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MR. BUERSTATTE: Thank you, Robin.
And thank you NACIE Members. Welcome to our
second official quarterly meeting here in D.C.
As you know, this is a public meeting
so also welcome a few members of the public.
Thanks for joining. For those of you that are
dialing in on the line, members of the public, we
will have a public comment period at the end.
Approximately 3:15, depending on the pace of
conversation.
But, and on that note, we do have a
transcription service here so if you are making a
comment or engaging, please try your best to
speak into the microphone. That way we can
capture all the words.
MR. SMITH: Sorry, one thing about
that. If your mic is off there's a little delay,
so give it a couple seconds before you start
talking.
MR. BUERSTATTE: Thanks, Eric.
And I noticed we have a packed afternoon. So if you do need to stand up, take a break, grab some coffee, hit the restroom, please do so at your own will. And I think I've covered all the logistics.

But you can take a look at the agenda. And I'd just like to highlight one thing really before I pass it over to the Co-Chairs. And very shortly we'll hear from some Agency and Program leads. And that's because we heard you.

Many of you were really thirsty to hear more about what the federal government is doing in innovation and entrepreneurship. So we have some great leaders here to talk about what they're doing in various roles to support those activities.

And we want to focus on that in two ways. One, think about ways that we can leverage that insight from them to better inform our current work, and maybe future work.

But two, take a step above the facts that you hear. And think about the levers that
they are using to fund, convene, support, you
name it, regulate and deploy policies to support
our innovators and entrepreneurs.

Because maybe that specific program
might not be as relevant to us directly, or near-
term, but the strategy or methodology could be
implemented in one of our conversations near-
term.

So with that said, again, welcome.

Excited to have you here. We've got a great 24
hours planned for you all. Steve and Melissa.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: Great. So,
welcome. It's good to see all you, particularly
those who have probably made almost the furthest
trip, unless you're coming from some fabulous
country elsewhere. So it's great to see everyone
around the table.

As Craig mentioned, we do have an
action packed today. Today is really focusing in
a continuing of work group activities. And to
really begin to refine those. So that tomorrow
becomes a day to move from what can we do on the
ground, to what can we do to really advance a 
much larger strategy?

So I'm excited to have some friends 
literally and figuratively from other agencies. 
So that we can think about synergies, but also 
partnerships. And certainly to think about what 
does the near-term and the long-term look like? 
And importantly, what is our role in doing that?

I want to acknowledge Brian and his 
work in helping us develop some frameworks, and 
Andrew and his work in doing some frameworks. So 
we -- Craig is holding up one right there.

MR. BUERSTATTE: And each of you have 
one, you'll see it at your desks.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: A multi-colored 
document.

So we appreciate the work that people 
have been doing in the interim. It has not gone 
unnoticed. And so that's really odd. It's great 
to see everyone on the floor, to working to with 
you. Pass it to Steve.

CO-CHAIR TANG: Thank you, Melissa.
And welcome everyone. It has been a busy winter since we last convened. A lot has gotten done. I also want to acknowledge the historic nature of NACIE 3.0 moving between administrations. That has not happened before in the two other incarnations of NACIE.

So, I acknowledge that there is the sort of normal transition of staff, and transition of policy, transition of politics that goes on. I would also acknowledge that it's a bit heightened over the last couple of weeks in this administration.

So, we'll have some time to I think talk a little bit later about career milestones, personal milestones, and we welcome and want to learn more about what everybody is doing around the table?

I also want to acknowledge that three of our colleagues, since October, have elected to step down for a variety of reasons. And we'll talk about that as well. But other than that I think we are exactly where we need to be in terms
of developing initiatives, ideas. Crystallizing thoughts for getting ready to advise the new administration and new Secretary of Commerce.

    So I am, as Melissa is, very interested and excited in getting started. So welcome back everyone.

    MR. BUERSTATTE: So I do want to highlight real quickly before we dive into the interagency presentations. That framework Melissa mentioned, thank you, Brian for taking an initial stab at it.

    As we start the conversations today, and dive deeper into our specific ideas and those initiatives. And Melissa said, we'll be building towards that broader strategy tomorrow.

    Just take a look at this framework. Think about how it might resonate with what discussions you're involved in? And how we can set the table for tomorrow? This is not a prescription. There's nothing finite about it, but rather I just want to be strategic about the way we move forward.
CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: I'm sorry. I just also want to take a moment to thank the OIE staff.

We have, Steve and I have the privilege of speaking to them on a relatively regular basis. And I can always hear Craig, despite his great service trajectory that he's sometimes out of breath. Because I know he's running all over the building.

So I want to especially thank Craig and Eric for their work, and the rest of the team. Because they played working hard, both to support us, but also support a very significant transition. So thank you.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Thank you, Melissa. First up we have David Langdon, from the Economics and Statistics Administration. David, you ready to roll?

MR. LANGDON: Good afternoon.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: Good afternoon.

(Off the record comment.)

MR. BUERSTATTE: Yes, do you have the
clicker over there?

MR. LANGDON: Oh, yes.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Great. Oh yes, you've got to do slides, sorry.

(Off the record comment.)

MR. LANGDON: I'm David Langdon, I'm the Senior Policy Advisor here, in the Office of the Secretary, and in Economics and Statistics Administration.

I'm going to speak some about our Workforce Development Initiatives that we have going on in the department. And dwell a little bit more on a study that we released a few months ago around apprenticeships.

As you know, the department in recent years has become much more strategically coordinated around a series of initiatives to support, strengthen in American's workforce. And to ensure that training programs are better tied to business needs.

I'm just going to provide a preview on some of the following speakers will delve into
for example, the Manufacturing Ascension Partnership. And some work at the Census Bureau around, particularly around entrepreneurship. But also just general workforce data.

And you know, the end of the administration, brought a good point. I want you to sort of think about our successes, and where, look ahead to what our priorities would be?

Some priority areas would include better coordination with our Manufacturing USA centers, formally called the NNMI centers. The difficulty of pronouncing them alone was a good reason to change the name.

All these centers have, 14 of them now, have workforce development as a key part of their mission. And there's a need and an opportunity to coordinate across them more. Both in, you know, tying technological development to workforce training models.

And thinking more just broadly around workforce needs, the fear is out. And the connection between automation and workforce
needs, because the compliment to conversations
around trade and workforce needs.

So stay tuned to that. The recently
released Deloitte report on the Manufacturing USA
centers if you haven't seen it. We can certainly
share it. It's a very good preview.

I would argue that the workforce
development piece is actually one of the thinner
parts of the study, and alone calls for some new
thinking about what we should be doing? And
we're in coordination of course with the
department of Energy and DoD on these
discussions.

In the last year or so, we've focused
more on the leadership role in EDA -- of course,
it's onus to be the experts in the room around
integration across economic development -- and
brought on a series of staff called Economic
Development Integrators.

Who both at the National Office and
the Regional Offices are looking to help EDOs and
other entities to better understand the full
range of federal workforce dollars and
opportunities available to them.

And I think that's also, just the
existence of this is a huge success, along with
EDA's broader grant, more specific focus around
workforce training and its grant giving.

One piece of this is around helping
communities become ready for FDI investment.
There's a long, there's an ongoing activity
called, under the Job-Creating Investment, Cross-
Agency Goal which basically is an effort to
provide greater technical assistance to
communities and understanding when they are ready
to receive FDI Investments. And something that I
think is actually another success for EDA.

(Off the record comment.)

MR. LANGDON: Oh, I'm sorry, Foreign
Direct Investment, Foreign Direct Investment,
yes. I just had to prove I'm a federal employee
by throwing --

(Laughter.)

MR. LANGDON: -- throwing out some
acronyms right away. But I think the main reason I came today was to share the fact that we, in late last year, published a, or basically the first ever U.S. study on apprenticeships. It was a joint effort between our department and Case Western Reserve University. Specifically with our prior Chief Economist, Sue Helper, who I think some of you know.

It was to -- sort of a sweet spot for our department -- in that you know, overall the Department of Commerce regardless of administrations is the voice of business. It's a two way street, right?

Providing the voice of business to policy making, and helping business understand key, you know, government priorities and maybe, key, you know, actions that they could take they may not be aware of.

A key priority of the last administration and it's a priority for many countries is promoting apprenticeship as a proven training model. And we found right away as our
Secretary then. I'm sure future Secretaries talk
about these kinds of activities that there wasn't
much known about why, what's in it for businesses
to do apprenticeships? Or even what
apprenticeships are?

And through our conversations around
it, and through the generous support of
organizations like JP Morgan Chase, and the Joyce
Foundation, Annie E. Casey Foundation. We
conducted the first ever U.S. study on this.

So it was through a series of case
studies of 13 companies and intermediaries that
have a great experience and prior experience in
apprenticeship. And were a part of a program at
the U.S. Department of Labor, called LEADERS.
It's modeled on a U.K. program basically. Has
companies, they volunteer basically to promote
the growth of apprenticeship in their countries.

So these are people that have, have
done apprenticeships. Believe in it, and were
willing to work with us and share information
about how their programs operate? And what the
specific costs they were facing were? And what
the types of benefits and perhaps the evaluation
of these benefits might be?

We went into it hoping to get a lot of
quantitative data. We got some from two of the
companies, which was sort of the stars of our
study. But all the case studies, I think,
provided a good illustration of what
apprenticeship looks like in the United States
today. And helps, I think, overcome a lot of
sort of misperceptions about apprenticeships.

Our key findings -- and this will be
really brief -- is that the apprenticeship models
are extremely flexible, both in time and in cost.
So that a program could be a short -- and just
the definition here -- an apprenticeship refers
to a specific type of training program that's
registered with either U.S. Department of Labor,
or with the state apprenticeship agencies.

It involves both classroom training,
on-the-job training, and mentorship, and wage
progression. And it ends in an apprentice having
a certification in a specific occupation.

The certification at least will come from the Department of Labor. But in many cases also includes maybe a community college degree, or at least community college credits, or an industry certification as well. So an apprenticeship, the word is thrown around a lot, but in the case of this study, it means something very specific.

But within this very specific definition is great flexibility. Programs are as short as one year, as long as four years. The per apprentice cost could be as low or even less than $25,000, or as much as a quarter of a million.

And the differences really depend largely on just sort of the wage cost and program cost. The biggest cost of apprenticeship is just the wages themselves.

And however, most of the successful programs we looked at had partnerships, which both helped programs be more successful, get
started quicker, and also be cheaper. But regardless of the cost --

MR. BUERSTATTE: David, quick question.

MR. LANGDON: Yes, I'm sorry.

MEMBER BOESCH: Partnerships with whom?

MR. LANGDON: Oh, good. So the apprentices here refers to, you know, could basically be in many cases young people or older workers who are, you know, learning a specific occupation. And they're with, as part of it, they have a contract with a company. So they are -- so did I, does that answer your question?

MEMBER BOWLES: No, like partnerships with the university?

MR. LANGDON: Oh, partnerships, I said apprenticeships.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

PARTICIPANT: Yes, you said programs that are most successful when they had partnerships.
MR. LANGDON: My mistake. Yes, no it's a great question. It's something we delve into in the reports. It could be community colleges, labor unions, intermediaries, or even other companies. So like consortiums are who we sort of consider our partnership model.

MEMBER BOESCH: Can we get a copy of the report? Kind of distribute it afterwards? I'd love to read it.

MR. LANGDON: Yes, definitely.

MR. BUERSTATTE: And David will be with us, so for later today, and we'll go to dive deeper. But certainly have an opportunity to ask more questions shortly. I know you've got a few more things to get through, right?

MR. LANGDON: Yes.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Great.

MR. LANGDON: So I think just a couple things around this. So we, you know, we were very happy with the results of the study. Our goal right now is to get this information into industry's hands. And we'd love, you know, your
thoughts around, you know, both the amplification of the results. But also what questions remain that, you know, we haven't really looked into yet?

We'll talk a lot, yes, about this at length later. But one thing that really popped out to me was that among all these companies, and we're talking companies like Siemens, like a Ford, Dartmouth-Hitchcock medical centers, which probably many of you may have heard of in the apprenticeship space. These companies believe in apprenticeship, have apprenticeships, but it's still a niche program.

They don't do a lot of it. They'll do it in certain occupations. And understanding the decision point that companies face that would help, you know, make them decide to make this type of investment in their workers is something I think is very critical.

So when we talk about growth of apprenticeships, it's not just new companies. It's going to these ones who already believe in
it. And helping them understand that they should be doing more of this.

And I'll leave it there.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Yes, and we have a few minutes for questions as well, so any initial feedback or thoughts from the Council?

Yes, so.

MEMBER REICHERT: I was curious about you mentioned just very briefly, state level involvement. What is the role for state governments in this?

MR. LANGDON: So there's a couple roles. So one is just the structure of the apprenticeship system in the United States is a little bit convoluted. But half of the states have federal offices that oversee apprenticeship and the regulatory side. Half of the states do that at the state level. So that's one piece.

The other piece it around --

MEMBER BOESCH: Meaning the Departments of Labor at the state and federal --

MR. LANGDON: Yes, so the state
Department of Labor, yes. So South Carolina I believe would be an example of that. And Massachusetts I'm not sure off the top of my head, but I can find out. Wisconsin?

(Off the record comment.)

MR. LANGDON: Wisconsin, yes.

And then but a second piece is just around the financial incentives. So there are, and DOL tracks this very well. But there are a number of states that are placed into like tax credits to help incentivize companies to do programs and to register them.

MEMBER S. SMITH: So we've put that legislation, in Indiana, we're putting that forward this time to give it tax incentives for apprenticeships and different things. But my question is around helping companies understand the value of apprenticeship. And really the hardest nut as you and I have talked just a few minutes ago, for us to crack is the Japanese owned companies.

I mean the Japanese owned companies
are just adamantly opposed to any kind of registration, and any apprentices because they feel there's a union connotation there that they're not willing to risk.

MR. LANGDON: Yes.

MEMBER S. SMITH: So, I think if we could come up with, you know, some thoughts around that I think we would be able to expand it. Expand apprenticeships a great deal.

MEMBER KAPP: I have a --

MEMBER S. SMITH: Joe.

MEMBER KAPP: Did you want to respond?

MR. LANGDON: No, not yet. I completely agree. I will say very few of our companies had, some did, but very few had union involvement.

MEMBER S. SMITH: Yes.

MR. LANGDON: And the classic example is Ford, Ford UAW, or in the building trades. But in the case of a company like Siemens, or Dartmouth-Hitchcock, yes just the companies, and the educational institutions on their own. So I
think, yes, but we'd be glad to work with you and
the Department of Health to share these stories.

MEMBER S. SMITH: Great, thanks.

MEMBER KAPP: So do you know if any
portion of the studies really looked at sort of
rural communities? And the impact of
apprenticeships within rural communities?

MR. LANGDON: Yes, great question. So
we did have, actually we had some rural
communities in our study. And this apparently is
-- I'd say one, we had both companies working in
urban settings, suburban and rural settings. And
the one common factor in all of them was that
they resorted to apprenticeships because of labor
shortages at their local level for specific types
of occupations.

And I think there's more that can be
done. But certainly I think the one great
company in that study would be Dr. Schneider's
Automotive Systems. It's in Russell Springs,
Kentucky, rural Kentucky. It's a German company
that setup shop there. It's actually one of its
few non-German operations.

And because of the strength of a pre-apprenticeship program in Kentucky at the high school level, they were actually able to relatively quickly setup a pretty successful, small actually, but a successful apprenticeship program.

MEMBER BOESCH: Were there any learnings on more of the supply side by companies that were seeking to have apprenticeships, but the kind students, or people that entered them, and barriers there?

MR. LANGDON: So a little bit. One thing we found was that as a rule apprenticeships allow companies to broaden their hiring pool a lot. And in some cases that's explicitly tied to companies' goals around having either a more diverse workforce, or maybe one that sort of looks like the market that they're in.

So classic example is CVS, which is one of the companies we looked at. So CVS has corporate social responsibility goals around
diversity hiring. And because of their
apprenticeship programs, they're able to move
forward pretty well in that space. And or an
eexample of companies actually looking to add more
occupations to their apprenticeship programs.

MEMBER BOESCH: And do like a lot of
people apply, like professionally, or do they
have issues in that area?

MR. LANGDON: It varied by company,
but it's surprisingly selective. And companies
are quite deliberative about, you know, how they
select apprentices?

MEMBER BARTHOLOMEUSZ: Did you do a
prioritization of skill sets in job areas that
would need this, or this would be most suited
for?

MR. LANGDON: So we didn't explicitly.
And there's a reason for this. I think one of
the goals around both doubling and diversifying
apprenticeships, which the labor department had
laid out, was to not inadvertently -- I think the
idea is to open people's eyes to the fact that
many jobs are apprenticeable in a sense. They
could, you could have apprenticeships.

And so because of that we didn't do
that necessarily. But I will say we tried to
highlight the fact that say jobs in the IT
sector, which we had a few examples of, or in
manufacturing, or in retail, could be very well
suited to apprenticeships.

And I know for example, with respect
to our department, we have a strong policy
interest in cyber security, and cyber security
jobs. And apprenticeships is very much one of
the training models we're exploring.

I know something that was called out
in a recent Cyber Security Commission Report,
like a layout of the, a numerical around the
number of apprenticeships we should have for
cyber security jobs. Something that we're
working to achieve.

MEMBER BAGLEY: You mentioned, I'm
sorry. You mentioned trying to get the word out
a little more broadly. So have you started that
process? And thought through some of the partners that might be able to do that yet? Or is it really a clean state as far as --

MR. LANGDON: So yes, and we're at an inflection point. So we're at an inflection point in the transition. And but we're all riding through the transition together here and for our department's sake, thumbs up, we're in good shape. We'll talk a little bit more about that later if you wanted.

But there are some mechanisms in place that will, I think are continuing forward well. And one was not our effort, but National Apprenticeship Week, which was an effort laid out by the Department of Labor modeled on our National Manufacturing Day.

MEMBER BAGLEY: Right.

MR. LANGDON: And noted similar efforts in apprenticeship. Those efforts have legs, and we're moving forward around that. There's going to be in May, yes in May, the first ever National Conference on Apprenticeships here
in D.C. Sponsored by JPMorgan Chase.

(Off the record comment.)

MR. LANGDON: And four other, yes.

Hope to see you all there.

(Off the record comment.)

MR. LANGDON: So there's, I think at the company level, the foundation level, and the government level, there's a lot that's going on. And I think just, as an, I'm an economist.

From the economics point of view we have a very tight labor market, very long employment rate. But also very low labor, in my mind, low labor force participation. And it points towards the needs to broaden our supply chain through programs like apprenticeship.

MEMBER BAGLEY: Thank you.

MEMBER STEVENSON: Are there any statistics around or stats around retention? So and which industries tend to have the higher retention from sourcing through apprenticeship?

MR. LANGDON: Great question. So we looked at, we looked at both -- I would say first
of all we don't have global stats on this. We would love to, but we do have some information on it.

And one of the things that we laid out were the variety of benefits that are associated with apprenticeship, both short-term and long-term. The most short-term benefit is just filling a job that otherwise wasn't being filled in many cases.

But companies did cite retention. In some cases provided statistics on the retention being much better with apprenticeship programs. And also on workers actually progressing, reaching, getting promotions more quickly because of it.

So we can talk about that more in detail later.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Yes, this is great. I think what you've done is provided a great teaser. And clearly identified that there's a lot interest and questions. And Dave will be with us through the rest of today. I think we're
going to take a quick break, but we'll do a
deeper dive through the skills team later today
on this.

And I want to transition from skills
to our next presenter real quick.

MEMBER REAMER: Craig, can I just ask
a quick question?

MR. BUERSTATTE: Real quick.

MEMBER REAMER: On a separate topic.

David, part of the Economics Statistics
Administration is oversight of the Bureau of
Economic Analysis which got some money from
Congress for a small business data initiative.
Can you give us a four sentence summary of the
status of that?

MR. LANGDON: So this is like the
small satellite accounts?

MEMBER REAMER: Yes.

MR. LANGDON: Yes, it is going
forward. And that's the extent I have off the
top of my head.

MEMBER REAMER: Okay.
MR. LANGDON: But I can find out Andrew, and let you --

MEMBER REAMER: If you could do that and if you're able to get that to us before we adjourn tomorrow.

MR. LANGDON: No, I think right about now.

MEMBER REAMER: Great.

MEMBER JOHNSON: Craig, can I point out one thing?

MR. BUERSTATTE: Yes.

MEMBER JOHNSON: The Defense Department has a program they just started, I believe it's during the last six months of somebody's time and service. They can be trained by an employer and the U.S. government will pay their salary. So it's similar to an apprenticeship program.

All the training has to, the cost of all that has to be borne by the company, but the largest expense is the salary. And I believe the maximum length of time was six months.
MR. BUERSTATTE: And is this in their final six months of transition work?

MEMBER JOHNSON: Yes.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Yes, so part, it's a transition aid program. And it's experimental at this time but that's a great point. I'm glad you highlighted it because we've been collaborating as recently with some of the VA folks. Talking about innovative ways for pathways.

MEMBER JOHNSON: We're aggressively looking for employers because at Fort Knox they have all kinds of illness and that's HRC --

MR. BUERSTATTE: Yes, thanks. So again, not to cut off a great momentum, but if you notice -- so we just talked about skills. And now we have one of our great friends from SBA with us to talk about some innovation.

So John Williams is the Director of Innovation and Technology at the Office of Investment and Innovation at SBA. John, thanks for joining us.

And again, he's going to give us some
innovation perspective, what they are up to there. And we'll close out with an entrepreneurship presentation. So again, skills, innovation and entrepreneurship, I think it's a great suite. John.

MR. WILLIAMS: Thanks a lot. I've got to leave at hard 2:30 because we're briefing our transition team members. So it's very exciting times at SBA and all these agencies right now.

So real high level, what Office of OII does at SBA? So most of SBA is seven day loan programs and things like that. So we're a different program. We do kind of the, so we have the SBIC program, which is a $4 billion loan program. So we're the largest fund-to-fund managers.

We provide matching dollars to fund managers. Most of that is debt financing. So there's a few of those, and I'll talk about those.

And then the SBIR program, and I'm more on the SBIR side. We have oversight
authority over that. But we basically help small businesses on the R&D side. And we also help on the investment side.

So SBIC, as I said, is a $4 billion authorization. We're doing about $2.5 billion a year. But actually we have non-leverage debt so we actually invest about $6 billion a year through that program into small businesses under 500.

Again, a lot of manufacturing. I've got folks that are debt financing moving in, less high growth type things. And we're trying to work, actually in developing an early stage and impact. We have those programs, we're really trying to bring those on a little stronger. So that program has 313 active SBICs.

And then the next program is SBIR that I'm more involved with, and that is a $2.5 billion program. The money is not managed at SBA, it's managed at the 11 agencies. We have the oversight authority, the ones that monitor the agencies for Congress. And then report
things back up, push out policy, all those kinds of things to work that program.

And just to kind of give you a highlight of our websites. To get more information we do an awful lot on the training side. So what we try to do is things that are beneficial to all the agencies, like these road tour events, training events, and then like I say, work with the Hill on legislation.

I know NACIE worked a lot on legislation last go around. I've had some papers that really focused on increasing the ability to use R&D, SBR dollars on the commercialization side, the patent side, things like that. Some of that was put in the bill. I'm going to talk at the end, which I don't have slides on, on kind of where some of that is going? And how we can work together?

And then last, our programs, is a growth-accelerator program. So this is a program where we provide $50,000 to accelerators. So we fund about 85 a year. We've done this for three
years. This is a fun one because it's appropriated, not authorized. So we'll see what happens this year.

We have a million dollars in an appropriation line, although we're under CR, as you all know. So we're kind of watching that. Last year we had a million also, but I was able to raise another $3.5 million from friends and family, not really, but government friends and family. And so we got to about the level we had last year. So we funded another 85 of those guys.

MR. BUERSTATTE: John, real quick, that's a big deal. That's not a light lift for government agencies to do ad hoc program sharing like that, funding like that. So just wanted to highlight that.

MR. WILLIAMS: Appreciate that.

MR. BUERSTATTE: That's good stuff.

(Off the record comment.)

MR. WILLIAMS: It means every time you go up to the Hill, they say why are you doing
this? So it puts us in a difficult position because actually we think a lot of the Hill supports the program. We've done a lot on making sure, and I should have brought a map of it. But if you look at our website, you'll see that we're in, I think the last one we did 85 awards in 42 different districts and things like that. So we really spread these things around.

You think that the maps up there?

(Off the record comment.)

MR. WILLIAMS: No, well you sent the slides over. So anyway, if you saw the map, it's a beautiful map. You know, it's every, I mean a lot of states, 42 of them.

So it's I think we're working, but what we're really trying to work is -- and the problem is once you're not authorized they kind of beat you up on that. And they don't want to authorize it.

So I think we're getting, so we're working on it, but again I have to figure out where the new administration stands on this. And
once we balance that out, it is a great job
growth program. We have amazing numbers on job
growth with the program. We fund some great
people around the table here.

So a lot of awards to a lot of -- you
know, and part of it is we fund some entities
that are well established accelerators. The ones
that they really don't need our money but they do
things that they wouldn't normally do with our
money.

