZER: Sure. I mean, yes, you can take a look at what's in there and who has an appetite for, yes, this is really exciting, carry it forward. And I think that, Melissa and Steve, in your wrap-up this afternoon, is that one of the areas that we're going to touch on, right? In kind of the last hour, going into tomorrow. So, yes, absolutely. As you read those, do you read the summaries and go, oh, okay, or do you read this and go, wow, wait, this is really something that we should do, and then make the case for it.

I will tell you that each of the folks

that are here from NACIE 2.0, most of them are here 1 because they have something that they're excited 2 3 about that they'd like to continue. So, expect to be -- yes, well, no, yes, and that's -- by the way 4 5 -- lobbied for it, yes. And by the way, we're all 6 professionals, productive conflict is good, right? 7 And if you guys are all sitting around the table nodding yes at each other, I'm going to be really 8 disappointed. 9 10 (Laughter.) MS. LENZER: We did not, no bobbleheads 11 12 were allowed at the last one. 13 MR. MANDELL: I'm Josh Mandell. 14 Penney's Senior Advisor on Innovation Competitiveness Policy. So, my time is short here 15 16 as well, so I'm going to do my best to influence 17 all of you as much as possible and then I'll just disappear. 18 19 (Laughter.) 20 MR. MANDELL: Just one point on time 21 So, if you look at NACIE 1.0, their biggest

achievement that I think is basically the passage

of the JOBS Act. Which was kind of just started to come online around 2011-2012 and just a few months ago actually became law. So, if you -- and that's basically allows non-accredited investors to invest in startups via crowdfunding mechanisms and so on and so forth. So, we're talking about the number of things you want to hit and the number of things you want to hit and the number of things you want to do and whether we want to make a big splash or a small splash, and I also think to add to the complexity is that you don't have to necessarily consider things which are going to be done on your watch.

And one person around, I mean, there's probably a few people around the table that can be a reality check for how long things take in Washington, especially when it comes to legislative change, but I would definitely take advantage of your friend, Andrew Reamer, at the end of the table who, I think, was modest in his ability to be a reality check for the kinds of ideas and the kinds of traction that you'll actually end up getting in Washington.

And I think that, I'm sure there's a lot of value that Andrew can add, but from where I sit, I think that's where he can kind of really be a filter for what's achievable in what kind of time frame, what's been tried and what hasn't. So, I think that that's certainly something to consider. And also, to reiterate what David said, I don't see any future Secretary of Commerce, or President for that matter, coming in and saying, this is what I want NACIE to focus on. I just don't see a scenario where that's going to be the case.

The whole idea behind having a Federal Advisory Committee of people that come from the real world is that we have 50,000 people who work in the Department of Commerce, millions who work for the federal government, we need people from outside our organization to tell us how we can operate better. So, in the scenario where someone is going and saying, these are the priorities, this is what you should focus on, I think that actually loses the value of NACIE. So, I would fight against -- you definitely want to be somewhat

1	aligned, I don't see anybody who's running for
2	president that is on an antiinnovation platform,
3	but then again, we never know. So, that's my
4	(Laughter.)
5	MR. MANDELL: And I'm here also until,
6	well, I don't know how long I'm going to be here
7	for, but January 20 is the latest that I'll be here,
8	but I'm a resource as well. I work with the State
9	Department, Small Business Administration, Labor,
10	Treasury, Transport. If there's any other
11	agencies or anything, these guys also work with
12	them, I can connect you with the right resource.
13	I'm here to act as a liaison between NACIE and the
14	Secretary and other parts of government, so, feel
15	free to use and abuse me for as long as I'm here.
16	MS. LENZER: Go ahead, Joe. Joe had a
17	question too.
18	MR. SCHOCKEN: Thank you.
19	(Laughter.)
20	MS. LENZER: He doesn't even know what
21	Slack is, but slacker.
22	MR. SCHOCKEN: And there are no slackers

around the table here. I'm Joe Schocken from Seattle, Washington, Broadmark Capital. In my business life, we're deeply involved in technology and medical life sciences kind of financing. And, Josh, I just wanted to pick up on the comments you made there about the JOBS Act, because that's something that hits really quite close to home. I was deeply involved in the development of the JOBS Act and actually very proud of that.

Josh, parts of it became effective in 2011 when it passed, the portions dealing with the It was the equity crowdfunding portions that were so badly delayed by the SEC. And so, if I could just kind of swing from that specific to the general, innovation more ΜV view on and entrepreneurship is that the big issue is capital I certainly take note of that report formation. back in the first NACIE cohort and that's certainly the issue that I would like to be focused on because there are so many things that could be done around capital formation.

One of the issues that came up this

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

morning is this question about the regionalization
of venture capital and the absence of financing for
innovative companies in parts of the country.
That's an issue I would certainly like to roll into.
Parts of the JOBS Act remain unimplemented today
or have been damaged by various agencies. So there
are a series of issues there that, I think, actually
cut right to the core of innovation and
entrepreneurship. And so, I'm going to certain
encourage that capital formation be a significant
focus and I certainly volunteer for being involved
in that.
MS. LENZER: Thank you. Orin, did you
have another question?
MR. HERSKOWITZ: Just a follow-up
question for Josh. You mentioned, just because
we're looking for a few positive examples of what
works, and going back to NACIE 1.0 within our group.
You said NACIE 1.0 worked extensively on the, had
an influence on the JOBS Act, how did that like,
what worked?

MS. LENZER: So, interestingly, none of

us were here when NACIE 1.0 was in and, in fact, we had very little institutional knowledge because there was no OIE for about a year after the former NACIE left and I came onboard in May of 2014. But I know that the access to capital report was where it outlined some of the broad ideas that eventually got implemented in the JOBS Act, but it wasn't NACIE itself, there were some individuals, like Steve Case, who worked with Joe and other folks to try and get that legislation pulled forward.

It was not necessarily a NACIE group, they kind of did the research on the access to capital and then it kind of -- like, to your point, don't be afraid to jump into something that's going to take longer than your two years, especially if you've laid out a path for it or see that there -- legislation doesn't happen overnight.

MR. MANDELL: Steve was the bridge between NACIE 1.0 and NACIE 2.0, that was kind of -- and so he's the one who educated us on kind of what worked and what didn't for the last NACIE, now we have that same pattern between 2.0 and 3.0.

