UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

+ + + + +

U.S. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

+ + + + +

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON
INNOVATION AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP (NACIE)

+ + + + +

MEETING

+ + + + +

FRIDAY
AUGUST 25, 2017

+ + + + +

      The Advisory Council met in Room
72015, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401
Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C., at
9:00 a.m., Stephen Tang, Co-Chair, presiding.

PRESENT
STEPHEN TANG, University City Science Center,
     Co-Chair
REBECCA BAGLEY, University of Pittsburgh*
ESTHER BALDWIN, Intel
TREY BOWLES III, The Dallas Innovation Alliance;
     The Dallas Entrepreneur Center
SCOTT FREDERICK, New Enterprise Associates
RICHARD JOHNSON, Kentucky Science and Technology
     Corporation
DAVID KENNEY, Oregon BEST
MIKE NEMETH, S3 Planning
MARIBEL PEREZ WADSWORTH, Gannett Company, Inc.
ANDREW REAMER, George Washington University
EMILY REICHERT, Greentown Labs

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*

ALSO PRESENT
CRAIG BUERSTATTE, Office of Innovation and
        Entrepreneurship, Department of Commerce;
        Designated Federal Official
ELLEN HERBST, Chief Financial Officer and
        Assistant Secretary for Administration,
        Department of Commerce
JENNIFER ANDBERG, Deputy Director, Office of
        Business Liaison, Department of Commerce
HENRY CHILDS, Senior Advisor, Economic
        Development Administration, Department of
        Commerce
BARRETT HAGA, Economic Development
        Administration, Department of Commerce
CAMILLE NELLANS, First Responder Network
        Authority (FirstNet)
JENNIFER SHIEH, Small Business Administration
ERIC SMITH, Office of Innovation and
        Entrepreneurship, Department of Commerce
PAUL ZIELINSKI, Executive Board Chair, Federal
        Lab Consortium

*via teleconference

CONTENTS

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

2   9:04 a.m.

3   MR. BUERSTATTE: All right, everyone.

4   Good morning, good morning, good morning. We

5   have the team in place.

6   You all know me, but for the record,

7   once again, I'm Craig Buerstatte, the Designated

8   Federal Officer for this council, and we are

9   beginning day two of our fourth quarterly meeting

10 as NACIE.

11   Thanks for coming. This was

12 definitely an exciting day yesterday, and it's

13 always fun to rehash that on day two. And as we

14 talked about yesterday, this is really an

15 opportunity to gel back together and discuss all

16 those brainstorm sessions yesterday, and we also

17 have a few guests with us too, to maybe provide

18 some firestarters, if you will, this morning.

19   One is very special. Ellen Herbst,

20 the current CFO for Commerce, but also performing

21 duties as the Assistant Secretary. Ellen has

22 been with Commerce for 12 years now, and in --

1 excuse me, as Deputy Secretary. Thank you,

2 Andrew. Twelve years in a number of different

3 roles, and fun fact, this is one of her favorite

4 councils, because during the dot com era, she was

5 an entrepreneur herself. So she comes from the

6 tech world. She gets it, she understands it.

7 Ellen, thanks for joining us.

8 MS. HERBST: Thanks, Craig. First of

9 all, thank you all for your service. I don't

10 mean to take you away from your agenda today, I

11 just wanted to spend a few minutes with you to

12 let you know how important what you do is.

13 As Craig said, I was -- I would say a

14 failed entrepreneur during the dot com --

15 MR. BUERSTATTE: Where you learn the

16 most.

17 MS. HERBST: We literally started up

18 after the bubble burst and were able to get

19 venture capital. And it was a tech idea. It

20 was, as it turned out, a little bit ahead of its

21 time, which was a key lesson for me.

22 And as Stephen -- we got to know one

1   another just a little bit this morning. We've

2   got a lot of educational history, at least,

3   together. I'm a proud Delawarean.

4   But I think, you know, we're here at

5   the beginning of an administration. I've had 12

6   years in federal service, and I don't know where

7   the time went. I spent 25 in the private sector.

8   I was going to come in and do my couple of years

9   of service to the country, and then 12 years

10   later, here I am. I worked on the Recovery Act,

11   and that's probably what kept me here.

12   But I know transition times are times

13   of change, they're times of uncertainty, but I

14   think it's gratifying to see that the

15   administration's agenda includes advanced

16   manufacturing, regulatory reform, STEM education,

17   the Office of American Innovation. So when I

18   look at the charter and the goals of this

19   council, and I did spend a little bit of time

20   refreshing my memory around your backgrounds, I

21   think it's a wonderful set of experiences to come

22   together.

1   I think, importantly, finding those

2   areas where this council can be most impactful is

3   what you're about in your meetings, and coming

4   together to identify those couple of things that

5   you want to put your firepower behind. And we're

6   looking forward to hearing what comes out of this

7   meeting.

8   I know you talked a little bit

9   yesterday about some areas. But those key areas,

10   as I looked at your agenda, and particularly in

11   the STEM area and in the -- how to go from those

12   ideas in the lab, that tech transfer idea, into

13   the marketplace, and then how to take it from a

14   start-up into a thriving business that creates

15   jobs. Those are very relevant to what Commerce

16   does, and it continues to be relevant to the

17   administration's agenda.

18   So I just wanted to say thank you, and

19   we're really counting on you and looking forward

20   to what this group is going to do over the next

21   year or two. I'm happy to take a question or

22   two, or I can close there.

1   MR. BUERSTATTE: We've got a little

2 bit of time, I think -- take it while you got

3 her. One or two questions?

4   MS. HERBST: Or not. I won't be

5 offended either way. Any questions? Yes?

6   MEMBER REICHERT: We have four pillar

7 priority areas, and I was wondering if you could

8 maybe comment or highlight any priorities you're

9 hearing from the Secretary?

10   MS. HERBST: Sure. So the Secretary

11 was not able to join you yesterday because he was

12 in Tennessee at the groundbreaking of the LG

13 kitchen appliance factory. I use that as an

14 example of, we continue many of the priorities

15 that Commerce has had for years. And that's not

16 surprising, because Commerce's mission is rooted

17 in its legislative authority.

18   So that is another example of bringing

19 together a workforce that has the capability, the

20 education, the capacity. So the university

21 systems, the tech lab systems, bringing together

22 the local economic regional authority, city,

1 state, regional authority, and working with

2 businesses. And part of what we do, I like to

3 say we're the concierge for businesses, in some

4 cases, to the federal government.

5   You bring that all together, and

6 that's all necessary to grow an economy locally.

7 So that's why I say -- and it's advanced

8 manufacturing. So I think in that one example of

9 celebrating a success for the American economy,

10 it brings all those things together. And I think

11 we recognize, and have for years, that you have

12 to coordinate and bring all that together to have

13 sustainable economic growth in a given region.

14   So certainly those areas continue to

15 be important for us. Regulatory reform, the

16 President tasked Commerce, as one of the lead

17 agencies, to lead other -- lead the federal

18 government into how we streamline permitting, how

19 we make it easier for businesses to expand, how

20 to work through issues with the federal

21 government. Those are very important.

22   I think, probably, he's been most

1   visible -- the Secretary has been most visible

2   around trade issues. So that level playing

3   field, making sure our U.S. companies are able to

4   compete on a level playing field with their

5   global competitors is something we're keenly,

6   keenly interested in.

7   So those are certainly areas. And

8   then, just for Commerce, operationally, we have a

9   few things going on. You heard from the FirstNet

10   president yesterday that being given that

11   responsibility to make sure that, this many years

12   after 9/11 we do finally deliver a nationwide,

13   broadband network to first responders is

14   something we are keenly aware of, the weight of

15   that responsibility, and focusing a lot on.

16   And then there's a little activity we

17   do every ten years called the decennial census

18   where we count every person in the United States,

19   where they live, and believe it or not that's

20   2020. But we are heavily involved in working on

21   that now.

22   So those are some of the key

1   priorities we're working on. But I think the

2   economic -- the direct economic development ones

3   are a continuation, really, of what you've seen

4   in the past.

5   MEMBER REAMER: In February, I think,

6   this council passed a recommendation to the

7   Secretary that the Secretary ask the Office of

8   Innovation and Entrepreneurship to prepare a

9   strategic plan regarding those activities within

10   Congress and beyond. Do you know the status of

11   that?

12   MS. HERBST: So I'm going to take the

13   lens out a little bit further. We are in the

14   process of updating our strategic plan writ large

15   for the Department, as are all the Cabinet

16   agencies. And we have -- we'll be publishing as

17   a federal government, or an executive branch of

18   the federal government, updated strategic plans

19   in February, along with the rollout of the next

20   year's President's budget request.

21   So I can tell you that what I've seen

22   thus far, which is still draft, includes quite a

1   bit around continuing to support the growth in

2   the economy. I will go back with your question

3   and find out specifically where we're at with

4   those specific activities, but there's quite a

5   bit, as you would expect from our department,

6   around continuing the sustained economic growth

7   for the economy.

8   CO-CHAIR TANG: Ellen, we appreciate

9   you being here. People from the small city of

10   Delaware meet at the most interesting places.

11   We were talking, Ellen and I probably

12   grew up five or ten miles away from each other in

13   little tiny Delaware. So small world.

14   You mentioned trade as a particular,

15   and that's not a topic that we have yet covered

16   here with NACIE, but I'm wondering if you have

17   some thoughts about how the Secretary's agenda on

18   trade might fit with our mission on innovation

19   and entrepreneurship.

20   MS. HERBST: Well, I have my own

21   thoughts, which are my own personal thoughts.

22   This is something that would be really

1   interesting to hear from the Council on. We've

2   done a lot of study around propensity to export

3   by size of business and by ownership of business,

4   and certainly small businesses and start-up

5   businesses play a key role in that.

6   So it's not just about helping the

7   very large, global companies export more. I

8   mentioned a level playing field, and we've always

9   been about that. I don't want to lead anybody to

10   believe we aren't also continuing our high level

11   of focus on promotion, helping companies learn

12   how to export more.

13   So if you're exporting one product to

14   one country, you've already broken a lot of the

15   barriers about how to do that. So how can you

16   grow on that and export to more countries? Or

17   export more products to a given country? That's

18   a big part of what we do as well, and we will

19   continue to do that.

20   So how that fits with innovative

21   companies, technology companies, it's not just

22   about goods. It's about services and technology.

1   And certainly the other part of that, that we

2   focus a lot on, is how to protect the

3   intellectual property that is embodied in those

4   services.

5   But I would love to hear your thoughts

6   on how that plays with your charter and your

7   system.

8   CO-CHAIR TANG: I'll start with one,

9   and I'm certain there are other members.

10   Start-up companies more and more these

11   days need to go global earlier in their

12   evolution. I'm speaking in particular for some

13   of the regulated industries, particularly in life

14   sciences, medical devices. It's much easier to

15   get the CE mark for the European market than it

16   is to get FDA approval. So that touches on the

17   deregulation portion, but also into the trade

18   portion.

19   And I'm just wondering if that

20   scenario, perhaps, that other people have

21   observed in the room here, but also a place where

22   we can interact better with the administration.

1   MS. HERBST: I'm going to take notes.

2   CO-CHAIR TANG: Okay. Wonderful.

3   MEMBER REICHERT: So I can add to

4   that. I run Greentown Labs, which is the largest

5   clean tech community in the country, and we work

6   a lot with companies who will eventually need to

7   take their products to markets in other areas.

8   Again, it's energy, it's a fairly regulated

9   industry.

10   MS. HERBST: Oh yes.

11   MEMBER REICHERT: We're also seeing a

12   lot of interest from around the work in coming to

13   the U.S. So we're looking at it from both

14   perspectives, of how do we help our companies to

15   access markets in other places, and how do other

16   companies come into the U.S. and build jobs and

17   companies here.

18   MS. HERBST: Right.

19   MEMBER REICHERT: So that's a very hot

20   area for us right now that we're thinking about.

21   MS. HERBST: And I'm going to tie back

22   to the strategic plan question. So I can tell

1   you that one of the things we're looking at is

2   how to tie even more tightly together the work we

3   do of attracting investment, either back into the

4   United States or into the United States, and how

5   that plays with the work in the field and on the

6   ground and our economic development regional

7   authorities and so forth.

8   And we think there's additional things

9   we can do to make that a more effective

10 partnership in support of businesses.

11   MEMBER REICHERT: For businesses

12 coming into the country, we've done quite a bit

13 of looking at this, in terms of how our state

14 handles start-up companies coming in. And

15 there's really not much infrastructure for that.

16 So if you're a big enough company that you have

17 revenues and you can get a tax incentive to

18 relocated, then the path is kind of clear,

19 there's a business development office for you.

20   But there's a real missing piece in

21 terms of bringing companies that are small, pre-

22 revenue companies, but with a large potential to

1   grow. In our state, but probably more broadly as

2   well, there just isn't a lot of infrastructure

3   for that.

4   MS. HERBST: Yes. I'm thinking

5   incubators, but incubators are more focused on

6   technology we're trying to grow.

7   MEMBER REICHERT: I run an incubator,

8   and we just don't have expertise on that basis.

9   We don't have expertise about, what are all the

10   business things that you need to think about if

11   you're relocating from another country.

12   MEMBER BALDWIN: Ireland does

13   something, they put together small office

14   complexes that are empty, because they know that

15   the time to get in and get started is really

16   important, and it differentiates them from other

17   European countries. So it's for small companies,

18   and they can go in and be part of this small

19   office park almost immediately. And they get

20   help with visas, they get help with the labor

21   law, it's similar to what I mentioned yesterday.

22   MR. BUERSTATTE: ITA piloted a program

1   called Start-Up Global about a year, a year and a

2   half ago. It got some traction, but there were

3   certainly some institutional lessons there. And

4   I think we can dig into that a little bit as a

5   council. It sounds like it might be really

6   meaningful for the Secretary.

7   So I'll follow up, Ellen, and we can

8   get some more information. It might be something

9   we can dive into over the next couple months.

10   But this is fantastic. Thank you for

11   coming, I really appreciate your time, Ellen.

12   MS. HERBST: Thank you. I wish I

13   could stay with you the entire day.

14   Unfortunately I can't, but thank you for letting

15   me take a few moments of your time. Thank you.

16   MR. BUERSTATTE: I appreciate it.

17   Well, that was really great to kick things off,

18   and I'll pass the ball over to Steve to

19   officially open us up now as a council.

20   CO-CHAIR TANG: Welcome, everybody.

21   I am happy to be here. I'm sorry to miss

22   yesterday, but I do like having a full set of

1   teeth, so I appreciate that.

2   I'm hoping that Craig's comment that

3   I was on drugs yesterday didn't make it into the

4   federal record here.

5   (Laughter.)

6   CO-CHAIR TANG: We'll see about that.

7   I understand you had a great day

8   yesterday, with some great discussion. Ellen may

9   have mentioned the four themes, deregulation,

10   apprenticeships, the first responder project, and

11   advanced manufacturing. And so I think we're

12   going to, as usual, hear our report out of that

13   discussion.

14   I think it has obviously taken some

15   time to get the kind of engagement that we want

16   with the administration to flesh out these

17   themes, but I liken it to reconnaissance. I'll

18   rely on the folks with actual military

19   experience, like Craig and Mike. But I have to

20   hand it to Craig and the OIE team of picking up

21   the weak signals and amplifying them into these

22   four themes, which took a lot of doing.

1   I think, as Melissa said yesterday,

2   this is the first time in which we've bridged

3   NACIE into a new administration. So some of the

4   issues of what we've done in the past, which

5   Andrew mentioned, and what we're going to do in

6   the future are just starting to come to light

7   here. But I think this meeting will ultimately

8   be viewed as a turning point, I think, for NACIE

9   and for OIE.

10   We appreciate your engagement, we

11   appreciate those of you that were here yesterday

12   and those of you that just joined today. Tiffany

13   and Rebecca, thanks for joining on the phone.

14   MR. BUERSTATTE: And one more thing

15   I'll add to the mix here. Henry, Henry, wave

16   real quick. Henry Childs, Senior Advisor to EDA,

17   new member of the team, been with us now for two

18   or three months, I think?

19   MR. CHILDS: Seven months.

20   MR. BUERSTATTE: Whew. Sorry about

21   that, time flies. Time flies. So Henry, he'll

22   be hanging out on the bench there. I wanted to

1   highlight you to say thanks. Henry has been a

2   strong champion for us behind the scenes to get

3   the engagement and the guidance for us so we can

4   continue our mission and drive forward.

5   There's been a lot of competition.

6   And with the administration still onboarding, you

7   can imagine everyone's fighting for mic time.

8   And again, I can't emphasize how great it was to

9   have Ellen here. I think it's a real indicator

10 of the good work that's happening. And thanks,

11 Henry. Please feel free to chat with him during

12 a break. He's been hustling behind the scenes

13 and knows a lot right now.

14   With that said, I'd like to open up,

15 finally, to our first presenter. We have Paul

16 Zielinski here. Paul is the chair of the Federal

17 Lab Commission, and Paul, you're in the corner

18 over there. Feel free to present however you're

19 most comfortable.

20   MR. ZIELINSKI: I'll come on up front.

21   MR. BUERSTATTE: Great.

22   MR. ZIELINSKI: Hello, and thank you

1   for the invitation today. I really very much

2   appreciate the chance to come out and speak to

3   everybody.

4   I'm very excited, actually, to come

5   out. This is the first time I think I've

6   actually addressed NACIE since the beginning of

7   the group, although several folks that I deal

8   with actually have on a regular basis. But I do

9   appreciate the chance to come out and talk to you

10   directly.

11   My name is Paul Zielinski, as was

12   said. I'm the chair of the Federal Laboratory

13   Consortium for Technology Transfer, which is a

14   mouthful, but I also -- my full time job is

15   actually the Director of the Technology

16   Partnerships Office at NIST.

17   And in fact I've actually operated the

18   technology transfer office within the federal

19   laboratory system. All the federal labs are

20   members of the Federal Lab Consortium, so it's

21   one of those things where you get to actually

22   practice what you're talking about and see how it

1   impacts you.

2   One of the things I wanted to actually

3   start with though, and again, it kind of gets

4   into a little bit of this in terms of roles, is

5   sort of laying a bit of the landscape of where

6   technology transfer sort of lives within the

7   federal government's system. And I know now some

8   of this might be a bit of a repeat for some of

9   you, maybe not, but putting it together isn't

10   always necessarily something that's incredibly

11   obvious to everybody. And so I want to just take

12   a couple minutes to sort of lay that out.

13   As most of you do know, there is a

14   NSTC sub-committee that deals with lab-to-market.

15   That is a term that was promoted generally within

16   the last administration, talking about tech

17   transfer, if you will, and it's not a lot

18   different in many ways. It was a bit of a

19   rebranding into that term. It's still the same

20   thing.

21   It's really a matter of how we take

22   this huge investment in research and development

1   that we have, $130 billion a year. And that you

2   make products and things that reach out to

3   people, the taxpayers, the people that gave us

4   the money in the first place. We do that in a

5   lot of different ways.

6   Like I said, this subcommittee has

7   existed -- it really came about in about 2015.

8   We are currently chartered through mid-September

9   -- I'm sorry, mid-October. It's a little unclear

10   exactly what's going to happen with all of those

11   sub-committees at the moment. They have not re-

12   formed. I do know that there's a group that's

13   looking at how they're going to re-form all of

14   them, but it's not entirely clear what's going to

15   happen.

16   But just because that -- whatever

17   happens with that, there's actually quite a bit

18   of support that exists at the next level that has

19   been going on for quite some time and will

20   continue to happen, and really could use some of

21   the advice and experience that you have coming

22   from this committee. So we really would

1   appreciate your input.

2   So the NSTC is supported by, actually,

3   several different sub-groups, if you will. One

4   of them in there is an inter-agency work group

5   for technology transfer. Now this group isn't

6   something that you're going to find on a lot of

7   websites, mostly because it's one of these groups

8   that's not funded. It is actually the meeting of

9   all of the different heads of tech transfer from

10   the different federal agencies, so it's very much

11   an agency level work group. A lot of the

12   attorneys and everything, we talk about policy

13   issues and basically report out.

14   One of the big products that we

15   actually do, which I actually brought, I don't

16   know if you want me to pass it around. It'll

17   just be available, I'll leave them with Craig

18   here, because they're really heavy and I don't

19   want to bring them back. But we do actually an

20   annual report that we produce out of my office at

21   NIST, which is actually a summary report of all

22   the tech transfer that's happening across the

1   intramural part of the federal government.

2   So this looks at what comes out of

3   federal laboratories' R&D themselves, not the

4   money that we give out in grants. So it's what

5   we're doing internally.

6   A very nice summary report, it is --

7   it does say 2014. If you look, it was actually

8   produced in 2016. This is actually the latest

9   version. It takes a while to get these things

10   through draft and clearance and everything like

11   that. This is the latest report.

12   I would invite you to take a look at

13   this. It breaks down the different agencies and

14   the different levels of production and the

15   different ways that we're trying to communicate

16   out the results of our work. So it's very useful

17   in that regard.

18   It kind of breaks it down into some

19   different areas. And that's one of the biggest

20   thing we're trying to do, is demystify what's

21   actually going on in different laboratories. So

22   I'll leave those with you for however you

1   distribute things.

2   They're also available online, which

3   is much easier to carry. However, it looks very

4   nice with this beautiful picture on the cover, so

5   I'll promote the book itself. It's very handy to

6   just sort of flip through.

7   So on a different -- in addition to

8   the inter-agency work group on tech transfer, a

9   couple of years ago, we actually spun off a

10   group, because there's a lot of interest --

11   specifically intramural, but there's a lot of

12   interest actually on the extramural side of

13   things. And so from an extramural policy side,

14   we deal with, of course, the Bayh-Dole Act and

15   how we're implementing the Bayh-Dole Act.

16   And so we actually formed a specific

17   work group that talks about different things

18   around that whole area, things like reporting in

19   and how the agencies are dealing with some of the

20   policy back end, and what we're doing with

21   inventions and technology transfer from

22   extramural inventions.

1   And so we have another group that

2   deals with that. I will say both of these groups

3   are something that we coordinate actually through

4   the Department of Commerce, through NIST, and so

5   I actually convene these things from NIST on

6   behalf of the Department of Commerce for the

7   federal government.

8   So they're active groups. The inter-

9   agency work group's been around since 1987. It

10   results from an Executive Order from Ronald

11   Reagan that set up an equivalent to NSTC group,

12   and it just kept on going. We do actually

13   convene it under the authority of the Secretary

14   of Commerce to share best practices and

15   information. There was a nice piece in Statute,

16   and I won't quote you all of those, but it is

17   their role within Commerce to coordinate this

18   type of function for the federal government. So

19   we do look at policy, we look at reporting, we

20   look at actually how we do things across -- at

21   the agency level.

22   In a very tactical way, then, the

1   Federal Lab Consortium is its own special entity.

2   It was created by Congress. It's actually been

3   around, it formed up in about '74, informally.

4   In 1986 it actually was formally commissioned by

5   Congress, and so you can find a nice little piece

6   in the U.S. code that talks about the formation

7   of the Federal Lab Consortium.