So really we're focused at SBA on
hitting underrepresented groups, which means
underrepresented states, women, and minorities.
And that's what we'll ask our more well-known
accelerators to do. But then also we have a lot
of accelerators in the middle of the country that
our $50,000 is maybe half, a third of what
they're getting. And it makes a big difference
to them.

So that's been a really strong
program. That's been funded, like in '14 we had
$2.5 million. We had $4 million in '15. And
then we had about $3.75 million in '16. Again, appropriation for a million. I'm hoping to, you know, again raise money. But again, I've got to get the green light that that's okay to work that side.

So I want to just bounce on a couple things that might be of interest to you guys. So legislation on SBIR was re-authorized. The people will say, well the SBR was re-authorized. It was and it wasn't.

It was in the sense that they extended it for five years, which was a big hurdle for a lot of folks. In that we wanted to that, or they wanted to take that off the table.

But the things that were in the bill, which was almost, on the Senate side a 60 page bill, of increasing, to set aside, of doing commercialization assistance, allowing patent costs, a bunch of pilot programs and all that. None of that was passed. So those all expire on September 30th, 2017.

The program though doesn't expire
until '22. So, there will be activity. In order to use the activity, so like Directive Phase II, there's a Phase Zero program with NIH that was about $5 million from STTR that went to universities, the Civilian Commercialization Pilot Program.

The three percent which was a big one. So this admin program which agencies funded, I-Corp out of, Commercialization Assistance Program training outreach, you know -- actually the accelerator money I did get. $1.5 of it, $1.6 of it came from this fund because it was used to get accelerators to train on SBIR.

So not having some of those tools will certainly hurt us, again that happens in '18. Yes.

MEMBER HERSKOWITZ: I'm sorry, in that list you mentioned the I-Corp program and the --

MR. WILLIAMS: Not the I-Corp program, but we fund projects through I-Corp. So not the, so kind of, I mean NSF is a Corp funding of I-Corp.
MEMBER HERSKOWITZ: Yes.

MR. WILLIAMS: And then what we would do is we would help companies go into that program.

MEMBER HERSKOWITZ: So did that get re-approved or did that not get approved?

MR. WILLIAMS: No, it did not.

MEMBER HERSKOWITZ: That did not.

MR. WILLIAMS: Right. Again, I mean it has nothing to do with I-Corp getting approved.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MR. WILLIAMS: But it allowed more companies to get --

MEMBER HERSKOWITZ: -- the funding for the companies to go into it.

MR. WILLIAMS: Right, so NIH used to run like, I think they ran 50 companies through it last year?

MEMBER HERSKOWITZ: Yes.

MR. WILLIAMS: That goes away in '18.

MEMBER HERSKOWITZ: They can still
offer the program, but the companies have to
self-fund their way in?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes.

MEMBER HERSKOWITZ: Which is not going
to happen?

MR. WILLIAMS: Right, exactly. It's
possible, yes.

So, and then the stuff, you know,
that you guys work, patent costs, marketing
costs, dollars toward commercialization, those
are things -- and you've got to remember like the
first one is Directive Phase II, you know, the
three percent money. That stuff the agencies
care about and they're going to fight for it.

Things like patent costs, more for
marketing and stuff, they don't care about.
That's something that if you're interested, and
still that is something that you would have to
fight for. And now is the time. I mean they are
drafting these bills now.

They are probably using, you know, the
bases of the two bills. I think the increase is
going to be a lot harder this year. There was a lot of push back from the Science Committee on the university side on the increase.

The signs, I think the Senate went a little too far maybe. They went from 3.5 or 3.2 percent to six percent, where the House went up to 4.5. So they were very close to a deal last year. It was kind of unfortunate, there was a bunch of things that kind of happened, to make it not happen.

But, we will continue to work and I think something will happen this year on getting something implemented, and probably through the NDA, and get it at the end of the year.

Things that SBA is working along those lines though is we -- so I've got a new employee from, Jennifer Shieh, who is over there from NIH, ran SBIR program. And has more university background and many more degrees than I do from better schools.

And so she's, and one of my reasons for bringing her over is I really want to work
this concept where we get universities to
develop, some say I shouldn't use the word, but I
want to see universities develop SBR mills within
the university system.

And it focused on women. We have a
lot of post docs that are running through that
program. I mean that are there for five years
and things like that, that would be perfect
candidates to help start companies, and then get
SBR dollars to do that.

It's a win for the university because
they would obviously use their facilities. They
would probably subcontract, or they would
subcontract most likely some of the fat. And I'm
trying to get universities to develop an
ecosystem where a lot of the irritating
government bureaucracy things that one has to do
to write a proposal can be done by a party that
understands it. And have the post doc focus on
the technology.

We're getting somewhere with that. We
had a great event at MIT. And we got a lot of
interest, but universities are harder than I
thought to deal with. I'm not sure, there's a
few of you here.

(Laughter.)

MR. WILLIAMS: And especially MIT, it
was a lot harder than I thought.

(No audible response.)

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, I might have.

So we're learning on that. We're
reaching out to more universities. And again
that's going to be Jen's main focus is how we do
that? And we're working with some of you, you
see when we go these outreach tours, we're going
to hit a lot of universities. We've got some
connections at the UC side.

But others that are doing it, we're
very interested in that model. What I'd love to
see is a university to stand up, a full-time SBIR
person that would kind of provide that
assistance. And so people could come in and you
have -- and then we have training.

So I have money to pay for training,
train-the-trainer training. We're even doing programs when an entity is brand new that will provide some of the assistance on that training that, free services. DOE has a great program that way. So I think there's a lot we can bring to the table.

I'm even interested in the Phase Zero program that NIH has. And whether that can be tweaked more towards helping proposal development, as maybe doing research. And it's a little bit of both right now. So learning more about that and what we can leverage with what we have?

So that's kind of, I think -- oh, and then growth accelerators real quick. Again, authorized, so that's something that we have to figure out whether we want to do that. And how we push forward that? But if we get money we'll probably have a program. It may not be as big.

And then we've got a Library of Congress study going on with accelerators right now that we started like three months ago, which
we might have a report in four or five months.
And then we'll have a couple reports coming out
that.

And what we're trying to find is -- we
know that, you know, the ecosystem accelerators
are out there. A lot of our challenge on that is
we have SBDCs and other things at SBA, and other
places. It's like, well, why couldn't they do
it? With, why do you need multiple programs?
There's always that question about duplicity.

We see this as a real value-added to
SBA because it's not always the coolest place to
go, SBDCs if you've been there and you go to an
accelerator, it has a kind of hipper, cooler
place to be. So how do we actually get those
people to work together?

So there's things that SBA and SBDCs
can do that accelerators don't want to do. Or,
and so sharing clientele so office hours, and
trying to get those networks. So what we're
seeing is a magnifying of the ability of SBA
folks to get into places and meet clients that
they normally would not have in the past.

And so we see that as our strength and we want to build that up. And so though
hopefully the Library of Congress will just kind of figure out, in this ecosystem if you've got,
usually accelerators have local state, state or local money, outside money, and where's the fed play in that? And how can we kind of, you know, figure the best place for the federal investment that gives the biggest bang for the buck?

So with that question.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Thanks, John. All right, yes, we've got a few minutes for questions for John while we have him here.

MEMBER BOWLES: Where does SCORE reside?

MR. WILLIAMS: What's that?

MEMBER BOWLES: SCORE.

MR. WILLIAMS: What about it?

MEMBER BOWLES: Where does that reside? Is that under your --

MR. WILLIAMS: No, that's an OED,
Office of Economic Development. It's right around the corner from me, and I just actually hired another person from that group, who's going to be working with me. So that's kind of the SBDC's SCORE, Women's Business Centers. Those all fall under that group.

MEMBER BOWLES: So there's opportunity for collaboration, because --

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes.

MEMBER BOWLES: -- I see huge value in SCORE, but from an innovation and maybe application perspective.

MR. WILLIAMS: Right.

MEMBER BOWLES: I don't think that's it's, we're leveraging those people like their experience and mentor capabilities --

MR. WILLIAMS: I agree. Yes, and that's why, one of the main reason why I hired this other person. Because, and she's going to work on the accelerator team of kind of how we bring all these parties together?

And, you know, I mean one of the big
problems we have is a lot of the times we're, you know -- this building is kind of hard to get into but we have ones that are harder. So how do you get people like SCORE and all that to get into places and be aware? So yes, we'll be working on that.

MEMBER HERSKOWITZ: If, you have a number of universities in the room here --

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes.

MEMBER HERSKOWITZ: -- that do a lot of SBIR, a lot of SBIR spinouts. If we wanted to collaborate, we would talk to Jennifer?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, send, well her, yes. Send, Jennifer you don't have cards yet.

(Off the record comment.)

MR. WILLIAMS: And my, certainly send emails to me. I mean because, and we'll pass them on. But she's going to be coordinating, she's going to be here at dinner, yes.

MEMBER BOWLES: Great.

MR. WILLIAMS: And we're very, very interested in trying to work that because what
I'd really like to do is get a model of some people that are doing this well. Get best practice from that. And then figure out how we can maybe leverage some of the resources we have towards the upgrade?

MEMBER KAPP: To what extent have you looked at Eastern West Virginia Community Technical College? One of the things, we co-located one of the SBDC coaches at the community colleges to the extent that, how much are you looking at community colleges across the United States in addition to the four year universities?

MR. WILLIAMS: So I haven't gone to that level because I've barely looked at universities. I mean, so we're looking at it as a whole. So we're not really concerned whether they're a university or a two year college. I think what we're trying to do is leverage our resources.

And again, so my ability, I can fund accelerators right now. And I have money for that. And so my goal is to take those
accelerators and make those resources available
to any of these other communities, especially
our SBDCs where they are already at. To pull
those two communities together.

So I should say, thank you. We won in
West Virginia, one of the accelerator grants.
And it's a rural community, so that $50,000 goes
a long way.

MEMBER BOWLES: Good.

MR. WILLIAMS: So we appreciate that.
The other thing, I just wanted to say is that,
not that there is competition, but community
colleges are easy to work with.

MEMBER BOWLES: Yes.

(Laughter.)

MEMBER BOWLES: Good point.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Any final questions
for John? Emily.

(Off the record comment.)

MR. WILLIAMS: Right. That's what
we're trying to do with the SBDCs and so we're
probably, so SBDCs are a little weird because
they don't quite fit under, I mean they're not SBA. But they, we fund them. But also they get a lot of state funding.

The District Offices are SBA funded. So we're kind of starting with the District Offices but really I think that we want to jump as quickly as possible to the SBDCs.

Yes.

(Off the record comment.)

MR. WILLIAMS: That's great, yes. And that will be, so Brittany Sickler will be my lead on that side, but also Jen will be helping with accelerators for you, yes.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Thanks, John. That's again, another great teaser on innovation. And I understand your team is going to be able to stick with us for the rest of the day?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, they are. Thank you very much.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Thank you. So Nagesh as well in the corner. We'll be doing deeper dives later.
MR. WILLIAMS: And we have a detail over in your shop too, so we have a spot.

MR. BUERSTATTE: We do.

MR. WILLIAMS: We are looking to collaborate more and more. Because I really do want to, we have a lot of things that complement each other, and we haven't worked as well together, just because I haven't had the time, because I've been here two years. But I really do want to focus on building that relationship.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Yes, it's funny how it's hard to get some of the best things done without the personnel. So, it's exciting to be able to collaborate like that. And hopefully NACIE can help us figure some of those strategies out. I know that one of the groups is working on that in fact, strategy.

So, thanks, John. And maybe one of best examples of governments thinking creatively is the Census Bureau. One might be surprised that the Census Bureau is thinking around, or thinking about entrepreneurship. So to close
this out is Ron Jarmin from the Census Bureau.

He's the Associate Director for Economic Programs.

Ron, thanks so much for joining us.

He's going to talk about the Annual Survey for Entrepreneurs that we've been doing for a few years.

MR. JARMIN: Right, so thank you.

Glad to be here to talk to you guys about, I'm not going to call it the Annual Survey of Entrepreneurs anymore. I'm going to call it the ASE.

MR. BUERSTATTE: ASE, another acronym for you.

MR. JARMIN: So if you have other meanings for ASE, temporarily suspend them for a few minutes while I talk about it in this context.

So just a little bit of background.

I've been associated with this enterprise for quite some time before it became the survey, so I'm sort of the entrepreneurship guy at the
Census Bureau. We've been building data to address the data needs around studying entrepreneurship for many years.

And, you know, probably the best example of that would be some data we've built from administrative data from the tax, from IRS, and from some of our own collections, called the Longitudinal Business Database, which has every establishment in the U.S. linked together since 1976 until now. So it's a valuable source of information on job creation, job destruction, firms, startups, exits, all that sort of stuff.

So the ASE is an attempt to sort of take some of the insights that we got from that data, and bring it together with what a five year collection that we've been doing for a number of years, called the Survey of Business Owners. It had different names in the past.

But lots of people, you know, that was collected only five years. And it had rich information on the demographic characteristics of business owners.
And one of the biggest complaints about that was that it was only available every five years. And people got a taste of having annual data on entrepreneurship, so obviously they wanted these data.

So again, so this is part of a broader effort that we've been doing, including the LBD. And it's sort of the data prize we've built off it, the BDS. We also have longitudinal information on jobs from the Longitudinal Employer Household Dynamics Program.

So we kind of have an interlocking suite of data programs that I think provide a pretty rich description of what's going on in the business sector, and with entrepreneurship in general.

So the ASE was started as a partnership with the Kauffman Foundation and BBA here at Commerce. And again, it was meant to sort of build onto the SBO, and to provide annual data on entrepreneurship, on business dynamics, the impacts of young businesses on the economy.
So basically unlike, you know, the SBO has a really large sampling rate and includes both employer businesses, and non-employer businesses. The ASE has an employer business only focus, much smaller sample, but again, it's annual. So that's, you know, we can't, we don't have the resources to sample at the SBO rates on an annual basis. And even if we did, OMB would never clear a PRA package to do it.

Importantly, and this is sort of unique for Census Bureau surveys, we over-sampled young businesses. And that's, you know, something some of us have been trying for years. And I guess, you know, now that I'm the boss, they're going to, have to do that.

But I think that much of the research that we've done is that the dynamics of young businesses is much more interesting than the dynamics of older businesses. And that, you know, usually within the first ten years of a firms life, you can kind of tell whether they're going to be a major source of job creation and
growth in the economy, or they're not, okay.

Okay, so again, the content for the collection is very similar to the SBO. Has all the demographic information about business owners. But again, some of the new stuff is, you know, looking at the businesses by the age of the firm. By looking, a little better drill down into their access to capital. And then looking at sort of shocks to their business.

So, and another innovative feature we hope is that, you know, instead of asking the same questions year after year, there will be sort of a core of questions that we do ask year after year, but then we'll use modules to ask more specialized content.

And so you can see here in 2014, R&D and Innovation, sponsored by the National Science Foundation, that was the focus. And then in 2015 we did sort of Management Practices and Data Driven Decision Making, which came out from another survey that we did in collaboration with academics, called the Management and
Organizational Practices Survey. But that was only from manufacturing sector.

And 2016, which, you know, we'll be out in the field shortly. Asking about regulations and sort of business advice, Kauffman and SBA are helping us with.

So just, you know, kind of giving you a sense of things. And sort of focusing on the importance of firm age. You can see here how like, access to capital, how it differs by firm age.

So the importance of, you know, for these small businesses, personal savings and family resources are always going to be an important source of funding. But for the younger businesses, they're even more important than they are for older businesses. Bank loans very rare amongst young businesses.

So, these are the sorts of insights that the SBO itself didn't really provide before. SBO linked to some other data that could do that, but now we have an annual source of data on this.
And again, it's, you know, the survey is now informed by what we've learned from these other administrative data source things.

So, you know, the 2015 ASE, we just finished collection on that. Hopefully, the data will be out this summer. And then the 2016 ASE we still need to get on the approval, but, you know, we should be in collection until either December and then really seeing it next summer.

So here's contact information on the survey. Again, this is something that we hope will be a model of some the ways we're trying to sort of streamline some of our business surveys to provide users with better, more granular data. But actually doing it at a reduced burden on the business community.

So with that, I'll just open it up to questions. And I'm not going to go through all the --

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: So in the module content, two questions. One, what is the relationship of those folks in parentheses? Is
that contact with capital, or both? And then once the module is done, do they stay? So that there's an ability to collect longitudinal data, or is it just for that time period?

MR. JARMIN: So it could be just for that period, but what we're hoping is that some of the, at least some of modules will be rotating. So there's a lot of things that we ask businesses that are not, don't vary with high frequency. And especially some of the questions on this survey. They don't vary that much by high frequency.

So you can ask them every other year, or every three years, or every five years and still be able to obtain a pretty good statistical picture of how that looks.

So things that do vary, importantly from year to year, you know, like employment, and receipts, and that sort of stuff. We're going to ask them every year.

But some of the things that are more like related to their strategy, you know, those
change more slowly. You know, whether you use
data in decision making, you know, that's not
going to change from year to year.

    It's usually going to change once from
no to yes. And, you know, so we just want to
observe that. And when the variation in that
question goes away, when everybody is using data
in their decision making, we'll stop asking it,
right.

    CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: And then the people
in parentheses, so like Kauffman, MOPS, are they
content input or capital?

    MR. JARMIN: So both. So Kauffman
helped us develop the questions, but also
provided funding. Okay, the MOPS was a survey
that we got actually, National Science Foundation
funding to help support -- Census, you know,
these are all jointly funded by some external
organizations and by the Census Bureau.

    So it's, and again, you know, I'm not
going to shell for funding here, but the funding
of these modules and ASE is not a clear thing
right now. We're trying to build a business model. And that's really going to be dependent on people coming to the table with interesting content questions that we can put onto these modules.

So this, you know, we're kind of putting up the, you know, the tent here. And saying, you know, come on in and let's collaborate, and so.

MEMBER REAMER: So you have one year's worth of data out. What's been the response among users and analysts to that data? There's two questions, so that's one. And the second is, could you give people a -- ASE is not the only data source at Census that talks about entrepreneurs.

There's also non-employer statistics, business dynamics statistics, just for the group's edification, can you give a, you know, a thumbnail sketch of the four things that --

MR. JARMIN: So I think the response has been very positive so far. I mean obviously
we only have one year out. You know, so we don't have for instance a cadre of researchers in the research data centers using the micro-data just yet.

But I think in terms, you know, we got pretty, you know, that was a Wall Street Journal posting that the graphic was from. So it's gotten some good press. I think that, you know, certainly the community of entrepreneurship scholars and stuff that I think was sort of a lot of the driving force behind getting done, have been very happy with it.

So, you know, I did try to mention a little bit how this is part of a broader set of, you know -- so, you know, the business community is very heterogeneous.

So we have, you know, most businesses, you know, millions of them have no employees. Some of them you might call legitimate business. Some of them are just, you know, somebody doing a little consulting on the side. But those are what we call non-employer businesses.
We observe those in the tax records. That's where we get most of the information that we know about them. But we do include a mailing of non-employer businesses on some of our surveys. So on the annual capital expenditure survey, on the five year SBO, there are sub-samples of those surveys that look at the non-employer businesses.

Non-employer businesses are very hard to do in a survey, context. Surveying is becoming a harder business to do generally. But the non-employer business universally is one of the harder groups to get good response from.

But then, you know, we also do, you know, so again, some of the, almost all of our surveys could be used as some source data for studying young businesses and entrepreneurship.

But the non-employer data, the business dynamics statistics which is explicitly meant to look at business performance by firm age, that's sourced from the longitudinal business database. That's a critical one.
And then the LEHD data, which is basically, you know, most Census Bureau surveys and activities are either household base, or firm, or establishment base. They're based on, you know, whether you're a business or an individual, or a household.

And so the LEHD data takes that and uses administrative data from state unemployment insurance systems. And the unit is actually a job. So we observe every UI covered job in the economy. And then we throw in data on federal workforce from OPM and stuff.

So we observe everybody. We observe the employee, and we observe their employer. And so that's a job. And those data can then be linked, you know, back to the ASE, you know, so you can see the workers who work at these businesses.

So there's a number of, you know, we've done a lot of work on trying to build new products and research outputs using these. But there's still lots of things that people can
learn. The surface is really only been
scratched.

MEMBER STEVENSON: Is there an example
of a survey that evaluates almost exit data. So
it's, the group is closed. Some, to identify
like what are some of the key themes that we can
learn from?

MR. JARMIN: So we have not done
anything like that. And I'm not sure. I know, I
think Kauffman had thought about doing it. The
problem is observing them when they -- so we have
very good information on when they close.

MEMBER STEVENSON: Yes.

MR. JARMIN: Because we see them stop
paying payroll taxes for instance. And, but then
that usually, you know, from a government
surveying perspective, that means they are no
longer in scope for our survey activities.

So, I think if that's something that
enough folks were interested in and we could see
if we could try to figure out. In some cases we
do know information about the owners.
Not all business, I mean many businesses we don't know much. You know, most you know, C-Corps and stuff like that we don't know. You know, publicly traded companies if they close, you know, we're not going to go in and ask them.

But the, you know, I think it's an interesting question to ask that sort of follow-up about, you know, why did they shut down?

MEMBER STEVENSON: It's funding, or their strategy or, yes?

MR. JARMIN: Right, right. I mean we do, we can in the data, separate businesses that really closed, from businesses that were purchased by another business, not always, but for the most -- we try really hard to make sure that if we see a business cease operation and it's coded as a death in the BDS statistics for instance, that it really is a death. That it's not something that's been part of some M&A activity and is now part of a new, or a, you know, an older firm that purchased it, so.
MEMBER KENNEY: I had a question. A lot of programs are trying to work to support small businesses and entrepreneurs, often differentiate between traditional main street kind of businesses and those that are poised for high growth.

MR. JARMIN: Right.

MEMBER KENNEY: And it's often hard to identify just from kind of publicly available data. I was curious to what extent does the surveys try and to differentiate either by self-selection or some other means?

MR. JARMIN: So I, the survey isn't necessarily trying to detect that. And we never, you know, we haven't found the formula yet for predicting this ex ante.

Scott Stern and a group up at MIT think that they have some insight into that, by you know, if you name your place, Bob's Pizza, you know, it's probably not going be a high growth firm.

You know, if it has Xs and Zs in it,
and it's incorporated in Delaware, you at least have some thinking that it's going to be high growth.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MEMBER KENNEY: We actually got that presentation from them last year. It was actually interesting.

MR. JARMIN: Yes, so we have not yet tried to do that, now we have the data to look at the ones that were high growth, as opposed to those that weren't in a cohort. And be able to look at what was different about the ones that were high growth versus not.

But we've not, and we haven't really attempted to. But we would like to actually use that same registration data that Scott and his team were using to make those predictions. We would just like to use those as part of the input data for all the products that we produce. I think we had one down here --

MR. BUERSTATTE: Last question, sorry we've got to wrap it up. Sorry, Brian.
Ron, can you explain aside from the
data and the program itself, can you talk a
little bit about the public private partnership
that you have with Kauffman?

MR. JARMIN: Sure. I mean we, this
has been a long-term relationship that originally
started just as a way to do some research
projects. And then it sort of, you know, the
research was to build the original LBD. And then
--

MR. BUERSTATTE: LBD?

MR. JARMIN: The Longitudinal Business
Database.

So they, you know, they funded some,
we collaborated with some academics. They funded
basically the academic graduate students that
came in and assisted us with these projects.

And then we, you know, as we started
producing research outputs, people started
saying, well, you should actually produce public
use data files from those research projects.

And that's how this has kind of grown
and matured over time to where now there's almost
like a two-way relationship between us and
Kauffman in trying to build, you know, data that
informs folks about entrepreneurship, so.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Last one.

MEMBER REAMER: Okay, I'll be -- you
have used the LBD to evaluate federal programs
that support small business, the Manufacturing
Extension Partnership in particular. Can you
again, just give a thumbnail sketch of, and
you've worked out a methodology for doing it, how?

MR. JARMIN: Right, so I think we've
evaluated, you know, the MEP. We've evaluated
some SBA financing projects.

Basically, if, you know, the
government agency has information about the
treatments that it does out in the business
community. And they have the name and address of
the businesses that they work with. And maybe
hopefully something about they did with them.

We can link that to our data and then
have a control group type analysis to look at
whether the program had any beneficial impacts.
Or whether it was sort of a wash, so.

MR. BUERSTATTE: All right. Thanks so
much, Ron.

MR. JARMIN: All right, and thank you.

MR. BUERSTATTE: And thank you to our
other federal friends. It's great to hear from
you. And again, many of them are going to be
hanging around with us for the rest of today, so.

CO-CHAIR TANG: So, on behalf of the
Council, we want to thank David, John and Ron for
their presentations. And now we have a
discussion session from what I hear. And so let
me just tee-off by asking Council, what
opportunities does this bring to light, that we
might want to work on?

MEMBER REAMER: I had a conversation
with Craig and Melissa off-line, a couple days
ago about the potential, given the role of the
federal government in collecting statistics on
trepreneurship and innovation, given that even
within the Census Bureau it's either a number of
distinct programs -- but like Census collects
very little in its own right on innovation.

That's primarily funded by NSF --
there's an opportunity I think to look at the
breadth of federal data collection on innovation
and entrepreneurship and provided by some
feedback.

For instance, I raised with David
Langdon about the BEA, Small Business data
initiative and building small business account
satellites. It's something the BEA does.

