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MR. BUERSTATTE: Welcome, everyone.
Welcome to our third National Advisory Council on
Innovation and Entrepreneurship quarterly
meeting. As the designated federal officer, I am
officially kicking off our public portion today.
Thank you so much for working through the
security to come here. I know we're a little bit late.

Those of you who are dialed in, please
forgive us as well. Thanks for your patience.

As a reminder, this is a public
federal advisory committee meeting. And we're
doing it a little bit differently today. We're
on Webex instead of our typical spider phone. So
really, really want to highlight, please, if
you're talking, use the microphones, pass them
around, otherwise those listening in and the
reporter won't capture it.

Other logistics. Bathrooms in the
back just outside the doors. Coffee is to your
left. Feel free to take a break when you need it. Otherwise, we're going to rock and roll all the way to 3:00 p.m.

Most of you are pretty comfortable with this by now. We're going to hear from -- well, we'll have our standard run of show today. We'll hear from a few federal guests and, actually, one of our own guests, Andrew Reamer, on a recent research report, and hear from the public.

We had a great research update from Third Way last time. We've got another visiting public member from EveryLibrary, a great industry association working to support entrepreneurship in libraries across the nation. And then we'll move into our general dialog session.

What I hope to encourage is, as always, this is a lively group, and let's keep that up, so keep the dialog moving both ways. If you've got a question to a presenter or anything, anyone else, please bring it up. Let's have a fun time today.
That's all I have. Before, I'd like to introduce our new, newest member, our newest leader of the Economic Development Administration, my new boss Dennis Alvord, the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Regional Affairs. Dennis is no, no foreigner to Department of Commerce. He's been here for quite some time. So we're thrilled to have him at EDA really during this time. He brings a lot of expert knowledge from, really from the most senior levels.

Before -- well, actually I won't go into more. Dennis, I'll let him give a few remarks and tell us a little bit about where he's coming from and his role at EDA.

MR. ALVORD: Thanks very much, Craig. A pleasure to be with you here today. I, as Craig said, I am the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Regional Affairs of EDA. Actually, my official title, if you'd like a little chuckle, is the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Regional Affairs Performing the Non-Exclusive Duties and
Functions of the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Development. I challenge any of you to get that on a business card. Really, really tiny print on the business card.

These are the kinds of things that we go to during transitions between administrations.

But as Craig said, I'm not -- though I'm new to NACIE and I'm new to the COMPETES Act and some of your work here, I'm not new to EDA. And I'm not new to Commerce either. I previously served a long tour of duty at EDA from about 1998 to 2010 where I served in a variety of different roles overseeing I guess what I think of as the traditional EDA Public Works and Economic Development Act programs.

After that I went off and did a few other things throughout the department. I worked on a secretarial initiative called Commerce Connect and a presidential initiative called Business USA. And the goal of that initiative was to make it easier for businesses and entrepreneurs to discover and access new sources
from throughout the entire federal government to make it easier for government to address their business needs.

And following that, most recently I come from the Office of the Deputy Secretary where I served as the Commerce Department's -- one of the co-leads at the Commerce Department's 2016-2017 presidential transition, where we coordinated the entire department's activities related to off-boarding the previous administration and helping to onboard the new administration.

And from there I've now found my way pleasantly back to EDA, where I'm very excited to kind of re-engage with old colleagues and meet new colleagues, to re-engage with old programs and learn about new programs and initiatives and the work that we have underway. And Craig has been quickly educating me and bringing me up to speed about all your good work.

I know that we have a very entrepreneurial group of folks here. And I
understand very hard-charging, you know, folks
that want to get things done. And I also
understand that it may have been a bit
frustrating the last few months as we've gone
through this transition. Just as I'm
transitioning into EDA, we're undergoing a
transition on a much larger scale throughout the
government.

And slowly but surely we have
continued to onboard our new political team. And
while we don't have as much definitive direction
as we might like today, we're starting to get
more and more each day as things go on. So I
would ask your patience as we continue to get
things solidified and bring our new colleagues up
to speed on all the diverse activities that are
happening throughout the department, and begin to
set new priorities as we move ahead.

I hope that we'll have clearer and
stronger direction for you on where we'd like to
see NACIE going in subsequent meetings, but for
the time being I know you have, from looking over
the agenda, a really robust agenda already
developed and underway. You have a number of
very important projects that you've been working
on for some time.

I look forward to learning a lot more
about that work and being able to really act as a
conduit for you all to the incoming team, kind of
serve as your transition coordinator, if you
will, and hopefully help to make that go smoothly
when the time comes and we're able to fully
engage folks.

With that I'd just like to really
welcome you to the Commerce Department today.
And I look forward to learning about the work.
Thanks.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Thanks, Dennis.

And I think what I appreciate most
about Dennis coming onboard is that, as you all
have learned, learning government can be tough:
our acronyms, our programs, our agencies, and
bureaus. But, again, with Dennis' expertise and
knowledge of Commerce we have been running
quickly from day one. So it's been fun and we're lucky to have him.

    Steve sends his regrets. As we know, as he sent out prior, he's receiving an award for leadership in the innovation ecosystem there in Philadelphia. He'll be with us in the morning.

    But, Melissa.

    CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: So, first and foremost, all NACIE members, it's so good to see your faces. It has been a pleasure chatting with some of you individually on the phone and getting to know you. I think that as entrepreneurs, as you so aptly put, we are used to constant change, so we forge ahead. And I look forward to the next couple of days together.

    I want to acknowledge our guests who took time out to be with us. Thank you very much. We're excited. And we look forward to working with you in the future with greater clarity, hopefully, next time around.

    Thank you.

    MR. BUERSTATTE: And I'll second that.
What's been fun observing the Council thus far is seeing all the ideas that have come in through the informal interactions that you've had. Visiting your organizations at the community level, just connecting with each other on the phone. And, in fact, Emily and Sue came here to DC partially on their own accord, but rolled in some NACIE meetings, related meetings as well to further investigate manufacturing talent opportunities.

And, so thank you for taking that amount of time. And thank you to so many others who have spent time either collaborating at South by Southwest or in your travels through each other's communities and organizations. It's been fun being a part of that dialog. And I can definitely say that the Council is fully formed and relationships are starting to deliver some fun and exciting outcomes.

So, with that being said, on the manufacturing piece Sue and Emily were here again last week. And we heard from a number of program
leads across Commerce agencies as well as DOE.

And if you note on the schedule, first up we have
a guest brief from Drew Steigerwald from
Department of Energy.

Drew, if you want to come up here and
get started.

Drew is working on a number of items
around advanced manufacturing for Department of
Energy. Of note, though, is some of their
interest in the talent development or that
pipeline.

So, Drew, I'll kick it off, pass it
over to you.

MR. STEIGERWALD: Hi. Hi, everyone.

Like Craig said, I'm Drew Steigerwald. I'm from
the Department of Energy.

I should start off by saying I guess
this is the time when I say I'm not a federal
employee, I'm a support contractor. So my title
is -- actually my title is longer than this, not
quite as long as yours, but it's actually Senior
Technical Advisor to the Director. But we deal
with technical stuff in my day-to-day job, so
scratch that.

So, the point of that is that I'm not
speaking on behalf of the department. I'm giving
you my perspective from my experience in my
capacity as a support contractor.

Okay, can I just ask real quick how
many people -- I looked at sort of the line-up --
how many people have worked with DOE before?

PARTICIPANT: Can you talk a little
louder?

MR. STEIGERWALD: Yes. Sorry.

So anybody work with AMO before?

(Show of hands.)

MR. STEIGERWALD: Okay, at least one.

Sorry, guys. Department of Energy and
the Advanced Manufacturing Office within DOE.

(Show of hands.)

MR. STEIGERWALD: So, a couple.

So, just briefly, at the Advanced
Manufacturing Office we're part of the Applied
Technology wing of DOE. So, for people who
aren't familiar with the department, DOE
especially does three things, again my opinion:

    We do nuclear and nuclear clean-up.

    We do Office of Science, which is

basic research.

And then we do the applied technology.

So that's I think things that you

traditionally think about when you think of
energy: solar, wind, geothermal.

The Advanced Manufacturing Office

falls in that slate. So we're an applied

technology office. But I think we're a little

bit different because of our mission space. So

we have sort of three core motivations: clean

energy; national security, particularly in the

industrial base of the country, and we work very

closely with our colleagues at DoD; and also the

environment. So, like manufacturing at the

department sort of in the energy-intensive industry

space really hits on all three of these.

    So, because we are at the Department

    of Energy, we have to focus primarily on things
that impact energy use, energy efficiency, or our
ability to be competitive at manufacturing clean
energy technologies, so things like iron and
steel refining, pulp and paper, chemicals, so oil
and petroleum, those sort of things. But it's
actually pretty broad.

    But, and I think importantly, as an
office we're non-sector-specific. So we don't,
we don't work directly with the iron and steel
industry. Instead, we focus on technologies that
if you can overcome key sort of R&D challenges, a
number of industries can move forward either
being more energy efficient or more competitive
in their manufacturing of energy technologies.

    So, a good example of this is process
heating, like it's just heating stuff up. A lot
of industries do it. It takes a ton of energy.
Traditionally you do it in, you know, big
furnaces, depending on what you're making. As an
example, there's, you know, micro, concentrated
microwave heating for chemical applications. So
that's an example of an R&D challenge that can
make a number of industries more efficient.

So this constellation actually lists out 14 technology areas that were developed in our quadrennial technology review in 2015. It's very broad. I think I told the folks that came in last week, I sort of, like, dare you guys to find something that doesn't fall in one of these buckets. So we have a very broad mission space.

But the point that I want you to sort of like take away, we really focus on technologies, not on, not on sectors. So how do we execute on this? The office is broken down into three pillars. One is direct technical partnerships with industries. So this is going out and helping the small and medium size businesses become more energy efficient, oftentimes in very practical ways.

We have R&D consortia. So this is large-scale public/private partnerships with universities, industry, national labs and other stakeholders.

And then we have R&D projects. So I
think this is, like, what you would think about
more traditionally as like direct engagements on
a specific research and development challenge.
But again we do it with industry, university, and
lab partners.

So all of the things that we fund are
in, they're collaborative and they're in
partnership with both industry and university.

Okay. So, I just wanted to get
through that really fast. Let me know if you
have any questions on the background of the
office.

Workforce development. So, we've been
thinking a lot about workforce development in the
office for a couple reasons. Actually, the main
reason is that we don't have a coordinated
workforce strategy, believe it or not. We don't
even have a workforce lead, to be honest with
you. So why is that?

Well, we're primarily a technical
office but we're in a weird position because
we're the manufacturing office. So when people
I want to talk about manufacturing they naturally
want to talk about workforce.

So we have three, sort it's sort of
broken into three things. Again, this is just --
I sort of made this up. You won't find this in
any, any documents anywhere.

We have what I call implicit workforce
development programs. As an example, inside our
technical partnerships is something called the
industrial assessment centers. So this is where
we take -- these are university-based groups. A
PI will go with engineering students and do
hands-on energy efficiency assessments. They'll
leave a business with a set of recommendations.
And then it's up to the business to implement
these recommendations.

So, here businesses are becoming more
competitive by better use of energy. But
students are also getting, like, hands-on
training. So the sort of the core objective of
the IACs is not necessarily workforce
development. There's a very strong, implied
workforce component.

On the other end of the spectrum is our Cyclotron Road program, which some of you may have heard, depending on, you know, where you're at in the innovation space. So this is focused actually on post-graduate work. It's based out of national labs. So Cyclotron Roads was the pilot program. We take in two-year fellows, but instead of focusing on research, we focus on giving them entrepreneurial training. So they have access to work, work class R&D technology to help develop their particular innovation.

But we also build connections and relationships with the venture capital community in the Bay Area in the case of Lawrence Berkeley. And we just expanded to Oak Ridge and also Argonne.

Okay. So then second is what I would call explicit workforce activities. So this is programs that have a built-in sort of workforce mandate or component. So just as an example, we do a lot of internships a lot of times with our
partners at Oak Ridge. We sponsored the first robotics internship, which some of you might have heard of.

We also run graduate-level traineeships. So this is where if we think there is a gap in, like an anticipated gap in skilled workforce down the road we set up curriculum in that area, house the universities to start training graduate students. Last year at the request of the Secretary we started a power electronic engineering graduate traineeship. So, it's kind of a niche topic with a big lead.

And then thirdly, we are partners in the Manufacturing USA network. Again, some of you guys might have heard of this. The Manufacturing USA is a collection of 14 manufacturing institutes, institutes or public/private partnerships. So they can have anywhere between I think the, I think the lowest number is maybe 20 all the way up to 200 industry, university, national lab partners. And these are cost shared. So partners are putting
in money, not just sort of signing up on the list
to participate.

The manufacturing institutes were
actually written into law through -- well, so
they were written into law and tacked onto one of
the defense spending bills a couple years ago.
But by statute they have a workforce component.
So the mission of the institutes is not just to
be a national leader in a particular technology
area, it's also to foster the next generation
skilled workforce in that technology area. So
it's a big lift.

Yes?

MEMBER BOESCH: Yes, this is Heather.
I had a question.

So my organization just joined, like,
AFFOA, the Advanced Functional Fabrics Institute
of America.

MR. STEIGERWALD: Yes.

MEMBER BOESCH: Is that part of that
--

MR. STEIGERWALD: It is.
MEMBER BOESCH: -- manufacturing institute group?

MR. STEIGERWALD: It is. So, DOE runs five. The Department of Defense runs eight.

Commerce runs one. And then Commerce also coordinates the network.

AFFOA is a defense lab institute.

But, yes, it's part of the network.

MEMBER BOESCH: What's the one that Commerce runs?

MR. STEIGERWALD: It is the -- and I'm going to ask my colleague Peter to correct me if I'm wrong -- but I believe it's the Pharmaceutical Manufacturing Institute. Is that right?


So I could talk about this at length. But one of the things I would highlight is we work extremely closely with DoD and DOC multiple times a week coordinating on the phone. Because it is truly a network. But each institute has
dramatically different technology areas.

So AFFOA is a advanced fibers and textiles institute.

DOE just announced a chemical manufacturing institute and a sustainable manufacturing institute focused on recycling in manufacturing. So these span the spectrum of technology areas.

But they all have the same sort of workforce mandate, so all of us are sort of grappling with the same issue of wrapping our heads around how do we take advantage of this unique opportunity where we have established built-in relationships with industry. They signed up for a particular reason. When they signed onto the team they knew there was a workforce component. And we have resources behind it.

So all of the federal partners are trying to think through this problem. And one of the biggest challenges is we're primarily technologists, so the amount of thought and
planning that goes into the technology side of things has sort of naturally led the workforce side of things to lag behind. So, and I'll talk about that in a minute.

The last type of workforce development at AMO is assumed manufacturing because manufacturing -- or, sorry, assumed workforce development, because is our name and everybody wants to do workforce development in advanced manufacturing. So every conversation we have naturally tends towards workforce. What are you guys doing in workforce?

Every time we go up to the Hill, you know, it's brought up. And even though we don't have a specific set-aside for workforce, you know, we believe very strongly that it's obviously an important component. And so that was sort of the motivation, starting about 12 months ago, to really pivot to make sure that we're doing as good as we can be doing on the workforce side.

So just really quickly on the
institutes. I just mentioned this. There's 14 institutes across the country. It's inter-agency. The cost share funding is, I think it's higher than this now, this number was $1.2 billion. I think it's, I think it's up around 1.5.

The model looks like this, so sort of the -- so the consortia acts as a central hub for SMEs, large companies, start-ups, brings in the universities, community colleges for training, and then state and local governments. And as time has gone on, one of the really encouraging things is that we've gotten a lot of buy-in from state governments. So states like New York, California, Kentucky, Ohio, Illinois -- the list is much longer -- because the institutes align with what they want to do in terms of economic development, they've been putting real money behind the launch of the institutes. So that's encouraging to see.

MEMBER HERSKOWITZ: Can I ask a question?
MR. STEIGERWALD: Sure.

MEMBER HERSKOWITZ: When you say within the state government where within -- like, within New York would that be NYSERDA of some other office of the Governor's --

I'm sorry, I'll repeat the question.

When you say engagement from the states, is that typically through the state energy-related groups like NYSERDA in New York, or is it through some sort of workforce development group? Or where does it typically come out from?

MR. STEIGERWALD: So to my knowledge, and I, of course, I can't speak for all of the institutes, it actually has not been the energy offices. So a lot of times it's been the mayor's office. So L.A. gave a lot of space.

I think, I think in the case of New York it was directly from the Governor's Office as well. It was state money. Whether or not they're from the economic development state-level agencies, I'm not sure. But primarily they seem
to come from sort of the main, the main offices.

It's a lot of money, too. I mean I, I don't -- so there was a DoD photonics institute, I don't remember the exact number, but it was a tremendous amount that the state gave, tens of millions or up into the 100 million over five years.

Sorry, one more thing I'd like to mention. The institutes, as a program, by design they have to be self-sustaining after five years. So that's unique. Especially at DOE they're truly public/private partnerships. And the institutes are 501(c)(3)s. Four of the five DOE ones are 501(c)(3)s, and they're co-managed with the federal partners. And the people, the folks that run the 501(c)(3)s, the institutes, they know they have to be self-sustaining in five years.

So, self-sustaining doesn't mean no federal funds. It just means that the annual funds, which right now is 14 million per year, per institute, will be shut off after five
years. So they can still be -- they can still apply for competitive funding.

The reason I mention that is we think that workforce could potentially be a key cog of the self-sustainability plan at an institute if the right relationships can be made and it's designed in the right way. So, those are some of -- like, that's really the main question that we're dealing with is, given the sort of unique position of the institutes, bringing together regional partners, establishing these relationships that take a lot of time to establish, can we execute on our workforce component in a way that will bring in enough resources to contribute meaningfully to the life of the institute?

Sorry. Was that a, was that the ding on my time?

Okay, so I'll wrap up real quick. What I really want to say is, you know, I think a lot of times we want to come and say we're doing XYZ in workforce. And, actually, it's the other
way around, we're trying to figure out what to do on workforce. So the questions that we're asking ourselves are how do we think about workforce development in the same way, in the same rigor that we think about our technology investments?

We have no ability, really, in the office to think about this from a hiring perspective. We almost always interact with CTO level or VP for R&D type folks, which is great, but we just have a -- we're missing a lot on sort of the hiring side. Who should we be talking to? And when we talk to them, what types of questions should we be asking?

I mean, on some level we're not sure what questions we should be asking, even if we can get the right people in the room to have a conversation.

Most importantly, once we do have these conversations, how do we make sure that it's translated into our funding opportunities so that the people getting the money know that they have to do things in a certain way or give us a
plan to do things in a certain way to capture
some of these ideas, to get beyond sort of the
conversational point.

And then, finally, actually there's a
lot of sort of one-off university, industry
models to do workforce development, and we're
wondering how can we scale those, given that we
have these consortia in place? Maybe I can talk
more about this later, but we are moving towards
a conversation like this with the Council on
Competitiveness.

As one of the many things we're trying
to do, we're going to try and engage the hiring
side of the -- I guess the hiring executives with
the council to have this type of conversation in
the second half of the year. And then that's
just a -- the slide with the logos of our
partners on it.

So thanks. Thanks for your time. And
happy to answer any questions that you guys have.

MEMBER BAGLEY: I was just going to
ask if there was one or two instances that -- I
know the workforces and their mandate -- is there
an institute where you feel like they're doing a
particularly good job or is that --

MR. STEIGERWALD: Yes. So, so there's
one institute, it's the Lightweight Metals
Institute. I think it's often cited as the one
that's doing the best. And I think one of the
interesting things -- and I mentioned this when
Sue and Emily came to town -- it's not
necessarily a money thing, although you do need
money to do it well. What they've done -- and
it's been led by Emily DeRocco, who worked at the
Department of Labor. I think she was assistant
secretary or -- Yeah, just a little bit.

But what she's done a great job of is
pulling together a tremendous number of existing
state and local-level workforce activities that
without a central organizing force had been sort
of doing the same thing, you know, not bad, just
sort of doing it in silos without talking to each
other. And she's really done a great job of
stepping in and being a central focal point.
MEMBER BAGLEY: Yes. So, I know one of the breakouts is in workforce manufacturing. And so Emily and I both sit on MForesight, which is an NSF and Department of Commerce funded initiative that is hosted at the University of Michigan, but it's a national board. Really manufacturing foresight is the frame. And so manufacturing workforce, as you can imagine, is a huge topic that Emily is driving the implementation of the, you know, or the paper and sort of what our recommendations will be.

So just as a FYI.

MR. STEIGERWALD: So I got the answer to the question, right? By saying Emily.

MEMBER BAGLEY: I wasn't sure what you were going to say.

MR. STEIGERWALD: Thanks.

MEMBER BALDWIN: Are any of the manufacturing institutes or other organizations supporting the maker movement? Is there any manufacturing maker resources where people can come in and make things, whether it be machine
shops, or printed circuit boards? You know, what's available to the community to foster that entrepreneurship?

MR. STEIGERWALD: Sure. So, so I would say that it's -- I would say yes and no. I think yes, but in a limited way.

There is an Additive Manufacturing Institute in Youngstown. And I think they're primarily focused on engaging the labor community.

Some of the institutes, you know, aren't, aren't right for that, just given the technology focus. But I think the fact is a lot of the institutes sort of fall in the middle. Where Additive is sort of the natural open house for the maker community.

I think things like there's a -- I'm sorry, I'm talking about another funding agencies, institutes. But I think, you know, NextFlex, which does flexible electronics. I think even getting hands-on experience for students, you know, even if they're not walking
out with a flexible television, it's very useful for them to see what and how, you know, what can be done and how you can do it.

And then the last thing I would say on that is that the funding agency offices have engaged in the maker community. So, so we were very involved in the White House maker fair last year. But I haven't heard if that's going to be on again, it's not going to be on again.

But the offices have been involved in the past.

MR. BUERSTATTE: So that's a good question, Esther. So one of the other jobs that I have is actually co-chairing the Interagency Makers' Working Group, so, the 90-plus programs and bureaus and agencies that are supporting making across government. And I'll briefly explain that right now we've organized this group into three categories.

One, in the early pipeline development of making, you have programs and agencies supporting the education and engagement. And
it's typically your high school or even younger. How do we encourage people to participate in the making movement?

Then transferring those skills internally where we have a number of programs supporting internal innovation by making. A great example is some of the marine expeditionary units leveraging 3D printing to source realtime widgets to fix the machinery, weapons, et cetera, and exponentially decrease costs. So, think about the supply chain involved in supporting troops down range in Afghanistan, it's very costly to send a widget. But if they can print in theater, it's much more cost effective.

Similarly with what we're doing over at HHS and the VA on how we're supporting some of our customers, innovation and making is really important. So that's the internal category. And thirdly is the economic development realm. This is where we, EDA, play. How do we encourage and support maker organizations, whether that's maker type of
incubators or maker spaces?

But I can tell you that there is a big gap between all three of them where there is -- we certainly, we as the federal government, have supported this movement in a variety of ways over the last few years. But I think the next opportunity is to better connect and integrate these efforts where we're doing this childhood education in making, but how are we transferring that pipeline and passing them into some of our supported incubator or accelerators where they can then learn how to take that talent and create a business.

And one of the gaps that we've identified, too, is where there is still a lot of copyists, where they see making as a creative output, this is just what I enjoy doing. Just as I would paint or sing or play my guitar, I'm a maker, I'm a creator. But there's an opportunity to help educate them to say, hey, you've got a talent. How can we help you leverage that to not only do what you love but do it in a way where
you can make a living?

So there's a few opportunities there.

I'd say overall we're early in that, in that
process, partly due to we're waiting to see what
guidance is going to come from this
administration and how we can, how we can catalog
inventory and align everything here.