1	MS. LENZER: Can you pass it down, Trey
2	wants to talk?
3	MR. BOWLES: Hi, Trey Bowles. I'm the CEO
4	of the Dallas Entrepreneur Center, which is a
5	501(c)3 organization in Dallas to help
6	entrepreneurs start, build, and grow businesses,
7	and co-founder of the Dallas Innovation Alliance,
8	which has developed a Smart Cities Initiative and
9	Test Lab launching in Dallas in the next few months.
10	So my question, and Marie, you mentioned this a
11	little bit, but I know NACIE doesn't have a budget,
12	but if there are things that NACIE want to do that
13	cost money that we can go get somebody to pay for
14	it, how does that work?
15	MS. LENZER: Network.
16	MR. BOWLES: Okay.
17	(Laughter.)
18	MS. LENZER: We've got this great thing
19	that will help you with that. You can't actually
20	ask for money on behalf of NACIE.
21	MR. BOWLES: But you can ask for money
22	on behalf of initiatives?

MS. LENZER: If the Dallas Entrepreneurship Center would like to find a sponsor for donuts and coffee so that we have donuts and coffee or somebody wants to provide that, that's fine. But, yes, those are good questions

for Dana when she comes in for the ethics briefing.

MS. LYNCH: Well, let me give a real So, we had an initiative that we were example. supporting, that employer driven training survey. And that was -- it was going to cost money to get that done. And so, what was happening, even though we didn't finish that up, what was happening was, there was a couple of foundations at the table and then there was also offers being made from NACIE members to identify other foundations who could then help fund that project. NACIE would be a co-sponsor, there was many, many folks involved in And so, it was a really effective way to it. actually utilize the network to get funding for something that was important to the group. when we kind of quickly said, that's a good thing, that's maybe an example of how it can

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

effectively.

1.3

MR. BOWLES: And organizations in exchange for their money?

MS. LENZER: So, Whitney, you're good at -- because you're unhappy, why don't you answer how somebody like JPMorgan Chase was evaluating what to fund?

MS. LYNCH: We may be getting a little bit into the weeds with this, but go ahead.

MS. W. SMITH: I mean, in a simple way, foundations are looking for good ideas to invest in and can take more risk often than government can. So, if you have ideas, I don't care where they come from, we will consider it. I mean, in this specific case, it wasn't clear that there was going to be an appropriation or federal money for it, but a lot of foundations are interested in answering the question of what employers are doing in terms of investing in their workers, so it aligned with our priorities. And that's actually not done, I think that foundations are still waiting for scope of work on it.

1 MS. LENZER: Believe it or not, that's been our hour. Really quickly, I'm going to go 2 3 around and ask the former NACIE members, why did you come back? And we're going to end with that. 4 5 Really quickly, tweetable response. CO-CHAIR TANG: There's more work to be 6 7 done. MS. LYNCH: I mentioned this at lunch, 8 because we weren't done, we were only halfway 9 10 through, it wasn't done. 11 KENNEY: Ι don't have anything MR. 12 terribly insightful beyond those. I mean, that was what motivated me. And I felt like I could 13 14 contribute to helping new people come onboard more effectively and I thought it would be a great way 15 16 to contribute by just helping to explain our experience. 17 MS. WILSON: All of the above. And just 18 19 to be really candid, a couple of years ago, I 20 started to get a little bored and this has been, 21 in just the day-to-day work, and this has been one

of the most rewarding experiences professionally

and personally in my adult life. And so, I'm just really looking forward on building that and enabling other stuff.

(Applause.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. BUERSTATTE: At this time, we are not going to break, but we will break into a new session. And I realize this has been a long push, so I would -- yes. But at this time, we will break from the public portion. So, for those on the line, we are breaking for an administrative session and we will be back, we will resume the public session at 4:30 Eastern. At 4:30 Eastern, we'll resume the public session.

Good afternoon, folks. This is Craiq Buerstatte back with the public portion of the National Advisory Council on Innovation Entrepreneurship FACA meeting. Right now we're going to convene or begin the final session of with co-chairs today's agenda leading off discussing what our next steps are. Steve and Melissa?

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: Thank you. This is

Melissa Bradley speaking. So, I just want to say a couple of things to help us transition. So, one, having been a political appointee, I have been where you are and the shock and awe, oh my goodness, what can I do. And I think that part of this is recognizing that we have a huge responsibility, right? That as entrepreneurs we want to be risk also takers. but fiduciary have we responsibilities and moral obligations, for the companies that we associate ourselves with, that we invest with, and certainly for the communities So, I would just ask as somebody that we serve. who's been through many ethics briefings, not because I did anything, but just to make sure --(Laughter.)

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: -- that it's important we put in context, right? That this is no different than if we were getting ready to make an investment and we need to be doing diligence that we would do in how we operate, because we do have the privilege to be at a much higher level. With that, I think to help us transition and hopefully

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

take a deep breath and we'll see everybody come back tomorrow and next time, is I am humbled by the excitement and enthusiasm for us to move forward.

And I think the beauty of this is that, again, it is a blank canvas, it's not the business model canvas, it's a blank canvas, and how do we begin to put some framing on that? And tomorrow is a great opportunity for us to go through design thinking and brainstorm, but I certainly heard the questions, okay, when do we get to the real issues? And I'm excited, because time is ticking. But I would ask that before we dive deep, to take a step back and think about, what is the best framing for us collectively?

We've heard a lot of themes, we heard a lot from NACIE 2.0, because there's lot of ways for us to frame this. And I was actually speaking to Andrew, and I'll just give some examples, I think that -- I don't think I've met anyone yet, but I haven't talked to everyone, that issues around diversity and inclusiveness are not important. Not because it's a moral obligation, but because

of demographic shifts and the historical under-investment in these communities is significant, in addition that for some or others, because of who we serve or who we are, it's a very personal issue.

Should that be or does it have to be an issue in and of itself? Maybe not. Could that be a larger rubric where we focus our efforts that then allow us to have the latitude to have a lot more issues. The other thing that I learned and heard from 2.0 was that we are federal special, special S-P-S-H-L, special federal employees. And that means that we have the duty to be unbiased. And so, yesterday I heard a lot of great research done that was very much data driven.

So, if our larger frame or North Star is inclusiveness and diversity in all that we do and the undergirding is driven by data, then that gives us a lot of opportunity to create pillars in between. And if I may use the example, I think that we all have issues that may not appear in conversation to be the same, but if we step back

and widen our aperture, there's probably a lot more commonality. May I use our discussion at lunch? So, we had a great conversation, thanks to Scott, in particular, and also Joseph and Chad and Kara.

And Joseph, if you haven't caught on, is very passionate about community colleges. But then we stepped back and said, you know, I said, do you think community colleges are going to make it? Do you think it should make it? Because I don't necessarily resonate with the community college, not because I don't personally, but I'm at a four year institution, but you know what we have in common? The same demographics. He's in West Virginia, I'm in D.C.

So, how do we step back and say, this is an issue around how to marginalized communities have a pipeline to education, access, and opportunity? That's a much easier sell, I think, for more of us than just focusing on community college. So, all I would say for tomorrow is to think about what are the big goals that we want to have in terms of solving? How and what are the ways

and pathways that we individually and, most importantly, in work groups can advance those?