So it's, there is a diverse set of
statistics and I think NACIE could say some
interesting things about what is useful to the
business community? What is useful for federal
data using agencies, like the SBA?

So I see this as a potential
opportunity.

MEMBER JOHNSON: I think that Trey,
and Joe, and myself should talk about how we can
maybe help the SBA?
When you talk about immigrating the SBDCs and accelerators, that's, you know, that's a self-cancelling phrase. But if you had -- I think we could come up with an idea of how through the networks, the kinds of footprints that we have between the three of us, and how, you know -- we all heard a few ideas that were thrown out. I think we could really help the SBA in that area.

MEMBER BOESCH: I know that one of the proposals is around some of those, some of the changes to the SBIR program, and the STTR. And I was wondering how those intersect with the needs that were brought up in the talk here? Are we already covering some of those in the current initiatives? Or are there gaps that we could look at taking up?

CO-CHAIR TANG: Yes, I'll start and then maybe David, or Tiffany can chime in here. They were very much aligned with where we left in NACIE 2.0. And so now it's a matter of reviving, I think, those issues so that they're not
expiring by the end of September of this year.

MEMBER BOESCH: And also just in terms of the kind of manufacturing support project that Emily and I have been working on, I think there's a lot of opportunity to help promote the apprenticeship program. And also, you know, think about how we can, you know, scale that, popularize that, get that in the hands of industry?

CO-CHAIR TANG: Okay, thank you.

Other thoughts or ideas?

MR. BUERSTATTE: One thought with respect to data, and thanks, Andrew, for bringing that up. We had some interesting conversations over the last few months. And so, we are one of roughly 60 advisory councils, believe it or not, here at Commerce. Many times, it's partially because many times when there is a unique specific policy issue, we will recruit federal advisors on specific challenges.

This one, on innovation and entrepreneurship is much more broadly focused.
And we cover a variety of universes here at Commerce. With that being said, we have a Data Advisory Council, we have a Digital Economy Advisory Council, and there's a number of other bodies that are looking at data with respect to their own unique industry, or silo, might be the wrong term.

But what I'm interested in on this piece, is there an opportunity where NACIE could really compile a broad spectra of data analysis, surveys, you name it, to elevate the study of entrepreneurship and innovation, and certain economic development impacts, and trends, and things that we should know?

Versus just one particular challenge like this survey. I think this is one of many opportunities that we could consider. And what I'm getting at is, think big.

You guys are direct advisors to the Secretary of Commerce. We want to make sure that we're spending time on things that are going to be really valuable for all 50 states and
territories, right?

So, I just wanted to plant that seed.

It's my initial response to the data discussion.

MEMBER REAMER: If I can respond to that? As you know, when we do a breakout, there will be conversation around the recommendation to the Secretary, to ask OIE to prepare a strategic plan. And then to have NACIE advise in that process.

So, if that goes forward, the Secretary approves that, I would imagine a starting point would be some assessment of the state of innovation and entrepreneurship in the U.S. And you do that on the basis of data.

So in that process, we will have an understanding of what the value, and the quality, and any gaps that there are in data systems. I can also imagine if the strategic planning process goes forward, that an element of that could be that OIE promote reliable, useful data on innovation and entrepreneurship through the federal government.
And if that were chosen, as an objective, then that would then lead to doing an inventory of what exits. And an assessment of quality and gaps, and or at least putting that on the strategic plan. It would be a, it's a long-term process clearly.

But it's, I think it would be useful for the Secretary's Office, and for OIE, and for NACIE to have a broad understanding of the pockets of data on innovation and entrepreneurship that reside in several places in Commerce, and several places outside of Commerce.

That while OIE reports to the Secretary, its scope mandated by Congress is government wide. And so, I think this is an important lift. And it's not a huge lift.

I mean it's going to take work. And it'll take some years, but it's all doable.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Thank you, Andrew.

Sign me up.

MEMBER KAPP: So kind of dovetailing off of what Richard said, I think that looking at
how we can review the array of resources that
exist across the Department of Commerce? And how
we can have them align to help potentially serve
as economic development/ecosystem developers in
rural communities?

I think when you look at urban
communities there's quite a bit more capacity.
And so there's not insignificant amount of
capacity building that needs to take place.

If you have SBDC coaches, and you have
sort of them, folks scattered across the region,
as opposed to potentially creating epicenters.
It creates disparate resources across a very
large area. And so potentially looking at how
the array of programs can be better assembled to
create epicenters of entrepreneurship and
innovation within rural communities?

MEMBER BAGLEY: Can I comment on the
rural, urban thing for a second? Because I have
a little bit of a different view on that.

I think that, so having worked at a
state level in Pennsylvania, you know, both with
rural and urban communities is where some of this understanding came from. As well as Nortec, you know, covered 21 counties.

And so I think it's just a different kind of capacity building. There's areas in which, you know, for instance in the urban communities like I now work in, you know, we have significant inclusion and opportunity challenges, right?

So the opportunities are not so, the capacity building may be in a slightly different area. Or when you're not in a place like Boston, or Silicone Valley, you know, your capacity to garner venture capital for instance.

So I'm not sure that it's rural versus urban capacity building, versus not. It depends on where you start. I think there's always opportunity to sort of build those things out. So I think we need to think about how do we match the right type of capacity building to the region or the area that's sort of works?

So I think when you talk about
underserved, you can sort of bring that across
either urban underserved, rural underserved. So
there's one sort of thing that ties together.
Just obviously very different strategies.

MEMBER REAMER: No, that's a good
point. Thank you for the clarification.

MEMBER BALDWIN: So I'm interested in
us defining measurable objectives. So we heard
that there's data. How are we going to use that
data? Or are we going to try and influence and
move something on that data? So that the next
survey we can see that we've had a direct result.

So as part of that strategic
discussion, you know, what are the measurable
objectives that we are trying to achieve?

And I think that as we go into the
breakout sessions, it would be excellent if we
could define how are going to measure our
success? What are our indicators? You know,
should we be reviewing that data to define what's
the top thing that we want to go after?

And come up with examples, you know,
that, you know, ten thousand unique hits on a certain website, or ten thousand underrepresented communities now have access. I'd really like to see us focus on the end vision.

MR. BUERSTATTE: I think that's a great question that we can tackle tomorrow during the Council framework discussion.

And as we move through today's conversations, and I think Eric's got a great relevant presentation coming up soon that will help communicate some of our near-term objectives. Or near-term action items and what this process looks like. And then we'll build to that tomorrow, I think.

MEMBER BALDWIN: Sure.

MEMBER BOESCH: I have one more. I'm particularly interested in how we have, almost like better market, and helped people go through the SBIR and SRRT programs? Both in universities and outside of those epicenters.

You know, I see all the time actually, you know, students or young entrepreneurs that
have things that I think would be very eligible for it. And things like having professional help on it at the university, or some simplification of those processes, I really think would help. Because I think it's an under-utilized resource and kind of outside of even, this area.

MEMBER NEMETH: So my thoughts on the SBIR. Sort of training and support, I think more aligned with Joe. And the concern that kind of centering in on some of the big universities turns off a lot of other entrepreneurs, and I'd say small businesses.

Like for instance in Ohio, are a bit envious of the resources that a big university already has. And so I'd be interested in us kind of exploring ways that if we're going to build a resource to help people go after SBIRs, that it's more accessible.

And then I'm not a data guy. I'm fascinated by it, but I would just throw out the other idea, that we're looking for a quick win. I'd love for there to some sort of investigation
or evaluation into the ever repeated statistic
that 90 percent of startups fail.

I think for someone on the outside, or
even for an entrepreneurship who's like, telling
his family member. Hey, I'm starting a new
business. And you have this like, bombardment of
you're going to fail. I don't know if that's
actually true.

And I, maybe it's even worse, who
knows. But I guess I would love to see some
greater support and consistency about what the
actual data is.

MEMBER BOWLES: I've got a couple of
thoughts. One, specifically around this process
of cataloging or bringing together the different
data sources that are existing across Commerce.

And first maybe looking at, has there
been any other governmental department that's had
to do something like this before? And maybe get
some learnings from them on how that was done?

How that was sort of aggregated?

And then second of all, I would say,
I think that we need to really recognize the different parties that have to be included to effectively grab this type of information, at both a macro- and micro-level.

There's an organization that exists, called the Startup Champions Network, which is sort of a continuation of Steve Cases' Startup America Partnership. And those are, and they're combined.

They're doing data analysis now and combining macro levels information that we're getting. Or something that a Kauffman could get with actual ecosystem innovators that are operating those specific locations.

And so they're getting truly micro data from the ground level, having sit with these companies, they can turn around and say that company doesn't exist anymore, that company does.

And builds a trust amongst that community to able to pull out that kind of information. But I think that public, private partnership model is something that's going to be
exceptionally important in identifying who those stakeholders need to be, to effectively pull out a cross stitch of that data to create the most robust and accurate source of data for the purposes of what we're trying to do.

MEMBER BAGLEY: I think just one other, a quick addition to that is RIAN, the Regional Innovation Acceleration Network too, I think would have, you know, be able to collect some of that data or has it. I'm not sure, Craig, but --

MR. BUERSTATTE: Yes, there's some work there. What I hear though is making data actionable. And Trey, to you point, what's been done before as far as cataloging? And let's not reinvent the wheel.

This is somewhat new for government. Its open data initiative, and building better data resources internally to share and inform our constituents. This has been a big undertaking for the last four, five, six years. So I don't know if we'll have a ton of resources to look at
and compare that are going to be apples to apples.

But clearly there's something more for us to discuss here.

MEMBER BOWLES: And just thinking specifically about the questions that a federal organization or agency would ask versus the questions an entrepreneur would ask another entrepreneur. It has to be the relevancy of the data.

I mean sure there's some data that an entrepreneur is not really going to care about that may be really important to the different areas inside of Commerce. And I think that made sense.

But really being able to empathize with the plight of an entrepreneur to ask the right questions to be able to determine the best way to support, and respond to that moving forward is a really important piece that we need to consider.

Because entrepreneurs speak a
different language that they all understand. And so I think making sure that those sorts of people are at the table helping design, you know, the data that's being collected. And also helping to interpret the data that's being brought in will be important for I think, the efficacy of the project, if we were to do that.

MEMBER REAMER: Trey raises a point about the, kind of the new frontier of data collection in the federal government. Because of advances in information technology the ability to grab data collected by the private sector and add it to, integrate it with the federal data to produce data that are enhanced.

So, and that's something we can look at. So just, I'll give a couple examples. Federal government for decades has done a monthly retail trade survey. Every month it surveys retail establishments.

They're beginning to, they've developed a relationship I think with Visa to start grabbing some of the charge card data. And
reducing the burden on businesses. And so
enhancing the quality expending the sample.

There is a private, at the University
of Michigan has developed a consortium of
universities to measure the impact of federally
funded R&D on the economy. Right now there is a
consortium of maybe 40 universities. They all,
they pool their data.

And they have an arrangement with the
Census Bureau. So they're pooling their data,
and it includes names of the people, the
principle investigators and the graduate students
who worked on projects. And Michigan is hiring
Census to track what happens to those people
using that LEHD database that Ron mentioned.

So you can say, so people involved in
these federally funded --

(Off the record comment.)

MR. BUERSTATTE: Robin, can you say
again, please?

Robin, this is Craig, are we coming in
clear? We'll continue driving on at this point.
MEMBER REAMER: Anyway, the point is that there's some things, there's a new frontier around using existing records from outside the government, integrating them to produce better statistics.

MEMBER FREDERICK: For what it's worth, I think that's opening up a lot of opportunity. I think I've mentioned this in the past. And we're willing to work closely with companies, like CareerBuilder, Headhunter.

I mean there's so many new data sources. I think there will be a willingness from industry to aggregate and share some of this data, which can be, it gives you a, I think it's the strength of signals is so much better. And it's so much wider.

MEMBER W. SMITH: At JP Morgan Chase we started a new research emphasis last year that's aggregating transactions of our --

(Off the record comment.)

MEMBER W. SMITH: Should I go ahead?

MR. BUERSTATTE: We're down.
MEMBER W. SMITH: -- of our client's.
Looking at particularly small businesses and
doing local commerce profiles. And we've had
lots of inquiries from the federal government.
So it's just another, yes.

(Off the record comment.)

MEMBER BAGLEY: I was going to say, I
dothink the main point though is the one that
Esther brought up earlier. And we've been sort
of commiserating over here, which is data for
data sake.

It's like what's the purpose of the
data? And then that starts to drive like, you
know, the outcomes that you were talking about,
Esther was talking about. So I think, you know,
we need to decide what are we trying to
accomplish? And then what data can actually
enable us to push towards those accomplishments?

And then there's tons of data sets and

(Off the record comment.)

MR. BUERSTATTE: Real quickly, we
spent a lot of time on entrepreneurship, and some
innovation, and SBIR, and grants and whatnot. I
don't want to overlook the skills and
apprenticeship. There's a lot of questions,
seemed like a lot of energy earlier in that
presentation.

Any thoughts on that from anyone?

MEMBER S. SMITH: Well, we're going to
have to figure that out for industry, how to
engage industry? I think is the biggest
challenge. And really when I talk to companies,
and I talk to them every day, and we talk about
apprenticeship. It's, you know, what's in it for
me? How is this going to benefit me?

And you have to answer that question
very well. Yesterday, I talked to a company,
Cummins, who said, that for every $10,000 they
invest, they get $200,000 back in return. And
they've done the numbers, and figured that out.

So, I think if we can show those kinds
of examples, you know, we'll have a better
opportunity to engage industry. But I do think
that incentivizing that, has got to be something that we discuss at length and have a proposal to put forward.

MR. BUERSTATTE: On the engaging industry piece, Sue, one thing that is amplified around here, Commerce is, Commerce is America's voice for business. So I think that's a role that might be an opportunity for us as far as messaging and amplifying.

If we're to be their voice, where are the opportunities there? And how can we better communicate that?

MEMBER S. SMITH: Yes, I think as you know, again, we have to be able to show return on investment. So we have to be that voice.

The other thing that, you know, there's also this supply and demand side. We've got to be able to recruit folks into these careers. And that's a big challenge for industry too. So if we can not only figure out how to incentivize the apprenticeship programs, and get industry to value those? Then we have to figure
out how to get potential employees to value those?

So how do we recruit folks into those apprenticeship programs and show them as -- you know, in Europe they're just as important as any sort of doctoral position there. You know, any sort of medical position and if we can sell that same importance here, then I think that we'll be successful. But that's I think how Commerce could help.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: I was just going to ask in the vain of partnerships and data, if to the extent possible, you could share the conference information? Is there something that we should be thinking about in terms of learning more? Or having a role in sharing a voice?

MEMBER W. SMITH: Yes, I can't remember the dates off-hand. But I'll send them so you can distribute them. But this rose up out of lots of activity happening in states and communities to try to diversify the sectors, and the businesses in those sectors that were using
apprenticeship models.

So as was talked about, when you get the reaction from the Japanese companies it's, you know, in the U.S. it's been traditionally labor sponsored programs in the building trades. And that's really starting to change, partly because the Department of Labor has pushed out a lot of money, but states have gotten on board, et cetera.

So, this is going to be the first National Conference that we're aware of that many funders came around the table. And it's going to have a policy dimension. There are a number of policy groups involved but it's mostly practitioner focused.

So there will be industry there, and community colleges, and other intermediaries that are stepping in where labor traditionally has played the role of putting these apprenticeship programs together. There are now chambers and others doing that. And they'll be there too, so I will share more information.
I will say, as long as I have the mic, and that's okay. One of my observations in looking the materials beforehand, and then hearing the separate conversations, is this continual kind of silo between the skills and the small business and innovation world.

And now that I'm in a space where I am investing in both ecosystems, I'm thinking a lot about how to bring them together? So there are experiments around the country of trying to bring the publicly funded workforce development system closer to the small business centers and technical assistance.

There are the CDFIs in the community that are trying to think about how do you promote not just job creation, but job quality? And how do you do that? And how do you create advancement opportunities?

I would love, maybe it's in the Skills Committee, which I'm going to later, but to think about more integration of the conversation we're having here.
MEMBER BALDWIN: So I just wanted to
poke on what one of the presenters gave to us,
and that was the cost of patents. If you look at
innovators and entrepreneurs they typically
provide a unique value proposition. And in the
absence of barriers, are able to grow. And one
of those barriers is the cost of patents.

I mean I know that even large
companies, incredibly innovative employees submit
many, many invention disclosure forms that are
then reviewed by committees. And a very small
portion of those are taken through the process
because of the high cost.

And so if we have small median
enterprises, small businesses, that are facing
that barrier, what can we do to reduce the
barrier? Because that really does impact America
COMPETES, because he who owns the intellectual
property, owns the rights to grow that business,
so.

(Off the record comment.)

MR. BUERSTATTE: Go ahead, Orin.
MEMBER HERSKOWITZ: Just I don't, if we're touching on patents. Yes, I mean unfortunately a lot of the cost of patents, the most significant cost of getting to a patent is not the fees in the Patent Office, but rather the attorneys you have to pay to get the patents.

So I'm not sure the government has, at least on the expense side, I'm not sure that the government has the tools to be able to reduce those costs.

But if at some point, the discussion of intellectual property would be interesting. Like the IPR process I would argue is actually more the sort of, the IPR provisions, the post-grant review provisions in the AIA, do more fundamental damage to undermining the interest and the ability to get strong patents that are useful for small businesses, than the costs. But --

MEMBER NEMETH: Wasn't the context though that you can use SBIR funds to cover your patent costs?
MEMBER HERSKOWITZ: Oh, if --

MEMBER NEMETH: I think that's where
that came from.

MEMBER HERSKOWITZ: Yes, I see what
you mean. So not on general, but specifically,
about whether you could use government funding to
offset those costs?

MEMBER NEMETH: Specifically SBIR funds.

MEMBER HERSKOWITZ: Didn't he say that
those were not renewed?

MEMBER NEMETH: No, I think what he
said was, currently, and expiring in September of
this year, there is an allowance. But it expires
if we don't renew it.

MEMBER HERSKOWITZ: Patent is an
opportunity to still --

MEMBER NEMETH: Correct.

MEMBER HERSKOWITZ: I see.

CO-CHAIR TANG: This is part of the
work that NACIE 2.0 did on that exact issue.

But it solves part of the issue, but
Esther is right. It's not the bigger issue. How do you create ways that small companies can actually pursue and prosecute their patents?

And maybe, we had a session in 2.0 with USPTO. Maybe that's something we can tee up a little later?

MR. BUERSTATTE: Yes, I hope there's been some good seeds planted today. But we also are realistic about, remember our December meeting where I think we discussed 13 different opportunities. And I know my NACIE 2.0 alum know all too well that focus is the key to success.

So hopefully some of this, if it's new, it can better inform us on some of the current ongoing discussions. And, or if we need to park something or re-orient as well, and focus in a new direction. That's great as well.

I will highlight Whitney's comments on the best opportunities come from merging all of these efforts. If, I don't know if Marie or Tiff, or Steve want to comment on that.

I'll offer up one quick example for
the team, which might setup Eric's presentation on how this process works. And one of them that really hit on all three cylinders, I thought, was when the Council engaged with Secretary Pritzker on the TechHire Initiative.

So we know that there is a demand for high tech skills right now. And real quick, by a show of hands, how many people are familiar with the TechHire Program?

Okay, a decent majority. So this was the Obama Administration's effort to elevate the importance of training, or in some cases, retraining, some of our citizens in the tech industry. Especially in communities that are growing their tech clusters.

So they're not having to pull expensive talent from other regions and recruit them in, but rather let's build that internally. So we're building those skills, building that talent pipeline. Infusing into the innovation ecosystems, into these tech firms, so these tech firms can remain competitive locally.
Secretary Pritzker engaged in a round table with NACIE Members in San Francisco. We took those learnings back here to D.C. And initiated a number of discussions with Department of Labor, Education and the White House to better inform our next steps with that program.

So again, I think that was a great example of an initiative driven by the Council, that hit on all cylinders. It was powerful for those communities and I think TechHires now maybe roughly in 70 or 80 communities. So really penetrated the U.S. and moving forward with getting new skills to new populations that are going to be relevant for tomorrow, while helping our firms.

Any other thoughts, Marie, or anyone?

Okay, actually so with that said, so that was a recommendation. It started right here around the round table. There's an opportunity to do something here and recommend a solution, or an idea to the Secretary of Commerce.

How that happens? Eric Smith is going
to walk us through some thoughts and strategies. Mainly because this is something that we've heard from many of you over the last few months. Received a lot of individual questions about expectations and goals. Eric, take it away.

MR. SMITH: Thanks.

MEMBER REICHERT: Eric, can I ask a question? While you're going through what you're going to go through, can you talk about that in context of the proposals that we've already put together?

And what the expectations around the groups that we were all sent in, and had an initial call? What, how does that fit into the process?

MR. SMITH: Yes, I think that will become clear but if it doesn't let me know and I'll address it separately.

So, I was going to call this a short detour into a fractally complex federal bureaucracy, but that seemed sort of, you know, not very appetizing.
So life cycle recommendation, so but as you all develop these recommendations, you know, why are doing it? And I wanted to sort of just go back to first principles on that.

So, you know, this is straight from the statute. Recovering lawyer, so I like to quote from the statute. But, you know, innovation and the commercialization of new technologies, that's what you all are here to do. That's the recommendations that we're looking for.

And there's actually only one thing NACIE can do, and that's provide advice. It's its one power. And so I think one thing to keep that, just keep that in the forefront of your mind.

There is a lot of power in that advice. And the fact that you are providing that advice directly to the Secretary of Commerce. But that's really what you do is you're providing advice.

And that can take a lot of different
forms. You've seen some of this in the Workgroup calls that you've setup so far. You know, it can be broad policy recommendations. It can be recommendations to change specific programs. You can recommend research and reports. Or you can actually conduct some research and reports.

One example of that was when David, and Tiff, and Steve, and some of the other Members last time were working on the SBIR, STTR recommendations.

David, you had done the call for information from some of the SBIR participants, some of the applicants and grantees, or awardees I guess. And also some of the state programs managers I think to get an idea of, you know, what the community was looking for? What the gaps were? And what they thought about some of the recommendations that we had?

And tangential to that, the outreach and socialization, part of the reason that we selected all of you is not just for your expertise, but also for the people that you know.
The networks that you have, and your ability to
get the message out. And to also bring
information in.

Sort of as David Langdon was talking
about earlier, Commerce is the voice of business.
And that channel goes both ways. So, something
to keep in mind.

Another thing that, you know, you all
can do is get other people to agree with you, and
in writing. You know, one of the things that the
first NACIE did was put together a recommendation
on innovative and entrepreneurial university.

And I think they ended up with
something like 130 or 140 universities that
signed a letter, signing on to this report and a
set of proposals that were in the report.

So there are a lot of different forms
of that advice that you give, can take. But, you
know, I think ultimately what it boils down to is
you're providing advice.

Once you give the advice, there's a
lot that we have to do on the backend, before
that gets implemented. So we had sent out a memo on this. And I thought, you know, just a sort of slide design would be to put all of the text of the memo on this page.

(Laughter.)

MR. SMITH: And read it to you directly. Maybe not. So instead, we got a diagram. Maybe not super easy to see. But essentially this is the path that a recommendation takes. And ultimately, I think the thing to focus on right now, because this is approximately where we're going to be, is the NACIE vote.

I think there are one or two recommendations tomorrow that you may all vote on, depending on how the Workgroup sessions go this evening. And that's sort of the first real decision point as to where we are now. You've already decided to pursue these. The Workgroups have been working on them.

And so, you might vote, no. I think that's probably unlikely, given the fact that
you've all worked on this for a while. But you
might vote no. You might vote, yes. And if you
vote, yes, that's sort of where our work as OIE
starts. Well, not starts but continues on,
without you for a little while.

So we package that recommendation,
which is usually a letter signed by the Co-Chairs
and maybe some supplementary material into a
briefing document for the Secretary. And then we
present that to the Secretary. And the Secretary
then approves or disapproves that.

And that's sort of depicted here as a
simple yes, no. But often times will involve
something much more than that. So perhaps we've
identified three Commerce Bureaus, or you all
have identified three different Commerce Bureaus
that would be involved in the implementation of
this recommendation.

Probably going to consult with those
bureaus, and with the bureau heads, and some of
their programmatic staff to think about
feasibility and, you know, whether or not there's
legislative authority to do this? And what would actually go into implementing these recommendations?

And then once that feedback has gotten back to the Secretary, that's going to enable her or him to make a decision on whether or not to approve the recommendation. And that will come along with some sort of action.

And so a simple example, or I guess one that's in front of you could be the Capital convenings effort, where the recommendation says, you know, EDA should, under this authority that already exists, implement a grant program that brings folks together in the Capital communities and certain regions across the U.S.

So that might just be EDA, implement this grant program using the authority that you have. And that would be the implementation of that recommendation. And so, you know, we would be given that direction.

Another thing that, you know, might happen is with respect to, I think going back to
the SBIR example, you know, maybe providing that advice to other agencies. So some of those recommendations were legislative in nature. Others of them, were recommendations that could have been implemented by the SBIR agencies, under the authority that existed with respect to, you know, streamlining some of their processes.

And that could take the form of the Commerce Secretary not only telling its own SBIR programs, hey, you should implement these. But also a ten other SBIR awarding agencies, you should consider these recommendations to improve commercialization outcomes from your program.