But interesting opportunity. And I'm
glad you brought that up.

At this point, though, I think we're
-- Drew's going to hang tight, and he'll be with
us for the rest of the afternoon and participate,
hopefully, in a little bit of the dialog after
these presentations.

But a quick show of hands, switching
topics, how many of you have individually reached
out to Andrew Reamer for some insight on a
government program.

(Show of hands.)


Yes, Andrew has been a wealth of
knowledge not only for OIE but the Council as a whole. And recently Andrew concluded a pretty meaningful investigation, probably exhausting, into all the various entrepreneurship and innovation supporting organizations or programs across government. And Andrew is going to present that to us today.

So, Andrew, take it away.

MEMBER REAMER: Thank you, Craig.

In lieu of a slide deck, I have printed a thing out.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Andrew, could you use that microphone.

MEMBER REAMER: Yes.

And there's some for guests.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Andrew, these will be available electronically? Can we get these electronically as well?

MEMBER REAMER: Yeah, yeah. It's available electronically. Thank you, Craig.

I'll talk about, briefly about the purpose of this and a little bit about the method
and then what's in it, and then conclude with
some thoughts about how NACIE might make use of
it.

So, this is a guide to federal efforts
that support entrepreneurship. It is part of a
task. I'm responsible for a grant from the
Kauffman Foundation. And I proposed this, so
I've gotten grants from the Kauffman Foundation
since about 2008. And since I'm self-employed,
you know, basically I try to make myself useful
to people that want to fund me. And suggested to
Kauffman there would be a decent, it would be a
decent return on their investment if they gave me
some money to put together a guide to federal
entrepreneurship.

Because the federal government has
been promoting entrepreneurship for a long time,
but there's really no single resource to
understand all the different things the
government has been supporting from Congress
through various departments, through the White
House, and so forth.
So the purpose of this, the purpose of this is really threefold. One is just as a reference, just to look up things to see who's doing what.

The second is as a basis for analysis. I did not do an evaluation. I did not look and say, okay, where are the gaps? Where's the overlap? How many of these things have been evaluated and what do they say? None of that. My aim was to be entirely descriptive.

The third reason to do it is a little subtle, but basically it was to take away the option of deniability on the part of Congress and senior political leadership so they couldn't say they didn't know something was going on. Because Congress runs on a committee system and committees jealously guard their territory, programs supporting entrepreneurship come out across many committees that are not aware of what other committees have done.

And so the aim here was to really inform people so instead of charging down into an
area where in fact someone else has been doing something. And so those three reasons.

The methods were basically me sitting in front of a laptop with headphones on and coffee and getting into a zone. It was not, you know, in the scheme of things not a lot of work. It was about 12 to 15 days of work. Okay? The idea is to have this thing -- I would like to see this thing live. I don't want to be the one to maintain it.

So I'm talking to Kauffman about where might it go? And I'm open to talking to the Commerce Department about where might it go. But, basically, this is a turnkey operation. I'll get it. This is a draft. I'm going to finish this thing by the summer. And then I would love to find someone to turn it over to.

Okay. So I want to walk you through this thing relatively quickly. Here's a table of contents. So if you flip to the first few pages you'll see From the U.S. Code, which is it's a compendium of laws that Congress passes. And
there are pages upon pages of laws in support of entrepreneurship.

And basically there the themes are small business is great, it's really important to America. You get, you know, a lot of this stuff came out of the '50s, the early '50s when the big super hierarchical corporations were dominating the economic landscape and there was fear that small businesses would be gone. And that's why the SBA was created in 1953. So there's that.

That has kind of morphed over time into entrepreneurship. That's not a term that was used in the '50s. And the notion -- the original small business legislation didn't really differentiate between businesses that were mom and pop shops and businesses that were really competing and going to markets.

But there's more of a differentiation now in the last 20 years about the ability of small businesses to compete in global markets, and in particular, in the, like the advanced manufacturing and advanced technology areas.
There's a whole other stream which is around procurement. And there, if you look at, if you look through the list of laws you will see for any initiative that Congress is putting together around hybrid, electric vehicles, or around the Alaska Pipeline, or around the transportation Security Administration there is language in there about making sure small businesses get a fair share of the dough.

So there is and then another part of that procurement aspect is around making sure that non-traditional entrepreneurs, that is people who are not white and male, get a share of procurement.

Again, back outside of procurement, from the late '60s going forward there was a substantial amount of emphasis on promoting women and minority entrepreneurship more generally. So there's a procurement piece, but then there's also -- that's the reason why the Minority Business Development Agency exists.

So just a footnote: the Minority
Business Development Agency exists through an Executive Order by Richard Nixon. It's not an act of Congress. Any president can shut it down in a moment.

So when you look at the list of agencies that are referred to in this, on that long list of laws, just to read them off to you, that all these agencies have responsibilities around small business development: USDA, Department of Defense, Federal Trade Commission, Export-Import Bank, Security and Exchange Commission, NIST, Small Business Administration, Overseas Private Investment Corporation, Department of Transportation, Department of Interior, Patent Office, Veterans' Affairs, Appalachian Regional Commission, National Science Foundation, Economic Development Administration, Department of Energy, Federal Communications Commission, and NASA.

So it is embedded in -- it's a kind of a value touchstone for Congress. It's good politics. And it's kind of ubiquitous in the
laws.

Okay. Then if you turn a few more pages you'll see a list of the acts, the legislation that was passed from the early '50s. And you will see, basically, every Congress passes something that has "small business" in the title. Very, very few Congresses don't.

All right, moving from Congress to programs, there are a number of pages -- you can organize this stuff in multiple ways. And I'm not -- you know, this is a way that made sense to me. But whoever I turn this over to, you're welcome to, you know, organize it in a different way. There are certain agencies their mission is to entrepreneurship expand.

And so that's Part A of the federal programs. You can see the first one is the Small Business Administration, the Office of Innovation and Entrepreneurship in the Department of Commerce.

And then there are Part B are programs, entrepreneurship development programs
in agencies with a broader mission. But they have some kind of standing unit to promote entrepreneurship. So NIST has the Manufacturing Extension Partnership. The Department of Homeland Security has the EB-5 Immigrant Investor Program. The Administration for Children and Families in HHS has the Microenterprise Development Program. So there are entrepreneurship-focused programs inside of agencies with broader missions.

And then the third category are programs that have a broader mission but there is a entrepreneurship element to it. And I would say Drew and the Advanced Manufacturing Officer, that's an element of that. Manufacturing USA, the federal laboratory consortium, ARPA-E in the Department of Energy, so there are lots and lots of these things.

And people who are interested in particularly the dimension of entrepreneurship it's, you know, unfortunately, incumbent upon them to kind of try to figure out where the
bodies are, where all these pieces are. And it's kind of an entrepreneurial activity to connect the dots here.

Okay. So the Part D is simply a kind of recasting of what came before in terms of the catalog of federal domestic assistance, which is the catalog of the grants that are available through some of these programs.

The next section has to do with interagency working groups. And Craig just mentioned one which I don't think is on my list. There was -- and we have a, we have the former director or the former coordinator for the Interagency Network of Enterprise Assistance Providers. Heidi, you want to wave. And there's an SBIR/STTR Interagency Policy Committee. They are standing organizations that are interagency working groups around things that deal with entrepreneurship, around procurement.

Every agency has an office of small and disadvantaged businesses. That's for the purposes of procurement, to make sure those
businesses get a share of federal procurement.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: Andrew, can I just jump in?

MEMBER REAMER: Yes.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: So I'm looking at people's faces. We're all going, Wow. And luckily you shared it with us, so I've seen it before. Can you just share less with the guide but what can we do with it and what did you learn as you talked to these groups? Are they aware of each other and, you know?

MEMBER REAMER: So I didn't talk to anybody. This is all me --

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: Just, okay.

MEMBER REAMER: -- with headphones.

Right?

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: Okay. Okay.

MEMBER REAMER: And although, I mean, I've talked to a few people.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: So you talked to everybody.

MEMBER REAMER: Well, --
CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: I guess how best would you advise that we use this? In light of our time --

MEMBER REAMER: Yes. So that's where I was going.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: -- because we can take this into the groups, too.

MEMBER REAMER: Right. So let me, I was going to point to one more section here which is the section on other advisory committees. Okay. So you'll see that after the interagency working groups. And, again, there are a number that are natural companions in conversation to NACIE.

So in terms of what NACIE might do with this, I think three things. Or, well, one is if our strategic planning process gets off the ground, that this is kind of a, you know, an asset map for thinking about. Okay.

The second is we have two other committees around capital formation and around manufacturing workforce that might find this
useful for their purposes. Okay. So it's an internal resource for us.

If the strategic planning process gets going, the idea is to do, help OIE do a strategic plan. And then a question is, so what kind of landscape assessment should OIE be doing around its functions so it can understand how it might add value to all these efforts?

MR. BUERSTATTE: Andrew, can you explain that function? I know where you're going. I just want to make sure everyone else is following with that function that we're supposed to be executing.

MEMBER REAMER: Okay. Well, the Office of Innovation and Entrepreneurship by law, by the America COMPETES Act, is a policy advisor to the Secretary around, in the topics of innovation and entrepreneurship. And that while the act was passed in 2010, staffing has been -- it's only been fully staffed --

MR. BUERSTATTE: Right. Well, specifically -- sorry, I didn't mean to cut you
off -- but the other interesting piece is that by statute we're supposed to be serving as an integrator for federal innovation and entrepreneurship programs.

MEMBER REAMER: Right.

MR. BUERSTATTE: So when you talk about an asset map, it's not so much about the strategic plan, but it's about the strategic plan to reach that goal of being a federal integrator.

MEMBER REAMER: Correct.

MR. BUERSTATTE: We talked about this in a group, there's roughly, there's been a variety of studies -- and now probably out of date. The last one I think I saw by GAO was maybe a 2012 or '13 study saying there was $7 billion or $8 billion going towards innovation and entrepreneurship programs.

So if there was a tool, a mechanism in the federal government where we could better align and deliver or serve our customers through USDA and all the other programs that Andrew just --
MEMBER REAMER: Right.

MR. BUERSTATTE: -- just listed, I think we'd be more efficient and productive. So it's a really exciting opportunity.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: Yes.

MEMBER SCHOCKEN: Seven or eight billion dollars?

MR. BUERSTATTE: Just for entrepreneurship programming. So you got to consider this is, this is the small innovation and research program with billions of dollars, billions of dollars going towards commercializing early stage research. This is the small business associations' growth accelerator challenge, which is ranked from $2 to $4 million a year. Our grants competition which is ranged from $10 million to $15 million.

So if you encompass all of those, there's a lot of capital going towards supporting different types of entrepreneurship and innovation, but understanding the right way to organize that is critical.
As Andrew pointed out, there is no shortage of both Main Street supporting programs and policies as well as some of the more high growth/high tech innovation and entrepreneurship which OIE mostly focuses on. So there's so many different ways, so many different lenses that we could apply to this, but knowing how and starting on the right foot I guess is what I'm getting at.

MEMBER REAMER: Thank you for that. And I'm very excited to be able to basically give raw material to OIE to work with.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: Yeah. And in terms of the --

MR. BUERSTATTE: Hold on. One question.

MEMBER HERSKOWITZ: I'm sorry. Just a question, Craig. You said that part of the role is to act as a coordinator. Do all of -- I don't know how to ask this politically sensitively -- do all of the groups in here share that vision, that OIE is going to help coordinate what they need to be coordinated.
MR. BUERSTATTE: Well, if anyone knows the history of COMPETES, Andrew, if you've got any light on this, please share, but I think this was we were charged with this goal purely with the intent and not, frankly, not with a plan. We have minimal resources to do so, and that's at the salary and staff level, let alone the podium to do so.

We have the authorization to do it but no real plan or long-term strategy.

Andrew, do you have any follow-up to add to that?

MEMBER REAMER: I don't have the language in front of me. It's a little subtle. It basically gives OIE the charge to look across the federal government, but it reports to the Secretary. So it's trying to help the Secretary look more broadly across the federal government.

But its mandate is from Congress. So it can go to any federal agency and say, we have a congressional mandate to do this, and we'd like you to talk to us.
MEMBER HERSKOWITZ ORIN: Could you theoretically go into the NIH's SBIR program -- and tell them what?

MEMBER REAMER: To talk with them. And they have a convening power that they can convene people from across the government. And they have the power to recommend to the Secretary, who sits on a number of White House task forces that cover all this stuff.

MEMBER HERSKOWITZ ORIN: Got it.

MEMBER REAMER: But basically, Congress said Congress wants the secretary to think about innovation and entrepreneurship across the federal government, not just in Congress, and that OIE is to be there to help the secretary.

MEMBER HERSKOWITZ ORIN: So the OIE is the Secretary of Commerce's arm to aggregate it. And Congress has given the Secretary of Commerce the charge to look across --

MEMBER REAMER: Correct.

MEMBER HERSKOWITZ ORIN: -- broadly
beyond Commerce's boundaries.

MEMBER REAMER: Correct.

MEMBER HERSKOWITZ ORIN: But the other groups are under not necessarily under any obligation to follow the advice --

MEMBER REAMER: Correct.

MEMBER HERSKOWITZ ORIN: -- of the Secretary?

MEMBER REAMER: Correct. Correct.

MEMBER HERSKOWITZ ORIN: Okay, thank you.

MEMBER REAMER: Yes. When Gary Locke became Secretary of Commerce in 2009 under President Obama, he created an Office of Innovation and Entrepreneurship that was in his office, and it was not congressionally mandated. It was just something he wanted to do. But a year later with America COMPETES, somebody gave the idea to somebody in Congress, and they threw it into the bill, and they ended up authorizing something that had been in place more informally.

MR. BUERSTATTE: And for longevity's
sake, that's often the norm here in D.C. where Congress needs to find a home for something where it will stick.

MEMBER REAMER: Right.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Oftentimes in a political environment, as administrations and leadership changes, you put something at risk if it's housed in a politically appointed office. So by establishing the Office of Innovation and Entrepreneurship with career staff and with grant programs and more, you build out a sustainable platform.

But honestly, right now, we're in the early stage of that but certainly need -- and why we're having this conversation --

MEMBER REAMER: Right.

MR. BUERSTATTE: -- I think it's an opportunity.

MEMBER REAMER: And so to your point, OIE was moved from the Secretary's Office to EDA for stability and funding purposes. But really, it has a dotted line relationship with the
Secretary's Office, while administratively it reports to Dennis.

So the last piece is something to think about, is the idea is, would each member of NACIE be up for picking a program or an advisory group to just talk to and create a relationship with? Because again, so much is going on. And it's great, you know, but we meet four times a year. We can hear from one or two guests. And we're all hard-charging people. It would be useful for each of us to have a person-to-person relationship with National Women's Business Council or the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, and just as a way of kind of building some soft relational infrastructure.

MEMBER BOWLES: Yes, my question was does any other group in any other department have a similar mandate?

MEMBER REAMER: No.

MR. BUERSTATTE: You can look at this packet and maybe I could give a 90 percent confidence guess that there isn't. But there's
an abundance of information that would have to be scoured. And maybe, maybe there's a similar charge that's maybe more targeted. Or let's take the National Women's Business Council, focused on business.

MEMBER REAMER: Most of it, most of this is programmatic. OIE has program responsibility, but it was created for policy purposes. And so that's its uniqueness is that it focuses on policy which sits above program.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Yes, go ahead real quick.

MEMBER KAPP: So first of all, I applaud your efforts. This is an amazing resource. And I know personally, having gotten together with you for lunch, and from bringing some other folks to bear, that you're a phenomenal resource, and we're really lucky to have you. So thank you so much for putting this together.

Based on the knowledge that you have, and one of the things that you had asked of us,
is there an area where you think we can serve as liaisons? And one of the things that I would potentially ask back is, based on the array of things that you put together, perhaps maybe offline you can identify either low-hanging fruit or the highest places where there may be -- because there's so many here that I would love for us to be able to maybe put in some sort of prioritization around that.

MEMBER REAMER: Sure. I'd be happy to --

MEMBER KAPP: I think that might be useful.

MEMBER REAMER: -- to do that.

And I will say, one in particular, the Securities and Exchange Commission has an advisory committee on small capital formation for small business, which is something a lot of people here care about. So it would be great to talk to them.

MEMBER KAPP: Yes. Just a prioritization. Because I think that -- I don't
want to speak for everybody here, but I think
that knowing some things that are priorities --

MEMBER REAMER: Sure.

MEMBER KAPP: -- for both of you would
really sort of elevate our interest, and
certainly my interest.

MEMBER REAMER: I'd be happy to.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Yes. And again,
we'll have a little bit longer later in the
afternoon to dive into this more. But just to
keep things moving --

MEMBER REAMER: Sorry, Craig. To
Orin's question, this is online. I will send out
the link to it.

The blue underlines, of course, are
live links. So you can click on any of these and
go to the website.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Thank you, Andrew.
I think this has given all of us a few new ideas
and an interesting perspective to take a look at
things.

At this point I'd like to, and before
we have our broader discussion this afternoon,
I'd like to open up the floor for public comment.
Last time, we heard from a researcher from the
Third Way on access to capital. And today, as
we've talked about inclusive entrepreneurship and
outreach to all types of communities, both urban,
city center, as well as rural, and everything in
between, we thought that it might be interesting
to hear from the executive director of
EveryLibrary.

So John Chrastka is the executive
director. And welcome John here to give us a few
thoughts.

And as I mentioned earlier,
EveryLibrary is an organization working to
advocate for libraries in every community. And
one of their more recent missions is to support
entrepreneurship through the assets and resources
they have in those libraries, which is especially
important if you think about some communities
that might not have the robust research or
university assets or start-up hubs or incubators.
Where do entrepreneurs go?

So John, thanks for coming.

MR. CHRASTKA: Thank you very much.

And Joe, I appreciate running into you again at South by Southwest a couple weeks ago and the impetus for this kind of conversation.

The work that I do is not as a librarian. I am not a librarian by trade. I've never worked in a library. I come at this as a civilian. I come at it as a failed entrepreneur or perhaps a serial entrepreneur if we want to be really polite about it. The entrepreneurial work that I did before starting EveryLibrary has influenced part of our mission and purpose with this organization.

Many library-facing organizations focus on education, cradle-to-grave, lifelong learning, pre-K to K-12. That's lovely. I'd like to try and address with the library community why my business failed.

The work that we did before starting EveryLibrary was with an organization or a
business called ClassMap. The ClassMap model was to set up, for university professors, course modules. There's Moodle. There's a few others in the space right now.

We didn't make it out. We didn't make it out not because we didn't have a good set of developers, we didn't make it out because we didn't know what we were doing when it came to market analytics and business intelligence. We made the wrong decisions. We failed, when it came right down to it, at the work that we should do in order to understand, interrogate, and exploit our market.

Now, taking that into a library advocacy organization, a library research organization, sure, K-12, pre-K, lifelong learning, that space is pretty well-explored. What isn't really, hasn't really been explored very well is the role that the public library could have had if I had asked.

We had 86 people working for us. We had $4.6 million in venture capital funding, all
angel round. We burned through a lot of lives
doing that, and I know it's because we didn't
understand our market, not because we couldn't
figure out how to do a dev cycle well.

The library has a few key
differentiators in the 21st Century than it had
in the previous generations for the average
entrepreneur, for the nascent entrepreneur, for
the person moving from ideation to market,
whether it is the access point to technology, or
it is the access point to market, or it is the
access point to analytics and business
intelligence.

I want to take you through it very
briefly. You guys have a really packed agenda,
but I hope to leaven the conversation, thinking
through what the built environment can already do
through public libraries to advance your goals.

The library as an incubator is a theme
that I want to bring before you. The incubation
of new ideas requires capital, access to capital,
access to markets, access to talent, and access
to intelligence. Well, I can tell you that the library community does not have a great deal of access to capital going on. Though I will bring up at the end a little bit about how the 501(c)(3) philanthropic community could be leveraged for this.

We certainly have an access to market that I want to go into in some more detail.

The access to talent. The venue that is the public library, the built space, the fact that you can drive no more than 45 minutes anywhere in this country and have access to this point of contact, to broadband, though that needs some work; access to the maker movement, though that is coming up to scale; access to the business reference space or the business reference that librarians do. These are massive points of leverage in small towns, in urban centers, and in big and small communities, whether it's a county-wide system or a town as big as Chicago.

The work that library as incubator
does brings together space, it brings together experience, and allows for capital to have some validation about the idea. The partnerships that exist in many communities are not done to scale yet. The successful communities, the examples of successes that I have for you are all places where the partnership between the library and the SBA or SCORE or the EOCs have come to fruition. And yet, there are some library communities out there, actually more than I would like to admit to, that don't have those kinds of partnerships because there has not been an organized level of support to make those partnership connections happen.

The innovations that happen at libraries because, through the incubator idea, well, it could start with co-working. I finally have a place to do it that's not my kitchen table.

It could start with I finally have access to somebody who has skill sets that I don't have.
I finally have access to a community of other creators through this intentional incubation at a neighborhood level. Sometimes at a ZIP Code level.

There are some fantastic examples of success stories for incubators, and they're not the ones I'm going to leave you with at the end because these are rare, because the triad of partnerships, of built environment, and encouragement that comes from policy hasn't pervaded libraries in this country. But we've got a wonderful example of the success here at the New York Public Library, the New York StartUP! Business Plan Competition at the Science, Industry, and Business Library.

This is the perfect marriage. There's capital coming in from Citibank to award a business plan start-up that has been built in an environment that has early access to market through the library and is helped by the librarians, who can bring some analytics and business intelligence to it.
There's other examples out there as well that I'd like to be able to share with you in the future, but it's Houston. It is Brooklyn Public. But they're rare, folks, and I think we should be exploring this more.

This idea of the library as showroom is something that is a core competency of libraries. We all know the story of the librarian who makes a recommendation for a book: hey, I really like John Grisham. What else should I read?

Well, that happens right now with wearables. That happens right now with health apps. That happens right now with iPhones or Androids, or that happens with technology up and down the spectrum. The librarian is a trusted validator and a trusted partner in helping you find the resources you need. And new media is part of that; new ideas are part of that. And quite honestly, the reason that the local Chamber of Commerce does their events at the library is to be validated by the library as a showroom
And yet we don't necessarily do this at scale. We do it in a mom and pop kind of fashion. And for us to do it at scale is to recognize that for the maker movement, the idea that this is the first point of access, the first showrooming, the first chance to be tactile and in contact, but to move from making and crafting, which is lovely, to craftsmen, artisans, and entrepreneurs, that's what I'm trying to move here forward.

What is not missing is the idea -- well, perhaps the vocabulary is missing of the library as a beta site, the library as a place for user groups to convene. If you've got a new idea and you want to test it out, who's the most friendly and the most honest? Your neighbors. Who's also going to be your cheering squad? Your neighbors.

To build out a beta site as, to frame the library as that beta site that you need for early intervention in bad ideas and early
validation of good ideas, the library as showroom
is shovel-ready for that.

Yes, Mid-Continent Public Library. My
good friends at the Mid-Continent Public Library
outside of Kansas City, Missouri, it's a three-
county system on the Missouri side of Kansas
City. Their Square One and Main Street programs
have been directly responsible for 45 business
over the last two-and-a-half, three years. And
those have all started not just as an idea and as
a business plan but as them trying it out at the
library.

My favorite one is the guy with the
food cart, with the food truck. And it's
literally pulled up there for lunch because he's
trying out his menu. And the fan club that he's
developed and the three new trucks he's been able
to buy and employ folks with. There's technology
inside this as well, either in or at the library
location. Well, if it's in the library location,
at the library location, or with the library's
brand attachment, the showroom idea helps carry
things forward.