And what is the undergirding we need to be successful?

It's going to be data, it's going to be access to other federal employees. And I would also say, personally, think about it in chunks, right? So, think about it in what can we do immediately to really leverage the momentum of what has happened before us? What are some of the short term things? Thinking about post-transition. And I think most importantly, to what Josh has said, what's the long game?

For me, I'm excited probably less about what we're going to do together, but when I watch my kids grow up, I can say, that happened because this group got together. When I see more kids coming to community colleges and being able to —that's a case study, as opposed to the MIT and the Stanford folks, nothing personal, being successful entrepreneurs. That's success to me. So, I think my only guidance or facilitation is, at dinner, if

you've got ideas, let me know personally.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

But I'd say, before you nail in on something, think about what is a larger goal that we collectively want to say, we checked the box and we nailed that? How do we do that by being much inclusive ourselves, so that community colleges, four vear institutions, urban environments, rural environments, we all have similar issues, capital is universal, how do we really hone in on that and organize around that? And then, what are the tools, much like Tom talked about, that we need to be successful?

CO-CHAIR TANG: I just want to pick up, and I agree with Melissa, some of the comments about what to do with the output of 2.0, okay? First of all, it's not proscriptive, it is a starting point, I think, and the reason that the veterans of 2.0 want you to have that is because we didn't have it for 1.0. So, it's your starting point, okay? Questions about why things didn't get done have a lot to do with the political environment more than anything else. It's not that conceptually they

were off, it's that we couldn't gather the support at the time to move them forward.

Even issues like SBIR, which I mentioned that I'm passionate about, don't have anything to do other than monitor the legislative process to see when the markup of the bill comes up and then we can act accordingly. So, don't take that as a constraint or as something that narrows your view, view that as this is something that the previous group came up with that you can build on or carry forward or monitor. So, if you have more specific questions, I think we can answer that in the context of the design session tomorrow.

But I think what Melissa and I are saying collectively is, don't presuppose anything, either your agenda or the agenda for this Council, all right? If you are passionate about something, be prepared to frame it in a way that makes it appealing for the broader audience and the collective wisdom and resources in this room. I will have to say that I would expect that some of things that you're going to suggest are not going

to gather a significant consensus collectively for the Council.

with it, you can find ways of working with other people on the Council to drive it forward outside of the official sanctions or support of the Council. That happened in numerous ways, I think, in 2.0. And you heard about the way that outside funders worked, I think it was specifically JPMorgan, the Aspen Institute, coming together to fund the work at the University of Chicago.

So, these things happen in the context of this room because you have folks that have day jobs that will pick up on these ideas as well. So, there are plenty of outlets for your ideas, all right? And so, the game is not to have the right answer tomorrow, the game is to start the process tomorrow and see if we can coalesce a couple things that we can action before the next meeting. So, Craig and Melissa, I'll just stop there and maybe if there are remaining questions on that, we can take that. But hopefully that puts you in a

1	mindset of abundance and positive thinking about
2	what you want to accomplish and we want to
3	accomplish tomorrow.
4	MR. BOWLES: Real quick, we were talking
5	earlier, Marie and I were talking about the
6	criteria by which 2.0 used to determine what
7	projects you were going to pursue. Is there any
8	way we can see what that criteria is before we meet
9	tomorrow so that we can
10	MR. BUERSTATTE: Yes. Marie, are you
11	referring to the framework that we kind of built
12	between the different verticals?
13	MS. LYNCH: Somehow it didn't, yes, it
14	didn't get, sorry, it did not get picked up in the
15	onboarding, I noticed
16	MR. BUERSTATTE: Okay.
17	MS. LYNCH: the document, but if you
18	
19	MR. BUERSTATTE: Yes.
20	MS. LYNCH: go back to the Google
21	meeting, we had
22	MR. BUERSTATTE: Yes. Yes, we looked at

a few -- just given the original charge of NACIE and, well, 2.0 with these subcommittees and the work around the policy initiatives related to those committees, as well as the opportunities that we had discussed over the first, and Marie is referring to the Google meetings, so this is about a year into it. So, then we took the portfolio of work that we had and then put it into verticals and essentially organized it into a broader strategic vision.

So, if you think about that, we're a year into it and organizing our work into strategic vision, maybe not the best way to go about it. We probably should have started with that strategic vision first, perhaps. Or it depends on how you prefer to work, you're the advisors, not I, maybe you discuss a few near term wins, things you want to look into for the first 100 days and then what language or what story does that tell?

MS. LYNCH: Is it -- do you have, sorry, just to be super specific, do you still have the list of, there was a literally a bulleted out list?

1 MR. BUERSTATTE: Yes. Yes, we sure do have that. 2 3 MS. LYNCH: Can you bring that for the 4 morning session so we can have it? MR. BUERSTATTE: Yes, absolutely. 5 MS. LYNCH: And in fairness to 6 7 everybody, you don't have to accept it. It's just place to start, consider it counsel 8 and direction, but --9 10 MR. BUERSTATTE: Yes. 11 Maybe Slack it. MS. LYNCH: Yes. 12 iust offer MR. KAPP: Can Ι one 13 recommendation? Because I hear a lot of emphasis 14 on 100 days and impact and all that kind of stuff, and I get it, I recognize that, but I also want to 15 16 go ahead and just make sure that we're also keeping the context of -- and, Melissa, it's something that 17 kind of dovetails with what you were saying, to just 18 19 kind of reiterate that we also have an opportunity So if we look at 20 for a shorter arc, right? 21 incubators and accelerators, the ability to go

ahead and fund things today, but if we look at it

also from a little bit of a longer arc, right, and what is it that we can go ahead and pass to 4.0?

And one of the things that I would encourage us to think about is something that perhaps maybe spans to the next folks and a little bit of a longer arc so that we maybe come up with sort of shorter things, but also think about what sort of legacy that we're going to be imparting when we go ahead and have that transition and what sort of legacy are we going to be leaving. Because a lot of the stuff that we've been talking about is immediate, let's go ahead and sort of businesses and different programs, but education in particular and what legacy do we leave and how do we go ahead and potentially even have an impact on the culture of America, both in communities, in rural communities, K-12, colleges, community colleges and universities?

I would like for us at least, and I'm a planner, I don't have any kids, but if one legacy that we can go ahead and think about is sort of starting with the end in mind and where do we go

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

so that we're leading into 4.0 potentially, in addition to that immediate 100 days. What are maybe one or two things that we may be able to work on that have longevity?

MS. BAGLEY: Repatriation of funds. mean, I don't know if it's a worthwhile exercise. Well, one, I think we need to look at that again in the transition. But, two, okay, so if you have whatever the number is, did you throw out \$4 Okay. So, let's say we have \$500 trillion? billion to spend on innovation, like, what do you even recommend happens with that money? I mean, again, is that an exercise that's in futility or is it an exercise that generates a huge vision that then we can also work back if it doesn't come to fruition into some things that are more manageable chunks of that.