So there are a lot of different ways that these things get implemented on the backend. But I think it's worth keeping in mind. And kind of the point of all this is to say that, you're going to give advice. And it may take quite a while before it gets implemented.

And we're going to give you updates on how those things are progressing. We're going to let you know what's happening on the backend at
each of these quarterly meetings. And on Workgroup calls in the interim. But it's good just to keep in mind that this life cycle is pretty long, and reasonably complex from a bureaucratic standpoint.

And we just want to let you all know that. That this is how it works. And this is a timing expectation setting.

So here are some examples and I don't want to read through this, but here are some examples of what the operating units can do, and what the action may take.

These are things that are going to depend on each specific recommendation. It might be that, you know, you should increase the budget for a certain program. And if so, there's a process through which Commerce and all the other agencies submit budget information up to the Office of Management and Budget, and the President, and that gets sent to Congress.

So that's, you know, one avenue you might have to make policy. Or to make policy
recommendations. Some of the others we've already discussed. But this is just something to keep in mind as the universe of tools that are available to us to implement your policy.

And you can, you know, recommend specific implementation tactics or not, as you see fit. And as you think makes the most sense given whatever your recommendation happens to be.

So with all that being said, have fun. But hopefully quick enough detour into that bureaucracy. Questions? Andrew.

MEMBER REAMER: What's the Secretary's accept-reject ratio of recommendations?

MR. SMITH: I think I will say having only operated one round of this our self, and not having been around for the first iteration of this. And it having operated in a very different way, I don't think that that's, it's not good data. So I wouldn't want to say at this point.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: So recognizing the life cycle could take a while, and we're at an interesting point. Maybe not just for you being
from 2.0. We give advice, but we're not excluded from activities. And so what is that balance of us advancing some of these ideas?

Particularly if we're able to find third party commitment or is that discouraged?
And are there examples in 2.0 where while you might have been waiting, there was something else you could be doing?

MR. SMITH: I mean I think, I think maybe the best example or the best way to frame it from my perspective is that, you know, going back to your outreach and your networks. Building consensus, getting ideas, refining the recommendations through those channels, I think is really valuable and helps to build the momentum behind those recommendations.

And it acts as a validator. So, you know, as it's going through the internal vetting process I think that's really powerful.

MEMBER WILSON: Yes, and I think, don't underestimate the role that we can play in our communities. That not everything has to
happen on a federal level.

And so what's been a great experience for me in 2.0 is every time I left this meeting I was, you know, energized, brainstorming, and kind of took that back to Atlanta to see what are things I can do and influence my own community?

That kind of feeds into the outreach, but that exercise of doing that isn't kind of talking about NACIE, it's just talking about the community. So really balancing, keeping NACIE here, but then doing stuff in your own community just within the context of what you do.

MR. BUERSTATTE: On going back to your community, Tiff, I know you, David and many others took deliberate action on behalf of NACIE as an official member in your community for the SBIR effort. And this might help answer your question, Melissa.

And how they did that was, their first step in that process was voting that as a body we would take official action to survey stakeholders on behalf of the Department of Commerce to better
inform us on tactics, to improve the SBIR program.

So, which technically as an Advisory Council, you can't do that because that's not advising -- well, you're getting advice, but you're taking action. You're in the field, you're representing Commerce, so that was a proposal made to the Secretary of Commerce that NACIE proposes as a body they would do x, y, and z, to survey, engage, et cetera.

So that's a type of activity that could absolutely be done, but there's still a process and a submission for it. So to your point, Melissa, how can we rally third parties? How can we generate partnerships? I think absolutely informally, but also formally we can do it. And I think sometimes it's helpful to do it formally because we then get the advantage of the podium.

MEMBER WILSON: Okay, historical answer and then a question. One thing I was going to mention is that I think one of the
things that we learned along too was, sometimes
we had ideas where we had individual interests.
And there were things we could attach to here,
you know, in D.C. that we would then find out
more information, which would then change what
our recommendation maybe started.

So I think some patience with actually
utilizing our own relationships and involvement
with things to see. That's something we thought
as a recommendation actually wasn't that same
type of recommendation. So I think being engaged
in just our work was helpful. So that's one
piece.

The other thing I just had as a
question, your comment about this being one of 60
councils. And I apologize if this was mentioned
before I came in, but did you share, or could you
share at all about, you know, have there been any
briefings to the new Secretary of Commerce about
the 60 councils and our existence. And can you
give any perspective on that?

MR. BUERSTATTE: Yes, absolutely. So
we participated in the transition briefings, like so many other agencies. And we did send up a lot of information about the work that Marie, you did on 2.0 and what we've done thus far with the new Council.

So, the new team is well aware. There was a formal transition process. The transition team that worked for, between the period of the election and the inauguration is now no longer here. And we are now, Commerce is now receiving new political appointees, which will be the leaders. So there's a separation between the transition team and the inbound new, political appointees.

But they are absolutely aware, and to the second part of the question, where we might compare with the other 60, I'd say that we've actually been on the radar because of this meeting. So I think we did a good thing with being aggressive and continuing forward, and getting this on the calendar.

I'm not sure if we had any visitors
today, but I am expecting participation, at some point during our, during the next 24 hours from some of the new senior policy team. So right now, I think we're about internally in Commerce, there's roughly 30 to 35 appointees here. And that's a 47,000 person agency. So we're just getting it started.

As we know, the Secretary nominee, Mr. Ross, I'm not sure if he's been confirmed yet, as of today. I'm seeing shaking heads, so confirmation has not happened. But once that milestone happens, I'm expecting an increase of politicals onboarding.

It's about as detailed as I can be right now.

MEMBER STEVENSON: It is possible to see any of the recommendations coming out of the Councils, to see where there might be opportunities for alignment of interest?

MR. BUERSTATTE: Yes, absolutely. We do our best. I'll say that we are, again, we are unique in the fact we're one, very few that
bridge to the administration. So most councils are vacant right now.

But as those develop, there are particular ones that we've collaborated with before. I mentioned the Digital Economy Advisory Board, the Data Advisory Board, there's a manufacturing one that we want keep a strong pulse on. And there's probably a few more in that list I'm forgetting.

But ultimately what we like to do, is collaborate and elevate. So we're certainly looking for opportunities to bring in consultations with the manufacturing team, with the digital economy team, and so on and so forth.

So I think that the more we can bring the community together, the better.

MEMBER REAMER: From the perspective of the 2.0 veterans and the staff, can you enlighten us newbies regarding the wins that you saw coming out of 2.0? Looking at Eric's list of possible actions, recommendations, outreach and so forth, just the veteran's, the two or three
MEMBER KENNEY: I'll respond to it, totally on SBIR recommendations because most of the recommendations we made were not things that Commerce could implement on its own. Or even really at all. It has two small SBIR programs of the 11 agencies. NOAA and NIST have the smallest SBIR programs, but the overwhelming majority of SBIR activity happens from a funny perspective at nine other agencies. And SBA controls a lot of the central coordination activities.

And so the recommendations we made were sort of, you know, have a way of publicly declaring, you know, hey, this group thinks these would be good things for the federal government to do. Some of which require Congressional action, some of which we need to be implemented, you know, independently at Department of Defense, or Energy, or elsewhere.

And but what I've seen, since we made those recommendations, there was a document that
came out in the last couple months that was ITIF, one of the other former NACIE Council Member's recommendations to the Trump Administration. Here's what you all should do to promote ideas for innovation and entrepreneurship.

Right in the middle, you know, was much broader set of recommendations, but right in there where, you know, almost word for word, in some cases, word for word, what we wrote. The recommendations that got picked up and were a part of, and that wasn't done as a NACIE activity but they took our material and used it.

Similarly, SSTI, Innovation Advocacy Council had a Hill day yesterday, and we were sharing a policy document which includes some recommendations. And I'm part of that separate from my NACIE role, and it includes some of the same SBIR recommendations as well that were lifted basically straight out of the NACIE recommendations.

And, you know, that's been carried on into some of the work that both NACIE Members
individually, in other capacities, and other organizations have used.

And it's not like our recommendations were like original ideas, and we're the first ones to think of these. A lot of time these were things that others had already been saying, or and we were kind of just amplifying recommendations that others had been making as well.

That's just an example.

MEMBER REAMER: Are there other examples?

MEMBER WILSON: Hey, I was just going to give a practical, slightly different type of example. You heard about at the first meeting, which was, we'd come up with the idea of community exchanges where we were going to different cities to be able to see the best practices in different locations.

And that was something that happened kind of organically. At one of our meetings, where we'd done that national, and then we were
able to -- there was energy, what, you know, Craig and I have talked about this a lot.

When there's energy, when you have few people who really found value in it. There's a group of us just ran with it and started to create it. And Craig's energy kept bringing it back here, which ultimately ended up, you know, leading to the conclusion.

But we did two or three of those that we just kind of organically did on our own and then they became part of report out to NACIE. So I think that's more of a pragmatic versus a policy area where, you know, if we have something else that we're finding that's of value that we can do on our own, you certainly, we have the energy of the group to do that.

CO-CHAIR TANG: I would just add a couple things. Andrew, so other examples. The Secretary took our recommendation on Measures of Innovation and I think commissioned within Commerce further exploration there.

There was an early issue about the use
of foreign profits to be repatriated to the U.S.
To be devoted towards innovation. This is part
of the -- you've heard this before because it's
being discussed with this administration in terms
of infrastructure -- and I think she ordered some
work to be done to look at the economic stats,
because that's really a treasury issue and not a
Commerce issue. So they were directed in the
right direction I think for further study.

One additional point to what David
said, just to be clear is, is you saw on Eric's
chart that there is no allowance for a NACIE
recommendations and official NACIE business to be
discussed on Capitol Hill, right? However, I
think the pivot point that David is talking about
is that we took the NACIE recommendations and
then as individuals, meaning -- and this is what
Tiff means by community -- going back to our
community and then were able to actually craft
the legislation which has ultimately went as far
as committee approval.

So, there are some official and there
are some stealth ways that NACIE works. And a lot of it had to do with the alignment of interests. I mean, David had done some excellent work. Tiff had done some excellent work, Michael Burham, Rohit Shukla, and then my team all came together on this issue.

So I think it can work is some really interesting ways outside of the official chart I think that Eric showed.

MEMBER REAMER: It sounds like a conclusion is that NACIE can get into a community organizer in a certain kind of way.

CO-CHAIR TANG: I would say, I don’t think I would say it that way. I would say those around the table can get involved in community activities.

MEMBER REAMER: That’s what I mean before.

MEMBER BOESCH: I think, one thing I might want to talk about, not now, but later is like what are the specific processes by which, you know, what you do in your community then kind
of makes its way more into these legislative
recommendations?

I had a really practical question on
in terms of the, outside of the official
recommendations, you know, two things that I'm,
you know, certainly interested in doing. One of
them is, you know, promoting things locally that
I see and hear about here.

Another is that a lot of the proposal
recommendations that we've been making do require
some up front research and outreach to people,
you know, some need finding. And so, you know,
do we need to do that officially, or
unofficially? Like where does that border line
go between what I'm doing as an individual,
either to work on researching a recommendation,
or on kind of promoting something, and what I
should do officially?

MR. SMITH: Yes, I mean, those
activities are fine. I think where you start to
get into a gray area is where you start to, where
you're representing yourself as acting on behalf
of NACIE.

You know, if you're going to do research for a recommendation that's fine. If you're going to distribute this information, or the recommendations that are made here, that's fine.

But if you go start to act on behalf of NACIE, but without having gone through the process and gotten the approval of NACIE, then that's where you get into the problem area.

MR. BUERSTATTE: So, maybe this is too brash of me to say, but as the entrepreneur in the eyes of the, there's no better way to learn, than do, right? So we can belabor the process discussion for as long we want here.

Government is huge, we're trying to move the Titanic, quite literally, so that's why I thank you, Eric, for the great points on the expectations. There's going to be some lead time to develop these efforts in a meaningful manner.

But let's learn by doing. You've got some amazingly talented staff. We've worked
through some really complex issues the last few years with this Council. And we'll be with you all the way.

So, on that note, before we transition into public comment, I did want to introduce a new Member of our staff, Ms. Shannon Rhoten. John Williams, from SBA mentioned her.

Shannon is with us. She is a Presidential Management Fellow, and what's neat about Shannon is she is the embodiment of everything that we're trying to do here with NACIE, and OIE, and better integrating entrepreneurship innovation across governments.

So, Shannon, no pressure but can you just give us a quick run-down of all the rotations that you've done thus far? It's pretty neat.

MS. RHOTEN: Sure, so, thank you. So I started SDA about 17 months ago as a Presidential Manager Fellow. So I started it off in John and Agnes' shop, at the Office of Investment and Innovation. And then I moved on
to work on some grant programs in our Office of Veterans Business Development. So trying to increase capital with the veterans who are starting up businesses.

And then I moved on to our Office of Entrepreneurial Development where I worked with our Strategic Initiatives Team, so trying to put together ScaleUp America, Lean for Main Street, things of this sort.

I also worked with our Office of Women's Business Ownership on trying to get out this year's iteration of the InnovateHER competition. And then I moved on to work with our Chief Operating Officer. So I've been a little bit of everywhere.

And now I'm here with the OIE team. And I'll be here until the end of May, at which point I will go back to OII, over at SBA.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Excuse me, I wanted to highlight that because just welcoming Shannon to the team for the next few months. And she's going to be leading a few of our policy efforts.
But two birds, one stone, Shannon's really talented and we're lucky to have her on the team. But also like I said, she just ran down four or five offices that we probably should be collaborating with, and learn more about. And we will throughout the next few years.

so again, this is a process. We'll get there. There's a lot of opportunity, so please be patient and ask questions along the way. We've got a bunch of time together over the next two days.

I'll transition to the public comment at this point. And I know we have a guest speaker. Do we have, oh, Emily Liner is up there. She's a Senior Policy Advisor with Third Way. Emily was kind enough to distribute some research that she's done on access to capital.

We did include that in the pre-reading if you got through it. This is Emily's report. Emily could you give us few insights of your own?

MS. LINER: Sure. Thank you so much. My name is Emily Liner. As Craig mentioned, I'm a
Senior Policy Advisor in the Economic Program at
Third Way, which is a think tank here in
Washington D.C.

Thanks for the opportunity to speak
here today. I'd like to also thank Andrew Reamer
for bringing this to my attention today. It's
actually serendipitous timing to be giving some
of, this presentation because I use the Annual
Survey of Entrepreneurs in some of the research
that I conducted, that you have in front of you.

So like NACIE, Third Way is interested
in supporting innovation and entrepreneurship.
We regularly engage with policy makers on these
issues. And we are actively working on policy
and research related to 21st century jobs in the
face of economic change caused by automation and
globalization.

We are also concerned by some signs
that indicate that it is getting harder for
Americans to start new businesses. As you may
know, the share of new businesses in the U.S.
economy has fallen from 13 percent in 1980, to
eight percent in 2014.

In previous Third Way research, we noted that bank lending to small businesses has not returned to pre-crisis levels.

Today I'm here to talk to you about our latest research, about the state of access to venture capital, or VC. To be published in our fourth coming report titled, America's Got Talent, Venture Capital Needs to Find it.

And as Craig mentioned, you should all have printed copies. I'm also happy to distribute electronic copies later on.

So on the surface, venture capital looks robust. In 2015, VC firms invested $59.1 billion into American startups. The highest level since 2000. Below the surface however, we find that three groups of entrepreneurs are underserved by the VC industry.

One, entrepreneurs outside of the four largest VC hub cities. Two, women, African American, and Hispanic entrepreneurs. And three, entrepreneurs in non-tech industries.
First, the geographic distribution of VC has become extremely concentrated over the last two decades. In 1995, about half of VC funding went to the four metro areas of Silicone Valley, New York, Boston, and Los Angeles.

In 2015, it was 78 percent, leaving just 22 percent for the rest of America. Five states received no venture capital funding at all, including West Virginia, of which I know there's a Member here today. And my home state of Mississippi.

The urban centers skew the appearance of the overall proportion of venture capital investment to output. While the average ratio of VC-to-GDP in the United States in 2015 was about one third of one percent, only four states actually had an above average ratio of VC investment to state output. Meaning that 46 states and D.C. had a below average ratio.

Second, we use recently released data from the 2014 Annual Survey of Entrepreneurs to look at gender and racial gaps in access to
venture capital.

Our analysis of firms under two years old that receive venture capital, finds that only two percent were black owned. Six percent were solely Hispanic owned. And 13 percent were solely female owned.

Another way to look at this is the likelihood that an individual who is part of a group of startup founders, receive VC funding. And we found that the likelihood of white entrepreneurs, white entrepreneurs were 18 percent more likely than black entrepreneurs to receive venture capital.

Non-Hispanic entrepreneurs were 29 percent more likely than Hispanic entrepreneurs. And male entrepreneurs were 119 percent more likely than female entrepreneurs. So more than twice as likely to receive venture capital funding.

Finally, tech receives a disproportionate share of venture capital. According to the ASE, 15 percent of U.S.
businesses would be considered either information
or professional, scientific, and technical
services. But 27 percent of the firms that
reported VC funding belong to these two
categories.

In sum, we believe that these
underserved groups demonstrate that venture
capital isn't being allocated as widely and
efficiently as it could be. I look forward to
hearing your comments about our findings. And
your policy ideas that can help all of America's
entrepreneurs access this important source of
funding. Thank you.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Emily, I think that
validates what the Community Convening Group is
doing. Tiff, and leading on how to rally capital
resources to underserved markets. This is an
effort that NACIE 2.0, so the last Council was
working on. And is now transitioning. I think
we're excited to have soft commits.

A quick update to the full Council
there, we do have soft commits from SBA and
Treasury to do a joint funding opportunity with EDA, which would bring together key capital resource stakeholders at the local level.

So again, these are focused on communities that aren't urban hubs, as you said, Emily. And make the networks and connections relevant, or necessary to get that capital to more entrepreneurs. Or in some cases, get the training and mentorship to those entrepreneurs so that they're ready and able for real venture funding.

So that's often the case as we've learned where in those markets where it's not about the capital resources, but it's about the quality of business. And the entrepreneurs' readiness for real venture. So, Tiff, anything to add there?

(Off the record comment.)

MEMBER REAMER: Emily, thank you for that. Where does Third Way want to go with its study? What's your vision for how to address this issue?
MS. LINER: Thank you for asking. So first, we wanted to just bring attention to these trends to policy makers. And make them aware of the difficulties that these three underserved groups face.

We do highlight a few policy proposals in this report. One, is Equity Crowd Funding which was recently enacted by the Securities and Exchange Commission. Another is the SSBCI program that's run through the Treasury Department. That unfortunately may be ending this year.

And then we also talk about private sector initiatives that can work as well. But I think that, you know, there is no silver bullet to addressing these entrepreneurship gaps. And the wider variety of initiatives that government and private sector can undertake, the better we'll be able to increase entrepreneurship.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Thanks, Emily. And to keep things moving, we just have a short time for public comments. As of this time I do not
have the records of other public members wishing
to make a comment, but I will open the line.

Robin, is there anyone on the line
that has signaled they want to make a comment?

(Off the record comment.)

MR. BUERSTATTE: Great, thanks so
much, Robin.

So we will wrap up very shortly with
the Co-Chair remarks, but I do see that my brave
boss has come in to get beat up my NACIE Members.

Mr. Tom Guevara, Tom did you want to make any
comments?

Tom is the Deputy Assist Secretary for
Regional Affairs and currently performing duties
as the Assistance Secretary for the Economic
Development Administration. I try to say that
five times as fast, and I failed.

But Tom's got a lot of stuff on his
plate. Thanks for coming, Tom.

MR. GUEVARA: Thanks, Craig. First of
all that's actually a person you can say that
about and --
(Off the record comment.)

MR. GUEVARA: No, I don't want to take much of your time. I know you're ending your meeting. Then you're going to do some breakout sessions. I just wanted to say, welcome and thank you for continuing to do the great work.

I mean, now more than ever we need your ideas, your thoughts, your inputs. And really direction for us. This is something that's an incredibly important time for us as we all know. And what you do pervades through every aspect of our economy.

It isn't just about manufacturing. It isn't just about services. It's about everything. And a lot of the ideas that you have and the experiences you have really will make us a lot stronger.

And so we're certainly looking forward to your continued great work. And I just wanted to say thank you very much for being here today. And you all have valuable time, and I very much appreciate it.
MR. BUERSTATTE: Thanks, Tom. Melissa or Steve?

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: So again, I just want to echo the appreciation for the work that various Members have put in to make this informative, and specifically the staff.

I think as we go into the workgroups -- maybe I sit in a slightly unique position because I actually live here in D.C. -- but I would encourage us as we take these next steps to really refine and in some ways learn how to advocate for, promote our ideas. That we really focus on the collective possibility.

I will call out, or at least look at one of my partners. I think that having served in government, we often times focus on what we accomplished. We missed the unintended consequences.

And so I would challenge us to be mindful of unintended consequences. i.e., only focusing on rural, but recognize the demographic similarities that exist for historically
marginalized populations, namely black and brown people.

And because we don't want to be in the business of separating. And there are many unintended consequences across sectors, across universities, across university types. So I would just call our attention to continue the great work, but now put a final lens on it.

As we think about this, is something we'll all be working on. And what do we need to do to align with other higher priorities that may exist? Not just for the Secretary, but for our partners, within Commerce and other agencies.

How do we make this the most collective and collaborative process while we still advance ideas and strategies that are important to us?

MR. BUERSTATTE: All right. At this time, Robin, this concludes our official public portion. You can close the line. Thank you.

And for NACIE Members here, this does conclude as well. We are going to transition
into our small groups. And we will take a break on site.

So we'd like to get you there first, and stretch your legs and whatnot, and then at the room's themselves, we'll give you a few minutes as we settle in to take that break.

So grab what you've got. We will not be back here. So if you brought luggage, phones, laptops, chargers, you name it. Eric, do you have something?

MR. SMITH: Yes, just, we'll divide you up into groups so you have someone to follow. Because this building as many of you know is a bit of a maze.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 3:10 p.m.)
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CO-CHAIR TANG: Good morning, everybody. Just a quick welcome. I was going to start by asking either Heather or Emily to make a Super Bowl prediction. But since they're not here, I'm going to ask Tiffany Wilson if she'll make a Super Bowl prediction.

MEMBER WILSON: Oh, an unbiased one, right? Rise up, you all. Go Falcons. We're going to crush it.

CO-CHAIR TANG: Thank you. Anybody else want to chime in?

MEMBER FREDERICK: Yeah. What's a Super Bowl?

(Laughter.)

CO-CHAIR TANG: I'll explain it to you later.

MEMBER GOLDIN: I heard the Audi commercial is the best one. I haven't seen it. I heard that.

MEMBER KAPP: I heard there's a Lady
Gaga show this weekend.

(Laughter.)

CO-CHAIR TANG: Yes, and there is some sport event around it. That's basically what it is. That's right.

All right. Well, I'm a Philadelphia Eagles fan. So the only cheering interest I have is the quarterback from the Falcons is from Philadelphia. That's where I'm moving.

We have a busy morning. We had some very robust discussions. I think all three groups yesterday afternoon had different approaches, different outcomes. But we're going to share all that this morning.

I just want to emphasize -- and then I'll ask Melissa for her comments as well -- that it's really important that each of us show up prepared for the discussion with some background of where the discussion has been and what needs to happen at these individual breakout sessions. Recognize that even if you come prepared that consensus is often difficult because we all come
with a different set of experiences from our own background.

That's where I will leave the feedback. Melissa, do you have something else you want to add to that?

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: I mean, I think I just want to thank everybody. We just said a quick brief. And I can speak Eric worked hard in sending emails and posting stuff on Slack. And I know Craig did the same.

But I think for a NACIE 3.0 we are off to a great start. I just want to make sure we focus on that, focus on what we're accomplishing despite all the things that are changing around us. And where there are things still to be accomplished, this is a chance for us also to think about to Steve's point coming prepared and remaining engaged.

I think one of our challenges and opportunities is what do we do when we leave here. So for those groups like mine who had a robust discussion, who talked about a lot of
things, who took a little detour but got back and stayed focused how do we continue to stay engaged and advance these moving forward.

I just want to echo that for those that may get voted our work is not done. For those who still have work to do, you can count us to support you and count on other groups to share what we have done.

The other piece is this is not a separate agenda. It's how do we get this to come together. And we're going to have some time before we leave of how do these all fit together and how do we continue to augment them. That's it.

MR. BUERSTATTE: And I think you mentioned, Melissa, but we've got two recommendations that we're going to put up for a vote today most likely. Comparatively, I think by the time we got to a clear, concise, ready-for-submission proposal on 2.0 it was at the third or fourth meeting.

You guys are doing great. I think the
subject matter has been really meaningful. And it's been tough, too.

Again, I know some of you aren't used to working with the Titanic of the Federal Government. But this is a great pace. I'm excited where we're at.

I'm going to pass things off to Tiffany I think who is going to brief out on the capital group's work. Then we'll move to the strategy session. I think Andrew is going to take that one. Actually Heather maybe, Heather and Andrew. And then after that we'll close these brief-outs with the skills team.

Tiff, if you're ready.

MEMBER WILSON: Yes. So the capital issue is something we've been working on for a while and really felt the timing was right going into this NACIE and Administration to go ahead and finalize that and have it ready and waiting as a recommendation. We're really looking for the support of the entire Council for a vote.