8   What's nice about that group is it

9   actually has a budget, and it has a physical

10   presence -- it has a presence, I shouldn't say a

11   physical presence, but it has a website. So we

12   can communicate things. And so from a very

13   tactical way of communicating products out, we

14   actually use the Federal Lab Consortium a good

15   bit. That tends to be the spokespiece, if you

16   will, for the different efforts.

17   They do work together. And so, for

18   example, the NSTC, when you look at the different

19   projects that we've rolled out, we talked about

20   things like human capital, and of course, you've

21   seen I-Corps and some of those efforts, but it

22   also deals with how we deal with people and what

1 we're doing within the lab and entrepreneurship

2 issues.

3   We also deal with federal facilities

4 and partnerships and we do have a nice little

5 project, FLC Business, if you go -- if you either

6 go to FLC Business dot com, or you can find it in

7 our toolkit at Federal Lab dot org, you can find

8 a very nice search tool now which never existed

9 before, basically, that'll take you through all

10 of the different inventions from every federal

11 agency and laboratory, at least the ones that we

12 know of. But we do crawl the web and we pull

13 them all in.

14   We -- you have a search that talks

15 about the capabilities of the federal laboratory,

16 because if you're thinking about, as I was

17 describing -- if you're sitting in Baltimore and

18 you're wondering, and you have a small business,

19 you don't necessarily know the capabilities of a

20 laboratory in California. It's nice that maybe

21 NIST is down the road, but we may not be the

22 right laboratory. So how do you figure out who

1   does what?

2   And yes, you can Google things, and

3   you can work through that result, but we do have

4   a nice tool that talks about what the labs

5   actually do and where they're located and

6   hopefully can help people actually figure out

7   maybe who you want to partner with.

8   It also lists unique equipment and

9   facilities. So if you are trying to figure out

10   who might have some test capability that you're

11   looking for, we do have a lot of unique

12   facilities. We have some unique equipment, and

13   you can access that in the federal laboratories.

14   And so that's actually one of the things we've

15   promoted as well.

16   So we actually have this whole system.

17   There's actually a concierge service. If you

18   really don't know how to figure it out, you can

19   ask, and we have a very nice network across the

20   government because we have agency reps and we

21   have lab reps and we can actually reach out

22   relatively quickly. It's actually one of those

1   things in government that works very well for

2   communication, just to quickly push information

3   out and get information back, hopefully to help

4   somebody out.

5   A lot of support there for small

6   business growth, a lot of for large business

7   growth, any business growth, if you will. And

8   that's really the mission, as well as -- this is

9   where we get training for people, this is how we

10   educate people within the federal government how

11   to do their job. This is actually through our

12   meetings with the Federal Lab Consortium.

13   In addition to the inter-agency work

14   groups that I mentioned and the FLC, there is

15   also the SBIR Program Manager's work group. I

16   know you're all familiar with SBIR. Actually,

17   also, within NIST, SBIR falls into my office as

18   well, so I'm familiar with the program. We don't

19   run that part of it, that's run by SBA, but we do

20   coordinate. And this where it all comes together

21   at the moment under this lab-to-market banner.

22   So, if you will, that's all the

1 different groups that sort of exist. It's not

2 always clear necessarily which one does what, I

3 suppose, to folks, but we do talk to each other.

4 There's a lot of overlap between the groups and

5 they do have their special functions.

6   And I will invite you -- any

7 recommendations you have on this, we're very

8 interested in what you have to say. We also have

9 a lot of capability to try to make some of those

10 things happen. So anything that you've got that

11 you'd like to recommend through the committee,

12 we're very interested. I know we invite EDA, we

13 have people come in and sit in these different

14 groups as well.

15   So what kind of things do we do?

16 Well, like I said, we do technologies. We

17 certainly invent and we patent things and we do

18 license those things. It's a very interesting

19 area. This is one of those things that's kind of

20 fun, where you see some of those.

21   The more interesting ones tend to be

22 the ones that cross over. A great example is we

1 have a heart stent that came -- basically, Boston

2 Scientific commercialized it for billions of

3 dollars a year, but it came out of actually doing

4 non-corrosive stuff from the energy technology

5 laboratory. So they're working on fossil fuels,

6 but it ends up in a heart stent, which is kind of

7 a fun -- it's sort of a neat story, especially

8 one that's very profitable and ends up going into

9 worldwide distribution.

10 We do a lot similar things. One

11 example I often walk through how the process

12 works is actually a fry coating. So it's a

13 gluten-free fried coating for your fried chicken

14 and whatever else you'd like to, you know, your

15 chicken fry. It comes out of USDA, and they

16 actually had a group in Montgomery -- I'm sorry,

17 Howard Community College picked it up, and it was

18 a spinoff group.

19 We sort of walked through where they

20 regionally started getting a foothold in some

21 supermarkets in this region and expanded, and so

22 this lovely fry coating is available. And it's

1   all based on a USDA technology.

2   So we do a lot of different

3   technologies and we spin those things off. Like

4   I said, you can find all the different ones that

5   are available on the FLC website. We are trying

6   to work with a number of partners to push that

7   information out. It's not secret information.

8   We want people to take it. So if you run a

9   website and you want all of our information, we'd

10 be happy to give it to you.

11   We have a couple different efforts

12 going in that regard to try to work with some

13 private companies to do some push out. I do

14 talk, for example, Autumn, with a different

15 university, the group is trying to pick up. I

16 had a call, for example, with them this week,

17 about trying to push our data to them. They have

18 a database, we'd love to get our information

19 carried on their database. Like I said, it's not

20 secret. We're trying to promote this the best we

21 can.

22   A lot of different technologies are

1   available in many different fields, which kind of

2   brings up the main point of Federal Lab. It

3   really isn't necessarily just this, you know, we

4   sell technologies end. It's much more about the

5   partnerships, at least in my mind. We have a lot

6   of ways to partner, we have a lot of ways to push

7   out information, and we're very flexible in the

8   way we can partner. We do cooperative research

9   and development agreements, that's a very

10 flexible mechanism. We do an incredible lot of

11 things with those. We do many of them.

12   There's also other agreements, there's

13 SpaceX, different things. One of the things

14 you'll find on the FLC website is actually a

15 matrix for a way to search who has different

16 types of authorities, which is kind of an

17 interesting thing, because we don't all always

18 have the same authority at each federal agency.

19 So we depend on what Congress says we can do.

20   But they are an incredibly flexible

21 tool. We do a lot of different things with them.

22 I know Ellen just mentioned things like FirstNet

1   and the fact that they are going to distribute,

2   we're going to actually have this nationwide

3   system, communication system for first

4   responders.

5   You know, if you're a business and you

6   want to figure out whether or not your particular

7   technology might work within this national

8   system, how do you do that? Well, we actually

9   partnered with another group, NTIS, with -- oh,

10   I'm sorry, NTIA, within Commerce. Between this

11   and NTIA, we actually have a test bed where

12   people can come and test their technology, get an

13   evaluation. It's blinded, it's given to the

14   company, to basically give them an idea of how

15   their particular product interacts with the rest

16   of its system set up on a test bed algorithm in

17   Boulder, Colorado.

18   So it's a nice little way for people

19   just to figure out how things work and whether

20   they're going to be able to enter. I mean it's -

21   - hundreds of billions of dollars will be

22   invested in this system, so it's certainly a big

1   opportunity.

2   We do a lot of things. We can do --

3   at that level, we can do a lot of individual

4   agreements. We can do things -- it's funny.

5   People think we're this huge monster of a federal

6   government, but we actually can help small

7   businesses, just answering questions. And one of

8   the biggest things I will usually point out to

9   someone is, if you're trying to find the national

10   expert and they don't seem like they have the

11   time for you, find another person, because we

12   have a lot of expertise, and there's probably

13   someone else who is willing to talk to you.

14   I'm dealing with a small business

15   right now that was -- I won't get into their

16   product, it's proprietary, but you know, they had

17   questions about their product melting in fires,

18   and it's like, well, we've got expertise in that.

19   We can help you out. We don't have to do a

20   formal review, we can just answer some questions.

21   And so we actually can serve in that capacity as

22   well.

1   We're really trying to make sure that

2   we reach out to people and try to grow

3   businesses. So the idea is we bought these

4   federal laboratories, we invest in them every

5   year, we have expertise, how do we get it out

6   there and make a difference in the marketplace?

7   So where are we going with this whole

8   thing? You know, I don't know, I don't think

9   anybody does. Like I said, these work groups

10   will continue. They've existed, as I said, for

11   decades. I do see the NSTC is probably, as I

12   understand it, re-forming. I know, for example,

13   lab-to-market is going to -- is at least

14   chartered through mid-October. I don't know the

15   future after that.

16   We are engaged in other things though.

17   So whatever comes out of it -- a great example of

18   this is, actually, I've been involved in a

19   different NSTC work group on defense research and

20   development, defense and security research

21   facilities, and the whole idea is facility

22   infrastructure things.

1   What's interesting is they actually

2   are using some of the FLC tools, because it

3   answers some of their questions. So rather than

4   reinventing things, like I said, you can search

5   laboratories. Well, they wanted to come up with

6   a search of laboratories. Well, we have that.

7   Or a mechanisms department, we've got that.

8   So what's interesting is that we're

9   not reinventing the wheel, we're actually taking

10   advantage of these investments. But the idea,

11   the reason I bring it up, is it actually is one

12   of these things -- no matter what gets

13   reinvented, there still is this piece of

14   interest, I think, across the board, in how do we

15   commercialize? How do we benefit the public from

16   this investment we have in research and

17   development?

18   And so we'll still be plugging in

19   somewhere along the line, I'm sure of that. And

20   you can see, as Ellen said, every indication is

21   that there will be a home for this, there will be

22   -- it may not be the banner line, but we'll be

1 supporting it in any case.

2 So, you know, as Ellen said, thank you

3 very much. I greatly appreciate your efforts in

4 coming out and advising us and the rest of the

5 federal government. I really appreciate your

6 service in everything and I look forward to

7 answering whatever questions you have and working

8 with you to try to implement some of the

9 recommendations you have. Thank you.

10 MEMBER TOOLE: So I had a couple of

11 comments/questions. So over the years I've been

12 involved in this in sort of a bunch of different

13 perspectives, from inside the federal government,

14 as an academic, and then an entrepreneur, and now

15 in the private sector as an investor.

16 I agree with you a thousand percent

17 that there's an incredible capability in lab

18 resources inside the federal government. I would

19 say that entrepreneurs as a group don't know

20 about them. And figuring out how you get to that

21 group of people is really hard.

22 I would say that organizations like

1   Autumn are not the right place to do it. Those

2   are people that are involved in licensing.

3   They're not involved in entrepreneurship, in

4   spending things out of universities for the most

5   part.

6   I would say that almost every major

7   academic university today in America has an

8   innovation and entrepreneurship effort at some

9   level, right? And getting involved with that

10 group of people and figuring out how to make

11 materials available to the entrepreneurs I think

12 would be incredibly impactful.

13   People like Emily and David, there's

14 this huge group, a growing group of innovation

15 efforts that live outside the universities and

16 speak to a big community as well. And figuring

17 out how to design materials for that group of

18 people and get things to that group of people

19 could be incredibly impactful, because it's an

20 almost unbelievable resource that's massively

21 under-utilized, the capabilities inside the

22 federal government.

1   So that would be one. On the --

2   MR. ZIELINSKI: Can I talk about that

3   briefly?

4   MEMBER TOOLE: Sure. As long as I get

5   to get to the second one.

6   MR. ZIELINSKI: We are actually -- so

7   one of the things we're actually trying to invest

8   in this year, because we're not really great at

9   advertising the program, but we have these

10   resources. I talk about them constantly, all

11   over the place.

12   But that really -- you know, every

13   time I talk to a new audience, it's the first

14   time they've ever heard it. And I know that. So

15   I end up repeating it a lot.

16   But how do you reach out to a lot of

17   people? One of the things we've been trying to

18   do is actually partner with some private sector

19   companies through NTIS. They have this joint

20   venture authority, and this is brand new, it's

21   not even really out there yet. We put out a

22   solicitation. It's not all done yet. But we're

1   trying to actually partner up with some private

2   folks to take advantage of their systems and

3   networks as opposed to doing it as a

4   government/academic -- you know, the usual

5   method. Because it hasn't been effective.

6   MEMBER TOOLE: I'm thrilled to hear

7   you say that.

8   MR. ZIELINSKI: But we'd love to hear

9   recommendations along those lines. I mean, it's

10   brand new. It's just up and coming.

11   MEMBER REAMER: Tell people what NTIS

12   is.

13   MR. ZIELINSKI: Oh, I'm sorry.

14   National Technology Information System Service.

15   It's a partner -- it's actually part of Commerce

16   as well, we like to throw our T's and I's around

17   a lot, rearrange the letters.

18   But actually, so if you think about

19   how you -- the original mission actually is very

20   much, how do you get information out from the

21   federal government? And they actually, the

22   original group, pre-internet, particularly, they

1   produced information that you would get from the

2   federal government. I think about most of us

3   know about the crazy guy with the question marks.

4   You can get free information from the government?

5   But actually, they were the source of information

6   from the federal government. So all of the

7   different technical information came through

8   NTIS.

9   Now of course everybody now just looks

10   at the internet and uses a search engine, and so

11   even Congress has said, well, we don't need you

12   anymore, we're going to defund you. Most of

13   their funding doesn't come from appropriated

14   funds, you really can't defund them very easily.

15   But they do it with this special authority called

16   joint ventures, and so they will partner with

17   different agencies on data issues, data-related

18   issues.

19   We have data. We have a lot of data

20   that surrounds partnerships, and that's sort of

21   the kernel of this, is how do you then push that

22   out?

1   That's NTIS in a quick nutshell, and

2   I'm sure I did not do them justice, but they're

3   an information based agency.

4   MEMBER TOOLE: On the IP side of

5   things, when I was at RPT we used cooperative

6   research agreements as the funding mechanism, and

7   we specifically required private sector

8   involvement in investment. The piece of IP, as

9   you know, there's government rights that attach

10   to IP that's generated using government

11   resources. And some of those rights give private

12   sector partners serious heartburn. And in

13   particular, the march-in rights.

14   You know, if you're trying to get

15   DuPont -- small companies don't really care

16   because they'll do anything for money. But if

17   you're trying to get a DuPont or somebody like

18   that to put money into this, and they look at

19   this and say, wait, I'm putting money into this

20   and at the end of the day some bureaucrat in

21   Washington is going to decide that I'm not trying

22   hard enough and come in and take the IP? Yeah,

1 right.

2 And the march-in rights have never

3 been exercised by the federal government. And

4 you can tell people that, and the lawyers go, so

5 what? That doesn't mean it won't happen

6 tomorrow. And so anything that you can do to get

7 rid of those really odious provisions I think

8 would be incredibly helpful for getting

9 government funded IP out into the world.

10 MR. ZIELINSKI: So the actual

11 provisions themselves are Congress --

12 MEMBER TOOLE: But I think that

13 Congress would list -- recommendations from the

14 administration carry some amount of weight with

15 Congress, right? And so anything that you could

16 do to help get rid of especially the march-in

17 rights. The other parts of it aren't so bad, but

18 especially the march-in rights.

19 MR. ZIELINSKI: Yes. I think -- so a

20 couple things quickly.

21 As you noted, these have been around

22 since 1980, and we've never used them. There's

1   never been a case. Now, they've been petitioned

2   to be used multiple times, at least several

3   times, and generally there's been a pushback,

4   saying that's not really why we do march-in.

5   There's a very specific rationale when you do it.

6   So it's been pretty stable in terms of

7   the government position. I've seen things in

8   bills and legislation too, so I don't know -- I

9   mean, I can't speak for Congress, and I don't

10   necessarily believe that they're in a position

11   where they're going to change that right now,

12   from what I've seen.

13   MEMBER TOOLE: Well, anything you

14   could do, you should.

15   MR. ZIELINSKI: But if there's things

16   that we can do -- I mean, one of the things we do

17   is the regulations. Now, we did issue a update

18   to the Bayh-Dole regulation in 37 CFR 401. We

19   did the proposed rulemaking just before the end

20   of the last administration. It is still awaiting

21   clearance within the new administration. You

22   know, everything in a regulation -- of course

1 they want to cut back regulations, so that hasn't

2 made it out.

3   MEMBER TOOLE: Now's the time, now's

4 the time.

5   MR. ZIELINSKI: But we do have some

6 authority in terms of the regulatory aspect. We

7 can't change the law, but there are some pieces

8 that are in there to try to look at regulation,

9 and in fact, that's one of those places that

10 there's recommendations. We can implement those.

11 And again, those are something that I personally

12 am right now engaged in, that's something that is

13 delegated through NIST to put together. So we

14 write them, and we're very interested in what you

15 have, in terms of ideas for that.

16   We do have the proposed rulemaking,

17 like I said, that's still hanging. I'm not dying

18 to go through the rulemaking again all the time

19 on this, but we are able to do things. But we

20 can't overturn the basic premise of the

21 government use right and the march-in.

22   MEMBER BALDWIN: Can I ask a very

1 fundamental question? When you talk about the

2 lab network, are you talking about JPL, Lawrence-

3 Livermore, or is this a different lab?

4   MR. ZIELINSKI: So we have 300 federal

5 laboratories nationwide. We've got all the DOE

6 labs, all of the NASA labs, all -- so it's all

7 the actual federal intramural labs, government-

8 owned, government-operated, as well as the

9 contractor-operated. All the federally funded

10 research and develop centers, all of those are

11 lumped into this.

12   The way Congress defined federal

13 laboratory actually includes all government

14 funded laboratories and FFRDCs, so it's all that.

15   MEMBER REAMER: What's the total

16 budget been for the lab?

17   MR. ZIELINSKI: The total intramural

18 budget runs around the neighborhood of about 50

19 billion. So it's roughly a third, a third, a

20 third, if you look at federal -- it's a little

21 bit different than that, but 130, 140 billion

22 dollars, roughly, 40-50 billion in the federal

1   labs, 30 university, 30-40 industry. And that's

2   roughly how it breaks out if you look at the NSF

3   statistics where they break it down, and that's

4   really where I get my numbers from.

5   MEMBER REAMER: And the DOE labs

6   would be maybe half?

7   MR. ZIELINSKI: So DOE has 17

8   laboratories out of 300 --

9   MEMBER REAMER: But budget-wise?

10   MR. ZIELINSKI: Oh no, not even close.

11   DOD's about half.

12   MEMBER REAMER: Okay.

13   MR. ZIELINSKI: DOE's a very large

14   portion, a quarter maybe. NIH, particularly

15   extramural, is huge. But actually, even on the

16   intramural side, NIH may -- they may be huge

17   extramural, but they still have a very large

18   portion of intramural.

19   MEMBER REAMER: So what are the

20   couple top challenges that you're facing that the

21   Council might be able to give you a solution?

22   MR. ZIELINSKI: I think you hit right

1   on. Our biggest challenge is always, how do we

2   reach people? I mean, we -- my usual pitch is,

3   we don't make anything. We spend $130 billion,

4   we don't make stuff.

5   Our products aren't going to reach the

6   public unless we have a partner. And the biggest

7   trick is, who's going to do that work? Who's

8   going to be that partner? Who's going to be the

9   entrepreneur that's actually going to produce,

10   make, sell, distribute this product?

11   And that's not an easy thing to do on

12   a national scale. We can produce products, we

13   have information, but how you actually connect to

14   people, we need a lot of partners to do that in

15   intermediate levels. And so we do work with

16   state test beds, we do work with -- I mean, we

17   work at many, many different levels, but anything

18   we can do to get that partner that's going to get

19   that product out there. And that gets to be

20   very, very individual. It's time-consuming and

21   it never ends.

22   MEMBER JOHNSON: Let me give you an

1 example. So the ISS is a national lab. The

2 space technology company that I'm working for

3 took a Boston company to do retinal implants

4 there and right now it's doing -- the Michael J.

5 Fox foundation is doing a Parkinson's disease

6 experiment.

7   And we actually get -- we have access

8 to the national lab. It's free. The Space Act

9 Agreement, we can get up access, down access, I

10 mean, they're wonderful people to work with. I

11 just wish I had agreements where I could access

12 more.

13   If your focus is commercialization and

14 then you can find somebody that you deal with,

15 for me, it's these start-ups, and then you have

16 this really, really rich resource, and you can

17 figure out how to navigate the bureaucracy, it's

18 fantastic.

19   MEMBER REAMER: So from your

20 organization's wish list, what would you like to

21 see? How could that be realized?

22   MEMBER JOHNSON: I need access. To

1   me, it's fragmented, so I'm going to follow up

2   with you. I need access, and we've already

3   talked about a couple of the labs. I need access

4   to people and technology there, because they

5   don't know how to commercialize it. And the more

6   exposure I have to just technology, if I can

7   match that with somebody that can commercialize

8   it, then everybody wins.

9   MEMBER FREDERICK: I really think

10   there's a huge opportunity with the universities

11   and also the venture community. I'm at NEA, and

12   I've done a fair amount of work with Lawrence

13   Livermore, and it's been a really up and down

14   relationship.

15   I'd say on the positive side, we have

16   a company Tri-Alpha. It's a nuclear fusion play

17   and it's raised hundreds of millions of dollars.

18   PARTICIPANT: Good luck.

19   (Laughter.)

20   MEMBER FREDERICK: When I reached out

21   to Lawrence Livermore, it was a complete fluke

22   that I met the person -- what they need is access

1   to supercomputer power. And they were actually

2   very receptive, and they set up a meeting, and it

3   was the headiest meeting I've ever been a part

4   of, no offense to this crew.

5   (Laughter.)

6   MEMBER FREDERICK: Everyone there was

7   a PhD nuclear physicist except for me. They

8   brought out all these scientists to help and it

9   was a really wonderful session.

10   But then we got bogged down in

11 bureaucracy. But through that, I then tried some

12 other things, because they were starting to hype

13 some of it -- and I shouldn't say hype, that

14 sounds wrong. They were starting to say, hey, we

15 have all these other innovations, would NEA be

16 interested?

17   And so I set up a meeting and I asked

18 them to bring, what are your five or six best?

19 But I gave simple asks that they couldn't follow

20 up with. I said, like, tell me in advance the

21 category so I can get the right general partner

22 there, and they switched it up at the last minute

1   and they brought like healthcare innovations

2   where I'd got the CTO of Sun Microsystems, who

3   was one of my partners, in the room and it was a

4   bloody waste of his time and theirs, because he

5   doesn't understand the drug discovery.

6   I'm sure it was cool, but I'm like,

7   guys.

8   MR. ZIELINSKI: One of the things you

9   will find, at least my experience with federal

10   labs is, we're really off with business. They're

11   not business people. You talk about the

12   scientists in the room. You get all the

13   scientists in the room and they're great, they're

14   incredibly smart and they can answer lots of

15   questions in their field. Don't ask them how to

16   run a business or what the best business -- I

17   mean, that's the trickiest part, is actually

18   defining these ideas.

