

**National Institute of Standards and Technology
Manufacturing Extension Partnership
Advisory Board
Minutes of the September 27, 2017 Meeting**

Background

The Department of Commerce (DOC), National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), Manufacturing Extension Partnership (MEP) Advisory Board met in an open session from 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. on September 27, 2017 at the NIST Headquarters, Building 101 in Gaithersburg, Maryland. Approximately 37 attendees, composed of Advisory Board members, NIST and NIST MEP participants, a guest speaker, and observers, attended the meeting. Ms. Carroll Thomas, Director of NIST MEP, is the Designated Federal Officer for the MEP Advisory Board.

Attendees

Board Members

Mr. Jose Anaya, Dean of Community Advancement, El Camino College
Ms. E. LaDon Byars, President and CEO, Colonial Diversified Polymer Products, LLC
Mr. Joe Eddy, President and CEO, Eagle Manufacturing
Mr. Gary Groleau, Corporate Manager of Labor Relations & Organizational Development, New Hampshire Ball Bearings
Ms. Bernadine Hawes, Vice Chair, NIST MEP Advisory Board, and Senior Research Analyst, Community Marketing Concepts
Mr. Mitch Magee, Director of Engineering, PPG's Architectural Coatings Business Unit
Mr. Matthew Newman, Director of Business Management, Covanta
Ms. Kathay Rennels, Associate Vice President for Engagement, Colorado State University
Mr. George Spottswood, Owner and CEO, Quality Filters, Inc.
Ms. Leslie Taito, Senior Vice President for Corporate Operations, Hope Global
Mr. Chris Weiser, President and Owner, J.V. Manufacturing, Inc.
Mr. Jeff Wilcox, Chair, NIST MEP Advisory Board, and Vice President for Engineering, Lockheed Martin
Mr. Jim Wright, Vice President of Operations, Proof Research

Guest Speaker

Dr. Kent Rochford, Acting Director, NIST

NIST MEP Participants

Ms. Carroll Thomas, Director, NIST MEP and Designated Federal Officer
Dr. Phil Singerman, NIST Associate Director for Innovation and Industry Services
Dr. Dave Cranmer, Deputy Director, NIST MEP
Ms. Cheryl Gendron, Advisory Board Liaison, NIST MEP
Ms. Mary Ann Pacelli, NIST MEP
Mr. David Stieren, NIST MEP

Observers

Mr. Buckley Brinkman, WCMP
Ms. Zara Brunner, NIST MEP

Mr. Tom Bugnitz, Manufacturer's Edge
Ms. Monica Claussen, NIST MEP
Mr. Mike Coast, MMTC
Mr. Jose Colucci, NIST MEP
Ms. Carrie Hines, ASMC
Mr. Ethan Karp, MAGNET
Mr. John Kennedy, NJ MEP
Ms. Tricia Kerney-Willis, NIST MEP
Mr. Brian Lagas, NIST MEP
Ms. Anne-Louise Marquis, NIST MEP
Mr. James Shillenn, PA MEP
Mr. Mike Simpson, NIST MEP
Mr. Dileep Thatte, NIST MEP
Mr. Ben Vickery, NIST MEP
Mr. Marlon Walker, NIST MEP
Mr. Tab Wilkins, NIST MEP

Welcome and Introductions

Speakers: Mr. Jeff Wilcox, Chair, MEP Advisory Board; Dr. Phil Singerman, Associate Director for Innovation and Industry Services, NIST; Dr. Kent Rochford, Acting Director, NIST; Ms. Carroll Thomas, Director, NIST MEP

Mr. Wilcox called the meeting to order at approximately 8:00 a.m. He made introductory remarks, welcomed new Board members Mr. George Spottswood and Ms. Leslie Taito, and asked other Board members and attendees to introduce themselves.