I mean, because that's just a whole other level of thinking. Let's say the whole \$4 trillion doesn't come into innovation, but a quarter of it does or whatever, I mean, that's an incredible amount of money to say, can we even

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

digest, how do we even digest that as a nation over the course of time to be able to make an impact on the types of things we're thinking? So, that's a way to consider the question tomorrow morning.

CO-CHAIR TANG: I think we are encouraging that type of thinking.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: Any other questions?

Because I wanted to pose one to the group and I don't want to shut it down. So, I have to imagine that because people are really busy, you didn't think about what you wanted to accomplish before you said yes, particularly after you've been given all that financial information. So, I would ask everybody, but in tweetable form, only two, but two things or two reasons why you said yes. Because I think we're all entrepreneurs, we think in various chunks, I'm hearing visioning and design thinking and reverse engineering.

So, try to step outside the process of how, but I'd love to hear what people want, because I also think there's some angst of, uh oh, are the 3.0 stuck with the 2.0, but we don't even know what

1	the 3.0s want. So, this is no commitment, I'm
2	asking as fellow member, no power here as a
3	co-chair, but what are people interested in? I
4	think it would just be good now, because it's
5	another way for us to continue to get to know each
6	other and have conversations. So
7	DR. WOMACK: Can I answer that?
8	CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: Chad?
9	DR. WOMACK: I want to create I want
10	to make sure that African-Americans are fully
11	participating in the innovation and tech economy.
12	And that we actually have deal flow that connects
13	up to the other ecosystems throughout the country.
14	CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: Thank you. We don't
15	have to go in any order, but I do want to ask
16	everyone to participate.
17	MS. FINNEY: And just to piggyback on
18	what Chad said, the reason why I accepted and wanted
19	to be part of it is, 80 percent of all new businesses
20	since 2007 have been created by black and Latino
21	women entrepreneurs, but we receive less than 0.2

percent of all venture capital and the receipts of

our companies are somewhere around \$35,000-36,000 a year.

If we are talking about why business is stagnating, it's because you have these huge groups of people who are being completely excluded from the innovation and entrepreneurship economy. So, how do we bridge that? How do we create connectivity between companies who signed on to the Tech Inclusion, with the people who are actually doing the work?

MR. KHOSLA: So, as I think about it, I think this whole country was built on innovation and entrepreneurship, used different words around World War I, World War II. And we have existence proof of successful examples of that, so I want to understand how do we scale it and why can it not be scaled? I mean, what is our problem right now? And I think if we can figure that out, we would be going very far, because except for like four or five cities, we've not been able to scale it. So that's one.

Secondly, I think we need to rejigger

the education system in a way that we have not done. And it's not about MOOCs, it's not about online education, it's about the fundamental notions of what is being taught, why, when, where, how. And so, I have a very big interest in that, because I think even -- it might not be the Department of Commerce's goal, but I think that is the basis from which everything starts. And we need to work with DOE and other agencies to just figure that out.

DR. TOONE: I would build on that too. I think that how we use our educational agencies deliver material to students, I'm interested in finding, thinking about ways that we can measure the impact of what we're doing. an awful lot of teaching, I don't think we do enough work to measure the impact of what that does. other thing that I very much want to do at the University is to find ways that the federal dollars that flow into universities to support fundamental research can be used more effectively to get the result of that research out into the big world where they actually impact people's lives.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MS. BAGLEY: I'd say one of the things that has always been of interest to me is the connectivity of things. So, I just see so many people working on so many great issues from all the been inclusion, we've talking about, connection, university pipelines, industry. just feel like there is so much disconnection around those efforts, companies don't SO understand, like Ι was just talking about, companies don't understand the work that's going to connect these disconnected, on African-American, whatever the population is, into these pipelines.

And so, one of my big continuous things is what are the big ideas to sort of connect these pieces together so that we can move forward in a more effective and efficient -- and I'm not saying it's like one ring that rules them all, right, but it's this network of connectivity that I don't think that everybody -- do you like my Lord of the Rings reference?

(Laughter.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: Go ahead.

MR. KENNEY: To Pradeep's point about scale, one idea that we had in 2.0 that we didn't really do much with, and I think both Marie and I remember having a conversation about it a long time ago, is the idea of replicating successful models. Rather than always looking for a new way of doing things, really using federal resources to say, that's a good idea and let's use federal resources to help other people copy it when appropriate. And so, that's something I would love to see and move forward.

MS. BOESCH: Yes, I was thinking I'd like to build on the theme of connectivity, because I've spent a lot of time working inside the government and a lot of time working for the private sector and I think the lines of communication between both of them kind of really need to be improved. I would love to see people that I see in the private sector, entrepreneurial sector, taking better advantage of, knowing more about, kind of having easier access to programs that the government already

offers that simply don't have visibility or connections to those places.

And vice versa, I want a lot of the really interesting and innovative things I see especially happening, in some place like Cambridge, to actually come back and benefit the U.S. Government and there's no real easy ways to So, I'm looking at how we can start do that either. to blur the lines between the people that kind of know how to work with the government exclusively do that and people that work in the private sector, because I think that will need to blur.

MR. NEMETH: So, I'd like to also add in the perspective from those Tier 2, Tier 3 cities. I'm in Columbus, Ohio and it's a long repeated phrase of, how do we build the next Silicon Valley in Columbus, as if it's going to be the same. It's going to be different. I'm in the science and technology space, so that's what I'm familiar with and I think those cities will adapt differently. I'd also like to throw out a comment on something

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that's come up a couple times and, for me, it was new a couple months ago, and that's this Smart Cities concepts.

And I know if you are like me, when you first heard of transportation as this economic driver in the last year, I didn't take it as seriously as I do now when I better understand the impact it has on a lot of different fronts. From a connectivity standpoint in the physical sense of connecting customers inside of just even community, and you think about sort of fundamentals of starting a new business, necessarily a huge startup, but even just a small retail shop in an underserved part of town, if you have a better transportation network, you have more customers, you have more opportunity for investors to just even come visit the opportunity that you're trying to build. So, I'd like to throw that out there as it's not something I'm an expert in, it's just something I'm interested in and I've seen the impact it's making on this.

DR. REAMER: I have two interests. One

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

is helping to build the capacity of the federal government to create and implement an effective economic strategy for competitiveness. think is that the economic well-being of residents of this country is dependent on the ability of American-based companies to compete in global markets. But the government has no strategy. government doesn't monitor the competitiveness of economic America. The policy of the U.S. Government is focused on managing the business cycle, it's not focused on managing the economic structure and the components of that, including innovation, entrepreneurship, and workforce.