19   There's some of them out there that

20   are very good, I mean, I don't mean to broad-

21   brush everybody. But for the most part, there's

22   a reason why they're where they are. They're

1   interested in the science. They're really into

2   it. They're not really into the business

3   discussion often.

4   So they'll come in, they'll talk about

5   their science, but they're really not -- they're

6   going to start to fade away in a lot of cases

7   when you start talking about the business side.

8   MEMBER FREDERICK: So I see

9   opportunities. We do a lot of work with Stanford

10   and Berkeley and all these schools, and I see so

11   many talented people who want to start businesses

12   and they don't have enough real-world experience

13   to know what the hell to do with it.

14   So if they could go see some of this

15   technology, I mean, you could almost just set up

16   programs where, let them try to do pitches. Dive

17   in. Figure out what's here. And I bet their

18   PowerPoints would be better than what I saw from

19   the lab folk who came in with a 70-page --

20   MR. ZIELINSKI: Yes, something like

21   that probably would be great. And things start

22   up like that. It's hard to -- their

1   sustainability tends to be the issue with those.

2   Because we start doing partnerships with business

3   schools here and there and it lasts a couple

4   years and then it goes away, you know.

5   It doesn't mean I'm trying to --

6   MEMBER FREDERICK: I don't mean to

7   trivialize it, but it shows how hard they were to

8   work with. After the meeting, there was one we

9   were interested in, and the deck was something

10   like a 70 MG file and they couldn't send it to

11   us, because it had all this unnecessary animation

12   and fancy graphics.

13   MR. ZIELINSKI: Well, I'll tell you,

14   the one cool thing I've seen in a couple

15   instances where these have been really successful

16   is that the people that actually pull the whole

17   thing together actually end up forming a

18   business, and then they go away, and then you

19   lose the steam. But they were really successful.

20   And that -- honestly, that tends to be one of the

21   bigger killers, I think, with some of these

22   programs. You really need a champion. And each

1 one, as soon as you get the champion, something

2 takes off.

3   MEMBER REAMER: We're running out of

4 time. Dave, we'll give you the last question.

5   MEMBER KENNEY: Thanks. First, I'd

6 like to second everything Eric said, and I --

7 I've come to interact with the labs on a few

8 commercialization efforts in the DOE lab network,

9 a few different labs, and the prior

10 administration sent out the memo specifically

11 targeting trying to increase the

12 commercialization output of the labs.

13   And I know they experimented with a

14 variety of things, but what I saw mostly were, in

15 fact, experiments that were run kind of like one-

16 time. DOE did America's Next Top Innovator.

17 It's the kind of thing that, over time, they --

18 people could have started to learn more if they'd

19 run it year after year after year.

20   The reality is, how do you get the

21 word out? You have to be consistent and get the

22 message out more than once. And I felt like

1 there was sort of an experiment and then they

2 moved on to something else.

3 And the other thing that I've noticed

4 that really comes back to the core of a lot of

5 these issues is the labs aren't measured on

6 commercialization output at their core. The DOE

7 labs, all but one of them, are a contract, a

8 very, very big contract awarded to a company to

9 run the lab, or a university, or a nonprofit.

10 And they -- if you look at what they're measured

11 on, it's like, 1/10th of one percent of their

12 metrics are tied to actually commercialization

13 output. And if I was running the lab, I wouldn't

14 worry too much about it either, if that's not

15 what my getting into the contract again the next

16 time around was based on.

17 So I think there's a fundamental,

18 systemic level that needs to be addressed there.

19 And sorry for that long little diatribe.

20 MR. ZIELINSKI: No, that's an issue,

21 I know, even that was tried -- way back even when

22 this whole lab-to-market thing was paying off,

1   that was actually one of the first issues was

2   having, I guess, how do you increase the

3   percentage? Look what happened. We made tons of

4   progress.

5   It's interesting, though, and you

6   mention these little flash in the pan projects,

7   and that has a little bit to do with the way

8   government works. We reinvent and then we

9   reinvent and then we reinvent and relabel. But

10   it is one of those reasons that I brought up

11   those work groups, is because that's actually

12   where some of the stability is. So we can get

13   those infused there, we can keep them going.

14   MEMBER KENNEY: Yes, so one of our

15   focus areas is deregulation, and I guess a

16   question I'll ask is, are there things that could

17   make a significant improvement in the tech

18   transfer and commercialization efforts at the

19   labs, broadly, that deregulation effort could

20   address?

21   And I know off the top of my head,

22   when we were working with one of the DOE labs at

1 ATL, as recently as four years ago they had to

2 get eight signatures on one piece of actual paper

3 from people in two different states, across the

4 country from each other, before they were allowed

5 to send a boilerplate NDA document out that was

6 blank to a company.

7 MR. ZIELINSKI: So the trick with that

8 is, there is nothing in regulation that says

9 they're required to do that. That is an agency

10 policy, that's not a regulatory effort.

11 MEMBER KENNEY: Okay. So are there

12 regulatory things that -- so they obviously can

13 then fix that themselves, but are there

14 regulatory things --

15 MR. ZIELINSKI: Well, if I'm going to

16 give my usual -- so, big picture, some of the big

17 problems that I always deal with. Software is a

18 huge issue for us, copyright. We can't

19 copyright. The federal government, 1908, you

20 can't copyright federal government works.

21 Well, they didn't really think about

22 software and apps at the time, and so how do you

1   transfer the rights to those things to a company

2   that might make and sell that product when you

3   don't own any copyright?

4   For that matter, how do you even do an

5   open license copyright? You can't, because you

6   can't copyright government works. That gets to

7   be -- that's a messy piece. I don't know if

8   that's deregulation, but --

9   MEMBER TOOLE: But when everybody

10   wants to talk about the deregulation, right, I

11   mean, some of it you don't need to go to Congress

12   for. Some of it, somebody just need to take a

13   damn weed-whacker to a bunch of stupid --

14   MR. ZIELINSKI: Well, and like your

15   NDA issue. If I look at a CRADA, at some

16   agencies, it takes 13 signatures. At mine, it

17   takes four signatures and one of them is the

18   partner's. You know, it depends on -- a lot of

19   that is policy. It is not regulation. And if

20   you look in the regulations, a lot of this

21   bureaucracy does not exist. It is self-inflicted

22   wounds, and cleaning that up actually would be a

1   huge area that we could use help with.

2   Entrepreneurship, though, is an issue

3   within -- like, from the federal lab side, you

4   talk about university spin-offs. We can't do

5   that. It's very difficult to do that from a

6   federal lab.

7   MR. BUERSTATTE: What's nice about

8   that too is, I think, this idea can complement

9   nicely the Council's broader efforts on

10   deregulation. It'll fit very nicely with that

11   pillar, so clearly a lot of energy here.

12   MEMBER REICHERT: Can I make one more

13   comment? So the Department of Energy, I think

14   it's in the EERE, has a program called Small

15   Business Vouchers?

16   MR. ZIELINSKI: Yes.

17   MEMBER REICHERT: Which is all about

18   helping start-ups access resources within the

19   national labs. And I wonder if that's something

20   -- you mentioned that there are test beds at

21   many, many different national labs. As far as I

22   know, this is a pretty limited scope program, and

1   it seems like these resources should be made

2   available to entrepreneurs, they should be easily

3   accessible.

4   And these are often -- I mean, in the

5   energy sector, where everything is super

6   expensive to test, and you're not going to be --

7   an entrepreneur is not going to be paid for

8   creating their own test bed, I guess, how do we

9   get more access? How do we scale that program?

10   MR. ZIELINSKI: So I'm going to give

11 you one of the reasons it doesn't scale all that

12 particularly well with all the agencies.

13   It's a great -- I don't mean to

14 diminish anything that they've done. I think

15 that they've done a great job. One of the unique

16 things with the DOE labs was they brought out

17 that 16 of the 17 labs are GOCOs, contractor

18 operated. They do work according to their

19 contract. And so they actually have to give them

20 vouchers in order to justify spending money on

21 something other than mission for the Department

22 of Energy. So that voucher's important for the

1   way they operate.

2   If you look at a laboratory that's a

3   normal federal lab, I don't need a voucher

4   program. If my scientists want to do work, all

5   they need to do is find the scientist that's

6   doing work in that area that you're going to walk

7   along with, like it's on a journey. Walk with

8   the person that's going the same direction you

9   are.

10   There's no limit. As long as it's

11   within mission scope, they can do work. You can

12   do a CRADA. We can do -- we can spend, we have

13   people, we have facilities. We can't give the

14   other party money, but the DOE voucher program

15   never gives the other party money. They only say

16   what you can spend a certain amount at the lab.

17   We can do every bit of that now.

18   There is nothing that's off the table in that,

19   for CRADAs. It's just a matter of finding the

20   right partner, which goes back to your point.

21   How do you find the right partner? And that's

22   the hard part. But we can do every bit of that

1 now.

2 MR. BUERSTATTE: All right. Let's get

3 back to that one. Maybe we can get some more

4 time on the calendar with Paul for November. I

5 definitely want to get that into the mix in the

6 deregulation stuff. Thank you. Thank you, Paul.

7 So one thing we've talked about many

8 times is just providing you all some near-term

9 network opportunities to engage the government in

10 different ways, so less of policy opportunity

11 here, but more about ways that you all, and I

12 think your organizations and networks, might be

13 able to help us directly with an initiative that

14 Barrett Haga is working on.

15 Barrett, do you want to talk?

16 MR. HAGA: I apologize for my

17 casualness and my laughing when you talked about

18 chicken fried. That's my daughter's favorite

19 song, it's "Chicken Fry" by the Zac Brown Band.

20 She's a three year old, but she calls it chicken

21 fries. This afternoon I've got a daddy-daughter

22 date with her. We're going to go do her favorite

1   activity, which is looking at pickup trucks. So

2   she's -- she wears cowboy boots, the way I do, so

3   it's --

4   MR. BUERSTATTE: Barrett, you have

5   four minutes. Time to pick it up.

6   MR. HAGA: Sorry, sorry.

7   (Laughter.)

8   MR. HAGA: America's Competitiveness

9   Exchange on Innovation and Entrepreneurship is a

10   newer program that was designed in a bar in 2014,

11   like most ideas. Most great ideas start with

12   alcohol. And it is kind of a reverse type of a

13   trade mission, focusing on innovative networks

14   and nodes.

15   For many years, we've said foreign

16   ministers, commerce ministers, scientists, we're

17   going to take you to Boston, Austin, Silicon

18   Valley, and Minneapolis, or something along those

19   lines. Innovation occurs in multiple areas in

20   the United States. So what we do is we take 50

21   of the most powerful people in the hemisphere,

22   the venture capital director of Mexico, for

1   instance, the undersecretary of commerce in

2   Argentina, or these new start-ups like the

3   Mexican entrepreneur of the year, or the Time

4   Magazine, and bring them into a super-region of

5   a country, particularly one in the U.S. per year

6   and one foreign per year.

7   Each one started from Atlanta through

8   Charlotte. So we did GCMI in Atlanta, which is -

9   -

10   PARTICIPANT: Tiffany Wilson's team.

11   MR. HAGA: Yes, Tiffany's team. CU-

12   ICAR, Clemson University ICAR Complex in

13   Greenville. Epix Research Energy Lab in UNC

14   Charlotte. And these communities have one day to

15   move the economic needle with these 50

16   gatekeepers.

17   They have assets, you have assets.

18   Let's link them together to create new IP, new

19   technology, new processes.

20   Mexico was two, stage three was

21   Minneapolis to Chicago. Mayo Clinic, Argonne

22   Labs. But one of the small -- some of the

1   smallest communities, like Vernon County,

2   Wisconsin, 2,500 individuals, they've got an

3   incubator focusing on new agricultural companies.

4   In fact, they've got seven companies now that are

5   plugged into the Whole Foods food chain.

6   Kickapoo Coffee, Fizzy Pop soda all came out of

7   there. So bringing these people there allowed

8   new supply chains of coffee beans.

9   We went through Burnett County. The

10   export director for all of Bolivia was there.

11   They had an issue with getting coffee. He said,

12   we can give you 14 tons of coffee without an

13   issue immediately. She said, how? He goes, they

14   all run through me anyway. So we make that

15   linkage points.

16   Four was for Argentina, five was back

17   in the U.S. again, which was Arizona to

18   California. Arizona State, University of

19   Arizona, Imperial Valley, UC San Diego. Six was

20   in the Toronto-Waterloo corridor. Seven was

21   Austin.

22   Eight would have been foreign, but we

1 flipped it, because we wanted to end up with the

2 tenth version back in the U.S. to make it -- the

3 tenth is a good number for branding and

4 marketing. So we did seven in the Austin-San

5 Antonio corridor. Eight is going to be in North

6 Central Florida, December 3-9 of this year.

7   What we're asking of NACIE is we want

8 to get NACIE either involved in that as a host

9 site, either as speakers, or people communicating

10 with the foreign assets on the assets that you

11 have, like GW or the University Science Center,

12 or UC San Diego, et cetera, and say, we've got

13 these assets here. What are we looking for in

14 these labs and facilities?

15   And when we open up these labs and

16 facilities at the presidential levels, they're at

17 minister levels, they're at the gatekeeper

18 levels, and saying, here's my card. Here's

19 yours. Let's move the needle.

20   And that's kind of -- the benefits of

21 ACE, so in terms of IP, ACE 1, Conover, North

22 Carolina at the manufacturing solutions testing

1   center. It's a very rural testing center. It's

2   kind of like MythBusters on steroids in rural

3   North Carolina. It's great. They have linked up

4   with Techno Monterrey, and now they have a joint

5   patent on a new line of thread that they debuted

6   in the Milan Fashion Show last -- a couple months

7   ago.

8   They share the IP, they share the

9   thing. We just made the connections. That's all

10   we do at this.

11   Charter bus, foreign security vehicle

12   spread, and I'm speaking very fast because I'm

13   trying to catch up some speed -- some time here.

14   Craig's looking at me like, faster.

15   Madison, Wisconsin's got new research

16   partnerships with Argentina, in terms that'll

17   last for their research. We've got over 800

18   things that we're tracking out of ACE 7 in

19   Central Texas. We say if you're invited to go on

20   ACE and if you don't move the needle, you're not

21   invited back. So it is a very high pressure

22   situation.

1   Unless you're a vice-minister of a

2   rank of courtesy, like vice-minister, full

3   minister of a country, if you're a lab, and if

4   you go on ACE, the Dean of the Manufacturing

5   School of -- Techno Monterrey is where he's at.

6   He had to produce. And we don't care if it's

7   U.S. to U.S. or foreign to foreign, they just

8   have to document how they produce or at least

9   change their model.

10   We also have countries outside the

11   hemisphere, so we're bringing you access to the

12   chief scientists of Israel. That's a big deal.

13   They generally comes -- he generally comes on

14   ACE. The Director of Manufacturing for Germany

15   will be on ACE, he was on 6 and 7, coming on 8.

16   ACE in 2019 is supposed to be four

17   days in Germany, four days in Israel, opening at

18   the labs in the greater Munich area and then the

19   Tel Aviv area.

20   So that's what ACE is. Ready to show

21   the quick video?

22   MR. BUERSTATTE: Oh, that would be

1   great, yes.

2   MR. HAGA: I probably ought to --

3   MR. BUERSTATTE: If we can queue it

4   up.

5   MR. HAGA: There's a slight lag, so I

6   apologize.

7   MEMBER BALDWIN: And we'll get soft

8   copies of this too?

9   MR. BUERSTATTE: Yes. As always. And

10   those of you on the line, sorry about some of

11   these read-aheads. Didn't know they were coming.

12   But we'll get you soft copies and with the whole

13   wrap up after today's meeting.

14   MR. HAGA: What I'll do is I'll show

15   you the fully built out exchange, and I'll send

16   these out to you as well. This is the California

17   trip where we went through Tucson through San

18   Diego.

19   UC San Diego, we actually signed an

20   agreement transferred through the Organization of

21   American States at UC San Diego. But the

22   participants, to give you an idea, if we brought

1   this level to your facility's sites and labs,

2   these are the ones that control the economic

3   development and the research in Canada alone.

4   That will bring 50, it's max of 50.

5   So we generally get three foreign applications

6   from the world, we select the individuals.

7   Outside the hemisphere an administrative

8   innovation, number two in the world in terms of

9   IT production as a whole. So that's the fifth.

10   Let me show you the video to the

11   eighth coming up. One moment.

12   (Video played)

13   MR. HAGA: We're going to try to

14   invite you and some of your people to target you

15   for speakers on this. Fly in, fly out, start

16   taking, building part of this network of the ACE

17   events.

18   Sid Martin Biotech Institute is one

19   biotech research university that's worlds beyond

20   this. The --

21   MR. BUERSTATTE: Are there particular

22   questions or challenges right now with Florida

1   ACE that you want to pose to the team just to

2   think about?

3   MR. HAGA: I have a couple.

4   MR. BUERSTATTE: Yes, so on the agenda

5   and subjects in with that?

6   MR. HAGA: The thing we're looking at

7   most is from how NACIE can gauge is how can we

8   get more US based assets that are outside that

9   region and scope that compliment that region

10   itself and your facilities and the global program

11   itself as a whole.

12   So what I mean by that is CAMID,

13   Florida Institute of Technology, FIT has got a

14   new facility called the CAMID, Center for

15   Advanced Materials and Innovation Design. It's a

16   materials group, it's part of Harris Corporation.

17   FIT's a good school, but the assets

18   that you have here could compliment that to make

19   it an even better program that if both went

20   there. So how can we get NACIE into CAMID at the

21   same time as this group going so CAMID can be

22   kind of like a network and nodes built for IP

1 transfer, innovation and workforce programs, et

2 cetera and everybody wins instantaneously.

3   So what I would like to do is probably

4 send out the agenda and say hey, my lab guys in

5 my facility or my network that I have as assets

6 that can be plugged in at that time, at that site

7 with this group. We can all win at the same

8 time. So that's kind of the thing we're looking

9 for.

10   MEMBER REICHERT: So are these trips

11 industry focused?

12   MR. HAGA: It's gatekeeper focused.

13 So we define gatekeeper as somebody who can move

14 the economic needle. Now we do have what's

15 called the rank of courtesy, which is the Vice

16 Minister of Commerce, kind of our Dep Sec level

17 or higher.

18   But of the 50, about a third are

19 private sector and a third are public sector, and

20 a third are government. So we look at

21 gatekeepers. So when Brazil wasn't sending us a

22 government individual, we took the third richest

1   individual in the entire country of Brazil. And

2   he went to the ACE for -- because he runs a huge

3   tech company that's got fingers and nodes in

4   multiple other sectors.

5   MR. BUERSTATTE: Yes, but in Florida

6   for instance, don't you have a emphasis on

7   tourism and hospitality technology?

8   MR. HAGA: No, we look at whatever the

9   cluster is in the area that can either be

10   developed, is developing, or makes the grade. So

11   there is, to kind of lock the Florida agenda, the

12   first day in Florida is Disney World because

13   tourism is a soft day, if you miss the flight

14   you're ok.

15   But instead of folks into tourism, are

16   folks into simulation facilities and the IP

17   behind Disney making Disney. So when you open

18   the Seven Dwarves Mine Train and look at the

19   simulation technology as a lineage point.

20   The next day is, on the simulation

21   theme with Orlando is number one in the United

22   States for simulation. Lockheed Martin and VA

1   are opening up their simulation labs which is a

2   highly sensitive facility, but since we're going

3   to open up these facilities.

4   NASA, of course NASA, Gainesville with

5   biotech at the University of Florida Gainesville.

6   When you go to Tallahassee, the asset is the

7   National MagLab and innovation upgrade, the Palm

8   Coast. We were just talking about the Palm

9   Coast, there's no real labs there.

10   But their economic asset is their K

11   through 12 system that's shifted their five

12   elementary schools, five middle schools, five

13   high schools on the cluster to better developing

14   in their area, so they have devised an

15   engineering school at the elementary school

16   level, an advanced business school at the

17   elementary school level that's plugged into the

18   middle school and the high school.

19   MR. BUERSTATTE: So these are all very

20   different, and kind of dynamic exchanges. And

21   while we want to present this in person to you

22   all, throughout your term, and we're clearly

1   already planning for next year, for 2020.

2   So as opportunities and geographies

3   are identified, we just wanted you to be aware of

4   that. And so whether it's you individually, your

5   organization or network could help make the

6   exchange more robust, and to Barrett's point,

7   really peel back the system and network behind

8   Asus, pretty tight obviously.

9   So we got to get driving, but thanks

10   a lot, Barrett. So he's just down the hall, so

11   if you really want to catch up with him after, we

12   can take you down.

13   But so looking at the Agenda, we were

14   supposed to hear from Jennifer Andberg next on

15   the Global Entrepreneurship Summit. She will

16   come later. So we'll do a quick adjustment and

17   move to workgroup report-outs.

18   And on that right now we've got

19   advanced manufacturing lined up first, however

20   we've got Camille Osborne Nellans from FirstNet

21   here who's got a flight to catch. So I wanted to

22   dive into our FirstNet discussion first so we

1   would have an opportunity to engage her, or more

2   importantly maybe so she can just listen to some

3   of our ideas.

4   So she participated in the breakout

5   yesterday, but really hoping to kind of gel some

6   of the ideas and better define what we want to do

7   next or what our questions are. So those of you

8   that participated in the FirstNet discussion,

9   feel free to kick things off.

10   CO-CHAIR TANG: I thought Heather was

11   our liaison.

12   (Simultaneous speaking.)

13   MEMBER NEMETH: That's what I thought

14   too, but we'll platoon it as an appropriate

15   response. So we had a very lively discussion in

16   our meeting group yesterday, and we kind of broke

17   down the problem into both just first off

18   outreach and introducing the network to potential

19   partners and customers.

20   And frankly, I think the group

21   understood better by the end of the meeting that

22   some of those problems are frankly part of AT&T's

1 effort to introduce the system to potential

2 customers.

3   And so if we looked a little further

4 into where can NACIE add some extra value, it was

5 in helping them refine the process on launching

6 the app store and some pitfalls to avoid in just

7 simply introducing a marketplace that isn't

8 compatible with the purchase decisions of the

9 potential customers.

10   But we really spent, I think, most of

11 the time talking about how do you help develop

12 companies and how do you introduce companies with

13 existing products into this market. So on that

14 note, Heather did kind of walk I think all of us

15 through, you know, the different stages of trying

16 to avoid the challenges of a hackathon that

17 doesn't lead to results and how we can do a

18 better job by setting up some of these events for

19 this organization. Trey, do you have any other

20 pieces to add to the --

21   MEMBER BOWLES: Yes. Well, I thought

22 Scott made an interesting sort of prescriptive

1   approach to looking at this app store or at this

2   new network as an opportunity to take, to your

3   point, existing products or services that are

4   already in market that could be moved over here,

5   taking existing products or technology that are

6   in completely separate markets but that could

7   apply over here and move them over here.

8   Then third, how do we help develop new

9   products and whatnot. So I think there was an

10   idea on how can we help connect in the local

11   agencies that are making these purchase decisions

12   with new technologies and be available, and then

13   demonstrating how this would work and really

14   making sure that some of the pitfalls that could

15   exist from corporate involvement from lock of

16   ability to innovate is a more continuous process.

