U.S. SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON SMALL

AND EMERGING COMPANIES MEETING

Tuesday, July 19, 2016

9:31 a.m.

AMENDED: 8/4/2016

U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission

100 F Street, N.E.

Washington, D.C.

	Page 2		Page 4
1	PARTICIPANTS:	1	PROCEEDINGS
2	TARTICII AIVIS.	2	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Why don't we think about
3	Sarah Hanks, Co-Chair	3	getting started. Can I ask people to take their seats?
4	Stephen Graham, Co-Chair	4	I would like to call this meeting to order.
5	Mary Jo White, SEC Chair	5	You know, welcome to the meeting of the SEC's Advisory
6	Kara M. Stein, Commissioner	6	Committee on Small and Emerging Companies.
7	Kara IVI. Stelli, Commissioner	7	Sebastian, do we have quorum?
8	Robert Aguilar	8	MR. GOMEZ: We do.
9	Julie Z. Davis	9	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. Well, again welcome
10	Paul Elio, Elio Motors	10	everyone. For those around the table that have not had
11	Sebastian Gomez	11	an opportunity yet to have a muffin, they're over there
12	Xavier Gutierrez	12	on the table to my left. And I didn't realize I was
13	Brian Hahn	13	going to be giving a muffin commercial, but I just want
14	Kyle Hauptman	14	you to know that these pastries are brought to you by a
15	Keith Higgins	15	small, local business, something called Lord of the Pies.
16	Catherine Mott	16	CHAIR WHITE: It's one of those things you
17	Betsy Murphy	17	can't make this up I think.
18	Jonathan Nelson	18	MR. GRAHAM: No, no. They were made just
19	Michael Pieciak	19	blocks away at a place called Union Kitchen, which is an
20	Patrick Reardon	20	incubator that offers commercial kitchen space, catering,
21	Amy Reischauer	21	distribution, consulting and more for culinary
22	Lisa Shimkat	22	businesses. So I hate to be trite, but this is just one
23	Annemarie Tierney	23	more example of how a small business makes your life
24	Mark Walsh	24	better.
25		25	Our agenda today includes three important
	Page 3		Page 5
1	PARTICIPANTS (CONT.):	1	matters. The first is the accredited investor definition
2		2	under the Securities Act. We had an engaging and
3	Gregory Yadley	3	thoughtful discussion on this important definition during
4	Laura Yamanaka	4	our May 18 meeting and came up with an outline for a
5	Dan Zinn, OTC Market Groups	5	recommendation, and I believe that we can finalize that
б		6	in probably short order.
7		7	Secondly we will turn to Regulation A, which is
8		8	timely because a month ago today was the one year
9		9	anniversary of the new Reg A Rules going into effect. We
10		10	will hear from Elio Motors and OTC Markets about their
11		11	experiences in this relatively new space.
12		12 13	And as a final matter today we will hear from
13		14	SEC staff about the Commission's new proposal to amend and update the definition of smaller reporting company, a
14		15	topic this committee has been interested in for some
15 16		16	time.
17		17	But before we move into our agenda for the day
18		18	we are honored to start with opening remarks from Chair
19		19	White and welcome, I didn't see you sneak in, and
20		20	Commissioner Stein.
21		21	Chair White, let me turn it over to you.
22		22	CHAIR WHITE: Thank you, Steve, and
23		23	thank you Steve and Sarah for presiding and welcome back
		1	
24		24	everyone. I guess these dog days of summer you see people
		24 25	everyone. I guess these dog days of summer you see people fleeing Washington, so it's very good to see you all here

	Page 6		Page 8
1	in Washington for this meeting.	1	public comments we receive on the SRC proposal from you
2	I'm just going to make a few very short	2	and all constituents, including investors and companies,
3	comments on each of your agenda items and then I'll just,	3	as well as the comments that we receive on our Regulation
4	you know, give a word on kind of what we're seeing so	4	SK concept release, which explores the scaled disclosure
5	far, and it's obviously early, but in the crowd funding	5	requirements for SRCs among many other areas.
6	space.	6	So your input along with the input from
7	So your agenda today starts with a discussion	7	investors, issuers and other affected market participants
8	of the accredited investor definition, which is obviously	8	will help inform any changes to the scaled disclosure
9	an issue of great importance which we and you are very	9	system or other changes to our disclosure requirements.
10	focused on. We've received some 40 comment letters on	10	The word I promised I would give, and really is
11	the staff's study of the definition, and as the staff is	11	just a word, a very quick update on another of our recent
12	working on further recommendations for the Commission I	12	rules to facilitate small business capital formation, and
13	look forward to your thoughts and recommendation. Your	13	that is Regulation Crowd Funding, which went into effect
14	feedback is obviously very important and helpful to us.	14	May 16th, which I think was just two days actually before
15	Your agenda today also focuses on Regulation	15	your last meeting here.
16	A+. It was actually just over a year ago, in June of	16	I can report that a diverse range of companies are
17	2015, that the Commission's amendments to Regulation A+	17	using the crowd funding exemption and that as of July
18	went into effect. We have had over a hundred offering	18	18th, which I think is yesterday, there had been over 60
19	statements filed with the Commission, with even more	19	offerings with a total of \$4.4 million in funds committed
20	issuers actually taking advantage of provisions in the	20	by investors. Twelve funding portals have registered with
21	rules that allow for non-public staff review of draft	21	the Commission and become members of FINRA, which are
22	offering statements before publicly filing.	22	both requirements. For our part the SEC staff continues
23	Since the effective date of the final rules the	23	to closely monitor the Regulation Crowd Funding, and
24	Commission has qualified nearly 50 of those offering	24	Regulation A+ markets and are available, the staff is
25	statements. So this is obviously a very interesting and	25	available to answer questions.
	Decc. 7		
	Page /		Page 9
1	Page 7 dynamic space and I very much look forward to today's	1	Page 9 So thank you again for being here and I very
1 2	dynamic space and I very much look forward to today's	1	So thank you again for being here and I very
	dynamic space and I very much look forward to today's discussion, and especially in the presentation by		_
2	dynamic space and I very much look forward to today's	2	So thank you again for being here and I very much look forward to your discussion and your input.
2 3	dynamic space and I very much look forward to today's discussion, and especially in the presentation by participants who are directly involved in this market.	2 3	So thank you again for being here and I very much look forward to your discussion and your input. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Commissioner Stein.
2 3 4	dynamic space and I very much look forward to today's discussion, and especially in the presentation by participants who are directly involved in this market. As was mentioned by Steve, last month the	2 3 4	So thank you again for being here and I very much look forward to your discussion and your input. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Commissioner Stein. COMMISSIONER STEIN: Thank you. Good morning
2 3 4 5	dynamic space and I very much look forward to today's discussion, and especially in the presentation by participants who are directly involved in this market. As was mentioned by Steve, last month the Commission proposed amendments that would increase the	2 3 4 5	So thank you again for being here and I very much look forward to your discussion and your input. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Commissioner Stein. COMMISSIONER STEIN: Thank you. Good morning to everyone and welcome to today's meeting of the
2 3 4 5 6	dynamic space and I very much look forward to today's discussion, and especially in the presentation by participants who are directly involved in this market. As was mentioned by Steve, last month the Commission proposed amendments that would increase the financial thresholds in the smaller reporting company	2 3 4 5 6	So thank you again for being here and I very much look forward to your discussion and your input. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Commissioner Stein. COMMISSIONER STEIN: Thank you. Good morning to everyone and welcome to today's meeting of the Advisory Committee on Small and Emerging Companies.
2 3 4 5 6 7	dynamic space and I very much look forward to today's discussion, and especially in the presentation by participants who are directly involved in this market. As was mentioned by Steve, last month the Commission proposed amendments that would increase the financial thresholds in the smaller reporting company definition. As you know the SRC definition has been of	2 3 4 5 6 7	So thank you again for being here and I very much look forward to your discussion and your input. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Commissioner Stein. COMMISSIONER STEIN: Thank you. Good morning to everyone and welcome to today's meeting of the Advisory Committee on Small and Emerging Companies. Always a mouthful to say. I want to take the opportunity
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	dynamic space and I very much look forward to today's discussion, and especially in the presentation by participants who are directly involved in this market. As was mentioned by Steve, last month the Commission proposed amendments that would increase the financial thresholds in the smaller reporting company definition. As you know the SRC definition has been of really keen interest to this committee for some time and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	So thank you again for being here and I very much look forward to your discussion and your input. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Commissioner Stein. COMMISSIONER STEIN: Thank you. Good morning to everyone and welcome to today's meeting of the Advisory Committee on Small and Emerging Companies. Always a mouthful to say. I want to take the opportunity to thank each of you for taking time out of very busy
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	dynamic space and I very much look forward to today's discussion, and especially in the presentation by participants who are directly involved in this market. As was mentioned by Steve, last month the Commission proposed amendments that would increase the financial thresholds in the smaller reporting company definition. As you know the SRC definition has been of really keen interest to this committee for some time and the subject of prior committee recommendations, which actually go beyond the reach of the Commission's current proposal in some respects. If adopted the proposal would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	So thank you again for being here and I very much look forward to your discussion and your input. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Commissioner Stein. COMMISSIONER STEIN: Thank you. Good morning to everyone and welcome to today's meeting of the Advisory Committee on Small and Emerging Companies. Always a mouthful to say. I want to take the opportunity to thank each of you for taking time out of very busy schedules to come to Washington to share your best thoughts with us and I'm looking forward to today's discussion.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	dynamic space and I very much look forward to today's discussion, and especially in the presentation by participants who are directly involved in this market. As was mentioned by Steve, last month the Commission proposed amendments that would increase the financial thresholds in the smaller reporting company definition. As you know the SRC definition has been of really keen interest to this committee for some time and the subject of prior committee recommendations, which actually go beyond the reach of the Commission's current proposal in some respects. If adopted the proposal would expand the number of companies that can qualify for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	So thank you again for being here and I very much look forward to your discussion and your input. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Commissioner Stein. COMMISSIONER STEIN: Thank you. Good morning to everyone and welcome to today's meeting of the Advisory Committee on Small and Emerging Companies. Always a mouthful to say. I want to take the opportunity to thank each of you for taking time out of very busy schedules to come to Washington to share your best thoughts with us and I'm looking forward to today's discussion. I'm especially interested in hearing more about
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	dynamic space and I very much look forward to today's discussion, and especially in the presentation by participants who are directly involved in this market. As was mentioned by Steve, last month the Commission proposed amendments that would increase the financial thresholds in the smaller reporting company definition. As you know the SRC definition has been of really keen interest to this committee for some time and the subject of prior committee recommendations, which actually go beyond the reach of the Commission's current proposal in some respects. If adopted the proposal would expand the number of companies that can qualify for certain existing scale disclosures provided in the SEC's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	So thank you again for being here and I very much look forward to your discussion and your input. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Commissioner Stein. COMMISSIONER STEIN: Thank you. Good morning to everyone and welcome to today's meeting of the Advisory Committee on Small and Emerging Companies. Always a mouthful to say. I want to take the opportunity to thank each of you for taking time out of very busy schedules to come to Washington to share your best thoughts with us and I'm looking forward to today's discussion. I'm especially interested in hearing more about the apparent hesitancy of issuers to use Regulation A+.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	dynamic space and I very much look forward to today's discussion, and especially in the presentation by participants who are directly involved in this market. As was mentioned by Steve, last month the Commission proposed amendments that would increase the financial thresholds in the smaller reporting company definition. As you know the SRC definition has been of really keen interest to this committee for some time and the subject of prior committee recommendations, which actually go beyond the reach of the Commission's current proposal in some respects. If adopted the proposal would expand the number of companies that can qualify for certain existing scale disclosures provided in the SEC's regulations, again by raising the public float threshold	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	So thank you again for being here and I very much look forward to your discussion and your input. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Commissioner Stein. COMMISSIONER STEIN: Thank you. Good morning to everyone and welcome to today's meeting of the Advisory Committee on Small and Emerging Companies. Always a mouthful to say. I want to take the opportunity to thank each of you for taking time out of very busy schedules to come to Washington to share your best thoughts with us and I'm looking forward to today's discussion. I'm especially interested in hearing more about the apparent hesitancy of issuers to use Regulation A+. Perhaps some of the hesitancy can be attributed to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	dynamic space and I very much look forward to today's discussion, and especially in the presentation by participants who are directly involved in this market. As was mentioned by Steve, last month the Commission proposed amendments that would increase the financial thresholds in the smaller reporting company definition. As you know the SRC definition has been of really keen interest to this committee for some time and the subject of prior committee recommendations, which actually go beyond the reach of the Commission's current proposal in some respects. If adopted the proposal would expand the number of companies that can qualify for certain existing scale disclosures provided in the SEC's regulations, again by raising the public float threshold from its current level of \$75 million to up to \$250	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	So thank you again for being here and I very much look forward to your discussion and your input. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Commissioner Stein. COMMISSIONER STEIN: Thank you. Good morning to everyone and welcome to today's meeting of the Advisory Committee on Small and Emerging Companies. Always a mouthful to say. I want to take the opportunity to thank each of you for taking time out of very busy schedules to come to Washington to share your best thoughts with us and I'm looking forward to today's discussion. I'm especially interested in hearing more about the apparent hesitancy of issuers to use Regulation A+. Perhaps some of the hesitancy can be attributed to the newness of the program, are we yet able to identify the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	dynamic space and I very much look forward to today's discussion, and especially in the presentation by participants who are directly involved in this market. As was mentioned by Steve, last month the Commission proposed amendments that would increase the financial thresholds in the smaller reporting company definition. As you know the SRC definition has been of really keen interest to this committee for some time and the subject of prior committee recommendations, which actually go beyond the reach of the Commission's current proposal in some respects. If adopted the proposal would expand the number of companies that can qualify for certain existing scale disclosures provided in the SEC's regulations, again by raising the public float threshold from its current level of \$75 million to up to \$250 million and the annual revenues threshold in the absence	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	So thank you again for being here and I very much look forward to your discussion and your input. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Commissioner Stein. COMMISSIONER STEIN: Thank you. Good morning to everyone and welcome to today's meeting of the Advisory Committee on Small and Emerging Companies. Always a mouthful to say. I want to take the opportunity to thank each of you for taking time out of very busy schedules to come to Washington to share your best thoughts with us and I'm looking forward to today's discussion. I'm especially interested in hearing more about the apparent hesitancy of issuers to use Regulation A+. Perhaps some of the hesitancy can be attributed to the newness of the program, are we yet able to identify the reasons issuers are either self-selecting out of using
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	dynamic space and I very much look forward to today's discussion, and especially in the presentation by participants who are directly involved in this market. As was mentioned by Steve, last month the Commission proposed amendments that would increase the financial thresholds in the smaller reporting company definition. As you know the SRC definition has been of really keen interest to this committee for some time and the subject of prior committee recommendations, which actually go beyond the reach of the Commission's current proposal in some respects. If adopted the proposal would expand the number of companies that can qualify for certain existing scale disclosures provided in the SEC's regulations, again by raising the public float threshold from its current level of \$75 million to up to \$250 million and the annual revenues threshold in the absence of a public float from less than \$50 million to less than	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	So thank you again for being here and I very much look forward to your discussion and your input. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Commissioner Stein. COMMISSIONER STEIN: Thank you. Good morning to everyone and welcome to today's meeting of the Advisory Committee on Small and Emerging Companies. Always a mouthful to say. I want to take the opportunity to thank each of you for taking time out of very busy schedules to come to Washington to share your best thoughts with us and I'm looking forward to today's discussion. I'm especially interested in hearing more about the apparent hesitancy of issuers to use Regulation A+. Perhaps some of the hesitancy can be attributed to the newness of the program, are we yet able to identify the reasons issuers are either self-selecting out of using Reg A+ or not even aware of it as a capital raising
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	dynamic space and I very much look forward to today's discussion, and especially in the presentation by participants who are directly involved in this market. As was mentioned by Steve, last month the Commission proposed amendments that would increase the financial thresholds in the smaller reporting company definition. As you know the SRC definition has been of really keen interest to this committee for some time and the subject of prior committee recommendations, which actually go beyond the reach of the Commission's current proposal in some respects. If adopted the proposal would expand the number of companies that can qualify for certain existing scale disclosures provided in the SEC's regulations, again by raising the public float threshold from its current level of \$75 million to up to \$250 million and the annual revenues threshold in the absence of a public float from less than \$50 million to less than \$100 million.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	So thank you again for being here and I very much look forward to your discussion and your input. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Commissioner Stein. COMMISSIONER STEIN: Thank you. Good morning to everyone and welcome to today's meeting of the Advisory Committee on Small and Emerging Companies. Always a mouthful to say. I want to take the opportunity to thank each of you for taking time out of very busy schedules to come to Washington to share your best thoughts with us and I'm looking forward to today's discussion. I'm especially interested in hearing more about the apparent hesitancy of issuers to use Regulation A+. Perhaps some of the hesitancy can be attributed to the newness of the program, are we yet able to identify the reasons issuers are either self-selecting out of using Reg A+ or not even aware of it as a capital raising alternative, are there any nascent trends in the data
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	dynamic space and I very much look forward to today's discussion, and especially in the presentation by participants who are directly involved in this market. As was mentioned by Steve, last month the Commission proposed amendments that would increase the financial thresholds in the smaller reporting company definition. As you know the SRC definition has been of really keen interest to this committee for some time and the subject of prior committee recommendations, which actually go beyond the reach of the Commission's current proposal in some respects. If adopted the proposal would expand the number of companies that can qualify for certain existing scale disclosures provided in the SEC's regulations, again by raising the public float threshold from its current level of \$75 million to up to \$250 million and the annual revenues threshold in the absence of a public float from less than \$50 million to less than \$100 million.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	So thank you again for being here and I very much look forward to your discussion and your input. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Commissioner Stein. COMMISSIONER STEIN: Thank you. Good morning to everyone and welcome to today's meeting of the Advisory Committee on Small and Emerging Companies. Always a mouthful to say. I want to take the opportunity to thank each of you for taking time out of very busy schedules to come to Washington to share your best thoughts with us and I'm looking forward to today's discussion. I'm especially interested in hearing more about the apparent hesitancy of issuers to use Regulation A+. Perhaps some of the hesitancy can be attributed to the newness of the program, are we yet able to identify the reasons issuers are either self-selecting out of using Reg A+ or not even aware of it as a capital raising alternative, are there any nascent trends in the data that we should be concerned about.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	dynamic space and I very much look forward to today's discussion, and especially in the presentation by participants who are directly involved in this market. As was mentioned by Steve, last month the Commission proposed amendments that would increase the financial thresholds in the smaller reporting company definition. As you know the SRC definition has been of really keen interest to this committee for some time and the subject of prior committee recommendations, which actually go beyond the reach of the Commission's current proposal in some respects. If adopted the proposal would expand the number of companies that can qualify for certain existing scale disclosures provided in the SEC's regulations, again by raising the public float threshold from its current level of \$75 million to up to \$250 million and the annual revenues threshold in the absence of a public float from less than \$50 million to less than \$100 million.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	So thank you again for being here and I very much look forward to your discussion and your input. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Commissioner Stein. COMMISSIONER STEIN: Thank you. Good morning to everyone and welcome to today's meeting of the Advisory Committee on Small and Emerging Companies. Always a mouthful to say. I want to take the opportunity to thank each of you for taking time out of very busy schedules to come to Washington to share your best thoughts with us and I'm looking forward to today's discussion. I'm especially interested in hearing more about the apparent hesitancy of issuers to use Regulation A+. Perhaps some of the hesitancy can be attributed to the newness of the program, are we yet able to identify the reasons issuers are either self-selecting out of using Reg A+ or not even aware of it as a capital raising alternative, are there any nascent trends in the data that we should be concerned about.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	dynamic space and I very much look forward to today's discussion, and especially in the presentation by participants who are directly involved in this market. As was mentioned by Steve, last month the Commission proposed amendments that would increase the financial thresholds in the smaller reporting company definition. As you know the SRC definition has been of really keen interest to this committee for some time and the subject of prior committee recommendations, which actually go beyond the reach of the Commission's current proposal in some respects. If adopted the proposal would expand the number of companies that can qualify for certain existing scale disclosures provided in the SEC's regulations, again by raising the public float threshold from its current level of \$75 million to up to \$250 million and the annual revenues threshold in the absence of a public float from less than \$50 million to less than \$100 million.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	So thank you again for being here and I very much look forward to your discussion and your input. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Commissioner Stein. COMMISSIONER STEIN: Thank you. Good morning to everyone and welcome to today's meeting of the Advisory Committee on Small and Emerging Companies. Always a mouthful to say. I want to take the opportunity to thank each of you for taking time out of very busy schedules to come to Washington to share your best thoughts with us and I'm looking forward to today's discussion. I'm especially interested in hearing more about the apparent hesitancy of issuers to use Regulation A+. Perhaps some of the hesitancy can be attributed to the newness of the program, are we yet able to identify the reasons issuers are either self-selecting out of using Reg A+ or not even aware of it as a capital raising alternative, are there any nascent trends in the data that we should be concerned about. I'm also interested in the committee's draft recommendations regarding the definition of accredited
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	dynamic space and I very much look forward to today's discussion, and especially in the presentation by participants who are directly involved in this market. As was mentioned by Steve, last month the Commission proposed amendments that would increase the financial thresholds in the smaller reporting company definition. As you know the SRC definition has been of really keen interest to this committee for some time and the subject of prior committee recommendations, which actually go beyond the reach of the Commission's current proposal in some respects. If adopted the proposal would expand the number of companies that can qualify for certain existing scale disclosures provided in the SEC's regulations, again by raising the public float threshold from its current level of \$75 million to up to \$250 million and the annual revenues threshold in the absence of a public float from less than \$50 million to less than \$100 million.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	So thank you again for being here and I very much look forward to your discussion and your input. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Commissioner Stein. COMMISSIONER STEIN: Thank you. Good morning to everyone and welcome to today's meeting of the Advisory Committee on Small and Emerging Companies. Always a mouthful to say. I want to take the opportunity to thank each of you for taking time out of very busy schedules to come to Washington to share your best thoughts with us and I'm looking forward to today's discussion. The especially interested in hearing more about the apparent hesitancy of issuers to use Regulation A+. Perhaps some of the hesitancy can be attributed to the newness of the program, are we yet able to identify the reasons issuers are either self-selecting out of using Reg A+ or not even aware of it as a capital raising alternative, are there any nascent trends in the data that we should be concerned about. The also interested in the committee's draft recommendations regarding the definition of accredited investor. As we move forward in considering how small
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	dynamic space and I very much look forward to today's discussion, and especially in the presentation by participants who are directly involved in this market. As was mentioned by Steve, last month the Commission proposed amendments that would increase the financial thresholds in the smaller reporting company definition. As you know the SRC definition has been of really keen interest to this committee for some time and the subject of prior committee recommendations, which actually go beyond the reach of the Commission's current proposal in some respects. If adopted the proposal would expand the number of companies that can qualify for certain existing scale disclosures provided in the SEC's regulations, again by raising the public float threshold from its current level of \$75 million to up to \$250 million and the annual revenues threshold in the absence of a public float from less than \$50 million to less than \$100 million. The objective of the proposal, which would raise the financial thresholds and the definition as I just indicated, is to promote capital formation and reduce compliance costs for smaller companies while maintaining important investor protections, such as those	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	So thank you again for being here and I very much look forward to your discussion and your input. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Commissioner Stein. COMMISSIONER STEIN: Thank you. Good morning to everyone and welcome to today's meeting of the Advisory Committee on Small and Emerging Companies. Always a mouthful to say. I want to take the opportunity to thank each of you for taking time out of very busy schedules to come to Washington to share your best thoughts with us and I'm looking forward to today's discussion. I'm especially interested in hearing more about the apparent hesitancy of issuers to use Regulation A+. Perhaps some of the hesitancy can be attributed to the newness of the program, are we yet able to identify the reasons issuers are either self-selecting out of using Reg A+ or not even aware of it as a capital raising alternative, are there any nascent trends in the data that we should be concerned about. I'm also interested in the committee's draft recommendations regarding the definition of accredited investor. As we move forward in considering how small businesses can best raise capital I like you also focus
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	dynamic space and I very much look forward to today's discussion, and especially in the presentation by participants who are directly involved in this market. As was mentioned by Steve, last month the Commission proposed amendments that would increase the financial thresholds in the smaller reporting company definition. As you know the SRC definition has been of really keen interest to this committee for some time and the subject of prior committee recommendations, which actually go beyond the reach of the Commission's current proposal in some respects. If adopted the proposal would expand the number of companies that can qualify for certain existing scale disclosures provided in the SEC's regulations, again by raising the public float threshold from its current level of \$75 million to up to \$250 million and the annual revenues threshold in the absence of a public float from less than \$50 million to less than \$100 million. The objective of the proposal, which would raise the financial thresholds and the definition as I just indicated, is to promote capital formation and reduce compliance costs for smaller companies while maintaining important investor protections, such as those provided by Section 404(b) of Sarbanes-Oxley. The	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	So thank you again for being here and I very much look forward to your discussion and your input. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Commissioner Stein. COMMISSIONER STEIN: Thank you. Good morning to everyone and welcome to today's meeting of the Advisory Committee on Small and Emerging Companies. Always a mouthful to say. I want to take the opportunity to thank each of you for taking time out of very busy schedules to come to Washington to share your best thoughts with us and I'm looking forward to today's discussion. I'm especially interested in hearing more about the apparent hesitancy of issuers to use Regulation A+. Perhaps some of the hesitancy can be attributed to the newness of the program, are we yet able to identify the reasons issuers are either self-selecting out of using Reg A+ or not even aware of it as a capital raising alternative, are there any nascent trends in the data that we should be concerned about. I'm also interested in the committee's draft recommendations regarding the definition of accredited investor. As we move forward in considering how small businesses can best raise capital I like you also focus on how to best protect investors. How can we increase
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	dynamic space and I very much look forward to today's discussion, and especially in the presentation by participants who are directly involved in this market. As was mentioned by Steve, last month the Commission proposed amendments that would increase the financial thresholds in the smaller reporting company definition. As you know the SRC definition has been of really keen interest to this committee for some time and the subject of prior committee recommendations, which actually go beyond the reach of the Commission's current proposal in some respects. If adopted the proposal would expand the number of companies that can qualify for certain existing scale disclosures provided in the SEC's regulations, again by raising the public float threshold from its current level of \$75 million to up to \$250 million and the annual revenues threshold in the absence of a public float from less than \$50 million to less than \$100 million. The objective of the proposal, which would raise the financial thresholds and the definition as I just indicated, is to promote capital formation and reduce compliance costs for smaller companies while maintaining important investor protections, such as those	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	So thank you again for being here and I very much look forward to your discussion and your input. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Commissioner Stein. COMMISSIONER STEIN: Thank you. Good morning to everyone and welcome to today's meeting of the Advisory Committee on Small and Emerging Companies. Always a mouthful to say. I want to take the opportunity to thank each of you for taking time out of very busy schedules to come to Washington to share your best thoughts with us and I'm looking forward to today's discussion. I'm especially interested in hearing more about the apparent hesitancy of issuers to use Regulation A+. Perhaps some of the hesitancy can be attributed to the newness of the program, are we yet able to identify the reasons issuers are either self-selecting out of using Reg A+ or not even aware of it as a capital raising alternative, are there any nascent trends in the data that we should be concerned about. I'm also interested in the committee's draft recommendations regarding the definition of accredited investor. As we move forward in considering how small businesses can best raise capital I like you also focus

	Page 10		Page 12
1	same time protecting investors. It's that tension that	1	Steve and Sara. Good morning to everyone here in the
2	we all, you know, have to keep struggling with.	2	building as well as those who are joining us on the
3	Finally, the committee this afternoon will	3	webcast.
4	discuss a proposed rule to amend the definition of	4	Of course before we begin I need to give the
5	smaller reporting company. As currently defined smaller	5	standard disclaimer on behalf of each person from the
6	reporting companies, as the Chair mentioned, registrants	6	SEC's staff who speaks today that the views they express
7	with less than \$75 million in public float as of the last	7	are their own and don't represent the views of the
8	business day of their second quarter or with zero public	8	Commission or any of our other colleagues on the staff of
9	float and annual revenues of less than \$50 million as of	9	the Commission.
10	the most recently completed fiscal year for which audited	10	I want to express the division's appreciation
11	financials are available. Companies that get designated	11	for all of you in the work that you do and the service
12	as smaller reporting companies are able to selectively	12	that you give to this committee. The topics that you'll
13	make use of certain scaled disclosure accommodations.	13	discuss today are very important to our work as we
14	The Commission's proposed rule would raise the	14	prepare our recommendations to the Commission on the
15	public float threshold form \$75 million to \$250 million.	15	accredited investor definition and on implementing and
16	It would also change the revenue threshold from \$50	16	as we continue to implement Regulation A.
17	million to \$100 million. I recognizes the committee's	17	While on that topic of Regulation A, our staff
18	interest in revising the smaller reporting company	18	is working on fine tuning our review of Regulation A
19	threshold to expand the availability of scaled disclosure	19	filings and we hope we're providing helpful and timely
20	to a larger group of companies. However, it's not clear	20	comments and assistance to smaller companies who are
21	to me that this will actually facilitate innovation and	21	often navigating the SEC disclosure regime and our
22	job creation.	22	registration system or our qualification system for the
23	The Commission's Division of Economic and Risk	23	first time. And our staff has really, you know, taken a
24	Analysis, we call it DERA so you don't usually have to	24	keen interest in making sure that we're getting it right
25	say the whole name out, their empirical findings, which	25	as we review these filings. I know these topics have
			- 10
	Page 11		Page 13
1	are attached to the proposed rule, suggest that	1	been important to the committee over the years and
2	are attached to the proposed rule, suggest that anticipated benefits for newly eligible smaller reporting	2	been important to the committee over the years and they're very important to us as well.
2 3	are attached to the proposed rule, suggest that anticipated benefits for newly eligible smaller reporting companies under the proposed revisions may be extremely	2 3	been important to the committee over the years and they're very important to us as well. We're looking forward to getting your feedback
2 3 4	are attached to the proposed rule, suggest that anticipated benefits for newly eligible smaller reporting companies under the proposed revisions may be extremely modest. Moreover, the flip side of all of this is an	2 3 4	been important to the committee over the years and they're very important to us as well. We're looking forward to getting your feedback on the small reporting company proposal that the
2 3 4 5	are attached to the proposed rule, suggest that anticipated benefits for newly eligible smaller reporting companies under the proposed revisions may be extremely modest. Moreover, the flip side of all of this is an observable cost to smaller reporting companies using	2 3 4 5	been important to the committee over the years and they're very important to us as well. We're looking forward to getting your feedback on the small reporting company proposal that the Commission recently put out for public comment, and you
2 3 4 5 6	are attached to the proposed rule, suggest that anticipated benefits for newly eligible smaller reporting companies under the proposed revisions may be extremely modest. Moreover, the flip side of all of this is an observable cost to smaller reporting companies using scaled disclosure. Less disclosure could lead to lower	2 3 4 5 6	been important to the committee over the years and they're very important to us as well. We're looking forward to getting your feedback on the small reporting company proposal that the Commission recently put out for public comment, and you may have seen last week the division has been busy on our
2 3 4 5 6 7	are attached to the proposed rule, suggest that anticipated benefits for newly eligible smaller reporting companies under the proposed revisions may be extremely modest. Moreover, the flip side of all of this is an observable cost to smaller reporting companies using scaled disclosure. Less disclosure could lead to lower liquidity and a higher cost of capital for smaller	2 3 4 5 6 7	been important to the committee over the years and they're very important to us as well. We're looking forward to getting your feedback on the small reporting company proposal that the Commission recently put out for public comment, and you may have seen last week the division has been busy on our disclosure effectiveness review, putting out another
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	are attached to the proposed rule, suggest that anticipated benefits for newly eligible smaller reporting companies under the proposed revisions may be extremely modest. Moreover, the flip side of all of this is an observable cost to smaller reporting companies using scaled disclosure. Less disclosure could lead to lower liquidity and a higher cost of capital for smaller companies if there's less transparency.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	been important to the committee over the years and they're very important to us as well. We're looking forward to getting your feedback on the small reporting company proposal that the Commission recently put out for public comment, and you may have seen last week the division has been busy on our disclosure effectiveness review, putting out another proposal on getting rid of redundant, overlapping,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	are attached to the proposed rule, suggest that anticipated benefits for newly eligible smaller reporting companies under the proposed revisions may be extremely modest. Moreover, the flip side of all of this is an observable cost to smaller reporting companies using scaled disclosure. Less disclosure could lead to lower liquidity and a higher cost of capital for smaller companies if there's less transparency. So I think that's the other part of this that we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	been important to the committee over the years and they're very important to us as well. We're looking forward to getting your feedback on the small reporting company proposal that the Commission recently put out for public comment, and you may have seen last week the division has been busy on our disclosure effectiveness review, putting out another proposal on getting rid of redundant, overlapping, superseded and outdated disclosure requirements. And so
2 3 6 7 8 9 10	are attached to the proposed rule, suggest that anticipated benefits for newly eligible smaller reporting companies under the proposed revisions may be extremely modest. Moreover, the flip side of all of this is an observable cost to smaller reporting companies using scaled disclosure. Less disclosure could lead to lower liquidity and a higher cost of capital for smaller companies if there's less transparency. So I think that's the other part of this that we need to at least think about. Is less transparency	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	been important to the committee over the years and they're very important to us as well. We're looking forward to getting your feedback on the small reporting company proposal that the Commission recently put out for public comment, and you may have seen last week the division has been busy on our disclosure effectiveness review, putting out another proposal on getting rid of redundant, overlapping, superseded and outdated disclosure requirements. And so we're interested in getting feedback from investors, from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	are attached to the proposed rule, suggest that anticipated benefits for newly eligible smaller reporting companies under the proposed revisions may be extremely modest. Moreover, the flip side of all of this is an observable cost to smaller reporting companies using scaled disclosure. Less disclosure could lead to lower liquidity and a higher cost of capital for smaller companies if there's less transparency. So I think that's the other part of this that we need to at least think about. Is less transparency something that smaller reporting companies benefit from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	been important to the committee over the years and they're very important to us as well. We're looking forward to getting your feedback on the small reporting company proposal that the Commission recently put out for public comment, and you may have seen last week the division has been busy on our disclosure effectiveness review, putting out another proposal on getting rid of redundant, overlapping, superseded and outdated disclosure requirements. And so we're interested in getting feedback from investors, from companies, and others on how we can make our disclosure
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	are attached to the proposed rule, suggest that anticipated benefits for newly eligible smaller reporting companies under the proposed revisions may be extremely modest. Moreover, the flip side of all of this is an observable cost to smaller reporting companies using scaled disclosure. Less disclosure could lead to lower liquidity and a higher cost of capital for smaller companies if there's less transparency. So I think that's the other part of this that we need to at least think about. Is less transparency	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	been important to the committee over the years and they're very important to us as well. We're looking forward to getting your feedback on the small reporting company proposal that the Commission recently put out for public comment, and you may have seen last week the division has been busy on our disclosure effectiveness review, putting out another proposal on getting rid of redundant, overlapping, superseded and outdated disclosure requirements. And so we're interested in getting feedback from investors, from
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	are attached to the proposed rule, suggest that anticipated benefits for newly eligible smaller reporting companies under the proposed revisions may be extremely modest. Moreover, the flip side of all of this is an observable cost to smaller reporting companies using scaled disclosure. Less disclosure could lead to lower liquidity and a higher cost of capital for smaller companies if there's less transparency. So I think that's the other part of this that we need to at least think about. Is less transparency something that smaller reporting companies benefit from in the long run and, you know, what are the costs. Why	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	been important to the committee over the years and they're very important to us as well. We're looking forward to getting your feedback on the small reporting company proposal that the Commission recently put out for public comment, and you may have seen last week the division has been busy on our disclosure effectiveness review, putting out another proposal on getting rid of redundant, overlapping, superseded and outdated disclosure requirements. And so we're interested in getting feedback from investors, from companies, and others on how we can make our disclosure system better for everybody.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	are attached to the proposed rule, suggest that anticipated benefits for newly eligible smaller reporting companies under the proposed revisions may be extremely modest. Moreover, the flip side of all of this is an observable cost to smaller reporting companies using scaled disclosure. Less disclosure could lead to lower liquidity and a higher cost of capital for smaller companies if there's less transparency. So I think that's the other part of this that we need to at least think about. Is less transparency something that smaller reporting companies benefit from in the long run and, you know, what are the costs. Why are some smaller reporting companies not using the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	been important to the committee over the years and they're very important to us as well. We're looking forward to getting your feedback on the small reporting company proposal that the Commission recently put out for public comment, and you may have seen last week the division has been busy on our disclosure effectiveness review, putting out another proposal on getting rid of redundant, overlapping, superseded and outdated disclosure requirements. And so we're interested in getting feedback from investors, from companies, and others on how we can make our disclosure system better for everybody. Now today I'm joined by members of the Office
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	are attached to the proposed rule, suggest that anticipated benefits for newly eligible smaller reporting companies under the proposed revisions may be extremely modest. Moreover, the flip side of all of this is an observable cost to smaller reporting companies using scaled disclosure. Less disclosure could lead to lower liquidity and a higher cost of capital for smaller companies if there's less transparency. So I think that's the other part of this that we need to at least think about. Is less transparency something that smaller reporting companies benefit from in the long run and, you know, what are the costs. Why are some smaller reporting companies not using the current option they have of scaled disclosure, you know,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	been important to the committee over the years and they're very important to us as well. We're looking forward to getting your feedback on the small reporting company proposal that the Commission recently put out for public comment, and you may have seen last week the division has been busy on our disclosure effectiveness review, putting out another proposal on getting rid of redundant, overlapping, superseded and outdated disclosure requirements. And so we're interested in getting feedback from investors, from companies, and others on how we can make our disclosure system better for everybody. Now today I'm joined by members of the Office of Small Business Policy, who of course need no
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	are attached to the proposed rule, suggest that anticipated benefits for newly eligible smaller reporting companies under the proposed revisions may be extremely modest. Moreover, the flip side of all of this is an observable cost to smaller reporting companies using scaled disclosure. Less disclosure could lead to lower liquidity and a higher cost of capital for smaller companies if there's less transparency. So I think that's the other part of this that we need to at least think about. Is less transparency something that smaller reporting companies benefit from in the long run and, you know, what are the costs. Why are some smaller reporting companies not using the current option they have of scaled disclosure, you know, even though they qualify.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	been important to the committee over the years and they're very important to us as well. We're looking forward to getting your feedback on the small reporting company proposal that the Commission recently put out for public comment, and you may have seen last week the division has been busy on our disclosure effectiveness review, putting out another proposal on getting rid of redundant, overlapping, superseded and outdated disclosure requirements. And so we're interested in getting feedback from investors, from companies, and others on how we can make our disclosure system better for everybody. Now today I'm joined by members of the Office of Small Business Policy, who of course need no introduction, Sebastian Gomez, who is our chief of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	are attached to the proposed rule, suggest that anticipated benefits for newly eligible smaller reporting companies under the proposed revisions may be extremely modest. Moreover, the flip side of all of this is an observable cost to smaller reporting companies using scaled disclosure. Less disclosure could lead to lower liquidity and a higher cost of capital for smaller companies if there's less transparency. So I think that's the other part of this that we need to at least think about. Is less transparency something that smaller reporting companies benefit from in the long run and, you know, what are the costs. Why are some smaller reporting companies not using the current option they have of scaled disclosure, you know, even though they qualify. So I hope you consider these issues in your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	been important to the committee over the years and they're very important to us as well. We're looking forward to getting your feedback on the small reporting company proposal that the Commission recently put out for public comment, and you may have seen last week the division has been busy on our disclosure effectiveness review, putting out another proposal on getting rid of redundant, overlapping, superseded and outdated disclosure requirements. And so we're interested in getting feedback from investors, from companies, and others on how we can make our disclosure system better for everybody. Now today I'm joined by members of the Office of Small Business Policy, who of course need no introduction, Sebastian Gomez, who is our chief of the office, and Julie Davis, who is senior special counsel in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	are attached to the proposed rule, suggest that anticipated benefits for newly eligible smaller reporting companies under the proposed revisions may be extremely modest. Moreover, the flip side of all of this is an observable cost to smaller reporting companies using scaled disclosure. Less disclosure could lead to lower liquidity and a higher cost of capital for smaller companies if there's less transparency. So I think that's the other part of this that we need to at least think about. Is less transparency something that smaller reporting companies benefit from in the long run and, you know, what are the costs. Why are some smaller reporting companies not using the current option they have of scaled disclosure, you know, even though they qualify. So I hope you consider these issues in your discussion of the proposed amendments. That's some of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	been important to the committee over the years and they're very important to us as well. We're looking forward to getting your feedback on the small reporting company proposal that the Commission recently put out for public comment, and you may have seen last week the division has been busy on our disclosure effectiveness review, putting out another proposal on getting rid of redundant, overlapping, superseded and outdated disclosure requirements. And so we're interested in getting feedback from investors, from companies, and others on how we can make our disclosure system better for everybody. Now today I'm joined by members of the Office of Small Business Policy, who of course need no introduction, Sebastian Gomez, who is our chief of the office, and Julie Davis, who is senior special counsel in the office. You know them well. With me also is Betsy
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	are attached to the proposed rule, suggest that anticipated benefits for newly eligible smaller reporting companies under the proposed revisions may be extremely modest. Moreover, the flip side of all of this is an observable cost to smaller reporting companies using scaled disclosure. Less disclosure could lead to lower liquidity and a higher cost of capital for smaller companies if there's less transparency. So I think that's the other part of this that we need to at least think about. Is less transparency something that smaller reporting companies benefit from in the long run and, you know, what are the costs. Why are some smaller reporting companies not using the current option they have of scaled disclosure, you know, even though they qualify. So I hope you consider these issues in your discussion of the proposed amendments. That's some of what I'm struggling with, and as always I look forward to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	been important to the committee over the years and they're very important to us as well. We're looking forward to getting your feedback on the small reporting company proposal that the Commission recently put out for public comment, and you may have seen last week the division has been busy on our disclosure effectiveness review, putting out another proposal on getting rid of redundant, overlapping, superseded and outdated disclosure requirements. And so we're interested in getting feedback from investors, from companies, and others on how we can make our disclosure system better for everybody. Now today I'm joined by members of the Office of Small Business Policy, who of course need no introduction, Sebastian Gomez, who is our chief of the office, and Julie Davis, who is senior special counsel in the office. You know them well. With me also is Betsy Murphy. Betsy is associate director in the division who
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	are attached to the proposed rule, suggest that anticipated benefits for newly eligible smaller reporting companies under the proposed revisions may be extremely modest. Moreover, the flip side of all of this is an observable cost to smaller reporting companies using scaled disclosure. Less disclosure could lead to lower liquidity and a higher cost of capital for smaller companies if there's less transparency. So I think that's the other part of this that we need to at least think about. Is less transparency something that smaller reporting companies benefit from in the long run and, you know, what are the costs. Why are some smaller reporting companies not using the current option they have of scaled disclosure, you know, even though they qualify. So I hope you consider these issues in your discussion of the proposed amendments. That's some of what I'm struggling with, and as always I look forward to hearing from you today. Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	been important to the committee over the years and they're very important to us as well. We're looking forward to getting your feedback on the small reporting company proposal that the Commission recently put out for public comment, and you may have seen last week the division has been busy on our disclosure effectiveness review, putting out another proposal on getting rid of redundant, overlapping, superseded and outdated disclosure requirements. And so we're interested in getting feedback from investors, from companies, and others on how we can make our disclosure system better for everybody. Now today I'm joined by members of the Office of Small Business Policy, who of course need no introduction, Sebastian Gomez, who is our chief of the office, and Julie Davis, who is senior special counsel in the office. You know them well. With me also is Betsy Murphy. Betsy is associate director in the division who oversees the office, and thank you Betsy and Sebastian and Julie and everybody on the staff who has helped to participate in getting these meetings off the ground.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	are attached to the proposed rule, suggest that anticipated benefits for newly eligible smaller reporting companies under the proposed revisions may be extremely modest. Moreover, the flip side of all of this is an observable cost to smaller reporting companies using scaled disclosure. Less disclosure could lead to lower liquidity and a higher cost of capital for smaller companies if there's less transparency. So I think that's the other part of this that we need to at least think about. Is less transparency something that smaller reporting companies benefit from in the long run and, you know, what are the costs. Why are some smaller reporting companies not using the current option they have of scaled disclosure, you know, even though they qualify. So I hope you consider these issues in your discussion of the proposed amendments. That's some of what I'm struggling with, and as always I look forward to hearing from you today. Thank you, CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Commissioner Stein. And I should note that Commissioner Piwowar is not here today, but he wanted to be here but he is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	been important to the committee over the years and they're very important to us as well. We're looking forward to getting your feedback on the small reporting company proposal that the Commission recently put out for public comment, and you may have seen last week the division has been busy on our disclosure effectiveness review, putting out another proposal on getting rid of redundant, overlapping, superseded and outdated disclosure requirements. And so we're interested in getting feedback from investors, from companies, and others on how we can make our disclosure system better for everybody. Now today I'm joined by members of the Office of Small Business Policy, who of course need no introduction, Sebastian Gomez, who is our chief of the office, and Julie Davis, who is senior special counsel in the office. You know them well. With me also is Betsy Murphy. Betsy is associate director in the division who oversees the office, and thank you Betsy and Sebastian and Julie and everybody on the staff who has helped to participate in getting these meetings off the ground. They do a great job and we appreciate their efforts.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	are attached to the proposed rule, suggest that anticipated benefits for newly eligible smaller reporting companies under the proposed revisions may be extremely modest. Moreover, the flip side of all of this is an observable cost to smaller reporting companies using scaled disclosure. Less disclosure could lead to lower liquidity and a higher cost of capital for smaller companies if there's less transparency. So I think that's the other part of this that we need to at least think about. Is less transparency something that smaller reporting companies benefit from in the long run and, you know, what are the costs. Why are some smaller reporting companies not using the current option they have of scaled disclosure, you know, even though they qualify. So I hope you consider these issues in your discussion of the proposed amendments. That's some of what I'm struggling with, and as always I look forward to hearing from you today. Thank you, CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Commissioner Stein. And I should note that Commissioner Piwowar is not here today, but he wanted to be here but he is traveling.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	been important to the committee over the years and they're very important to us as well. We're looking forward to getting your feedback on the small reporting company proposal that the Commission recently put out for public comment, and you may have seen last week the division has been busy on our disclosure effectiveness review, putting out another proposal on getting rid of redundant, overlapping, superseded and outdated disclosure requirements. And so we're interested in getting feedback from investors, from companies, and others on how we can make our disclosure system better for everybody. Now today I'm joined by members of the Office of Small Business Policy, who of course need no introduction, Sebastian Gomez, who is our chief of the office, and Julie Davis, who is senior special counsel in the office. You know them well. With me also is Betsy Murphy. Betsy is associate director in the division who oversees the office, and thank you Betsy and Sebastian and Julie and everybody on the staff who has helped to participate in getting these meetings off the ground. They do a great job and we appreciate their efforts. And with that, Steve, I'll turn it back to you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	are attached to the proposed rule, suggest that anticipated benefits for newly eligible smaller reporting companies under the proposed revisions may be extremely modest. Moreover, the flip side of all of this is an observable cost to smaller reporting companies using scaled disclosure. Less disclosure could lead to lower liquidity and a higher cost of capital for smaller companies if there's less transparency. So I think that's the other part of this that we need to at least think about. Is less transparency something that smaller reporting companies benefit from in the long run and, you know, what are the costs. Why are some smaller reporting companies not using the current option they have of scaled disclosure, you know, even though they qualify. So I hope you consider these issues in your discussion of the proposed amendments. That's some of what I'm struggling with, and as always I look forward to bearing from you today. Thank you, Commissioner Stein, And I should note that Commissioner Piwowar is not here today, but he wanted to be here but he is itaveling. Keith.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	been important to the committee over the years and they're very important to us as well. We're looking forward to getting your feedback on the small reporting company proposal that the Commission recently put out for public comment, and you may have seen last week the division has been busy on our disclosure effectiveness review, putting out another proposal on getting rid of redundant, overlapping, superseded and outdated disclosure requirements. And so we're interested in getting feedback from investors, from companies, and others on how we can make our disclosure system better for everybody. Now today I'm joined by members of the Office of Small Business Policy, who of course need no introduction, Sebastian Gomez, who is our chief of the office, and Julie Davis, who is senior special counsel in the office. You know them well. With me also is Betsy Murphy. Betsy is associate director in the division who oversees the office, and thank you Betsy and Sebastian and Julie and everybody on the staff who has helped to participate in getting these meetings off the ground. They do a great job and we appreciate their efforts. And with that, Steve, I'll turn it back to you for getting back to business.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	are attached to the proposed rule, suggest that anticipated benefits for newly eligible smaller reporting companies under the proposed revisions may be extremely modest. Moreover, the flip side of all of this is an observable cost to smaller reporting companies using scaled disclosure. Less disclosure could lead to lower liquidity and a higher cost of capital for smaller companies if there's less transparency. So I think that's the other part of this that we need to at least think about. Is less transparency something that smaller reporting companies benefit from in the long run and, you know, what are the costs. Why are some smaller reporting companies not using the current option they have of scaled disclosure, you know, even though they qualify. So I hope you consider these issues in your discussion of the proposed amendments. That's some of what I'm struggling with, and as always I look forward to hearing from you today. Thank you, CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Commissioner Stein. And I should note that Commissioner Piwowar is not here today, but he wanted to be here but he is traveling.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	been important to the committee over the years and they're very important to us as well. We're looking forward to getting your feedback on the small reporting company proposal that the Commission recently put out for public comment, and you may have seen last week the division has been busy on our disclosure effectiveness review, putting out another proposal on getting rid of redundant, overlapping, superseded and outdated disclosure requirements. And so we're interested in getting feedback from investors, from companies, and others on how we can make our disclosure system better for everybody. Now today I'm joined by members of the Office of Small Business Policy, who of course need no introduction, Sebastian Gomez, who is our chief of the office, and Julie Davis, who is senior special counsel in the office. You know them well. With me also is Betsy Murphy. Betsy is associate director in the division who oversees the office, and thank you Betsy and Sebastian and Julie and everybody on the staff who has helped to participate in getting these meetings off the ground. They do a great job and we appreciate their efforts. And with that, Steve, I'll turn it back to you

Page	16

	Page 14		Page 16
1	I would like to echo your comments, Keith. I know that I	1	income standards that whatever is decided upon does not
2	couldn't do this without Julie and Sebastian's help so	2	go above 50 percent of the current levels. So income
3	So let's turn to accredited, the accredited	3	would go to 300, 450 net worth would go to 1.5 million.
4	investor definition. At our last meeting I really	4	So that is a recommendation I would make with respect to
5	appreciated our lively discussion on the subject. As you	5	the current test, that we not jump out and do the
6	know it is a central component of Regulation D, which in	6	inflation based change that would exclude too many
7	turn is central to our unregistered markets.	7	potential investors.
8	We came up with a strong recommendation at that	8	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: You know, at our last
9	meeting and today hope to finalize it. We distributed	9	meeting, you know, I would like to think that the balance
10	drafts. I think you all have had an opportunity to	10	of the committee essentially agrees with you. That
11	review it and I think it reflects where we came out last	11	seemed to be the consensus, that, you know, to resist
12	time. This is an opportunity to supplement that	12	this, maybe this inclination to make changes because the
13	recommendation and to otherwise refine it and finalize	13	question has been raised.
14	it.	14	MR. REARDON: Right.
15	As you all know the concept behind accredited	15	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: You know, certainly it's my
16	investor is intended to encompass those individuals and	16	feeling, and I think it's the feeling of the balance of
17	entities with the financial sophistication and ability to	17	the committee, that we concluded that this is a part of
18	sustain risk of loss of investment or the ability to fend	18	the small business capital formation system that wasn't
19	for themselves. The current definition, which was	19	broken, seemed to work, and that we should be careful
20	adopted in 1982, uses only financial measures, income and	20	about doing anything that might reduce the pool of
21	net worth, to serve as a proxy for determining whether an	21	accredited investors and only think in terms of what
22	investor possesses these attributes.	22	might be done to might be done to expand the pool.
23	The recent SEC staff study on this topic	23	So the draft recommendation essentially
24	recommended that the Commission revise the definition to	24	reflects the recommendation to maintain the status quo in
25	allow individuals who qualify as accredited based on	25	terms of the numbers, in terms of the thresholds. But we
	1 2		, ,
	Page 15		Page 17
1	Page 15	1	Page 17
1	other measures of sophistication. The study set forth	1	didn't we didn't provide much commentary relating to
2	other measures of sophistication. The study set forth alternative approaches which could be considered to	2	didn't we didn't provide much commentary relating to non-financial measures and, you know, before we finalize
2 3	other measures of sophistication. The study set forth alternative approaches which could be considered to identify individuals who could qualify as accredited	2 3	didn't we didn't provide much commentary relating to non-financial measures and, you know, before we finalize the recommendation I wanted to give everybody an
2 3 4	other measures of sophistication. The study set forth alternative approaches which could be considered to identify individuals who could qualify as accredited investors based on criteria other than income and net	2 3 4	didn't we didn't provide much commentary relating to non-financial measures and, you know, before we finalize the recommendation I wanted to give everybody an opportunity to weigh in, you know, with respect to those
2 3 4 5	other measures of sophistication. The study set forth alternative approaches which could be considered to identify individuals who could qualify as accredited investors based on criteria other than income and net worth.	2 3 4 5	didn't we didn't provide much commentary relating to non-financial measures and, you know, before we finalize the recommendation I wanted to give everybody an opportunity to weigh in, you know, with respect to those suggestions to see if well, to see what your input
2 3 4 5 6	other measures of sophistication. The study set forth alternative approaches which could be considered to identify individuals who could qualify as accredited investors based on criteria other than income and net worth. As the staff and the Commission move forward in	2 3 4 5 6	didn't we didn't provide much commentary relating to non-financial measures and, you know, before we finalize the recommendation I wanted to give everybody an opportunity to weigh in, you know, with respect to those suggestions to see if well, to see what your input might be.
2 3 4 5 6 7	other measures of sophistication. The study set forth alternative approaches which could be considered to identify individuals who could qualify as accredited investors based on criteria other than income and net worth. As the staff and the Commission move forward in this area we think specific feedback on these measures	2 3 4 5 6 7	didn't we didn't provide much commentary relating to non-financial measures and, you know, before we finalize the recommendation I wanted to give everybody an opportunity to weigh in, you know, with respect to those suggestions to see if well, to see what your input might be. Just to throw them all out on the table,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	other measures of sophistication. The study set forth alternative approaches which could be considered to identify individuals who could qualify as accredited investors based on criteria other than income and net worth. As the staff and the Commission move forward in this area we think specific feedback on these measures would be helpful. So we would like run through each	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	didn't we didn't provide much commentary relating to non-financial measures and, you know, before we finalize the recommendation I wanted to give everybody an opportunity to weigh in, you know, with respect to those suggestions to see if well, to see what your input might be. Just to throw them all out on the table, they're in the study, I'm sure you've all reviewed the
2 3 5 6 7 8 9	other measures of sophistication. The study set forth alternative approaches which could be considered to identify individuals who could qualify as accredited investors based on criteria other than income and net worth. As the staff and the Commission move forward in this area we think specific feedback on these measures would be helpful. So we would like run through each potential approach one at a time and briefly hear what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	didn't we didn't provide much commentary relating to non-financial measures and, you know, before we finalize the recommendation I wanted to give everybody an opportunity to weigh in, you know, with respect to those suggestions to see if well, to see what your input might be. Just to throw them all out on the table, they're in the study, I'm sure you've all reviewed the study. I don't expect you to have committed the study to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	other measures of sophistication. The study set forth alternative approaches which could be considered to identify individuals who could qualify as accredited investors based on criteria other than income and net worth. As the staff and the Commission move forward in this area we think specific feedback on these measures would be helpful. So we would like run through each potential approach one at a time and briefly hear what you have to say about each of them.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	didn't we didn't provide much commentary relating to non-financial measures and, you know, before we finalize the recommendation I wanted to give everybody an opportunity to weigh in, you know, with respect to those suggestions to see if well, to see what your input might be. Just to throw them all out on the table, they're in the study, I'm sure you've all reviewed the study. I don't expect you to have committed the study to memory.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	other measures of sophistication. The study set forth alternative approaches which could be considered to identify individuals who could qualify as accredited investors based on criteria other than income and net worth. As the staff and the Commission move forward in this area we think specific feedback on these measures would be helpful. So we would like run through each potential approach one at a time and briefly hear what you have to say about each of them. The first non-financial measure or proposal if	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	didn't we didn't provide much commentary relating to non-financial measures and, you know, before we finalize the recommendation I wanted to give everybody an opportunity to weigh in, you know, with respect to those suggestions to see if well, to see what your input might be. Just to throw them all out on the table, they're in the study, I'm sure you've all reviewed the study. I don't expect you to have committed the study to memory. CO-CHAIR HANKS: There's a test later.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	other measures of sophistication. The study set forth alternative approaches which could be considered to identify individuals who could qualify as accredited investors based on criteria other than income and net worth. As the staff and the Commission move forward in this area we think specific feedback on these measures would be helpful. So we would like run through each potential approach one at a time and briefly hear what you have to say about each of them. The first non-financial measure or proposal if you will is to permit individuals with a minimum with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	didn't we didn't provide much commentary relating to non-financial measures and, you know, before we finalize the recommendation I wanted to give everybody an opportunity to weigh in, you know, with respect to those suggestions to see if well, to see what your input might be. Just to throw them all out on the table, they're in the study, I'm sure you've all reviewed the study. I don't expect you to have committed the study to memory. CO-CHAIR HANKS: There's a test later. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Yeah, there's a test later says
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	other measures of sophistication. The study set forth alternative approaches which could be considered to identify individuals who could qualify as accredited investors based on criteria other than income and net worth. As the staff and the Commission move forward in this area we think specific feedback on these measures would be helpful. So we would like run through each potential approach one at a time and briefly hear what you have to say about each of them. The first non-financial measure or proposal if you will is to permit individuals with a minimum with a minimum amount of investments to qualify as accredited	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	didn't we didn't provide much commentary relating to non-financial measures and, you know, before we finalize the recommendation I wanted to give everybody an opportunity to weigh in, you know, with respect to those suggestions to see if well, to see what your input might be. Just to throw them all out on the table, they're in the study, I'm sure you've all reviewed the study. I don't expect you to have committed the study to memory. CO-CHAIR HANKS: There's a test later. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Yeah, there's a test later says Sara.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	other measures of sophistication. The study set forth alternative approaches which could be considered to identify individuals who could qualify as accredited investors based on criteria other than income and net worth. As the staff and the Commission move forward in this area we think specific feedback on these measures would be helpful. So we would like run through each potential approach one at a time and briefly hear what you have to say about each of them. The first non-financial measure or proposal if you will is to permit individuals with a minimum with a minimum amount of investments to qualify as accredited investors. Investors may in some cases investments	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>didn't we didn't provide much commentary relating to non-financial measures and, you know, before we finalize the recommendation I wanted to give everybody an opportunity to weigh in, you know, with respect to those suggestions to see if well, to see what your input might be.</li> <li>Just to throw them all out on the table, they're in the study, I'm sure you've all reviewed the study. I don't expect you to have committed the study to memory.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: There's a test later.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Yeah, there's a test later says Sara.</li> <li>But let me just throw them out. Number one as</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	other measures of sophistication. The study set forth alternative approaches which could be considered to identify individuals who could qualify as accredited investors based on criteria other than income and net worth. As the staff and the Commission move forward in this area we think specific feedback on these measures would be helpful. So we would like run through each potential approach one at a time and briefly hear what you have to say about each of them. The first non-financial measure or proposal if you will is to permit individuals with a minimum with a minimum amount of investments to qualify as accredited investors. Investors may in some cases – investments may in some cases be more meaningful in terms of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>didn't we didn't provide much commentary relating to non-financial measures and, you know, before we finalize the recommendation I wanted to give everybody an opportunity to weigh in, you know, with respect to those suggestions to see if well, to see what your input might be.</li> <li>Just to throw them all out on the table, they're in the study, I'm sure you've all reviewed the study. I don't expect you to have committed the study to memory.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: There's a test later.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Yeah, there's a test later says Sara.</li> <li>But let me just throw them out. Number one as I said is to permit individuals with a minimum amount of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	other measures of sophistication. The study set forth alternative approaches which could be considered to identify individuals who could qualify as accredited investors based on criteria other than income and net worth. As the staff and the Commission move forward in this area we think specific feedback on these measures would be helpful. So we would like run through each potential approach one at a time and briefly hear what you have to say about each of them. The first non-financial measure or proposal if you will is to permit individuals with a minimum with a minimum amount of investments to qualify as accredited investors. Investors may in some cases investments may in some cases be more meaningful in terms of measuring an individual's experience and exposure than	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>didn't we didn't provide much commentary relating to non-financial measures and, you know, before we finalize the recommendation I wanted to give everybody an opportunity to weigh in, you know, with respect to those suggestions to see if well, to see what your input might be.</li> <li>Just to throw them all out on the table, they're in the study, I'm sure you've all reviewed the study. I don't expect you to have committed the study to memory.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: There's a test later.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Yeah, there's a test later says Sara.</li> <li>But let me just throw them out. Number one as I said is to permit individuals with a minimum amount of investments to qualify as accredited investors. And my</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	other measures of sophistication. The study set forth alternative approaches which could be considered to identify individuals who could qualify as accredited investors based on criteria other than income and net worth. As the staff and the Commission move forward in this area we think specific feedback on these measures would be helpful. So we would like run through each potential approach one at a time and briefly hear what you have to say about each of them. The first non-financial measure or proposal if you will is to permit individuals with a minimum with a minimum amount of investments to qualify as accredited investors. Investors may in some cases investments may in some cases be more meaningful in terms of measuring an individual's experience and exposure than the net worth test or the income test.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>didn't we didn't provide much commentary relating to non-financial measures and, you know, before we finalize the recommendation I wanted to give everybody an opportunity to weigh in, you know, with respect to those suggestions to see if well, to see what your input might be.</li> <li>Just to throw them all out on the table, they're in the study, I'm sure you've all reviewed the study. I don't expect you to have committed the study to memory.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: There's a test later.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Yeah, there's a test later says Sara.</li> <li>But let me just throw them out. Number one as I said is to permit individuals with a minimum amount of investments to qualify as accredited investors. And my own thought there is if you don't qualify as an</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	other measures of sophistication. The study set forth alternative approaches which could be considered to identify individuals who could qualify as accredited investors based on criteria other than income and net worth. As the staff and the Commission move forward in this area we think specific feedback on these measures would be helpful. So we would like run through each potential approach one at a time and briefly hear what you have to say about each of them. The first non-financial measure or proposal if you will is to permit individuals with a minimum with a minimum amount of investments to qualify as accredited investors. Investors may in some cases investments may in some cases be more meaningful in terms of measuring an individual's experience and exposure than the net worth test or the income test. Any thoughts on that? Patrick.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>didn't we didn't provide much commentary relating to non-financial measures and, you know, before we finalize the recommendation I wanted to give everybody an opportunity to weigh in, you know, with respect to those suggestions to see if well, to see what your input might be.</li> <li>Just to throw them all out on the table, they're in the study, I'm sure you've all reviewed the study. I don't expect you to have committed the study to memory.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: There's a test later.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Yeah, there's a test later says Sara.</li> <li>But let me just throw them out. Number one as I said is to permit individuals with a minimum amount of investments to qualify as accredited investors. And my own thought there is if you don't qualify as an accredited investor how did you make the investments in</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	other measures of sophistication. The study set forth alternative approaches which could be considered to identify individuals who could qualify as accredited investors based on criteria other than income and net worth. As the staff and the Commission move forward in this area we think specific feedback on these measures would be helpful. So we would like run through each potential approach one at a time and briefly hear what you have to say about each of them. The first non-financial measure or proposal if you will is to permit individuals with a minimum with a minimum amount of investments to qualify as accredited investors. Investors may in some cases investments may in some cases be more meaningful in terms of measuring an individual's experience and exposure than the net worth test or the income test. MR. REARDON: I'm not aware well, I agree	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>didn't we didn't provide much commentary relating to non-financial measures and, you know, before we finalize the recommendation I wanted to give everybody an opportunity to weigh in, you know, with respect to those suggestions to see if well, to see what your input might be.</li> <li>Just to throw them all out on the table, they're in the study, I'm sure you've all reviewed the study. I don't expect you to have committed the study to memory.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: There's a test later.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Yeah, there's a test later says Sara.</li> <li>But let me just throw them out. Number one as I said is to permit individuals with a minimum amount of investments to qualify as accredited investors. And my own thought there is if you don't qualify as an accredited investor how did you make the investments in the first place, but that's something that maybe someone</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	other measures of sophistication. The study set forth alternative approaches which could be considered to identify individuals who could qualify as accredited investors based on criteria other than income and net worth. As the staff and the Commission move forward in this area we think specific feedback on these measures would be helpful. So we would like run through each potential approach one at a time and briefly hear what you have to say about each of them. The first non-financial measure or proposal if you will is to permit individuals with a minimum with a minimum amount of investments to qualify as accredited investors. Investors may in some cases investments may in some cases be more meaningful in terms of measuring an individual's experience and exposure than the net worth test or the income test. MR. REARDON: I'm not aware well, I agree with your conclusion that we have here that we don't need	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>didn't we didn't provide much commentary relating to non-financial measures and, you know, before we finalize the recommendation I wanted to give everybody an opportunity to weigh in, you know, with respect to those suggestions to see if well, to see what your input might be.</li> <li>Just to throw them all out on the table, they're in the study, I'm sure you've all reviewed the study. I don't expect you to have committed the study to memory.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: There's a test later.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Yeah, there's a test later says Sara.</li> <li>But let me just throw them out. Number one as I said is to permit individuals with a minimum amount of investments to qualify as accredited investors. And my own thought there is if you don't qualify as an accredited investor how did you make the investments in</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	other measures of sophistication. The study set forth alternative approaches which could be considered to identify individuals who could qualify as accredited investors based on criteria other than income and net worth. As the staff and the Commission move forward in this area we think specific feedback on these measures would be helpful. So we would like run through each potential approach one at a time and briefly hear what you have to say about each of them. The first non-financial measure or proposal if you will is to permit individuals with a minimum with a minimum amount of investments to qualify as accredited investors. Investors may in some cases investments may in some cases be more meaningful in terms of measuring an individual's experience and exposure than the net worth test or the income test. MR. REARDON: I'm not aware well, I agree with your conclusion that we have here that we don't need to fix the definition, it's not broken. But knowing that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>didn't we didn't provide much commentary relating to non-financial measures and, you know, before we finalize the recommendation I wanted to give everybody an opportunity to weigh in, you know, with respect to those suggestions to see if well, to see what your input might be.</li> <li>Just to throw them all out on the table, they're in the study, I'm sure you've all reviewed the study. I don't expect you to have committed the study to memory.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: There's a test later.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Yeah, there's a test later says Sara.</li> <li>But let me just throw them out. Number one as I said is to permit individuals with a minimum amount of investments to qualify as accredited investors. And my own thought there is if you don't qualify as an accredited investor how did you make the investments in the first place, but that's something that maybe someone can enlighten me on.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	other measures of sophistication. The study set forth alternative approaches which could be considered to identify individuals who could qualify as accredited investors based on criteria other than income and net worth. As the staff and the Commission move forward in this area we think specific feedback on these measures would be helpful. So we would like run through each potential approach one at a time and briefly hear what you have to say about each of them. The first non-financial measure or proposal if you will is to permit individuals with a minimum with a minimum amount of investments to qualify as accredited investors. Investors may in some cases investments may in some cases be more meaningful in terms of measuring an individual's experience and exposure than the net worth test or the income test. MR. REARDON: I'm not aware well, I agree with your conclusion that we have here that we don't need to fix the definition, it's not broken. But knowing that once you ask if something should be changed there's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>didn't we didn't provide much commentary relating to non-financial measures and, you know, before we finalize the recommendation I wanted to give everybody an opportunity to weigh in, you know, with respect to those suggestions to see if well, to see what your input might be.</li> <li>Just to throw them all out on the table, they're in the study, I'm sure you've all reviewed the study. I don't expect you to have committed the study to memory.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: There's a test later.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Yeah, there's a test later says sara.</li> <li>But let me just throw them out. Number one as I said is to permit individuals with a minimum amount of investments to qualify as accredited investors. And my own thought there is if you don't qualify as an accredited investor how did you make the investments in the first place, but that's something that maybe someone can enlighten me on.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	other measures of sophistication. The study set forth alternative approaches which could be considered to identify individuals who could qualify as accredited investors based on criteria other than income and net worth. As the staff and the Commission move forward in this area we think specific feedback on these measures would be helpful. So we would like run through each potential approach one at a time and briefly hear what you have to say about each of them. The first non-financial measure or proposal if you will is to permit individuals with a minimum with a minimum amount of investments to qualify as accredited investors. Investors may in some cases investments may in some cases be more meaningful in terms of measuring an individual's experience and exposure than the net worth test or the income test. MR. REARDON: I'm not aware well, I agree with your conclusion that we have here that we don't need to fix the definition, it's not broken. But knowing that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>didn't we didn't provide much commentary relating to non-financial measures and, you know, before we finalize the recommendation I wanted to give everybody an opportunity to weigh in, you know, with respect to those suggestions to see if well, to see what your input might be.</li> <li>Just to throw them all out on the table, they're in the study, I'm sure you've all reviewed the study. I don't expect you to have committed the study to memory.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: There's a test later.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Yeah, there's a test later says Sara.</li> <li>But let me just throw them out. Number one as I said is to permit individuals with a minimum amount of investments to qualify as accredited investors. And my own thought there is if you don't qualify as an accredited investor how did you make the investments in the first place, but that's something that maybe someone can enlighten me on.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	other measures of sophistication. The study set forth alternative approaches which could be considered to identify individuals who could qualify as accredited investors based on criteria other than income and net worth. As the staff and the Commission move forward in this area we think specific feedback on these measures would be helpful. So we would like run through each potential approach one at a time and briefly hear what you have to say about each of them. The first non-financial measure or proposal if you will is to permit individuals with a minimum with a minimum amount of investments to qualify as accredited investors. Investors may in some cases - investments may in some cases be more meaningful in terms of measuring an individual's experience and exposure than the net worth test or the income test. MR. REARDON: I'm not aware well, I agree with your conclusion that we have here that we don't need to fix the definition, it's not broken. But knowing that once you ask if something should be changed there's sometimes pressure to go ahead and make change.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>didn't we didn't provide much commentary relating to non-financial measures and, you know, before we finalize the recommendation I wanted to give everybody an opportunity to weigh in, you know, with respect to those suggestions to see if well, to see what your input might be.</li> <li>Just to throw them all out on the table, they're in the study, I'm sure you've all reviewed the study. I don't expect you to have committed the study to memory.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: There's a test later.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Yeah, there's a test later says Sara.</li> <li>But let me just throw them out. Number one as I said is to permit individuals with a minimum amount of investments to qualify as accredited investors. And my own thought there is if you don't qualify as an accredited investor how did you make the investments in the first place, but that's something that maybe someone can enlighten me on.</li> <li>Then number two, permit individuals with certain professional credentials to qualify as accredited investors, for example those who pass Series 7, Series 65</li> </ul>

	Page 18		Page 20
1	be accredited. As a member of the bar I'm not sure if	1	example they retire and they no longer have the income
2	that's a good idea.	2	that would have allowed them to qualify, then because of
3	Number three is permit individuals with	3	the fact that they already had that experience in
4	experience investing in exempt offerings to qualify as	4	previous investments the idea is that experience might
5	accredited investors. And again how did you get this	5	have given them the tools to understand what they need to
6	experience if you if they're already screened out.	6	look for in future investments.
7	Again if somebody can maybe explain that to me.	7	So the staff didn't call that a grandfathering
8	Number four, permit knowledgeable employees of	8	rule, but I can see how it could be something if you
9	private funds to qualify as accredited investors for	9	previously qualified and you got to the investments but
10	investments in their employer's funds.	10	you no longer qualify.
11	And number five is to permit individuals who	11	MS. MOTT: Now I understand. Thank you.
12	pass an accredited investor examination to qualify, which	12	That's good.
13	I find attractive. I think the idea of just having,	13	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm not sure if I understand,
14	coming up with a test that you either pass or fail that's	14	Sebastian
15	that has there's simplicity, there's certainty,	15	MS. MOTT: thank you for the clarification.
16	that has some appeal to me.	16	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: because you're saying that
17	So any comments? Catherine.	17	if you qualified before but then you lost all your money
18	MS. MOTT: Obviously this is a topic near and	18	because you did such a bad job investing and you no
19	dear to my heart. So Stephen, when I looked at the	19	longer qualify, as long as there were ten bad investments
20	numbers here my reactions were very similar to yours.	20	you
21	With the minimum amount of investment I just thought	21	MR. GOMEZ: It could have been that you
22	about my colleagues, the group of people that are in our	22	invested it all in artwork and you just had a bad choice
23	investor group in Pittsburgh, is that they likely do have	23	of art.
24	investments. It's something that if they qualify	24	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay.
25	according to the minimum standards of a net worth of a	25	CO-CHAIR HANKS: You just haven't had an exit
	-	<u> </u>	
	Page 19		
	5		Page 21
1	million or they have \$200,000 revenue they tend to be	1	yet.
2	million or they have \$200,000 revenue they tend to be sophisticated enough to have these investments anyway.	2	yet. MS. MOTT: Well, regarding the exam, I think
2 3	million or they have \$200,000 revenue they tend to be sophisticated enough to have these investments anyway. Professional credentials, to me it really does	2 3	yet. MS. MOTT: Well, regarding the exam, I think there would be some pushback from the industry itself on
2 3 4	million or they have \$200,000 revenue they tend to be sophisticated enough to have these investments anyway. Professional credentials, to me it really does make sense to include anyone if you're a Series 7, Series	2 3 4	yet. MS. MOTT: Well, regarding the exam, I think there would be some pushback from the industry itself on an exam. But on the other hand I think that if it was
2 3 4 5	million or they have \$200,000 revenue they tend to be sophisticated enough to have these investments anyway. Professional credentials, to me it really does make sense to include anyone if you're a Series 7, Series 63. I mean, you certainly if you pass that test	2 3 4 5	yet. MS. MOTT: Well, regarding the exam, I think there would be some pushback from the industry itself on an exam. But on the other hand I think that if it was clarified managed, accessible, whatever, I think an exam
2 3 4 5 6	million or they have \$200,000 revenue they tend to be sophisticated enough to have these investments anyway. Professional credentials, to me it really does make sense to include anyone if you're a Series 7, Series 63. I mean, you certainly if you pass that test and I've taken that test, so I know. I mean, it	2 3 4 5 6	yet. MS. MOTT: Well, regarding the exam, I think there would be some pushback from the industry itself on an exam. But on the other hand I think that if it was clarified managed, accessible, whatever, I think an exam might make sense.
2 3 4 5 6 7	million or they have \$200,000 revenue they tend to be sophisticated enough to have these investments anyway. Professional credentials, to me it really does make sense to include anyone if you're a Series 7, Series 63. I mean, you certainly if you pass that test and I've taken that test, so I know. I mean, it certainly would make sense.	2 3 4 5 6 7	yet. MS. MOTT: Well, regarding the exam, I think there would be some pushback from the industry itself on an exam. But on the other hand I think that if it was clarified managed, accessible, whatever, I think an exam might make sense. CO-CHAIR HANKS: It would be always be in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>million or they have \$200,000 revenue they tend to be sophisticated enough to have these investments anyway.</li> <li>Professional credentials, to me it really does make sense to include anyone if you're a Series 7, Series 63. I mean, you certainly if you pass that test and I've taken that test, so I know. I mean, it certainly would make sense.</li> <li>Experience. When I was reading this I actually</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	yet. MS. MOTT: Well, regarding the exam, I think there would be some pushback from the industry itself on an exam. But on the other hand I think that if it was clarified managed, accessible, whatever, I think an exam might make sense. CO-CHAIR HANKS: It would be always be in addition to.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>million or they have \$200,000 revenue they tend to be sophisticated enough to have these investments anyway.</li> <li>Professional credentials, to me it really does make sense to include anyone if you're a Series 7, Series 63. I mean, you certainly if you pass that test and I've taken that test, so I know. I mean, it certainly would make sense.</li> <li>Experience. When I was reading this I actually wrote a question down. I actually said does that mean we</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	yet. MS. MOTT: Well, regarding the exam, I think there would be some pushback from the industry itself on an exam. But on the other hand I think that if it was clarified managed, accessible, whatever, I think an exam might make sense. CO-CHAIR HANKS: It would be always be in addition to. MS. MOTT: Yes, right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>million or they have \$200,000 revenue they tend to be sophisticated enough to have these investments anyway. Professional credentials, to me it really does make sense to include anyone if you're a Series 7, Series 63. I mean, you certainly if you pass that test and I've taken that test, so I know. I mean, it certainly would make sense.</li> <li>Experience. When I was reading this I actually wrote a question down. I actually said does that mean we does this is this a grandfathering clause, you</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	yet. MS. MOTT: Well, regarding the exam, I think there would be some pushback from the industry itself on an exam. But on the other hand I think that if it was clarified managed, accessible, whatever, I think an exam might make sense. CO-CHAIR HANKS: It would be always be in addition to. MS. MOTT: Yes, right. CO-CHAIR HANKS: I think you know, we have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	million or they have \$200,000 revenue they tend to be sophisticated enough to have these investments anyway. Professional credentials, to me it really does make sense to include anyone if you're a Series 7, Series 63. I mean, you certainly if you pass that test and I've taken that test, so I know. I mean, it certainly would make sense. Experience. When I was reading this I actually wrote a question down. I actually said does that mean we does this is this a grandfathering clause, you know, instead of you know, I don't see how you get the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	yet. MS. MOTT: Well, regarding the exam, I think there would be some pushback from the industry itself on an exam. But on the other hand I think that if it was clarified managed, accessible, whatever, I think an exam might make sense. CO-CHAIR HANKS: I twould be always be in addition to. MS. MOTT: Yes, right. CO-CHAIR HANKS: I think you know, we have to be very clear that we are not talking about changing -
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	million or they have \$200,000 revenue they tend to be sophisticated enough to have these investments anyway. Professional credentials, to me it really does make sense to include anyone if you're a Series 7, Series 63. I mean, you certainly if you pass that test and I've taken that test, so I know. I mean, it certainly would make sense. Experience. When I was reading this I actually wrote a question down. I actually said does that mean we does this is this a grandfathering clause, you know, instead of you know, I don't see how you get the experience if you can't qualify you can't get the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	yet. MS. MOTT: Well, regarding the exam, I think there would be some pushback from the industry itself on an exam. But on the other hand I think that if it was clarified managed, accessible, whatever, I think an exam might make sense. CO-CHAIR HANKS: It would be always be in addition to. MS. MOTT: Yes, right. CO-CHAIR HANKS: I think you know, we have to be very clear that we are not talking about changing - - this is accretive as opposed to substituting.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	million or they have \$200,000 revenue they tend to be sophisticated enough to have these investments anyway. Professional credentials, to me it really does make sense to include anyone if you're a Series 7, Series 63. I mean, you certainly if you pass that test and I've taken that test, so I know. I mean, it certainly would make sense. Experience. When I was reading this I actually wrote a question down. I actually said does that mean we does this is this a grandfathering clause, you know, instead of you know, I don't see how you get the experience if you can't qualify you can't get the experience. So you have to qualify to get the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	yet. MS. MOTT: Well, regarding the exam, I think there would be some pushback from the industry itself on an exam. But on the other hand I think that if it was clarified managed, accessible, whatever, I think an exam might make sense. CO-CHAIR HANKS: It would be always be in addition to. MS. MOTT: Yes, right. CO-CHAIR HANKS: I think you know, we have to be very clear that we are not talking about changing - - this is accretive as opposed to substituting. MS. MOTT: Yes, I think that's a good point.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	million or they have \$200,000 revenue they tend to be sophisticated enough to have these investments anyway. Professional credentials, to me it really does make sense to include anyone if you're a Series 7, Series 63. I mean, you certainly if you pass that test and I've taken that test, so I know. I mean, it certainly would make sense. Experience. When I was reading this I actually wrote a question down. I actually said does that mean we does this is this a grandfathering clause, you know, instead of you know, I don't see how you get the experience if you can't qualify you can't get the experience. So you have to qualify to get the experience. So I was a little confused about that so I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	yet. MS. MOTT: Well, regarding the exam, I think there would be some pushback from the industry itself on an exam. But on the other hand I think that if it was clarified managed, accessible, whatever, I think an exam might make sense. CO-CHAIR HANKS: It would be always be in addition to. MS. MOTT: Yes, right. CO-CHAIR HANKS: I think you know, we have to be very clear that we are not talking about changing - - this is accretive as opposed to substituting. MS. MOTT: Yes, I think that's a good point. Yeah, thank you. And then finally my thoughts on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	million or they have \$200,000 revenue they tend to be sophisticated enough to have these investments anyway. Professional credentials, to me it really does make sense to include anyone if you're a Series 7, Series 63. I mean, you certainly if you pass that test and I've taken that test, so I know. I mean, it certainly would make sense. Experience. When I was reading this I actually wrote a question down. I actually said does that mean we does this is this a grandfathering clause, you know, instead of you know, I don't see how you get the experience. So you have to qualify to get the experience. So I was a little confused about that so I wrote down the question grandfathering. Is that is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	yet. MS. MOTT: Well, regarding the exam, I think there would be some pushback from the industry itself on an exam. But on the other hand I think that if it was clarified managed, accessible, whatever, I think an exam might make sense. CO-CHAIR HANKS: It would be always be in addition to. MS. MOTT: Yes, right. CO-CHAIR HANKS: I think you know, we have to be very clear that we are not talking about changing - - this is accretive as opposed to substituting. MS. MOTT: Yes, I think that's a good point. Yeah, thank you. And then finally my thoughts on experience, whether lawyers so you have your CPA, MBA,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	million or they have \$200,000 revenue they tend to be sophisticated enough to have these investments anyway. Professional credentials, to me it really does make sense to include anyone if you're a Series 7, Series 63. I mean, you certainly if you pass that test and I've taken that test, so I know. I mean, it certainly would make sense. Experience. When I was reading this I actually wrote a question down. I actually said does that mean we does this is this a grandfathering clause, you know, instead of you know, I don't see how you get the experience if you can't qualify you can't get the experience. So I was a little confused about that so I wrote down the question grandfathering. Is that is that what we mean by this? I guess let me go, jump to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	yet. MS. MOTT: Well, regarding the exam, I think there would be some pushback from the industry itself on an exam. But on the other hand I think that if it was clarified managed, accessible, whatever, I think an exam might make sense. CO-CHAIR HANKS: It would be always be in addition to. MS. MOTT: Yes, right. CO-CHAIR HANKS: I think you know, we have to be very clear that we are not talking about changing - - this is accretive as opposed to substituting. MS. MOTT: Yes, I think that's a good point. Yeah, thank you. And then finally my thoughts on experience, whether lawyers so you have your CPA, MBA, whatever, again I looked at the I looked to our group,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	million or they have \$200,000 revenue they tend to be sophisticated enough to have these investments anyway. Professional credentials, to me it really does make sense to include anyone if you're a Series 7, Series 63. I mean, you certainly if you pass that test and I've taken that test, so I know. I mean, it certainly would make sense. Experience. When I was reading this I actually wrote a question down. I actually said does that mean we does this is this a grandfathering clause, you know, instead of you know, I don't see how you get the experience if you can't qualify you can't get the experience. So you have to qualify to get the experience. So I was a little confused about that so I wrote down the question grandfathering. Is that is that what we mean by this? I guess let me go, jump to the last	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	yet. MS. MOTT: Well, regarding the exam, I think there would be some pushback from the industry itself on an exam. But on the other hand I think that if it was clarified managed, accessible, whatever, I think an exam might make sense. CO-CHAIR HANKS: It would be always be in addition to. MS. MOTT: Yes, right. CO-CHAIR HANKS: I think you know, we have to be very clear that we are not talking about changing - - this is accretive as opposed to substituting. MS. MOTT: Yes, I think that's a good point. Yeah, thank you. And then finally my thoughts on experience, whether lawyers so you have your CPA, MBA, whatever, again I looked at the I looked to our group, I looked at my colleagues across the country, most of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>million or they have \$200,000 revenue they tend to be sophisticated enough to have these investments anyway.</li> <li>Professional credentials, to me it really does make sense to include anyone if you're a Series 7, Series 63. I mean, you certainly if you pass that test and I've taken that test, so I know. I mean, it certainly would make sense.</li> <li>Experience. When I was reading this I actually wrote a question down. I actually said does that mean we does this is this a grandfathering clause, you know, instead of you know, I don't see how you get the experience if you can't qualify you can't get the experience. So J was a little confused about that so I wrote down the question grandfathering. Is that is that what we mean by this? I guess let me go, jump to the last</li> <li>MR. GOMEZ: Catherine, if</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	yet. MS. MOTT: Well, regarding the exam, I think there would be some pushback from the industry itself on an exam. But on the other hand I think that if it was clarified managed, accessible, whatever, I think an exam might make sense. CO-CHAIR HANKS: It would be always be in addition to. MS. MOTT: Yes, right. CO-CHAIR HANKS: I think you know, we have to be very clear that we are not talking about changing - - this is accretive as opposed to substituting. MS. MOTT: Yes, I think that's a good point. Yeah, thank you. And then finally my thoughts on experience, whether lawyers so you have your CPA, MBA, whatever, again I looked at the I looked to our group,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>million or they have \$200,000 revenue they tend to be sophisticated enough to have these investments anyway. Professional credentials, to me it really does make sense to include anyone if you're a Series 7, Series 63. I mean, you certainly – if you pass that test – and I've taken that test, so I know. I mean, it certainly would make sense.</li> <li>Experience. When I was reading this I actually wrote a question down. I actually said does that mean we – does this – is this a grandfathering clause, you know, instead of – you know, I don't see how you get the experience. So you have to qualify to get the experience. So I was a little confused about that so I wrote down the question grandfathering. Is that – is that what we mean by this? I guess let me go, jump to the last –.</li> <li>MR. GOMEZ: Catherine, if – MS. MOTT: – jump to the last one.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	yet. MS. MOTT: Well, regarding the exam, I think there would be some pushback from the industry itself on an exam. But on the other hand I think that if it was clarified managed, accessible, whatever, I think an exam might make sense. CO-CHAIR HANKS: It would be always be in addition to. MS. MOTT: Yes, right. CO-CHAIR HANKS: I think you know, we have to be very clear that we are not talking about changing - - this is accretive as opposed to substituting. MS. MOTT: Yes, I think that's a good point. Yeah, thank you. And then finally my thoughts on experience, whether lawyers so you have your CPA, MBA, whatever, again I looked at the I looked to our group, I looked at my colleagues across the country, most of them tend to be educated, have some sort of degree, tend to fall in that category unless it's simply they got
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>million or they have \$200,000 revenue they tend to be sophisticated enough to have these investments anyway.</li> <li>Professional credentials, to me it really does make sense to include anyone if you're a Series 7, Series 63. I mean, you certainly if you pass that test and I've taken that test, so I know. I mean, it certainly would make sense.</li> <li>Experience. When I was reading this I actually wrote a question down. I actually said does that mean we does this is this a grandfathering clause, you know, instead of you know, I don't see how you get the experience if you can't qualify you can't get the experience. So J was a little confused about that so I wrote down the question grandfathering. Is that is that what we mean by this? I guess let me go, jump to the last</li> <li>MR. GOMEZ: Catherine, if</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	yet. MS. MOTT: Well, regarding the exam, I think there would be some pushback from the industry itself on an exam. But on the other hand I think that if it was clarified managed, accessible, whatever, I think an exam might make sense. CO-CHAIR HANKS: It would be always be in addition to. MS. MOTT: Yes, right. CO-CHAIR HANKS: I think you know, we have to be very clear that we are not talking about changing - - this is accretive as opposed to substituting. MS. MOTT: Yes, I think that's a good point. Yeah, thank you. And then finally my thoughts on experience, whether lawyers so you have your CPA, MBA, whatever, again I looked at the I looked to our group, I looked at my colleagues across the country, most of them tend to be educated, have some sort of degree, tend
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>million or they have \$200,000 revenue they tend to be sophisticated enough to have these investments anyway.</li> <li>Professional credentials, to me it really does make sense to include anyone if you're a Series 7, Series 63. I mean, you certainly if you pass that test and I've taken that test, so I know. I mean, it certainly would make sense.</li> <li>Experience. When I was reading this I actually wrote a question down. I actually said does that mean we does this is this a grandfathering clause, you know, instead of you know, I don't see how you get the experience. So you have to qualify to get the experience. So I was a little confused about that so I wrote down the question grandfathering. Is that is that what we mean by this? I guess let me go, jump to the last MR. GOMEZ: Catherine, if MS. MOTT: jump to the last one.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	yet. MS. MOTT: Well, regarding the exam, I think there would be some pushback from the industry itself on an exam. But on the other hand I think that if it was clarified managed, accessible, whatever, I think an exam might make sense. CO-CHAIR HANKS: It would be always be in addition to. MS. MOTT: Yes, right. CO-CHAIR HANKS: I think you know, we have to be very clear that we are not talking about changing - - this is accretive as opposed to substituting. MS. MOTT: Yes, I think that's a good point. Yeah, thank you. And then finally my thoughts on experience, whether lawyers so you have your CPA, MBA, whatever, again I looked at the I looked to our group, I looked at my colleagues across the country, most of them tend to be educated, have some sort of degree, tend to fall in that category unless it's simply they got lucky and inherited money or got it made it big on one
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>million or they have \$200,000 revenue they tend to be sophisticated enough to have these investments anyway.</li> <li>Professional credentials, to me it really does make sense to include anyone if you're a Series 7, Series 63. I mean, you certainly – if you pass that test and I've taken that test, so I know. I mean, it certainly would make sense.</li> <li>Experience. When I was reading this I actually wrote a question down. I actually said does that mean we does this is this a grandfathering clause, you know, instead of you know, I don't see how you get the experience. So you have to qualify to get the experience. So I was a little confused about that so I wrote down the question grandfathering. Is that is that what we mean by this? I guess let me go, jump to the last MR. GOMEZ: Catherine, if MS. MOTT: jump to the last one.</li> <li>MR. GOMEZ: This is Sebastian, if I may just to jump in on that one.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	yet. MS. MOTT: Well, regarding the exam, I think there would be some pushback from the industry itself on an exam. But on the other hand I think that if it was clarified managed, accessible, whatever, I think an exam might make sense. CO-CHAIR HANKS: It would be always be in addition to. MS. MOTT: Yes, right. CO-CHAIR HANKS: I think you know, we have to be very clear that we are not talking about changing - - this is accretive as opposed to substituting. MS. MOTT: Yes, I think that's a good point. Yeah, thank you. And then finally my thoughts on experience, whether lawyers so you have your CPA, MBA, whatever, again I looked at the I looked to our group, I looked at my colleagues across the country, most of them tend to be educated, have some sort of degree, tend to fall in that category unless it's simply they got lucky and inherited money or got it made it big on one investment, something like that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>million or they have \$200,000 revenue they tend to be sophisticated enough to have these investments anyway.</li> <li>Professional credentials, to me it really does make sense to include anyone if you're a Series 7, Series 63. I mean, you certainly – if you pass that test – and I've taken that test, so I know. I mean, it certainly would make sense.</li> <li>Experience. When I was reading this I actually wrote a question down. I actually said does that mean we – does this – is this a grandfathering clause, you know, instead of –- you know, I don't see how you get the experience. So you have to qualify to get the experience. So I was a little confused about that so I wrote down the question grandfathering. Is that –- is that what we mean by this? I guess let me go, jump to the last –- MR. GOMEZ: Catherine, if –- MS. MOTT: –- jump to the last one.</li> <li>MR. GOMEZ: This is Sebastian, if I may just to jump in on that one.</li> <li>MS. MOTT: Okay.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	yet. MS. MOTT: Well, regarding the exam, I think there would be some pushback from the industry itself on an exam. But on the other hand I think that if it was clarified managed, accessible, whatever, I think an exam night make sense. CO-CHAIR HANKS: It would be always be in addition to. MS. MOTT: Yes, right. CO-CHAIR HANKS: I think you know, we have to be very clear that we are not talking about changing - this is accretive as opposed to substituting. MS. MOTT: Yes, I think that's a good point. Yeah, thank you. And then finally my thoughts on experience, whether lawyers so you have your CPA, MBA, whatever, again I looked at the I looked to our group, I looked at my colleagues across the country, most of them tend to be educated, have some sort of degree, tend to fall in that category unless it's simply they got lucky and inherited money or got it made it big on one investment, something like that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>million or they have \$200,000 revenue they tend to be sophisticated enough to have these investments anyway. Professional credentials, to me it really does make sense to include anyone if you're a Series 7, Series 63. I mean, you certainly if you pass that test and I've taken that test, so I know. I mean, it certainly would make sense.</li> <li>Experience. When I was reading this I actually wrote a question down. I actually said does that mean we does this is this a grandfathering clause, you know, instead of you know, I don't see how you get the experience if you can't qualify you can't get the experience. So you have to qualify to get the experience. So I was a little confused about that so I wrote down the question grandfathering. Is that is that what we mean by this? I guess let me go, jump to the last MR. GOMEZ: Catherine, if MS. MOTT: jump to the last one. MR. GOMEZ: This is Sebastian, if I may just to jump in on that one.</li> <li>MR. GOMEZ: What the staff was thinking is a</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	yet. MS. MOTT: Well, regarding the exam, I think there would be some pushback from the industry itself on an exam. But on the other hand I think that if it was clarified managed, accessible, whatever, I think an exam might make sense. CO-CHAIR HANKS: It would be always be in addition to. MS. MOTT: Yes, right. CO-CHAIR HANKS: I think you know, we have to be very clear that we are not talking about changing - this is accretive as opposed to substituting. MS. MOTT: Yes, I think that's a good point. Yeah, thank you. And then finally my thoughts on experience, whether lawyers so you have your CPA, MBA, whatever, again I looked at the I looked to our group, I looked at my colleagues across the country, most of them tend to be educated, have some sort of degree, tend to fall in that category unless it's simply they got lucky and inherited money or got it made it big on one investment, something like that. But for the most part people, you know, that are doing this are already qualified according to the net