We're calling this the Community
Capital Convening C3 Pilot Program. And it's really looking at bringing together in a convening local leaders from across the public, private, academic and business development areas really to address this issue of access to capital and gaps in the capital continuum, moving from early stage technologies into full commercial launch.

What we're proposing to do is run a pilot where we identify seven to ten cities/communities across the country that have an entrepreneurial mindset and really have an active discussion among all those groups of how we bridge the capital continuum and have more of an impact there.

What we're talking about doing is running a grant program, putting it out to communities around the U.S. to really tell us how they would pull those activities together. It will have an emphasis on inclusion, diversity, focused on the technologies of the industry sectors in those communities, hopefully having a
very broad report back on that. That ultimately
would result in us drafting facilitation guides
and best practices for building on those
activities in other communities and that sort of
thing.

Any questions or?

MEMBER BOWLES: I've got a question.

Can I ask it or?

MEMBER WILSON: Yeah.

MEMBER BOWLES: No.

MEMBER WILSON: No, sorry. I wanted
to add one thing that's a critical thing. We're
looking at partnering with other agencies such as
SBA and Treasury to build on other programs that
are existing there. This would be an interagency
collaboration opportunity which is a good thing,
increased efficiencies.

MEMBER BOWLES: What is the money for?
I mean, have you gone through what size grants
there are and what they're for? Is it for paying
for the meeting space and organizing?

MEMBER WILSON: That's something that
once this is voted on assuming it goes forward we
would sit down with the OIE team. They've got a
lot of experience in putting these programs
together and what the right parameters are and
things like that. But NACIE would have input on
what those parameters would be and what the
metrics and reporting requirements would be.

MEMBER BOWLES: Would cities
represented by people in this be precluded from
participating?

MEMBER WILSON: No.

MR. BUERSTATTE: A couple of questions
that I have that I'm looking forward to working
with you all on. If we're talking about a
national effort to convene seven to ten or dozen
communities, is this managed by a singular
organization? Is it a foundation of sorts that
can bring these communities together in specific,
concrete engagements, elevate those studies and
practices across various sectors and regions? Or
are these awards, these funds, going towards
specific entities at the local level where they
would be $50,000 a pop and a local ESO would be
the convener? But the question there is how do
we elevate those practices and those ideas and
lessons to that national conversation?

MEMBER WILSON: Yes. So we talked
about this a little bit yesterday in our breakout
session where as part of the reporting
requirements and report back all of those would
come to OIE after completion. And then we could
look at consolidating those, doing a little bit
of analysis and then amplify that through a
report from OIE or the other agencies.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: When you say in
terms of where does the money go, I think that's
TBD.

MEMBER WILSON: Yes.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: I think that's
where we would look to OIE and our funding of
what is best practices of the money goes into one
intermediary who then manages it or in their
capacity to manage five or seven grantees. I
think the key though is that there is a layer
where this is an opportunity for NACIE members to engage, oversee, particularly if it's in their community tray or people that you know.

And this is a chance to encourage others in our network to really be a part of it. I want to distinguish between who gets the money and who has the opportunity to be engaged and drive the documentation.

MEMBER WILSON: And I would expect just given the diversity in the room here and around the table we are all from very active, entrepreneurial communities that I would look to the entire Council, whatever communities we ended up, to really spearhead that in your own communities.

MEMBER BOWLES: I think this is a great idea and a great program. I think also, too, looking around the room that there is an opportunity to bring people in from other communities to help facilitate, encourage and provide feedback for how maybe this is done in other places and maybe this could be done well
there.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: Exactly. So taking those learnings. No matter what community you live in, what the industry sector focus of that community and what that ecosystem looks like, ultimately you've got a blueprint for having a discussion around access to capital and gaps in the capital continuum where people aren't simply having those conversations right now. I think having and pulling in outside input from other communities at the table in that discussion and sharing what works in their communities or at a national level would be part of that.

MEMBER BOWLES: And we're going to be doing something like this in Dallas soon. So what I would love assuming it's going to take a while to do this is maybe talk to you guys and say, "What would this look like?" And we'll just do it as a pre-pilot.

MEMBER WILSON: Right.

MEMBER BOWLES: And then we'll come back and say, "This is what we learned based on
that."

MEMBER WILSON: And what we can do as
well is we piloted something like this in
Nashville last March and we've got great
documentation and takeaways. I think that's been
shared in a prep packet. I'll make sure we share
that again. Hopefully, it will provide some
insight.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: I just want to say
I think that's an important point that the goal
of this is not only done though unless we get
funding, right?

MEMBER WILSON: Right.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: There's not a
chance for us. D.C. would probably never get it,
but I would want to be able to do it in D.C. So
I think it's also a roadmap as we go along. So I
guess it won't take long. I think because
there's some momentum that it won't take that
long.

But to the extent that people want to
try it themselves, let's do that. And we will
get what worked and what didn't work. That then
can form the grander scheme. It's a reference.

MEMBER KAPP: So I really applaud your
efforts on this. This is great and there's no
but at the end of this statement. So don't worry
about that.

(Laughter.)

This is really important for the R
world, the rural communities. And I wear several
hats when I sit at this table. There is a number
of hats that I wear.

So I represent Eastern West Virginia
Community and Technical College. But I'm now
also working with all nine community colleges in
this State of West Virginia to begin coordinating
efforts. And we have something within the state
called our District Consortium meetings, but not
all the schools are doing them. At Eastern West
Virginia, we have a bit of a concept of us
bringing together what is roughly equivalent to
the size of the geography of three times the size
of Rhode Island to bring together folks to have
these conversations.

And then the other organization that I represent is an organization called NACCE which is the National Association for Community College Entrepreneurship which is about 300 community colleges that all work together over the course of the United States.

This is one particular issue that consistently -- So I really applaud the efforts. And this is a great document. I'm really excited to be able to endorse this.

MEMBER WILSON: Thank you.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: And we totally encourage you to have them apply individually. I also want to take a moment to thank Scott who was very helpful yesterday. He has willingly to stay to help people here. He had some strategies about what we talked about things. He had experience in North Carolina.

So I think that's the beauty of if you're not on the committee and you don't want your city, but if you have some expertise please
share that with us. You have connection on how we can learn to make this better.

MEMBER WILSON: Yes, and I'll echo that. It's been really fantastic with this group in discussing these issues. I've learned from Scott that just even the vocabulary is different in different communities and how you refer to certain aspects about little pockets of capital. Just making sure that the language that we use is clear across the board and we're not leaving anything important out.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: Other questions? Comments?

MR. BUERSTATTE: All right. At this point, we're going to cross the threshold and no return. Emily, please.

MEMBER REICHERT: First, I want to just applaud the efforts of the team in bringing the proposal together. I think it looks like a really good plan. And I'm happy to endorse it.

I guess I would like to understand a little bit better how the proposal might evolve
based on the priorities of the new
Administration. I think the original intent here
was we were formed before we knew who was going
to win the next election.

And I'm just wondering we're only 12
or 13 days into this new Administration. So how
do you see what the propose is for bringing new
ideas or bringing it might even be new language
into this proposal?

MR. BUERSTATTE: Emily, let me take
that one. What happened between December and now
was a very deliberate effort to elevate issues
that we felt given the knowledge we've had, the
engagements we've had with inbound team and just
institutional knowledge here at Commerce. The
issues we've discussed over the last 12 hours or
so we think compliment the direction quite well.

MEMBER REICHERT: Okay.

MR. BUERSTATTE: However, should there
be an opportunity adjust OIE will certainly steer
you in that direction. We'll inform you and I
shouldn't say steer but rather ask, right. You
guys are our advisors. So if something or priorities might change or shift, then we'll let you know.

But I just want to communicate that I'm very confident in the conversations we had yesterday that they will continue to be relevant. Should there be tweaks? Very possible. Always possible. But we as a staff are not too concerned.

MEMBER REICHERT: And just one more comment. I'm happy as a resident of Boston, one of the ecosystems cited as places maybe to emulate or maybe get help from, to provide support or network resources of anything that would be needed.

MEMBER WILSON: We'll definitely take you up on that.

MR. BUERSTATTE: All right. So we're going to do a quick vote. We're going to vote by hands. We know who is here in the room. So we will do a visual reference. Will the team note yeas and nays? But at this point, all in favor
of this effort to submit to the Secretary of
Commerce as a formal recommendation from the
Council please raise your hand.

Thank you. Any not in favor?

Thank you.

(Appplause.)

PARTICIPANT: One for one. Come on
people. One for one.

MR. BUERSTATTE: And I'll take a quick
second to emphasize that part of that
recommendation was NACIE's involvement in the
development. So we make this and we will submit
it. And it's not OIE or EDA taking this off and
creating something in a silo.

This will be real time engagement in
development of this program. And we look forward
to that consultation. Much more work to be done.

We'll transition to Andrew and
Heather. Do you want to talk the strategy
session?

MEMBER REAMER: Great. Thank you,
Craig. What I want to do is it's a short
recommendation and you haven't seen it because Craig just wrote this version of it an hour ago.

MR. BUERSTATTE: I edited your wise thoughts, Andrew.

MEMBER REAMER: Well, you did a great job in the revisions. I'll explain the rationale for this. This project is a bit unusual in that our point of focus is OIE. So I want Craig to say a few words about his perception of the value of this to OIE and then ask Heather to speak about if this is approved and the Secretary approves it then Heather would lead the effort. I'll let Heather give her views of how this might move forward.

If you pull out the recommendation.

On behalf of NACIE, we are pleased to recommend OIE to prepare a strategic plan with NACIE's advice for your review by fall of 2017. Congress through the America COMPETES Act direct the Secretary to establish an Office of Innovation Entrepreneurship to foster innovation and commercialization of new technologies, products,
processes and services with the goal of promoting productivity and economic growth in the United States.

Since this statute passes in early 2011, OIE both received dedicated appropriations for its grants program and hired career staff for the first time in 2014. In Federal terms, it is well within its startup phase and given its impacts to date has great potential to increase that impact including through its work direct and indirect that builds regional capacities to create jobs and increase economic growth and global competitiveness.

To better fulfill its mandate and to realize its full potential, NACIE believes OIE would benefit from the development of a periodically updated strategic plan that is approved and supported by senior departmental leadership.

Among its 27 members, NACIE has substantial experience in and knowledge about promoting customer driven business through a
strategic assessment and action. NACIE believes that OIE should be as entrepreneurial as the businesses it serves and use one of its most experienced and knowledgeable resources NACIE to enhance its own operation. We appreciate your consideration of this recommendation.

So the idea is to as the resolution says -- this is information that Craig inserted -- OIE itself didn't really have full-time staff until fairly recently. It has a pretty ambitious mandate that Congress gave it. And as we saw, the prior Secretary gave OIE additional responsibilities.

One of the I think anomalies of the OIE operation is that while entrepreneurship is in the title, it's not mentioned in the legislation. So to the extent to which OIE can focus on the entrepreneurship is that something needs to be directed by the Secretary.

The idea here is to enable OIE to thoughtfully develop goals and objectives, to work with us to identify means to achieve those
and develop consensus with the departmental leadership in that process. And the results are if the plan is approved by the Secretary, then it gives OIE the authority, the running room, to go in directions for which we, OIE and NACIE and the departmental leadership, have some consensus.

It also helps build the capacity of OIE staff. The idea is to make this a regularly updated strategic plan. This would be a collaborative relationship between OIE staff and NACIE.

This is not NACIE writing this plan. This is working with OIE staff. They need to own it and they're the ones taking it to the Secretary for review.

This also would provide a framework and model for future NACIEs, NACIE 4.0, to infinity and beyond to work with.

(Laughter.)

And to the earlier point, a strategic plan if approved gives OIE the authority to work on subjects not specifically mentioned in the
legislation.

With that introduction, I'm going to ask Craig to say a few words about his perceptions of the value of this effort.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Sure. To put it bluntly, many of you asked, "Craig, do you really want the strategic plan?" Well, look. Start with the end in mind, over the last few years, we've been lucky to award nearly $60 million in grants towards I&E focused activities, focused on economic development practices, using innovation and entrepreneurship to create jobs, economic resilience and stronger regional economies.

We know, us professionals at the table understand, the value of this to our nation. We know that this is an important practice. And I think OIE is on the cusp of something very interesting. And we want to be able to scale that. We want to better understand the opportunities across all government agencies and the billions of dollars going towards other grant programs and other policies.
There is a statute for us to be an integrator across Federal agencies. What does that look like? How can we do that effectively and what's our first step?

I think the last four years or so have showed tons of promise and now we want to take a look at, a serious look at, the best steps forward and no better way to do that than leverage our close friends on NACIE. Thank you.

MEMBER REAMER: Heather.

MEMBER BOESCH: I can say a few words.

I also thought it might be clarifying because it was for me in terms of steps that are being taken. Our mission as NACIE is to advise the Secretary. We want to be able to include in that mission the ability to advise OIE. This is the first step towards that.

With that said, if we can get approval for that, we'd like to move forward pretty quickly. We're thinking about it in a few phases.

A lot of us around this table have
experience in corporate and strategic planning. So we're hoping to bring that to bear.

It will be relatively straightforward and layered. We think that it's important to have a really clear kind of mission and narrative for the agency to point it in the right direction given the broad mandate that it has and understand the real kind of value submission that we're working for. Then how is that translated into maybe a three or five year strategy that helps us achieve that mission? And then what's the one to two year plan for the exact steps we're going to take there?

We have some early ideas about the kinds of things that that's going to include such as being an integrator for all of the great programs that actually already exist around the Government. Where can we look for overlaps? Where can we find efficiencies?

How can we clarify the process using a user-centered point of view to entrepreneurs and innovators looking towards the Federal
Government for help? And where can we find white space or gaps where OIE might need to fill an important role in that? That's what we plan to do.

MEMBER REAMER: I also want to ask the co-chairs if you would say a few words about your view about this?

CO-CHAIR TANG: Certainly. I'll say a few words and then I'm going to ask in addition to Melissa the other members of the Committee that were in discussion. We had I think a very robust discussion about this.

To me, the most significant piece of this work is that we are convened to serve innovation and entrepreneurship in the start-up community. Why shouldn't OIE as a start-up community in its own right be part of that overall purview? This is essentially a way to begin a business plan for OIE to connect the dots with various programs within Commerce and outside of Commerce and also looking forward what programs may be in legislation that OIE might
have a role in steering or funding, etc.

That's my view and that's why I fully support. Melissa.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: I would just say that I think the important part here is developing and planning a process. I want to make sure we come in that this is not what we do at our own company or what we do at our own boards.

There are two things I want to highlight. One is as Andrew said this is really going to be driven by the staff and by what we can and cannot do and really be aligned with the priorities going forward. And, two, I think our job in the development is really support, kind of the sounding board and mirror, sharing additional resources and opportunities.

And as it goes forward, now we have a collaborative and evaluation process. So I just want to state that we should not look at it as something else we've done but a unique opportunity to have a permanent framework moving
forward that will be flexible and malleable but
that part of our job is implementation as well as
evaluation.

CO-CHAIR TANG: Brian, Eric, Maribel
or Chad, also in the discussion, any thoughts to
share?

MEMBER BARTHOLOMEUSZ: To me, the
interesting part of this discussion was in terms
of who the perpetual customers of all of us are.
Have a definition of them. I think everybody has
a somewhat different opinion of who they are and
what constituencies they serve. Trying to pull
all of these together and to catalog and classify
them I think would be very interesting.

For me personally, a knowledge of all
other programs and initiatives that overlap with
what we are trying to do would be extremely
helpful. Every meeting I come to I'm learning of
more stuff that seems to be related to what we're
doing. It's sort of progressive disclosure.

But I think Andrew is doing some kind
of a project where he's collecting and collating
all this stuff. I think that would be extremely valuable. The last thing we want to is have yet another program that duplicates what exists.

I thought it was very interesting discussion and couched very much in terms of staff-ups, you know, what's your markets, what's the pain point, what's your solution, who are your customers, what's your value proposal. All of these things would in some way, shape or form implicitly enter into the formulation and the discussion. I think it will be a very interesting exercise.

MEMBER BOESCH: I just have one follow-up point to that that was mentioned. I think one of the great values to this is so many agencies are doing really incredible things already. How can we amplify those efforts and make sure they're having the most success with those programs as well I think will very valuable.

MEMBER HERSKOWITZ: One structural question. Does this then absorb -- on this map
here, does this then absorb the line with DOC I&E
program and the federal convening authority? Is
this sort of taking the landscaping piece of what
you are planning on doing?

MR. BUERSTATTE: It could. That's
the part of the strategic plan, right. We
haven't done it yet. There is a reason why we
grouped the groups together the way we did. So I
think there's certain alignment with an OIE
strategy and aligning I&E activities across
Commerce. I think they are very complimentary as
well as perhaps the Federal Innovation Summit.

We'll focus on that framework later
today. Great question. We should be thinking
about this. But I'll just say that there are no
confining bricks on the framework. This is just
a conversation starter. As these develop, we'll
have a better idea of how things fit where.

(Off the record comment.)

MEMBER TOONE: Absolutely. And I
think that we all felt that it's almost
impossible to even think about a strategic plan
without doing that sort of analysis to see what's out there.

MEMBER BAGLEY: I had a question about the wording, the use of the word "business." And I think this goes back to Brian's customer-centric. So in the last paragraph, we talk about promoting customer-driven businesses through strategic assessment and then again we say you should be as entrepreneurial as your businesses.

I guess that given the set of programs and the set of activities of OIE it didn't seem like that was necessarily the key direct constituent. It might be the second tier, right, because you're actually working with the organizations.

I don't want to make it sound too bureaucratic. But on the other hand, I don't want to make it sound like --

MEMBER REAMER: Rebecca, if we put the word "ultimately" in front of "serves" would that fix it?

MEMBER BAGLEY: I guess I was thinking
more like Craig said during entrepreneurial
economies or something. I mean, you're really
serving regions which I don't think we want to
use that word. I'm not sure what the new,
updated word for ecosystems, regions,
entrepreneurial economies should be. But that's
what it feels like here. That's our target for
most of our programs and things at this point,
right.

MEMBER REAMER: One of the suggestions
that was is there was consensus in the room about
trying to put in the word "businesses" or
something like that.

CO-CHAIR TANG: Let me just make sure
I understand your question, Rebecca. Let me read
this and you identify the point.

It says, "Among its 27 members, NACIE
has substantial experience in the knowledge about
promoting customer-driven businesses for
strategic assessment and action." That refers to
NACIE, right. "NACIE believes that OIE should be
as entrepreneurial as the businesses it serves."
In other words, entrepreneurs, right. "And use one of its most experienced or knowledgeable resources at NACIE to enhance its own operations."

What are you offering as an edit?

MEMBER BAGLEY: I guess I was offering a conversation about I think language is going to be extremely important as we go into the new Secretary. And that the word "businesses" struck me as something that could be construed in a way that we're trying to affect a current capitalist economy.

CO-CHAIR TANG: Okay. I think we actually edited it the other way which is to be more in line with the pro-business strategy.

MEMBER BAGLEY: Okay.

CO-CHAIR TANG: That was the intention.

MEMBER BAGLEY: You guys spent a lot of time on it. So I don't want to totally suck up this discussion. But it's just one reaction.

MEMBER REAMER: Are there other people
that share Rebecca's concern?

(Off the record comment.)

MEMBER BAGLEY: Yes, I mean I'm a little out of loss for what the actual word is. But I think it's like entrepreneurs, entrepreneurial economy, entrepreneurial activities. That to me sort of sets better than businesses. But I'm not quite sure how you incorporate it into the language.

Again, you guys spent a lot of time on this. So if it's not an issue for others, I don't want to derail the conversation.

(Off the record comments.)

MEMBER BAGLEY: Yes, that's true.

MEMBER REAMER: I want to add one other element reporting back on the conversation we had yesterday. It was clear that one of the functions of OIE as desired by the members in the room was to identify and make available publicly the list of all the resources offered by the Federal Government Innovation and Entrepreneurship.
Another opportunity that was brought up -- I brought it up -- is there was until about a year ago a loosely-organized federal entity called the Interagency Network for Entrepreneurial Assistance Programs or INEAP. And it was a gathering that went on for four or five years maybe of all the federal agencies that provide assistance to entrepreneurs.

It was hosted by NIST which is part of the Department of Commerce. I would say there were probably 15 agencies that would come. And it had no authority. It was just social as much as anything. It was just sharing information.

But the woman running INEAP had other things to do and no one has taken it over. It's not that INEAP has to be recreated in the mold it was informally, but it's to say that there is experience in bringing together and doing relationship building and coordination among federal agencies that support entrepreneurship. That's something that could be looked at as part of the strategic planning process.
MEMBER WILSON: I think that this is very valuable in bringing together and making available what's already been planned. And I think that as we go forward you should consider opening beyond the Government to NDOs and entrepreneurs that they could also be playing in that space for them to say "I'm here, too." They can attach their label to whatever that one-stop shop is that we end up using.

There's a lot of things that I hear about that I didn't even know existed, and they're not all necessarily in the Government. So I think we should consider the open source type model.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Great. Is that it for comments and questions? All right.

Our number two vote for the day. So this is voting for NACIE's recommendation to participate in a collaborative experience with OIE to develop a strategic plan. This would be target submission by fall 2017 to the Secretary of Commerce. All in favor?
Thank you.

Any against?

(No response.)

No. For the record, that's a unanimous vote. Thank you very much.

And I think, Tiffany, will you be talking about skills then?

MEMBER STEVENSON: Okay. We had a very hearty conversation about skills and though what you won't see is us in a space to start to vote yet. But we would like to share the journey and where we are in the process. And we look forward to coming back with a more formalized proposal in a subsequent session.

I would also like to invite my peers to feel free to amend, edit, amen anything as we go through the skills mandate. In our balcony moment when we had a chance to step back, you can see when you look at the framework that there are quite a few initiatives that fall under training and workforce development. All of them are really strong ideas.
But in recognizing that we have a new Administration with some very strong views on the future of jobs, we recognized that we had an opportunity to do a couple of things: (1) to speak to why we feel that people development and training belongs as a pillar within NACIE and then why not Department of Labor, being really crisp on what we think the vision and the purpose of training and workforce development is as it relates to NACIE; and (2) how our focuses can really enable the current Administration's agenda as it relates to jobs; and then (3) making sure that our proposed actions are really the most critical and the most relevant for this upcoming two years as a team.

In saying that, our discussion to address this first point around why people development belongs with NACIE, we were able to really reflect on what we've learned about our future Secretary as well as what we know about the current Administration's focus on job creation, bringing in new jobs and the
sustainability of jobs. We recognize that whatever we need in order to enable that we have to ensure that we have the workforce who are prepared to take on these new jobs as they are being created.

We also recognize that entrepreneurship is a key driver of job growth. So we have an opportunity to ensure that we're training and preparing entrepreneurs to be able to take that on.

Our conversation around why people's development belongs with NACIE is really our answer to those two things. We think that it's important going forward that we have clearly stated that. And I would also would recommend for our strategy team that we look at being explicit about that because it's not really clear on the original mandate of NACIE.

The second thing around how our two focuses enable the current Job Administration's agenda is what you see in this mandate is first starting with workforce development. We came
away with the conclusion that it's being increasingly clear that some of the shifts in capabilities means that we're not necessarily prepared to support the demand.

If we look at things like advanced manufacturing, it's one thing to say we're bringing manufacturing back to America. But if it's advanced manufacturing, are we really prepared with the field with capabilities to do so? As we look at the emergence of new sectors whether it's technology, automation, automobile industry, we just really want to make sure that whatever we're doing is in service to really bridging the capability divide.

When we talk about entrepreneurial leaders, we know that their network isn't as open for all, providing all communities with the opportunity to access. Whether it's mentorship development, are we really preparing entrepreneurs to be successful? We feel like we have an opportunity there to ensure that we're providing the correct networks.
Long story short, we feel that these are the two areas under NACIE that we feel like we have the opportunity to put together and relook at the proposals that we have to make sure that they are where they need to be.

Under action, we think that this two-pronged approach of highly skilled workforce and highly skilled entrepreneurs is really where we want to provide our focus. What you see at the bottom of page one under highly skilled workforce are current actions.

We would like to come back together to relook at these actions to make sure that these are still right. What we feel confident in is the advanced manufacturing initiative. We feel like it is the right initiative. But we also had some great discussion around regional workforce development, really understanding the role that Federal Government can play at the same regional workforce development efforts.

Under highly skilled entrepreneurs, we still feel strongly that having mentorship
networks is still a good place for us to focus. But we also want to look at this idea of the national innovation and entrepreneurship academy idea to ensure that it's continuing to align with this idea of developing and equipping our best entrepreneurial to succeed.

More work to come. Again, what we feel good about is alignment of the purpose of people development. We feel like it will have a continually strong role in NACIE. We want to take a step back to look at the initiatives that we have under both highly skilled workforce and highly skilled entrepreneurs to make sure that they're aligned.

I'm going to open it to the team to see if there are any other comments or takeaways from yesterday's conversation.

MEMBER BOWLES: I hope this is important. It took a long time to get. At least it's at the bar level, right. I think that's great. I think what I would say to clarify is that we're not suggesting that workforce
development doesn't exist in the Department of Labor as well.