17   Specifically, Heather specifically

18   focused on the idea of it's not just about

19   creating, getting a product and getting it out

20   there, but taking it to that second level which

21   is how do we create that product to be an actual

22   company, and then that company to actually be

1 sustainable.

2 And so, you know, we talked about the

3 ability that NACIE would have to convene groups

4 around this and then specifically what are some

5 of the things that we could do on the front end

6 just with knowledge transfer and experience to

7 help support this makes sense.

8 So I know Rick and Scott had thoughts

9 as well.

10 MEMBER JOHNSON: No, I think it was

11 just important to make sure the launch of the app

12 store was successful, and even stage it a little

13 to have the brand in the marketplace be

14 successful. And there were lots of offers to

15 help, from Scott, from Heather.

16 MEMBER FREDERICK: Yes, one of the

17 things, I mean, ways that we can help, I think

18 one of the most important things, if we're trying

19 to get information from the field, is to do that

20 effectively.

21 I threw out some examples of, like,

22 what DHS and DoD do with their SVIO or their DIUX

1   program. And what those do is they basically

2   pull together a problem set to let industry know

3   whether or not it's been venture capital firms or

4   universities or the entrepreneurial ecosystem.

5   One of the high level problems that

6   need to be solved, and then there was that

7   discussion where people threw out, you know, the

8   oxygen sensors. I think that's a perfect example

9   of how do you surface that problem so that the

10   right people can try to tackle it.

11   So that was kind of one angle. There

12   was a lot of tactical stuff on just if you're

13   going to set up an app store, you know, stock the

14   end on the front end and identify some companies

15   that you want on that platform, and kind of, you

16   know, prewire some sales so that you're up and

17   running with a positive proof point.

18   The other thing that I think needs to

19   be thought of were, especially because you're

20   potentially dealing with a niche audience. I'm

21   not saying that it's all going to be niche, but

22   the first responders, you know, it's not like a

1   cloud platform.

2   You need me to worry about overall

3   market size. So anything you can do to kind of

4   change the risk/reward math for a company

5   thinking about building an app for that platform.

6   One thing I was thinking about last

7   night, and I don't think it will be something

8   new. But through other work I've been doing I've

9   learned about a FEMA deductible program where

10   FEMA's issue is they want states and

11   municipalities to do some work on their own, and

12   not just to show off when the shit hits the fan

13   and say we need FEMA's help.

14   So my understanding is that there is

15   a deductible program, one that will make this app

16   store a huge win. I don't know if it's even

17   possible, but I'm trying to help some of our

18   companies figure out how to qualify a FEMA

19   deductible.

20   If there was a way to make anything in

21   the app store qualify for the FEMA deductible,

22   you just solved your problem of what do you offer

1   to companies to come on to the app store because

2   bang, you suddenly made the math from the

3   purchasing side make a heck of a lot of sense.

4   And so that may be something from a

5   policy perspective that --

6   MR. BUERSTATTE: Yes, I agree, Scott.

7   Yes, that's what today's all about, new ideas and

8   improving what we discussed yesterday. So I'll

9   offer on Trey's point on convening my three

10   pillars of what we tend to do best around

11   government, you know, regulate, fund, and convene

12   and amplify, those three things.

13   So I think that really helps us

14   operate at the level at which we should. And I

15   thought it could be interesting, and FirstNet is

16   still digesting a lot of this feedback. But it

17   could be interesting for NACIE to serve as a

18   strategic advisor in there for mean of their

19   launch plan.

20   They're already underway towards the

21   app store. But thinking okay, what's next and

22   how do we do, there was some strong feelings

1   around, you know, the hackathons and whatnot.

2   And I think we're all in agreement on the risks

3   there.

4   But making sure that the actions, the

5   discussion, what I heard was essentially making

6   sure that whatever actions are taken are

7   deliberate and are building toward a broader

8   regional and the national strategy.

9   So I think we could form a nice

10   working group around that. And just, we could

11   incorporate Scott's point, talking about capital

12   there.

13   MEMBER BOWLES: I think one of the

14   things that was also demonstrated is the idea of

15   when you're creating any ecosystem, it takes a

16   bunch of different stakeholders.

17   And if we can effectively identify who

18   some of those stakeholders are and then ensure

19   that those stakeholders are doing the things that

20   they're best fit to do, i.e. AT&T is not the best

21   to innovate early stage technology, so let's not

22   ask them to do that.

1   However, I think they would come

2   alongside some of the funding that FirstNet has

3   available to do this to match grants, match

4   challenge related things.

5   So I think that's something that we

6   could help too is help identify, as we did

7   yesterday, some of these key aggregators that are

8   already out finding these companies and vetting

9   these companies, whether it be incubators,

10   accelerators, or whoever it may be so that we

11   make sure that when we're getting to the point of

12   the challenge or an app store or whatever the

13   case may be that we're not relying on FirstNet,

14   we're not relying on AT&T, we're not relying on

15   the wrong people to help determine the viability

16   of a company or an idea or product.

17   So yes, I agree. I think there was a

18   lot of excitement in the room, and when you're

19   able to build this, you know, nationwide, new

20   nationwide network there's a lot of opportunity

21   that we've got to prove to these entrepreneurs

22   that there's a market and that market is large

1   enough and sustainable enough to merit their

2   time.

3   MS. NELLANS: Well, I just want to

4   thank you all. This was hugely helpful for us.

5   As Rich pointed out, and I think we talked about

6   yesterday, we have a lot of first responders that

7   work at FirstNet, but not many people from

8   entrepreneur or innovation community.

9   So just getting your ideas, and we're

10   not building the strategy within a vacuum. A lot

11   of things we haven't thought of in terms of this

12   aspect were, you know, really provided a lot of

13   insight and direction down paths we were already

14   going down that we may not have been headed down.

15   So I think that we'll not only to

16   continue to call on you as a group, but perhaps

17   as we move forward as individuals. You brought

18   up yesterday, you have a company that is working

19   on ex-access issues?

20   MEMBER FREDERICK: Yes, NextNet.

21   MS. NELLANS: That is the number one

22   issue for firefighters.

1   (Simultaneous speaking.)

2   MEMBER FREDERICK: Yes, and I know

3   they're in discussions with AT&T and it's been

4   going on for years.

5   MS. NELLANS: Well, we might be able

6   to help.

7   MEMBER FREDERICK: Yes, that would be

8   great.

9   MS. NELLANS: I mean, that would be a

10   perfect example. When we got back yesterday we

11   were like we didn't realize that that is the

12   problem that we're trying to solve on firefighter

13   side.

14   MEMBER FREDERICK: Yes.

15   MS. NELLANS: So as you guys, you

16   know, go back home, look through your portfolio

17   of things you already have because as we talked

18   about stocking the pond, you know, we may need to

19   work with AT&T to kind of make sure that our

20   roll-out on the app store is more thoughtful and

21   maybe a little bit slower than we were originally

22   anticipating.

1   But you know, on that same front, if

2   we've already got technologies that are out

3   there, then as Trey said, you know, you guys have

4   already vetted. Let's work together on that and

5   make sure that, you know, they're getting to you.

6   MEMBER FREDERICK: NextNet had one

7   concern. I mean, they're perfect. And again, I

8   made the joke not to negotiate against our

9   portfolio.

10   But I would tell them if you're going

11   to do a deal with them, that they've got to go to

12   the app store and that's the way you stock the

13   pond. You can kind of pre-wire it with two, you

14   know, these are both very substantial companies

15   and they have raised fifty plus million dollars

16   probably in each instance. They would be good

17   fits, and they could execute at that scale.

18   MS. NELLANS: You know, that's great.

19   And what you -- T.J. appreciated your offer about

20   the foundation and also the chance for UCSD. So

21   we will be following up on that individually.

22   MEMBER FREDERICK: That resiliency

1 group is good. I just came across them a month

2 ago.

3   MR. BUERSTATTE: And Camille, we can

4 definitely, no, there's a lot of follow ups in

5 here and I would like to build out a list and

6 follow up with the team so everyone's aware of

7 what's what, and might spark some new ideas.

8   But any other thoughts, you know, kind

9 of final feedback or questions generated?

10   (No response.)

11   MR. BUERSTATTE: Cool. And thank you,

12 Camille, for helping us coordinate with T.J. and

13 getting the team and really came in full force

14 yesterday to have a robust conversation. And she

15 flew all the way from Austin. So thank you for

16 coming, Camille. Thank you, appreciate it.

17   MEMBER FREDERICK: Craig, just real

18 quick. One other thing. Camille, I mentioned

19 SoftWorks yesterday. They're backed by something

20 called the Doolittle Institute. It's a horrible

21 name. But aside from that, I think it's a really

22 neat model.

1   Their tagline is assembling and

2   leading collaborative efforts that result in

3   rapid innovation and problem solving for the

4   Department of Defense's most challenging

5   problems.

6   So it's a very tailored, go out to the

7   community, figure out what the problems are, and

8   how do you communicate it to the appropriate, you

9   know, venture community, entrepreneur community,

10 universities.

11   But they do good marketing, and

12 they've engaged I think the right folks. It

13 would be a pretty easy model to knock off. Just

14 don't call it the Doolittle --

15   (Simultaneous speaking.)

16   MEMBER FREDERICK: Call it something

17 else.

18   MR. BUERSTATTE: Sure, sure. Great.

19 All right, well I think that's it for our

20 FirstNet discussion. A lot of great ideas and

21 do-outs. We'll follow up.

22   At this time I would like to switch

1   over to advanced manufacturing. And similarly,

2   anyone want to open up the conversation on what

3   we discussed yesterday?

4   MEMBER REICHERT: I can do that, and

5   then colleagues can add in as they see fit or as

6   I've left anything out.

7   So just to back up a little bit,

8   advanced manufacturing workgroup has really

9   focused on this topic because of experiences that

10   we've had, Sue at the community college level and

11   trying to incorporate a workforce, next

12   generation workforce to address manufacturing

13   needs in Indiana.

14   For me, it's been about helping

15   connect entrepreneurs to advanced manufacturing

16   resources in Massachusetts, and realizing through

17   that process just how big the gap of workers is

18   that needs to fill these jobs.

19   And so from our perspective, this is

20   very important to supporting our entire

21   innovation economy in the United States with

22   building hardware.

1   So that's kind of how NACIE has come

2   to the topic. Our current status as a workgroup

3   is that we have a set of draft recommendations,

4   and I think that we will be doing more work on

5   those between the next, this meeting and the next

6   meeting.

7   During the workgroup session

8   yesterday, we heard from a variety of different

9   folks, Phil Singerman from NIST, David Langdon

10   participated from Department of Commerce, Drew

11   Siderwall from DOE and Doug Lynott from EDA.

12   And all of those folks really were

13   able to share different perspectives about where

14   the administration is going and thinking about

15   advanced manufacturing and workforce in the

16   context of very specific programs that are

17   already in existence and perhaps ways that NACIE

18   might be involved or think about incorporating

19   these programs into our recommendations.

20   So the ICMP, sorry --

21   MR. BUERSTATTE: IMCP.

22   MEMBER REICHERT: IMCP?

1   MR. BUERSTATTE: Investigating

2   Manufacturing Communities Partnership.

3   MEMBER REICHERT: That one. We talked

4   about the importance of that program in terms of

5   setting up an ecosystem where ideas can be

6   shared.

7   That program does not involve

8   particular funding, but it does enable an

9   ecosystem of people who are all involved in

10 developing manufacturing resources and workforce

11 to communicate with one another.

12   And we heard how that program has been

13 perceived to be very successful, and that that's

14 something perhaps NACIE can think about, how do

15 we continue that or grow that program.

16   We also heard about manufacturing day.

17 A common theme which is pretty much universal in

18 manufacturing is that it has a reputation as

19 being a dirty and old feel. People have an idea

20 of assembly lines in the 1950s, and that is the

21 projection that parents have when they send their

22 kids out to be doctors and lawyers rather than

1   manufacturers.

2   And so we heard from, let's see, I

3   think we talked about that. Mike Molnar talked

4   about manufacturing day. And the impetus there

5   is to get students and other folks who might be

6   interested in manufacturing out into what the

7   modern manufacturing plant looks like so that you

8   can interest more students.

9   And I guess the thinking around that

10   is, you know, is one day a year enough. Are

11   there other things that we could be doing on more

12   of an ongoing basis, and what stakeholders need

13   to be involved, what can the public sector

14   contribute to that effort going forward.

15   We also talked a lot about the

16   Manufacturing USA network, and specifically what

17   that network is doing around workforce. And

18   Whitney shared some experience she had about

19   reaching out to the different centers and hearing

20   from them.

21   Maybe workforce is still a topic

22   underdevelopment. And so are there some

1   recommendations or some review that NACIE could

2   do with these different centers and help

3   influence them towards having workforce more of a

4   primary focus area.

5   In terms of next steps for this group,

6   I think we are going to have a follow up call to

7   review recommendations that were reported out at

8   the last NACIE gathering and, you know, kind of

9   incorporate what we've heard during this

10   particular workgroup meeting into those

11   recommendations.

12   So at this point I'll ask any

13   colleagues who are in the room to add anything I

14   night have missed, or add a different

15   perspective.

16   MEMBER S. SMITH: So one of the things

17   that was discussed was sort of a request or a

18   recommendation to hold a forum of sorts where

19   everyone could come in and share best practices.

20   So I'm not sure, you know, if that

21   will be part of our recommendation, but certainly

22   something that we would consider.

1   MR. BUERSTATTE: Best practices around

2   building manufacturing communities?

3   MEMBER S. SMITH: Right.

4   MR. BUERSTATTE: Okay.

5   MEMBER S. SMITH: Building

6   manufacturing workforce, communities, different

7   programs and projects that are going on that are

8   considered best practices.

9   MR. BUERSTATTE: So last year we held

10   a couple IMCP summits, the Investigative

11   Manufacturing Communities Partnership program,

12   IMCP. This is the one where it's really about

13   building a network in the system. And there's no

14   funding behind it, it's a designation.

15   And two of them now, and they were

16   both extremely well received as far as interest.

17   And it's just unfortunate where we didn't quite

18   have a ton of robust resources behind it. But I

19   know from that proof of concept that it would be

20   really valuable.

21   And something that we can think about

22   in the coming weeks and months is figuring out

1 how to wrap that in a way where maybe there's

2 some longevity. Like, there is an entity, what

3 body should own that because one of the bigger

4 lessens is we learn once you do that, people

5 become reliant.

6   The network is very robust but they

7 become reliant on that type of engagement, in a

8 good way. And you want to keep that momentum

9 moving.

10   So what agency or foundation or

11 public/private partnership, there's just a couple

12 different strategies there and, Whitney, a couple

13 ideas. But longevity I guess is what I'm getting

14 at, how do do that with institutional --

15   MEMBER BAGLEY: Craig?

16   MR. BUERSTATTE: Yes.

17   MEMBER BAGLEY: It's Rebecca.

18   MR. BUERSTATTE: Hey, Rebecca.

19   MEMBER BAGLEY: Would this be a good

20 time to speak?

21   MR. BUERSTATTE: Yes.

22   MEMBER BAGLEY: Okay. So one of the

1   things we might want to consider out of the

2   longevity case is SSCI has been doing, you know,

3   those interest group convening in conjunction

4   with their conference. It has been, you know,

5   partner with MEP and the manufacturing community

6   for a while, so that's one just option that I'll

7   throw on the table.

8   The other thing is it would be

9   interesting, I have been slightly less close to

10   it recently but I would be interested in IMCP and

11   kind of how it's been assessed and the feedback

12   because I think that it probably varies community

13   to community, the effectiveness of the program.

14   I mean, one of the goals of the

15   program was to get, what's the right word, better

16   access to federal funding and have a conduit, you

17   know, to be able to while you organize apply for

18   federal funding in a more robust way.

19   And I wonder if that could use some

20   sharpening of focus for these communities so that

21   they could, you know, get some of their work

22   funded an a more robust way.

1   MR. BUERSTATTE: Yes, that's correct.

2   And do you think, are you saying that that was a

3   missed opportunity or that was good and you would

4   like to see more of it, or was it just a general

5   comment?

6   MEMBER BAGLEY: I would think that my

7   impression, which I would like to validate a

8   little bit more is that it's a opportunity that

9   was not as well organized as it should have been

10   to be able to take advantage of it.

11   MR. BUERSTATTE: Okay.

12   MEMBER KENNEY: If I could just

13   piggyback on that. My organization's a part of

14   one of the IMCP communities. And the reason we

15   organized was the promise of, right, it didn't

16   come with money but the designation was sort of

17   this idea that we were going to get preferential

18   treatment for dozens or hundreds of solicitations

19   across the federal government that had to do with

20   manufacturing.

21   And there were billions and billions

22   of dollars. And this was all written into the

1 document to use I don't remember how many

2 billions of dollars. And we would be

3 specifically doing preferential treatment for all

4 of these solicitations.

5   And this was obviously kind of part of

6 the prior administration's kind of vision

7 forming, you know, putting a big exclamation

8 point on manufacturing.

9   And I think, you know, there has been,

10 and it's been noted that a lot of the communities

11 got value from it, just from organizing and being

12 together. But the reason that they got together,

13 you know, kind of asked observes, you know, do we

14 want to keep meeting, keep doing stuff together

15 as a community.

16   And I think it's still the potential

17 promise of federal funding that keeps those

18 groups organized in my mind. And so I think

19 there's still a big opportunity, you know, if the

20 current administration wants to carry that notion

21 forward in, you know, under the same or a

22 different name that this idea of recognizing hey,

1   these groups have organized and those dollars

2   will be more efficiently used in the communities

3   in a more coordinated fashion.

4   And so I would think that there's

5   still a big opportunity to try to deliver on that

6   promise.

7   MR. CHILDS: I'll comment on that. I

8   don't know if you're aware about this currently,

9   Congress to codify IMCP. So you'll probably see

10   something about that in the next month. But

11   Congress may take it up but there's definitely

12   talks about doing that.

13   MEMBER KENNEY: That's great. Yes,

14   and there have been some solicitations, you know,

15   that included that language about preferential

16   treatment or, you know, it's encouraged or

17   something like that.

18   So I mean, it's not like the promise

19   wasn't delivered on at all, but I don't think it

20   was quite as much as folks had envisioned. So

21   that would be great to see that.

22   MR. BUERSTATTE: Henry, do you think

1   there would be an opportunity, or I don't know

2   how flexible the guidance will be. Do you think

3   it will be fairly prescriptive on what needs to

4   take place or might there be an opportunity for

5   NACIE to help influence what an IMCP 2.0 would

6   look like? There's a lot of lessons learned.

7   MR. CHILDS: I think if Congress

8   decides to act on it, then obviously this

9   administration is going to follow up on it. And

10   that's when NACIE would probably look to do

11   something.

12   MR. BUERSTATTE: Okay, great.

13   MEMBER REAMER: How does the promotion

14   of IMCP fit with in the administration's request

15   for Congress to eliminate EDA?

16   MR. CHILDS: What do you mean?

17   MEMBER REAMER: Well, the FY '18

18   budget from the President zeros out EDA, it says

19   it shouldn't exist anymore. And that's, I assume

20   that's going to be in the '19 budget too.

21   MR. CHILDS: So your question, concern

22   is that what --

1   MEMBER REAMER: Well, it's great that

2   IMCP is going to be codified. But if there's no,

3   the administration is asking for EDA to be

4   eliminated. And so --

5   MR. CHILDS: We'll have to see what

6   Congress does with EDA too. They put the House

7   and Senate have put out their lines we'll have to

8   see what happens.

9   MEMBER TOOLE: The administration, to

10   be fair, has asked Congress to zero out a whole

11   bunch of things that I don't think is going to

12   happen.

13   MEMBER REAMER: I understand that.

14   But it's, like, administration policy is what I'm

15   interested.

16   MR. BUERSTATTE: Yes, I think we're

17   going to get some much better signals pretty soon

18   on what next steps are going to be. So it's, you

19   know, like Ellen emphasized, it's changeover

20   takes time.

21   We'll have, we've continued to get a

22   lot more clarity this summer. Clearly the last

1   few days were I think a real nice turning point

2   for us and made some real concrete progress and

3   some guidance.

4   So we'll keep everyone in the loop on

5   this. But it would -- Whitney, do you have

6   something?

7   MEMBER W. SMITH: Can I make a comment

8   about the manufacture breakup? First of all, you

9   did a great job summarizing as usual. I have two

10 observations about the work of the manufacturing

11 workgroup.

12   One I was just thinking about last

13 night which is I know we're about to talk about

14 apprenticeship. But in both the case of the

15 FirstNet responder broadband work and the

16 apprenticeship new authority for Commerce, there

17 is something very tangible for us to advise on,

18 to strengthen and generate ideas.

19   And I think in the manufacturing work,

20 you have significant work happening through the

21 Department of Manufacturing. But for the most

22 part, you know, the centers are going on, MEP

1   isn't a good place. So we can kind of comment

2   around the margins about strengthening, like my

3   comment about trying to reach out to the

4   workforce advisors.

5   But there's not a clear kind of meaty

6   thing for us to be advising. So we've ended up

7   being like well maybe we could do a forum. And I

8   don't think we have the bandwidth, personally,

9   people have the energy to do this all for them.

10   But to be, like, pulling together a conference as

11   an advisory, I think we should be advising.

12   So maybe we have to get through the

13   congressional piece. But maybe ICMP is the thing

14   --

15   MR. BUERSTATTE: The concrete piece,

16   sure.

17   MEMBER W. SMITH: -- that we can

18   really strengthen. I think we need to find that

19   thing for the manufacturing group. I have one

20   other thought, but if you want to react --

21   MR. BUERSTATTE: No. Go ahead.

22   MEMBER W. SMITH: -- specifically to

1   that?

2   MEMBER REAMER: No, I just want to

3   follow on to that. But go ahead.

4   MEMBER W. SMITH: Well, at the end of

5   the meeting, Phil made a comment that I thought -

6   made a comment kind of toward the end quietly but

7   I very much noted it, which is just reminding us

8   that Commerce does not have workforce at the

9   heart of its mission, that's Department of

10   Labor's mission.

11   But as we know, economic growth is so

12   often hindered by the lack of skilled talent. So

13   it has become a focus of NACIE and in other

14   programs that you do, but that we should always

15   lead our recommendations to the secretary on

16   manufacturing with a clear statement that the

17   reason we are focusing on workforce and

18   manufacturing is because we interact with

19   manufacturers all the time and, you know, that

20   talent really isn't, it's not the top barrier to

21   growth, one of the top barriers of growth.

22   Just kind of consistently reinforcing

1   that the department should continue to make that

2   connection.

3   MR. BUERSTATTE: Yes. He might use

4   the words Department of Commerce is America's

5   voice for business. And that's where that led.

6   So we as a council can act as a voice for

7   manufacturers to communicate their trials.

8   So I think that's a good point. And

9   on the thoughts around kind of I guess the

10   generalization of manufacturing right now, and

11   maybe using IMCP as a specific target

12   opportunity, I agree.