Page	24
------	----

	Page 22		Page 24
1	So the only comment I would make is that when I	1	I would assume that people have gained
2	look at everything that we're going to talk about today,	2	experience hey, Greg gained experience investing
3	including this, is that the more complex something is	3	maybe through interstate exemptions or 506 offerings
4	made, the more expensive it is made, there's always going	4	where you're one of the 35 non-accredited, or maybe a
5	to be resistance in the market and you're going to reduce	5	504. So there are other options out there for people to
6	the amount of qualified individuals who could potentially	6	have made investments in the private space.
7	participate in investing in particularly, you know, this	7	So I like that idea, if you have investment
8	asset class.	8	experience in the private space to translate that into
9	So my concerns are about for instance if we	9	another option to meet the accredited investor
10	include the minimum investment amount is there going to	10	definition. I'm all for that.
11	be now a procedure by which you will have to report your	11	The exam idea, we were thinking about that when
12	I mean, have your CPA, you know, verify or your stock	12	I was at Second Market many moons ago and we were trying
13	advisor to verify that you are now we're going back to	13	to figure out who would write the exam, who would police
14	that verification versus self-certification, and then	14	the exam, who would, you know, give the exam. And we
15	we're talking about cost, and complexity, and resistance	15	kept saying it's probably going to be FINRA. So if FINRA
16	and, you know, because that was really what was holding,	16	doesn't hate the idea then I support that idea as well.
17	you know, because that was really what was housing, you know, the investors back between with, if I remember	17	I've taken the Series 7 as well. It's terrible, but if
18	right, we were talking about 506(b) and (c).	18	you study and you have a little finance expertise then
19	So when I think about the market and how it reacts,	19	you pass. So I like the idea of the exam as well.
20	I think it's just important for us to continue to keep it	20	So again my suggestion would be support
20	simple in order to avoid resistance in the marketplace	20	anything that addresses options, doesn't take away from
21	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	22	the pool that already is able to invest, and just creates
22	and impact entrepreneurs, and particularly in this asset	23	more money out there for angel networks and companies to
23 24	class. This is the first place they come besides	23	access capital. Because that's really going to I
24 25	incubators. If they don't make it through here they don't make it to venture capital.	24	think it's going to be a huge help to private companies
20	don't make it to venture capital.	2.5	think it's going to be a huge help to private companies
	Page 23		Page 25
1	Page 23	1	Page 25
1	So if we if we decrease the number if we	1	if there's additional access to capital.
2	So if we if we decrease the number if we decrease this here it will have impact on future rounds	2	if there's additional access to capital. CO-CHAIR HANKS: Annemarie, if we were to
2 3	So if we if we decrease the number if we decrease this here it will have impact on future rounds and other I guess and the opportunity in particular	2 3	if there's additional access to capital. CO-CHAIR HANKS: Annemarie, if we were to include a minimum number of investments as a test is
2 3 4	So if we if we decrease the number if we decrease this here it will have impact on future rounds and other I guess and the opportunity in particular for high growth companies like, you know, I think they've	2 3 4	if there's additional access to capital. CO-CHAIR HANKS: Annemarie, if we were to include a minimum number of investments as a test is there a number, is it a dollar number, a number of
2 3 4 5	So if we if we decrease the number if we decrease this here it will have impact on future rounds and other I guess and the opportunity in particular for high growth companies like, you know, I think they've been termed by, as gazelles in the industry, anything	2 3 4 5	if there's additional access to capital. CO-CHAIR HANKS: Annemarie, if we were to include a minimum number of investments as a test is there a number, is it a dollar number, a number of investments?
2 3 4 5 6	So if we if we decrease the number if we decrease this here it will have impact on future rounds and other I guess and the opportunity in particular for high growth companies like, you know, I think they've been termed by, as gazelles in the industry, anything that's fast growing. I mean, I'm just worried about	2 3 4 5 6	if there's additional access to capital. CO-CHAIR HANKS: Annemarie, if we were to include a minimum number of investments as a test is there a number, is it a dollar number, a number of investments? MS. TIERNEY: I don't know the answer to that,
2 3 4 5 6 7	So if we if we decrease the number if we decrease this here it will have impact on future rounds and other I guess and the opportunity in particular for high growth companies like, you know, I think they've been termed by, as gazelles in the industry, anything that's fast growing. I mean, I'm just worried about impacting the marketplace, so as long as we keep it	2 3 4 5 6 7	if there's additional access to capital. CO-CHAIR HANKS: Annemarie, if we were to include a minimum number of investments as a test is there a number, is it a dollar number, a number of investments? MS. TIERNEY: I don't know the answer to that, Sara. I have the idea of its you have blanket
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	So if we if we decrease the number if we decrease this here it will have impact on future rounds and other I guess and the opportunity in particular for high growth companies like, you know, I think they've been termed by, as gazelles in the industry, anything that's fast growing. I mean, I'm just worried about impacting the marketplace, so as long as we keep it simple and not make it complicated.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	if there's additional access to capital. CO-CHAIR HANKS: Annemarie, if we were to include a minimum number of investments as a test is there a number, is it a dollar number, a number of investments? MS. TIERNEY: I don't know the answer to that, Sara. I have the idea of its you have blanket investments, because I would have a sense that people
2 3 5 6 7 8 9	So if we if we decrease the number if we decrease this here it will have impact on future rounds and other I guess and the opportunity in particular for high growth companies like, you know, I think they've been termed by, as gazelles in the industry, anything that's fast growing. I mean, I'm just worried about impacting the marketplace, so as long as we keep it simple and not make it complicated. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Catherine.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	if there's additional access to capital. CO-CHAIR HANKS: Annemarie, if we were to include a minimum number of investments as a test is there a number, is it a dollar number, a number of investments? MS. TIERNEY: I don't know the answer to that, Sara. I have the idea of its you have blanket investments, because I would have a sense that people would want that number to be fairly high. And maybe
2 3 5 6 7 8 9	So if we if we decrease the number if we decrease this here it will have impact on future rounds and other I guess and the opportunity in particular for high growth companies like, you know, I think they've been termed by, as gazelles in the industry, anything that's fast growing. I mean, I'm just worried about impacting the marketplace, so as long as we keep it simple and not make it complicated. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Catherine. Annemarie.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	if there's additional access to capital. CO-CHAIR HANKS: Annemarie, if we were to include a minimum number of investments as a test is there a number, is it a dollar number, a number of investments? MS. TIERNEY: I don't know the answer to that, Sara. I have the idea of its you have blanket investments, because I would have a sense that people would want that number to be fairly high. And maybe that's not going to be the case, maybe it's a number of
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	So if we if we decrease the number if we decrease this here it will have impact on future rounds and other I guess and the opportunity in particular for high growth companies like, you know, I think they've been termed by, as gazelles in the industry, anything that's fast growing. I mean, I'm just worried about impacting the marketplace, so as long as we keep it simple and not make it complicated. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Catherine. Annemarie. MS. TIERNEY: I like the idea that I think you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	if there's additional access to capital. CO-CHAIR HANKS: Annemarie, if we were to include a minimum number of investments as a test is there a number, is it a dollar number, a number of investments? MS. TIERNEY: I don't know the answer to that, Sara. I have the idea of its you have blanket investments, because I would have a sense that people would want that number to be fairly high. And maybe that's not going to be the case, maybe it's a number of investments. But I don't know what the I don't have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	So if we if we decrease the number if we decrease this here it will have impact on future rounds and other I guess and the opportunity in particular for high growth companies like, you know, I think they've been termed by, as gazelles in the industry, anything that's fast growing. I mean, I'm just worried about impacting the marketplace, so as long as we keep it simple and not make it complicated. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Catherine. Annemarie. MS. TIERNEY: I like the idea that I think you expressed of like do no harm, right. So we know from the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	if there's additional access to capital. CO-CHAIR HANKS: Annemarie, if we were to include a minimum number of investments as a test is there a number, is it a dollar number, a number of investments? MS. TIERNEY: I don't know the answer to that, Sara. I have the idea of its you have blanket investments, because I would have a sense that people would want that number to be fairly high. And maybe that's not going to be the case, maybe it's a number of investments. But I don't know what the I don't have an idea in my head of what would be comfortable.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	So if we if we decrease the number if we decrease this here it will have impact on future rounds and other I guess and the opportunity in particular for high growth companies like, you know, I think they've been termed by, as gazelles in the industry, anything that's fast growing. I mean, I'm just worried about impacting the marketplace, so as long as we keep it simple and not make it complicated. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Catherine. Annemarie. MS. TIERNEY: I like the idea that I think you expressed of like do no harm, right. So we know from the statistics, I think we talked about this before, that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	if there's additional access to capital. CO-CHAIR HANKS: Annemarie, if we were to include a minimum number of investments as a test is there a number, is it a dollar number, a number of investments? MS. TIERNEY: I don't know the answer to that, Sara. I have the idea of its you have blanket investments, because I would have a sense that people would want that number to be fairly high. And maybe that's not going to be the case, maybe it's a number of investments. But I don't know what the I don't have an idea in my head of what would be comfortable. I like the idea of, you know, do you have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	So if we if we decrease the number if we decrease this here it will have impact on future rounds and other I guess and the opportunity in particular for high growth companies like, you know, I think they've been termed by, as gazelles in the industry, anything that's fast growing. I mean, I'm just worried about impacting the marketplace, so as long as we keep it simple and not make it complicated. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Catherine. Annemarie. MS. TIERNEY: I like the idea that I think you expressed of like do no harm, right. So we know from the statistics, I think we talked about this before, that when the accredited investor definition was changed to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	if there's additional access to capital. CO-CHAIR HANKS: Annemarie, if we were to include a minimum number of investments as a test is there a number, is it a dollar number, a number of investments? MS. TIERNEY: I don't know the answer to that, Sara. I have the idea of its you have blanket investments, because I would have a sense that people would want that number to be fairly high. And maybe that's not going to be the case, maybe it's a number of investments. But I don't know what the I don't have an idea in my head of what would be comfortable. I like the idea of, you know, do you have experience investing, have you invested in maybe five to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	So if we if we decrease the number if we decrease this here it will have impact on future rounds and other I guess and the opportunity in particular for high growth companies like, you know, I think they've been termed by, as gazelles in the industry, anything that's fast growing. I mean, I'm just worried about impacting the marketplace, so as long as we keep it simple and not make it complicated. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Catherine. Annemarie. MS. TIERNEY: I like the idea that I think you expressed of like do no harm, right. So we know from the statistics, I think we talked about this before, that when the accredited investor definition was changed to exclude primary residence from the net worth test it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	if there's additional access to capital. CO-CHAIR HANKS: Annemarie, if we were to include a minimum number of investments as a test is there a number, is it a dollar number, a number of investments? MS. TIERNEY: I don't know the answer to that, Sara. I have the idea of its you have blanket investments, because I would have a sense that people would want that number to be fairly high. And maybe that's not going to be the case, maybe it's a number of investments. But I don't know what the I don't have an idea in my head of what would be comfortable. I like the idea of, you know, do you have experience investing, have you invested in maybe five to ten offerings over the past five years, and maybe that's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	So if we if we decrease the number if we decrease this here it will have impact on future rounds and other I guess and the opportunity in particular for high growth companies like, you know, I think they've been termed by, as gazelles in the industry, anything that's fast growing. I mean, I'm just worried about impacting the marketplace, so as long as we keep it simple and not make it complicated. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Catherine. Annemarie. MS. TIERNEY: I like the idea that I think you expressed of like do no harm, right. So we know from the statistics, I think we talked about this before, that when the accredited investor definition was changed to exclude primary residence from the net worth test it decreased the pool of potential investors, I think it was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	if there's additional access to capital. CO-CHAIR HANKS: Annemarie, if we were to include a minimum number of investments as a test is there a number, is it a dollar number, a number of investments? MS. TIERNEY: I don't know the answer to that, Sara. I have the idea of its you have blanket investments, because I would have a sense that people would want that number to be fairly high. And maybe that's not going to be the case, maybe it's a number of investments. But I don't know what the I don't have an idea in my head of what would be comfortable. I like the idea of, you know, do you have experience investing, have you invested in maybe five to ten offerings over the past five years, and maybe that's comfortable. But there may not be that many options for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	So if we if we decrease the number if we decrease this here it will have impact on future rounds and other I guess and the opportunity in particular for high growth companies like, you know, I think they've been termed by, as gazelles in the industry, anything that's fast growing. I mean, I'm just worried about impacting the marketplace, so as long as we keep it simple and not make it complicated. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Catherine. Annemarie. MS. TIERNEY: I like the idea that I think you expressed of like do no harm, right. So we know from the statistics, I think we talked about this before, that when the accredited investor definition was changed to exclude primary residence from the net worth test it decreased the pool of potential investors, I think it was like from 9 percent of Americans to 7 percent o	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	if there's additional access to capital. CO-CHAIR HANKS: Annemarie, if we were to include a minimum number of investments as a test is there a number, is it a dollar number, a number of investments? MS. TIERNEY: I don't know the answer to that, Sara. I have the idea of its you have blanket investments, because I would have a sense that people would want that number to be fairly high. And maybe that's not going to be the case, maybe it's a number of investments. But I don't know what the I don't have an idea in my head of what would be comfortable. I like the idea of, you know, do you have experience investing, have you invested in maybe that's comfortable. But there may not be that many options for non-accredited investors to have made those investments.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	So if we if we decrease the number if we decrease this here it will have impact on future rounds and other I guess and the opportunity in particular for high growth companies like, you know, I think they've been termed by, as gazelles in the industry, anything that's fast growing. I mean, I'm just worried about impacting the marketplace, so as long as we keep it simple and not make it complicated. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Catherine. Annemarie. MS. TIERNEY: I like the idea that I think you expressed of like do no harm, right. So we know from the statistics, I think we talked about this before, that when the accredited investor definition was changed to exclude primary residence from the net worth test it decreased the pool of potential investors, I think it was like from 9 percent of Americans to 7 percent o Americans. That's that's a pretty big percentage	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>if there's additional access to capital.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: Annemarie, if we were to include a minimum number of investments as a test is there a number, is it a dollar number, a number of investments?</li> <li>MS. TIERNEY: I don't know the answer to that, Sara. I have the idea of its you have blanket investments, because I would have a sense that people would want that number to be fairly high. And maybe that's not going to be the case, maybe it's a number of investments. But I don't know what the I don't have an idea in my head of what would be comfortable.</li> <li>I like the idea of, you know, do you have experience investing, have you invested in maybe five to ten offerings over the past five years, and maybe that's comfortable. But there may not be that many options for non-accredited investors to have made those investments. So I hate to put a number on it that would limit</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	So if we if we decrease the number if we decrease this here it will have impact on future rounds and other I guess and the opportunity in particular for high growth companies like, you know, I think they've been termed by, as gazelles in the industry, anything that's fast growing. I mean, I'm just worried about impacting the marketplace, so as long as we keep it simple and not make it complicated. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Catherine. Annemarie. MS. TIERNEY: I like the idea that I think you expressed of like do no harm, right. So we know from the statistics, I think we talked about this before, that when the accredited investor definition was changed to exclude primary residence from the net worth test it decreased the pool of potential investors, I think it was like from 9 percent of Americans to 7 percent o Americans. That's that's a pretty big percentage decrease.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	if there's additional access to capital. CO-CHAIR HANKS: Annemarie, if we were to include a minimum number of investments as a test is there a number, is it a dollar number, a number of investments? MS. TIERNEY: I don't know the answer to that, Sara. I have the idea of its you have blanket investments, because I would have a sense that people would want that number to be fairly high. And maybe that's not going to be the case, maybe it's a number of investments. But I don't know what the I don't have an idea in my head of what would be comfortable. I like the idea of, you know, do you have experience investing, have you invested in maybe five to ten offerings over the past five years, and maybe that's comfortable. But there may not be that many options for non-accredited investors to have made those investments. So I hate to put a number on it that would limit somebody who maybe has done, you know, two sizeable
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	So if we if we decrease the number if we decrease this here it will have impact on future rounds and other I guess and the opportunity in particular for high growth companies like, you know, I think they've been termed by, as gazelles in the industry, anything that's fast growing. I mean, I'm just worried about impacting the marketplace, so as long as we keep it simple and not make it complicated. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Catherine. Annemarie. MS. TIERNEY: I like the idea that I think you expressed of like do no harm, right. So we know from the statistics, I think we talked about this before, that when the accredited investor definition was changed to exclude primary residence from the net worth test it decreased the pool of potential investors, I think it was like from 9 percent of Americans to 7 percent of Americans. That's that's a pretty big percentage decrease.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>if there's additional access to capital.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: Annemarie, if we were to include a minimum number of investments as a test is there a number, is it a dollar number, a number of investments?</li> <li>MS. TIERNEY: I don't know the answer to that, Sara. I have the idea of its you have blanket investments, because I would have a sense that people would want that number to be fairly high. And maybe that's not going to be the case, maybe it's a number of investments. But I don't know what the I don't have an idea in my head of what would be comfortable.</li> <li>I like the idea of, you know, do you have experience investing, have you invested in maybe five to ten offerings over the past five years, and maybe that's comfortable. But there may not be that many options for non-accredited investors to have made those investments. So I hate to put a number on it that would limit somebody who maybe has done, you know, two sizeable 506(b) investments but only two, but instead of somebody</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	So if we if we decrease the number if we decrease this here it will have impact on future rounds and other I guess and the opportunity in particular for high growth companies like, you know, I think they've been termed by, as gazelles in the industry, anything that's fast growing. I mean, I'm just worried about impacting the marketplace, so as long as we keep it simple and not make it complicated. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Catherine. Annemarie. MS. TIERNEY: I like the idea that I think you expressed of like do no harm, right. So we know from the statistics, I think we talked about this before, that when the accredited investor definition was changed to exclude primary residence from the net worth test it decreased the pool of potential investors, I think it was like from 9 percent of Americans to 7 percent o Americans. That's that's a pretty big percentage decrease.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>if there's additional access to capital.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: Annemarie, if we were to include a minimum number of investments as a test is there a number, is it a dollar number, a number of investments?</li> <li>MS. TIERNEY: I don't know the answer to that, Sara. I have the idea of its you have blanket investments, because I would have a sense that people would want that number to be fairly high. And maybe that's not going to be the case, maybe it's a number of investments. But I don't know what the I don't have an idea in my head of what would be comfortable.</li> <li>I like the idea of, you know, do you have experience investing, have you invested in maybe that's comfortable. But there may not be that many options for non-accredited investors to have made those investments. So I hate to put a number on it that would limit somebody who maybe has done, you know, two sizeable 506(b) investments but only two, but instead of somebody who has done five or six teeny investments.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	So if we if we decrease the number if we decrease this here it will have impact on future rounds and other I guess and the opportunity in particular for high growth companies like, you know, I think they've been termed by, as gazelles in the industry, anything that's fast growing. I mean, I'm just worried about impacting the marketplace, so as long as we keep it simple and not make it complicated. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Catherine. Annemarie. MS. TIERNEY: I like the idea that I think you expressed of like do no harm, right. So we know from the statistics, I think we talked about this before, that when the accredited investor definition was changed to exclude primary residence from the net worth test it decreased the pool of potential investors, I think it was like from 9 percent of Americans to 7 percent o Americans. That's that's a pretty big percentage decrease.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>if there's additional access to capital.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: Annemarie, if we were to include a minimum number of investments as a test is there a number, is it a dollar number, a number of investments?</li> <li>MS. TIERNEY: I don't know the answer to that, Sara. I have the idea of its you have blanket investments, because I would have a sense that people would want that number to be fairly high. And maybe that's not going to be the case, maybe it's a number of investments. But I don't know what the I don't have an idea in my head of what would be comfortable.</li> <li>I like the idea of, you know, do you have experience investing, have you invested in maybe that's comfortable. But there may not be that many options for non-accredited investors to have made those investments. So I hate to put a number on it that would limit somebody who maybe has done, you know, two sizeable 506(b) investments but only two, but instead of somebody who has done five or six teeny investments.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	So if we if we decrease the number if we decrease this here it will have impact on future rounds and other I guess and the opportunity in particular for high growth companies like, you know, I think they've been termed by, as gazelles in the industry, anything that's fast growing. I mean, I'm just worried about impacting the marketplace, so as long as we keep it simple and not make it complicated. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Catherine. Annemarie. MS. TIERNEY: I like the idea that I think you expressed of like do no harm, right. So we know from the statistics, I think we talked about this before, that when the accredited investor definition was changed to exclude primary residence from the net worth test it decreased the pool of potential investors, I think it was like from 9 percent of Americans to 7 percent o Americans. That's that's a pretty big percentage decrease.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>if there's additional access to capital.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: Annemarie, if we were to include a minimum number of investments as a test is there a number, is it a dollar number, a number of investments?</li> <li>MS. TIERNEY: I don't know the answer to that, Sara. I have the idea of its you have blanket investments, because I would have a sense that people would want that number to be fairly high. And maybe that's not going to be the case, maybe it's a number of investments. But I don't know what the I don't have an idea in my head of what would be comfortable.</li> <li>I like the idea of, you know, do you have experience investing, have you invested in maybe that's comfortable. But there may not be that many options for non-accredited investors to have made those investments. So I hate to put a number on it that would limit somebody who maybe has done, you know, two sizeable 506(b) investments but only two, but instead of somebody who has done five or six teeny investments.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	So if we if we decrease the number if we decrease this here it will have impact on future rounds and other I guess and the opportunity in particular for high growth companies like, you know, I think they've been termed by, as gazelles in the industry, anything that's fast growing. I mean, I'm just worried about impacting the marketplace, so as long as we keep it simple and not make it complicated. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Catherine. Annemarie. MS. TIERNEY: I like the idea that I think you expressed of like do no harm, right. So we know from the statistics, I think we talked about this before, that when the accredited investor definition was changed to exclude primary residence from the net worth test it decreased the pool of potential investors, I think it was like from 9 percent of Americans to 7 percent o Americans. That's that's a pretty big percentage decrease. So the idea of changing the numeric thresholds that exist, I think we've all discussed the fact that we probably would not support that, I certainly wouldn't support that. The idea of adding additional options to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>if there's additional access to capital.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: Annemarie, if we were to include a minimum number of investments as a test is there a number, is it a dollar number, a number of investments?</li> <li>MS. TIERNEY: I don't know the answer to that, Sara. I have the idea of its you have blanket investments, because I would have a sense that people would want that number to be fairly high. And maybe that's not going to be the case, maybe it's a number of investments. But I don't know what the I don't have an idea in my head of what would be comfortable.</li> <li>I like the idea of, you know, do you have experience investing, have you invested in maybe five to ten offerings over the past five years, and maybe that's comfortable. But there may not be that many options for non-accredited investors to have made those investments. So I hate to put a number on it that would limit somebody who maybe has done, you know, two sizeable 506(b) investments but only two, but instead of somebody who has done five or six teeny investments.</li> <li>I don't know. I don't know the right I don't know what the right parameter would be.</li> </ul>

	Page 20		Page 20
1	be a difficult one to come up with. But also keep mind	1	kind of menu that you can go up and down. I would just
2	what Sara said a moment ago, and that is that we're	2	posit this. I was just in Birmingham, Alabama at an
3	talking about adding. And so if one of the things we add	3	incredible accelerated incubator down there and I met a
4	is, you know, you qualify if you've done X number of	4	whole bunch of accredited private investors that are
5	investments over X period, you don't have to really spend	5	supporting this giant incubator and accelerator, which
6	that much time thinking about whether or not that's the	6	took over an old Sears store as a matter of fact.
7	right measure or whether it's too difficult because it's	7	And a bunch of them were saying, effectively said
8	not the only measure.	8	to me I have no idea what I'm doing but I know the
9	MS. TIERNEY: Well, I think what I was	9	business I'm investing in. Like there was a cooking
10	getting at, is it the number of investments or is it the	10	business, they were making a special kind of cold coffee
11	amount. I think that it's difficult to that's what	11	that was going to be in Whole Foods.
12	I'm saying I have difficulty.	12	So as you went down some of these
13	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Oh, yeah.	13	conversations, knowledge of the company and knowledge of
14	MS. TIERNEY: I'm all for adding it,	14	the industry as opposed to being an accredited investor
15	absolutely. I'm just when Sara asked me what numbers	15	who knows the investing business, I think that's another
16	might be comfortable I actually don't have enough data to	16	interesting dynamic and I think you just touched on it as
17	sort of assess what a typical non-accredited investment -	17	well. I don't know how you put it into the regs and I
18	- non-accredited investor portfolio would look like.	18	don't know how you phrase it, but some of the smartest
19	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I would agree with that.	19	investors I've ever seen know the company and the
20	MS. TIERNEY: Yes.	20	industry as opposed to the investing community.
21	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I mean, is it is it the	21	And I'm not sure how we commemorate that, but it is
22	number, the amount, the issuer, the industry. You can go	22	something I would argue to include in the argument of the
23	you can go on and on I think.	23	additional things, which is industry knowledge or
24	MS. TIERNEY: Right.	24	specific knowledge of the company and the environment, or
25	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Any other comments? Yes,	25	even the geography that it's in, which you sometimes see
	• • •		
	Page 27		Page 29
1	Page 27	1	5
1	Mark.	1	when you go to these incubators and accelerators or
2	Mark. MR. WALSH: Just to clarify. These things that	2	when you go to these incubators and accelerators or startups that are in places in our nation that typically
2 3	Mark. MR. WALSH: Just to clarify. These things that you listed are in replacement of the dollar figure	2 3	when you go to these incubators and accelerators or startups that are in places in our nation that typically do not get venture capital as was mentioned in the
2 3 4	Mark. MR. WALSH: Just to clarify. These things that you listed are in replacement of the dollar figure CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No.	2 3 4	when you go to these incubators and accelerators or startups that are in places in our nation that typically do not get venture capital as was mentioned in the document.
2 3 4 5	Mark. MR. WALSH: Just to clarify. These things that you listed are in replacement of the dollar figure CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No. MR. WALSH: they are additional too?	2 3 4 5	when you go to these incubators and accelerators or startups that are in places in our nation that typically do not get venture capital as was mentioned in the document. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you. Laura.
2 3 4 5 6	Mark. MR. WALSH: Just to clarify. These things that you listed are in replacement of the dollar figure CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No. MR. WALSH: they are additional too? CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Additional too.	2 3 4 5 6	when you go to these incubators and accelerators or startups that are in places in our nation that typically do not get venture capital as was mentioned in the document. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you. Laura. MS. YAMANAKA: Yes, first off I want to say I
2 3 4 5 6 7	Mark. MR. WALSH: Just to clarify. These things that you listed are in replacement of the dollar figure CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No. MR. WALSH: they are additional too? CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Additional too. MR. WALSH: So as long as I have the dollar	2 3 4 5 6 7	when you go to these incubators and accelerators or startups that are in places in our nation that typically do not get venture capital as was mentioned in the document. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you. Laura. MS. YAMANAKA: Yes, first off I want to say I really agree with a lot of the ideas that I'm hearing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Mark. MR. WALSH: Just to clarify. These things that you listed are in replacement of the dollar figure CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No. MR. WALSH: they are additional too? CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Additional too. MR. WALSH: So as long as I have the dollar amount this would be a separate layer on top of that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	when you go to these incubators and accelerators or startups that are in places in our nation that typically do not get venture capital as was mentioned in the document. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you. Laura. MS. YAMANAKA: Yes, first off I want to say I really agree with a lot of the ideas that I'm hearing coming across and I really support the idea of broadening
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Mark. MR. WALSH: Just to clarify. These things that you listed are in replacement of the dollar figure CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No. MR. WALSH: they are additional too? CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Additional too. MR. WALSH: So as long as I have the dollar amount this would be a separate layer on top of that? CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Exactly.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	when you go to these incubators and accelerators or startups that are in places in our nation that typically do not get venture capital as was mentioned in the document. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you. Laura. MS. YAMANAKA: Yes, first off I want to say I really agree with a lot of the ideas that I'm hearing coming across and I really support the idea of broadening the pool of potential funders for this in this area.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Mark. MR. WALSH: Just to clarify. These things that you listed are in replacement of the dollar figure CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No. MR. WALSH: they are additional too? CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Additional too. MR. WALSH: So as long as I have the dollar amount this would be a separate layer on top of that? CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Exactly. MR. WALSH: So just a couple of quick thoughts	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	when you go to these incubators and accelerators or startups that are in places in our nation that typically do not get venture capital as was mentioned in the document. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you. Laura. MS. YAMANAKA: Yes, first off I want to say I really agree with a lot of the ideas that I'm hearing coming across and I really support the idea of broadening the pool of potential funders for this – in this area. I also want to comment in light of life and what's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Mark. MR. WALSH: Just to clarify. These things that you listed are in replacement of the dollar figure CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No. MR. WALSH: they are additional too? CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Additional too. MR. WALSH: So as long as I have the dollar amount this would be a separate layer on top of that? CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Exactly. MR. WALSH: So just a couple of quick thoughts on that. The a couple of I think as you mentioned	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	when you go to these incubators and accelerators or startups that are in places in our nation that typically do not get venture capital as was mentioned in the document. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you. Laura. MS. YAMANAKA: Yes, first off I want to say I really agree with a lot of the ideas that I'm hearing coming across and I really support the idea of broadening the pool of potential funders for this in this area. I also want to comment in light of life and what's happening in the world that it's not just about the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Mark. MR. WALSH: Just to clarify. These things that you listed are in replacement of the dollar figure CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No. MR. WALSH: they are additional too? CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Additional too. MR. WALSH: So as long as I have the dollar amount this would be a separate layer on top of that? CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Exactly. MR. WALSH: So just a couple of quick thoughts on that. The a couple of I think as you mentioned were sort of tautological. They were kind of they	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	when you go to these incubators and accelerators or startups that are in places in our nation that typically do not get venture capital as was mentioned in the document. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you. Laura. MS. YAMANAKA: Yes, first off I want to say I really agree with a lot of the ideas that I'm hearing coming across and I really support the idea of broadening the pool of potential funders for this in this area. I also want to comment in light of life and what's happening in the world that it's not just about the investors, but it's about the people who have the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Mark. MR. WALSH: Just to clarify. These things that you listed are in replacement of the dollar figure CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No. MR. WALSH: they are additional too? CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Additional too. MR. WALSH: So as long as I have the dollar amount this would be a separate layer on top of that? CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Exactly. MR. WALSH: So just a couple of quick thoughts on that. The a couple of I think as you mentioned were sort of tautological. They were kind of they were self-referential and I think you could probably	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	when you go to these incubators and accelerators or startups that are in places in our nation that typically do not get venture capital as was mentioned in the document. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you. Laura. MS. YAMANAKA: Yes, first off I want to say I really agree with a lot of the ideas that I'm hearing coming across and I really support the idea of broadening the pool of potential funders for this in this area. I also want to comment in light of life and what's happening in the world that it's not just about the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Mark. MR. WALSH: Just to clarify. These things that you listed are in replacement of the dollar figure CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No. MR. WALSH: they are additional too? CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Additional too. MR. WALSH: So as long as I have the dollar amount this would be a separate layer on top of that? CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Exactly. MR. WALSH: So just a couple of quick thoughts on that. The a couple of I think as you mentioned were sort of tautological. They were kind of they were self-referential and I think you could probably purge those pretty rapidly.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	when you go to these incubators and accelerators or startups that are in places in our nation that typically do not get venture capital as was mentioned in the document. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you. Laura. MS. YAMANAKA: Yes, first off I want to say I really agree with a lot of the ideas that I'm hearing coming across and I really support the idea of broadening the pool of potential funders for this in this area. I also want to comment in light of life and what's happening in the world that it's not just about the investors, but it's about the people who have the opportunity to invest. So while we want to protect and we want to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Mark. MR. WALSH: Just to clarify. These things that you listed are in replacement of the dollar figure CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No. MR. WALSH: they are additional too? CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Additional too. MR. WALSH: So as long as I have the dollar amount this would be a separate layer on top of that? CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Exactly. MR. WALSH: So just a couple of quick thoughts on that. The a couple of I think as you mentioned were sort of tautological. They were kind of they were self-referential and I think you could probably purge those pretty rapidly. But the test idea, I would suggest that whatever	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	when you go to these incubators and accelerators or startups that are in places in our nation that typically do not get venture capital as was mentioned in the document. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you. Laura. MS. YAMANAKA: Yes, first off I want to say I really agree with a lot of the ideas that I'm hearing coming across and I really support the idea of broadening the pool of potential funders for this – in this area. I also want to comment in light of life and what's happening in the world that it's not just about the investors, but it's about the people who have the opportunity to invest. So while we want to protect and we want to provide Transparency, and we do have to protect those who
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Mark. MR. WALSH: Just to clarify. These things that you listed are in replacement of the dollar figure CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No. MR. WALSH: they are additional too? CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Additional too. MR. WALSH: So as long as I have the dollar amount this would be a separate layer on top of that? CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Exactly. MR. WALSH: So just a couple of quick thoughts on that. The a couple of I think as you mentioned were sort of tautological. They were kind of they were self-referential and I think you could probably purge those pretty rapidly. But the test idea, I would suggest that whatever test you make the answers will be shared on the Internet	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	when you go to these incubators and accelerators or startups that are in places in our nation that typically do not get venture capital as was mentioned in the document. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you. Laura. MS. YAMANAKA: Yes, first off I want to say I really agree with a lot of the ideas that I'm hearing coming across and I really support the idea of broadening the pool of potential funders for this in this area. I also want to comment in light of life and what's happening in the world that it's not just about the investors, but it's about the people who have the opportunity to invest. So while we want to protect and we want to provide Transparency, and we do have to protect those who are not able to protect themselves, on the other hand as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Mark. MR. WALSH: Just to clarify. These things that you listed are in replacement of the dollar figure CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No. MR. WALSH: they are additional too? CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Additional too. MR. WALSH: So as long as I have the dollar amount this would be a separate layer on top of that? CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Exactly. MR. WALSH: So just a couple of quick thoughts on that. The a couple of I think as you mentioned were sort of tautological. They were kind of they were self-referential and I think you could probably purge those pretty rapidly. But the test idea, I would suggest that whatever	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	when you go to these incubators and accelerators or startups that are in places in our nation that typically do not get venture capital as was mentioned in the document. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you. Laura. MS. YAMANAKA: Yes, first off I want to say I really agree with a lot of the ideas that I'm hearing coming across and I really support the idea of broadening the pool of potential funders for this – in this area. I also want to comment in light of life and what's happening in the world that it's not just about the investors, but it's about the people who have the opportunity to invest. So while we want to protect and we want to provide Transparency, and we do have to protect those who
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Mark.</li> <li>MR. WALSH: Just to clarify. These things that you listed are in replacement of the dollar figure CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No.</li> <li>MR. WALSH: they are additional too?</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Additional too.</li> <li>MR. WALSH: So as long as I have the dollar amount this would be a separate layer on top of that?</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Exactly.</li> <li>MR. WALSH: So just a couple of quick thoughts on that. The a couple of I think as you mentioned were sort of tautological. They were kind of they were self-referential and I think you could probably purge those pretty rapidly.</li> <li>But the test idea, I would suggest that whatever test you make the answers will be shared on the Internet for everybody so that the issuers will give the answers.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	when you go to these incubators and accelerators or startups that are in places in our nation that typically do not get venture capital as was mentioned in the document. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you. Laura. MS. YAMANAKA: Yes, first off I want to say I really agree with a lot of the ideas that I'm hearing coming across and I really support the idea of broadening the pool of potential funders for this in this area. I also want to comment in light of life and what's happening in the world that it's not just about the investors, but it's about the people who have the opportunity to invest. So while we want to protect and we want to provide Transparency, and we do have to protect those who are not able to protect themselves, on the other hand as we look at the economy, how it's moving forward, how
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Mark. MR. WALSH: Just to clarify. These things that you listed are in replacement of the dollar figure CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No. MR. WALSH: they are additional too? CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Additional too. MR. WALSH: So as long as I have the dollar amount this would be a separate layer on top of that? CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Exactly. MR. WALSH: So just a couple of quick thoughts on that. The a couple of I think as you mentioned were sort of tautological. They were kind of they were self-referential and I think you could probably purge those pretty rapidly. But the test idea, I would suggest that whatever test you make the answers will be shared on the Internet for everybody so that the issuers will give the answers. I mean, I know I know it's an interesting idea, but I just don't see where a test for an individual as opposed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	when you go to these incubators and accelerators or startups that are in places in our nation that typically do not get venture capital as was mentioned in the document. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you. Laura. MS. YAMANAKA: Yes, first off I want to say I really agree with a lot of the ideas that I'm hearing coming across and I really support the idea of broadening the pool of potential funders for this in this area. I also want to comment in light of life and what's happening in the world that it's not just about the investors, but it's about the people who have the opportunity to invest. So while we want to protect and we want to provide Transparency, and we do have to protect those who are not able to protect themselves, on the other hand as we look at the economy, how it's moving forward, how people accumulate wealth, how they save for their
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Mark.</li> <li>MR. WALSH: Just to clarify. These things that you listed are in replacement of the dollar figure CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No.</li> <li>MR. WALSH: they are additional too?</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Additional too.</li> <li>MR. WALSH: So as long as I have the dollar amount this would be a separate layer on top of that?</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Exactly.</li> <li>MR. WALSH: So just a couple of quick thoughts on that. The a couple of I think as you mentioned were sort of tautological. They were kind of they were self-referential and I think you could probably purge those pretty rapidly.</li> <li>But the test idea, I would suggest that whatever test you make the answers will be shared on the Internet for everybody so that the issuers will give the answers. I mean, I know I know it's an interesting idea, but I just don't see where a test for an individual as opposed to a Series 7, and they're more official and kind of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	when you go to these incubators and accelerators or startups that are in places in our nation that typically do not get venture capital as was mentioned in the document. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you. Laura. MS. YAMANAKA: Yes, first off I want to say I really agree with a lot of the ideas that I'm hearing coming across and I really support the idea of broadening the pool of potential funders for this – in this area. I also want to comment in light of life and what's happening in the world that it's not just about the investors, but it's about the people who have the opportunity to invest. So while we want to protect and we want to provide Transparency, and we do have to protect those who are not able to protect themselves, on the other hand as we look at the economy, how it's moving forward, how people accumulate wealth, how they save for their
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Mark. MR. WALSH: Just to clarify. These things that you listed are in replacement of the dollar figure CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No. MR. WALSH: they are additional too? CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Additional too. MR. WALSH: So as long as I have the dollar amount this would be a separate layer on top of that? CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Exactly. MR. WALSH: So just a couple of quick thoughts on that. The a couple of I think as you mentioned were sort of tautological. They were kind of they were self-referential and I think you could probably purge those pretty rapidly. But the test idea, I would suggest that whatever test you make the answers will be shared on the Internet for everybody so that the issuers will give the answers. I mean, I know I know it's an interesting idea, but I just don't see where a test for an individual as opposed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	when you go to these incubators and accelerators or startups that are in places in our nation that typically do not get venture capital as was mentioned in the document. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you. Laura. MS. YAMANAKA: Yes, first off I want to say I really agree with a lot of the ideas that I'm hearing coming across and I really support the idea of broadening the pool of potential funders for this – in this area. I also want to comment in light of life and what's happening in the world that it's not just about the investors, but it's about the people who have the opportunity to invest. So while we want to protect and we want to provide Transparency, and we do have to protect those who are not able to protect themselves, on the other hand as we look at the economy, how it's moving forward, how people accumulate wealth, how they save for their retirement, and how all those economics impact how we all live, I think it's really important that we as a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Mark.</li> <li>MR. WALSH: Just to clarify. These things that you listed are in replacement of the dollar figure CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No.</li> <li>MR. WALSH: they are additional too? CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Additional too.</li> <li>MR. WALSH: So as long as I have the dollar amount this would be a separate layer on top of that? CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Exactly.</li> <li>MR. WALSH: So just a couple of quick thoughts on that. The a couple of I think as you mentioned were sort of tautological. They were kind of they were self-referential and I think you could probably purge those pretty rapidly.</li> <li>But the test idea, I would suggest that whatever test you make the answers will be shared on the Internet for everybody so that the issuers will give the answers. I mean, I know I know it's an interesting idea, but I just don't see where a test for an individual as opposed to a Series 7, and they're more official and kind of rigorous ones, I'm not sure that would ever work. So I</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	when you go to these incubators and accelerators or startups that are in places in our nation that typically do not get venture capital as was mentioned in the document. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you. Laura. MS. YAMANAKA: Yes, first off I want to say I really agree with a lot of the ideas that I'm hearing coming across and I really support the idea of broadening the pool of potential funders for this in this area. I also want to comment in light of life and what's happening in the world that it's not just about the investors, but it's about the people who have the opportunity to invest. So while we want to protect and we want to provide Transparency, and we do have to protect those who are not able to protect themselves, on the other hand as we look at the economy, how it's moving forward, how people accumulate wealth, how they save for their retirement, and how all those economics impact how we all live, I think it's really important that we as a committee see what we can do to balance those factors
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Mark.</li> <li>MR. WALSH: Just to clarify. These things that you listed are in replacement of the dollar figure CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No.</li> <li>MR. WALSH: they are additional too? CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Additional too.</li> <li>MR. WALSH: So as long as I have the dollar amount this would be a separate layer on top of that? CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Exactly.</li> <li>MR. WALSH: So just a couple of quick thoughts on that. The a couple of I think as you mentioned were sort of tautological. They were kind of they were self-referential and I think you could probably purge those pretty rapidly.</li> <li>But the test idea, I would suggest that whatever test you make the answers will be shared on the Internet for everybody so that the issuers will give the answers. I mean, I know I know it's an interesting idea, but I just don't see where a test for an individual as opposed to a Series 7, and they're more official and kind of rigorous ones, I'm not sure that would ever work. So I would just personally tell you I think that's going</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	when you go to these incubators and accelerators or startups that are in places in our nation that typically do not get venture capital as was mentioned in the document. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you. Laura. MS. YAMANAKA: Yes, first off I want to say I really agree with a lot of the ideas that I'm hearing coming across and I really support the idea of broadening the pool of potential funders for this in this area. I also want to comment in light of life and what's happening in the world that it's not just about the investors, but it's about the people who have the joportunity to invest. So while we want to protect and we want to provide Transparency, and we do have to protect those who are not able to protect themselves, on the other hand as we look at the economy, how it's moving forward, how people accumulate wealth, how they save for their retirement, and how all those economics impact how we all live, I think it's really important that we as a committee see what we can do to balance those factors out.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Mark.</li> <li>MR. WALSH: Just to clarify. These things that you listed are in replacement of the dollar figure CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No.</li> <li>MR. WALSH: they are additional too?</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Additional too.</li> <li>MR. WALSH: So as long as I have the dollar amount this would be a separate layer on top of that?</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Exactly.</li> <li>MR. WALSH: So just a couple of quick thoughts on that. The a couple of I think as you mentioned were sort of tautological. They were kind of they were self-referential and I think you could probably purge those pretty rapidly.</li> <li>But the test idea, I would suggest that whatever test you make the answers will be shared on the Internet for everybody so that the issuers will give the answers. I mean, I know I know it's an interesting idea, but I just don't see where a test for an individual as opposed to a Series 7, and they're more official and kind of rigorous ones, I'm not sure that would ever work. So I would just personally tell you I think that's going that's going to fail.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	when you go to these incubators and accelerators or startups that are in places in our nation that typically do not get venture capital as was mentioned in the document. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you. Laura. MS. YAMANAKA: Yes, first off I want to say I really agree with a lot of the ideas that I'm hearing coming across and I really support the idea of broadening the pool of potential funders for this in this area. I also want to comment in light of life and what's happening in the world that it's not just about the investors, but it's about the people who have the opportunity to invest. So while we want to protect and we want to provide Transparency, and we do have to protect those who are not able to protect themselves, on the other hand as we look at the economy, how it's moving forward, how people accumulate wealth, how they save for their retirement, and how all those economics impact how we all live, I think it's really important that we as a committee see what we can do to balance those factors out.

	Page 30		Page 32
-			
1	committee, and they don't do anything and who really	1	investing is invest in what you know and this is what
2	cares.	2	small investors do. Yeah, I bet angels have input in it.
3	And, you know, got my dander up a little bit and I	3	How do we put that into words that our friends at the
4	gave them my standard answer, and, you know, who cares.	4	Commission could actually put into a rule?
5	But then when I really thought about it this is exactly	5	MS. MOTT: First of all I probably I'll
6	why we're here too. Yes, it's for capitalism, it's for -	6	speak on behalf of the ACA. I'm sure they would be
7	- to make sure that we continue to fund at all different	7	pleased to help participate in defining that. So let me
8	levels the growth and the innovation of the United	8	ask, was your uncle he had the net worth, though,
9	States, but it's also equally and maybe more important	9	right?
10	that we're giving our people the opportunity at the	10	MS. YAMANAKA: Eventually he did, but when he
11	broadest possible section to invest in the United States	11	started out he was he just saved money on the side,
12	and in their small companies, in the companies that you	12	you know. No, in the beginning he didn't. He was always
13	talked about.	13	the one who told me, you know, when we were little he
14	My uncle just died. He didn't go to college.	14	goes, "You got to save a little money for the rainy day
15	He worked right out of high school. He started out at an	15	and you save, you know, a couple dollars here for this",
16	electrical company, okay. He put my parents through	16	he called it his play fund, right.
17	my father through college. And when he died he had	17	And what happened is over time it smart
18	amassed a huge amount of investments. He would have	18	investing he got to be he would have qualified, okay.
19	never qualified under any of these rules.	19	But it took him how many years? I mean, he lived a long
20	One time I spoke to him, I go, "Uncle, how are you	20	time, but that's what he said. He goes, hey, if he knew
21	doing this?"	21	that he could be this successful he would have done this
22	He goes, "Well, you know, I can't do it the	22	first instead of the first 30 years and whatever.
23	other way so I just do it by the school of hard knocks."	23	So their group really made investments viable I
24	And I go, "What do you mean?"	24	think after they retired. They retired at 55 and they
25	And he goes, "I knew" he knew the electrical	25	could back, you know, union and stuff. And then after
	Page 31		Page 33
1	Page 31 industry, he knew it backward and forwards. He knew what	1	Page 33 that that's when they made their real money.
1 2		1 2	
	industry, he knew it backward and forwards. He knew what		that that's when they made their real money.
2	industry, he knew it backward and forwards. He knew what would work in the short run and long run. He got his	2	that that's when they made their real money. MS. MOTT: Okay. So what you and Mark have
2 3	industry, he knew it backward and forwards. He knew what would work in the short run and long run. He got his buddies together, they made an investment pool, and they	2	that that's when they made their real money. MS. MOTT: Okay. So what you and Mark have both described is characterizes the industry of
2 3 4	industry, he knew it backward and forwards. He knew what would work in the short run and long run. He got his buddies together, they made an investment pool, and they invested in all these little technologies that, hey,	2 3 4	that that's when they made their real money. MS. MOTT: Okay. So what you and Mark have both described is characterizes the industry of private investors because they provide more than their
2 3 4 5	industry, he knew it backward and forwards. He knew what would work in the short run and long run. He got his buddies together, they made an investment pool, and they invested in all these little technologies that, hey, maybe you're not going to see it grow, but he did quite	2 3 4 5	that that's when they made their real money. MS. MOTT: Okay. So what you and Mark have both described is characterizes the industry of private investors because they provide more than their money, they provide their knowledge, their expertise,
2 3 4 5 6	industry, he knew it backward and forwards. He knew what would work in the short run and long run. He got his buddies together, they made an investment pool, and they invested in all these little technologies that, hey, maybe you're not going to see it grow, but he did quite well, turned over, turned over.	2 3 4 5 6	that that's when they made their real money. MS. MOTT: Okay. So what you and Mark have both described is characterizes the industry of private investors because they provide more than their money, they provide their knowledge, their expertise, their, you know, their connections. They open up their
2 3 4 5 6 7	industry, he knew it backward and forwards. He knew what would work in the short run and long run. He got his buddies together, they made an investment pool, and they invested in all these little technologies that, hey, maybe you're not going to see it grow, but he did quite well, turned over, turned over. And I'm going, that's the kind of intelligence,	2 3 4 5 6 7	that that's when they made their real money. MS. MOTT: Okay. So what you and Mark have both described is characterizes the industry of private investors because they provide more than their money, they provide their knowledge, their expertise, their, you know, their connections. They open up their rolodexes to find vendors, suppliers, advisors. I'm trying to think. Even when they're doing due diligence they're looking in their rolodex and they're connecting
2 3 6 7 8 9 10	industry, he knew it backward and forwards. He knew what would work in the short run and long run. He got his buddies together, they made an investment pool, and they invested in all these little technologies that, hey, maybe you're not going to see it grow, but he did quite well, turned over, turned over. And I'm going, that's the kind of intelligence, funds, resources that we want to encourage here. And the fact that I like that we're expanding, it's great, I think it's wonderful. But I'm thinking are there ways	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	that that's when they made their real money. MS. MOTT: Okay. So what you and Mark have both described is characterizes the industry of private investors because they provide more than their money, they provide their knowledge, their expertise, their, you know, their connections. They open up their rolodexes to find vendors, suppliers, advisors. I'm trying to think. Even when they're doing due diligence they're looking in their rolodex and they're connecting to and I'll just give you an example.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	industry, he knew it backward and forwards. He knew what would work in the short run and long run. He got his buddies together, they made an investment pool, and they invested in all these little technologies that, hey, maybe you're not going to see it grow, but he did quite well, turned over, turned over. And I'm going, that's the kind of intelligence, funds, resources that we want to encourage here. And the fact that I like that we're expanding, it's great, I think it's wonderful. But I'm thinking are there ways that we can also expand the reach for all those people	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	that that's when they made their real money. MS. MOTT: Okay. So what you and Mark have both described is characterizes the industry of private investors because they provide more than their money, they provide their knowledge, their expertise, their, you know, their connections. They open up their rolodexes to find vendors, suppliers, advisors. I'm trying to think. Even when they're doing due diligence they're looking in their rolodex and they're connecting to and I'll just give you an example. We looked at a device that is going to help us
2 3 6 7 8 9 10	industry, he knew it backward and forwards. He knew what would work in the short run and long run. He got his buddies together, they made an investment pool, and they invested in all these little technologies that, hey, maybe you're not going to see it grow, but he did quite well, turned over, turned over. And I'm going, that's the kind of intelligence, funds, resources that we want to encourage here. And the fact that I like that we're expanding, it's great, I think it's wonderful. But I'm thinking are there ways that we can also expand the reach for all those people for my uncle out there, for all my uncles out there and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	that that's when they made their real money. MS. MOTT: Okay. So what you and Mark have both described is characterizes the industry of private investors because they provide more than their money, they provide their knowledge, their expertise, their, you know, their connections. They open up their rolodexes to find vendors, suppliers, advisors. I'm trying to think. Even when they're doing due diligence they're looking in their rolodex and they're connecting to and I'll just give you an example. We looked at a device that is going to help us understand and manage strokes. And so we were like, we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	industry, he knew it backward and forwards. He knew what would work in the short run and long run. He got his buddies together, they made an investment pool, and they invested in all these little technologies that, hey, maybe you're not going to see it grow, but he did quite well, turned over, turned over. And I'm going, that's the kind of intelligence, funds, resources that we want to encourage here. And the fact that I like that we're expanding, it's great, I think it's wonderful. But I'm thinking are there ways that we can also expand the reach for all those people for my uncle out there, for all my uncles out there and people who are they knew their industry, they know it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	that that's when they made their real money. MS. MOTT: Okay. So what you and Mark have both described is characterizes the industry of private investors because they provide more than their money, they provide their knowledge, their expertise, their, you know, their connections. They open up their rolodexes to find vendors, suppliers, advisors. I'm trying to think. Even when they're doing due diligence they're looking in their rolodex and they're connecting to and I'll just give you an example. We looked at a device that is going to help us understand and manage strokes. And so we were like, we don't have neurosurgeons in our group, but we have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	industry, he knew it backward and forwards. He knew what would work in the short run and long run. He got his buddies together, they made an investment pool, and they invested in all these little technologies that, hey, maybe you're not going to see it grow, but he did quite well, turned over, turned over. And I'm going, that's the kind of intelligence, funds, resources that we want to encourage here. And the fact that I like that we're expanding, it's great, I think it's wonderful. But I'm thinking are there ways that we can also expand the reach for all those people for my uncle out there, for all my uncles out there and people who are they knew their industry, they know it backwards and forwards.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>that that's when they made their real money.</li> <li>MS. MOTT: Okay. So what you and Mark have both described is characterizes the industry of private investors because they provide more than their money, they provide their knowledge, their expertise, their, you know, their connections. They open up their rolodexes to find vendors, suppliers, advisors. I'm trying to think. Even when they're doing due diligence they're looking in their rolodex and they're connecting to and I'll just give you an example.</li> <li>We looked at a device that is going to help us understand and manage strokes. And so we were like, we don't have neurosurgeons in our group, but we have doctors and doctors who know neurosurgeons. And the next</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	industry, he knew it backward and forwards. He knew what would work in the short run and long run. He got his buddies together, they made an investment pool, and they invested in all these little technologies that, hey, maybe you're not going to see it grow, but he did quite well, turned over, turned over. And I'm going, that's the kind of intelligence, funds, resources that we want to encourage here. And the fact that I like that we're expanding, it's great, I think it's wonderful. But I'm thinking are there ways that we can also expand the reach for all those people for my uncle out there, for all my uncles out there and people who are they knew their industry, they know it backwards and forwards. Because the rules that we're setting are not for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	that that's when they made their real money. MS. MOTT: Okay. So what you and Mark have both described is characterizes the industry of private investors because they provide more than their money, they provide their knowledge, their expertise, their, you know, their connections. They open up their rolodexes to find vendors, suppliers, advisors. I'm trying to think. Even when they're doing due diligence they're looking in their rolodex and they're connecting to and I'll just give you an example. We looked at a device that is going to help us understand and manage strokes. And so we were like, we don't have neurosurgeons in our group, but we have doctors and doctors who know neurosurgeons. And the next thing you know, before you know it, we're calling the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	industry, he knew it backward and forwards. He knew what would work in the short run and long run. He got his buddies together, they made an investment pool, and they invested in all these little technologies that, hey, maybe you're not going to see it grow, but he did quite well, turned over, turned over. And I'm going, that's the kind of intelligence, funds, resources that we want to encourage here. And the fact that I like that we're expanding, it's great, I think it's wonderful. But I'm thinking are there ways that we can also expand the reach for all those people for my uncle out there, for all my uncles out there and people who are they knew their industry, they know it backwards and forwards. Because the rules that we're setting are not for today or for tomorrow, we're setting the seeds for the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	that that's when they made their real money. MS. MOTT: Okay. So what you and Mark have both described is characterizes the industry of private investors because they provide more than their money, they provide their knowledge, their expertise, their, you know, their connections. They open up their rolodexes to find vendors, suppliers, advisors. I'm trying to think. Even when they're doing due diligence they're looking in their rolodex and they're connecting to and I'll just give you an example. We looked at a device that is going to help us understand and manage strokes. And so we were like, we don't have neurosurgeons in our group, but we have doctors and doctors who know neurosurgeons. And the next thing you know, before you know it, we're calling the head of neurosurgery at Columbia University because one
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>industry, he knew it backward and forwards. He knew what would work in the short run and long run. He got his buddies together, they made an investment pool, and they invested in all these little technologies that, hey, maybe you're not going to see it grow, but he did quite well, turned over, turned over.</li> <li>And I'm going, that's the kind of intelligence, funds, resources that we want to encourage here. And the fact that I like that we're expanding, it's great, I think it's wonderful. But I'm thinking are there ways that we can also expand the reach for all those people for my uncle out there, for all my uncles out there and people who are they knew their industry, they know it backwards and forwards.</li> <li>Because the rules that we're setting are not for today or for tomorrow, we're setting the seeds for the future. And I got to put my one last shout out for we</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>that that's when they made their real money.</li> <li>MS. MOTT: Okay. So what you and Mark have both described is characterizes the industry of private investors because they provide more than their money, they provide their knowledge, their expertise, their, you know, their connections. They open up their rolodexes to find vendors, suppliers, advisors. I'm trying to think. Even when they're doing due diligence they're looking in their rolodex and they're connecting to and I'll just give you an example.</li> <li>We looked at a device that is going to help us understand and manage strokes. And so we were like, we don't have neurosurgeons in our group, but we have doctors and doctors who know neurosurgeons. And the next thing you know, before you know it, we're calling the head of neurosurgery at Columbia University because one of our doctors knew him, went to med school with him. So</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>industry, he knew it backward and forwards. He knew what would work in the short run and long run. He got his buddies together, they made an investment pool, and they invested in all these little technologies that, hey, maybe you're not going to see it grow, but he did quite well, turned over, turned over.</li> <li>And I'm going, that's the kind of intelligence, funds, resources that we want to encourage here. And the fact that I like that we're expanding, it's great, I think it's wonderful. But I'm thinking are there ways that we can also expand the reach for all those people for my uncle out there, for all my uncles out there and people who are they knew their industry, they know it backwards and forwards.</li> <li>Because the rules that we're setting are not for today or for tomorrow, we're setting the seeds for the future. And I got to put my one last shout out for we really need data. We really, really need more data so we</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>that that's when they made their real money.</li> <li>MS. MOTT: Okay. So what you and Mark have both described is characterizes the industry of private investors because they provide more than their money, they provide their knowledge, their expertise, their, you know, their connections. They open up their rolodexes to find vendors, suppliers, advisors. I'm trying to think. Even when they're doing due diligence they're looking in their rolodex and they're connecting to and I'll just give you an example.</li> <li>We looked at a device that is going to help us understand and manage strokes. And so we were like, we don't have neurosurgeons in our group, but we have doctors and doctors who know neurosurgeons. And the next thing you know, before you know it, we're calling the head of neurosurgery at Columbia University because one of our doctors knew him, went to med school with him. So that got us someone who could help advise on making those</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>industry, he knew it backward and forwards. He knew what would work in the short run and long run. He got his buddies together, they made an investment pool, and they invested in all these little technologies that, hey, maybe you're not going to see it grow, but he did quite well, turned over, turned over.</li> <li>And I'm going, that's the kind of intelligence, funds, resources that we want to encourage here. And the fact that – I like that we're expanding, it's great, I think it's wonderful. But I'm thinking are there ways that we can also expand the reach for all those peoplefor my uncle out there, for all my uncles out there and people who are they knew their industry, they know it backwards and forwards.</li> <li>Because the rules that we're setting are not for today or for tomorrow, we're setting the seeds for the future. And I got to put my one last shout out for we really need data. We really, really need more data so we can make solid decisions and not guess and use my uncle</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>that that's when they made their real money.</li> <li>MS. MOTT: Okay. So what you and Mark have both described is characterizes the industry of private investors because they provide more than their money, they provide their knowledge, their expertise, their, you know, their connections. They open up their rolodexes to find vendors, suppliers, advisors. I'm trying to think. Even when they're doing due diligence they're looking in their rolodex and they're connecting to and I'll just give you an example.</li> <li>We looked at a device that is going to help us understand and manage strokes. And so we were like, we don't have neurosurgeons in our group, but we have doctors and doctors who know neurosurgeons. And the next thing you know, before you know it, we're calling the head of neurosurgery at Columbia University because one of our doctors knew him, went to med school with him. So that got us someone who could help advise on making those decisions.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>industry, he knew it backward and forwards. He knew what would work in the short run and long run. He got his buddies together, they made an investment pool, and they invested in all these little technologies that, hey, maybe you're not going to see it grow, but he did quite well, turned over, turned over.</li> <li>And I'm going, that's the kind of intelligence, funds, resources that we want to encourage here. And the fact that I like that we're expanding, it's great, I think it's wonderful. But I'm thinking are there ways that we can also expand the reach for all those people for my uncle out there, for all my uncles out there and people who are they knew their industry, they know it backwards and forwards.</li> <li>Because the rules that we're setting are not for today or for tomorrow, we're setting the seeds for the future. And I got to put my one last shout out for we really need data. We really, really need more data so we can make solid decisions and not guess and use my uncle as evidence. Thank you.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>that that's when they made their real money.</li> <li>MS. MOTT: Okay. So what you and Mark have both described is characterizes the industry of private investors because they provide more than their money, they provide their knowledge, their expertise, their, you know, their connections. They open up their rolodexes to find vendors, suppliers, advisors. I'm trying to think. Even when they're doing due diligence they're looking in their rolodex and they're connecting to and I'll just give you an example.</li> <li>We looked at a device that is going to help us understand and manage strokes. And so we were like, we don't have neurosurgeons in our group, but we have doctors and doctors who know neurosurgeons. And the next thing you know, before you know it, we're calling the head of neurosurgery at Columbia University because one of our doctors knew him, went to med school with him. So that got us someone who could help advise on making those decisions.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>industry, he knew it backward and forwards. He knew what would work in the short run and long run. He got his buddies together, they made an investment pool, and they invested in all these little technologies that, hey, maybe you're not going to see it grow, but he did quite well, turned over, turned over.</li> <li>And I'm going, that's the kind of intelligence, funds, resources that we want to encourage here. And the fact that I like that we're expanding, it's great, I think it's wonderful. But I'm thinking are there ways that we can also expand the reach for all those people for my uncle out there, for all my uncles out there and people who are they knew their industry, they know it backwards and forwards.</li> <li>Because the rules that we're setting are not for today or for tomorrow, we're setting the seeds for the future. And I got to put my one last shout out for we really need data. We really, really need more data so we can make solid decisions and not guess and use my uncle as evidence. Thank you.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: In the absence of data, I mean</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>that that's when they made their real money.</li> <li>MS. MOTT: Okay. So what you and Mark have both described is characterizes the industry of private investors because they provide more than their money, they provide their knowledge, their expertise, their, you know, their connections. They open up their rolodexes to find vendors, suppliers, advisors. I'm trying to think. Even when they're doing due diligence they're looking in their rolodex and they're connecting to and I'll just give you an example.</li> <li>We looked at a device that is going to help us understand and manage strokes. And so we were like, we don't have neurosurgeons in our group, but we have doctors and doctors who know neurosurgeons. And the next thing you know, before you know it, we're calling the head of neurosurgery at Columbia University because one of our doctors knew him, went to med school with him. So that got us someone who could help advise on making those decisions.</li> <li>So my point is here is you've characterized the industry. They want to help these companies be</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>industry, he knew it backward and forwards. He knew what would work in the short run and long run. He got his buddies together, they made an investment pool, and they invested in all these little technologies that, hey, maybe you're not going to see it grow, but he did quite well, turned over, turned over.</li> <li>And I'm going, that's the kind of intelligence, funds, resources that we want to encourage here. And the fact that I like that we're expanding, it's great, I think it's wonderful. But I'm thinking are there ways that we can also expand the reach for all those people for my uncle out there, for all my uncles out there and people who are they knew their industry, they know it backwards and forwards.</li> <li>Because the rules that we're setting are not for today or for tomorrow, we're setting the seeds for the future. And I got to put my one last shout out for we really need data. We really, really need more data so we can make solid decisions and not guess and use my uncle as evidence. Thank you.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: In the absence of data, I mean how does anyone have any ideas on how we do the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>that that's when they made their real money.</li> <li>MS. MOTT: Okay. So what you and Mark have both described is characterizes the industry of private investors because they provide more than their money, they provide their knowledge, their expertise, their, you know, their connections. They open up their rolodexes to find vendors, suppliers, advisors. I'm trying to think. Even when they're doing due diligence they're looking in their rolodex and they're connecting to and I'll just give you an example.</li> <li>We looked at a device that is going to help us understand and manage strokes. And so we were like, we don't have neurosurgeons in our group, but we have doctors and doctors who know neurosurgeons. And the next thing you know, before you know it, we're calling the head of neurosurgery at Columbia University because one of our doctors knew him, went to med school with him. So that got us someone who could help advise on making those decisions.</li> <li>So my point is here is you've characterized the industry. They want to help these companies be successful. It's their own money, it's not someone else's</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>industry, he knew it backward and forwards. He knew what would work in the short run and long run. He got his buddies together, they made an investment pool, and they invested in all these little technologies that, hey, maybe you're not going to see it grow, but he did quite well, turned over, turned over.</li> <li>And I'm going, that's the kind of intelligence, funds, resources that we want to encourage here. And the fact that I like that we're expanding, it's great, I think it's wonderful. But I'm thinking are there ways that we can also expand the reach for all those people for my uncle out there, for all my uncles out there and people who are they knew their industry, they know it backwards and forwards.</li> <li>Because the rules that we're setting are not for today or for tomorrow, we're setting the seeds for the future. And I got to put my one last shout out for we really need data. We really, really need more data so we can make solid decisions and not guess and use my uncle as evidence. Thank you.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: In the absence of data, I mean how does anyone have any ideas on how we do the industry specific uncle definition for accredited</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>that that's when they made their real money.</li> <li>MS. MOTT: Okay. So what you and Mark have both described is characterizes the industry of private investors because they provide more than their money, they provide their knowledge, their expertise, their, you know, their connections. They open up their rolodexes to find vendors, suppliers, advisors. I'm trying to think. Even when they're doing due diligence they're looking in their rolodex and they're connecting to and I'll just give you an example.</li> <li>We looked at a device that is going to help us understand and manage strokes. And so we were like, we don't have neurosurgeons in our group, but we have doctors and doctors who know neurosurgeons. And the next thing you know, before you know it, we're calling the head of neurosurgery at Columbia University because one of our doctors knew him, went to med school with him. So that got us someone who could help advise on making those decisions.</li> <li>So my point is here is you've characterized the industry. They want to help these companies be successful. It's their own money, it's not someone else's money, and it's also typically, you know, their neighbor</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>industry, he knew it backward and forwards. He knew what would work in the short run and long run. He got his buddies together, they made an investment pool, and they invested in all these little technologies that, hey, maybe you're not going to see it grow, but he did quite well, turned over, turned over.</li> <li>And I'm going, that's the kind of intelligence, funds, resources that we want to encourage here. And the fact that I like that we're expanding, it's great, I think it's wonderful. But I'm thinking are there ways that we can also expand the reach for all those people for my uncle out there, for all my uncles out there and people who are they knew their industry, they know it backwards and forwards.</li> <li>Because the rules that we're setting are not for today or for tomorrow, we're setting the seeds for the future. And I got to put my one last shout out for we really need data. We really, really need more data so we can make solid decisions and not guess and use my uncle as evidence. Thank you.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: In the absence of data, I mean how does anyone have any ideas on how we do the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>that that's when they made their real money.</li> <li>MS. MOTT: Okay. So what you and Mark have both described is characterizes the industry of private investors because they provide more than their money, they provide their knowledge, their expertise, their, you know, their connections. They open up their rolodexes to find vendors, suppliers, advisors. I'm trying to think. Even when they're doing due diligence they're looking in their rolodex and they're connecting to and I'll just give you an example.</li> <li>We looked at a device that is going to help us understand and manage strokes. And so we were like, we don't have neurosurgeons in our group, but we have doctors and doctors who know neurosurgeons. And the next thing you know, before you know it, we're calling the head of neurosurgery at Columbia University because one of our doctors knew him, went to med school with him. So that got us someone who could help advise on making those decisions.</li> <li>So my point is here is you've characterized the industry. They want to help these companies be successful. It's their own money, it's not someone else's</li> </ul>

	Page 34		Page 36
1	How we can characterize that in a number, Sara? I	1	we're talking about private placements.
2	don't know, but I think it would be worth, you know,	2	I think one of the fundamental problems
3	saying you know I mean, we could certainly survey our	3	everyone has when we're talking about more regulation
4	membership. It's just a thought.	4	here is investor protection. What does that mean? Are
5	MR. WALSH: I have another suggestion in the	5	we I think what it means, what it ought to mean is
6	oft used but rarely achieved synergy amongst government.	6	protecting investors from fraud, not protecting investors
7	At the SBA we have engaged the Library of Congress,	7	from loss. Most businesses don't work out the way
8	which has a for profit research arm, which I did not know	8	they're planned to, and I don't care how much specialized
9	when I arrived there. And we're doing they're	9	knowledge somebody has it doesn't mean this deal is going
10	surveying all of our SBIC investments to see what kind of	10	to work out. Because maybe management is not that good,
11	SBIC funds or Latino, African American women managed and	11	maybe the concept is really stupid but they've got a
12	then what kinds of companies that they invest in to see -	12	really good marketing person or a charismatic individual
13	- to make sure, to validate that we're doing our part to	13	who is able to penetrate the market.
14	get dollars where they often don't go and should go.	14	So I think it's all about disclosure, and in
15	But we're doing another survey with them on	15	essence what investors need to know is that there is risk
16	accelerators and incubators. And because we have an	16	here and the risk factors should identify with
17	accelerator, incubator contest that we offer every year	17	particularity the kinds of risk that exists here. And I
18	with hundreds and hundreds of accelerators and incubators	18	think trying to put too precise a point on this we're
19	that submit their plan, and their strategy, and videos	19	simply going to have lots of wordy regulations that are
20	and we hand them cash awards of \$50,000. The third one	20	going to be hard to apply.
21	is happening right now. But we're doing research to make	21	So I'm I'm happy with sticking with what we
22	sure that the accelerators and incubators we choose are	22	have, period. If we're going to add things I think the
23	better than the ones that we don't choose. And I won't	23	specific training, charter financial analysts, the Series
24	bore you with the details, but it's actually a wonderful	24	7 and other FINRA exams are good and the previous
25	story that we're	25	investment experience would all be things I would
	-		
		1	
	Page 35		Page 37
1	So I'm happy to expand that if you're looking	1	Page 37 support. Thank you.
1 2		1 2	2
	So I'm happy to expand that if you're looking		support. Thank you.
2	So I'm happy to expand that if you're looking for either hard data across a large audience or anecdotal	2 3 4	support. Thank you. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Greg. Michael. MR. PIECIAK: Thank you, Stephen. I just wanted to make a couple of broader policy points from a
2 3 4 5	So I'm happy to expand that if you're looking for either hard data across a large audience or anecdotal not anecdotal, but survey type data, sample type data across a larger audience, happy to expand that and sit with you or your teammates to see how the stuff we're	2 3 4 5	support. Thank you. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Greg. Michael. MR. PIECIAK: Thank you, Stephen. I just wanted to make a couple of broader policy points from a state regulator perspective. When we often think of
2 3 4 5 6	So I'm happy to expand that if you're looking for either hard data across a large audience or anecdotal not anecdotal, but survey type data, sample type data across a larger audience, happy to expand that and sit with you or your teammates to see how the stuff we're gathering could be of value in this data need.	2 3 4 5 6	support. Thank you. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Greg. Michael. MR. PIECIAK: Thank you, Stephen. I just wanted to make a couple of broader policy points from a state regulator perspective. When we often think of accredited investor we think of wealth and income as a
2 3 4 5 6 7	So I'm happy to expand that if you're looking for either hard data across a large audience or anecdotal not anecdotal, but survey type data, sample type data across a larger audience, happy to expand that and sit with you or your teammates to see how the stuff we're gathering could be of value in this data need. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you for that. Greg,	2 3 4 5 6 7	support. Thank you. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Greg. Michael. MR. PIECIAK: Thank you, Stephen. I just wanted to make a couple of broader policy points from a state regulator perspective. When we often think of accredited investor we think of wealth and income as a proxy for sophistication, experience, knowledge, which I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	So I'm happy to expand that if you're looking for either hard data across a large audience or anecdotal not anecdotal, but survey type data, sample type data across a larger audience, happy to expand that and sit with you or your teammates to see how the stuff we're gathering could be of value in this data need. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you for that. Greg, welcome.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	support. Thank you. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Greg. Michael. MR. PIECIAK: Thank you, Stephen. I just wanted to make a couple of broader policy points from a state regulator perspective. When we often think of accredited investor we think of wealth and income as a proxy for sophistication, experience, knowledge, which I think we're all discussing today. But in addition the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	So I'm happy to expand that if you're looking for either hard data across a large audience or anecdotal not anecdotal, but survey type data, sample type data across a larger audience, happy to expand that and sit with you or your teammates to see how the stuff we're gathering could be of value in this data need. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you for that. Greg, welcome. MR. YADLEY: Thank you. I apologize for being	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	support. Thank you. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Greg. Michael. MR. PIECIAK: Thank you, Stephen. I just wanted to make a couple of broader policy points from a state regulator perspective. When we often think of accredited investor we think of wealth and income as a proxy for sophistication, experience, knowledge, which I think we're all discussing today. But in addition the ability to withstand loss as Greg points out, there's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	So I'm happy to expand that if you're looking for either hard data across a large audience or anecdotal not anecdotal, but survey type data, sample type data across a larger audience, happy to expand that and sit with you or your teammates to see how the stuff we're gathering could be of value in this data need. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you for that. Greg, welcome. MR. YADLEY: Thank you. I apologize for being late. The date of the meeting was changed and I was on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	support. Thank you. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Greg. Michael. MR. PIECIAK: Thank you, Stephen. I just wanted to make a couple of broader policy points from a state regulator perspective. When we often think of accredited investor we think of wealth and income as a proxy for sophistication, experience, knowledge, which I think we're all discussing today. But in addition the ability to withstand loss as Greg points out, there's both the risk of the loss, there's a risk of fraud.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	So I'm happy to expand that if you're looking for either hard data across a large audience or anecdotal not anecdotal, but survey type data, sample type data across a larger audience, happy to expand that and sit with you or your teammates to see how the stuff we're gathering could be of value in this data need. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you for that. Greg, welcome. MR. YADLEY: Thank you. I apologize for being late. The date of the meeting was changed and I was on vacation, didn't get home until last night, didn't have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	support. Thank you. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Greg. Michael. MR. PIECIAK: Thank you, Stephen. I just wanted to make a couple of broader policy points from a state regulator perspective. When we often think of accredited investor we think of wealth and income as a proxy for sophistication, experience, knowledge, which I think we're all discussing today. But in addition the ability to withstand loss as Greg points out, there's both the risk of the loss, there's a risk of fraud. There's also legal risk in my opinion that, you know, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	So I'm happy to expand that if you're looking for either hard data across a large audience or anecdotal not anecdotal, but survey type data, sample type data across a larger audience, happy to expand that and sit with you or your teammates to see how the stuff we're gathering could be of value in this data need. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you for that. Greg, welcome. MR. YADLEY: Thank you. I apologize for being late. The date of the meeting was changed and I was on vacation, didn't get home until last night, didn't have time to shave. But I did find a clean white shirt.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	support. Thank you. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Greg. Michael. MR. PIECIAK: Thank you, Stephen. I just wanted to make a couple of broader policy points from a state regulator perspective. When we often think of accredited investor we think of wealth and income as a proxy for sophistication, experience, knowledge, which I think we're all discussing today. But in addition the ability to withstand loss as Greg points out, there's both the risk of the loss, there's a risk of fraud. There's also legal risk in my opinion that, you know, the terms of the deal might not be quite what you understood
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	So I'm happy to expand that if you're looking for either hard data across a large audience or anecdotal not anecdotal, but survey type data, sample type data across a larger audience, happy to expand that and sit with you or your teammates to see how the stuff we're gathering could be of value in this data need. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you for that. Greg, welcome. MR. YADLEY: Thank you. I apologize for being late. The date of the meeting was changed and I was on vacation, didn't get home until last night, didn't have time to shave. But I did find a clean white shirt. So I'm not sure what everyone has said but I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	support. Thank you. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Greg. Michael. MR. PIECIAK: Thank you, Stephen. I just wanted to make a couple of broader policy points from a state regulator perspective. When we often think of accredited investor we think of wealth and income as a proxy for sophistication, experience, knowledge, which I think we're all discussing today. But in addition the ability to withstand loss as Greg points out, there's both the risk of the loss, there's a risk of fraud. There's also legal risk in my opinion that, you know, the terms of the deal might not be quite what you understood them to be or you could be put at risk by future rounds
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	So I'm happy to expand that if you're looking for either hard data across a large audience or anecdotal not anecdotal, but survey type data, sample type data across a larger audience, happy to expand that and sit with you or your teammates to see how the stuff we're gathering could be of value in this data need. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you for that. Greg, welcome. MR. YADLEY: Thank you. I apologize for being late. The date of the meeting was changed and I was on vacation, didn't get home until last night, didn't have time to shave. But I did find a clean white shirt. So I'm not sure what everyone has said but I the draft recommendations I definitely concur in and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	support. Thank you. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Greg. Michael. MR. PIECIAK: Thank you, Stephen. I just wanted to make a couple of broader policy points from a state regulator perspective. When we often think of accredited investor we think of wealth and income as a proxy for sophistication, experience, knowledge, which I think we're all discussing today. But in addition the ability to withstand loss as Greg points out, there's both the risk of the loss, there's a risk of fraud. There's also legal risk in my opinion that, you know, the terms of the deal might not be quite what you understood them to be or you could be put at risk by future rounds of investment, and that's something to be considerate of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	So I'm happy to expand that if you're looking for either hard data across a large audience or anecdotal not anecdotal, but survey type data, sample type data across a larger audience, happy to expand that and sit with you or your teammates to see how the stuff we're gathering could be of value in this data need. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you for that. Greg, welcome. MR. YADLEY: Thank you. I apologize for being late. The date of the meeting was changed and I was on vacation, didn't get home until last night, didn't have time to shave. But I did find a clean white shirt. So I'm not sure what everyone has said but I the draft recommendations I definitely concur in and would underscore the do no harm and the fact that we're	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	support. Thank you. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Greg. Michael. MR. PIECIAK: Thank you, Stephen. I just wanted to make a couple of broader policy points from a state regulator perspective. When we often think of accredited investor we think of wealth and income as a proxy for sophistication, experience, knowledge, which I think we're all discussing today. But in addition the ability to withstand loss as Greg points out, there's both the risk of the loss, there's a risk of fraud. There's also legal risk in my opinion that, you know, the terms of the deal might not be quite what you understood them to be or you could be put at risk by future rounds of investment, and that's something to be considerate of as well.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	So I'm happy to expand that if you're looking for either hard data across a large audience or anecdotal not anecdotal, but survey type data, sample type data across a larger audience, happy to expand that and sit with you or your teammates to see how the stuff we're gathering could be of value in this data need. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you for that. Greg, welcome. MR. YADLEY: Thank you. I apologize for being late. The date of the meeting was changed and I was on vacation, didn't get home until last night, didn't have time to shave. But I did find a clean white shirt. So I'm not sure what everyone has said but I the draft recommendations I definitely concur in and would underscore the do no harm and the fact that we're talking about additional exemptions.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	support. Thank you. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Greg. Michael. MR. PIECIAK: Thank you, Stephen. I just wanted to make a couple of broader policy points from a state regulator perspective. When we often think of accredited investor we think of wealth and income as a proxy for sophistication, experience, knowledge, which I think we're all discussing today. But in addition the ability to withstand loss as Greg points out, there's both the risk of the loss, there's a risk of fraud. There's also legal risk in my opinion that, you know, the terms of the deal might not be quite what you understood them to be or you could be put at risk by future rounds of investment, and that's something to be considerate of as well. So when we move away from, you know, asset
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	So I'm happy to expand that if you're looking for either hard data across a large audience or anecdotal not anecdotal, but survey type data, sample type data across a larger audience, happy to expand that and sit with you or your teammates to see how the stuff we're gathering could be of value in this data need. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you for that. Greg, welcome. MR. YADLEY: Thank you. I apologize for being late. The date of the meeting was changed and I was on vacation, didn't get home until last night, didn't have time to shave. But I did find a clean white shirt. So I'm not sure what everyone has said but I the draft recommendations I definitely concur in and would underscore the do no harm and the fact that we're talking about additional exemptions. I agree with Mark that a test sounds like a good	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	support. Thank you. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Greg. Michael. MR. PIECIAK: Thank you, Stephen. I just wanted to make a couple of broader policy points from a state regulator perspective. When we often think of accredited investor we think of wealth and income as a proxy for sophistication, experience, knowledge, which I think we're all discussing today. But in addition the ability to withstand loss as Greg points out, there's both the risk of the loss, there's a risk of fraud. There's also legal risk in my opinion that, you know, the terms of the deal might not be quite what you understood them to be or you could be put at risk by future rounds of investment, and that's something to be considerate of as well. So when we move away from, you know, asset based qualifications to credentials or a test or things
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	So I'm happy to expand that if you're looking for either hard data across a large audience or anecdotal not anecdotal, but survey type data, sample type data across a larger audience, happy to expand that and sit with you or your teammates to see how the stuff we're gathering could be of value in this data need. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you for that. Greg, welcome. MR. YADLEY: Thank you. I apologize for being late. The date of the meeting was changed and I was on vacation, didn't get home until last night, didn't have time to shave. But I did find a clean white shirt. So I'm not sure what everyone has said but I the draft recommendations I definitely concur in and would underscore the do no harm and the fact that we're talking about additional exemptions. I agree with Mark that a test sounds like a good idea, but I'm a part-time law professor and I have to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	support. Thank you. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Greg. Michael. MR. PIECIAK: Thank you, Stephen. I just wanted to make a couple of broader policy points from a state regulator perspective. When we often think of accredited investor we think of wealth and income as a proxy for sophistication, experience, knowledge, which I think we're all discussing today. But in addition the ability to withstand loss as Greg points out, there's both the risk of the loss, there's a risk of fraud. There's also legal risk in my opinion that, you know, the terms of the deal might not be quite what you understood them to be or you could be put at risk by future rounds of investment, and that's something to be considerate of as well. So when we move away from, you know, asset based qualifications to credentials or a test or things of that nature, we move away from the ability to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	So I'm happy to expand that if you're looking for either hard data across a large audience or anecdotal not anecdotal, but survey type data, sample type data across a larger audience, happy to expand that and sit with you or your teammates to see how the stuff we're gathering could be of value in this data need. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you for that. Greg, welcome. MR. YADLEY: Thank you. I apologize for being late. The date of the meeting was changed and I was on vacation, didn't get home until last night, didn't have time to shave. But I did find a clean white shirt. So I'm not sure what everyone has said but I the draft recommendations I definitely concur in and would underscore the do no harm and the fact that we're talking about additional exemptions. I agree with Mark that a test sounds like a good idea, but I'm a part-time law professor and I have to change my homework assignments every year in major ways	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	support. Thank you. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Greg. Michael. MR. PIECIAK: Thank you, Stephen. I just wanted to make a couple of broader policy points from a state regulator perspective. When we often think of accredited investor we think of wealth and income as a proxy for sophistication, experience, knowledge, which I think we're all discussing today. But in addition the ability to withstand loss as Greg points out, there's both the risk of the loss, there's a risk of fraud. There's also legal risk in my opinion that, you know, the terms of the deal might not be quite what you understood them to be or you could be put at risk by future rounds of investment, and that's something to be considerate of as well. So when we move away from, you know, asset based qualifications to credentials or a test or things of that nature, we move away from the ability to withstand loss in terms of the individuals that are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	So I'm happy to expand that if you're looking for either hard data across a large audience or anecdotal not anecdotal, but survey type data, sample type data across a larger audience, happy to expand that and sit with you or your teammates to see how the stuff we're gathering could be of value in this data need. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you for that. Greg, welcome. MR. YADLEY: Thank you. I apologize for being late. The date of the meeting was changed and I was on vacation, didn't get home until last night, didn't have time to shave. But I did find a clean white shirt. So I'm not sure what everyone has said but I the draft recommendations I definitely concur in and would underscore the do no harm and the fact that we're talking about additional exemptions. I agree with Mark that a test sounds like a good idea, but I'm a part-time law professor and I have to change my homework assignments every year in major ways because otherwise I get the same bad answers back because	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	support. Thank you. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Greg. Michael. MR. PIECIAK: Thank you, Stephen. I just wanted to make a couple of broader policy points from a state regulator perspective. When we often think of accredited investor we think of wealth and income as a proxy for sophistication, experience, knowledge, which I think we're all discussing today. But in addition the ability to withstand loss as Greg points out, there's both the risk of the loss, there's a risk of fraud. There's also legal risk in my opinion that, you know, the terms of the deal might not be quite what you understood them to be or you could be put at risk by future rounds of investment, and that's something to be considerate of as well. So when we move away from, you know, asset based qualifications to credentials or a test or things of that nature, we move away from the ability to withstand loss in terms of the individuals that are making the investment. So I just make that point, not to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	So I'm happy to expand that if you're looking for either hard data across a large audience or anecdotal not anecdotal, but survey type data, sample type data across a larger audience, happy to expand that and sit with you or your teammates to see how the stuff we're gathering could be of value in this data need. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you for that. Greg, welcome. MR. YADLEY: Thank you. I apologize for being late. The date of the meeting was changed and I was on vacation, didn't get home until last night, didn't have time to shave. But I did find a clean white shirt. So I'm not sure what everyone has said but I the draft recommendations I definitely concur in and would underscore the do no harm and the fact that we're talking about additional exemptions. I agree with Mark that a test sounds like a good idea, but I'm a part-time law professor and I have to change my homework assignments every year in major ways because otherwise I get the same bad answers back because they're shared.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	support. Thank you. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Greg. Michael. MR. PIECIAK: Thank you, Stephen. I just wanted to make a couple of broader policy points from a state regulator perspective. When we often think of accredited investor we think of wealth and income as a proxy for sophistication, experience, knowledge, which I think we're all discussing today. But in addition the ability to withstand loss as Greg points out, there's both the risk of the loss, there's a risk of fraud. There's also legal risk in my opinion that, you know, the terms of the deal might not be quite what you understood them to be or you could be put at risk by future rounds of investment, and that's something to be considerate of as well. So when we move away from, you know, asset based qualifications to credentials or a test or things of that nature, we move away from the ability to withstand loss in terms of the individuals that are making the investment. So I just make that point, not to make a recommendation but to say, you know, is there some
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	So I'm happy to expand that if you're looking for either hard data across a large audience or anecdotal not anecdotal, but survey type data, sample type data across a larger audience, happy to expand that and sit with you or your teammates to see how the stuff we're gathering could be of value in this data need. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you for that. Greg, welcome. MR. YADLEY: Thank you. I apologize for being late. The date of the meeting was changed and I was on vacation, didn't get home until last night, didn't have time to shave. But I did find a clean white shirt. So I'm not sure what everyone has said but I the draft recommendations I definitely concur in and would underscore the do no harm and the fact that we're talking about additional exemptions. I agree with Mark that a test sounds like a good idea, but I'm a part-time law professor and I have to change my homework assignments every year in major ways because otherwise I get the same bad answers back because they're shared.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	support. Thank you. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Greg. Michael. MR. PIECIAK: Thank you, Stephen. I just wanted to make a couple of broader policy points from a state regulator perspective. When we often think of accredited investor we think of wealth and income as a proxy for sophistication, experience, knowledge, which I think we're all discussing today. But in addition the ability to withstand loss as Greg points out, there's both the risk of the loss, there's a risk of fraud. There's also legal risk in my opinion that, you know, the terms of the deal might not be quite what you understood them to be or you could be put at risk by future rounds of investment, and that's something to be considerate of as well. So when we move away from, you know, asset based qualifications to credentials or a test or things of that nature, we move away from the ability to withstand loss in terms of the individuals that are making the investment. So I just make that point, not to make a recommendation but to say, you know, is there some way of protecting those investors that are young, have a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	So I'm happy to expand that if you're looking for either hard data across a large audience or anecdotal not anecdotal, but survey type data, sample type data across a larger audience, happy to expand that and sit with you or your teammates to see how the stuff we're gathering could be of value in this data need. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you for that. Greg, welcome. MR. YADLEY: Thank you. I apologize for being late. The date of the meeting was changed and I was on vacation, didn't get home until last night, didn't have time to shave. But I did find a clean white shirt. So I'm not sure what everyone has said but I the draft recommendations I definitely concur in and would underscore the do no harm and the fact that we're talking about additional exemptions. I agree with Mark that a test sounds like a good idea, but I'm a part-time law professor and I have to change my homework assignments every year in major ways because otherwise I get the same bad answers back because they're shared. I think minimum investments is a good test, but it's priming the pump. I was I lost on my second	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	support. Thank you. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Greg. Michael. MR. PIECIAK: Thank you, Stephen. I just wanted to make a couple of broader policy points from a state regulator perspective. When we often think of accredited investor we think of wealth and income as a proxy for sophistication, experience, knowledge, which I think we're all discussing today. But in addition the ability to withstand loss as Greg points out, there's both the risk of the loss, there's a risk of fraud. There's also legal risk in my opinion that, you know, the terms of the deal might not be quite what you understood them to be or you could be put at risk by future rounds of investment, and that's something to be considerate of as well. So when we move away from, you know, asset based qualifications to credentials or a test or things of that nature, we move away from the ability to withstand loss in terms of the individuals that are making the investment. So I just make that point, not to make a recommendation but to say, you know, is there some way of protecting those investors that are young, have a credential but don't have considerable net worth or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	So I'm happy to expand that if you're looking for either hard data across a large audience or anecdotal not anecdotal, but survey type data, sample type data across a larger audience, happy to expand that and sit with you or your teammates to see how the stuff we're gathering could be of value in this data need. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you for that. Greg, welcome. MR. YADLEY: Thank you. I apologize for being late. The date of the meeting was changed and I was on vacation, didn't get home until last night, didn't have time to shave. But I did find a clean white shirt. So I'm not sure what everyone has said but I the draft recommendations I definitely concur in and would underscore the do no harm and the fact that we're talking about additional exemptions. I agree with Mark that a test sounds like a good idea, but I'm a part-time law professor and I have to change my homework assignments every year in major ways because otherwise I get the same bad answers back because they're shared.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	support. Thank you. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Greg. Michael. MR. PIECIAK: Thank you, Stephen. I just wanted to make a couple of broader policy points from a state regulator perspective. When we often think of accredited investor we think of wealth and income as a proxy for sophistication, experience, knowledge, which I think we're all discussing today. But in addition the ability to withstand loss as Greg points out, there's both the risk of the loss, there's a risk of fraud. There's also legal risk in my opinion that, you know, the terms of the deal might not be quite what you understood them to be or you could be put at risk by future rounds of investment, and that's something to be considerate of as well. So when we move away from, you know, asset based qualifications to credentials or a test or things of that nature, we move away from the ability to withstand loss in terms of the individuals that are making the investment. So I just make that point, not to make a recommendation but to say, you know, is there some way of protecting those investors that are young, have a

	Page 38		Page 40
1	On the knowledge of the industry perspective, I	1	know, sophistication goes on both sides of the table and
2	just wanted to make one point there as well. People can	2	you've seen it many, many, times, I've seen it many, many
3	have great experience and great knowledge of a particular	3	times, where you're representing a company and there's
4	industry, but I think as John, and Greg, and Stephen, and	4	certain investors that you just stay away from for those
5	other lawyers would attest it doesn't necessarily mean	5	kinds of reasons.
6	that they understand the deal terms, and just for one	6	MR. REARDON: There's a joke about that. The
7	risk for example do they understand what dilution means	7	guy goes back to his college reunion, flies in on a
8	if the next round of investment comes in.	8	helicopter. Have you heard this old joke?
9	So there has to be some level of sophistication	9	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No, please tell.
10	built into someone's knowledge of a particular industry	10	MR. REARDON: He gets off with his body guards
11	or experience in my opinion.	11	and some of his classmates from the class of whatever go
12	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Michael. Anyone	12	up to him and say, "Gee, Joe, you're this is great.
13	else? Patrick.	13	How did you make all this money?"
14	MR. REARDON: I'm happy with tests or anything	14	And he said, "Well, I make a part for a dollar and
15	on sophistication. I do think the problem we're not	15	I sell it for \$4, and that 4 percent interest really adds
16	going to be able to create a test, so we will have to	16	up."
17	rely on somebody else's certification, like a chartered	17	(Laughter.)
18	financial analyst. Once you have one test there's going	18	MR. REARDON: There are a lot of people like
19	to be the me too syndrome, that the certified financial	19	that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Yeah. Okay. Anyone
20	planners are going to want to come in and or the	20	else?
21	accountants take a test and the lawyers take a test.	21	Well, everyone has a copy of the draft
22	Wherever you go there are going to be people	22	recommendation. I'm not going to read through it again.
23	that may have credentials and there are going to be	23	But what I would like to do is to, you know, move to
24	dummies in there that are going to make bad investments.	24	adopt that recommendation with the following changes that
25	But, I mean, I'm happy as long as and Julie pointed	25	we can sort out later this morning or early this
	Page 39		Page 41
1	out that this we had a discussion of this before the	1	afternoon so we can have a final to look at today. Is
2			-
	meeting, and she's got a mind like a steel trap. She	2	that feasible?

8	immediately said this may be already in there, but there	3	And add to that the suggestion that expanding
Ł	needs to be a presumption that if somebody says I'm	4	the pool to include those who have passed the Series 7,
5	sophisticated for this reason that they've got the burden	5	65 or 82 exams, you know, makes sense, and that the
5	if they ever get buyer's remorse of proving they weren't	6	Commission should give some thought to this whole idea
,	sophisticated and there was some reason why the issuer	7	that we're talking about where it's and we touched on
3	should have not accepted that self-certification.	8	this a little bit the last time around as well, is that
)	You know, I'll pick on my own profession.	9	when when it seems it seems a little bit out of
)	There are plenty of lawyers and a lot of lawyers will	10	bounds when we start trying to protect people from
-	tell you they know everything. But, you know, if they	11	themselves as opposed to trying to protect people from
2	lose some money it's going to be that they were cheated	12	fraudsters when because you come from a certain
8	and deceived and they're going to have remorse over	13	background or a certain income level you're not given the
Ł	making that investment.	14	opportunity to invest in things that could be very
5	So if you're going into the area of	15	lucrative.
5	subjectivity, and we talked about protecting the	16	The flip side of that is of course as we all
7	investor, I worry about protecting the issuer, that the	17	know is investor protection. That's I think that's
3	issuer is not set up if they if the rule says you're	18	something that needs to be thought about because I think
)	going to you're going to take their certification.	19	that's a real issue. I don't know how you get there
)	Well, if I take their certification that's got to be it	20	necessarily, but I think it's something that does deserve
-	and for you know, absent fraud and winking and	21	additional thought. If you can somehow define the
2	nodding. But, I mean, there are plenty of people out	22	industry expertise, somehow define the knowledge that you
3	there who for whatever reason don't know things and I see	23	might have with respect to a particular company to enable
Ł	it all the time.	24	you to qualify I think we should kind of put our heads
5	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Yeah, you're right. You	25	together and see if there's an answer.