I want to reframe in the 21st Century
the idea that the collection is anything other
than for the business community, business
intelligence, and market analytics. We're
sitting in a fabulous reference collection. The
digital collection that's available here as a
support for this department of the U.S.
Government is available to every single American
through their library card. And I'm not just
talking about it in a virtuous way. The market
intelligence and analytics that I missed when I
was doing my development work for that university
ecosystem, I wish, I simply wish.

There are some extraordinary examples
of this, but with the right kind of support and
the right kind of framing, that could be taken
out to folks. It's not a popular fiction; it's
not your average non-fiction. We have a
fantastic example for business intelligence and
market analytics success is through the Michigan
e-Library program. MeL, the Michigan e-Library
program, it is direct support, 24/7, staffed by
real humans most of the 24, for support and
resources directed to entrepreneurs and small
businesses. And it is focused on the Michigan
market, expensed for the Michigan market. It
comes through a IMLS grant, the Institute of
Museum and Library Services, a federal program,
through the state Library of Michigan. And
without these resources, thousands of people
would be short, falling short, sometimes at 2:00
in the morning, sometimes when they're burning
that midnight oil, on the intelligence that they
need to succeed.

Likewise, I want to reframe for you
all here the role of the librarian not just as
the story time librarian, though that is
absolutely essential for early growth of the
child, learning how to read so they can read to
learn, the librarian who makes the reference
question happen, the librarian who provides. I
would like to reframe the librarian in our lives
as what they truly are, which is a market
analyst. All of those resources in the collection are static without somebody who can help support the interrogation of the data and support, well, business literacy.

We have a lot of supports in this ecosystem that are about how to: How do I do? How do I find? How do I know? And to have somebody as a partner in you developing literacy skills, that's a lovely idea. Libraries have been doing it for generations. On the business side we've been doing it for years and years and years. And there is not necessarily an integration of the librarian into that matrix.

The expertise and the experience that they bring, for example, with the National Institute of Health and the National Library of Medicine, there is a certification program for health medicine librarianship. I would suggest that there is something like that that could be available through SBA or Department of Commerce or one of our other agencies where a trusted professional who can teach business literacy
skills, who has the asterisk next to his or her name about them being certified in developing small businesses would go a long way to making that trusted provider of family literacy resources a powerful provider, a highly leveraged provider of business literacy resources as well.

There's some great examples of it. Biz Boost at the Denver Public Library is one. They've got a heck of a team over there. Thousands of people have walked through the door since 2013 to ask their business reference librarian those kind of questions and have that relationship develop that helps build skills and not just provide answers.

The last piece that I want to leave you with today is a reminder about the built infrastructure, the built infrastructure of the library. It is a first mile and a last mile opportunity for innovation, entrepreneurship, small business development. The last mile/first mile on it is either wrap-around services when it comes to a fully functional partnership with an
SBA or an EOC. The first mile/last mile on it in a business literacy desert is that they can provide those kinds of skills with the right kinds of supports.

The built infrastructure includes access to broadband, access to the collection, access to the librarians. It completes the ecosystem in venture capital funded environments as well. I got to say this: the local infrastructure of having a librarian who's sitting behind a reference desk at the local public library and not with 1871 in Chicago, not with another business -- I live in Chicagoland -- not with another business incubator doing that kind of reference service I think is a shortfall for many of these kinds of high tech enterprises. It jumpstarts the ecosystem in otherwise isolated communities by being the co-working space, the space that accesses. And it provides a wrap-around, like I said before, with other existing partnerships.

I appreciate you taking a few minutes
and just putting this in your head. I want to
give you a couple keywords to talk about. And I
do want to encourage the opportunity to chat
about what this environment of public libraries
could do to accelerate the work that you guys are
charged with.

Yes, please?

MEMBER BOESCH: Yes. So I had kind of
a comment and a request.

MR. CHRASTKA: Certainly.

MEMBER BOESCH: So, the kind of the
new role of the library is kind of dear to my
heart. My husband did the renovation of the
Boston Public Library as an architect. We're
also doing amazing programs like this.

But one thing that we have found is
that for places that don't have the kind of
resources like the New York City Library or
Boston Public Library, the organization that I
work for and the Gates Foundation collaborated on
a free resource toolkit for librarians, which is
like a design learning toolkit for librarians on
how to help them, like, reimagine their roles and
prototype things at very low cost.

So I would encourage you to use that
as a resource in your network. I think it's very
helpful for kind of thinking about the librarians
inside of the library.

The other question that I had is that
I often get requests from people that want to use
libraries as resources from other things. For
example, there's an amazing guy on the digital
development team in the city of Boston that
wanted to talk exactly about libraries as places
to convene music groups, because he would love to
have a beta test group for new government
services that he's designing digitally.

So how does somebody like that that
just has that idea actually make a connection to
this group to kind of make it happen?

MR. CHRASTKA: Well, the opportunity
to do it starts, of course, with local
relationships, but it also starts with the
leavening of a policy conversation that says this
is normal and normative. So on both prongs, the local, yes, I'd like to do this; let's talk it through. That's the human-to-human. But from a policy perspective, the idea that that is validated and that is encouraged is the magical approach I would suggest.

MEMBER KAPP: So I just want to add two things, because your presence here came out of really a conversation I had with Andy Stoll over at the Kauffman Foundation after some of the work that we did. And when you think about rural communities and sort of non-traditional communities, there's a couple of anchor institutions. And as you know, I carry the flag for community colleges in particular. But the library, and one of the things that Andy and I were having a conversation with was that libraries are often one of the first places that many entrepreneurs still go to when they think about starting a business.

So for the organizations that we represent, in addition to thinking about it as a
macro, from a macro perspective, it still is one of the primary entrees for entrepreneurs and people who are thinking about starting businesses, and particularly in communities. And so I just want to underscore what you said, particularly in communities that may not necessarily have the resources of a large city, that outside of a community college the library is going to be one of the primary institutions where people are going to come.

And having the ability of those librarians to both collaborate with them and also point them in a right direction is a significant opportunity to help spur rural entrepreneurship, which has recently become very important as a result of a new Executive Order that Andrew had made me aware of that came out on April 25th from the president underscoring and putting together a rural task force among a number of agencies.

So this conversation is germane on a number of different levels. And it's important to understand that, that the various roles that
the library can play in some of the more non-
traditional, as we talk about access to capital
and we talk about communities that don't
necessarily always have access to the amount of
resources, a library is one of those anchor
institutions that offers a bunch, a number of
possibilities.

MR. CHRASTKA: Yes, in the presence of
an existing ecosystem of entrepreneurship and
support through either VC-funded or philanthropy-
funded incubators or accelerators, the library
has a component. In the absence of that, the
library might be a sole provider.

We've got some states where everyone
has a community college, like Illinois. Not
everyone has a library. There are some gaps in
the service area. We flip that in other places.
And the fact that it works in a way that is
relevant to the local community, whether it's an
urban, rural, suburban, farming community,
whatever, that relevancy makes it possible to
move very quickly into this kind of a model.
Yes, sir?

MEMBER KENNEY: First of all, this is great, a really though-provoking thought about resources that we can take advantage of, especially in the far-flung parts of the country. I know in Oregon, where I'm from, a lot of our rural areas, the libraries have closed branches and are also down to, like, two days a week of being open.

MR. CHRASTKA: Right.

MEMBER KENNEY: And I'm just curious, if I were to try to approach them, they're not thinking about adding services; they're thinking about trying to keep the doors open. Is there sort of a financial access to capital for libraries kind of argument? You know, hey, if you consider doing this you may be able to access some additional resources to support the library overall.

MR. CHRASTKA: Right now the financial -- so the average public library receives about 90 percent of its revenue and funding from the
local ZIP Code, 90 to 93 percent. There's another 3 to 5 percent that is state, and then another 3 percent or so that's federal on a pass-through basis, usually for programmatic.

There is no innovation fund right now in this country that's at the federal level, and there are no innovation funds at the state level that I'm aware of. What we see are built environment tax credits happening in certain states to try and encourage a public/private partnership between a developer and the library as a public institution, and that allows then for states to be utilized for making, for fabrication, for co-working, that kind of stuff.

Indiana's got some good models. Colorado's got some very robust models as well. But at the federal level right now, an innovation fund that would move through public libraries to impact small and rural, to impact urban business literacy deserts would be a fascinating discussion to have.

In Oregon, you're right. There's some
real issues in timber country right now. We're actually losing a library system in Oregon this year. Douglas County, Oregon, is closing in 11 towns, 9 branches, because they failed on a local ballot measure. That's that 90 percent of the funding formula.

Yeah? Yes, please.

MEMBER BALDWIN: So there's a new high school in Chandler, Arizona. And the high school library is the public library. And that seems to me that that's a very efficient model, that it's closed during the weekend: high school kids aren't at school; it's open on the weekend for the public. And it gives economies of scale.

So do you see any more of that happening in order to keep libraries open?

MR. CHRASTKA: There is a significant push going on in the Dakotas to do co-located spaces for public libraries and school libraries. And there's some real intentionality on the part of the state library agency to help cultivate those. It tends to be in more rural and
isolated, though there are also examples in the exurbs in a place like Oakley, California, where it started, the public library started as the third room of a three-classroom size high school space. And now the city's grown enough -- it's outside of, it's about an hour and 15, hour and 20 minutes west of San Francisco or Oakland -- to then emancipate the library as a stand-alone.

So those kinds of relevant local partnerships certainly help bridge the funding divide between the public library and the school system and certainly help leverage the staff. What's appropriate for the community, given its size though, is always an issue. I don't know the community in Arizona that you're referring to, but it is a working model.

Yes, please.

MEMBER BOWLES: How do you measure success? How do you know if this is working?

MR. CHRASTKA: Well, in the Mid-Continent Public Library example from earlier where there's 45 fully built-out businesses in
either one, two, or three years of at-market,
there's another 45 or 50 that didn't get all the
way fledged, and they're going back to the
drawing board. So you can measure the metrics on
outputs.

In Dallas, where there's the Dallas
B.R.A.I.N. project which brings together -- maybe
you're familiar -- the measures of success there
vary. They are point of contact, how many folks
did we actually help? How's the quality of the
business reference interview? I think that there
still has to be some work done in terms of
looking at business literacy in the same way that
we can score early childhood reading literacy. I
don't think we've gotten there quite yet.

And that has to be a collaborative
discussion because if we're looking at college-
ready, that's one thing. If we're looking at
career-ready, that's another.

MEMBER BOWLES: And how do you ensure
that the people that are there advising, helping,
building these companies actually have any
experience doing that?

MR. CHRASTKA: Right. Right.

MEMBER BOWLES: I think that's what we struggle with in Dallas with the B.R.A.I.N.

MR. CHRASTKA: Business reference, on the part of a librarian doing business reference, there is training; there is standards and practices; there are ongoing opportunities to learn to do business reference. The partnerships that exist with organizations like SBA and SCORE and other for-profit or not-for-profit local partnerships have to be vetted.

My ideal is a project called the Alexandria Network in Arizona. It's Maricopa County. It is Phoenix. It is one or two other, Goodyear, where it is a relationship between the library both as venue and as business reference resources, private capital, and some philanthropic capital coming in to encourage different populations, and ASU. And they have Arizona State University in that mix is certainly the validator that we're looking for.
I would look at the community college environment as being one of those in many communities. Otherwise, access to business intelligence is one thing. Access to mentorship, we all have our conundrums.

MEMBER BOWLES: Thank you.

MR. CHRASTKA: Thank you so much.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Thank you so much, John. Yes, we --

MEMBER BAGLEY: Is there a website or something where --

MR. CHRASTKA: Everylibrary.org.

MEMBER BAGLEY: Okay. But I didn't see entrepreneurship there.

MR. CHRASTKA: I will work on highlighting another tab for you in the next day or two, and I'll pass some information along from Craig, if that's all right.

MEMBER BAGLEY: Okay. Sorry about that.

MR. CHRASTKA: You're good, don't worry.
Thank you.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Thanks so much for spending some time with us, John. That was really insightful. Really appreciate it.

So lots of new ideas. And rather than -- but it's always good to deliver on the things that we've been discussing already, making sure we're wrapping things up and packaging them well for the Secretary. So as I mentioned earlier, Sue and Emily had visited D.C. and have made a lot of progress on their manufacturing talent initiative. And I think they might have some updates.

And also Trey and Joe probably have some updates on the entrepreneurship initiative and engaging more communities.

So really wanted to open up the platform right now for some general updates before we all breakout later.

Sue or Emily, would you want to kick things off?

MEMBER REICHERT: Is there anything in
particular you wanted to cover?

MEMBER SMITH: Yes. I think just kind of talking about some of the things that we found out and some of the observations that we made. There's no real good definition, no universal definition for advanced manufacturing. And so it's kind of all over the place. And so the Department of Labor had suggested modern manufacturing, which is advanced manufacturing and also high tech manufacturing. So that was kind of interesting.

And there's really also no -- although apprenticeship is well-recognized as a solution or one of the solutions for the workforce skills gap, there's no real champion of apprenticeship programs across the country. So we talked about that a lot.

And getting all the -- just figuring out what was going on across the country and from various groups within the state or federal government was amazing, too, I thought. So, yes, so we took all that and we sort of, we revamped
our recommendation. And Eric was good enough to fix that up for us. And so I think it's really pretty good actually, pretty comprehensive.

MEMBER REICHERT: So I assume we'll be distributing the recommendation here. Oh, we have distributed it already.

So you will notice that what I think has been done very skillfully -- and again I'll credit Eric for figuring this out -- is that we not only talked about advanced manufacturing and what needs to be done there based on the research that we have done across both the Department of Commerce, talking to the National Association of Manufacturers, and Department of Labor on our recent trip, but we've also been able to pull in there the relationship to hard technology development.

So really we're looking at this as a way that hard technology, entrepreneurship, and innovation and be enabled by having a stronger advanced manufacturing workforce across the board. So, you'll see in the recommendations
made that it really spans across everything from
DOE and some of the things that we heard about
today, all the way to some of the programs under
Department of Commerce, including the
Manufacturing Extension Partnership.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Just to be clear, it
is attached to the back of your agenda. So this
draft recommendation that they just discussed, if
you haven't browsed through it, please do. And
they'll be diving into that again later this
afternoon.

But maybe more related to this
EveryLibrary discussion is Trey and Joe's effort.
I think we're calling it in draft form right now
E for All, Entrepreneurship for All. Trey or
Joe, any interest in sharing updates there?

MEMBER SCHOCKEN: You don't have a
microphone. Can somebody give him a microphone.

MEMBER BOWLES: I'll start. Joe and
I got the chance to meet in Austin during --

MR. BUERSTATTE: Hold on just a second.
Can't hear you.
All right. We're back.

MEMBER BOWLES: Joe and I had the opportunity to meet at South by Southwest to sort of talk through this concept of what does it look like to bring support services to entrepreneurs across the country and how do we make that work? And so we have been working through a proposal for the rest of the NACIE group to walk through a how NACIE can participate in this.

And I think forgive Joe and I that we have discovered a problem. And it's hard to get an entrepreneur to discover the problem then not try to solve the problem at the same time. So we are still working on generalizing it a little bit, making it a little bit more high level as to how we can be involved as opposed to actually going and developing a plan and implementing it.

But we have separated this problem into four different areas, the four Cs as we call them: competence, capital, coaching, and capacity. And so we can walk through some of that later as we want to. But the idea is -- and
I'll let Joe go into a little bit more on the community college side -- but recognizing that we believe one of the most important components of helping entrepreneurs be successful is that coaching or mentorship piece, recognizing that things like the libraries and the community colleges and the different institutions that exist can be helpful.

But until you put somebody who's done it before in front of an entrepreneur, that's really the most valuable thing you can add. They're even more valuable than capital in some cases. So we are working on that and I think hope to have that up to the group prior to the next meeting.

Joe, you want to?

MEMBER SCHOCKEN: Yeah. I would just add to that that when we look at entrepreneurship and scale, the challenge that I think we all have is that, how do we go ahead and identify organizations and communities across the United States that can help leverage assets and
resources to help entrepreneurs? And those are
the institutions that I previously sort of
referred to as anchor institutions that exist.

And unlike perhaps some other
institutional organizations where you may have
sort of one-off non-profits that focus on
economic development, community colleges have a
history, one, of working with industry and
collaborating with workforce development. And
they're fairly ubiquitous. There's about a
thousand community colleges across the United
States. And so while we were trying to identify
institutions that may be able to serve as the
sort of proverbial hub, the community college
institution really lends itself well because of
the expanse of geography and the nature and the
history of it.

In addition, I'd also add is the
ability for the community colleges to also work
and collaborate with K through 12 systems in
their local communities, and the ability to bring
other resources, both from a local perspective, a
state perspective, a federal perspective, and
even international perspective. And so part of
this is, you know, as we discussed the sort of
four C's, what is the ability, how can we go
ahead and leverage it so it scales across the
United States?

And so, in collaboration, one of the
things that we found is that in working and
collaborating with four-year institutions and the
ability to work with universities who also have a
significant role and often have a lot of the
research, the ability for those organizations to
work collaboratively to really help drive sort of
these four Cs, part of this is to go ahead and
identify opportunities into sort of non-
traditional communities, communities that maybe
historically have been bypassed, marginalized
communities.

So we've done a lot of thinking and
work around this. And we're looking forward to
continuing the input so we can make sure that
we're both expansive but also are able to put
together some things that the OIE and this team
can really help from an execution perspective and
fits within -- under the framework of what this
group and OIE is supposed to do.

MEMBER GOONEWARDENE: Just a comment
on the mentoring. So this is an issue that we
think about a lot at UT system because we're
trying to cover places like El Paso and Rio
Grande Valley. And so we have piloted
successfully a mentoring network that has
curriculum, code of conduct, a selection process
for mentors, puts mentors together on teams, and
then has an IT infrastructure customized
underneath it where you can schedule
appointments. You can every -- after every
mentoring session, each party gets an evaluation
mechanism. There's tracking, and there's a
virtual mentoring component to it.

And the first pilot has gone very
well, and so now it's being expanded through UT
System. So if you ever want to talk to the
person that works in my office that's doing that,
we might be able to save you a little bit of
time.

MEMBER HERSKOWITZ ORIN: So you built
that -- is it Union, 1776 was Union software.
You guys custom built this?

MEMBER GOONEWARDENE: No. We work
with the guy that developed Blackboard.

MEMBER HERSKOWITZ ORIN: Okay.

MEMBER GOONEWARDENE: And we
customized his product. Yeah, I'm familiar with
the 1776 solution.

MEMBER HERSKOWITZ ORIN: Thank you.

MR. BUERSTATTE: So real quick, I
think that would be -- that's a great example of
a program or a tool that could complement one of
the categories that Joe and Trey just described.
So from a federal perspective what they were
alluding to was, Andrea and I have been pushing
them to think how in government's mind can we be
a facilitator, a catalyst for this conversation.

And if you look at a theoretical
national initiative to support confidence,
coaching, capital, and capacity, how do you organize national and regional players in those verticals to double down on what they're doing?

So I think national players goes without saying.

But the effort aligns in also finding the right regional solutions that can or maybe have an opportunity to scale or at the right time in their organizations grow so they can reach more communities. That's the end goal here, right?

So, we are not the ones -- and again, Joe and Trey, sorry if I sound like a broken record -- but we're not the ones, federal government are not the ones rolling out these programs, but how can we be the convener, a funder, a supporter, an amplifier of those solutions that are working? And how do we spread the news?

MEMBER KAPP: And I would just add to that one component. Maribel and I had lunch today. And I think when we talk about this in some of the broader contexts of robotics and innovation, the future of workforce, what I call
the future of workforce, because the nature of work is changing as more artificial intelligence and more of those things come online the importance of -- I'll give you a really good tangible example.

With the automation of automated cars and self-driving cares, about 1.5 million truck drivers are potentially out of work when that happens. And so the role that this has in that workforce development -- and a lot of people referenced West Virginia and the coal economies and what's happened there -- and I believe that with automation robotics, we're on the cusp of a significant change in the way that the workforce is going to be utilized in the future.

And so in many respects, this conversation about the four Cs is a bit of a visionary conversation as well about the future of workforce and how do we begin to mobilize and have those conversation in meaningful ways, and what' the role that government plays, what's the role that foundations play, and what's the role
that corporations play to ensure that we have
workforces and/or that the United States has the
ability to make sure that its population
continues to engage in meaningful and purposeful
activities?

So that's a bit further out there. I
get it. But this work is very, very important.

MEMBER BOWLES: And I think what we're
learning as we have to sort of take this problem,
come up with a solution, and then back out of it
into where NACIE can play a role, because there's
so many different parties that will need a play a
role. Fortunately, OIE has been very helpful in
letting us know what that can look like. And so
I'm hoping that we're going to make even more
progress today. But I think that it's something
that Joe and I are exceptionally passionate
about, and I know several other people around the
table are.

And we're looking forward to coming
back with something that you guys can get excited
about.
MR. BUERSTATTE: Any other questions?

Questions or thoughts on that?

MEMBER HERSKOWITZ ORIN: The only one being that Andrew from Venture for America -- thank you -- he's posted frequently on that specific, Joe, on what you were just talking about, about the sort of -- what the impact of machine learning and natural language processing and those other things, robotics and automated manufacturing, are going to have on the workforce.

And when Bill Gates and Warren Buffett were at Columbia -- I think I sent that link around -- but they spent a good chunk of that talk, of their talk talking about the challenge that these technological innovations accrue -- the benefits accrue to a very small number of people, but the damage accrues very widely. And that there's no clear market-based approach to try and rectify that. That it's sort of those are the classic must-be-done-by-government problems because there's no free market incentive
to redistribute the wealth backwards.

And so it seems like it's a great topic.

MEMBER KAPP: Yes. And Mark Cuban I'll add to that list. Mark Cuban's another one who's having, you know, those conversations. And so I think that if there's any sort of legacy piece when we look a little bit forward as well, it's kind of maybe offering up some ideas. You know, I know that we want to get traction as soon as possible, but also, you know, thinking a little bit further out as well on some of the ways that we can go ahead and initiate this dialog within OIE, and the role that government can play, because it's an important piece.

And we've seen it in Appalachia in coal-affected communities. And I think that that is sort of an indicator, a leading indicator of some of the potential challenges. And I think it's a good conversation to have.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Anything from someone who hasn't spoken yet today? A lot of you have
been quiet. This is unusual.

Anything related to John's presentation on EveryLibrary, or Drew? We'll have Drew with us for the rest of the day but wanted to take advantage of them while we've got them here.

All right, Andrew.

MEMBER REAMER: I introduced her briefly but I just want to introduce again Heidi Sheppard who, for four years, coordinated the Interagency Network of Enterprise Assistance Providers; is that right? Can you say just a couple words about what that was?

MR. BUERSTATTE: Heidi, can you go to a mic please.

MS. SHEPPARD: So the acronym is AnyApp, which was a group of agency representatives across the federal government, all of whom were working to support the development of small businesses. So we had folks from EDA, from Department of Labor, from DOE, from EPA, from NIST/MEP, ARC, DRA, I mean a whole
yes, all the acronyms, AACC. There were other
people involved as well, other organizations. So
there were non-profits and associations that
would come to the meetings.

And the sole focus was to hear about
what each other -- what everybody was doing and
how they could leverage and build stronger
partnerships and relationships and understand
what each other was doing and help each other
achieve the goals that they were setting out to
do to support small businesses.

Unfortunately, it dissolved. There,
I was leading the charge and just didn't have the
capacity to really work on it anymore. We looked
for other folks to take it over, and just that
never really happened. So it would be great to
revive it if anybody wants to. But this is
certainly kind of like that. But that was
something that I worked on for a number of years
while being at MEP.

MR. BUERSTATTE: I'll just add my
take-away from that and having participated in
AnyApp, it is a great example of what we discussed earlier around being tactical with where you place your policies and efforts and programs to ensuring that there is the right resources and it's housed in the right agency with a long-term game plan perhaps. And we -- Heidi, she was really doing this by just volunteering really. And it was like she had a full program she was managing on the side.