Dr. Singerman introduced Dr. Kent Rochford, Acting Director, NIST and reviewed his career highlights. Dr. Rochford applauded the work of the MEP and discussed what the Board brings to NIST. His remarks included the following highlights:

- One of NIST's goals is to connect the outreach work of the Advisory Board with the research work at the Institute. NIST researchers are interested in understanding the measurement and standards challenges manufacturers face.
- Strategic areas NIST labs hope to prioritize:
 - Cybersecurity
 - NIST MEP will soon be releasing a cybersecurity workbook of the security requirements Department of Defense (DoD) now includes in its federal acquisitions
 - Advanced manufacturing
 - Machine learning
 - enhance efforts in measurement and characterization of machine learning
 - improving the analysis of big data sets
 - Quantum-based measurements and quantum-based science investments
 - developing compact and straightforward quantum standards to enable traceability on the factory floor
- Walter Copan, PhD, was nominated by the President of the United States to serve as Under Secretary of Commerce for Standards and Technology and the next Director of NIST. His nomination hearing before the U.S. Senate was held the same day as this Board meeting. Dr. Copan has expressed great support for MEP.

Presentations

MEP Strategic Plan 2017-2022/Future is Now (FIN)/National Network Brand

Speaker: Ms. Carroll Thomas, Director, NIST MEP

NIST MEP FY 2017 Spend Plan:(as of September 15, 2017)

- Enacted appropriation \$128M
- Recoveries and Carryover \$20.3M
 - Total available funding \$148.3M
- Center Renewals \$103.4M
- Strategic Competitions \$21.4M
- Contracts \$3.8M
- NIST MEP Staff/Overhead \$15.5M
 - Estimated remaining \$4.2M
- All supplemental activities, including embedding awards, the rolling funding opportunity, and Hurricane Harvey non-competitive awards, are funded through carryover funds from FY2016.

Legislative Outlook:

President's FY2018 Budget Request

- Program proposed for elimination with \$6M for wind-down

FY 2018 Appropriations Status:

- Continuing Resolution funding of \$24M through 12/8/17
- Appropriations' Committee actions
 - House Omnibus at \$105M
 - Senate Mark at \$130M
- Final appropriation to be determined

NIST MEP FY 2018 Projected Spend Plan: (in the Continuing Resolution)

- Continuing resolution funding (through 12/8/17) \$24M
- Estimated Carryover from FY2017 \$4.2M
 - Total available funding \$28.2M

Planned Expenditures:

- Centers Renewals \$21M
- Strategic Competitions \$4.2M
- Contracts \$0.0
- NIST MEP Staff/Overhead \$3M
 - Total planned expenditures \$28.2M

NIST MEP FY 2018 Projected Spend Plan: (Full Year at Senate Mark)

- Full Year Appropriation \$130M
- Estimated Carryover from FY2017 \$4.2M
 - Total available funding \$134.2M

Planned Expenditures:

- Centers Renewals \$110M

- Strategic Competitions \$4.2M
- Contracts \$5M
- NIST MEP Staff/Overhead \$15M
 - Total planned expenditures \$134.2M

Discussion:

- Mr. Magee asked what the general trend for appropriations has been. Ms. Thomas said that it has stayed relatively flat over the last several years.

MEP National Network™ Mission and Vision

Current Mission – Core Purpose

- Current mission: “*Enhance the productivity and technology performance of U.S. manufacturing.*”
- Proposed mission: “*Strengthen and empower U.S. manufacturers.*”

Members felt the mission statement was concise and captured the MEP National Network’s role of being the voice for manufacturing.

Vision Statement

- Current vision statement: “*Changing the way the world defines manufacturing.*”
- Proposed vision statement: “*We are the go-to resource for America’s manufacturers ensuring U.S. manufacturing is resilient and leads the world in advanced manufacturing innovations.*”

Members felt the vision statement was the right one, particularly the addition of the concept of resilience. Some members thought that “advanced manufacturing innovations” would appeal to the future workforce. Mr. Wilcox cautioned against a vision statement that sounds too technology-focused. There was some discussion about reconsidering the phrase “advanced manufacturing innovations.” Ms. Thomas said they would leave out the word “advanced”.

Core values (from the Brand Project)

The core values are the few strong and enduring beliefs that the MEP National Network hold to be true.

- *MEP is passionate about advancing manufacturing, serving manufacturers, and empowering one another through collaboration. MEP is committed to excellence and accountability, and is results driven.*

Board Members had no comments on the core values.

Future is Now Initiative

Ms. Thomas provided background on the Future is Now (FIN) initiative aimed at developing an integrated network of capabilities. She presented the framework of key principles and behaviors based on both a Center and Network focus and asked for comments from the Board.