D	
Page	44

	Page 42		Page 44
1	MS. YAMANAKA: Stephen, that's so important. I	1	how many times they're told that they might lose
2	just want to give people the opportunity to play. If we	2	everything, they never believe it. And then when they
3	can be part of a group that broadens that pool in however	3	lose everything then it's it's you have a difficult
4	way we can do it I don't think it could hurt in that	4	situation. Well, sometimes yes, sometimes no. Sometimes
5	sense, If people have the opportunity to participate in a	5	they I mean, there are those that are prone to sue,
6	non-traditional way. Because all the others are, to	6	but there are others who just lose everything.
7	Mark's point, you know, you got to be you're in the	7	And so, you know, some sort of balance, and I don't
8	group already. I think that if we can look and see if	8	know what the answer is but, you know, I could I can -
9	there are other ways if you're not in the group how can	9	- in this context I would I could see the I could
10	you participate. Thank you.	10	see room for limits. I don't know what they might be,
11	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Right.	11	but I can see some sort of limitation.
12	CHAIR WHITE: Stephen.	12	MS. YAMANAKA: Let's say it's on the table.
13	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Yes, please.	13	It's a tough, it's a tough question, I agree. I just
14	CHAIR WHITE: If I may just follow up	14	I think that right now as it stands you're eliminating a
15	with a question. Does that also mean I mean,	15	whole category of people that we can bring into the
16	-	16	wealth making process of the United States, and not only
	opportunity to participate, I guess I would ask you I		•••
17	think I probably know the answer but, you know, your	17	that but they bring something else to the table, to
18	views on investment limits coupled with the opportunity,	18	Catherine's point and then to Mark's point, regarding
19	broadening the opportunity to participate, I assume	19	knowledge and expertise.
20	let me let you answer for yourself, okay.	20	I don't think it's our responsibility to prevent
21	MS. YAMANAKA: I struggle with limits, right,	21	loss because if not, you know, we're out of business
22	because I think let's take my uncle again. He was in	22	before we start. On the other hand I don't think we're
23	a totally different situation. He was a bachelor, he had	23	talking about people who are going to take their first
24	no his first big investment was his house that he paid	24	paycheck and put it into this. We're talking about I
25	off early because he had no family obligations. And he	25	think a different level or segment of the population that
	Page 43		Page 45
1	Page 43 was in a different financial situation versus my parents	1	Page 45 has some sort of knowledge and they're not just investing
1 2		1 2	
	was in a different financial situation versus my parents		has some sort of knowledge and they're not just investing
2	was in a different financial situation versus my parents who put their kids through college on their own and all	2	has some sort of knowledge and they're not just investing in their 401K at their company level stock.
2 3	was in a different financial situation versus my parents who put their kids through college on their own and all this other kind of things.	2 3	has some sort of knowledge and they're not just investing in their 401K at their company level stock. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Right. It's a difficult
2 3 4	was in a different financial situation versus my parents who put their kids through college on their own and all this other kind of things. I think that when you like we had all	2 3 4	has some sort of knowledge and they're not just investing in their 401K at their company level stock. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Right. It's a difficult question.
2 3 4 5	was in a different financial situation versus my parents who put their kids through college on their own and all this other kind of things. I think that when you like we had all indicated earlier, there's no protection against loss. I	2 3 4 5	has some sort of knowledge and they're not just investing in their 401K at their company level stock. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Right. It's a difficult question. MS. YAMANAKA: It's a line.
2 3 4 5 6	was in a different financial situation versus my parents who put their kids through college on their own and all this other kind of things. I think that when you like we had all indicated earlier, there's no protection against loss. I mean, if there is it would be you know, this would be	2 3 4 5 6	has some sort of knowledge and they're not just investing in their 401K at their company level stock. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Right. It's a difficult question. MS. YAMANAKA: It's a line. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I don't know what the answer
2 3 4 5 6 7	was in a different financial situation versus my parents who put their kids through college on their own and all this other kind of things. I think that when you like we had all indicated earlier, there's no protection against loss. I mean, if there is it would be you know, this would be a different business. So loss is a very real part of the	2 3 4 5 6 7	has some sort of knowledge and they're not just investing in their 401K at their company level stock. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Right. It's a difficult question. MS. YAMANAKA: It's a line. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I don't know what the answer is. But you don't want and I have I have said I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>was in a different financial situation versus my parents</li> <li>who put their kids through college on their own and all</li> <li>this other kind of things.</li> <li>I think that when you like we had all</li> <li>indicated earlier, there's no protection against loss. I</li> <li>mean, if there is it would be you know, this would be</li> <li>a different business. So loss is a very real part of the</li> <li>equation that people have to understand.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	has some sort of knowledge and they're not just investing in their 401K at their company level stock. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Right. It's a difficult question. MS. YAMANAKA: It's a line. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I don't know what the answer is. But you don't want and I have I have said I don't like paternalistic attitudes, but nonetheless I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>was in a different financial situation versus my parents</li> <li>who put their kids through college on their own and all</li> <li>this other kind of things.</li> <li>I think that when you like we had all</li> <li>indicated earlier, there's no protection against loss. I</li> <li>mean, if there is it would be you know, this would be</li> <li>a different business. So loss is a very real part of the</li> <li>equation that people have to understand.</li> <li>I think that, and I could be wrong, but I'm hoping</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	has some sort of knowledge and they're not just investing in their 401K at their company level stock. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Right. It's a difficult question. MS. YAMANAKA: It's a line. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I don't know what the answer is. But you don't want and I have I have said I don't like paternalistic attitudes, but nonetheless I don't want to see somebody lose their house.
2 3 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>was in a different financial situation versus my parents</li> <li>who put their kids through college on their own and all</li> <li>this other kind of things.</li> <li>I think that when you like we had all</li> <li>indicated earlier, there's no protection against loss. I</li> <li>mean, if there is it would be you know, this would be</li> <li>a different business. So loss is a very real part of the</li> <li>equation that people have to understand.</li> <li>I think that, and I could be wrong, but I'm hoping</li> <li>that people understand when they have to start thinking</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	has some sort of knowledge and they're not just investing in their 401K at their company level stock. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Right. It's a difficult question. MS. YAMANAKA: It's a line. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I don't know what the answer is. But you don't want and I have I have said I don't like paternalistic attitudes, but nonetheless I don't want to see somebody lose their house. MS. YAMANAKA: Yes, yes, absolutely.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>was in a different financial situation versus my parents</li> <li>who put their kids through college on their own and all</li> <li>this other kind of things.</li> <li>I think that when you like we had all</li> <li>indicated earlier, there's no protection against loss. I</li> <li>mean, if there is it would be you know, this would be</li> <li>a different business. So loss is a very real part of the</li> <li>equation that people have to understand.</li> <li>I think that, and I could be wrong, but I'm hoping</li> <li>that people understand when they have to start thinking</li> <li>about investments as a normal course of their whole life</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	has some sort of knowledge and they're not just investing in their 401K at their company level stock. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Right. It's a difficult question. MS. YAMANAKA: It's a line. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I don't know what the answer is. But you don't want and I have I have said I don't like paternalistic attitudes, but nonetheless I don't want to see somebody lose their house. MS. YAMANAKA: Yes, yes, absolutely. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And it's you know, and as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>was in a different financial situation versus my parents who put their kids through college on their own and all this other kind of things.</li> <li>I think that when you like we had all indicated earlier, there's no protection against loss. I mean, if there is it would be you know, this would be a different business. So loss is a very real part of the equation that people have to understand.</li> <li>I think that, and I could be wrong, but I'm hoping that people understand when they have to start thinking about investments as a normal course of their whole life directory it's like having a checking account, thinking</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	has some sort of knowledge and they're not just investing in their 401K at their company level stock. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Right. It's a difficult question. MS. YAMANAKA: It's a line. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I don't know what the answer is. But you don't want and I have I have said I don't like paternalistic attitudes, but nonetheless I don't want to see somebody lose their house. MS. YAMANAKA: Yes, yes, absolutely. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And it's you know, and as far as preventing loss is concerned, the idea is to make
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>was in a different financial situation versus my parents</li> <li>who put their kids through college on their own and all</li> <li>this other kind of things.</li> <li>I think that when you like we had all</li> <li>indicated earlier, there's no protection against loss. I</li> <li>mean, if there is it would be you know, this would be</li> <li>a different business. So loss is a very real part of the</li> <li>equation that people have to understand.</li> <li>I think that, and I could be wrong, but I'm hoping</li> <li>that people understand when they have to start thinking</li> <li>about investments as a normal course of their whole life</li> <li>directory it's like having a checking account, thinking</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	has some sort of knowledge and they're not just investing in their 401K at their company level stock. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Right. It's a difficult question. MS. YAMANAKA: It's a line. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I don't know what the answer is. But you don't want and I have I have said I don't like paternalistic attitudes, but nonetheless I don't want to see somebody lose their house. MS. YAMANAKA: Yes, yes, absolutely. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And it's you know, and as far as preventing loss is concerned, the idea is to make people understand, really truly understand the risk
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>was in a different financial situation versus my parents</li> <li>who put their kids through college on their own and all</li> <li>this other kind of things.</li> <li>I think that when you like we had all</li> <li>indicated earlier, there's no protection against loss. I</li> <li>mean, if there is it would be you know, this would be</li> <li>a different business. So loss is a very real part of the</li> <li>equation that people have to understand.</li> <li>I think that, and I could be wrong, but I'm hoping</li> <li>that people understand when they have to start thinking</li> <li>about investments as a normal course of their whole life</li> <li>directory it's like having a checking account, thinking</li> <li>about retirement, and now, look, they're not going to be</li> <li>taken care of. They have to take care of these things</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	has some sort of knowledge and they're not just investing in their 401K at their company level stock. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Right. It's a difficult question. MS. YAMANAKA: It's a line. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I don't know what the answer is. But you don't want and I have I have said I don't like paternalistic attitudes, but nonetheless I don't like paternalistic attitudes, but nonetheless I don't want to see somebody lose their house. MS. YAMANAKA: Yes, yes, absolutely. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And it's you know, and as far as preventing loss is concerned, the idea is to make people understand, really truly understand the risk involved and the possibility of loss and not to not to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>was in a different financial situation versus my parents who put their kids through college on their own and all this other kind of things.</li> <li>I think that when you like we had all indicated earlier, there's no protection against loss. I mean, if there is it would be you know, this would be a different business. So loss is a very real part of the equation that people have to understand.</li> <li>I think that, and I could be wrong, but I'm hoping that people understand when they have to start thinking about investments as a normal course of their whole life directory it's like having a checking account, thinking about retirement, and now, look, they're not going to be taken care of. They have to take care of these things for themselves. I think that it's fair to them if they</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	has some sort of knowledge and they're not just investing in their 401K at their company level stock. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Right. It's a difficult question. MS. YAMANAKA: It's a line. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I don't know what the answer is. But you don't want and I have I have said I don't like paternalistic attitudes, but nonetheless I don't like paternalistic attitudes, but nonetheless I don't want to see somebody lose their house. MS. YAMANAKA: Yes, yes, absolutely. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And it's you know, and as far as preventing loss is concerned, the idea is to make people understand, really truly understand the risk involved and the possibility of loss and not to not to ever hope to prevent loss because that's, that's folly.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>was in a different financial situation versus my parents who put their kids through college on their own and all this other kind of things.</li> <li>I think that when you like we had all indicated earlier, there's no protection against loss. I mean, if there is it would be you know, this would be a different business. So loss is a very real part of the equation that people have to understand.</li> <li>I think that, and I could be wrong, but I'm hoping that people understand when they have to start thinking about investments as a normal course of their whole life directory it's like having a checking account, thinking about retirement, and now, look, they're not going to be taken care of. They have to take care of these things for themselves. I think that it's fair to them if they are going to have that responsibility that they have full</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	has some sort of knowledge and they're not just investing in their 401K at their company level stock. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Right. It's a difficult question. MS. YAMANAKA: It's a line. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I don't know what the answer is. But you don't want and I have I have said I don't like paternalistic attitudes, but nonetheless I don't want to see somebody lose their house. MS. YAMANAKA: Yes, yes, absolutely. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And it's you know, and as far as preventing loss is concerned, the idea is to make people understand, really truly understand the risk involved and the possibility of loss and not to not to ever hope to prevent loss because that's, that's folly. MS. YAMANAKA: Right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>was in a different financial situation versus my parents who put their kids through college on their own and all this other kind of things.</li> <li>I think that when you like we had all indicated earlier, there's no protection against loss. I mean, if there is it would be you know, this would be a different business. So loss is a very real part of the equation that people have to understand.</li> <li>I think that, and I could be wrong, but I'm hoping that people understand when they have to start thinking about investments as a normal course of their whole life directory it's like having a checking account, thinking about retirement, and now, look, they're not going to be taken care of. They have to take care of these things for themselves. I think that it's fair to them if they are going to have that responsibility that they have full access to the complement. I'm not saying there has to be</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	has some sort of knowledge and they're not just investing in their 401K at their company level stock. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Right. It's a difficult question. MS. YAMANAKA: It's a line. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I don't know what the answer is. But you don't want and I have I have said I don't like paternalistic attitudes, but nonetheless I don't want to see somebody lose their house. MS. YAMANAKA: Yes, yes, absolutely. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And it's you know, and as far as preventing loss is concerned, the idea is to make people understand, really truly understand the risk involved and the possibility of loss and not to not to ever hope to prevent loss because that's, that's folly. MS. YAMANAKA: Right. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Greg.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>was in a different financial situation versus my parents who put their kids through college on their own and all this other kind of things.</li> <li>I think that when you like we had all indicated earlier, there's no protection against loss. I mean, if there is it would be you know, this would be a different business. So loss is a very real part of the equation that people have to understand.</li> <li>I think that, and I could be wrong, but I'm hoping that people understand when they have to start thinking about investments as a normal course of their whole life directory it's like having a checking account, thinking about retirement, and now, look, they're not going to be taken care of. They have to take care of these things for themselves. I think that it's fair to them if they are going to have that responsibility that they have full access to the complement. I'm not saying there has to be a lot of education, structure, or whatever those things</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	has some sort of knowledge and they're not just investing in their 401K at their company level stock. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Right. It's a difficult question. MS. YAMANAKA: It's a line. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I don't know what the answer is. But you don't want and I have I have said I don't like paternalistic attitudes, but nonetheless I don't like paternalistic attitudes, but nonetheless I don't want to see somebody lose their house. MS. YAMANAKA: Yes, yes, absolutely. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And it's you know, and as far as preventing loss is concerned, the idea is to make people understand, really truly understand the risk involved and the possibility of loss and not to not to ever hope to prevent loss because that's, that's folly. MS. YAMANAKA: Right. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Greg. MR. YADLEY: If we if the Commission is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>was in a different financial situation versus my parents who put their kids through college on their own and all this other kind of things.</li> <li>I think that when you like we had all indicated earlier, there's no protection against loss. I mean, if there is it would be you know, this would be a different business. So loss is a very real part of the equation that people have to understand.</li> <li>I think that, and I could be wrong, but I'm hoping that people understand when they have to start thinking about investments as a normal course of their whole life directory it's like having a checking account, thinking about retirement, and now, look, they're not going to be taken care of. They have to take care of these things for themselves. I think that it's fair to them if they are going to have that responsibility that they have full access to the complement. I'm not saying there has to be a lot of education, structure, or whatever those things are but, no, we can't protect against loss or limits</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	has some sort of knowledge and they're not just investing in their 401K at their company level stock. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Right. It's a difficult question. MS. YAMANAKA: It's a line. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I don't know what the answer is. But you don't want and I have I have said I don't like paternalistic attitudes, but nonetheless I don't like paternalistic attitudes, but nonetheless I don't want to see somebody lose their house. MS. YAMANAKA: Yes, yes, absolutely. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And it's you know, and as far as preventing loss is concerned, the idea is to make people understand, really truly understand the risk involved and the possibility of loss and not to not to ever hope to prevent loss because that's, that's folly. MS. YAMANAKA: Right. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Greg. MR. YADLEY: If we if the Commission is going to look at limits I would start with the crowd
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>was in a different financial situation versus my parents who put their kids through college on their own and all this other kind of things.</li> <li>I think that when you like we had all indicated earlier, there's no protection against loss. I mean, if there is it would be you know, this would be a different business. So loss is a very real part of the equation that people have to understand.</li> <li>I think that, and I could be wrong, but I'm hoping that people understand when they have to start thinking about investments as a normal course of their whole life directory it's like having a checking account, thinking about retirement, and now, look, they're not going to be taken care of. They have to take care of these things for themselves. I think that it's fair to them if they are going to have that responsibility that they have full access to the complement. I'm not saying there has to be a lot of education, structure, or whatever those things are but, no, we can't protect against loss or limits because again by definition you're keeping that pool</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	has some sort of knowledge and they're not just investing in their 401K at their company level stock. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Right. It's a difficult question. MS. YAMANAKA: It's a line. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I don't know what the answer is. But you don't want and I have I have said I don't like paternalistic attitudes, but nonetheless I don't want to see somebody lose their house. MS. YAMANAKA: Yes, yes, absolutely. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And it's you know, and as far as preventing loss is concerned, the idea is to make people understand, really truly understand the risk involved and the possibility of loss and not to not to ever hope to prevent loss because that's, that's folly. MS. YAMANAKA: Right. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Greg. MR. YADLEY: If we if the Commission is going to look at limits I would start with the crowd funding limits only because one of the things we want to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>was in a different financial situation versus my parents who put their kids through college on their own and all this other kind of things.</li> <li>I think that when you like we had all indicated earlier, there's no protection against loss. I mean, if there is it would be you know, this would be a different business. So loss is a very real part of the equation that people have to understand.</li> <li>I think that, and I could be wrong, but I'm hoping that people understand when they have to start thinking about investments as a normal course of their whole life directory it's like having a checking account, thinking about retirement, and now, look, they're not going to be taken care of. They have to take care of these things for themselves. I think that it's fair to them if they are going to have that responsibility that they have full access to the complement. I'm not saying there has to be a lot of education, structure, or whatever those things are but, no, we can't protect against loss or limits because again by definition you're keeping that pool small.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	has some sort of knowledge and they're not just investing in their 401K at their company level stock. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Right. It's a difficult question. MS. YAMANAKA: It's a line. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I don't know what the answer is. But you don't want and I have I have said I don't like paternalistic attitudes, but nonetheless I don't want to see somebody lose their house. MS. YAMANAKA: Yes, yes, absolutely. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And it's you know, and as far as preventing loss is concerned, the idea is to make people understand, really truly understand the risk involved and the possibility of loss and not to not to ever hope to prevent loss because that's, that's folly. MS. YAMANAKA: Right. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Greg. MR. YADLEY: If we if the Commission is going to look at limits I would start with the crowd funding limits only because one of the things we want to keep in mind is simplicity there. And I think the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>was in a different financial situation versus my parents who put their kids through college on their own and all this other kind of things.</li> <li>I think that when you like we had all indicated earlier, there's no protection against loss. I mean, if there is it would be you know, this would be a different business. So loss is a very real part of the equation that people have to understand.</li> <li>I think that, and I could be wrong, but I'm hoping that people understand when they have to start thinking about investments as a normal course of their whole life directory it's like having a checking account, thinking about retirement, and now, look, they're not going to be taken care of. They have to take care of these things for themselves. I think that it's fair to them if they are going to have that responsibility that they have full access to the complement. I'm not saying there has to be a lot of education, structure, or whatever those things are but, no, we can't protect against loss or limits because again by definition you're keeping that pool small.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	has some sort of knowledge and they're not just investing in their 401K at their company level stock. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Right. It's a difficult question. MS. YAMANAKA: It's a line. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I don't know what the answer is. But you don't want and I have I have said I don't like paternalistic attitudes, but nonetheless I don't want to see somebody lose their house. MS. YAMANAKA: Yes, yes, absolutely. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And it's you know, and as far as preventing loss is concerned, the idea is to make people understand, really truly understand the risk involved and the possibility of loss and not to not to ever hope to prevent loss because that's, that's folly. MS. YAMANAKA: Right. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Greg. MR. YADLEY: If we if the Commission is going to look at limits I would start with the crowd funding limits only because one of the things we want to keep in mind is simplicity there. And I think the Commission has done a good job in the bad actor area
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>was in a different financial situation versus my parents who put their kids through college on their own and all this other kind of things.</li> <li>I think that when you like we had all indicated earlier, there's no protection against loss. I mean, if there is it would be you know, this would be a different business. So loss is a very real part of the equation that people have to understand.</li> <li>I think that, and I could be wrong, but I'm hoping that people understand when they have to start thinking about investments as a normal course of their whole life directory it's like having a checking account, thinking about retirement, and now, look, they're not going to be taken care of. They have to take care of these things for themselves. I think that it's fair to them if they are going to have that responsibility that they have full access to the complement. I'm not saying there has to be a lot of education, structure, or whatever those things are but, no, we can't protect against loss or limits because again by definition you're keeping that pool small.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Yeah, we can't do that and I don't know what the answer is, but so many investors that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	has some sort of knowledge and they're not just investing in their 401K at their company level stock. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Right. It's a difficult question. MS. YAMANAKA: It's a line. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I don't know what the answer is. But you don't want and I have I have said I don't like paternalistic attitudes, but nonetheless I don't want to see somebody lose their house. MS. YAMANAKA: Yes, yes, absolutely. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And it's you know, and as far as preventing loss is concerned, the idea is to make people understand, really truly understand the risk involved and the possibility of loss and not to not to ever hope to prevent loss because that's, that's folly. MS. YAMANAKA: Right. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Greg. MR. YADLEY: If we if the Commission is going to look at limits I would start with the crowd funding limits only because one of the things we want to keep in mind is simplicity there. And I think the Commission has done a good job in the bad actor area about trying to get to one standard. So if we're going

	Page 46		Page 48
1	that's Regulation CF.	1	they're not looking for a hundred investors, they're
2	Personally part of me says, yeah, it's nice	2	looking for a limited number, a network of SPV,
3	that there should be limits. I'm not a gambler, but	3	something. They don't want to do a lot of small
4	whenever I've been on a cruise ship I've taken the amount	4	investors.
5	of money that I've decided I can lose and gone to play	5	So I think again if you look at crowd funding we've
6	and gone to bed early.	6	always talked about, you know, in kind of the area where
7	And I'll say that my most successful investments	7	I practice a lot of companies aren't going to want to
8	have been those where my conservative nature came through	8	take advantage of crowd funding offerings potentially
9	and I said I trust the people, I think it's a good deal,	9	because they're ending up with a lot of really small
10	I don't want to get over extended, and those have always	10	investors. And we've talked in a conference that I've
11	been the best ones.	11	attended, venture capital firms have said they will
12	So the next time when I invest in something I	12	probably never come in and invest after a crowd funding
13	invest more and it doesn't work out. So I think that's	13	round because there's just going to be too many people on
14	the problem with limits. But at least a percentage of	14	the cap table and too hard to manage.
15	assets or net income, although it's a snapshot at times,	15	So again they do have a small limitation amount.
16	at a moment in time, and it may prevent you, an individual	16	It will impact what they can invest in, it will impact
17	from taking advantage of a deal that you believe in, if	17	issuers' interests in allowing them to invest. So I
18	we're going to do that then I guess that's okay.	18	think we have to be really careful to balance that as
19	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Annemarie.	19	well.
20	MS. TIERNEY: I have a couple of thoughts.	20	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you for that. Again I
21	First of all I would be adamantly opposed to any kind of	21	let's stipulate that we're not doing anything to the
22	limits that impact the existing structure. So if there	22	core, the core framework, right. And then anything that
23	was a limitation I would think it would need to be on a	23	we might add to that, for example passing a Series 7, et
24	category where there's less comfort, so maybe it's	24	cetera, that we're not talking about applying limits to
25	somebody who has a minimum investment history. But you	25	that either, at least that's not what I'm thinking.
	Page 47		Page 49
1	Page 47 certainly wouldn't want to tell a financially accredited	1	Page 49 I'm thinking about and again I don't have the
1 2	_	1 2	_
	certainly wouldn't want to tell a financially accredited		I'm thinking about and again I don't have the
2	certainly wouldn't want to tell a financially accredited investor that they were that they needed to be limited	2	I'm thinking about and again I don't have the answer, but just going back to those individuals that
2 3 4 5	certainly wouldn't want to tell a financially accredited investor that they were that they needed to be limited in their investment. I think the CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No, not at all. MS. TIERNEY: thing you need to think about	2 3 4 5	I'm thinking about and again I don't have the answer, but just going back to those individuals that otherwise would be left out, how do you bring them in in a rationale way. Catherine.
2 3 4 5 6	certainly wouldn't want to tell a financially accredited investor that they were that they needed to be limited in their investment. I think the CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No, not at all. MS. TIERNEY: thing you need to think about when you talk bout limits is that's going to preclude	2 3 4 5 6	I'm thinking about and again I don't have the answer, but just going back to those individuals that otherwise would be left out, how do you bring them in in a rationale way. Catherine. MS. MOTT: So, yes, I wanted to respond to
2 3 4 5 6 7	certainly wouldn't want to tell a financially accredited investor that they were that they needed to be limited in their investment. I think the CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No, not at all. MS. TIERNEY: thing you need to think about when you talk bout limits is that's going to preclude limited people from investing in a lot of opportunities	2 3 4 5 6 7	I'm thinking about and again I don't have the answer, but just going back to those individuals that otherwise would be left out, how do you bring them in in a rationale way. Catherine. MS. MOTT: So, yes, I wanted to respond to Commissioner White's question because, you know, one of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	certainly wouldn't want to tell a financially accredited investor that they were that they needed to be limited in their investment. I think the CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No, not at all. MS. TIERNEY: thing you need to think about when you talk bout limits is that's going to preclude limited people from investing in a lot of opportunities because there's always a minimum investment amount. So	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	I'm thinking about and again I don't have the answer, but just going back to those individuals that otherwise would be left out, how do you bring them in in a rationale way. Catherine. MS. MOTT: So, yes, I wanted to respond to Commissioner White's question because, you know, one of the things I've you know, my first let me talk
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	certainly wouldn't want to tell a financially accredited investor that they were that they needed to be limited in their investment. I think the CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No, not at all. MS. TIERNEY: thing you need to think about when you talk bout limits is that's going to preclude limited people from investing in a lot of opportunities because there's always a minimum investment amount. So if you have a minimum investment amount of \$25,000 or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I'm thinking about and again I don't have the answer, but just going back to those individuals that otherwise would be left out, how do you bring them in in a rationale way. Catherine. MS. MOTT: So, yes, I wanted to respond to Commissioner White's question because, you know, one of the things I've you know, my first let me talk historically. The industry has changed dramatically over
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	certainly wouldn't want to tell a financially accredited investor that they were that they needed to be limited in their investment. I think the CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No, not at all. MS. TIERNEY: thing you need to think about when you talk bout limits is that's going to preclude limited people from investing in a lot of opportunities because there's always a minimum investment amount. So	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	I'm thinking about and again I don't have the answer, but just going back to those individuals that otherwise would be left out, how do you bring them in in a rationale way. Catherine. MS. MOTT: So, yes, I wanted to respond to Commissioner White's question because, you know, one of the things I've you know, my first let me talk historically. The industry has changed dramatically over the past ten years. I made my first investment in 1999,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	certainly wouldn't want to tell a financially accredited investor that they were that they needed to be limited in their investment. I think the CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No, not at all. MS. TIERNEY: thing you need to think about when you talk bout limits is that's going to preclude limited people from investing in a lot of opportunities because there's always a minimum investment amount. So if you have a minimum investment amount of \$25,000 or \$50,000, Catherine, right, in a normal angel investment	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	I'm thinking about and again I don't have the answer, but just going back to those individuals that otherwise would be left out, how do you bring them in in a rationale way. Catherine. MS. MOTT: So, yes, I wanted to respond to Commissioner White's question because, you know, one of the things I've you know, my first let me talk historically. The industry has changed dramatically over the past ten years. I made my first investment in 1999, and it was one of those things where I was sitting,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	certainly wouldn't want to tell a financially accredited investor that they were that they needed to be limited in their investment. I think the CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No, not at all. MS. TIERNEY: thing you need to think about when you talk bout limits is that's going to preclude limited people from investing in a lot of opportunities because there's always a minimum investment amount. So if you have a minimum investment amount of \$25,000 or \$50,000, Catherine, right, in a normal angel investment MS. MOTT: The average is 20.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	I'm thinking about and again I don't have the answer, but just going back to those individuals that otherwise would be left out, how do you bring them in in a rationale way. Catherine. MS. MOTT: So, yes, I wanted to respond to Commissioner White's question because, you know, one of the things I've you know, my first let me talk historically. The industry has changed dramatically over the past ten years. I made my first investment in 1999, and it was one of those things where I was sitting, talking to some folks, sitting at the bar talking bout a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	certainly wouldn't want to tell a financially accredited investor that they were that they needed to be limited in their investment. I think the CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No, not at all. MS. TIERNEY: thing you need to think about when you talk bout limits is that's going to preclude limited people from investing in a lot of opportunities because there's always a minimum investment amount. So if you have a minimum investment amount of \$25,000 or \$50,000, Catherine, right, in a normal angel investment MS. MOTT: The average is 20. MS. TIERNEY: The average is 20. Then if you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I'm thinking about and again I don't have the answer, but just going back to those individuals that otherwise would be left out, how do you bring them in in a rationale way. Catherine. MS. MOTT: So, yes, I wanted to respond to Commissioner White's question because, you know, one of the things I've you know, my first let me talk historically. The industry has changed dramatically over the past ten years. I made my first investment in 1999, and it was one of those things where I was sitting, talking to some folks, sitting at the bar talking bout a deal. It was Smart tech, Smart card technology. It
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	certainly wouldn't want to tell a financially accredited investor that they were that they needed to be limited in their investment. I think the CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No, not at all. MS. TIERNEY: thing you need to think about when you talk bout limits is that's going to preclude limited people from investing in a lot of opportunities because there's always a minimum investment amount. So if you have a minimum investment amount of \$25,000 or \$50,000, Catherine, right, in a normal angel investment - MS. MOTT: The average is 20. MS. TIERNEY: The average is 20. Then if you set a limit that precludes people from investing that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	I'm thinking about and again I don't have the answer, but just going back to those individuals that otherwise would be left out, how do you bring them in in a rationale way. Catherine. MS. MOTT: So, yes, I wanted to respond to Commissioner White's question because, you know, one of the things I've you know, my first let me talk historically. The industry has changed dramatically over the past ten years. I made my first investment in 1999, and it was one of those things where I was sitting, talking to some folks, sitting at the bar talking bout a deal. It was Smart tech, Smart card technology. It sounded great and I wrote my check without any due
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	certainly wouldn't want to tell a financially accredited investor that they were that they needed to be limited in their investment. I think the CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No, not at all. MS. TIERNEY: thing you need to think about when you talk bout limits is that's going to preclude limited people from investing in a lot of opportunities because there's always a minimum investment amount. So if you have a minimum investment amount of \$25,000 or \$50,000, Catherine, right, in a normal angel investment MS. MOTT: The average is 20. MS. TIERNEY: The average is 20. Then if you set a limit that precludes people from investing that amount then they're already out of they're out of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I'm thinking about and again I don't have the answer, but just going back to those individuals that otherwise would be left out, how do you bring them in in a rationale way. Catherine. MS. MOTT: So, yes, I wanted to respond to Commissioner White's question because, you know, one of the things I've you know, my first let me talk historically. The industry has changed dramatically over the past ten years. I made my first investment in 1999, and it was one of those things where I was sitting, talking to some folks, sitting at the bar talking bout a deal. It was Smart tech, Smart card technology. It sounded great and I wrote my check without any due diligence, you know, lost everything. But you know
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	certainly wouldn't want to tell a financially accredited investor that they were that they needed to be limited in their investment. I think the CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No, not at all. MS. TIERNEY: thing you need to think about when you talk bout limits is that's going to preclude limited people from investing in a lot of opportunities because there's always a minimum investment amount. So if you have a minimum investment amount of \$25,000 or \$50,000, Catherine, right, in a normal angel investment - MS. MOTT: The average is 20. MS. TIERNEY: The average is 20. Then if you set a limit that precludes people from investing that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	I'm thinking about and again I don't have the answer, but just going back to those individuals that otherwise would be left out, how do you bring them in in a rationale way. Catherine. MS. MOTT: So, yes, I wanted to respond to Commissioner White's question because, you know, one of the things I've you know, my first let me talk historically. The industry has changed dramatically over the past ten years. I made my first investment in 1999, and it was one of those things where I was sitting, talking to some folks, sitting at the bar talking bout a deal. It was Smart tech, Smart card technology. It sounded great and I wrote my check without any due
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	certainly wouldn't want to tell a financially accredited investor that they were that they needed to be limited in their investment. I think the CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No, not at all. MS. TIERNEY: thing you need to think about when you talk bout limits is that's going to preclude limited people from investing in a lot of opportunities because there's always a minimum investment amount. So if you have a minimum investment amount of \$25,000 or \$50,000, Catherine, right, in a normal angel investment MS. MOTT: The average is 20. MS. TIERNEY: The average is 20. Then if you set a limit that precludes people from investing that amount then they're already out of they're out of the network of investing, and then maybe they can only invest	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I'm thinking about and again I don't have the answer, but just going back to those individuals that otherwise would be left out, how do you bring them in in a rationale way. Catherine. MS. MOTT: So, yes, I wanted to respond to Commissioner White's question because, you know, one of the things I've you know, my first let me talk historically. The industry has changed dramatically over the past ten years. I made my first investment in 1999, and it was one of those things where I was sitting, talking to some folks, sitting at the bar talking bout a deal. It was Smart tech, Smart card technology. It sounded great and I wrote my check without any due diligence, you know, lost everything. But you know But how the industry has changed since that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	certainly wouldn't want to tell a financially accredited investor that they were that they needed to be limited in their investment. I think the CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No, not at all. MS. TIERNEY: thing you need to think about when you talk bout limits is that's going to preclude limited people from investing in a lot of opportunities because there's always a minimum investment amount. So if you have a minimum investment amount of \$25,000 or \$50,000, Catherine, right, in a normal angel investment MS. MOTT: The average is 20. MS. TIERNEY: The average is 20. Then if you set a limit that precludes people from investing that amount then they're already out of they're out of the network of investing, and then maybe they can only invest in one opportunity a year.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	I'm thinking about and again I don't have the answer, but just going back to those individuals that otherwise would be left out, how do you bring them in in a rationale way. Catherine. MS. MOTT: So, yes, I wanted to respond to Commissioner White's question because, you know, one of the things I've you know, my first let me talk historically. The industry has changed dramatically over the past ten years. I made my first investment in 1999, and it was one of those things where I was sitting, talking to some folks, sitting at the bar talking bout a deal. It was Smart tech, Smart card technology. It sounded great and I wrote my check without any due diligence, you know, lost everything. But you know But how the industry has changed since that time you know, with dot com and what it's like today. It
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	certainly wouldn't want to tell a financially accredited investor that they were that they needed to be limited in their investment. I think the CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No, not at all. MS. TIERNEY: thing you need to think about when you talk bout limits is that's going to preclude limited people from investing in a lot of opportunities because there's always a minimum investment amount. So if you have a minimum investment amount of \$25,000 or \$50,000, Catherine, right, in a normal angel investment - MS. MOTT: The average is 20. MS. TIERNEY: The average is 20. Then if you set a limit that precludes people from investing that amount then they're already out of they're out of the network of investing, and then maybe they can only invest in one opportunity a year. So I think you have to be really careful with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I'm thinking about and again I don't have the answer, but just going back to those individuals that otherwise would be left out, how do you bring them in in a rationale way. Catherine. MS. MOTT: So, yes, I wanted to respond to Commissioner White's question because, you know, one of the things I've you know, my first let me talk historically. The industry has changed dramatically over the past ten years. I made my first investment in 1999, and it was one of those things where I was sitting, talking to some folks, sitting at the bar talking bout a deal. It was Smart tech, Smart card technology. It sounded great and I wrote my check without any due diligence, you know, lost everything. But you know But how the industry has changed since that time you know, with dot com and what it's like today. It is much more sophisticated. Best practices are out
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	certainly wouldn't want to tell a financially accredited investor that they were that they needed to be limited in their investment. I think the CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No, not at all. MS. TIERNEY: thing you need to think about when you talk bout limits is that's going to preclude limited people from investing in a lot of opportunities because there's always a minimum investment amount. So if you have a minimum investment amount of \$25,000 or \$50,000, Catherine, right, in a normal angel investment MS. MOTT: The average is 20. MS. TIERNEY: The average is 20. Then if you set a limit that precludes people from investing that amount then they're already out of they're out of the network of investing, and then maybe they can only invest in one opportunity a year. So I think you have to be really careful with limitations because you're going to shoot yourself in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	I'm thinking about and again I don't have the answer, but just going back to those individuals that otherwise would be left out, how do you bring them in in a rationale way. Catherine. MS. MOTT: So, yes, I wanted to respond to Commissioner White's question because, you know, one of the things I've you know, my first let me talk historically. The industry has changed dramatically over the past ten years. I made my first investment in 1999, and it was one of those things where I was sitting, talking to some folks, sitting at the bar talking bout a deal. It was Smart tech, Smart card technology. It sounded great and I wrote my check without any due diligence, you know, lost everything. But you know But how the industry has changed since that time you know, with dot com and what it's like today. It is much more sophisticated. Best practices are out there. There was not there was no Angel Capital
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	certainly wouldn't want to tell a financially accredited investor that they were that they needed to be limited in their investment. I think the CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No, not at all. MS. TIERNEY: thing you need to think about when you talk bout limits is that's going to preclude limited people from investing in a lot of opportunities because there's always a minimum investment amount. So if you have a minimum investment amount of \$25,000 or \$50,000, Catherine, right, in a normal angel investment MS. MOTT: The average is 20. MS. TIERNEY: The average is 20. Then if you set a limit that precludes people from investing that amount then they're already out of they're out of the network of investing, and then maybe they can only invest in one opportunity a year. So I think you have to be really careful with limitations because you're going to shoot yourself in the foot. You're not going to get these people are not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I'm thinking about and again I don't have the answer, but just going back to those individuals that otherwise would be left out, how do you bring them in in a rationale way. Catherine. MS. MOTT: So, yes, I wanted to respond to Commissioner White's question because, you know, one of the things I've you know, my first let me talk historically. The industry has changed dramatically over the past ten years. I made my first investment in 1999, and it was one of those things where I was sitting, talking to some folks, sitting at the bar talking bout a deal. It was Smart tech, Smart card technology. It sounded great and I wrote my check without any due diligence, you know, lost everything. But you know But how the industry has changed since that time you know, with dot com and what it's like today. It is much more sophisticated. Best practices are out there. There was not there was no Angel Capital Association, there were no portals like Angel List and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	certainly wouldn't want to tell a financially accredited investor that they were that they needed to be limited in their investment. I think the CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No, not at all. MS. TIERNEY: thing you need to think about when you talk bout limits is that's going to preclude limited people from investing in a lot of opportunities because there's always a minimum investment amount. So if you have a minimum investment amount of \$25,000 or \$50,000, Catherine, right, in a normal angel investment MS. MOTT: The average is 20. MS. TIERNEY: The average is 20. Then if you set a limit that precludes people from investing that amount then they're already out of they're out of the network of investing, and then maybe they can only invest in one opportunity a year. So I think you have to be really careful with limitations because you're going to shoot yourself in the foot. You're not going to get these people are not going to get the opportunity to invest.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I'm thinking about and again I don't have the answer, but just going back to those individuals that otherwise would be left out, how do you bring them in in a rationale way. Catherine. MS. MOTT: So, yes, I wanted to respond to Commissioner White's question because, you know, one of the things I've you know, my first let me talk historically. The industry has changed dramatically over the past ten years. I made my first investment in 1999, and it was one of those things where I was sitting, talking to some folks, sitting at the bar talking bout a deal. It was Smart tech, Smart card technology. It sounded great and I wrote my check without any due diligence, you know, lost everything. But you know But how the industry has changed since that time you know, with dot com and what it's like today. It is much more sophisticated. Best practices are out there. There was not there was no Angel Capital Association, there were no portals like Angel List and other things that really help the individual investor with a portfolio approach. Because this is as a matter of fact we have an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	certainly wouldn't want to tell a financially accredited investor that they were – that they needed to be limited in their investment. I think the –. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No, not at all. MS. TIERNEY: – thing you need to think about when you talk bout limits is that's going to preclude limited people from investing in a lot of opportunities because there's always a minimum investment amount. So if you have a minimum investment amount of \$25,000 or \$50,000, Catherine, right, in a normal angel investment - MS. MOTT: The average is 20. MS. TIERNEY: The average is 20. Then if you set a limit that precludes people from investing that amount then they're already out of – they're out of the network of investing, and then maybe they can only invest in one opportunity a year. So I think you have to be really careful with limitations because you're going to shoot yourself in the foot. You're not going to get – these people are not going to get the opportunity to invest. Also I think companies that are raising capital probably are tending to look to accumulate the capital from a limited number of investors, right. Most Reg D	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I'm thinking about and again I don't have the answer, but just going back to those individuals that otherwise would be left out, how do you bring them in in a rationale way. Catherine. MS. MOTT: So, yes, I wanted to respond to Commissioner White's question because, you know, one of the things I've you know, my first let me talk historically. The industry has changed dramatically over the past ten years. I made my first investment in 1999, and it was one of those things where I was sitting, talking to some folks, sitting at the bar talking bout a deal. It was Smart tech, Smart card technology. It sounded great and I wrote my check without any due diligence, you know, lost everything. But you know But how the industry has changed since that time you know, with dot com and what it's like today. It is much more sophisticated. Best practices are out there. There was not there was no Angel Capital Association, there were no portals like Angel List and other things that really help the individual investor with a portfolio approach. Because this is as a matter of fact we have an orientation, most of the best practices of the ACA has an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	certainly wouldn't want to tell a financially accredited investor that they were that they needed to be limited in their investment. I think the CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No, not at all. MS. TIERNEY: thing you need to think about when you talk bout limits is that's going to preclude limited people from investing in a lot of opportunities because there's always a minimum investment amount. So if you have a minimum investment amount of \$25,000 or \$50,000, Catherine, right, in a normal angel investment MS. MOTT: The average is 20. MS. TIERNEY: The average is 20. Then if you set a limit that precludes people from investing that amount then they're already out of they're out of the network of investing, and then maybe they can only invest in one opportunity a year. So I think you have to be really careful with limitations because you're going to shoot yourself in the foot. You're not going to get these people are not going to get the opportunity to invest.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I'm thinking about and again I don't have the answer, but just going back to those individuals that otherwise would be left out, how do you bring them in in a rationale way. Catherine. MS. MOTT: So, yes, I wanted to respond to Commissioner White's question because, you know, one of the things I've you know, my first let me talk historically. The industry has changed dramatically over the past ten years. I made my first investment in 1999, and it was one of those things where I was sitting, talking to some folks, sitting at the bar talking bout a deal. It was Smart tech, Smart card technology. It sounded great and I wrote my check without any due diligence, you know, lost everything. But you know But how the industry has changed since that time you know, with dot com and what it's like today. It is much more sophisticated. Best practices are out there. There was not there was no Angel Capital Association, there were no portals like Angel List and other things that really help the individual investor with a portfolio approach. Because this is as a matter of fact we have an

	Page 50		Page 52
1	everything that our financial advisors tell us and say,	1	it. He was smart but, you know, I just think there are a
2	hey, we advise that this you know, we're not telling	2	lot of people out there doing those things and to not let
3	you how much to put in here or how much to do, but we	3	them expand but however we can do it.
4	advise that you limit it to 10 percent of your investable	4	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay.
5	assets. So we tell them that.	5	CO-CHAIR HANKS: Jonathan.
б	We also say that we you should not invest in	6	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay, Lisa.
7	less than ten companies, and even ten may not be right.	7	MS. SHIMKAT: I just wanted to add a little bit
8	I mean, some of the research that we've done and we've	8	on the I don't think that we need to put more limits
9	shown is that it may mean 15 or 18 in order to get a 27	9	on and I know that it is something that was just out
10	percent, you know, return on investment.	10	there and thrown on the table, because I think when we
11	So, I mean, so the industry has changed, and so	11	start overstepping back into the away from protection
12	even if you're an individual investor like your uncle now	12	of fraud and more protection for themselves. And we have
13	there is information available now that he could just	13	to remember, too, what makes the headlines. What makes
14	search the Internet and with his group of friends say,	14	the headlines is a fraud or and that's how somebody
15	oh, gee, we shouldn't put all our eggs in one basket,	15	lost it.
16	although there's a temptation to do that sometimes	16	It's just like the customer service. You hear from
17	because this is this next antibiotic is going to be	17	the 2 percent that had a bad experience but you don't
18	the best thing ever and I'm going to put \$300,000 in it	18	hear from the 98 percent that had a wonderful experience.
19	and, you know what I mean. There is a temptation there.	19	And so I think, though, the news media grabs those
20		20	first and that's what we have to remember, that that is not
21	But as again the information has the whole	21	the majority hopefully out there.
22	industry has changed and you can jump onto Angel List or	22	And we do business differently now, it is so much
23	a crowd funding portal, something like that that will	23	different. It's like the whole incubator, the whole
24	help you make some decisions differently than you would	24	industry is inside out now and we're pushing resources to
25	have 12 years ago.	25	it. So I appreciate what we have now and I just want to
	Page 51		Page 53
1		1	
1 2	Page 51 MS. YAMANAKA: I just want to point out that my uncle didn't know about the ACA. I don't think he got	1 2	make sure that we don't start the conversation again to
	MS. YAMANAKA: I just want to point out that my		
2	MS. YAMANAKA: I just want to point out that my uncle didn't know about the ACA. I don't think he got	2	make sure that we don't start the conversation again to where we're trying to protect people from themselves
2 3	MS. YAMANAKA: I just want to point out that my uncle didn't know about the ACA. I don't think he got the Internet in the last, you know, whatever. But a lot	2 3	make sure that we don't start the conversation again to where we're trying to protect people from themselves again.
2 3 4	MS. YAMANAKA: I just want to point out that my uncle didn't know about the ACA. I don't think he got the Internet in the last, you know, whatever. But a lot but the portfolio, the limitation, the expertise, they	2 3 4	make sure that we don't start the conversation again to where we're trying to protect people from themselves again. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. It's about time to
2 3 4 5	MS. YAMANAKA: I just want to point out that my uncle didn't know about the ACA. I don't think he got the Internet in the last, you know, whatever. But a lot but the portfolio, the limitation, the expertise, they his group had all of those in place. So if one of the	2 3 4 5	make sure that we don't start the conversation again to where we're trying to protect people from themselves again. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. It's about time to wrap up. Commissioner Stein, did you have something?
2 3 4 5 6	MS. YAMANAKA: I just want to point out that my uncle didn't know about the ACA. I don't think he got the Internet in the last, you know, whatever. But a lot but the portfolio, the limitation, the expertise, they his group had all of those in place. So if one of the guys said, hey, I got this buddy and he wants to like	2 3 4 5 6	make sure that we don't start the conversation again to where we're trying to protect people from themselves again. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. It's about time to wrap up. Commissioner Stein, did you have something? COMMISSIONER STEIN: No, Jonathan has
2 3 4 5 6 7	MS. YAMANAKA: I just want to point out that my uncle didn't know about the ACA. I don't think he got the Internet in the last, you know, whatever. But a lot but the portfolio, the limitation, the expertise, they his group had all of those in place. So if one of the guys said, hey, I got this buddy and he wants to like whatever and remember they're all kind of similar	2 3 4 5 6 7	make sure that we don't start the conversation again to where we're trying to protect people from themselves again. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. It's about time to wrap up. Commissioner Stein, did you have something? COMMISSIONER STEIN: No, Jonathan has CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm going to Jonathan.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. YAMANAKA: I just want to point out that my uncle didn't know about the ACA. I don't think he got the Internet in the last, you know, whatever. But a lot but the portfolio, the limitation, the expertise, they his group had all of those in place. So if one of the guys said, hey, I got this buddy and he wants to like whatever and remember they're all kind of similar industries. So they would put less money in and if they had three of them they would put more money in. And they had this whole thing on liquidation, you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	make sure that we don't start the conversation again to where we're trying to protect people from themselves again. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. It's about time to wrap up. Commissioner Stein, did you have something? COMMISSIONER STEIN: No, Jonathan has CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm going to Jonathan. COMMISSIONER STEIN: I'm fine. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: You're fine, okay. So Jonathan, wrap it up.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	MS. YAMANAKA: I just want to point out that my uncle didn't know about the ACA. I don't think he got the Internet in the last, you know, whatever. But a lot but the portfolio, the limitation, the expertise, they his group had all of those in place. So if one of the guys said, hey, I got this buddy and he wants to like whatever and remember they're all kind of similar industries. So they would put less money in and if they had three of them they would put more money in. And they had this whole thing on liquidation, you know, as far as how much do they want to get out, when,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	make sure that we don't start the conversation again to where we're trying to protect people from themselves again. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. It's about time to wrap up. Commissioner Stein, did you have something? COMMISSIONER STEIN: No, Jonathan has CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm going to Jonathan. COMMISSIONER STEIN: I'm fine. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: You're fine, okay. So Jonathan, wrap it up. MR. NELSON: Just to kind of dovetail on what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MS. YAMANAKA: I just want to point out that my uncle didn't know about the ACA. I don't think he got the Internet in the last, you know, whatever. But a lot - but the portfolio, the limitation, the expertise, they - his group had all of those in place. So if one of the guys said, hey, I got this buddy and he wants to like whatever and remember they're all kind of similar industries. So they would put less money in and if they had three of them they would put more money in. And they had this whole thing on liquidation, you know, as far as how much do they want to get out, when, who, the tax situation, the extra money, because they	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	make sure that we don't start the conversation again to where we're trying to protect people from themselves again. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. It's about time to wrap up. Commissioner Stein, did you have something? COMMISSIONER STEIN: No, Jonathan has CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm going to Jonathan. COMMISSIONER STEIN: I'm fine. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: You're fine, okay. So Jonathan, wrap it up. MR. NELSON: Just to kind of dovetail on what Ms. Mott was saying, has there been any discussion in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. YAMANAKA: I just want to point out that my uncle didn't know about the ACA. I don't think he got the Internet in the last, you know, whatever. But a lot but the portfolio, the limitation, the expertise, they his group had all of those in place. So if one of the guys said, hey, I got this buddy and he wants to like whatever and remember they're all kind of similar industries. So they would put less money in and if they had three of them they would put more money in. And they had this whole thing on liquidation, you know, as far as how much do they want to get out, when, who, the tax situation, the extra money, because they would have their meetings in Vegas, right. All of these	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>make sure that we don't start the conversation again to where we're trying to protect people from themselves again.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. It's about time to wrap up. Commissioner Stein, did you have something? COMMISSIONER STEIN: No, Jonathan has CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm going to Jonathan. COMMISSIONER STEIN: I'm fine.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: You're fine, okay. So Jonathan, wrap it up.</li> <li>MR. NELSON: Just to kind of dovetail on what Ms. Mott was saying, has there been any discussion in terms of protecting investors from bad investments by</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS. YAMANAKA: I just want to point out that my uncle didn't know about the ACA. I don't think he got the Internet in the last, you know, whatever. But a lot but the portfolio, the limitation, the expertise, they his group had all of those in place. So if one of the guys said, hey, I got this buddy and he wants to like whatever and remember they're all kind of similar industries. So they would put less money in and if they had three of them they would put more money in. And they had this whole thing on liquidation, you know, as far as how much do they want to get out, when, who, the tax situation, the extra money, because they would have their meetings in Vegas, right. All of these things that it's kind of funny because when I started	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>make sure that we don't start the conversation again to where we're trying to protect people from themselves again.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. It's about time to wrap up. Commissioner Stein, did you have something? COMMISSIONER STEIN: No, Jonathan has CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm going to Jonathan. COMMISSIONER STEIN: I'm fine.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: You're fine, okay. So Jonathan, wrap it up.</li> <li>MR. NELSON: Just to kind of dovetail on what Ms. Mott was saying, has there been any discussion in terms of protecting investors from bad investments by encouraging them, like smart defaults would be to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. YAMANAKA: I just want to point out that my uncle didn't know about the ACA. I don't think he got the Internet in the last, you know, whatever. But a lot but the portfolio, the limitation, the expertise, they his group had all of those in place. So if one of the guys said, hey, I got this buddy and he wants to like whatever and remember they're all kind of similar industries. So they would put less money in and if they had three of them they would put more money in. And they had this whole thing on liquidation, you know, as far as how much do they want to get out, when, who, the tax situation, the extra money, because they would have their meetings in Vegas, right. All of these things that it's kind of funny because when I started reading all the best practices they were already doing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>make sure that we don't start the conversation again to where we're trying to protect people from themselves again.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. It's about time to wrap up. Commissioner Stein, did you have something? COMMISSIONER STEIN: No, Jonathan has CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm going to Jonathan. COMMISSIONER STEIN: I'm fine.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: You're fine, okay. So Jonathan, wrap it up.</li> <li>MR. NELSON: Just to kind of dovetail on what Ms. Mott was saying, has there been any discussion in terms of protecting investors from bad investments by encouraging them, like smart defaults would be to actually help them create portfolios of 20 to 25</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. YAMANAKA: I just want to point out that my uncle didn't know about the ACA. I don't think he got the Internet in the last, you know, whatever. But a lot but the portfolio, the limitation, the expertise, they his group had all of those in place. So if one of the guys said, hey, I got this buddy and he wants to like whatever and remember they're all kind of similar industries. So they would put less money in and if they had three of them they would put more money in. And they had this whole thing on liquidation, you know, as far as how much do they want to get out, when, who, the tax situation, the extra money, because they would have their meetings in Vegas, right. All of these things that it's kind of funny because when I started reading all the best practices they were already doing it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	make sure that we don't start the conversation again to where we're trying to protect people from themselves again. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. It's about time to wrap up. Commissioner Stein, did you have something? COMMISSIONER STEIN: No, Jonathan has CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm going to Jonathan. COMMISSIONER STEIN: I'm fine. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: You're fine, okay. So Jonathan, wrap it up. MR. NELSON: Just to kind of dovetail on what Ms. Mott was saying, has there been any discussion in terms of protecting investors from bad investments by encouraging them, like smart defaults would be to actually help them create portfolios of 20 to 25 companies? From what I understand it's actually
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. YAMANAKA: I just want to point out that my uncle didn't know about the ACA. I don't think he got the Internet in the last, you know, whatever. But a lot - but the portfolio, the limitation, the expertise, they - his group had all of those in place. So if one of the guys said, hey, I got this buddy and he wants to like whatever and remember they're all kind of similar industries. So they would put less money in and if they had three of them they would put more money in. And they had this whole thing on liquidation, you know, as far as how much do they want to get out, when, who, the tax situation, the extra money, because they would have their meetings in Vegas, right. All of these things that it's kind of funny because when I started reading all the best practices they were already doing it. So my point is I think there's a lot of people	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	make sure that we don't start the conversation again to where we're trying to protect people from themselves again. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. It's about time to wrap up. Commissioner Stein, did you have something? COMMISSIONER STEIN: No, Jonathan has CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm going to Jonathan. COMMISSIONER STEIN: I'm fine. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: You're fine, okay. So Jonathan, wrap it up. MR. NELSON: Just to kind of dovetail on what Ms. Mott was saying, has there been any discussion in terms of protecting investors from bad investments by encouraging them, like smart defaults would be to actually help them create portfolios of 20 to 25 companies? From what I understand it's actually unaccredited investors actually can't make those types of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. YAMANAKA: I just want to point out that my uncle didn't know about the ACA. I don't think he got the Internet in the last, you know, whatever. But a lot but the portfolio, the limitation, the expertise, they his group had all of those in place. So if one of the guys said, hey, I got this buddy and he wants to like whatever and remember they're all kind of similar industries. So they would put less money in and if they had three of them they would put more money in. And they had this whole thing on liquidation, you know, as far as how much do they want to get out, when, who, the tax situation, the extra money, because they would have their meetings in Vegas, right. All of these things that it's kind of funny because when I started reading all the best practices they were already doing it. So my point is I think there's a lot of people out there that we don't realize who don't have the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>make sure that we don't start the conversation again to where we're trying to protect people from themselves again.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. It's about time to wrap up. Commissioner Stein, did you have something? COMMISSIONER STEIN: No, Jonathan has CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm going to Jonathan. COMMISSIONER STEIN: I'm fine.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: You're fine, okay. So Jonathan, wrap it up.</li> <li>MR. NELSON: Just to kind of dovetail on what Ms. Mott was saying, has there been any discussion in terms of protecting investors from bad investments by encouraging them, like smart defaults would be to actually help them create portfolios of 20 to 25 companies? From what I understand it's actually unaccredited investors actually can't make those types of investments, they can't actually invest in funds. But</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MS. YAMANAKA: I just want to point out that my uncle didn't know about the ACA. I don't think he got the Internet in the last, you know, whatever. But a lot - but the portfolio, the limitation, the expertise, they - his group had all of those in place. So if one of the guys said, hey, I got this buddy and he wants to like whatever and remember they're all kind of similar industries. So they would put less money in and if they had three of them they would put more money in. And they had this whole thing on liquidation, you know, as far as how much do they want to get out, when, who, the tax situation, the extra money, because they would have their meetings in Vegas, right. All of these things that it's kind of funny because when I started reading all the best practices they were already doing it. So my point is I think there's a lot of people out there that we don't realize who don't have the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	make sure that we don't start the conversation again to where we're trying to protect people from themselves again. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. It's about time to wrap up. Commissioner Stein, did you have something? COMMISSIONER STEIN: No, Jonathan has CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm going to Jonathan. COMMISSIONER STEIN: I'm fine. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: You're fine, okay. So Jonathan, wrap it up. MR. NELSON: Just to kind of dovetail on what Ms. Mott was saying, has there been any discussion in terms of protecting investors from bad investments by encouraging them, like smart defaults would be to actually help them create portfolios of 20 to 25 companies? From what I understand it's actually unaccredited investors actually can't make those types of investments, they can't actually invest in funds. But portfolio diversification is actually one of the best
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. YAMANAKA: I just want to point out that my uncle didn't know about the ACA. I don't think he got the Internet in the last, you know, whatever. But a lot - but the portfolio, the limitation, the expertise, they - his group had all of those in place. So if one of the guys said, hey, I got this buddy and he wants to like whatever and remember they're all kind of similar industries. So they would put less money in and if they had three of them they would put more money in. And they had this whole thing on liquidation, you know, as far as how much do they want to get out, when, who, the tax situation, the extra money, because they would have their meetings in Vegas, right. All of these things that it's kind of funny because when I started reading all the best practices they were already doing it. So my point is I think there's a lot of people out there that we don't realize who don't have the jopportunity to sit in this room, who don't have the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	make sure that we don't start the conversation again to where we're trying to protect people from themselves again. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. It's about time to wrap up. Commissioner Stein, did you have something? COMMISSIONER STEIN: No, Jonathan has CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm going to Jonathan. COMMISSIONER STEIN: I'm fine. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: You're fine, okay. So Jonathan, wrap it up. MR. NELSON: Just to kind of dovetail on what Ms. Mott was saying, has there been any discussion in terms of protecting investors from bad investments by encouraging them, like smart defaults would be to actually help them create portfolios of 20 to 25 companies? From what I understand it's actually unaccredited investors actually can't make those types of investments, they can't actually invest in funds. But portfolio diversification is actually one of the best ways to actually encourage, you know, actually to build
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. YAMANAKA: I just want to point out that my uncle didn't know about the ACA. I don't think he got the Internet in the last, you know, whatever. But a lot but the portfolio, the limitation, the expertise, they his group had all of those in place. So if one of the guys said, hey, I got this buddy and he wants to like whatever and remember they're all kind of similar industries. So they would put less money in and if they had three of them they would put more money in. And they had this whole thing on liquidation, you know, as far as how much do they want to get out, when, who, the tax situation, the extra money, because they would have their meetings in Vegas, right. All of these things that it's kind of funny because when I started reading all the best practices they were already doing it. So my point is I think there's a lot of people out there that we don't realize who don't have the opportunity to sit in this room, who don't have the little degrees, haven't gone to college in that way, aren't connected, aren't on the Coast, that are doing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	make sure that we don't start the conversation again to where we're trying to protect people from themselves again. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. It's about time to wrap up. Commissioner Stein, did you have something? COMMISSIONER STEIN: No, Jonathan has CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm going to Jonathan. COMMISSIONER STEIN: I'm fine. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: You're fine, okay. So Jonathan, wrap it up. MR. NELSON: Just to kind of dovetail on what Ms. Mott was saying, has there been any discussion in terms of protecting investors from bad investments by encouraging them, like smart defaults would be to actually help them create portfolios of 20 to 25 companies? From what I understand it's actually unaccredited investors actually can't make those types of investments, they can't actually invest in funds. But portfolio diversification is actually one of the best ways to actually encourage, you know, actually to build those results in those, have those IRRs.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. YAMANAKA: I just want to point out that my uncle didn't know about the ACA. I don't think he got the Internet in the last, you know, whatever. But a lot but the portfolio, the limitation, the expertise, they his group had all of those in place. So if one of the guys said, hey, I got this buddy and he wants to like whatever and remember they're all kind of similar industries. So they would put less money in and if they had three of them they would put more money in. And they had this whole thing on liquidation, you know, as far as how much do they want to get out, when, who, the tax situation, the extra money, because they would have their meetings in Vegas, right. All of these things that it's kind of funny because when I started reading all the best practices they were already doing it. So my point is I think there's a lot of people out there that we don't realize who don't have the pipportunity to sit in this room, who don't have the little degrees, haven't gone to college in that way, aren't connected, aren't on the Coast, that are doing this and we probably don't know about it, which gets back	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	make sure that we don't start the conversation again to where we're trying to protect people from themselves again. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. It's about time to wrap up. Commissioner Stein, did you have something? COMMISSIONER STEIN: No, Jonathan has CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm going to Jonathan. COMMISSIONER STEIN: I'm fine. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: You're fine, okay. So Jonathan, wrap it up. MR. NELSON: Just to kind of dovetail on what Ms. Mott was saying, has there been any discussion in terms of protecting investors from bad investments by encouraging them, like smart defaults would be to actually help them create portfolios of 20 to 25 companies? From what I understand it's actually unaccredited investors actually can't make those types of investments, they can't actually invest in funds. But portfolio diversification is actually one of the best ways to actually encourage, you know, actually to build those results in those, have those IRRs. I also in terms of investor protection was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. YAMANAKA: I just want to point out that my uncle didn't know about the ACA. I don't think he got the Internet in the last, you know, whatever. But a lot - but the portfolio, the limitation, the expertise, they - his group had all of those in place. So if one of the guys said, hey, I got this buddy and he wants to like whatever and remember they're all kind of similar industries. So they would put less money in and if they had three of them they would put more money in. And they had this whole thing on liquidation, you know, as far as how much do they want to get out, when, who, the tax situation, the extra money, because they would have their meetings in Vegas, right. All of these things that it's kind of funny because when I started reading all the best practices they were already doing it. So my point is I think there's a lot of people out there that we don't realize who don't have the little degrees, haven't gone to college in that way, aren't connected, aren't on the Coast, that are doing this and we probably don't know about it, which gets back to my thing about really with liking to have data to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>make sure that we don't start the conversation again to where we're trying to protect people from themselves again.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. It's about time to wrap up. Commissioner Stein, did you have something? COMMISSIONER STEIN: No, Jonathan has CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm going to Jonathan. COMMISSIONER STEIN: I'm fine.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: You're fine, okay. So Jonathan, wrap it up.</li> <li>MR. NELSON: Just to kind of dovetail on what Ms. Mott was saying, has there been any discussion in terms of protecting investors from bad investments by encouraging them, like smart defaults would be to actually help them create portfolios of 20 to 25 companies? From what I understand it's actually unaccredited investors actually can't make those types of investments, they can't actually invest in funds. But portfolio diversification is actually one of the best ways to actually encourage, you know, actually to build those results in those, have those IRRs.</li> <li>I also in terms of investor protection was talking with a friend of mine who runs the largest</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. YAMANAKA: I just want to point out that my uncle didn't know about the ACA. I don't think he got the Internet in the last, you know, whatever. But a lot but the portfolio, the limitation, the expertise, they his group had all of those in place. So if one of the guys said, hey, I got this buddy and he wants to like whatever and remember they're all kind of similar industries. So they would put less money in and if they had three of them they would put more money in. And they had this whole thing on liquidation, you know, as far as how much do they want to get out, when, who, the tax situation, the extra money, because they would have their meetings in Vegas, right. All of these things that it's kind of funny because when I started reading all the best practices they were already doing it. So my point is I think there's a lot of people out there that we don't realize who don't have the pipportunity to sit in this room, who don't have the little degrees, haven't gone to college in that way, aren't connected, aren't on the Coast, that are doing this and we probably don't know about it, which gets back	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	make sure that we don't start the conversation again to where we're trying to protect people from themselves again. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. It's about time to wrap up. Commissioner Stein, did you have something? COMMISSIONER STEIN: No, Jonathan has CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm going to Jonathan. COMMISSIONER STEIN: I'm fine. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: You're fine, okay. So Jonathan, wrap it up. MR. NELSON: Just to kind of dovetail on what Ms. Mott was saying, has there been any discussion in terms of protecting investors from bad investments by encouraging them, like smart defaults would be to actually help them create portfolios of 20 to 25 companies? From what I understand it's actually unaccredited investors actually can't make those types of investments, they can't actually invest in funds. But portfolio diversification is actually one of the best ways to actually encourage, you know, actually to build those results in those, have those IRRs. I also in terms of investor protection was

	Page 54		Page 56
1	listed companies is because frankly the returns on	1	So we should probably think about the financial
2	capital are all in the private markets. Unaccredited	2	designations. And I would even throw in, you know, the
3	investors only have public markets to actually invest in	3	MBA as well as a component for identifying a
4	or they have real estate, and when everybody gets frothy	4	sophisticated investor.
5	about that we've seen what happens there.	5	CO-CHAIR HANKS: I think we all know a lot of
6	I think it would be interesting to encourage them	6	MBAs who are as stupid as JDs.
7	to invest in these other asset classes and actually build	7	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: If not more so. So
8	smart defaults by building portfolios. I don't	8	MR. WALSH: They were in my class by the way.
9	necessarily see that listed here, but I was wondering if	9	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: It's I don't recall being
10	anybody else had had conversations along those lines.	10	in your class but
11	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: You know, that might dovetail	11	So why don't we say 7, 65, 82, CFA or similar?
12	into what we've talked about and we'll probably get to in	12	CO-CHAIR HANKS: Yeah, similar or equivalent,
13	later meetings, and that's outreach. I think there's a	13	yeah.
14	lot of educating that needs to be done on both sides of	14	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. Anything else? Can I
15	the table.	15	get a motion?
16	Okay, so we have the we have the draft	16	(Motion made and seconded.)
17	recommendation from last time and I'm suggesting that we	17	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Any additional discussion?
18	add to that, that we suggest expanding the pool of	18	All those in favor?
19	accredited investors by including those who have passed a	19	(Chorus of ayes.)
20	Series 7, 65 or 82 exams. And I'll also ask the	20	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Opposed?
21	Commission to look for ways to be more inclusive,	21	(No response.)
22	shorthand for what we've been talking about for the last	22	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay, thank you.
23	30 minutes.	23	We're just a little bit behind, but let's just
24	Any does that does that	24	kind of dive into Regulation A.
25	MR. REARDON: What about the CFP exam?	25	Sarah.
	D		
	Page 55		Page 57
1	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm sorry?	1	Page 57 CO-CHAIR HANKS: All right. So one of the
1 2	-	1 2	
	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm sorry?	1	CO-CHAIR HANKS: All right. So one of the
2	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm sorry? MR. REARDON: CFP, chartered financial no,	2	CO-CHAIR HANKS: All right. So one of the things we were talking about earlier is the fact that a
2 3 4 5	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm sorry? MR. REARDON: CFP, chartered financial no, it's chartered financial analyst, CFA.	2 3	CO-CHAIR HANKS: All right. So one of the things we were talking about earlier is the fact that a number of us have been distressed by the fact that there's a lot of small businesses out there who really don't know how many options there are for capital raising
2 3 4	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm sorry? MR. REARDON: CFP, chartered financial no, it's chartered financial analyst, CFA. MR. YADLEY: Yeah, CFA is really I mean, my son passed it so I know how hard it is. I would and I mentioned that earlier.	2 3 4	CO-CHAIR HANKS: All right. So one of the things we were talking about earlier is the fact that a number of us have been distressed by the fact that there's a lot of small businesses out there who really don't know how many options there are for capital raising outside of the public market. This ties into what we've
2 3 4 5 6 7	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm sorry? MR. REARDON: CFP, chartered financial no, it's chartered financial analyst, CFA. MR. YADLEY: Yeah, CFA is really I mean, my son passed it so I know how hard it is. I would and I mentioned that earlier. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7	CO-CHAIR HANKS: All right. So one of the things we were talking about earlier is the fact that a number of us have been distressed by the fact that there's a lot of small businesses out there who really don't know how many options there are for capital raising outside of the public market. This ties into what we've been talking about throughout this committee with respect
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm sorry? MR. REARDON: CFP, chartered financial no, it's chartered financial analyst, CFA. MR. YADLEY: Yeah, CFA is really I mean, my son passed it so I know how hard it is. I would and I mentioned that earlier. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. MR. YADLEY: And I'm not sure that CPAs and law	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	CO-CHAIR HANKS: All right. So one of the things we were talking about earlier is the fact that a number of us have been distressed by the fact that there's a lot of small businesses out there who really don't know how many options there are for capital raising outside of the public market. This ties into what we've been talking about throughout this committee with respect to outreach to small businesses, and I'll get to the
2 3 5 6 7 8 9	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm sorry? MR. REARDON: CFP, chartered financial no, it's chartered financial analyst, CFA. MR. YADLEY: Yeah, CFA is really I mean, my son passed it so I know how hard it is. I would and I mentioned that earlier. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. MR. YADLEY: And I'm not sure that CPAs and law degrees really matter.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	CO-CHAIR HANKS: All right. So one of the things we were talking about earlier is the fact that a number of us have been distressed by the fact that there's a lot of small businesses out there who really don't know how many options there are for capital raising outside of the public market. This ties into what we've been talking about throughout this committee with respect to outreach to small businesses, and I'll get to the investor side of that in a second.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm sorry? MR. REARDON: CFP, chartered financial no, it's chartered financial analyst, CFA. MR. YADLEY: Yeah, CFA is really I mean, my son passed it so I know how hard it is. I would and I mentioned that earlier. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. MR. YADLEY: And I'm not sure that CPAs and law degrees really matter. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	CO-CHAIR HANKS: All right. So one of the things we were talking about earlier is the fact that a number of us have been distressed by the fact that there's a lot of small businesses out there who really don't know how many options there are for capital raising outside of the public market. This ties into what we've been talking about throughout this committee with respect to outreach to small businesses, and I'll get to the investor side of that in a second. But we're now celebrating the 13 month
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm sorry? MR. REARDON: CFP, chartered financial no, it's chartered financial analyst, CFA. MR. YADLEY: Yeah, CFA is really I mean, my son passed it so I know how hard it is. I would and I mentioned that earlier. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. MR. YADLEY: And I'm not sure that CPAs and law degrees really matter. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No. MR. YADLEY: But I think the chartered	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	CO-CHAIR HANKS: All right. So one of the things we were talking about earlier is the fact that a number of us have been distressed by the fact that there's a lot of small businesses out there who really don't know how many options there are for capital raising outside of the public market. This ties into what we've been talking about throughout this committee with respect to outreach to small businesses, and I'll get to the investor side of that in a second. But we're now celebrating the 13 month anniversary or so of implementation of one of those
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm sorry? MR. REARDON: CFP, chartered financial no, it's chartered financial analyst, CFA. MR. YADLEY: Yeah, CFA is really I mean, my son passed it so I know how hard it is. I would and I mentioned that earlier. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. MR. YADLEY: And I'm not sure that CPAs and law degrees really matter. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No. MR. YADLEY: But I think the chartered financial analyst is a pretty good	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	CO-CHAIR HANKS: All right. So one of the things we were talking about earlier is the fact that a number of us have been distressed by the fact that there's a lot of small businesses out there who really don't know how many options there are for capital raising outside of the public market. This ties into what we've been talking about throughout this committee with respect to outreach to small businesses, and I'll get to the investor side of that in a second. But we're now celebrating the 13 month anniversary or so of implementation of one of those exemptions, which is Regulation A, also referred to as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm sorry? MR. REARDON: CFP, chartered financial no, it's chartered financial analyst, CFA. MR. YADLEY: Yeah, CFA is really I mean, my son passed it so I know how hard it is. I would and I mentioned that earlier. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. MR. YADLEY: And I'm not sure that CPAs and law degrees really matter. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No. MR. YADLEY: But I think the chartered	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	CO-CHAIR HANKS: All right. So one of the things we were talking about earlier is the fact that a number of us have been distressed by the fact that there's a lot of small businesses out there who really don't know how many options there are for capital raising outside of the public market. This ties into what we've been talking about throughout this committee with respect to outreach to small businesses, and I'll get to the investor side of that in a second. But we're now celebrating the 13 month anniversary or so of implementation of one of those exemptions, which is Regulation A, also referred to as Regulation A+ or the mini IPO. And I hadn't realized
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm sorry? MR. REARDON: CFP, chartered financial no, it's chartered financial analyst, CFA. MR. YADLEY: Yeah, CFA is really I mean, my son passed it so I know how hard it is. I would and I mentioned that earlier. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. MR. YADLEY: And I'm not sure that CPAs and law degrees really matter. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No. MR. YADLEY: But I think the chartered financial analyst is a pretty good CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I can assure you they don't.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	CO-CHAIR HANKS: All right. So one of the things we were talking about earlier is the fact that a number of us have been distressed by the fact that there's a lot of small businesses out there who really don't know how many options there are for capital raising outside of the public market. This ties into what we've been talking about throughout this committee with respect to outreach to small businesses, and I'll get to the investor side of that in a second. But we're now celebrating the 13 month anniversary or so of implementation of one of those exemptions, which is Regulation A, also referred to as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm sorry? MR. REARDON: CFP, chartered financial no, it's chartered financial analyst, CFA. MR. YADLEY: Yeah, CFA is really I mean, my son passed it so I know how hard it is. I would and I mentioned that earlier. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. MR. YADLEY: And I'm not sure that CPAs and law degrees really matter. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No. MR. YADLEY: But I think the chartered financial analyst is a pretty good	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	CO-CHAIR HANKS: All right. So one of the things we were talking about earlier is the fact that a number of us have been distressed by the fact that there's a lot of small businesses out there who really don't know how many options there are for capital raising outside of the public market. This ties into what we've been talking about throughout this committee with respect to outreach to small businesses, and I'll get to the investor side of that in a second. But we're now celebrating the 13 month anniversary or so of implementation of one of those exemptions, which is Regulation A, also referred to as Regulation A+ or the mini IPO. And I hadn't realized that – are you guys okay with calling it a mini IPO? We
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm sorry? MR. REARDON: CFP, chartered financial no, it's chartered financial analyst, CFA. MR. YADLEY: Yeah, CFA is really I mean, my son passed it so I know how hard it is. I would and I mentioned that earlier. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. MR. YADLEY: And I'm not sure that CPAs and law degrees really matter. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No. MR. YADLEY: But I think the chartered financial analyst is a pretty good CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I can assure you they don't.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	CO-CHAIR HANKS: All right. So one of the things we were talking about earlier is the fact that a number of us have been distressed by the fact that there's a lot of small businesses out there who really don't know how many options there are for capital raising outside of the public market. This ties into what we've been talking about throughout this committee with respect to outreach to small businesses, and I'll get to the investor side of that in a second. But we're now celebrating the 13 month anniversary or so of implementation of one of those exemptions, which is Regulation A, also referred to as Regulation A+ or the mini IPO. And I hadn't realized that – are you guys okay with calling it a mini IPO? We
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm sorry? MR. REARDON: CFP, chartered financial no, it's chartered financial analyst, CFA. MR. YADLEY: Yeah, CFA is really I mean, my son passed it so I know how hard it is. I would and I mentioned that earlier. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. MR. YADLEY: And I'm not sure that CPAs and law degrees really matter. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No. MR. YADLEY: But I think the chartered financial analyst is a pretty good CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I can assure you they don't. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I can assure you they don't.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	CO-CHAIR HANKS: All right. So one of the things we were talking about earlier is the fact that a number of us have been distressed by the fact that there's a lot of small businesses out there who really don't know how many options there are for capital raising outside of the public market. This ties into what we've been talking about throughout this committee with respect to outreach to small businesses, and I'll get to the investor side of that in a second. But we're now celebrating the 13 month anniversary or so of implementation of one of those exemptions, which is Regulation A, also referred to as Regulation A+ or the mini IPO. And I hadn't realized that are you guys okay with calling it a mini IPO? We
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm sorry? MR. REARDON: CFP, chartered financial no, it's chartered financial analyst, CFA. MR. YADLEY: Yeah, CFA is really I mean, my son passed it so I know how hard it is. I would and I mentioned that earlier. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. MR. YADLEY: And I'm not sure that CPAs and law degrees really matter. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No. MR. YADLEY: But I think the chartered financial analyst is a pretty good CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I can assure you they don't.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	CO-CHAIR HANKS: All right. So one of the things we were talking about earlier is the fact that a number of us have been distressed by the fact that there's a lot of small businesses out there who really don't know how many options there are for capital raising outside of the public market. This ties into what we've been talking about throughout this committee with respect to outreach to small businesses, and I'll get to the investor side of that in a second. But we're now celebrating the 13 month anniversary or so of implementation of one of those exemptions, which is Regulation A, also referred to as Regulation A+ or the mini IPO. And I hadn't realized that – are you guys okay with calling it a mini IPO? We
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm sorry? MR. REARDON: CFP, chartered financial no, it's chartered financial analyst, CFA. MR. YADLEY: Yeah, CFA is really I mean, my son passed it so I know how hard it is. I would and I mentioned that earlier. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. MR. YADLEY: And I'm not sure that CPAs and law degrees really matter. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No. MR. YADLEY: But I think the chartered financial analyst is a pretty good CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I can assure you they don't. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I can assure you they don't. CO-CHAIR HANKS: WE all know too many lawyers. MS. TIERNEY: What were the exam numbers that you were suggesting? I'm sorry, I heard the 7 and the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	CO-CHAIR HANKS: All right. So one of the things we were talking about earlier is the fact that a number of us have been distressed by the fact that there's a lot of small businesses out there who really don't know how many options there are for capital raising outside of the public market. This ties into what we've been talking about throughout this committee with respect to outreach to small businesses, and I'll get to the investor side of that in a second. But we're now celebrating the 13 month anniversary or so of implementation of one of those exemptions, which is Regulation A, also referred to as Regulation A+ or the mini IPO. And I hadn't realized that are you guys okay with calling it a mini IPO? We
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm sorry? MR. REARDON: CFP, chartered financial no, it's chartered financial analyst, CFA. MR. YADLEY: Yeah, CFA is really I mean, my son passed it so I know how hard it is. I would and I mentioned that earlier. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. MR. YADLEY: And I'm not sure that CPAs and law degrees really matter. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No. MR. YADLEY: But I think the chartered financial analyst is a pretty good CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I can assure you they don't. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I can assure you they don't. CO-CHAIR HANKS: WE all know too many lawyers. MS. TIERNEY: What were the exam numbers that you were suggesting? I'm sorry, I heard the 7 and the CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: 65.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	CO-CHAIR HANKS: All right. So one of the things we were talking about earlier is the fact that a number of us have been distressed by the fact that there's a lot of small businesses out there who really don't know how many options there are for capital raising outside of the public market. This ties into what we've been talking about throughout this committee with respect to outreach to small businesses, and I'll get to the investor side of that in a second. But we're now celebrating the 13 month anniversary or so of implementation of one of those exemptions, which is Regulation A, also referred to as Regulation A+ or the mini IPO. And I hadn't realized that are you guys okay with calling it a mini IPO? We remain the table of table of the table of the table of table
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm sorry? MR. REARDON: CFP, chartered financial no, it's chartered financial analyst, CFA. MR. YADLEY: Yeah, CFA is really I mean, my son passed it so I know how hard it is. I would and I mentioned that earlier. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. MR. YADLEY: And I'm not sure that CPAs and law degrees really matter. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No. MR. YADLEY: But I think the chartered financial analyst is a pretty good CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I can assure you they don't. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I can assure you they don't. CO-CHAIR HANKS: WE all know too many lawyers. MS. TIERNEY: What were the exam numbers that you were suggesting? I'm sorry, I heard the 7 and the CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: 65. MS. TIERNEY: so that's the financial advisor?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	CO-CHAIR HANKS: All right. So one of the things we were talking about earlier is the fact that a number of us have been distressed by the fact that there's a lot of small businesses out there who really don't know how many options there are for capital raising outside of the public market. This ties into what we've been talking about throughout this committee with respect to outreach to small businesses, and I'll get to the investor side of that in a second. But we're now celebrating the 13 month anniversary or so of implementation of one of those exemptions, which is Regulation A, also referred to as Regulation A+ or the mini IPO. And I hadn't realized that are you guys okay with calling it a mini IPO? We
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm sorry? MR. REARDON: CFP, chartered financial no, it's chartered financial analyst, CFA. MR. YADLEY: Yeah, CFA is really I mean, my son passed it so I know how hard it is. I would and I mentioned that earlier. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. MR. YADLEY: And I'm not sure that CPAs and law degrees really matter. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No. MR. YADLEY: But I think the chartered financial analyst is a pretty good CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I can assure you they don't. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I can assure you they don't. CO-CHAIR HANKS: WE all know too many lawyers. MS. TIERNEY: What were the exam numbers that you were suggesting? I'm sorry, I heard the 7 and the CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: 65. MS. TIERNEY: so that's the financial advisor? CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And 82.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	CO-CHAIR HANKS: All right. So one of the things we were talking about earlier is the fact that a number of us have been distressed by the fact that there's a lot of small businesses out there who really don't know how many options there are for capital raising outside of the public market. This ties into what we've been talking about throughout this committee with respect to outreach to small businesses, and I'll get to the investor side of that in a second. But we're now celebrating the 13 month anniversary or so of implementation of one of those exemptions, which is Regulation A, also referred to as Regulation A+ or the mini IPO. And I hadn't realized that are you guys okay with calling it a mini IPO? We refuse that are you guys okay with calling it a mini IPO? We for the APARTICIPANT: A+ is nice. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: It's not okay. A PARTICIPANT: Stick with A+. CO-CHAIR HANKS: So I personally don't call it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm sorry? MR. REARDON: CFP, chartered financial no, it's chartered financial analyst, CFA. MR. YADLEY: Yeah, CFA is really I mean, my son passed it so I know how hard it is. I would and I mentioned that earlier. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. MR. YADLEY: And I'm not sure that CPAs and law degrees really matter. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No. MR. YADLEY: But I think the chartered financial analyst is a pretty good CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I can assure you they don't. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I can assure you they don't. CO-CHAIR HANKS: WE all know too many lawyers. MS. TIERNEY: What were the exam numbers that you were suggesting? I'm sorry, I heard the 7 and the CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: 65. MS. TIERNEY: so that's the financial advisor? CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And 82. MS. TIERNEY: Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	CO-CHAIR HANKS: All right. So one of the things we were talking about earlier is the fact that a number of us have been distressed by the fact that there's a lot of small businesses out there who really don't know how many options there are for capital raising outside of the public market. This ties into what we've been talking about throughout this committee with respect to outreach to small businesses, and I'll get to the investor side of that in a second. But we're now celebrating the 13 month anniversary or so of implementation of one of those exemptions, which is Regulation A, also referred to as Regulation A+ or the mini IPO. And I hadn't realized that – are you guys okay with calling it a mini IPO? We
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm sorry? MR. REARDON: CFP, chartered financial no, it's chartered financial analyst, CFA. MR. YADLEY: Yeah, CFA is really I mean, my son passed it so I know how hard it is. I would and I mentioned that earlier. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. MR. YADLEY: And I'm not sure that CPAs and law degrees really matter. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No. MR. YADLEY: But I think the chartered financial analyst is a pretty good CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I can assure you they don't. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I can assure you they don't. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: We all know too many lawyers. MS. TIERNEY: What were the exam numbers that you were suggesting? I'm sorry, I heard the 7 and the CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: 65. MS. TIERNEY: so that's the financial advisor? CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And 82. MS. TIERNEY: Okay. MR. AGUILAR: Yeah, there's a few exams that I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	CO-CHAIR HANKS: All right. So one of the things we were talking about earlier is the fact that a number of us have been distressed by the fact that there's a lot of small businesses out there who really don't know how many options there are for capital raising outside of the public market. This ties into what we've been talking about throughout this committee with respect to outreach to small businesses, and I'll get to the investor side of that in a second. But we're now celebrating the 13 month anniversary or so of implementation of one of those exemptions, which is Regulation A, also referred to as Regulation A+ or the mini IPO. And I hadn't realized that – are you guys okay with calling it a mini IPO? We - (Laughter.) CO-CHAIR HANKS: I'm going to take that - A PARTICIPANT: A+ is nice. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: It's not okay. A PARTICIPANT: Stick with A+. CO-CHAIR HANKS: So I personally don't call it a mini IPO because the implications of public markets. But those amendments went into effect just over

Page	60

	Page 58		Page 60
1	We talked about Reg A back in our February	1	of presentations. We are lucky to have Paul Elio. We
2	meeting and several of us have worked with companies who	2	are going to have that? Okay. So we're going to be
3	have contemplated or executed a Reg A offering. I've got	3	joined virtually by Paul Elio, one of the success stories
4	to say I've worked on 11 filings of Reg A now and I	4	of Reg A. And before we hear form Paul, Sebastian is
5	really want to give some props to the Commission and the	5	going to give us a brief update with some stats.
6	staff because it is very much a right sized scaled	6	Sebastian.
7	approach to the whole review process. I've had no	7	MR. GOMEZ: Thanks, Sara. So as all of you
8	problems with it and I can say that all of the filings	8	know the rules became effective June 19th of last year.
9	I've worked on are better coming out of the SEC review	9	Just briefly to bring everyone up to date as to what Reg
10	process than they were going in and it's really not been	10	A or Reg $A$ + is, it's an exemption from registration and
11	too burdensome. So well done on hitting the right	11	as amended it consists of two tiers. Tier one for
12	balance there, and all of my clients would have said the	12	offerings of up to \$20 million a year and tier two for
13	same thing.	13	offerings of up to \$50 million a year.
14	But now that we've got this one year	14	For offerings of up to \$20 million a year a
15	anniversary it's a good time to start thinking about how	15	company can elect to proceed either under tier one or
16	it's been used. From my own experience I've seen that	16	tier two. Both of those tiers are subject to basic
17	there's a number of filings out there. As the Chair said	17	requirements as to eligibility, disclosure, and other
18	there's been roughly a hundred filings. It looks like	18	matters that were drawn from the current, what existed in
19	roughly half of them are real estate, which is a	19	
20	completely different asset class in many ways, and some	20	Reg A before and updated by the Commission.
	of these that we identify I think don't apply to real		Both tiers also permit companies to submit
21		21	draft offering statements for non-public review. That
22	estate. Some of the real estate companies have been very	22	means that a company that wants to start the process
23	successful.	23	doesn't have to actually go live, public in the filing,
24	There have been a lot of really exciting	24	but can commence a review of that filing behind the
25	companies filing who are operating companies, roller	25	scenes with the staff and start getting those comments
	Page 59		Page 61
1	2	1	
1 2	coasters for example, virtual reality companies, every	1	from the staff before they actually go public with their
	coasters for example, virtual reality companies, every sort of three wheeled vehicle that you can imagine. I		
2	coasters for example, virtual reality companies, every sort of three wheeled vehicle that you can imagine. I think there's about five of them testing the waters or	2	from the staff before they actually go public with their filing.
2 3	coasters for example, virtual reality companies, every sort of three wheeled vehicle that you can imagine. I think there's about five of them testing the waters or filing at the moment. So there's some very exciting	2 3	from the staff before they actually go public with their filing. Companies can also test the waters both before the filing of the offering circular and while the
2 3 4	coasters for example, virtual reality companies, every sort of three wheeled vehicle that you can imagine. I think there's about five of them testing the waters or	2 3 4	from the staff before they actually go public with their filing. Companies can also test the waters both before
2 3 4 5	coasters for example, virtual reality companies, every sort of three wheeled vehicle that you can imagine. I think there's about five of them testing the waters or filing at the moment. So there's some very exciting companies there.	2 3 4 5	from the staff before they actually go public with their filing. Companies can also test the waters both before the filing of the offering circular and while the offering circular is under review by the Commission, by
2 3 4 5 6	coasters for example, virtual reality companies, every sort of three wheeled vehicle that you can imagine. I think there's about five of them testing the waters or filing at the moment. So there's some very exciting companies there. But to answer the question that Commissioner	2 3 4 5 6	from the staff before they actually go public with their filing. Companies can also test the waters both before the filing of the offering circular and while the offering circular is under review by the Commission, by the staff. In addition to the basic requirements that
2 3 4 5 6 7	coasters for example, virtual reality companies, every sort of three wheeled vehicle that you can imagine. I think there's about five of them testing the waters or filing at the moment. So there's some very exciting companies there. But to answer the question that Commissioner Stein raised earlier, she was asking why aren't more	2 3 4 5 6 7	from the staff before they actually go public with their filing. Companies can also test the waters both before the filing of the offering circular and while the offering circular is under review by the Commission, by the staff. In addition to the basic requirements that applies to both tiers. Tier two offerings are subject to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	coasters for example, virtual reality companies, every sort of three wheeled vehicle that you can imagine. I think there's about five of them testing the waters or filing at the moment. So there's some very exciting companies there. But to answer the question that Commissioner Stein raised earlier, she was asking why aren't more companies using this exemption. And I think part of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	from the staff before they actually go public with their filing. Companies can also test the waters both before the filing of the offering circular and while the offering circular is under review by the Commission, by the staff. In addition to the basic requirements that applies to both tiers. Tier two offerings are subject to some other requirements, including the requirement to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	coasters for example, virtual reality companies, every sort of three wheeled vehicle that you can imagine. I think there's about five of them testing the waters or filing at the moment. So there's some very exciting companies there. But to answer the question that Commissioner Stein raised earlier, she was asking why aren't more companies using this exemption. And I think part of the answer is the investors don't know it's out there. We've	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	from the staff before they actually go public with their filing. Companies can also test the waters both before the filing of the offering circular and while the offering circular is under review by the Commission, by the staff. In addition to the basic requirements that applies to both tiers. Tier two offerings are subject to some other requirements, including the requirement to provide audited financial statements, the requirement to
2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10	coasters for example, virtual reality companies, every sort of three wheeled vehicle that you can imagine. I think there's about five of them testing the waters or filing at the moment. So there's some very exciting companies there. But to answer the question that Commissioner Stein raised earlier, she was asking why aren't more companies using this exemption. And I think part of the answer is the investors don't know it's out there. We've already seen a number of these really exciting companies	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	from the staff before they actually go public with their filing. Companies can also test the waters both before the filing of the offering circular and while the offering circular is under review by the Commission, by the staff. In addition to the basic requirements that applies to both tiers. Tier two offerings are subject to some other requirements, including the requirement to provide audited financial statements, the requirement to file annual and semi-annual reports, and a limitation on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	coasters for example, virtual reality companies, every sort of three wheeled vehicle that you can imagine. I think there's about five of them testing the waters or filing at the moment. So there's some very exciting companies there. But to answer the question that Commissioner Stein raised earlier, she was asking why aren't more companies using this exemption. And I think part of the answer is the investors don't know it's out there. We've already seen a number of these really exciting companies file, not get anywhere, withdraw, and that seems really	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	from the staff before they actually go public with their filing. Companies can also test the waters both before the filing of the offering circular and while the offering circular is under review by the Commission, by the staff. In addition to the basic requirements that applies to both tiers. Tier two offerings are subject to some other requirements, including the requirement to provide audited financial statements, the requirement to file annual and semi-annual reports, and a limitation on the number of securities that non-accredited investors
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	coasters for example, virtual reality companies, every sort of three wheeled vehicle that you can imagine. I think there's about five of them testing the waters or filing at the moment. So there's some very exciting companies there. But to answer the question that Commissioner Stein raised earlier, she was asking why aren't more companies using this exemption. And I think part of the answer is the investors don't know it's out there. We've already seen a number of these really exciting companies file, not get anywhere, withdraw, and that seems really disappointing, and especially building on the thing that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	from the staff before they actually go public with their filing. Companies can also test the waters both before the filing of the offering circular and while the offering circular is under review by the Commission, by the staff. In addition to the basic requirements that applies to both tiers. Tier two offerings are subject to some other requirements, including the requirement to provide audited financial statements, the requirement to file annual and semi-annual reports, and a limitation on the number of securities that non-accredited investors can purchase of no more than 10 percent of the greater of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	coasters for example, virtual reality companies, every sort of three wheeled vehicle that you can imagine. I think there's about five of them testing the waters or filing at the moment. So there's some very exciting companies there. But to answer the question that Commissioner Stein raised earlier, she was asking why aren't more companies using this exemption. And I think part of the answer is the investors don't know it's out there. We've already seen a number of these really exciting companies file, not get anywhere, withdraw, and that seems really disappointing, and especially building on the thing that Laura was talking about earlier about access and the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	from the staff before they actually go public with their filing. Companies can also test the waters both before the filing of the offering circular and while the offering circular is under review by the Commission, by the staff. In addition to the basic requirements that applies to both tiers. Tier two offerings are subject to some other requirements, including the requirement to provide audited financial statements, the requirement to file annual and semi-annual reports, and a limitation on the number of securities that non-accredited investors can purchase of no more than 10 percent of the greater of the investor's income or net worth.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	coasters for example, virtual reality companies, every sort of three wheeled vehicle that you can imagine. I think there's about five of them testing the waters or filing at the moment. So there's some very exciting companies there. But to answer the question that Commissioner Stein raised earlier, she was asking why aren't more companies using this exemption. And I think part of the answer is the investors don't know it's out there. We've already seen a number of these really exciting companies file, not get anywhere, withdraw, and that seems really disappointing, and especially building on the thing that Laura was talking about earlier about access and the ability for small investors to build their portfolio.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	from the staff before they actually go public with their filing. Companies can also test the waters both before the filing of the offering circular and while the offering circular is under review by the Commission, by the staff. In addition to the basic requirements that applies to both tiers. Tier two offerings are subject to some other requirements, including the requirement to provide audited financial statements, the requirement to file annual and semi-annual reports, and a limitation on the number of securities that non-accredited investors can purchase of no more than 10 percent of the greater of the investor's income or net worth.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	coasters for example, virtual reality companies, every sort of three wheeled vehicle that you can imagine. I think there's about five of them testing the waters or filing at the moment. So there's some very exciting companies there. But to answer the question that Commissioner Stein raised earlier, she was asking why aren't more companies using this exemption. And I think part of the answer is the investors don't know it's out there. We've already seen a number of these really exciting companies file, not get anywhere, withdraw, and that seems really disappointing, and especially building on the thing that Laura was talking about earlier about access and the ability for small investors to build their portfolio. I mean, here is a very safe place where investors	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	from the staff before they actually go public with their filing. Companies can also test the waters both before the filing of the offering circular and while the offering circular is under review by the Commission, by the staff. In addition to the basic requirements that applies to both tiers. Tier two offerings are subject to some other requirements, including the requirement to provide audited financial statements, the requirement to file annual and semi-annual reports, and a limitation on the number of securities that non-accredited investors can purchase of no more than 10 percent of the greater of the investor's income or net worth. So touching upon the numbers that the Chair mentioned this morning, more specifically since the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	coasters for example, virtual reality companies, every sort of three wheeled vehicle that you can imagine. I think there's about five of them testing the waters or filing at the moment. So there's some very exciting companies there. But to answer the question that Commissioner Stein raised earlier, she was asking why aren't more companies using this exemption. And I think part of the answer is the investors don't know it's out there. We've already seen a number of these really exciting companies file, not get anywhere, withdraw, and that seems really disappointing, and especially building on the thing that Laura was talking about earlier about access and the ability for small investors to build their portfolio. I mean, here is a very safe place where investors could build their portfolio. These securities have been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	from the staff before they actually go public with their filing. Companies can also test the waters both before the filing of the offering circular and while the offering circular is under review by the Commission, by the staff. In addition to the basic requirements that applies to both tiers. Tier two offerings are subject to some other requirements, including the requirement to provide audited financial statements, the requirement to file annual and semi-annual reports, and a limitation on the number of securities that non-accredited investors can purchase of no more than 10 percent of the greater of the investor's income or net worth. So touching upon the numbers that the Chair mentioned this morning, more specifically since the effectiveness of the rules, and that's as of July 5th,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	coasters for example, virtual reality companies, every sort of three wheeled vehicle that you can imagine. I think there's about five of them testing the waters or filing at the moment. So there's some very exciting companies there. But to answer the question that Commissioner Stein raised earlier, she was asking why aren't more companies using this exemption. And I think part of the answer is the investors don't know it's out there. We've already seen a number of these really exciting companies file, not get anywhere, withdraw, and that seems really disappointing, and especially building on the thing that Laura was talking about earlier about access and the ability for small investors to build their portfolio. I mean, here is a very safe place where investors could build their portfolio. These securities have been – they've gone through an SEC review process. They are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	from the staff before they actually go public with their filing. Companies can also test the waters both before the filing of the offering circular and while the offering circular is under review by the Commission, by the staff. In addition to the basic requirements that applies to both tiers. Tier two offerings are subject to some other requirements, including the requirement to provide audited financial statements, the requirement to file annual and semi-annual reports, and a limitation on the number of securities that non-accredited investors can purchase of no more than 10 percent of the greater of the investor's income or net worth. So touching upon the numbers that the Chair mentioned this morning, more specifically since the effectiveness of the rules, and that's as of July 5th, issuers have publicly filed 108 offerings with the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	coasters for example, virtual reality companies, every sort of three wheeled vehicle that you can imagine. I think there's about five of them testing the waters or filing at the moment. So there's some very exciting companies there. But to answer the question that Commissioner Stein raised earlier, she was asking why aren't more companies using this exemption. And I think part of the answer is the investors don't know it's out there. We've already seen a number of these really exciting companies file, not get anywhere, withdraw, and that seems really disappointing, and especially building on the thing that Laura was talking about earlier about access and the ability for small investors to build their portfolio. I mean, here is a very safe place where investors could build their portfolio. These securities have been – they've gone through an SEC review process. They are very risky, but they are less risky in many ways than	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	from the staff before they actually go public with their filing. Companies can also test the waters both before the filing of the offering circular and while the offering circular is under review by the Commission, by the staff. In addition to the basic requirements that applies to both tiers. Tier two offerings are subject to some other requirements, including the requirement to provide audited financial statements, the requirement to file annual and semi-annual reports, and a limitation on the number of securities that non-accredited investors can purchase of no more than 10 percent of the greater of the investor's income or net worth. So touching upon the numbers that the Chair mentioned this morning, more specifically since the effectiveness of the rules, and that's as of July 5th, issuers have publicly filed 108 offerings with the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	coasters for example, virtual reality companies, every sort of three wheeled vehicle that you can imagine. I think there's about five of them testing the waters or filing at the moment. So there's some very exciting companies there. But to answer the question that Commissioner Stein raised earlier, she was asking why aren't more companies using this exemption. And I think part of the answer is the investors don't know it's out there. We've already seen a number of these really exciting companies file, not get anywhere, withdraw, and that seems really disappointing, and especially building on the thing that Laura was talking about earlier about access and the ability for small investors to build their portfolio. I mean, here is a very safe place where investors could build their portfolio. These securities have been – they've gone through an SEC review process. They are very risky, but they are less risky in many ways than some of the Reg D offerings we've talked about before. I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	from the staff before they actually go public with their filing. Companies can also test the waters both before the filing of the offering circular and while the offering circular is under review by the Commission, by the staff. In addition to the basic requirements that applies to both tiers. Tier two offerings are subject to some other requirements, including the requirement to provide audited financial statements, the requirement to file annual and semi-annual reports, and a limitation on the number of securities that non-accredited investors can purchase of no more than 10 percent of the greater of the investor's income or net worth. So touching upon the numbers that the Chair mentioned this morning, more specifically since the effectiveness of the rules, and that's as of July 5th, issuers have publicly filed 108 offerings with the Commission. A number have taken advantage of this non-public staff review process that I have described. The
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	coasters for example, virtual reality companies, every sort of three wheeled vehicle that you can imagine. I think there's about five of them testing the waters or filing at the moment. So there's some very exciting companies there. But to answer the question that Commissioner Stein raised earlier, she was asking why aren't more companies using this exemption. And I think part of the answer is the investors don't know it's out there. We've already seen a number of these really exciting companies file, not get anywhere, withdraw, and that seems really disappointing, and especially building on the thing that Laura was talking about earlier about access and the ability for small investors to build their portfolio. I mean, here is a very safe place where investors could build their portfolio. These securities have been – they've gone through an SEC review process. They are very risky, but they are less risky in many ways than some of the Reg D offerings we've talked about before. I think it's a real shame that the investors are not yet	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	from the staff before they actually go public with their filing. Companies can also test the waters both before the filing of the offering circular and while the offering circular is under review by the Commission, by the staff. In addition to the basic requirements that applies to both tiers. Tier two offerings are subject to some other requirements, including the requirement to provide audited financial statements, the requirement to file annual and semi-annual reports, and a limitation on the number of securities that non-accredited investors can purchase of no more than 10 percent of the greater of the investor's income or net worth. So touching upon the numbers that the Chair mentioned this morning, more specifically since the effectiveness of the rules, and that's as of July 5th, issuers have publicly filed 108 offerings with the Commission. A number have taken advantage of this non-public staff review process that I have described. The 108 public filings are seeking an aggregate amount of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	coasters for example, virtual reality companies, every sort of three wheeled vehicle that you can imagine. I think there's about five of them testing the waters or filing at the moment. So there's some very exciting companies there. But to answer the question that Commissioner Stein raised earlier, she was asking why aren't more companies using this exemption. And I think part of the answer is the investors don't know it's out there. We've already seen a number of these really exciting companies file, not get anywhere, withdraw, and that seems really disappointing, and especially building on the thing that Laura was talking about earlier about access and the ability for small investors to build their portfolio. I mean, here is a very safe place where investors could build their portfolio. These securities have been they've gone through an SEC review process. They are very risky, but they are less risky in many ways than some of the Reg D offerings we've talked about before. I think it's a real shame that the investors are not yet turning up, and I think the fact that the investors are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	from the staff before they actually go public with their filing. Companies can also test the waters both before the filing of the offering circular and while the offering circular is under review by the Commission, by the staff. In addition to the basic requirements that applies to both tiers. Tier two offerings are subject to some other requirements, including the requirement to provide audited financial statements, the requirement to file annual and semi-annual reports, and a limitation on the number of securities that non-accredited investors can purchase of no more than 10 percent of the greater of the investor's income or net worth. So touching upon the numbers that the Chair mentioned this morning, more specifically since the effectiveness of the rules, and that's as of July 5th, issuers have publicly filed 108 offerings with the Commission. A number have taken advantage of this non-public staff review process that I have described. The 108 public filings are seeking an aggregate amount of just over \$2 billion.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	coasters for example, virtual reality companies, every sort of three wheeled vehicle that you can imagine. I think there's about five of them testing the waters or filing at the moment. So there's some very exciting companies there. But to answer the question that Commissioner Stein raised earlier, she was asking why aren't more companies using this exemption. And I think part of the answer is the investors don't know it's out there. We've already seen a number of these really exciting companies file, not get anywhere, withdraw, and that seems really disappointing, and especially building on the thing that Laura was talking about earlier about access and the ability for small investors to build their portfolio. I mean, here is a very safe place where investors could build their portfolio. These securities have been – they've gone through an SEC review process. They are very risky, but they are less risky in many ways than some of the Reg D offerings we've talked about before. I think it's a real shame that the investors are not yet turning up, and I think the fact that the investors are not turning up is one of the reasons why the issuers are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	from the staff before they actually go public with their filing. Companies can also test the waters both before the filing of the offering circular and while the offering circular is under review by the Commission, by the staff. In addition to the basic requirements that applies to both tiers. Tier two offerings are subject to some other requirements, including the requirement to provide audited financial statements, the requirement to file annual and semi-annual reports, and a limitation on the number of securities that non-accredited investors can purchase of no more than 10 percent of the greater of the investor's income or net worth. So touching upon the numbers that the Chair mentioned this morning, more specifically since the effectiveness of the rules, and that's as of July 5th, issuers have publicly filed 108 offerings with the Commission. A number have taken advantage of this non-public staff review process that I have described. The 108 public filings are seeking an aggregate amount of just over \$2 billion.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	coasters for example, virtual reality companies, every sort of three wheeled vehicle that you can imagine. I think there's about five of them testing the waters or filing at the moment. So there's some very exciting companies there. But to answer the question that Commissioner Stein raised earlier, she was asking why aren't more companies using this exemption. And I think part of the answer is the investors don't know it's out there. We've already seen a number of these really exciting companies file, not get anywhere, withdraw, and that seems really disappointing, and especially building on the thing that Laura was talking about earlier about access and the ability for small investors to build their portfolio. I mean, here is a very safe place where investors could build their portfolio. These securities have been - they've gone through an SEC review process. They are very risky, but they are less risky in many ways than some of the Reg D offerings we've talked about before. I think it's a real shame that the investors are not yet turning up, and I think the fact that the investors are not turning up is one of the reasons why the issuers are not turning up is one of the reasons why the issuers are not filing, and you've got a whole chicken and egg thing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	from the staff before they actually go public with their filing. Companies can also test the waters both before the filing of the offering circular and while the offering circular is under review by the Commission, by the staff. In addition to the basic requirements that applies to both tiers. Tier two offerings are subject to some other requirements, including the requirement to provide audited financial statements, the requirement to file annual and semi-annual reports, and a limitation on the number of securities that non-accredited investors can purchase of no more than 10 percent of the greater of the investor's income or net worth. So touching upon the numbers that the Chair mentioned this morning, more specifically since the effectiveness of the rules, and that's as of July 5th, issuers have publicly filed 108 offerings with the Commission. A number have taken advantage of this non-public staff review process that I have described. The 108 public filings are seeking an aggregate amount of just over \$2 billion.