And so when we think about maybe these ideas and solutions that we think might be good, make sure we're also thinking about how they could possibly be sourced and ensuring we've got a long-term game plan.

MS. STEVENSON: Can I ask a layperson question? So one of the things I don't understand is it seems like there would be so much value in having a full-time role or head count that dedicated to integration, maintenance marketing of integration. It seems like it could almost pay for itself in terms of finding scalability, efficiency, effectiveness.
I'm just curious sort of how head count decisions are made? Or is that an area where we could also provide some perspective or influence? Because when I look at what Andrew put together and the fact that this was sort of, as we would say at my company, your side hustle, like you're doing this just out of will. But it just seems like there would be so much value to this. Is there anything that we could do to help to support that effort?

MR. BUERSTATTE: Absolutely. A short, quick answer is I think the easiest way to address that might be through the OIE strategic plan development and talking about that integration role. But I'll -- and there's a few other ways we could look into that. And I'd love to spend some time peeling back layers.

But my maybe more robust answer is, because of the way we're structured, we are inherently biased to protect what we do. And it is hard in D.C. to go to another agency and say, hey, I'm doing this. Let me, let me help you.
And it happens in any organization.

It's no different in corporate America. People feel that you are infringing on their territory. So I think there's multiple problems or opportunities that you'd have to look at, not only sourcing, what type of head count and resources would be needed, but also finding the right podium or venue that would help decrease any sort of friction and increase buy-in from all the stakeholders.

We're learning -- we actually have a traditional economic development integration role. So this is your bricks and mortar, some of your technical assistance in strategic planning that EDA does, we, by OMB, have been mandated to be the integrator for all the federal government for economic development. That's aside from the innovation and entrepreneurship charge.

And we're about 10 or 11 months into that now. And that's exactly what we're finding. There's apprehension. There's some lack of buy-
in. And at the scale to which we operate, too, it's a massive movement where you're literally trying to steer the Titanic. So lots of challenges there. But we've got lots of opportunity.

MEMBER STEVENSON: And are successes is measured sort of vertically, or is there opportunity to look at incentivizing shared integration in terms of how people's individual performance is measured?

MR. BUERSTATTE: I think that's another challenge where we all, agencies, and Andrew identified the variety of entrepreneurship happening across government, and we're all looking for different outputs or different outcomes, right? Whether it's at EDA, it's a thriving economy and competitive innovation and high-wage jobs. In other agencies, let's take the Small Business Innovation Research Program, for example, billions of dollars going towards commercialization of early-stage research, many of them are less concerned, most of them might be
less concerned about the economic development outputs, but they're more concerned about the actual technology.

DoD wants their armor. Navy wants a new vessel, and so on and so forth. While the jobs numbers are important, so how do you -- what mechanisms at a macro, like, management level can you use to incentivize if they're all looking -- if they all have different incentives. That's my long-winded way of saying that's a challenge, too.

Joe.

MEMBER SCHOCKEN: Do you want me to talk about some of the things that I've been working on?

MR. BUERSTATTE: Sure. Please.

MEMBER SCHOCKEN: So my experience in innovation and entrepreneurship is such that capital formation is just absolutely critical and terribly important. As I listen to everybody around the table and all these very thoughtful programs, I hear that with great respect.
I look back to the experience I had around the JOBS Act which passed in 2012. And let me just do a little got and bad around the JOBS Act.

The good would be on the IPO side that there has been an increase in the number of IPOs as a result of the JOBS Act. I can go into the thinking behind that. It has not been as successful in generating new IPOs, but that's for other market-related kind of reasons. But, nonetheless, it has been successful.

I would say three things around the good side of the JOBS Act. So, one being IPOs. The second being general solicitation. And without going into an awful lot of detail around general solicitation, I can give you an eye-popping number that I think is $33 billion funded in a year-and-a-half. Under the general solicitation provisions of the JOBS Act, $33 billion of capital.

Now, how much of that would have been created anyway via private placements without the
benefits of the JOBS Act isn't clear. It's still a pretty impressive number. And much of that was made possible by the minor regulatory fixes in the JOBS Act.

And the third thing I would say on the good side of the ledger is online funding. In the first I think it is two years since the JOBS Act, $1.4 billion of funding went into various kinds of enterprises under rules created by the JOBS Act.

And so those are pretty significant financial impacts on job creation and entrepreneurship.

On the negative side talking about the JOBS Act, I will say two things. First of all, the bad side on general solicitation is that the rules put in by the SEC, which requires third party verification -- and, again, I don't want to get too detailed here -- and while that may not seem like a major distinction, I can tell you it has had a major chilling effect. The general solicitation provisions would have been far more
successful had the previous self-verification rules been allowed to remain in force.

And the second thing I would say is the equity crowd funding, which is one of the really central pieces of the JOBS Act. Equity crowd funding around the world is a major modality when it comes to capital creation. It is not in the United States. And the SEC rules created around the JOBS Act have been an abject failure. I think we've had about 18 months of experience under equity crowd funding, and I think the total amount of capital that's been raised is something like $15 or $20 million nationally. I mean it's just an absolute failure.

So the frame that I bring to this discussion is my experience in funding early-stage companies and the importance of capital in doing so. And so what we have been working on is a piece of legislation to address some of the short-term issues and to begin to address some of the longer term issues facing capital in the
innovation economy. And we have draft language on that legislation. We have sponsors in both the House and the Senate. We're kind of haggling these days over the wording on some of the findings and some of the actual provisions in the legislation. But you should expect to see it -- unless I'm terribly disappointed here -- I expect to see it introduced in both houses of the Congress in the next 30 days.

And I think this can also, I think this can be hugely influential from a job creation and innovation standpoint. And I'm happy to talk about that more.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Yes, thanks, Joe. And, again, we'll have more time this afternoon. So those that maybe it might have piqued your interest just now, I'd encourage you to speak with Joe on that.

I'd also encourage you to remember that we are, friendly reminder, we are an advisory council to the Secretary, so anything discussed as far as legislative issues, as Joe is
also doing in a different capacity, make sure
that we keep things related to our jobs and roles
here on the advisory council.

    But with that said, I did breeze
through the rest of the public comment earlier
because I was so happy to hear from John that I
forgot to mention are there any other public
members here that would like to comment at this
point, either in the room or on the line?

    (No audible response.)

    MR. BUERSTATTE: Also, I think we have
Rick Johnson and Whitney were dialed in for
portions of this. Rick or Whitney, any comments
on your end? Want to make sure we include you.

    (No audible response.)

    MR. BUERSTATTE: All right. So a lot
of information today. I'm hoping that as we get
up and stretch our legs, the energy and
engagement might be a little bit higher. I'm
looking at you, Mike. Rarely quiet. And Scott
Frederick, I'm not sure if we've heard from you
today. But hopefully the breakouts will add a
little bit more depth to the conversation.

And that is it from me formally.

Melissa, any remarks?

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: I would just say thank you to Emily and Sue, to Trey and Joe, certainly to Andrew. I want to acknowledge the work that has transpired between the time we've met. I know we're going to hear from you, Heather, tomorrow as well, I think.

And so I really appreciate the momentum. I also appreciate your patience in trying to understand all the acronyms of what our role is and is not. But I'm looking forward to the breakout session to figure out how do we connect the dots, and certainly working with Trey and Joe and others.

Thank you. Oh, and Tiffany stepped up as a leader. You mean Stevenson. Yes, I got her. We had a good call.

So I guess I just want to make sure that as we go into the breakout sessions, while we oftentimes get into minutia in these sessions,
we're clear, and I appreciate Trey and Joe stepping back and saying how do we reverse engineer. But we respectfully stay in our lane, but also keep a running parking lot because we do also have the opportunity, much like Joe, thank you for what you do in your work and outside of the NACIE role. So I look forward to our report outs this afternoon.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Great. At this point then, as the designated federal officer, I would like to officially close the meeting, the public portion. This concludes today's session.

We will begin tomorrow morning I believe at 8:45 here at the Commerce Library.

Thanks so much.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 3:13 p.m.)
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MR. BUERSTATTE: All right. Good morning everyone.

Welcome to our second day of the National Advisory Council on Innovation and Entrepreneurship's third quarterly meeting.

As the designated federal officer, I am officially kicking it off. So, thanks for your patience once again working through security to come in and find your way to the library.

We still have a few more members trickling in. They're in the building, but on the way. To keep ourselves on schedule, I wanted to rock and roll.

So, you all know the drill by now. You've got the agendas in front of you. Pretty standard. Although, one tweak for today. We're going to do things a little bit different to start things off with a pitch.

Most of you are familiar with this. We've sent some emails out and you've seen some
of the correspondence.

And what this is, is a pitch for our November offsite meeting. November is National Entrepreneurship Month. And to switch things up and bring the council into the community -- down to the community level, we thought it would be fun to do an offsite meeting.

And as you'll see, we'll hear from Sue Smith. Rick Johnson, I believe, is also dialed into the WebEx. Rick will be pitching from us virtually. Steve Tang, Trey Bowles and Joe Kapp.

I know many of you are super excited to participate in this and the timing just didn't work out for November, where November was a rough month for your organization to host or your city and what have you.

We're very hopeful that we'll do another one of these next year with -- as long as the timing and policy issues align. So, don't be dismayed if you couldn't participate. I certainly hope we can do another offsite in 2018.

Other than that, we'll be excited to
hear the report-outs. And, again, nothing informal, we're not expected to hear anything specific or, in fact, I don't think we're ready for any votes today, but that's fine.

Let me just emphasize that this is an opportunity for the broader group as a whole to hear what some of the smaller groups have worked on.

So, if you've hit a wall, you've had a specific question you're toying with and trying to -- trying to wrap your heads around, let's elevate that to the broader group and let's work through it.

So, you don't have to have all the answers. In fact, we hope you don't. Because if you do, that would be, you know, we're lacking the --- or not leveraging all the brain power at the table.

So, with that said, that's it for me. Logistics, you know the drill also. A restroom is in the back. We'll break at 10:30. Take breaks as you need, and I'll kick things over to
the co-chairs.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: So, one, welcome back, Steve, and congratulations on your award. I'm glad you made it.

(Applause.)

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: I hope that -- when I was driving home out to the country last night, I was like, wow, how much fun I had yesterday.

So, I think I want to thank everyone again for their patience in this process. I think we had some great conversations yesterday.

I want to commend Joe and Trey and Heather, because at least those are the groups I was in where I think we made a lot of great progress.

And it was good to see everybody getting a little more relaxed and having fun at dinner. So, I look forward to today.

CO-CHAIR TANG: It's great to be here. I wish I were with you yesterday, especially for the breakout groups, which we'll hear more about, and the dinner, which I heard was spectacular.
And in case you're wondering, if you take the six o'clock train from Philadelphia, it's a really quiet train for some reason. So, I'm happy to be here with you.

And I apologize, again, I'll have to leave at the first break to do the testimony at Congress for Small Business, but also a plug for what we're doing here at NACIE. So, glad to be with you.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Real quick for those that might be dialed in, I think Whitney and Rick, can you chime in and give us a comms check?

I just want to make sure that you're able to contribute via voice before we really dive into things.

(Pause.)

MR. BUERSTATTE: We'll get started, but Rick and Sue -- excuse me, I'm sorry. Rick and Whitney --- Whitney Smith, the other Smith, let us know if --- just give us a good, positive comms check.

Eric Smith is looking into this right
now. We want to make sure we've got voice capabilities for you. So, we'll start off with the pitches. First up is Sue.

We also have distributed -- underneath the agenda, take a look real quick, we have a voting box or pamphlet for you.

We avoided any --- inserting any chads, so hopefully there will be no problems --- issues there.

But we've got five options here, and we simply want you to rank them one through five on your preference.

I'll also highlight that your preference is one of three inputs into this decision process.

We will weight this and get an idea of what location is a top preference for the council, but number 2 will of course be Secretary Ross' guidance on where he sees the council best engaged. And, three, our own policy considerations.

As you know, we're still in the early
phases of developing some of these broader, real big picture policy ideas. And we want to make sure that the site we travel to complements, as best as possible, some of the issues that we're working through on the team.

So, those three factors, again, your vote; our chair, Secretary Ross; and, third, policy considerations.

We'll keep you abreast of this process. I'm hopeful that we can have a final decision by late June mainly because we need to make the decision soon so that individual and the community there has enough time to prepare for our visit in November.

It's quite a lift and we want to be respectful of your own full-time jobs. So, keep that in mind --- but, actually, any questions on that real quick before we start off with Sue?

(Pause.)

MR. BUERSTATTE: All right.

MEMBER STEVENSON: Is there criteria that we should be thinking about in terms of
based on some of the work projects that we're doing?

So, like, advance manufacturing, is it in proximity of? So, just other criteria that we can be thinking about to help frame our decision?

MR. BUERSTATTE: Yeah. Absolutely. And I think we'll get that information from the pitches.

So, I'm hopeful that each individual that's pitching today will help communicate the type of exposure and lessons gained from that immersive experience.

But, no, there's no specific value, matrix to apply to this, how many policy ideas does this community complement, how many issues we will cover while there, especially since some of the issues we worked on vary on scope.

We know some are smaller and more tactical. And others like the ones we -- most of the ones we worked through yesterday were very broad-reaching, very big picture. And those are going to take some time.
And possibly if we were to weight those, theoretically we would weight those with a little bit more just because of their scope and impact versus some of the earlier stuff we worked through quicker.

Does that answer your question, Tiffany?

Okay. Thanks. Anything else?

MEMBER STEVENSON: I just want to say "thank you" to everybody in advance for the hard work.

I'm looking forward to the handouts and the entertainment. I'm sure Joe's getting entertainment.

MR. BUERSTATTE: All right.

(Laughter.)

MR. BUERSTATTE: So, we'll start off with Sue. Sue, here you go.

MEMBER SMITH: Okay. Thank you very much. I really appreciate the opportunity. I will say that I can't take credit for this. My staff put all this together.
And our Chamber of Commerce gave all the information, materials, and of course our college did, too. So, they're very excited about the opportunity to host in November.

So, first of all, some Indiana facts. The things that I will tell you that are not on the slides, are that Indiana is the No. 1 manufacturing state.

We are the center for BioCrossroads. We have a BioCrossroads center. We have an Orthopedic Capital of the World in the northern part of our state.

So, we have SalesForce that just came into Indianapolis, and that's an IT center that we're having some opportunities in innovation and in technology.

And so, it is a very progressive state, it's a very manufacturing-oriented state, but it also has some IT and it also has some health sciences with Lilly and some of the other folks that are there.

"Crossroads to America," of course,
but Ivy Tech Community College is kind of a
unique place.

It's the largest community college
system in the United States. We have about
170,000 students and we blanket the state of
Indiana with all of our campuses.

Our flagship campus is in Indianapolis
and that is our largest campus. And it has
several interesting labs that would probably be
of interest to you all.

One of the main centers there is
culinary. And so, we have a tremendous amount of
tourism and gambling boats and that kind of thing
in our state. And so, we teach a lot of that
there.

So, this is the schedule that we had
proposed. We had talked about having the
reception with our culinary art students and
having them show off their talents and abilities.

A lot of those folks will go on to do
vertical farming, they go on to do, you know,
open their own restaurants. And so, it's a very
innovative kind of program.

We are looking at guest speakers. We are hoping to talk to Mike Pence and see if he would come. I think he might, if he's available.

If not, we have some other folks within our state that would be interested in doing it. The governor is always an option and, of course, the mayor of Indianapolis.

Indianapolis is a very international city. We have a lot of international relationships.

One of those that sort of drives that international relationship and innovation is our Indy500, which is the "greatest spectacle in racing," as many of you. And the Indianapolis Motor Speedway is one of the bucket list destinations for a lot of people.

And I think it's --- I've been there every year since 1987, '90, something like that. And my husband has been there every year since he was seven, and he is 62. So, we are very committed to the Speedway.
So, Dinner at the Speedway is quite a unique event. I don't know if you know much about it, but there's a pagoda out in the middle of the Speedway and we usually get that donated by the Speedway to have dinner there.

So, then our group meeting, we could ride around the track. The museum is always interesting.

Our downtown is -- if you look at the top 10 things to do in Indy, you can see our downtown is quite robust and there is a lot of things to do there.

If you haven't had the shrimp cocktails downtown that we're famous for with the special sauce, that's always a good thing to do.

And then Friday, of course, is our wrap-up and next steps. So, we do think we have accommodated for the meeting, as well as, you know, for the entertainment.

And we're really excited and hope to see you in Indy in November. Thank you.

(Applause.)
MR. BUERSTATTE: Real quick, any questions for Sue while we've got her up?

MEMBER PEREZ WADSWORTH: So, I just -- less a question and more an offer. With our deep roots in Indianapolis, we of course own the IndyStar, we could rather than have meetings in a hotel and have that expense, we would certainly be happy to host onsite at our facilities for our meetings.

And can also be helpful with all of our connections there in terms of speakers, even something like a panel of community business leaders who might, you know, whose perspective might be interesting to us as we focus on our work. So, happy to help with that.

MEMBER SMITH: That's great. And, yeah, we could have --- we could get industry leaders as well.

Cummins has offered their new headquarters. One of their buildings is downtown Indy. It's beautiful. They have offered to host, as well.
So, I think we would have a lot of southern hospitality in Indianapolis.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Great. And, actually, Rick wasn't able to make it online and he did warn us. He had an emergency come up, so he wasn't sure if he'd be able to make it.

But in lieu of Rick, I thought it might be helpful for Tiffany Wilson to share her experience as a council member when we visited Nashville and did this community visit on the last council.

Tiffany, could you share some light on why you felt it was valuable and what you took away from the experience?

MEMBER WILSON: Yeah. I think the first one --- I guess the main one when we did the voting last time, Nashville won. Michael Burcham pulled out the whole --- rolled out the red carpet with the boots and this music and the whole nine yards.

I think my takeaway from that was it just wasn't around --- kind of focused on
innovation and entrepreneurship. It really ---
with all the things, the topics that we cover at
NACIE, the program that was put together was a
really great snapshot example of that in that
community.

So, we started --- we had the mayor
talk to us. She had --- Megan Barry had just
been elected, had a little overview of the
Nashville --- the Music Hall of Fame.

The next day we got to tour Thistle
Farms, which is a not-for-profit organization
that gives women who have been in --- abused and
with addiction, a real clear pathway forward.

And so, that was really an interesting
model of workforce development and kind of a
social impact entrepreneurship.

They had just signed a big contract
with Whole Foods and were planning on
manufacturing and bringing in workers from the
community. So, it was unique, right?

And so, then we headed over to Casa
Azafran, which was an opportunity to help the
Latino community in Nashville that was growing and it was an interesting intersection of services to help the Latino community in terms of immigration, education, law, but then also a daycare.

And then what I found incredibly fascinating was they had an incubator kind of accelerator there for food trucks. It was like an industrial kitchen.

So, that actually got me thinking about, you know, with all these NACIE experiences, I always take it back to Atlanta and say, "What can we be doing in Atlanta to do better," right?

And so, for example, on that we've got a big westside development going on with the new Falcons stadium. And we just completed a study -- or Georgia Tech did, that EDA had funded, to look at building out this biomedical innovation neighborhood.

Well, if that's going to really be successful, I kind of drew on what I saw in
Nashville, you know, how do you pull from those surrounding communities, right, so the whole thing doesn't just get gentrified, but we're integrating the community on the west side in the overall development.

So, could there be kind of a Casa Azafran, you know, for food service, for hotel, hospitality, you know, and that sort of thing.

So, you know, as we're going to these different communities, there's so many opportunities to learn and grow.

And then we spent a lot of time, obviously, at the EC, the Entrepreneur Center, that Michael basically founded and started.

And so, it was a --- we spent a night at a secret music hall, like invitation only. Everyone has their own little whiskey locker. I was really kind of jealous, but it was fun, right, but very educational.

And I think that experience was so unique and different and a good example of bringing together all these ideas that we discuss
here that other people wanted to highlight their cities and their unique ecosystems, too.

And so, that led to, you know, Austin, which I wasn't able to attend, then Chicago. And Chicago was hosted by Marie Lynch and her background is very workforce-oriented.

So, Chicago and everything going on there in terms of underserved communities, workforce development, poverty and all of the unique things that Chicago is doing to address that, we got to see firsthand and how the community is coming together, you know, with Whitney and J.P. Morgan.

And so, these strong, public-private partnerships to address some of these key issues has been great.

So, I guess that's kind of like anything, right? So, you know, when you were in school and go on field trips and you got to take what you learned in the classroom and what you were discussing and then see it in play, you know, I think these city tours are a great way to
have insight that we can bring back and have even
more meaningful policy discussions.

MR. BUERSTATTE: And I'll just add
that on the note of our presentation from Mayor
Barry starting off the Nashville visit, on
through the variety of places that we visited, it
was clear that Nashville has infused
entrepreneurship into their music culture.

And the same sentiment was true for
Chicago, except it was more workforce-related.
And the sentiment there was really the public-
private partnerships helping drive the 77
neighborhoods across the Chicago metroplex area.

And when you're talking about that
diverse of a community, you're really relying on
those subject matter experts that are providing
great support in unique ways and they're able to
do that through those public-private
partnerships.

So, each of those visits had a unique
theme and I think we walked away with a clearer
understanding of the personality or the
characteristics.

And we also, as many of us --- as we call ecosystem builders or entrepreneurship supporters, I've referred to that as the culture --- the culture of that is the thread across the community.

So, we think about this --- these pitches, what culture, what personality --- what community personalities might be most valuable for the council to better understand.

So, thank you so much, Tiffany. That was great.

MEMBER STEVENSON: Uh-huh.

MR. BUERSTATTE: With that said, I think we're ready for Philadelphia.

Steve Tang.

CO-CHAIR TANG: Thank you, Craig.

And let me just echo what Tiff shared with you. This is a tremendous learning experience.

By the way, you cannot go wrong with any of the choices that are on the ballot here.
All, I think, are going to offer different dimensions of what we've been doing, focus on access inclusion, as well as innovation and entrepreneurship.

What I try to do is take some lessons learned from the experiences in NACIE 2.0. Michael Burcham's experience having the entire NACIE convene there, and then Julia's experience in Austin and Marie's experience in Chicago.

So, the first thing I want to share with you is, we've hired a professional event organizer to help us do this. Okay. And that's the Economy League of Greater Philadelphia.

They do a yearly Greater Philadelphia leadership exchange, which is a program to both educate local leaders in terms of what's going on in Philadelphia, and then other cities like San Francisco, Toronto -- well, it's Los Angeles of late.

So, that's --- my up front offer is that we've learned enough to know that we need professionals to do this.
The other thing I'd offer to you is that we have set aside budget at the Science Center to host this.

So, should you pick Philadelphia, the only expenses that you would be responsible for are getting yourself there and lodging, and we'll take care of the rest.

So, three elements to Philadelphia. Eds and Meds innovation in University City, which is the part of the city that the Science Center is located in; the Navy Yard --- the country's oldest navy yard, which is undergoing a renaissance to focus in on a --- kind of a suburban campus on a waterway; and then the overall tech scene in Philadelphia.

So, just as a background for Philadelphia, we like to say that we are the home to the country's first startup, which is this thing called the United States of America. And the founders of that, obviously, are well-known to all of you.

The other thing which is, I think,
obvious, is it is a large city, fifth largest
city in the country. We have both opportunities
and challenges.

We are at once the largest --- the
biggest --- the city that has received the
highest influx of millennials in the last five
years.

Over a hundred thousand millennials
have moved into Philadelphia. That creates a
certain vibrancy for the city.

On the other side of that, we are also
the poorest big city in the county with an
endemic poverty rate close to 26 percent. I see
that firsthand and I'll talk more about that for
University City.