So, if I ask people in the Commerce Department, what are the ten key industries that compete in global markets and how are they doing, they can't tell me. And so, people who run businesses run them with a strategy, you scan your environment, you figure out your competitive strengths and weaknesses and you act on them. Federal efforts around competitiveness are program driven, but there's no overarching strategy. And

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that concerns me greatly. It's something that states have been doing for 30 years, and I can go into reasons why the federal government doesn't do it.

But that is a broad interest. And then, a more specific interest is in the realm of improving the ability of the federal government to see to the provision of labor market information so labor markets can work better and so that workers, students, employers, and educators can all make better decisions in labor markets.

MS. LYNCH: I would like to see us scale and replicate the best practices in innovation, entrepreneurship, and workforce that reside in a lot of our great cities, and do that either through a vehicle of community exchanges or some new idea that will come out of this group so that we can make our cities stronger.

MS. GOLDIN: I'm Kara Goldin and I'm the founder and CEO of this product, Hint. Haven't said much today, been listening a lot. But basically, I started the company 11 years ago to

really get people thinking about what's inside their products. And specifically around food and beverages, very soon in the skin care market as well. And I didn't come from the food and beverage sector, I came from the tech sector, was at AOL to seven years prior to that running the e-commerce team.

And basically, I think a lot of success has been just because I've asked the question, why? And why are things done this way in this industry and why do we believe this and why are we allowing sugar and sweeteners to be inside water? So, I want to take that same really stance to really understand why are we thinking this way, why aren't things pushing through? And too, my conversation with Craig earlier, is can we create little wins along the way? It's great to have long term goals for what we're going to accomplish in the next two years, but part of my success has been being able to chip away at the rock, as I say, in order to create small wins, even though I'm up against major lobbyists like sugar and Monsanto and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

lots of companies like that. So, thanks.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. BOWLES: I think for me it's twofold. First is to help understand from a governmental perspective what resources, tools, funding, solutions we can make available to early stage entrepreneurs, and we focus a lot in the government on small businesses, but specifically early stage entrepreneurs of all types. So that's one initiative, to be the voice of that entrepreneur and what kind of things they need to be successful.

And two, I see over our work at Startup America and now with the Startup Champions Network, I see an emerging group of new ecosystem builders, and making sure that we are incorporating them into standard incubators and research parks and universities as we do and really understand -because they have a lot of really great firsthand data and insight into what's happening with those same entrepreneurs and what those people need. And so, I think being able to really think from that perspective what kind of things can be done to help them be more successful at an early stage.

SMITH: MS. S. Ι can see some similarities in some of the things that have been said so far and Andrew in particular with regard I think any economic strategy has to to strategy. include a way to have more accessibility for students to education. And whether that's four education or two year education, education is critical to our country and to companies in our country. So, that was one of the things that, among other things that have been said here, but that was one of the things that I was particularly interested in trying to determine.

MS. STEVENSON: So, speaking from a retail business, because I work for Sephora, we're in a huge growth mode, which has been really exciting, and we've been trying to keep the spirit of innovation. Knowing that retail traffic is way down, people have fewer and fewer reasons to come to a mall, we've really had to think differently about what attracts a client, what keeps a client, what makes that relationship sticky and so, we've really put a lot of investment on innovative

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

thinking about redefining what the client experience is.

And we've had a lot of success with defining sort of a curriculum that has really And after going prompted a lot of thinking. through a few cycles of doing an innovation lab, it really made me think about, from a workforce development perspective, how do we create a mindset around innovation that pushes far beyond just digital? So, working in San Francisco, it's very Silicon Valley focused, but innovation and entrepreneurship, it's a mindset.

And it's something that I think I would love to leave a legacy of that mindset being a part of our educational system very early on and getting into communities that don't get this information. So, why shouldn't we start at the second grade, third grade, about innovative thinking? And we're taught to memorize things and regurgitate, but we're not taught to think about what if and why. And so, I really would like that curriculum to be something that's available to all, so that's why

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I joined.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

FREDERICK: Very well said. Ιt actually dovetails pretty well with my experience. And it's interesting, I love seeing how diverse all these experiences are, but then how common so many of the goals are. So, I've been involved in entrepreneurship for probably 20 plus years, most of it on the venture side, but I also was an entrepreneur, helped start a business. So, near and dear to my heart are the teaching entrepreneurship.

I've never thought that the majority of schools do that right, and it can be taught. And I have two young daughters and just read a piece on how we teach our boys to be brave and our girls to be perfect and the long term ramifications of that when it comes to STEM and entrepreneurship. So, at a personal level, those are some of the things that motivate me, but the other thing I want to say, because I'm -- NEA is an interesting beast, we're the world's largest venture fund, we manage \$17 billion, and we're obviously profit motivated.

1 What I love -- I will. (Laughter.) 2 3 MR. FREDERICK: I've been picking up --I mean, I'm happy to do it and I --4 5 (Laughter.) MR. FREDERICK: So, this is an important 6 7 point, and what you're probably going to see come out is to some extent quilt, because what I'm seeing 8 are an amazing group of talented people who are very 9 10 mission driven. And the Valley's too dollar 11 driven and in my new role, I'm no longer on the 12 investment side at NEA, but what I do is I lead our biz dev, corps dev, and federal initiatives. 13 So, 14 I've been going around meeting with all agencies, primarily at the federal level, but to 15 16 be honest, I should also do it at the state, local, municipal. 17 But I'm consistently impressed by the 18 19 talent and the extent to which people are mission 20 driven and it frustrates me when people in D.C. are

in the Valley, not government. Sure, there might

be a middle layer that's wasteful, but, man, the

21

people are trying and they're talented. And so, what I can bring, what I want to bring, is just a wider aperture, because I see great people, but they lack context. We've got context, because between 507 portfolio companies, trust me, we see just about anything out there on the entrepreneurial front. So, that's what I hope to do and look forward to working with you all.

MS. PEREZ WADSWORTH: Okay. So, couple of thoughts, and you all have shared so many On the issue of access to education, good things. specifically in service of innovation and entrepreneurship, particularly among minority communities, I think many people tend to think of that in terms of the technology. And I think we need to be even more broad, because successful entrepreneurship requires a lot of skills, be it in finance, in general business planning, marketing, in a lot of other areas, and I think we need to not necessarily pigeonhole how we think about education.

And I see this in my role, again, one

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

of the many hats I wear is running our innovation lab, and there are many interesting ideas that tend to sort of meander and go nowhere specifically because you're missing some of those key pieces. And so, I think that's important. Along those same lines, from where I sit in corporate America, and I recognize I'm sort of one of the few at the table with that perspective, I see a tremendous amount of trapped innovation and entrepreneurship sitting across big companies in this country.