13   And I think that's a smart way to look

14   at it, but also as the administration clearly has

15   prioritized manufacturing, we want to consider

16   other strategies and ideas so we can be that

17   fresh voice.

18   And whether it's next week or in two

19   months, we'll start to get more direct

20   engagement. And I think, you know, Steve and I

21   have talked about we just want to position the

22   Council as having a few offerings on the menu.

1   MEMBER REAMER: Yesterday I offered

2   three ideas. One was to identify that the US

3   Chamber of Commerce has the Talent Pipeline

4   Management Initiative which is an effort funded

5   by the Strata Foundation to --

6   MEMBER W. SMITH: And JP Morgan Chase.

7   MEMBER REAMER: What's that? Oh, and

8   you guys too?

9   MEMBER W. SMITH: Yes.

10   MEMBER REAMER: Great, great. So help

11   me with this, to create regional collaboratives

12   of employers that are self-organized. And so

13   employers in manufacturing could organize

14   themselves to create a more effective talent

15   pipeline, talent supply chain.

16   And the idea is to apply the

17   principles of supply chain management to human

18   resource management at a regional level. So the

19   Chamber is running workshops, the TPM Academy,

20   Talent Pipeline Management Academy in which they

21   are funding now, I think they fund 40

22   collaboratives around the country.

1   And the aim is by 2019 I think to fund

2   100. So I would, one recommendation NACIE could

3   make to the Secretary is to, for the Secretary to

4   encourage or direct the manufacturing efforts of

5   NIST to engage with the Talent Pipeline

6   Management project to see if they can be useful

7   both through MEP and through the Manufacturing

8   USA.

9   So this is an existing structure, I

10   think, that Commerce can leverage through the

11   private sector. That's number one.

12   Number two, as I mentioned, a big

13   issue around manufacturing workforce is

14   information market failure. And Emily eluded to

15   one aspect of it, that people have a

16   misconception of what manufacturing work is.

17   But educators don't have a full sense

18   of what employers' demands are in terms of the

19   numbers, the skills that are needed. And

20   Congress directed the Labor Department, the

21   Secretary of Labor to create a nationwide

22   workforce and labor market information system

1   that would provide the data needed by employers,

2   by educators, by workers, and by students in

3   labor market, having to make decisions so that

4   people can make better decisions, so students

5   don't go to a four year college when that's not

6   really the best path for them, and then get stuck

7   with $25,000 in debt.

8   So I'm a member of the Workforce

9   Information Advisory Council which is set up by

10   Congress to advise the Secretary of Labor on how

11   to create this workforce labor market institution

12   system.

13   The aim of the system is to get the

14   federal statistical agencies who are producing

15   data and information on jobs and employment and

16   occupations, Department of Labor, I mean there

17   are labor statistics, the Employment Training

18   Administration, NBENs and Congress, the Census

19   Bureau is a huge player in this. And the

20   National Science Foundation.

21   And so we are trying to herd cats and

22   get these folks to talk to each other. I would

1   ask NACIE to ask the Secretary to direct the

2   Census Bureau to cooperate and participate in

3   this effort, and which they show every indication

4   of doing.

5   What I want to do is elevate this

6   notion of the importance of information for

7   efficient labor markets to the Secretary's office

8   so we can ensure that the Census Bureau gets the

9   funding it needs to provide the kind of data that

10   people can use so that manufacturers get the

11   employees they need.

12   And then the third thing, with this

13   idea of a convening --- I had suggested kind of a

14   near term, I agree with Whitney. You know, I

15   want to be an advisory council, I don't want to

16   run things.

17   And so I would ask staff to spend a

18   day, look, and talk to Whitney, talk to people

19   who Whitney recommends about what are some

20   examples out there of really good projects that

21   we can just pass around and look.

22   So I don't think we need a convening

1 to do best practices. People know that stuff.

2 And so let's put together a list of ten local

3 efforts around manufacturing employment and

4 workforce development, and educate ourselves, but

5 get staff to do it.

6 MEMBER KENNEY: I really like Andrew's

7 first suggestion. Phil talked about 250,000

8 manufacturing firms in the US, most of which are

9 small and medium companies. And it's hard for

10 them to engage around workforce issues without

11 some kind of a structure to participate in.

12 They can't self-organize easily. So

13 if there's a tool available that's already out

14 there with a goal to grow to increase the number

15 of organized groups, it feels like there's a real

16 opportunity in the low hanging fruit category to

17 extend some of that to manufacturing communities.

18 And both MEPs that are in touch with

19 a lot of those firms, or the IMCP community, you

20 know, could both be vehicles for which so that

21 organization could have that Commerce authority

22 over it.

1   MEMBER REAMER: I would be happy to

2   set up, to bring the guy who runs the town

3   management project on a conference call with him.

4   MR. BUERSTATTE: Real quick, a

5   clarification. On the forum piece, I don't

6   think, Sue, you were talking about pulling a

7   forum together to identify best practices, but is

8   more about connecting and elevating this type of

9   work, and the community overall very similar to

10   what the IMCP is doing, correct?

11   MEMBER S. SMITH: Yes, that's what the

12   discussion was around.

13   MR. BUERSTATTE: Yes, okay. And it's

14   a quick feedback operational, but yes, the

15   Council is absolutely not going to do that, but

16   rather I think what would be interesting is the

17   Council's advice on what strategy should Commerce

18   take in executing that.

19   What organizations, what channels,

20   what foundations, universities, et cetera, how

21   would you build out that event and what would

22   some specific outcomes be which would have long

1   term, sustainable impacts.

2   So there's, to your point, Whitney,

3   yes I agree. Just the last five minutes makes it

4   clear that there's some uncertainty around what

5   we should be focusing on. So you know, Emily and

6   Sue, I think we've got a lot of questions that we

7   can follow up on and further vet out what we want

8   to prioritize in the manufacturing group.

9   And I hate to leave it at such an open

10   end right there, but we do have a time schedule.

11   But any final thoughts from either of you on

12   this?

13   MEMBER REICHERT: Well, we didn't

14   really delve too much into it in the group

15   meeting yesterday, but I think there's actually a

16   lot of opportunity to innovate around the MEP

17   model as well.

18   And there's some very specific things

19   I know from working very closely with ARS,

20   different people in different states have very

21   different experiences in terms of quality level

22   and how engaging those organizations are. So I

1   think there's a very specific opportunity to

2   provide recommendations to make the MEP system

3   stronger and more open to useful interaction with

4   the people that it represents and the innovation

5   community.

6   MEMBER S. SMITH: I would agree.

7   MR. BUERSTATTE: Well, we're a little

8   bit behind. We will get to this break very

9   shortly, but we have Jennifer Andberg, Team

10   Director for the Office of Business Liaison here

11   with us to talk to us about the global

12   entrepreneurship summit.

13   Jennifer, they're getting your handout

14   right now, passing it out. Thanks for joining

15   me.

16   MS. ANDBERG: Thank you for allowing

17   me a few minutes to talk to you guys. I know

18   that you are getting ready for a break. I just

19   want to make sure that you are aware of and would

20   love any support or input that you might have for

21   the global entrepreneurship summit which will be

22   happening this year in Hyderabad, India at the

1 end of November, so November 28th through the

2 30th.

3 This is the eighth year that the

4 summit is occurring. This summit was launched by

5 the Obama administration. The first conference

6 was held in Washington, D.C. and subsequently was

7 held in several different countries around the

8 world.

9 Last year the administration wrapped

10 up with a summit in Silicon Valley, and now India

11 is going to be our co-host for the summit. This

12 year's theme is women first, prosperity for all.

13 And unlike previous years, they are

14 making an effort to concentrate on several

15 specific sectors so that the programming at the

16 summit can be more targeted. And these sectors

17 are energy and infrastructure, healthcare and

18 life sciences.

19 It's actually on the sheet on the

20 front page. And then I think in the first

21 paragraph, so healthcare and life sciences,

22 fintech and digital economy, and then media and

1   entertainment.

2   As of today, and one of the reasons

3   why I wanted to come and talk to all of you, the

4   application for participants for both the

5   entrepreneurs and then the investors and

6   ecosystem supporters is open.

7   And we are looking for interest from

8   any of you who might want to participate in GES

9   as well as if you do have suggestions of either

10   investors and ecosystem supporters or

11   entrepreneurs that you think that would be good

12   candidates, we would love to work with you so

13   that you could send an application link out to

14   these individuals and then provide those lists to

15   us.

16   This year it is a very condensed

17   period of time that we're putting together a very

18   large summit. It's 1,500 participants. So we

19   are doing a nominated, closed application

20   process.

21   Last year, for example, was open.

22   There were somewhere over 9,000 applicants for

1   just the entrepreneurs that participated for 800

2   slots. So this year we're trying to manage that

3   process. There will be 1,200 slots for

4   entrepreneurs from around the world.

5   The target is for 400 Indian

6   entrepreneurs, 400 US entrepreneurs, and then 400

7   representing the rest of the world. And then on

8   the investor ecosystem side it's about a third, a

9   third, a third for the hundred, the 300 investor

10   and ecosystem participants.

11   So on the sheet that I passed out, it

12   does have a little bit of information in terms of

13   the criteria that we're looking for. Obviously

14   we would love to have candidates who are in our

15   target sectors because this is a focused summit,

16   and just a couple of other items that obviously

17   make sense when you're recruiting and trying to

18   make an audience that is the best suited for the

19   content that we have.

20   MR. BUERSTATTE: And we'll of course

21   follow up with a soft copy here and some links

22   which are in the document I think. Any quick

1   questions from the team?

2   MS. ANDBERG: Yes.

3   MEMBER KENNEY: So you're looking for

4   400. And this refers to nominations for up to 15

5   American entrepreneurs and 500 investors or

6   ecosystem. Is that, like, per nominator?

7   MS. ANDBERG: Yes, per nominator.

8   MEMBER KENNEY: So each one of us can

9   nominate 15?

10   MS. ANDBERG: Absolutely.

11   MEMBER KENNEY: Okay.

12   MS. ANDBERG: And the reason that we

13   did limit that is because there are a number of

14   different trusted organizations that the

15   Department of Commerce and this whole business

16   administration, the State Department and USAID

17   are working with so that we don't, again, have

18   9,000 applications to potentially look through.

19   But somewhere, you know, in the several thousand

20   to get down toward --

21   MEMBER KENNEY: We send them the link,

22   how do we let you know that that's one of our 15

1 that we nominated?

2 MS. ANDBERG: So I will follow up with

3 an email to Craig so he can send it all to you.

4 I have a template spreadsheet that is very easy.

5 You just insert the information and get that back

6 to me.

7 MEMBER BALDWIN: And does that include

8 nominating Indian entrepreneurs?

9 MS. ANDBERG: So that is actually a

10 very good question. The Indian entrepreneurs and

11 the Indian investor ecosystem supporters, that

12 process is being managed by the Indians. They

13 are the ones that have set up a separate

14 application portal.

15 But in our discussions with them, they

16 have said that they are welcome to suggestions.

17 So if you do have suggestions for stellar

18 entrepreneurs or investors or ecosystem

19 supporters of India, please do share that with me

20 as well, and I'm happy to pass that on to the

21 Indians.

22 If you could do it in a separate

1   spreadsheet so that it's very easy to pass that

2   on to the Indians, I would appreciate that. But

3   I think that we certainly can do that.

4   MR. BUERSTATTE: Sorry to cut you off,

5   David. But I just want to keep us on time and

6   break. Jennifer, if you don't mind staying

7   around for a couple minutes --

8   MS. ANDBERG: No, that's fine.

9   MR. BUERSTATTE: -- for anyone who's

10   got follow on questions. I know we've got a

11   couple people that actually need to head out and

12   grab a flight.

13   But at this time, I'm going to break

14   for ten minutes. So if you could get back around

15   11:07, seated, we'll get going and we'll whip

16   through our final two workgroups and close out.

17   So thanks --

18   MS. ANDBERG: And I can stay here, we

19   can go in the hall. However you guys want to do

20   it, continue asking questions, I'm open. And

21   Emily, we met just a few months ago, so I had

22   already sent some of that information to you. I

1   got your message and it didn't make the

2   connection that would be actually in this room

3   with me today. But I've already sent you the

4   applications as well.

5   (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter

6   went off the record at 10:58 a.m. and resumed at

7   11:10 a.m.)

8   MR. BUERSTATTE: All right, so we've

9   got a couple big things to get through still in

10   this last hour. Number one is wrapping up our

11   workgroup report outs, and next up is

12   deregulation and the STEM apprenticeship program.

13   Let's start with deregulation, as we

14   did before. Any passionate team members there

15   want to brief out the rest of us? I know

16   deregulation is really exciting.

17   MEMBER KENNEY: Heather was the one

18   who had kind of been screening a lot of things.

19   And Andrew was there and I was there, and I can't

20   remember who else.

21   PARTICIPANT: Esther, were you --

22   MEMBER KENNEY: We were in the same

1   room for about a second. I'm blending together

2   who was in each one. But I think we, the

3   regulatory sandbox topic came up again which is

4   something that Heather's brought up in the past

5   which is this idea of creating some kind of a

6   place for, you know, especially in highly

7   regulated industry, the number of companies

8   participating in a way where they can kind of

9   experiment with some oversight, you know, some

10   different regulatory model that allows some

11   experiment.

12   And we didn't get real specific about

13   what that would look like. And then kind of went

14   off on some other things about regulations as

15   they relate to the Paperwork Reduction Act in

16   federal agencies that work with organizations

17   like a lot of ours from the programs that

18   Commerce already has jurisdiction over.

19   And then the Economic Development and

20   Innovation Office folks, part of their role is to

21   actually look at a lot of these programs across

22   the federal government, not just within Commerce,

1   to I believe it was touching economic development

2   or cluster oriented programs and looking for

3   efficiencies and ways that we could work together

4   more effectively.

5   And a component of that could be

6   regulatory challenges that either create

7   redundancies or prevent better cooperation. So

8   there was some talk about whether there might be

9   a home for a project within an EDI group that

10   could be something.

11   On the Paperwork Reduction Act front,

12   I think that the thought was could there be an

13   experiment just, like, within Commerce where it's

14   more of an internal benefit, efficiency as

15   proposed to directly helping businesses, you

16   know, some number of forms or processes be

17   changed or approved.

18   Eric was taking notes, I think, on

19   some of this. I don't know if you had anything

20   else, or if anybody else from our group. I know

21   we came away with a lot of specific

22   recommendations. Andrew had some, I think some

1   more casual ideas.

2   MEMBER REAMER: Yes. To add to what

3   you're saying, we talked about regulation kind of

4   in two big buckets. One is federal rules about,

5   that regulate firm behavior. They think about

6   the Securities Exchange Commission.

7   And then there are the regulations

8   that govern the management of grant programs, the

9   forms that, and contracting, the forms that

10   companies have to fill out to qualify, the audits

11   that happen at the back end, and all the stuff

12   around, you know, government giving out money in

13   one form or another and the rules and regulations

14   attached to that.

15   So this is for people who are not

16   familiar with the Paperwork Reduction Act was an

17   Act passed by Congress that, in the Reagan years

18   that was intended to reduce the paperwork burden

19   on the public because a lot of federal agencies,

20   federal agencies were unbound in terms of their

21   ability to write grants, write surveys and ask

22   businesses to fill them out.

1   And businesses were overwhelmed.

2   Well, Congress said that every federal data

3   collection could be like an application to work

4   at EDA, right, has to go through this paperwork

5   reduction process which is a long process.

6   There are two public comment periods,

7   there has to be a notice in the Federal Register.

8   And I'm talking for everything. Right? The form

9   that Eric and Craig filled out to get their jobs

10   had to go through a Federal Register, you know,

11   before it was approved, has an OMB control number

12   at the bottom.

13   A Federal Record notice, the public

14   was invited to comment on this 60 day notice,

15   then a 30 day notice, then OMB blesses it. And

16   then they have to do it again in three years.

17   Every three years.

18   So it's a huge burden on the

19   agencies, plus it makes, to the extent you're

20   trying to align the data collection efforts of

21   individual agencies, it just makes it much more

22   difficult to do that.

1   So David, I actually think reducing

2   the burden on the government staff will actually

3   reduce burden, has potential to reduce burden if

4   the forms can be improved.

5   So my thought was can there be a

6   regulatory sandbox for the Paperwork Reduction

7   Act that would give some room for folks in

8   Commerce to create these forms and processes that

9   would reduce the burden eventually on themselves

10 and the people filling out the forms.

11   MR. BUERSTATTE: I think that's a good

12 way to case, or I think we need some

13 categorization, some pillars within this because

14 it is a lofty subject. So if it's firm

15 regulation versus the regulatory operational,

16 like, government operation regulation, those are

17 two different areas and do, does the Council see

18 concrete, meaty enough opportunity in both of

19 those near term? Any thoughts there?

20   MEMBER REAMER: Craig, I would say it

21 would be very helpful to get a declaration of

22 priority from the government in terms of what's

1   important. I mean, we can have our own ideas

2   that one might be useful. But we talked about a

3   lot, so what does the Commerce Department care

4   about?

5   MR. BUERSTATTE: Sure, yes.

6   MEMBER BALDWIN: There was a lot of

7   discussion around elimination of bureaucracy in

8   addition to the regulation. You know, the fact

9   that people don't know what the rules are until

10   they break them, then ends up with a $10,000

11   fine.

12   And for entrepreneurs, that's just

13   punitive. You know, John Williams had a lot of

14   good discussion, good ideas of things that could

15   be done there. And we had some look into is

16   there a role for expert systems to actually mine

17   what are the mistakes that everybody has made,

18   and how can we guide people through the process

19   to eliminate the mistakes, or prompt them before

20   it's a problem.

21   So you failed to file, you made zero

22   money on this but you failed to file that you

1 made zero money on it. It's not intuitive that

2 you should because you made zero, but you're

3 going to pay $10,000. And so there's an

4 opportunity for technology to perhaps help.

5   MEMBER JOHNSON: So, in Kentucky we

6 turned it around. Instead of trying to think

7 what that is, we just told the people what really

8 annoys you and then you just look where that

9 question spikes, in what areas.

10   You say wow, there's the problem,

11 let's fix it. And so that works really well.

12 It's just what's trending now.

13   MEMBER FREDERICK: So I wasn't in this

14 --

15   MEMBER BALDWIN: How did you capture

16 that?

17   MEMBER JOHNSON: We have a website.

18 We have a website. We would say if there's

19 anything you don't like about government, respond

20 here. And then they follow a format. And it

21 works really well. It's been in place about a

22 year now, works really well.

1   Like, wow that's really stupid, let's

2   change that. It just happens over and over

3   again. It's easy to do. We're just a little

4   state, right? It's really easy, there's like six

5   people around the state. It's not like the

6   federal government. But it works really well.

7   MEMBER REICHERT: What are some of the

8   things that they suggest?

9   MEMBER JOHNSON: Things just like

10   that. You know, we had to file these things even

11   though it's not obvious we should file them. We

12   shouldn't have to file it. Oh, okay. You don't

13   have to file it.

14   I can get you a detailed list of

15   what's happened over the last year. But the key

16   is not what's happened, it's just how we

17   prioritize it. We didn't try to decide what the

18   issue was, we let them tell us. It's like wow,

19   that was really easy.

20   MEMBER JOHNSON: But what I would like

21   to do is get ahead of that curve. What we're

22   saying is you came across this problem, it was a

1 problem.

2 MEMBER JOHNSON: That's because you're

3 really smart and I'm not. And so I just tell him

4 what am I doing that annoys you. And it's like

5 okay. Now --

6 MEMBER REICHERT: I think it's

7 interesting you get responses back because --

8 MEMBER JOHNSON: Oh, yes.

9 MEMBER REICHERT: -- when we ask our

10 entrepreneurs that, we often get back there's

11 nothing bothering us.

12 MEMBER JOHNSON: In Kentucky, nobody

13 talks to people out in rural Kentucky. And you

14 just give them an open-ended question, how much

15 time do you have.

16 (Simultaneous speaking.)

17 MEMBER REICHERT: You sit down in a

18 room with a politician and you ask about this

19 question and there's just blank stares.

20 MEMBER FREDERICK: So I wasn't in the

21 session so I'm reluctant to speak. But I wanted

22 to give a little bit of administrative color, and

1   I don't want to over play. You know, I don't

2   really know what they're thinking.

3   But one thread that is now being

4   talked about a lot is around open data and the

5   Open Data Act and the Australian Initiatives.

6   And any discussion I've had with folks from the

7   administration, they get really excited.

8   And the Data Foundation is right here

9   in DC. They did a big piece with PWC that looked

10   at what Australia did. And Australia saved a

11   billion dollars in year one. And the idea is

12   basically any form that a business needs to

13   submit that's standard, you know, just like

14   registering an employee and stuff like that.

15   They've made it an open data standard

16   that's machine readable. I'm happy, I don't even

17   know who on the group would be interested, but I

18   just met with them and it hits on Trump's key

19   language. It leverages technology to streamline

20   safe costs, get bureaucracy out.

21   PARTICIPANT: Sounds like it would be

22   a great topic.

1   MEMBER REICHERT: Yes.

2   MEMBER FREDERICK: I mean, and these

3 people have done a lot of work. I saw a

4 presentation on the Australian system and it is,

5 it's slick.

6   MEMBER REAMER: Now, is this Daniel

7 Castro, is he the guy that, you say David

8 Foundation.

9   MEMBER FREDERICK: No, Hudson

10 Hollister --

11   MEMBER REAMER: Yes, Dave Coalition.

12   MEMBER FREDERICK: Dave Coalition.

13 And yes.

14   MEMBER REAMER: Oh really, they did

15 that? Okay, cool.

16   MEMBER FREDERICK: Yes. And they've

17 got a lot of congressional support. Like, Will

18 Hurd has been pretty big behind it.

19   MEMBER REAMER: And so this is a

20 great, I know Hudson. Hudson's really effective.

21 Hudson used to work for Issa in the House.

22   MEMBER FREDERICK: Yes.

1   MEMBER REAMER: And he knows how to

2 work the outside/inside. He would be a cool

3 person to --

4   MEMBER FREDERICK: I'm a big fan. And

5 I just met with him and told him that this had

6 appeared on our agenda, and he got all excited

7 and sent me these.

8   MEMBER REAMER: Okay.

9   MEMBER FREDERICK: So if anybody would

10 like these.

11   MEMBER REAMER: Let me see, I might

12 even have it from Hudson. He just sent it to me

13 Monday.

14   PARTICIPANT: This gets at something

15 that could be actionable.

16   MEMBER BALDWIN: There was some

17 discussion about that. How do you help somebody,

18 either by not requiring the rules and regulations

19 for a short time or by putting them into a

20 sandbox environment where it's going to be up to

21 the experts. Get them their licensing, guide

22 them.

1   And I mentioned the network across

2   China where they actually do that. And I had

3   forgotten about what the idea, that's their

4   external development where this is internal

5   organization. Can we capture some best practices

6   globally, like this Australia one sounds like a

7   great idea. Let's copy what works.