So, the idea here is to not just show
you the glitz and glamor and everything that's
going right, but also engage you and the input
that you might have on how to work with
underserved communities that have been
historically very poor for many generations.

So, University City, just a snapshot.
We are the home to University of Pennsylvania, Drexel University, Children's Hospital of Philadelphia, but also some really exciting and emerging companies.

Spark Therapeutics, which is a gene therapy company, which is working for a --- working on a therapy to cure forms of childhood blindness by introducing genetic engineering to infected patients, and of course my organization, the Science Center. So, one of the highest densities of Eds and Meds in the country.

Second of all the navy yard, the world's oldest navy yard which was shuttered back in the 1990s, has had a significant comeback.

There are actually more jobs in the navy yard today based on high tech and based on entrepreneurial ventures, than there were actual shipbuilding jobs in the heyday of the navy yard.

So, some of the --- you'll recognize the logos for Urban Outfitters, GSK, Glaxo-SmithKline, Tastykake. We'll tempt you always with Tastykakes. And a lot of very interesting
development going on there.

And then last, but not least, the tech community. Overall, a hundred thousand tech workers. Comcast will open their Innovation Tower in two years, a million and a half square feet of space.

So, if you're having trouble with your Comcast service, I'll take you directly to the customer service area. You can work it out with them there.

So, here's a brief look at how we see the agenda. We do not have a prescription yet about what the entertainment will be, but there's a vibrant restaurant scene, there's a vibrant music scene especially in the jazz area. And of course November, we typically have some of our sports teams still playing.

The Phillies used to play in early November. Not so much these days. We'll see what happens there.

But we are looking to open on that Thursday morning with an overview and some
notable guests there, leaders of the city,
leaders of the state. Explore University City
hands on, have lunch, then have our NACIE meeting
and then a group dinner. Place to be determined.

The morning presentation on Friday
will focus on the tech scene, then take a trip to
the navy yard, then lunch in another block from
there.

So, we are ready to welcome you.

Again, if you don't pick Philadelphia, any of the
other choices are going to be outstanding, but we
would love to have you. So, thank you.

(Appause.)

MR. BUERSTATTE: Any questions?

MEMBER REAMER: What is DuckDuckGo?

CO-CHAIR TANG: DuckDuckGo is a

website that actually is encrypted so that
cookies do not work.

So, in other words, your web history
doesn't exist if you use the web browser

DuckDuckGo.

MEMBER KAPP: So, I was in graduate
school at University of Pennsylvania and helped write some of the revitalization documents for the naval ship yard -- for the shipyard.

So, I'd like to take credit for that and --

(Laughter.)

MEMBER KAPP: -- want to go ahead and preempt the conversation so that you can come out to West Virginia and just see what we're going to do out there.

CO-CHAIR TANG: Touche.

(Laughter.)

MR. BUERSTATTE: before we move on to Trey, I'll add that Steve touched on an important point.

I know many of you are, as we've identified over and over, many of you are doers and want to make impacts today.

That was another great output from these events where relationships were established, partnerships were developed and many NACIE members have gone on to support the
programming in Nashville, in Austin and in Chicago.

So, this is also an opportunity for us to drive some change --- some immediate change at the local level versus the meta federal, national level that we're focused on right now.

MEMBER BOWLES: All right. Good morning.

GROUP RESPONSE: Good morning.

MEMBER BOWLES: How we doing?

GROUP RESPONSE: Good.

MEMBER BOWLES: I get excited --- I tell people I get excited when I talk about Dallas, because I don't just drink the Kool-Aid, I help stir it. So, if I get really excited, I apologize.

In lieu of not being able to bring any materials, Mark Cuban was going to come with me this morning to vie for Dallas and he couldn't.

And President --- former President W. Bush --- George W. Bush is available now. He doesn't have a lot of stuff going on. So, he's
agreed to be our event planner for the trip to Dallas.

(Laughter.)

MEMBER BOWLES: So, good morning. Many of you have heard it said "everything is bigger and better in Texas." Well, we agree. And we also agree that we had this great campaign several years ago called Don't mess with Texas, it was about not littering, but we're talking about some of the things that stand out about what we're doing.

In Dallas we have 21 Fortune 500 companies, which doesn't take into account the tens and tens of other major corporations that have large headquarters there from the second largest location for Microsoft and Ericsson's North American headquarters.

We have the largest arts district in the US. Our downtown has a walkability score of 97. I don't know how many of you guys have been to Dallas, but with as sprawling as it is, I'm assuming you did not think you could walk through
the downtown, but you easily can.

We also have the largest light rail system in the country, which goes to both of our international airports that you can fly into. And for, I think, about $2.50 you can get into the city on our new light rail system.

We are centrally located in the middle of the country. If you will look at this map that we have, I put several examples of where each of you live to show you that nobody is having to travel cross-country to get here.

Many people have been to Dallas and through Dallas, but not as many people have been into Dallas. And so, I'm excited to show that to you.

We're looking at a humongous population growth. 10.5 million by 2040. We have six Major League teams, including a WNBA team and several Minor League teams.

We have a Federal Reserve Bank and one of the only four US Patent and Trademark Office regional offices.
You will be hosted by two organizations when you come to Dallas. One is the Dallas Entrepreneur Center, or the DEC, which is an organization I lead.

And the second is the Dallas Innovation Alliance, which has been cast by the City of Dallas, the mayor and the city manager, to help come up with a Smart City Strategy for the city.

If you look at the bottom of this banner, these are several of the different locations that we have that fall underneath the DEC.

We have nine announced locations across Texas now, and these are just a few of them that sort of exist across the 9200-square-mile region that is north Texas.

As you can see, I'm showing some of the stuff that we have going on here in terms of sports.

There will be several of our sports teams that will still be playing in November.
So, that would be a great way for us to go to a
game if that's of interest to you.

Talked about the Federal Reserve Bank,
the United States Patent and Trademark Office and
the George W. Bush Presidential Library.

Which I don't know how many of you
have been to a presidential library before. But
regardless of whether you like a president or you
don't, they are fascinating.

And we would --- and I'll get to it
later, but we'd like to have the president come
and speak to us one of those days and maybe have
some meetings at the George Bush Institute.

One of the things I'm really excited,
though, when I think about what we can show you
that's going on in Dallas as we have the
conversation on innovation and entrepreneurship,
is the great things that are going on there.

I mentioned the DEC. I would love for
you guys to come see the work that we are doing
in Dallas and how it is affecting entrepreneurs
at the ground level.
Same with the Dallas Innovation Alliance. We're one of only a few public-private partnerships in the country that works very well with the city and about 23 other organizations to make that work.

We recently launched at the end of March, a Smart Cities Lab powered by AT&T, which fills up an area that we are calling the Dallas Innovation District.

So, we would be able to walk you through that, show you around, show you the different things that are working and the data that's being collected and how it will help create efficiencies inside of our city, as well as revenue opportunities for our city ultimately creating the best possible place for our citizens to live, work and play.

One of the things that we believe makes up an innovation district, there's three components; one is startup innovation, one is corporate innovation, and one is civic innovation.
Our Innovation District has startup innovation through the DEC, civic innovation through the Smart Cities Living Lab, and corporate innovation through organizations like BlueCross BlueShield which is launching an innovation lab called C1, which is Customers First, in about 40,000-square-foot space inside of that district, which we would love to show you.

Toyota recently moved to Dallas and has a connected innovation component. Blackstone just launched something called Launch Pad at University of Texas at Dallas, which is one of our rising stars in terms of being a Tier 1 research university. We have AT&T Foundry, which is one of their innovation labs.

And then you guys were talking --- I think Tiff was talking about this earlier. We have something called the GroundFloor, which is a social innovation accelerator and fund -- funded by the United Way, in Dallas as well, which is right around the corner from where our office is.
When I look at sort of our agenda, this is a proposed agenda. If you want to get there early and see the Dealey Plaza and the grassy knoll, sometimes they are not wonderful stories in your history, but they're still part of your history. And a lot of people come to see the Book Depository and the six-floor museum.

We'll have our mayor come out and participate. Cafe Momentum is actually an interesting social enterprise started by a chef who brings in workers that are juvenile delinquents that he brings back into his program and helps substantially reduce the recidivism rate in Dallas as a result.

We'll probably have Senator Cornyn come, the president of the Federal Reserve, the executive director for the US Patent and Trademark Office.

As I mentioned, we will try to get President Bush to come in there. He's usually good about that kind of stuff. He's in town. And as you, I think, Orin, suggested, maybe we
can get him to do a NACIE portrait for us while
we're there.

One of the other things that I think
is really exciting is as we think about what kind
of things we can be doing in Dallas, one of the
projects that we're working on that you'll hear a
little bit more about later this morning is the
mentor networks and Entrepreneurship for All.

I would love to invite the president
of our community college district to come in and
talk about their commitment to this initiative
and how they see this playing out across the rest
of their seven-school program.

And I think that being able to see how
the work that we do and the things that we're
proposing here will affect in an individual
community, would be really exciting for all of
us.

Here's a couple of examples of the
Fortune 500 companies that exist in Dallas.
We'll make sure that we will make a good, fun
time for you. Definitely hit up some barbecue --
- some Texas barbecue, but just excited to have you guys come and do this.

I can say that I'm a part of another organization called the Startup Champions Network and we do this where we go to a different community every single, you know, every six months or so.

And to Steve's point earlier, I will agree there is nothing like being able to bring a bunch of people into your community, have them connecting with the leaders of that community to advocate for you the work that you're doing, to showcase the work that's being done around the rest of the country.

So, wherever we decide to go, I think this is a really exciting initiative that we've done in other cases and I think can be transformational and a real shot in the arm for a community. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MEMBER REAMER: I think we should create a spinoff of NACIE that's a for-profit
pitch group that sells tours. We clearly have
the talent.

(Off the record comments.)

MEMBER KAPP: Well, first of all, I'd
like to go ahead and let everybody know that as a
part of the tour to the Potomac Highlands, we are
-- actually, the host and the event planner is
Alexander Hamilton, who will be hosting the tour.

(Laughter.)

MEMBER KAPP: So, I'm excited to
present about the Potomac Highlands. In many
respects, I think what I'm representing is
communities across the United States. And I
actually struggled with two ways to go about
this.

One community was actually in the
heart of coal --- coal community --- coal-
affected communities, and the other is where
we're located in the Potomac Highlands in
Appalachia.

And the challenge with Appalachia is
that it's not one of the easiest places to get
But being mindful of the folks around this table and also striking a balance between understanding what's from a coal-affected community, but also understanding how --- what you might have the opportunity to see is playing out across the United States, I went with the Potomac Highlands, because I feel like it's representative of --- and while we're here representing the organizations that we work with, in many respects we also are here to speak for voices that can't necessarily speak for themselves with regards to entrepreneurship.

So, that's a little bit of a precursor to kind of give you a little bit of a rural perspective on economic development.

A lot of people don't necessarily know where West Virginia is. And so, you start with Virginia and you go west.

The area that I am in is in the Potomac Highlands, and a lot of the coal country is down in the south. And so, there's a number
of initiatives going on here.

We're actually the most agricultural community in the State of West of Virginia. And so, a lot of what we're going to be seeing is things associated with agriculture, actually going to see some farms and stuff like that.

It's nice, because it's actually a two-hour --- it's about a two-hour, hour-and-a-half drive from Dulles Airport where we are. So, in many respects it's --- it kind of can dovetail with some of the stuff that we're doing.

You know, we don't have huge numbers of incubators and huge numbers of employers. This is individual farmers and folks who are running their own businesses. They don't necessarily see themselves as entrepreneurs.

And so, what you will find is that we have sparse populations. This is the way it exists across all of --- both Appalachia, as well as rural communities within your own states.

Expansive geographies, limited internet and mobile capabilities. You're going
to see some of the challenges of what it means to really start a business in a rural community. And I know that Craig had the opportunity to go out there and see it.

We have amazing, beautiful scenery, beautiful vistas and the people are wonderful. You'll have the opportunity to meet some of the -- both the employers of --- the small employers, but we have a very large manufacturer in two areas.

One is in a chicken processing plant. And depending on biohazard issues, we may or may not be able to go ahead and see that, but also the manufacturing --- cabinet manufacturing.

So, looking at our institution as a community college, we represent community colleges in rural communities and community colleges across the United States.

And I think what you will find is in rural communities, there's largely been a reliance on single economies, single industries.

So, as a result, we work with what
we've got. We work with what we've got. And so, we're working on creative rural economies. And we'll have the opportunity to go see a couple of different places within the economy that highlights creative rural economies.

And that includes ag tourism, the opportunity to see farms that are actually trying to go ahead and move the needle in terms of their own particular income.

Rural and ag innovation, and what does that mean? We have farmers that are working on really, really fascinating projects, chicken manure and the rendering of that into potential coal, those sorts of things. And so, looking at the creative initiatives that it represents.

You will walk away from this experience with, really, a couple different things.

One, what do rural communities look like and how does that impact entrepreneurship and innovation and the national landscape? I think a lot of us kind of have heard about that.
Leveraging community colleges, we'll have the tour of the community college, we'll understand what does a rural accelerator look like. We'll tour a working farm and we'll tour some of the area businesses and manufacturers.

Potential speakers in addition to Alexander Hamilton, we've reached out to the chancellor of the community college system, as well as the West Virginia Governor and reaching out to the Appalachian Regional Commission.

As I mentioned, this tour is not just a tour of West Virginia, but also spans Appalachia.

For those of you who don't know, Appalachia runs all the way from New York pretty much all the way down to Alabama in that whole swath.

And so, looking at that and understanding --- we'll see a representative from a foundation and why they are so instrumental in sort of funding these types of initiatives and understanding the challenges and the
opportunities that rural communities represent.
And then our senators.

Finally, you also get to hear from Dr. Terrell, who is the award winner of the 2016 Entrepreneur Community College President, and understand his background and how anchor institutions play in rural communities.

So, that's my pitch. It's not nearly as sexy. We don't have handouts. But if you really want to understand -- what's that? If you really want to understand, you know, some of the challenges that are playing out in rural communities and in Appalachia, I encourage you to go ahead and check the bottom of the box. It's the easiest one. Just go all the way down to the bottom and just check that box.

I assure you we'll have a good opportunity and you'll have the opportunity to see a number of things that certainly, you know, is going to be different from a lot of the experiences which, like you said, they're all really, really good experiences. So, thank you.
Any questions?

(Applause.)

MEMBER REICHERT: Would we meet students?

MEMBER KAPP: Would you meet --- yeah.

So, there would be a couple different --- there would be a couple of students that you'd meet.

I have a couple already in mind. One of them raises award-winning pigs. And so, you'd get the opportunity to meet a number of the students from FFA, as well as the students in our own incubator which are learning skills about 3D printing and laser cutting and learning more about technology and gaming and those sorts of things. All of the things that previously have not been --- the students haven't been exposed to.

So, in addition to the businesses, you'll have the opportunity to see some of the work that we're doing to help drive culture change as well.
MEMBER REICHERT: Joe, another

question.

MEMBER KAPP: Sure.

MEMBER REICHERT: So, you mentioned

briefly that we would learn more about Appalachia

in general and what's going on across a variety

of states.

Can you talk a little bit more about

how would we --- or who would we be hearing from?

MEMBER KAPP: So, in particular, we

would hear from the folks from the Appalachia

Regional Commission.

They --- it's a commission that

comprises all of the states of Appalachia. They

actually drive a not insignificant amount of

projects both in capital projects, as well as

economic development projects. So, you would

hear from them.

The other possibility is for us to go

ahead and loop in --- we have another project

that's going on and it's something that we have

the ability to be able to do is to loop in the
seven or eight other community colleges within Appalachia to be able to talk about some of the things that they are working on.

For example, there's a broadband initiative going on at a community college, at Big Sandy Community College down in Kentucky. So, this is the reason why I say we're really spanning a large area. So, in addition to Appalachia, it's also the agricultural communities.

But what I would look to do is to go ahead and loop in some of those other community colleges that are working on entrepreneurship and economic development to really give you a sense of sort of the broad array of things that are going on in Appalachia.

MEMBER REICHERT: Thank you.

MR. BUERSTATTE: All right. So, we've got the headcounts. We know how many ballots are out.

(Laughter.)

MR. BUERSTATTE: All that I ask is
before you head out today, please hand those to Shannon. Shannon, can you raise your hand? Shannon.

And before you leave -- and why I say that, if you do want to spend some time talking offline with the potential host to ask him some more questions about what that would look like, please do.

This is clearly a very important opportunity. So, at your convenience, feel free to pass it along to Shannon.

With that said, looking at the agenda we're a little bit behind, but hopefully we can get through these report-outs pretty quickly.

We don't have a run of show for the workgroups. We had four of them meet yesterday. I'm hopeful that one of you is excited enough about the discussion that you had yesterday that you want to break the ice and share with the broader group some of the ideas that were generated and worked through. But also, again, some of the challenges that you're still
continuing to figure out.

Anyone want to kick it off?

MEMBER REICHERT: Good morning, everyone. And I'm going to give the report-out on the Advanced Manufacturing Workgroup.

And just to go back and remind everyone a little bit about this topic, we are looking at advanced manufacturing workforce, because we believe it is truly critical to promoting and growing America's innovation economy.

If you have a good idea in the United States, you should be able to make it in the United States.

And the advanced manufacturing workforce is an issue and a topic because of the number of jobs that remain unfilled in this workforce in the United States.

This is an across-the-country problem and it has been estimated that there are about two million jobs that are going to go unfilled in the next decade.
And that's according to the Manufacturing Institute, which is part of the National Association of Manufacturers.

So, we need to figure out ways/strategies to be able to get people that are potentially going to be able to fill these jobs, whether they're currently not --- whether they're currently not able to find them, so there's a lack of connection, whether they're currently not inspired to do manufacturing because their parents are telling them that this is not the most exciting thing you could do versus being a doctor or a lawyer, but there are many reasons why these jobs are not going --- are going unfilled. And so, Sue Smith and I set out to attack this topic.

I'll say one other thing that this is something that's on the minds of many across the nation.

And when Trump --- President Trump brought together two dozen manufacturing CEOs to the White House just a month or two ago, it was
suggested to him that there were actually still plenty of openings in the United States for factory jobs, but too few qualified people to fill them.

And the CEOs urged Trump --- President Trump to support vocational training for the high-tech skills that today's manufacturers increasingly require.

The jobs are there, but the skills are not. And so, that's the topic that we're trying to tackle.

We had some additional ideas, because Sue Smith is a leader in this topic. At Ivy Tech she is part of really running programs that are all about training folks for manufacturing jobs in the state of Indiana. And so, she brings a lot of good experience to the table.

But as we are setting off to do this or learn more about this topic, we felt that we needed to get some additional background.

And so, in the last month or two, we've gathered additional feedback from a variety
of different experts.

    So, of course, first and foremost we went to Andrew Reamer who is the font of all
government knowledge and interviewed him. And he had some excellent suggestions.

    One of which was to bring all of the parts of Department of Commerce that deal with
manufacturing together in one room.

    And as far as we know having done that, a lot of these people were meeting each
other for the first time.

    So, even just doing that act of bringing people together is something that
perhaps can start us thinking about how to address this challenge as a nation and the
recommendations that we can make to the Secretary of Commerce.

    We also met with David Langdon,
Department of Commerce. We met with the National Association of Manufacturers, the head of the Manufacturing Institute, as well as the COO of that organization.
We met with the Department of Labor's apprenticeship's program leader. And as I mentioned, with Eric Smith's help, and thank you, Eric, we met with a number of folks from the Department of Commerce, including NIST, ITA, EDA's Innovative Technologies and Manufacturing Loan Guarantee Program, the EDA's Investing in Manufacturing Communities Partnership.

And these -- this gathering that we had two weeks ago was really both an amazing opportunity to learn about all the different things Commerce is doing in manufacturing, but also an incredible amount of information which we are still, at this point, processing to be able to understand how to best move forward with making the recommendations to the Secretary.

But we did attempt to put all these recommendations together to the extent that we could process them and come up with some ideas that we wanted to move forward with in the page that you received yesterday.

And in yesterday's workgroup, we were
able to share that and get some helpful feedback from the workgroup that was assembled.

And many of them, of course, are around this table and I would encourage them to speak up if you have things that you personally want to share about the proposal.

But I'd say the main bottom line was that based on the amount of information that we had collected and tried to put in recommendations, maybe the first suggestion was this could be actually five different sets of recommendations.

Perhaps one around the Manufacturing Extension Partnerships and that program and making that, you know, more -- it's really updating that program, evaluating its metrics, et cetera.

Another one was around the Manufacturing USA Institutes and how they're working in workforce, and better understanding that and coming up with some specific recommendations around that.
And there were a variety of others, all of which could be, I think, pulled forward into some more -- some specific recommendations for various parts of Commerce.

And also, various parts of agencies that work on manufacturing across the government simply talking to each other more, understanding what each other is doing. And so, there's potentially some interagency work and recommendations that we could have here as well.

Then I think at this point, I will pass the mic to Sue. And if there are additional comments around the table about the manufacturing workforce proposal, we'd be happy to hear them at this point.

I think in general, we received really good, constructive feedback yesterday and we look forward to putting this feedback into the next version of our proposal that you will see perhaps between now and the August meeting.

MEMBER SMITH: Yeah. Thanks, Emily.

And thanks, everyone.
It was just what we needed, I guess, yesterday's discussion, because, you know, there's that -- there's that you know something is just not right exactly the way you want it, but you really are too close to it to kind of figure out what that is. So, that was helpful.

I think the next steps for us are to regroup as a team and to take a good look at some of the things that we have talked about and we talked about yesterday, and really flesh out maybe three to five recommendations. So, that's really our next steps.

So, anyone who wants to participate in that is certainly welcome to do so.

CO-CHAIR TANG: It's like musical chairs with the mics here.

I'm curious as to whether the topic of apprenticeships came up. This is something that we discussed in NACIE 2.0.

And then separately, what's the role of organized labor as you see in this -- in that overall mix of solutions?
MEMBER SMITH: So, it did come up. We did talk to the Department of Labor and we talked to two folks there and it was a very good conversation.

We talked about a number of things. One of the things that we talked about with the DOL was that it's apprenticeship doesn't really have a good, defined value proposition. So, industry kind of isn't aware that that's a really good opportunity for them.

And there's also this -- whether it's perceived or earned, this reputation that it's very difficult to register a program and very cumbersome to register a program.

So, we have to -- that's why we were talking about bringing that out as its own initiative and then trying to look at how we might deal with those two issues around apprenticeship.

But everyone, I think, feels that it's a good and viable solution, it's just how do we make it work for industry.
CO-CHAIR TANG: Good. Thank you.

MR. BUERSTATTE: I think that wraps up the manufacturing discussion. Pretty concrete. Making some great headway.

And I love the fact that the group session in person where you were able to roll up your sleeves, was really beneficial and get that feedback.

So, and once again, thank you both Sue and Emily, for taking the lead on this. I know it's -- with potentially five separate recommendations, it's a lot.

So, opening the floor. Who else?

What group is next? David, please.

MEMBER KENNEY: All right.

So, in contrast to the last report-out, which had done a fair amount of work already, this -- the topic of meta clusters was a brand new topic for this meeting and it emerged from a conversation that Eric Smith, Emily and I had at lunch.

At the tail end of the last NACIE
meeting as everyone was leaving for their
flights, we grabbed a quick bite together.

    Emily and I were sharing information
about a network that we're part of called the
Incubatenergy Network. And Eric suggested it
might be worth exploring that as a model for how
other programs around the country could come
together similarly.

    And so, the concept -- and I know
clusters -- one of the things we talked about in
our conversation yesterday, is that there is many
different definitions of "clusters."