	Page 62		Page 64
1	qualified 48 offering statements. Qualification means	1	the securities pursuant to that tier two offering to
2	the staff has completed the review process and the	2	register a class of securities, so the equivalent of
3	company can begin selling the securities. Those	3	actually doing an IPO. Instead of doing it through the
4	qualified offerings are seeking to raise \$841 million.	4	traditional registration statement and Form S-1 the
5	That's all that I have, Sara.	5	company would do the Reg A offering and then try to
6	CO-CHAIR HANKS: I had another question for	6	register the class of securities afterwards.
7	you, Sebastian, on the rulemaking petition we understand	7	To date there's been very, very few companies
8	from OTC to expand the companies who can use Regulation	8	who have done the tier two offering in conjunction with
9	A. And I wondered if you might explain to everybody what	9	an 8(a). I'm aware of at least one, but it's a very small
10	the issue and what the process is for that rulemaking	10	number compared to the total pool.
11	petition.	11	MS. TIERNEY: Thank you.
12	MR. GOMEZ: Sure. For all of those of you who	12	MR. REARDON: Sebastian, can you tell, do you
13	want to take a look at it, anyone can submit a rulemaking	13	happen to know out of the 108 how many had placement
14	petition to the Commission. They're actually posted on	14	agents or underwriters, whatever they're called in these
15	the SEC website. So anyone can go to the SEC website and	15	offerings?
16	look at the specific petition.	16	MR. GOMEZ: That's a great point, Patrick. I
17	The petition is seeking to expand Reg A with	17	don't have the specific numbers, but it is a very small
18	respect to two aspects. One is to permit companies that	18	percentage of them. A lot of them, the vast majority of
19	are already reporting companies to use the exemption.	19	them are self-underwritten. There has been some of those
20	The original Reg A and as amended by the Commission, both	20	offerings that had underwriters or placement agents, but
21	of them excluded from participating in the exemption	21	it's a small percentage of the 108 pool.
22	companies that were already reporting companies, so	22	MR. REARDON: That might be an avenue because,
23	companies that had already done the IPO and were already	23	I mean, to reach out to the small broker/dealers are
24	reporting companies.	24	these done on at best I assume they're best efforts?
25	So the petition asked for the Commission to	25	MR. GOMEZ: That's right. And Sara may have
	Page 63		Page 65
			Page 05
1	expand the issuer eligibility to allow those companies to	1	some more. She worked on a number of them. So you may
2	expand the issuer eligibility to allow those companies to use the exemption. In addition to that the petition also	2	some more. She worked on a number of them. So you may have some idea as to the thinking between Paul might
2 3	expand the issuer eligibility to allow those companies to use the exemption. In addition to that the petition also asked with respect to resale of the securities for	2 3	some more. She worked on a number of them. So you may have some idea as to the thinking between Paul might also have some thoughts as to the thinking between the
2 3 4	expand the issuer eligibility to allow those companies to use the exemption. In addition to that the petition also asked with respect to resale of the securities for expansion there as well. I encourage everyone to take a	2 3 4	some more. She worked on a number of them. So you may have some idea as to the thinking between Paul might also have some thoughts as to the thinking between the writing, the offering versus self-underwritten, best
2 3 4 5	expand the issuer eligibility to allow those companies to use the exemption. In addition to that the petition also asked with respect to resale of the securities for expansion there as well. I encourage everyone to take a look at it.	2 3 4 5	some more. She worked on a number of them. So you may have some idea as to the thinking between Paul might also have some thoughts as to the thinking between the writing, the offering versus self-underwritten, best efforts.
2 3 4 5 6	expand the issuer eligibility to allow those companies to use the exemption. In addition to that the petition also asked with respect to resale of the securities for expansion there as well. I encourage everyone to take a look at it. As far as the process itself, once a petition	2 3 4 5 6	some more. She worked on a number of them. So you may have some idea as to the thinking between Paul might also have some thoughts as to the thinking between the writing, the offering versus self-underwritten, best efforts. CO-CHAIR HANKS: There's some real challenges
2 3 4 5 6 7	expand the issuer eligibility to allow those companies to use the exemption. In addition to that the petition also asked with respect to resale of the securities for expansion there as well. I encourage everyone to take a look at it. As far as the process itself, once a petition comes in the staff will look at it and consider it and	2 3 4 5 6 7	some more. She worked on a number of them. So you may have some idea as to the thinking between Paul might also have some thoughts as to the thinking between the writing, the offering versus self-underwritten, best efforts. CO-CHAIR HANKS: There's some real challenges there because one of the issues very few of them as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	expand the issuer eligibility to allow those companies to use the exemption. In addition to that the petition also asked with respect to resale of the securities for expansion there as well. I encourage everyone to take a look at it. As far as the process itself, once a petition comes in the staff will look at it and consider it and provide recommendations to the Commission. The staff is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	some more. She worked on a number of them. So you may have some idea as to the thinking between Paul might also have some thoughts as to the thinking between the writing, the offering versus self-underwritten, best efforts. CO-CHAIR HANKS: There's some real challenges there because one of the issues very few of them as Sebastian says have there's several different ways of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	expand the issuer eligibility to allow those companies to use the exemption. In addition to that the petition also asked with respect to resale of the securities for expansion there as well. I encourage everyone to take a look at it. As far as the process itself, once a petition comes in the staff will look at it and consider it and provide recommendations to the Commission. The staff is currently taking a look at that petition.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	some more. She worked on a number of them. So you may have some idea as to the thinking between Paul might also have some thoughts as to the thinking between the writing, the offering versus self-underwritten, best efforts. CO-CHAIR HANKS: There's some real challenges there because one of the issues very few of them as Sebastian says have there's several different ways of going about it, you know, firm commitment, underwriting,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	expand the issuer eligibility to allow those companies to use the exemption. In addition to that the petition also asked with respect to resale of the securities for expansion there as well. I encourage everyone to take a look at it. As far as the process itself, once a petition comes in the staff will look at it and consider it and provide recommendations to the Commission. The staff is currently taking a look at that petition. CO-CHAIR HANKS: Thank you, Sebastian.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	some more. She worked on a number of them. So you may have some idea as to the thinking between Paul might also have some thoughts as to the thinking between the writing, the offering versus self-underwritten, best efforts. CO-CHAIR HANKS: There's some real challenges there because one of the issues very few of them as Sebastian says have there's several different ways of going about it, you know, firm commitment, underwriting, there aren't any best efforts, a person saying that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	expand the issuer eligibility to allow those companies to use the exemption. In addition to that the petition also asked with respect to resale of the securities for expansion there as well. I encourage everyone to take a look at it. As far as the process itself, once a petition comes in the staff will look at it and consider it and provide recommendations to the Commission. The staff is currently taking a look at that petition. CO-CHAIR HANKS: Thank you, Sebastian. MS. TIERNEY: Can I just ask a question on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	some more. She worked on a number of them. So you may have some idea as to the thinking between Paul might also have some thoughts as to the thinking between the writing, the offering versus self-underwritten, best efforts. CO-CHAIR HANKS: There's some real challenges there because one of the issues very few of them as Sebastian says have there's several different ways of going about it, you know, firm commitment, underwriting, there aren't any best efforts, a person saying that they're in underwriting, the selling broker, it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	expand the issuer eligibility to allow those companies to use the exemption. In addition to that the petition also asked with respect to resale of the securities for expansion there as well. I encourage everyone to take a look at it. As far as the process itself, once a petition comes in the staff will look at it and consider it and provide recommendations to the Commission. The staff is currently taking a look at that petition. CO-CHAIR HANKS: Thank you, Sebastian. MS. TIERNEY: Can I just ask a question on the data? So Sebastian, of the 48 companies that have been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	some more. She worked on a number of them. So you may have some idea as to the thinking between Paul might also have some thoughts as to the thinking between the writing, the offering versus self-underwritten, best efforts. CO-CHAIR HANKS: There's some real challenges there because one of the issues very few of them as Sebastian says have there's several different ways of going about it, you know, firm commitment, underwriting, there aren't any best efforts, a person saying that they're in underwriting, the selling broker, it's probably about 10 percent of those filings. And then the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	expand the issuer eligibility to allow those companies to use the exemption. In addition to that the petition also asked with respect to resale of the securities for expansion there as well. I encourage everyone to take a look at it. As far as the process itself, once a petition comes in the staff will look at it and consider it and provide recommendations to the Commission. The staff is currently taking a look at that petition. CO-CHAIR HANKS: Thank you, Sebastian. MS. TIERNEY: Can I just ask a question on the data? So Sebastian, of the 48 companies that have been qualified do you have a breakdown of how many of those	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	some more. She worked on a number of them. So you may have some idea as to the thinking between Paul might also have some thoughts as to the thinking between the writing, the offering versus self-underwritten, best efforts. CO-CHAIR HANKS: There's some real challenges there because one of the issues very few of them as Sebastian says have there's several different ways of going about it, you know, firm commitment, underwriting, there aren't any best efforts, a person saying that they're in underwriting, the selling broker, it's probably about 10 percent of those filings. And then the next level down is either completely self-underwritten,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	expand the issuer eligibility to allow those companies to use the exemption. In addition to that the petition also asked with respect to resale of the securities for expansion there as well. I encourage everyone to take a look at it. As far as the process itself, once a petition comes in the staff will look at it and consider it and provide recommendations to the Commission. The staff is currently taking a look at that petition. CO-CHAIR HANKS: Thank you, Sebastian. MS. TIERNEY: Can I just ask a question on the data? So Sebastian, of the 48 companies that have been qualified do you have a breakdown of how many of those were tier two and did any of them also file the 8(a)?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	some more. She worked on a number of them. So you may have some idea as to the thinking between Paul might also have some thoughts as to the thinking between the writing, the offering versus self-underwritten, best efforts. CO-CHAIR HANKS: There's some real challenges there because one of the issues very few of them as Sebastian says have there's several different ways of going about it, you know, firm commitment, underwriting, there aren't any best efforts, a person saying that they're in underwriting, the selling broker, it's probably about 10 percent of those filings. And then the next level down is either completely self-underwritten, or they're going out on their own, or they're using an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	expand the issuer eligibility to allow those companies to use the exemption. In addition to that the petition also asked with respect to resale of the securities for expansion there as well. I encourage everyone to take a look at it. As far as the process itself, once a petition comes in the staff will look at it and consider it and provide recommendations to the Commission. The staff is currently taking a look at that petition. CO-CHAIR HANKS: Thank you, Sebastian. MS. TIERNEY: Can I just ask a question on the data? So Sebastian, of the 48 companies that have been qualified do you have a breakdown of how many of those were tier two and did any of them also file the 8(a)? I'm just curious, though, are they just doing the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	some more. She worked on a number of them. So you may have some idea as to the thinking between Paul might also have some thoughts as to the thinking between the writing, the offering versus self-underwritten, best efforts. CO-CHAIR HANKS: There's some real challenges there because one of the issues very few of them as Sebastian says have there's several different ways of going about it, you know, firm commitment, underwriting, there aren't any best efforts, a person saying that they're in underwriting, the selling broker, it's probably about 10 percent of those filings. And then the next level down is either completely self-underwritten,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	expand the issuer eligibility to allow those companies to use the exemption. In addition to that the petition also asked with respect to resale of the securities for expansion there as well. I encourage everyone to take a look at it. As far as the process itself, once a petition comes in the staff will look at it and consider it and provide recommendations to the Commission. The staff is currently taking a look at that petition. CO-CHAIR HANKS: Thank you, Sebastian. MS. TIERNEY: Can I just ask a question on the data? So Sebastian, of the 48 companies that have been qualified do you have a breakdown of how many of those were tier two and did any of them also file the 8(a)? I'm just curious, though, are they just doing the straight tier two or are they doing the tier two with the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	some more. She worked on a number of them. So you may have some idea as to the thinking between Paul might also have some thoughts as to the thinking between the writing, the offering versus self-underwritten, best efforts. CO-CHAIR HANKS: There's some real challenges there because one of the issues very few of them as Sebastian says have there's several different ways of going about it, you know, firm commitment, underwriting, there aren't any best efforts, a person saying that they're in underwriting, the selling broker, it's probably about 10 percent of those filings. And then the next level down is either completely self-underwritten, or they're going out on their own, or they're using an executing broker/dealer to address state Blue Sky broker/dealer issues.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	expand the issuer eligibility to allow those companies to use the exemption. In addition to that the petition also asked with respect to resale of the securities for expansion there as well. I encourage everyone to take a look at it. As far as the process itself, once a petition comes in the staff will look at it and consider it and provide recommendations to the Commission. The staff is currently taking a look at that petition. CO-CHAIR HANKS: Thank you, Sebastian. MS. TIERNEY: Can I just ask a question on the data? So Sebastian, of the 48 companies that have been qualified do you have a breakdown of how many of those were tier two and did any of them also file the 8(a)? I'm just curious, though, are they just doing the straight tier two or are they doing the tier two with the 8(a)? Is there any trend there?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	some more. She worked on a number of them. So you may have some idea as to the thinking between Paul might also have some thoughts as to the thinking between the writing, the offering versus self-underwritten, best efforts. CO-CHAIR HANKS: There's some real challenges there because one of the issues very few of them as Sebastian says have there's several different ways of going about it, you know, firm commitment, underwriting, there aren't any best efforts, a person saying that they're in underwriting, the selling broker, it's probably about 10 percent of those filings. And then the next level down is either completely self-underwritten, or they're going out on their own, or they're using an executing broker/dealer to address state Blue Sky broker/dealer issues. So there's very various different levels.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	expand the issuer eligibility to allow those companies to use the exemption. In addition to that the petition also asked with respect to resale of the securities for expansion there as well. I encourage everyone to take a look at it. As far as the process itself, once a petition comes in the staff will look at it and consider it and provide recommendations to the Commission. The staff is currently taking a look at that petition. CO-CHAIR HANKS: Thank you, Sebastian. MS. TIERNEY: Can I just ask a question on the data? So Sebastian, of the 48 companies that have been qualified do you have a breakdown of how many of those were tier two and did any of them also file the 8(a)? I'm just curious, though, are they just doing the straight tier two or are they doing the tier two with the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	some more. She worked on a number of them. So you may have some idea as to the thinking between Paul might also have some thoughts as to the thinking between the writing, the offering versus self-underwritten, best efforts. CO-CHAIR HANKS: There's some real challenges there because one of the issues very few of them as Sebastian says have there's several different ways of going about it, you know, firm commitment, underwriting, there aren't any best efforts, a person saying that they're in underwriting, the selling broker, it's probably about 10 percent of those filings. And then the next level down is either completely self-underwritten, or they're going out on their own, or they're using an executing broker/dealer to address state Blue Sky broker/dealer issues.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	expand the issuer eligibility to allow those companies to use the exemption. In addition to that the petition also asked with respect to resale of the securities for expansion there as well. I encourage everyone to take a look at it. As far as the process itself, once a petition comes in the staff will look at it and consider it and provide recommendations to the Commission. The staff is currently taking a look at that petition. CO-CHAIR HANKS: Thank you, Sebastian. MS. TIERNEY: Can I just ask a question on the data? So Sebastian, of the 48 companies that have been qualified do you have a breakdown of how many of those were tier two and did any of them also file the 8(a)? I'm just curious, though, are they just doing the straight tier two or are they doing the tier two with the 8(a)? Is there any trend there? MS. GOMEZ: So the – I don't have the specific	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	some more. She worked on a number of them. So you may have some idea as to the thinking between Paul might also have some thoughts as to the thinking between the writing, the offering versus self-underwritten, best efforts. CO-CHAIR HANKS: There's some real challenges there because one of the issues very few of them as Sebastian says have there's several different ways of going about it, you know, firm commitment, underwriting, there aren't any best efforts, a person saying that they're in underwriting, the selling broker, it's probably about 10 percent of those filings. And then the next level down is either completely self-underwritten, or they're going out on their own, or they're using an executing broker/dealer to address state Blue Sky broker/dealer issues. So there's very various different levels. Part of the problem here from the point of view of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	expand the issuer eligibility to allow those companies to use the exemption. In addition to that the petition also asked with respect to resale of the securities for expansion there as well. I encourage everyone to take a look at it. As far as the process itself, once a petition comes in the staff will look at it and consider it and provide recommendations to the Commission. The staff is currently taking a look at that petition. CO-CHAIR HANKS: Thank you, Sebastian. MS. TIERNEY: Can I just ask a question on the data? So Sebastian, of the 48 companies that have been qualified do you have a breakdown of how many of those were tier two and did any of them also file the 8(a)? I'm just curious, though, are they just doing the straight tier two or are they doing the tier two with the 8(a)? Is there any trend there? MS. GOMEZ: So the I don't have the specific numbers, but the divide between tier one and tier two	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	some more. She worked on a number of them. So you may have some idea as to the thinking between Paul might also have some thoughts as to the thinking between the writing, the offering versus self-underwritten, best efforts. CO-CHAIR HANKS: There's some real challenges there because one of the issues very few of them as Sebastian says have there's several different ways of going about it, you know, firm commitment, underwriting, there aren't any best efforts, a person saying that they're in underwriting, the selling broker, it's probably about 10 percent of those filings. And then the next level down is either completely self-underwritten, or they're going out on their own, or they're using an executing broker/dealer to address state Blue Sky broker/dealer issues. So there's very various different levels. Part of the problem here from the point of view of brokers is a lot of these companies and we're talking
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>expand the issuer eligibility to allow those companies to use the exemption. In addition to that the petition also asked with respect to resale of the securities for expansion there as well. I encourage everyone to take a look at it.</li> <li>As far as the process itself, once a petition comes in the staff will look at it and consider it and provide recommendations to the Commission. The staff is currently taking a look at that petition.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: Thank you, Sebastian.</li> <li>MS. TIERNEY: Can I just ask a question on the data? So Sebastian, of the 48 companies that have been qualified do you have a breakdown of how many of those were tier two and did any of them also file the 8(a)? I'm just curious, though, are they just doing the straight tier two or are they doing the tier two with the 8(a)? Is there any trend there?</li> <li>MS. GOMEZ: So the – I don't have the specific numbers, but the divide between tier one and tier two companies for qualification was also largely equal in</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	some more. She worked on a number of them. So you may have some idea as to the thinking between Paul might also have some thoughts as to the thinking between the writing, the offering versus self-underwritten, best efforts. CO-CHAIR HANKS: There's some real challenges there because one of the issues very few of them as Sebastian says have there's several different ways of going about it, you know, firm commitment, underwriting, there aren't any best efforts, a person saying that they're in underwriting, the selling broker, it's probably about 10 percent of those filings. And then the next level down is either completely self-underwritten, or they're going out on their own, or they're using an executing broker/dealer to address state Blue Sky broker/dealer issues. So there's very various different levels. Part of the problem here from the point of view of brokers is a lot of these companies and we're talking about operating here as opposed to real estate a lot
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	expand the issuer eligibility to allow those companies to use the exemption. In addition to that the petition also asked with respect to resale of the securities for expansion there as well. I encourage everyone to take a look at it. As far as the process itself, once a petition comes in the staff will look at it and consider it and provide recommendations to the Commission. The staff is currently taking a look at that petition. CO-CHAIR HANKS: Thank you, Sebastian. MS. TIERNEY: Can I just ask a question on the data? So Sebastian, of the 48 companies that have been qualified do you have a breakdown of how many of those were tier two and did any of them also file the 8(a)? I'm just curious, though, are they just doing the straight tier two or are they doing the tier two with the 8(a)? Is there any trend there? MS. GOMEZ: So the – I don't have the specific numbers, but the divide between tier one and tier two companies for qualification was also largely equal in their – so there wasn't really a big difference with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	some more. She worked on a number of them. So you may have some idea as to the thinking between Paul might also have some thoughts as to the thinking between the writing, the offering versus self-underwritten, best efforts. CO-CHAIR HANKS: There's some real challenges there because one of the issues very few of them as Sebastian says have there's several different ways of going about it, you know, firm commitment, underwriting, there aren't any best efforts, a person saying that they're in underwriting, the selling broker, it's probably about 10 percent of those filings. And then the next level down is either completely self-underwritten, or they're going out on their own, or they're using an executing broker/dealer to address state Blue Sky broker/dealer issues. So there's very various different levels. Part of the problem here from the point of view of brokers is a lot of these companies and we're talking about operating here as opposed to real estate a lot of them are complete startups with negative shareholder's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>expand the issuer eligibility to allow those companies to use the exemption. In addition to that the petition also asked with respect to resale of the securities for expansion there as well. I encourage everyone to take a look at it.</li> <li>As far as the process itself, once a petition comes in the staff will look at it and consider it and provide recommendations to the Commission. The staff is currently taking a look at that petition.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: Thank you, Sebastian.</li> <li>MS. TIERNEY: Can I just ask a question on the data? So Sebastian, of the 48 companies that have been qualified do you have a breakdown of how many of those were tier two and did any of them also file the 8(a)?</li> <li>I'm just curious, though, are they just doing the straight tier two or are they doing the tier two with the s(a)? Is there any trend there?</li> <li>MS. GOMEZ: So theI don't have the specific numbers, but the divide between tier one and tier two companies for qualification was also largely equal in their so there wasn't really a big difference with that respect.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	some more. She worked on a number of them. So you may have some idea as to the thinking between Paul might also have some thoughts as to the thinking between the writing, the offering versus self-underwritten, best efforts. CO-CHAIR HANKS: There's some real challenges there because one of the issues very few of them as Sebastian says have there's several different ways of going about it, you know, firm commitment, underwriting, there aren't any best efforts, a person saying that they're in underwriting, the selling broker, it's probably about 10 percent of those filings. And then the next level down is either completely self-underwritten, or they're going out on their own, or they're using an executing broker/dealer to address state Blue Sky broker/dealer issues. So there's very various different levels. Part of the problem here from the point of view of brokers is a lot of these companies and we're talking about operating here as opposed to real estate a lot of them are complete startups with negative shareholder's equity and no revenues. There are a lot of broker/dealers
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	expand the issuer eligibility to allow those companies to use the exemption. In addition to that the petition also asked with respect to resale of the securities for expansion there as well. I encourage everyone to take a look at it. As far as the process itself, once a petition comes in the staff will look at it and consider it and provide recommendations to the Commission. The staff is currently taking a look at that petition. CO-CHAIR HANKS: Thank you, Sebastian. MS. TIERNEY: Can I just ask a question on the data? So Sebastian, of the 48 companies that have been qualified do you have a breakdown of how many of those were tier two and did any of them also file the 8(a)? Im just curious, though, are they just doing the straight tier two or are they doing the tier two with the 8(a)? Is there any trend there? MS. GOMEZ: So the – I don't have the specific numbers, but the divide between tier one and tier two companies for qualification was also largely equal in their so there wasn't really a big difference with itar respect.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	some more. She worked on a number of them. So you may have some idea as to the thinking between Paul might also have some thoughts as to the thinking between the writing, the offering versus self-underwritten, best efforts. CO-CHAIR HANKS: There's some real challenges there because one of the issues very few of them as Sebastian says have there's several different ways of going about it, you know, firm commitment, underwriting, there aren't any best efforts, a person saying that they're in underwriting, the selling broker, it's probably about 10 percent of those filings. And then the next level down is either completely self-underwritten, or they're going out on their own, or they're using an executing broker/dealer to address state Blue Sky broker/dealer issues. So there's very various different levels. Part of the problem here from the point of view of brokers is a lot of these companies and we're talking about operating here as opposed to real estate a lot of them are complete startups with negative shareholder's equity and no revenues. There are a lot of broker/dealers who are not the slightest bit interested in this. So

	Page 66		Page 68
1	time. You said 108 registrants with \$2 billion in total	1	Engineering. He is an automotive enthusiast who saw a
2	ask. 48 were qualified with \$800 million. The delta	2	need for radically different vehicle, and if you've seen
3	or have they been withdrawn? What's the delta, what's	3	them they are really radically different. They are
4	going to happen to the Delta?	4	economical in terms of initial purchase price and ongoing
5	MR. GOMEZ: So part of it is the fact that this	5	fuel costs as well as safe, environmentally conscious,
6	is relatively new. So you have a one year period in	6	and fun to drive.
7	which the companies are going through a process of filing	7	So in 2009 he founded Elio Motors, the design and
8	the offering document. It goes through the review	8	manufacturing company, to make efficient, low cost, three
9	process with the staff. The ones that are tier one are	9	wheeled vehicles in the United States. In November 2015
10	also going through the review process at the state level.	10	he began a Regulation A offering of Elio's common stock.
11	So part of the delta is the fact that it's just	11	They have raised nearly \$17 million from the offering.
12	so new. A number of companies that were the earlier	12	The shares are now traded on the OTCQX market and we
13	filers have completed the process and already cleared it.	13	thought it would be interesting to hear both from Elio
14	The 108 also includes companies that have very recently	14	and later OTC Markets about their experiences with Reg A.
15	filed and are just starting the process. So I think the	15	And Paul, thank you for joining us and go
16	delta is something that as time progresses I expect that	16	ahead.
17	it's going to be compressed and it's just due to the fact	17	MR. ELIO: Thanks for having me. My
18	that this is very new.	18	understanding is you kind of wanted to go through a
19	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: So again how much has	19	little overview of the company first and then talk about
20	actually been raised that we're aware of?	20	Reg A+.
21	MR. GOMEZ: So that's a great question, Steve,	21	This is a very interesting conversation to listen
22	and I'll give you a number, but also want to put that	22	in on. I have to say that the single biggest hurdle in
23	number in context. The rules require a company to report	23	creating Elio Motors was attracting capital. And I don't
24	to the SEC the total amount that has been raised once the	24	think if Reg A+ hadn't happened we would have made it.
25	offering has been completed. And if the company is a	25	This was absolutely key to our success. So I thank you.
	Page 67		Page 69
1	Page 67	1	Page 69
1	tier one company they will file a short form that reports	1	So any forward looking statements. So
2	tier one company they will file a short form that reports how much was raised after the offering was completed.	2	So any forward looking statements. So basically Elio is about four things: a compelling value
2 3	tier one company they will file a short form that reports how much was raised after the offering was completed. The companies that are tier two will report that in	2	So any forward looking statements. So basically Elio is about four things: a compelling value proposition, low price and high mileage. So our target
2 3 4	tier one company they will file a short form that reports how much was raised after the offering was completed. The companies that are tier two will report that in their annual report.	2 3 4	So any forward looking statements. So basically Elio is about four things: a compelling value proposition, low price and high mileage. So our target sticker price is \$6,800 and our target mileage is 84
2 3	tier one company they will file a short form that reports how much was raised after the offering was completed. The companies that are tier two will report that in their annual report. A lot of these offering's costs they are self-	2	So any forward looking statements. So basically Elio is about four things: a compelling value proposition, low price and high mileage. So our target sticker price is \$6,800 and our target mileage is 84 miles per gallon. And either one of those by themselves
2 3 4 5	tier one company they will file a short form that reports how much was raised after the offering was completed. The companies that are tier two will report that in their annual report. A lot of these offering's costs they are self- underwritten. Best efforts by the company are very long	2 3 4 5	So any forward looking statements. So basically Elio is about four things: a compelling value proposition, low price and high mileage. So our target sticker price is \$6,800 and our target mileage is 84 miles per gallon. And either one of those by themselves is compelling, but when you put them together it's an
2 3 4 5 6	tier one company they will file a short form that reports how much was raised after the offering was completed. The companies that are tier two will report that in their annual report. A lot of these offering's costs they are self- underwritten. Best efforts by the company are very long going. So the company has not completed the offering	2 3 4 5 6	So any forward looking statements. So basically Elio is about four things: a compelling value proposition, low price and high mileage. So our target sticker price is \$6,800 and our target mileage is 84 miles per gallon. And either one of those by themselves is compelling, but when you put them together it's an overwhelming value proposition.
2 3 4 5 6 7	tier one company they will file a short form that reports how much was raised after the offering was completed. The companies that are tier two will report that in their annual report. A lot of these offering's costs they are self- underwritten. Best efforts by the company are very long	2 3 4 5 6 7	So any forward looking statements. So basically Elio is about four things: a compelling value proposition, low price and high mileage. So our target sticker price is \$6,800 and our target mileage is 84 miles per gallon. And either one of those by themselves is compelling, but when you put them together it's an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	tier one company they will file a short form that reports how much was raised after the offering was completed. The companies that are tier two will report that in their annual report. A lot of these offering's costs they are self- underwritten. Best efforts by the company are very long going. So the company has not completed the offering itself, so has not reported has not been required to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	So any forward looking statements. So basically Elio is about four things: a compelling value proposition, low price and high mileage. So our target sticker price is \$6,800 and our target mileage is 84 miles per gallon. And either one of those by themselves is compelling, but when you put them together it's an overwhelming value proposition. It's got to be safe. We're designing it to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	tier one company they will file a short form that reports how much was raised after the offering was completed. The companies that are tier two will report that in their annual report. A lot of these offering's costs they are self- underwritten. Best efforts by the company are very long going. So the company has not completed the offering itself, so has not reported has not been required to report how much they sold because the offering is still	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	So any forward looking statements. So basically Elio is about four things: a compelling value proposition, low price and high mileage. So our target sticker price is \$6,800 and our target mileage is 84 miles per gallon. And either one of those by themselves is compelling, but when you put them together it's an overwhelming value proposition. It's got to be safe. We're designing it to the highest automotive safety standards. We aren't allowing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	tier one company they will file a short form that reports how much was raised after the offering was completed. The companies that are tier two will report that in their annual report. A lot of these offering's costs they are self- underwritten. Best efforts by the company are very long going. So the company has not completed the offering itself, so has not reported has not been required to report how much they sold because the offering is still ongoing.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	So any forward looking statements. So basically Elio is about four things: a compelling value proposition, low price and high mileage. So our target sticker price is \$6,800 and our target mileage is 84 miles per gallon. And either one of those by themselves is compelling, but when you put them together it's an overwhelming value proposition. It's got to be safe. We're designing it to the highest automotive safety standards. We aren't allowing any new technology. I believe technology risk is the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	tier one company they will file a short form that reports how much was raised after the offering was completed. The companies that are tier two will report that in their annual report. A lot of these offering's costs they are self- underwritten. Best efforts by the company are very long going. So the company has not completed the offering itself, so has not reported has not been required to report how much they sold because the offering is still ongoing. So the data that we have is the data for the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	So any forward looking statements. So basically Elio is about four things: a compelling value proposition, low price and high mileage. So our target sticker price is \$6,800 and our target mileage is 84 miles per gallon. And either one of those by themselves is compelling, but when you put them together it's an overwhelming value proposition. It's got to be safe. We're designing it to the highest automotive safety standards. We aren't allowing any new technology. I believe technology risk is the death now of many pre-revenue startups, right. Even if
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	tier one company they will file a short form that reports how much was raised after the offering was completed. The companies that are tier two will report that in their annual report. A lot of these offering's costs they are self- underwritten. Best efforts by the company are very long going. So the company has not completed the offering itself, so has not reported has not been required to report how much they sold because the offering is still ongoing. So the data that we have is the data for the very small sliver of companies that likely underestimates	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	So any forward looking statements. So basically Elio is about four things: a compelling value proposition, low price and high mileage. So our target sticker price is \$6,800 and our target mileage is 84 miles per gallon. And either one of those by themselves is compelling, but when you put them together it's an overwhelming value proposition. It's got to be safe. We're designing it to the highest automotive safety standards. We aren't allowing any new technology. I believe technology risk is the death now of many pre-revenue startups, right. Even if you bet on the technology, if it takes you six or nine
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	tier one company they will file a short form that reports how much was raised after the offering was completed. The companies that are tier two will report that in their annual report. A lot of these offering's costs they are self- underwritten. Best efforts by the company are very long going. So the company has not completed the offering itself, so has not reported – has not been required to report how much they sold because the offering is still ongoing. So the data that we have is the data for the very small sliver of companies that likely underestimates how much has been sold because of the fact that it only	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	So any forward looking statements. So basically Elio is about four things: a compelling value proposition, low price and high mileage. So our target sticker price is \$6,800 and our target mileage is 84 miles per gallon. And either one of those by themselves is compelling, but when you put them together it's an overwhelming value proposition. It's got to be safe. We're designing it to the highest automotive safety standards. We aren't allowing any new technology. I believe technology risk is the death now of many pre-revenue startups, right. Even if you bet on the technology, if it takes you six or nine months longer to work out the thought and you're working
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	tier one company they will file a short form that reports how much was raised after the offering was completed. The companies that are tier two will report that in their annual report. A lot of these offering's costs they are self- underwritten. Best efforts by the company are very long going. So the company has not completed the offering itself, so has not reported has not been required to report how much they sold because the offering is still ongoing. So the data that we have is the data for the very small sliver of companies that likely underestimates how much has been sold because of the fact that it only captures those companies that have actually completed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	So any forward looking statements. So basically Elio is about four things: a compelling value proposition, low price and high mileage. So our target sticker price is \$6,800 and our target mileage is 84 miles per gallon. And either one of those by themselves is compelling, but when you put them together it's an overwhelming value proposition. It's got to be safe. We're designing it to the highest automotive safety standards. We aren't allowing any new technology. I believe technology risk is the death now of many pre-revenue startups, right. Even if you bet on the technology, if it takes you six or nine months longer to work out the thought and you're working off of other people's money bad things happen. So by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	tier one company they will file a short form that reports how much was raised after the offering was completed. The companies that are tier two will report that in their annual report. A lot of these offering's costs they are self- underwritten. Best efforts by the company are very long going. So the company has not completed the offering itself, so has not reported has not been required to report how much they sold because the offering is still ongoing. So the data that we have is the data for the very small sliver of companies that likely underestimates how much has been sold because of the fact that it only captures those companies that have actually completed their offering, meaning they filed, qualified, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	So any forward looking statements. So basically Elio is about four things: a compelling value proposition, low price and high mileage. So our target sticker price is \$6,800 and our target mileage is 84 miles per gallon. And either one of those by themselves is compelling, but when you put them together it's an overwhelming value proposition. It's got to be safe. We're designing it to the highest automotive safety standards. We aren't allowing any new technology. I believe technology risk is the death now of many pre-revenue startups, right. Even if you bet on the technology, if it takes you six or nine months longer to work out the thought and you're working off of other people's money bad things happen. So by using all technology that's already out there, it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	tier one company they will file a short form that reports how much was raised after the offering was completed. The companies that are tier two will report that in their annual report. A lot of these offering's costs they are self- underwritten. Best efforts by the company are very long going. So the company has not completed the offering itself, so has not reported has not been required to report how much they sold because the offering is still ongoing. So the data that we have is the data for the very small sliver of companies that likely underestimates how much has been sold because of the fact that it only captures those companies that have actually completed their offering, meaning they filed, qualified, and completed the offering. The data has been reported as \$99 million to date, but keep in mind the caveat because it likely underestimates companies that have started	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	So any forward looking statements. So basically Elio is about four things: a compelling value proposition, low price and high mileage. So our target sticker price is \$6,800 and our target mileage is 84 miles per gallon. And either one of those by themselves is compelling, but when you put them together it's an overwhelming value proposition. It's got to be safe. We're designing it to the highest automotive safety standards. We aren't allowing any new technology. I believe technology risk is the death now of many pre-revenue startups, right. Even if you bet on the technology, if it takes you six or nine months longer to work out the thought and you're working off of other people's money bad things happen. So by using all technology that's already out there, it's already being made and on other vehicles and executing it on this vehicle, we substantially mitigate that risk. And we're committed to making it in America. We
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	tier one company they will file a short form that reports how much was raised after the offering was completed. The companies that are tier two will report that in their annual report. A lot of these offering's costs they are self- underwritten. Best efforts by the company are very long going. So the company has not completed the offering itself, so has not reported – has not been required to report how much they sold because the offering is still ongoing. So the data that we have is the data for the very small sliver of companies that likely underestimates how much has been sold because of the fact that it only captures those companies that have actually completed their offering, meaning they filed, qualified, and completed the offering. The data has been reported as \$99 million to date, but keep in mind the caveat because	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	So any forward looking statements. So basically Elio is about four things: a compelling value proposition, low price and high mileage. So our target sticker price is \$6,800 and our target mileage is 84 miles per gallon. And either one of those by themselves is compelling, but when you put them together it's an overwhelming value proposition. It's got to be safe. We're designing it to the highest automotive safety standards. We aren't allowing any new technology. I believe technology risk is the death now of many pre-revenue startups, right. Even if you bet on the technology, if it takes you six or nine months longer to work out the thought and you're working off of other people's money bad things happen. So by using all technology that's already out there, it's already being made and on other vehicles and executing it on this vehicle, we substantially mitigate that risk. And we're committed to making it in America. We control a site that we got out of the GM bankruptcy in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	tier one company they will file a short form that reports how much was raised after the offering was completed. The companies that are tier two will report that in their annual report. A lot of these offering's costs they are self- underwritten. Best efforts by the company are very long going. So the company has not completed the offering itself, so has not reported has not been required to report how much they sold because the offering is still ongoing. So the data that we have is the data for the very small sliver of companies that likely underestimates how much has been sold because of the fact that it only captures those companies that have actually completed their offering, meaning they filed, qualified, and completed the offering. The data has been reported as \$99 million to date, but keep in mind the caveat because it likely underestimates companies that have started selling but have not completed the offering themselves. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thanks.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	So any forward looking statements. So basically Elio is about four things: a compelling value proposition, low price and high mileage. So our target sticker price is \$6,800 and our target mileage is 84 miles per gallon. And either one of those by themselves is compelling, but when you put them together it's an overwhelming value proposition. It's got to be safe. We're designing it to the highest automotive safety standards. We aren't allowing any new technology. I believe technology risk is the death now of many pre-revenue startups, right. Even if you bet on the technology, if it takes you six or nine months longer to work out the thought and you're working off of other people's money bad things happen. So by using all technology that's already out there, it's already being made and on other vehicles and executing it on this vehicle, we substantially mitigate that risk. And we're committed to making it in America. We control a site that we got out of the GM bankruptcy in Shreveport, Louisiana. And we have a target of 90
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	tier one company they will file a short form that reports how much was raised after the offering was completed. The companies that are tier two will report that in their annual report. A lot of these offering's costs they are self- underwritten. Best efforts by the company are very long going. So the company has not completed the offering itself, so has not reported – has not been required to report how much they sold because the offering is still ongoing. So the data that we have is the data for the very small sliver of companies that likely underestimates how much has been sold because of the fact that it only captures those companies that have actually completed their offering, meaning they filed, qualified, and completed the offering. The data has been reported as \$99 million to date, but keep in mind the caveat because it likely underestimates companies that have started selling but have not completed the offering themselves. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thanks.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	So any forward looking statements. So basically Elio is about four things: a compelling value proposition, low price and high mileage. So our target sticker price is \$6,800 and our target mileage is 84 miles per gallon. And either one of those by themselves is compelling, but when you put them together it's an overwhelming value proposition. It's got to be safe. We're designing it to the highest automotive safety standards. We aren't allowing any new technology. I believe technology risk is the death now of many pre-revenue startups, right. Even if you bet on the technology, if it takes you six or nine months longer to work out the thought and you're working off of other people's money bad things happen. So by using all technology that's already out there, it's already being made and on other vehicles and executing it on this vehicle, we substantially mitigate that risk. And we're committed to making it in America. We control a site that we got out of the GM bankruptcy in Shreveport, Louisiana. And we have a target of 90 percent North American content and I think we'll come
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>tier one company they will file a short form that reports how much was raised after the offering was completed. The companies that are tier two will report that in their annual report.</li> <li>A lot of these offering's costs they are self-underwritten. Best efforts by the company are very long going. So the company has not completed the offering itself, so has not reported – has not been required to report how much they sold because the offering is still ongoing.</li> <li>So the data that we have is the data for the very small sliver of companies that likely underestimates how much has been sold because of the fact that it only captures those companies that have actually completed their offering. The data has been reported as \$99 million to date, but keep in mind the caveat because it likely underestimates companies that have started selling but have not completed the offering themselves. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thanks.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: All right. We are ready to go to Paul. So thanks, everyone. We are now pleased to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	So any forward looking statements. So basically Elio is about four things: a compelling value proposition, low price and high mileage. So our target sticker price is \$6,800 and our target mileage is 84 miles per gallon. And either one of those by themselves is compelling, but when you put them together it's an overwhelming value proposition. It's got to be safe. We're designing it to the highest automotive safety standards. We aren't allowing any new technology. I believe technology risk is the death now of many pre-revenue startups, right. Even if you bet on the technology, if it takes you six or nine months longer to work out the thought and you're working off of other people's money bad things happen. So by using all technology that's already out there, it's already being made and on other vehicles and executing it on this vehicle, we substantially mitigate that risk. And we're committed to making it in America. We control a site that we got out of the GM bankruptcy in Shreveport, Louisiana. And we have a target of 90 percent North American content and I think we'll come very close to that. So not only is it assembled in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>tier one company they will file a short form that reports how much was raised after the offering was completed.</li> <li>The companies that are tier two will report that in their annual report.</li> <li>A lot of these offering's costs they are self-underwritten. Best efforts by the company are very long going. So the company has not completed the offering itself, so has not reported has not been required to report how much they sold because the offering is still ongoing.</li> <li>So the data that we have is the data for the very small sliver of companies that likely underestimates how much has been sold because of the fact that it only captures those companies that have actually completed their offering, meaning they filed, qualified, and completed the offering. The data has been reported as \$99 million to date, but keep in mind the caveat because it likely underestimates companies that have started selling but have not completed the offering themselves.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thanks.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: All right. We are ready to go to Paul. So thanks, everyone. We are now pleased to have Paul Elio join us from Phoenix, Arizona. Prior to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	So any forward looking statements. So basically Elio is about four things: a compelling value proposition, low price and high mileage. So our target sticker price is \$6,800 and our target mileage is 84 miles per gallon. And either one of those by themselves is compelling, but when you put them together it's an overwhelming value proposition. It's got to be safe. We're designing it to the highest automotive safety standards. We aren't allowing any new technology. I believe technology risk is the death now of many pre-revenue startups, right. Even if you bet on the technology, if it takes you six or nine months longer to work out the thought and you're working off of other people's money bad things happen. So by using all technology that's already out there, it's already being made and on other vehicles and executing it on this vehicle, we substantially mitigate that risk. And we're committed to making it in America. We control a site that we got out of the GM bankruptcy in Shreveport, Louisiana. And we have a target of 90 percent North American content and I think we'll come very close to that. So not only is it assembled in America but the parts are coming from here as well.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>tier one company they will file a short form that reports how much was raised after the offering was completed. The companies that are tier two will report that in their annual report.</li> <li>A lot of these offering's costs they are self-underwritten. Best efforts by the company are very long going. So the company has not completed the offering itself, so has not reported – has not been required to report how much they sold because the offering is still ongoing.</li> <li>So the data that we have is the data for the very small sliver of companies that likely underestimates how much has been sold because of the fact that it only captures those companies that have actually completed their offering. The data has been reported as \$99 million to date, but keep in mind the caveat because it likely underestimates companies that have started selling but have not completed the offering themselves. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thanks.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: All right. We are ready to go to Paul. So thanks, everyone. We are now pleased to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	So any forward looking statements. So basically Elio is about four things: a compelling value proposition, low price and high mileage. So our target sticker price is \$6,800 and our target mileage is 84 miles per gallon. And either one of those by themselves is compelling, but when you put them together it's an overwhelming value proposition. It's got to be safe. We're designing it to the highest automotive safety standards. We aren't allowing any new technology. I believe technology risk is the death now of many pre-revenue startups, right. Even if you bet on the technology, if it takes you six or nine months longer to work out the thought and you're working off of other people's money bad things happen. So by using all technology that's already out there, it's already being made and on other vehicles and executing it on this vehicle, we substantially mitigate that risk. And we're committed to making it in America. We control a site that we got out of the GM bankruptcy in Shreveport, Louisiana. And we have a target of 90 percent North American content and I think we'll come very close to that. So not only is it assembled in

	Page 70		Page 72
1	is that's the key to the gas mileage. At highway speeds	1	credit card and every time you charge gas we charge a
2	most of your fuel goes to moving air. We are half as	2	trip. So buy \$10 worth of a gas and it shows up as a \$30
3	wide and we move half as much air, so we get double	3	charge on your credit card statement and that \$20 extra
4	mileage.	4	goes to paying down your loan, right, it's your car
5	It has three wheels, which technically makes it a	5	payment.
6	Motorcycle, but what it does for us is it hides that	6	Now as long as you drove into the dealership in
7	third wheel behind the air stream that you've already	7	something that gets 27 miles to the gallon or less, and
8	moved. So it improves aerodynamics. It's front engine,	8	all 100 million of those old cars do, your monthly fuel
9	front wheel drive. So 70 percent of your mass and all	9	bill actually goes down, right. Three times 27 is 81 and
10	your traction is happening over those front two wheels.	10	we get 84. So from the consumers' perspective they have
11	This is showing some of the engineering going	11	a brand new vehicle, under warranty, that's fun to drive.
12	on behind the scenes. This is the front, side and rear	12	They don't have a car payment and they are guaranteed to
13	impact analysis, the computational fluid dynamics, which	13	spend less on gas. Next month they'll triple the amount
14	is predicting drag, which drives our gas mileage	14	on their brand new Elio than they did single amount on
15	calculations. This is a high speed swerve at 50 miles an	15	their clunker last month on the vehicle they were
16	hour and this is showing the interior finish.	16	struggling to keep on the road. We can literally give
17	So this is not a paper napkin sketch. There's	17	cars away with 100 million old cars driving.
18	a lot of work that's gone on with this project.	18	The last segment that we create is the third
19	We believe that there are four markets that we	19	vehicle or the and vehicle, a-n-d. So the premise here
20	can sell Elio into. Two of them exist and two of them we	20	is that Americans buy big vehicles for a reason, right.
21	are going to create all by ourselves, at least for a	21	We like to disparage ourselves as being wasteful and
22	time. The first and most obvious is the new car market.	22	lazy, but the reality is you can't haul plywood in a
23	It's traditionally about 16 million units a year. It's	23	Prius, you can't tow a boat with a Versa, right. And we
24	more this year than probably next year. It's highly	24	buy big vehicles with a specific use in mind and we use
25	developed, highly segmented, with hundred year old	25	that vehicle for that purpose. Five percent of it is
	Page 71		
	Page /1		Page 73
1	players with great reputations, and quite honestly we	1	minds, right.
1 2	2	1 2	
	players with great reputations, and quite honestly we		minds, right.
2	players with great reputations, and quite honestly we will get our hats handed to us in that market. We're not	2	minds, right. And because small cars are too expensive they're
2 3	players with great reputations, and quite honestly we will get our hats handed to us in that market. We're not going to go in and take 100,000 Toyota, Ford or GM customers away. So although it's by far the most obvious, it's the least interesting.	2 3	minds, right. And because small cars are too expensive they're not a choice. And so we end up driving all that metal
2 3 4	players with great reputations, and quite honestly we will get our hats handed to us in that market. We're not going to go in and take 100,000 Toyota, Ford or GM customers away. So although it's by far the most obvious, it's the least interesting. The next market that also exists is the used car	2 3 4 5 6	minds, right. And because small cars are too expensive they're not a choice. And so we end up driving all that metal back and forth to work all by ourselves to have that functionality when we need it. At \$6,800 and 84 miles per gallon Elio becomes
2 3 4 5 6 7	players with great reputations, and quite honestly we will get our hats handed to us in that market. We're not going to go in and take 100,000 Toyota, Ford or GM customers away. So although it's by far the most obvious, it's the least interesting. The next market that also exists is the used car market. It's traditionally 2-1/2 to 3 times larger than	2 3 4 5 6 7	minds, right. And because small cars are too expensive they're not a choice. And so we end up driving all that metal back and forth to work all by ourselves to have that functionality when we need it. At \$6,800 and 84 miles per gallon Elio becomes a choice. So you buy and keep the big vehicle for the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	players with great reputations, and quite honestly we will get our hats handed to us in that market. We're not going to go in and take 100,000 Toyota, Ford or GM customers away. So although it's by far the most obvious, it's the least interesting. The next market that also exists is the used car market. It's traditionally 2-1/2 to 3 times larger than the new car market and I think we play very well there.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	minds, right. And because small cars are too expensive they're not a choice. And so we end up driving all that metal back and forth to work all by ourselves to have that functionality when we need it. At \$6,800 and 84 miles per gallon Elio becomes a choice. So you buy and keep the big vehicle for the reasons that you wanted it and you buy an Elio too. Now
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	players with great reputations, and quite honestly we will get our hats handed to us in that market. We're not going to go in and take 100,000 Toyota, Ford or GM customers away. So although it's by far the most obvious, it's the least interesting. The next market that also exists is the used car market. It's traditionally 2-1/2 to 3 times larger than the new car market and I think we play very well there. If your alternative is a 120,000 mile Civic for \$7,000 or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	minds, right. And because small cars are too expensive they're not a choice. And so we end up driving all that metal back and forth to work all by ourselves to have that functionality when we need it. At \$6,800 and 84 miles per gallon Elio becomes a choice. So you buy and keep the big vehicle for the reasons that you wanted it and you buy an Elio too. Now we have been preaching that this segment existed and now
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	players with great reputations, and quite honestly we will get our hats handed to us in that market. We're not going to go in and take 100,000 Toyota, Ford or GM customers away. So although it's by far the most obvious, it's the least interesting. The next market that also exists is the used car market. It's traditionally 2-1/2 to 3 times larger than the new car market and I think we play very well there. If your alternative is a 120,000 mile Civic for \$7,000 or a brand new Elio for \$7,000 I think I would win a fair	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	minds, right. And because small cars are too expensive they're not a choice. And so we end up driving all that metal back and forth to work all by ourselves to have that functionality when we need it. At \$6,800 and 84 miles per gallon Elio becomes a choice. So you buy and keep the big vehicle for the reasons that you wanted it and you buy an Elio too. Now we have been preaching that this segment existed and now we have data. We pulled our reservations, and this is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	players with great reputations, and quite honestly we will get our hats handed to us in that market. We're not going to go in and take 100,000 Toyota, Ford or GM customers away. So although it's by far the most obvious, it's the least interesting. The next market that also exists is the used car market. It's traditionally 2-1/2 to 3 times larger than the new car market and I think we play very well there. If your alternative is a 120,000 mile Civic for \$7,000 or a brand new Elio for \$7,000 I think I would win a fair number of those.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	minds, right. And because small cars are too expensive they're not a choice. And so we end up driving all that metal back and forth to work all by ourselves to have that functionality when we need it. At \$6,800 and 84 miles per gallon Elio becomes a choice. So you buy and keep the big vehicle for the reasons that you wanted it and you buy an Elio too. Now we have been preaching that this segment existed and now we have data. We pulled our reservations, and this is about a year, year-and-a-half ago, and asked them if they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	players with great reputations, and quite honestly we will get our hats handed to us in that market. We're not going to go in and take 100,000 Toyota, Ford or GM customers away. So although it's by far the most obvious, it's the least interesting. The next market that also exists is the used car market. It's traditionally 2-1/2 to 3 times larger than the new car market and I think we play very well there. If your alternative is a 120,000 mile Civic for \$7,000 or a brand new Elio for \$7,000 I think I would win a fair number of those. Then we have the two markets that we create.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	minds, right. And because small cars are too expensive they're not a choice. And so we end up driving all that metal back and forth to work all by ourselves to have that functionality when we need it. At \$6,800 and 84 miles per gallon Elio becomes a choice. So you buy and keep the big vehicle for the reasons that you wanted it and you buy an Elio too. Now we have been preaching that this segment existed and now we have data. We pulled our reservations, and this is about a year, year-and-a-half ago, and asked them if they were going to trade a vehicle. Ninety percent said they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	players with great reputations, and quite honestly we will get our hats handed to us in that market. We're not going to go in and take 100,000 Toyota, Ford or GM customers away. So although it's by far the most obvious, it's the least interesting. The next market that also exists is the used car market. It's traditionally 2-1/2 to 3 times larger than the new car market and I think we play very well there. If your alternative is a 120,000 mile Civic for \$7,000 or a brand new Elio for \$7,000 I think I would win a fair number of those. Then we have the two markets that we create. First is the clunker market. There's approximately 100	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	minds, right. And because small cars are too expensive they're not a choice. And so we end up driving all that metal back and forth to work all by ourselves to have that functionality when we need it. At \$6,800 and 84 miles per gallon Elio becomes a choice. So you buy and keep the big vehicle for the reasons that you wanted it and you buy an Elio too. Now we have been preaching that this segment existed and now we have data. We pulled our reservations, and this is about a year, year-and-a-half ago, and asked them if they were going to trade a vehicle. Ninety percent said they were not going to trade in a vehicle, they were just
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	players with great reputations, and quite honestly we will get our hats handed to us in that market. We're not going to go in and take 100,000 Toyota, Ford or GM customers away. So although it's by far the most obvious, it's the least interesting. The next market that also exists is the used car market. It's traditionally 2-1/2 to 3 times larger than the new car market and I think we play very well there. If your alternative is a 120,000 mile Civic for \$7,000 or a brand new Elio for \$7,000 I think I would win a fair number of those. Then we have the two markets that we create. First is the clunker market. There's approximately 100 million clunkers on U.S. highways. Now these are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	minds, right. And because small cars are too expensive they're not a choice. And so we end up driving all that metal back and forth to work all by ourselves to have that functionality when we need it. At \$6,800 and 84 miles per gallon Elio becomes a choice. So you buy and keep the big vehicle for the reasons that you wanted it and you buy an Elio too. Now we have been preaching that this segment existed and now we have data. We pulled our reservations, and this is about a year, year-and-a-half ago, and asked them if they were going to trade a vehicle. Ninety percent said they were not going to trade in a vehicle, they were just going to buy an Elio.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	players with great reputations, and quite honestly we will get our hats handed to us in that market. We're not going to go in and take 100,000 Toyota, Ford or GM customers away. So although it's by far the most obvious, it's the least interesting. The next market that also exists is the used car market. It's traditionally 2-1/2 to 3 times larger than the new car market and I think we play very well there. If your alternative is a 120,000 mile Civic for \$7,000 or a brand new Elio for \$7,000 I think I would win a fair number of those. Then we have the two markets that we create. First is the clunker market. There's approximately 100 million clunkers on U.S. highways. Now these are different than used cars. These are cars that people are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	minds, right. And because small cars are too expensive they're not a choice. And so we end up driving all that metal back and forth to work all by ourselves to have that functionality when we need it. At \$6,800 and 84 miles per gallon Elio becomes a choice. So you buy and keep the big vehicle for the reasons that you wanted it and you buy an Elio too. Now we have been preaching that this segment existed and now we have data. We pulled our reservations, and this is about a year, year-and-a-half ago, and asked them if they were going to trade a vehicle. Ninety percent said they were not going to trade in a vehicle, they were just going to buy an Elio.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	players with great reputations, and quite honestly we will get our hats handed to us in that market. We're not going to go in and take 100,000 Toyota, Ford or GM customers away. So although it's by far the most obvious, it's the least interesting. The next market that also exists is the used car market. It's traditionally 2-1/2 to 3 times larger than the new car market and I think we play very well there. If your alternative is a 120,000 mile Civic for \$7,000 or a brand new Elio for \$7,000 I think I would win a fair number of those. Then we have the two markets that we create. First is the clunker market. There's approximately 100 million clunkers on U.S. highways. Now these are different than used cars. These are cars that people are using duct tape and bubble gum to keep on the road	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	minds, right. And because small cars are too expensive they're not a choice. And so we end up driving all that metal back and forth to work all by ourselves to have that functionality when we need it. At \$6,800 and 84 miles per gallon Elio becomes a choice. So you buy and keep the big vehicle for the reasons that you wanted it and you buy an Elio too. Now we have been preaching that this segment existed and now we have data. We pulled our reservations, and this is about a year, year-and-a-half ago, and asked them if they were going to trade a vehicle. Ninety percent said they were not going to trade in a vehicle, they were just going to buy an Elio. So we've now demonstrated that this vehicle or this segment exists and almost of our reservations are coming
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	players with great reputations, and quite honestly we will get our hats handed to us in that market. We're not going to go in and take 100,000 Toyota, Ford or GM customers away. So although it's by far the most obvious, it's the least interesting. The next market that also exists is the used car market. It's traditionally 2-1/2 to 3 times larger than the new car market and I think we play very well there. If your alternative is a 120,000 mile Civic for \$7,000 or a brand new Elio for \$7,000 I think I would win a fair number of those. Then we have the two markets that we create. First is the clunker market. There's approximately 100 million clunkers on U.S. highways. Now these are different than used cars. These are cars that people are using duct tape and bubble gum to keep on the road because they can't afford to trade up to get a better	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	minds, right. And because small cars are too expensive they're not a choice. And so we end up driving all that metal back and forth to work all by ourselves to have that functionality when we need it. At \$6,800 and 84 miles per gallon Elio becomes a choice. So you buy and keep the big vehicle for the reasons that you wanted it and you buy an Elio too. Now we have been preaching that this segment existed and now we have data. We pulled our reservations, and this is about a year, year-and-a-half ago, and asked them if they were going to trade a vehicle. Ninety percent said they were not going to trade in a vehicle, they were just going to buy an Elio. So we've now demonstrated that this vehicle or this segment exists and almost of our reservations are coming from that segment, which makes sense, right. If you're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	players with great reputations, and quite honestly we will get our hats handed to us in that market. We're not going to go in and take 100,000 Toyota, Ford or GM customers away. So although it's by far the most obvious, it's the least interesting. The next market that also exists is the used car market. It's traditionally 2-1/2 to 3 times larger than the new car market and I think we play very well there. If your alternative is a 120,000 mile Civic for \$7,000 or a brand new Elio for \$7,000 I think I would win a fair number of those. Then we have the two markets that we create. First is the clunker market. There's approximately 100 million clunkers on U.S. highways. Now these are different than used cars. These are cars that people are using duct tape and bubble gum to keep on the road	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	minds, right. And because small cars are too expensive they're not a choice. And so we end up driving all that metal back and forth to work all by ourselves to have that functionality when we need it. At \$6,800 and 84 miles per gallon Elio becomes a choice. So you buy and keep the big vehicle for the reasons that you wanted it and you buy an Elio too. Now we have been preaching that this segment existed and now we have data. We pulled our reservations, and this is about a year, year-and-a-half ago, and asked them if they were going to trade a vehicle. Ninety percent said they were not going to trade in a vehicle, they were just going to buy an Elio. So we've now demonstrated that this vehicle or this segment exists and almost of our reservations are coming
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	players with great reputations, and quite honestly we will get our hats handed to us in that market. We're not going to go in and take 100,000 Toyota, Ford or GM customers away. So although it's by far the most obvious, it's the least interesting. The next market that also exists is the used car market. It's traditionally 2-1/2 to 3 times larger than the new car market and I think we play very well there. If your alternative is a 120,000 mile Civic for \$7,000 or a brand new Elio for \$7,000 I think I would win a fair number of those. Then we have the two markets that we create. First is the clunker market. There's approximately 100 million clunkers on U.S. highways. Now these are different than used cars. These are cars that people are using duct tape and bubble gum to keep on the road because they can't afford to trade up to get a better	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	minds, right. And because small cars are too expensive they're not a choice. And so we end up driving all that metal back and forth to work all by ourselves to have that functionality when we need it. At \$6,800 and 84 miles per gallon Elio becomes a choice. So you buy and keep the big vehicle for the reasons that you wanted it and you buy an Elio too. Now we have been preaching that this segment existed and now we have data. We pulled our reservations, and this is about a year, year-and-a-half ago, and asked them if they were going to trade a vehicle. Ninety percent said they were not going to trade in a vehicle, they were just going to buy an Elio. So we've now demonstrated that this vehicle or this segment exists and almost of our reservations are coming from that segment, which makes sense, right. If you're in the market for a new or used car you need a vehicle
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	players with great reputations, and quite honestly we will get our hats handed to us in that market. We're not going to go in and take 100,000 Toyota, Ford or GM customers away. So although it's by far the most obvious, it's the least interesting. The next market that also exists is the used car market. It's traditionally 2-1/2 to 3 times larger than the new car market and I think we play very well there. If your alternative is a 120,000 mile Civic for \$7,000 or a brand new Elio for \$7,000 I think I would win a fair number of those. Then we have the two markets that we create. First is the clunker market. There's approximately 100 million clunkers on U.S. highways. Now these are different than used cars. These are cars that people are using duct tape and bubble gum to keep on the road because they can't afford to trade up to get a better used car. I think we would do very well in this segment.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	minds, right. And because small cars are too expensive they're not a choice. And so we end up driving all that metal back and forth to work all by ourselves to have that functionality when we need it. At \$6,800 and 84 miles per gallon Elio becomes a choice. So you buy and keep the big vehicle for the reasons that you wanted it and you buy an Elio too. Now we have been preaching that this segment existed and now we have data. We pulled our reservations, and this is about a year, year-and-a-half ago, and asked them if they were going to trade in a vehicle, they were just going to buy an Elio. So we've now demonstrated that this vehicle or this segment exists and almost of our reservations are coming from that segment, which makes sense, right. If you're in the market for a new or used car you need a vehicle today, so you're not putting a reservation on an Elio.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	players with great reputations, and quite honestly we will get our hats handed to us in that market. We're not going to go in and take 100,000 Toyota, Ford or GM customers away. So although it's by far the most obvious, it's the least interesting. The next market that also exists is the used car market. It's traditionally 2-1/2 to 3 times larger than the new car market and I think we play very well there. If your alternative is a 120,000 mile Civic for \$7,000 or a brand new Elio for \$7,000 I think I would win a fair number of those. Then we have the two markets that we create. First is the clunker market. There's approximately 100 million clunkers on U.S. highways. Now these are different than used cars. These are cars that people are using duct tape and bubble gum to keep on the road because they can't afford to trade up to get a better used car. I think we would do very well in this segment.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	minds, right. And because small cars are too expensive they're not a choice. And so we end up driving all that metal back and forth to work all by ourselves to have that functionality when we need it. At \$6,800 and 84 miles per gallon Elio becomes a choice. So you buy and keep the big vehicle for the reasons that you wanted it and you buy an Elio too. Now we have been preaching that this segment existed and now we have data. We pulled our reservations, and this is about a year, year-and-a-half ago, and asked them if they were going to trade in a vehicle, they were just going to buy an Elio. So we've now demonstrated that this vehicle or this segment exists and almost of our reservations are coming from that segment, which makes sense, right. If you're in the market for a new or used car you need a vehicle today, so you're not putting a reservation on an Elio.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	players with great reputations, and quite honestly we will get our hats handed to us in that market. We're not going to go in and take 100,000 Toyota, Ford or GM customers away. So although it's by far the most obvious, it's the least interesting. The next market that also exists is the used car market. It's traditionally 2-1/2 to 3 times larger than the new car market and I think we play very well there. If your alternative is a 120,000 mile Civic for \$7,000 or a brand new Elio for \$7,000 I think I would win a fair number of those. Then we have the two markets that we create. First is the clunker market. There's approximately 100 million clunkers on U.S. highways. Now these are different than used cars. These are cars that people are using duct tape and bubble gum to keep on the road because they can't afford to trade up to get a better used car. I think we would do very well in this segment. We're going to run a program aimed at those folks called let your gas savings make your payments. And the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	minds, right. And because small cars are too expensive they're not a choice. And so we end up driving all that metal back and forth to work all by ourselves to have that functionality when we need it. At \$6,800 and 84 miles per gallon Elio becomes a choice. So you buy and keep the big vehicle for the reasons that you wanted it and you buy an Elio too. Now we have been preaching that this segment existed and now we have data. We pulled our reservations, and this is about a year, year-and-a-half ago, and asked them if they were going to trade in a vehicle, they were just going to buy an Elio. So we've now demonstrated that this vehicle or this segment exists and almost of our reservations are coming from that segment, which makes sense, right. If you're in the market for a new or used car you need a vehicle today, so you're not putting a reservation on an Elio. If you're in the clunker market you don't have money to put down on a vehicle you're not going to see for a year.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>players with great reputations, and quite honestly we will get our hats handed to us in that market. We're not going to go in and take 100,000 Toyota, Ford or GM customers away. So although it's by far the most obvious, it's the least interesting.</li> <li>The next market that also exists is the used car market. It's traditionally 2-1/2 to 3 times larger than the new car market and I think we play very well there. If your alternative is a 120,000 mile Civic for \$7,000 or a brand new Elio for \$7,000 I think I would win a fair number of those.</li> <li>Then we have the two markets that we create. First is the clunker market. There's approximately 100 million clunkers on U.S. highways. Now these are different than used cars. These are cars that people are using duct tape and bubble gum to keep on the road because they can't afford to trade up to get a better used car. I think we would do very well in this segment.</li> <li>We're going to run a program aimed at those folks called let your gas savings make your payments. And the way it works is you walk in showroom, sign your name, you get a brand new vehicle and a credit card with a \$300 limit on it and we let you walk back out the door. Now</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	minds, right. And because small cars are too expensive they're not a choice. And so we end up driving all that metal back and forth to work all by ourselves to have that functionality when we need it. At \$6,800 and 84 miles per gallon Elio becomes a choice. So you buy and keep the big vehicle for the reasons that you wanted it and you buy an Elio too. Now we have been preaching that this segment existed and now we have data. We pulled our reservations, and this is about a year, year-and-a-half ago, and asked them if they were going to trade a vehicle. Ninety percent said they were not going to trade in a vehicle, they were just going to buy an Elio. So we've now demonstrated that this vehicle or this segment exists and almost of our reservations are coming from that segment, which makes sense, right. If you're in the market for a new or used car you need a vehicle today, so you're not putting a reservation on an Elio. If you're in the clunker market you don't have money to put down on a vehicle you're not going to see for a year. So that it makes sense that all of our reservations
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	players with great reputations, and quite honestly we will get our hats handed to us in that market. We're not going to go in and take 100,000 Toyota, Ford or GM customers away. So although it's by far the most obvious, it's the least interesting. The next market that also exists is the used car market. It's traditionally 2-1/2 to 3 times larger than the new car market and I think we play very well there. If your alternative is a 120,000 mile Civic for \$7,000 or a brand new Elio for \$7,000 I think I would win a fair number of those. Then we have the two markets that we create. First is the clunker market. There's approximately 100 million clunkers on U.S. highways. Now these are different than used cars. These are cars that people are using duct tape and bubble gum to keep on the road because they can't afford to trade up to get a better used car. I think we would do very well in this segment. We're going to run a program aimed at those folks called let your gas savings make your payments. And the way it works is you walk in showroom, sign your name, you get a brand new vehicle and a credit card with a \$300	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	minds, right. And because small cars are too expensive they're not a choice. And so we end up driving all that metal back and forth to work all by ourselves to have that functionality when we need it. At \$6,800 and 84 miles per gallon Elio becomes a choice. So you buy and keep the big vehicle for the reasons that you wanted it and you buy an Elio too. Now we have been preaching that this segment existed and now we have data. We pulled our reservations, and this is about a year, year-and-a-half ago, and asked them if they were going to trade a vehicle. Ninety percent said they were not going to trade in a vehicle, they were just going to buy an Elio. So we've now demonstrated that this vehicle or this segment exists and almost of our reservations are coming from that segment, which makes sense, right. If you're in the market for a new or used car you need a vehicle today, so you're not putting a reservation on an Elio. If you're in the clunker market you don't have money to put down on a vehicle you're not going to see for a year. So that it makes sense that all of our reservations are coming from that one segment. And as we have go into

	Page 74		Page 76
1	We've gotten really good traction in social	1	need nor want to get the things that you do want.
2	media. We have 320,000 likes on Facebook. We	2	So we're going to do that differently. We're
3	consistently get about 500 to 600,000 unique visitors to	3	only going to build it two ways, a standard and an
4	our website every month, which puts us ahead of Fiat, and	4	automatic, that's it. Everyone comes with air
5	Sion, and on the heels of Volvo Mini. And for a new	5	conditioning, power windows, power door locks, a stereo
6		6	and cruise control because pretty much everybody wants
7	company we're pretty proud of that. We're now over 55,000 reservations. So we have	7	that. All of the rest of the upscale content that you
8		8	
	55,000 people who have said I want an Elio and is willing		are used to seeing on your vehicle you can get on your
9	to put money down. We have two programs, refundable and	9	Elio but add it post manufacturer. So if you wanted
10	non-refundable, and we've collected approximately \$24	10	power leather seats we can get you that. If you want
11	million in rewards crowd funding. \$23 million of that is	11	blind spot protecting mirrors, you know, Continental is
12	non-refundable, so it skews heavily to the non-refundable	12	our electronic supplier, they're the world's largest, we
13	category.	13	can get you that.
14	We recently did a survey on have you ever heard	14	So the process is you walk into our showroom
15	of Elio, and it turns out only 6-1/2 percent of America	15	and say I want the red automatic with the leather seat
16	has heard of us. So this these reservations, the	16	and blind spot protecting mirrors. That order goes out
17	number is rather impressive, but it would be more	17	to one of seven marshalling centers where the content
18	impressive when you realize that we've only we've	18	gets added as the orders come in. We close our stores at
19	ruled out 93 percent of America so far. So we're on a	19	9:00 p.m. and we build out vehicles to midnight, so we
20	mission to increase the brand awareness, because	20	have three hours to clear the system.
21	obviously if you haven't heard of us you can't make a	21	At midnight all those vehicles go on trucks, and
22	reservation.	22	with seven marshaling centers we're within nine hours of
23	And by the way, this rewards crowd funding has	23	all of our showrooms. So theoretically at 10:00 a.m. the
24	been critical for our success. The dollars obviously	24	next day you get the vehicle exactly the way you wanted
25	were important, but what's more important is providing	25	it the day before no matter what time you walked in.
	Page 75		Page 77
1	5	1	
1 2	the market. So when we first hatched the idea and we	1	So at first blush this system gives the
	the market. So when we first hatched the idea and we said, hey, people will buy this low cost, high mileage	1	So at first blush this system gives the customer a lot more for a lot less, but it does a lot
2	the market. So when we first hatched the idea and we said, hey, people will buy this low cost, high mileage vehicle with front to back seating and three wheels in	2	So at first blush this system gives the customer a lot more for a lot less, but it does a lot but it does more than that. Most of the content that you
2 3	the market. So when we first hatched the idea and we said, hey, people will buy this low cost, high mileage	2 3	So at first blush this system gives the customer a lot more for a lot less, but it does a lot but it does more than that. Most of the content that you see in vehicles today are created by the tier one supply
2 3 4	the market. So when we first hatched the idea and we said, hey, people will buy this low cost, high mileage vehicle with front to back seating and three wheels in this unproven market, it was very hard to get traction. But as we've gotten more and more people to say, yeah, I	2 3 4	So at first blush this system gives the customer a lot more for a lot less, but it does a lot but it does more than that. Most of the content that you see in vehicles today are created by the tier one supply base, not by the OEMs. And those tier ones have a very
2 3 4 5	the market. So when we first hatched the idea and we said, hey, people will buy this low cost, high mileage vehicle with front to back seating and three wheels in this unproven market, it was very hard to get traction.	2 3 4 5	So at first blush this system gives the customer a lot more for a lot less, but it does a lot but it does more than that. Most of the content that you see in vehicles today are created by the tier one supply
2 3 4 5 6	the market. So when we first hatched the idea and we said, hey, people will buy this low cost, high mileage vehicle with front to back seating and three wheels in this unproven market, it was very hard to get traction. But as we've gotten more and more people to say, yeah, I will buy that, that really has helped us in so many other	2 3 4 5 6	So at first blush this system gives the customer a lot more for a lot less, but it does a lot but it does more than that. Most of the content that you see in vehicles today are created by the tier one supply base, not by the OEMs. And those tier ones have a very difficult time getting their new ideas executed on a
2 3 4 5 6 7	the market. So when we first hatched the idea and we said, hey, people will buy this low cost, high mileage vehicle with front to back seating and three wheels in this unproven market, it was very hard to get traction. But as we've gotten more and more people to say, yeah, I will buy that, that really has helped us in so many other areas.	2 3 4 5 6 7	So at first blush this system gives the customer a lot more for a lot less, but it does a lot but it does more than that. Most of the content that you see in vehicles today are created by the tier one supply base, not by the OEMs. And those tier ones have a very difficult time getting their new ideas executed on a vehicle.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the market. So when we first hatched the idea and we said, hey, people will buy this low cost, high mileage vehicle with front to back seating and three wheels in this unproven market, it was very hard to get traction. But as we've gotten more and more people to say, yeah, I will buy that, that really has helped us in so many other areas. Our business model is different as well. So	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	So at first blush this system gives the customer a lot more for a lot less, but it does a lot but it does more than that. Most of the content that you see in vehicles today are created by the tier one supply base, not by the OEMs. And those tier ones have a very difficult time getting their new ideas executed on a vehicle. The two questions they have the hardest time
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the market. So when we first hatched the idea and we said, hey, people will buy this low cost, high mileage vehicle with front to back seating and three wheels in this unproven market, it was very hard to get traction. But as we've gotten more and more people to say, yeah, I will buy that, that really has helped us in so many other areas. Our business model is different as well. So we're going to do company owned stores, direct sales to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	So at first blush this system gives the customer a lot more for a lot less, but it does a lot but it does more than that. Most of the content that you see in vehicles today are created by the tier one supply base, not by the OEMs. And those tier ones have a very difficult time getting their new ideas executed on a vehicle. The two questions they have the hardest time answering is who else has it. Nobody wants to be first,
2 3 6 7 8 9 10	the market. So when we first hatched the idea and we said, hey, people will buy this low cost, high mileage vehicle with front to back seating and three wheels in this unproven market, it was very hard to get traction. But as we've gotten more and more people to say, yeah, I will buy that, that really has helped us in so many other areas. Our business model is different as well. So we're going to do company owned stores, direct sales to customers, the same as Tesla. So that's not particularly	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	So at first blush this system gives the customer a lot more for a lot less, but it does a lot but it does more than that. Most of the content that you see in vehicles today are created by the tier one supply base, not by the OEMs. And those tier ones have a very difficult time getting their new ideas executed on a vehicle. The two questions they have the hardest time answering is who else has it. Nobody wants to be first, everybody wants to be second. Nobody wants to be fourth,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the market. So when we first hatched the idea and we said, hey, people will buy this low cost, high mileage vehicle with front to back seating and three wheels in this unproven market, it was very hard to get traction. But as we've gotten more and more people to say, yeah, I will buy that, that really has helped us in so many other areas. Our business model is different as well. So we're going to do company owned stores, direct sales to customers, the same as Tesla. So that's not particularly innovative, but I think it's the right way to go.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	So at first blush this system gives the customer a lot more for a lot less, but it does a lot but it does more than that. Most of the content that you see in vehicles today are created by the tier one supply base, not by the OEMs. And those tier ones have a very difficult time getting their new ideas executed on a vehicle. The two questions they have the hardest time answering is who else has it. Nobody wants to be first, everybody wants to be second. Nobody wants to be fourth, but nobody wants to be first because if they integrate it
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	the market. So when we first hatched the idea and we said, hey, people will buy this low cost, high mileage vehicle with front to back seating and three wheels in this unproven market, it was very hard to get traction. But as we've gotten more and more people to say, yeah, I will buy that, that really has helped us in so many other areas. Our business model is different as well. So we're going to do company owned stores, direct sales to customers, the same as Tesla. So that's not particularly innovative, but I think it's the right way to go. What we're really doing different is we are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	So at first blush this system gives the customer a lot more for a lot less, but it does a lot but it does more than that. Most of the content that you see in vehicles today are created by the tier one supply base, not by the OEMs. And those tier ones have a very difficult time getting their new ideas executed on a vehicle. The two questions they have the hardest time answering is who else has it. Nobody wants to be first, everybody wants to be second. Nobody wants to be fourth, but nobody wants to be first because if they integrate it and it doesn't work they're on the hook on repairing that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the market. So when we first hatched the idea and we said, hey, people will buy this low cost, high mileage vehicle with front to back seating and three wheels in this unproven market, it was very hard to get traction. But as we've gotten more and more people to say, yeah, I will buy that, that really has helped us in so many other areas. Our business model is different as well. So we're going to do company owned stores, direct sales to customers, the same as Tesla. So that's not particularly innovative, but I think it's the right way to go. What we're really doing different is we are abandoning the package system. So current auto	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	So at first blush this system gives the customer a lot more for a lot less, but it does a lot but it does more than that. Most of the content that you see in vehicles today are created by the tier one supply base, not by the OEMs. And those tier ones have a very difficult time getting their new ideas executed on a vehicle. The two questions they have the hardest time answering is who else has it. Nobody wants to be first, everybody wants to be second. Nobody wants to be fourth, but nobody wants to be first because if they integrate it and it doesn't work they're on the hook on repairing that widget for a decade trying to keep their customer.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the market. So when we first hatched the idea and we said, hey, people will buy this low cost, high mileage vehicle with front to back seating and three wheels in this unproven market, it was very hard to get traction. But as we've gotten more and more people to say, yeah, I will buy that, that really has helped us in so many other areas. Our business model is different as well. So we're going to do company owned stores, direct sales to customers, the same as Tesla. So that's not particularly innovative, but I think it's the right way to go. What we're really doing different is we are abandoning the package system. So current auto manufacturers can build millions of configurations of a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	So at first blush this system gives the customer a lot more for a lot less, but it does a lot but it does more than that. Most of the content that you see in vehicles today are created by the tier one supply base, not by the OEMs. And those tier ones have a very difficult time getting their new ideas executed on a vehicle. The two questions they have the hardest time answering is who else has it. Nobody wants to be first, everybody wants to be second. Nobody wants to be fourth, but nobody wants to be first because if they integrate it and it doesn't work they're on the hook on repairing that widget for a decade trying to keep their customer. We don't have that issue. Because it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the market. So when we first hatched the idea and we said, hey, people will buy this low cost, high mileage vehicle with front to back seating and three wheels in this unproven market, it was very hard to get traction. But as we've gotten more and more people to say, yeah, I will buy that, that really has helped us in so many other areas. Our business model is different as well. So we're going to do company owned stores, direct sales to customers, the same as Tesla. So that's not particularly innovative, but I think it's the right way to go. What we're really doing different is we are abandoning the package system. So current auto manufacturers can build millions of configurations of a given model. Now they don't because that would cripple	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	So at first blush this system gives the customer a lot more for a lot less, but it does a lot but it does more than that. Most of the content that you see in vehicles today are created by the tier one supply base, not by the OEMs. And those tier ones have a very difficult time getting their new ideas executed on a vehicle. The two questions they have the hardest time answering is who else has it. Nobody wants to be first, everybody wants to be second. Nobody wants to be fourth, but nobody wants to be first because if they integrate it and it doesn't work they're on the hook on repairing that widget for a decade trying to keep their customer. We don't have that issue. Because it's designed to put on after the vehicle is made it comes off
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the market. So when we first hatched the idea and we said, hey, people will buy this low cost, high mileage vehicle with front to back seating and three wheels in this unproven market, it was very hard to get traction. But as we've gotten more and more people to say, yeah, I will buy that, that really has helped us in so many other areas. Our business model is different as well. So we're going to do company owned stores, direct sales to customers, the same as Tesla. So that's not particularly innovative, but I think it's the right way to go. What we're really doing different is we are abandoning the package system. So current auto manufacturers can build millions of configurations of a given model. Now they don't because that would cripple their inventory. So they've created packages, LX, SX and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	So at first blush this system gives the customer a lot more for a lot less, but it does a lot but it does more than that. Most of the content that you see in vehicles today are created by the tier one supply base, not by the OEMs. And those tier ones have a very difficult time getting their new ideas executed on a vehicle. The two questions they have the hardest time answering is who else has it. Nobody wants to be first, everybody wants to be second. Nobody wants to be fourth, but nobody wants to be first because if they integrate it and it doesn't work they're on the hook on repairing that widget for a decade trying to keep their customer. We don't have that issue. Because it's designed to put on after the vehicle is made it comes off easily as well. So we will we're okay with being
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the market. So when we first hatched the idea and we said, hey, people will buy this low cost, high mileage vehicle with front to back seating and three wheels in this unproven market, it was very hard to get traction. But as we've gotten more and more people to say, yeah, I will buy that, that really has helped us in so many other areas. Our business model is different as well. So we're going to do company owned stores, direct sales to customers, the same as Tesla. So that's not particularly innovative, but I think it's the right way to go. What we're really doing different is we are abandoning the package system. So current auto manufacturers can build millions of configurations of a given model. Now they don't because that would cripple their inventory. So they've created packages, LX, SX and VX to constrain their build sequences to 3 to 500.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	So at first blush this system gives the customer a lot more for a lot less, but it does a lot but it does more than that. Most of the content that you see in vehicles today are created by the tier one supply base, not by the OEMs. And those tier ones have a very difficult time getting their new ideas executed on a vehicle. The two questions they have the hardest time answering is who else has it. Nobody wants to be first, everybody wants to be second. Nobody wants to be fourth, but nobody wants to be first because if they integrate it and it doesn't work they're on the hook on repairing that widget for a decade trying to keep their customer. We don't have that issue. Because it's designed to put on after the vehicle is made it comes off easily as well. So we will – we're okay with being first, and if it doesn't work we're going to have a very
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the market. So when we first hatched the idea and we said, hey, people will buy this low cost, high mileage vehicle with front to back seating and three wheels in this unproven market, it was very hard to get traction. But as we've gotten more and more people to say, yeah, I will buy that, that really has helped us in so many other areas. Our business model is different as well. So we're going to do company owned stores, direct sales to customers, the same as Tesla. So that's not particularly innovative, but I think it's the right way to go. What we're really doing different is we are abandoning the package system. So current auto manufacturers can build millions of configurations of a given model. Now they don't because that would cripple their inventory. So they've created packages, LX, SX and VX to constrain their build sequences to 3 to 500.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	So at first blush this system gives the customer a lot more for a lot less, but it does a lot but it does more than that. Most of the content that you see in vehicles today are created by the tier one supply base, not by the OEMs. And those tier ones have a very difficult time getting their new ideas executed on a vehicle. The two questions they have the hardest time answering is who else has it. Nobody wants to be first, everybody wants to be second. Nobody wants to be fourth, but nobody wants to be first because if they integrate it and it doesn't work they're on the hook on repairing that widget for a decade trying to keep their customer. We don't have that issue. Because it's designed to put on after the vehicle is made it comes off easily as well. So we will we're okay with being first, and if it doesn't work we're going to have a very liberal return policy and we'll take it back it off and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	the market. So when we first hatched the idea and we said, hey, people will buy this low cost, high mileage vehicle with front to back seating and three wheels in this unproven market, it was very hard to get traction. But as we've gotten more and more people to say, yeah, I will buy that, that really has helped us in so many other areas. Our business model is different as well. So we're going to do company owned stores, direct sales to customers, the same as Tesla. So that's not particularly innovative, but I think it's the right way to go. What we're really doing different is we are abandoning the package system. So current auto manufacturers can build millions of configurations of a given model. Now they don't because that would cripple their inventory. So they've created packages, LX, SX and VX to constrain their build sequences to 3 to 500. The problem with that is you get forced to buy an enormous amount of content you don't want. JD Powers	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	So at first blush this system gives the customer a lot more for a lot less, but it does a lot but it does more than that. Most of the content that you see in vehicles today are created by the tier one supply base, not by the OEMs. And those tier ones have a very difficult time getting their new ideas executed on a vehicle. The two questions they have the hardest time answering is who else has it. Nobody wants to be first, everybody wants to be second. Nobody wants to be fourth, but nobody wants to be first because if they integrate it and it doesn't work they're on the hook on repairing that widget for a decade trying to keep their customer. We don't have that issue. Because it's designed to put on after the vehicle is made it comes off easily as well. So we will we're okay with being first, and if it doesn't work we're going to have a very liberal return policy and we'll take it back it off and return the customer's money.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the market. So when we first hatched the idea and we said, hey, people will buy this low cost, high mileage vehicle with front to back seating and three wheels in this unproven market, it was very hard to get traction. But as we've gotten more and more people to say, yeah, I will buy that, that really has helped us in so many other areas. Our business model is different as well. So we're going to do company owned stores, direct sales to customers, the same as Tesla. So that's not particularly innovative, but I think it's the right way to go. What we're really doing different is we are abandoning the package system. So current auto manufacturers can build millions of configurations of a given model. Now they don't because that would cripple their inventory. So they've created packages, LX, SX and VX to constrain their build sequences to 3 to 500. The problem with that is you get forced to buy an enormous amount of content you don't want. JD Powers recently did a survey and consumers were reporting they	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	So at first blush this system gives the customer a lot more for a lot less, but it does a lot but it does more than that. Most of the content that you see in vehicles today are created by the tier one supply base, not by the OEMs. And those tier ones have a very difficult time getting their new ideas executed on a vehicle. The two questions they have the hardest time answering is who else has it. Nobody wants to be first, everybody wants to be second. Nobody wants to be fourth, but nobody wants to be first because if they integrate it and it doesn't work they're on the hook on repairing that widget for a decade trying to keep their customer. We don't have that issue. Because it's designed to put on after the vehicle is made it comes off easily as well. So we will we're okay with being first, and if it doesn't work we're going to have a very liberal return policy and we'll take it back it off and return the customer's money.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the market. So when we first hatched the idea and we said, hey, people will buy this low cost, high mileage vehicle with front to back seating and three wheels in this unproven market, it was very hard to get traction. But as we've gotten more and more people to say, yeah, I will buy that, that really has helped us in so many other areas. Our business model is different as well. So we're going to do company owned stores, direct sales to customers, the same as Tesla. So that's not particularly innovative, but I think it's the right way to go. What we're really doing different is we are abandoning the package system. So current auto manufacturers can build millions of configurations of a given model. Now they don't because that would cripple their inventory. So they've created packages, LX, SX and VX to constrain their build sequences to 3 to 500. The problem with that is you get forced to buy an enormous amount of content you don't want. JD Powers recently did a survey and consumers were reporting they don't use 40 percent of the technology embedded in their	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	So at first blush this system gives the customer a lot more for a lot less, but it does a lot but it does more than that. Most of the content that you see in vehicles today are created by the tier one supply base, not by the OEMs. And those tier ones have a very difficult time getting their new ideas executed on a vehicle. The two questions they have the hardest time answering is who else has it. Nobody wants to be first, everybody wants to be second. Nobody wants to be fourth, but nobody wants to be first because if they integrate it and it doesn't work they're on the hook on repairing that widget for a decade trying to keep their customer. We don't have that issue. Because it's designed to put on after the vehicle is made it comes off easily as well. So we will we're okay with being first, and if it doesn't work we're going to have a very biberal return policy and we'll take it back it off and return the customer's money. The next question they have a very difficult answer - question answering is does my customer actually
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the market. So when we first hatched the idea and we said, hey, people will buy this low cost, high mileage vehicle with front to back seating and three wheels in this unproven market, it was very hard to get traction. But as we've gotten more and more people to say, yeah, I will buy that, that really has helped us in so many other areas. Our business model is different as well. So we're going to do company owned stores, direct sales to customers, the same as Tesla. So that's not particularly innovative, but I think it's the right way to go. What we're really doing different is we are abandoning the package system. So current auto manufacturers can build millions of configurations of a given model. Now they don't because that would cripple their inventory. So they've created packages, LX, SX and VX to constrain their build sequences to 3 to 500. The problem with that is you get forced to buy an enormous amount of content you don't want. JD Powers recently did a survey and consumers were reporting they don't use 40 percent of the technology embedded in their vehicle. The problem is it's not the same 40 percent for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	So at first blush this system gives the customer a lot more for a lot less, but it does a lot but it does more than that. Most of the content that you see in vehicles today are created by the tier one supply base, not by the OEMs. And those tier ones have a very difficult time getting their new ideas executed on a vehicle. The two questions they have the hardest time answering is who else has it. Nobody wants to be first, everybody wants to be second. Nobody wants to be fourth, but nobody wants to be first because if they integrate it and it doesn't work they're on the hook on repairing that widget for a decade trying to keep their customer. We don't have that issue. Because it's designed to put on after the vehicle is made it comes off easily as well. So we will – we're okay with being first, and if it doesn't work we're going to have a very liberal return policy and we'll take it back it off and return the customer's money. The next question they have a very difficult answer – question answering is does my customer actually want this. Because these things are always packaged in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the market. So when we first hatched the idea and we said, hey, people will buy this low cost, high mileage vehicle with front to back seating and three wheels in this unproven market, it was very hard to get traction. But as we've gotten more and more people to say, yeah, I will buy that, that really has helped us in so many other areas. Our business model is different as well. So we're going to do company owned stores, direct sales to customers, the same as Tesla. So that's not particularly innovative, but I think it's the right way to go. What we're really doing different is we are abandoning the package system. So current auto manufacturers can build millions of configurations of a given model. Now they don't because that would cripple their inventory. So they've created packages, LX, SX and VX to constrain their build sequences to 3 to 500. The problem with that is you get forced to buy an enormous amount of content you don't want. JD Powers recently did a survey and consumers were reporting they don't use 40 percent of the technology embedded in their vehicle. The problem is it's not the same 40 percent for any of us, so they can't just lop it off of the package.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	So at first blush this system gives the customer a lot more for a lot less, but it does a lot but it does more than that. Most of the content that you see in vehicles today are created by the tier one supply base, not by the OEMs. And those tier ones have a very difficult time getting their new ideas executed on a vehicle. The two questions they have the hardest time answering is who else has it. Nobody wants to be first, everybody wants to be second. Nobody wants to be fourth, but nobody wants to be first because if they integrate it and it doesn't work they're on the hook on repairing that widget for a decade trying to keep their customer. We don't have that issue. Because it's designed to put on after the vehicle is made it comes off easily as well. So we will we're okay with being first, and if it doesn't work we're going to have a very liberal return policy and we'll take it back it off and return the customer's money. The next question they have a very difficult answer question answering is does my customer actually want this. Because these things are always packaged in with a bunch of other stuff they can't say yes your