And so, something I think is worthwhile to think about and to discuss is how we might unleash that, how we incentivize our companies to really -- as an issue of workforce development, of inclusion, of, frankly, growing great ideas and strengthening business, I think that's something that's very important.

MR. BARTHOLOMEUSZ: Apart from seeking out scalable and replicable models to deploy, I was interested in joining this group to find out if there are actual tangible exchanges that can take places between regions where innovation and

entrepreneurship are at an advanced stage and places where it's in early stages. And one of the 2.0 initiatives, the one that had to do with innovation fellows, was something along the lines that I was thinking about, where you would have perhaps undergraduates from, catch them early, undergrads from regions where there is a lack of startups that they can intern at and bring them out to New York, California, or Boston and have them spend the summer there and see what this is all about. This kind of thing. And I thought this might be a good community to do that in.

The second thing, of course, that interests me very much is increasing, finding ways to increase participation of women in tech startups. And I think that's something also that we should be looking at more broadly and could be looking at more broadly.

MR. HERSKOWITZ: So, speaking from the university technology transfer side of the world, I think when -- so, I didn't realize before I started this ten years ago is that it is an

extraordinarily close community of tech transfer people across the country. So, especially amongst the major research universities, most of the people doing this day-to-day all know each other and are all constantly talking to each other about ways to do it better.

last five And over the vears in particular, there's been an explosion of startups, startups for all sorts of reasons, but in our case, startups is a way of getting what Eric was talking about, these lifesaving life improving or technologies out of the lab and into the market so they can change the world, generate jobs, taxes, exports, all that stuff. And increasingly, without the startups, many of these technologies are just dying on the vine. And so, basic research is important, but what I'd love to see us focus on so that we can get the message back to this network is all the ways to cross that valley of death.

So, SBIR, that's why I love what you were talking about SBIRs and the focus from the first program, but SBIRs are just part of it. So,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

all the other ways to get these hard tech, the things you can touch and stumble over, and often do, get them into the market, not just out of the university. So I would love to see that happen. And for better or for worse, and I think I might — this always a somewhat dirty topic, but because it's part of Commerce, the intellectual property system in the U.S. seems like it is at a really difficult point.

And we've got half of the future of the country lobbying hard to kill patents, for totally rational economical reasons, and we've got the other half of the future of the country, devices and diagnostics and therapeutics and energy and materials, lobbying hard to strengthen patents. And it seems like that are just like two trains heading down the tracks straight at each other, and if there's any ability to improve that situation — if Commerce can't influence commerce, then I don't know what we're doing here. So, I would love to see a discussion around intellectual property, for better or for worse.

JOHNSON: my MR. So, name is Rick I work for a private nonprofit that does Johnson. innovation-based economic development. sort of for the state and programs government where they outsource things to us. biggest program I run is the Kentucky Innovation Network. We have 12 offices across the state, we have 12 partners in each of the cities we're in. But sort of my thing, I started out as an engineer, I kept going to smaller companies where I could get something done.

I ended up as seventh person or the thirtieth person at a company and running an engineering department with seven people in it.

We grew it to 1,800 people along the way. I moved from engineering to sales to general management.

So, I've been the underdog sort of my whole life is how it's felt. We got bought by a big company and then I did turnarounds, that actually wasn't all that fun. So I'm in Kentucky, sort of having the time of my life, but Kentucky's an underdog, everybody ignores it, most people haven't been

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

there, they don't know anybody from it, and it's actually really a wonderful place.

So, my goal, what I really want to take away from this is, I mean, I'm really proud to be associated with all of you and hopefully there are ideas I can get and ways I can help you, but I know there will be ways that you can help me. And I'm really trying to drive the services from the public point of view, really focusing on the customer and who's a customer? Well, the taxpayer of the State of Kentucky, I have lots of customers, I have the Governor of the state, the Secretary for the Cabinet. But how can we do more for less?

And so, I'm not stopping with this Innovation Network, I'm trying to integrate all federally funded, locally funded, state funded programs and have a single point of contact and have it across the state. I just put in a proposal back to the Governor where we're going to have 18 locations across the state where we will be considered local, but we're going to have a focus that's going to bring together resources from

anywhere, from anywhere in the state, from anywhere in the country, money from anywhere.

And I always like big challenges and I like being the underdog, but my goal here is to change Kentucky and in five or ten years have people say, what happened to Kentucky? How did they go from forty-ninth to wherever? And by the way, we are, this nonprofit I work for, we also administer the SBIR/STTR program in the state of Kentucky and the State of Kentucky has a matching program, dollar for dollar, non-diluted equity up to \$1.15 million, Phase 1, Phase 2, and actually DoD contracts at Phase 3, the customer's built it.

We've used that to recruit about 45 companies there and how we've done it is, we find out who gets a grant, for example, an NIH grant, and where we have researchers at UK or U of L, the two research universities we have, that can be part of their team and we go solicit them. We contact about 2,000 every year and we get about ten to relocate. Is that a lot or a little? It's something. Once you have your foot in the door and

it starts working, then you keep leveraging it.

We also run the largest early stage venture capital fund in the state and the value of our portfolio is nothing like yours, but it's probably \$100 million. We probably make through exits now somewhere between \$5 million and \$10 million a year in investments on that. Is that lot or a little? It sucks, it's nothing. But we need to grow that. We need to -- we can't be the lead investor. So, there's all kinds of issues on the capital side.

There's really, I'll finish with this, there's really three pillars that I'm focused on in the state to get the entrepreneurial ecosystem there to grow. One is change the culture. The other is program execution, and it has to be all programs. And the other is access to capital. And there's different types of capital, so I'm trying to integrate the SBDCs into my organization now and I've shown the Governor a way we can do that and reduce personnel and expenses by 30 percent and deliver more services.

But the most important thing to me is the ecosystem on the front-end and how do you get the people as early as possible? And you talk to them, you say, you can take control of your life, you don't have to work at the company, work for the Man, work for the, do whatever. You can go come up with a dream, a passion, and you can take control of your life following that passion. There are too many kids that are left out, all the people that apply for the Governor's School for Entrepreneurs and all these things, it's just resume padding to get into the right university. They're going to leave Kentucky to go to an Ivy League school somewhere else, I don't want them to leave.