8   MR. BUERSTATTE: So in general, this

9   one sounds to me, not in any order here, but it

10   sounds like this is a little bit less defined and

11   developed than others, and that's fine. And I

12   respect what you said, Andrew, and I agree.

13   You know, we need a little bit tighter

14   guidelines from Bob, and we're working that. But

15   I think we wanted to have a more deliberate

16   conversation yesterday and today because we know

17   this is a priority. We wanted to be able to

18   strike should we have the opportunity to affect

19   some of the deregulation activities here.

20   But one specific question then, who,

21   and a show of hands, could we pull together over

22   the coming weeks to one or two conference calls

1 to try to work through this a little bit more so

2 we can head into our future conversations with

3 more definition. Esther?

4   MEMBER REAMER: I can do it. And I'm

5 going to suggest that I really like this idea of

6 the Australia thing. It's concrete. We can get

7 Hudson to work for us. I mean, and so it's,

8 there's a platform to actually do something that

9 I think would resonate with the administration.

10   MEMBER KENNEY: I was just reading the

11 first page. It sounds like there's an issue

12 recommendation in here.

13   MEMBER FREDERICK: Oh, yes. They have

14 done all the heavy lift. Can I ask just a really

15 stupid question? Like, when we get the agenda

16 and I saw that that was on it, it's okay for me

17 to tell --

18   MR. BUERSTATTE: Yes, please.

19   MEMBER FREDERICK: Okay.

20   MR. BUERSTATTE: Please.

21   MEMBER FREDERICK: I just don't want

22 to --

1   MR. BUERSTATTE: No, that's why we

2   need you to seek out the organizations and the

3   networks. So no, this type of resource is

4   fantastic.

5   MEMBER REAMER: And we could get

6   Hudson on the phone.

7   MEMBER FREDERICK: Oh, yes. He would

8   come in. He would come and meet with us. I

9   mean, this is --

10   PARTICIPANT: He wants to see it.

11   MR. BUERSTATTE: Yes, let's dig into

12   it offline, let's all group --

13   MEMBER FREDERICK: I'm going to

14   forward everybody what he forwarded me because he

15   had an electronic copy of it.

16   MEMBER KENNEY: So an example, by the

17   way, specifically that's used on the first page

18   of the executive summary talks about the $2

19   trillion that manufacturers alone are sort of

20   carry as a cost associated with regulatory

21   compliance in the US.

22   MEMBER REAMER: This is important. So

1   let me just give a minute on the background of

2   Hudson and his organization. As I said, Hudson

3   worked for Darrell Issa who was I think at a

4   point the chair of government oversight four or

5   five years ago.

6   The passion of ISA and of Hudson were

7   the transparency around government spending and

8   financial stuff. So Hudson left Congress to

9   start this foundation and work from the outside

10   to revamp the federal act around the transparency

11   of federal spending.

12   And he put together a coalition of

13   ISA, Portman from Ohio, and democrat Warner from

14   Virginia. And they got a bill through Congress a

15   few years ago called the Data Act that was passed

16   unanimously. And another thing, that he is also

17   into financial, Scott, into the financial

18   transparency.

19   PARTICIPANT: So that's how I met him

20   is through Treasury. I worked closely with him

21   on that treasury release because we were using

22   similar tech companies.

1   MEMBER BALDWIN: One of us asked, I

2   think it was John Williams, what the top issues

3   were. Remind me, were these the two that he

4   replied, restoring the supply chains and cyber

5   security? Does anyone recall that?

6   MR. BUERSTATTE: What was the program?

7   MEMBER BALDWIN: What are the two top

8   issues, we asked that question. And I think he

9   said restoring the supply chains that getting

10   qualified suppliers into the system is a barrier

11   to entry --

12   (Simultaneous speaking.)

13   MR. BUERSTATTE: The manufacturing

14   supply chain?

15   MEMBER BALDWIN: Manufacturing came up

16   a lot in the deregulation discussion. I don't

17   know if it was because Drew was there. And then

18   the other one was cyber security, and the

19   Baldridge assessment was mentioned, that many

20   small manufacturers have to meet requirements

21   that even large corporations --

22   MR. BUERSTATTE: Right.

1   MEMBER BALDWIN: -- have difficulty

2   with entire departments, you know, dedicated to -

3   - and what was the rule with the states and those

4   economic development strategies?

5   MR. BUERSTATTE: All right, so again,

6   I think we've got some good questions to dive

7   into. Let's pull the team together, Andrew,

8   Esther, Rick, David, Scott, and we'll massage

9   this to a more finite question and opportunity.

10   Switching gears a bit, and I know it's

11   been a long eight hours together in conference

12   rooms and whatnot. But this last one I'll offer

13   up some anecdotes that I was told this is a

14   surprise, I'm not sure what we can do here, or

15   this intrigues me by a number of people.

16   And then we walked away with a lot of

17   wows and this is a really big opportunity. It's

18   still a very big challenge. I don't think the

19   group defined exactly the direction we want to

20   go. But nonetheless, the STEM apprenticeship

21   group, feel free, what do you think about

22   yesterday?

1   MEMBER W. SMITH: Does someone want to

2   volunteer to do the --

3   MEMBER REICHERT: I think you just

4   did.

5   MEMBER W. SMITH: So in the pre-read,

6   you saw that there now, Commerce has some

7   authority to get involved in STEM apprenticeships

8   and has grant making authority. No appropriation

9   yet, but potentially funding that could be

10   pulled. That's kind of a question on the table.

11   So we brain stormed what could the

12   department do that would be value add to the

13   Department of Labor's huge, you know, almost, I

14   can't recall what their budget figure is now but

15   they're putting, you know, $100 million into

16   apprenticeship that is more geared to specific

17   sectors and meeting employer needs and building

18   competency pathways.

19   You know, so what could we do that

20   would be additive to that. And I think maybe you

21   made the comment, Rich, that got us really

22   thinking about doing an apprenticeship around

1 entrepreneurship skills and teaching kind of

2 adaptability and problem solving and those kinds

3 of really critical skills that could cut across

4 businesses, but could also meet the talent needs

5 of some of the stirred up or second stage

6 companies that are having trouble.

7 They don't know how to work, first of

8 all, in system works and need talent. So there

9 were ideas from now that we kind of flipped back

10 and said we have to be clearer about what problem

11 we're actually trying to solve.

12 And I think my take away from that is

13 we would have to build, lean on those of you who

14 are in, you know, regularly communicating with

15 small businesses, whether they're start-ups again

16 or a little bit further down in their growth and

17 really understand what the talent that's needed,

18 what we're trying to solve.

19 But I think we got excited about kind

20 of taking a new idea and expanding the

21 apprenticeship notion of work and learn to men

22 more around this space. And then I just had

1 coffee in the break with David Langdon who's kind

2 of a workforce expert within the department.

3   And he had to go to another meeting,

4 but he said he really felt like we were on to

5 something. And then this morning when we were

6 talking about the federal labs and the disconnect

7 between, like, the scientists and then figuring

8 out how to turn it into a business, there are

9 lots of pathway problems and we would just have

10 to zero in on what we were exactly trying to fix.

11 But to him that reinforced the general direction

12 we were on.

13   MEMBER JOHNSON: So to build on that,

14 I have very selfish motives on startup community

15 and to create this sort of matchmaking service.

16 But what we talked about was with a slush fund

17 that Craig has. Some freedom with the money,

18 there may be some, the way startups work, maybe

19 you could prototype several different types of

20 systems --

21   PARTICIPANT: A challenge.

22   MEMBER JOHNSON: -- that work in this

1   area, in this area. So and then see if they ever

2   take the one or ones that were more successful

3   and build those out.

4   MR. BUERSTATTE: My first response to

5   that, and after just hearing your point, Whitney,

6   it's interesting because we talked about maybe

7   some themes that we would like to hit in a

8   challenge where looking for apprenticeship

9   programs with respect to X industry, with respect

10 to this type of geography, with respect to

11 federal labs perhaps.

12   And maybe, and just off the cuff I

13 think I had mentioned piloting eight or awarding

14 eight grants, prizes, and if you got two of each

15 perhaps. And not trying to over engineer it and

16 get into the tactics but I think, and then we had

17 discussed using that then and the lessons gleaned

18 from a pilot program that you would have a better

19 idea how to deploy those more long term.

20   MEMBER JOHNSON: So I took, I created

21 a document and sent it to the people I can

22 remember that were in that meeting yesterday and

1   tried to sort of frame the problem a little bit

2   and then give an example.

3   I always like, so I gave a very

4   specific example. But to me, what I'm excited

5   about this, I like to think of a very, very

6   specific area that's going to involve startups

7   and it's going to involve getting women into

8   startups.

9   I have a lot of people that say I have

10   an investor, she's invested in 33 or 35 women-

11   owned, you know, women CEO startups. I don't

12   know where to find them, I don't know how to

13   create one, I don't know how to do that.

14   This is a way. It's like the light

15   went on. I could take college graduates that I

16   don't care what their degree is, they're going to

17   have interest, personal interest.

18   And when I find out what those are, I

19   can match them with a startup and see if it

20   works, and then coach them along the way what it

21   is. So it's two phased, there's an educational

22   component but it's not the traditional high

1   school or university education. It's sort of

2   more the school of hard knocks.

3   And then for real life experience,

4   it's not a safe experience, you're going to be an

5   intern at a big company and empty garbage cans.

6   It's going to be you're in the mix with these

7   people that you only have a certain amount of

8   runway, you know, for all these problems.

9   MR. BUERSTATTE: The things that

10   happen, I can see it's hard to engage some of the

11   workforce ports. So the traditional plans, we

12   talked about that and the questions that we would

13   want to figure out, what types of organizations.

14   And since we haven't defined the real

15   problem that we're trying to address with this

16   yet, but after that, you know, what type of

17   organizations would we want to target to solicit

18   from. Who do we want to tackle it so the

19   traditional --

20   MEMBER TOOLE: Remember, at least the

21   way it was written down, this was about STEM

22   apprenticeship, right?

1   MR. BUERSTATTE: Yes, yes.

2   MEMBER TOOLE: Dumping the modern

3   grant program and do policies to spur more

4   apprenticeship programs in old and new STEM

5   industries. And so I think that the point is

6   what is it that we're trying to do.

7   Are we trying to create entrepreneurs

8   for the STEM field, are we trying to create, you

9   know, STEM workers that can work an

10   entrepreneurship, are we trying to encourage more

11   people to consider careers? What is it that

12   we're trying to do? I think you need to be

13   really clear on that before you start trying to

14   design programs.

15   MEMBER REAMER: And who proposed the

16   topic in the first place? Where did the STEM

17   apprenticeship topic come from?

18   MEMBER TOOLE: Don't know.

19   MR. BUERSTATTE: So it's been

20   apprenticeships are a priority for the

21   administration.

22   MEMBER REAMER: I know, but I mean --

1   okay, go ahead.

2   MR. BUERSTATTE: So this was Commerce

3   driven, not within the Council. So this came

4   down and there's some interest internally for it.

5   So I wanted the Council to --

6   CO-CHAIR TANG: And there was NACIE

7   2.0 work on this also.

8   MR. BUERSTATTE: Yes.

9   MEMBER BALDWIN: I love the idea of

10 when the apprenticeship, that it's --

11 entrepreneurship apprenticeship. I love that

12 idea because it addresses a common theme that

13 I've heard that people don't know where to go,

14 they don't know what the rules are, they break

15 them.

16   They don't know what the one stop shop

17 is, they don't know what the forms are. You

18 know, even if there are four forms that have to

19 be filled out. I really like the idea of, I

20 mean, it's not a technical apprenticeship but

21 it's a very commerce and business related

22 apprenticeship.

1   MR. BUERSTATTE: And to be cognizant

2   of Eric's point on STEM apprenticeships though,

3   yes so I think you could frame, especially given

4   the rise of technology and every business is a

5   tech business as they sometimes say now, right,

6   STEM is applicable in so many industries. But we

7   would have to work through --

8   MEMBER BALDWIN: Well, maybe the

9   recommendation is that there's an

10   entrepreneurship module that must be included in

11   all STEM apprenticeships.

12   MEMBER TOOLE: Well, so maybe. And if

13   you're going to go down that road, the fact that

14   you're going to do entrepreneurship in STEM,

15   however that's defined or configured, you also

16   definitely, definitely, definitely need to do

17   this with I-Corps and in conjunction with I-

18   Corps.

19   There's this huge part federal

20   government already set up to do entrepreneurship

21   in the sciences. Started at NSF, now NIH, DOE,

22   all over the place. And so what the last thing

1   you want to do is go off and reinvent the wheel.

2   MEMBER BALDWIN: Reinvent the wheel.

3   CO-CHAIR TANG: I just have, Esther,

4   to your point, the science center has been

5   working on this. We already have STEM programs

6   for K through 8 students and K through 12

7   students, really focusing on middle school and

8   high school.

9   Our approach is to let the

10   entrepreneurs be the mentors in that program. So

11   the bridge to entrepreneurship apprenticeships to

12   us is the next likely step.

13   But I think some of the challenges in

14   general STEM education programs is the work and

15   the mentoring is not done by entrepreneurs, it's

16   done by other folks in STEM careers, which is

17   fine. But it doesn't bridge into the

18   entrepreneur world as easily.

19   So maybe the pivot point is around

20   more the innovation side, right? So mentoring by

21   folks that are in research and development or

22   have some sort of knowledge in commercialization

1   then leads more likely I think into

2   entrepreneurship and apprenticeships along that

3   path.

4   MEMBER JOHNSON: So I agree with it,

5   but there's an immediate problem that getting to

6   elementary school and middle and high school kids

7   doesn't solve.

8   We have a term we use called million

9   dollar babies. Those are companies that have a

10   million dollars in revenue that have received a

11   million dollars in funding. And they might have

12   a staff of seven let's say.

13   And they're starting to scale up, and

14   they're going to hire seven more people. That's

15   a very, very dangerous time for them. And so

16   it's hard enough to find the right person, but

17   then the expectations have to be right.

18   So back to your final statement there,

19   just preparing the person that's going to go in

20   there on what life's going to be like there.

21   Okay, and sort of so otherwise they're going to,

22   you know, jump out the window on day three or

1   they'll get fired. You know, the organism will

2   reject them.

3   And so to me there are groups, if

4   they're in Kentucky they got to be everywhere,

5   that will work with people like that. The non-

6   profits, they exist that sort of work in that

7   space.

8   MEMBER REICHERT: Yes, there's one in

9   Boston. I think it's Boston based called Startup

10   Institute where they train people how to think

11   entrepreneurially and join startup companies.

12   MR. BUERSTATTE: One thing that hasn't

13   been mentioned, just going back to Eric's point

14   on I-Corps, EDA does have some nice flexibility

15   in receiving funds as acting as the economic

16   development integration, or integrator role that

17   we play.

18   So we're allowed, in a pretty flexible

19   manner, to collaborate with agencies. And

20   something to keep in mind as we work through this

21   conversation, is there an opportunity to augment,

22   update, modernize some of the I-Corps NSF work

1 through a program and using some of their funding

2 and combining it with ours. Not sure.

3   MEMBER TOOLE: Well, I-Corps is under

4 a lot of pressure, as you know, from Congress to

5 demonstrate efficacy. And I think they would be

6 very willing to play.

7   MEMBER REICHERT: On that topic, you

8 may have already mentioned this, Eric, but

9 conducing the I-Corps output to incubators and

10 accelerator program would be really effective

11 because we've hosted I-Corps programs related to

12 energy. So we've had a lot of touch actually

13 with the I-Corps program.

14   But I can't say that one I-Corps

15 company has ever ended up in Greentown Labs. And

16 it's kind of surprising to me. So where are

17 those companies going? Are they dissolving?

18 Like, what happens to them. Does anyone know?

19 Who's tracking that and is there a funnel for

20 them to continue to grow after the business model

21 campus is done?

22   MS. SHIEH: I wanted to say, somebody,

1   or VentureWell is tracking that kind of

2   information. And then the other thing to note is

3   that I-Corps at the different agencies actually

4   is different, it's a little different.

5   So I-Corps and the SBIR, NIH is

6   actually already --- it's Phase I SKR awarded

7   companies as opposed to original NSF program

8   which is concrete company based. But VentureWell

9   is tracking that kind of data.

10   PARTICIPANT: NSF also has a bunch of

11   data too they've been tracking. And I would

12   probably reach out back to Steve on this, because

13   he's got a lot of data as well.

14   MEMBER TOOLE: It's not very useful

15   data. It's how much money have they raised, it's

16   how many patents have they filed, it's that sort

17   of stuff. It doesn't tell you anything because

18   you don't know what they would have done in the

19   absence of attorneys. There's no control of it,

20   though. It's not useful data.

21   MR. BUERSTATTE: Again, questions for

22   us to dig into. Show of hands, who can we pull

1   together to help define this next couple weeks?

2   Thanks. All right. I'm making sure I got all

3   these. That's Emily, Eric, Steve, who else was -

4   - thanks, Rick. Whitney, Emily, Steve, Sue,

5   Rick. Anyone else?

6   CO-CHAIR TANG: Anybody else on the

7   phone?

8   MEMBER STEVENSON: Tiffany.

9   MR. BUERSTATTE: Hey, Tiffany, thanks

10   so much. Great, all right. That concludes our

11   workgroup sessions. Getting into our offsite

12   discussion, we had targeted November for an

13   offsite meeting.

14   The objective was to take the Council,

15   the organizations you represent, expertise, your

16   networks, move our discussion outside of D.C.

17   while also engaging with that local community.

18   I'll tell you that we had a vote

19   earlier in the spring, and Indianapolis and

20   Dallas were the favorites, and which I think

21   we'll talk about it in a sec. But Steve, you had

22   some thoughts on that?

1   CO-CHAIR TANG: Yes. The reason for

2   doing this, I think, is still a very valid

3   reason. I think what we're moving towards is a

4   model that postpones these visits until a little

5   bit later.

6   The reason is really about the

7   evolution of engagement with the administration.

8   In November we're likely to have I think a better

9   sense of how these four initiatives relate to the

10   agenda of the administration.

11   I think we have, for the good work of

12   Craig and his team, better ties to both the

13   career folks and the political folks that are

14   gathering in the administration here. I think it

15   would be a missed opportunity not to be in

16   Washington in November for entrepreneurship

17   month.

18   And so therefore, I would ask the

19   Council's input, but also understanding that this

20   aspect of visits to regions is important. But I

21   think owing to the fact that we have, it's been

22   slower to get the engagement with the

1   administration up to now, we should probably look

2   for a later meeting to do that.

3   So with all due respect to Sue and to

4   Trey and the great work that you've done into

5   planning for your communities, I think that we

6   should probably wait until a later meeting to do

7   that.

8   MR. BUERSTATTE: Does anyone want to

9   visit Indianapolis in February?

10   (Laughter.)

11   MR. BUERSTATTE: So I think we'll be,

12   as Steve said -- and very soon will have a better

13   definition of not only what we're interested

14   within these four verticals but also what the

15   leadership wants us to dive into. And that could

16   better inform the execution of those visits and

17   who we engage, the organizations, and whatnot.

18   But real quick, you know, Trey had to

19   leave and catch a flight. But Sue, we talked

20   offline a little bit about this. But given what

21   we talked about today on those four priorities

22   and just the progression of the Council, any new

1 thoughts about Indianapolis, your community and

2 what we might want to think about leading up to

3 that in the coming six, nine months?

4 MEMBER S. SMITH: Sure. I think that,

5 you know, Indianapolis would be a really good

6 place to visit. There's a lot of things going

7 on, and there's a lot of things going on around

8 those four areas.

9 I mean, we have a lot of, even in

10 manufacturing I think in looking at best

11 practices, I think we could talk to a lot of

12 folks about different best practices in

13 manufacturing, and certainly in apprenticeships

14 and in addressing those four areas.

15 I think we would have a tremendous

16 amount. We've talked about, I've talked to a lot

17 of different agencies and in bringing them in.

18 So, you know, as we get closer and closer, maybe

19 we could just have a little more focus on who you

20 want to talk to.

21 MEMBER REICHERT: In terms of engaging

22 with the administration, Vice President Pence is

1   from there and has done a lot of work in

2   manufacturing in that state.

3   MEMBER S. SMITH: Absolutely.

4   MR. BUERSTATTE: Yes, it makes sense,

5   that kind of thing. It could help us get a

6   little more support for maybe even a broader

7   effort than what we had before. My hope is we

8   can bring in other federal partners with us, not

9   just Commerce but our friends at SBA and others

10   who might want to join.

11   And this gives us a lead time to

12   really prepare and think about the opportunity.

13   So we'll defer to a little bit later. So what

14   that said -- Jennifer mentioned it briefly, yes.

15   And we've got enough lead time where we could do

16   that. And we just heard from Paul Zielinski this

17   morning, the outgoing FLC chair. And the

18   incoming chair is also is from Indiana.

19   So we talked about federal labs. And

20   clearly on the deregulation piece, there should

21   be some interesting activities there. So it's

22   shaping up pretty nicely actually. I like that,

1   thanks for offering.

2   PARTICIPANT: Yes, I mean, I know in

3   the past during the term one of the Obama

4   administration there was some coordinated

5   activities at that time. So just trying to say

6   hey, we did this in the past; let's run this

7   again.

8   MR. BUERSTATTE: Yes, yes, great. Any

9   final thoughts on that? All right. I'm sorry

10   that we didn't hear from as many folks on the

11   phone today, but I think we have both Tiffanys on

12   the line, Tiffany Wilson and Tiffany Stevenson.

13   And Rebecca, thanks for joining us earlier.

14   Did anyone on the line have any

15   thoughts before we wrap up?

16   MEMBER BAGLEY: No, I think I've

17   commented online. This is Rebecca.

18   MR. BUERSTATTE: Yes, thanks, Rebecca.

19   MEMBER STEVENSON: Yes, me as well.

20   MR. BUERSTATTE: Thanks, Tiffany.

21   Yes, I just wanted to make sure you guys had an

22   opportunity. I know it's hard sometimes to butt

1   in virtually, especially you've got a bunch of

2   Type As around the table.

3   So at this point really I would like

4   to open it up to public comment. So Operator,

5   could you signal the public comment portion?

6   (No response)

7   MR. BUERSTATTE: One more time.

8   Operator, could you please open the line for

9   public comment?

10   OPERATOR: Yes, thank you. We will

11   now begin the question and answer session. If

12   you would like to ask a question, please press

13   star one, unmute your phone, and record your name

14   clearly. Your name is required to introduce your

15   question.

16   If you need to withdraw your question,

17   please press star two. Again, to ask a question,

18   please press star one. It will take a few

19   moments for the questions to come through.

20   Please stand by.

21   MR. BUERSTATTE: Thank you. We'll go

22   into internal public comment, if anyone here on

1   the bench wants to comment.

2   (No response)

3   MR. BUERSTATTE: All right, Operator,

4   no takers?

5   OPERATOR: We show no questions in the

6   queue at this time.

7   MR. BUERSTATTE: Thank you very much.

8   Anyone in the bench? All right, great. Thanks

9   so much. Steve?

10   CO-CHAIR TANG: Thanks, everybody, for

11   making it out, and those who are on the phone. I

12   think we have turned the corner in terms of

13   engagement. I think we have much to look forward

14   to.