    And in our case, we're not necessarily
a cluster organization, we're actually -- it's a
collection of incubator programs from around the
country.

    But the idea is that the EDA often
funds regionally-focused efforts for either
clusters or startup support ecosystems, capital
formation efforts within a specific geographic
region, sometimes within a specific industry
sector, things that share common supply chains,
workforce resources, talent and other things.

And the idea here is, could there be benefits of groups like that around the country coming together nationally and benefitting from a more structured sharing of resources across clusters -- across geographic clusters within a particular industry sector, within a particular research area, within a particular, you know, set of technologies. And that's exactly what we're part of.

The Department of Energy created a national clean energy incubator network that Emily's organization, my organization have been part of and we've seen a lot of value from it.

And I'll let Emily chime in here in a minute about, you know, some of the value that we've gotten from being part of that.

And so, in our conversation yesterday, there were some good insights shared about, you know, actually some good questions for us, you know. What was it that made that group successful?
And part of it was the specificity of the fact that we were not trying to serve the entire industry, but we were really focused on startup support.

And so, there was a shared set of common issues and concerns and resources available that we could share with each other, but also the support of a federal agency that had a particular interest in that topic.

In this case, the Department of Energy, which was trying to promote some specific goals and they helped to convene that.

And so, one of the suggestions is if we do move forward with the idea of EDA helping to facilitate something like this in other areas, that it would also be valuable to have another federal agency involved in some way to identify the, you know, the potential partners and parties to participate in something like that.

So, this is -- as I said, it's a very nascent concept. Eric agreed to write up some of the notes from this that we'll be bringing
forward, but we had great input from the
participants in the discussion.

And I'll let Emily add anything about
the Incubatenergy Network and we can open it up
for any questions or comments.

MEMBER REICHERT: Sure.

Well, Dave, you've covered it pretty
well, but I'll just add that this Incubatenergy
Network which was set up about three years ago
through a Department of Energy grant, is now
going to be an independent -- well, not quite
independent, but is going to be continued to be
run by an organization called the EPRI, Electric
Power Research Institute.

And that is because they see value in
hosting the organization. And so, it is an
example of a program that launched a network that
is now sustainable through a partner that sees
value in this convening. And so, I think that is
a good element of the model as well.

The value of this Incubatenergy
Network to us has been really far beyond what I
believe was even originally envisioned.

It has become a place to share best practices. There aren't too many people running energy incubators in the United States or anywhere.

And so, there are few leaders or guideposts that you can look to in order to figure out what you're doing well and to learn from others. And so, this has been an incredible forum for doing that.

It also started out three years ago that a bunch of organizations that were -- and there was ten of us competing with one another for grant funding.

They have really found a way now to work together very collaboratively and we've gone together for grant funding as a network, which I don't think any of us would have imagined that we would do at the outset.

And these leaders across the country are people that any of us can pick up the phone and, you know, ask about a particular topic, help
one another's startups -- that happens a lot -- promote each other's programs.

And so, there's really just a lot of value created just by the fact of convening this group of incubators over the course of a period where we both meet in person twice a year through other meetings that we're all a part of in our industry, but also often phone calls that are set up either ahead of time or, you know, maybe a few days in advance, because we all realize there's a critical topic to be addressed.

So, I think there's a lot of power there, there's a lot of value creation, and I hope that this model can be shared and perhaps expanded upon into other industries.

So, I would think that the NIH might be a good partner for a network of incubators or other similar organizations for biotech or medtech.

You might think the Department of Defense could be a good partner for a robotics network. So, I think that there's a lot of
potential industries that could have value in setting up a similar network across the country.

Also to say that when people think innovation, they often think of the two coasts. And I think that what's very valuable about this network is that it is the two coasts are represented, but there is a lot of power in having the middle of the country represented.

And, in fact, more than half of our members are from states that are Midwestern and southwest and southern. And that makes the network much more powerful.

MR. BUERSTATTE: All right. Any final, quick questions for this team?

(Pause.)

MR. BUERSTATTE: All right. We've got about 25 minutes left -- I take that back. 30. Let's keep driving on.

Any other teams?

Heather, thanks.

MEMBER BOESCH: All right. So, we revived an earlier proposal that had been made
last November around thinking about regulation and innovation sandboxes.

It was really interesting yesterday, because since it had been so long since any of us had talked about it, we kind of unpacked it into two different tracks that we thought were interesting.

So, we kind of identified two related needs for commercializing innovations domestically in heavily-regulated industries like healthcare, financial services, transportation and energy.

One of them was a need for a more consistent and entrepreneur-friendly process for kind of applying for and obtaining low-level regulatory exemptions from agencies in highly-regulated industries.

The EPA actually has a good example of this that was shared. And so, it would be interesting to do some kind of best practice research around that and see how the Department of Commerce could kind of provide guidance on,
you know, how to make that an entrepreneur-
friendly experience.

The second was to actually think about
an innovation or regulation sandbox program
within regulatory agencies that allow
entrepreneurs to pilot and test their innovations
while they work towards regulatory compliance.

This is something that has recently
been done in Singapore, in Australia, in Canada,
in the UK and in Bahrain in the fintech industry,
because they found that, you know, not -- either
having some clarity on regulatory compliance or
being able to actually test their products in any
kind of scale or in a live pilot was kind of
freezing innovation investment in those areas,
but it's possible that this could be applied
across a kind of broader section of industries
and we could kind of run with a successful pilot.

So, what they actually are -- so,
there are a set of rules that allow people to
test kind of products or business models in a
live environment.
And they have to -- they don't have to follow all of the regulatory requirements, but subject to a lot of predefined conditions.

Like, there are limitations on the risk exposure or the number of people that you can be exposed to. It's very time limited. You're only given these exemptions for the actual time that you're testing it and it's entirely under the regulator's supervision.

So, you know, the way that it works, actually, to be a little bit more specifically like if you think about how the UK's fintech sandbox works, actually firms have to apply in a cohort.

It's not like a thing that you can just do at any time. And they have to apply to it about 60 at a time.

And that establishes baselines for quality, making sure the consumer benefit is high enough, and also establishing the appropriate amount of risk.

And the firms that get accepted get
individual guidance from regulators on how they
would interpret the relevant rules in the context
of the test not necessarily after, but just to
allow them to get through that kind of prototype
and testing moment.

They can also choose to waive/modify
certain rules or issue no enforcement letters for
the duration of the test, but critically they
don't actually limit liability for customers.
So, there's still kind of an amount of
responsibility that has to be maintained.

In exchange, the companies have to be
very transparent, they have to agree to testing
parameters, they have to treat customers really
fairly.

For example, if they're kind of doing
a more broader client test, they have to agree to
actually restore them to their pretest state if
something goes wrong in the test.

If it's a much more sophisticated
group of investors, then they just have to
provide, you know, very clear disclosures.
They have to have exit strategies for transitioning them to other products and services once the tests end.

So, this has been very successful already in a number of places. And there was actually a bill introduced into Congress in September to kind of encourage agencies to try and develop these.

So, we think that the Department of Commerce as a kind of convener, could play an interesting role here.

And there are a number of ways that could happen, which I'm going to try and develop into a recommendation for August.

So, you know, we could research and promote best practices and kind of convene agencies on the design of these innovation sandboxes.

The Department of Commerce could even pilot a regulatory sandbox and things that are within its purview like export regulations as a way of testing it.
We can look at also what's being done in the private sector. You could research or promote best practices in these private sector consortia that allow testing of new things or kind of otherwise incentivize those industries like, for example, the R3 Consortium, which is also in the fintech industry. It's about 40 banks that allow people to kind of test those technologies within their customer bases.

You know, you could convene private sector organizations that might be willing to participate in these sandboxes, you know, and kind of publicly incentivize it in other ways, you know.

Or even if you're trying to provide low-level exemptions, you could kind of fund grant programs to help companies to conduct the tests that they need to clear these kind of regulatory hurdles.

So, I think there's -- there's a lot of things that you could do and it's basically trying to align the level of regulation in
proportion to the scale of the innovation being tested for the duration of the test.

So, I think this could be very interesting and it's something that's being done, you know, internationally as we're looking to kind of keep companies in these very competitive industries in the United States.

So, we just kind of pivoted this a little bit yesterday. So, we're certainly open for any recommendations or suggestions. Please feel free to contact me, you know, and I may kind of share drafts as I start to write them up.

CO-CHAIR TANG: Heather, I'm wondering did you cover the general topic of disruptive technology?

And what I'm thinking of is companies that emerged from the sharing economy, so Uber and Airbnb, where the regulations were only addressed in hindsight or in the wake of the innovation.

So, the examples I'll give in Philadelphia, Uber was approved at the state
level, but outlawed in Philadelphia.

Those that have a history working with Uber know that they are slash and burn from a legal perspective and that's causing a tremendous amount of blowback. So, I don't know what you do in terms of regulation and how you address that issue.

On the Airbnb side, of course it's the issue of taxation. Because as Airbnb becomes more popular, the traditional hotels and hospitality industries are going to react by saying, "You're just undercutting us because you're flying below the radar screen."

So, I'm just wondering how those challenges fit into this overall sandbox concept.

MEMBER BOESCH: Yeah. I think it's important to make the distinction that it's very specifically for kind of testing and piloting things at that stage and it's not meant to, you know, even encourage any kind of workaround.

In fact, I think it could help avoid some situations like that, because it basically
makes the regulator kind of an entrepreneurial partner in the development of the service.

So, when they're still at a kind of small testing phase, they can be working alongside the regulatory agencies and kind of interpret those rules as they go kind of before it gets to scale.

Because I think there is a tendency to -- and some of those companies can throw enough money behind it that you can sidestep it.

And I think if we make a more kind of collaborative relationship between organizations in these kind of highly-regulated industries and the agencies themselves, it might make some of those things smoother in the future.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: And the other thing is yesterday we made a distinction based on the examples what would be a good, quick win for us, and so thinking about the meta strategy of deregulation opening up markets as opposed to trying to impose regulation.

I also think there was a very keen
focus on what we could do at a federal level since those issue exist, but many of them start locally.

But I think David did bring up, as we think this through where certain regulatory things are pushed down to the state, what are the incentives around funding, points, tax credits that could be used to help support regulation on a local level.

MEMBER REAMER: In terms of Commerce agencies that might be interested, the Commerce has a National Telecommunications and Information Administration which clearly those industries deal with some aspects of regulation.

You had mentioned that a bill was introduced in the fall in Congress regarding financial regulation.

The sponsor of that is Patrick McHenry, who is a Republican from North Carolina. And it just -- in one of these small-world stories, the chief economist at NTIA is his wife.

So, Julia McHenry is a Department of
Commerce economist who works at NTIA. And so, she would be an appropriate person to talk about this.

MEMBER BOESCH: Andrew continues to know everything ---

(Laughter.)

MEMBER BOESCH: -- and everyone.

That's a great idea.

MR. BUERSTATTE: All right. If there's no other questions, then I think the last up is Trey and Joe with the Entrepreneurship for All Workgroup.

MEMBER BOWLES: Great.

So, we had a productive, active discussion yesterday. Really, I think what we're trying to figure out here is we kind of know -- and we mentioned this yesterday, we kind of know where we want to go, we know what we want to have happen. What we're really sort of working on now is, what role does NACIE plan in that?

And so, as we look at sort of just from a broad perspective, what do entrepreneurs
across the country need to be successful, we believe that we have separated that up into these four different categories that we mentioned yesterday, the four Cs of confidence, coaching, capacity and capital.

And so, what we're sort of noodling with now is how do we convene a group of stakeholders that represent the resources that go into these -- providing these resources for these different stages that exist in entrepreneurship?

And from my take yesterday -- and, Tiffany, you may want to weigh in on this, because she really tried to help consolidate this into something that would be something that we could communicate -- is really going now and saying, let's identify these stakeholders, let's pull them into the room, let's determine the outcomes that we want to realize not from the overall program, which we kind of know what we want those outcomes to be, but what do we want the outcomes to be from a convening of these different stakeholders.
Because we believe that by putting these stakeholders in a room together and showcasing to them and allowing them to see the opportunities where they can dive in and support, that this becomes an actionable initiative across the country not that NACIE is responsible for implementing, but the stakeholder is responsible for implementing.

Joe.

MEMBER KAPP: Yeah. I mean, I would just add to that.

I think one of the things, and just to underscore and echo what you've said, is that we believe that with the four areas, that one of the primary pieces is the convening piece, I think that power to bring those folks together and have a meaningful dialog about capacity, coaching, access to capital and confidence and what that looks like.

Because, frankly -- and one of the things that we know is that it's going to be different across different communities. And that
includes even from within the cities, rural communities.

And so, I think what became probably most apparent yesterday was that convening piece, what ultimately the agenda looks like, who the attendees might be and what the outcomes, I think, are still, you know, some things that are being reviewed and addressed.

But I think when you look at how do we spur entrepreneurship and communities across the United States, it's -- that convening piece, I think, is probably going to have the opportunity to play a central role.

I think over the course of the next couple weeks we're going to try to come to a much more solid idea and identification of what the intended outcomes are so that we can be more intentional about who should be at the table, the participants and those sorts of things and that we're able to go ahead and represent a broad range and community of participants who would be invited to it.
Is there anything I'm missing?

MEMBER BOWLES: Well, and just understanding that one of those groups of stakeholders would be organizations that exist across different departments in government.

And obviously from what Andrew created, that gives us a good -- a good place to start to begin to identify those along with our friends at OIE who can sort of say this is who I think needs to be there, but one of those stakeholders is the governmental organizations, one of those stakeholders are the people who actually do the coaching, which are some of the corporations.

Mike came up with a good point yesterday that we're not just -- we don't need to go just find major corporations whose, you know, chief innovation officer could come and assign projects within their organization, but also mid-level and smaller organizations that can provide those coaching capabilities.

And then you've got to look at the
community colleges, which is a key point for a
physical meeting and education as a component of
what we're doing, how do they play that role.

And then technology platforms so that
we can not only manage and implement a mentorship
network, but that we can measure the success of
its working.

If you remember yesterday, I asked the
gentleman from EveryLibrary, how do you measure —
— how do you know if this is working?

And he said, well, in Kansas City, 45
companies were created in three years. My
question is, is that good or bad?

It could be great, it could be a huge
failure. Who knows, but we've got to determine
those sorts of things.

And so, we need to bring the people
into the room that can -- that have the
experience and expertise in building that.

Julie had a good example yesterday of
something that they have developed for the
University of Texas system that does some of this
stuff as a platform.

But if you bring those different resources to the table, people will find their way to figure out the role that they can play and how they can contribute.

And ultimately getting somebody to commit to participating and playing a role in the roll-out and implementation of this is something that we want to do.

Tiffany, do you want to add anything as the voice of reason in the room?

MEMBER KAPP: Before you speak, can I just applaud you?

Because I know that there's a lot of people that -- but Tiffany has done a great job of herding the cats and keeping us on track.

And I just want to applaud you because you have -- I mean, seriously, you've done a fantastic job.

(Applause.)

MEMBER KAPP: And I think that that sometimes may get a little bit overlooked in the
course of all this reporting out. So, thank you.

MEMBER STEVENSON: You're very kind.

I definitely think we captured what was said.

I'm really excited about it.

I think that what I was struck with is thinking about -- I was looking at sort of the strategy and where we're going next around what are the things that NACIE are uniquely prepared and set up to do?

I think that was sort of our takeaway as how do we leverage the best of what the strength is of NACIE.

And I think us kind of coming away with, like, this idea of convening, which we spoke to, but I thought the idea of amplify and promote would be the other topic that maybe we also spoke to as, like, what is the lasting trailer effect?

And is it -- does NACIE have an opportunity to think about how we can amplify and promote the platforms that already exist today, how can we create sort of an overarching strategy
that would allow other people to gain access within a region.

So, I think that that's sort of the second part of this above and beyond convening, but thinking about how NACIE specifically can amplify and promote the strategy, resources or platforms.

I think Scott had a good example of a platform that sort of ties everything together. And so, where can we start to leverage those and allow NACIE to be that integrator and promoter of what is already out there within the region.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: So, I would just add to that, that I think that it's clear for those who weren't in the room, that this is something that I think, particularly because of Trey and Joe, is going to happen regardless.

And I think the question becomes, what is NACIE's role? Because I think at the end, thanks to Tiffany's facilitation, we realize that NACIE and the federal government is probably one or four to five stakeholders.
So, I think we have to be mindful of what is the larger opportunity and what is our ability to participate.

I will just share one example, because I gave it some more thought yesterday, which is how some of this -- and there's been a theme of what the government can start and what the private sector can pick up.

And so, we talked a lot about yesterday the Startup in a Day example, which was the SBA, OSTP and the National League of Cities.

But the idea was to create a system that helped people start up in a day, to create an online entry point nationally that people could plug into, to develop a community of practice which is still facilitated by National League of Cities and to have a pledge.

And so, to thinking about while there's probably a much broader strategy and set of outcomes in that great PowerPoint, what is it that we can do moving forward.

So, I do want to applaud how far we
got yesterday.

MEMBER KAPP: And I would just say

given the list that we've seen from Andrew, I
think that one of the things that we, as a NACIE
group, the requests that we can make of the other
agencies within the federal government, is to --
as representatives of entrepreneurship and
innovation communities around the United States,
that we are requesting their presence, as a NACIE
council, as a NACIE body, that they participate
in a meaningful way to sort of amalgamate or
create an easier onboarding process for
entrepreneurs.

Because that was the piece that we had
talked about is that there's a lot of brand
confusion about where you go to start a business.
Is it the state? Is it, you know, those sorts of
things.

And so, I think as part of the role
that we play as NACIE, is the ability to also go
ahead and say, you know, we, as representatives
of a diverse section of the United States, want
to be able to solicit their participation in a
meaningful and active way in sort of this process
of gathering.

MEMBER BALDWIN: If I could just add,
what resonated for me was pointing back to
Andrew's consolidation again, which was the gap
that was identified.

When one of us said, "Oh, we need
this," then Orin spoke up and said, "Oh, there's
three apps that do that." When we need something
else, Scott said, "Oh, there's a platform that
can do that."

And so, for each stage of the
entrepreneurial process, it seems like there's
existing things out there, but nobody has put it
all together like Andrew has.

And if I look at entrepreneurship,
there's the desire and there's the opportunity.
If you've got desire, which is the confidence
piece, then you can get past towards the
opportunity, but opportunity seems to be the
people that are in the know right now are the
ones that can get the funding and can navigate
all of the paths.

And that if we, as a council, can put
together an initiative that gets everybody in the
know, then we're democratizing access and
entrepreneurship.

CO-CHAIR TANG: First of all, great
work. Great discussion.

I'm wondering if you -- if this
distinction has come into the thinking, which
I've been sort of wondering about also, which is,
is the target of this to create more founders, or
is the target of this to create a larger people
that work in the entrepreneurial community?

So, the distinction is you don't have
to be a founder to be an entrepreneur or
contribute to the community.

And it's one of the things I run
across in my own work, because you're trying to
have broader inclusion for underrepresented
communities, but not everybody is going to be a
founder and, in fact, could you -- is this a
pathway into other career development?

Because I think that those of us that review resumes for would-be entrepreneurs, one of the biggest, you know, sort of shutdowns is, oh, they're all corporate, they've never worked in a startup, right?

So, how do we create that bridge to sort of the established career paths, and how does an entrepreneurial pathway or entrepreneurial approach fit into this notion of Entrepreneurship for All?

MEMBER BOWLES: So, I think where I agree with you is this concept of teaching entrepreneurial skillsets, because an entrepreneurial skillset can be used in whatever, you know, role or vocation that you take.

I find in my background, that I see the opportunity to do that at an education level, because you -- I have classes where at the beginning of the class, 95 percent of the students say they want to be entrepreneurs. And at the end of the class, five percent of the
class say that they want to be entrepreneurs,
which I think is a great thing.

    Which is why I then say, this is why
we learned what we did. Because even though you
may not want to be an entrepreneur now, these are
the skillsets you learned that will help you in
any business.

    And so, I think there's -- to answer
your question, there's a piece of it that's about
teaching these entrepreneurial skillsets which at
the very simple nature can just be problem-
solving, things -- I mean, things like that.

    There's all these different skillsets
that you can learn, but I also think what we're
really trying to do is enlarge the number of
people that believe that they can be an
entrepreneur, enlarge the number of people who
are willing to take a chance at being an
entrepreneur, the courage it takes to start
something, creating and instilling in them a
persistence that's necessary to be successful,
but ultimately we want to equip them with the
skillset to build good, sound, fundamental businesses.

Because if we can do that, then we will -- and this is in our presentation -- we first will reduce the number of companies that fail. And, second, we will increase the number of companies that succeed. And I really believe it is a two-step process.

And so, I see so often in my work that entrepreneur and startups fail not because they have bad ideas, but because they have no idea what they're doing.

And so, if we can help take that lack of experience piece, which is often the one thing that they need more than anything else and definitely the one thing that they don't have, this -- these four Cs if infused in the right way with the right partners, can help solve that problem, which will increase the number of founders from a diversity of backgrounds and, you know, whatever that diversity category is, geographic, ethnic, age, gender, but then it will
also help increase the number to be successful.

And then at the end of it as we are building their confidence and, really, the capacity, explaining to somebody that building a company that does not work is not a failure, it's an education, and you could either take that education, plug it back in and go try to start something else, or you can take that education and use that as you go out and try to apply for jobs and participate in other vocations.

Does that answer your question?

MEMBER KAPP: Let me just add to this education piece as a practitioner and educator in entrepreneurship, because there's three large buckets of entrepreneurship education.

The first is some of the traditional. This is what gets taught in academia. But when you look at the pedagogy, a lot of it falls in the space of QuickBooks and marketing and very, very technical skills. So, that's sort of the first piece.

The second piece then falls into a
little bit more of the -- what we would say is traditional. Business startup conversations, business plans, you know, developing a lean canvas startup, those sorts of things, a little bit more closer.

Then there's the third piece. And I think that in some respects, the challenge that we're having is that this third piece really is dealing in some respects with the entrepreneurial mindsets and the skillsets that you can teach by association working and partly by going through it.

And so, when we talk about the -- this idea of a convener, it's that last piece of how do we go ahead and instill and infuse entrepreneurial mindsets and then create from that, entrepreneurs, and can we use the opportunity to -- for NACIE to be able to bring people together as a convening to really address that piece.

And I'm talking about it from a couple different perspectives. One is at a very young
age, how do we infuse entrepreneurship, grit, perseverance, those sorts of things in order to be able to change culture, but then also increase the success and outcomes of entrepreneurs who -- people who have been in the corporate environment and have them more exposure to that.

MEMBER STEVENSON: And I would just add I think there's also a benefit to the coaching model as well as I think part of what we've been talking about is trying to get mid-sized/large-sized companies to invest more in being coaches.

And I think that that has another benefit in that the coaches oftentimes if you're pulling them from that landscape, they haven't worked with an entrepreneur. They have no idea about how much of a generalist that an entrepreneur has to be.

And I think that there is also sort of a dual education that gets people from corporate America to think a little bit more broadly about some of the unique challenges that underlie
entrepreneurs in general to help support their
growth and development.

Which, in turn, also helps companies
have a bigger appreciation on how they need to
provide some of those functional skills, support
and development for entrepreneurs.

I think it's a dual benefit as well in
terms of collective education.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Any final comments on
this one?

(Pause.)

MR. BUERSTATTE: Great. We finished
a few minutes early. And another great example
of putting smart minds together and maybe add a -
- two smart minds and one extra variable being a
cold beverage, you get other good ideas.

So, Orin and David, I understood, had
an interesting conversation last night around
some accelerator work.

Do you want to talk about that right
now? We've got a couple extra minutes before we
break.
MEMBER HERSKOWITZ: I'll be less than five. Do we have a clicker? There was something floating around before -- oh, there it is.