Discussion:

- Ms. Taito asked if there are any incentives driving Center-to-Center collaborations. Ms. Thomas said they do not have that in place yet but MEP Center leadership is working on it now. NIST MEP must develop metrics that will determine how successful the program is. The ability to bring in national capabilities and expertise is a big draw for Centers.
- Ms. Byars added that getting credit for lending resources to other Centers would be a useful incentive. Ms. Thomas said Centers will be held accountable for the success of the totality of the Network.

- Dr. Singerman asked if it was correct that, when two Centers partner on a project, the Center that does the work receives the revenue and the Center named in the statement of work gets the survey results. Ms. Thomas said that is generally the case and Mr. Simpson discussed a new potential way to share credit in which the people managing the overall project would see the impact. These collaboration efforts will be included in NIST MEP's metrics.
- Mr. Wilcox noted that many of the Manufacturing USA Institutes are multi-state and there may be a way to gain some visibility in projects that are Institute-driven.
- Ms. Hawes said the bottom line is that they want to release Centers from the burden of needing to get credit from collaborative efforts. Mr. Wright said it is critical to have infrastructure and protocols in place that can support these efforts. Ms. Thomas replied that the development of NIST MEP as a learning organization is intended to provide those protocols.

Integrated mission and vision for the MEP National Network

- Integrating strategic focus areas (Vision, Strategic Plan, Future is Now, and Branding) into the MEP National Network vision of becoming the go-to trusted resource for growing U.S. manufacturing.
- The MEP National Network Brand handbook will be released by the end of September. This will provide Centers with messaging, logos, and other information

Board Members had no comment on the integrated mission and vision for the MEP National Network.

MEP National Network 2017-2022 Strategic Plan

Ms. Hawes provided background on the MEP Strategic Plan 2017-2022.

Ms. Thomas reviewed the MEP National Network 2017-2022 Strategic Plan and presented the plan's four goals and their associated objectives:

- Champion Manufacturing
 - Promote the importance of a strong manufacturing base
 - Create awareness of innovations in manufacturing
 - Enable strong workforce development partnerships
 - Maximize awareness of the MEP National Network
- Empower Manufacturers
 - Provide support to enhance productivity to achieve growth
 - Trusted Advisor to navigate technology solutions
 - Employ strategies to recruit and retain skilled employees
- Leverage Partners
 - Increase market penetration
 - Become a recognized manufacturing resource brand
 - Expand service delivery model
- Transform the Network
 - Maximize MEP National Network knowledge and experience
 - Increase efficiency and effectiveness
 - Create a resilient and adaptive MEP National Network

Discussion:

- Ms. Byars said "championing manufacturing" is how this all fits together; leveraging the "small to medium manufacturers" (SMMs) really strengthens the entire U.S. economy through an improved supply chain.
- Mr. Wilcox suggested NIST MEP reach out to 'original equipment manufacturers' (OEMs) and supply chain associations with these goals and objectives. Ms. Thomas said large manufacturers informing SMMs about the program is the key to the Network's market penetration. Mr. Magee said that these goals are what Centers should be doing every day.
- Ms. Hawes said that the goals slide that was presented is ideal for presenting what the Network is designed to do for the more visually-inclined millennials.
- Mr. Newman discussed the relevancy of the resiliency concept, not just resiliency to natural disasters but also regarding cyberattacks, economic downturns, and unpredictable events.

Network priorities for the next 18 months:

- Create an integrated MEP National Network Service Delivery System
- Update national-level partnerships and performance support services
- Define areas of focus for manufacturing technology advances
- Develop supply chain national services and information and technology access
- Build infrastructure for a National Network learning organization

Discussion:

- Ms. Thomas noted that the five priorities are all interlinked. Board Members felt the priorities were concise and tangible.
- Mr. Wilcox said the list of focus areas should include quantum measurement and machine learning entering the supply chain as the Acting Director mentioned earlier.
- Mr. Spottswood said the packaging of the marketing materials for this will be crucial.
- Ms. Thomas added that frequency and consistency are extraordinarily important.
- Dr. Singerman said that the framing of the vision for the MEP National Network provides the context for defining at least the implementation of the strategy at the system-wide level. He asked Ms. Thomas to discuss further how the FIN initiative has informed this strategy. She discussed the work of the group looking at how they could transform the 51 Centers into the National Network.