But I think what we're saying is that we think there is a reason and a valid point for why we should focus on this inside of NACIE as well. A small nuance, but we don't want DOL to think we're trying to steal this.

MEMBER JOHNSON: From my point of view, there's a short-term problem and a long-term problem. It's one thing to say we're going to stop jobs from leaving the country and we're going to bring jobs back. That's fine. That exacerbates an already existing problem from workforce in the advanced manufacturing sector. Some thought should be given to that.

But that's short term because you can't do that forever and keep growing the economy. The long-term solution is through this entrepreneurial development. And they both have really the same focus. So that in my mind is how they're related.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: I just want to say
this is -- While we're not voting, I want to acknowledge this is significant work because you have probably one of the larger bodies of work than the other groups. I think framing is everything.

I would put the question back. What is next? Only because I think yesterday we heard of one opportunity around the apprenticeship piece. Because of the short-term, long-term complications or opportunities while this group is here as you all will continue to meet, what can we do to help advance that, to share insight, to think about some shorter term deliverables even if it's making sure we're present at the apprenticeship conference, having Whitney report back to us?

I just want to make sure that we can support your momentum since we don't meet again. But you have people who are committed to this topic around the table.

MEMBER STEVENSON: I definitely agree.

I think our next step is to reconvene fairly
quickly to think about how we can take advantage of low-hanging fruit. To your point, we think that apprenticeship is exactly a perfect opportunity for us to leverage. And there are probably some others.

So we think that there is an opportunity even to understand what is the landscape today. So even if we're looking at the mentorship program for entrepreneurs we have some immediate action steps to understand what is out there that we can be better taking advantage of.

We sort of ran out of time. We hit the buzzer before we were able to get there. But I think that is our very next step is to identify what are the short-term things that we can go over.

But I think language is one thing that we want to take advantage of right now and making sure that we're repositioning the purpose of workforce development so it feels really aligned.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: So I would just encourage you to use Slack so that we can all see
it and weigh in and give you feedback and you
don't have to wait for us.

MEMBER BALDWIN: So if I could just
add that I think this is another opportunity for
us to look for collaboration interdepartmentally.
So we said, how is it different from the
Department of Labor or the Department of
Education. But how could be also be the same so
that they join us in collaboration to deliver
this?

MEMBER TOONE: I would just like to
make a comment not specifically to this group,
but to all of us in everything that we do. In
all of these things, we should be thinking at the
outset about evaluation and how we're going to
measure the impact of what we're doing. I think
that we can massively, massively, massively
amplify the impact of what we're doing if we can
create good metrics for demonstrating success.

And I would suggest that there are a
lot of smart people in business schools at Duke
and in other places that are thinking about this.
It's not simple to do those things. What people inevitably do in this space when they want to talk about success is they tell stories. Oh, so and so did this and that happened.

And somebody pointed out to me a long time ago that the plural of anecdote is not data. (Laughter.)

MEMBER TOONE: And so you know figuring out way at the outset that we can separate selection from treatment and things like that and being sophisticated about how we measure the impact of what we're doing will massively, massively amplify the value of all that we do.

MEMBER KAPP: Just as an addendum to all that, first of all, I have a model that I developed in concert with a couple of other colleges that I would love for you to take a look at in terms of it's certainly not scientific. And since I am new to this area of data in this respect and how we capture it and attribution and all that.

I was fortunate to go to SSTI and
learn how much I don't know about this. I would
welcome the opportunity to be able to learn about
how we've done this particularly within a
community college realm.

As you all know, there's a couple of
flags that I raised. So I'm going to go back to
the community college piece because across the
United States we have an infrastructure that
already exists on the workforce development side.

Every community college has primarily
two functions. One is academics. And the second
is workforce development. One of the reasons
that I am on this Council and one of the things
that I am working on very steadfastly is the
addition of entrepreneurship as that third leg of
the stool.

The reason why I bring that up is
because it will allow us to go ahead and leverage
off of existing resources across the United
States in places that already exist with
resources that are already there. When we think
about the possibilities and the opportunities,
how can we possibly leverage those community colleges and how can each of us at our institutions look at those colleges to be able to leverage those assets so that we can further the work of NACIE and our individual organizations.

MEMBER READER: I want to raise and just make people aware of some things that are going on so that you have the sense of some of the options to pursue. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce Foundation has a Center for Educational Workforce. The director of that is a man named Jason Tidsco. Marie spoke with him recently.

Jason has gotten a big chunk of money from USA Funds to create -- He is approaching workforce development at a regional level with a supply chain management approach. So the idea is to create employer collaboratives at a regional level that are connecting to education and training providers. The providers understand what the employers are looking for and building regional data systems to track the success or
lack of success of people coming out of various
institutions.

It's called TPM, Talent Pipeline
Management. They are doing an academy. So it
started recently. They are bringing in people
from various regions to train them how to do
this. I'd be happy to make a point to talk to
Jason.

Jason is also working with -- I can't
describe this project very well, but I could get
information on the data side. So the National
Association of Manufacturers has its own little
thing called the Manufacturing Institute. The
Manufacturing Institute is working with one of my
colleagues at GW and the Census Bureau to try to
create a data system that better understands the
movement of people who are getting certifications
in manufacturing related fields as to what
happens to them, what kind of jobs they get and
so forth.

The third thing is there is another
advisory committee in the Department of Labor and
I'm a member of it called the Workforce Information Advisory Council. The Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, WIOA, 2014 which is the primarily legislation that guides federal workforce development activities, a side piece of it is Congress recognized that in this internet age that data can be used by people in labor markets to make better decisions, students, workers, educators, employers about what careers to go into, where the jobs are, what's in demand, what employers are asking educators to teach students, where to locate businesses.

So Congress directed the Secretary of Labor to create a nationwide workforce and labor market information system that enables, not the Federal Government, folks at the ground level to have the information they need to make good decisions. And the legislation creates this council that I'm on to advise the Secretary.

That group, the WIAC, is coming up with its own strategic plan. It would be great to have your input and you can just use me as a
conduit. I'll stop there.

MEMBER STEVENSON: Perfect. I think one of the challenges that we're going to have increasingly is sharing the front, too. So in the spirit of having stronger metrics, getting a firm grasp on once we do select the industries that we want to focus on, what is the state of the union today? Then we will be able to show some measurable impact even if it's beyond our term. I think that would be fantastic to get some baseline information once we hone in on the industries. Thank you.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: Could I just ask Maribel and Kara particularly because of your positions do you have any thoughts on this one in particular?

MEMBER WADSWORTH: This, to me, is I think arguably some of the most important work that can happen, getting to a concrete what does a proposal look like, what does a pilot look like. Something that I think about on a daily basis is how we can build truly that crosswalk
from the jobs that are disappearing and not to other countries, but to technological advances. Build that crosswalk to the jobs that exist that companies are struggling to fill because we don't have the right labor, the right skill sets in the workforce.

We can solve for that. We are absolutely solving for the heart of what is creating this kind of division, this kind of stress in our economy and frankly just a quality of life issue. This is a really, really big deal. I'm glad you all are being as thoughtful as you are and taking your time with the detail around it.

But I would imagine that beyond just looking at all of the federal programs that exist across all these variety of agencies this is a real opportunity to engage and partner with the private sector very directly. And so I would encourage you to seek those opportunities.

For example, the jobs that may exist in one community may be very different than
another. So as you think about the industries,
think about identifying places to pilot this kind
of partnership where there's a clear jobs
disappearing from this sector or these types of
manufacturing jobs but jobs exist in this other
realm. How can we swarm that with the right
private and public resources to create that
crosswalk for people from one place to the other?

That's how I would think about it.

I'd be delighted -- I know that our company would
be delighted to help on that front. So tap in.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: Will do.

MEMBER GOLDIN: I think Tiffany
recapped it really, really well. Thanks for
going back to the room and doing that. But I
just think that the key thing really is the
innovation piece and sort of what happens not
just outside of the U.S. but when jobs are going
away in the U.S. from as I mentioned to this
group like things like the toll booth operator,
right. It's gone. And what happens to those
people.
I think also we just need to make sure that there isn't another group that's working on these things. I'm not sure that every toll booth operator, for example, is going to become an entrepreneur. But can we figure out a way to create an environment for those people as well? I think we just need more definition more than anything else.

MEMBER BOWLES: I have a question. I think we all agree that collecting the data on what organizations already exist and working across departmentally as well as inside the different initiatives of Commerce is important. But at what point -- How long can we take to do that? Maybe this is a part of the strategic plan. But we could spend the next two years cataloging initiatives. What's the Council's thought on how much time do you spend on looking around before you just start doing things?

MEMBER S. SMITH: Well, I would go back to the comment that anecdotes aren't data.
So we can spend years looking at anecdotal information. But I think the real data out there is what we need to be looking at. And I think that's much less than the anecdotal kinds of things.

MEMBER REICHERT: I would propose that most people are entrepreneurs of some sort around this table. And we're used to doing things in a quick and dirty way and then act it. So I would think you're doing a span. You're looking at what's out there already especially, for example, on the advanced manufacturing topic. Just in one call someone was able to identify there's already something out there called Manufacturing.gov. That already led to a whole bunch of information being found.

So I think we wanted to understand what is it out there that exists in a broad sense and then we want to start moving forward based on that information. And we're, of course, going to find new things as we go.

I would say the discovery period is
short. The learning period is long. But we just
need to start. We need to take action.

MEMBER FREDERICK: Not to over
complicate it, but there is so much work out
there. Should we use something like Slack to
kick some ideas in? Obviously, the U.S. Chamber
is doing a lot here. There's the Manufacturers
Association.

Believe it or not, I've had
discussions over the last couple of months with
groups as diverse as DOE who is doing a lot in
advanced manufacturing. The Department of
Defense and then our U.S. Intelligence are really
focused on this issue because of the
destabilizing impact.

I mean I don't mean to overdramatize
the issue. But they recognize it as incredibly
destabilizing. And they're studying it in
interesting ways, in quantitative ways. I don't
know to what extent some of those groups will
share.

But you can use me as the tip of the
spear to ask. I'm not afraid to ask for
anything.

MEMBER REAMER: I have a lot of this
information in my head.

PARTICIPANT: Me too.

MEMBER REAMER: I'm with Emily in
this. The aim is to have good enough information
going forward. And between me and a few people I
can put people in touch with they can just do
brain dumps. And as I mentioned this morning,
for the Kauffman Foundation, I have a deliverable
of listing all the federal entrepreneurship
programs. That's going to be handed to the
strategic planning group.

MEMBER STEVENSON: Maybe offline we
can just take a couple.

MEMBER REAMER: Fine.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: Two quick things.
One is I want to keep supporting enthusiasm. I
cannot underestimate the need to write it down
because this is not just about us. So the point
of strategic plan to perpetuity, beginning to
leverage a framework of which like your research or discovery and then learn and then do, I think just a level of transparency at least within the group. But let's make sure we're documenting this so that there's progress.

And the second thing is I just want to say that there are always things that we can do individually. And we should continue to do those. Before we jump and do things though, we should just remember what hat we're wearing and be mindful of how we leverage our NACIE affiliation.

Unlike entrepreneurship, this is one of those things where we really can't afford to fail. And so I just really want to echo Eric's comments around evaluation and making sure that we have both evaluations but also metrics.

I'm a visual person. I would love to see a dashboard that at some point in time we can track, but really continue to amplify what our impact is. But I do think it's important that we are just mindful of sharing and what lens
we're going to act and recognizing that we can act individually probably sooner than we can as NACIE.

MEMBER REAMER: I want to just introduce the term to the discussion of due diligence. Part of the work as entrepreneurs and as advisory council is to do due diligence up front so you're not walking into a situation where you're going to fail. And due diligence is not perfect, but it's good enough.

MEMBER FREDERICK: The term we use is don't like the perfect be the enemy of the good.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: You guys are so technical.

(Laughter.)

MR. BUERSTATTE: I'll also add that one of the things we wanted to touch base on towards the end of today's meeting is next steps. And I think some of the comments dovetail nicely with what are your next action items and how are you as a council planning to hold yourselves accountable to some of these discussions and
goals.

  Is it compiling information and engaging via Slack? Do we need to set up a certain rhythm of calls? I'm ahead of myself, but we've got a quarter under us now. So I think we need to understand a little bit what's working well and what's not and where we as a team can improve. Just frame that thought in your head for now and we'll get to it at the end.

  CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: Does Tiffany need anything from us in terms of any actions?

  MEMBER STEVENSON: I would say Slack is probably the best way. So I'm hearing that there's lots of resources out there of work that's already happening. So it's on the workforce page. You can start to drop those things. That would be perfect. But I think as a team we need to regroup and tighten up around what are the priorities that are going to fall under these two categories of job skills and entrepreneurship.

  MEMBER REICHERT: From the perspective
of one who was part of the group yesterday, I
would suggest that we have subcommittees that are
working on these two streams. I think there are
several people that are very passionate about the
manufacturing piece and are very willing to do
work on that. And I assume that there are --
Well, I knew from the discussion that there are
definitely people who are passionate about the
academy and also passionate about the other topic
as well.

MR. BUERSTATTE: We're a few minutes
ahead of time. But I do see Tom Guevara in the
back. And, Tom, real quick, did you have any
thoughts on this? I wanted to get your feedback
while you're down here.

MR. GUEVARA: Of course, since you
asked. First of all again, thank you. This is
really great to watch this thoughtful engagement
and exchange of ideas. I think it's really
something that's very heartening in terms of your
engagement and real interest in doing things that
are meaningful.
A couple of observations. One is that I'm certainly very heartened to hear about the need to think about experimentation. A lot of times we look at things and we look at saying let's do some empirical work in this particular area. But I think particularly when it comes to innovation and entrepreneurship and figuring out what is a true ecosystem and what are the essential elements of that in what I call a decontextualized situation, then you probably need to do some experimentation to really figure that out and carry that across.

I'm a little bit weary of things like best practices. Usually they involve a particular context. And I usually tell people to try to this best practice. I say, "Sure. If you give me your people, your resources, your situation and your constraints, I think I'll get exactly the same results as you, really great results." I think we do have to be a little bit careful as we think about some of our recommendations.
The only other thought and this is really mostly a thought about the workforce side of it because I think about this constantly, too, in looking at the research I look at is that I hope someone else thinks about the other side of the equation. That is actually educating employers.

We think about this almost strictly from the supply side. However, I think that often times -- and I think many of you know -- it becomes down between hiring somebody with a specific skill or somebody with an aptitude and a preference for the work. In other words, they like that kind of work. I think I'd almost rather take the person with the aptitude and wants to do that kind of work rather than whether they have a particular skill.

I can train them. And they will be an incredibly long-serving employee that will be probably highly engaged and come up with a lot of great ideas. And I think sometimes employers overlook this. We don't talk enough about that
part of it in terms of helping to solve the
skills gap for a lot of employers.

I hope also that you think about that
and think about your work in the workforce area.
Think about the other side of the equation, too.
What can do to help employers be a little more
flexible and creative and engaging in building
their workforces?

Just a couple of thought. But really
great ideas here in terms of what you're doing.
Again, thank you.

MEMBER BAGLEY: I just wanted to
reinforce what he said because that's a great
point that wasn't -- In Pittsburgh, we're doing
actually the Allegheny Conference which is our
Economic Development Business Organization
Chamber. We're doing a big push with the HR
representatives from all the large companies
looking at how they're doing their job
descriptions, hiring, getting rid of the entry
level, needs two years' experience instead being
able to hire out of college and then the
retraining and all the other things. And how you
actually look for in a large corporation not
necessarily exact skill set but the types of
things Tom was talking about. I think that's a
great addition to the conversation.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: And the beauty is
Maribel has stepped up already. So that could be
a great model.

MR. BUERSTATTE: We did have a few
offline conversations about -- I think it was
Whitney who commented about it yesterday -- the
JP Morgan Chase Summit. That could be an
interesting opportunity for NACIE really to
activate and serve as that voice and rally some
key employers to communicate those points. I
just want to put that on everyone's radar. I
think that's something that you all might want to
take a more serious look at.

MEMBER FREDERICK: Another potential
resource, firms like ours, NEA, we have two-
talent partners. And I know they're very
connected to the other large Valley firms.
Almost all venture firms will have a talent partner. And these are issues they talk about a lot.

I got the benefit of sitting in on one of their workshops on how to rewrite job requirements and specs. Absolutely eye-opening to me. This one had a particular focus on how wording can basically discourage women from applying to certain positions in unintended ways. Literally just saying something like "Looking for rock stars" and things like that, it was fascinating. And they had concrete data on what then happens to the number of women versus men applying for that position.

This is top of mind in the Valley. To your point, the Valley is becoming much less focused on academic degrees, but things like passion and can they just get in and get things done. It's just another resource.

They're out there. And I know the talent folks do a very good job of networking.

So I think there even is a group of like VC
talent professionals.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Is that it, Tiffany?

Great. I think that was a lot of awesome feedback for report-outs. We're about 15 minutes ahead which will save time for maybe more robust discussion on next steps at the end.

I'd like to break at this point. We'll do 15 minutes. If you look at your schedule, we're ahead of time. Instead of breaking at 10:15 a.m., I'd like to come back at 10:15 a.m. Please enjoy a quick break and those of you who might be dialed in we'll mute and convene back at 10:15 a.m. Eastern. Thanks so much.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 10:02 a.m. and resumed at 10:21 a.m.)

MR. BUERSTATTE: So we teased this earlier. Scott, could you go ahead and put us off mute please. Welcome back to anyone who's dialing in. We're getting started on our next session.

MR. BUERSTATTE: We spoke earlier this
morning about working our efforts towards a broader framework. So that's what this next 45 minutes or an hour is going to focus on. To lead that I'd ask the co-chairs to kick things off.

CO-CHAIR TANG: So I'll stall while Melissa coming back here. We're talking about the framework right here. This is a snapshot actually of where we were after our last meeting in October. And, Orin, you very purposely asked the question where things fit in. And that's the whole point is that the framework is designed to illustrate where things are fitting in.

This is a dynamic model. It does not yet reflect I think the discussion that we've already had and the approvals that we've just had and the discussion we had on the skills side. So keep that in mind.

But what I like about this is that it gives a reference at least on how we are integrating the various thoughts and initiatives and where they fit together across themes.

That's helpful I think not only in terms of
organizing scarce resources within OIE and scarce time among NACIE, but also in evolving our thoughts on how to coalesce around high impact initiatives and programs.

With that in mind, the other thing I think is the lesson learned from previous NACIE experiences which is this does evolve as the Council gets a better sense of the working relationship it has within itself and the external organizations or people that they want to bring into the discussion.

This has been I think very, very helpful at least to me at least based on past experience of how we can begin looking at the impact of what we're doing.

Melissa, I was stalling so that you could get back in the room here to offer any other comments.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: I think this is -- I again want to acknowledge Brian for getting it started. To Orin's question earlier, this is our opportunity to also use this and, Eric, it would
be great to hear from you of how this can integrate with our evaluation and our checkpoint.

I think we should see this more as a white board where things can be moved around. It is not etched in stone. And I think the biggest thing for me was as we talked about how does this all roll up. I think yesterday several people kept saying or actually Eric kicked us off with the end in mind, always being mindful of the end engaging all communities.

We talk about universities and making sure we're talking about community colleges. And we talk about various demographics. It's rural. It's urban. It's underserved communities. It's the new majority. It's women. It's disabled.

And then when we think about how and what our message is we're mindful. Yesterday I learned a lot around innovators and entrepreneurs and businesses, small and large and that we are continuing to operate across a continuum. I would open it up now. Or, Brian, if you want to say anything about your original thinking and how
we should be looking at this and even changing
things up as we advance these various
recommendations.

MEMBER BARTHOLOMEUSZ: As you said,
this was just a snapshot in time. And when we
went through the first round of proposals,
initially they seemed like just a bunch of
disjointed, disparate ideas and concepts.

For my edification, I sat down and
just tried to organize it. And I found that they
actually created a continuous fabric that I just
sat down and banged out in an evening. So
there's not a lot of thought in it. But it gave
me the comfort to know that there was integrated
or some cohesive vision here.

And I did this from two perspectives.
One was it sort of concerned me a little bit and
I accepted the fact that we could only do a
limited number of detailed projects. Three of
them I think was the number Craig raised.

But it seemed to me a pity that there
was all this other stuff. And I wondered where
they would go. On Eric's graph they were parked somewhere.

And I thought to myself in just abandoning them when they were just one or two page proposals it almost seemed to me like it would make sense if we could flesh them out into maybe four or five or six pages, spend a little time and maybe not burden OIE staff, but there's a lot of people here working for two years. I mean groups of three or four can sit down and just flesh those out a little bit and then park them and have a repository of ideas.

Otherwise, I think this would be a good historical record. It tracks the breadth and extent of the thinking here at NACIE. But I think it could also serve as catalysts and germination points for new ideas and maybe for future NACIEs even.

But it seemed to me they are kind of interrelated. And I don't want them to be lost. That's really where it started out. And then I looked at it and I felt comforted because they
all -- I could convince myself that they made a
coherent story and a continuous rational
framework. That's how I started.

CO-CHAIR TANG: Thank you. Just to
the point of lost, yesterday Eric presented the
flow of how projects get discussed and negotiated
and voted on. Nothing is ever lost. Things are
just parked I guess in the verbiage of that
process.

But your point is well taken. The
discussion and deliberation we have is valuable
for a lot of reasons and it shouldn't be lost.

CO-CHAIR TANG: Thank you.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: Comments on the
framework?

MR. BUERSTATTE: While you're thinking
about that, I'll add on this parking note. What
sometime we really need to see is when the stars
align and maybe there's another agency that
starts to look into or investigate an opportunity
around a new program or a policy. And Eric and I
have at times said, "Hey, look at this. Here's a
nice three-page concept drafted by the National Advisory Council on Innovation and Entrepreneurship."

I just don't want you to think in any way that parking something is invaluable. We really do value words on paper. And I do endorse Brian's thought of if there's opportunity and interest to further vet some of these of course with OIE's input we can help guide in the right direction. I think some of them could help in future conversations. That's all.

MEMBER BAGLEY: I like the framework. I think it makes sense and it aligns things which is always good because you can see the pyramid of how it starts from the top and goes down into more details.

One of the general thoughts that I had and it fits into this discussion because I think these are the things that we're considering doing is we made a lot of progress this morning I think by approving two initiatives. I think it positions in front of the Secretary in a good way
that we have suggestions that we can make as he
or she comes in, he.

My concern is that I also want to
position NACIE as a big thinker with big ideas.
So I think as the Secretary comes in and defines
a little bit of policy direction we want to be
careful not to get too big too fast or outside of
the Administration's goals.

But I think that I'd like to see --
The two things that we passed are a little bit of
-- The strategic planning and the convening in
regions, it's not really here's a big thing that
the Administration could do to solve for the
challenges or the opportunities that are across
the blue or that interconnect across the access
to capital workforce training. I would just like
us to consider as we go into our next meeting and
as we have a little bit more policy direction,
can we be thought of as a big thinking entity
that can put big things in front of the Secretary
for consideration. That's just one comment.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: I would just say
that what was evident in 2.0 was this balance of
the advice is internal and centered around what
the agency could do. But the opportunity of who
we are and why we got selected to really have an
external presence, to be careful when we're
representing and when we're not. But we need to
think about how do we think big outside in our
own roles and our own communities.

I don't know how we advance that. I
want to be honest, but I saw a couple of heads
shake when you said think big. And I just want
to say that this is really the opportunity where
we need to start taking some more ownership.

The staff has been phenomenal in
organizing us. But I think to your point is
internal accountability of us having our own
phone calls and organizing them. And I know
everybody doesn't have an assistant, but how do
we do that? How do we in certain areas because
we have advanced two priorities -- How does
those of us whose priorities are working or
almost on autopilot lend a hand to some of the
other committees?

    Dare I say I think by default we've
had people step up like Tiff, Andrew and Heather,
Tiffany that we will be co-chairs looking to say
how can we help you to keep this going. We don't
meet again for a long time. But I expect that
Steve and I will just confirm that we'll be here.

    We're going to see some folks in a
couple of weeks in the State of Entrepreneurship
here in D.C. Whitney is going to make sure that
we get to the conference. I would say also
thinking about what do we do with these
internally, but what can we bring back to put
some meat under these and to have us be larger
thinkers for sure.

    MEMBER KENNEY: I was going to ask
Brian if you could elaborate a little on the
shared resources column. I understand what
access to capital is and training workforce
development. I wasn't sure if I really
understood -- And I was curious if you just try
to organize all of the topics that were out there
and try and find some natural groupings for them.
Or is this more here are the big things that we
should be working on and then put the topics out
there?

MEMBER BARTHOLOMEUSZ: The former. So
I basically took what we had and I just tried to
make some sense of them.

MEMBER KENNEY: Okay. Could you talk
a little bit more about the shared resources one?
What is that? How would you define that?

MEMBER BARTHOLOMEUSZ: I tried to find
a word that covered what ended up in that column
básically.

MEMBER KENNEY: Okay.

MEMBER BARTHOLOMEUSZ: So that was the
best descriptor I could find. And like I said,
this is not a lot of thought. This is one glass
of wine and my pathetic attempt at Excel or
PowerPoint or something. I'm not an expert at
drawing this stuff. You can tell. It's
horrible.

MEMBER KENNEY: This is great and I
would love to see what you could do with two or three glasses of wine.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: Do you have suggestions?