So, after talking to you, I was speaking to Nikesh (phonetic) about this and he suggested that rather than just go do it, we should just see -- this is one of those we're going to do some version of this anyway, but maybe this is a role for NACIE kind of conversations.

So, just by way of context, and I'm not going to dwell on this, Columbia -- and this is -- I didn't make these slides for today. We had these already.

(Laughter.)

MEMBER HERSKOWITZ: The -- Columbia already runs four technology accelerators. This basically happened organically.

We got a $5 million grant from the Coulter Foundation to do one in biomedical engineering -- so, medical devices, diagnostics and imaging -- and we sort of figured out a lot
of stuff about how to run an accelerator.

How do you, you know, do a call for
proposals? How do you have IP reviews? How do
you get through a mentor network?

So, after that, NYSERDA, the energy
research group in New York, offered a $10 million
grant to do the same thing for energy.

So, we proposed building off of what
we learned from medical devices, we partnered
with NYU, CUNY, Stony Brook, Brookhaven and
Cornell on that one and won the $10 million
accelerator for energy. We called it Coulter for
Clean Energy.

We basically took everything we
learned from Coulter, reapplied it to clean
energy.

Based on those two, we also applied
for a grant from the mayor of New York to help
run the New York City Media Lab, which was also
joined with NYU, CUNY and a number of other
institutions. Very similar model.

And then finally we just got an
accelerator from the NIH for therapeutics, which
is part of their CTSA programs.

    And, actually, in the meantime we also
are partnering with Celgene and some other
institutions doing one on cancer, blue-skies
cancer research.

    What we found was that there was --
some of these were industry-specific, but a lot
of them were very generalizable.

    It's actually interesting, because if
you think of it, it's sort of a meta meta
clusters discussion in the sense that these are
cross-verticals.

    Many of the activities that we were
doing we were finding was essentially the same
across all the accelerators.

    So, what we started to do was these
four groups started to meet regularly to share
ideas and best practices like, how do you hire an
IP attorney, what startup counsel do you
recommend, what -- can you negotiate master
service agreements with the startup counsel so
it's cheaper for your startups, can you share
mentors and executives and residents, things like
that.

And so, what we're now doing at
Columbia, which is where I think there's a NACIE
component potentially on the last slide, is we
are now in the process at Columbia of bringing
these together.

So, we're taking the sort of 80
percent of the stuff that is common and creating
the Columbia Accelerator Network.

So, what we're doing is we're
basically merging the common ops and admin roles
into a shared service across the university while
keeping the sort of industry-specific knowledge
within each vertical.

What that means is you can do this
much more efficiently and effectively, we think,
because you can share resources.

You don't need an actual FTE for each
vertical. You can have one person who does all
your Twitter, LinkedIn, social media websites,
putting out a call for proposals, handling the
FluidReview judging software, booking rooms,
coordinating the physical networking events for
the judges, managing the network.

All that stuff can just be shared in
common where the verticals can go out and raise
funds for their own pieces.

One way to -- so, this is just a slide
-- I'm not going to go through this, but just to
give you a sense of -- we went through and
brainstormed all the different things that we
were all doing essentially the same way. And,
therefore, could probably be coordinated and
actually just shared. I'm happy to make these
slides available, by the way.

So, the opportunity, I think, is --
well, actually, this is just a visualization, but
basically there will be this accelerator network
core. And that we're telling our faculty is,
look, you want to go start a battery accelerator?
All you need to do now is raise the money to fund
the battery projects. We'll run all the
administration and infrastructure for you.

You want to do another in clean energy, you want to do another one in cybersecurity, you want to do one in cosmetics, fashion, whatever you want to do, we can run it for you. You just raise the funding from the donors directly without all that overhead.

So, opportunity potentially for NACIE, there's two things that we've been talking about doing to broaden this conversation out to make it a national opportunity.

The first is we have an article coming out next month in The Journal of National Academy of Inventors on the lessons we have learned from this. I'm happy to make a pre-draft of that available to anyone who wants it.

But one of the things we proposed in that, is that we would be happy to host again for free, a compendium of any of those templates that we all use, sort of a discussion group online for people to say, hey, how do you do judging software? How do you manage your networks? Do
you use Union, you know, from 1776 for sharing content, or do you use some other platform? How do you do your video editing? Are there any national law firms that provide discounts? What do you pay? Things like that. So, that article is coming out anyway.

We have been talking about putting together a physical conference sometime during this next academic year, which would be a recurring event, hopefully, where people who run these kind of either physical or vertical accelerators can get together and share best practices, can maybe share templates, could help new accelerators that are just figuring out what to do, sort of get some hands-on support, maybe share our EIR networks and our mentors.

Like, I might have a great ophthalmologist, but I don't have a lot of ophthalmology projects. So, if we can share that across institutions, that would be great.

I am sure that we would be able to get sponsorship from this from the Wilson Sonsinins,
the Goodwin Procters of the world, because they
would love to work with all your startups.

So, that's it. I mentioned this to
Nikesh yesterday and he was like, well, it sounds
like it should fit somewhere within NACIE, just
not really sure where.

But we don't want to slow this down
too much, because left to our own devices we'll
still hold this conference.

So, it was more of a -- if people --
we don't need to talk about it now if people
don't want to, but if people are interested in
this either as an individual institution or as
part of NACIE, I'm happy to -- or if you want to
fold this into something around meta clusters, I
--

MR. BUERSTATTE: What I'd suggest,
Orin, is to keep things on track, we do need to
break at this moment.

But those of you that are interested,
touch base with Orin. Let's have some dialog
offline. And I think we might be able to bake in
some more conversation time toward the end of the
day if needed, but I know Steve's got to go.

Steve, not to put you on the spot, but
any final remarks for the team?

CO-CHAIR TANG: Great discussion. I
understand why the continual discussion needs to
happen here.

And hopefully as we position towards
August, we'll get a little better direction from
the Administration because I think you're ready
to crystallize many of these ideas.

But I understand your sensitivity
towards language and positioning of these
options, but it's great work. So, thank you.

And I'm sorry I have to leave, but
I'll be carrying a different cause here.

MR. BUERSTATTE: And -- so, thank you,
Steve.

And before we break, one more thank
you. Heather, thanks for bringing in coffee and
donuts this morning.

(Appause.)
MEMBER FREDERICK: Craig, I have one quick question.

One, I thought that idea was tremendous -- one of the things that I'm struck by the last 48 hours is how many good ideas and how many good resources there are, but how hard it is to keep tabs of them and organize it.

And I just went to our Slack channel and I love it, but I got to tell you I'm even confused by it, because I'm trying to map our channels to the four ideas, and they don't. I mean, I was in the -- so, we don't need to solve it now, but it's something to think about.

Like Entrepreneurship For All, I wanted to share some materials, and I'm like, wait, is that K through 14, or is that mentor?

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: So, we'll just create some new ones so we can -- now that we have the priorities, we'll add ours. We can just create new channels and then plug them in.

MEMBER FREDERICK: But it's something
to think about organizationally going forward and it also underscores the problem at a national level if it's hard for us to maintain -- a six-month-old Slack channel becomes -- really, have Andrew take care of it all.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Actually, Scott, really it's perfect, because after the break we'll convene with a framework discussion.

Heather has put together a reference document for us, a great visual, and we can dive into some of that next.

So, let's take a few minutes, enjoy Heather's coffee, and well convene back at 10:45. Thanks so much.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 10:34 a.m. and resumed at 10:52 a.m.)

MR. BUERSTATTE: Okay. So, this reconvenes Day 2 after our break and we'll start off now with Heather.

I understand you're going to lead the discussion that presents this wonderful document
that you've been working on. All members, you
should have this in front of you, this framework
discussion.

Take it away, Heather.

MEMBER BOESCH: So, yeah. So, I had
agreed at our last meeting to take that
PowerPoint slide that Brian had made around --
trying to get his head around both what we're
working on and what NACIE can work on, and kind
of give it aw rev with some of our communication
designers.

So, I'm going to thank Fran Barrios
who did this for me, but the -- as I was going
through it, it kind of unpacked two needs that I
thought.

I think for those of us that don't
work in government, it can be very confusing.
What can we do? What can the Department of
Commerce do? Where do we sit? What's OIE?
What's NACIE?

So, I kind of -- the first two pages
are a bit of a primer on that I'll show you. And
then the last one we kind of, like, redid the slide.

And this, we kind of redid the slide of the projects. So, I'll just go through a little bit so you can see.

And it's definitely, like, in draft, but could be used as an organizing function around some things that we're doing.

So, you know, I just put our mission statement up here. I kind of visualize where we sit within DOC, EDA, all the acronyms, and kind of, you know, what the flow of our work is.

So, if you look at, you know, there's many things we can do as individuals on our own. There's lots of things the Department of Commerce can do.

Our formal recommendations really need to sit at the intersection of that, but that doesn't mean there's not kind of great value in doing the things that sit on the individual action side.

Those get filtered through a set of
kind of Department of Commerce and national priorities around innovation and entrepreneurship.

And if they're accepted, there are kind of actions fall in these major groups and they can, you know, implement programs, they can fund things, they can convene things, they can promote policy, they can amplify.

And since I also didn't necessarily know what that meant, on the next page I asked Eric for a bunch of examples.

So, it will say, you know, what's the kind of process. So, what we can do, the things that our proposal should actually think about addressing. So, as we make the proposals, I think we can always ask ourselves, like, for this issue, like, what can the DOC kind of fund, convene, amplify, promote, you know, as Tiffany was saying.

So, I also tried to put some thoughts around the difference between policy and programs, which I did not know.
So, it says based on what we -- the recommendation we put forward, what could the Department of Commerce actually do and then what are examples of those, just to have as a reference to keep us on topic.

Because, personally, I found it so easy to, like, what actually goes in the recommendation and what's kind of just like a thing that we should do. So, hopefully that's helpful.

And then on the next slide, I had put just all of the things that we talked about to date.

So, this included all of the December recommendations. It also included the things that we were still working on in this area.

I grouped them into where they're sitting. So, the top two are formal recommendations that we approved last time.

They have yet to be signed by the Secretary, which is why we haven't discussed them at this meeting, you know, but those kind of
continue to be in mind.

The second set are things that are currently under discussion. The third set are things that we propose, but were parked.

So, I'm happy to update this as things and titles evolve. I think maybe an idea for the Slack channel could be once it makes its way to under discussion, we kind of can make a channel for that, you know, and keep those matching.

I had taken the original priorities just from the list Brian had made that I put at the top to see, like, how does this map to some priorities and where do each of these sit, you know.

Those might not be right, and I'd love kind of direction, too, from you guys in Commerce, you know, as those evolve and the Secretary and the Administration have influence, like what are those real things that we think will impact whether or not some of these proposals make through, you know.

And I can just, you know, modify this
and keep it updated, but I just -- I needed a visual frame, because I was also like, wait, what happened to that other thing?

So, hopefully this is helpful. And, you know, if you need things visualized with clarity for various initiatives -- I want to get my hand on Andrew's document --

(Laughter.)

MEMBER BOESCH: -- next. So, I'll put it on the Slack channel. And if you guys -- as you are, like, changing names, updating things that we're working on like clusters isn't about clusters anymore, I'll change it.

And maybe you guys can kind of reconcile it with the Slack channel so that we have a bit of organization. All right. That's it.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Anyone have any comments or questions?

MEMBER BOESCH: It's NACIE for government novices. Okay?

(Laughter.)
MEMBER KENNEY: I have a question.

MEMBER BOESCH: Well, that's why I'm hoping it could potentially be used maybe to onboard people in the future.

So, that -- because it took me like two meetings to understand where I was. No offense, but it's complicated.

MEMBER KENNEY: Heather, a question for you.

MEMBER BOESCH: Yes.

MEMBER KENNEY: At the end of our last NACIE there was a document that a few members created that had a bunch of recommendations for the next NACIE.

And I'm trying to remember -- and, Eric, you or Craig might remember there may have been some things that were irrelevant for this from that and I wasn't sure if anybody looked at that to see if there's anything that could be brought over.

MEMBER BOESCH: I don't know what that is. I had just asked Eric, like, what are the
things that are currently on the table and I took the December list.

I don't know if you're referring to, like, the actions we all agreed to take as action items at the end of ---

MEMBER KENNEY: No. This was actually from NACIE 2.0 ---

MEMBER BOESCH: Oh, okay.

MEMBER KENNEY: -- the prior group, because we struggled so much with these very questions.

It was a small group that put together a document and it was really like how to make sure that this NACIE didn't have the same learning curve duration.

And I don't know, Eric, if you think there's anything in that that might be relevant that would be worth looking at, or if you already did that.

(Off microphone comments.)

MEMBER BOESCH: Yes, and I mean, this is yours now. So, if anyone needs training in
design, I can teach them.

MEMBER NEMETH: This is probably the closest segue to a small project that I've been working on.

Some of you had a chance to see it yesterday. But as promised from our last meeting, I've put together a logo for NACIE.

It's a determined-looking eagle. And if you take a look at the eagle in the Commerce logo instead of whatever that eagle is holding, our eagle is holding a Slack channel hashtag and a cell phone since I feel those two items best represent our committee.

So, I have a small preview of it here on my phone if you care to offer me anymore input on it.

And then shortly I'll have some custom Moleskine notebooks, as well as some other corporate swag available for our team.

MEMBER BOESCH: I have a request.

I just saw from your phone it looks circular. So, you should make it a challenge
coin.

MEMBER NEMETH: Done.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MEMBER BOESCH: A challenge coin is like a kind of adult Pokemon that is played in the government where different organizations, projects, institutions, they make a kind of metal coin.

You can see them for sale sometimes, like, you can get the President's in the gift shop if you all went to it the first time. And people trade them with each other and kind of collect them as they meet almost like business cards.

So, yeah, if you -- you can search them online, but it's a -- it's a kind of insider currency that you can give people as reminders of what you're working on.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Any other maybe more focused questions on the framework, that is?

MEMBER REICHERT: Hi, Heather.

First of all, this is great work and
very helpful in clarifying a lot of the verbiage that we've all been throwing around in our heads and putting on paper, but maybe not in an organized way such as we now have here.

My question is about -- we've talked about within the Advanced Manufacturing Workforce Initiative, the idea of bringing together both folks within an agency and also interagency bringing, you know, maybe the DOE and the DOC and Department of Labor together.

So, does that fit under convenings here?

MEMBER BOESCH: So, it would fit in two places. And I'm also not an expert in this, so feel free to tell me, but I would have it fit under convening, like they can convene gatherings across agencies.

I also made a note on the first two items on the second page that if we're making policy or program recommendations or best practices that might be outside the purview of the agency, I think it's something they can do is
recommend or share it, you know, with those other agencies.

MEMBER REICHERT: Okay. Thank you.

MEMBER STEVENSON: I think one of the questions -- and I completely echo what Emily said. This is magical.

The question I have around -- we've been talking about the purpose of workforce development particularly given that there are other agencies that tackle workforce development.

I'm just curious where it would potentially fit in with the description of NACIE and what NACIE is set to do.

MEMBER BOESCH: So, I have -- kind of developing a competitive workforce is like in our kind of original mission that comes from the NACIE document.

So, it's kind of, you know, it's thought of as contained within that innovation and entrepreneurship language.

I had also made encouraging workforce development one of the kind of priority buckets
about which -- we're kind of seeing which of our projects applied to that, you know.

    I'm personally also interested in being able to continue that first -- that first line on the sheet if it is approved, because I think that could start to put some things around that, too, like a lot of the things we've talked about, about kind of convening resources, being a front door, what are some of those goals. So, that might be able to articulate some of those.

    But if there's sharper thoughts around what these things that I just said are around here from Commerce, let's update them.

    MR. BUERSTATTE: And to Scott's point, I think there's an opportunity for us to reinventory what we're working on. And this is, as Heather has done so nicely in this last page, organized the original discussions.

    And we can take a look at this, maybe do some reprioritization and rebranding on some of these topics as the conversations have evolved. And from there, I think it might be
helpful to build towards a broader message.

And I think that's what you were getting at, Heather. What's our tag line, what's our -- in fact, maybe the last time I think it was, Orin, you said it, you know, what's our elevator pitch? I think this will be a great starting point for that.

MEMBER BOESCH: I was just going to say one thing that might be a good exercise for maybe a few of us to do in between to pitch back, because, like, I just listed them here, but a lot of them were similar, right? Like, it's aligning the entrepreneurship programs, something that might be under the strategic plan, are we, you know, there was a couple that were starting to merge together or get renamed.

So, doing a quick synthesis of this where maybe we could be a little more streamlined might be a helpful thing for a working group to do just virtually before we meet again.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Okay. Any final notes on this subject?
MR. BUERSTATTE: I know we cut things a little short on Orin.
Any follow-on discussion during the break that you wanted to report out on your Accelerator Network pitch?

MEMBER HERSKOWITZ: Sure.
I mean, it wasn't anything specific about whether we wanted to do this as part of NACIE or not, but a number of individuals came over and asked to see the slides to talk about other kinds of resources.
I think Melissa and I already have a breakfast meeting set up to come back here next week anyway. So, she's trying to do something similar within D.C.

And so, to the extent that we already have resources that she could put to use, I'm happy to share them. Beyond that, that's pretty much what we talked about during the break.
I didn't know if you -- if you want to get into, like, what -- is this something that we want to -- I don't -- we're not quite ready yet.
So, you know what? I think probably the best thing to do is why I don't get my own -- this was opportunistic because of the beers.

And so, maybe -- why don't I over the next couple of weeks, pull together what we plan to do with this and I'll share the slides as they exist within a couple of weeks when they're a little tightened up.

And then if NACIE feels like this is something that wants -- we want to try and do under the NACIE umbrella in some way or other, happy to do it.

If not, then we can just say, yeah, can you include me on the mailing list that gets created, can you invite me to this conference when you have it? I mean, I'm happy to do any of that stuff.

I think it's not quite ready for prime time in terms of, like, there's no consumable yet. But once we have a consumable, I'm happy to share that.

MEMBER BOWLES: Well, I think we were
talking about this in one of our groups. I think what you guys have created is something that probably 50 organizations across the country have, but what's unique about what you guys are doing is you're willing to share it.

And so, one of the things that we could help do -- and the example we used was the SBA accelerator grant that they have, is just incentivize people to host the content that they already are using into a centralized location that could be managed by you guys or something else or maybe there's an SBA grant written specifically for managing the assimilation and aggregation of that data.

But I think, you know, whether it's GAN, which is the Global Accelerator Network, that Techstars has, or the 17 accelerators that are in Texas that are all -- they're all trying to figure out a way to do this.

But I think your example of leadership of saying, hey, we're going to be willing to make this available for free, how do we think through
incentivizing other groups to do the same.

MEMBER HERSKOWITZ: Yeah. And we -- we do this a lot. It's something some of you know. I had mentioned this to Scott, but we did something similar around merging our -- I think I've mentioned this before -- merging -- there was an observation that many universities have their entrepreneurs and residents networks, but they're only captive to their own university.

And so, if you've got a great cybersecurity guy, but no cybersecurity startups, then it's kind of a waste, and vice versa.

So, we merged our -- we got -- it's just very elitist in this case. It just happens to be a group that meets once a year anyway. So, we got sort of the Ivy League tech transfer office, plus MIT, Stanford, Johns Hopkins, WashU and UChicago to merge our EIR programs so that startups from any institution can tap into any of the mentors.

And we're -- because that seemed to work, we're now packaging up those materials and
making them available to other groups that want
to try and do the same kind of network, whether
it's -- we're talking about doing something for
New York City within life sciences, and with New
York State around energy-related companies to
create sort of regional entrepreneurship -- the
EIR networks, but we've generally found that
people don't share unless you share.

But once they see that you're sharing
it and offer to take the, like, grease the
machinery by offering to maintain something, then
everybody shares.

So, at least in our experience so far,
because we've done this repeatedly around how do
you run an EIR program, how do you run a fellow's
internship program -- and we have all those
materials packaged up and shared on our website.
And we found that when we offer to share, then
everyone else offers to share, too.

It hasn't needed an economic
incentive, it's needed like a manual labor
incentive, and we're always happy to do that.
MR. BUESTATTE: It's positive peer pressure.

MEMBER REICHERT: Orin, a couple of comments.

So, one is I think this is a really good initiative. And I agree that there's probably pockets of this information around the country that's not being shared.

And it would be, I mean, if your organization is willing to do the lift of having a place to maintain it, I would see a lot of value in that.

The other thing is that someone has probably mentioned to you groups like -- and I'm sure you know the International Business Incubators Association, which tries to do something like this or is equivalent -- oh, you don't know that. Okay.

So, there's a Business -- it used to be NBIA. Now, it's InBIA to reflect the fact that they're turning their focus to be international, but it is a repository of
information on the web, as well as a listserv for organizations that do incubation, acceleration and kind of anything that --

MEMBER HERSKOWITZ: So, maybe they could maintain it.

MEMBER REICHERT: -- falls under that, so then maybe they could maintain it.

But what I like about what you're doing, is that it is very specific to accelerator programs.

So, what I found is InBIA is not the best resource for me, because it's not focused enough.

MEMBER HERSKOWITZ: It's not focused on, like, hard science tech.

MEMBER REICHERT: It's not focused on hard science tech or the type of incubation that we do.

So, I think having kind of subcategories of information that is specific to how do you run an accelerator program, how do you run an incubator, that's the thing that I've had
trouble finding through other resources.

And for the Incubatenergy Network, that's what's been so valuable about that, is that there are ten organizations that are doing very similar things who are all learning from each other.

So, I'm wondering if you focus on accelerator programs, I think that could be of value no matter where it lives.

MEMBER HERSKOWITZ: But you could actually go either way with that. So, when you guys see the material in the article, feel free to tell me someone's already done this.

Because if it -- to take your sort of meta clusters idea, if it turns out the best -- the highest and best use for this is to be contributing, we all start contributing material towards what the InBIA is doing, but some of the material that we're all contributing is specific for technology-based accelerators, some of it is not.

So, the idea of having startup
attorneys that we've discounted, you know,
negotiated a fixed and discounted referred rate
for would apply just as well towards people
opening a bakery.

You might have different attorneys,
but the concept would be the same, or insurance
providers or, you know, when we were talking
earlier, Tiffany suggested HR executives, you
know, someone who can help with those first
couple of hires.

So, that doesn't need to be technology
accelerator only, but hiring IP attorneys would
probably be less useful for a bakery.

So, there could be -- if you could
organize the information right, then you could
either sort of go meta, or you could keep it to a
network of just technology accelerators.

We have no preference, nor are we
experts in the topic. We just know what we want.

MEMBER REICHERT: I'm just saying
there's value in kind of a subset of incubators
and accelerators having a shared knowledge base.
 MEMBER HERSKOWITZ: And Trey said that he knows the CEO of InBIA.


 MEMBER HERSKOWITZ: Okay.

 MEMBER BOWLES: Yeah. I think she's trying to make some changes inside the organization. She's trying to have it be more relevant to current -- the current needs of incubators and entrepreneur centers.

 And so, maybe there's movement in that, but --

 MR. BUERSTATTE: Yes. Trey, let me stop you right there. Sorry.

 I want to add that EDA has funded InBIA for a research grant to better understand outputs and outcomes from the various incubation organizations.

 As we know recently in the last few years especially, we've seen a huge change in the landscape whether it's coworking spaces, an incubator, an accelerator, a mix of all of the
above --

MEMBER BOWLES: Entrepreneur centers.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Entrepreneur centers.

Correct. And InBIA is, I'd say, maybe one-third of the way through a large research study leveraging the thousand plus stakeholders that they have to better understand how -- what types of activities are delivering meaningful outcomes across the spectrum of those organizations.

So, I think with that information with some -- a bit of standardized understanding of what's working in the coworking space, what's working in acceleration and so on and so forth, I think we're -- we, from a federal perspective, get a little bit closer to helping support an accepted best practices, in a way.