MEP National Network Significant Long-Term Goals:

Ten-Year measures of success:

- The MEP National Network is known and recognized by U.S. manufacturers as the go-to resource
- MEP Centers triple the number of manufacturers served annually
- The MEP National Network impact numbers are increased four-fold

Discussion:

- Mr. Wilcox asked if the goals originated from an analysis of what is necessary or simply a sense of what might be achievable. Ms. Thomas said it is a combination of both; they arose from internal discussions with NIST MEP staff and with Centers and stakeholders.
- Mr. Magee said that it would be helpful for the Board to have something like a traffic light dashboard showing the status of each of the goals. Ms. Thomas said for the first couple years, she would like to do quarterly updates showing the progress made on the goals, then move to biannually.

- Mr. Wright suggested adding a goal to show the impact to U.S. manufacturing. Mr. Wilcox said there are a number of competitiveness indices in use today. NIST MEP should look at what they are measuring and if any of the metrics are applicable to these goals.

Five-Year measures of success:

- The Network is recognized by small and medium-sized manufacturers as a valuable and essential resources for delivering advanced technology solutions and cited by key manufacturing stakeholders (local, state, federal) as integral to growing U.S. manufacturing ecosystems
- Market penetration as an integrated national network has increased by 20%
- As leaders delivering integrated digitization and cybersecurity assistance to dispersed supply chains, the Network members have embraced Industry 4.0 in their own operational excellence

Discussion:

- Mr. Wilcox asked if Industry 4.0 has become a significant part of the conversation. Ms. Thomas said it is becoming significant for many reasons, including its place in global trends.

Eighteen-Month measures of success:

- Piloted integrated MEP National Network approach to delivery system; engaging 50% of Centers in multi-center delivery projects
- Increased small/rural engagements through 3rd party partnerships by 10% and increased longer-term impactful projects with these smaller firms by 5%
- Attained operational excellence in 25% of Centers' operations and in 50% of NIST MEP administrative support
- Increased awareness of the MEP National Network brand by 10% over base brand recognition measurement a year after the Network launches the brand

Discussion:

- Ms. Thomas intends to go further in-depth on this topic at future Board meetings. One item that may be added in the future relates to the recent successful use of NIST authority to award noncompetitive funds to Texas and Louisiana following Hurricane Harvey. A streamlined proposal with special award conditions allowed the funds to be awarded less than three weeks after the process began. She would like to add an objective that empowers NIST MEP to quickly and effectively provide funds to Centers in a situation where there's a critical mass of manufacturers that need special assistance.
- In further overarching discussion of the Strategic Plan and Goals/Measures of Success, Mr. Magee confirmed that "Operational Excellence" is the same as 5S for manufacturers.
- Mr. Eddy said developing synergies between the Centers is what really enhances collaboration.
- Mr. Newman said that there is a theme of diversity and inclusion embedded in this plan and that should be made explicit.

Next Steps:

- Advisory Board ratifies Strategic Plan/new working groups
- Baseline current status of the MEP National Network
- NIST MEP champions and initiates working groups
- Progress on MEP National Network presented
- Engage Center Boards

The Board voted unanimously to ratify the Strategic Plan as amended.

Working Groups Wrap Up

Connecting User Facilities and Labs with SMMs

Speaker: Mr. David Stieren, NIST MEP

Mr. Stieren discussed the activities of the Technology Acceleration Working Group.

- In 2015, the working group produced a plan for NIST MEP that guided their actions and provided priorities, including a focus on working with NIST Labs as well as the Manufacturing USA Institutes
- Consistent with that guidance and as an integral component of the American Innovation and Competitiveness Act was continued emphasis of the role NIST MEP plays in the space of transitioning technology from the work at NIST and other federal laboratories.
- Success will take on many different forms as the MEP Assisted Technology and Technical Resource (MATTR) effort progresses
 - Solving problems of MEP Center client small manufacturers via NIST Lab staff, capabilities, and research services
 - Providing manufacturer/market intelligence to NIST Lab research via MEP Center queries of small manufacturing clients
 - Potential expansion to include other tech resources (outside NIST)
- A system has been operationalized whereby, when Centers encounter manufacturers that have a challenge or problem in the metrology or standards space, they can submit requests to NIST MEP which does the triage and connects the manufacturer with NIST Lab staff. This is a no-cost exchange up to a point. NIST MEP then pursues more substantial avenues of collaboration.
- The NIST Lab staff is very interested in obtaining market intelligence that they generally do not have access to.