MEMBER KENNEY: I don't know that I have a suggestion. In a prior NACIE we started right off the bat with this organizing principle around an innovation group and an entrepreneurship group and a workforce development group. We actually felt constrained by that because we didn't get to talk amongst groups as much as we wanted to. That was one of our pieces of advice to not force us into these separate areas.

It does feel like there's some value ultimately of self-organizing into some big buckets. So I agree. I might have come up with the same label if I was doing the same exercise of trying to organize these concepts and these specific ideas.

I think it also might be worth -- and I don't have a suggested grouping -- us thinking
at that high level and maybe as part of the strategic planning process about workforce as clearly a big area and capital is a big area. Is there another big area that we collectively think we want to have maybe multiple projects and a group of people working on together?

   It could be more around that innovation, converting ideas into businesses or it could around -- There is a whole bunch of different categories. And some of the things here in the shared resource may fall into a different name. That's just a naming thing. That's just my thought.

   CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: That's what I thought.

   MEMBER KENNEY: I think that's a good point.

   CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: We will carve them out. So I don't think we're have all the wordsmithing. But I think we want to make this a collaborative process. Naming Heather and Andrew and others, not that they're going to go off and
do it. I'm not pushing you to come up with something. But I think this is the time for us to say what else we would like to see.

MEMBER KENNEY: Yes, which is great. And I've been sitting here thinking I was working on the capital one. We just passed it. So what do I work on now?

(Laughter.)

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: That's a good question.

MEMBER KENNEY: I would welcome other ideas and would love to help think about that at both a high level as well as specific ideas.

MEMBER STEVENSON: I would say that when I look at items C, D and N they really represent to me the how. So are there some common measurements or measurements of success on how we want to get our work done? I would say there might be more than fall into that category. But I think our purpose is we want to make sure that we're always aligning and that we're taking advantage of what's happening with Federal and
convening and working with established businesses. Maybe it's working at a local and regional level to understand how to accommodate our suggestions and to existing framework as a suggestion.

MEMBER WOMACK: So I'm getting increasingly excited about all of this. But the entrepreneurial personality inside of me wants to engage external stakeholders and leverage what we're doing to really engage thought leaders and doers out there in so-called real world.

Part of the challenge is we are a client or rather OIE is a client to NACIE. They're our customer in a sense. But there are all these other customers and clients out there. I'm wondering if we should consider establishing some sort of forum that would allow us to engage more directly folks like Kauffman and other folks who are out there doing good things in various buckets that could inform NACIE. Therefore, they could inform OIE within the framework that we're discussing. I'm actually putting forth an idea
for consideration.

(Off the record comment.)

MR. BUERSTATTE: OIE has been engaged with Kauffman to discuss some strategies to identify the continuum of entrepreneurship and innovation servicing programs and policies across government in preparation for their E-SHIP Summit in June of which OIE will likely have a decent sized role in that category to helping pull together the resources in that continuum of players on the Fed side. That would be a great way to engage Kauffman through OIE and NACIE. And Kauffman being the convener that they are, no doubt I think there will some other great external players there.

But I think that's also just a great nod again to Whitney's conference in April -- May. So we'll go to Chicago in May and then -- D.C.

(Laughter.)

MR. BUERSTATTE: You guys are making me crazy. We'll come back in May. What are the
dates on that, Whitney?

(Off the record comment)

MR. BUERSTATTE: Okay. Interesting.

I'm wondering if we could wrap a NACIE meeting around that. Right. So maybe we have our official meeting either the day before or the day after. I'm getting ahead of myself. We'll talk about that at the end.

But I love it. I'll just emphasize that all these nods and mentions of various organizations. Joe, the National Association for Community Colleges and Entrepreneurship, that's 300 community colleges. That's an awesome channel. Heather's organization, Heather has offered to share some of the resources and consulting and innovative services they have to help us work through this. And I know many others of you as well. Looking at you actually, Rebecca, with the Innovation Advocacy Council through SSTI.

Absolutely, let's use what we've got.

That's the power of the team. That's why we
bring you in here and happy to see all the
discussions happening. Happy to see the
friendships growing because that's where the neat
ideas start.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: Things are going to
be very strategic for OIE and maybe you should
try and coordinate. But if you have other ideas
for Kauffman or other groups then we should also
---

MEMBER WOMACK: Yes, I don't want to
be Kauffman-centric. But I think they're great,
but there are other folks doing great things as
well. The point I was making is I'm certainly
willing to roll up my sleeves and work with
everybody here on this idea that we, NACIE, could
externally engage stakeholders, thought leaders,
organizations. We all represent networks.

I represent a huge network of
historical black colleges and universities, about
100 of them, that are engaged in innovation and
entrepreneurship. But they're not plugged in
with you guys. And they need to be. That's just
one example.

But I think the concept of the forum would be that it would allow NACIE to engage and therefore be informed and therefore inform OIE through its framework what's actually going on in the real world out there and how policy can impact in a positive sense those activities. So I'm happy to --

I think Craig's idea of leveraging existing events is great. I don't think that's a bad idea at all. Maybe that's a step towards doing something independently.

MEMBER KAPP: Chad, let me. We had at some point during the course of the iterations there was a conversation about a national innovation summit which dovetails onto what you're saying. So potentially this is this carving these out for that which is taking place in June and then there's the apprenticeship piece.

One of the things that I have found -- and maybe somebody has additional information on
this, but to piggyback off of what you're saying -- as a challenge is that when you take a look at the public policy aspect of things, when you take a look at what foundations are doing, in Appalachia, we have a group of funders who are funding things with regards to workforce development and entrepreneurship, economic development, public policy folks, potentially venture capitalists.

And my experience is -- and potentially this is not the case -- I have not come across a convening of all of those folks who have vested interests where there's been a national summit or national conversation or national discourse to really meet out some of the things in terms of the ways that we can create leverage and collaboration unless somebody else is aware of something.

I know SSTI was really fascinating for me and I started to go to a number of conferences, South by Southwest, USASBE and a whole host of different conferences. But what
I'm finding is that there are these conversations that are taking place in silos. One of the things that we have talked about in a not insignificant way is -- and the community college and academics at that table as well -- that there's a not insignificant opportunity to bring all those folks together with a very targeted agenda that we can put together to see what is it that it would look like and what would we want the outcomes to be.

MEMBER BAGLEY: There was a group that used to convene called National Association of Seed and Venture Funds, but it dissolved about three or four years ago. I was on the board.

It brought together entrepreneurs, some of the SSTI stakeholders, venture capital, seed funders, not everybody. But it was more broad. I think there is a gap in that market from what I've seen. I think that it may be more sustainable if like an association could pick it up as a major push of something that they are interested in rather than organizing a meeting.
like that at OIE would be really tough. But I do
think that there is an opportunity to figure out
what the right way is.

MEMBER KAPP: That's good to hear.

I'm happy to work with you on that because I
think that piece is going to be really important.

MEMBER WOMACK: One last point is I
don't think this needs to be necessarily an
official OIE function per se.

MEMBER BAGLEY: Right.

MEMBER WOMACK: But more of a NACIE-
driven thing. Obviously, OIE would be present
supportive.

MR. BUERSTATTE: I hope you are
inviting me to the party.

MEMBER WOMACK: Oh absolutely.

(Laughter.)

MEMBER TOONE: You've got to think
this is an epic lift, right. We did this at
AARP. We ran the summit.

MEMBER BAGLEY: Right.

MEMBER TOONE: It was hugely impactful
and helped us punch way above our weight. But I
am telling you this is an epic workforce.

MEMBER BAGLEY: It's huge, yes.

MR. BUERSTATTE: That's a great point.

I was just thinking the same thing. But with
respect to, yes, we can't do this solo. But how
can the Federal Government act to be the
convener? What are our best levers? Is it
funding mechanism where we fund the foundation to
do the lift?

Do we use the bully pulpit? We've
seen a lot of that in the past few years. Where
funding has lacked, we've been able to amplify
with designations, with challenges and prizes
that maybe not necessarily amount in funding or
amount to funding but some sort of designation or
just acknowledgment. That seems to rally
communities. And I would be interested in any
thoughts as you guys chew on this in how we might
be able to support that aside as we as a team
trying that lift.

MEMBER REAMER: I have an idea I want
to see what you think as a compliment to what
you're talking about. It's a low level of effort
which I think potentially impacted. When Emily
from Third Way was speaking yesterday, I had
this. Right here, this is a think tank in D.C.
Clearly, you're doing work that relates to this.

Did anybody know Emily before? I met
her two weeks ago. There are a lot of
organizations in this town that work in this
space. And I look at that space outside that
door and think could we just set up four tables
so before each meeting we invite four
organizations like the Economic Innovation Group
or Third Way or Brookings. They just send to
staff. They put out their wares and you guys
mingle and you meet them.

I know there's an opportunity to make
presentations. But they would not be taking
meeting time. How many people walked up to Emily
yesterday? So several of you.

And there would be that opportunity
for the meet and greet. It's a very efficient
way to learn what all these people are doing and
to exchange cards. I'm happy to help arrange
that if that's of interest.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: I want to echo that
because I love the big idea. But I think that
there is probably a gap in everyone's
understanding of these groups, how they operate.
Before we can invite them to all come together,
we need to better understand them. I think that
idea is great.

I think last night's dinner. I don't
see why we couldn't invite HBCU folks or if
somebody is in town or there's another
representative from the board to get some VCs
around the table. This is again where we need to
take ownership though and think about how do we
use the in-between space and how do we use the
social space when we're here.

Except maybe Whitney who's not allowed
to access various forms of technology, there are
webinars. Chad, if there are webinars coming up,
send it out to us. It doesn't have to be an
official thing. But if there is something that
you think or, Joe, there's something that's
public and at least two of us can sign on to and
pay attention and take notes.

I think like people don't know about
us I do not want us personally to enter a space
and we don't know enough about them and identify
an overlying framework of their shared views and
opportunities.

I just keep hearing this is a call.
And I think Steve and I will make ourselves
available. But how do we keep this moving and
how do we continue to remain connected and not
having to rely on Eric and Craig to do?

MEMBER REICHERT: So I'd like to build
a little bit on Andrew's idea and wonder if he
brought in the Third Way folks as part of the
public comment period so that we could hear what
they have to say. It was very relevant to work
that we were potentially going to be doing.

Is the public comment period a forum
in which we could do similar things, if we wanted
to have people from the Manufacturing Institute come in and talk to this group about what is advanced manufacturing for example or what are the challenges, using that as an example. I think Craig and his team have been very good about bringing in speakers who are helping us understand different capabilities of government and different channels that we have.

But we could also if it's okay with the group use the public comment period for providing information to NACIE. It's just an idea.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: I don't see anything wrong with that. The only thing I would say is I was vetting this here. It would have been great if we had more time. So I think thinking about all the spaces we have, there's no reason why we can't recept and listen to someone and then sit down and have dinner with them.

I just want to say that I think any of this time is available. But I also felt like we could have heard 20 more minutes from Emily and
had more time for Q&A. So we should be mindful
of what is allowed in terms of time and what are
other venues to go deep. I would think for the
American Manufacturing and particularly the
significance of the issue have them in public,
but then also have them come to dinner and do
something else for us. I just think it's a
management of time and making sure we get what we
want because we only get one chance.

CO-CHAIR TANG: If I may just call our
attention back to the framework. I think we're
talking about next steps which is great, but aim
further discussion about the framework.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: Dave would agree to
fix it or revise it. I'm sorry. Not fix it.

MEMBER NEMETH: I just have a couple
quick thoughts on the framework side. It strikes
me. I suppose it's the systems engineering
perspective I reluctantly have. I think
identifying them alphabetically almost implies
that each of them carry the same weight and you
see N kind of stuck along off in the bottom
corner there.

And I think it's okay to maybe start looking at combining them as well as an option. We talk about putting them aside. But now that I understand connecting community capital resources better I think that's really just a small subset. It's like if we're going to convene all of these stakeholders, the point of N was that capital doesn't necessarily come from your traditional sources of capital. Capital can come from an existing business that's thinking about investing in R&D and how can we better encourage.

I think as far as the framework of where we're going to put things another option should be not shelf it, but roll it into other ones. So I would propose that we roll N into E.

One other thought, too, was -- and I very reluctantly go down the road of introducing a grand, other piece to our discussion because I'm really excited how much work we have done in a short amount of time -- something that struck me in our conversation yesterday about regulatory
and trade, two things that aren't a big part of what we've talked about but from an administration standpoint, we see at the forefront, was looking at L. It reminds everybody that in certain environments for entrepreneurs they're saddled with long regulatory approvals and the idea of creating some easy to operate either digital or physical sandboxes to experiment. This strikes me as a really opportune focus for us. And then maybe we include trade and regulatory as a better label for shared resources.

I just put that out that we should start thinking about where to find a home for trade and regulatory. And one final thought on the trade, that's the other thing for a technical business exporting to customers overseas that are often greater, more eager customers of our technology. That's really intimidating for a smaller entrepreneur.

So then it ultimately gets either shelved or the larger organization comes in and
buys it purely for the sake that they have an export committee and team that can sell it overseas. I think that could really unlock a whole different subset of entrepreneurs. They could more easily sell their equipment without having to worry about months and years of ITAR and every other frankly Commerce regulation on trade.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: I just had a technical question. You have great suggestions. Who is going to -- I don't want to assume it's Brian. Are you going to edit it?

MEMBER BOESCH: I was about to volunteer to work with Brian.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: Awesome.

MEMBER BOESCH: For digital clarity.

(Laughter.)

MEMBER NEMETH: I like the PowerPoint on that color scheme though. It works.

(Off the record comment.)

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: So we have David and then Esther.
MEMBER KENNEY: I was sitting here thinking about there's a huge amount of unknowns related to the new Administration and the new Secretary and policy priorities. Mike's comment just made me think.

Regulation is one we know is a big topic that there's a strong desire to reduce the amount of regulations. To the extent we could have an initiative that could say "Here's some well thought out suggestions for improving regulations." I would think that would be embraced and welcomed. I think that that's a very interesting one that we could be thinking about.

And I would also encourage all of us as we hear the priorities of the new Administration becoming more apparent that if there are things that we feel like we can constructively jump on as a council -- some of them are obviously way outside our scope and anything that we can do constructively -- to the extent that there are things that we can jump on
and influence, I think that would be a great thing for us to be quick to work on if we can.

MEMBER BALDWIN: And I think that there's an opportunity to either color code or identify what can be done that fall under fund, convene and the other things that are possible for OIE. So what's the charter? What can they do? Convene what? Fund what?

MR. BUERSTATTE: Just so you know as a reminder, we're advising the Secretary of Commerce. So we've got a lot more than what just OIE can do. So we really do have the assets of Commerce behind us.

MEMBER BALDWIN: Okay. But I don't see -- I see one convening and a couple of funding. But it's not labeled. It might help us as "Yes, this is possible."

MEMBER BOESCH: As I think about how to draft this, what might be nice, too, is maybe we can make a draft and put it up on the Slack channel so that people can get feedback as we evolve this. At the beginning of the discussion,
I would not have taken all the notes I have taken had I volunteered for it. So I'll appreciate if you guys can do that.

What I think would be very helpful and this will probably be a good exercise in practice for our strategic planning for OIE is what I want to remember here is I think it needs to simultaneously achieve two goals. I think it's great to have clarity so we can have a mental model of what's the scope of things that we're working on, where do we fit them in and how they have action.

But I also really want it to bring in what Rebecca is saying that I think it's important to remind us of what's the big picture mission of these things. We'll try to make it in a way that can capture and that can be inspirational in that way. We can then always ask ourselves, "Are we thinking big enough?"

MEMBER JOHNSON: I agree with that. I think you don't want to leave Rebecca's idea out of this. And what if the Commerce Secretary
asked you, Craig, "Forget all this stuff. What's something really big that we could do that would make an impact?" What would you say? That's sort of where I'm at.

An entrepreneur always has their elevator speaker ready. They always do.

MR. BUERSTATTE: My elevator speech right now, one of which we're working on in the OIE strategy is there is $7 or $8 billion going towards innovation, entrepreneurship program and policies right now across the Federal Government. There is an opportunity to elevate OIE's role to be a convener and expert in this field for all of Federal Government. So we are going to make the Federal Government's I&E programs more effective and more valuable. That's one pitch.

So I just respectively disagree with some of it. Sometimes it's how you sell it. I think the strategy plan and that work is going to be hugely valuable if done right.

I also think many of the conversations here are in infancy right now. So we will build
towards those big, bold ideas as long as we all push each other.

MEMBER BAGLEY: -- presidential candidates through the transition -- thank you -- evolved into a presidential that we shared with both candidates through the presidential election and had some pickup from some of the wording and things. That was positive on both sides.

So we then recreated that into a suggested set of ideas for legislators, but more for administrators. I can post that up on Slack because it gives a little bit of fuel. And it was really worked at the SSTI conference with a fairly broad set of people.

Again, to Joe's point, it's more practitioners, university, the industry flares in there. So it would be good for us to test it. But it could give some ideas to start with.

MEMBER REAMER: Does everyone know what SSTI is?

MEMBER BAGLEY: It actually used to stand for State Science and Technology Institute.
But it has evolved. So it's an association.

Well, it's not an association. It's C3 organization that works on best practice sharing between people that are working in technology-based economic development.

So it's independent non-profits like the Science Center, like my previous job at NorTech. It's universities who are doing economic development in a technology-based way. It's states and their funding mechanisms. It's practitioners in technology-based economic development. And there are 46 states that are involved. So it's a pretty broad set of constituents.

CO-CHAIR TANG: The current chairman is former Governor Tom Ridge who was also the first head of the Department of Homeland Security.

MEMBER BAGLEY: Correct.

CO-CHAIR TANG: A strong advocate both nationally and at the state level.

MEMBER BAGLEY: And I'm both on the
board of SSTI as well as I chaired the Innovation Advocacy Council for the first three years. So I've been pretty involved.

CO-CHAIR TANG: They're based in Columbus.

MEMBER BAGLEY: They are based in Columbus, but that's just leadership.

PARTICIPANT: Don't knock Columbus.

(Laughter.)

CO-CHAIR TANG: That was not a knock.

I'm going to offer just in the spirit of big ideas and this is perhaps not just an example of an idea but how you may be thinking about from your own community perspective of how to gain support for big ideas. Let me just preface it by saying I think Mike very, very appropriately has caught onto the two anchors I think of this Administration which are trade and deregulation which I think we ought to be aware of.

The other piece which I think is being discussed a lot is infrastructure and the
opportunity to invest heavily in infrastructure
during the campaign. Their numbers thrown around
are $1.0 to $2.0 trillion that could be accessed
and primarily from repatriating foreign profits
back into the U.S.

I did some business on the Hill
yesterday to define and expand the definition of
infrastructure to innovation infrastructure and
assets as well. And this could be obviously a
huge windfall to everything that we are
advocating I think for the economy.

But obviously it goes beyond Commerce.

In order to create that ground swell support
you're going to have to do your own work if you
believe in that with your own local communities
to get support at the legislative level. I offer
that as one thing that's in the background. I'm
not ready yet to present it to the Council for
support. But I'm trying to see whether I have
local traction within our legislators and I hope
you would do the same thing.

(Off the record comment.)
CO-CHAIR TANG: Yes, and by the way
part of this was advocated in the previous NACIE.
I think we'll add to that. Sure.

(Off the record comment.)

CO-CHAIR TANG: Sure, absolutely.

MEMBER WILSON: I just wanted to tag
on to that infrastructure. I'm not an
entrepreneur. But I've spent years and years and
years doing innovation as a discipline. And the
highest ROI from an innovation standpoint comes
from reapplied innovation.

If we look at what's been done for
innovation infrastructure elsewhere, I've got
some examples. A Chinese national infrastructure
for supporting entrepreneurs and innovators from
a structural standpoint, where they can go. They
have an office. They have mentors that help them
get their licenses. They have funding.

I really would like to engage on that
infrastructure. But what can be reapplied that
is already successful and working? What can we
learn from those successes and reapply it?
CO-CHAIR TANG: Good point. Whitney.

MEMBER W. SMITH: Yesterday in the workforce work group, David Langdon shared with us that the Department has been commissioned over the next 120 days through a consultation period and then a writing period look at how to streamline the permitting and procedure and indeed figure out how to remove regulations that hinder the growth of manufacturing in the U.S.

What was talked about in the work force group knowing the manufacturing sector and many owners of manufacturing firms that work force is their top of mind issue, not that permitting and regulation might not get in the way. But workforce is their number one challenge in terms of economic growth.

Just picking up on the what would you say if you got someone's attention, when some of the appointees come in and say "What should the priorities be" I would appreciate if you could say "One of the things that NACIE has been thinking about is how to meet your goals of
"growing the manufacturing sector." And as you go through this process around regulation and permitting, could we have a parallel inquiry process around what we could do around skilling the workforce for manufacturing and partner with the U.S. Department of Labor on it. And NACIE has a number of experts and resources in this place and could be one of the thought burners.

CO-CHAIR TANG: Andrew.

MEMBER REAMER: I appreciate the desire to have a lot of impact and the idea of picking some big ideas to create that impact. And I appreciate last night I think we adopted the cleaned-up version of the motto of NACIE 3.0 which is get stuff done.

My perspective is that in my mind in public policy the way to create the biggest impact is create the capacity for other people to do big stuff. That's why I'm particularly interested in the strategic planning process.

One of my aims in working with this group is to help build the capacity of OIE and to
create a framework not only for this NACIE but future NACIEs to have an impact. Hence is the idea for building a structure for strategic planning.

About five years ago I was part of the team. That's how I know Tom. We were hired to look at how EDA might improve its evaluation of its impact. And I've done probably five or six evaluations of EDA programs over the years. And the way it's traditionally done is you count the number of jobs that are created.

And our argument was which EDA adopted is you now look at EDA's mission statement. EDA's mission is to enhance the capacity of regions to create jobs. And EDA then hired one of the think tanks to figure out ways of how you measure increases in capacity. It is not as easy as actually measuring the number of jobs. But EDA has adopted that.

And that's how I think about it. I want to encourage others to think about NACIE's role in building the capacity for other people to
do good things which often takes below the radar screen. But it's a large multiplier effect.

MEMBER BAGLEY: I think in this environment where so much is unknown you never know what disruption is available. So you're being prepared to put some things forward that are big is I guess all I'm arguing for.

I agree with you that watching public policy for the last 15 years its capacity tends to be incremental. But there are points of disruption where things happen. And it feels like we're at one. And now whether some of our stuff is there or not is unclear.

MEMBER REAMER: I don't feel like they're mutually exclusive.

MEMBER BAGLEY: No, that's what I was saying, too.

MEMBER REAMER: And if big stuff, there can be marketing reasons, branding reasons to do something. You get people to notice you.

MEMBER BAGLEY: Right.

MEMBER REAMER: There may be an
opportunity to do something big. But there needs
to be a strategic reason for doing the big thing
in the context of --

MEMBER BAGLEY: I think we're in
agreement is what I hear.

CO-CHAIR TANG: Anything further on
the framework? Heather.

MEMBER BOESCH: Just something that
would be helpful to me as I do this, could
someone put on the Slack channel an org chart of
Commerce?

CO-CHAIR TANG: That would take hours
to download I would think.

(Laughter.)

MEMBER BOESCH: Just to I make sure
that we're referencing all of the groups. Thank
you.

CO-CHAIR TANG: Melissa, what I've
heard is that thanks Brian and Heather for taking
the lead to process our ideas here. I think big
support from Mike, from David, perhaps others who
have offered different thinking. Be mindful of
what we're hearing in terms of anchors in this Administration's agenda. Manufacturing, jobs, deregulation, trade, infrastructure. If you could help us visually portray that.

I think with the understanding that this is a fluid document, a fluid document, right now. But we need something to map our ideas and our initiatives right now including the two that we've already approved.

Any additional thoughts beyond that?

(No audible response.)

Thank you, Brian and Heather.

MR. BUERSTATTE: I'm going to call an audible real quick. We'll take a seven minute break and what I want you to do during that break is think and perhaps discuss with a colleague what one thing you can do between now and the next few weeks and do I mean accomplish to move some of these things forward.

We'll talk about that in the next steps. And we'll talk about scheduling and how we can accomplish those together. But I'd really
like a report out from everyone. I think it's an opportunity to do a quick self-audit. Do we have and have we identified the right things, so we can think big? And we're moving in the right direction.

Quick break. Seven minutes. We'll be back shortly.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 11:10 a.m. and resumed at 11:19 a.m.)

MR. BUERSTATTE: Hopefully everybody's identified a specific task, action, they can take that defines or they feel will be very valuable for the team given the discussion and help define our next steps, not only individually but what direction are we heading in. And I see this as an opportunity to give feedback and sure that we're clear on things in that specific building block that you serve for the broader picture.

I'll start with two examples. (1) We have two great, very clear initiatives that have been voted on. So OIE will take those. We will
formalize and prepare documentation to submit to the Secretary. We will brief and we will bring back specific guidance and feedback to you all.

That guidance might involve two thumbs up. And we will race forward with for instance the capital convening effort and OIE will immediately take that, start drafting a funding opportunity and again bring that to you for that ongoing dialogue.

(2) It is clear that there is still some uncertainty around what some priorities might be and how we can think big. My commit to you is to ensure that OIE is continually engaged with the inbound team as they onboard and bring you up to date information to ensure how we are crafting our policy ideas as meaningful and up to date.