	Page 78		Page 80
1	Plus system. With the E Plus system now they can go and	1	This is really the story of Elio Motors, it's
2	say are you are you first? No, Elio has got it. Does	2	the supply base. So people outside of Detroit look at
3	my customer want it? Yes.	3	who's selling us parts and say of course they'll sell you
4	Seventy percent of Elio customers are putting it on	4	parts. And the answer is no, actually, they won't. They
5	their vehicle and are willing to pay \$150. So they want	5	don't like startups and they don't like small companies,
6	it and this is what they're willing to pay. So it's a	6	and particularly right now. So in the downturn a ton of
7	great way for them to test out their new technology and	7	suppliers went out of business. We're now back at record
8	prove that it's viable and drive it through their	8	volumes and every single supplier is resource
9	traditional customer.	9	constrained. So they are telling the big guys no in
10	What's good for our customers is they get see	10	order to have resources available to work on Elio.
11	the new technology first, right. If the big guys get	11	So the fact that they're engaged really means
12	enamored with the technology because of their design	12	something and it's truly the who's who of the global
13	cycle it takes them three years before it shows on the	13	supply base. Continental is the largest auto part
14	market. Our accessories won't have a model year. So as	14	supplier of any description. They're doing our
15	soon as it's available it will be available on Elio.	15	electronics. Bosch is the second largest auto parts
16	So for the first time ever the lowest priced	16	supplier of any description. They're doing fuel
17	vehicle on the market will have the best technology	17	injection, and safety sensors, and a bunch of other
18	first. That's never happened before and our customers	18	stuff. Aisin is the world's largest transmission
19	will get a lot better options on how to appoint their	19	supplier and the fifth largest auto parts supplier of any
20	vehicle.	20	description. Comau is our manufacturing partner.
21	The next thing is the vehicle stays relevant	21	They're wholly owned by Fiat/Chrysler. Guardian is the
22	longer. So particularly with electronics, the cycle time	22	world's largest auto glass supplier. I can go on, but
23	for electronics is much, much faster than the useful life	23	it's truly a who's who of the global supply base.
24	of a car. Think about how many vehicles are on the road	24	And that's really the story of Elio Motors is
25	with today with cassette players and CD players that	25	getting these folks engaged. And how the vehicle is
	Page 79		Page 81
1		1	
1 2	are all but obsolete and it's taking up that real estate	1 2	designed is through a series of what we call supplier
3	in your dash. If that weren't integrated in so that when the next big technology comes out you can pull that off	3	summits. So we get all these folks together for three days, work on the vehicle as a group, break apart, come
4	and add the new thing your vehicle stays relevant for	4	back together, and do it again.
5	much, much longer.	5	We acquired this site out of the GM bankruptcy.
6	So I think although there's not a huge risk,		we dequired this site out of the Givi builduptey.
Ű	bo i unik uniough neres not a nage risk,	6	It's a 4 million square foot building on 500 acres of
7	we're not going outside the lines too far. This is going	6	It's a 4 million square foot building on 500 acres of land. To put that number into perspective, the Empire
7 8	we're not going outside the lines too far. This is going to be a big improvement in customer satisfaction and	7	land. To put that number into perspective, the Empire
7 8 9	to be a big improvement in customer satisfaction and		land. To put that number into perspective, the Empire State Building, it's about 1-1/2 Empire State Buildings.
8	to be a big improvement in customer satisfaction and making the vehicle viable for quite a long time.	7	land. To put that number into perspective, the Empire State Building, it's about 1-1/2 Empire State Buildings. So it's an enormous site. And GM left all the equipment
8 9	to be a big improvement in customer satisfaction and making the vehicle viable for quite a long time. On service we've partnered with Pep Boys. That	7 8 9	<ul><li>land. To put that number into perspective, the Empire</li><li>State Building, it's about 1-1/2 Empire State Buildings.</li><li>So it's an enormous site. And GM left all the equipment</li><li>behind. We believe or estimate that the it reduces</li></ul>
8 9 10	to be a big improvement in customer satisfaction and making the vehicle viable for quite a long time.	7 8 9 10	land. To put that number into perspective, the Empire State Building, it's about 1-1/2 Empire State Buildings. So it's an enormous site. And GM left all the equipment
8 9 10 11	to be a big improvement in customer satisfaction and making the vehicle viable for quite a long time. On service we've partnered with Pep Boys. That allows us to have 800 authorized service centers day one.	7 8 9 10 11	land. To put that number into perspective, the Empire State Building, it's about 1-1/2 Empire State Buildings. So it's an enormous site. And GM left all the equipment behind. We believe or estimate that the it reduces our total startup cost by about \$400 million or cuts our
8 9 10 11 12	to be a big improvement in customer satisfaction and making the vehicle viable for quite a long time. On service we've partnered with Pep Boys. That allows us to have 800 authorized service centers day one. So we have more service centers than Volkswagen day one,	7 8 9 10 11 12	land. To put that number into perspective, the Empire State Building, it's about 1-1/2 Empire State Buildings. So it's an enormous site. And GM left all the equipment behind. We believe or estimate that the it reduces our total startup cost by about \$400 million or cuts our startup costs in half. We get out of about \$300 million
8 9 10 11 12 13	to be a big improvement in customer satisfaction and making the vehicle viable for quite a long time. On service we've partnered with Pep Boys. That allows us to have 800 authorized service centers day one. So we have more service centers than Volkswagen day one, which is a big win for a startup.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13	land. To put that number into perspective, the Empire State Building, it's about 1-1/2 Empire State Buildings. So it's an enormous site. And GM left all the equipment behind. We believe or estimate that the it reduces our total startup cost by about \$400 million or cuts our startup costs in half. We get out of about \$300 million of equipment purchased at about \$100 million of building
8 9 10 11 12 13 14	to be a big improvement in customer satisfaction and making the vehicle viable for quite a long time. On service we've partnered with Pep Boys. That allows us to have 800 authorized service centers day one. So we have more service centers than Volkswagen day one, which is a big win for a startup. I think I've talked through that slide.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	land. To put that number into perspective, the Empire State Building, it's about 1-1/2 Empire State Buildings. So it's an enormous site. And GM left all the equipment behind. We believe or estimate that the it reduces our total startup cost by about \$400 million or cuts our startup costs in half. We get out of about \$300 million of equipment purchased at about \$100 million of building construction as opposed to a greenfield.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	to be a big improvement in customer satisfaction and making the vehicle viable for quite a long time. On service we've partnered with Pep Boys. That allows us to have 800 authorized service centers day one. So we have more service centers than Volkswagen day one, which is a big win for a startup. I think I've talked through that slide. So we have developed our own engine in	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	land. To put that number into perspective, the Empire State Building, it's about 1-1/2 Empire State Buildings. So it's an enormous site. And GM left all the equipment behind. We believe or estimate that the it reduces our total startup cost by about \$400 million or cuts our startup costs in half. We get out of about \$300 million of equipment purchased at about \$100 million of building construction as opposed to a greenfield. But it's even more important than that. If you
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	to be a big improvement in customer satisfaction and making the vehicle viable for quite a long time. On service we've partnered with Pep Boys. That allows us to have 800 authorized service centers day one. So we have more service centers than Volkswagen day one, which is a big win for a startup. I think I've talked through that slide. So we have developed our own engine in cooperation with IAV. IAV has 65 percent of the	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>land. To put that number into perspective, the Empire</li> <li>State Building, it's about 1-1/2 Empire State Buildings.</li> <li>So it's an enormous site. And GM left all the equipment</li> <li>behind. We believe or estimate that the it reduces</li> <li>our total startup cost by about \$400 million or cuts our</li> <li>startup costs in half. We get out of about \$300 million</li> <li>of equipment purchased at about \$100 million of building</li> <li>construction as opposed to a greenfield.</li> <li>But it's even more important than that. If you</li> <li>gave me all this equipment it wouldn't be nearly as</li> </ul>
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	to be a big improvement in customer satisfaction and making the vehicle viable for quite a long time. On service we've partnered with Pep Boys. That allows us to have 800 authorized service centers day one. So we have more service centers than Volkswagen day one, which is a big win for a startup. I think I've talked through that slide. So we have developed our own engine in cooperation with IAV. IAV has 65 percent of the engineering services business in Germany and does engine	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>land. To put that number into perspective, the Empire</li> <li>State Building, it's about 1-1/2 Empire State Buildings.</li> <li>So it's an enormous site. And GM left all the equipment</li> <li>behind. We believe or estimate that the it reduces</li> <li>our total startup cost by about \$400 million or cuts our</li> <li>startup costs in half. We get out of about \$300 million</li> <li>of equipment purchased at about \$100 million of building</li> <li>construction as opposed to a greenfield.</li> <li>But it's even more important than that. If you</li> <li>gave me all this equipment it wouldn't be nearly as</li> <li>valuable as it is in place. A manufacturing plant like</li> </ul>
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	to be a big improvement in customer satisfaction and making the vehicle viable for quite a long time. On service we've partnered with Pep Boys. That allows us to have 800 authorized service centers day one. So we have more service centers than Volkswagen day one, which is a big win for a startup. I think I've talked through that slide. So we have developed our own engine in cooperation with IAV. IAV has 65 percent of the engineering services business in Germany and does engine development for Mercedes Benz, BMW, Bugatti and others.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>land. To put that number into perspective, the Empire</li> <li>State Building, it's about 1-1/2 Empire State Buildings.</li> <li>So it's an enormous site. And GM left all the equipment</li> <li>behind. We believe or estimate that the it reduces</li> <li>our total startup cost by about \$400 million or cuts our</li> <li>startup costs in half. We get out of about \$300 million</li> <li>of equipment purchased at about \$100 million of building</li> <li>construction as opposed to a greenfield.</li> <li>But it's even more important than that. If you</li> <li>gave me all this equipment it wouldn't be nearly as</li> <li>valuable as it is in place. A manufacturing plant like</li> <li>this is a very complex, one off organism, and it takes a</li> </ul>
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	to be a big improvement in customer satisfaction and making the vehicle viable for quite a long time. On service we've partnered with Pep Boys. That allows us to have 800 authorized service centers day one. So we have more service centers than Volkswagen day one, which is a big win for a startup. I think I've talked through that slide. So we have developed our own engine in cooperation with IAV. IAV has 65 percent of the engineering services business in Germany and does engine development for Mercedes Benz, BMW, Bugatti and others. We showed the vehicle down here, the red one in the corner at the LA auto show with an Elio engine in it. And that is not a trivial milestone. It's the first	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>land. To put that number into perspective, the Empire State Building, it's about 1-1/2 Empire State Buildings.</li> <li>So it's an enormous site. And GM left all the equipment behind. We believe or estimate that the it reduces our total startup cost by about \$400 million or cuts our startup costs in half. We get out of about \$300 million of equipment purchased at about \$100 million of building construction as opposed to a greenfield.</li> <li>But it's even more important than that. If you gave me all this equipment it wouldn't be nearly as valuable as it is in place. A manufacturing plant like this is a very complex, one off organism, and it takes a lot of time and money to get all those pieces and lines to work together. All that debugging and technology has been accomplished for us by GM and we get the benefit</li> </ul>
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	to be a big improvement in customer satisfaction and making the vehicle viable for quite a long time. On service we've partnered with Pep Boys. That allows us to have 800 authorized service centers day one. So we have more service centers than Volkswagen day one, which is a big win for a startup. I think I've talked through that slide. So we have developed our own engine in cooperation with IAV. IAV has 65 percent of the engineering services business in Germany and does engine development for Mercedes Benz, BMW, Bugatti and others. We showed the vehicle down here, the red one in the corner at the LA auto show with an Elio engine in it.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>land. To put that number into perspective, the Empire</li> <li>State Building, it's about 1-1/2 Empire State Buildings.</li> <li>So it's an enormous site. And GM left all the equipment</li> <li>behind. We believe or estimate that the it reduces</li> <li>our total startup cost by about \$400 million or cuts our</li> <li>startup costs in half. We get out of about \$300 million</li> <li>of equipment purchased at about \$100 million of building</li> <li>construction as opposed to a greenfield.</li> <li>But it's even more important than that. If you</li> <li>gave me all this equipment it wouldn't be nearly as</li> <li>valuable as it is in place. A manufacturing plant like</li> <li>this is a very complex, one off organism, and it takes a</li> <li>lot of time and money to get all those pieces and lines</li> <li>to work together. All that debugging and technology has</li> </ul>
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	to be a big improvement in customer satisfaction and making the vehicle viable for quite a long time. On service we've partnered with Pep Boys. That allows us to have 800 authorized service centers day one. So we have more service centers than Volkswagen day one, which is a big win for a startup. I think I've talked through that slide. So we have developed our own engine in cooperation with IAV. IAV has 65 percent of the engineering services business in Germany and does engine development for Mercedes Benz, BMW, Bugatti and others. We showed the vehicle down here, the red one in the corner at the LA auto show with an Elio engine in it. And that is not a trivial milestone. It's the first	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>land. To put that number into perspective, the Empire State Building, it's about 1-1/2 Empire State Buildings.</li> <li>So it's an enormous site. And GM left all the equipment behind. We believe or estimate that the it reduces our total startup cost by about \$400 million or cuts our startup costs in half. We get out of about \$300 million of equipment purchased at about \$100 million of building construction as opposed to a greenfield.</li> <li>But it's even more important than that. If you gave me all this equipment it wouldn't be nearly as valuable as it is in place. A manufacturing plant like this is a very complex, one off organism, and it takes a lot of time and money to get all those pieces and lines to work together. All that debugging and technology has been accomplished for us by GM and we get the benefit</li> </ul>

24

25

years since somebody did that and we're very proud that 24

we made that milestone. 25

why of the project. So the billboard on the right is a

real billboard from South Africa. German engineering and

	Page 82		Page 84
1	Swiss innovation, American nothing, smart for four. And	1	MR. YADLEY: We're speechless. Thank you very
2	if that don't piss you off. That's what the world thinks	2	much.
3	of us, and quite honestly that's what we think of	3	MR. ELIO: Oh, there you go.
4	ourselves.	4	MR. WALSH: Yes, we are. What's your market
5	And I believe that the direct impact of Elio is	5	cap?
6	significant, but I believe the indirect impact of Elio is	6	MR. ELIO: About 500 million.
7	even more significant. Just like Roger Bannister didn't	7	MR. WALSH: What was it at issue?
8	get the memo that the human body couldn't run a mile in	8	MR. ELIO: 300. So if we the Reg A+ was \$12
9	under four minutes, so he went ahead and did it and	9	a share and there was 25 million shares outstanding, so
10	within 90 days I think three or four people did it and	10	it was \$300 million pre-money valuation and then 317
11	within two years like 20 people did it. The same thing	11	post.
12	here. We didn't get the memo that you can't build a high	12	MR. WALSH: Thank you.
13	quality, high mileage, low cost vehicle in this country	13	MR. REARDON: Patrick Reardon here. Did you
14	with substantially all North American parts, so we're	14	have any selling stockholders?
15	going to go ahead and do it. And when we succeed this is	15	MR. ELIO: I'm sorry, what was that?
16	a high profile sexy project. Other entrepreneurs will	16	MR. REARDON: Did you have any selling
17	follow in our footsteps and make things in America.	17	stockholders in your Reg A offering?
18	Patriotic or green, it's both. So after our	18	MR. ELIO: Selling stockholders?
19	nominal business case volume was 250,000 units. So we're	19	MR. REARDON: Yes, did any of your existing
20	fast tightening the line to do 250,000 units on two	20	stockholders, insiders, sell any shares in the Reg A
21	shifts, five days. We can overrun that obviously. And	21	offering?
22	so after five years of sales we can reduce total U.S. gas	22	MR. ELIO: No, no. We didn't have that
23	consumption by nearly half a percent. That's a	23	facility. I didn't realize the possibility. But, no,
24	meaningful number.	24	that didn't happen.
25	Whether your biggest concern is greenhouse gases	25	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I've got I've got one
	5 00		
	Page 83		Page 85
1	Page 83 and global warming or a trade deficit due to foreign oil,	1	
1 2		1	Page 85 question for you. MR. ELIO: But our Reg A+ experience, 64
	and global warming or a trade deficit due to foreign oil,	1	question for you.
2	and global warming or a trade deficit due to foreign oil, the answers are the same, use less oil. And Elio can do	2	question for you. MR. ELIO: But our Reg A+ experience, 64
2 3	and global warming or a trade deficit due to foreign oil, the answers are the same, use less oil. And Elio can do that better than any other project that I'm aware of.	2 3	question for you. MR. ELIO: But our Reg A+ experience, 64 percent of our Reg A+ shareholders and 68 percent of the
2 3 4 5 6	and global warming or a trade deficit due to foreign oil, the answers are the same, use less oil. And Elio can do that better than any other project that I'm aware of. And then the last piece that doesn't immediately leap off the page is if you're struggling in this country your biggest issue is mobility. Harvard	2 3 4 5 6	question for you. MR. ELIO: But our Reg A+ experience, 64 percent of our Reg A+ shareholders and 68 percent of the dollar value came from people who already have a reservation on the vehicle. So, you know, it looks like an overnight success but a lot of it had to do with, you
2 3 4 5 6 7	and global warming or a trade deficit due to foreign oil, the answers are the same, use less oil. And Elio can do that better than any other project that I'm aware of. And then the last piece that doesn't immediately leap off the page is if you're struggling in this country your biggest issue is mobility. Harvard economists recently came out with a study that said the	2 3 4 5 6 7	question for you. MR. ELIO: But our Reg A+ experience, 64 percent of our Reg A+ shareholders and 68 percent of the dollar value came from people who already have a reservation on the vehicle. So, you know, it looks like an overnight success but a lot of it had to do with, you know, several years of hard work, communicating the Elio
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	and global warming or a trade deficit due to foreign oil, the answers are the same, use less oil. And Elio can do that better than any other project that I'm aware of. And then the last piece that doesn't immediately leap off the page is if you're struggling in this country your biggest issue is mobility. Harvard economists recently came out with a study that said the number one predictor on whether you get out of poverty or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	question for you. MR. ELIO: But our Reg A+ experience, 64 percent of our Reg A+ shareholders and 68 percent of the dollar value came from people who already have a reservation on the vehicle. So, you know, it looks like an overnight success but a lot of it had to do with, you know, several years of hard work, communicating the Elio Motor story and getting them behind it before Reg A+
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	and global warming or a trade deficit due to foreign oil, the answers are the same, use less oil. And Elio can do that better than any other project that I'm aware of. And then the last piece that doesn't immediately leap off the page is if you're struggling in this country your biggest issue is mobility. Harvard economists recently came out with a study that said the number one predictor on whether you get out of poverty or not is mobility. It correlates better than test scores	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	question for you. MR. ELIO: But our Reg A+ experience, 64 percent of our Reg A+ shareholders and 68 percent of the dollar value came from people who already have a reservation on the vehicle. So, you know, it looks like an overnight success but a lot of it had to do with, you know, several years of hard work, communicating the Elio Motor story and getting them behind it before Reg A+ happened.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	and global warming or a trade deficit due to foreign oil, the answers are the same, use less oil. And Elio can do that better than any other project that I'm aware of. And then the last piece that doesn't immediately leap off the page is if you're struggling in this country your biggest issue is mobility. Harvard economists recently came out with a study that said the number one predictor on whether you get out of poverty or not is mobility. It correlates better than test scores in your community, in your grade schools, the number of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	question for you. MR. ELIO: But our Reg A+ experience, 64 percent of our Reg A+ shareholders and 68 percent of the dollar value came from people who already have a reservation on the vehicle. So, you know, it looks like an overnight success but a lot of it had to do with, you know, several years of hard work, communicating the Elio Motor story and getting them behind it before Reg A+ happened. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Could you kind of let us know
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	and global warming or a trade deficit due to foreign oil, the answers are the same, use less oil. And Elio can do that better than any other project that I'm aware of. And then the last piece that doesn't immediately leap off the page is if you're struggling in this country your biggest issue is mobility. Harvard economists recently came out with a study that said the number one predictor on whether you get out of poverty or not is mobility. It correlates better than test scores in your community, in your grade schools, the number of two parent households or crime rates in your community.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>question for you.</li> <li>MR. ELIO: But our Reg A+ experience, 64</li> <li>percent of our Reg A+ shareholders and 68 percent of the dollar value came from people who already have a reservation on the vehicle. So, you know, it looks like an overnight success but a lot of it had to do with, you know, several years of hard work, communicating the Elio Motor story and getting them behind it before Reg A+ happened.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Could you kind of let us know your thinking in choosing to go the Reg A route?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	and global warming or a trade deficit due to foreign oil, the answers are the same, use less oil. And Elio can do that better than any other project that I'm aware of. And then the last piece that doesn't immediately leap off the page is if you're struggling in this country your biggest issue is mobility. Harvard economists recently came out with a study that said the number one predictor on whether you get out of poverty or not is mobility. It correlates better than test scores in your community, in your grade schools, the number of two parent households or crime rates in your community. The number one correlator is mobility.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>question for you.</li> <li>MR. ELIO: But our Reg A+ experience, 64</li> <li>percent of our Reg A+ shareholders and 68 percent of the dollar value came from people who already have a</li> <li>reservation on the vehicle. So, you know, it looks like an overnight success but a lot of it had to do with, you know, several years of hard work, communicating the Elio Motor story and getting them behind it before Reg A+ happened.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Could you kind of let us know your thinking in choosing to go the Reg A route?</li> <li>MR. ELIO: Well, you know, again I really</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	and global warming or a trade deficit due to foreign oil, the answers are the same, use less oil. And Elio can do that better than any other project that I'm aware of. And then the last piece that doesn't immediately leap off the page is if you're struggling in this country your biggest issue is mobility. Harvard economists recently came out with a study that said the number one predictor on whether you get out of poverty or not is mobility. It correlates better than test scores in your community, in your grade schools, the number of two parent households or crime rates in your community. The number one correlator is mobility. New Jersey had a study that said some huge	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>question for you.</li> <li>MR. ELIO: But our Reg A+ experience, 64</li> <li>percent of our Reg A+ shareholders and 68 percent of the dollar value came from people who already have a reservation on the vehicle. So, you know, it looks like an overnight success but a lot of it had to do with, you know, several years of hard work, communicating the Elio Motor story and getting them behind it before Reg A+ happened.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Could you kind of let us know your thinking in choosing to go the Reg A route?</li> <li>MR. ELIO: Well, you know, again I really enjoyed hearing the discussion before my presentation.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	and global warming or a trade deficit due to foreign oil, the answers are the same, use less oil. And Elio can do that better than any other project that I'm aware of. And then the last piece that doesn't immediately leap off the page is if you're struggling in this country your biggest issue is mobility. Harvard economists recently came out with a study that said the number one predictor on whether you get out of poverty or not is mobility. It correlates better than test scores in your community, in your grade schools, the number of two parent households or crime rates in your community. The number one correlator is mobility. New Jersey had a study that said some huge percentage of their chronologically unemployed have been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>question for you.</li> <li>MR. ELIO: But our Reg A+ experience, 64</li> <li>percent of our Reg A+ shareholders and 68 percent of the dollar value came from people who already have a reservation on the vehicle. So, you know, it looks like an overnight success but a lot of it had to do with, you know, several years of hard work, communicating the Elio Motor story and getting them behind it before Reg A+ happened.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Could you kind of let us know your thinking in choosing to go the Reg A route?</li> <li>MR. ELIO: Well, you know, again I really enjoyed hearing the discussion before my presentation. Access to capital has been the single most difficult part</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	and global warming or a trade deficit due to foreign oil, the answers are the same, use less oil. And Elio can do that better than any other project that I'm aware of. And then the last piece that doesn't immediately leap off the page is if you're struggling in this country your biggest issue is mobility. Harvard economists recently came out with a study that said the number one predictor on whether you get out of poverty or not is mobility. It correlates better than test scores in your community, in your grade schools, the number of two parent households or crime rates in your community. The number one correlator is mobility. New Jersey had a study that said some huge percentage of their chronologically unemployed have been forced to turn down jobs because they had no way to get	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>question for you.</li> <li>MR. ELIO: But our Reg A+ experience, 64</li> <li>percent of our Reg A+ shareholders and 68 percent of the dollar value came from people who already have a reservation on the vehicle. So, you know, it looks like an overnight success but a lot of it had to do with, you know, several years of hard work, communicating the Elio Motor story and getting them behind it before Reg A+ happened.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Could you kind of let us know your thinking in choosing to go the Reg A route?</li> <li>MR. ELIO: Well, you know, again I really enjoyed hearing the discussion before my presentation. Access to capital has been the single most difficult part of the Elio project. You would think designing a \$6,800,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	and global warming or a trade deficit due to foreign oil, the answers are the same, use less oil. And Elio can do that better than any other project that I'm aware of. And then the last piece that doesn't immediately leap off the page is if you're struggling in this country your biggest issue is mobility. Harvard economists recently came out with a study that said the number one predictor on whether you get out of poverty or not is mobility. It correlates better than test scores in your community, in your grade schools, the number of two parent households or crime rates in your community. The number one correlator is mobility. New Jersey had a study that said some huge percentage of their chronologically unemployed have been forced to turn down jobs because they had no way to get to the job, and at \$6,800 and 84 miles per gallon people	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>question for you.</li> <li>MR. ELIO: But our Reg A+ experience, 64</li> <li>percent of our Reg A+ shareholders and 68 percent of the dollar value came from people who already have a reservation on the vehicle. So, you know, it looks like an overnight success but a lot of it had to do with, you know, several years of hard work, communicating the Elio Motor story and getting them behind it before Reg A+ happened.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Could you kind of let us know your thinking in choosing to go the Reg A route?</li> <li>MR. ELIO: Well, you know, again I really enjoyed hearing the discussion before my presentation.</li> <li>Access to capital has been the single most difficult part of the Elio project. You would think designing a \$6,800, 84 miles per gallon car built in this country would be</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	and global warming or a trade deficit due to foreign oil, the answers are the same, use less oil. And Elio can do that better than any other project that I'm aware of. And then the last piece that doesn't immediately leap off the page is if you're struggling in this country your biggest issue is mobility. Harvard economists recently came out with a study that said the number one predictor on whether you get out of poverty or not is mobility. It correlates better than test scores in your community, in your grade schools, the number of two parent households or crime rates in your community. The number one correlator is mobility. New Jersey had a study that said some huge percentage of their chronologically unemployed have been forced to turn down jobs because they had no way to get to the job, and at \$6,800 and 84 miles per gallon people can afford to get to their job. This product really	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>question for you.</li> <li>MR. ELIO: But our Reg A+ experience, 64</li> <li>percent of our Reg A+ shareholders and 68 percent of the dollar value came from people who already have a reservation on the vehicle. So, you know, it looks like an overnight success but a lot of it had to do with, you know, several years of hard work, communicating the Elio Motor story and getting them behind it before Reg A+ happened.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Could you kind of let us know your thinking in choosing to go the Reg A route?</li> <li>MR. ELIO: Well, you know, again I really enjoyed hearing the discussion before my presentation. Access to capital has been the single most difficult part of the Elio project. You would think designing a \$6,800,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	and global warming or a trade deficit due to foreign oil, the answers are the same, use less oil. And Elio can do that better than any other project that I'm aware of. And then the last piece that doesn't immediately leap off the page is if you're struggling in this country your biggest issue is mobility. Harvard economists recently came out with a study that said the number one predictor on whether you get out of poverty or not is mobility. It correlates better than test scores in your community, in your grade schools, the number of two parent households or crime rates in your community. The number one correlator is mobility. New Jersey had a study that said some huge percentage of their chronologically unemployed have been forced to turn down jobs because they had no way to get to the job, and at \$6,800 and 84 miles per gallon people	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>question for you.</li> <li>MR. ELIO: But our Reg A+ experience, 64</li> <li>percent of our Reg A+ shareholders and 68 percent of the dollar value came from people who already have a reservation on the vehicle. So, you know, it looks like an overnight success but a lot of it had to do with, you know, several years of hard work, communicating the Elio Motor story and getting them behind it before Reg A+ happened.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Could you kind of let us know your thinking in choosing to go the Reg A route?</li> <li>MR. ELIO: Well, you know, again I really enjoyed hearing the discussion before my presentation. Access to capital has been the single most difficult part of the Elio project. You would think designing a \$6,800, 84 miles per gallon car built in this country would be the hard part of the project and it turns out no, finding</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	and global warming or a trade deficit due to foreign oil, the answers are the same, use less oil. And Elio can do that better than any other project that I'm aware of. And then the last piece that doesn't immediately leap off the page is if you're struggling in this country your biggest issue is mobility. Harvard economists recently came out with a study that said the number one predictor on whether you get out of poverty or not is mobility. It correlates better than test scores in your community, in your grade schools, the number of two parent households or crime rates in your community. The number one correlator is mobility. New Jersey had a study that said some huge percentage of their chronologically unemployed have been forced to turn down jobs because they had no way to get to the job, and at \$6,800 and 84 miles per gallon people can afford to get to their job. This product really matters at the end of the day.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>question for you.</li> <li>MR. ELIO: But our Reg A+ experience, 64</li> <li>percent of our Reg A+ shareholders and 68 percent of the dollar value came from people who already have a reservation on the vehicle. So, you know, it looks like an overnight success but a lot of it had to do with, you know, several years of hard work, communicating the Elio Motor story and getting them behind it before Reg A+ happened.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Could you kind of let us know your thinking in choosing to go the Reg A route?</li> <li>MR. ELIO: Well, you know, again I really enjoyed hearing the discussion before my presentation. Access to capital has been the single most difficult part of the Elio project. You would think designing a \$6,800, 84 miles per gallon car built in this country would be the hard part of the project and it turns out no, finding the money to build it has been the hard part, right.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	and global warming or a trade deficit due to foreign oil, the answers are the same, use less oil. And Elio can do that better than any other project that I'm aware of. And then the last piece that doesn't immediately leap off the page is if you're struggling in this country your biggest issue is mobility. Harvard economists recently came out with a study that said the number one predictor on whether you get out of poverty or not is mobility. It correlates better than test scores in your community, in your grade schools, the number of two parent households or crime rates in your community. The number one correlator is mobility. New Jersey had a study that said some huge percentage of their chronologically unemployed have been forced to turn down jobs because they had no way to get to the job, and at \$6,800 and 84 miles per gallon people can afford to get to their job. This product really matters at the end of the day. So on financing, we've raised \$100 million to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>question for you.</li> <li>MR. ELIO: But our Reg A+ experience, 64</li> <li>percent of our Reg A+ shareholders and 68 percent of the dollar value came from people who already have a reservation on the vehicle. So, you know, it looks like an overnight success but a lot of it had to do with, you know, several years of hard work, communicating the Elio Motor story and getting them behind it before Reg A+ happened.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Could you kind of let us know your thinking in choosing to go the Reg A route?</li> <li>MR. ELIO: Well, you know, again I really enjoyed hearing the discussion before my presentation. Access to capital has been the single most difficult part of the Elio project. You would think designing a \$6,800, 84 miles per gallon car built in this country would be the hard part of the project and it turns out no, finding the money to build it has been the hard part, right. And we were stuck with the institutions before Reg</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	and global warming or a trade deficit due to foreign oil, the answers are the same, use less oil. And Elio can do that better than any other project that I'm aware of. And then the last piece that doesn't immediately leap off the page is if you're struggling in this country your biggest issue is mobility. Harvard economists recently came out with a study that said the number one predictor on whether you get out of poverty or not is mobility. It correlates better than test scores in your community, in your grade schools, the number of two parent households or crime rates in your community. The number one correlator is mobility. New Jersey had a study that said some huge percentage of their chronologically unemployed have been forced to turn down jobs because they had no way to get to the job, and at \$6,800 and 84 miles per gallon people can afford to get to their job. This product really matters at the end of the day. So on financing, we've raised \$100 million to date if you allow me to round slightly. \$17 million of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>question for you.</li> <li>MR. ELIO: But our Reg A+ experience, 64</li> <li>percent of our Reg A+ shareholders and 68 percent of the dollar value came from people who already have a reservation on the vehicle. So, you know, it looks like an overnight success but a lot of it had to do with, you know, several years of hard work, communicating the Elio Motor story and getting them behind it before Reg A+ happened.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Could you kind of let us know your thinking in choosing to go the Reg A route?</li> <li>MR. ELIO: Well, you know, again I really enjoyed hearing the discussion before my presentation. Access to capital has been the single most difficult part of the Elio project. You would think designing a \$6,800, 84 miles per gallon car built in this country would be the hard part of the project and it turns out no, finding the money to build it has been the hard part, right. And we were stuck with the institutions before Reg A+, and as soon as I found out about it, because we had</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	and global warming or a trade deficit due to foreign oil, the answers are the same, use less oil. And Elio can do that better than any other project that I'm aware of. And then the last piece that doesn't immediately leap off the page is if you're struggling in this country your biggest issue is mobility. Harvard economists recently came out with a study that said the number one predictor on whether you get out of poverty or not is mobility. It correlates better than test scores in your community, in your grade schools, the number of two parent households or crime rates in your community. The number one correlator is mobility. New Jersey had a study that said some huge percentage of their chronologically unemployed have been forced to turn down jobs because they had no way to get to the job, and at \$6,800 and 84 miles per gallon people can afford to get to their job. This product really matters at the end of the day. So on financing, we've raised \$100 million to date if you allow me to round slightly. \$17 million of that came from Reg A+, and as I've said \$24 million came from rewards crowd funding. We're trading on the OTCQX as I mentioned earlier.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>question for you.</li> <li>MR. ELIO: But our Reg A+ experience, 64</li> <li>percent of our Reg A+ shareholders and 68 percent of the dollar value came from people who already have a reservation on the vehicle. So, you know, it looks like an overnight success but a lot of it had to do with, you know, several years of hard work, communicating the Elio Motor story and getting them behind it before Reg A+ happened.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Could you kind of let us know your thinking in choosing to go the Reg A route?</li> <li>MR. ELIO: Well, you know, again I really enjoyed hearing the discussion before my presentation. Access to capital has been the single most difficult part of the Elio project. You would think designing a \$6,800, 84 miles per gallon car built in this country would be the hard part of the project and it turns out no, finding the money to build it has been the hard part, right. And we were stuck with the institutions before Reg A+, and as soon as I found out about it, because we had such good luck with the rewards crowd funding, I thought Reg A+ was a natural fit. And at the time I didn't understand it. Since then I've read the book "The</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	and global warming or a trade deficit due to foreign oil, the answers are the same, use less oil. And Elio can do that better than any other project that I'm aware of. And then the last piece that doesn't immediately leap off the page is if you're struggling in this country your biggest issue is mobility. Harvard economists recently came out with a study that said the number one predictor on whether you get out of poverty or not is mobility. It correlates better than test scores in your community, in your grade schools, the number of two parent households or crime rates in your community. The number one correlator is mobility. New Jersey had a study that said some huge percentage of their chronologically unemployed have been forced to turn down jobs because they had no way to get to the job, and at \$6,800 and 84 miles per gallon people can afford to get to their job. This product really matters at the end of the day. So on financing, we've raised \$100 million to date if you allow me to round slightly. \$17 million of that came from Reg A+, and as I've said \$24 million came from rewards crowd funding. We're trading on the OTCQX as I mentioned earlier. And that is all I have on the planned presentation.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>question for you.</li> <li>MR. ELIO: But our Reg A+ experience, 64</li> <li>percent of our Reg A+ shareholders and 68 percent of the dollar value came from people who already have a reservation on the vehicle. So, you know, it looks like an overnight success but a lot of it had to do with, you know, several years of hard work, communicating the Elio Motor story and getting them behind it before Reg A+ happened.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Could you kind of let us know your thinking in choosing to go the Reg A route?</li> <li>MR. ELIO: Well, you know, again I really enjoyed hearing the discussion before my presentation. Access to capital has been the single most difficult part of the Elio project. You would think designing a \$6,800, 84 miles per gallon car built in this country would be the hard part of the project and it turns out no, finding the money to build it has been the hard part, right. And we were stuck with the institutions before Reg A+, and as soon as I found out about it, because we had such good luck with the rewards crowd funding, I thought Reg A+ was a natural fit. And at the time I didn't understand it. Since then I've read the book "The Innovator' Dilemma," and I think that really fits Elio's</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and global warming or a trade deficit due to foreign oil, the answers are the same, use less oil. And Elio can do that better than any other project that I'm aware of. And then the last piece that doesn't immediately leap off the page is if you're struggling in this country your biggest issue is mobility. Harvard economists recently came out with a study that said the number one predictor on whether you get out of poverty or not is mobility. It correlates better than test scores in your community, in your grade schools, the number of two parent households or crime rates in your community. The number one correlator is mobility. New Jersey had a study that said some huge percentage of their chronologically unemployed have been forced to turn down jobs because they had no way to get to the job, and at \$6,800 and 84 miles per gallon people can afford to get to their job. This product really matters at the end of the day. So on financing, we've raised \$100 million to date if you allow me to round slightly. \$17 million of that came from Reg A+, and as I've said \$24 million came from rewards crowd funding. We're trading on the OTCQX as I mentioned earlier.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>question for you.</li> <li>MR. ELIO: But our Reg A+ experience, 64</li> <li>percent of our Reg A+ shareholders and 68 percent of the dollar value came from people who already have a reservation on the vehicle. So, you know, it looks like an overnight success but a lot of it had to do with, you know, several years of hard work, communicating the Elio Motor story and getting them behind it before Reg A+ happened.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Could you kind of let us know your thinking in choosing to go the Reg A route?</li> <li>MR. ELIO: Well, you know, again I really enjoyed hearing the discussion before my presentation. Access to capital has been the single most difficult part of the Elio project. You would think designing a \$6,800, 84 miles per gallon car built in this country would be the hard part of the project and it turns out no, finding the money to build it has been the hard part, right. And we were stuck with the institutions before Reg A+, and as soon as I found out about it, because we had such good luck with the rewards crowd funding, I thought Reg A+ was a natural fit. And at the time I didn't understand it. Since then I've read the book "The</li> </ul>

	Page 86		Page 88
1	studies the disc drive industry and then uses what it	1	track of the question in my answer I think.
2	learned there across other industries and proves that it	2	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Well, I think you did. The
3	seems to fit.	3	question was just kind of give us some insight as to your
4	And what what happened on the disc drive	4	thinking and choosing to go the Reg A route. And I guess
5	industry was in the 60's there were 14 inch disc drives	5	a follow on question might be follow on offerings and
6	and they were for mainframes. And the somebody came	6	what are you thinking about, what are your future capital
7	up with an 8 inch disc drive and it was more expensive	7	needs that you're projecting, and then how do you plan on
8	per megabyte, but it was overall cheaper. And what	8	addressing that?
9	characterizes a disruptive technology is a low price	9	MR. ELIO: So this is the I'm learning to be
10	point, carryover technology, and an undefined market,	10	a CEO of a public company. I don't know how much of that
11	which describes Elio to a T.	11	I can answer now because if it's not publicly disclosed I
12	And so the 14 inch disc drive companies were well	12	can't talk about it. That's been the biggest change for
13	managed companies, and so they listened to their	13	me because normally I'm a lay all the cards on the table
14	customers and they invested, improving their product in	14	down kind of guy.
15	high margin demonstrable markets and didn't worry about	15	MR. GOMEZ: Stephen Steve, sounds like Paul
16	these 8 inch disc drives who were aimed at mini	16	has better counsel than very smart answer I think,
17	computers, and who knew how big mini computers would ever	17	Paul. You might want to stop there.
18	get anyway.	18	MR. ELIO: Okay, thank you.
19	These disc drive guys got so good they put all	19	MR. GOMEZ: Yeah.
20	the 14 inch guys out of business. Now they were the	20	MR. WALSH: Can I you raised if I saw the
21	incumbents. Somebody came up with a 5-1/4 inch drive	21	math right you raised almost 16 million in the round and
22	aimed at a PC. And the same thing, you know, undefined	22	you've raised 99 million or almost 100 million total.
23 24	market, low price point. The well managed 8 inch drive	23	What made you chose the size of the Reg A+ round that you
24 25	company listened their customers, plowed money into	24 25	ended up executing?
25	making their drives better, faster, et cetera, went after	25	MR. ELIO: So we had targeted 25 million. We
		1	
	Page 87		Page 89
1	Page 87 the high margin, well defined markets, and those	1	Page 89 did a test the waters campaign. We got \$46 million in
1 2	5	1 2	
	the high margin, well defined markets, and those previously disruptive companies, their incumbents got put out of business by the 5-1/4" guys. It happened again at		did a test the waters campaign. We got \$46 million in
2	the high margin, well defined markets, and those previously disruptive companies, their incumbents got put out of business by the 5-1/4" guys. It happened again at 3-1/4 with the laptop and then again at 2.2	2	did a test the waters campaign. We got \$46 million in indications of interest. \$6 million of that came from 12 people who had reserved 500,000 shares. None of them purchased even a share, so I'm going to write those off
2 3 4 5	the high margin, well defined markets, and those previously disruptive companies, their incumbents got put out of business by the 5-1/4" guys. It happened again at 3-1/4 with the laptop and then again at 2.2 So what seems to happen is big companies are	2 3 4 5	did a test the waters campaign. We got \$46 million in indications of interest. \$6 million of that came from 12 people who had reserved 500,000 shares. None of them purchased even a share, so I'm going to write those off as not serous. So we had \$40 million of actual
2 3 4 5 6	the high margin, well defined markets, and those previously disruptive companies, their incumbents got put out of business by the 5-1/4" guys. It happened again at 3-1/4 with the laptop and then again at 2.2 So what seems to happen is big companies are really good at sustaining technology but horrible at	2 3 4 5 6	did a test the waters campaign. We got \$46 million in indications of interest. \$6 million of that came from 12 people who had reserved 500,000 shares. None of them purchased even a share, so I'm going to write those off as not serous. So we had \$40 million of actual indications of interest to raise 25.
2 3 4 5 6 7	the high margin, well defined markets, and those previously disruptive companies, their incumbents got put out of business by the 5-1/4" guys. It happened again at 3-1/4 with the laptop and then again at 2.2 So what seems to happen is big companies are really good at sustaining technology but horrible at disruptive technology. And my experience is big funds	2 3 4 5 6 7	did a test the waters campaign. We got \$46 million in indications of interest. \$6 million of that came from 12 people who had reserved 500,000 shares. None of them purchased even a share, so I'm going to write those off as not serous. So we had \$40 million of actual indications of interest to raise 25. Our timing was horrible. We got qualified by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the high margin, well defined markets, and those previously disruptive companies, their incumbents got put out of business by the 5-1/4" guys. It happened again at 3-1/4 with the laptop and then again at 2.2 So what seems to happen is big companies are really good at sustaining technology but horrible at disruptive technology. And my experience is big funds and VCs are the same. They're looking for the high	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	did a test the waters campaign. We got \$46 million in indications of interest. \$6 million of that came from 12 people who had reserved 500,000 shares. None of them purchased even a share, so I'm going to write those off as not serous. So we had \$40 million of actual indications of interest to raise 25. Our timing was horrible. We got qualified by the SEC right before Thanksgiving, which is not a great
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the high margin, well defined markets, and those previously disruptive companies, their incumbents got put out of business by the 5-1/4" guys. It happened again at 3-1/4 with the laptop and then again at 2.2 So what seems to happen is big companies are really good at sustaining technology but horrible at disruptive technology. And my experience is big funds and VCs are the same. They're looking for the high margin, well-defined market. They're horrible at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	did a test the waters campaign. We got \$46 million in indications of interest. \$6 million of that came from 12 people who had reserved 500,000 shares. None of them purchased even a share, so I'm going to write those off as not serous. So we had \$40 million of actual indications of interest to raise 25. Our timing was horrible. We got qualified by the SEC right before Thanksgiving, which is not a great time to raise money, but that's okay because we had
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the high margin, well defined markets, and those previously disruptive companies, their incumbents got put out of business by the 5-1/4" guys. It happened again at 3-1/4 with the laptop and then again at 2.2 So what seems to happen is big companies are really good at sustaining technology but horrible at disruptive technology. And my experience is big funds and VCs are the same. They're looking for the high margin, well-defined market. They're horrible at identifying disruptive technologies, but the public is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	did a test the waters campaign. We got \$46 million in indications of interest. \$6 million of that came from 12 people who had reserved 500,000 shares. None of them purchased even a share, so I'm going to write those off as not serous. So we had \$40 million of actual indications of interest to raise 25. Our timing was horrible. We got qualified by the SEC right before Thanksgiving, which is not a great time to raise money, but that's okay because we had January. And then in January the markets collapsed and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the high margin, well defined markets, and those previously disruptive companies, their incumbents got put out of business by the 5-1/4" guys. It happened again at 3-1/4 with the laptop and then again at 2.2 So what seems to happen is big companies are really good at sustaining technology but horrible at disruptive technology. And my experience is big funds and VCs are the same. They're looking for the high margin, well-defined market. They're horrible at identifying disruptive technologies, but the public is not.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	did a test the waters campaign. We got \$46 million in indications of interest. \$6 million of that came from 12 people who had reserved 500,000 shares. None of them purchased even a share, so I'm going to write those off as not serous. So we had \$40 million of actual indications of interest to raise 25. Our timing was horrible. We got qualified by the SEC right before Thanksgiving, which is not a great time to raise money, but that's okay because we had January. And then in January the markets collapsed and the first time in six years that nobody did an IPO,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the high margin, well defined markets, and those previously disruptive companies, their incumbents got put out of business by the 5-1/4" guys. It happened again at 3-1/4 with the laptop and then again at 2.2 So what seems to happen is big companies are really good at sustaining technology but horrible at disruptive technology. And my experience is big funds and VCs are the same. They're looking for the high margin, well-defined market. They're horrible at identifying disruptive technologies, but the public is not. And that was the key is being able to go to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	did a test the waters campaign. We got \$46 million in indications of interest. \$6 million of that came from 12 people who had reserved 500,000 shares. None of them purchased even a share, so I'm going to write those off as not serous. So we had \$40 million of actual indications of interest to raise 25. Our timing was horrible. We got qualified by the SEC right before Thanksgiving, which is not a great time to raise money, but that's okay because we had January. And then in January the markets collapsed and the first time in six years that nobody did an IPO, right, it was the first time in six years.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the high margin, well defined markets, and those previously disruptive companies, their incumbents got put out of business by the 5-1/4" guys. It happened again at 3-1/4 with the laptop and then again at 2.2 So what seems to happen is big companies are really good at sustaining technology but horrible at disruptive technology. And my experience is big funds and VCs are the same. They're looking for the high margin, well-defined market. They're horrible at identifying disruptive technologies, but the public is not. And that was the key is being able to go to the public, do the Reg A+ offering. And on the strength of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	did a test the waters campaign. We got \$46 million in indications of interest. \$6 million of that came from 12 people who had reserved 500,000 shares. None of them purchased even a share, so I'm going to write those off as not serous. So we had \$40 million of actual indications of interest to raise 25. Our timing was horrible. We got qualified by the SEC right before Thanksgiving, which is not a great time to raise money, but that's okay because we had January. And then in January the markets collapsed and the first time in six years that nobody did an IPO, right, it was the first time in six years. So I think that had our timing been a little
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the high margin, well defined markets, and those previously disruptive companies, their incumbents got put out of business by the 5-1/4" guys. It happened again at 3-1/4 with the laptop and then again at 2.2 So what seems to happen is big companies are really good at sustaining technology but horrible at disruptive technology. And my experience is big funds and VCs are the same. They're looking for the high margin, well-defined market. They're horrible at identifying disruptive technologies, but the public is not. And that was the key is being able to go to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	did a test the waters campaign. We got \$46 million in indications of interest. \$6 million of that came from 12 people who had reserved 500,000 shares. None of them purchased even a share, so I'm going to write those off as not serous. So we had \$40 million of actual indications of interest to raise 25. Our timing was horrible. We got qualified by the SEC right before Thanksgiving, which is not a great time to raise money, but that's okay because we had January. And then in January the markets collapsed and the first time in six years that nobody did an IPO, right, it was the first time in six years.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the high margin, well defined markets, and those previously disruptive companies, their incumbents got put out of business by the 5-1/4" guys. It happened again at 3-1/4 with the laptop and then again at 2.2 So what seems to happen is big companies are really good at sustaining technology but horrible at disruptive technology. And my experience is big funds and VCs are the same. They're looking for the high margin, well-defined market. They're horrible at identifying disruptive technologies, but the public is not. And that was the key is being able to go to the public, do the Reg A+ offering. And on the strength of that offering we were able to pick up our E series of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	did a test the waters campaign. We got \$46 million in indications of interest. \$6 million of that came from 12 people who had reserved 500,000 shares. None of them purchased even a share, so I'm going to write those off as not serous. So we had \$40 million of actual indications of interest to raise 25. Our timing was horrible. We got qualified by the SEC right before Thanksgiving, which is not a great time to raise money, but that's okay because we had January. And then in January the markets collapsed and the first time in six years that nobody did an IPO, right, it was the first time in six years. So I think that had our timing been a little different we would have gotten through a little earlier,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the high margin, well defined markets, and those previously disruptive companies, their incumbents got put out of business by the 5-1/4" guys. It happened again at 3-1/4 with the laptop and then again at 2.2 So what seems to happen is big companies are really good at sustaining technology but horrible at disruptive technology. And my experience is big funds and VCs are the same. They're looking for the high margin, well-defined market. They're horrible at identifying disruptive technologies, but the public is not. And that was the key is being able to go to the public, do the Reg A+ offering. And on the strength of that offering we were able to pick up our E series of vehicles. We're in the process of building 23 prototypes	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	did a test the waters campaign. We got \$46 million in indications of interest. \$6 million of that came from 12 people who had reserved 500,000 shares. None of them purchased even a share, so I'm going to write those off as not serous. So we had \$40 million of actual indications of interest to raise 25. Our timing was horrible. We got qualified by the SEC right before Thanksgiving, which is not a great time to raise money, but that's okay because we had January. And then in January the markets collapsed and the first time in six years that nobody did an IPO, right, it was the first time in six years. So I think that had our timing been a little different we would have gotten through a little earlier, we would have raised the full 25. But it was enough to,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the high margin, well defined markets, and those previously disruptive companies, their incumbents got put out of business by the 5-1/4" guys. It happened again at 3-1/4 with the laptop and then again at 2.2 So what seems to happen is big companies are really good at sustaining technology but horrible at disruptive technology. And my experience is big funds and VCs are the same. They're looking for the high margin, well-defined market. They're horrible at identifying disruptive technologies, but the public is not. And that was the key is being able to go to the public, do the Reg A+ offering. And on the strength of that offering we were able to pick up our E series of vehicles. We're in the process of building 23 prototypes to do validation on before we kick off the hard tools.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	did a test the waters campaign. We got \$46 million in indications of interest. \$6 million of that came from 12 people who had reserved 500,000 shares. None of them purchased even a share, so I'm going to write those off as not serous. So we had \$40 million of actual indications of interest to raise 25. Our timing was horrible. We got qualified by the SEC right before Thanksgiving, which is not a great time to raise money, but that's okay because we had January. And then in January the markets collapsed and the first time in six years that nobody did an IPO, right, it was the first time in six years. So I think that had our timing been a little different we would have gotten through a little earlier, we would have raised the full 25. But it was enough to, you know, get the E1a series going and get us off the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the high margin, well defined markets, and those previously disruptive companies, their incumbents got put out of business by the 5-1/4" guys. It happened again at 3-1/4 with the laptop and then again at 2.2 So what seems to happen is big companies are really good at sustaining technology but horrible at disruptive technology. And my experience is big funds and VCs are the same. They're looking for the high margin, well-defined market. They're horrible at identifying disruptive technologies, but the public is not. And that was the key is being able to go to the public, do the Reg A+ offering. And on the strength of that offering we were able to pick up our E series of vehicles. We're in the process of building 23 prototypes to do validation on before we kick off the hard tools. We unveiled E1a a couple of weeks ago, and I opened that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	did a test the waters campaign. We got \$46 million in indications of interest. \$6 million of that came from 12 people who had reserved 500,000 shares. None of them purchased even a share, so I'm going to write those off as not serous. So we had \$40 million of actual indications of interest to raise 25. Our timing was horrible. We got qualified by the SEC right before Thanksgiving, which is not a great time to raise money, but that's okay because we had January. And then in January the markets collapsed and the first time in six years that nobody did an IPO, right, it was the first time in six years. So I think that had our timing been a little different we would have gotten through a little earlier, we would have raised the full 25. But it was enough to, you know, get the E1a series going and get us off the dime. Does that answer your question?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the high margin, well defined markets, and those previously disruptive companies, their incumbents got put out of business by the 5-1/4" guys. It happened again at 3-1/4 with the laptop and then again at 2.2 So what seems to happen is big companies are really good at sustaining technology but horrible at disruptive technology. And my experience is big funds and VCs are the same. They're looking for the high margin, well-defined market. They're horrible at identifying disruptive technologies, but the public is not. And that was the key is being able to go to the public, do the Reg A+ offering. And on the strength of that offering we were able to pick up our E series of vehicles. We're in the process of building 23 prototypes to do validation on before we kick off the hard tools. We unveiled E1a a couple of weeks ago, and I opened that event and said this is an event brought to you by Reg A+. So that was the key to getting us off the dime and now that we have gone through the process and we're a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	did a test the waters campaign. We got \$46 million in indications of interest. \$6 million of that came from 12 people who had reserved 500,000 shares. None of them purchased even a share, so I'm going to write those off as not serous. So we had \$40 million of actual indications of interest to raise 25. Our timing was horrible. We got qualified by the SEC right before Thanksgiving, which is not a great time to raise money, but that's okay because we had January. And then in January the markets collapsed and the first time in six years that nobody did an IPO, right, it was the first time in six years. So I think that had our timing been a little different we would have gotten through a little earlier, we would have raised the full 25. But it was enough to, you know, get the E1a series going and get us off the dime. Does that answer your question? MR. WALSH: It does, thank you. MR. YADLEY: Another – thank you very much, Paul. I'm a lawyer in Florida, and so the same type of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	the high margin, well defined markets, and those previously disruptive companies, their incumbents got put out of business by the 5-1/4" guys. It happened again at 3-1/4 with the laptop and then again at 2.2 So what seems to happen is big companies are really good at sustaining technology but horrible at disruptive technology. And my experience is big funds and VCs are the same. They're looking for the high margin, well-defined market. They're horrible at identifying disruptive technologies, but the public is not. And that was the key is being able to go to the public, do the Reg A+ offering. And on the strength of that offering we were able to pick up our E series of vehicles. We're in the process of building 23 prototypes to do validation on before we kick off the hard tools. We unveiled E1a a couple of weeks ago, and I opened that event and said this is an event brought to you by Reg A+. So that was the key to getting us off the dime and now that we have gone through the process and we're a publicly traded company it's a whole new world.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	did a test the waters campaign. We got \$46 million in indications of interest. \$6 million of that came from 12 people who had reserved 500,000 shares. None of them purchased even a share, so I'm going to write those off as not serous. So we had \$40 million of actual indications of interest to raise 25. Our timing was horrible. We got qualified by the SEC right before Thanksgiving, which is not a great time to raise money, but that's okay because we had January. And then in January the markets collapsed and the first time in six years that nobody did an IPO, right, it was the first time in six years. So I think that had our timing been a little different we would have gotten through a little earlier, we would have raised the full 25. But it was enough to, you know, get the E1a series going and get us off the dime. Does that answer your question? MR. WALSH: It does, thank you. MR. YADLEY: Another – thank you very much, Paul. I'm a lawyer in Florida, and so the same type of question. In terms of trying to decide how to raise the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the high margin, well defined markets, and those previously disruptive companies, their incumbents got put out of business by the 5-1/4" guys. It happened again at 3-1/4 with the laptop and then again at 2.2 So what seems to happen is big companies are really good at sustaining technology but horrible at disruptive technology. And my experience is big funds and VCs are the same. They're looking for the high margin, well-defined market. They're horrible at identifying disruptive technologies, but the public is not. And that was the key is being able to go to the public, do the Reg A+ offering. And on the strength of that offering we were able to pick up our E series of vehicles. We're in the process of building 23 prototypes to do validation on before we kick off the hard tools. We unveiled E1a a couple of weeks ago, and I opened that event and said this is an event brought to you by Reg A+. So that was the key to getting us off the dime and now that we have gone through the process and we're a publicly traded company it's a whole new world. Institutions that didn't want to talk to us and wouldn't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	did a test the waters campaign. We got \$46 million in indications of interest. \$6 million of that came from 12 people who had reserved 500,000 shares. None of them purchased even a share, so I'm going to write those off as not serous. So we had \$40 million of actual indications of interest to raise 25. Our timing was horrible. We got qualified by the SEC right before Thanksgiving, which is not a great time to raise money, but that's okay because we had January. And then in January the markets collapsed and the first time in six years that nobody did an IPO, right, it was the first time in six years. So I think that had our timing been a little different we would have gotten through a little earlier, we would have raised the full 25. But it was enough to, you know, get the E1a series going and get us off the dime. Does that answer your question? MR. WALSH: It does, thank you. MR. YADLEY: Another thank you very much, Paul. I'm a lawyer in Florida, and so the same type of question. In terms of trying to decide how to raise the capital you didn't use commissioned salespeople. Had you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the high margin, well defined markets, and those previously disruptive companies, their incumbents got put out of business by the 5-1/4" guys. It happened again at 3-1/4 with the laptop and then again at 2.2 So what seems to happen is big companies are really good at sustaining technology but horrible at disruptive technology. And my experience is big funds and VCs are the same. They're looking for the high margin, well-defined market. They're horrible at identifying disruptive technologies, but the public is not. And that was the key is being able to go to the public, do the Reg A+ offering. And on the strength of that offering we were able to pick up our E series of vehicles. We're in the process of building 23 prototypes to do validation on before we kick off the hard tools. We unveiled E1a a couple of weeks ago, and I opened that event and said this is an event brought to you by Reg A+. So that was the key to getting us off the dime and now that we have gone through the process and we're a publicly traded company it's a whole new world. Institutions that didn't want to talk to us and wouldn't return our phone calls are calling us. So this has been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	did a test the waters campaign. We got \$46 million in indications of interest. \$6 million of that came from 12 people who had reserved 500,000 shares. None of them purchased even a share, so I'm going to write those off as not serous. So we had \$40 million of actual indications of interest to raise 25. Our timing was horrible. We got qualified by the SEC right before Thanksgiving, which is not a great time to raise money, but that's okay because we had January. And then in January the markets collapsed and the first time in six years that nobody did an IPO, right, it was the first time in six years. So I think that had our timing been a little different we would have gotten through a little earlier, we would have raised the full 25. But it was enough to, you know, get the E1a series going and get us off the dime. Does that answer your question? MR. WALSH: It does, thank you. MR. YADLEY: Another thank you very much, Paul. I'm a lawyer in Florida, and so the same type of question. In terms of trying to decide how to raise the capital you didn't use commissioned salespeople. Had you thought about instead of doing Reg A+, a private
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the high margin, well defined markets, and those previously disruptive companies, their incumbents got put out of business by the 5-1/4" guys. It happened again at 3-1/4 with the laptop and then again at 2.2 So what seems to happen is big companies are really good at sustaining technology but horrible at disruptive technology. And my experience is big funds and VCs are the same. They're looking for the high margin, well-defined market. They're horrible at identifying disruptive technologies, but the public is not. And that was the key is being able to go to the public, do the Reg A+ offering. And on the strength of that offering we were able to pick up our E series of vehicles. We're in the process of building 23 prototypes to do validation on before we kick off the hard tools. We unveiled E1a a couple of weeks ago, and I opened that event and said this is an event brought to you by Reg A+. So that was the key to getting us off the dime and now that we have gone through the process and we're a publicly traded company it's a whole new world. Institutions that didn't want to talk to us and wouldn't return our phone calls are calling us. So this has been a critical step for us.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	did a test the waters campaign. We got \$46 million in indications of interest. \$6 million of that came from 12 people who had reserved 500,000 shares. None of them purchased even a share, so I'm going to write those off as not serous. So we had \$40 million of actual indications of interest to raise 25. Our timing was horrible. We got qualified by the SEC right before Thanksgiving, which is not a great time to raise money, but that's okay because we had January. And then in January the markets collapsed and the first time in six years that nobody did an IPO, right, it was the first time in six years. So I think that had our timing been a little different we would have gotten through a little earlier, we would have raised the full 25. But it was enough to, you know, get the E1a series going and get us off the dime. Does that answer your question? MR. WALSH: It does, thank you. MR. YADLEY: Another – thank you very much, Paul. I'm a lawyer in Florida, and so the same type of question. In terms of trying to decide how to raise the capital you didn't use commissioned salespeople. Had you thought about instead of doing Reg A+, a private placement using general solicitation, what lawyers called
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the high margin, well defined markets, and those previously disruptive companies, their incumbents got put out of business by the 5-1/4" guys. It happened again at 3-1/4 with the laptop and then again at 2.2 So what seems to happen is big companies are really good at sustaining technology but horrible at disruptive technology. And my experience is big funds and VCs are the same. They're looking for the high margin, well-defined market. They're horrible at identifying disruptive technologies, but the public is not. And that was the key is being able to go to the public, do the Reg A+ offering. And on the strength of that offering we were able to pick up our E series of vehicles. We're in the process of building 23 prototypes to do validation on before we kick off the hard tools. We unveiled E1a a couple of weeks ago, and I opened that event and said this is an event brought to you by Reg A+. So that was the key to getting us off the dime and now that we have gone through the process and we're a publicly traded company it's a whole new world. Institutions that didn't want to talk to us and wouldn't return our phone calls are calling us. So this has been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	did a test the waters campaign. We got \$46 million in indications of interest. \$6 million of that came from 12 people who had reserved 500,000 shares. None of them purchased even a share, so I'm going to write those off as not serous. So we had \$40 million of actual indications of interest to raise 25. Our timing was horrible. We got qualified by the SEC right before Thanksgiving, which is not a great time to raise money, but that's okay because we had January. And then in January the markets collapsed and the first time in six years that nobody did an IPO, right, it was the first time in six years. So I think that had our timing been a little different we would have gotten through a little earlier, we would have raised the full 25. But it was enough to, you know, get the E1a series going and get us off the dime. Does that answer your question? MR. WALSH: It does, thank you. MR. YADLEY: Another thank you very much, Paul. I'm a lawyer in Florida, and so the same type of question. In terms of trying to decide how to raise the capital you didn't use commissioned salespeople. Had you thought about instead of doing Reg A+, a private

	Page 90		Page 92
1	and did you not do that because you planned on trying to	1	MR. YADLEY: Yes, thank you very much.
2	be publicly traded and therefore this was easier?	2	MS. YAMANAKA: I would like to confirm a stat.
3	MR. ELIO: Well, there's two parts to that	3	You said that 68 percent of the funders actually were
4	answer. So one is the underwriting piece that I would	4	pre-reservation holders also?
5	like to talk to and the other one is 506(c). We actually	5	MR. ELIO: No, 64 percent by number, 68 percent
6	did do a $506(c)$ before Reg A+ was available. We raised	6	by dollar value.
7	\$5 million in that effort.	7	MR. NELSON: Can you talk about what you
8	I think the problem with 506(c), it's better to	8	MR. ELIO: And that's the other thing. And
9	be able to publicly disclose that you're trying to raise	9	that's well, on that point, that's another thing that
10	money, but it's still a very cumbersome process, right.	10	Reg A+ did for the public is I would go to Elio events
11	One, you constrain yourself to 7 percent of the	11	and people would say, "Hey, I would love to invest in
12	population and that 7 percent is over marketed to because	12	Elio."
13	everybody is constrained to that 7 percent of the	13	And I would say, "Are you accredited?"
14	population. And two, because of the check sizes it's one	14	"No."
15	off meetings, right. They have to meet with management	15	"Well, you can't."
16	in order to do a deal.	16	So these people who identified this is a good
17	And so it's a very slow cumbersome process.	17	company and I want to be a part of it and they were
18	It's doable, but it's very difficult. And the nice thing	18	precluded and now when and when we did our 506(c) we
19	about Reg A+ is the pool is much bigger, people can	19	marketed to our reservations. So the 6,400 people who
20	invest much less, and you can do you know, multiply	20	did Reg A+, assumably the majority were non-accredited,
21	your marketing efforts by using social media and the	21	wanted to be part of Elio, but couldn't and then were
22	Internet, et cetera.	22	allowed to. So and if we make it, you know, that will
23	On using brokers, I wanted to use brokers in	23	be a great story.
24	addition to the portals. So we used startengine.com.	24	MS. YAMANAKA: So you marketed to 64 or you
25	That was a very good experience. But I wanted to also	25	got 6,400 out of the 54,000 reservations that you have?
	Page 91		Page 93
1	Page 91 have brokers because when you're investing your money	1	Page 93 MR. ELIO: Correct. At the time it was less,
1 2	have brokers because when you're investing your money there's a lot of people who want to talk to somebody.	1 2	_
	have brokers because when you're investing your money		MR. ELIO: Correct. At the time it was less, it was probably 40 something thousand, but yes. MS. YAMANAKA: Thank you.
2	have brokers because when you're investing your money there's a lot of people who want to talk to somebody. They don't want to just click the button, right. And we looked into that and the brokers that we	2	MR. ELIO: Correct. At the time it was less, it was probably 40 something thousand, but yes. MS. YAMANAKA: Thank you. MR. NELSON: Can you talk about your pitch
2 3 4 5	have brokers because when you're investing your money there's a lot of people who want to talk to somebody. They don't want to just click the button, right. And we looked into that and the brokers that we were talking to said it was going to take an extra 90 to	2 3 4 5	MR. ELIO: Correct. At the time it was less, it was probably 40 something thousand, but yes. MS. YAMANAKA: Thank you. MR. NELSON: Can you talk about your pitch process, how many VCs, angels, different vehicles,
2 3 4 5 6	have brokers because when you're investing your money there's a lot of people who want to talk to somebody. They don't want to just click the button, right. And we looked into that and the brokers that we were talking to said it was going to take an extra 90 to 120 days for them to do their due diligence, get through	2 3 4 5 6	MR. ELIO: Correct. At the time it was less, it was probably 40 something thousand, but yes. MS. YAMANAKA: Thank you. MR. NELSON: Can you talk about your pitch process, how many VCs, angels, different vehicles, methods of trying to raise capital you went through
2 3 4 5 6 7	have brokers because when you're investing your money there's a lot of people who want to talk to somebody. They don't want to just click the button, right. And we looked into that and the brokers that we were talking to said it was going to take an extra 90 to 120 days for them to do their due diligence, get through FINRA in order to be able to do it with us. And I was in	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. ELIO: Correct. At the time it was less, it was probably 40 something thousand, but yes. MS. YAMANAKA: Thank you. MR. NELSON: Can you talk about your pitch process, how many VCs, angels, different vehicles, methods of trying to raise capital you went through before settling on Reg A+?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	have brokers because when you're investing your money there's a lot of people who want to talk to somebody. They don't want to just click the button, right. And we looked into that and the brokers that we were talking to said it was going to take an extra 90 to 120 days for them to do their due diligence, get through FINRA in order to be able to do it with us. And I was in a hurry. You know, I needed to keep this company going.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. ELIO: Correct. At the time it was less, it was probably 40 something thousand, but yes. MS. YAMANAKA: Thank you. MR. NELSON: Can you talk about your pitch process, how many VCs, angels, different vehicles, methods of trying to raise capital you went through before settling on Reg A+? MR. ELIO: Yeah. So, you know, we talked to a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	have brokers because when you're investing your money there's a lot of people who want to talk to somebody. They don't want to just click the button, right. And we looked into that and the brokers that we were talking to said it was going to take an extra 90 to 120 days for them to do their due diligence, get through FINRA in order to be able to do it with us. And I was in a hurry. You know, I needed to keep this company going. And so although I wanted to do it that way we chose not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. ELIO: Correct. At the time it was less, it was probably 40 something thousand, but yes. MS. YAMANAKA: Thank you. MR. NELSON: Can you talk about your pitch process, how many VCs, angels, different vehicles, methods of trying to raise capital you went through before settling on Reg A+? MR. ELIO: Yeah. So, you know, we talked to a lot of different institutions. We're a company that
2 3 6 7 8 9 10	have brokers because when you're investing your money there's a lot of people who want to talk to somebody. They don't want to just click the button, right. And we looked into that and the brokers that we were talking to said it was going to take an extra 90 to 120 days for them to do their due diligence, get through FINRA in order to be able to do it with us. And I was in a hurry. You know, I needed to keep this company going. And so although I wanted to do it that way we chose not to because it was time prohibitive.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. ELIO: Correct. At the time it was less, it was probably 40 something thousand, but yes. MS. YAMANAKA: Thank you. MR. NELSON: Can you talk about your pitch process, how many VCs, angels, different vehicles, methods of trying to raise capital you went through before settling on Reg A+? MR. ELIO: Yeah. So, you know, we talked to a lot of different institutions. We're a company that doesn't so VCs are comfortable with pre-revenue
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	have brokers because when you're investing your money there's a lot of people who want to talk to somebody. They don't want to just click the button, right. And we looked into that and the brokers that we were talking to said it was going to take an extra 90 to 120 days for them to do their due diligence, get through FINRA in order to be able to do it with us. And I was in a hurry. You know, I needed to keep this company going. And so although I wanted to do it that way we chose not to because it was time prohibitive. So we self-underwrote, and honestly self-	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. ELIO: Correct. At the time it was less, it was probably 40 something thousand, but yes. MS. YAMANAKA: Thank you. MR. NELSON: Can you talk about your pitch process, how many VCs, angels, different vehicles, methods of trying to raise capital you went through before settling on Reg A+? MR. ELIO: Yeah. So, you know, we talked to a lot of different institutions. We're a company that doesn't so VCs are comfortable with pre-revenue startups but they want to spend \$3 million and create
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	have brokers because when you're investing your money there's a lot of people who want to talk to somebody. They don't want to just click the button, right. And we looked into that and the brokers that we were talking to said it was going to take an extra 90 to 120 days for them to do their due diligence, get through FINRA in order to be able to do it with us. And I was in a hurry. You know, I needed to keep this company going. And so although I wanted to do it that way we chose not to because it was time prohibitive. So we self-underwrote, and honestly self- underwriting other than not having live people to talk to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. ELIO: Correct. At the time it was less, it was probably 40 something thousand, but yes. MS. YAMANAKA: Thank you. MR. NELSON: Can you talk about your pitch process, how many VCs, angels, different vehicles, methods of trying to raise capital you went through before settling on Reg A+? MR. ELIO: Yeah. So, you know, we talked to a lot of different institutions. We're a company that doesn't so VCs are comfortable with pre-revenue startups but they want to spend \$3 million and create Facebook, and when you show them a 3 or \$400 million
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	have brokers because when you're investing your money there's a lot of people who want to talk to somebody. They don't want to just click the button, right. And we looked into that and the brokers that we were talking to said it was going to take an extra 90 to 120 days for them to do their due diligence, get through FINRA in order to be able to do it with us. And I was in a hurry. You know, I needed to keep this company going. And so although I wanted to do it that way we chose not to because it was time prohibitive. So we self-underwrote, and honestly self- underwriting other than not having live people to talk to worked pretty well. I think the one mistake that we made	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. ELIO: Correct. At the time it was less, it was probably 40 something thousand, but yes. MS. YAMANAKA: Thank you. MR. NELSON: Can you talk about your pitch process, how many VCs, angels, different vehicles, methods of trying to raise capital you went through before settling on Reg A+? MR. ELIO: Yeah. So, you know, we talked to a lot of different institutions. We're a company that doesn't so VCs are comfortable with pre-revenue startups but they want to spend \$3 million and create Facebook, and when you show them a 3 or \$400 million budget their heads pop off.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	have brokers because when you're investing your money there's a lot of people who want to talk to somebody. They don't want to just click the button, right. And we looked into that and the brokers that we were talking to said it was going to take an extra 90 to 120 days for them to do their due diligence, get through FINRA in order to be able to do it with us. And I was in a hurry. You know, I needed to keep this company going. And so although I wanted to do it that way we chose not to because it was time prohibitive. So we self-underwrote, and honestly self- underwriting other than not having live people to talk to worked pretty well. I think the one mistake that we made if I had it to do over again is we did not get analyst's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. ELIO: Correct. At the time it was less, it was probably 40 something thousand, but yes. MS. YAMANAKA: Thank you. MR. NELSON: Can you talk about your pitch process, how many VCs, angels, different vehicles, methods of trying to raise capital you went through before settling on Reg A+? MR. ELIO: Yeah. So, you know, we talked to a lot of different institutions. We're a company that doesn't so VCs are comfortable with pre-revenue startups but they want to spend \$3 million and create Facebook, and when you show them a 3 or \$400 million budget their heads pop off. You go to private equity guys, they're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	have brokers because when you're investing your money there's a lot of people who want to talk to somebody. They don't want to just click the button, right. And we looked into that and the brokers that we were talking to said it was going to take an extra 90 to 120 days for them to do their due diligence, get through FINRA in order to be able to do it with us. And I was in a hurry. You know, I needed to keep this company going. And so although I wanted to do it that way we chose not to because it was time prohibitive. So we self-underwrote, and honestly self- underwriting other than not having live people to talk to worked pretty well. I think the one mistake that we made if I had it to do over again is we did not get analyst's coverage engaged until after we were on the QX. So I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. ELIO: Correct. At the time it was less, it was probably 40 something thousand, but yes. MS. YAMANAKA: Thank you. MR. NELSON: Can you talk about your pitch process, how many VCs, angels, different vehicles, methods of trying to raise capital you went through before settling on Reg A+? MR. ELIO: Yeah. So, you know, we talked to a lot of different institutions. We're a company that doesn't so VCs are comfortable with pre-revenue startups but they want to spend \$3 million and create Facebook, and when you show them a 3 or \$400 million budget their heads pop off. You go to private equity guys, they're comfortable with that check but when you say you're pre-
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	have brokers because when you're investing your money there's a lot of people who want to talk to somebody. They don't want to just click the button, right. And we looked into that and the brokers that we were talking to said it was going to take an extra 90 to 120 days for them to do their due diligence, get through FINRA in order to be able to do it with us. And I was in a hurry. You know, I needed to keep this company going. And so although I wanted to do it that way we chose not to because it was time prohibitive. So we self-underwrote, and honestly self- underwriting other than not having live people to talk to worked pretty well. I think the one mistake that we made if I had it to do over again is we did not get analyst's coverage engaged until after we were on the QX. So I don't know if it was three, four weeks ago Zacks finally	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. ELIO: Correct. At the time it was less, it was probably 40 something thousand, but yes. MS. YAMANAKA: Thank you. MR. NELSON: Can you talk about your pitch process, how many VCs, angels, different vehicles, methods of trying to raise capital you went through before settling on Reg A+? MR. ELIO: Yeah. So, you know, we talked to a lot of different institutions. We're a company that doesn't so VCs are comfortable with pre-revenue startups but they want to spend \$3 million and create Facebook, and when you show them a 3 or \$400 million budget their heads pop off. You go to private equity guys, they're comfortable with that check but when you say you're pre- revenue and will be for another year their heads pop off.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	have brokers because when you're investing your money there's a lot of people who want to talk to somebody. They don't want to just click the button, right. And we looked into that and the brokers that we were talking to said it was going to take an extra 90 to 120 days for them to do their due diligence, get through FINRA in order to be able to do it with us. And I was in a hurry. You know, I needed to keep this company going. And so although I wanted to do it that way we chose not to because it was time prohibitive. So we self-underwrote, and honestly self- underwriting other than not having live people to talk to worked pretty well. I think the one mistake that we made if I had it to do over again is we did not get analyst's coverage engaged until after we were on the QX. So I don't know if it was three, four weeks ago Zacks finally came out with an analyst's report.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. ELIO: Correct. At the time it was less, it was probably 40 something thousand, but yes. MS. YAMANAKA: Thank you. MR. NELSON: Can you talk about your pitch process, how many VCs, angels, different vehicles, methods of trying to raise capital you went through before settling on Reg A+? MR. ELIO: Yeah. So, you know, we talked to a lot of different institutions. We're a company that doesn't so VCs are comfortable with pre-revenue startups but they want to spend \$3 million and create Facebook, and when you show them a 3 or \$400 million budget their heads pop off. You go to private equity guys, they're comfortable with that check but when you say you're pre- revenue and will be for another year their heads pop off. And both of them like to specialize because their
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	have brokers because when you're investing your money there's a lot of people who want to talk to somebody. They don't want to just click the button, right. And we looked into that and the brokers that we were talking to said it was going to take an extra 90 to 120 days for them to do their due diligence, get through FINRA in order to be able to do it with us. And I was in a hurry. You know, I needed to keep this company going. And so although I wanted to do it that way we chose not to because it was time prohibitive. So we self-underwrote, and honestly self- underwriting other than not having live people to talk to worked pretty well. I think the one mistake that we made if I had it to do over again is we did not get analyst's coverage engaged until after we were on the QX. So I don't know if it was three, four weeks ago Zacks finally came out with an analyst's report. I think there needs to be a cottage industry of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. ELIO: Correct. At the time it was less, it was probably 40 something thousand, but yes. MS. YAMANAKA: Thank you. MR. NELSON: Can you talk about your pitch process, how many VCs, angels, different vehicles, methods of trying to raise capital you went through before settling on Reg A+? MR. ELIO: Yeah. So, you know, we talked to a lot of different institutions. We're a company that doesn't so VCs are comfortable with pre-revenue startups but they want to spend \$3 million and create Facebook, and when you show them a 3 or \$400 million budget their heads pop off. You go to private equity guys, they're comfortable with that check but when you say you're pre- revenue and will be for another year their heads pop off. And both of them like to specialize because their concentration of wealth they get really good at a sector.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	have brokers because when you're investing your money there's a lot of people who want to talk to somebody. They don't want to just click the button, right. And we looked into that and the brokers that we were talking to said it was going to take an extra 90 to 120 days for them to do their due diligence, get through FINRA in order to be able to do it with us. And I was in a hurry. You know, I needed to keep this company going. And so although I wanted to do it that way we chose not to because it was time prohibitive. So we self-underwrote, and honestly self- underwriting other than not having live people to talk to worked pretty well. I think the one mistake that we made if I had it to do over again is we did not get analyst's coverage engaged until after we were on the QX. So I don't know if it was three, four weeks ago Zacks finally came out with an analyst's report. I think there needs to be a cottage industry of analysts who follow Reg A+ deals. I think the investor	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. ELIO: Correct. At the time it was less, it was probably 40 something thousand, but yes. MS. YAMANAKA: Thank you. MR. NELSON: Can you talk about your pitch process, how many VCs, angels, different vehicles, methods of trying to raise capital you went through before settling on Reg A+? MR. ELIO: Yeah. So, you know, we talked to a lot of different institutions. We're a company that doesn't so VCs are comfortable with pre-revenue startups but they want to spend \$3 million and create Facebook, and when you show them a 3 or \$400 million budget their heads pop off. You go to private equity guys, they're comfortable with that check but when you say you're pre- revenue and will be for another year their heads pop off. And both of them like to specialize because their concentration of wealth they get really good at a sector. Hey, we invest in biotech, we invest in technology.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	have brokers because when you're investing your money there's a lot of people who want to talk to somebody. They don't want to just click the button, right. And we looked into that and the brokers that we were talking to said it was going to take an extra 90 to 120 days for them to do their due diligence, get through FINRA in order to be able to do it with us. And I was in a hurry. You know, I needed to keep this company going. And so although I wanted to do it that way we chose not to because it was time prohibitive. So we self-underwrote, and honestly self- underwriting other than not having live people to talk to worked pretty well. I think the one mistake that we made if I had it to do over again is we did not get analyst's coverage engaged until after we were on the QX. So I don't know if it was three, four weeks ago Zacks finally came out with an analyst's report. I think there needs to be a cottage industry of analysts who follow Reg A+ deals. I think the investor needs that feedback from professional advisors looking at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. ELIO: Correct. At the time it was less, it was probably 40 something thousand, but yes. MS. YAMANAKA: Thank you. MR. NELSON: Can you talk about your pitch process, how many VCs, angels, different vehicles, methods of trying to raise capital you went through before settling on Reg A+? MR. ELIO: Yeah. So, you know, we talked to a lot of different institutions. We're a company that doesn't so VCs are comfortable with pre-revenue startups but they want to spend \$3 million and create Facebook, and when you show them a 3 or \$400 million budget their heads pop off. You go to private equity guys, they're comfortable with that check but when you say you're pre- revenue and will be for another year their heads pop off. And both of them like to specialize because their concentration of wealth they get really good at a sector. Hey, we invest in biotech, we invest in technology. And so we needed to convince these big
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	have brokers because when you're investing your money there's a lot of people who want to talk to somebody. They don't want to just click the button, right. And we looked into that and the brokers that we were talking to said it was going to take an extra 90 to 120 days for them to do their due diligence, get through FINRA in order to be able to do it with us. And I was in a hurry. You know, I needed to keep this company going. And so although I wanted to do it that way we chose not to because it was time prohibitive. So we self-underwrote, and honestly self- underwriting other than not having live people to talk to worked pretty well. I think the one mistake that we made if I had it to do over again is we did not get analyst's coverage engaged until after we were on the QX. So I don't know if it was three, four weeks ago Zacks finally came out with an analyst's report. I think there needs to be a cottage industry of analysts who follow Reg A+ deals. I think the investor	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. ELIO: Correct. At the time it was less, it was probably 40 something thousand, but yes. MS. YAMANAKA: Thank you. MR. NELSON: Can you talk about your pitch process, how many VCs, angels, different vehicles, methods of trying to raise capital you went through before settling on Reg A+? MR. ELIO: Yeah. So, you know, we talked to a lot of different institutions. We're a company that doesn't so VCs are comfortable with pre-revenue startups but they want to spend \$3 million and create Facebook, and when you show them a 3 or \$400 million budget their heads pop off. You go to private equity guys, they're comfortable with that check but when you say you're pre- revenue and will be for another year their heads pop off. And both of them like to specialize because their concentration of wealth they get really good at a sector. Hey, we invest in biotech, we invest in technology.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	have brokers because when you're investing your money there's a lot of people who want to talk to somebody. They don't want to just click the button, right. And we looked into that and the brokers that we were talking to said it was going to take an extra 90 to 120 days for them to do their due diligence, get through FINRA in order to be able to do it with us. And I was in a hurry. You know, I needed to keep this company going. And so although I wanted to do it that way we chose not to because it was time prohibitive. So we self-underwrote, and honestly self- underwriting other than not having live people to talk to worked pretty well. I think the one mistake that we made if I had it to do over again is we did not get analyst's coverage engaged until after we were on the QX. So I don't know if it was three, four weeks ago Zacks finally came out with an analyst's report. I think there needs to be a cottage industry of analysts who follow Reg A+ deals. I think the investor needs that feedback from professional advisors looking at companies and doing due diligence and saying I think this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. ELIO: Correct. At the time it was less, it was probably 40 something thousand, but yes. MS. YAMANAKA: Thank you. MR. NELSON: Can you talk about your pitch process, how many VCs, angels, different vehicles, methods of trying to raise capital you went through before settling on Reg A+? MR. ELIO: Yeah. So, you know, we talked to a lot of different institutions. We're a company that doesn't so VCs are comfortable with pre-revenue startups but they want to spend \$3 million and create Facebook, and when you show them a 3 or \$400 million budget their heads pop off. You go to private equity guys, they're comfortable with that check but when you say you're pre- revenue and will be for another year their heads pop off. And both of them like to specialize because their concentration of wealth they get really good at a sector. Hey, we invest in biotech, we invest in technology. And so we needed to convince these big institutions to do two things they were uncomfortable
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	have brokers because when you're investing your money there's a lot of people who want to talk to somebody. They don't want to just click the button, right. And we looked into that and the brokers that we were talking to said it was going to take an extra 90 to 120 days for them to do their due diligence, get through FINRA in order to be able to do it with us. And I was in a hurry. You know, I needed to keep this company going. And so although I wanted to do it that way we chose not to because it was time prohibitive. So we self-underwrote, and honestly self- underwriting other than not having live people to talk to worked pretty well. I think the one mistake that we made if I had it to do over again is we did not get analyst's coverage engaged until after we were on the QX. So I don't know if it was three, four weeks ago Zacks finally came out with an analyst's report. I think there needs to be a cottage industry of analysts who follow Reg A+ deals. I think the investor needs that feedback from professional advisors looking at companies and doing due diligence and saying I think this one is good, I don't think that one is good. So	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. ELIO: Correct. At the time it was less, it was probably 40 something thousand, but yes. MS. YAMANAKA: Thank you. MR. NELSON: Can you talk about your pitch process, how many VCs, angels, different vehicles, methods of trying to raise capital you went through before settling on Reg A+? MR. ELIO: Yeah. So, you know, we talked to a lot of different institutions. We're a company that doesn't so VCs are comfortable with pre-revenue startups but they want to spend \$3 million and create Facebook, and when you show them a 3 or \$400 million budget their heads pop off. You go to private equity guys, they're comfortable with that check but when you say you're pre- revenue and will be for another year their heads pop off. And both of them like to specialize because their concentration of wealth they get really good at a sector. Hey, we invest in biotech, we invest in technology. And so we needed to convince these big institutions to do two things they were uncomfortable with. One sector, because there's not enough new vehicle
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	have brokers because when you're investing your money there's a lot of people who want to talk to somebody. They don't want to just click the button, right. And we looked into that and the brokers that we were talking to said it was going to take an extra 90 to 120 days for them to do their due diligence, get through FINRA in order to be able to do it with us. And I was in a hurry. You know, I needed to keep this company going. And so although I wanted to do it that way we chose not to because it was time prohibitive. So we self-underwrote, and honestly self- underwriting other than not having live people to talk to worked pretty well. I think the one mistake that we made if I had it to do over again is we did not get analyst's coverage engaged until after we were on the QX. So I don't know if it was three, four weeks ago Zacks finally came out with an analyst's report. I think there needs to be a cottage industry of analysts who follow Reg A+ deals. I think the investor needs that feedback from professional advisors looking at companies and doing due diligence and saying I think this one is good, I don't think that one is good. So hopefully more and more companies will start looking at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. ELIO: Correct. At the time it was less, it was probably 40 something thousand, but yes. MS. YAMANAKA: Thank you. MR. NELSON: Can you talk about your pitch process, how many VCs, angels, different vehicles, methods of trying to raise capital you went through before settling on Reg A+? MR. ELIO: Yeah. So, you know, we talked to a lot of different institutions. We're a company that doesn't so VCs are comfortable with pre-revenue startups but they want to spend \$3 million and create Facebook, and when you show them a 3 or \$400 million budget their heads pop off. You go to private equity guys, they're comfortable with that check but when you say you're pre- revenue and will be for another year their heads pop off. And both of them like to specialize because their concentration of wealth they get really good at a sector. Hey, we invest in biotech, we invest in technology. And so we needed to convince these big institutions to do two things they were uncomfortable with. One sector, because there's not enough new vehicle startups for anybody to specialize in it and then