15   Craig, thanks again to you and your

16   team, thanks for organizing the next steps. And

17   for those of you that volunteer to participate in

18   the four areas, we look forward to further work.

19   So thanks for your patience, thanks for your

20   persistence and your diligence. Much appreciated

21   here.

22   And those that couldn't make the

1　meeting, we'll make sure that they're briefed as

2　well. So safe travel, everybody. Enjoy the rest

3　of your summer.

4　　　　　　　MEMBER REAMER: Question. Are the

5　dates for November 2nd?

6　　　　　　　CO-CHAIR TANG: Second and third, I

7　believe.

8　　　　　　　MR. BUERSTATTE: Correct, yes. The

9　2nd and 3rd. There should be a save the date

10　out. If not, we'll get that out immediately.

11　But 2nd and 3rd look like our typical run of

12　show, a Thursday afternoon, Friday morning.

13　　　　　　　The only way I could foresee that

14　changing is if we needed to adjust for the

15　Secretary's schedule. We certainly want to

16　prioritize that as this momentum builds.

17　　　　　　　And on that logistics item, I'll

18　emphasize OIE will certainly follow up. A lot of

19　do-outs, a lot of readings and ideas generated,

20　the papers distributed and whatnot. We'll

21　compile all that, and just give us until Monday

22　or Tuesday to distribute everything cleanly with

1   some notes and some thoughts on today's

2   discussion.

3   And of course, as always, please do

4   reach out with questions or ideas. Scott, your

5   question was great. You absolutely can bring in

6   your network if you think they would help us

7   think through some ideas.

8   And I can't emphasize it enough,

9   that's why we have this crazy, diverse team here.

10   So you all have such a neat background --

11   MEMBER FREDERICK: The question would

12   have been better if I asked it on the front end

13   of doing it.

14   MR. BUERSTATTE: No, it's great. A

15   true entrepreneur. So we'll hang out for a little

16   bit if you've got any follow-on questions. But

17   everyone, safe travels and thank you so much.

18   (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter

19   went off the record at 11:53 a.m.)

20

21

22

Atlanta 69:7,8
attach 46:9
attached 129:14
attorneys 25:12 158:19
attracting 16:3
audience 43:13 85:20
    122:18
audits 129:10
augment 156:21
AUGUST 1:10
Austin 68:17 70:21
    93:15
Austin-San 71:4
Australia 136:10,10
    139:6 140:6
Australian 136:5 137:4
authorities 16:7 36:16
authority 2:12 8:17,22
    9:1 28:13 36:18 43:20
    45:15 49:6 108:16
    116:21 145:7,8
Autumn 35:14 42:1
available 25:17 27:2
    34:22 35:5 36:1 42:11
    65:2 83:12 89:3
    116:13
Avenue 1:13
Aviv 73:19
avoid 82:6,16
awaiting 48:20
awarded 60:8 158:6
awarding 148:13
aware 10:14 80:3 93:6
    105:8 119:19

B

babies 155:9
back 4:15 12:2 15:21
    16:3 25:19 27:20 32:3
    49:1 60:4,21 66:20
    67:3 70:16 71:2 72:21
    80:7 91:10,16 95:7
    124:5 125:14 129:11
    135:7,10 146:9
    155:18 156:13 158:12
backed 93:19
background 142:1
    168:10
backgrounds 6:20
bad 47:17
BAGLEY 1:16 101:15
    101:17,19,22 103:6
    164:16
Baldridge 143:19
BALDWIN 1:17 17:12
    49:22 74:7 124:7
    132:6 133:15 138:16
    143:1,7,15 144:1

152:9 153:8 154:2
ball 18:18
Baltimore 30:17
Band 67:19
bandwidth 109:8
bang 87:2
banner 32:21 40:22
bar 68:10
Barrett 2:11 3:13 67:14
    67:15 68:4 80:10
Barrett's 80:6
barrier 110:20 143:10
barriers 13:15 110:21
based 35:1 46:3 60:16
    76:8 156:9 158:8
basic 49:20
basically 25:13 30:9
    34:1 37:14 85:1
    136:12
basis 17:8 22:8 98:12
Bayh-Dole 27:14,15
    48:18
beans 70:8
beautiful 27:4
bed 37:11,16 65:8
beds 52:16 64:20
beginning 4:9 6:5 22:6
behalf 28:6
behavior 129:5
believe 10:19 13:10
    48:10 128:1 167:7
bench 20:22 166:1,8
benefit 40:15 128:14
benefits 71:20
Berkeley 57:10
best 1:20 28:14 35:20
    55:18 56:16 87:10
    88:20,20 99:19 100:1
    100:8 114:6 116:1
    117:7 122:18 139:5
    162:10,12
bet 57:17
better 14:22 57:18
    76:19 79:13 81:6,21
    82:18 102:15 107:17
    114:4 128:7 148:18
    160:8,12 161:12,16
    168:12
beyond 11:10 75:19
big 13:18 16:16 25:14
    37:22 42:16 60:8
    62:16,16 73:12 95:17
    104:7,19 105:5
    113:12 126:9 129:4
    136:9 137:18 138:4
    144:17,18 150:5
bigger 58:21 101:3
biggest 26:19 38:8 52:1

52:6
bill 142:14
billion 24:1 50:19,21,22
    52:3 136:11
billions 34:2 37:21
    103:21,21 104:2
bills 48:8
biotech 75:18,19 79:5
bit 5:20 6:1,19 7:8 8:2
    11:13 12:1,5 16:12
    18:4 23:4,5,8,18
    24:17 29:15 50:21
    61:7 66:17,22 91:21
    95:7 103:8 119:8
    122:12 135:22 139:10
    139:13 140:1 144:10
    146:16 149:1 160:5
    161:20 163:13 168:16
blank 62:6 135:19
blending 127:1
blesses 130:15
blinded 37:13
bloody 56:4
board 2:14 40:14
Bob 139:14
body 101:3
bogged 55:10
boilerplate 62:5
Bolivia 70:10
book 27:5
boots 68:2
Boston 34:1 53:3 68:17
    156:9,9
bothering 135:11
bottom 130:12
bought 39:3
Boulder 37:17
BOWLES 1:17 82:21
    88:13
brain 145:11
brainstorm 4:16
branch 11:17
brand 43:20 44:10
    84:13
branding 71:3
Brazil 77:21 78:1
break 21:12 51:3 119:8
    119:18 125:6,13
    132:10 147:1 152:14
breakout 81:4
breaks 26:13,18 51:2
breakup 108:8
bridge 154:11,17
bridged 20:2
brief 126:15
briefed 167:1
briefly 43:3 163:14
bring 9:5,12 25:19

40:11 55:18 69:4 75:4
    117:2 163:8 168:5
bringing 8:18,21 16:21
    70:7 73:11 162:17
brings 9:10 36:2
broad- 56:20
broadband 10:13
    108:15
broader 64:9 88:7
    163:6
broadly 17:1 61:19
broke 81:16
broken 13:14
brought 25:15 55:8
    56:1 61:10 65:16
    74:22 90:17 127:4
Brown 67:19
brush 56:21
bubble 5:18
buckets 129:4
budget 11:20 29:9
    50:16,18 106:18,20
    145:14
budget-wise 51:9
Buerstatte 2:5 4:3,7
    5:15 8:1 17:22 18:16
    20:14,20 21:21 64:7
    67:2 68:4 73:22 74:3
    74:9 75:21 76:4 78:5
    79:19 87:6 93:3,11
    94:18 96:21 97:1
    100:1,4,9 101:16,18
    101:21 103:1,11
    105:22 106:12 107:16
    109:15,21 111:3
    117:4,13 119:7
    122:20 125:4,9 126:8
    131:11 132:5 139:8
    140:18,20 141:1,11
    143:6,13,22 144:5
    148:4 150:9 151:1,19
    152:2,8 153:1 156:12
    158:21 159:9 161:8
    161:11 163:4 164:8
    164:18,20 165:7,21
    166:3,7 167:8 168:14
build 15:16 89:19 93:5
    117:21 146:13 147:13
    148:3
building 75:16 86:5
    88:7 90:10 95:22
    100:2,5,13 145:17
builds 167:16
built 74:15 76:22
bunch 41:12 63:13
    88:16 107:11 158:10
    165:1
burden 129:18 130:18

77:21
gathering 99:8 160:14
gauge 76:7
GCMI 69:8
geared 145:16
gears 144:10
gel 4:15 81:5
general 55:21 103:4
  139:8 147:11 154:14
generalization 111:10
generally 23:15 48:3
  73:13,13 75:5
generate 108:18
generated 46:10 93:9
  167:19
generation 95:12
geographies 80:2
geography 148:10
George 1:21
Germany 73:14,17
GES 121:8
getting 34:20 42:9 47:8
  60:15 70:11 83:19,19
  89:11 90:9 92:5 93:13
  101:13 119:13,18
  143:9 149:7 155:5
  159:11
give 26:4 35:10 37:14
  46:11 51:21 52:22
  59:4 62:16 65:10,19
  66:13 70:12 74:22
  131:7 135:14,22
  142:1 149:2 167:21
given 9:13 10:10 13:17
  37:13 153:3 161:20
gives 66:15 163:11
giving 129:12
gleaned 148:17
global 2:3 10:5 13:7
  14:11 18:1 76:10
  80:15 119:11,21
globally 139:6
gluten-free 34:13
goal 3:15 116:14
goals 6:18 102:14
GOCOs 65:17
goods 13:22
Google 31:2
govern 129:8
government 9:4,18,21
  11:17,18 26:1 28:7,18
  31:20 32:1,10 38:6
  41:5,13,18 42:22
  44:21 45:2,4,6 46:9
  46:10 47:3,9 48:7
  49:21 50:13 61:8
  62:19,20 63:6 67:9
  77:20,22 87:11

103:19 127:22 129:12
  131:2,16,22 133:19
  134:6 142:4,7 153:20
government's 23:7
government- 50:7
government-operated
  50:8
government/academic
  44:4
grab 125:12
grade 78:10
graduates 149:15
grant 129:8 145:8 151:3
grants 26:4 89:3 129:21
  148:14
graphics 58:12
gratifying 6:14
greater 73:18
greatly 41:3
Greentown 1:22 15:4
  157:15
Greenville 69:13
grew 12:12
GRIFFITH 2:1
ground 16:6
groundbreaking 8:12
group 7:20 22:7 24:12
  25:4,5,11 27:8,10,17
  28:1,11 29:8 32:15
  34:16,18 35:15 37:9
  39:19 41:19,21 42:10
  42:14,14,17,18 44:22
  76:16,21 77:7 81:16
  81:20 88:10 90:16
  93:1 99:5 102:3
  109:19 118:8,14
  128:9,20 136:17
  141:12 144:19,21
group's 28:9
groups 25:7 28:2,8
  32:14 33:1,4,14 39:9
  61:11 84:3 104:18
  105:1 116:15 156:3
grow 9:6 13:16 17:1,6
  39:2 97:15 116:14
  157:20
growing 42:14
growth 9:13 12:1,6 32:6
  32:7,7 110:11,21,21
  146:16
guess 61:2,15 65:8
  98:9 101:13 111:9
Guest 3:5
guests 4:17
guidance 21:3 106:2
  108:3
guide 132:18 138:21
guidelines 139:14

GW 71:11

H

hackathon 82:16
hackathons 88:1
Haga 2:11 3:13 67:14
  67:16 68:6,8 69:11
  74:2,5,14 75:13 76:3
  76:6 77:12 78:8
half 18:2 51:6,11
hall 80:10 125:19
hand 19:20
handles 16:14
handout 119:13
hands 139:21 158:22
handy 27:5
hang 168:15
hanging 20:22 49:17
  116:16
happen 24:10,15,20
  33:10 47:5 107:12
  129:11 150:10
happened 61:3 134:15
  134:16
happening 21:10 25:22
  108:20 119:22
happens 24:17 107:8
  134:2 157:18
happy 7:21 18:21 35:10
  117:1 124:20 136:16
hard 41:21 46:22 57:22
  58:7 66:22 116:9
  150:2,10 155:16
  164:22
hardware 95:22
Harris 76:16
hate 118:9
he'll 20:21
head 61:21 125:11
  140:2
headed 90:14
headiest 55:3
heads 25:9
healthcare 56:1 120:17
  120:21
hear 13:1 14:5 19:12
  44:6,8 80:14 164:10
heard 10:9 43:14 88:5
  96:8 97:12,16 98:2
  99:9 152:13 163:16
hearing 7:6 8:9 98:19
  148:5
heart 34:1,6 110:9
heartburn 46:12
Heather 81:10 82:14
  83:17 84:15 126:17
Heather's 127:4
heavily 10:20

heavy 25:18 140:14
heck 87:3
held 100:9 120:6,7
hell 57:13
Hello 21:22
help 15:14 17:20,20
  31:6 32:3 38:6,19
  47:16 55:8 64:1 67:13
  80:5 82:11 83:8,10
  84:7,15,17 86:13,17
  89:6,6,15 91:6 99:2
  106:5 112:10 133:4
  138:17 159:1 163:5
  168:6
helpful 47:8 90:4
  131:21
helping 13:6,11 64:18
  82:5 93:12 95:14
  128:15
helps 87:13
hemisphere 68:21
  73:11 75:7
Henry 2:9 20:15,15,16
  20:21 21:1,11 105:22
Herbst 2:7 3:6 4:19 5:8
  5:17 8:4,10 11:12
  12:20 15:1,10,18,21
  17:4 18:12
herd 114:21
hey 55:14 77:4 101:18
  104:22 159:9 164:6
high 13:10 72:21 79:13
  79:18 85:5 149:22
  154:8 155:6
higher 77:17
highlight 8:8 21:1
highly 79:2 127:6
hindered 110:12
hire 155:14
history 6:2
hit 51:22 148:7
hits 86:12 136:18
hold 99:18
Hollister 137:10
home 40:21 91:16
  128:9
honestly 58:20
hope 163:7
hopefully 31:6 32:3
hoping 19:2 81:5
horrible 93:20
hospitality 78:7
host 71:8
hosted 157:11
hot 15:19
hour 126:10
hours 144:11
House 107:6 137:21

premise 49:20
prepare 11:8 163:12
preparing 155:19
prescriptive 82:22
  106:3
presence 29:10,10,11
present 1:15 2:5 21:18
  79:21
presentation 3:11,13
  137:4
presenter 21:15
president 9:16 10:10
  106:18 162:22
President's 11:20
presidential 71:16
presiding 1:13
press 165:12,17,18
pressure 72:21 157:4
pretty 48:6 64:22 80:8
  94:13 97:17 107:17
  137:18 156:18 163:22
prevent 128:7
previous 120:13
prewire 85:16
primary 99:4
principles 112:17
prior 59:9 104:6
priorities 8:8,14 11:1
  161:21
prioritize 118:8 134:17
  167:16
prioritized 111:15
priority 8:7 131:22
  139:17 151:20
private 6:7 35:13 41:15
  43:18 44:1 46:7,11
  77:19 113:11
prizes 148:14
probably 6:11 9:22
  12:11 17:1 38:12
  39:11 57:21 74:2 77:3
  92:16 102:12 105:9
  106:10 158:12 161:1
  161:6
problem 81:17 85:2,9
  86:22 91:12 94:3
  132:20 133:10 134:22
  135:1 146:2,10 149:1
  150:15 155:5
problems 62:17 81:22
  85:5 94:5,7 147:9
  150:8
process 11:14 34:11
  82:5 83:16 95:17
  121:20 122:3 124:12
  130:5,5 132:18
processes 69:19
  128:16 131:8

produce 25:20 52:9,12
  73:6,8
produced 26:8 45:1
producing 114:14
product 13:13 37:15
  38:16,17 52:10,19
  63:2 83:19,21 89:16
production 26:14 75:9
products 13:17 15:7
  24:2 25:14 29:13 52:5
  52:12 82:13 83:3,5,9
profitable 34:8
profits 156:6
program 17:22 32:15
  32:18 43:9 64:14,22
  65:9 66:4,14 68:10
  76:10,19 85:1 86:9,15
  97:4,7,12,15 100:11
  102:13,15 126:12
  143:6 148:18 151:3
  154:10 157:1,10,13
  158:7
programming 120:15
programs 57:16 58:22
  77:1 96:16,19 100:7
  110:14 127:17,21
  128:2 129:8 148:9
  151:4,14 154:5,14
  157:11
progress 61:4 108:2
progression 161:22
project 19:10 30:5
  113:6 117:3 128:9
projection 97:21
projects 29:19 61:6
  100:7 115:20
promise 103:15 104:17
  105:6,18
promote 27:5 35:20
promoted 23:15 31:15
promotion 13:11
  106:13
prompt 132:19
proof 85:17 100:19
propensity 13:2
property 14:3
proposed 48:19 49:16
  128:15 151:15
proprietary 38:16
prosperity 120:12
protect 14:2
prototype 147:19
proud 6:3
prove 89:21
provide 4:17 114:1
  115:9 119:2 121:14
provided 90:12
providing 67:8

provisions 47:7,11
public 3:17 40:15 52:6
  77:19 98:13 129:19
  130:6,13 165:4,5,9,22
public/private 101:11
publishing 11:16
pull 30:12 58:16 85:2
  139:21 144:7 158:22
pulled 145:10
pulling 109:10 117:6
punitive 132:13
purchase 82:8 83:11
purchasing 87:3
push 32:2 35:6,13,17
  36:6 45:21
pushback 48:3
put 7:5 17:13 43:21
  46:18 49:13 107:6,7
  116:2 142:12
putting 23:9 46:19
  104:7 121:17 138:19
  145:15
PWC 136:9

_____
Q
qualified 143:10
qualify 86:18,21 129:10
quality 118:21
quarter 51:14
quarterly 4:9
question 7:21 12:2
  15:22 45:3 50:1 59:4
  61:16 106:21 124:10
  133:9 135:14,19
  139:20 140:15 143:8
  144:9 145:10 165:11
  165:12,15,16,17
  167:4 168:5,11
questions 8:3,5 38:7,17
  38:20 40:3 41:7 56:15
  75:22 81:7 93:9 118:6
  123:1 125:10,20
  144:6 150:12 158:21
  165:19 166:5 168:4
  168:16
queue 74:3 166:6
quick 20:16 46:1 73:21
  80:16 93:18 117:4,14
  122:22 161:18
quickly 31:22 32:2
  47:20
quietly 110:6
quite 11:22 12:4 16:12
  24:17,19 100:17
  105:20
quote 28:16

_____
R

R&D 26:3
raised 54:17 92:15
  158:15
rank 73:2 77:15
rapid 94:3
rationale 48:5
re- 24:11
re-form 24:13
re-forming 39:12
reach 24:2 31:21 39:2
  43:16 52:2,5 109:3
  158:12 168:4
reached 54:20
reaching 98:19
react 109:20
read-aheads 74:11
readable 136:16
reading 140:10
readings 167:19
ready 73:20 119:18
Reagan 28:11 129:17
real 16:20 20:16 21:9
  79:9 93:17 108:1,2
  116:15 117:4 127:12
  150:3,14 161:18
real-world 57:12
reality 59:20
realize 91:11
realized 53:21
realizing 95:16
REAMER 1:21 11:5
  44:11 50:15 51:5,9,12
  51:19 53:19 59:3
  106:13,17 107:1,13
  110:2 112:1,7,10
  117:1 129:2 131:20
  137:6,11,14,19 138:1
  138:8,11 140:4 141:5
  141:22 151:15,22
  167:4
rearrange 44:17
reason 40:11 56:22
  103:14 104:12 110:17
  123:12 160:1,3,6
reasons 61:10 65:11
  121:2
Rebecca 1:16 20:13
  101:17,18 164:13,17
  164:18
rebranding 23:19
recall 143:5 145:14
received 100:16 155:10
receiving 156:15
receptive 55:2
recognize 9:11
recognizing 104:22
recommend 33:11
recommendation 11:6

99:18,21 113:2
140:12 153:9
recommendations 33:7
41:9 44:9 47:13 49:10
96:3,19 99:1,7,11
110:15 119:2 128:22
recommends 115:19
reconnaissance 19:17
record 4:6 19:4 126:6
130:13 165:13 168:19
Recovery 6:10
recruiting 122:17
reduce 129:18 131:3,3
131:9
reducing 131:1
reduction 127:15
128:11 129:16 130:5
131:6
redundancies 128:7
refers 123:4
refine 82:5
reform 6:16 9:15
refreshing 6:20
regard 26:17 35:12
regarding 11:9
region 9:13 34:21 76:9
76:9
regional 8:22 9:1 16:6
88:8 112:11,18
regionally 34:20
regions 160:20
Register 130:7,10
registering 136:14
regular 22:8
regularly 146:14
regulate 87:11 129:5
regulated 14:13 15:8
127:7
regulation 48:18,22
49:8 62:8 63:19 129:3
131:15,16 132:8
regulations 48:17 49:1
63:20 127:14 129:7
129:13 138:18
regulatory 6:16 9:15
49:6 62:10,12,14
127:3,10 128:6 131:6
131:15 141:20
rehash 4:13
REICHERT 1:22 8:6
15:3,11,19 16:11 17:7
64:12,17 77:10 95:4
96:22 97:3 118:13
134:7 135:6,9,17
137:1 145:3 156:8
157:7 162:21
reinforced 147:11
reinforcing 110:22

reinvent 61:8,9,9 154:1
154:2
reinvented 40:13
reinventing 40:4,9
reject 156:2
relabel 61:9
relate 127:15 160:9
related 89:4 152:21
157:11
relationship 54:14
relatively 31:22
release 142:21
relevant 7:15,16
reliant 101:5,7
relocated 16:18
relocating 17:11
reluctant 135:21
rely 19:18
relying 89:13,14,14
Remarks 3:5,8,19
remember 104:1
126:20 148:22 150:20
Remind 143:3
reminding 110:7
repeat 23:8
repeating 43:15
replied 143:4
report 19:12 25:13,20
25:21 26:6,11 126:11
report-outs 80:17
reported 99:7
reporting 27:18 28:19
represent 159:15
representing 122:7
represents 119:4
reps 31:20,21
reputation 97:18
request 11:20 99:17
106:14
required 46:7 62:9
165:14
requirements 143:20
requiring 138:18
research 23:22 36:8
39:19,20 40:16 46:6
50:10 69:13 72:15,17
75:3,19 154:21
resiliency 92:22
resonate 140:9
resource 42:20 53:16
112:18 141:3
resources 41:18 43:10
46:11 64:18 65:1
95:16 97:10 100:18
respect 139:12 148:9,9
148:10 161:3
respond 133:19
responder 2:12 19:10