CO-CHAIR TANG: I am trying through several intermediaries to meet the Secretary-Designate as a way of previewing what we're doing here with NACIE. That's Item 1.

Item 2 I think as I mentioned before
is the issue of infrastructure and funding. I am making the rounds on Capitol Hill to see if there is a groundswell support in expanding that definition. I would encourage you to do the same.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Real quick update. Melissa and Steve will actually have a call shortly with the Secretary.

CO-CHAIR TANG: Ah, thanks. I need to find another one then. Let me think.

MR. BUERSTATTE: We don't have a schedule yet, but it will be soon.

MEMBER BOWLES: Can I just at the risk of being a little hokey? I would like just to say to the rest of the Council that I was exceptionally encouraged yesterday by the healthy and hardy discussions that we were having. As I'm sure all of you have experienced when you're building teams and councils and things like that, there is nothing like a little bit of healthy discussion to build and bond a group together.

As I watched all the stuff that was
happening yesterday, I sort of just smiled
thinking this is our bonding moment. And like I
said at the sake of being hokey, I think it's
really important and exciting and I think it will
help make us more effective as we move forward.

Thank you all for being willing to be
honest and open and confrontational. And I think
that's going to be a great thing for us moving
forward. You never know what will happen. For a
group to truly gel is important and essential and
I'm glad ours happened now versus two or three
meetings from now. Thank you.

CO-CHAIR TANG: Let's continue around
for one or two things.

MEMBER NEMETH: Also as a member of
that meeting, I enjoyed the experience of seeing
some passion behind our discussions. And I think
that's a good thing. As you recall, I shared my
professional thoughts earlier about what our
focus was.

I would also just like to share some
personal thoughts that aside from the
professional place I have in the technical and nanotech world I also do a lot of products and branding. I'm not aware of any official NACIE logo or perhaps unofficial logo. Now that we have an official motto perhaps you'll see little bit of work from me on that side that will show up in your mailbox over the next couple of weeks. So keep your eye out for some good NACIE swag that will be off the record.

(Off the record comment.)

MEMBER REAMER: I think the role I want to take is designated free safety.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

It's Super Bowl week. Yes, being available as useful. I will be available to the workforce team around sharing my understanding of resources and people they may talk with. I feel like I'll be feeding info to Heather and as useful and needed engaged in the strategic planning process.

I would like to talk to the co-chairs and staff about ways I might be able to help with
outreach to these outside groups in a way that we can do relationship building.

Then the last thing is as I mentioned earlier for Kauffman I'm supposed to produce a listing of federal efforts in support of entrepreneurship. You saw some of the early or the first stage stuff on that, the advisory committees and interagency working groups. The more complicated stuff is around the programs and the laws. But in the first half of this year, I should be completing that.

I also have a document that I just did on spec, but didn't get anyone to fund it. Four years ago, I got a research assistant to do the same thing with innovation programs which I think I shared with you guys a while ago.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Let's keep it moving. And I violated my own rule by doing two examples. So 30 seconds and then we elevate everything.

MEMBER REICHERT: So when it gets to my turn now it's 30 seconds.

(Laughter.)
CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: And you just used ten. Oh no.

(Off the record comment.)

MEMBER REICHERT: Sue and I have been talking about what's kind of next on the advanced manufacturing topic of the workforce group. And one thing we talked about is setting up a call in the very near future to talk about next steps.

We also talked about having a core subcommittee to get stuff done and then sharing that information with a broader group. We thought one thing that might be very important is first developing a bit of a mission statement and also which would help the team as a whole understand the importance of advanced manufacturing to innovation and entrepreneurship.

I feel like that's maybe a missing piece. And we feel strongly that it is very central to innovation and entrepreneurship. But we should maybe think about how to communicate that better. I'll let Sue add anything I've forgotten.
MEMBER S. SMITH: Yeah, only one thing. That was good, Emily. We're going to start with these meetings to talk to other folks and invite other folks in on the conversation. The National Association of Manufacturers was one. Some of the others that have been talked about here are others that we will consider. We're going to schedule those as well to connect with other groups.

MEMBER REICHERT: And the other thing we talked about is one of the first things we're going to do which is interview Andrew.

MEMBER W. SMITH: I'm really interested in working on the manufacturing group. So I'll join whatever you organize. I love the idea of not just having the group be a manufacturing workforce group, but be across the three areas that we're working in.

But on apprenticeship, I'm happy that people are interested in the conference. I can push out the information about the conference. One of the 2.0 members, Fred Dedrick, is one of
the main organizers. I'll follow up with Fred, get more information about the content so I can advise on how you can plug in and use the conference. It's great if you want to come.

And then there are a lot of things beyond the conference really to apprenticeship that David brought up when he presented on the research around collecting stories in your own backyard of companies that are seen ROI and how do we craft the message. Ultimately, if Commerce is -- what was the tag? The face of --

CO-CHAIR TANG: Voice for Visit.

MEMBER W. SMITH: The Voice for Visit. The more we can craft messages on the value of apprenticeship that Commerce can push out through its various programs related to business I think the better.

MEMBER STEVENSON: I think with my role I'll be focused on how we can finalize the narrative around workforce development. I would love to partner with Heather as you're building out this strategic framework to say more
specifically how workforce development is in
service to that.

And then my most immediate action is
inviting everyone who is on the workforce team if
you have 30 minutes after today. We'd like to do
a quick huddle to make sure that we're aligned on
what next steps are particularly as we start to
subgroup.

MEMBER TOONE: I really believe
strongly in this idea of looking at other
resources that exist across other branches of
government. I think that's a huge untapped
resource and to make those ongoing activities
more effective. I plan to plug my contacts at
DOE especially, at ARPA-E where we had attacked
the market's program within ARPA-E but also other
parts of the Department of Energy and at NIH.
I'll certainly connect with Andrew on that.

MEMBER GOLDIN: So I joined this group
primarily because I'm an entrepreneur and because
I really want to encourage entrepreneurs overall.
And there's just a ton of great ideas that have
been around the table here and discussed.

My feeling is that mentorship is super key to entrepreneurs and actually getting people to actually go and do stuff and help them think through the hows. And whether or not this Administration understand that, I'm not sure. But regardless I think we need to take a lot of these ideas and just go do them.

MEMBER BAGLEY: David and I talked at the break. We committed to share the SSTI or the Innovation Advocacy Council Policy platforms that have some of the big ideas in them and then convene a call around that to get feedback from NACIE members and see if there is anything of interest or sticks. So we'll do that in the next couple weeks.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: I think I'm just going to keep doing hopefully what I've been doing which is push people along, call you, email you, keep chiming in on Slack. Maybe I'll be the cheerleader.

To your point, I resigned from two
other boards so that I could focus on this. Regardless of what happens, I think this is the one unique opportunity particularly for the entrepreneurs that I represent that we have the closest shot ever to really change things.

So I appreciate your comments. You can call me hokey, but I will be the cheerleader to make sure that we're staying accountable to each other and to the communities that all we represent as diverse as they are.

MEMBER WILSON: Craig and Eric, whatever you need from me to help take the capital thing across the finish line just from a nuts and bolts getting it done let me know. I think, Steve and Melissa, to the extent you need back up along the way just don't hesitate to call on me and likewise to the rest of the Council, if I can be a set of ears or help brainstorm around certain issues and provide perspective. After thinking about some of these things and how they all intersect and relate over the past couple of years, I'm happy to do that, too. Just message
MEMBER LYNCH: I met with Heather and I'll let her say what she's going to send to me. But I'm going to send to her specific examples under infrastructure of things are working. I'm also going to send to her some notes that I have and what I know of around infrastructure, jobs, US share of IEP and GDP growth.

And I will do that by the end of February. If we can add some accountability to ourselves of where we said what we would do, let's say when we're going to do it.

MEMBER BARTHOLOMEUSZ: I had a quick chat with Eric about perhaps setting up a Slack channel that lists all the conferences and webinars that might be of interest to NACIE members. I think that would be really useful. Some of that stuff is buried in all of the threads and you can't find them.

It might be also useful to have I thought a list of resources along the lines that Andrew and others have proposed that maybe we
could tap into or speak to. And maybe everybody submits a list of people. Then we vote in terms of who we might want to speak to, not simply who they are but why it is that we should talk to them or what it is they might have to offer to us. I think that would be very useful. I would be very interested to see such a list.

MEMBER BOESCH: Okay. Well, first of all, if we need a slightly toned down language version of our motto, one that I like is Don't Get Ready Get Started. I have three things that are my immediate action items. 

First, I'm going to collaborate with Fran on revising the framework to provide some clarity and a mental model for all the work that we're doing. I'll share a draft on the Slack channel for everybody's feedback. That will probably happen realistically looking at my schedule late February or early March. 

Second, I'm going to send out a summary of the next step action items to the rest of the people that were in my subcommittee where
we discussed yesterday. I think we have some subsets that we can start working on simultaneously.

And, finally, I just wanted to make myself and my organization available as a resource. There are two things that we're very good at and which I already have volunteers from my company asking how they can help.

One of them is doing qualitative research interviews. We do research to inspire action and how do you structure and plan those and run those so that you can actually start to understand what people's unmet needs are, what psychology that's driving some of these things. So I've already volunteered to help with research plans or things like that.

And then, second, like Mike, I have a pretty good design organization behind me. So if there's some things that we want to do to make some of our outward facing communications visually impactful I offer those resources as well.
MEMBER REAMER: Do you do animation?

MEMBER BOESCH: Yes. But that takes

a little longer.

MEMBER BOWLES: So my action items are
to take the conversation that we had yesterday in
the skills and workforce development and
reevaluate the mentorship network group proposal
that we are putting together. I want to make
sure that we're updating it based on that
information and circulating that around to the
people who were on the call we had a couple of
weeks ago as well as the rest of our group to
come back with something that we think can be
pushed forward and presented to the rest of the
group for approval. I'll stop.

MEMBER FREDERICK: I think the way
that I can help most in a short term and probably
in the long term as well is as a connector. From
my entrepreneurial aperture, I see a lot of stuff
both in the start-up world and then in the big
business world. And I'm out there as the tip of
the spear.
Right now, I'm deep into meetings with most the agencies on the transition team. So I'll certainly try to do that at Commerce as well to figure out what people's hot button issues are. And I'm doing the same thing with NBCA and the biggest companies out there.

On the manufacturing front, I've been talking to the GEs. So use me as a resource and I can knock down doors for you.

MEMBER WADSWORTH: Two quick things. One, I feel very committed especially after an earlier conversation to put pen to paper on a synthesis of my thoughts around what a public/private/academic kind of partnership on these workforce development issues might look like. I've been sharing that with that team for your consideration as you get to more concrete next steps.

And then of course I will make myself available to Heather and Andrew as we start to build out a framework for a strategic plan assuming that we get the go-ahead to fulfill on
that. And I will be taking you up on this
tutoring Andrew keeps offering, most immediately
on the periodic table of Federal Government
acronyms. Thank you for that.

(Laughter.)

MEMBER HERSKOWITZ: I had three. I
was on two committees, but I could only attend
one meeting yesterday. So it sounds like the
capital team is in a pretty good place. Similar
to Tiffany, if I can be useful, that's great.

But in the meantime the topic of
mentorship in particular and connecting
entrepreneurs to mentors is something that I care
a lot about. So I'm looking forward to
reengaging directly with whoever. I think Trey
is leading that effort. As that starts to take
more shape if I can be useful, please let me
know. I'm happy to join the calls.

Two, I think to something Chad
mentioned earlier if gathering information from
other stakeholders who care deeply about this
topic, it's useful.
When we're at a stage where it's useful to gather information from other university center of entrepreneurship or technology innovation or tech transfer, that is a very, very tight community with a very active network. In fact, our annual meeting is coming up in mid-March. We're pretty much the leaders of every university tech transfer. All of us get together for five days. If it's useful to get feedback or to gather data or compile practices of things we're doing, I'm happy to be a resource to connect to the rest of the broader university community.

And, thirdly, I was struck by something that I think Rebecca said of --Actually, no, I think it was Richard on just remembering to always have your elevator pitch and looking back on when we were talking last night about how to make sure that at the end of two years we've done stuff we're all proud of and not just executed on what we came up with today.

I would really like to keep that focus
over the next couple of months but also years on
just what's the big picture of what we're trying
to accomplish. What are the things that we could
add to the stew that would make it really
transformative.

MEMBER JOHNSON: On mentorship
networks, I'm talking to the Endeavor Group and
the University of Kentucky. We also just had 500
mentors sign up for the Lieutenant Governor's
Entrepreneurial Challenge in Kentucky. I'm going
to try to figure out if that's something that can
be replicated elsewhere.

High school kid/college scholarship
competition, we're giving away $100,000. I don't
know if this is just parents or what. We'll have
to sort through that list and see. But an
incredible amount of energy on that.

And the final thing is I'm working
with a group of students and faculty at Harvard
Law School. They want to provide fellowships,
two-year, fully-paid fellows, for graduates to go
out to Middle America to be part of a mentor
network. That's going to the dean this month for
signoff. We'll see what happens on that.

MEMBER KAPP: Before I talk about the
deliverables, I just want to say one thing just
as a reminder. I know that we are all in
different communities. But at the end of the day
for us, the final outcome is about increasing
economic outcomes. Whether that's through new
jobs or through new businesses, I think that
fundamentally what we're here to do is to help
create economic opportunity.

I work in Appalachia. I've worked in
cities as well. And I'm all too familiar about
the challenges. And I think that fundamentally
our role is to go ahead and help people shift
from poverty to prosperity. So in each of the
things that we do really thinking about how that
manifests.

Chad and I are going to work on this
national conference together to come up with a
one-pager of what that would look like, who are
the potential types of invitees, not specifically
the potential organizations, but an amalgamation of all these pieces.

Once we have that together, then we will look at putting together a proposed agenda for us to review in consideration so that we can go ahead and move on that. We both have a lot of experience in conference planning. I think we'd be able to collaborate on that and figure out those pieces.

In addition, personally I'm going to continue to work with Tiffany and Maribel on this whole workforce development piece and bring additional resources and contacts to bear.

MEMBER KENNEY: Rebecca already shared that she and I together are going to share the SSTI material via a call that we hope many of you will be able to join.

The other thing I'll offer to anyone who is working in this space is my organization has applied both successfully and unsuccessfully in many cases to a variety of innovation and entrepreneurship programs across Department of
Energy, SBA as well as EDA and in NIST I think as well either on our own or with other organizations in collaborative efforts. So I feel like I've got a lot of experience as an organization appealing to the Federal Government for support in some of these things. I think that may be a valuable perspective particularly as the groups are thinking about strategic plan and looking across the Federal Government.

And the other thing just from the conversation about regulation, I'm going to try to think a little bit more about whether there's something there that we could turn into something of value. It's a hugely overwhelming topic to me not being an expert in that space. But I also feel like if there was something that was specific to entrepreneurship that could be addressed in an environment where people were really trying to cut through regulations that something we might be able to contribute to positively.

MR. BUERSTATTE: What are we missing?
Do you feel pretty good? Do you feel like that's the right direction? Okay, a lot of heads shaking.

MEMBER REAMER: Can we have a band the next time we get dinner together?

MR. BUERSTATTE: So we will certainly work on changing up the meetings. It's an important goal. I will comment that I can sense the bonding to Trey's point, storming and informing. The more interesting we can make these we certainly will try. I'm serious about that.

But if you take a quick look at -- Actually before we dive into the calendar, you can pull out your calendar, but I think Steve has a few comments real quick.

CO-CHAIR TANG: First, I want to thank everybody for their commitments in the Next Steps and in particular on what we've discussed today and approved. Thanks, Andrew and Heather, for stepping up on the OAI strategy, Tiffany Wilson on the capital community continuum and Tiffany
Stevenson on the workforce side.

I know you have your huddles scheduled. I would just offer that Melissa and I are willing to participate. If you want to have a follow-up call to not involve just the people here but the broader group, we're happy to do that.

I would like the Council's concurrence on a slight change in language to what we've already adopted for the strategy piece. So if you'll bear with me and just look at your sheet. I'm going to offer with your concurrence to change in their third paragraph the last sentence which currently reads as follows: "NACIE believes that OAI should be as entrepreneurial as the businesses it serves and use one of its most experience and knowledgeable resources, NACIE, to enhance its own operations." We're going to change that slightly to the following: "NACIE believes that OAI should be as innovative and strategic as the entrepreneurs it serves and to use" -- from then on the same -- "one of its most
experienced and knowledgeable resources, NACIE, to enhance its own operations."

It makes it more specific to entrepreneurs and businesses. Are we all okay with that?

(Chorus of yes.)

Okay. And thanks, Rebecca, for prompting that discussion.

MR. BUERSTATTE: All right. So real quick if you could take a look at the 12 month calendar in front of you. This was green text above the months. It might be in the bottom of the packet. NACIE meeting options, keynote options.

The options are highlighted in yellow. And I would also like to highlight a few dates that we identified today that might be important. Starting in May, I think that second week, Whitney, you said here.

(Off the record comment.)

May 4th and 5th.

(Off the record comment.)
May 4th and 5th could be great. And we'll try and maybe straddle a meeting around that. But any quick feedback on that or thoughts? We'll push this out in an email so that you have a chance to look into your calendars in more depth. I just wanted to broach the conversation now.

Then in June --

(Off the record comment.)

Correct.

MEMBER KENNEY: The other thing that's going on is the National Innovation Summit and the National SBIR Conference. They are all located together the week of the 14th. I was just sharing that date. I don't know if you wanted consider scheduling around that either.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Yes, that's a good opportunity. Thanks. Part of this is --

MEMBER KENNEY: It's down at National Harbor.

MR. BUERSTATTE: So National Tech and Ed Conference. A lot of SBIR stakeholders and
other government funders participating as well as
the entrepreneurs and businesses themselves. And
many of you participate in that I know.

Good to know options because as we
look at these, it's hard to get something fixed
right now because I think our next priority
should be getting the new Secretary into the
meetings. I'd like to get some concrete options
for us that we can propose to the should-he-be-
confirmed in-bound Mr. Ross and his team and see
what works best for his schedule.

In June, we noted the E-SHIP Summit
and this is the 21st or 24th. It's not marked on
the calendar, but just make a mark of that
please. We'll follow up with more details.

PARTICIPANT: What's E-SHIP?

MR. BUERSTATTE: E-SHIP,
Entrepreneurship Summit. They're calling it E-
SHIP.

And again Kauffman, that's going to be
in Kansas City. We're working on some government
convenings there across federal innovation and
entrepreneurship stakeholders.

(Off the record comment.)

MR. BUERSTATTE: No. I think that there might be a role for us to participate, but not as a full Council. This might be individual basis to better inform some of our efforts.

But looking in August I think would be our next target time frame for a late summer meeting. Something to note there, we always seem to struggle with getting a critical mass due to vacations. Kids are out of school. People take vacations.

So please take a hard look at your calendar there. Again, we'll follow up. We'll poll the team and see which dates work for the critical mass. But 10th and 11th seems to be a nice time. If we have to bump it to the right on the 17th or 18th, that's possible. But again just putting some dates out there.

And then November we're looking at National Entrepreneurship Week. That could be really advantageous for us to meet during. Maybe
at that point we've gotten some great traction
with certain things and could be an opportunity
for us to amplify.

But I also know that most of you are
very busy during that week in your own
organizations and communities. So we want to be
realistic and cognizant of that. But let's put
on a marker. We could do the week before. We
can't do the week after. That is Thanksgiving
week. But in or around that time frame would be
great I think.

Quick feedback/thoughts? Other big
conferences or events that we might want to be
aware of right now on the calendar? Brian, I
know you're putting that stuff together with Eric
on the Slack channel of conferences and events in

(Off the record comment.)

Yes, and we're excited to support
that. OIE is really hopeful we can execute that.
We would do it even sooner in fact, but again
just prioritizing engagement with the Secretary.
It's much easier to get that engagement if we're here in D.C.

Again, no better to amplify our work than going out into the communities during National Entrepreneurship Week. So that's a great point. Thanks, Melissa.

(Off the record comment.)

Yes, I'd love to know more and good of have personal experience on the Council on that. So maybe that's another one we should look at closely.

And just to be more clear, David, Tiffany, Steve and many others in the previous council did go out and engage in an official capacity as a NACIE member. So we don't always need to do it as a council. We can certainly attend these and whether serving on panels or pulling panels together to better inform us.

Think creatively around it. I know you all are hustlers. Hopefully, we can get some good opportunities. Heather.

MEMBER BOESCH: Can I just suggest for
my own convenience that in addition to the Slack channel you just maybe have like a shared Google calendar for NACIE where these things can start showing up and potentially blocking our calendars from that. I don't know if everyone uses it, but it would be really helpful to me.

MR. BUERSTATTE: We'll look at a technology solution for that. We have our NACIE email and that NACIE calendar which we sent out through Microsoft Outlook. I know sometimes depending on your mail server some people have expressed confusion with it. But could we do it through that? Through that means? Through the NACIE calendar when we send out those calendar invites to you? Would that work?

(Off the record comment.)

Sure. Okay. Yeah, I know there's been some issues lately. We'll look into a couple of options. Thanks.

MEMBER BOESCH: Two other things I'll mention is that (1) it's beautiful in the fall and we have good offices and meetings spaces in
both of those locations. I will also sponsor breakfast at the next meeting. Since it's starting at 8:30 a.m. we need breakfast.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Andrew.

MEMBER REAMER: I would suggest a Doodle poll in the next couple weeks about these three sets of dates.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Yes, absolutely, like we typically do. I just wanted to tease the crowd now.

MEMBER WOMACK: Can I also say is September better than August given that we struggle with critical mass? It still falls within the quarter and would give us maybe the vacations, the challenges of organizing.

Then I also would make a pitch for San Francisco. We also have space and we feed people. And we have eye shadow.

(Laughter.)

MR. BUERSTATTE: You had me at eyeshadow.

PARTICIPANT: I know what that is. I
MR. BUERSTATTE: Yes, absolutely. I would say actually to be more specific across the summer that we've had issues. So it's not just August. I meant more broadly. If September is better, again we'll push it out. Take a look and thank you. Thank you for all offers to host. That's awesome.

MEMBER KAPP: Actually, I'd like to just make an offer that potentially in addition to a large city that we potentially look at maybe some place in Appalachia. I would love for you guys to understand the struggles that people are feeling and that they're experiencing firsthand. So to the extent that we can identify, I'm happy to go and help identify a place where we can do that.

MEMBER HERSKOWITZ: That was close. Despite coming from a big city and being happy to host also, I would think -- I would be very interested in going into a region that doesn't have the kind of infrastructure that San
Francisco, New York, Boston, Austin and others have just to see how that works and where the kinds of programs we're putting together are likely to have the most impact.

I would second that. I would love to go somewhere we haven't been.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Since we have such an abundance of options, I sense we'll do something very similar as we did with the last Council. We'll put together our pitches and we'll vote. I think we had five or six communities pitch to host a NACIE.

We ultimately chose, the majority chose, Nashville for our first official visit. We did some smaller exchanges at the group level in Chicago and Austin too. But start thinking about that. Yes.

MEMBER REAMER: I like the idea of actually having an auction for naming rights for each meeting. Then we can have people bid against each other.

(Laughter.)
That way we can augment your budget.

MR. BUERSTATTE: I don't want to hear about finances right now.

MEMBER REAMER: Whitney is on my team.

(Laughter.)

MR. BUERSTATTE: This has been a great discussion. I think we've got some good ideas. At this point, I'd like to open up to any public members here in person for public comment.

(No audible response.)

Not seeing anyone. Or an operator on the line, if you could open the call for any members signaling comments on the line please?

(No audible response.)

Thank you very much. And Steve and Melissa.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: Thank you. Truly. I don't say that. I think I look around the room and I think I respect how far you have traveled. I respect those of you who have kids and are juggling play dates. I respect the open-mindedness. I respect the commitments. So truly,
thank you.

CO-CHAIR TANG: Yeah. Thank you for the level of engagement also. I think this level of deliberation that some of us who are used to who work in academia and close to government. Folks who may not be as close may not be as used to. But this is part of the process.

And our basketball team in Philadelphia's slogan is Trust the Process. So I hope you'll join me in that.

The last thing, Emily and Heather, I offered Tiffany Wilson a chance to predict the Super Bowl outcome and you weren't here then. So would you like to offer a prediction for the game?

MEMBER BOESCH: I have no knowledge about football ever.

MEMBER REICHERT: We never cheat.

CO-CHAIR TANG: I think that's a defer.

(Off the record comment.)

MEMBER BOESCH: You know what? The
weather could have done that. I have a physicist friend who proved it.

(Laughter.)

CO-CHAIR TANG: Okay. And last but not least, thanks to the OIE team. Craig, Eric, Andrea, thank you.

(Applause.)

MEMBER BOWLES: Real quick, at the risk of sounding like a mother on prom night can we get a group picture before we all leave?

MR. BUERSTATTE: Yeah, let's do it. Let's do a picture and we also hopefully shared the pictures with Secretary Pritzker last time. Hopefully you guys go those. If not, we'll resend. But as the Designated Federal Officer, this officially concludes our meeting. Thanks so much for coming.

(Whereupon, at 11:58 a.m., the above-entitled matter went off the record.)
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