But what about the people that are left behind early on? We're implementing programs for those people in the cities, and the earlier and earlier we can get to them, the better it's going to be. Our Lieutenant Governor, Jenean Hampton, a black lady, she was in the military, she's not from Kentucky either, we're rolling out a program for her. How are we going to fund it? I don't have

1	any money for it, we're going back to private
2	industry to fund that and we're up to, whatever,
3	\$84,000, and we're going to give kids college
4	scholarships, but it's not for four year schools,
5	it's for four or two or, actually, if they want to
6	start a business and not go to college, we're going
7	to help them fund that way. But anyway.
8	CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: So, you I should
9	clarify, you only get one Twitter, that was like
10	ten.
11	MR. JOHNSON: I yes.
12	(Laughter.)
13	MR. JOHNSON: I have an on switch
14	CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: One hundred forty
15	characters.
16	MR. JOHNSON: I'm sorry.
17	CO-CHAIR TANG: Rick, I'm glad to say,
18	I land in Kentucky on the way to Cincinnati.
19	MR. YANG: Hello all, I'm Andrew Yang.
20	I just want to make a quick point about the fact
21	that entrepreneurship programs have tripled in the
22	last 20 years in colleges around the country and

rates of business formation among 18 to 30 year olds have gone down by more than 50 percent in the same period. So, it's not like more education is necessarily the answer.

I also want to throw out the fact, and this is a comparison I draw a lot, because I went to law school, that if you want to go to law school and you're a 22 year old, your parents will think it's a great idea, it's easy to find, and the government will give you a \$100,000 loan no questions asked. If you want to start a business as a 22 year old, your parents will think it's a terrible idea, it's still hard to find, and no one is going to give you a \$100,000 loan.

So, there's a reason why we have a surplus of 176,000 unemployed or underemployed law school graduates, most of which federally funded by 2020. And a similar dearth of entrepreneurs around the country. I ran the country's largest GMAT prep company, that was acquired by the Washington Post, so I personally taught the analysts at Goldman Sachs, McKinsey, JPMorgan,

Morgan Stanley, and I saw all these smart kids doing like what I did, which was go to law school and become a corporate attorney. I lasted for five months before I left to start a company.

And so, I started this organization,
Venture for America, to try and give them a path
towards entrepreneurship in Columbus, Detroit, St.
Louis, New Orleans, Baltimore, and other cities.
I started with \$120,000 of my own that I put in in
2011, this year our budget is around \$5.5 million
thanks to a lot of people. So, I'm here because,
one, I'm allergic to D.C. a little bit and I thought
that some repetitive exposure would help.

(Laughter.)

MR. YANG: But too, I think there are real problems that need to be solved and that, like if I could meet other people that wanted to help solve them, that would be a fantastic use of time. Hopefully we can get some real resources to work and actually do things to be proud of in the next two years.

MR. SCHOCKEN: Yes. I'm Joe Schocken.

I kind of tipped my hand earlier by saying that to me capital formation is really the issue, that's where you create jobs and there's a significant and significant problems shortage around capital availability for innovation and entrepreneurship. Those problems in capital formation are short term and they're long term. And so, my idea is to pay attention to some of the short term problems, such as fixing some of the things, some of the low-hanging fruit in the JOBS Act, that would create a lot of jobs.

But also to pay attention to some of the systemic long term issues in terms of capital formation that are hugely important. We have a 50 percent decline in the number of venture capital firms in this country. We have a 50 percent decline in the number of publically listed companies in this country. And we have a huge decline in new business formation. And so, that leads to long term systemic kind of issues, how do you move capital into other regions of the country besides California and New York, things like that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

And so, those are some of the issues that I'd like to talk to or address in this effort. Going beyond that, first of all, I want to encourage a broader definition of innovation and entrepreneurship. I hear an awful lot of focus around the table today about technology, because we're all kind of focused that direction, but innovation incorporates much more than technology. And so, I encourage us to really use a far broader definition as we consider the various things that we talk about.

Which leads to a subject which has not come up much today, if at all, and that is regulatory reform. It came up in one sense, the One Day Startup proposal that was talked about this morning, which I thought was just a brilliant idea and I would certainly hope that comes to pass. But think about the daunting tasks facing people starting new companies, the federal, the state, the local, the country regulations they have to deal with. They want to start their business, they want to hire people, they want to do things, and that's

mentally where they are, but they're forced to deal with this incredible array of regulations. And regulatory reform is a hugely important issue if you really want to address innovation and entrepreneurship.

And finally, the last subject I would talk about is this lobbying subject. And I understand I may walk into some minefield here, so I'm going to try to be careful about that. But that is something that I've spent an awful lot of time on. All of you connect to elected officials, your Congressmen, your Senators, whatever. And I'm not talking, here I'm not really talking about wearing the NACIE hat at all, but what I am saying is that all new job creation in the United States comes from new and growing small companies, that's what all the statistics show.

That's not understood on Capitol Hill.

And in fairness to our elected officials, they're pretty busy people, they've got to spend half their time raising money, and they've got to deal with some pretty significant issues the rest of the

time. And so, I think the other point that I would make is that there's a real task and opportunity for everybody here to take what they learn about innovation and entrepreneurship and share it with the elected officials and make them understand the importance of this industry and doing things to encourage business formation and business growth, because you would think it is really understood well by our elected officials and I can tell you from long personal experience, that's not the case. Thank you.

MS. BALDWIN: Hi, Esther Baldwin, Intel Corporation. I've been with Intel 29 years, mostly in startups, and I was in a software startup before that. I'm here because I want to make a difference. I was about two months away from having my green card in China. I moved to China. My top skills are strategy and futurism. I first went there in 1985, I went back on an expat assignment in the 1990s, another one in the 2000s, and I just finished five years there.

It was my futurism and my patent

recognition that made me want to move there. I wanted to get a foot in the door for grandkids and my great-grandkids before the immigration door there closed, in a similar way that it has closed here in the United States to immigrants. I am an immigrant, it's very difficult to come here. I came back because my daughter influenced me in some of the things that she said, because I wanted to come back and make a difference.

And a huge majority of the German GDP comes from small to medium enterprises. If you look at the Golden Years of the United States, it came from people entering the labor market, and we don't have that any more. So we have to replace that and we have to replace it with innovation and entrepreneurship. And I've spent since 2002 in the discipline of innovation. Before that, I was in workforce development, technical training, engineering training for our engineers.

And so, I know that innovation is a process, IDO came to Intel and helped us learn that. It's a process with tools and methods and you can

measure it and you can manage it. I suspect that entrepreneurship is exactly the same. And so, I'm here because I want to make a difference, to help see that GDP number go back and help America get back to the Golden Years of GDP growth.

DR. REICHERT: Great. The microphone Thank you. close enough this time? All right. So, I'm here for a lot of reasons, but I've been surprised even in the short time we've been together just how many things that you all have said resonate with what I'm already thinking. So, just a few things that have been touched on and then one that hasn't. So, dear, dear issue of mine is commercialization of hard technology, and I've already had this conversation with at least six people in this room, so I think that that might be an area that we might want to focus on.

For me, that is all about the area in which I work, which is energy startup technology development and the lack of venture capital in that space. That model is, the model does not work, venture capital does not work for hard technology.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

And there are models out there that people are experimenting with, with philanthropy, we're working with corporate strategic partners, there is potentially other ways to engage the government to help in this sector. So, I'd like to look at models, see what's working, measure it in a quantitative way, and figure out what is the best way to move forward?