108:15
responders 10:13 37:4
85:22 90:6
response 81:15 93:10
148:4 165:6 166:2
responses 135:7
responsibility 10:11,15
rest 37:15 41:4 122:7
126:15 167:2
restoring 143:4,9
result 31:3 94:2
results 26:16 28:10
82:17
resumed 126:6
retinal 53:3
revamp 142:10
revenue 16:22 155:10
revenues 16:17
reverse 68:12
review 38:20 99:1,7
rich 53:16 90:5 145:21
RICHARD 1:19
richest 77:22
Rick 84:8 144:8 159:4,5
rid 47:7,16
rights 46:9,11,13 47:2
47:17,18 63:1
rise 153:4
risk/reward 86:4
risks 88:2
road 30:21 153:13
robust 80:6 93:14
100:18 101:6 102:18
102:22
role 13:5 28:17 127:20
132:16 156:16
roles 5:3 23:4
roll-out 91:20
rolled 29:19
rollout 11:19
Ronald 28:10
room 1:12 14:21 56:3
56:12,13 89:18 99:13
126:2 127:1 131:7
135:18
rooms 144:12
rooted 8:16
roughly 50:19,22 51:2
RPT 46:5
rule 144:3
rulemaking 48:19 49:16
49:18
rules 129:4,13 132:9
138:18 152:14
run 15:4 17:7 32:19,19
35:8 56:16 59:15,19
60:9 70:14 115:16
164:6 167:11

running 59:3 60:13
85:17 112:19
runs 50:18 78:2 117:2
runway 150:8
rural 72:1,2 135:13

S

S 99:16 100:3,5 117:11
119:6 162:4 163:3
S3 1:20
safe 136:20 150:4 167:2
168:17
sales 85:16
San 70:19 71:12 74:17
74:19,21
sandbox 127:3 131:6
138:20
save 167:9
saved 136:10
saw 57:18 59:14 137:3
140:16 145:6
saying 48:4 71:18
85:21 103:2 129:3
134:22
says 36:19 62:8 106:18
SBA 32:19 163:9
SBIR 32:15,16,17 158:5
scale 52:12 65:9,11
92:17 155:13
scenario 14:20
scenes 21:2,12
schedule 118:10
167:15
school 73:5 76:17
79:15,15,16,17,18,18
150:1,2 154:7,8 155:6
155:6
schools 57:10 58:3
79:12,12,13
science 1:15,19 57:1,5
71:11 114:20 154:4
sciences 14:14 120:18
120:21 153:21
Scientific 34:2
scientist 66:5
scientists 55:8 56:12
56:13 66:4 68:16
73:12 147:7
scope 64:22 66:11 76:9
Scott 1:18 82:22 84:8
84:15 87:6 142:17
144:8 168:4
Scott's 88:11
screening 126:18
search 30:8,14 36:15
40:4,6 45:10
seated 125:15
sec 77:16 159:21

second 43:5 59:6 83:20
127:1 146:5 167:6
secret 35:7,20
secretary 2:7 4:21 5:1
8:9,10 10:1 11:7,7
18:6 28:13 110:15
113:3,3,21 114:10
115:1
Secretary's 12:17 115:7
167:15
sector 6:7 41:15 43:18
46:7,12 65:5 77:19,19
98:13 113:11
sectors 78:4 120:15,16
122:15 145:17
Securities 129:6
security 39:20 72:11
143:5,18
seeing 15:11
seek 141:2
seen 11:3,21 29:21 48:7
48:12 58:14
select 75:6
self-inflicted 63:21
self-organize 116:12
self-organized 112:12
selfish 147:14
sell 36:4 52:10 63:2
Senate 107:7
send 58:10 62:5 74:15
77:4 97:21 121:13
123:21 124:3
sending 77:21
Senior 2:9 20:16
sense 84:7 87:3 113:17
122:17 160:9 163:4
sensitive 79:2
sensors 85:8
sent 59:10 125:22
126:3 138:7,12
148:21
separate 83:6 124:13
124:22
Sephora 2:2
serious 46:12
serve 38:21 87:17
service 5:9 6:6,9 31:17
41:6 44:14 147:15
services 13:22 14:4
83:3
session 55:9 96:7
135:21 165:11
sessions 4:16 159:11
set 6:21 18:22 28:11
37:16 55:2,17 57:15
85:2,13 96:3 114:9
117:2 124:13 153:20
setting 3:15 82:18 97:5

seven 20:19 70:4,20
71:4 78:18 155:12,14
shaping 163:22
share 28:14 72:8,8
96:13 99:19 124:19
shared 97:6 98:18
sharpening 102:20
sheet 120:19 122:11
SHIEH 2:13 157:22
shifted 79:11
shit 86:12
shop 152:16
short 138:19
shortly 119:9
show 72:6 73:20 74:14
75:10 86:12 115:3
139:21 158:22 166:5
167:12
shows 58:7
Sid 75:18
side 27:12,13 46:4
51:16 54:15 57:7 64:3
87:3 91:13 122:8
154:20
Siderwall 96:11
signal 165:5
signals 19:21 107:17
signatures 62:2 63:16
63:17
signed 74:19
significant 61:17
108:20
Silicon 68:17 120:10
similar 17:21 34:10
117:9 142:22
similarly 95:1
simple 55:19
simply 82:7
simulation 78:16,19,20
78:22 79:1
Simultaneous 81:12
91:1 94:15 135:16
143:12
Singerman 96:9
sit 33:13 135:17
site 71:9 77:6
sites 75:1
sitting 30:17
situation 72:22
six 55:18 70:19 134:4
162:3
size 13:3 86:3
skilled 110:12
skills 113:19 146:1,3
SKR 158:6
slick 137:5
slight 74:5
slightly 102:9

slots 122:2,3
slower 91:21 160:22
slush 147:16
small 2:13 12:9,13 13:4
16:21 17:13,17,18
30:18 32:5 38:6,14
46:15 64:14 69:22
116:9 143:20 146:15
smallest 70:1
smart 56:14 111:13
135:3
SMITH 2:1,1,13 99:16
100:3,5 108:7 109:17
109:22 110:4 112:6,9
117:11 119:6 145:1,5
162:4 163:3
soda 70:6
soft 74:7,12 78:13
122:21
software 62:17,22
SoftWorks 93:19
solicit 150:17
solicitation 43:22
solicitations 103:18
104:4 105:14
solution 51:21
solutions 71:22
solve 91:12 146:11,18
155:7
solved 85:6 86:22
solving 94:3 146:2
somebody 32:4 46:17
53:14 54:7 63:12
77:13 138:17 157:22
song 67:19
soon 59:1 107:17
161:12
sorry 18:21 20:20 24:9
34:16 37:10 44:13
60:19 68:6,6 74:10
96:20 125:4 164:9
sort 23:5,6,12 27:6 33:1
34:7,19 41:12 45:20
60:1 82:22 99:17
103:16 141:19 147:15
149:1 150:1 154:22
155:21 156:6 158:16
sorts 99:18
sounds 18:5 55:14
136:21 139:6,9,10
140:11
source 45:5
space 53:2,8 146:22
156:7
SpaceX 36:13
spark 93:7
speak 22:2 42:16 48:9
101:20 135:21

speakers 71:9 75:15
speaking 14:12 72:12
81:12 91:1 94:15
135:16 143:12
special 4:19 29:1 33:5
45:15
specific 12:4 27:16
48:5 96:16 111:11
117:22 118:18 119:1
120:15 127:12 128:21
139:20 145:16 149:4
149:6
specifically 12:3 27:11
46:7 59:10 83:17,17
84:4 98:16 104:3
109:22 141:17
speed 72:13
spend 5:11 6:19 52:3
66:12,16 115:17
spending 42:4 65:20
142:7,11
spent 6:7 82:10
spikes 133:9
spin 35:3
spin-offs 64:4
spinoff 34:18
spokespiece 29:15
spread 72:12
spreadsheet 124:4
125:1
spring 159:19
spun 27:9
spur 151:3
SSCI 102:2
stability 61:12
stable 48:6
staff 115:17 116:5
131:2 155:12
stage 69:20 84:12
88:21 146:5
stages 82:15
stakeholders 88:16,18
88:19 98:12
stand 165:20
standard 136:13,15
Stanford 57:9
star 165:13,17,18
stares 135:19
start 14:8 23:3 57:6,7
57:11,21 58:2 68:11
75:15 111:19 126:13
142:9 151:13
start-up 7:14 13:4
14:10 16:14 18:1
start-ups 53:15 64:18
69:2 146:15
started 5:17 17:15
34:20 59:18 69:7

ten 10:17 12:12 116:2
   125:14
tend 33:21 87:10
tends 29:15 58:1,20
Tennessee 8:12
tenth 71:2,3
term 23:15,19 79:22
   115:14 118:1 131:19
   148:19 155:8 164:3
terms 16:13,21 23:4
   48:6 49:6,15 71:21
   72:16 75:8 90:11 97:4
   99:5 113:18 118:21
   122:12 129:20 131:22
   162:21 166:12
test 31:10 37:11,12,16
   52:16 64:20 65:6,8
testing 71:22 72:1
Texas 72:19
thank 5:1,9 7:18 18:10
   18:12,14,15 21:22
   41:2,9 67:6,6 90:4
   93:11,15,16 119:16
   165:10,21 166:7
   168:17
thanks 4:11 5:7,8 20:13
   21:1,10 59:5 80:9
   119:14 125:17 159:2
   159:4,9 164:1,13,18
   164:20 166:8,10,15
   166:16,19,19
theirs 56:4
theme 78:21 97:17
   120:12 152:12
themes 19:9,17,22
   148:7
they'd 59:18
things 7:4 9:10 10:9
   16:1,8 17:10 18:17
   22:21 23:2 24:2 26:9
   27:1,13,17,18 28:5,20
   29:12,20 31:2,14 32:1
   33:10,15,17,18,19
   34:10 35:3 36:11,13
   36:13,21,22 37:19
   38:2,4,8 39:16,22
   40:4,12 42:4,18 43:7
   43:17 46:5 47:20 48:7
   48:15,16 49:19 55:12
   56:8 57:21 59:14
   61:16 62:12,14 63:1
   65:16 72:18 81:9 84:5
   84:17,18 87:12 88:14
   88:19 89:4 90:11
   91:17 98:11 99:16
   102:1 107:11 115:16
   118:18 126:9,18
   127:14 132:14 134:8

134:9,10 150:9 162:6
   162:7
third 50:19,19,20 77:18
   77:19,20,22 83:8
   115:12 122:8,9,9
   167:6
thought 81:10,13 82:21
   85:19 87:15 90:11
   109:20 110:5 128:12
   131:5
thoughtful 91:20
thoughts 12:17,21,21
   14:5 84:8 93:8 111:9
   118:11 131:19 159:22
   162:1 164:9,15 168:1
thousand 41:16 123:19
thread 72:5 136:3
three 20:18 67:20 69:20
   75:5 87:9,12 112:2
   130:16,17 155:22
threw 84:21 85:7
thrilled 44:6
thriving 7:14
throw 44:16 102:7
Thursday 167:12
tie 15:21 16:2
tied 60:12
ties 160:12
Tiffany 2:2,3 20:12
   69:10 159:8,9 164:12
   164:12,20
Tiffany's 69:11
Tiffanys 164:11
tight 80:8
tighter 139:13
tightly 16:2
time-consuming 52:20
times 6:12,12,13 48:2,3
   67:8
tiny 12:13
today 5:10 20:12 22:1
   42:7 121:2 126:3
   139:16 161:21 164:11
today's 74:13 87:7
   168:1
told 133:7 138:5 144:13
tomorrow 47:6
ton 100:18
tons 61:3 70:12
tool 30:8 31:4 36:21
   116:13
TOOLE 41:10 43:4 44:6
   46:4 47:12 48:13 49:3
   63:9 107:9 150:20
   151:2,18 153:12
   157:3 158:14
toolkit 30:7
tools 40:2

TOONE 2:2
top 51:20 59:16 61:21
   110:20,21 143:2,7
topic 12:15 95:9 96:2
   98:21 127:3 136:22
   151:16,17 157:7
Toronto-Waterloo
   70:20
total 50:15,17
touch 116:18 157:12
touches 14:16
touching 128:1
tourism 78:7,13,15
town 117:2
TPM 112:19
tracking 72:18 157:19
   158:1,9,11
traction 18:2
trade 10:2 12:14,18
   14:17 68:13
traditional 149:22
   150:11,19
train 78:18 156:10
training 32:9 114:17
transfer 7:12 22:13,18
   23:6,17 25:5,9,22
   27:8,21 61:18 63:1
   77:1 84:6
transferred 74:20
transition 6:12
transparency 142:7,10
   142:18
travel 167:2
travels 168:17
treasury 142:20,21
treatment 103:18 104:3
   105:16
tremendous 162:15
trending 133:12
Trey 1:17 82:19 92:3
   161:4,18
Trey's 87:9
Tri-Alpha 54:16
trials 111:7
trick 52:7 62:7
trickiest 56:17
tried 55:11 60:21 149:1
trillion 141:19
trip 74:17
trips 77:10
trivialize 58:7
trouble 146:6
trucks 68:1
true 168:15
Trump's 136:18
trusted 123:14
try 33:9 35:12 39:2 41:8
   49:8 57:16 75:13

85:10 105:5 134:17
   140:1
trying 17:6 26:15,20
   31:9 35:5,15,17,20
   38:9 39:1 43:7,17
   44:1 46:14,17,21 58:5
   59:11 72:13 82:15
   84:18 86:17 91:12
   95:11 109:3 114:21
   122:2,17 130:20
   133:6 146:11,18
   147:10 148:15 150:15
   151:6,7,8,10,12,13
   164:5
Tucson 74:17
Tuesday 167:22
turn 147:8
turned 5:20 133:6
   166:12
turning 20:8 108:1
Twelve 5:2
two 4:9,13 7:21,22 8:3
   20:17 62:3 69:20 75:8
   92:13 100:15 108:9
   111:18 113:12 125:16
   129:4 130:6 131:17
   139:22 143:3,7
   148:14 149:21 165:17
type 28:18 68:12 101:7
   117:8 141:3 148:10
   150:16 165:2
types 36:16 147:19
   150:13
typical 167:11

───────── U ─────────
U.S 1:3,12 10:3 15:13
   15:16 29:6 69:5 70:17
   71:2 73:7,7
UC 70:19 71:12 74:19
   74:21
UCSD 92:20
ultimately 20:7
unanimously 142:16
unbelievable 42:20
unbound 129:20
UNC 69:13
uncertainty 6:13 118:4
unclear 24:9
under-utilized 42:21
underdevelopment
   98:22
undersecretary 69:1
understand 19:7 39:12
   56:5 107:13 146:17
understanding 86:14
   160:19
understands 5:6

understood 81:21
underway 87:20
unfortunate 100:17
Unfortunately 18:14
unique 31:8,11,12
 65:15
United 1:1 10:18 16:4,4
 68:20 78:21 95:21
universal 97:17
universities 42:4,15
 54:10 85:4 94:10
 117:20
university 1:15,16,21
 2:2 8:20 35:15 42:7
 51:1 60:9 64:4 69:12
 70:18 71:11 75:19
 79:5 150:1
unmute 165:13
unnecessary 58:11
update 48:17 156:22
updated 11:18
updating 11:14
upgrade 79:7
ups 93:4
USA 2:2 98:16 113:8
USAID 123:16
USDA 34:15 35:1
use 8:13 24:20 29:14
 49:21 64:1 102:19
 104:1 111:3 115:10
 155:8
useful 26:16 113:6
 119:3 132:2 158:14
 158:20
uses 45:10
usual 19:12 44:4 52:2
 62:16 108:9
usually 38:8

V

VA 78:22
vacuum 90:10
valid 160:2
validate 103:7
Valley 68:18 70:19
 120:10
valuable 100:20
value 82:4 104:11
 145:12
varies 102:12
variety 59:14 96:8
vehicle 72:11
vehicles 116:20
venture 5:19 43:20
 54:11 68:22 85:3 94:9
ventures 45:16
VentureWell 158:1,8
Vernon 70:1

version 26:9 71:2
versus 131:15
verticals 161:14
vet 118:7
vetted 92:4
vetting 89:8
viability 89:15
Vice 77:15 162:22
vice-minister 73:1,2
video 73:21 75:10,12
viewed 20:8
Virginia 142:14
virtually 165:1
visas 17:20
visible 10:1,1
vision 104:6
visit 161:9 162:6
visits 160:4,20 161:16
voice 111:5,6,17
volunteer 145:2 166:17
vote 159:18
voucher 66:3,14
voucher's 65:22
vouchers 64:15 65:20

W

W 108:7 109:17,22
 110:4 112:6,9 145:1,5
WADSWORTH 1:21
wait 46:19 161:6
walk 34:11 66:6,7 82:14
walked 34:19 144:16
wanted 5:11 7:18 20:22
 23:2 40:5 71:1 80:3
 80:21 121:3 135:21
 139:15,17 152:5
 157:22 164:21
wants 63:10 104:20
 141:10 161:15 166:1
Warner 142:13
Washington 1:13,21
 46:21 120:6 160:16
wasn't 77:21 105:19
 133:13 135:20
waste 56:4
wave 20:15
way 8:5 28:22 29:13
 36:8,15 37:18 50:12
 60:21 61:7 66:1 68:2
 86:20 92:12 93:15
 101:1,8 102:18,22
 111:13 127:8 131:12
 141:17 147:18 149:14
 149:20 150:21 167:13
ways 23:18 24:5 26:15
 36:6,6 67:10,11 84:17
 96:17 128:3
weak 19:21

wears 68:2
web 30:12
website 29:11 35:5,9
 36:14 133:17,18
websites 25:7
weed-whacker 63:13
week 35:16 111:18
weeks 100:22 139:22
 159:1
weight 10:14 47:14
welcome 3:3 18:20
 124:16
went 6:7 70:9 74:17
 76:19 78:2 126:6
 127:13 149:15 168:19
whatnot 83:9 88:1
 144:12 161:17 167:20
wheel 40:9 154:1,2
Whew 20:20
whip 125:15
Whitney 2:1 98:18
 101:12 108:5 115:14
 115:18,19 118:2
 148:5 159:4
Williams 132:13 143:2
willing 38:13 157:6
Wilson 2:3 164:12
Wilson's 69:10
win 77:7 86:16
window 155:22
wins 54:8 77:2
Wisconsin 70:2
Wisconsin's 72:15
wish 18:12 53:11,20
withdraw 165:16
women 120:12 149:7
 149:11
women- 149:10
wonder 64:19 102:19
wonderful 6:21 15:2
 53:10 55:9
wondering 8:7 12:16
 14:19 30:18
word 59:21 102:15
words 111:4
work 9:20 15:5,12 16:2
 16:5 21:10 25:4,11
 26:16 27:8,17 28:9
 29:17 31:3 32:13,15
 35:6,12 37:7,19 39:9
 39:19 52:7,15,16,17
 53:10 54:12 57:9 58:8
 61:11 65:18 66:4,6,11
 83:13 86:8,11 90:7
 91:19 92:4 96:4
 102:21 108:10,15,19
 108:20 113:16 117:9
 121:12 127:16 128:3

 130:3 137:3,21 138:2
 140:1,7 142:9 146:7
 146:21 147:18,22
 151:9 152:7 153:7
 154:14 156:5,6,20,22
 160:11 161:4 163:1
 166:18
worked 6:10 142:3,20
workers 95:17 114:2
 151:9
workforce 8:19 77:1
 95:11,12 96:15 97:10
 98:17,21 99:3 100:6
 109:4 110:8,17
 113:13,22 114:8,11
 116:4,10 147:2
 150:11
workgroup 80:17 95:8
 96:2,7 99:10 108:11
 126:11 159:11
workgroups 125:16
working 9:1 10:20 11:1
 34:5 41:7 53:2 61:22
 67:14 88:10 90:18
 118:19 123:17 139:14
 154:5
works 32:1 34:12 61:8
 62:20 63:6 133:11,21
 133:22 134:6 139:7
 146:8 149:20
workshops 112:19
world 5:6 12:13 47:9
 75:6,8 78:12 120:8
 122:4,7 154:18
worlds 75:19
worldwide 34:9
worry 60:14 86:2
wouldn't 60:13
wounds 63:22
wow 133:10 134:1,18
wows 144:17
wrap 74:13 101:1
 164:15
wrapped 120:9
wrapping 126:10
writ 11:14
write 49:14 129:21,21
written 103:22 150:21
wrong 55:14 89:15

X

X 148:9

Y

year 7:21 18:1,1 24:1
 34:3 39:5 43:8 59:19
 59:19,19 67:20 69:3,5
 69:6 71:6 80:1 98:10

100:9 114:5 119:22
120:3,9 121:16,21
122:2 133:22 134:15
136:11
year's 11:20 120:12
years 4:22 5:2 6:6,8,9
8:15 9:11 10:11,17
27:9 41:11 58:4 62:1
68:15 91:4 120:13
129:17 130:16,17
142:5,15
yesterday 4:12,14,16
7:9 8:11 10:10 17:21
18:22 19:3,8 20:1,11
81:5,16 87:8 89:7
90:6,18 91:10 93:14
93:19 95:3 96:8 112:1
118:15 139:16 144:22
148:22

Z

Zac 67:19
zero 107:10 132:21
133:1,2 147:10
zeros 106:18
Zielinski 2:14 3:11
21:16,20,22 22:11
43:2,6 44:8,13 47:10
47:19 48:15 49:5 50:4
50:17 51:7,10,13,22
56:8 57:20 58:13
60:20 62:7,15 63:14
64:16 65:10 163:16

0

1

1,200 122:3
1,500 121:18
1/10th 60:11
10,000 132:10 133:3
10:58 126:6
100 113:2 145:15
11:07 125:15
11:10 126:7
11:53 168:19
12 3:9 4:22 6:5,9 79:11
154:6
13 63:16
130 24:1 50:21 52:3
14 70:12
140 50:21
1401 1:12
15 123:4,9,22
159 3:15
16 65:17
165 3:17
166 3:19

168 3:21
17 51:7 65:17
18 106:17
19 106:20
1908 62:19
1950s 97:20
1980 47:22
1986 29:4
1987 28:9

2

2 141:18
2,500 70:2
2.0 106:5 152:7
2014 26:7 68:10
2015 24:7
2016 26:8
2017 1:10
2019 73:16 113:1
2020 10:20 80:1
21 3:11
25 1:10 6:7
25,000 114:7
250,000 116:7
28th 120:1
2nd 167:5,9,11

3

3-9 71:6
30 51:1 130:15
30-40 51:1
300 50:4 51:8 122:9
30th 120:2
33 149:10
35 149:10
37 48:18
3rd 167:9,11

4

4 3:3
40 112:21
40-50 50:22
400 122:5,6,6 123:4
401 48:18

5

5 3:6
50 50:18 68:20 69:15
75:4,4 77:18
500 123:5

6

6 73:15
60 130:14
67 3:13

7

7 72:18 73:15

70 58:10
70-page 57:19
72015 1:12
74 29:3

8

8 73:15 154:6
800 72:17 122:1

9

9,000 121:22 123:18
9/11 10:12
9:00 1:13
9:04 4:2

C E R T I F I C A T E

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: National Advisory Council on
                  Innovation and Entrepreneurship

Before: US DOC

Date: 08-25-17

Place: Washington, DC

was duly recorded and accurately transcribed under

my direction; further, that said transcript is a

true and accurate record of the proceedings.

_____
Court Reporter