Embedding MEP Centers into Manufacturing USA Institutes:

- There are currently 14 Manufacturing USA Institutes established and operating: eight from the Department of Defense, five from the Department of Energy, and one from NIST.
- As of September 1, 2017, NIST MEP has awarded funds to Centers to embed MEP personnel into all 14 of these Institutes to assist in the space of technology acceleration. The staff will help the MEP National Network understand what the Institutes are doing and serve three purposes:
 - Develop service delivery mechanisms, whereby Centers can engage and provide assistance to small manufacturers in the technology areas that are the focus of the Institutes
 - Address business model issues associated with how small manufacturers can work in these technology areas
 - Developing an MEP National Network of expertise in these areas
- Projects are working toward sustainable relationships beyond NIST MEP two-year project investments and development of Nationally Networked capabilities for project investments and development of nationally networked capabilities for MEP Centers to be able to serve small manufacturers in these areas
- The embedding project has been well-received by the Manufacturing USA Institutes

Mr. Stieren asked the Board for any guidance on priority focus areas and/or areas to avoid for MATTR, or guidance on Embedding sustainability and national capability development.

Discussion:

- Mr. Wilcox said that this seems to be going very well and appears sustainable.

- Mr. Newman pointed out that the Centers of Excellence tend to be centered around Centers with critical mass of size and scope. He asked if smaller Centers have good cooperation and support from the larger Centers. Mr. Stieren said that, within the context of the Manufacturing USA Institutes, the Centers are reducing to practice what the Institutes are doing and small manufacturers can harness whatever that might be. The MEP National Network is not serving as marketing agents for the Institutes. He stressed that NIST MEP is focused on developing engagement mechanisms for the MEP National Network rather than for the Institutes.
- Ms. Thomas added that underutilizing the capabilities of smaller Centers is a major weakness and NIST MEP is looking at several strategies to address this challenge.
- Ms. Hawes suggested having a representative from the Embedding Project Leadership Team present to the Board on what capabilities the embedding project is bringing to the MEP National Network.

MEP Learning Organization

Speaker: Ms. Mary Ann Pacelli, NIST MEP

Ms. Pacelli discussed the development of an MEP-U type learning system.

The MEP-U type system will include:

- Learning content for the MEP National Network
- Continuous Learning: communities of learning, working groups
- Opportunity for networking

Current Actions:

- The RFI informing the Statement of Work is moving through the legal department
- It is currently being called the MEP National Learning and Knowledge Sharing System

Ms. Pacelli asked the Board to review the RFI and provide any feedback on the following questions:

- What other questions might we ask?
- What experience do any of you have with Learning Systems?
- What organizations might we benchmark?

Discussion:

- Mr. Magee said many learning management systems are top-down driven and more concerned with documentation than how information is delivered. He suggested that Wikipedia and the Khan Academy may be models that could be referenced.
- Ms. Pacelli said there are many open source platforms available that can be customized much quicker than if they were created internally.
- Ms. Taito suggested looking to the military or other federal agencies to see what they have done with similar projects.
- Board members were asked to provide Ms. Pacelli further feedback via email.

Board Governance/Open Items

Speakers: Mr. Matthew Newman, MEP Advisory Board and Ms. Carroll Thomas, Director, NIST MEP

Mr. Newman discussed tips and experiences regarding networking and outreach.

- When someone reaches out to you, just say “yes.”

- Board members should get involved with their Chambers of Commerce. If the local Chamber of Commerce is not effective, look to the state Chamber of Commerce. This allows members to introduce the MEP Centers to large numbers of area businesses and state/federal legislators.
- Lieutenants or proxies are a good tool for engaging SMMs. Not only can they fill in when schedules do not permit you to be present, it is also good for succession planning.
- Banks that make loans to SMMs are a great resource for outreach as they have a vested interest in ensuring their customers are resilient.
- Take advantage of any available venue to interact with state and federal officials, no matter how redundant.

Discussion:

- Mr. Magee said it really is up to the Board to raise awareness about the program.
- Mr. Wilcox said that in a time of such tremendous changes in the manufacturing commons and global political/economic landscape, the MEP National Network serves as the connective tissue for SMMs.
- Ms. Byars noted that some Centers are not allowed to ask for anything and it is the Board's responsibility to advocate for them.
- Mr. Spottswood said word of mouth is the best form of marketing.