The second thing is, how do we get more women tech entrepreneurs and encourage women to take these roles? And we've already had a conversation with a couple of people during the last break about that. So, from my perspective, I have 54 companies at Greentown Labs, and of those, we probably have six female founders, not CEOs, founders, members of the founding team. So, that's a horrible number, right, percentage wise. And most of these people are mechanical engineers, they're electronics engineers, they're MBA type folks.

And I look at MIT, which is where a lot of our companies come from, 50 percent of MIT

entering freshmen are women now, so why does that not translate into more women wanting to entrepreneurship and more women wanting to entrepreneurship in hard tech? And I think that it has a lot to do with how we hold up a model of an entrepreneur as kind of a white male, typically like a Mark Zuckerberg type character, and that women don't see themselves like that. I mean, I think that's probably true for minorities from a diversity perspective as well. You don't see anyone that looks like you and so, you don't have a model, you don't have a guide, or someone that can show you the way.

I also think that women think you have to be the CEO in order to do your own startup or that that's the role, and what I see is that there are many founding roles. And so, I think there can be founding teams that are diverse and mixed, but someone needs to tell people that there's more than just the CEO role that you can do, and that may be more comfortable for someone that doesn't want to stand up and pitch all the time or maybe doesn't

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

want to stand up and pitch in front of a bunch of male venture capitalists, maybe someone else is better suited for that. Great, it doesn't mean you can't be part of an entrepreneurial founding team.

The final one I'll say, and this is very different than I think anyone, territory anyone has covered, but at Greentown Labs, we have founded a whole initiative around connecting startup companies who are developing hard tech, so hardware based things that are going to be manufactured. So that's kind of what most of clean tech and energy is, you're making physical products, so you need to manufacture those products.

So we've set up a program to help connect startups to local contract manufacturers across the state of Massachusetts and the State has paid for that effort, and we have a whole network now of manufacturers that we work with. And in doing that, what I've come to understand, when you talk to the manufacturers in these networks, you realize that there's this huge thing that these people are scared of, and that is the growing gap

of talent to fill in for the people that are retiring in manufacturing.

And it's kind of funny because when you manufacturing, you think, oh, think of manufacturing jobs are moving overseas, there's less jobs. But actually in advance manufacturing, the jobs that have to do with computing and building stuff, and in today's manufacturing world, there are not enough people to do it. And we're not students do this, training our to because manufacturing, most parents are going to tell their kids to be lawyers, right? They're not going to tell them to be in manufacturing, yet these jobs are like \$70,000 or \$80,000 jobs like right out the gate.

So, how do you connect the talent that is out there with these manufacturing jobs that need to be filled? And so, that's something that I'd be interested in exploring or trying to It is a true gap and it's not just understand. Massachusetts, it's all over the country that there not enough people fill jobs in are to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 manufacturing. CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: Thank you. 2 MR. BUERSTATTE: Great. 3 And I think 4 you're our last one. 5 CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: There are two more, but I trust that the ladies will --6 7 BUERSTATTE: Running behind, MR. let's make it good. Let's make it sweet, but good. 8 MS. W. SMITH: He's passing me notes 9 10 saying I have to be really brief. Okay. I'm with 11 JPMorgan Chase Foundation, I'm based in Chicago. 12 And professionally and personally, I'm interested 13 in strategies around inclusive economic growth, making sure that everybody benefits from the 14 growth, particularly in regions. I think the fact 15 16 that NACIE is trying to bring together innovation, 17 entrepreneurship, and workforce is what was most exciting to me, and I've been told by several people 18 19 in the 2.0 community that it took an entire year 20 for the workforce people to get more integrated 21 into the conversation. My number one goal is to

cut that, tomorrow we're going to start talking

about that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

And I'll just say, secondly, those of us who were in the roundtable this morning on workforce heard that there's been this big paradigm shift in workforce to be more demand driven. frankly, employers that are large who have big able to navigate internal resources are workforce development system better than small companies, but the growth is in small companies. So, I would really like to come up with some really creative models around bringing talent workforce development together with those of you that are growing small businesses.

MS. WILSON: Capital and women.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Capital and women, you heard it here first. I'd actually like to hear from one more person and that is the United States public. Is there anyone on the line? We're open for public comment at this point. All right. I will take that as no one is on the line. Anyone in person here, any public comment? Great. So, at this point, we'd like to -- wow, it's hard to

wrap up after all that passion and interest and ideas. To the co-chairs, Steve and Melissa, do you have any final remarks?

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: I would just say thank you, because I think the point of that was, one, to kind of take the stress off.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Real quick, I just need to add that what I'm passionate about, I would love to make everyone here at this table as passionate about national innovation and entrepreneurship as Rick is passionate about Kentucky. That's a win for me. Hey, real quick, we have yet to introduce formally our OIE staff. And Eric Smith, you're in the back there, Eric will be joining us for dinner for sure. Eric's our senior policy advisor and he has done some phenomenal work on moving that SBIR initiative forward, as well as many others.

As our policy advisor, I think he's got a unique perspective and if you haven't spoken with him yet, I really encourage you to do so. And Andria Fisanich, our program analyst. So, I think Andria has quick announcements for us on logistics

for tonight and tomorrow morning. Andria, what are we doing tonight? We're going to get some barbeque, right?

MS. FISANICH: For those of you that want to come with us, we're going over, it's about a 12 to 15 minute walk, it's really nice outside. So, DC has great fall weather, if you want to come with us. It's \$42 cash, so if you don't have it, on the way there I'm sure there are a few ATMs that you can stop on the way and take out some cash. And then, tomorrow we're headed to OPM, the Office of Personnel Management.

You can put it in your Google Maps and it pops up. Just make sure that you go through the entrance on E Street, because when you put it in Google Maps, it shows up kind of on a different street in the middle of a building. So, just make sure that you're going through the E Street entrance and you shouldn't have any issues, just bring your ID.

MR. BUERSTATTE: So, and again, we provided the map to you guys, it should be in the

email and the Slack channel. Real quick, any questions from the group about any of that or tomorrow's procedures? Great. Thanks for your patience today and this morning and yesterday, I know it's a lot of information. This is absolutely the longest meeting for us as we kick things off. It's super important to get a great understanding of all that's happening and the lessons learned from the prior Council.

So, just a quick reminder though and trying to keep things simple despite all that's just been, the long discussion and the ideas here, our number three and number four goals, come together as a team, so really encourage you tonight another friend, build to make another relationship. Number four, understand the value this experience. And as you build those bridges, try to create some value. The tighter our network is, the more meaningful our work will be. So, thanks so much. Have a wonderful and see you for some barbeque in a bit.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

went off the record at 5:40 p.m.)