Because it's -- we talk about these a lot and this was actually a product of NACIE 2.0 where we talked about identifying and communicating best practices in this space, but it's hard to do that if you haven't done some sort of standardization as well.
Because what might be a best practice in one accelerator organization, might be completely wrong in a certain type of community or in a certain type of business cluster.

So, I just wanted to offer that up that we are supporting them and this is -- as this conversation has developed, it's very clear to me that that could be an interesting opportunity.

Trey, I cut you off. Sorry. I just wanted to inject that.

MEMBER BOWLES: No, that's good.

MEMBER REAMER: To introduce, I guess, Julia McHenry is the chief economist at the National Telecommunications and Information Administration, NTIA, and we had talked about regulatory sandbox.

NTIA clearly is interested in innovation and entrepreneurship. So, I just asked her to come down and at an appropriate moment, whether it's now or sometime in the meeting, just to have her say a couple words
about NTIA, but also to make a connection with
Heather regarding the regulatory sandbox idea.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Yeah. Thanks,
Andrew. I think we might have some extra time.

So, let's keep moving forward and then we'd love
to hear if we get some time. Thanks. Or on
anything else to close that one out. Okay.

So, we also, I think -- Joe, do you
have some thoughts you wanted to discuss?

MEMBER SCHOCKEN: As I listen to this
conversation, you know, it occurs to me that so
much we talk about is impacted by the laws and,
you know, around innovation and entrepreneurship.

So, I -- and I understand here I'm
beyond NACIE so that we're talking about us as
individuals and what we do individually.

We're learning so much about this part
of the economy and how important it is. And so,
I just want to make a point that all of us have
connections with elected officials.

And as I think about the elected
officials who make these policies, you know,
they're pretty busy people.

Mike, we were talking about the congressman coming by to see you. And this is not NACIE. So, this is individually.

And I think about these congress people, you know, they're spending half their time raising money to get elected, and then they deal with all these really important national and international issues.

The issue we talk about is so critically important, because this is where all the job creation comes from in the economy. That is not something they know about innately, you know. Very few of them have the background on these issues.

And so, you know, all of us connect with these elected officials, and this is just an encouragement by me, that you pay attention to that and you take them aside and explain the importance of the innovation economy and the regulations they make, how impactful those are in job creation and economic development.
And if anybody wants to talk further about that offline, I'm more than happy to do that.

MR. BUERSTATTE: All right. So, at this time, we're a little bit ahead of schedule. At 11:30 we will hear some next steps, but, Andrew, I did want to offer up some time, it looks like.

MEMBER REAMER: Thank you.

Julia, you want to come up and just grab a mic and introduce yourself and say a few words about NTIA, and then we can tell you a bit about the idea we're playing with.

MS. McHENRY: Great. Hi.

So, my name is Julia McHenry. I am the chief economist at NTIA. NTIA is the National Telecommunications and Information Administration, but it is, more importantly, an executive branch agency within the Department of Commerce that actually has a dotted line to the White House in terms of advising on internet-related and telecommunications-related issues.
So, we've been around since 1978 and have been sort of playing that role as an advisor on internet and telecommunications issues.

So, playing in the digital space, obviously, innovation and economic development is incredibly important to us.

And we have a variety of initiatives around the digital economy focused on everything from measuring the digital economy to we have our own advisory group on the digital economy, Digital Economy Board of Advisors.

So, we really are interested in everything in this space. We also are obviously within the Department of Commerce. So, we can talk to and try and work with other agencies.

So, I know you guys are focused on sandboxes. And the Department of Commerce, because we're not traditionally the regulatory group, can't really help with the regulation side of things, but we certainly can -- we work a lot with industry and we do our best to help industry in terms of economic development.
So, we'd be happy to work with you and I can answer any questions. And certainly, you know, I think we certainly at NTIA would be happy to start thinking about are there ways that we can sort of start to think about sandboxes from the digital economy point of view.

MEMBER BOESCH: I was actually just wondering has it come up as something you guys have discussed already?

MS. MCHENRY: No. So, it actually hasn't. And I don't actually know why. I'm more familiar with them from actually the legislative side and from the financial side. So -- but I don't know why.

I think we may be focused more on in terms of service, like, entrepreneurship and innovation how maybe from the internet side, you know, platforms can help innovation and entrepreneurship.

But really I was actually just yesterday at a PayPal lunch thing on the Hill where they were talking about really, you know,
licensing is a huge aspect for -- a huge
challenge for small businesses.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Julia, speaking of
DEBA, the Digital Economy Board of Advisors, one
thing that this council is very interested is the
collaborative opportunities across agencies and
advisory councils.

What's the status of DEBA right now?

MS. MCHENRY: So, we are -- I think
right now the next meeting is scheduled for June.
So, like you all, the current group was appointed
by Penny Pritzker, but is very interested in
moving forward in the new administration.

So, we've sent a letter up to the
Secretary's office and sort of have, you know,
are just sort of awaiting next steps. So, we are
currently looking at June, I think, for our next
meeting.

MR. BUERSTATTE: That's great. OIE
would love to support and participate however we
can just so we can be better aware of what you
guys are discussing.
MS. MCHENRY: Excellent. So, I'm also one of the SMEs on the Digital Measurement Group. So, to the extent I can be helpful in terms of facilitating that, just let me know.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Great. And the second question just out of curiosity, so our prior councils, we call them NACIE 2.0, this is the third iteration, so NACIE 2.0 collaborated with ESA on -- I believe it was the Platform Economy Report, is what it was titled.

I'm curious to what your role in that report was if you had any contribution.

MS. MCHENRY: So, we didn't -- I was familiar as it was going along. We actually -- NTIA works very closely with ESA -- or has worked very closely in the past, and particularly with their economists who work on digital economy issues.

So, but, you know, we have -- so, ESA has some measurement around the digital economy. We are very focused on the measurement of the digital economy and particularly are looking for
ways we can better understand the impact of the
digital economy on small businesses and
entrepreneurship.

So, if you all had any idea as how to
do that, you know, we had explored the concepts
of surveys, because we have a survey on the
population side, the household side, but, you
know, if there are better ways that we can think
about measuring, you know, the relationship
between the digital economy, broadband
connection, innovation and entrepreneurship, we
would be more than happy -- or if there are
things like better measuring components to the
digital economy that are focused on
entrepreneurship, we'd be happy to get involved.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Thank you.

Any other questions real quick?

MEMBER REAMER: I know there are a few
members of NACIE who work in the space of
telecommunications and information. So, just
give Julia like a sentence about -- like, Scott,
I imagine you do something.
Now, just introduce yourself to --

MEMBER FREDERICK: Sure.

MEMBER REAMER: Microphone.

MEMBER FREDERICK: I head up business development, corporate development in federal initiatives for NEA, New Enterprise Associates.

So, we're the world's largest financial capital firm.

MEMBER KAPP: My name is Joe Kapp. I started a nonprofit -- I'm cofounder of nonprofit organization called the LGBT Technology Partnership.

So, you're probably -- you may have heard of some of the work that we do with the FCC, an advocacy on the intersection of LGBT communities and telecommunications policy, homeless LGBT youth and access to closing the digital divide.

Can you just help me understand just a little bit and it may be helpful for folks, the distinction between NTIA and the FCC? Because that sometimes gets a little bit muddy.
MS. MCHENRY: Right. So, number one, FCC is a fully independent agency. So, they are not beholding to the executive branch or the legislative branch, actually.

FCC's major role is both regulatory and then also -- but regulatory in terms of working with the commercial sector.

So, for instance, what I'm most familiar with, FCC holds all, you know, distributes all of the -- and manages all of the licenses for commercial and private spectrum holders, right?

So, but they also manage -- they also work on regulation related to the telecommunication industry more broadly.

NTIA's job is both more on the agency side -- so, for example, we manage spectrum related to -- to the extent that radio spectrum is something that you're familiar with, we manage it from the federal side, but we are also then, again, have this advisory, sort of internet and telecommunications policy advisory role.
We also have played the role of administering BTOP grants for broadband access in the past.

And going forward, we will administer any grants for states who opt out of FirstNet, if that's something you're familiar with.

So, we take more -- less of a regulatory role, and more of an industry -- more of a, essentially, policy advisory role and federal role.

With respect to digital adoption, I don't know if you're familiar, we have been -- actually, since 1994 we have been administering a survey through the current population survey on digital adoption, computer and internet use.

So, we do that every two years. We're slated for October -- or November 2017 is coming up to be our next one.

And, actually, we write quite a bit on the digital -- on broadband adoption and the digital divide and are very focused on closing the digital divide both in terms of facilitating
broadband access and connectivity through our --
originally the BTOP grants, but also we have an
office that works with local communities in terms
of identifying grants and funding in terms of to
close those divides, but also on digital
literacy.

So, ensuring that we actually have the
digital literacy to use the internet in order to
facilitate some of this stuff.

So, broadband adoption is actually
less than 80 percent, which would surprise a lot
of people. Whereas connectivity, you know, those
people who could have access, I think there's
closer to four or five percent of households that
have no connectivity possibility.

So, there's really -- there is a major
divide there that has to be filled and, you know,
we really work hard to do what we can on that
front. So, I hope that --

MEMBER KAPP: I also represent rural
communities and also Appalachia. And so, I'm
sure you're --
MS. MCHENRY: Yes.

MEMBER KAPP: -- more than familiar with a lot of those challenges as well.

MEMBER BALDWIN: Julia, I work for Intel Corporation and, you know, we're clearly in the IT space, but we also have a program called Teach for the Future which supports STEM education. And we've trained over 40 million educators around the world to help improve digital literacy among educators and passing through to the students.

MS. MCHENRY: Oh, great. Actually, this is something that I have been asking myself quite a bit recently, which is in terms of connecting schools and ensuring that schools have the connectivity they need, but also that the educators have the training they need to actually be productive with those.

MEMBER BALDWIN: I'd be happy to give you more info on Teach for the Future.

MS. MCHENRY: Yes. That would be great. Thank you.
MR. BUERSTATTE: Okay. Thanks for coming, Julia. It's clear that there is a number of opportunities for us to continue the conversation and, like I said, looking forward to June and seeing how Eric, myself and other OIE staff can support and collaborate.

So, at this time, we do need to move on to our next steps. Melissa.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: So, first, I again cannot thank you enough. I feel like this was a very different meeting than before in terms of a lot of momentum.

And that's what happens when entrepreneurs have very little parameters and no guardrails. So, that's a good thing.

I've been making notes and I want to be fair that I can only note who I've talked to, but I want to just list a few things that have come up and then ask us to have a running list of things to do moving forward.

So, first is the Slack channel, kind of getting that aligned. And I'll be honest, I
don't know who can do that. I'm happy to do it if I have rights, but to add the working group so that we can start putting more information.

I think it's been a great tool. I want to thank everybody for using it, but I think it helps keep us offline and give us a chance to communicate with each other.

Yes, Trey.

MEMBER BOWLES: I would just say in the hopes of not losing some information, I think some of these channels that have been created need to be renamed and merged, but not start a new one without -- because we'll lose all the data from before if we don't do that.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: I would agree.

MEMBER FREDERICK: Yeah. I was going to say if they get too narrow, it makes it hard to decide where to put some of the content and that's what I was wrestling with. I wish I had an easy answer for you, but --

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: So, I think we can do that. I also would say -- I say this
respectfully for all of us texters, there are
also a way to cross-reference channels.

So, we might do a better job of doing
that as well of using hashtags and @ symbols so
that if we're posting something in one or the
other, because I think mass migration -- I don't
want to change what people have put, but there's
certainly a way to cross-reference that. So,
I'll be very tactical.

Is that something we can do, Eric, or
we need to leave that to you guys?

(Off mic comment)

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: Okay. Okay.
The other thing was obviously to keep
doing for the working groups. Obviously, there's
something already happening for advanced
manufacturing that may just need to review.
We've got EShip for all.

So, I would encourage to not only
leverage staff, but if there's anything that
Steve and I can do to help facilitate those
calls, I want to commend the groups that made
great progress in the last meeting to this
meeting.

    And so, I will say that I would expect
we have some things ready to go and sign either
before we get to August, or, at a minimum,
wherever we end up beyond D.C. in August would be
awesome.

    The other piece is something that
Andrew touched upon yesterday and we talked about
briefly over drinks, is we have a tremendous
opportunity with resources. How do we tap them?

    And I want to thank Andrew and all the
guests that continue to come, but how could we
facilitate that in between meetings?

    So, Andrew had suggested yesterday
that we each identify a group and reach out. And
what I have suggested is that we pick two to
three, and Andrew and I, we can do that, and say,
here's two to three based on proximity, based on
work, based on alignment that we can maybe get in
groups of two or three and just have
conversations with.
And I want to be clear to your point, Joe, I think that's going to be valuable for NACIE, but hopefully valuable to people individually as many of us work in different capacities with the federal government.

So, you're not going to be assigned, but we'll identify a group and say, if this can help you personally, if this can help advance NACIE, if it helps your workgroup, then how do we get those conversations started.

I don't know how many we're going to get scheduled before August, but at least Andrew and I will commit to coming up with a few to choose from and then take it from there.

The other piece is also just meeting one on one. I am -- I have the privilege to be here in D.C., but I feel like I don't travel as much as everybody else. So, I look forward to hosting Orin when he comes back, but I think just keep meeting because it's clear, for example, the group that Heather led, that things are popping up, or that David and Orin in our personal lives
and professionally, how do we bring that to the group.

So, I think some of that is facilitated by Slack, but then some of that is facilitated in person.

The other piece is, how many folks are going to Kansas City in June for the EShip conference for Kauffman? Anybody going there? Okay.

So, we'll do another poll of people -- are people familiar with it and aware of it? Yes? No? Maybe? No? Okay.

So, we can send some information out.

Go ahead, Trey.

MEMBER BOWLES: I was going to advocate for the conference. I think it's -- I think there's been a lot of changes at Kauffman in the last year or two.

They brought in somebody new to sort of run the entrepreneurship component of it, Victor Hwang. And he's brought a team of people underneath him that are doing amazing things.
And they are really sort of transitioning from being research-driven to being -- to understanding the needs of entrepreneurs, making their initiatives and their priorities based on that and then building the research component to that.

So, they are -- I think it would be really great to have some NACIE representation there.

They are trying to bring people from across the country who really represent entrepreneurship and innovation and they're looking at a broad swath of stakeholders that could do that.

So, I would encourage you that if you have an interest in having those conversations and really forwarding the work that we're doing here, it would make a lot of sense to have, you know, at least three or four of us there to sort of carry the flag of NACIE in addition to the OIE stuff that's already going.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: So, we can -- I can
find the link and send it out, put it on a Slack channel, but I would highly encourage it.

We had talked about if there is enough of us, to, at minimum, have a social event. And then if there's a way to use that as an entre for EShip For All, if there's a way to bring some leverage there to convene people or however that may work as a precursor to, I think, the conference we all agree to happen in the fall.

So, hopefully -- that's the 21st to the 23rd, I think, of June. It's 199 bucks. So, it should be pretty good.

And they've been pretty intent to -- I know they've been talking to a lot of NACIE members on how to make it relevant. So, I can assure you even with turnover there's been a good, I would say, touch with the community in terms of what we're looking for.

So, those are the immediate action items. I want to pause there and see if there's anything else that people need or want to get done.
Yes, sir.

MEMBER REAMER: I may have missed it yesterday, but can we get an update around the number of politicals in the building and the -- I know our recommendations are on hold, but just the status of OIE's relationship.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: Anything else?

MEMBER KAPP: Just a quick comment about the next meeting.

Is that kind of where we're at? I want to make sure -- okay. Just based on the list that Andrew has put together, I'm wondering -- I mean, it is very beneficial.

I know that we have a short period of time, but I'm wondering whether or not an opportunity exists for us to go ahead and continue kind of what we've done already, but maybe potentially even reach out to a number of those folks who are represented on that list to maybe come in and do like a ten-minute -- five to ten-minute, you know, synopsis of the programs.

And based on what Andrew has put
together, I mean, even having folks here from NTIA, I'm just wondering if that's something that you guys would entertain so that at the August meeting we might be able to gain more -- greater clarity in terms of some of those other governmental functions that are here in D.C.

MEMBER HERSKOWITZ: I second that. I think that would be fascinating.

MR. BUERSTATTE: Yeah. Let's talk about that more. I think we did have Drew from the Advanced Manufacturing Office. And while that's -- it's always great and I think beneficial to have that and Julia come in and visit, we do need to strike a balance between getting work done and learning.

I think learning is hearing directly from the actors in government is important -- is a critical piece of you all formulating your recommendations.

So -- but, yes, we will continue to try to do that and, of course, find the right balance though.
CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: To that point, though, and I know we've raised it before, I mean, I think some of these I think we can look and prioritize.

I'd be wondering if because of where people are, if there are ways prior to August to identify two or three that could do some kind of video conference or teleconference with us so that it could maybe even begin to frame some of our final recommendations, but I think we -- I think that's a great call for partnership when we reach out to them to say, hey, we're here and we'd love to get to know you better. So, I appreciate it.

Other thoughts for NACIE before we talk about admin stuff? Did everybody vote? The final thing.

MEMBER HERSKOWITZ: You know, I will say on the Slack channel, I find it -- I don't know -- it's -- I don't know if people -- where they are on the being bombarded versus wanting more information stage.
I actually really appreciate it when people send around interesting articles they've found. And if you -- if people are going to conferences or events that they think would be of general interest, I personally would love to hear about them.

So, like, if Kauffman is having a conference, I may not attend, but maybe I'd send someone to go or at least have it on my radar, see who's speaking. So, I would just encourage people to share those.

I know some people share a lot, and some people don't share at all. So, I was just -- I actually haven't shared that much, so I should do more.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: But the stuff you share is good. That video was good.

MEMBER HERSKOWITZ: We do a lot of videos on that. I'll keep posting and people like seeing the links to videos and -- like videos on entrepreneurship, not family videos.

(Laughter.)
CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: Are all the heads of workgroups good? Do you all need anything from the group?

(Pause.)

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: Great. Thanks.

MR. BUERSTATTE: I've got one question on next steps.

I do like the idea for some conference calls with other US government offices. I think that would be valuable not only for us, but also despite having many advisory councils, there's many offices and programs that don't have the resource that you all provide. So, I think there's a lot of feds that would love to engage with you.

With that said, it is a lift for us to coordinate that and reach out to all these offices that we -- that list is long and we clearly don't have connections everywhere.

But if we could find a way to -- thank you. Great. Great. Because I would love to be able to say, hey, our council is uniquely
interested in X, Y and Z. It will just help
provide a little more glue to the relationship.

So, on a couple of administrative
items that I have, Eric and I have been
approached about group assignments.

And as always -- well, as ideas
continue to develop and you think you might be
able to offer new insight to a different group,
by all means, please -- please contribute however
you see fit.

And also for those of you that haven't
been able to be as active because maybe the topic
isn't related to your professional wheelhouse as
much, don't worry. We'll get to you soon enough.

Things will develop over time and we
will get new and different insight from
leadership as they come on board. So, this is a
two-year term, don't forget.

And if we are ready to polish off and
conduct a vote on either of these more developed
initiatives, we can absolutely do so before
August.
We can call a virtual meeting. It will be an official virtual session and we'll do so mostly just because the dialog is best in person. We know that.

But when we do a call like that, typically it's when we have something that's ready for a vote and final discussion. So, we're more than happy to do that, just for your awareness.

Also, want to make you aware of OIE's grant program. So, many of you are familiar with it. It's our Regional Innovation Strategies Program.

Congress just came through authorizing us for 17 million this year. This is a two-million-dollar bump.

And one thing that we really love to engage NACIE on is being champions for us for the Department of Commerce and our programs at the community level.

So, we're nearing release of that program. I expect it will come out soon. Early
summer, hopefully. And would love to -- would
love your assistance in getting the word out, the
funding opportunity.

The classic problem that we have is we
can't make awards to organizations that don't
apply. So, in order to get the award, you got to
apply. So, it's so important to get the word out.

Many of you have a lot of experience
with federal grants and it's not an easy lift,
it's not something you submit overnight. It
takes some big, strategic planning.

So, the sooner we can get the word out
to a diverse set of stakeholders, the better our
investments will be.

So, we'll have a specific ask for you
to open your networks up and get the word out
when that comes out.

Eric, anything else?

(Pause.)

MR. BUERSTATTE: All right. At this
time, then, I think we have -- the scheduled
public comment we had from Ryan Vogel, he was
unable to make it. So, we will be skipping his remarks.

But I will open the floor to anyone in the room for public comments, or online for public comments. First, in the room. Looks like we have no public comment in the room.

Online?

(Pause.)

MR. BUERSTATTE: Eric's giving me the thumbs up. No one online for public comment.

Closing remarks. Melissa.

CO-CHAIR BRADLEY: I think the only thing to say is a huge "thank you." I know that during the one-on-ones, people really stepped up and said they were here.

And having had the privilege to work in administration and see both sides, I get and really want to honor and thank Craig and Eric and the entire OIE team, because transitions are not easy.

And I certainly want to thank each and every one of you for coming back, certainly
recognizing we had some tentativeness of whether we're meeting or not.

And, really, I'm walking away in deep gratitude for what I see is a real commitment to this work irrespective of the group, and then the opportunity of leverage, the privilege we have in setting these positions.

So, I look forward to working more with each of you one on one, and certainly look forward to wherever we are in August, wherever that may be.

Whether in Appalachia, or Philly, or Indianapolis, I'm looking forward to having fun. But, again, thank you all very much.

MR. BUERSTATTE: I'll second that and just add that I am happy that OIE was much quieter this session. And it's a testament to you all starting to understand how we work.

The workgroups were fantastic yesterday. I think the team engagement is really there and it's really where we want it to be.

Heather's product here, this
framework, you know, I wish we had it during the first meeting, but, yes, I sense you all hit your stride.

And the less talking that we do and the more engagement that you have is really where we want to be.

So, I thank you for showing up. Thank you for your patience and engaging us. And, as always, if you have any questions, don't hesitate to reach out either later after the meeting today or virtually.

And speaking of questions, we have one from Andrew. Yes.

MEMBER REAMER: To the question I raised earlier --

MR. BUERSTATTE: Yes, politica\hs.\n
MEMBER REAMER: -- an update of the new politica\hs in the building. I know there's a lot of open positions, so what's likely to be filled in the coming time and the implications for OIE and NACIE.

MR. BUERSTATTE: I don't have stats on
what's been filled and what hasn't. They are coming in.

It is a longer process, I think, than some people anticipated, but -- and as far as implications for OIE, we have gotten some early engagement from senior policy staff.

Unfortunately, it hasn't been enough yet to provide concrete policy guidance to you all just yet. I am hopeful that we will receive that soon.

I think we saw some key positions filled just within the last month and change. So, as those members settle in, we'll have more opportunity to engage.

As a reminder, Commerce has 13 different offices and bureaus and we have over 48,000 employees.

So, as these leaders step in, they've got a lot to learn and a lot of stakeholders to engage with.

So, we are certainly pushing and advocating to engage as soon as we can, but at
this time I don't have any more concrete --

MEMBER REAMER: Thank you. And a specific question. People might remember from our first meeting, Josh Mandel was from the Secretary's Office. He was the innovation guy.

And is there someone who has taken his place in the new administration?

MR. BUERSTATTE: To my knowledge, no, not yet.

MEMBER REAMER: Okay.

MR. BUERSTATTE: All right. Any other questions?

(Pause.)

MR. BUERSTATTE: So, again, thanks for coming. I'm wishing you all a safe trip back to your respective communities and don't be strangers.

At this time as the designated federal officer, I officially conclude our third quarterly NACIE meeting. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 11:46 a.m.)
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