	Page 94		Page 96
1	whole innovator's dilemma issue that I just spoke about.	1	the water campaign and startengine.com wanted to put a
2	whole milovator s diferinita issue that I just spoke about.	2	counter up on, you know, how many people have reserved
3	And it's kind of funny, the last institution I	3	and what the dollar amount was. And so internally our
4	pitched like two weeks before we went live on Reg A+,	4	legal team debated whether it was allowed or not for four
5	about halfway through a very similar presentation to what	5	or five days, and finally we said, well, let's ask the
6	you saw the guy interrupted me and said why would I	6	SEC. We called up the SEC, asked the question. They got
7	invest in you before you build the vehicle?	7	back to us with an answer within days.
8	And I thought to myself, you know, the point of	8	So within and we were told yes it was okay,
9	the equity markets have gotten lost. You know, in the	9	and so we put the counter up. And that that process
10	1700's where people when people were trading	10	happened over and over and over. The SEC encouraged us
11	securities underneath a tree on the corner of Broad and	11	to ask questions. There was a lot of things where it
12	Wall the equity market was a place for companies to raise	12	wasn't clear what we could and should do with a given
13	capital to either start or expand, not a place for VCs	13	situation and it was a very quick and easy feedback loop
14	and private equity firms to cash out their winnings. And	14	of question and answer to get through the process. So
15	that kind of has gotten lost with this concentration of	15	MR. WALSH: Have you personally invested in any
16	capital, and I think Reg A+ has a chance to bring it back	16	other Reg A companies?
17	to its roots, where equity is about a place for companies	17	MR. ELIO: No, I'm pretty much all in in Elio
18	to find capital to start and to expand.	18	Motors at the moment, so the answer is no.
19	MR. NELSON: How many of those conversations	19	MS. YAMANAKA: Paul, this is Laurie Yamanaka.
20	did you have roughly? Did you keep track?	20	I had a question. When you were going through this and
21	MR. ELIO: I did not keep track. From 2009 to	21	you said the hardest thing to do was to find capital,
22	today it had to be hundreds. But in fairness when the	22	when you were starting this process and even all during
23	Dow is at 7,000 it didn't matter what you were pitching	23	the process did you have a lot of professional people who
24	the answer was no, right. So there's a couple of years	24	were coming to you and saying try this, try this, try
25	there where there was a lot of meetings with those types	25	this, and they weren't working or was it just people
		1	
	Page 95		Page 97
1	Page 95 of institutions that had you know, it didn't matter	1	going, well, maybe you could try this but we don't know?
2	of institutions that had you know, it didn't matter what you were pitching so	2	going, well, maybe you could try this but we don't know? What kind of advice because I'm presuming you didn't
2 3	of institutions that had you know, it didn't matter what you were pitching so MS. MOTT: Paul, this is Catherine Mott. I	2	going, well, maybe you could try this but we don't know? What kind of advice because I'm presuming you didn't all have you didn't do it out of your head.
2 3 4	of institutions that had you know, it didn't matter what you were pitching so MS. MOTT: Paul, this is Catherine Mott. I just want to commend you on an excellent I guess job	2 3 4	going, well, maybe you could try this but we don't know? What kind of advice because I'm presuming you didn't all have you didn't do it out of your head. MR. ELIO: Right. So it was a combination of
2 3 4 5	of institutions that had you know, it didn't matter what you were pitching so MS. MOTT: Paul, this is Catherine Mott. I just want to commend you on an excellent I guess job raising capital. You went along the path of least	2 3 4 5	going, well, maybe you could try this but we don't know? What kind of advice because I'm presuming you didn't all have you didn't do it out of your head. MR. ELIO: Right. So it was a combination of both. You know, I just kept trying to figure it out. So
2 3 4 5 6	of institutions that had you know, it didn't matter what you were pitching so MS. MOTT: Paul, this is Catherine Mott. I just want to commend you on an excellent I guess job raising capital. You went along the path of least resistance in all of these situations and found capital	2 3 4 5 6	going, well, maybe you could try this but we don't know? What kind of advice because I'm presuming you didn't all have you didn't do it out of your head. MR. ELIO: Right. So it was a combination of both. You know, I just kept trying to figure it out. So at a couple of different points we engaged different
2 3 4 5 6 7	of institutions that had you know, it didn't matter what you were pitching so MS. MOTT: Paul, this is Catherine Mott. I just want to commend you on an excellent I guess job raising capital. You went along the path of least resistance in all of these situations and found capital and found successful ways to fund the growth of your	2 3 4 5 6 7	going, well, maybe you could try this but we don't know? What kind of advice because I'm presuming you didn't all have you didn't do it out of your head. MR. ELIO: Right. So it was a combination of both. You know, I just kept trying to figure it out. So at a couple of different points we engaged different firms to go out to the private equity hedge funds and VC
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	of institutions that had you know, it didn't matter what you were pitching so MS. MOTT: Paul, this is Catherine Mott. I just want to commend you on an excellent I guess job raising capital. You went along the path of least resistance in all of these situations and found capital and found successful ways to fund the growth of your company.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	going, well, maybe you could try this but we don't know? What kind of advice because I'm presuming you didn't all have you didn't do it out of your head. MR. ELIO: Right. So it was a combination of both. You know, I just kept trying to figure it out. So at a couple of different points we engaged different firms to go out to the private equity hedge funds and VC markets. They would say, hey, we can get this done.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9	of institutions that had you know, it didn't matter what you were pitching so MS. MOTT: Paul, this is Catherine Mott. I just want to commend you on an excellent I guess job raising capital. You went along the path of least resistance in all of these situations and found capital and found successful ways to fund the growth of your company. And you correctly characterize the VC industry.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	going, well, maybe you could try this but we don't know? What kind of advice because I'm presuming you didn't all have you didn't do it out of your head. MR. ELIO: Right. So it was a combination of both. You know, I just kept trying to figure it out. So at a couple of different points we engaged different firms to go out to the private equity hedge funds and VC markets. They would say, hey, we can get this done. We're going to get you a ton of meetings, we're going to
2 3 6 7 8 9 10	of institutions that had you know, it didn't matter what you were pitching so MS. MOTT: Paul, this is Catherine Mott. I just want to commend you on an excellent I guess job raising capital. You went along the path of least resistance in all of these situations and found capital and found successful ways to fund the growth of your company. And you correctly characterize the VC industry. I'm in that industry, so I know exactly what you're	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	going, well, maybe you could try this but we don't know? What kind of advice because I'm presuming you didn't all have you didn't do it out of your head. MR. ELIO: Right. So it was a combination of both. You know, I just kept trying to figure it out. So at a couple of different points we engaged different firms to go out to the private equity hedge funds and VC markets. They would say, hey, we can get this done. We're going to get you a ton of meetings, we're going to do a road show, because this is a compelling company.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	of institutions that had you know, it didn't matter what you were pitching so MS. MOTT: Paul, this is Catherine Mott. I just want to commend you on an excellent I guess job raising capital. You went along the path of least resistance in all of these situations and found capital and found successful ways to fund the growth of your company. And you correctly characterize the VC industry. I'm in that industry, so I know exactly what you're talking about. There is a tendency to follow this, you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	going, well, maybe you could try this but we don't know? What kind of advice because I'm presuming you didn't all have you didn't do it out of your head. MR. ELIO: Right. So it was a combination of both. You know, I just kept trying to figure it out. So at a couple of different points we engaged different firms to go out to the private equity hedge funds and VC markets. They would say, hey, we can get this done. We're going to get you a ton of meetings, we're going to do a road show, because this is a compelling company. MS. YAMANAKA: Yeah.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	of institutions that had you know, it didn't matter what you were pitching so MS. MOTT: Paul, this is Catherine Mott. I just want to commend you on an excellent I guess job raising capital. You went along the path of least resistance in all of these situations and found capital and found successful ways to fund the growth of your company. And you correctly characterize the VC industry. I'm in that industry, so I know exactly what you're talking about. There is a tendency to follow this, you know, focus on what you know and understand and also	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	going, well, maybe you could try this but we don't know? What kind of advice because I'm presuming you didn't all have you didn't do it out of your head. MR. ELIO: Right. So it was a combination of both. You know, I just kept trying to figure it out. So at a couple of different points we engaged different firms to go out to the private equity hedge funds and VC markets. They would say, hey, we can get this done. We're going to get you a ton of meetings, we're going to do a road show, because this is a compelling company. MS. YAMANAKA: Yeah. MR. ELIO: Right. And they're excited and they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	of institutions that had you know, it didn't matter what you were pitching so MS. MOTT: Paul, this is Catherine Mott. I just want to commend you on an excellent I guess job raising capital. You went along the path of least resistance in all of these situations and found capital and found successful ways to fund the growth of your company. And you correctly characterize the VC industry. I'm in that industry, so I know exactly what you're talking about. There is a tendency to follow this, you know, focus on what you know and understand and also focus on the trends. And so when something comes along	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>going, well, maybe you could try this but we don't know?</li> <li>What kind of advice because I'm presuming you didn't all have you didn't do it out of your head.</li> <li>MR. ELIO: Right. So it was a combination of both. You know, I just kept trying to figure it out. So at a couple of different points we engaged different firms to go out to the private equity hedge funds and VC markets. They would say, hey, we can get this done.</li> <li>We're going to get you a ton of meetings, we're going to do a road show, because this is a compelling company.</li> <li>MS. YAMANAKA: Yeah.</li> <li>MR. ELIO: Right. And they're excited and they would spend, depending on the situation because I think</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	of institutions that had you know, it didn't matter what you were pitching so MS. MOTT: Paul, this is Catherine Mott. I just want to commend you on an excellent I guess job raising capital. You went along the path of least resistance in all of these situations and found capital and found successful ways to fund the growth of your company. And you correctly characterize the VC industry. Tm in that industry, so I know exactly what you're talking about. There is a tendency to follow this, you know, focus on what you know and understand and also focus on the trends. And so when something comes along that is not trendy and there's, you know, they're risk	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>going, well, maybe you could try this but we don't know?</li> <li>What kind of advice because I'm presuming you didn't all have you didn't do it out of your head.</li> <li>MR. ELIO: Right. So it was a combination of both. You know, I just kept trying to figure it out. So at a couple of different points we engaged different firms to go out to the private equity hedge funds and VC markets. They would say, hey, we can get this done.</li> <li>We're going to get you a ton of meetings, we're going to do a road show, because this is a compelling company.</li> <li>MS. YAMANAKA: Yeah.</li> <li>MR. ELIO: Right. And they're excited and they would spend, depending on the situation because I think there was three different ones that we used over the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	of institutions that had you know, it didn't matter what you were pitching so MS. MOTT: Paul, this is Catherine Mott. I just want to commend you on an excellent I guess job raising capital. You went along the path of least resistance in all of these situations and found capital and found successful ways to fund the growth of your company. And you correctly characterize the VC industry. I'm in that industry, so I know exactly what you're talking about. There is a tendency to follow this, you know, focus on what you know and understand and also focus on the trends. And so when something comes along	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>going, well, maybe you could try this but we don't know?</li> <li>What kind of advice because I'm presuming you didn't all have you didn't do it out of your head.</li> <li>MR. ELIO: Right. So it was a combination of both. You know, I just kept trying to figure it out. So at a couple of different points we engaged different firms to go out to the private equity hedge funds and VC markets. They would say, hey, we can get this done.</li> <li>We're going to get you a ton of meetings, we're going to do a road show, because this is a compelling company.</li> <li>MS. YAMANAKA: Yeah.</li> <li>MR. ELIO: Right. And they're excited and they would spend, depending on the situation because I think</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	of institutions that had you know, it didn't matter what you were pitching so MS. MOTT: Paul, this is Catherine Mott. I just want to commend you on an excellent I guess job raising capital. You went along the path of least resistance in all of these situations and found capital and found successful ways to fund the growth of your company. And you correctly characterize the VC industry. Tm in that industry, so I know exactly what you're talking about. There is a tendency to follow this, you know, focus on what you know and understand and also focus on the trends. And so when something comes along that is not trendy and there's, you know, they're risk adverse like you know, because they're managing other	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>going, well, maybe you could try this but we don't know?</li> <li>What kind of advice because I'm presuming you didn't all have you didn't do it out of your head.</li> <li>MR. ELIO: Right. So it was a combination of both. You know, I just kept trying to figure it out. So at a couple of different points we engaged different firms to go out to the private equity hedge funds and VC markets. They would say, hey, we can get this done.</li> <li>We're going to get you a ton of meetings, we're going to do a road show, because this is a compelling company.</li> <li>MS. YAMANAKA: Yeah.</li> <li>MR. ELIO: Right. And they're excited and they would spend, depending on the situation because I think there was three different ones that we used over the course of the years, they would spend anywhere from two</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	of institutions that had you know, it didn't matter what you were pitching so MS. MOTT: Paul, this is Catherine Mott. I just want to commend you on an excellent I guess job raising capital. You went along the path of least resistance in all of these situations and found capital and found successful ways to fund the growth of your company. And you correctly characterize the VC industry. T'm in that industry, so I know exactly what you're talking about. There is a tendency to follow this, you know, focus on what you know and understand and also focus on the trends. And so when something comes along that is not trendy and there's, you know, they're risk adverse like you know, because they're managing other people's money, the key thing that you've done is you've	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	going, well, maybe you could try this but we don't know? What kind of advice because I'm presuming you didn't all have you didn't do it out of your head. MR. ELIO: Right. So it was a combination of both. You know, I just kept trying to figure it out. So at a couple of different points we engaged different firms to go out to the private equity hedge funds and VC markets. They would say, hey, we can get this done. We're going to get you a ton of meetings, we're going to do a road show, because this is a compelling company. MS. YAMANAKA: Yeah. MR. ELIO: Right. And they're excited and they would spend, depending on the situation because I think there was three different ones that we used over the course of the years, they would spend anywhere from two to five months doing due diligence, putting together this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	of institutions that had you know, it didn't matter what you were pitching so MS. MOTT: Paul, this is Catherine Mott. I just want to commend you on an excellent I guess job raising capital. You went along the path of least resistance in all of these situations and found capital and found successful ways to fund the growth of your company. And you correctly characterize the VC industry. I'm in that industry, so I know exactly what you're talking about. There is a tendency to follow this, you know, focus on what you know and understand and also focus on the trends. And so when something comes along that is not trendy and there's, you know, they're risk adverse like you know, because they're managing other people's money, the key thing that you've done is you've found people who are willing to risk their own money and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	going, well, maybe you could try this but we don't know? What kind of advice because I'm presuming you didn't all have you didn't do it out of your head. MR. ELIO: Right. So it was a combination of both. You know, I just kept trying to figure it out. So at a couple of different points we engaged different firms to go out to the private equity hedge funds and VC markets. They would say, hey, we can get this done. We're going to get you a ton of meetings, we're going to do a road show, because this is a compelling company. MS. YAMANAKA: Yeah. MR. ELIO: Right. And they're excited and they would spend, depending on the situation because I think there was three different ones that we used over the course of the years, they would spend anywhere from two to five months doing due diligence, putting together this beautiful package to send out and an enormous amount of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of institutions that had you know, it didn't matter what you were pitching so MS. MOTT: Paul, this is Catherine Mott. I just want to commend you on an excellent I guess job raising capital. You went along the path of least resistance in all of these situations and found capital and found successful ways to fund the growth of your company. And you correctly characterize the VC industry. Tm in that industry, so I know exactly what you're talking about. There is a tendency to follow this, you know, focus on what you know and understand and also focus on the trends. And so when something comes along that is not trendy and there's, you know, they're risk adverse like you know, because they're managing other people's money, the key thing that you've done is you've found people who are willing to risk their own money and you went after, you know, potential customers. And I think that's brilliant and I just want to commend you on what you've done. I have no question. I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	going, well, maybe you could try this but we don't know? What kind of advice because I'm presuming you didn't all have you didn't do it out of your head. MR. ELIO: Right. So it was a combination of both. You know, I just kept trying to figure it out. So at a couple of different points we engaged different firms to go out to the private equity hedge funds and VC markets. They would say, hey, we can get this done. We're going to get you a ton of meetings, we're going to do a road show, because this is a compelling company. MS. YAMANAKA: Yeah. MR. ELIO: Right. And they're excited and they would spend, depending on the situation because I think there was three different ones that we used over the course of the years, they would spend anywhere from two to five months doing due diligence, putting together this beautiful package to send out and an enormous amount of work. And they would send it out and we would get two
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	of institutions that had you know, it didn't matter what you were pitching so MS. MOTT: Paul, this is Catherine Mott. I just want to commend you on an excellent I guess job raising capital. You went along the path of least resistance in all of these situations and found capital and found successful ways to fund the growth of your company. And you correctly characterize the VC industry. T'm in that industry, so I know exactly what you're talking about. There is a tendency to follow this, you know, focus on what you know and understand and also focus on the trends. And so when something comes along that is not trendy and there's, you know, they're risk adverse like you know, because they're managing other people's money, the key thing that you've done is you've found people who are willing to risk their own money and you went after, you know, potential customers. And I think that's brilliant and I just want to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	going, well, maybe you could try this but we don't know? What kind of advice because I'm presuming you didn't all have you didn't do it out of your head. MR. ELIO: Right. So it was a combination of both. You know, I just kept trying to figure it out. So at a couple of different points we engaged different firms to go out to the private equity hedge funds and VC markets. They would say, hey, we can get this done. We're going to get you a ton of meetings, we're going to do a road show, because this is a compelling company. MS. YAMANAKA: Yeah. MR. ELIO: Right. And they're excited and they would spend, depending on the situation because I think there was three different ones that we used over the course of the years, they would spend anywhere from two to five months doing due diligence, putting together this beautiful package to send out and an enormous amount of work. And they would send it out and we would get two meetings.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	of institutions that had you know, it didn't matter what you were pitching so MS. MOTT: Paul, this is Catherine Mott. I just want to commend you on an excellent I guess job raising capital. You went along the path of least resistance in all of these situations and found capital and found successful ways to fund the growth of your company. And you correctly characterize the VC industry. I'm in that industry, so I know exactly what you're talking about. There is a tendency to follow this, you know, focus on what you know and understand and also focus on the trends. And so when something comes along that is not trendy and there's, you know, they're risk adverse like you know, because they're managing other people's money, the key thing that you've done is you've found people who are willing to risk their own money and you went after, you know, potential customers. And I think that's brilliant and I just want to commend you on what you've done. I have no question. I just wanted to say congratulations. MR. ELIO: Oh, thank you. And back at you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	going, well, maybe you could try this but we don't know? What kind of advice because I'm presuming you didn't all have you didn't do it out of your head. MR. ELIO: Right. So it was a combination of both. You know, I just kept trying to figure it out. So at a couple of different points we engaged different firms to go out to the private equity hedge funds and VC markets. They would say, hey, we can get this done. We're going to get you a ton of meetings, we're going to do a road show, because this is a compelling company. MS. YAMANAKA: Yeah. MR. ELIO: Right. And they're excited and they would spend, depending on the situation because I think there was three different ones that we used over the course of the years, they would spend anywhere from two to five months doing due diligence, putting together this beautiful package to send out and an enormous amount of work. And they would send it out and we would get two meetings. So we would get tied up for six or nine months and only get two meetings out of it. Because they were shocked too. And I think that dynamic, it was the three
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	of institutions that had you know, it didn't matter what you were pitching so MS. MOTT: Paul, this is Catherine Mott. I just want to commend you on an excellent I guess job raising capital. You went along the path of least resistance in all of these situations and found capital and found successful ways to fund the growth of your company. And you correctly characterize the VC industry. Tm in that industry, so I know exactly what you're talking about. There is a tendency to follow this, you know, focus on what you know and understand and also focus on the trends. And so when something comes along that is not trendy and there's, you know, they're risk adverse like you know, because they're managing other people's money, the key thing that you've done is you've found people who are willing to risk their own money and you went after, you know, potential customers. And I think that's brilliant and I just want to commend you on what you've done. I have no question. I just wanted to say congratulations. MR. ELIO: Oh, thank you. And back at you. So the Reg A+ process was very it was a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	going, well, maybe you could try this but we don't know? What kind of advice because I'm presuming you didn't all have you didn't do it out of your head. MR. ELIO: Right. So it was a combination of both. You know, I just kept trying to figure it out. So at a couple of different points we engaged different firms to go out to the private equity hedge funds and VC markets. They would say, hey, we can get this done. We're going to get you a ton of meetings, we're going to do a road show, because this is a compelling company. MS. YAMANAKA: Yeah. MR. ELIO: Right. And they're excited and they would spend, depending on the situation because I think there was three different ones that we used over the course of the years, they would spend anywhere from two to five months doing due diligence, putting together this beautiful package to send out and an enormous amount of work. And they would send it out and we would get two meetings. So we would get tied up for six or nine months and only get two meetings out of it. Because they were shocked too. And I think that dynamic, it was the three things that we talked about, the innovator's dilemma, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	of institutions that had you know, it didn't matter what you were pitching so MS. MOTT: Paul, this is Catherine Mott. I just want to commend you on an excellent I guess job raising capital. You went along the path of least resistance in all of these situations and found capital and found successful ways to fund the growth of your company. And you correctly characterize the VC industry. Tm in that industry, so I know exactly what you're talking about. There is a tendency to follow this, you know, focus on what you know and understand and also focus on the trends. And so when something comes along that is not trendy and there's, you know, they're risk adverse like you know, because they're managing other people's money, the key thing that you've done is you've found people who are willing to risk their own money and you went after, you know, potential customers. And I think that's brilliant and I just want to commend you on what you've done. I have no question. I just wanted to say congratulations. MR. ELIO: Oh, thank you. And back at you. So the Reg A+ process was very it was a great experience for us. The SEC was incredibly	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	going, well, maybe you could try this but we don't know? What kind of advice because I'm presuming you didn't all have you didn't do it out of your head. MR. ELIO: Right. So it was a combination of both. You know, I just kept trying to figure it out. So at a couple of different points we engaged different firms to go out to the private equity hedge funds and VC markets. They would say, hey, we can get this done. We're going to get you a ton of meetings, we're going to do a road show, because this is a compelling company. MS. YAMANAKA: Yeah. MR. ELIO: Right. And they're excited and they would spend, depending on the situation because I think there was three different ones that we used over the course of the years, they would spend anywhere from two to five months doing due diligence, putting together this beautiful package to send out and an enormous amount of work. And they would send it out and we would get two meetings. So we would get tied up for six or nine months and only get two meetings out of it. Because they were shocked too. And I think that dynamic, it was the three things that we talked about, the innovator's dilemma, the concentration of capital and, you know, that nobody
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	of institutions that had you know, it didn't matter what you were pitching so MS. MOTT: Paul, this is Catherine Mott. I just want to commend you on an excellent I guess job raising capital. You went along the path of least resistance in all of these situations and found capital and found successful ways to fund the growth of your company. And you correctly characterize the VC industry. Tm in that industry, so I know exactly what you're talking about. There is a tendency to follow this, you know, focus on what you know and understand and also focus on the trends. And so when something comes along that is not trendy and there's, you know, they're risk adverse like you know, because they're managing other people's money, the key thing that you've done is you've found people who are willing to risk their own money and you went after, you know, potential customers. And I think that's brilliant and I just want to commend you on what you've done. I have no question. I just wanted to say congratulations. MR. ELIO: Oh, thank you. And back at you. So the Reg A+ process was very it was a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	going, well, maybe you could try this but we don't know? What kind of advice because I'm presuming you didn't all have you didn't do it out of your head. MR. ELIO: Right. So it was a combination of both. You know, I just kept trying to figure it out. So at a couple of different points we engaged different firms to go out to the private equity hedge funds and VC markets. They would say, hey, we can get this done. We're going to get you a ton of meetings, we're going to do a road show, because this is a compelling company. MS. YAMANAKA: Yeah. MR. ELIO: Right. And they're excited and they would spend, depending on the situation because I think there was three different ones that we used over the course of the years, they would spend anywhere from two to five months doing due diligence, putting together this beautiful package to send out and an enormous amount of work. And they would send it out and we would get two meetings. So we would get tied up for six or nine months and only get two meetings out of it. Because they were shocked too. And I think that dynamic, it was the three things that we talked about, the innovator's dilemma, the

	Page 98		Page 100
1	And I think it shocked even the professionals how	1	lost the audio. Can you still hear me?
2	difficult it was to get somebody to write a check for	2	MR. GUTIERREZ: Yes.
3	Elio Motors because we just don't fit.	3	MR. ELIO: Okay. So when we started this is
4	MS. YAMANAKA: Thank you.	4	what the map looked like. Yellow and red are bad, green
5	MR. WALSH: One last question. You say you	5	is good on requiring a helmet to drive an Elio, right.
6	don't fit and you're describing that situation. What	6	Because we are technically a motorcycle. And so what
7	percentage of the time was Tesla brought up as either a	7	we've done is go state by state and create a new category
8	positive or negative example either by you or the person	8	called an auto cycle. An auto cycle is an enclosed three
9	listening to you as an example of what you were trying to	9	wheel vehicle with at least three air bags, seat belts
10	accomplish?	10	for every occupant position, et cetera, and if you're an
11	MR. ELIO: It doesn't get brought up much but	11	auto cycle you don't need a motorcycle license or a
12	it definitely helps us. You know, I cheer Tesla every	12	helmet.
13	single day because if you take Tesla out of the question,	13	This is the map as of June 27th. So there's
14	out of the equation, the last American vehicle company	14	five states left where if you're under 21 or under 18
15	started and still standing is Walter Chrysler in 1928.	15	that you need a helmet, and there's only one state that
16	So it's been, you know, 90 years since somebody has done	16	over 21 that you still need a helmet and that's West
17	this successfully and that doesn't help the story either.	17	Virginia. The problem there is their legislature only
18	But Tesla having done it and have a \$30 billion market	18	works 45 days a year and we missed it and so we've got to
19	cap certainly helps us, so I continue to applaud them.	19	wait for a year.
20	MR. GUTIERREZ: Hey, Paul. I have a quick	20	And then on the licensing the same story.
21	question So again I want to echo the congratulations	21	Yellow is bad, green is good. This is where we're at.
22	earlier. I think this is a phenomenal company and the	22	So we're about a year from production, so I suspect by
23	fact that you went through the Reg A process makes it	23	the time we hit production our intent is to have both
24	even more exciting, certainly for us as a real shining	24	maps completely green.
25	example of how this process can be successful.	25	MR GUTIERREZ: Great, thank you.
	Page 99		Page 101
1	Page 99 I had a question about that. Did going through	1	Page 101 MS. YAMANAKA: Paul, back to a non-sexy
1 2		1	
	I had a question about that. Did going through		MS. YAMANAKA: Paul, back to a non-sexy
2	I had a question about that. Did going through that process, and the notoriety, and the marketing of	2	MS. YAMANAKA: Paul, back to a non-sexy question here. Were you able to track the total costs of
2 3	I had a question about that. Did going through that process, and the notoriety, and the marketing of going through that with investors help you with your	2 3	MS. YAMANAKA: Paul, back to a non-sexy question here. Were you able to track the total costs of going through the Reg A process versus the anticipated
2 3 4	I had a question about that. Did going through that process, and the notoriety, and the marketing of going through that with investors help you with your suppliers and the other partners of the company? Was	2 3 4	MS. YAMANAKA: Paul, back to a non-sexy question here. Were you able to track the total costs of going through the Reg A process versus the anticipated costs for other avenues and how did it line up and did it
2 3 4 5	I had a question about that. Did going through that process, and the notoriety, and the marketing of going through that with investors help you with your suppliers and the other partners of the company? Was there was there an accretive sort of value that you	2 3 4 5	MS. YAMANAKA: Paul, back to a non-sexy question here. Were you able to track the total costs of going through the Reg A process versus the anticipated costs for other avenues and how did it line up and did it fall into what your expectations were? I'm talking all
2 3 4 5 6	I had a question about that. Did going through that process, and the notoriety, and the marketing of going through that with investors help you with your suppliers and the other partners of the company? Was there was there an accretive sort of value that you saw because of going through the process?	2 3 4 5 6	MS. YAMANAKA: Paul, back to a non-sexy question here. Were you able to track the total costs of going through the Reg A process versus the anticipated costs for other avenues and how did it line up and did it fall into what your expectations were? I'm talking all in costs. MR. ELIO: Yes. You know, I should know that number off the top of my head and I don't. I'm kind of
2 3 4 5 6 7	I had a question about that. Did going through that process, and the notoriety, and the marketing of going through that with investors help you with your suppliers and the other partners of the company? Was there was there an accretive sort of value that you saw because of going through the process? MR. ELIO: Kind of but not really. So most of the supply base was already highly engaged before Reg A+, but what it did is keep them engaged, right. So you got	2 3 4 5 6 7	MS. YAMANAKA: Paul, back to a non-sexy question here. Were you able to track the total costs of going through the Reg A process versus the anticipated costs for other avenues and how did it line up and did it fall into what your expectations were? I'm talking all in costs. MR. ELIO: Yes. You know, I should know that number off the top of my head and I don't. I'm kind of embarrassed that I didn't prep myself on that one.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	I had a question about that. Did going through that process, and the notoriety, and the marketing of going through that with investors help you with your suppliers and the other partners of the company? Was there was there an accretive sort of value that you saw because of going through the process? MR. ELIO: Kind of but not really. So most of the supply base was already highly engaged before Reg A+, but what it did is keep them engaged, right. So you got to keep all the stakeholders engaged. And like I said,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. YAMANAKA: Paul, back to a non-sexy question here. Were you able to track the total costs of going through the Reg A process versus the anticipated costs for other avenues and how did it line up and did it fall into what your expectations were? I'm talking all in costs. MR. ELIO: Yes. You know, I should know that number off the top of my head and I don't. I'm kind of embarrassed that I didn't prep myself on that one. MS. YAMANAKA: That's okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	I had a question about that. Did going through that process, and the notoriety, and the marketing of going through that with investors help you with your suppliers and the other partners of the company? Was there was there an accretive sort of value that you saw because of going through the process? MR. ELIO: Kind of but not really. So most of the supply base was already highly engaged before Reg A+, but what it did is keep them engaged, right. So you got to keep all the stakeholders engaged. And like I said, the biggest issue is attracting the capital, and so as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS. YAMANAKA: Paul, back to a non-sexy question here. Were you able to track the total costs of going through the Reg A process versus the anticipated costs for other avenues and how did it line up and did it fall into what your expectations were? I'm talking all in costs. MR. ELIO: Yes. You know, I should know that number off the top of my head and I don't. I'm kind of embarrassed that I didn't prep myself on that one. MS. YAMANAKA: That's okay. MR. ELIO: I apologize. That's something I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	I had a question about that. Did going through that process, and the notoriety, and the marketing of going through that with investors help you with your suppliers and the other partners of the company? Was there was there an accretive sort of value that you saw because of going through the process? MR. ELIO: Kind of but not really. So most of the supply base was already highly engaged before Reg A+, but what it did is keep them engaged, right. So you got to keep all the stakeholders engaged. And like I said, the biggest issue is attracting the capital, and so as they saw this being successful their commitment certainly	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MS. YAMANAKA: Paul, back to a non-sexy question here. Were you able to track the total costs of going through the Reg A process versus the anticipated costs for other avenues and how did it line up and did it fall into what your expectations were? I'm talking all in costs. MR. ELIO: Yes. You know, I should know that number off the top of my head and I don't. I'm kind of embarrassed that I didn't prep myself on that one. MS. YAMANAKA: That's okay. MR. ELIO: I apologize. That's something I should know. It was cheap relatively to other options,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I had a question about that. Did going through that process, and the notoriety, and the marketing of going through that with investors help you with your suppliers and the other partners of the company? Was there was there an accretive sort of value that you saw because of going through the process? MR. ELIO: Kind of but not really. So most of the supply base was already highly engaged before Reg A+, but what it did is keep them engaged, right. So you got to keep all the stakeholders engaged. And like I said, the biggest issue is attracting the capital, and so as they saw this being successful their commitment certainly deepened because now they believe that we can market it,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. YAMANAKA: Paul, back to a non-sexy question here. Were you able to track the total costs of going through the Reg A process versus the anticipated costs for other avenues and how did it line up and did it fall into what your expectations were? I'm talking all in costs. MR. ELIO: Yes. You know, I should know that number off the top of my head and I don't. I'm kind of embarrassed that I didn't prep myself on that one. MS. YAMANAKA: That's okay. MR. ELIO: I apologize. That's something I should know. It was cheap relatively to other options, you know, to a traditional IPO with a major bank. It was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	I had a question about that. Did going through that process, and the notoriety, and the marketing of going through that with investors help you with your suppliers and the other partners of the company? Was there was there an accretive sort of value that you saw because of going through the process? MR. ELIO: Kind of but not really. So most of the supply base was already highly engaged before Reg A+, but what it did is keep them engaged, right. So you got to keep all the stakeholders engaged. And like I said, the biggest issue is attracting the capital, and so as they saw this being successful their commitment certainly deepened because now they believe that we can market it, right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS. YAMANAKA: Paul, back to a non-sexy question here. Were you able to track the total costs of going through the Reg A process versus the anticipated costs for other avenues and how did it line up and did it fall into what your expectations were? I'm talking all in costs. MR. ELIO: Yes. You know, I should know that number off the top of my head and I don't. I'm kind of embarrassed that I didn't prep myself on that one. MS. YAMANAKA: That's okay. MR. ELIO: I apologize. That's something I should know. It was cheap relatively to other options, you know, to a traditional IPO with a major bank. It was certainly doable and rather inexpensive.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	I had a question about that. Did going through that process, and the notoriety, and the marketing of going through that with investors help you with your suppliers and the other partners of the company? Was there was there an accretive sort of value that you saw because of going through the process? MR. ELIO: Kind of but not really. So most of the supply base was already highly engaged before Reg A+, but what it did is keep them engaged, right. So you got to keep all the stakeholders engaged. And like I said, the biggest issue is attracting the capital, and so as they saw this being successful their commitment certainly deepened because now they believe that we can market it, right. And that was always the hardest part to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. YAMANAKA: Paul, back to a non-sexy question here. Were you able to track the total costs of going through the Reg A process versus the anticipated costs for other avenues and how did it line up and did it fall into what your expectations were? I'm talking all in costs. MR. ELIO: Yes. You know, I should know that number off the top of my head and I don't. I'm kind of embarrassed that I didn't prep myself on that one. MS. YAMANAKA: That's okay. MR. ELIO: I apologize. That's something I should know. It was cheap relatively to other options, you know, to a traditional IPO with a major bank. It was certainly doable and rather inexpensive. MS. YAMANAKA: So going into the process it was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I had a question about that. Did going through that process, and the notoriety, and the marketing of going through that with investors help you with your suppliers and the other partners of the company? Was there was there an accretive sort of value that you saw because of going through the process? MR. ELIO: Kind of but not really. So most of the supply base was already highly engaged before Reg A+, but what it did is keep them engaged, right. So you got to keep all the stakeholders engaged. And like I said, the biggest issue is attracting the capital, and so as they saw this being successful their commitment certainly deepened because now they believe that we can market it, right. And that was always the hardest part to believe. Like they know that we can pull off the stats.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. YAMANAKA: Paul, back to a non-sexy question here. Were you able to track the total costs of going through the Reg A process versus the anticipated costs for other avenues and how did it line up and did it fall into what your expectations were? I'm talking all in costs. MR. ELIO: Yes. You know, I should know that number off the top of my head and I don't. I'm kind of embarrassed that I didn't prep myself on that one. MS. YAMANAKA: That's okay. MR. ELIO: I apologize. That's something I should know. It was cheap relatively to other options, you know, to a traditional IPO with a major bank. It was certainly doable and rather inexpensive. MS. YAMANAKA: So going into the process it was obviously less expensive and actually going through the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	I had a question about that. Did going through that process, and the notoriety, and the marketing of going through that with investors help you with your suppliers and the other partners of the company? Was there was there an accretive sort of value that you saw because of going through the process? MR. ELIO: Kind of but not really. So most of the supply base was already highly engaged before Reg A+, but what it did is keep them engaged, right. So you got to keep all the stakeholders engaged. And like I said, the biggest issue is attracting the capital, and so as they saw this being successful their commitment certainly deepened because now they believe that we can market it, right. Mnd that was always the hardest part to believe. Like they know that we can pull off the stats. It's like can you find the money to build the car, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. YAMANAKA: Paul, back to a non-sexy question here. Were you able to track the total costs of going through the Reg A process versus the anticipated costs for other avenues and how did it line up and did it fall into what your expectations were? I'm talking all in costs. MR. ELIO: Yes. You know, I should know that number off the top of my head and I don't. I'm kind of embarrassed that I didn't prep myself on that one. MS. YAMANAKA: That's okay. MR. ELIO: I apologize. That's something I should know. It was cheap relatively to other options, you know, to a traditional IPO with a major bank. It was certainly doable and rather inexpensive. MS. YAMANAKA: So going into the process it was obviously less expensive and actually going through the process itself it came in under within expectations?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I had a question about that. Did going through that process, and the notoriety, and the marketing of going through that with investors help you with your suppliers and the other partners of the company? Was there was there an accretive sort of value that you saw because of going through the process? MR. ELIO: Kind of but not really. So most of the supply base was already highly engaged before Reg A+, but what it did is keep them engaged, right. So you got to keep all the stakeholders engaged. And like I said, the biggest issue is attracting the capital, and so as they saw this being successful their commitment certainly deepened because now they believe that we can market it, right. Mnd that was always the hardest part to believe. Like they know that we can pull off the stats. It's like can you find the money to build the car, and certainly Reg A+ helped that belief and depend their	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. YAMANAKA: Paul, back to a non-sexy question here. Were you able to track the total costs of going through the Reg A process versus the anticipated costs for other avenues and how did it line up and did it fall into what your expectations were? I'm talking all in costs. MR. ELIO: Yes. You know, I should know that number off the top of my head and I don't. I'm kind of embarrassed that I didn't prep myself on that one. MS. YAMANAKA: That's okay. MR. ELIO: I apologize. That's something I should know. It was cheap relatively to other options, you know, to a traditional IPO with a major bank. It was certainly doable and rather inexpensive. MS. YAMANAKA: So going into the process it was obviously less expensive and actually going through the process itself it came in under within expectations? Even though you didn't hit your 25 million target 17 was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	I had a question about that. Did going through that process, and the notoriety, and the marketing of going through that with investors help you with your suppliers and the other partners of the company? Was there was there an accretive sort of value that you saw because of going through the process? MR. ELIO: Kind of but not really. So most of the supply base was already highly engaged before Reg A+, but what it did is keep them engaged, right. So you got to keep all the stakeholders engaged. And like I said, the biggest issue is attracting the capital, and so as they saw this being successful their commitment certainly deepened because now they believe that we can market it, right. I was always the hardest part to believe. Like they know that we can pull off the stats. It's like can you find the money to build the car, and certainly Reg A+ helped that belief and depend their commitments.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MS. YAMANAKA: Paul, back to a non-sexy question here. Were you able to track the total costs of going through the Reg A process versus the anticipated costs for other avenues and how did it line up and did it fall into what your expectations were? I'm talking all in costs. MR. ELIO: Yes. You know, I should know that number off the top of my head and I don't. I'm kind of embarrassed that I didn't prep myself on that one. MS. YAMANAKA: That's okay. MR. ELIO: I apologize. That's something I should know. It was cheap relatively to other options, you know, to a traditional IPO with a major bank. It was certainly doable and rather inexpensive. MS. YAMANAKA: So going into the process it was obviously less expensive and actually going through the process itself it came in under within expectations? Even though you didn't hit your 25 million target 17 was totally fine?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I had a question about that. Did going through that process, and the notoriety, and the marketing of going through that with investors help you with your suppliers and the other partners of the company? Was there was there an accretive sort of value that you saw because of going through the process? MR. ELIO: Kind of but not really. So most of the supply base was already highly engaged before Reg A+, but what it did is keep them engaged, right. So you got to keep all the stakeholders engaged. And like I said, the biggest issue is attracting the capital, and so as they saw this being successful their commitment certainly deepened because now they believe that we can market it, right. MR that was always the hardest part to believe. Like they know that we can pull off the stats. It's like can you find the money to build the car, and certainly Reg A+ helped that belief and depend their commitments.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. YAMANAKA: Paul, back to a non-sexy question here. Were you able to track the total costs of going through the Reg A process versus the anticipated costs for other avenues and how did it line up and did it fall into what your expectations were? I'm talking all in costs. MR. ELIO: Yes. You know, I should know that number off the top of my head and I don't. I'm kind of embarrassed that I didn't prep myself on that one. MS. YAMANAKA: That's okay. MR. ELIO: I apologize. That's something I should know. It was cheap relatively to other options, you know, to a traditional IPO with a major bank. It was certainly doable and rather inexpensive. MS. YAMANAKA: So going into the process it was obviously less expensive and actually going through the process itself it came in under within expectations? Even though you didn't hit your 25 million target 17 was totally fine? MR. ELIO: Right, right. So, you know, we had
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I had a question about that. Did going through that process, and the notoriety, and the marketing of going through that with investors help you with your suppliers and the other partners of the company? Was there – was there an accretive sort of value that you saw because of going through the process? MR ELIO: Kind of but not really. So most of the supply base was already highly engaged before Reg A+, but what it did is keep them engaged, right. So you got to keep all the stakeholders engaged. And like I said, the biggest issue is attracting the capital, and so as they saw this being successful their commitment certainly deepened because now they believe that we can market it, right. And that was always the hardest part to believe. Like they know that we can pull off the stats. It's like can you find the money to build the car, and certainly Reg A+ helped that belief and depend their commitments. MR. GUTIERREZ: And another quick question.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. YAMANAKA: Paul, back to a non-sexy question here. Were you able to track the total costs of going through the Reg A process versus the anticipated costs for other avenues and how did it line up and did it fall into what your expectations were? I'm talking all in costs. MR. ELIO: Yes. You know, I should know that number off the top of my head and I don't. I'm kind of embarrassed that I didn't prep myself on that one. MS. YAMANAKA: That's okay. MR. ELIO: I apologize. That's something I should know. It was cheap relatively to other options, you know, to a traditional IPO with a major bank. It was certainly doable and rather inexpensive. MS. YAMANAKA: So going into the process it was obviously less expensive and actually going through the process itself it came in under within expectations? Even though you didn't hit your 25 million target 17 was totally fine? MR. ELIO: Right, right. So, you know, we had a minimum of 12.6 and a target of 25. And, you know,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I had a question about that. Did going through that process, and the notoriety, and the marketing of going through that with investors help you with your suppliers and the other partners of the company? Was there – was there an accretive sort of value that you saw because of going through the process? MR. ELIO: Kind of but not really. So most of the supply base was already highly engaged before Reg A+, but what it did is keep them engaged, right. So you got to keep all the stakeholders engaged. And like I said, the biggest issue is attracting the capital, and so as they saw this being successful their commitment certainly deepened because now they believe that we can market it, right. MR duta twas always the hardest part to believe. Like they know that we can pull off the stats. It's like can you find the money to build the car, and certainly Reg A+ helped that belief and depend their commitments.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. YAMANAKA: Paul, back to a non-sexy question here. Were you able to track the total costs of going through the Reg A process versus the anticipated costs for other avenues and how did it line up and did it fall into what your expectations were? I'm talking all in costs. MR. ELIO: Yes. You know, I should know that number off the top of my head and I don't. I'm kind of embarrassed that I didn't prep myself on that one. MS. YAMANAKA: That's okay. MR. ELIO: I apologize. That's something I should know. It was cheap relatively to other options, you know, to a traditional IPO with a major bank. It was certainly doable and rather inexpensive. MS. YAMANAKA: So going into the process it was obviously less expensive and actually going through the process itself it came in under within expectations? Even though you didn't hit your 25 million target 17 was totally fine? MR. ELIO: Right, right. So, you know, we had a minimum of 12.6 and a target of 25. And, you know, there was different plans on how to run the business
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I had a question about that. Did going through that process, and the notoriety, and the marketing of going through that with investors help you with your suppliers and the other partners of the company? Was there was there an accretive sort of value that you saw because of going through the process? MR. ELIO: Kind of but not really. So most of the supply base was already highly engaged before Reg A+, but what it did is keep them engaged, right. So you got to keep all the stakeholders engaged. And like I said, the biggest issue is attracting the capital, and so as they saw this being successful their commitment certainly deepened because now they believe that we can market it, right. MR. GUTIERREZ: And another quick question. Just as someone who is now very interested in buying one of these, do I need to have a motorcycle license in order to drive or can I use and I live in California, so I'm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. YAMANAKA: Paul, back to a non-sexy question here. Were you able to track the total costs of going through the Reg A process versus the anticipated costs for other avenues and how did it line up and did it fall into what your expectations were? I'm talking all in costs. MR. ELIO: Yes. You know, I should know that number off the top of my head and I don't. I'm kind of embarrassed that I didn't prep myself on that one. MS. YAMANAKA: That's okay. MR. ELIO: I apologize. That's something I should know. It was cheap relatively to other options, you know, to a traditional IPO with a major bank. It was certainly doable and rather inexpensive. MS. YAMANAKA: So going into the process it was obviously less expensive and actually going through the process itself it came in under within expectations? Even though you didn't hit your 25 million target 17 was totally fine? MR. ELIO: Right, right. So, you know, we had a minimum of 12.6 and a target of 25. And, you know, there was different plans on how to run the business depending on different funding levels. And the 17.6 like
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I had a question about that. Did going through that process, and the notoriety, and the marketing of going through that with investors help you with your suppliers and the other partners of the company? Was there – was there an accretive sort of value that you saw because of going through the process? MR. ELIO: Kind of but not really. So most of the supply base was already highly engaged before Reg A+, but what it did is keep them engaged, right. So you got to keep all the stakeholders engaged. And like I said, the biggest issue is attracting the capital, and so as they saw this being successful their commitment certainly deepened because now they believe that we can market it, right. MR duta twas always the hardest part to believe. Like they know that we can pull off the stats. It's like can you find the money to build the car, and certainly Reg A+ helped that belief and depend their commitments.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. YAMANAKA: Paul, back to a non-sexy question here. Were you able to track the total costs of going through the Reg A process versus the anticipated costs for other avenues and how did it line up and did it fall into what your expectations were? I'm talking all in costs. MR. ELIO: Yes. You know, I should know that number off the top of my head and I don't. I'm kind of embarrassed that I didn't prep myself on that one. MS. YAMANAKA: That's okay. MR. ELIO: I apologize. That's something I should know. It was cheap relatively to other options, you know, to a traditional IPO with a major bank. It was certainly doable and rather inexpensive. MS. YAMANAKA: So going into the process it was obviously less expensive and actually going through the process itself it came in under within expectations? Even though you didn't hit your 25 million target 17 was totally fine? MR. ELIO: Right, right. So, you know, we had a minimum of 12.6 and a target of 25. And, you know, there was different plans on how to run the business
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I had a question about that. Did going through that process, and the notoriety, and the marketing of going through that with investors help you with your suppliers and the other partners of the company? Was there was there an accretive sort of value that you saw because of going through the process? MR. ELIO: Kind of but not really. So most of the supply base was already highly engaged before Reg A+, but what it did is keep them engaged, right. So you got to keep all the stakeholders engaged. And like I said, the biggest issue is attracting the capital, and so as they saw this being successful their commitment certainly deepened because now they believe that we can market it, right. So you find the money to build the car, and certainly Reg A+ helped that belief and depend their commitments. MR. GUTIERREZ: And another quick question. Just as someone who is now very interested in buying one of these, do I need to have a motorcycle license in order to drive or can I use and I live in California, so Im assuming it's state specific?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MS. YAMANAKA: Paul, back to a non-sexy question here. Were you able to track the total costs of going through the Reg A process versus the anticipated costs for other avenues and how did it line up and did it fall into what your expectations were? I'm talking all in costs. MR. ELIO: Yes. You know, I should know that number off the top of my head and I don't. I'm kind of embarrassed that I didn't prep myself on that one. MS. YAMANAKA: That's okay. MR. ELIO: I apologize. That's something I should know. It was cheap relatively to other options, you know, to a traditional IPO with a major bank. It was certainly doable and rather inexpensive. MS. YAMANAKA: So going into the process it was obviously less expensive and actually going through the process itself it came in under within expectations? Even though you didn't hit your 25 million target 17 was totally fine? MR. ELIO: Right, right. So, you know, we had a minimum of 12.6 and a target of 25. And, you know, there was different plans on how to run the business depending on different funding levels. And the 17.6 like I said, or the 17 was certainly enough. I mean, it got

	Page 102		Page 104
1	publicly traded there was just a lot more tools in our	1	you have interest credit cards pay those off, go invest
2	tool kit in order to raise capital.	2	in Reg A+. If you don't have three to nine months of
3	And it's a different world. You know, I've	3	savings of salary ins savings, save money, go invest in
4	said several times I feel like Reg A+ put us over the	4	Reg A+. You know, and if you do have all these criteria
5	hump. Now you don't actually get a memo or an email to	5	met invest in five to ten like just mirroring the
6	say you're officially over a hump. It's just a sense	6	discussion you had.
7	that we're over the hump. But I feel like it did that.	7	So we put that on both the portal startengine
8	MS. YAMANAKA: Well, they're calling you,	8	and our website to try to you know, people are taking
9	right, that's the hump. So that's good.	9	a risk when they buy Elio shares, they are. You know,
10	Congratulations.	10	until we're in production we're not, right. But letting
11	MR. ELIO: Yes. Thank you.	11	people go in eyes wide open I think that's really the
12	CO-CHAIR HANKS: Time for one last question.	12	key.
13	MR. HAUPTMAN: Yeah, Mr. Elio, fantastic	13	MS. YAMANAKA: That is great. You could have
14	company. Did you encounter people who heard about this,	14	led off with you could have led off with that. That's
15	wanted in, but have never heard of the accredited	15	great. That's something you got so many hits on that I
16	investor rule, don't know whether they themselves are or	16	bet, right, as far as people who are checking that out
17	not?	17	and actually checking out the video. It's exactly the
18	MR. ELIO: Yes, I would suspect that the	18	kind of marketing you need.
19	majority of the people who invested in our Reg A+	19	MR. ELIO: Yeah.
20	offering had never heard of the accredited investor rule	20	MS. YAMANAKA: Thank you.
21	until they read the stuff on startengine.com.	21	MR. ELIO: Yeah. So if you want I'm sure we
22	MR. HAUPTMAN: Okay. If may follow up.	22	can share it with you. I'm sure Motley Fool wouldn't be
23	MR. ELIO: And the reason I say that is that	23	sad if you had their name somewhere in sharing that
24	even before this was available and reservation holders	24	information.
25	were asking can I invest in your company and I would have	25	MS. YAMANAKA: We'll see what we can do, right.
	Demo 102		Dama 105
	Page 103		
- 1	d	1	Page 105
1	that discussion with them. They were unaware of that,	1	I'm sure
2	right. I'm extrapolating.	2	I'm sure MR. REARDON: One question. You say you're a
2 3	right. I'm extrapolating. MR. HAUPTMAN: Do you find the accredited rule	2 3	I'm sure MR. REARDON: One question. You say you're a car person. What's the 0 to 60 time?
2 3 4	right. I'm extrapolating. MR. HAUPTMAN: Do you find the accredited rule to be too stringent or not stringent enough? Do you have	2 3 4	I'm sure MR. REARDON: One question. You say you're a car person. What's the 0 to 60 time? MR. ELIO: We've been targeting under ten
2 3 4 5	right. I'm extrapolating. MR. HAUPTMAN: Do you find the accredited rule to be too stringent or not stringent enough? Do you have a view on that?	2 3 4 5	I'm sure MR. REARDON: One question. You say you're a car person. What's the 0 to 60 time? MR. ELIO: We've been targeting under ten seconds. I don't know that we're going to achieve that
2 3 4 5 6	right. I'm extrapolating. MR. HAUPTMAN: Do you find the accredited rule to be too stringent or not stringent enough? Do you have a view on that? MR. ELIO: Yeah, you know, I it's a fine	2 3 4 5 6	I'm sure MR. REARDON: One question. You say you're a car person. What's the 0 to 60 time? MR. ELIO: We've been targeting under ten seconds. I don't know that we're going to achieve that from our current stats. The target has been under 10
2 3 4 5 6 7	right. I'm extrapolating. MR. HAUPTMAN: Do you find the accredited rule to be too stringent or not stringent enough? Do you have a view on that? MR. ELIO: Yeah, you know, I it's a fine line to walk. I get you want to protect the little guy	2 3 4 5 6 7	I'm sure MR. REARDON: One question. You say you're a car person. What's the 0 to 60 time? MR. ELIO: We've been targeting under ten seconds. I don't know that we're going to achieve that from our current stats. The target has been under 10 seconds.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	right. I'm extrapolating. MR. HAUPTMAN: Do you find the accredited rule to be too stringent or not stringent enough? Do you have a view on that? MR. ELIO: Yeah, you know, I it's a fine line to walk. I get you want to protect the little guy who doesn't know what he's doing, but by the same token	2 3 4 5 6	I'm sure MR. REARDON: One question. You say you're a car person. What's the 0 to 60 time? MR. ELIO: We've been targeting under ten seconds. I don't know that we're going to achieve that from our current stats. The target has been under 10 seconds. MR. REARDON: That's not bad for that little
2 3 4 5 6 7	right. I'm extrapolating. MR. HAUPTMAN: Do you find the accredited rule to be too stringent or not stringent enough? Do you have a view on that? MR. ELIO: Yeah, you know, I it's a fine line to walk. I get you want to protect the little guy who doesn't know what he's doing, but by the same token you preclude him from investing in Uber, and Facebook,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	I'm sure MR. REARDON: One question. You say you're a car person. What's the 0 to 60 time? MR. ELIO: We've been targeting under ten seconds. I don't know that we're going to achieve that from our current stats. The target has been under 10 seconds. MR. REARDON: That's not bad for that little engine.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	right. I'm extrapolating. MR. HAUPTMAN: Do you find the accredited rule to be too stringent or not stringent enough? Do you have a view on that? MR. ELIO: Yeah, you know, I it's a fine line to walk. I get you want to protect the little guy who doesn't know what he's doing, but by the same token you preclude him from investing in Uber, and Facebook, and Elio and, you know, things that can have huge swings.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I'm sure MR. REARDON: One question. You say you're a car person. What's the 0 to 60 time? MR. ELIO: We've been targeting under ten seconds. I don't know that we're going to achieve that from our current stats. The target has been under 10 seconds. MR. REARDON: That's not bad for that little
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	right. I'm extrapolating. MR. HAUPTMAN: Do you find the accredited rule to be too stringent or not stringent enough? Do you have a view on that? MR. ELIO: Yeah, you know, I it's a fine line to walk. I get you want to protect the little guy who doesn't know what he's doing, but by the same token you preclude him from investing in Uber, and Facebook,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	I'm sure MR. REARDON: One question. You say you're a car person. What's the 0 to 60 time? MR. ELIO: We've been targeting under ten seconds. I don't know that we're going to achieve that from our current stats. The target has been under 10 seconds. MR. REARDON: That's not bad for that little engine. MR. ELIO: No, and you can turbo charge it and then I think we can get it under five. So there's no
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	right. I'm extrapolating. MR. HAUPTMAN: Do you find the accredited rule to be too stringent or not stringent enough? Do you have a view on that? MR. ELIO: Yeah, you know, I it's a fine line to walk. I get you want to protect the little guy who doesn't know what he's doing, but by the same token you preclude him from investing in Uber, and Facebook, and Elio and, you know, things that can have huge swings. And so how do you determine if they really know enough	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	I'm sure MR. REARDON: One question. You say you're a car person. What's the 0 to 60 time? MR. ELIO: We've been targeting under ten seconds. I don't know that we're going to achieve that from our current stats. The target has been under 10 seconds. MR. REARDON: That's not bad for that little engine. MR. ELIO: No, and you can turbo charge it and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	right. I'm extrapolating. MR. HAUPTMAN: Do you find the accredited rule to be too stringent or not stringent enough? Do you have a view on that? MR. ELIO: Yeah, you know, I it's a fine line to walk. I get you want to protect the little guy who doesn't know what he's doing, but by the same token you preclude him from investing in Uber, and Facebook, and Elio and, you know, things that can have huge swings. And so how do you determine if they really know enough that they're taking the risk eyes wide open, right. It's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	I'm sure MR. REARDON: One question. You say you're a car person. What's the 0 to 60 time? MR. ELIO: We've been targeting under ten seconds. I don't know that we're going to achieve that from our current stats. The target has been under 10 seconds. MR. REARDON: That's not bad for that little engine. MR. ELIO: No, and you can turbo charge it and then I think we can get it under five. So there's no turbo plan, but in the design that I have used doing the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	right. I'm extrapolating. MR. HAUPTMAN: Do you find the accredited rule to be too stringent or not stringent enough? Do you have a view on that? MR. ELIO: Yeah, you know, I it's a fine line to walk. I get you want to protect the little guy who doesn't know what he's doing, but by the same token you preclude him from investing in Uber, and Facebook, and Elio and, you know, things that can have huge swings. And so how do you determine if they really know enough that they're taking the risk eyes wide open, right. It's not guaranteeing that they're going to win, that they're	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I'm sure MR. REARDON: One question. You say you're a car person. What's the 0 to 60 time? MR. ELIO: We've been targeting under ten seconds. I don't know that we're going to achieve that from our current stats. The target has been under 10 seconds. MR. REARDON: That's not bad for that little engine. MR. ELIO: No, and you can turbo charge it and then I think we can get it under five. So there's no turbo plan, but in the design that I have used doing the cylinder wall thicknesses and everything will accept the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	right. I'm extrapolating. MR. HAUPTMAN: Do you find the accredited rule to be too stringent or not stringent enough? Do you have a view on that? MR. ELIO: Yeah, you know, I it's a fine line to walk. I get you want to protect the little guy who doesn't know what he's doing, but by the same token you preclude him from investing in Uber, and Facebook, and Elio and, you know, things that can have huge swings. And so how do you determine if they really know enough that they're taking the risk eyes wide open, right. It's not guaranteeing that they're going to win, that they're not going to lose money, but that they understand the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	I'm sure MR. REARDON: One question. You say you're a car person. What's the 0 to 60 time? MR. ELIO: We've been targeting under ten seconds. I don't know that we're going to achieve that from our current stats. The target has been under 10 seconds. MR. REARDON: That's not bad for that little engine. MR. ELIO: No, and you can turbo charge it and then I think we can get it under five. So there's no turbo plan, but in the design that I have used doing the cylinder wall thicknesses and everything will accept the stress, the extra stress that would be from a turbo. The
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	right. I'm extrapolating. MR. HAUPTMAN: Do you find the accredited rule to be too stringent or not stringent enough? Do you have a view on that? MR. ELIO: Yeah, you know, I it's a fine line to walk. I get you want to protect the little guy who doesn't know what he's doing, but by the same token you preclude him from investing in Uber, and Facebook, and Elio and, you know, things that can have huge swings. And so how do you determine if they really know enough that they're taking the risk eyes wide open, right. It's not guaranteeing that they're going to win, that they're not going to lose money, but that they understand the risk they're undertaking.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	I'm sure MR. REARDON: One question. You say you're a car person. What's the 0 to 60 time? MR. ELIO: We've been targeting under ten seconds. I don't know that we're going to achieve that from our current stats. The target has been under 10 seconds. MR. REARDON: That's not bad for that little engine. MR. ELIO: No, and you can turbo charge it and then I think we can get it under five. So there's no turbo plan, but in the design that I have used doing the cylinder wall thicknesses and everything will accept the stress, the extra stress that would be from a turbo. The inner cooler packaging is protected for and Comau when
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	right. I'm extrapolating. MR. HAUPTMAN: Do you find the accredited rule to be too stringent or not stringent enough? Do you have a view on that? MR. ELIO: Yeah, you know, I it's a fine line to walk. I get you want to protect the little guy who doesn't know what he's doing, but by the same token you preclude him from investing in Uber, and Facebook, and Elio and, you know, things that can have huge swings. And so how do you determine if they really know enough that they're taking the risk eyes wide open, right. It's not guaranteeing that they're going to win, that they're not going to lose money, but that they understand the risk they're undertaking. And I like some of the discussion. I think the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I'm sure MR. REARDON: One question. You say you're a car person. What's the 0 to 60 time? MR. ELIO: We've been targeting under ten seconds. I don't know that we're going to achieve that from our current stats. The target has been under 10 seconds. MR. REARDON: That's not bad for that little engine. MR. ELIO: No, and you can turbo charge it and then I think we can get it under five. So there's no turbo plan, but in the design that I have used doing the cylinder wall thicknesses and everything will accept the stress, the extra stress that would be from a turbo. The inner cooler packaging is protected for and Comau when they designed the engine assembly line left a hole so we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	right. I'm extrapolating. MR. HAUPTMAN: Do you find the accredited rule to be too stringent or not stringent enough? Do you have a view on that? MR. ELIO: Yeah, you know, I it's a fine line to walk. I get you want to protect the little guy who doesn't know what he's doing, but by the same token you preclude him from investing in Uber, and Facebook, and Elio and, you know, things that can have huge swings. And so how do you determine if they really know enough that they're taking the risk eyes wide open, right. It's not guaranteeing that they're going to win, that they're not going to lose money, but that they understand the risk they're undertaking. And I like some of the discussion. I think the test, although it can be circumvented, was a good idea. Because even if you circumvent it, if you have to memorize all those answers you know enough to know that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	I'm sure MR. REARDON: One question. You say you're a car person. What's the 0 to 60 time? MR. ELIO: We've been targeting under ten seconds. I don't know that we're going to achieve that from our current stats. The target has been under 10 seconds. MR. REARDON: That's not bad for that little engine. MR. ELIO: No, and you can turbo charge it and then I think we can get it under five. So there's no turbo plan, but in the design that I have used doing the cylinder wall thicknesses and everything will accept the stress, the extra stress that would be from a turbo. The inner cooler packaging is protected for and Comau when they designed the engine assembly line left a hole so we could put a turbo in. So although no work has been done on a turbo, because you got to crawl before you walk, we have certainly protected for it. And I think that would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	right. I'm extrapolating. MR. HAUPTMAN: Do you find the accredited rule to be too stringent or not stringent enough? Do you have a view on that? MR. ELIO: Yeah, you know, I it's a fine line to walk. I get you want to protect the little guy who doesn't know what he's doing, but by the same token you preclude him from investing in Uber, and Facebook, and Elio and, you know, things that can have huge swings. And so how do you determine if they really know enough that they're taking the risk eyes wide open, right. It's not guaranteeing that they're going to win, that they're not going to lose money, but that they understand the risk they're undertaking. And I like some of the discussion. I think the test, although it can be circumvented, was a good idea. Because even if you circumvent it, if you have to memorize all those answers you know enough to know that you're the risk that you're taking.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I'm sure MR. REARDON: One question. You say you're a car person. What's the 0 to 60 time? MR. ELIO: We've been targeting under ten seconds. I don't know that we're going to achieve that from our current stats. The target has been under 10 seconds. MR. REARDON: That's not bad for that little engine. MR. ELIO: No, and you can turbo charge it and then I think we can get it under five. So there's no turbo plan, but in the design that I have used doing the cylinder wall thicknesses and everything will accept the stress, the extra stress that would be from a turbo. The inner cooler packaging is protected for and Comau when they designed the engine assembly line left a hole so we could put a turbo in. So although no work has been done on a turbo, because you got to crawl before you walk, we have certainly protected for it. And I think that would be a really fun product.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	right. I'm extrapolating. MR. HAUPTMAN: Do you find the accredited rule to be too stringent or not stringent enough? Do you have a view on that? MR. ELIO: Yeah, you know, I it's a fine line to walk. I get you want to protect the little guy who doesn't know what he's doing, but by the same token you preclude him from investing in Uber, and Facebook, and Elio and, you know, things that can have huge swings. And so how do you determine if they really know enough that they're taking the risk eyes wide open, right. It's not guaranteeing that they're going to win, that they're not going to lose money, but that they understand the risk they're undertaking. And I like some of the discussion. I think the test, although it can be circumvented, was a good idea. Because even if you circumvent it, if you have to memorize all those answers you know enough to know that you're the risk that you're taking. And one of the things we did is we reached out	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<text><text><text></text></text></text>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	right. I'm extrapolating. MR. HAUPTMAN: Do you find the accredited rule to be too stringent or not stringent enough? Do you have a view on that? MR. ELIO: Yeah, you know, I it's a fine line to walk. I get you want to protect the little guy who doesn't know what he's doing, but by the same token you preclude him from investing in Uber, and Facebook, and Elio and, you know, things that can have huge swings. And so how do you determine if they really know enough that they're taking the risk eyes wide open, right. It's not guaranteeing that they're going to win, that they're not going to lose money, but that they understand the risk they're undertaking. Mnd I like some of the discussion. I think the test, although it can be circumvented, was a good idea. Because even if you circumvent it, if you have to memorize all those answers you know enough to know that you're the risk that you're taking. And one of the things we did is we reached out to Motley Fool and we asked them to create a video on or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<text><text><text></text></text></text>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	right. I'm extrapolating. MR. HAUPTMAN: Do you find the accredited rule to be too stringent or not stringent enough? Do you have a view on that? MR. ELIO: Yeah, you know, I it's a fine line to walk. I get you want to protect the little guy who doesn't know what he's doing, but by the same token you preclude him from investing in Uber, and Facebook, and Elio and, you know, things that can have huge swings. And so how do you determine if they really know enough that they're taking the risk eyes wide open, right. It's not guaranteeing that they're going to win, that they're not going to lose money, but that they understand the risk they're undertaking. Mnd I like some of the discussion. I think the test, although it can be circumvented, was a good idea. Because even if you circumvent it, if you have to memorize all those answers you know enough to know that you're the risk that you're taking. Mnd one of the things we did is we reached out to Motley Fool and we asked them to create a video on or a paper on how to invest in Reg A+ deals to specific	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<text><text><text></text></text></text>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	right. I'm extrapolating. MR. HAUPTMAN: Do you find the accredited rule to be too stringent or not stringent enough? Do you have a view on that? MR. ELIO: Yeah, you know, I it's a fine line to walk. I get you want to protect the little guy who doesn't know what he's doing, but by the same token you preclude him from investing in Uber, and Facebook, and Elio and, you know, things that can have huge swings. And so how do you determine if they really know enough that they're taking the risk eyes wide open, right. It's not guaranteeing that they're going to win, that they're not going to lose money, but that they understand the risk they're undertaking. And I like some of the discussion. I think the test, although it can be circumvented, was a good idea. Because even if you circumvent it, if you have to memorize all those answers you know enough to know that you're the risk that you're taking. And one of the things we did is we reached out to Motley Fool and we asked them to create a video on or a paper on how to invest in Reg A+ deals to specific to Elio. And we put that on startengine.com and on our	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<text><text><text></text></text></text>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	right. I'm extrapolating. MR. HAUPTMAN: Do you find the accredited rule to be too stringent or not stringent enough? Do you have a view on that? MR. ELIO: Yeah, you know, I it's a fine line to walk. I get you want to protect the little guy who doesn't know what he's doing, but by the same token you preclude him from investing in Uber, and Facebook, and Elio and, you know, things that can have huge swings. And so how do you determine if they really know enough that they're taking the risk eyes wide open, right. It's not guaranteeing that they're going to win, that they're not going to lose money, but that they understand the risk they're undertaking. Mnd I like some of the discussion. I think the test, although it can be circumvented, was a good idea. Because even if you circumvent it, if you have to memorize all those answers you know enough to know that you're the risk that you're taking. Mnd one of the things we did is we reached out to Motley Fool and we asked them to create a video on or a paper on how to invest in Reg A+ deals to specific	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<text><text><text></text></text></text>

	Page 106		Page 108
1	that one. So thank you very much for presenting and good	1	What I have observed not only here but my sense
2	luck.	2	of, it let's put it this way, and also in very successful
3	MR. ELIO: And thank you for having me and	3	crowd funding campaigns is they manage to reach the
4	thanks for accommodating the virtual appearance. I do	4	audience that would be passionate about that product or
5	appreciate it.	5	service and capture them as investors. So they found
6	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay.	6	their community so to speak.
7	CO-CHAIR HANKS: Do we have any questions on,	7	So he was able to tap into that community,
8	general questions on that?	8	which I think would be the question for those who are
9	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I guess we can we're going	9	interested in this is, and I think we already talked
10	to pick this up after lunch, right?	10	about it is outreach, you know, how do you how do you
11	CO-CHAIR HANKS: Yeah. We've got Reg A after	11	inform the public that there's another way to support
12	lunch.	12	something. And, you know, social media, I mean I'm sure
13	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: So unless anyone wants to	13	that we've seen communities come together to invest
14	just kind of toss in a comment or two and then we're	14	because there's a social influencer or influencers,
15	going to pick up the Reg A conversation after lunch so	15	things like that that are happening.
16	Greg, you just seem itching to	16	So, you know, I'm definitely excited about this
17	MR. YADLEY: No, I've been theoretically	17	and intrigued on how he was able to build a company,
18	feeling positive about Reg A+, and as I mentioned last	18	tapping into the community. And it's a capital intensive
19	time our firm did one, got it qualified, ended up not	19	business. It's not one of those that it's a small, you
20	having enough investor interest, spent a lot of money but	20	know, it's a it's a cool, one off, you know Sphero,
21	felt the SEC and the states were very cooperative. Now	21	you know what I mean, you know, a little toy. This is a
22	we had a baseline of information, raised money privately,	22	big this is a big deal and I think it's going to have
23	and may try something else again in another year.	23	implications on the economy. I mean, you could see how
24	And I think what I heard Mr. Elio say in answer	24	it ripples through various suppliers. I mean, this is
25	to his question about why Reg A+ and $506(c)$ , those	25	so that's going to impact, you know, employment. I mean,
	Page 107		Page 109
1	Page 107 answers made a lot of sense. I mean he's really	1	Page 109 there's just a lot to be said about it. I'm just excited
1 2	answers made a lot of sense. I mean he's really exponentially using his own time and the market out there	1 2	
	answers made a lot of sense. I mean he's really exponentially using his own time and the market out there and cutting through a lot of the I guess rigmarole, and	2	there's just a lot to be said about it. I'm just excited about it. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And I still worry a little
2	answers made a lot of sense. I mean he's really exponentially using his own time and the market out there and cutting through a lot of the I guess rigmarole, and the one-on-ones, but he clearly also wanted to be public.	2 3 4	there's just a lot to be said about it. I'm just excited about it.
2 3 4 5	answers made a lot of sense. I mean he's really exponentially using his own time and the market out there and cutting through a lot of the I guess rigmarole, and the one-on-ones, but he clearly also wanted to be public. And that's always been sort of a dilemma with me because	2 3 4 5	there's just a lot to be said about it. I'm just excited about it. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And I still worry a little bit about liquidity and how realistic additional capital raises are.
2 3 4 5 6	answers made a lot of sense. I mean he's really exponentially using his own time and the market out there and cutting through a lot of the I guess rigmarole, and the one-on-ones, but he clearly also wanted to be public. And that's always been sort of a dilemma with me because I think IPOs are a great idea if that's your plan, and if	2 3 4 5 6	there's just a lot to be said about it. I'm just excited about it. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And I still worry a little bit about liquidity and how realistic additional capital raises are. CO-CHAIR HANKS: On the liquidity issue, I mean
2 3 4 5 6 7	answers made a lot of sense. I mean he's really exponentially using his own time and the market out there and cutting through a lot of the I guess rigmarole, and the one-on-ones, but he clearly also wanted to be public. And that's always been sort of a dilemma with me because I think IPOs are a great idea if that's your plan, and if that's your plan why would you do a Reg A+.	2 3 4 5 6 7	there's just a lot to be said about it. I'm just excited about it. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And I still worry a little bit about liquidity and how realistic additional capital raises are. CO-CHAIR HANKS: On the liquidity issue, I mean just playing devil's advocate for a moment here, a lot of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	answers made a lot of sense. I mean he's really exponentially using his own time and the market out there and cutting through a lot of the I guess rigmarole, and the one-on-ones, but he clearly also wanted to be public. And that's always been sort of a dilemma with me because I think IPOs are a great idea if that's your plan, and if that's your plan why would you do a Reg A+. So he's an example of somebody that sort of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	there's just a lot to be said about it. I'm just excited about it. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And I still worry a little bit about liquidity and how realistic additional capital raises are. CO-CHAIR HANKS: On the liquidity issue, I mean just playing devil's advocate for a moment here, a lot of the guys who are buying the car they're not selling those
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	answers made a lot of sense. I mean he's really exponentially using his own time and the market out there and cutting through a lot of the I guess rigmarole, and the one-on-ones, but he clearly also wanted to be public. And that's always been sort of a dilemma with me because I think IPOs are a great idea if that's your plan, and if that's your plan why would you do a Reg A+. So he's an example of somebody that sort of said I could do it quicker within the anticipated budget.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	there's just a lot to be said about it. I'm just excited about it. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And I still worry a little bit about liquidity and how realistic additional capital raises are. CO-CHAIR HANKS: On the liquidity issue, I mean just playing devil's advocate for a moment here, a lot of the guys who are buying the car they're not selling those shares. I mean, they love that company, they want to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	answers made a lot of sense. I mean he's really exponentially using his own time and the market out there and cutting through a lot of the I guess rigmarole, and the one-on-ones, but he clearly also wanted to be public. And that's always been sort of a dilemma with me because I think IPOs are a great idea if that's your plan, and if that's your plan why would you do a Reg A+. So he's an example of somebody that sort of said I could do it quicker within the anticipated budget. His comment about the analysts is something that we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	there's just a lot to be said about it. I'm just excited about it. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And I still worry a little bit about liquidity and how realistic additional capital raises are. CO-CHAIR HANKS: On the liquidity issue, I mean just playing devil's advocate for a moment here, a lot of the guys who are buying the car they're not selling those shares. I mean, they love that company, they want to hold. They're buy and hold investors, they're not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	answers made a lot of sense. I mean he's really exponentially using his own time and the market out there and cutting through a lot of the I guess rigmarole, and the one-on-ones, but he clearly also wanted to be public. And that's always been sort of a dilemma with me because I think IPOs are a great idea if that's your plan, and if that's your plan why would you do a Reg A+. So he's an example of somebody that sort of said I could do it quicker within the anticipated budget. His comment about the analysts is something that we talked about really in the first iteration of this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	there's just a lot to be said about it. I'm just excited about it. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And I still worry a little bit about liquidity and how realistic additional capital raises are. CO-CHAIR HANKS: On the liquidity issue, I mean just playing devil's advocate for a moment here, a lot of the guys who are buying the car they're not selling those shares. I mean, they love that company, they want to hold. They're buy and hold investors, they're not looking for a flip.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	answers made a lot of sense. I mean he's really exponentially using his own time and the market out there and cutting through a lot of the I guess rigmarole, and the one-on-ones, but he clearly also wanted to be public. And that's always been sort of a dilemma with me because I think IPOs are a great idea if that's your plan, and if that's your plan why would you do a Reg A+. So he's an example of somebody that sort of said I could do it quicker within the anticipated budget. His comment about the analysts is something that we talked about really in the first iteration of this committee as a reason why the IPOs aren't there, so	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	there's just a lot to be said about it. I'm just excited about it. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And I still worry a little bit about liquidity and how realistic additional capital raises are. CO-CHAIR HANKS: On the liquidity issue, I mean just playing devil's advocate for a moment here, a lot of the guys who are buying the car they're not selling those shares. I mean, they love that company, they want to hold. They're buy and hold investors, they're not looking for a flip. And I think a lot of it's the same in a lot of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	answers made a lot of sense. I mean he's really exponentially using his own time and the market out there and cutting through a lot of the I guess rigmarole, and the one-on-ones, but he clearly also wanted to be public. And that's always been sort of a dilemma with me because I think IPOs are a great idea if that's your plan, and if that's your plan why would you do a Reg A+. So he's an example of somebody that sort of said I could do it quicker within the anticipated budget. His comment about the analysts is something that we talked about really in the first iteration of this committee as a reason why the IPOs aren't there, so hopefully more will come.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	there's just a lot to be said about it. I'm just excited about it. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And I still worry a little bit about liquidity and how realistic additional capital raises are. CO-CHAIR HANKS: On the liquidity issue, I mean just playing devil's advocate for a moment here, a lot of the guys who are buying the car they're not selling those shares. I mean, they love that company, they want to hold. They're buy and hold investors, they're not looking for a flip. And I think a lot of it's the same in a lot of this affinity play. I've seen a couple of – there's a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	answers made a lot of sense. I mean he's really exponentially using his own time and the market out there and cutting through a lot of the I guess rigmarole, and the one-on-ones, but he clearly also wanted to be public. And that's always been sort of a dilemma with me because I think IPOs are a great idea if that's your plan, and if that's your plan why would you do a Reg A+. So he's an example of somebody that sort of said I could do it quicker within the anticipated budget. His comment about the analysts is something that we talked about really in the first iteration of this committee as a reason why the IPOs aren't there, so hopefully more will come. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I have a similar bias, but	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	there's just a lot to be said about it. I'm just excited about it. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And I still worry a little bit about liquidity and how realistic additional capital raises are. CO-CHAIR HANKS: On the liquidity issue, I mean just playing devil's advocate for a moment here, a lot of the guys who are buying the car they're not selling those shares. I mean, they love that company, they want to hold. They're buy and hold investors, they're not looking for a flip. And I think a lot of it's the same in a lot of this affinity play. I've seen a couple of – there's a crowd funding company out there that is addressing type
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	answers made a lot of sense. I mean he's really exponentially using his own time and the market out there and cutting through a lot of the I guess rigmarole, and the one-on-ones, but he clearly also wanted to be public. And that's always been sort of a dilemma with me because I think IPOs are a great idea if that's your plan, and if that's your plan why would you do a Reg A+. So he's an example of somebody that sort of said I could do it quicker within the anticipated budget. His comment about the analysts is something that we talked about really in the first iteration of this committee as a reason why the IPOs aren't there, so hopefully more will come. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I have a similar bias, but I'm becoming more and more intrigued. It's I think it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	there's just a lot to be said about it. I'm just excited about it. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And I still worry a little bit about liquidity and how realistic additional capital raises are. CO-CHAIR HANKS: On the liquidity issue, I mean just playing devil's advocate for a moment here, a lot of the guys who are buying the car they're not selling those shares. I mean, they love that company, they want to hold. They're buy and hold investors, they're not looking for a flip. And I think a lot of it's the same in a lot of this affinity play. I've seen a couple of there's a crowd funding company out there that is addressing type one diabetes in children. The people who are investing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	answers made a lot of sense. I mean he's really exponentially using his own time and the market out there and cutting through a lot of the I guess rigmarole, and the one-on-ones, but he clearly also wanted to be public. And that's always been sort of a dilemma with me because I think IPOs are a great idea if that's your plan, and if that's your plan why would you do a Reg A+. So he's an example of somebody that sort of said I could do it quicker within the anticipated budget. His comment about the analysts is something that we talked about really in the first iteration of this committee as a reason why the IPOs aren't there, so hopefully more will come. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I have a similar bias, but I'm becoming more and more intrigued. It's – I think it was – I think it was a great example.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	there's just a lot to be said about it. I'm just excited about it. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And I still worry a little bit about liquidity and how realistic additional capital raises are. CO-CHAIR HANKS: On the liquidity issue, I mean just playing devil's advocate for a moment here, a lot of the guys who are buying the car they're not selling those shares. I mean, they love that company, they want to hold. They're buy and hold investors, they're not looking for a flip. And I think a lot of it's the same in a lot of this affinity play. I've seen a couple of there's a crowd funding company out there that is addressing type one diabetes in children. The people who are investing in that really don't care about liquidity. They care
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	answers made a lot of sense. I mean he's really exponentially using his own time and the market out there and cutting through a lot of the I guess rigmarole, and the one-on-ones, but he clearly also wanted to be public. And that's always been sort of a dilemma with me because I think IPOs are a great idea if that's your plan, and if that's your plan why would you do a Reg A+. So he's an example of somebody that sort of said I could do it quicker within the anticipated budget. His comment about the analysts is something that we talked about really in the first iteration of this committee as a reason why the IPOs aren't there, so hopefully more will come. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I have a similar bias, but I'm becoming more and more intrigued. It's I think it was I think it was a great example. MS. MOTT: So when I think about this in a big	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	there's just a lot to be said about it. I'm just excited about it. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And I still worry a little bit about liquidity and how realistic additional capital raises are. CO-CHAIR HANKS: On the liquidity issue, I mean just playing devil's advocate for a moment here, a lot of the guys who are buying the car they're not selling those shares. I mean, they love that company, they want to hold. They're buy and hold investors, they're not looking for a flip. And I think a lot of it's the same in a lot of this affinity play. I've seen a couple of – there's a crowd funding company out there that is addressing type one diabetes in children. The people who are investing in that really don't care about liquidity. They care about this thing happening and that company succeeding.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	answers made a lot of sense. I mean he's really exponentially using his own time and the market out there and cutting through a lot of the I guess rigmarole, and the one-on-ones, but he clearly also wanted to be public. And that's always been sort of a dilemma with me because I think IPOs are a great idea if that's your plan, and if that's your plan why would you do a Reg A+. So he's an example of somebody that sort of said I could do it quicker within the anticipated budget. His comment about the analysts is something that we talked about really in the first iteration of this committee as a reason why the IPOs aren't there, so hopefully more will come. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I have a similar bias, but I'm becoming more and more intrigued. It's – I think it was – I think it was a great example. MS. MOTT: So when I think about this in a big picture, so I'm like you, Greg, I want to say something.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	there's just a lot to be said about it. I'm just excited about it. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And I still worry a little bit about liquidity and how realistic additional capital raises are. CO-CHAIR HANKS: On the liquidity issue, I mean just playing devil's advocate for a moment here, a lot of the guys who are buying the car they're not selling those shares. I mean, they love that company, they want to hold. They're buy and hold investors, they're not looking for a flip. And I think a lot of it's the same in a lot of this affinity play. I've seen a couple of there's a crowd funding company out there that is addressing type one diabetes in children. The people who are investing in that really don't care about liquidity. They care about this thing happening and that company succeeding. So I think to a certain extent let's not I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	answers made a lot of sense. I mean he's really exponentially using his own time and the market out there and cutting through a lot of the I guess rigmarole, and the one-on-ones, but he clearly also wanted to be public. And that's always been sort of a dilemma with me because I think IPOs are a great idea if that's your plan, and if that's your plan why would you do a Reg A+. So he's an example of somebody that sort of said I could do it quicker within the anticipated budget. His comment about the analysts is something that we talked about really in the first iteration of this committee as a reason why the IPOs aren't there, so hopefully more will come. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I have a similar bias, but I'm becoming more and more intrigued. It's I think it was I think it was a great example. MS. MOTT: So when I think about this in a big picture, so I'm like you, Greg, I want to say something. When I think about the big picture is he was spot on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>there's just a lot to be said about it. I'm just excited about it.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And I still worry a little bit about liquidity and how realistic additional capital raises are.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: On the liquidity issue, I mean just playing devil's advocate for a moment here, a lot of the guys who are buying the car they're not selling those shares. I mean, they love that company, they want to hold. They're buy and hold investors, they're not looking for a flip.</li> <li>And I think a lot of it's the same in a lot of this affinity play. I've seen a couple of there's a crowd funding company out there that is addressing type one diabetes in children. The people who are investing in that really don't care about liquidity. They care about this thing happening and that company succeeding. So I think to a certain extent let's not I mean, we're going to talk about liquidity this afternoon,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	answers made a lot of sense. I mean he's really exponentially using his own time and the market out there and cutting through a lot of the I guess rigmarole, and the one-on-ones, but he clearly also wanted to be public. And that's always been sort of a dilemma with me because I think IPOs are a great idea if that's your plan, and if that's your plan why would you do a Reg A+. So he's an example of somebody that sort of said I could do it quicker within the anticipated budget. His comment about the analysts is something that we talked about really in the first iteration of this committee as a reason why the IPOs aren't there, so hopefully more will come. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I have a similar bias, but I'm becoming more and more intrigued. It's I think it was I think it was a great example. MS. MOTT: So when I think about this in a big picture, so I'm like you, Greg, I want to say something. When I think about the big picture is he was spot on about the industry, the tendency for, you know, the VCs	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>there's just a lot to be said about it. I'm just excited about it.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And I still worry a little bit about liquidity and how realistic additional capital raises are.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: On the liquidity issue, I mean just playing devil's advocate for a moment here, a lot of the guys who are buying the car they're not selling those shares. I mean, they love that company, they want to hold. They're buy and hold investors, they're not looking for a flip.</li> <li>And I think a lot of it's the same in a lot of this affinity play. I've seen a couple of there's a crowd funding company out there that is addressing type one diabetes in children. The people who are investing in that really don't care about liquidity. They care about this thing happening and that company succeeding. So I think to a certain extent let's not I mean, we're going to talk about liquidity this afternoon, but let's not say that liquidity is driving the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	answers made a lot of sense. I mean he's really exponentially using his own time and the market out there and cutting through a lot of the I guess rigmarole, and the one-on-ones, but he clearly also wanted to be public. And that's always been sort of a dilemma with me because I think IPOs are a great idea if that's your plan, and if that's your plan why would you do a Reg A+. So he's an example of somebody that sort of said I could do it quicker within the anticipated budget. His comment about the analysts is something that we talked about really in the first iteration of this committee as a reason why the IPOs aren't there, so hopefully more will come. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I have a similar bias, but I'm becoming more and more intrigued. It's – I think it was – I think it was a great example. MS. MOTT: So when I think about this in a big picture, so I'm like you, Greg, I want to say something. When I think about the big picture is he was spot on about the industry, the tendency for, you know, the VCs to, you know, to be trend oriented. And of course, you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>there's just a lot to be said about it. I'm just excited about it.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And I still worry a little bit about liquidity and how realistic additional capital raises are.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: On the liquidity issue, I mean just playing devil's advocate for a moment here, a lot of the guys who are buying the car they're not selling those shares. I mean, they love that company, they want to hold. They're buy and hold investors, they're not looking for a flip.</li> <li>And I think a lot of it's the same in a lot of this affinity play. I've seen a couple of there's a crowd funding company out there that is addressing type one diabetes in children. The people who are investing in that really don't care about liquidity. They care about this thing happening and that company succeeding. So I think to a certain extent let's not I mean, we're going to talk about liquidity this afternoon, but let's not say that liquidity is driving the investors. If you're if liquidity is a precondition</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	answers made a lot of sense. I mean he's really exponentially using his own time and the market out there and cutting through a lot of the I guess rigmarole, and the one-on-ones, but he clearly also wanted to be public. And that's always been sort of a dilemma with me because I think IPOs are a great idea if that's your plan, and if that's your plan why would you do a Reg A+. So he's an example of somebody that sort of said I could do it quicker within the anticipated budget. His comment about the analysts is something that we talked about really in the first iteration of this committee as a reason why the IPOs aren't there, so hopefully more will come. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I have a similar bias, but I'm becoming more and more intrigued. It's I think it was I think it was a great example. MS. MOTT: So when I think about this in a big picture, so I'm like you, Greg, I want to say something. When I think about the big picture is he was spot on about the industry, the tendency for, you know, the VCs	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>there's just a lot to be said about it. I'm just excited about it.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And I still worry a little bit about liquidity and how realistic additional capital raises are.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: On the liquidity issue, I mean just playing devil's advocate for a moment here, a lot of the guys who are buying the car they're not selling those shares. I mean, they love that company, they want to hold. They're buy and hold investors, they're not looking for a flip.</li> <li>And I think a lot of it's the same in a lot of this affinity play. I've seen a couple of there's a crowd funding company out there that is addressing type one diabetes in children. The people who are investing in that really don't care about liquidity. They care about this thing happening and that company succeeding. So I think to a certain extent let's not I mean, we're going to talk about liquidity this afternoon, but let's not say that liquidity is driving the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	answers made a lot of sense. I mean he's really exponentially using his own time and the market out there and cutting through a lot of the I guess rigmarole, and the one-on-ones, but he clearly also wanted to be public. And that's always been sort of a dilemma with me because I think IPOs are a great idea if that's your plan, and if that's your plan why would you do a Reg A+. So he's an example of somebody that sort of said I could do it quicker within the anticipated budget. His comment about the analysts is something that we talked about really in the first iteration of this committee as a reason why the IPOs aren't there, so hopefully more will come. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I have a similar bias, but I'm becoming more and more intrigued. It's I think it was I think it was a great example. MS. MOTT: So when I think about this in a big picture, so I'm like you, Greg, I want to say something. When I think about the big picture is he was spot on about the industry, the tendency for, you know, the VCs to, you know, to be trend oriented. And of course, you know, to some extent, you know, you could say they're	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>there's just a lot to be said about it. I'm just excited about it.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And I still worry a little bit about liquidity and how realistic additional capital raises are.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: On the liquidity issue, I mean just playing devil's advocate for a moment here, a lot of the guys who are buying the car they're not selling those shares. I mean, they love that company, they want to hold. They're buy and hold investors, they're not looking for a flip.</li> <li>And I think a lot of it's the same in a lot of this affinity play. I've seen a couple of there's a crowd funding company out there that is addressing type one diabetes in children. The people who are investing in that really don't care about liquidity. They care about this thing happening and that company succeeding. So I think to a certain extent let's not I mean, we're going to talk about liquidity this afternoon, but let's not say that liquidity is driving the investors. If you're if liquidity is a precondition to an investment in Reg A then I think that might not be</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>answers made a lot of sense. I mean he's really exponentially using his own time and the market out there and cutting through a lot of the I guess rigmarole, and the one-on-ones, but he clearly also wanted to be public. And that's always been sort of a dilemma with me because I think IPOs are a great idea if that's your plan, and if that's your plan why would you do a Reg A+. So he's an example of somebody that sort of said I could do it quicker within the anticipated budget. His comment about the analysts is something that we talked about really in the first iteration of this committee as a reason why the IPOs aren't there, so hopefully more will come.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I have a similar bias, but I'm becoming more and more intrigued. It's I think it was I think it was a great example.</li> <li>MS. MOTT: So when I think about this in a big picture, so I'm like you, Greg, I want to say something. When I think about the big picture is he was spot on about the industry, the tendency for, you know, the VCs to, you know, to be trend oriented. And of course, you know, to some extent, you know, you could say they're managing other people's money so there's some you</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>there's just a lot to be said about it. I'm just excited about it.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And I still worry a little bit about liquidity and how realistic additional capital raises are.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: On the liquidity issue, I mean just playing devil's advocate for a moment here, a lot of the guys who are buying the car they're not selling those shares. I mean, they love that company, they want to hold. They're buy and hold investors, they're not looking for a flip.</li> <li>And I think a lot of it's the same in a lot of this affinity play. I've seen a couple of – there's a crowd funding company out there that is addressing type one diabetes in children. The people who are investing in that really don't care about liquidity. They care about this thing happening and that company succeeding. So I think to a certain extent let's not – I mean, we're going to talk about liquidity this afternoon, but let's not say that liquidity is driving the investors. If you're – if liquidity is a precondition to an investment in Reg A then I think that might not be the ideal investor for that company because this is a</li> </ul>