Future Working Groups:

Three topics were introduced for consideration as areas for Board attention moving forward. Board members were asked to lend their expertise on one or more of the following developing working groups:

- Advisory Board Executive Committee Working Group
 - Focus: Related to Board governance; includes future chair and vice chair
- DoD Partnership Working Group
 - Focus: Establishment of MEP National Network role in manufacturing as it relates to the defense industrial base
- Performance, Research and Analysis Working Group
 - Focus: Creating performance-based diagnosis and feedback to Centers service, enabling applications for Center self-assessment, Center-to-Center sharing

Discussion:

- Dr. Singerman noted that non-MEP Board members can participate in working groups
- Ms. Taito suggested that the DoD Partnership Working Group finds Centers that are actively engaged with their Procurement Technical Assistance Centers and ensure there's delineation and buy-in
- Board Members should email their working group preferences to Mr. Wilcox or Ms. Hawes

Board Development Initiative:

Ms. Thomas provided an update on Center Board governance support and the plan for the next Advisory Board meeting in March 2018.

Assistance for MEP Center Boards:

- 30 Centers have engaged in the contracted NIST MEP Board development support through BoardSource
- Board Self-Assessment
 - 15 completed (six stand-alone, nine combined with Action Planning)
 - two in progress; two more interested
- Facilitated Action Planning Sessions
 - six complete; four scheduled/planned

- Training for new or reconstituted Boards
 - six completed; five scheduled/planned

Ms. Thomas presented a proposed plan and timeline for the assessment of the MEP Advisory Board through the BoardSource tools

- January 2018: Board independently participates in BoardSource self-assessment
 - Results reviewed in February
- February 2018: BoardSource conducts interviews with each Board member
 - Collect feedback about the assessment process
 - Discuss and identify what Board Members would personally like to achieve as part of the MEP Advisory Board
- BoardSource to facilitate ‘Action Planning Session’ at the March 2018 meeting

Discussion:

- Mr. Wilcox said it would be a good idea to wait until the new Board members are more familiar with the work of the board to conduct the interviews. Ms. Thomas said the feedback and planning session could be pushed back until the June 2018 meeting.
- Mr. Wilcox suggested new Board members view a webinar on the structure of the different Boards in the Network, if it is still available.
- Dr. Cranmer said Board members should also receive information concerning the new Center requirements under the reauthorization. It requires that Centers have an advisory board or an oversight committee, and that each board must submit their bylaws to NIST MEP. NIST MEP can deem some things necessary for all Centers and recommend other best practices.
- Mr. Wilcox said this would be good to do in tandem with the presentation of the different types of Center boards.

Wrap-Up and Public Comments

Public Comments:

- Mr. Brinkman said that being a part of the FIN core group has been a great opportunity to look at the MEP National Network ecosystem. He encouraged the Board to consider themselves part of that ecosystem. They have a very important role to play in aligning the various parts of the whole, directing, guiding, and advising the ecosystem. One thing that is developing out of the FIN initiative is a group of Centers willing to take responsibility for the performance of the network. The more the FIN group engages the network and different points of view, the better solutions they have come up with and the better they are accepted.
- Mr. Karp emphasized how important the FIN initiative is and how deeply involved Ms. Thomas has been in leading the group to be engaged in the process.
- Mr. Stieren said that in looking for potential members of the DoD Partnership Working Group, suppliers to DoD are wanted, but so are other suppliers. One of the biggest value-adds the MEP National Network offers DoD is in helping them increase the elasticity of their industrial base. Bringing in capabilities and perspectives of U.S. manufacturers that aren’t currently supplying DoD is very valuable.
- Mr. Bugnitz said every Center Director feels fortunate to be in the job and wanted to publicly convey their commitment and passion.

Concluding Comments:

- Mr. Newman challenged the Board to be part of Center Board meetings to listen and learn how to better advocate for the program. He also mentioned that participation is bonding and Board members could fill in for each other visiting various MEP Center Boards.
- Other members stressed the importance of continuous learning and getting the learning organization right, the value of comparing Center assessments, and that funding is of primary importance and will be a recurrent issue.

Next Meeting

The next MEP Advisory Board Meeting is set for March 7, 2018 in Washington, D.C.

Adjournment

With no further business, Mr. Wilcox adjourned the meeting at 11:39 a.m.