	Dama 110		Dama 110
	Page 110		Page 112
1	liquidity issue, and this may be somewhere where we just	1	is we do need to focus on what the channels for
2	totally disagree.	2	liquidity are.
3	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No, I think if you have if	3	This is why we're pleased to have Dan Zinn from
4	it really is a buy an hold affinity play then of course	4	OTC Markets here to discuss some of these issues. The
5	it works. If you're debating whether you should go this	5	OTC Markets Group runs three marketplaces, OTCQX, OTCB
6	route or the traditional IPO route I think one of the	6	and OTC Pink based on the quality and quantity of
7	things you think about are attracting the kind of	7	information that the companies make available. They also
8	investors who are concerned about liquidity and at the	8	have an alternative trading system, OTC Link, and as we
9	same time they're concerned about as you know, you know,	9	heard this morning Elio is one of the companies that
10	building their own interests in companies. And so	10	trades on the OTCQX.
11	therefore they want enough stock out there so that you	11	Dan joined OTC Markets Group as general counsel
12	so that they can build a position.	12	and corporate secretary in November of 2010. Prior to
13	But, you know, liquidity is all part of the	13	joining OTC Markets he was partner at the Nelson Law Firm
14	equation. And so it just this will probably be part	14	LLC. And thank you very much for being here, Dan.
15	of the conversation this afternoon but it's and this	15	MR. ZINN: Thank you so much for having me. I
16	is this is one reason why we're doing what we're doing	16	really appreciate it and very much enjoyed the morning
17	and thinking about the things that we're thinking about	17	session as well.
18	is because one size doesn't fit all and we've got and	18	I certainly don't want to overpromise and under
19	that's part of that's part of expanding the toolbox,	19	deliver, but my very patient wife has listened to a
20	and that's part of it's part of the outreach efforts	20	number of these Reg A type presentations over the past
21	that are required. So it's I think it all fits.	21	couple of years and this is the first one that has kept
22	CO-CHAIR HANKS: There's just one thing I	22	her awake from beginning to end, so I think we may be in
23	wanted to mention before we wind up and I just wanted to	23	for a treat.
24	remind everybody, especially everyone watching out there	24	I like Paul Elio could talk about this sort of
25	in Internet land, Regulation A changed certain exemptions	25	thing for hours and hours, but in the interest of time
	Page 111		Page 113
1	Page 111 under 33 Act. Let's not forget that the broker/dealer	1	Page 113 I'm going to focus on what I think are a few key points
1 2		1 2	
	under 33 Act. Let's not forget that the broker/dealer		I'm going to focus on what I think are a few key points
2	under 33 Act. Let's not forget that the broker/dealer registration rules have not changed and Section 17(b),	2	I'm going to focus on what I think are a few key points to note, and then very much looking forward to all of
2 3	under 33 Act. Let's not forget that the broker/dealer registration rules have not changed and Section 17(b), which addresses stock touts for want of a better word, those things have changed. So make sure you talk to your lawyers before doing any of this stuff.	2 3	I'm going to focus on what I think are a few key points to note, and then very much looking forward to all of your questions.
2 3 4 5 6	under 33 Act. Let's not forget that the broker/dealer registration rules have not changed and Section 17(b), which addresses stock touts for want of a better word, those things have changed. So make sure you talk to your lawyers before doing any of this stuff. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I thought we changed that,	2 3 4 5 6	I'm going to focus on what I think are a few key points to note, and then very much looking forward to all of your questions. I'm going start with some background on OTC Markets. I think Sara set the stage for me nicely there. I want to talk more specifically about, you know, what
2 3 4 5 6 7	under 33 Act. Let's not forget that the broker/dealer registration rules have not changed and Section 17(b), which addresses stock touts for want of a better word, those things have changed. So make sure you talk to your lawyers before doing any of this stuff. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I thought we changed that, Greg. MR. YADLEY: Still working on it.	2 3 4 5 6 7	I'm going to focus on what I think are a few key points to note, and then very much looking forward to all of your questions. I'm going start with some background on OTC Markets. I think Sara set the stage for me nicely there. I want to talk more specifically about, you know, what we do and how that relates to Reg A, and why I'm the one
2 3 4 5 6	under 33 Act. Let's not forget that the broker/dealer registration rules have not changed and Section 17(b), which addresses stock touts for want of a better word, those things have changed. So make sure you talk to your lawyers before doing any of this stuff. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I thought we changed that, Greg. MR. YADLEY: Still working on it. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. Let's break for lunch,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	I'm going to focus on what I think are a few key points to note, and then very much looking forward to all of your questions. I'm going start with some background on OTC Markets. I think Sara set the stage for me nicely there. I want to talk more specifically about, you know, what we do and how that relates to Reg A, and why I'm the one who is here talking to you about secondary trading for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	under 33 Act. Let's not forget that the broker/dealer registration rules have not changed and Section 17(b), which addresses stock touts for want of a better word, those things have changed. So make sure you talk to your lawyers before doing any of this stuff. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I thought we changed that, Greg. MR. YADLEY: Still working on it. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. Let's break for lunch, reconvene at 1:30.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I'm going to focus on what I think are a few key points to note, and then very much looking forward to all of your questions. I'm going start with some background on OTC Markets. I think Sara set the stage for me nicely there. I want to talk more specifically about, you know, what we do and how that relates to Reg A, and why I'm the one who is here talking to you about secondary trading for Reg A securities ad how we interplay with that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	under 33 Act. Let's not forget that the broker/dealer registration rules have not changed and Section 17(b), which addresses stock touts for want of a better word, those things have changed. So make sure you talk to your lawyers before doing any of this stuff. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I thought we changed that, Greg. MR. YADLEY: Still working on it. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. Let's break for lunch, reconvene at 1:30. (Whereupon, at 11:52 a.m., a luncheon recess	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	I'm going to focus on what I think are a few key points to note, and then very much looking forward to all of your questions. I'm going start with some background on OTC Markets. I think Sara set the stage for me nicely there. I want to talk more specifically about, you know, what we do and how that relates to Reg A, and why I'm the one who is here talking to you about secondary trading for Reg A securities ad how we interplay with that. I want to talk a little bit more broadly about
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	under 33 Act. Let's not forget that the broker/dealer registration rules have not changed and Section 17(b), which addresses stock touts for want of a better word, those things have changed. So make sure you talk to your lawyers before doing any of this stuff. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I thought we changed that, Greg. MR. YADLEY: Still working on it. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. Let's break for lunch, reconvene at 1:30. (Whereupon, at 11:52 a.m., a luncheon recess was taken.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	I'm going to focus on what I think are a few key points to note, and then very much looking forward to all of your questions. I'm going start with some background on OTC Markets. I think Sara set the stage for me nicely there. I want to talk more specifically about, you know, what we do and how that relates to Reg A, and why I'm the one who is here talking to you about secondary trading for Reg A securities ad how we interplay with that. I want to talk a little bit more broadly about issues generally facing Reg A issuers. You get the
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	under 33 Act. Let's not forget that the broker/dealer registration rules have not changed and Section 17(b), which addresses stock touts for want of a better word, those things have changed. So make sure you talk to your lawyers before doing any of this stuff. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I thought we changed that, Greg. MR. YADLEY: Still working on it. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. Let's break for lunch, reconvene at 1:30. (Whereupon, at 11:52 a.m., a luncheon recess was taken.) AFTERNOON SESSION	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	I'm going to focus on what I think are a few key points to note, and then very much looking forward to all of your questions. I'm going start with some background on OTC Markets. I think Sara set the stage for me nicely there. I want to talk more specifically about, you know, what we do and how that relates to Reg A, and why I'm the one who is here talking to you about secondary trading for Reg A securities ad how we interplay with that. I want to talk a little bit more broadly about issues generally facing Reg A issuers. You get the impression from Paul and all of the entrepreneurs that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	under 33 Act. Let's not forget that the broker/dealer registration rules have not changed and Section 17(b), which addresses stock touts for want of a better word, those things have changed. So make sure you talk to your lawyers before doing any of this stuff. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I thought we changed that, Greg. MR. YADLEY: Still working on it. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. Let's break for lunch, reconvene at 1:30. (Whereupon, at 11:52 a.m., a luncheon recess was taken.) A F T E R N O O N S E S S I O N CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. Can I ask everyone to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I'm going to focus on what I think are a few key points to note, and then very much looking forward to all of your questions. I'm going start with some background on OTC Markets. I think Sara set the stage for me nicely there. I want to talk more specifically about, you know, what we do and how that relates to Reg A, and why I'm the one who is here talking to you about secondary trading for Reg A securities ad how we interplay with that. I want to talk a little bit more broadly about issues generally facing Reg A issuers. You get the impression from Paul and all of the entrepreneurs that I've spoken to that the focus, as it should be, is on the
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	under 33 Act. Let's not forget that the broker/dealer registration rules have not changed and Section 17(b), which addresses stock touts for want of a better word, those things have changed. So make sure you talk to your lawyers before doing any of this stuff. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I thought we changed that, Greg. MR. YADLEY: Still working on it. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. Let's break for lunch, reconvene at 1:30. (Whereupon, at 11:52 a.m., a luncheon recess was taken.) A F T E R N O O N S E S S I O N CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. Can I ask everyone to take their seats. I would like to get started.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	I'm going to focus on what I think are a few key points to note, and then very much looking forward to all of your questions. I'm going start with some background on OTC Markets. I think Sara set the stage for me nicely there. I want to talk more specifically about, you know, what we do and how that relates to Reg A, and why I'm the one who is here talking to you about secondary trading for Reg A securities ad how we interplay with that. I want to talk a little bit more broadly about issues generally facing Reg A issuers. You get the impression from Paul and all of the entrepreneurs that I've spoken to that the focus, as it should be, is on the offering, is on getting capital in the door. People want
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	under 33 Act. Let's not forget that the broker/dealer registration rules have not changed and Section 17(b), which addresses stock touts for want of a better word, those things have changed. So make sure you talk to your lawyers before doing any of this stuff. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I thought we changed that, Greg. MR. YADLEY: Still working on it. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. Let's break for lunch, reconvene at 1:30. (Whereupon, at 11:52 a.m., a luncheon recess was taken.) A F T E R N O O N S E S S I O N CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. Can I ask everyone to take their seats. I would like to get started. For this afternoon as you know we're going to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	I'm going to focus on what I think are a few key points to note, and then very much looking forward to all of your questions. I'm going start with some background on OTC Markets. I think Sara set the stage for me nicely there. I want to talk more specifically about, you know, what we do and how that relates to Reg A, and why I'm the one who is here talking to you about secondary trading for Reg A securities ad how we interplay with that. I want to talk a little bit more broadly about issues generally facing Reg A issuers. You get the impression from Paul and all of the entrepreneurs that I've spoken to that the focus, as it should be, is on the offering, is on getting capital in the door. People want to understand how they're going to fund their company and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	under 33 Act. Let's not forget that the broker/dealer registration rules have not changed and Section 17(b), which addresses stock touts for want of a better word, those things have changed. So make sure you talk to your lawyers before doing any of this stuff. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I thought we changed that, Greg. MR. YADLEY: Still working on it. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. Let's break for lunch, reconvene at 1:30. (Whereupon, at 11:52 a.m., a luncheon recess was taken.) A F T E R N O O N S E S S I O N CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. Can I ask everyone to take their seats. I would like to get started. For this afternoon as you know we're going to continue on with our Reg A discussion, and I'm going to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I'm going to focus on what I think are a few key points to note, and then very much looking forward to all of your questions. I'm going start with some background on OTC Markets. I think Sara set the stage for me nicely there. I want to talk more specifically about, you know, what we do and how that relates to Reg A, and why I'm the one who is here talking to you about secondary trading for Reg A securities ad how we interplay with that. I want to talk a little bit more broadly about issues generally facing Reg A issuers. You get the impression from Paul and all of the entrepreneurs that I've spoken to that the focus, as it should be, is on the offering, is on getting capital in the door. People want to understand how they're going to fund their company and take that to the next level. But with Reg A's there's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>under 33 Act. Let's not forget that the broker/dealer</li> <li>registration rules have not changed and Section 17(b),</li> <li>which addresses stock touts for want of a better word,</li> <li>those things have changed. So make sure you talk to your</li> <li>lawyers before doing any of this stuff.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I thought we changed that,</li> <li>Greg. MR. YADLEY: Still working on it.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. Let's break for lunch,</li> <li>reconvene at 1:30.</li> <li>(Whereupon, at 11:52 a.m., a luncheon recess</li> <li>was taken.)</li> <li>A F T E R N O O N S E S S I O N</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. Can I ask everyone to</li> <li>take their seats. I would like to get started.</li> <li>For this afternoon as you know we're going to</li> <li>continue on with our Reg A discussion, and I'm going to</li> <li>hand it back to Sara.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	I'm going to focus on what I think are a few key points to note, and then very much looking forward to all of your questions. I'm going start with some background on OTC Markets. I think Sara set the stage for me nicely there. I want to talk more specifically about, you know, what we do and how that relates to Reg A, and why I'm the one who is here talking to you about secondary trading for Reg A securities ad how we interplay with that. I want to talk a little bit more broadly about issues generally facing Reg A issuers. You get the impression from Paul and all of the entrepreneurs that I've spoken to that the focus, as it should be, is on the offering, is on getting capital in the door. People want to understand how they're going to fund their company and take that to the next level. But with Reg A's there's this entirely new process for a lot of these companies
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>under 33 Act. Let's not forget that the broker/dealer</li> <li>registration rules have not changed and Section 17(b),</li> <li>which addresses stock touts for want of a better word,</li> <li>those things have changed. So make sure you talk to your</li> <li>lawyers before doing any of this stuff.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I thought we changed that,</li> <li>Greg. MR. YADLEY: Still working on it.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. Let's break for lunch,</li> <li>reconvene at 1:30.</li> <li>(Whereupon, at 11:52 a.m., a luncheon recess</li> <li>was taken.)</li> <li>A F T E R N O O N S E S S I O N</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. Can I ask everyone to</li> <li>take their seats. I would like to get started.</li> <li>For this afternoon as you know we're going to</li> <li>continue on with our Reg A discussion, and I'm going to</li> <li>hand it back to Sara.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: Well, thanks. As you probably</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I'm going to focus on what I think are a few key points to note, and then very much looking forward to all of your questions. I'm going start with some background on OTC Markets. I think Sara set the stage for me nicely there. I want to talk more specifically about, you know, what we do and how that relates to Reg A, and why I'm the one who is here talking to you about secondary trading for Reg A securities ad how we interplay with that. I want to talk a little bit more broadly about issues generally facing Reg A issuers. You get the impression from Paul and all of the entrepreneurs that I've spoken to that the focus, as it should be, is on the offering, is on getting capital in the door. People want to understand how they're going to fund their company and take that to the next level. But with Reg A's there's this entirely new process for a lot of these companies and entrepreneurs of developing a secondary market and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>under 33 Act. Let's not forget that the broker/dealer</li> <li>registration rules have not changed and Section 17(b),</li> <li>which addresses stock touts for want of a better word,</li> <li>those things have changed. So make sure you talk to your</li> <li>lawyers before doing any of this stuff.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I thought we changed that,</li> <li>Greg. MR. YADLEY: Still working on it.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. Let's break for lunch,</li> <li>reconvene at 1:30.</li> <li>(Whereupon, at 11:52 a.m., a luncheon recess</li> <li>was taken.)</li> <li>A F T E R N O O N S E S S I O N</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. Can I ask everyone to</li> <li>take their seats. I would like to get started.</li> <li>For this afternoon as you know we're going to</li> <li>continue on with our Reg A discussion, and I'm going to</li> <li>hand it back to Sara.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: Well, thanks. As you probably</li> <li>saw towards the end of this morning's session the issue</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	I'm going to focus on what I think are a few key points to note, and then very much looking forward to all of your questions. I'm going start with some background on OTC Markets. I think Sara set the stage for me nicely there. I want to talk more specifically about, you know, what we do and how that relates to Reg A, and why I'm the one who is here talking to you about secondary trading for Reg A securities ad how we interplay with that. I want to talk a little bit more broadly about issues generally facing Reg A issuers. You get the impression from Paul and all of the entrepreneurs that I've spoken to that the focus, as it should be, is on the offering, is on getting capital in the door. People want to understand how they're going to fund their company and take that to the next level. But with Reg A's there's this entirely new process for a lot of these companies and entrepreneurs of developing a secondary market and interacting with investors. And there are a lot of steps
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>under 33 Act. Let's not forget that the broker/dealer</li> <li>registration rules have not changed and Section 17(b),</li> <li>which addresses stock touts for want of a better word,</li> <li>those things have changed. So make sure you talk to your</li> <li>lawyers before doing any of this stuff.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I thought we changed that,</li> <li>Greg. MR. YADLEY: Still working on it.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. Let's break for lunch,</li> <li>reconvene at 1:30.</li> <li>(Whereupon, at 11:52 a.m., a luncheon recess</li> <li>was taken.)</li> <li>A F T E R N O O N S E S S I O N</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. Can I ask everyone to</li> <li>take their seats. I would like to get started.</li> <li>For this afternoon as you know we're going to</li> <li>continue on with our Reg A discussion, and I'm going to</li> <li>hand it back to Sara.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: Well, thanks. As you probably</li> <li>saw towards the end of this morning's session the issue</li> <li>of liquidity is one that interests this committee a great</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I'm going to focus on what I think are a few key points to note, and then very much looking forward to all of your questions. I'm going start with some background on OTC Markets. I think Sara set the stage for me nicely there. I want to talk more specifically about, you know, what we do and how that relates to Reg A, and why I'm the one who is here talking to you about secondary trading for Reg A securities ad how we interplay with that. I want to talk a little bit more broadly about issues generally facing Reg A issuers. You get the impression from Paul and all of the entrepreneurs that I've spoken to that the focus, as it should be, is on the offering, is on getting capital in the door. People want to understand how they're going to fund their company and take that to the next level. But with Reg A's there's this entirely new process for a lot of these companies and entrepreneurs of developing a secondary market and interacting with investors. And there are a lot of steps in that process that need to be considered, and improving
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>under 33 Act. Let's not forget that the broker/dealer</li> <li>registration rules have not changed and Section 17(b),</li> <li>which addresses stock touts for want of a better word,</li> <li>those things have changed. So make sure you talk to your</li> <li>lawyers before doing any of this stuff.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I thought we changed that,</li> <li>Greg. MR. YADLEY: Still working on it.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. Let's break for lunch,</li> <li>reconvene at 1:30.</li> <li>(Whereupon, at 11:52 a.m., a luncheon recess</li> <li>was taken.)</li> <li>A F T E R N O O N S E S S I O N</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. Can I ask everyone to</li> <li>take their seats. I would like to get started.</li> <li>For this afternoon as you know we're going to</li> <li>continue on with our Reg A discussion, and I'm going to</li> <li>hand it back to Sara.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: Well, thanks. As you probably</li> <li>saw towards the end of this morning's session the issue</li> <li>of liquidity is one that interests this committee a great</li> <li>deal and the issue of liquidity and Regulation A is not</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I'm going to focus on what I think are a few key points to note, and then very much looking forward to all of your questions. I'm going start with some background on OTC Markets. I think Sara set the stage for me nicely there. I want to talk more specifically about, you know, what we do and how that relates to Reg A, and why I'm the one who is here talking to you about secondary trading for Reg A securities ad how we interplay with that. I want to talk a little bit more broadly about issues generally facing Reg A issuers. You get the impression from Paul and all of the entrepreneurs that I've spoken to that the focus, as it should be, is on the offering, is on getting capital in the door. People want to understand how they're going to fund their company and take that to the next level. But with Reg A's there's this entirely new process for a lot of these companies and entrepreneurs of developing a secondary market and interacting with investors. And there are a lot of steps in that process that need to be considered, and improving the way that works will I think lead to a little bit more
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>under 33 Act. Let's not forget that the broker/dealer</li> <li>registration rules have not changed and Section 17(b),</li> <li>which addresses stock touts for want of a better word,</li> <li>those things have changed. So make sure you talk to your</li> <li>lawyers before doing any of this stuff.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I thought we changed that,</li> <li>Greg. MR. YADLEY: Still working on it.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. Let's break for lunch,</li> <li>reconvene at 1:30.</li> <li>(Whereupon, at 11:52 a.m., a luncheon recess</li> <li>was taken.)</li> <li>A F T E R N O O N S E S S I O N</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. Can I ask everyone to</li> <li>take their seats. I would like to get started.</li> <li>For this afternoon as you know we're going to</li> <li>continue on with our Reg A discussion, and I'm going to</li> <li>hand it back to Sara.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: Well, thanks. As you probably</li> <li>saw towards the end of this morning's session the issue</li> <li>of liquidity is one that interests this committee a great</li> <li>deal and the issue of liquidity and Regulation A is not</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I'm going to focus on what I think are a few key points to note, and then very much looking forward to all of your questions. I'm going start with some background on OTC Markets. I think Sara set the stage for me nicely there. I want to talk more specifically about, you know, what we do and how that relates to Reg A, and why I'm the one who is here talking to you about secondary trading for Reg A securities ad how we interplay with that. I want to talk a little bit more broadly about issues generally facing Reg A issuers. You get the impression from Paul and all of the entrepreneurs that I've spoken to that the focus, as it should be, is on the offering, is on getting capital in the door. People want to understand how they're going to fund their company and take that to the next level. But with Reg A's there's this entirely new process for a lot of these companies and entrepreneurs of developing a secondary market and interacting with investors. And there are a lot of steps in that process that need to be considered, and improving the way that works will I think lead to a little bit more success in terms of Reg A offerings going forward.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>under 33 Act. Let's not forget that the broker/dealer registration rules have not changed and Section 17(b), which addresses stock touts for want of a better word, those things have changed. So make sure you talk to your lawyers before doing any of this stuff.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I thought we changed that, Greg. MR. YADLEY: Still working on it.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. Let's break for lunch, reconvene at 1:30.</li> <li>(Whereupon, at 11:52 a.m., a luncheon recess was taken.)</li> <li>A F T E R N O O N S E S S I O N</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. Can I ask everyone to take their seats. I would like to get started.</li> <li>For this afternoon as you know we're going to continue on with our Reg A discussion, and I'm going to hand it back to Sara.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: Well, thanks. As you probably saw towards the end of this morning's session the issue of liquidity is one that interests this committee a great deal and the issue of liquidity and Regulation A is not necessarily sort of cut and dried.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I'm going to focus on what I think are a few key points to note, and then very much looking forward to all of your questions. I'm going start with some background on OTC Markets. I think Sara set the stage for me nicely there. I want to talk more specifically about, you know, what we do and how that relates to Reg A, and why I'm the one who is here talking to you about secondary trading for Reg A securities ad how we interplay with that. I want to talk a little bit more broadly about issues generally facing Reg A issuers. You get the impression from Paul and all of the entrepreneurs that I've spoken to that the focus, as it should be, is on the offering, is on getting capital in the door. People want to understand how they're going to fund their company and take that to the next level. But with Reg A's there's this entirely new process for a lot of these companies and entrepreneurs of developing a secondary market and interacting with investors. And there are a lot of steps in that process that need to be considered, and improving the way that works will I think lead to a little bit more success in terms of Reg A offerings going forward. I will touch on some of my company's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>under 33 Act. Let's not forget that the broker/dealer</li> <li>registration rules have not changed and Section 17(b),</li> <li>which addresses stock touts for want of a better word,</li> <li>those things have changed. So make sure you talk to your</li> <li>lawyers before doing any of this stuff.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I thought we changed that,</li> <li>Greg. MR. YADLEY: Still working on it.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. Let's break for lunch,</li> <li>reconvene at 1:30.</li> <li>(Whereupon, at 11:52 a.m., a luncheon recess</li> <li>was taken.)</li> <li>A F T E R N O O N S E S S I O N</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. Can I ask everyone to</li> <li>take their seats. I would like to get started.</li> <li>For this afternoon as you know we're going to</li> <li>continue on with our Reg A discussion, and I'm going to</li> <li>hand it back to Sara.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: Well, thanks. As you probably</li> <li>saw towards the end of this morning's session the issue</li> <li>of liquidity is one that interests this committee a great</li> <li>deal and the issue of liquidity and Regulation A is not</li> <li>necessarily sort of cut and dried.</li> <li>We've always focused on the idea of liquidity</li> <li>in general. People aren't going to put money into a deal</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I'm going to focus on what I think are a few key points to note, and then very much looking forward to all of your questions. I'm going start with some background on OTC Markets. I think Sara set the stage for me nicely there. I want to talk more specifically about, you know, what we do and how that relates to Reg A, and why I'm the one who is here talking to you about secondary trading for Reg A securities ad how we interplay with that. I want to talk a little bit more broadly about issues generally facing Reg A issuers. You get the impression from Paul and all of the entrepreneurs that I've spoken to that the focus, as it should be, is on the offering, is on getting capital in the door. People want to understand how they're going to fund their company and take that to the next level. But with Reg A's there's this entirely new process for a lot of these companies and entrepreneurs of developing a secondary market and interacting with investors. And there are a lot of steps in that process that need to be considered, and improving the way that works will I think lead to a little bit more success in terms of Reg A offerings going forward. I will touch on some of my company's initiatives. Sara and Sebastian talked a little bit about
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>under 33 Act. Let's not forget that the broker/dealer registration rules have not changed and Section 17(b), which addresses stock touts for want of a better word, those things have changed. So make sure you talk to your lawyers before doing any of this stuff.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I thought we changed that, Greg. MR. YADLEY: Still working on it.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. Let's break for lunch, reconvene at 1:30.</li> <li>(Whereupon, at 11:52 a.m., a luncheon recess was taken.)</li> <li>A F T E R N O O N S E S S I O N</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. Can I ask everyone to take their seats. I would like to get started.</li> <li>For this afternoon as you know we're going to continue on with our Reg A discussion, and I'm going to hand it back to Sara.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: Well, thanks. As you probably saw towards the end of this morning's session the issue of liquidity is one that interests this committee a great deal and the issue of liquidity and Regulation A is not necessarily sort of cut and dried.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I'm going to focus on what I think are a few key points to note, and then very much looking forward to all of your questions. I'm going start with some background on OTC Markets. I think Sara set the stage for me nicely there. I want to talk more specifically about, you know, what we do and how that relates to Reg A, and why I'm the one who is here talking to you about secondary trading for Reg A securities ad how we interplay with that. I want to talk a little bit more broadly about issues generally facing Reg A issuers. You get the impression from Paul and all of the entrepreneurs that I've spoken to that the focus, as it should be, is on the offering, is on getting capital in the door. People want to understand how they're going to fund their company and take that to the next level. But with Reg A's there's this entirely new process for a lot of these companies and entrepreneurs of developing a secondary market and interacting with investors. And there are a lot of steps in that process that need to be considered, and improving the way that works will I think lead to a little bit more success in terms of Reg A offerings going forward. I will touch on some of my company's

	Page 114		Page 116
1	I'll touch on that a little bit and of course take any	1	companies that are ready to really engage with investors
2	questions that you all have.	2	and build a much larger potential market for their
3	And I will close briefly with a discussion of	3	securities.
4	the type of market that makes sense for a Reg A company	4	The way we've conceived of OTCQX all along has
5	or other similarly situated companies, kind of venture	5	been to allow issuers to leverage whatever other
6	stage companies, which has been a big topic of	6	disclosure requirements they might have and best use that
7	conversation both at the SEC and on Capitol Hill.	7	in an efficient manner to interact with investors to meet
8	So who are we? OTC Markets as Sara mentioned	8	current requirements. So OTCQX companies can certainly
9	operates an SEC registered alternative trading system	9	be SEC reporting and current, current in their reporting
10	known as OTC Link that brings together about 110 FINRA	10	to a banking regulator, or an insurance regulator, or to
11	member broker/dealer subscribers that use our system to	11	their home country to the extent it's a foreign company.
12	publicly quote and message one another for the purposes	12	We've also built rules to accommodate Reg A
13	of ultimately trading a group of about 10,000 over-the-	13	issuers. So you take the tier two ongoing disclosure
14	counter securities. So that's for the most part	14	that a company is required to provide and add a few extra
15	securities that are not otherwise traded on a listed	15	components that bring that disclosure up to the standard
16	exchange, like the New York Stock Exchange or NASDAQ.	16	of the remaining OTCQX companies that we have, things
17	Sara mentioned our market structure. We've	17	like quarterly reporting and the annual audit being done
18	separated companies into three markets based largely on	18	by a PCAOB registered auditors, and that company can
19	the disclosure aspect of their interaction with	19	qualify with the ongoing requirements for OTCQX. We did
20	investors, so the timelines and sufficiency. At the top	20	this fairly far in advance of OT excuse me of Reg A
21	levels there are some quantitative or qualitative	21	becoming effective with the idea that we wanted companies
22	qualifications as well. Just for context, OTCQX out of	22	to start to understand what their trading market might
23	the 10,000 securities has about 450 or so. OTCQB, which	23	look like.
24	is the next market down, it's what we consider really our	24	You can see on the slide some of the key
25	venture market, has a slightly different set of	25	qualifications, and I'm happy to talk about this more if
	Daga 115		
	Page 115		Page 117
1	quantitative requirements that are maybe more in line	1	Page 117 there's interest. Some of the things I'll highlight are
1 2		1	
	quantitative requirements that are maybe more in line	1	there's interest. Some of the things I'll highlight are
2	quantitative requirements that are maybe more in line with what we think of as a venture company starting out,	2	there's interest. Some of the things I'll highlight are just no penny stocks, and we use penny stocks as that's
2 3	quantitative requirements that are maybe more in line with what we think of as a venture company starting out, getting their feet wet in public trading, using this as a	2 3	there's interest. Some of the things I'll highlight are just no penny stocks, and we use penny stocks as that's defined under the Securities Act, no shell or blank check
2 3 4	quantitative requirements that are maybe more in line with what we think of as a venture company starting out, getting their feet wet in public trading, using this as a springboard to build and grow a public market. So there	2 3 4	there's interest. Some of the things I'll highlight are just no penny stocks, and we use penny stocks as that's defined under the Securities Act, no shell or blank check companies. OTCQX really is for operating companies.
2 3 4 5	quantitative requirements that are maybe more in line with what we think of as a venture company starting out, getting their feet wet in public trading, using this as a springboard to build and grow a public market. So there are about 900 securities on the OTCQB market.	2 3 4 5	there's interest. Some of the things I'll highlight are just no penny stocks, and we use penny stocks as that's defined under the Securities Act, no shell or blank check companies. OTCQX really is for operating companies. The other statistic that I will note from the
2 3 4 5 6	quantitative requirements that are maybe more in line with what we think of as a venture company starting out, getting their feet wet in public trading, using this as a springboard to build and grow a public market. So there are about 900 securities on the OTCQB market. The remaining securities trade on pink, which	2 3 4 5 6	there's interest. Some of the things I'll highlight are just no penny stocks, and we use penny stocks as that's defined under the Securities Act, no shell or blank check companies. OTCQX really is for operating companies. The other statistic that I will note from the slide is the \$58 million median market cap of OTCQX
2 3 4 5 6 7	quantitative requirements that are maybe more in line with what we think of as a venture company starting out, getting their feet wet in public trading, using this as a springboard to build and grow a public market. So there are about 900 securities on the OTCQB market. The remaining securities trade on pink, which I'm not going to focus on all that much for purposes of our discussion, but it exists as a broker quoted market. So our subscribers have customers have potentially	2 3 4 5 6 7	there's interest. Some of the things I'll highlight are just no penny stocks, and we use penny stocks as that's defined under the Securities Act, no shell or blank check companies. OTCQX really is for operating companies. The other statistic that I will note from the slide is the \$58 million median market cap of OTCQX securities. As you look at other venture markets around the world, the smaller company markets, and I'll touch on this towards the end, something like the TSX Venture in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	quantitative requirements that are maybe more in line with what we think of as a venture company starting out, getting their feet wet in public trading, using this as a springboard to build and grow a public market. So there are about 900 securities on the OTCQB market. The remaining securities trade on pink, which I'm not going to focus on all that much for purposes of our discussion, but it exists as a broker quoted market. So our subscribers have customers have potentially proprietary interest in quoting and trading these	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	there's interest. Some of the things I'll highlight are just no penny stocks, and we use penny stocks as that's defined under the Securities Act, no shell or blank check companies. OTCQX really is for operating companies. The other statistic that I will note from the slide is the \$58 million median market cap of OTCQX securities. As you look at other venture markets around the world, the smaller company markets, and I'll touch on this towards the end, something like the TSX Venture in Canada has a 5 or \$10 million median market cap. So it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	quantitative requirements that are maybe more in line with what we think of as a venture company starting out, getting their feet wet in public trading, using this as a springboard to build and grow a public market. So there are about 900 securities on the OTCQB market. The remaining securities trade on pink, which I'm not going to focus on all that much for purposes of our discussion, but it exists as a broker quoted market. So our subscribers have customers have potentially proprietary interest in quoting and trading these securities. They have best execution obligations. You	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	there's interest. Some of the things I'll highlight are just no penny stocks, and we use penny stocks as that's defined under the Securities Act, no shell or blank check companies. OTCQX really is for operating companies. The other statistic that I will note from the slide is the \$58 million median market cap of OTCQX securities. As you look at other venture markets around the world, the smaller company markets, and I'll touch on this towards the end, something like the TSX Venture in Canada has a 5 or \$10 million median market cap. So it's a different kind for security.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	quantitative requirements that are maybe more in line with what we think of as a venture company starting out, getting their feet wet in public trading, using this as a springboard to build and grow a public market. So there are about 900 securities on the OTCQB market. The remaining securities trade on pink, which I'm not going to focus on all that much for purposes of our discussion, but it exists as a broker quoted market. So our subscribers have customers have potentially proprietary interest in quoting and trading these securities. They have best execution obligations. You know, they have they have to provide good, efficient	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	there's interest. Some of the things I'll highlight are just no penny stocks, and we use penny stocks as that's defined under the Securities Act, no shell or blank check companies. OTCQX really is for operating companies. The other statistic that I will note from the slide is the \$58 million median market cap of OTCQX securities. As you look at other venture markets around the world, the smaller company markets, and I'll touch on this towards the end, something like the TSX Venture in Canada has a 5 or \$10 million median market cap. So it's a different kind for security. You see a little bit more of a one-to-one
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	quantitative requirements that are maybe more in line with what we think of as a venture company starting out, getting their feet wet in public trading, using this as a springboard to build and grow a public market. So there are about 900 securities on the OTCQB market. The remaining securities trade on pink, which I'm not going to focus on all that much for purposes of our discussion, but it exists as a broker quoted market. So our subscribers have customers have potentially proprietary interest in quoting and trading these securities. They have best execution obligations. You know, they have they have to provide good, efficient service to their customers in terms of trading these	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	there's interest. Some of the things I'll highlight are just no penny stocks, and we use penny stocks as that's defined under the Securities Act, no shell or blank check companies. OTCQX really is for operating companies. The other statistic that I will note from the slide is the \$58 million median market cap of OTCQX securities. As you look at other venture markets around the world, the smaller company markets, and I'll touch on this towards the end, something like the TSX Venture in Canada has a 5 or \$10 million median market cap. So it's a different kind for security. You see a little bit more of a one-to-one correlation with OTCQB, which I'll describe in a moment.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	quantitative requirements that are maybe more in line with what we think of as a venture company starting out, getting their feet wet in public trading, using this as a springboard to build and grow a public market. So there are about 900 securities on the OTCQB market. The remaining securities trade on pink, which I'm not going to focus on all that much for purposes of our discussion, but it exists as a broker quoted market. So our subscribers have customers have potentially proprietary interest in quoting and trading these securities. They have best execution obligations. You know, they have they have to provide good, efficient service to their customers in terms of trading these securities.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	there's interest. Some of the things I'll highlight are just no penny stocks, and we use penny stocks as that's defined under the Securities Act, no shell or blank check companies. OTCQX really is for operating companies. The other statistic that I will note from the slide is the \$58 million median market cap of OTCQX securities. As you look at other venture markets around the world, the smaller company markets, and I'll touch on this towards the end, something like the TSX Venture in Canada has a 5 or \$10 million median market cap. So it's a different kind for security. You see a little bit more of a one-to-one correlation with OTCQB, which I'll describe in a moment. But I just want to make sure everyone has the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	quantitative requirements that are maybe more in line with what we think of as a venture company starting out, getting their feet wet in public trading, using this as a springboard to build and grow a public market. So there are about 900 securities on the OTCQB market. The remaining securities trade on pink, which I'm not going to focus on all that much for purposes of our discussion, but it exists as a broker quoted market. So our subscribers have customers have potentially proprietary interest in quoting and trading these securities. They have best execution obligations. You know, they have they have to provide good, efficient service to their customers in terms of trading these securities.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	there's interest. Some of the things I'll highlight are just no penny stocks, and we use penny stocks as that's defined under the Securities Act, no shell or blank check companies. OTCQX really is for operating companies. The other statistic that I will note from the slide is the \$58 million median market cap of OTCQX securities. As you look at other venture markets around the world, the smaller company markets, and I'll touch on this towards the end, something like the TSX Venture in Canada has a 5 or \$10 million median market cap. So it's a different kind for security. You see a little bit more of a one-to-one correlation with OTCQB, which I'll describe in a moment. But I just want to make sure everyone has the appropriate kind of picture of what an OTCQX company is.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	quantitative requirements that are maybe more in line with what we think of as a venture company starting out, getting their feet wet in public trading, using this as a springboard to build and grow a public market. So there are about 900 securities on the OTCQB market. The remaining securities trade on pink, which I'm not going to focus on all that much for purposes of our discussion, but it exists as a broker quoted market. So our subscribers have customers have potentially proprietary interest in quoting and trading these securities. They have best execution obligations. You know, they have they have to provide good, efficient service to their customers in terms of trading these securities. A lot of them are quoted on our pink market. We will indicate on pink whether a security or a company	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	there's interest. Some of the things I'll highlight are just no penny stocks, and we use penny stocks as that's defined under the Securities Act, no shell or blank check companies. OTCQX really is for operating companies. The other statistic that I will note from the slide is the \$58 million median market cap of OTCQX securities. As you look at other venture markets around the world, the smaller company markets, and I'll touch on this towards the end, something like the TSX Venture in Canada has a 5 or \$10 million median market cap. So it's a different kind for security. You see a little bit more of a one-to-one correlation with OTCQB, which I'll describe in a moment. But I just want to make sure everyone has the appropriate kind of picture of what an OTCQX company is. We have of course done some studies on what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	quantitative requirements that are maybe more in line with what we think of as a venture company starting out, getting their feet wet in public trading, using this as a springboard to build and grow a public market. So there are about 900 securities on the OTCQB market. The remaining securities trade on pink, which I'm not going to focus on all that much for purposes of our discussion, but it exists as a broker quoted market. So our subscribers have customers have potentially proprietary interest in quoting and trading these securities. They have best execution obligations. You know, they have they have to provide good, efficient service to their customers in terms of trading these securities. A lot of them are quoted on our pink market. We will indicate on pink whether a security or a company is publishing current information as it relates to their	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	there's interest. Some of the things I'll highlight are just no penny stocks, and we use penny stocks as that's defined under the Securities Act, no shell or blank check companies. OTCQX really is for operating companies. The other statistic that I will note from the slide is the \$58 million median market cap of OTCQX securities. As you look at other venture markets around the world, the smaller company markets, and I'll touch on this towards the end, something like the TSX Venture in Canada has a 5 or \$10 million median market cap. So it's a different kind for security. You see a little bit more of a one-to-one correlation with OTCQB, which I'll describe in a moment. But I just want to make sure everyone has the appropriate kind of picture of what an OTCQX company is. We have of course done some studies on what happens with OTCQX companies. This was an independent
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	quantitative requirements that are maybe more in line with what we think of as a venture company starting out, getting their feet wet in public trading, using this as a springboard to build and grow a public market. So there are about 900 securities on the OTCQB market. The remaining securities trade on pink, which I'm not going to focus on all that much for purposes of our discussion, but it exists as a broker quoted market. So our subscribers have customers have potentially proprietary interest in quoting and trading these securities. They have best execution obligations. You know, they have they have to provide good, efficient service to their customers in terms of trading these securities. A lot of them are quoted on our pink market. We will indicate on pink whether a security or a company is publishing current information as it relates to their company, a listed set of information or no information,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	there's interest. Some of the things I'll highlight are just no penny stocks, and we use penny stocks as that's defined under the Securities Act, no shell or blank check companies. OTCQX really is for operating companies. The other statistic that I will note from the slide is the \$58 million median market cap of OTCQX securities. As you look at other venture markets around the world, the smaller company markets, and I'll touch on this towards the end, something like the TSX Venture in Canada has a 5 or \$10 million median market cap. So it's a different kind for security. You see a little bit more of a one-to-one correlation with OTCQB, which I'll describe in a moment. But I just want to make sure everyone has the appropriate kind of picture of what an OTCQX company is. We have of course done some studies on what happens with OTCQX companies. This was an independent study through Oxford Metrica that we commissioned. The
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	quantitative requirements that are maybe more in line with what we think of as a venture company starting out, getting their feet wet in public trading, using this as a springboard to build and grow a public market. So there are about 900 securities on the OTCQB market. The remaining securities trade on pink, which I'm not going to focus on all that much for purposes of our discussion, but it exists as a broker quoted market. So our subscribers have customers have potentially proprietary interest in quoting and trading these securities. They have best execution obligations. You know, they have they have to provide good, efficient service to their customers in terms of trading these securities. A lot of them are quoted on our pink market. We will indicate on pink whether a security or a company is publishing current information as it relates to their company, a listed set of information or no information, which actually appears with a stop sign next to the stock	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	there's interest. Some of the things I'll highlight are just no penny stocks, and we use penny stocks as that's defined under the Securities Act, no shell or blank check companies. OTCQX really is for operating companies. The other statistic that I will note from the slide is the \$58 million median market cap of OTCQX securities. As you look at other venture markets around the world, the smaller company markets, and I'll touch on this towards the end, something like the TSX Venture in Canada has a 5 or \$10 million median market cap. So it's a different kind for security. You see a little bit more of a one-to-one correlation with OTCQB, which I'll describe in a moment. But I just want to make sure everyone has the appropriate kind of picture of what an OTCQX company is. We have of course done some studies on what happens with OTCQX companies. This was an independent study through Oxford Metrica that we commissioned. The general counsel in me feels obligated to say that there
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	quantitative requirements that are maybe more in line with what we think of as a venture company starting out, getting their feet wet in public trading, using this as a springboard to build and grow a public market. So there are about 900 securities on the OTCQB market. The remaining securities trade on pink, which I'm not going to focus on all that much for purposes of our discussion, but it exists as a broker quoted market. So our subscribers have customers have potentially proprietary interest in quoting and trading these securities. They have best execution obligations. You know, they have they have to provide good, efficient service to their customers in terms of trading these securities. A lot of them are quoted on our pink market. We will indicate on pink whether a security or a company is publishing current information as it relates to their company, a listed set of information or no information, which actually appears with a stop sign next to the stock symbol on our website. So we do offer the kind of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	there's interest. Some of the things I'll highlight are just no penny stocks, and we use penny stocks as that's defined under the Securities Act, no shell or blank check companies. OTCQX really is for operating companies. The other statistic that I will note from the slide is the \$58 million median market cap of OTCQX securities. As you look at other venture markets around the world, the smaller company markets, and I'll touch on this towards the end, something like the TSX Venture in Canada has a 5 or \$10 million median market cap. So it's a different kind for security. You see a little bit more of a one-to-one correlation with OTCQB, which I'll describe in a moment. But I just want to make sure everyone has the appropriate kind of picture of what an OTCQX company is. We have of course done some studies on what happens with OTCQX companies. This was an independent study through Oxford Metrica that we commissioned. The general counsel in me feels obligated to say that there is no guarantee that anybody will trade in any given way
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	quantitative requirements that are maybe more in line with what we think of as a venture company starting out, getting their feet wet in public trading, using this as a springboard to build and grow a public market. So there are about 900 securities on the OTCQB market. The remaining securities trade on pink, which I'm not going to focus on all that much for purposes of our discussion, but it exists as a broker quoted market. So our subscribers have customers have potentially proprietary interest in quoting and trading these securities. They have best execution obligations. You know, they have they have to provide good, efficient service to their customers in terms of trading these securities. A lot of them are quoted on our pink market. We will indicate on pink whether a security or a company is publishing current information as it relates to their company, a listed set of information or no information, which actually appears with a stop sign next to the stock symbol on our website. So we do offer the kind of investor background and whatever information is made	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	there's interest. Some of the things I'll highlight are just no penny stocks, and we use penny stocks as that's defined under the Securities Act, no shell or blank check companies. OTCQX really is for operating companies. The other statistic that I will note from the slide is the \$58 million median market cap of OTCQX securities. As you look at other venture markets around the world, the smaller company markets, and I'll touch on this towards the end, something like the TSX Venture in Canada has a 5 or \$10 million median market cap. So it's a different kind for security. You see a little bit more of a one-to-one correlation with OTCQB, which I'll describe in a moment. But I just want to make sure everyone has the appropriate kind of picture of what an OTCQX company is. We have of course done some studies on what happens with OTCQX companies. This was an independent study through Oxford Metrica that we commissioned. The general counsel in me feels obligated to say that there is no guarantee that anybody will trade in any given way on OTCQX or otherwise, but in a broad based study it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	quantitative requirements that are maybe more in line with what we think of as a venture company starting out, getting their feet wet in public trading, using this as a springboard to build and grow a public market. So there are about 900 securities on the OTCQB market. The remaining securities trade on pink, which I'm not going to focus on all that much for purposes of our discussion, but it exists as a broker quoted market. So our subscribers have customers have potentially proprietary interest in quoting and trading these securities. They have best execution obligations. You know, they have they have to provide good, efficient service to their customers in terms of trading these securities. A lot of them are quoted on our pink market. We will indicate on pink whether a security or a company is publishing current information as it relates to their company, a listed set of information or no information, which actually appears with a stop sign next to the stock symbol on our website. So we do offer the kind of investor background and whatever information is made available is obviously there for investors to review.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	there's interest. Some of the things I'll highlight are just no penny stocks, and we use penny stocks as that's defined under the Securities Act, no shell or blank check companies. OTCQX really is for operating companies. The other statistic that I will note from the slide is the \$58 million median market cap of OTCQX securities. As you look at other venture markets around the world, the smaller company markets, and I'll touch on this towards the end, something like the TSX Venture in Canada has a 5 or \$10 million median market cap. So it's a different kind for security. You see a little bit more of a one-to-one correlation with OTCQB, which I'll describe in a moment. But I just want to make sure everyone has the appropriate kind of picture of what an OTCQX company is. We have of course done some studies on what happens with OTCQX companies. This was an independent study through Oxford Metrica that we commissioned. The general counsel in me feels obligated to say that there is no guarantee that anybody will trade in any given way on OTCQX or otherwise, but in a broad based study it's nice to see that there are benefits that most companies
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	quantitative requirements that are maybe more in line with what we think of as a venture company starting out, getting their feet wet in public trading, using this as a springboard to build and grow a public market. So there are about 900 securities on the OTCQB market. The remaining securities trade on pink, which I'm not going to focus on all that much for purposes of our discussion, but it exists as a broker quoted market. So our subscribers have customers have potentially proprietary interest in quoting and trading these securities. They have best execution obligations. You know, they have they have to provide good, efficient service to their customers in terms of trading these securities. A lot of them are quoted on our pink market. We will indicate on pink whether a security or a company is publishing current information as it relates to their company, a listed set of information or no information, which actually appears with a stop sign next to the stock symbol on our website. So we do offer the kind of investor background and whatever information is made available is obviously there for investors to review.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	there's interest. Some of the things I'll highlight are just no penny stocks, and we use penny stocks as that's defined under the Securities Act, no shell or blank check companies. OTCQX really is for operating companies. The other statistic that I will note from the slide is the \$58 million median market cap of OTCQX securities. As you look at other venture markets around the world, the smaller company markets, and I'll touch on this towards the end, something like the TSX Venture in Canada has a 5 or \$10 million median market cap. So it's a different kind for security. You see a little bit more of a one-to-one correlation with OTCQB, which I'll describe in a moment. But I just want to make sure everyone has the appropriate kind of picture of what an OTCQX company is. We have of course done some studies on what happens with OTCQX companies. This was an independent study through Oxford Metrica that we commissioned. The general counsel in me feels obligated to say that there is no guarantee that anybody will trade in any given way on OTCQX or otherwise, but in a broad based study it's nice to see that there are benefits that most companies realize from trading on a market that has standards, that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	quantitative requirements that are maybe more in line with what we think of as a venture company starting out, getting their feet wet in public trading, using this as a springboard to build and grow a public market. So there are about 900 securities on the OTCQB market. The remaining securities trade on pink, which I'm not going to focus on all that much for purposes of our discussion, but it exists as a broker quoted market. So our subscribers have customers have potentially proprietary interest in quoting and trading these securities. They have best execution obligations. You know, they have they have to provide good, efficient service to their customers in terms of trading these securities. A lot of them are quoted on our pink market. We will indicate on pink whether a security or a company is publishing current information as it relates to their company, a listed set of information or no information, which actually appears with a stop sign next to the stock symbol on our website. So we do offer the kind of investor background and whatever information is made available is obviously there for investors to review. Diving in a little bit more to how this interacts with OTCQX and Reg A. So OTCQX is for more	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	there's interest. Some of the things I'll highlight are just no penny stocks, and we use penny stocks as that's defined under the Securities Act, no shell or blank check companies. OTCQX really is for operating companies. The other statistic that I will note from the slide is the \$58 million median market cap of OTCQX securities. As you look at other venture markets around the world, the smaller company markets, and I'll touch on this towards the end, something like the TSX Venture in Canada has a 5 or \$10 million median market cap. So it's a different kind for security. You see a little bit more of a one-to-one correlation with OTCQB, which I'll describe in a moment. But I just want to make sure everyone has the appropriate kind of picture of what an OTCQX company is. We have of course done some studies on what happens with OTCQX companies. This was an independent study through Oxford Metrica that we commissioned. The general counsel in me feels obligated to say that there is no guarantee that anybody will trade in any given way on OTCQX or otherwise, but in a broad based study it's nice to see that there are benefits that most companies realize from trading on a market that has standards, that requires this kind of disclosure, that allows investors
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	quantitative requirements that are maybe more in line with what we think of as a venture company starting out, getting their feet wet in public trading, using this as a springboard to build and grow a public market. So there are about 900 securities on the OTCQB market. The remaining securities trade on pink, which I'm not going to focus on all that much for purposes of our discussion, but it exists as a broker quoted market. So our subscribers have customers have potentially proprietary interest in quoting and trading these securities. They have best execution obligations. You know, they have they have to provide good, efficient service to their customers in terms of trading these securities. A lot of them are quoted on our pink market. We will indicate on pink whether a security or a company is publishing current information as it relates to their company, a listed set of information or no information, which actually appears with a stop sign next to the stock symbol on our website. So we do offer the kind of investor background and whatever information is made available is obviously there for investors to review.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	there's interest. Some of the things I'll highlight are just no penny stocks, and we use penny stocks as that's defined under the Securities Act, no shell or blank check companies. OTCQX really is for operating companies. The other statistic that I will note from the slide is the \$58 million median market cap of OTCQX securities. As you look at other venture markets around the world, the smaller company markets, and I'll touch on this towards the end, something like the TSX Venture in Canada has a 5 or \$10 million median market cap. So it's a different kind for security. You see a little bit more of a one-to-one correlation with OTCQB, which I'll describe in a moment. But I just want to make sure everyone has the appropriate kind of picture of what an OTCQX company is. We have of course done some studies on what happens with OTCQX companies. This was an independent study through Oxford Metrica that we commissioned. The general counsel in me feels obligated to say that there is no guarantee that anybody will trade in any given way on OTCQX or otherwise, but in a broad based study it's nice to see that there are benefits that most companies realize from trading on a market that has standards, that

	Page 118		Page 120
1	understand the steps a company is taking to establish its	1	their depositors, they can focus on their regulatory
2	public market.	2	requirements. Because, you know, as banks they have
3	Things like narrower bid ask spreads and more	3	their plates full with those kinds of things and they use
4	broker/dealers coming to the market are the result of	4	our markets as a way to continue to engage investors and
5	education and a comfort level, and that's a common theme	5	show that they're providing current information.
6	that I think is going to help drive Reg A securities and	6	I won't get too deep into the weeds unless
7	make people comfortable with how that process works. If	7	people are interested, in which case I'll have to book a
8	you understand what the marketplace is as a broker, or a	8	hotel room for tonight, about how trading actually works,
9	clearing firm, or an advisor you're going to be much more	9	you know, kind of the behind the scenes market structure.
10	likely to engage in that kind of offering or advise your	10	But I think it's instructive just to note the
11	client to do so.	11	
		1	differences between the way our market operates versus
12 13	I'll touch on OTCQB. Again the thing to note here a \$12 million median market cap. So that's much	12 13	what most people are familiar with, a traditional exchange.
14	more in line with some of the other venture markets round	14	Our market is a network model, so it is what I
		1	*
15	the world. Here because of the types of companies that	15	described earlier. It is a group of FINRA member
16	really would make up the OTCQB profile we've allowed	16	broker/dealers that post attributable quotes, meaning the
17	companies to take their tier two ongoing disclosure and	17	people on the bid side can see who the people on the
18	just use that as their qualifying disclosure for OTCQB.	18	offer side are. They use our facility to communicate.
19	So there is no additional quarterly filing requirement.	19	They can negotiate trades and ultimately it's the broker,
20	As long as they are following the rules set forth by the	20	it's the end point, not us, that is executing the
21	SEC in relation to Reg A they're permitted to quote on	21	transaction. It really helps facilitate communication
22	OTCQB.	22	between liquidity seekers and liquidity providers.
23	This is one of my favorite slides. One of the	23	The exchanges operate in a central limit order
24	things that we think about in terms of the role that our	24	book, a matching engine function where a broker/dealer
25	market plays and the role of the venture market generally	25	submits an order to the exchange. That order gets
	Page 119		Page 121
1		1	
1 2	is what's happening to companies after they trade there.	1	Page 121 executed. The broker does not know who is on the other side of it. For the most part they don't care. When
		1	executed. The broker does not know who is on the other side of it. For the most part they don't care. When
2	is what's happening to companies after they trade there. We celebrate when companies what we call graduate from our markets and move to the New York Stock Exchange or	2	executed. The broker does not know who is on the other side of it. For the most part they don't care. When you're trading Apple, and Google and Microsoft that is a
2 3	is what's happening to companies after they trade there. We celebrate when companies what we call graduate from	2 3	executed. The broker does not know who is on the other side of it. For the most part they don't care. When
2 3 4	is what's happening to companies after they trade there. We celebrate when companies what we call graduate from our markets and move to the New York Stock Exchange or NASDAQ. We've had over 200 of those events over the past	2 3 4	executed. The broker does not know who is on the other side of it. For the most part they don't care. When you're trading Apple, and Google and Microsoft that is a perfectly fine way to trade, probably the best model that's been developed. You pay a little fee to the
2 3 4 5	is what's happening to companies after they trade there. We celebrate when companies what we call graduate from our markets and move to the New York Stock Exchange or NASDAQ. We've had over 200 of those events over the past few years and as much as it is in most cases a good, a	2 3 4 5	executed. The broker does not know who is on the other side of it. For the most part they don't care. When you're trading Apple, and Google and Microsoft that is a perfectly fine way to trade, probably the best model
2 3 4 5 6	is what's happening to companies after they trade there. We celebrate when companies what we call graduate from our markets and move to the New York Stock Exchange or NASDAQ. We've had over 200 of those events over the past few years and as much as it is in most cases a good, a strong company leaving our markets to go somewhere else,	2 3 4 5 6	executed. The broker does not know who is on the other side of it. For the most part they don't care. When you're trading Apple, and Google and Microsoft that is a perfectly fine way to trade, probably the best model that's been developed. You pay a little fee to the exchange for the privilege of executing the transaction
2 3 4 5 6 7	is what's happening to companies after they trade there. We celebrate when companies what we call graduate from our markets and move to the New York Stock Exchange or NASDAQ. We've had over 200 of those events over the past few years and as much as it is in most cases a good, a strong company leaving our markets to go somewhere else, it inevitably leads to two or three phone calls from	2 3 4 5 6 7	executed. The broker does not know who is on the other side of it. For the most part they don't care. When you're trading Apple, and Google and Microsoft that is a perfectly fine way to trade, probably the best model that's been developed. You pay a little fee to the exchange for the privilege of executing the transaction and you're on your way.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	is what's happening to companies after they trade there. We celebrate when companies what we call graduate from our markets and move to the New York Stock Exchange or NASDAQ. We've had over 200 of those events over the past few years and as much as it is in most cases a good, a strong company leaving our markets to go somewhere else, it inevitably leads to two or three phone calls from companies in a similar industry or similar geographic	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	executed. The broker does not know who is on the other side of it. For the most part they don't care. When you're trading Apple, and Google and Microsoft that is a perfectly fine way to trade, probably the best model that's been developed. You pay a little fee to the exchange for the privilege of executing the transaction and you're on your way. Where companies need a little bit more support,
2 3 4 5 7 8 9	is what's happening to companies after they trade there. We celebrate when companies what we call graduate from our markets and move to the New York Stock Exchange or NASDAQ. We've had over 200 of those events over the past few years and as much as it is in most cases a good, a strong company leaving our markets to go somewhere else, it inevitably leads to two or three phone calls from companies in a similar industry or similar geographic location saying that's a great story. That's my end	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	executed. The broker does not know who is on the other side of it. For the most part they don't care. When you're trading Apple, and Google and Microsoft that is a perfectly fine way to trade, probably the best model that's been developed. You pay a little fee to the exchange for the privilege of executing the transaction and you're on your way. Where companies need a little bit more support, need the dealer support either with their customer base
2 3 6 7 8 9 10	is what's happening to companies after they trade there. We celebrate when companies what we call graduate from our markets and move to the New York Stock Exchange or NASDAQ. We've had over 200 of those events over the past few years and as much as it is in most cases a good, a strong company leaving our markets to go somewhere else, it inevitably leads to two or three phone calls from companies in a similar industry or similar geographic location saying that's a great story. That's my end goal. How does how do you do that? Can I work with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	executed. The broker does not know who is on the other side of it. For the most part they don't care. When you're trading Apple, and Google and Microsoft that is a perfectly fine way to trade, probably the best model that's been developed. You pay a little fee to the exchange for the privilege of executing the transaction and you're on your way. Where companies need a little bit more support, need the dealer support either with their customer base or the dealer proprietary interest, a dealer market
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	is what's happening to companies after they trade there. We celebrate when companies what we call graduate from our markets and move to the New York Stock Exchange or NASDAQ. We've had over 200 of those events over the past few years and as much as it is in most cases a good, a strong company leaving our markets to go somewhere else, it inevitably leads to two or three phone calls from companies in a similar industry or similar geographic location saying that's a great story. That's my end goal. How does how do you do that? Can I work with your markets in order to achieve that result?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	executed. The broker does not know who is on the other side of it. For the most part they don't care. When you're trading Apple, and Google and Microsoft that is a perfectly fine way to trade, probably the best model that's been developed. You pay a little fee to the exchange for the privilege of executing the transaction and you're on your way. Where companies need a little bit more support, need the dealer support either with their customer base or the dealer proprietary interest, a dealer market allows for that kind of optionality and has proven
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	is what's happening to companies after they trade there. We celebrate when companies what we call graduate from our markets and move to the New York Stock Exchange or NASDAQ. We've had over 200 of those events over the past few years and as much as it is in most cases a good, a strong company leaving our markets to go somewhere else, it inevitably leads to two or three phone calls from companies in a similar industry or similar geographic location saying that's a great story. That's my end goal. How does how do you do that? Can I work with your markets in order to achieve that result? And we view that as a key component to what we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	executed. The broker does not know who is on the other side of it. For the most part they don't care. When you're trading Apple, and Google and Microsoft that is a perfectly fine way to trade, probably the best model that's been developed. You pay a little fee to the exchange for the privilege of executing the transaction and you're on your way. Where companies need a little bit more support, need the dealer support either with their customer base or the dealer proprietary interest, a dealer market allows for that kind of optionality and has proven I'll get into some academic studies towards the end, but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	is what's happening to companies after they trade there. We celebrate when companies what we call graduate from our markets and move to the New York Stock Exchange or NASDAQ. We've had over 200 of those events over the past few years and as much as it is in most cases a good, a strong company leaving our markets to go somewhere else, it inevitably leads to two or three phone calls from companies in a similar industry or similar geographic location saying that's a great story. That's my end goal. How does how do you do that? Can I work with your markets in order to achieve that result? And we view that as a key component to what we do, and so we're very proud of the way that that's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	executed. The broker does not know who is on the other side of it. For the most part they don't care. When you're trading Apple, and Google and Microsoft that is a perfectly fine way to trade, probably the best model that's been developed. You pay a little fee to the exchange for the privilege of executing the transaction and you're on your way. Where companies need a little bit more support, need the dealer support either with their customer base or the dealer proprietary interest, a dealer market allows for that kind of optionality and has proven I'll get into some academic studies towards the end, but has proven to be a better model for smaller company
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	is what's happening to companies after they trade there. We celebrate when companies what we call graduate from our markets and move to the New York Stock Exchange or NASDAQ. We've had over 200 of those events over the past few years and as much as it is in most cases a good, a strong company leaving our markets to go somewhere else, it inevitably leads to two or three phone calls from companies in a similar industry or similar geographic location saying that's a great story. That's my end goal. How does how do you do that? Can I work with your markets in order to achieve that result? And we view that as a key component to what we do, and so we're very proud of the way that that's developed over time. We cite the similar statistics for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	executed. The broker does not know who is on the other side of it. For the most part they don't care. When you're trading Apple, and Google and Microsoft that is a perfectly fine way to trade, probably the best model that's been developed. You pay a little fee to the exchange for the privilege of executing the transaction and you're on your way. Where companies need a little bit more support, need the dealer support either with their customer base or the dealer proprietary interest, a dealer market allows for that kind of optionality and has proven I'll get into some academic studies towards the end, but has proven to be a better model for smaller company trading.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	is what's happening to companies after they trade there. We celebrate when companies what we call graduate from our markets and move to the New York Stock Exchange or NASDAQ. We've had over 200 of those events over the past few years and as much as it is in most cases a good, a strong company leaving our markets to go somewhere else, it inevitably leads to two or three phone calls from companies in a similar industry or similar geographic location saying that's a great story. That's my end goal. How does how do you do that? Can I work with your markets in order to achieve that result? And we view that as a key component to what we do, and so we're very proud of the way that that's developed over time. We cite the similar statistics for the LSE's AIM and the TSX Venture Market, which are much	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	executed. The broker does not know who is on the other side of it. For the most part they don't care. When you're trading Apple, and Google and Microsoft that is a perfectly fine way to trade, probably the best model that's been developed. You pay a little fee to the exchange for the privilege of executing the transaction and you're on your way. Where companies need a little bit more support, need the dealer support either with their customer base or the dealer proprietary interest, a dealer market allows for that kind of optionality and has proven I'll get into some academic studies towards the end, but has proven to be a better model for smaller company trading. You see the bottom of the slide here it's just
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	is what's happening to companies after they trade there. We celebrate when companies what we call graduate from our markets and move to the New York Stock Exchange or NASDAQ. We've had over 200 of those events over the past few years and as much as it is in most cases a good, a strong company leaving our markets to go somewhere else, it inevitably leads to two or three phone calls from companies in a similar industry or similar geographic location saying that's a great story. That's my end goal. How does how do you do that? Can I work with your markets in order to achieve that result? And we view that as a key component to what we do, and so we're very proud of the way that that's developed over time. We cite the similar statistics for the LSE's AIM and the TSX Venture Market, which are much lower numbers of graduates.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	executed. The broker does not know who is on the other side of it. For the most part they don't care. When you're trading Apple, and Google and Microsoft that is a perfectly fine way to trade, probably the best model that's been developed. You pay a little fee to the exchange for the privilege of executing the transaction and you're on your way. Where companies need a little bit more support, need the dealer support either with their customer base or the dealer proprietary interest, a dealer market allows for that kind of optionality and has proven I'll get into some academic studies towards the end, but has proven to be a better model for smaller company trading. You see the bottom of the slide here it's just a view of what level two quotes look like just to give
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	is what's happening to companies after they trade there. We celebrate when companies what we call graduate from our markets and move to the New York Stock Exchange or NASDAQ. We've had over 200 of those events over the past few years and as much as it is in most cases a good, a strong company leaving our markets to go somewhere else, it inevitably leads to two or three phone calls from companies in a similar industry or similar geographic location saying that's a great story. That's my end goal. How does how do you do that? Can I work with your markets in order to achieve that result? And we view that as a key component to what we do, and so we're very proud of the way that that's developed over time. We cite the similar statistics for the LSE's AIM and the TSX Venture Market, which are much lower numbers of graduates. All of this for our markets is not to say that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	executed. The broker does not know who is on the other side of it. For the most part they don't care. When you're trading Apple, and Google and Microsoft that is a perfectly fine way to trade, probably the best model that's been developed. You pay a little fee to the exchange for the privilege of executing the transaction and you're on your way. Where companies need a little bit more support, need the dealer support either with their customer base or the dealer proprietary interest, a dealer market allows for that kind of optionality and has proven I'll get into some academic studies towards the end, but has proven to be a better model for smaller company trading. You see the bottom of the slide here it's just a view of what level two quotes look like just to give you a sense of what I mean by attributable quoting. So
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	is what's happening to companies after they trade there. We celebrate when companies what we call graduate from our markets and move to the New York Stock Exchange or NASDAQ. We've had over 200 of those events over the past few years and as much as it is in most cases a good, a strong company leaving our markets to go somewhere else, it inevitably leads to two or three phone calls from companies in a similar industry or similar geographic location saying that's a great story. That's my end goal. How does how do you do that? Can I work with your markets in order to achieve that result? And we view that as a key component to what we do, and so we're very proud of the way that that's developed over time. We cite the similar statistics for the LSE's AIM and the TSX Venture Market, which are much lower numbers of graduates. All of this for our markets is not to say that OTCQX or OTCQB can't be a home. I think banks, and our	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	executed. The broker does not know who is on the other side of it. For the most part they don't care. When you're trading Apple, and Google and Microsoft that is a perfectly fine way to trade, probably the best model that's been developed. You pay a little fee to the exchange for the privilege of executing the transaction and you're on your way. Where companies need a little bit more support, need the dealer support either with their customer base or the dealer proprietary interest, a dealer market allows for that kind of optionality and has proven I'll get into some academic studies towards the end, but has proven to be a better model for smaller company trading. You see the bottom of the slide here it's just a view of what level two quotes look like just to give you a sense of what I mean by attributable quoting. So you can see the market makers and all of the information
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	is what's happening to companies after they trade there. We celebrate when companies what we call graduate from our markets and move to the New York Stock Exchange or NASDAQ. We've had over 200 of those events over the past few years and as much as it is in most cases a good, a strong company leaving our markets to go somewhere else, it inevitably leads to two or three phone calls from companies in a similar industry or similar geographic location saying that's a great story. That's my end goal. How does how do you do that? Can I work with your markets in order to achieve that result? And we view that as a key component to what we do, and so we're very proud of the way that that's developed over time. We cite the similar statistics for the LSE's AIM and the TSX Venture Market, which are much lower numbers of graduates. All of this for our markets is not to say that OTCQX or OTCQB can't be a home. I think banks, and our constituent group of about 75 community banks on OTCQX	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	executed. The broker does not know who is on the other side of it. For the most part they don't care. When you're trading Apple, and Google and Microsoft that is a perfectly fine way to trade, probably the best model that's been developed. You pay a little fee to the exchange for the privilege of executing the transaction and you're on your way. Where companies need a little bit more support, need the dealer support either with their customer base or the dealer proprietary interest, a dealer market allows for that kind of optionality and has proven I'll get into some academic studies towards the end, but has proven to be a better model for smaller company trading. You see the bottom of the slide here it's just a view of what level two quotes look like just to give you a sense of what I mean by attributable quoting. So you can see the market makers and all of the information related to their quotes there. One of the goals with OTC
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	is what's happening to companies after they trade there. We celebrate when companies what we call graduate from our markets and move to the New York Stock Exchange or NASDAQ. We've had over 200 of those events over the past few years and as much as it is in most cases a good, a strong company leaving our markets to go somewhere else, it inevitably leads to two or three phone calls from companies in a similar industry or similar geographic location saying that's a great story. That's my end goal. How does how do you do that? Can I work with your markets in order to achieve that result? And we view that as a key component to what we do, and so we're very proud of the way that that's developed over time. We cite the similar statistics for the LSE's AIM and the TSX Venture Market, which are much lower numbers of graduates. All of this for our markets is not to say that OTCQX or OTCQB can't be a home. I think banks, and our constituent group of about 75 community banks on OTCQX provide a great example of an industry group that really	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	executed. The broker does not know who is on the other side of it. For the most part they don't care. When you're trading Apple, and Google and Microsoft that is a perfectly fine way to trade, probably the best model that's been developed. You pay a little fee to the exchange for the privilege of executing the transaction and you're on your way. Where companies need a little bit more support, need the dealer support either with their customer base or the dealer proprietary interest, a dealer market allows for that kind of optionality and has proven I'll get into some academic studies towards the end, but has proven to be a better model for smaller company trading. You see the bottom of the slide here it's just a view of what level two quotes look like just to give you a sense of what I mean by attributable quoting. So you can see the market makers and all of the information related to their quotes there. One of the goals with OTC Link and the way we operate is to give investors a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	is what's happening to companies after they trade there. We celebrate when companies what we call graduate from our markets and move to the New York Stock Exchange or NASDAQ. We've had over 200 of those events over the past few years and as much as it is in most cases a good, a strong company leaving our markets to go somewhere else, it inevitably leads to two or three phone calls from companies in a similar industry or similar geographic location saying that's a great story. That's my end goal. How does how do you do that? Can I work with your markets in order to achieve that result? And we view that as a key component to what we do, and so we're very proud of the way that that's developed over time. We cite the similar statistics for the LSE's AIM and the TSX Venture Market, which are much lower numbers of graduates. All of this for our markets is not to say that OTCQX or OTCQB can't be a home. I think banks, and our constituent group of about 75 community banks on OTCQX provide a great example of an industry group that really seems to be comfortable finding a home on OTCQX. A lot	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	executed. The broker does not know who is on the other side of it. For the most part they don't care. When you're trading Apple, and Google and Microsoft that is a perfectly fine way to trade, probably the best model that's been developed. You pay a little fee to the exchange for the privilege of executing the transaction and you're on your way. Where companies need a little bit more support, need the dealer support either with their customer base or the dealer proprietary interest, a dealer market allows for that kind of optionality and has proven I'll get into some academic studies towards the end, but has proven to be a better model for smaller company trading. You see the bottom of the slide here it's just a view of what level two quotes look like just to give you a sense of what I mean by attributable quoting. So you can see the market makers and all of the information related to their quotes there. One of the goals with OTC Link and the way we operate is to give investors a comparable trading experience as if they were trading an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	is what's happening to companies after they trade there. We celebrate when companies what we call graduate from our markets and move to the New York Stock Exchange or NASDAQ. We've had over 200 of those events over the past few years and as much as it is in most cases a good, a strong company leaving our markets to go somewhere else, it inevitably leads to two or three phone calls from companies in a similar industry or similar geographic location saying that's a great story. That's my end goal. How does how do you do that? Can I work with your markets in order to achieve that result? And we view that as a key component to what we do, and so we're very proud of the way that that's developed over time. We cite the similar statistics for the LSE's AIM and the TSX Venture Market, which are much lower numbers of graduates. All of this for our markets is not to say that OTCQX or OTCQB can't be a home. I think banks, and our constituent group of about 75 community banks on OTCQX provide a great example of an industry group that really seems to be comfortable finding a home on OTCQX. A lot of those companies, those banks were exchange listed,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	executed. The broker does not know who is on the other side of it. For the most part they don't care. When you're trading Apple, and Google and Microsoft that is a perfectly fine way to trade, probably the best model that's been developed. You pay a little fee to the exchange for the privilege of executing the transaction and you're on your way. Where companies need a little bit more support, need the dealer support either with their customer base or the dealer proprietary interest, a dealer market allows for that kind of optionality and has proven I'll get into some academic studies towards the end, but has proven to be a better model for smaller company trading. You see the bottom of the slide here it's just a view of what level two quotes look like just to give you a sense of what I mean by attributable quoting. So you can see the market makers and all of the information related to their quotes there. One of the goals with OTC Link and the way we operate is to give investors a comparable trading experience as if they were trading an exchange listed security. So being able to go on your E
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	is what's happening to companies after they trade there. We celebrate when companies what we call graduate from our markets and move to the New York Stock Exchange or NASDAQ. We've had over 200 of those events over the past few years and as much as it is in most cases a good, a strong company leaving our markets to go somewhere else, it inevitably leads to two or three phone calls from companies in a similar industry or similar geographic location saying that's a great story. That's my end goal. How does how do you do that? Can I work with your markets in order to achieve that result? And we view that as a key component to what we do, and so we're very proud of the way that that's developed over time. We cite the similar statistics for the LSE's AIM and the TSX Venture Market, which are much lower numbers of graduates. All of this for our markets is not to say that OTCQX or OTCQB can't be a home. I think banks, and our constituent group of about 75 community banks on OTCQX provide a great example of an industry group that really seems to be comfortable finding a home on OTCQX. A lot of those companies, those banks were exchange listed, used excuse me some of the provisions of the JOBS	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	executed. The broker does not know who is on the other side of it. For the most part they don't care. When you're trading Apple, and Google and Microsoft that is a perfectly fine way to trade, probably the best model that's been developed. You pay a little fee to the exchange for the privilege of executing the transaction and you're on your way. Where companies need a little bit more support, need the dealer support either with their customer base or the dealer proprietary interest, a dealer market allows for that kind of optionality and has proven I'll get into some academic studies towards the end, but has proven to be a better model for smaller company trading. You see the bottom of the slide here it's just a view of what level two quotes look like just to give you can see the market makers and all of the information related to their quotes there. One of the goals with OTC Link and the way we operate is to give investors a comparable trading experience as if they were trading an exchange listed security. So being able to go on your E Trade or your TD Ameritrade account, your Schwab account,

	Page 122		Page 124
1	It's done across our market behind the scenes	1	minds asks a number of questions that go well outside of
2	in this way, but the investor experience is similar if	2	just what kind of information is publicly available. The
3	not identical. And that's a big driver not only for the	3	way that impacts secondary trading and particularly for
4	companies that currently exist on our market but for how	4	Reg A's is that first of all FINRA is not obligated to
5	we perceive Reg A companies trading in the future.	5	clear a 211 at all. So there's no guarantee that they're
6	Now on to some more broad based considerations	6	going to say, okay, go ahead and quote. They're
7	as it relates to secondary trading for Reg A's. Again	7	certainly not obligated to do it in line with when the
8	this is that next step after the offering that I think a	8	offering closes.
9	lot of businesses have not focused on. Sebastian towards	9	So again thinking about Elio their offering
10	the beginning talked about some of the components	10	closes, they distribute shares to investors, investor has
11	generally of Reg A and, you know, what the SEC changed in	11	a share in his or her hands that they would like to
12	this version of the rule. One of the key things for a	12	trade, there's nobody permitted to quote it. You know,
13	market operator is the free trading aspect of shares once	13	that's a very conceivable result from this.
14	they're in the hands of non-affiliates following the	14	Qualification for our OTCQX or OTCQB markets or
15	offering.	15	potentially other markets that may develop for these
16	But just because there's an SEC rule that	16	kinds of securities is often also at least partially
17	permits for that doesn't mean it automatically happens.	17	based on the bid price, you know, how much is this
18	There are number of regulatory steps that have to take	18	going to be a tenth of a penny security or is this going
19	place. The most prominent of those is what's called the	19	to be a \$2 or \$12 security. And until FINRA clears that
20	FINRA Form 211. So in order for a broker to be able to	20	Form 211 you don't know what the bid price is going to be
21	quote a security, and think about Elio as the prime	21	and you can't necessarily qualify it for a particular
22	example as it is for many of these things, before Elio	22	market.
23	could be quoted and traded on our market FINRA had to	23	So it's a lot of dominoes that have to fall in
24	tell a broker/dealer, okay, we allow you to do that.	24	line in order for this to be a smooth process. With all
25	That's the rule if you're not an exchange listed	25	211's, not just Reg A's, once the form has been approved
	Page 123		Page 125
1	security.	1	there's a single broker/dealer that can quote that
2	The FINRA Form 211 is based off of an SEC rule	2	security for 30 days. In theory multiple broker/dealers
3	called 15c211 that basically requires a broker/dealer to	3	could file a 211. That very rarely happens.
4	have in its possession and to verify that it is publicly	4	But for the first 30 days you don't see the
-		-	to deal the state of the state

-	have in its possession and to verify that it is publicly	- 1
5	available certain information about a company before it	5
6	can quote on a system like ours publicly. The way the	6
7	FINRA rules operate, it acts on its members, on the	7
8	brokers, and it's written as a notice filing. So brokers	8
9	would submit this form to FINRA, indicate that they had	9
10	the required information, and then wait at least three	10
11	days before publicly quoting.	11
12	In practice the 211 process is a little bit	12
13	more of a merit review. It's almost what you would see	13
14	in an S-1 qualification process with the SEC. There are	14
15	comments back and forth. Under the SEC version of the	15
16	rule one of the things that qualifies as enough	16
17	information for quoting to begin is a Reg A offering	17
18	statement. So in theory the Form 1A, a Reg A offering	18
19	statement, should just be linked to in a broker's filing.	19
20	They should say here's where it is, it's publicly	20
21	available. We have it as does everybody else. FINRA	21
22	could theoretically say, okay, that sounds great,	22
23	commence quoting.	23
24	That's not at all how it works. FINRA, you	24

#### 25 know, I think trying to do the right thing in their own

depth of book, you don't see additional market makers coming because they're not permitted to. Then after that 30 day period you'll see a little bit more of a market develop.

I talk here about Blue Sky laws. I'm going to put that off for a moment because I talk about that in a few slides.

DTC eligibility really just refers to make sure that the shares are available for electronic transfer at DTC. The role of the transfer agent is kind of tied in with that. There's a transfer agent that has to help process the transaction, indicate who the owners of all the securities are, work with the issuer, work with the investors, work with potentially their brokers to transfer those shares so that trading can ultimately take place. With Elio that was one of the big impediments early on, it was how are shareholders going to deposit their shares into their brokerage accounts. You had a number of excited shareholders who said this is great,

25 I'm ready to deposit, I hold at any number of brokers.

	Page 126		Page 128
1	And brokers were saying, no, you can't deposit. We're	1	out into the market for new shareholders. It's also been
2	not accepting that. We're not going to take a Reg A	2	used in M&A activity and that should, you know, go to the
3	share.	3	credit of what Reg A has been able to accomplish.
4	So through a lot of work form Elio, their	4	So I cited here an example of an OTCQX company,
5	advisors, from OTC Markets, we contacted a number of	5	Coastal Banking, that completed a Reg A offering, used
6	brokers, a number of clearing firms and their compliance	6	that as part of an acquisition, and I gave you some of
7	teams approached it probably as they should, which is to	7	the trading statistics there. Again I could probably
8	say they really didn't know what Reg A was. And so they	8	disclaim all of these slides. I can barely help myself.
9	said, no, I'm not going to I don't know what the	9	But I'm looking at it but none of you are.
10	security is, I don't know what this means, I'm not going	10	But you see a nice pattern of trading. People
11	to let it in.	11	understood what the use of this tool was, what the
12	With a little bit of an education process and,	12	acquisition was, and things were able to kind of move in
13	you know, thankfully people like Paul Elio are willing to	13	a natural direction.
14	go through this and kind of push the boundaries a little	14	Back to the topic of Blue Sky, and I'll spend a
15	bit, most of those brokerage firms said, okay, we get it,	15	couple of minutes here because this is another important
16	we understand, free tradeable share. This is how it's	16	component of what people need to understand in terms of
17	going to work and they put their processes in place.	17	the Reg A secondary market and really the secondary
18	But trading was able to commence at a more	18	market more generally.
19	normal level. You know, brokers look at these kinds of	19	One of the big things that people talked about
20	deals and maybe their first instant is to think it's a	20	around Reg A's adoption was the Blue Sky preemption at
21	pipe or an equity line financing or something else that	21	the offering stage, which certainly got its own its
22	may have terms that are not necessarily either apparent	22	own fair share of press. Secondary trading, there are
23	in favor of the issuer or the shareholder, and so	23	also Blue Sky rules that act on secondary trading. So
24	differentiating Reg A from those kinds of offerings was a	24	it's a set of state laws, and Mike Pieciak can probably
25	big part of this.	25	explain it even better that I can, that act on what
	Page 127		Page 129
1	You see this is just a little bit more insight	1	brokers can and can't do with respect to advising
2	You see this is just a little bit more insight into Elio's trading activity since they joined OTCQX. As	2	brokers can and can't do with respect to advising investors in their state about a certain company.
2 3	You see this is just a little bit more insight into Elio's trading activity since they joined OTCQX. As Paul noted they closed their offering at \$12. Their	2	brokers can and can't do with respect to advising investors in their state about a certain company. So if a company is not Blue Sky exempt or
2 3 4	You see this is just a little bit more insight into Elio's trading activity since they joined OTCQX. As Paul noted they closed their offering at \$12. Their initial bid price on OTCQX was actually \$14. That spoke	2 3 4	brokers can and can't do with respect to advising investors in their state about a certain company. So if a company is not Blue Sky exempt or compliant in a given state brokers are prohibited from
2 3 4 5	You see this is just a little bit more insight into Elio's trading activity since they joined OTCQX. As Paul noted they closed their offering at \$12. Their initial bid price on OTCQX was actually \$14. That spoke you see very early on was due it could be due to a	2 3 4 5	brokers can and can't do with respect to advising investors in their state about a certain company. So if a company is not Blue Sky exempt or compliant in a given state brokers are prohibited from taking certain actions, things like distribution of
2 3 4 5 6	You see this is just a little bit more insight into Elio's trading activity since they joined OTCQX. As Paul noted they closed their offering at \$12. Their initial bid price on OTCQX was actually \$14. That spoke you see very early on was due it could be due to a number of factors, but it was due I think in part to the	2 3 4 5 6	brokers can and can't do with respect to advising investors in their state about a certain company. So if a company is not Blue Sky exempt or compliant in a given state brokers are prohibited from taking certain actions, things like distribution of research, which is considered advice. Again this is
2 3 4 5 6 7	You see this is just a little bit more insight into Elio's trading activity since they joined OTCQX. As Paul noted they closed their offering at \$12. Their initial bid price on OTCQX was actually \$14. That spoke you see very early on was due it could be due to a number of factors, but it was due I think in part to the amount of interest that Elio generated at the beginning	2 3 4 5 6 7	brokers can and can't do with respect to advising investors in their state about a certain company. So if a company is not Blue Sky exempt or compliant in a given state brokers are prohibited from taking certain actions, things like distribution of research, which is considered advice. Again this is general. The state laws are very unique and things will
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	You see this is just a little bit more insight into Elio's trading activity since they joined OTCQX. As Paul noted they closed their offering at \$12. Their initial bid price on OTCQX was actually \$14. That spoke you see very early on was due it could be due to a number of factors, but it was due I think in part to the amount of interest that Elio generated at the beginning of the process and that supply/demand shortage created by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	brokers can and can't do with respect to advising investors in their state about a certain company. So if a company is not Blue Sky exempt or compliant in a given state brokers are prohibited from taking certain actions, things like distribution of research, which is considered advice. Again this is general. The state laws are very unique and things will vary state to state, but generally research is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	You see this is just a little bit more insight into Elio's trading activity since they joined OTCQX. As Paul noted they closed their offering at \$12. Their initial bid price on OTCQX was actually \$14. That spoke you see very early on was due it could be due to a number of factors, but it was due I think in part to the amount of interest that Elio generated at the beginning of the process and that supply/demand shortage created by the fact that brokerage firms were not accepting these	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	brokers can and can't do with respect to advising investors in their state about a certain company. So if a company is not Blue Sky exempt or compliant in a given state brokers are prohibited from taking certain actions, things like distribution of research, which is considered advice. Again this is general. The state laws are very unique and things will vary state to state, but generally research is prohibited, which impacts not only research directed to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	You see this is just a little bit more insight into Elio's trading activity since they joined OTCQX. As Paul noted they closed their offering at \$12. Their initial bid price on OTCQX was actually \$14. That spoke you see very early on was due it could be due to a number of factors, but it was due I think in part to the amount of interest that Elio generated at the beginning of the process and that supply/demand shortage created by the fact that brokerage firms were not accepting these shares.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	brokers can and can't do with respect to advising investors in their state about a certain company. So if a company is not Blue Sky exempt or compliant in a given state brokers are prohibited from taking certain actions, things like distribution of research, which is considered advice. Again this is general. The state laws are very unique and things will vary state to state, but generally research is prohibited, which impacts not only research directed to people in a specific state but anybody who is thinking
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	You see this is just a little bit more insight into Elio's trading activity since they joined OTCQX. As Paul noted they closed their offering at \$12. Their initial bid price on OTCQX was actually \$14. That spoke you see very early on was due it could be due to a number of factors, but it was due I think in part to the amount of interest that Elio generated at the beginning of the process and that supply/demand shortage created by the fact that brokerage firms were not accepting these shares. So if you were an interested and motivated	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	brokers can and can't do with respect to advising investors in their state about a certain company. So if a company is not Blue Sky exempt or compliant in a given state brokers are prohibited from taking certain actions, things like distribution of research, which is considered advice. Again this is general. The state laws are very unique and things will vary state to state, but generally research is prohibited, which impacts not only research directed to people in a specific state but anybody who is thinking about distributing national research will not do so
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	You see this is just a little bit more insight into Elio's trading activity since they joined OTCQX. As Paul noted they closed their offering at \$12. Their initial bid price on OTCQX was actually \$14. That spoke you see very early on was due it could be due to a number of factors, but it was due I think in part to the amount of interest that Elio generated at the beginning of the process and that supply/demand shortage created by the fact that brokerage firms were not accepting these shares. So if you were an interested and motivated buyer you had to pay from one of the very few, you know,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	brokers can and can't do with respect to advising investors in their state about a certain company. So if a company is not Blue Sky exempt or compliant in a given state brokers are prohibited from taking certain actions, things like distribution of research, which is considered advice. Again this is general. The state laws are very unique and things will vary state to state, but generally research is prohibited, which impacts not only research directed to people in a specific state but anybody who is thinking about distributing national research will not do so because no OTC company has Blue sky qualification or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	You see this is just a little bit more insight into Elio's trading activity since they joined OTCQX. As Paul noted they closed their offering at \$12. Their initial bid price on OTCQX was actually \$14. That spoke you see very early on was due it could be due to a number of factors, but it was due I think in part to the amount of interest that Elio generated at the beginning of the process and that supply/demand shortage created by the fact that brokerage firms were not accepting these shares. So if you were an interested and motivated buyer you had to pay from one of the very few, you know, accounts that was offering freely tradeable shares. As	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	brokers can and can't do with respect to advising investors in their state about a certain company. So if a company is not Blue Sky exempt or compliant in a given state brokers are prohibited from taking certain actions, things like distribution of research, which is considered advice. Again this is general. The state laws are very unique and things will vary state to state, but generally research is prohibited, which impacts not only research directed to people in a specific state but anybody who is thinking about distributing national research will not do so because no OTC company has Blue sky qualification or exemption in every state.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	You see this is just a little bit more insight into Elio's trading activity since they joined OTCQX. As Paul noted they closed their offering at \$12. Their initial bid price on OTCQX was actually \$14. That spoke you see very early on was due it could be due to a number of factors, but it was due I think in part to the amount of interest that Elio generated at the beginning of the process and that supply/demand shortage created by the fact that brokerage firms were not accepting these shares. So if you were an interested and motivated buyer you had to pay from one of the very few, you know, accounts that was offering freely tradeable shares. As that smoothed out over time you see a much more normal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	brokers can and can't do with respect to advising investors in their state about a certain company. So if a company is not Blue Sky exempt or compliant in a given state brokers are prohibited from taking certain actions, things like distribution of research, which is considered advice. Again this is general. The state laws are very unique and things will vary state to state, but generally research is prohibited, which impacts not only research directed to people in a specific state but anybody who is thinking about distributing national research will not do so because no OTC company has Blue sky qualification or exemption in every state. No transactions in managed accounts. You're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	You see this is just a little bit more insight into Elio's trading activity since they joined OTCQX. As Paul noted they closed their offering at \$12. Their initial bid price on OTCQX was actually \$14. That spoke you see very early on was due it could be due to a number of factors, but it was due I think in part to the amount of interest that Elio generated at the beginning of the process and that supply/demand shortage created by the fact that brokerage firms were not accepting these shares. So if you were an interested and motivated buyer you had to pay from one of the very few, you know, accounts that was offering freely tradeable shares. As	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	brokers can and can't do with respect to advising investors in their state about a certain company. So if a company is not Blue Sky exempt or compliant in a given state brokers are prohibited from taking certain actions, things like distribution of research, which is considered advice. Again this is general. The state laws are very unique and things will vary state to state, but generally research is prohibited, which impacts not only research directed to people in a specific state but anybody who is thinking about distributing national research will not do so because no OTC company has Blue sky qualification or exemption in every state.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	You see this is just a little bit more insight into Elio's trading activity since they joined OTCQX. As Paul noted they closed their offering at \$12. Their initial bid price on OTCQX was actually \$14. That spoke you see very early on was due it could be due to a number of factors, but it was due I think in part to the amount of interest that Elio generated at the beginning of the process and that supply/demand shortage created by the fact that brokerage firms were not accepting these shares. So if you were an interested and motivated buyer you had to pay from one of the very few, you know, accounts that was offering freely tradeable shares. As that smoothed out over time you see a much more normal trading partner. They trade give or take at around \$20 a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	brokers can and can't do with respect to advising investors in their state about a certain company. So if a company is not Blue Sky exempt or compliant in a given state brokers are prohibited from taking certain actions, things like distribution of research, which is considered advice. Again this is general. The state laws are very unique and things will vary state to state, but generally research is prohibited, which impacts not only research directed to people in a specific state but anybody who is thinking about distributing national research will not do so because no OTC company has Blue sky qualification or exemption in every state. No transactions in managed accounts. You're never going to stop none of the Blue Sky laws to my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	You see this is just a little bit more insight into Elio's trading activity since they joined OTCQX. As Paul noted they closed their offering at \$12. Their initial bid price on OTCQX was actually \$14. That spoke you see very early on was due it could be due to a number of factors, but it was due I think in part to the amount of interest that Elio generated at the beginning of the process and that supply/demand shortage created by the fact that brokerage firms were not accepting these shares. So if you were an interested and motivated buyer you had to pay from one of the very few, you know, accounts that was offering freely tradeable shares. As that smoothed out over time you see a much more normal trading partner. They trade give or take at around \$20 a share now, which is nice growth. And there are eight	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	brokers can and can't do with respect to advising investors in their state about a certain company. So if a company is not Blue Sky exempt or compliant in a given state brokers are prohibited from taking certain actions, things like distribution of research, which is considered advice. Again this is general. The state laws are very unique and things will vary state to state, but generally research is prohibited, which impacts not only research directed to people in a specific state but anybody who is thinking about distributing national research will not do so because no OTC company has Blue sky qualification or exemption in every state. No transactions in managed accounts. You're never going to stop none of the Blue Sky laws to my knowledge stop self-directed investors from buying or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	You see this is just a little bit more insight into Elio's trading activity since they joined OTCQX. As Paul noted they closed their offering at \$12. Their initial bid price on OTCQX was actually \$14. That spoke you see very early on was due it could be due to a number of factors, but it was due I think in part to the amount of interest that Elio generated at the beginning of the process and that supply/demand shortage created by the fact that brokerage firms were not accepting these shares. So if you were an interested and motivated buyer you had to pay from one of the very few, you know, accounts that was offering freely tradeable shares. As that smoothed out over time you see a much more normal trading partner. They trade give or take at around \$20 a share now, which is nice growth. And there are eight market makers, at least as of June 30th there were eight	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	brokers can and can't do with respect to advising investors in their state about a certain company. So if a company is not Blue Sky exempt or compliant in a given state brokers are prohibited from taking certain actions, things like distribution of research, which is considered advice. Again this is general. The state laws are very unique and things will vary state to state, but generally research is prohibited, which impacts not only research directed to people in a specific state but anybody who is thinking about distributing national research will not do so because no OTC company has Blue sky qualification or exemption in every state. No transactions in managed accounts. You're never going to stop none of the Blue Sky laws to my knowledge stop self-directed investors from buying or selling a security. So an investor calls their broker
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	You see this is just a little bit more insight into Elio's trading activity since they joined OTCQX. As Paul noted they closed their offering at \$12. Their initial bid price on OTCQX was actually \$14. That spoke you see very early on was due it could be due to a number of factors, but it was due I think in part to the amount of interest that Elio generated at the beginning of the process and that supply/demand shortage created by the fact that brokerage firms were not accepting these shares. So if you were an interested and motivated buyer you had to pay from one of the very few, you know, accounts that was offering freely tradeable shares. As that smoothed out over time you see a much more normal trading partner. They trade give or take at around \$20 a share now, which is nice growth. And there are eight market makers, at least as of June 30th there were eight market makers in Elio holding themselves out as able to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	brokers can and can't do with respect to advising investors in their state about a certain company. So if a company is not Blue Sky exempt or compliant in a given state brokers are prohibited from taking certain actions, things like distribution of research, which is considered advice. Again this is general. The state laws are very unique and things will vary state to state, but generally research is prohibited, which impacts not only research directed to people in a specific state but anybody who is thinking about distributing national research will not do so because no OTC company has Blue sky qualification or exemption in every state. No transactions in managed accounts. You're never going to stop none of the Blue Sky laws to my knowledge stop self-directed investors from buying or selling a security. So an investor calls their broker and says I'm interested in purchasing Elio Motors or OTC
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	You see this is just a little bit more insight into Elio's trading activity since they joined OTCQX. As Paul noted they closed their offering at \$12. Their initial bid price on OTCQX was actually \$14. That spoke - you see very early on was due it could be due to a number of factors, but it was due I think in part to the amount of interest that Elio generated at the beginning of the process and that supply/demand shortage created by the fact that brokerage firms were not accepting these shares. So if you were an interested and motivated buyer you had to pay from one of the very few, you know, accounts that was offering freely tradeable shares. As that smoothed out over time you see a much more normal trading partner. They trade give or take at around \$20 a share now, which is nice growth. And there are eight market makers, at least as of June 30th there were eight market makers in Elio holding themselves out as able to buy or sell the shares. So some of that goes to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	brokers can and can't do with respect to advising investors in their state about a certain company. So if a company is not Blue Sky exempt or compliant in a given state brokers are prohibited from taking certain actions, things like distribution of research, which is considered advice. Again this is general. The state laws are very unique and things will vary state to state, but generally research is prohibited, which impacts not only research directed to people in a specific state but anybody who is thinking about distributing national research will not do so because no OTC company has Blue sky qualification or exemption in every state. No transactions in managed accounts. You're never going to stop none of the Blue Sky laws to my knowledge stop self-directed investors from buying or selling a security. So an investor calls their broker and says I'm interested in purchasing Elio Motors or OTC Markets or selling my shares, that's always going to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	You see this is just a little bit more insight into Elio's trading activity since they joined OTCQX. As Paul noted they closed their offering at \$12. Their initial bid price on OTCQX was actually \$14. That spoke - you see very early on was due - it could be due to a number of factors, but it was due I think in part to the amount of interest that Elio generated at the beginning of the process and that supply/demand shortage created by the fact that brokerage firms were not accepting these shares. So if you were an interested and motivated buyer you had to pay from one of the very few, you know, accounts that was offering freely tradeable shares. As that smoothed out over time you see a much more normal trading partner. They trade give or take at around \$20 a share now, which is nice growth. And there are eight market makers, at least as of June 30th there were eight market makers in Elio holding themselves out as able to buy or sell the shares. So some of that goes to the liquidity concerns I think that Stephen was expressing earlier.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	brokers can and can't do with respect to advising investors in their state about a certain company. So if a company is not Blue Sky exempt or compliant in a given state brokers are prohibited from taking certain actions, things like distribution of research, which is considered advice. Again this is general. The state laws are very unique and things will vary state to state, but generally research is prohibited, which impacts not only research directed to people in a specific state but anybody who is thinking about distributing national research will not do so because no OTC company has Blue sky qualification or exemption in every state. No transactions in managed accounts. You're never going to stop none of the Blue Sky laws to my knowledge stop self-directed investors from buying or selling a security. So an investor calls their broker and says I'm interested in purchasing Elio Motors or OTC Markets or selling my shares, that's always going to be okay. It's the broker/dealer advice and interaction with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	You see this is just a little bit more insight into Elio's trading activity since they joined OTCQX. As Paul noted they closed their offering at \$12. Their initial bid price on OTCQX was actually \$14. That spoke - you see very early on was due - it could be due to a number of factors, but it was due I think in part to the amount of interest that Elio generated at the beginning of the process and that supply/demand shortage created by the fact that brokerage firms were not accepting these shares. So if you were an interested and motivated buyer you had to pay from one of the very few, you know, accounts that was offering freely tradeable shares. As that smoothed out over time you see a much more normal trading partner. They trade give or take at around \$20 a share now, which is nice growth. And there are eight market makers, at least as of June 30th there were eight market makers in Elio holding themselves out as able to buy or sell the shares. So some of that goes to the liquidity concerns I think that Stephen was expressing earlier. I want to briefly note some of the other uses for Reg A without using the term mini IPO, which I now	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	brokers can and can't do with respect to advising investors in their state about a certain company. So if a company is not Blue Sky exempt or compliant in a given state brokers are prohibited from taking certain actions, things like distribution of research, which is considered advice. Again this is general. The state laws are very unique and things will vary state to state, but generally research directed to people in a specific state but anybody who is thinking about distributing national research will not do so because no OTC company has Blue sky qualification or exemption in every state. No transactions in managed accounts. You're never going to stop none of the Blue Sky laws to my knowledge stop self-directed investors from buying or selling a security. So an investor calls their broker and says I'm interested in purchasing Elio Motors or OTC Markets or selling my shares, that's always going to be okay. It's the broker/dealer advice and interaction with their customer that's impacted.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	You see this is just a little bit more insight into Elio's trading activity since they joined OTCQX. As Paul noted they closed their offering at \$12. Their initial bid price on OTCQX was actually \$14. That spoke - you see very early on was due it could be due to a number of factors, but it was due I think in part to the amount of interest that Elio generated at the beginning of the process and that supply/demand shortage created by the fact that brokerage firms were not accepting these shares. So if you were an interested and motivated buyer you had to pay from one of the very few, you know, accounts that was offering freely tradeable shares. As that smoothed out over time you see a much more normal trading partner. They trade give or take at around \$20 a share now, which is nice growth. And there are eight market makers, at least as of June 30th there were eight market makers in Elio holding themselves out as able to buy or sell the shares. So some of that goes to the liquidity concerns I think that Stephen was expressing earlier. I want to briefly note some of the other uses for Reg A without using the term mini IPO, which I now understand is frowned upon. I think the traditional Reg	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	brokers can and can't do with respect to advising investors in their state about a certain company. So if a company is not Blue Sky exempt or compliant in a given state brokers are prohibited from taking certain actions, things like distribution of research, which is considered advice. Again this is general. The state laws are very unique and things will vary state to state, but generally research directed to people in a specific state but anybody who is thinking about distributing national research will not do so because no OTC company has Blue sky qualification or exemption in every state. No transactions in managed accounts. You're never going to stop none of the Blue Sky laws to my knowledge stop self-directed investors from buying or selling a security. So an investor calls their broker and says I'm interested in purchasing Elio Motors or OTC Markets or selling my shares, that's always going to be okay. It's the broker/dealer advice and interaction with their customer that's impacted.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	You see this is just a little bit more insight into Elio's trading activity since they joined OTCQX. As Paul noted they closed their offering at \$12. Their initial bid price on OTCQX was actually \$14. That spoke - you see very early on was due - it could be due to a number of factors, but it was due I think in part to the amount of interest that Elio generated at the beginning of the process and that supply/demand shortage created by the fact that brokerage firms were not accepting these shares. So if you were an interested and motivated buyer you had to pay from one of the very few, you know, accounts that was offering freely tradeable shares. As that smoothed out over time you see a much more normal trading partner. They trade give or take at around \$20 a share now, which is nice growth. And there are eight market makers, at least as of June 30th there were eight market makers in Elio holding themselves out as able to buy or sell the shares. So some of that goes to the liquidity concerns I think that Stephen was expressing earlier. I want to briefly note some of the other uses for Reg A without using the term mini IPO, which I now	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	brokers can and can't do with respect to advising investors in their state about a certain company. So if a company is not Blue Sky exempt or compliant in a given state brokers are prohibited from taking certain actions, things like distribution of research, which is considered advice. Again this is general. The state laws are very unique and things will vary state to state, but generally research directed to people in a specific state but anybody who is thinking about distributing national research will not do so because no OTC company has Blue sky qualification or exemption in every state. No transactions in managed accounts. You're never going to stop none of the Blue Sky laws to my knowledge stop self-directed investors from buying or selling a security. So an investor calls their broker and says I'm interested in purchasing Elio Motors or OTC Markets or selling my shares, that's always going to be okay. It's the broker/dealer advice and interaction with their customer that's impacted.

	Page 130		Page 132
1	to solicit, which is a separate discussion in and of	1	all in one spot. And to their immense credit NASAA has
2	itself. The advice portion is just as important.	2	been supportive of the effort. Many of the states have
3	So when that self-directed broker calls or a	3	gotten on board.
4	self-directed investor calls their broker and says I	4	We certainly OTC Markets loves all the
5	would really like to buy shares of OTC Markets, the	5	states, but the four that we'll call out here as the
6	broker is not permitted to say actually I watched a	6	first movers in this endeavor, Vermont, which is Mike's
7	webcast of their general counsel and I think that's a	7	state, Wyoming, Iowa and Washington. It's never easy as
8	terrible idea. This is not going to work out well for	8	I'm sure Paul Elio would tell you, it's never easy to be
9	you. They have to just take direction. They can't say	9	the first mover but these four have done that and that
10	yay or nay. That's considered advice, that's outside the	10	will help the market for Reg A and other securities.
11	scope of the law.	11	I want to touch on the petition for rulemaking
12	Rescission risk I note is just the possibility	12	that was noted earlier. I think Sara and Sebastian did a
13	that even an unsolicited transaction, an investor that is	13	nice job of kind raising the points there. In the
14	self-directed is going to come back to their broker and	14	initial adopting release for Reg A the Commission noted
15	say, when the trade goes sour of course, and say you did	15	that the reason that they didn't want to include Exchange
16	actually provide me advice there. Whether they choose to	16	Act reporting companies was that they hadn't been
17	fight it out the broker has to account for the	17	included in the prior iteration of Reg A. And really I
18	possibility that they're going to be held responsible,	18	think they just wanted to see what would happen, how were
19	they're going to have to rescind the trade, take the	19	the new rules going to impact this exempt offering type.
20	loss, which chills activity by some brokers in these	20	As we approached and now have passed the one
21	securities and also obviously adds an additional cost	21	year anniversary we thought it made sense to start
22	factor that they have to think bout.	22	considering how you really expand the pool and Exchange
23	On the positive side of all of this there are a	23	Act companies, Exchange Act reporting companies in
24	number of exemptions and qualifications that Reg A and	24	particular have been in touch with us about their desire
25	other companies can go through to be able to trade, to be	25	to access Reg A and also seem to be the least
		1	
	Page 131		Page 133
1	Page 131 able to allow brokers to engage in some of these	1	Page 133 controversial of the additional issuer types to
1 2		1 2	
	able to allow brokers to engage in some of these activities in a given state. The most prominent among those is the manual exemption, meaning the way NASAA has		controversial of the additional issuer types to potentially gain access to Reg A. These are companies that are already current in
2	able to allow brokers to engage in some of these activities in a given state. The most prominent among those is the manual exemption, meaning the way NASAA has framed it in their uniform Securities Act for companies	2 3 4	controversial of the additional issuer types to potentially gain access to Reg A. These are companies that are already current in their SEC reporting requirements, so they're providing
2 3 4 5	able to allow brokers to engage in some of these activities in a given state. The most prominent among those is the manual exemption, meaning the way NASAA has framed it in their uniform Securities Act for companies that meet a certain set of qualifications as long as a	2 3 4 5	controversial of the additional issuer types to potentially gain access to Reg A. These are companies that are already current in their SEC reporting requirements, so they're providing more information than is required under Reg A already.
2 3 4 5 6	able to allow brokers to engage in some of these activities in a given state. The most prominent among those is the manual exemption, meaning the way NASAA has framed it in their uniform Securities Act for companies that meet a certain set of qualifications as long as a certain amount of information is published in a	2 3 4 5 6	controversial of the additional issuer types to potentially gain access to Reg A. These are companies that are already current in their SEC reporting requirements, so they're providing more information than is required under Reg A already. They are, you know, again current so they're kind of
2 3 4 5 6 7	able to allow brokers to engage in some of these activities in a given state. The most prominent among those is the manual exemption, meaning the way NASAA has framed it in their uniform Securities Act for companies that meet a certain set of qualifications as long as a certain amount of information is published in a nationally recognized securities manual, the theory being	2 3 4 5 6 7	controversial of the additional issuer types to potentially gain access to Reg A. These are companies that are already current in their SEC reporting requirements, so they're providing more information than is required under Reg A already. They are, you know, again current so they're kind of active good citizens already. They are permitted of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	able to allow brokers to engage in some of these activities in a given state. The most prominent among those is the manual exemption, meaning the way NASAA has framed it in their uniform Securities Act for companies that meet a certain set of qualifications as long as a certain amount of information is published in a nationally recognized securities manual, the theory being give investors enough information availability you're	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	controversial of the additional issuer types to potentially gain access to Reg A. These are companies that are already current in their SEC reporting requirements, so they're providing more information than is required under Reg A already. They are, you know, again current so they're kind of active good citizens already. They are permitted of course to do more traditional offering types, S-1 and S-
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	able to allow brokers to engage in some of these activities in a given state. The most prominent among those is the manual exemption, meaning the way NASAA has framed it in their uniform Securities Act for companies that meet a certain set of qualifications as long as a certain amount of information is published in a nationally recognized securities manual, the theory being give investors enough information availability you're able to trade that security or it's exempt from Blue Sky	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	controversial of the additional issuer types to potentially gain access to Reg A. These are companies that are already current in their SEC reporting requirements, so they're providing more information than is required under Reg A already. They are, you know, again current so they're kind of active good citizens already. They are permitted of course to do more traditional offering types, S-1 and S- 3. Those are more costly avenues in many cases. They
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	able to allow brokers to engage in some of these activities in a given state. The most prominent among those is the manual exemption, meaning the way NASAA has framed it in their uniform Securities Act for companies that meet a certain set of qualifications as long as a certain amount of information is published in a nationally recognized securities manual, the theory being give investors enough information availability you're able to trade that security or it's exempt from Blue Sky rules, limited broker behavior in that state.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	controversial of the additional issuer types to potentially gain access to Reg A. These are companies that are already current in their SEC reporting requirements, so they're providing more information than is required under Reg A already. They are, you know, again current so they're kind of active good citizens already. They are permitted of course to do more traditional offering types, S-1 and S- 3. Those are more costly avenues in many cases. They don't have the Blue Sky preemption at the offering stage
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	able to allow brokers to engage in some of these activities in a given state. The most prominent among those is the manual exemption, meaning the way NASAA has framed it in their uniform Securities Act for companies that meet a certain set of qualifications as long as a certain amount of information is published in a nationally recognized securities manual, the theory being give investors enough information availability you're able to trade that security or it's exempt from Blue Sky rules, limited broker behavior in that state. The most prominent manual, which was operated	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	controversial of the additional issuer types to potentially gain access to Reg A. These are companies that are already current in their SEC reporting requirements, so they're providing more information than is required under Reg A already. They are, you know, again current so they're kind of active good citizens already. They are permitted of course to do more traditional offering types, S-1 and S- 3. Those are more costly avenues in many cases. They don't have the Blue Sky preemption at the offering stage that Reg A offers. Even S-3, which is obviously a more
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	able to allow brokers to engage in some of these activities in a given state. The most prominent among those is the manual exemption, meaning the way NASAA has framed it in their uniform Securities Act for companies that meet a certain set of qualifications as long as a certain amount of information is published in a nationally recognized securities manual, the theory being give investors enough information availability you're able to trade that security or it's exempt from Blue Sky rules, limited broker behavior in that state.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	controversial of the additional issuer types to potentially gain access to Reg A. These are companies that are already current in their SEC reporting requirements, so they're providing more information than is required under Reg A already. They are, you know, again current so they're kind of active good citizens already. They are permitted of course to do more traditional offering types, S-1 and S- 3. Those are more costly avenues in many cases. They don't have the Blue Sky preemption at the offering stage that Reg A offers. Even S-3, which is obviously a more streamlined process, has some public float requirements,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	able to allow brokers to engage in some of these activities in a given state. The most prominent among those is the manual exemption, meaning the way NASAA has framed it in their uniform Securities Act for companies that meet a certain set of qualifications as long as a certain amount of information is published in a nationally recognized securities manual, the theory being give investors enough information availability you're able to trade that security or it's exempt from Blue Sky rules, limited broker behavior in that state. The most prominent manual, which was operated by Standard & Poor's, ceased publication earlier this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	controversial of the additional issuer types to potentially gain access to Reg A. These are companies that are already current in their SEC reporting requirements, so they're providing more information than is required under Reg A already. They are, you know, again current so they're kind of active good citizens already. They are permitted of course to do more traditional offering types, S-1 and S- 3. Those are more costly avenues in many cases. They don't have the Blue Sky preemption at the offering stage that Reg A offers. Even S-3, which is obviously a more
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	able to allow brokers to engage in some of these activities in a given state. The most prominent among those is the manual exemption, meaning the way NASAA has framed it in their uniform Securities Act for companies that meet a certain set of qualifications as long as a certain amount of information is published in a nationally recognized securities manual, the theory being give investors enough information availability you're able to trade that security or it's exempt from Blue Sky rules, limited broker behavior in that state. The most prominent manual, which was operated by Standard & Poor's, ceased publication earlier this year, in May. We've taken that opportunity to you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	controversial of the additional issuer types to potentially gain access to Reg A. These are companies that are already current in their SEC reporting requirements, so they're providing more information than is required under Reg A already. They are, you know, again current so they're kind of active good citizens already. They are permitted of course to do more traditional offering types, S-1 and S- 3. Those are more costly avenues in many cases. They don't have the Blue Sky preemption at the offering stage that Reg A offers. Even S-3, which is obviously a more streamlined process, has some public float requirements, 75 million in public float.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	able to allow brokers to engage in some of these activities in a given state. The most prominent among those is the manual exemption, meaning the way NASAA has framed it in their uniform Securities Act for companies that meet a certain set of qualifications as long as a certain amount of information is published in a nationally recognized securities manual, the theory being give investors enough information availability you're able to trade that security or it's exempt from Blue Sky rules, limited broker behavior in that state. The most prominent manual, which was operated by Standard & Poor's, ceased publication earlier this year, in May. We've taken that opportunity to you know, all of this goes to how do you inform issuers what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	controversial of the additional issuer types to potentially gain access to Reg A. These are companies that are already current in their SEC reporting requirements, so they're providing more information than is required under Reg A already. They are, you know, again current so they're kind of active good citizens already. They are permitted of course to do more traditional offering types, S-1 and S- 3. Those are more costly avenues in many cases. They don't have the Blue Sky preemption at the offering stage that Reg A offers. Even S-3, which is obviously a more streamlined process, has some public float requirements, 75 million in public float. So there are issuers who are kind of left out
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	able to allow brokers to engage in some of these activities in a given state. The most prominent among those is the manual exemption, meaning the way NASAA has framed it in their uniform Securities Act for companies that meet a certain set of qualifications as long as a certain amount of information is published in a nationally recognized securities manual, the theory being give investors enough information availability you're able to trade that security or it's exempt from Blue Sky rules, limited broker behavior in that state. The most prominent manual, which was operated by Standard & Poor's, ceased publication earlier this year, in May. We've taken that opportunity to you know, all of this goes to how do you inform issuers what the trading market is going to look like. We've taken	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	controversial of the additional issuer types to potentially gain access to Reg A. These are companies that are already current in their SEC reporting requirements, so they're providing more information than is required under Reg A already. They are, you know, again current so they're kind of active good citizens already. They are permitted of course to do more traditional offering types, S-1 and S- 3. Those are more costly avenues in many cases. They don't have the Blue Sky preemption at the offering stage that Reg A offers. Even S-3, which is obviously a more streamlined process, has some public float requirements, 75 million in public float. So there are issuers who are kind of left out who might otherwise be able to use this financing tool
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	able to allow brokers to engage in some of these activities in a given state. The most prominent among those is the manual exemption, meaning the way NASAA has framed it in their uniform Securities Act for companies that meet a certain set of qualifications as long as a certain amount of information is published in a nationally recognized securities manual, the theory being give investors enough information availability you're able to trade that security or it's exempt from Blue Sky rules, limited broker behavior in that state. The most prominent manual, which was operated by Standard & Poor's, ceased publication earlier this year, in May. We've taken that opportunity to you know, all of this goes to how do you inform issuers what the trading market is going to look like. We've taken that opportunity to work with NASAA, with Mike Pieciak	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	controversial of the additional issuer types to potentially gain access to Reg A. These are companies that are already current in their SEC reporting requirements, so they're providing more information than is required under Reg A already. They are, you know, again current so they're kind of active good citizens already. They are permitted of course to do more traditional offering types, S-1 and S- 3. Those are more costly avenues in many cases. They don't have the Blue Sky preemption at the offering stage that Reg A offers. Even S-3, which is obviously a more streamlined process, has some public float requirements, 75 million in public float. So there are issuers who are kind of left out who might otherwise be able to use this financing tool not only to kind of raise money as a traditional capital raise but also get that marketing impact, the additional impact that Paul Elio was describing of engaging with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	able to allow brokers to engage in some of these activities in a given state. The most prominent among those is the manual exemption, meaning the way NASAA has framed it in their uniform Securities Act for companies that meet a certain set of qualifications as long as a certain amount of information is published in a nationally recognized securities manual, the theory being give investors enough information availability you're able to trade that security or it's exempt from Blue Sky rules, limited broker behavior in that state. The most prominent manual, which was operated by Standard & Poor's, ceased publication earlier this year, in May. We've taken that opportunity to you know, all of this goes to how do you inform issuers what the trading market is going to look like. We've taken that opportunity to work with NASAA, with Mike Pieciak and others to establish OTCQX and OTCQB as manuals so that a company like Elio can say, all right, I'm making all of this disclosure available on OTCQX, not just a set	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	controversial of the additional issuer types to potentially gain access to Reg A. These are companies that are already current in their SEC reporting requirements, so they're providing more information than is required under Reg A already. They are, you know, again current so they're kind of active good citizens already. They are permitted of course to do more traditional offering types, S-1 and S- 3. Those are more costly avenues in many cases. They don't have the Blue Sky preemption at the offering stage that Reg A offers. Even S-3, which is obviously a more streamlined process, has some public float requirements, 75 million in public float. So there are issuers who are kind of left out who might otherwise be able to use this financing tool not only to kind of raise money as a traditional capital raise but also get that marketing impact, the additional impact that Paul Elio was describing of engaging with their potential customer base, all the things that Reg A
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	able to allow brokers to engage in some of these activities in a given state. The most prominent among those is the manual exemption, meaning the way NASAA has framed it in their uniform Securities Act for companies that meet a certain set of qualifications as long as a certain amount of information is published in a nationally recognized securities manual, the theory being give investors enough information availability you're able to trade that security or it's exempt from Blue Sky rules, limited broker behavior in that state. The most prominent manual, which was operated by Standard & Poor's, ceased publication earlier this year, in May. We've taken that opportunity to you know, all of this goes to how do you inform issuers what the trading market is going to look like. We've taken that opportunity to work with NASAA, with Mike Pieciak and others to establish OTCQX and OTCQB as manuals so that a company like Elio can say, all right, I'm making all of this disclosure available on OTCQX, not just a set of audited financials that are going to sit in a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	controversial of the additional issuer types to potentially gain access to Reg A. These are companies that are already current in their SEC reporting requirements, so they're providing more information than is required under Reg A already. They are, you know, again current so they're kind of active good citizens already. They are permitted of course to do more traditional offering types, S-1 and S- 3. Those are more costly avenues in many cases. They don't have the Blue Sky preemption at the offering stage that Reg A offers. Even S-3, which is obviously a more streamlined process, has some public float requirements, 75 million in public float. So there are issuers who are kind of left out who might otherwise be able to use this financing tool not only to kind of raise money as a traditional capital raise but also get that marketing impact, the additional impact that Paul Elio was describing of engaging with their potential customer base, all the things that Reg A does very well or allows for very well.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	able to allow brokers to engage in some of these activities in a given state. The most prominent among those is the manual exemption, meaning the way NASAA has framed it in their uniform Securities Act for companies that meet a certain set of qualifications as long as a certain amount of information is published in a nationally recognized securities manual, the theory being give investors enough information availability you're able to trade that security or it's exempt from Blue Sky rules, limited broker behavior in that state. The most prominent manual, which was operated by Standard & Poor's, ceased publication earlier this year, in May. We've taken that opportunity to you know, all of this goes to how do you inform issuers what the trading market is going to look like. We've taken that opportunity to work with NASAA, with Mike Pieciak and others to establish OTCQX and OTCQB as manuals so that a company like Elio can say, all right, I'm making all of this disclosure available on OTCQX, not just a set of audited financials that are going to sit in a published book in a library somewhere.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	controversial of the additional issuer types to potentially gain access to Reg A. These are companies that are already current in their SEC reporting requirements, so they're providing more information than is required under Reg A already. They are, you know, again current so they're kind of active good citizens already. They are permitted of course to do more traditional offering types, S-1 and S- 3. Those are more costly avenues in many cases. They don't have the Blue Sky preemption at the offering stage that Reg A offers. Even S-3, which is obviously a more streamlined process, has some public float requirements, 75 million in public float. So there are issuers who are kind of left out who might otherwise be able to use this financing tool not only to kind of raise money as a traditional capital raise but also get that marketing impact, the additional impact that Paul Elio was describing of engaging with their potential customer base, all the things that Reg A does very well or allows for very well.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	able to allow brokers to engage in some of these activities in a given state. The most prominent among those is the manual exemption, meaning the way NASAA has framed it in their uniform Securities Act for companies that meet a certain set of qualifications as long as a certain amount of information is published in a nationally recognized securities manual, the theory being give investors enough information availability you're able to trade that security or it's exempt from Blue Sky rules, limited broker behavior in that state. The most prominent manual, which was operated by Standard & Poor's, ceased publication earlier this year, in May. We've taken that opportunity to you know, all of this goes to how do you inform issuers what the trading market is going to look like. We've taken that opportunity to work with NASAA, with Mike Pieciak and others to establish OTCQX and OTCQB as manuals so that a company like Elio can say, all right, I'm making all of this disclosure available on OTCQX, not just a set of audited financials that are going to sit in a published book in a library somewhere.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	controversial of the additional issuer types to potentially gain access to Reg A. These are companies that are already current in their SEC reporting requirements, so they're providing more information than is required under Reg A already. They are, you know, again current so they're kind of active good citizens already. They are permitted of course to do more traditional offering types, S-1 and S- 3. Those are more costly avenues in many cases. They don't have the Blue Sky preemption at the offering stage that Reg A offers. Even S-3, which is obviously a more streamlined process, has some public float requirements, 75 million in public float. So there are issuers who are kind of left out who might otherwise be able to use this financing tool not only to kind of raise money as a traditional capital raise but also get that marketing impact, the additional impact that Paul Elio was describing of engaging with their potential customer base, all the things that Reg A does very well or allows for very well.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	able to allow brokers to engage in some of these activities in a given state. The most prominent among those is the manual exemption, meaning the way NASAA has framed it in their uniform Securities Act for companies that meet a certain set of qualifications as long as a certain amount of information is published in a nationally recognized securities manual, the theory being give investors enough information availability you're able to trade that security or it's exempt from Blue Sky rules, limited broker behavior in that state. The most prominent manual, which was operated by Standard & Poor's, ceased publication earlier this year, in May. We've taken that opportunity to you know, all of this goes to how do you inform issuers what the trading market is going to look like. We've taken that opportunity to work with NASAA, with Mike Pieciak and others to establish OTCQX and OTCQB as manuals so that a company like Elio can say, all right, I'm making all of this disclosure available on OTCQX, not just a set of audited financials that are going to sit in a published book in a library somewhere. But this is dynamic information. It's the annual audited financials, its quarterly reports, timely	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	controversial of the additional issuer types to potentially gain access to Reg A. These are companies that are already current in their SEC reporting requirements, so they're providing more information than is required under Reg A already. They are, you know, again current so they're kind of active good citizens already. They are permitted of course to do more traditional offering types, S-1 and S- 3. Those are more costly avenues in many cases. They don't have the Blue Sky preemption at the offering stage that Reg A offers. Even S-3, which is obviously a more streamlined process, has some public float requirements, 75 million in public float. So there are issuers who are kind of left out who might otherwise be able to use this financing tool not only to kind of raise money as a traditional capital raise but also get that marketing impact, the additional impact that Paul Elio was describing of engaging with their potential customer base, all the things that Reg A does very well or allows for very well. Sebastian touched on it briefly, but the additional part of our petition is to allow for at the market offerings, which more or less means allowing the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	able to allow brokers to engage in some of these activities in a given state. The most prominent among those is the manual exemption, meaning the way NASAA has framed it in their uniform Securities Act for companies that meet a certain set of qualifications as long as a certain amount of information is published in a nationally recognized securities manual, the theory being give investors enough information availability you're able to trade that security or it's exempt from Blue Sky rules, limited broker behavior in that state. The most prominent manual, which was operated by Standard & Poor's, ceased publication earlier this year, in May. We've taken that opportunity to you know, all of this goes to how do you inform issuers what the trading market is going to look like. We've taken that opportunity to work with NASAA, with Mike Pieciak and others to establish OTCQX and OTCQB as manuals so that a company like Elio can say, all right, I'm making all of this disclosure available on OTCQX, not just a set of audited financials that are going to sit in a published book in a library somewhere. But this is dynamic information. It's the annual audited financials, its quarterly reports, timely disclosure of material news and all of the trading	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	controversial of the additional issuer types to potentially gain access to Reg A. These are companies that are already current in their SEC reporting requirements, so they're providing more information than is required under Reg A already. They are, you know, again current so they're kind of active good citizens already. They are permitted of course to do more traditional offering types, S-1 and S- 3. Those are more costly avenues in many cases. They don't have the Blue Sky preemption at the offering stage that Reg A offers. Even S-3, which is obviously a more streamlined process, has some public float requirements, 75 million in public float. So there are issuers who are kind of left out who might otherwise be able to use this financing tool not only to kind of raise money as a traditional capital raise but also get that marketing impact, the additional impact that Paul Elio was describing of engaging with their potential customer base, all the things that Reg A does very well or allows for very well. Sebastian touched on it briefly, but the additional part of our petition is to allow for at the market offerings, which more or less means allowing the offering to adjust to the current trading price of a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	able to allow brokers to engage in some of these activities in a given state. The most prominent among those is the manual exemption, meaning the way NASAA has framed it in their uniform Securities Act for companies that meet a certain set of qualifications as long as a certain amount of information is published in a nationally recognized securities manual, the theory being give investors enough information availability you're able to trade that security or it's exempt from Blue Sky rules, limited broker behavior in that state. The most prominent manual, which was operated by Standard & Poor's, ceased publication earlier this year, in May. We've taken that opportunity to you know, all of this goes to how do you inform issuers what the trading market is going to look like. We've taken that opportunity to work with NASAA, with Mike Pieciak and others to establish OTCQX and OTCQB as manuals so that a company like Elio can say, all right, I'm making all of this disclosure available on OTCQX, not just a set of audited financials that are going to sit in a published book in a library somewhere. But this is dynamic information. It's the annual audited financials, its quarterly reports, timely	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	controversial of the additional issuer types to potentially gain access to Reg A. These are companies that are already current in their SEC reporting requirements, so they're providing more information than is required under Reg A already. They are, you know, again current so they're kind of active good citizens already. They are permitted of course to do more traditional offering types, S-1 and S- 3. Those are more costly avenues in many cases. They don't have the Blue Sky preemption at the offering stage that Reg A offers. Even S-3, which is obviously a more streamlined process, has some public float requirements, 75 million in public float. So there are issuers who are kind of left out who might otherwise be able to use this financing tool not only to kind of raise money as a traditional capital raise but also get that marketing impact, the additional impact that Paul Elio was describing of engaging with their potential customer base, all the things that Reg A does very well or allows for very well. Sebastian touched on it briefly, but the additional part of our petition is to allow for at the market offerings, which more or less means allowing the

	Page 134		Page 136
1	registered theoretically there's a market, a trading	1	done in that way. That doesn't allow for the dealer
2	market that exists for them already. And so an at the	2	market model that OTC Markets and potentially others may
3	market offering would allow any Reg A offering to be	3	find more useful.
4	priced accordingly.	4	Our point in all of our discussions about this
5	And there's I noted some public support	5	has been you want to allow for competition, particularly
6	here. I got an email just before I sat down here that	6	where you have a tool that is clearly useful, like Reg A.
7	there are now a dozen comment letters in support in the	7	It clearly has a lot of applications. You don't want to
8	SEC file. As Sebastian did I encourage everyone to take	8	start prescribing the kind of trading market that needs
9	a look at it, come back with any questions. Obviously	9	to develop around it. Allow these companies to trade in
		1	a number of different markets. Resources will flow to
10	submit comments through the process, and we're looking	10	
11	forward to working with the SEC more on that going	11	the ones that work. The market will actually figure this
12	forward.	12	out.
13	I will end, I promise I will end on a couple of	13	Some of the reasoning, at least that we've
14	slides just discussing the type of market that may work	14	heard behind directing these types of discussions towards
15	best for Reg A companies and others that are similarly	15	exchanges specifically are that exchanges get Blue Sky
16	situated. There's been a lot of discussion, a lot of it	16	preemption for secondary trading, they get things like
17	started at the SEC and Commissioner Gallagher was a big	17	margin eligibility. I think when you're talking to a
18	proponent of this kind of conversation. It's moved to	18	regulatory or legislative crowd that has a little bit of
19	the Hill. There have been some legislative proposals	19	control over how these things work the better model, at
20	talking about venture markets or what's really been	20	least I submit the better model, is to establish what you
21	venture exchanges.	21	think of as venture company.
22	I think there's sometimes a lack of	22	What are the companies that you're trying to
23	understanding about what exists now in terms of OTC	23	help with this? I indicate what factors those companies
24	Markets and just what the current regulations would allow	24	need to meet to qualify, and then say, all right, those
25	for in development, things that are not OTC Markets but	25	companies they get Blue Sky preemption, or margin
	Page 135		Page 137
	J	1	Fage 157
1	that may develop over time.	1	eligibility, or whatever other treatment the regulator or
1 2		1 2	
	that may develop over time.	1	eligibility, or whatever other treatment the regulator or
2	that may develop over time. I promised academic studies and here you go. There was a study done by Professors Aggarwal and Angel that was really exploring why the AMEX small company	2	eligibility, or whatever other treatment the regulator or Congress thinks is appropriate, but don't mandate where they have to trade. That's it's a roundabout way of dictating what's going to happen and potentially
2 3	that may develop over time. I promised academic studies and here you go. There was a study done by Professors Aggarwal and Angel	2 3	eligibility, or whatever other treatment the regulator or Congress thinks is appropriate, but don't mandate where they have to trade. That's it's a roundabout way of
2 3 4	that may develop over time. I promised academic studies and here you go. There was a study done by Professors Aggarwal and Angel that was really exploring why the AMEX small company	2 3 4	eligibility, or whatever other treatment the regulator or Congress thinks is appropriate, but don't mandate where they have to trade. That's it's a roundabout way of dictating what's going to happen and potentially foreclosing options that could be a lot more useful. Again competition is the key. I will close on
2 3 4 5	that may develop over time. I promised academic studies and here you go. There was a study done by Professors Aggarwal and Angel that was really exploring why the AMEX small company market, small company marketplace in the 90's failed and it talked about some of the common characteristics of successful small company markets. They grew out of the	2 3 4 5	eligibility, or whatever other treatment the regulator or Congress thinks is appropriate, but don't mandate where they have to trade. That's it's a roundabout way of dictating what's going to happen and potentially foreclosing options that could be a lot more useful. Again competition is the key. I will close on a slide that I will fully attribute in the spirit of
2 3 4 5 6	that may develop over time. I promised academic studies and here you go. There was a study done by Professors Aggarwal and Angel that was really exploring why the AMEX small company market, small company marketplace in the 90's failed and it talked about some of the common characteristics of	2 3 4 5 6	eligibility, or whatever other treatment the regulator or Congress thinks is appropriate, but don't mandate where they have to trade. That's it's a roundabout way of dictating what's going to happen and potentially foreclosing options that could be a lot more useful. Again competition is the key. I will close on
2 3 4 5 6 7	that may develop over time. I promised academic studies and here you go. There was a study done by Professors Aggarwal and Angel that was really exploring why the AMEX small company market, small company marketplace in the 90's failed and it talked about some of the common characteristics of successful small company markets. They grew out of the	2 3 4 5 6 7	eligibility, or whatever other treatment the regulator or Congress thinks is appropriate, but don't mandate where they have to trade. That's it's a roundabout way of dictating what's going to happen and potentially foreclosing options that could be a lot more useful. Again competition is the key. I will close on a slide that I will fully attribute in the spirit of transparency to our CEO, Cromwell Coulson. This is one of his favorites. And it's just an image to kind of take
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	that may develop over time. I promised academic studies and here you go. There was a study done by Professors Aggarwal and Angel that was really exploring why the AMEX small company market, small company marketplace in the 90's failed and it talked about some of the common characteristics of successful small company markets. They grew out of the preexisting over-the-counter markets. They operated as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	eligibility, or whatever other treatment the regulator or Congress thinks is appropriate, but don't mandate where they have to trade. That's it's a roundabout way of dictating what's going to happen and potentially foreclosing options that could be a lot more useful. Again competition is the key. I will close on a slide that I will fully attribute in the spirit of transparency to our CEO, Cromwell Coulson. This is one of his favorites. And it's just an image to kind of take away about why the auction model, the exchange model is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	that may develop over time. I promised academic studies and here you go. There was a study done by Professors Aggarwal and Angel that was really exploring why the AMEX small company market, small company marketplace in the 90's failed and it talked about some of the common characteristics of successful small company markets. They grew out of the preexisting over-the-counter markets. They operated as dealer markets and they were separate from the existing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	eligibility, or whatever other treatment the regulator or Congress thinks is appropriate, but don't mandate where they have to trade. That's it's a roundabout way of dictating what's going to happen and potentially foreclosing options that could be a lot more useful. Again competition is the key. I will close on a slide that I will fully attribute in the spirit of transparency to our CEO, Cromwell Coulson. This is one of his favorites. And it's just an image to kind of take
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	that may develop over time. I promised academic studies and here you go. There was a study done by Professors Aggarwal and Angel that was really exploring why the AMEX small company market, small company marketplace in the 90's failed and it talked about some of the common characteristics of successful small company markets. They grew out of the preexisting over-the-counter markets. They operated as dealer markets and they were separate from the existing exchanges.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	eligibility, or whatever other treatment the regulator or Congress thinks is appropriate, but don't mandate where they have to trade. That's it's a roundabout way of dictating what's going to happen and potentially foreclosing options that could be a lot more useful. Again competition is the key. I will close on a slide that I will fully attribute in the spirit of transparency to our CEO, Cromwell Coulson. This is one of his favorites. And it's just an image to kind of take away about why the auction model, the exchange model is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	that may develop over time. I promised academic studies and here you go. There was a study done by Professors Aggarwal and Angel that was really exploring why the AMEX small company market, small company marketplace in the 90's failed and it talked about some of the common characteristics of successful small company markets. They grew out of the preexisting over-the-counter markets. They operated as dealer markets and they were separate from the existing exchanges. That really is what OTC Markets has built. It	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	eligibility, or whatever other treatment the regulator or Congress thinks is appropriate, but don't mandate where they have to trade. That's it's a roundabout way of dictating what's going to happen and potentially foreclosing options that could be a lot more useful. Again competition is the key. I will close on a slide that I will fully attribute in the spirit of transparency to our CEO, Cromwell Coulson. This is one of his favorites. And it's just an image to kind of take away about why the auction model, the exchange model is not always right for companies that don't have a deep
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	that may develop over time. I promised academic studies and here you go. There was a study done by Professors Aggarwal and Angel that was really exploring why the AMEX small company market, small company marketplace in the 90's failed and it talked about some of the common characteristics of successful small company markets. They grew out of the preexisting over-the-counter markets. They operated as dealer markets and they were separate from the existing exchanges. That really is what OTC Markets has built. It is certainly an available path for others that may hop	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	eligibility, or whatever other treatment the regulator or Congress thinks is appropriate, but don't mandate where they have to trade. That's it's a roundabout way of dictating what's going to happen and potentially foreclosing options that could be a lot more useful. Again competition is the key. I will close on a slide that I will fully attribute in the spirit of transparency to our CEO, Cromwell Coulson. This is one of his favorites. And it's just an image to kind of take away about why the auction model, the exchange model is not always right for companies that don't have a deep order book. This was Joan Rivers dog's bowl I suppose that sold at auction for about 30 times the low estimate on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	that may develop over time. I promised academic studies and here you go. There was a study done by Professors Aggarwal and Angel that was really exploring why the AMEX small company market, small company marketplace in the 90's failed and it talked about some of the common characteristics of successful small company markets. They grew out of the preexisting over-the-counter markets. They operated as dealer markets and they were separate from the existing exchanges. That really is what OTC Markets has built. It is certainly an available path for others that may hop into the market that may find some sort of market structure that works best for these companies. All of those things are possible.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	eligibility, or whatever other treatment the regulator or Congress thinks is appropriate, but don't mandate where they have to trade. That's it's a roundabout way of dictating what's going to happen and potentially foreclosing options that could be a lot more useful. Again competition is the key. I will close on a slide that I will fully attribute in the spirit of transparency to our CEO, Cromwell Coulson. This is one of his favorites. And it's just an image to kind of take away about why the auction model, the exchange model is not always right for companies that don't have a deep order book. This was Joan Rivers dog's bowl I suppose that sold at auction for about 30 times the low estimate on Christie's, a specialty item like you might think of a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	that may develop over time. I promised academic studies and here you go. There was a study done by Professors Aggarwal and Angel that was really exploring why the AMEX small company market, small company marketplace in the 90's failed and it talked about some of the common characteristics of successful small company markets. They grew out of the preexisting over-the-counter markets. They operated as dealer markets and they were separate from the existing exchanges. That really is what OTC Markets has built. It is certainly an available path for others that may hop into the market that may find some sort of market structure that works best for these companies. All of those things are possible. The current proposals have focused specifically on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	eligibility, or whatever other treatment the regulator or Congress thinks is appropriate, but don't mandate where they have to trade. That's it's a roundabout way of dictating what's going to happen and potentially foreclosing options that could be a lot more useful. Again competition is the key. I will close on a slide that I will fully attribute in the spirit of transparency to our CEO, Cromwell Coulson. This is one of his favorites. And it's just an image to kind of take away about why the auction model, the exchange model is not always right for companies that don't have a deep order book. This was Joan Rivers dog's bowl I suppose that sold at auction for about 30 times the low estimate on Christie's, a specialty item like you might think of a company, a Reg A kind of company that appeals to a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	that may develop over time. I promised academic studies and here you go. There was a study done by Professors Aggarwal and Angel that was really exploring why the AMEX small company market, small company marketplace in the 90's failed and it talked about some of the common characteristics of successful small company markets. They grew out of the preexisting over-the-counter markets. They operated as dealer markets and they were separate from the existing exchanges. That really is what OTC Markets has built. It is certainly an available path for others that may hop into the market that may find some sort of market structure that works best for these companies. All of those things are possible. The current proposals have focused specifically on the exchange model and said we need to have a venture	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	eligibility, or whatever other treatment the regulator or Congress thinks is appropriate, but don't mandate where they have to trade. That's it's a roundabout way of dictating what's going to happen and potentially foreclosing options that could be a lot more useful. Again competition is the key. I will close on a slide that I will fully attribute in the spirit of transparency to our CEO, Cromwell Coulson. This is one of his favorites. And it's just an image to kind of take away about why the auction model, the exchange model is not always right for companies that don't have a deep order book. This was Joan Rivers dog's bowl I suppose that sold at auction for about 30 times the low estimate on Christie's, a specialty item like you might think of a company, a Reg A kind of company that appeals to a certain kind of investor or consumer base that traded a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	that may develop over time. I promised academic studies and here you go. There was a study done by Professors Aggarwal and Angel that was really exploring why the AMEX small company market, small company marketplace in the 90's failed and it talked about some of the common characteristics of successful small company markets. They grew out of the preexisting over-the-counter markets. They operated as dealer markets and they were separate from the existing exchanges. That really is what OTC Markets has built. It is certainly an available path for others that may hop into the market that may find some sort of market structure that works best for these companies. All of those things are possible.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	eligibility, or whatever other treatment the regulator or Congress thinks is appropriate, but don't mandate where they have to trade. That's it's a roundabout way of dictating what's going to happen and potentially foreclosing options that could be a lot more useful. Again competition is the key. I will close on a slide that I will fully attribute in the spirit of transparency to our CEO, Cromwell Coulson. This is one of his favorites. And it's just an image to kind of take away about why the auction model, the exchange model is not always right for companies that don't have a deep order book. This was Joan Rivers dog's bowl I suppose that sold at auction for about 30 times the low estimate on Christie's, a specialty item like you might think of a company, a Reg A kind of company that appeals to a certain kind of investor or consumer base that traded a little bit out of whack because the model available to it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	that may develop over time. I promised academic studies and here you go. There was a study done by Professors Aggarwal and Angel that was really exploring why the AMEX small company market, small company marketplace in the 90's failed and it talked about some of the common characteristics of successful small company markets. They grew out of the preexisting over-the-counter markets. They operated as dealer markets and they were separate from the existing exchanges. That really is what OTC Markets has built. It is certainly an available path for others that may hop into the market that may find some sort of market structure that works best for these companies. All of those things are possible. The current proposals have focused specifically on the exchange model and said we need to have a venture exchange, meaning a national – a registered securities exchange.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	eligibility, or whatever other treatment the regulator or Congress thinks is appropriate, but don't mandate where they have to trade. That's it's a roundabout way of dictating what's going to happen and potentially foreclosing options that could be a lot more useful. Again competition is the key. I will close on a slide that I will fully attribute in the spirit of transparency to our CEO, Cromwell Coulson. This is one of his favorites. And it's just an image to kind of take away about why the auction model, the exchange model is not always right for companies that don't have a deep order book. This was Joan Rivers dog's bowl I suppose that sold at auction for about 30 times the low estimate on Christie's, a specialty item like you might think of a company, a Reg A kind of company that appeals to a certain kind of investor or consumer base that traded a little bit out of whack because the model available to it was auction. If you could have some competing dealers
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	that may develop over time. I promised academic studies and here you go. There was a study done by Professors Aggarwal and Angel that was really exploring why the AMEX small company market, small company marketplace in the 90's failed and it talked about some of the common characteristics of successful small company markets. They grew out of the preexisting over-the-counter markets. They operated as dealer markets and they were separate from the existing exchanges. That really is what OTC Markets has built. It is certainly an available path for others that may hop into the market that may find some sort of market structure that works best for these companies. All of those things are possible. The current proposals have focused specifically on the exchange model and said we need to have a venture exchange, meaning a national – a registered securities exchange. So going back to that market structure	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	eligibility, or whatever other treatment the regulator or Congress thinks is appropriate, but don't mandate where they have to trade. That's it's a roundabout way of dictating what's going to happen and potentially foreclosing options that could be a lot more useful. Again competition is the key. I will close on a slide that I will fully attribute in the spirit of transparency to our CEO, Cromwell Coulson. This is one of his favorites. And it's just an image to kind of take away about why the auction model, the exchange model is not always right for companies that don't have a deep order book. This was Joan Rivers dog's bowl I suppose that sold at auction for about 30 times the low estimate on Christie's, a specialty item like you might think of a company, a Reg A kind of company that appeals to a certain kind of investor or consumer base that traded a little bit out of whack because the model available to it was auction. If you could have some competing dealers that maybe bring a little more sense to the market you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	that may develop over time. I promised academic studies and here you go. There was a study done by Professors Aggarwal and Angel that was really exploring why the AMEX small company market, small company marketplace in the 90's failed and it talked about some of the common characteristics of successful small company markets. They grew out of the preexisting over-the-counter markets. They operated as dealer markets and they were separate from the existing exchanges. That really is what OTC Markets has built. It is certainly an available path for others that may hop into the market that may find some sort of market structure that works best for these companies. All of those things are possible. The current proposals have focused specifically on the exchange model and said we need to have a venture exchange, meaning a national a registered securities exchange. So going back to that market structure discussion from earlier, an exchange has to operate with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	eligibility, or whatever other treatment the regulator or Congress thinks is appropriate, but don't mandate where they have to trade. That's it's a roundabout way of dictating what's going to happen and potentially foreclosing options that could be a lot more useful. Again competition is the key. I will close on a slide that I will fully attribute in the spirit of transparency to our CEO, Cromwell Coulson. This is one of his favorites. And it's just an image to kind of take away about why the auction model, the exchange model is not always right for companies that don't have a deep order book. This was Joan Rivers dog's bowl I suppose that sold at auction for about 30 times the low estimate on Christie's, a specialty item like you might think of a company, a Reg A kind of company that appeals to a certain kind of investor or consumer base that traded a little bit out of whack because the model available to it was auction. If you could have some competing dealers that maybe bring a little more sense to the market you might not have wound – although the Rivers' estate is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	that may develop over time. I promised academic studies and here you go. There was a study done by Professors Aggarwal and Angel that was really exploring why the AMEX small company market, small company marketplace in the 90's failed and it talked about some of the common characteristics of successful small company markets. They grew out of the preexisting over-the-counter markets. They operated as dealer markets and they were separate from the existing exchanges. That really is what OTC Markets has built. It is certainly an available path for others that may hop into the market that may find some sort of market structure that works best for these companies. All of those things are possible. The current proposals have focused specifically on the exchange model and said we need to have a venture exchange, meaning a national – a registered securities exchange. So going back to that market structure discussion from earlier, an exchange has to operate with that central limit order book, that fast kind of speed of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	eligibility, or whatever other treatment the regulator or Congress thinks is appropriate, but don't mandate where they have to trade. That's it's a roundabout way of dictating what's going to happen and potentially foreclosing options that could be a lot more useful. Again competition is the key. I will close on a slide that I will fully attribute in the spirit of transparency to our CEO, Cromwell Coulson. This is one of his favorites. And it's just an image to kind of take away about why the auction model, the exchange model is not always right for companies that don't have a deep order book. This was Joan Rivers dog's bowl I suppose that sold at auction for about 30 times the low estimate on Christie's, a specialty item like you might think of a company, a Reg A kind of company that appeals to a certain kind of investor or consumer base that traded a little bit out of whack because the model available to it was auction. If you could have some competing dealers that maybe bring a little more sense to the market you might not have wound although the Rivers' estate is not complaining, you might not have wound up with a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that may develop over time. I promised academic studies and here you go. There was a study done by Professors Aggarwal and Angel that was really exploring why the AMEX small company market, small company marketplace in the 90's failed and it talked about some of the common characteristics of successful small company markets. They grew out of the preexisting over-the-counter markets. They operated as dealer markets and they were separate from the existing exchanges. That really is what OTC Markets has built. It is certainly an available path for others that may hop into the market that may find some sort of market structure that works best for these companies. All of those things are possible. The current proposals have focused specifically on the exchange model and said we need to have a venture exchange, meaning a national a registered securities exchange. So going back to that market structure discussion from earlier, an exchange has to operate with that central limit order book, that fast kind of speed of execution based model for the volume. For the trading to the execution based model for the volume. For the trading to the present of the companies.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	eligibility, or whatever other treatment the regulator or Congress thinks is appropriate, but don't mandate where they have to trade. That's it's a roundabout way of dictating what's going to happen and potentially foreclosing options that could be a lot more useful. Again competition is the key. I will close on a slide that I will fully attribute in the spirit of transparency to our CEO, Cromwell Coulson. This is one of his favorites. And it's just an image to kind of take away about why the auction model, the exchange model is not always right for companies that don't have a deep order book. This was Joan Rivers dog's bowl I suppose that sold at auction for about 30 times the low estimate on Christie's, a specialty item like you might think of a company, a Reg A kind of company that appeals to a certain kind of investor or consumer base that traded a little bit out of whack because the model available to it was auction. If you could have some competing dealers that maybe bring a little more sense to the market you might not have wound although the Rivers' estate is not complaining, you might not have wound up with a \$14,000 dog bowl.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<text><text><text></text></text></text>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	eligibility, or whatever other treatment the regulator or Congress thinks is appropriate, but don't mandate where they have to trade. That's it's a roundabout way of dictating what's going to happen and potentially foreclosing options that could be a lot more useful. Again competition is the key. I will close on a slide that I will fully attribute in the spirit of transparency to our CEO, Cromwell Coulson. This is one of his favorites. And it's just an image to kind of take away about why the auction model, the exchange model is not always right for companies that don't have a deep order book. This was Joan Rivers dog's bowl I suppose that sold at auction for about 30 times the low estimate on Christie's, a specialty item like you might think of a company, a Reg A kind of company that appeals to a certain kind of investor or consumer base that traded a little bit out of whack because the model available to it was auction. If you could have some competing dealers that maybe bring a little more sense to the market you might not have wound although the Rivers' estate is not complaining, you might not have wound up with a \$14,000 dog bowl. With that I will end the presentation and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that may develop over time. I promised academic studies and here you go. There was a study done by Professors Aggarwal and Angel that was really exploring why the AMEX small company market, small company marketplace in the 90's failed and it talked about some of the common characteristics of successful small company markets. They grew out of the preexisting over-the-counter markets. They operated as dealer markets and they were separate from the existing exchanges. That really is what OTC Markets has built. It is certainly an available path for others that may hop into the market that may find some sort of market structure that works best for these companies. All of those things are possible. The current proposals have focused specifically on the exchange model and said we need to have a venture exchange, meaning a national a registered securities exchange. So going back to that market structure discussion from earlier, an exchange has to operate with that central limit order book, that fast kind of speed of execution based model for the volume. For the trading to the execution based model for the volume. For the trading to the present of the companies.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	eligibility, or whatever other treatment the regulator or Congress thinks is appropriate, but don't mandate where they have to trade. That's it's a roundabout way of dictating what's going to happen and potentially foreclosing options that could be a lot more useful. Again competition is the key. I will close on a slide that I will fully attribute in the spirit of transparency to our CEO, Cromwell Coulson. This is one of his favorites. And it's just an image to kind of take away about why the auction model, the exchange model is not always right for companies that don't have a deep order book. This was Joan Rivers dog's bowl I suppose that sold at auction for about 30 times the low estimate on Christie's, a specialty item like you might think of a company, a Reg A kind of company that appeals to a certain kind of investor or consumer base that traded a little bit out of whack because the model available to it was auction. If you could have some competing dealers that maybe bring a little more sense to the market you might not have wound although the Rivers' estate is not complaining, you might not have wound up with a \$14,000 dog bowl.

	Page 138		Page 140
1	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Before you ask questions	1	company, whether they're going to quote it on our system
2	could we get copies of the slides?	2	or another system out there.
3	A PARTICIPANT: They're up on the website.	3	The kinds of questions that can come back, and
4	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: They're on the website.	4	just to focus it on Reg A, are sometimes the nature of
5	Okay.	5	the purchaser. They want to see subscription agreements
6	MR. ZINN: I can certainly send them around	6	from each individual purchaser of the securities. They
7	too, to the extent people are interested. I'll make sure	7	want to know from a broker mind you things that really
8	they get distributed to the group.	8	even the issuer is not necessarily permitted to provide.
9	MR. GOMEZ: Steve, would you like copies now,	9	So you have this competition between a broker
10	is that what you	10	who's not allowed to receive compensation for performing
11	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: No, I should have asked	11	the service, this has to be of their own accord, and so
12	before but it's I'm fine.	12	really can't have that kind of close relationship with
13	MR. ZINN: If there's anything you want me to	13	the issuer, being asked to answer questions about
14	reference I'll make sure I get to it.	14	insiders and about, you know, where the money came from
15	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. Questions, comments.	15	to purchase shares. It becomes a very sticky process.
16	Patrick.	16	And some of that is FINRA going through the
17	MR. REARDON: You referenced these brokers as	17	same process as the brokers and clearing firms I've
18	market makers but they are I think I heard you say	18	described before and really learning what it is to be a
19	that they're really matching orders is what they're	19	Reg A security and trying to figure out how they can
20	doing, they're not making a market in these securities.	20	handle that. So they are they are open to our
21	MR. ZINN: Oh, you mean on OTC Link? No, they	21	outreach in terms of trying to improve the process a
22	are acting as market makers.	22	little bit. We try to work with them.
23	MR. REARDON: So they buy for their own	23	MS. MOTT: Can you help me understand. I
24	account?	24	probably got it's probably in one of your slides, but
25	MR. ZINN: Yes, they buy for their own account	25	if there if they're filed with Reg A do they are
	Page 139		Page 141
1	_	1	
1 2	or for the account of customers, but they stand ready to	1	Page 141 they under the QX or the QB? I mean, which is it is it
	_		they under the QX or the QB? I mean, which is it is
2	or for the account of customers, but they stand ready to buy or sell.	2	they under the QX or the QB? I mean, which is it is it
2 3	or for the account of customers, but they stand ready to buy or sell. MR. REARDON: So like a trading balance or	2 3	they under the QX or the QB? I mean, which is it is it MR. ZINN: So it can be either.
2 3 4	or for the account of customers, but they stand ready to buy or sell. MR. REARDON: So like a trading balance or something like that they've got to buy into it or	2 3 4	they under the QX or the QB? I mean, which is it is it MR. ZINN: So it can be either. MS. MOTT: Okay.
2 3 4 5	or for the account of customers, but they stand ready to buy or sell. MR. REARDON: So like a trading balance or something like that they've got to buy into it or MR. ZINN: Right. So all the brokers that	2 3 4 5	they under the QX or the QB? I mean, which is it is it MR. ZINN: So it can be either. MS. MOTT: Okay. MR. ZINN: So for QX and QB, you know, an
2 3 4 5 6	or for the account of customers, but they stand ready to buy or sell. MR. REARDON: So like a trading balance or something like that they've got to buy into it or MR. ZINN: Right. So all the brokers that subscribe to our system are required to be FINRA members.	2 3 4 5 6	they under the QX or the QB? I mean, which is it is it MR. ZINN: So it can be either. MS. MOTT: Okay. MR. ZINN: So for QX and QB, you know, an issuer is applying to achieve that designation. At the
2 3 4 5 6 7	or for the account of customers, but they stand ready to buy or sell. MR. REARDON: So like a trading balance or something like that they've got to buy into it or MR. ZINN: Right. So all the brokers that subscribe to our system are required to be FINRA members. So they're subject to the entire FINRA rule book, which	2 3 4 5 6 7	they under the QX or the QB? I mean, which is it is it MR. ZINN: So it can be either. MS. MOTT: Okay. MR. ZINN: So for QX and QB, you know, an issuer is applying to achieve that designation. At the end of the day what QX is the same thing as NASDAQ or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	or for the account of customers, but they stand ready to buy or sell. MR. REARDON: So like a trading balance or something like that they've got to buy into it or MR. ZINN: Right. So all the brokers that subscribe to our system are required to be FINRA members. So they're subject to the entire FINRA rule book, which gives certain consideration to brokers that act as market	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	they under the QX or the QB? I mean, which is it is it MR. ZINN: So it can be either. MS. MOTT: Okay. MR. ZINN: So for QX and QB, you know, an issuer is applying to achieve that designation. At the end of the day what QX is the same thing as NASDAQ or New York. It's not the mechanism by which you're raising
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	or for the account of customers, but they stand ready to buy or sell. MR. REARDON: So like a trading balance or something like that they've got to buy into it or MR. ZINN: Right. So all the brokers that subscribe to our system are required to be FINRA members. So they're subject to the entire FINRA rule book, which gives certain consideration to brokers that act as market makers in certain capacities. And so not every broker is required. We would allow an agency broker to participate in the market. But	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	they under the QX or the QB? I mean, which is it is it MR. ZINN: So it can be either. MS. MOTT: Okay. MR. ZINN: So for QX and QB, you know, an issuer is applying to achieve that designation. At the end of the day what QX is the same thing as NASDAQ or New York. It's not the mechanism by which you're raising money, it's just kind of the advertisement for lack of a better word of I've met this standard, I qualify for this club, and this is where I'm going to trade.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	or for the account of customers, but they stand ready to buy or sell. MR. REARDON: So like a trading balance or something like that they've got to buy into it or MR. ZINN: Right. So all the brokers that subscribe to our system are required to be FINRA members. So they're subject to the entire FINRA rule book, which gives certain consideration to brokers that act as market makers in certain capacities. And so not every broker is required. We would allow an agency broker to participate in the market. But to the extent they are holding themselves out as market	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	they under the QX or the QB? I mean, which is it is it MR. ZINN: So it can be either. MS. MOTT: Okay. MR. ZINN: So for QX and QB, you know, an issuer is applying to achieve that designation. At the end of the day what QX is the same thing as NASDAQ or New York. It's not the mechanism by which you're raising money, it's just kind of the advertisement for lack of a better word of I've met this standard, I qualify for this club, and this is where I'm going to trade. So somebody like Elio determined to try to meet
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	or for the account of customers, but they stand ready to buy or sell. MR. REARDON: So like a trading balance or something like that they've got to buy into it or MR. ZINN: Right. So all the brokers that subscribe to our system are required to be FINRA members. So they're subject to the entire FINRA rule book, which gives certain consideration to brokers that act as market makers in certain capacities. And so not every broker is required. We would allow an agency broker to participate in the market. But to the extent they are holding themselves out as market makers for treatment under the FINRA rules they act as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>they under the QX or the QB? I mean, which is it is it</li> <li>MR. ZINN: So it can be either. MS. MOTT: Okay. MR. ZINN: So for QX and QB, you know, an issuer is applying to achieve that designation. At the end of the day what QX is the same thing as NASDAQ or New York. It's not the mechanism by which you're raising money, it's just kind of the advertisement for lack of a better word of I've met this standard, I qualify for this club, and this is where I'm going to trade.</li> <li>So somebody like Elio determined to try to meet the OTCQX requirements. So there are this is why I</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	or for the account of customers, but they stand ready to buy or sell. MR. REARDON: So like a trading balance or something like that they've got to buy into it or MR. ZINN: Right. So all the brokers that subscribe to our system are required to be FINRA members. So they're subject to the entire FINRA rule book, which gives certain consideration to brokers that act as market makers in certain capacities. And so not every broker is required. We would allow an agency broker to participate in the market. But to the extent they are holding themselves out as market makers for treatment under the FINRA rules they act as market makers on our system.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>they under the QX or the QB? I mean, which is it is it</li> <li>MR. ZINN: So it can be either. MS. MOTT: Okay. MR. ZINN: So for QX and QB, you know, an issuer is applying to achieve that designation. At the end of the day what QX is the same thing as NASDAQ or New York. It's not the mechanism by which you're raising money, it's just kind of the advertisement for lack of a better word of I've met this standard, I qualify for this club, and this is where I'm going to trade.</li> <li>So somebody like Elio determined to try to meet the OTCQX requirements. So there are this is why I could have done this for hours, but there are a whole set</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	or for the account of customers, but they stand ready to buy or sell. MR. REARDON: So like a trading balance or something like that they've got to buy into it or MR. ZINN: Right. So all the brokers that subscribe to our system are required to be FINRA members. So they're subject to the entire FINRA rule book, which gives certain consideration to brokers that act as market makers in certain capacities. And so not every broker is required. We would allow an agency broker to participate in the market. But to the extent they are holding themselves out as market makers for treatment under the FINRA rules they act as market makers on our system. MR. REARDON: Okay, thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>they under the QX or the QB? I mean, which is it is it</li> <li>MR. ZINN: So it can be either.</li> <li>MS. MOTT: Okay.</li> <li>MR. ZINN: So for QX and QB, you know, an issuer is applying to achieve that designation. At the end of the day what QX is the same thing as NASDAQ or New York. It's not the mechanism by which you're raising money, it's just kind of the advertisement for lack of a better word of I've met this standard, I qualify for this club, and this is where I'm going to trade.</li> <li>So somebody like Elio determined to try to meet the OTCQX requirements. So there are this is why I could have done this for hours, but there are a whole set of OTCQX rules, not exactly the same but similar to what</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	or for the account of customers, but they stand ready to buy or sell. MR. REARDON: So like a trading balance or something like that they've got to buy into it or MR. ZINN: Right. So all the brokers that subscribe to our system are required to be FINRA members. So they're subject to the entire FINRA rule book, which gives certain consideration to brokers that act as market makers in certain capacities. And so not every broker is required. We would allow an agency broker to participate in the market. But to the extent they are holding themselves out as market makers for treatment under the FINRA rules they act as market makers on our system. MR. REARDON: Okay, thank you. MR. ZINN: Sure.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>they under the QX or the QB? I mean, which is it is it</li> <li>MR. ZINN: So it can be either.</li> <li>MS. MOTT: Okay.</li> <li>MR. ZINN: So for QX and QB, you know, an issuer is applying to achieve that designation. At the end of the day what QX is the same thing as NASDAQ or New York. It's not the mechanism by which you're raising money, it's just kind of the advertisement for lack of a better word of I've met this standard, I qualify for this club, and this is where I'm going to trade.</li> <li>So somebody like Elio determined to try to meet the OTCQX requirements. So there are this is why I could have done this for hours, but there are a whole set of OTCQX rules, not exactly the same but similar to what you would see on a NASDAQ or New York rule set, based</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	or for the account of customers, but they stand ready to buy or sell. MR. REARDON: So like a trading balance or something like that they've got to buy into it or MR. ZINN: Right. So all the brokers that subscribe to our system are required to be FINRA members. So they're subject to the entire FINRA rule book, which gives certain consideration to brokers that act as market makers in certain capacities. And so not every broker is required. We would allow an agency broker to participate in the market. But to the extent they are holding themselves out as market makers for treatment under the FINRA rules they act as market makers on our system. MR. REARDON: Okay, thank you. MR. ZINN: Sure. MR. YADLEY: Can you just talk a little bit	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	they under the QX or the QB? I mean, which is it is it MR. ZINN: So it can be either. MS. MOTT: Okay. MR. ZINN: So for QX and QB, you know, an issuer is applying to achieve that designation. At the end of the day what QX is the same thing as NASDAQ or New York. It's not the mechanism by which you're raising money, it's just kind of the advertisement for lack of a better word of I've met this standard, I qualify for this club, and this is where I'm going to trade. So somebody like Elio determined to try to meet the OTCQX requirements. So there are a whole set of OTCQX rules, not exactly the same but similar to what you would see on a NASDAQ or New York rule set, based largely on the NASAA Uniform Securities Act with some
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	or for the account of customers, but they stand ready to buy or sell. MR. REARDON: So like a trading balance or something like that they've got to buy into it or – MR. ZINN: Right. So all the brokers that subscribe to our system are required to be FINRA members. So they're subject to the entire FINRA rule book, which gives certain consideration to brokers that act as market makers in certain capacities. And so not every broker is required. We would allow an agency broker to participate in the market. But to the extent they are holding themselves out as market makers for treatment under the FINRA rules they act as market makers on our system. MR. REARDON: Okay, thank you. MR. ZINN: Sure. MR. YADLEY: Can you just talk a little bit more about the initial quotation dialogue between you all	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	they under the QX or the QB? I mean, which is it is it MR. ZINN: So it can be either. MS. MOTT: Okay. MR. ZINN: So for QX and QB, you know, an issuer is applying to achieve that designation. At the end of the day what QX is the same thing as NASDAQ or New York. It's not the mechanism by which you're raising money, it's just kind of the advertisement for lack of a better word of I've met this standard, I qualify for this club, and this is where I'm going to trade. So somebody like Elio determined to try to meet the OTCQX requirements. So there are this is why I could have done this for hours, but there are a whole set of OTCQX rules, not exactly the same but similar to what you would see on a NASDAQ or New York rule set, based largely on the NASAA Uniform Securities Act with some other bells and whistles in there.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	or for the account of customers, but they stand ready to buy or sell. MR. REARDON: So like a trading balance or something like that they've got to buy into it or MR. ZINN: Right. So all the brokers that subscribe to our system are required to be FINRA members. So they're subject to the entire FINRA rule book, which gives certain consideration to brokers that act as market makers in certain capacities. And so not every broker is required. We would allow an agency broker to participate in the market. But to the extent they are holding themselves out as market makers for treatment under the FINRA rules they act as market makers on our system. MR. REARDON: Okay, thank you. MR. ZINN: Sure. MR. YADLEY: Can you just talk a little bit more about the initial quotation dialogue between you all and FINRA and what kind of questions they ask and where	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	they under the QX or the QB? I mean, which is it is it MR. ZINN: So it can be either. MS. MOTT: Okay. MR. ZINN: So for QX and QB, you know, an issuer is applying to achieve that designation. At the end of the day what QX is the same thing as NASDAQ or New York. It's not the mechanism by which you're raising money, it's just kind of the advertisement for lack of a better word of I've met this standard, I qualify for this club, and this is where I'm going to trade. So somebody like Elio determined to try to meet the OTCQX requirements. So there are this is why I could have done this for hours, but there are a whole set of OTCQX rules, not exactly the same but similar to what you would see on a NASDAQ or New York rule set, based largely on the NASAA Uniform Securities Act with some other bells and whistles in there.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	or for the account of customers, but they stand ready to buy or sell. MR. REARDON: So like a trading balance or something like that they've got to buy into it or – MR. ZINN: Right. So all the brokers that subscribe to our system are required to be FINRA members. So they're subject to the entire FINRA rule book, which gives certain consideration to brokers that act as market makers in certain capacities. And so not every broker is required. We would allow an agency broker to participate in the market. But to the extent they are holding themselves out as market makers for treatment under the FINRA rules they act as market makers on our system. MR. REARDON: Okay, thank you. MR. ZINN: Sure. MR. YADLEY: Can you just talk a little bit more about the initial quotation dialogue between you all and FINRA and what kind of questions they ask and where they give you grief probably in your view?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	they under the QX or the QB? I mean, which is it is it MR. ZINN: So it can be either. MS. MOTT: Okay. MR. ZINN: So for QX and QB, you know, an issuer is applying to achieve that designation. At the end of the day what QX is the same thing as NASDAQ or New York. It's not the mechanism by which you're raising money, it's just kind of the advertisement for lack of a better word of I've met this standard, I qualify for this club, and this is where I'm going to trade. So somebody like Elio determined to try to meet the OTCQX requirements. So there are this is why I could have done this for hours, but there are a whole set of OTCQX rules, not exactly the same but similar to what you would see on a NASDAQ or New York rule set, based largely on the NASAA Uniform Securities Act with some other bells and whistles in there. So companies can choose to qualify for either of those markets. If they chose to if they don't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	or for the account of customers, but they stand ready to buy or sell. MR. REARDON: So like a trading balance or something like that they've got to buy into it or MR. ZINN: Right. So all the brokers that subscribe to our system are required to be FINRA members. So they're subject to the entire FINRA rule book, which gives certain consideration to brokers that act as market makers in certain capacities. And so not every broker is required. We would allow an agency broker to participate in the market. But to the extent they are holding themselves out as market makers for treatment under the FINRA rules they act as market makers on our system. MR. REARDON: Okay, thank you. MR. ZINN: Sure. MR. YADLEY: Can you just talk a little bit more about the initial quotation dialogue between you all and FINRA and what kind of questions they ask and where they give you grief probably in your view? MR. ZINN: Right. So it's not a process that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	they under the QX or the QB? I mean, which is it is it MR. ZINN: So it can be either. MS. MOTT: Okay. MR. ZINN: So for QX and QB, you know, an issuer is applying to achieve that designation. At the end of the day what QX is the same thing as NASDAQ or New York. It's not the mechanism by which you're raising money, it's just kind of the advertisement for lack of a better word of I've met this standard, I qualify for this club, and this is where I'm going to trade. So somebody like Elio determined to try to meet the OTCQX requirements. So there are this is why I could have done this for hours, but there are a whole set of OTCQX rules, not exactly the same but similar to what you would see on a NASDAQ or New York rule set, based largely on the NASAA Uniform Securities Act with some other bells and whistles in there. So companies can choose to qualify for either of those markets. If they chose to if they don't chose to go through the process at all and maybe decide
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	or for the account of customers, but they stand ready to buy or sell. MR. REARDON: So like a trading balance or something like that they've got to buy into it or MR. ZINN: Right. So all the brokers that subscribe to our system are required to be FINRA members. So they're subject to the entire FINRA rule book, which gives certain consideration to brokers that act as market makers in certain capacities. And so not every broker is required. We would allow an agency broker to participate in the market. But to the extent they are holding themselves out as market makers for treatment under the FINRA rules they act as market makers on our system. MR. REARDON: Okay, thank you. MR. ZINN: Sure. MR. YADLEY: Can you just talk a little bit more about the initial quotation dialogue between you all and FINRA and what kind of questions they ask and where they give you grief probably in your view? MR. ZINN: Right. So it's not a process that we go through. We kind of sit on the sidelines and watch	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	they under the QX or the QB? I mean, which is it is it MR. ZINN: So it can be either. MS. MOTT: Okay. MR. ZINN: So for QX and QB, you know, an issuer is applying to achieve that designation. At the end of the day what QX is the same thing as NASDAQ or New York. It's not the mechanism by which you're raising money, it's just kind of the advertisement for lack of a better word of I've met this standard, I qualify for this club, and this is where I'm going to trade. So somebody like Elio determined to try to meet the OTCQX requirements. So there are this is why I could have done this for hours, but there are a whole set of OTCQX rules, not exactly the same but similar to what you would see on a NASDAQ or New York rule set, based largely on the NASAA Uniform Securities Act with some other bells and whistles in there. So companies can choose to qualify for either of those markets. If they chose to if they don't chose to go through the process at all and maybe decide that they don't want to engage investors or they don't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	or for the account of customers, but they stand ready to buy or sell. MR. REARDON: So like a trading balance or something like that they've got to buy into it or – MR. ZINN: Right. So all the brokers that subscribe to our system are required to be FINRA members. So they're subject to the entire FINRA rule book, which gives certain consideration to brokers that act as market makers in certain capacities. And so not every broker is required. We would allow an agency broker to participate in the market. But to the extent they are holding themselves out as market makers for treatment under the FINRA rules they act as market makers on our system. MR. REARDON: Okay, thank you. MR. ZINN: Sure. MR. YADLEY: Can you just talk a little bit more about the initial quotation dialogue between you all and FINRA and what kind of questions they ask and where they give you grief probably in your view? MR. ZINN: Right. So it's not a process that we go through. We kind of sit on the sidelines and watch as the process unfolds. But a broker will file this Form	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	they under the QX or the QB? I mean, which is it is it MR. ZINN: So it can be either. MS. MOTT: Okay. MR. ZINN: So for QX and QB, you know, an issuer is applying to achieve that designation. At the end of the day what QX is the same thing as NASDAQ or New York. It's not the mechanism by which you're raising money, it's just kind of the advertisement for lack of a better word of I've met this standard, I qualify for this club, and this is where I'm going to trade. So somebody like Elio determined to try to meet the OTCQX requirements. So there are this is why I could have done this for hours, but there are a whole set of OTCQX rules, not exactly the same but similar to what you would see on a NASDAQ or New York rule set, based largely on the NASAA Uniform Securities Act with some other bells and whistles in there. So companies can choose to qualify for either of those markets. If they chose to if they don't chose to go through the process at all and maybe decide that they don't want to engage investors or they don't want to continue to provide information, you know,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	or for the account of customers, but they stand ready to buy or sell. MR. REARDON: So like a trading balance or something like that they've got to buy into it or MR. ZINN: Right. So all the brokers that subscribe to our system are required to be FINRA members. So they're subject to the entire FINRA rule book, which gives certain consideration to brokers that act as market makers in certain capacities. And so not every broker is required. We would allow an agency broker to participate in the market. But to the extent they are holding themselves out as market makers for treatment under the FINRA rules they act as market makers on our system. MR. REARDON: Okay, thank you. MR. ZINN: Sure. MR. YADLEY: Can you just talk a little bit more about the initial quotation dialogue between you all and FINRA and what kind of questions they ask and where they give you grief probably in your view? MR. ZINN: Right. So it's not a process that we go through. We kind of sit on the sidelines and watch	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	they under the QX or the QB? I mean, which is it is it MR. ZINN: So it can be either. MS. MOTT: Okay. MR. ZINN: So for QX and QB, you know, an issuer is applying to achieve that designation. At the end of the day what QX is the same thing as NASDAQ or New York. It's not the mechanism by which you're raising money, it's just kind of the advertisement for lack of a better word of I've met this standard, I qualify for this club, and this is where I'm going to trade. So somebody like Elio determined to try to meet the OTCQX requirements. So there are this is why I could have done this for hours, but there are a whole set of OTCQX rules, not exactly the same but similar to what you would see on a NASDAQ or New York rule set, based largely on the NASAA Uniform Securities Act with some other bells and whistles in there. So companies can choose to qualify for either of those markets. If they chose to if they don't chose to go through the process at all and maybe decide that they don't want to engage investors or they don't

	Page 142		Page 144
1	appropriate investor indication is necessary based on how	1	of you know are often not necessarily correlated to
2	much they're putting out into the world.	2	record, you know, Dow results, it's a different
3	MS. MOTT: Okay. Back to Greg's question, I	3	calculation. So as volumes ebb and flow in the listed
4	think it was Greg that asked about the or Patrick,	4	markets we follow a fairly similar pattern.
5	market maker. So you said they were sort of acting like	5	So we've seen for many years we experienced
6	market makers. Can you talk about the big picture of	6	growth, upon growth, upon growth as, you know, our
7	what happens on the OTC, the velocity, how much is	7	electronic capacity expanded a little bit and brokers
8	traded, you know, that kind of thing? Can you give us	8	were able to quote more securities and do it faster with
9	I don't think it was one of your slides, but can you give	9	us. There's still distance to be covered there. There
10	us a big picture of that?	10	are more things that we're constantly introducing that I
11	MR. ZINN: Sure, and I'll do it a little bit	11	think will be accretive to these kinds of numbers.
12	through a slide. So over on the in the little text	12	But we're at a point where trading happens at
13	box there on the right for the OTCQX Market year to date,	13	the speed that brokers want it to happen and quoting is
14	that second number down is \$17.5 billion in dollar volume	14	available for as many securities as they want. You know,
15	traded. We look at dollar volume traded as the better	15	our capacity and our consistency is there. So we will
16	metric. Shares are what they are.	16	probably just continue to move more or less with the
17	So that's a picture of OTCQX. For OTCQB it's	17	listed markets. Sure.
18	significantly different. Even though there are more	18	MR. NELSON: The internet is failing me and so
19	companies it's \$4.3 billion in dollar volume. That	19	I was wondering how the daily or annual traded volume
20	speaks in some way to the, you know, the types of	20	number wise, in absolute numbers, compares to like the
21	companies on each market and the trading prices.	21	ASX, or the AIM, or the London Stock Exchange, or some of
22	But to the earlier part of your question, it's	22	the other kind of comparable smaller markets.
23	an electronic market. So our biggest participants are	23	MR. ZINN: So we're a little bit bigger than
24	the same market makers that work with the New York Stock	24	some of those markets. In part, you know, 10,000
25	Exchange and NASDAQ. So KCG and Citadel and firms like	25	securities is more than you see on NASDAQ as well. So
	Page 143		Page 145
1	Page 143 that are also operating in our markets. We also allow	1	Page 145 it's a larger number. I don't have the specific data in
1 2		1 2	
	that are also operating in our markets. We also allow	1	it's a larger number. I don't have the specific data in
2	that are also operating in our markets. We also allow for some smaller brokers. You know, there are brokers that specialize in community banks, which is always an example that I use	2 3 4	it's a larger number. I don't have the specific data in front of me, but I can certainly get it for you. But, you know, we look at it both from I mentioned the market cap aspect of it, but also form the
2 3 4 5	that are also operating in our markets. We also allow for some smaller brokers. You know, there are brokers that specialize in community banks, which is always an example that I use that maybe don't have the algorithmic trading capacity,	2 3 4 5	it's a larger number. I don't have the specific data in front of me, but I can certainly get it for you. But, you know, we look at it both from I
2 3 4 5 6	that are also operating in our markets. We also allow for some smaller brokers. You know, there are brokers that specialize in community banks, which is always an example that I use that maybe don't have the algorithmic trading capacity, maybe it's a person clicking a button. So trading can	2 3 4 5 6	it's a larger number. I don't have the specific data in front of me, but I can certainly get it for you. But, you know, we look at it both from I mentioned the market cap aspect of it, but also form the depth of book, the number of market makers involved, which is generally greater on our markets than you see
2 3 4 5 6 7	that are also operating in our markets. We also allow for some smaller brokers. You know, there are brokers that specialize in community banks, which is always an example that I use that maybe don't have the algorithmic trading capacity, maybe it's a person clicking a button. So trading can take place incredibly quickly when you have two	2 3 4 5 6 7	it's a larger number. I don't have the specific data in front of me, but I can certainly get it for you. But, you know, we look at it both from I mentioned the market cap aspect of it, but also form the depth of book, the number of market makers involved, which is generally greater on our markets than you see there. But some of those are very comparable markets,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	that are also operating in our markets. We also allow for some smaller brokers. You know, there are brokers that specialize in community banks, which is always an example that I use that maybe don't have the algorithmic trading capacity, maybe it's a person clicking a button. So trading can take place incredibly quickly when you have two electronic participants matching off against each other	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	it's a larger number. I don't have the specific data in front of me, but I can certainly get it for you. But, you know, we look at it both from I mentioned the market cap aspect of it, but also form the depth of book, the number of market makers involved, which is generally greater on our markets than you see there. But some of those are very comparable markets, and so to the extent anybody else is interested as well,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	that are also operating in our markets. We also allow for some smaller brokers. You know, there are brokers that specialize in community banks, which is always an example that I use that maybe don't have the algorithmic trading capacity, maybe it's a person clicking a button. So trading can take place incredibly quickly when you have two electronic participants matching off against each other or working with each other to ultimately execute a trade	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	it's a larger number. I don't have the specific data in front of me, but I can certainly get it for you. But, you know, we look at it both from I mentioned the market cap aspect of it, but also form the depth of book, the number of market makers involved, which is generally greater on our markets than you see there. But some of those are very comparable markets, and so to the extent anybody else is interested as well, and honestly in those numbers or anything else, we can
2 3 6 7 8 9 10	that are also operating in our markets. We also allow for some smaller brokers. You know, there are brokers that specialize in community banks, which is always an example that I use that maybe don't have the algorithmic trading capacity, maybe it's a person clicking a button. So trading can take place incredibly quickly when you have two electronic participants matching off against each other or working with each other to ultimately execute a trade through us. And that's an important distinction because	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	it's a larger number. I don't have the specific data in front of me, but I can certainly get it for you. But, you know, we look at it both from I mentioned the market cap aspect of it, but also form the depth of book, the number of market makers involved, which is generally greater on our markets than you see there. But some of those are very comparable markets, and so to the extent anybody else is interested as well, and honestly in those numbers or anything else, we can turn those things around pretty quickly.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	that are also operating in our markets. We also allow for some smaller brokers. You know, there are brokers that specialize in community banks, which is always an example that I use that maybe don't have the algorithmic trading capacity, maybe it's a person clicking a button. So trading can take place incredibly quickly when you have two electronic participants matching off against each other or working with each other to ultimately execute a trade through us. And that's an important distinction because we at no point do we match for them, which is why you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	it's a larger number. I don't have the specific data in front of me, but I can certainly get it for you. But, you know, we look at it both from I mentioned the market cap aspect of it, but also form the depth of book, the number of market makers involved, which is generally greater on our markets than you see there. But some of those are very comparable markets, and so to the extent anybody else is interested as well, and honestly in those numbers or anything else, we can turn those things around pretty quickly. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Laura, I think did you have a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	that are also operating in our markets. We also allow for some smaller brokers. You know, there are brokers that specialize in community banks, which is always an example that I use that maybe don't have the algorithmic trading capacity, maybe it's a person clicking a button. So trading can take place incredibly quickly when you have two electronic participants matching off against each other or working with each other to ultimately execute a trade through us. And that's an important distinction because we at no point do we match for them, which is why you see a little bit of a time difference.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	it's a larger number. I don't have the specific data in front of me, but I can certainly get it for you. But, you know, we look at it both from I mentioned the market cap aspect of it, but also form the depth of book, the number of market makers involved, which is generally greater on our markets than you see there. But some of those are very comparable markets, and so to the extent anybody else is interested as well, and honestly in those numbers or anything else, we can turn those things around pretty quickly. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Laura, I think did you have a comment?
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	that are also operating in our markets. We also allow for some smaller brokers. You know, there are brokers that specialize in community banks, which is always an example that I use that maybe don't have the algorithmic trading capacity, maybe it's a person clicking a button. So trading can take place incredibly quickly when you have two electronic participants matching off against each other or working with each other to ultimately execute a trade through us. And that's an important distinction because we at no point do we match for them, which is why you see a little bit of a time difference. So the speed of trading is there for the most	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>it's a larger number. I don't have the specific data in front of me, but I can certainly get it for you.</li> <li>But, you know, we look at it both from I mentioned the market cap aspect of it, but also form the depth of book, the number of market makers involved, which is generally greater on our markets than you see there. But some of those are very comparable markets, and so to the extent anybody else is interested as well, and honestly in those numbers or anything else, we can turn those things around pretty quickly.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Laura, I think did you have a comment?</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: Actually I've got a question</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	that are also operating in our markets. We also allow for some smaller brokers. You know, there are brokers that specialize in community banks, which is always an example that I use that maybe don't have the algorithmic trading capacity, maybe it's a person clicking a button. So trading can take place incredibly quickly when you have two electronic participants matching off against each other or working with each other to ultimately execute a trade through us. And that's an important distinction because we at no point do we match for them, which is why you see a little bit of a time difference. So the speed of trading is there for the most part. Again if it was Apple or Google it's probably not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>it's a larger number. I don't have the specific data in front of me, but I can certainly get it for you.</li> <li>But, you know, we look at it both from I mentioned the market cap aspect of it, but also form the depth of book, the number of market makers involved, which is generally greater on our markets than you see there. But some of those are very comparable markets, and so to the extent anybody else is interested as well, and honestly in those numbers or anything else, we can turn those things around pretty quickly.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Laura, I think did you have a comment?</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: Actually I've got a question which is kind of off topic. But one of the things that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	that are also operating in our markets. We also allow for some smaller brokers. You know, there are brokers that specialize in community banks, which is always an example that I use that maybe don't have the algorithmic trading capacity, maybe it's a person clicking a button. So trading can take place incredibly quickly when you have two electronic participants matching off against each other or working with each other to ultimately execute a trade through us. And that's an important distinction because we at no point do we match for them, which is why you see a little bit of a time difference. So the speed of trading is there for the most part. Again if it was Apple or Google it's probably not where you would want it to be, but for these kinds of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>it's a larger number. I don't have the specific data in front of me, but I can certainly get it for you.</li> <li>But, you know, we look at it both from I mentioned the market cap aspect of it, but also form the depth of book, the number of market makers involved, which is generally greater on our markets than you see there. But some of those are very comparable markets, and so to the extent anybody else is interested as well, and honestly in those numbers or anything else, we can turn those things around pretty quickly.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Laura, I think did you have a comment?</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: Actually I've got a question which is kind of off topic. But one of the things that came up in discussions among the committee with respect</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	that are also operating in our markets. We also allow for some smaller brokers. You know, there are brokers that specialize in community banks, which is always an example that I use that maybe don't have the algorithmic trading capacity, maybe it's a person clicking a button. So trading can take place incredibly quickly when you have two electronic participants matching off against each other or working with each other to ultimately execute a trade through us. And that's an important distinction because we at no point do we match for them, which is why you see a little bit of a time difference. So the speed of trading is there for the most part. Again if it was Apple or Google it's probably not where you would want it to be, but for these kinds of companies, for those that trade, you know, less than a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>it's a larger number. I don't have the specific data in front of me, but I can certainly get it for you.</li> <li>But, you know, we look at it both from I mentioned the market cap aspect of it, but also form the depth of book, the number of market makers involved, which is generally greater on our markets than you see there. But some of those are very comparable markets, and so to the extent anybody else is interested as well, and honestly in those numbers or anything else, we can turn those things around pretty quickly.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Laura, I think did you have a comment?</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: Actually I've got a question which is kind of off topic. But one of the things that came up in discussions among the committee with respect to accredited investors and is a continuing theme of this</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	that are also operating in our markets. We also allow for some smaller brokers. You know, there are brokers that specialize in community banks, which is always an example that I use that maybe don't have the algorithmic trading capacity, maybe it's a person clicking a button. So trading can take place incredibly quickly when you have two electronic participants matching off against each other or working with each other to ultimately execute a trade through us. And that's an important distinction because we – at no point do we match for them, which is why you see a little bit of a time difference. So the speed of trading is there for the most part. Again if it was Apple or Google it's probably not where you would want it to be, but for these kinds of companies, for those that trade, you know, less than a million times a year it's that kind of market.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>it's a larger number. I don't have the specific data in front of me, but I can certainly get it for you.</li> <li>But, you know, we look at it both from I mentioned the market cap aspect of it, but also form the depth of book, the number of market makers involved, which is generally greater on our markets than you see there. But some of those are very comparable markets, and so to the extent anybody else is interested as well, and honestly in those numbers or anything else, we can turn those things around pretty quickly.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Laura, I think did you have a comment?</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: Actually I've got a question which is kind of off topic. But one of the things that came up in discussions among the committee with respect to accredited investors and is a continuing theme of this committee is lack of data about anything. So it seems to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	that are also operating in our markets. We also allow for some smaller brokers. You know, there are brokers that specialize in community banks, which is always an example that I use that maybe don't have the algorithmic trading capacity, maybe it's a person clicking a button. So trading can take place incredibly quickly when you have two electronic participants matching off against each other or working with each other to ultimately execute a trade through us. And that's an important distinction because we at no point do we match for them, which is why you see a little bit of a time difference. So the speed of trading is there for the most part. Again if it was Apple or Google it's probably not where you would want it to be, but for these kinds of companies, for those that trade, you know, less than a million times a year it's that kind of market.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	it's a larger number. I don't have the specific data in front of me, but I can certainly get it for you. But, you know, we look at it both from I mentioned the market cap aspect of it, but also form the depth of book, the number of market makers involved, which is generally greater on our markets than you see there. But some of those are very comparable markets, and so to the extent anybody else is interested as well, and honestly in those numbers or anything else, we can turn those things around pretty quickly. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Laura, I think did you have a comment? CO-CHAIR HANKS: Actually I've got a question which is kind of off topic. But one of the things that came up in discussions among the committee with respect to accredited investors and is a continuing theme of this committee is lack of data about anything. So it seems to me that somebody whose market demographic consists of a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	that are also operating in our markets. We also allow for some smaller brokers. You know, there are brokers that specialize in community banks, which is always an example that I use that maybe don't have the algorithmic trading capacity, maybe it's a person clicking a button. So trading can take place incredibly quickly when you have two electronic participants matching off against each other or working with each other to ultimately execute a trade through us. And that's an important distinction because we at no point do we match for them, which is why you see a little bit of a time difference. So the speed of trading is there for the most part. Again if it was Apple or Google it's probably not where you would want it to be, but for these kinds of companies, for those that trade, you know, less than a million times a year it's that kind of market. Ms. MOTT: Okay. So tell me about how does that the market volume trading, how has that been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	it's a larger number. I don't have the specific data in front of me, but I can certainly get it for you. But, you know, we look at it both from I mentioned the market cap aspect of it, but also form the depth of book, the number of market makers involved, which is generally greater on our markets than you see there. But some of those are very comparable markets, and so to the extent anybody else is interested as well, and honestly in those numbers or anything else, we can turn those things around pretty quickly. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Laura, I think did you have a comment? CO-CHAIR HANKS: Actually I've got a question which is kind of off topic. But one of the things that came up in discussions among the committee with respect to accredited investors and is a continuing theme of this committee is lack of data about anything. So it seems to me that somebody whose market demographic consists of a whole bunch of companies who have recently raised money
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	that are also operating in our markets. We also allow for some smaller brokers. You know, there are brokers that specialize in community banks, which is always an example that I use that maybe don't have the algorithmic trading capacity, maybe it's a person clicking a button. So trading can take place incredibly quickly when you have two electronic participants matching off against each other or working with each other to ultimately execute a trade through us. And that's an important distinction because we at no point do we match for them, which is why you see a little bit of a time difference. So the speed of trading is there for the most part. Again if it was Apple or Google it's probably not where you would want it to be, but for these kinds of companies, for those that trade, you know, less than a million times a year it's that kind of market. Ms. MOTT: Okay. So tell me about how does that the market volume trading, how has that been trending? So talk about the previous three years and how	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>it's a larger number. I don't have the specific data in front of me, but I can certainly get it for you.</li> <li>But, you know, we look at it both from I mentioned the market cap aspect of it, but also form the depth of book, the number of market makers involved, which is generally greater on our markets than you see there. But some of those are very comparable markets, and so to the extent anybody else is interested as well, and honestly in those numbers or anything else, we can turn those things around pretty quickly.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Laura, I think did you have a comment?</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: Actually I've got a question which is kind of off topic. But one of the things that came up in discussions among the committee with respect to accredited investors and is a continuing theme of this committee is lack of data about anything. So it seems to me that somebody whose market demographic consists of a whole bunch of companies who have recently raised money privately might keep some records on people who might be</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	that are also operating in our markets. We also allow for some smaller brokers. You know, there are brokers that specialize in community banks, which is always an example that I use that maybe don't have the algorithmic trading capacity, maybe it's a person clicking a button. So trading can take place incredibly quickly when you have two electronic participants matching off against each other or working with each other to ultimately execute a trade through us. And that's an important distinction because we at no point do we match for them, which is why you see a little bit of a time difference. So the speed of trading is there for the most part. Again if it was Apple or Google it's probably not where you would want it to be, but for these kinds of companies, for those that trade, you know, less than a million times a year it's that kind of market. Ms. MOTT: Okay. So tell me about how does that the market volume trading, how has that been trending? So talk about the previous three years and how does this look, you know, today	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	it's a larger number. I don't have the specific data in front of me, but I can certainly get it for you. But, you know, we look at it both from I mentioned the market cap aspect of it, but also form the depth of book, the number of market makers involved, which is generally greater on our markets than you see there. But some of those are very comparable markets, and so to the extent anybody else is interested as well, and honestly in those numbers or anything else, we can turn those things around pretty quickly. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Laura, I think did you have a comment? CO-CHAIR HANKS: Actually I've got a question which is kind of off topic. But one of the things that came up in discussions among the committee with respect to accredited investors and is a continuing theme of this committee is lack of data about anything. So it seems to me that somebody whose market demographic consists of a whole bunch of companies who have recently raised money privately might keep some records on people who might be potential issuers on the OTC. Do you got anything?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	that are also operating in our markets. We also allow for some smaller brokers. You know, there are brokers that specialize in community banks, which is always an example that I use that maybe don't have the algorithmic trading capacity, maybe it's a person clicking a button. So trading can take place incredibly quickly when you have two electronic participants matching off against each other or working with each other to ultimately execute a trade through us. And that's an important distinction because we at no point do we match for them, which is why you see a little bit of a time difference. So the speed of trading is there for the most part. Again if it was Apple or Google it's probably not where you would want it to be, but for these kinds of companies, for those that trade, you know, less than a million times a year it's that kind of market. Ms. MOTT: Okay. So tell me about how does that the market volume trading, how has that been trending? So talk about the previous three years and how	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	it's a larger number. I don't have the specific data in front of me, but I can certainly get it for you. But, you know, we look at it both from I mentioned the market cap aspect of it, but also form the depth of book, the number of market makers involved, which is generally greater on our markets than you see there. But some of those are very comparable markets, and so to the extent anybody else is interested as well, and honestly in those numbers or anything else, we can turn those things around pretty quickly. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Laura, I think did you have a comment? CO-CHAIR HANKS: Actually I've got a question which is kind of off topic. But one of the things that came up in discussions among the committee with respect to accredited investors and is a continuing theme of this committee is lack of data about anything. So it seems to me that somebody whose market demographic consists of a whole bunch of companies who have recently raised money privately might keep some records on people who might be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	that are also operating in our markets. We also allow for some smaller brokers. You know, there are brokers that specialize in community banks, which is always an example that I use that maybe don't have the algorithmic trading capacity, maybe it's a person clicking a button. So trading can take place incredibly quickly when you have two electronic participants matching off against each other or working with each other to ultimately execute a trade through us. And that's an important distinction because we - at no point do we match for them, which is why you see a little bit of a time difference. So the speed of trading is there for the most part. Again if it was Apple or Google it's probably not where you would want it to be, but for these kinds of companies, for those that trade, you know, less than a million times a year it's that kind of market. Ms. MOTT: Okay. So tell me about how does that the market volume trading, how has that been trending? So talk about the previous three years and how does this look, you know, today MR. ZINN: Sure. And I had a slide, I took it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>it's a larger number. I don't have the specific data in front of me, but I can certainly get it for you.</li> <li>But, you know, we look at it both from I mentioned the market cap aspect of it, but also form the depth of book, the number of market makers involved, which is generally greater on our markets than you see there. But some of those are very comparable markets, and so to the extent anybody else is interested as well, and honestly in those numbers or anything else, we can turn those things around pretty quickly.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Laura, I think did you have a comment?</li> <li>CO-CHAIR HANKS: Actually I've got a question which is kind of off topic. But one of the things that came up in discussions among the committee with respect to accredited investors and is a continuing theme of this committee is lack of data about anything. So it seems to me that somebody whose market demographic consists of a whole bunch of companies who have recently raised money privately might keep some records on people who might be potential issuers on the OTC. Do you got anything?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that are also operating in our markets. We also allow for some smaller brokers. You know, there are brokers that specialize in community banks, which is always an example that I use that maybe don't have the algorithmic trading capacity, maybe it's a person clicking a button. So trading can take place incredibly quickly when you have two electronic participants matching off against each other or working with each other to ultimately execute a trade through us. And that's an important distinction because we – at no point do we match for them, which is why you see a little bit of a time difference. So the speed of trading is there for the most part. Again if it was Apple or Google it's probably not where you would want it to be, but for these kinds of companies, for those that trade, you know, less than a million times a year it's that kind of market. Ms. MOTT: Okay. So tell me about how does that – the market volume trading, how has that been trending? So talk about the previous three years and how does this look, you know, today MR. ZINN: Sure. And I had a slide, I took it out, that had the 2015 numbers. It's a little bit	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	it's a larger number. I don't have the specific data in front of me, but I can certainly get it for you. But, you know, we look at it both from I mentioned the market cap aspect of it, but also form the depth of book, the number of market makers involved, which is generally greater on our markets than you see there. But some of those are very comparable markets, and so to the extent anybody else is interested as well, and honestly in those numbers or anything else, we can turn those things around pretty quickly. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Laura, I think did you have a comment? CO-CHAIR HANKS: Actually I've got a question which is kind of off topic. But one of the things that came up in discussions among the committee with respect to accredited investors and is a continuing theme of this committee is lack of data about anything. So it seems to me that somebody whose market demographic consists of a whole bunch of companies who have recently raised money privately might keep some records on people who might be potential issuers on the OTC. Do you got anything? MR. ZINN: I don't have anything offhand. I have a feeling we can get it for you. We call that

	Page 140		Page 140
1	appropriate amount of time under Rule 144. They are six	1	At some point prior to NASDAQ becoming an
2	months for a reporting company or a year for a non-	2	exchange they basically said, all right, every NASDAQ
3	reporting company, and then a public market developing	3	company is on the OTC margin list. Then NASDAQ became an
4	often through the 211 process. It's not always an issuer	4	exchange and they never picked up the OTC margin list, so
5	that is conscious of that and is creating that public	5	there were no OTC companies that are eligible for margin.
6	market, it is sometimes an investor who says I now have	6	So we have engaged the Fed to the extent we can on that,
7	this security that's publicly available for trade. They	7	but would love to see something like that happen.
8	call their broker, the process kind of proceeds from	8	What companies want for the most part is a
9	there.	9	comparable experience to what you see on an exchange
10	So I'll see what we've got and I'll get you	10	based on them their ability to meet certain
11	anything that we have.	11	requirements, not necessarily just the market on which
12	CO-CHAIR HANKS: That would be great. Because	12	they trade. So we have talked to the IRS and Treasury
13	I think, you know, as we're trying to pull data together	13	about employee stock ownership plans and the way OTC
14	it's a number of tiny little mismatched jigsaw pieces and	14	securities are viewed and the obligations of an employer
15	the more jigsaw pieces we can get we can see how it works	15	or a company when developing an employee stock ownership
16	together.	16	plan it works differently for OTC companies than it does
17	MR. ZINN: I can look at if I could find the	17	for exchange listed companies and those are, you know,
		18	you want to help your employees, you want to be able to
18	camera I'll look directly into it and ask our data	19	
19	reporting team to send me that information.	20	run that in an approximate fashion, not always just doing
20	CO-CHAIR HANKS: Thanks.		a 701 offering.
21	MR. YADLEY: As a follow up to that, liquidity	21	We look at international designations. So, you
22	as Sara said is something that we're interested in.	22	know, this may be a little far afield in terms of what
23	Since research can't be disseminated, I mean what are	23	the committee focuses on, but there are a number of
24	some what are some of the constraints to a company	24	designations in Canada, in Europe, in South America and
25	being able to get more of a following? I mean, so you've	25	others for what markets they deem qualified for certain
	Page 147		Page 149
1	Page 147 now done an offering, you have a bunch of investors, you	1	Page 149 interactions with investors in these countries. It is
1 2	5	1 2	_
	now done an offering, you have a bunch of investors, you		interactions with investors in these countries. It is
2	now done an offering, you have a bunch of investors, you have a market, your sole purpose is to have activity in	2	interactions with investors in these countries. It is consistently an uphill battle for us to get recognition
2 3	now done an offering, you have a bunch of investors, you have a market, your sole purpose is to have activity in your market, right, and you're trying to be hospitable to	2 3	interactions with investors in these countries. It is consistently an uphill battle for us to get recognition for these markets in some of those jurisdictions. Again
2 3 4	now done an offering, you have a bunch of investors, you have a market, your sole purpose is to have activity in your market, right, and you're trying to be hospitable to the brokers. So there's the SEC, FINRA and the states.	2 3 4	interactions with investors in these countries. It is consistently an uphill battle for us to get recognition for these markets in some of those jurisdictions. Again a lot of these is largely due to education, people not
2 3 4 5	now done an offering, you have a bunch of investors, you have a market, your sole purpose is to have activity in your market, right, and you're trying to be hospitable to the brokers. So there's the SEC, FINRA and the states. So what are the sort of top five things that even	2 3 4 5	interactions with investors in these countries. It is consistently an uphill battle for us to get recognition for these markets in some of those jurisdictions. Again a lot of these is largely due to education, people not necessarily knowing what the market is now, what OTC
2 3 4 5 6	now done an offering, you have a bunch of investors, you have a market, your sole purpose is to have activity in your market, right, and you're trying to be hospitable to the brokers. So there's the SEC, FINRA and the states. So what are the sort of top five things that even understanding that there are issues to work through based	2 3 4 5 6	interactions with investors in these countries. It is consistently an uphill battle for us to get recognition for these markets in some of those jurisdictions. Again a lot of these is largely due to education, people not necessarily knowing what the market is now, what OTC markets is, and maybe only having a picture of what it
2 3 4 5 6 7	now done an offering, you have a bunch of investors, you have a market, your sole purpose is to have activity in your market, right, and you're trying to be hospitable to the brokers. So there's the SEC, FINRA and the states. So what are the sort of top five things that even understanding that there are issues to work through based on the jurisdictional issues and the mandates of those	2 3 4 5 6 7	interactions with investors in these countries. It is consistently an uphill battle for us to get recognition for these markets in some of those jurisdictions. Again a lot of these is largely due to education, people not necessarily knowing what the market is now, what OTC markets is, and maybe only having a picture of what it was 20 years ago.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	now done an offering, you have a bunch of investors, you have a market, your sole purpose is to have activity in your market, right, and you're trying to be hospitable to the brokers. So there's the SEC, FINRA and the states. So what are the sort of top five things that even understanding that there are issues to work through based on the jurisdictional issues and the mandates of those organizations on your wish list, what are five things	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	interactions with investors in these countries. It is consistently an uphill battle for us to get recognition for these markets in some of those jurisdictions. Again a lot of these is largely due to education, people not necessarily knowing what the market is now, what OTC markets is, and maybe only having a picture of what it was 20 years ago. I put it on the slide but didn't mention it.
2 4 5 7 8 9	now done an offering, you have a bunch of investors, you have a market, your sole purpose is to have activity in your market, right, and you're trying to be hospitable to the brokers. So there's the SEC, FINRA and the states. So what are the sort of top five things that even understanding that there are issues to work through based on the jurisdictional issues and the mandates of those organizations on your wish list, what are five things that you would change so that a company that's just	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	interactions with investors in these countries. It is consistently an uphill battle for us to get recognition for these markets in some of those jurisdictions. Again a lot of these is largely due to education, people not necessarily knowing what the market is now, what OTC markets is, and maybe only having a picture of what it was 20 years ago. I put it on the slide but didn't mention it. We're the NASDAQ of the 90's with today's technology.
2 3 6 7 8 9	now done an offering, you have a bunch of investors, you have a market, your sole purpose is to have activity in your market, right, and you're trying to be hospitable to the brokers. So there's the SEC, FINRA and the states. So what are the sort of top five things that even understanding that there are issues to work through based on the jurisdictional issues and the mandates of those organizations on your wish list, what are five things that you would change so that a company that's just raised money can have liquidity quicker?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	interactions with investors in these countries. It is consistently an uphill battle for us to get recognition for these markets in some of those jurisdictions. Again a lot of these is largely due to education, people not necessarily knowing what the market is now, what OTC markets is, and maybe only having a picture of what it was 20 years ago. I put it on the slide but didn't mention it. We're the NASDAQ of the 90's with today's technology. And you see going back through a lot of the securities
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	now done an offering, you have a bunch of investors, you have a market, your sole purpose is to have activity in your market, right, and you're trying to be hospitable to the brokers. So there's the SEC, FINRA and the states. So what are the sort of top five things that even understanding that there are issues to work through based on the jurisdictional issues and the mandates of those organizations on your wish list, what are five things that you would change so that a company that's just raised money can have liquidity quicker? MR. ZINN: That's a great question. This is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	interactions with investors in these countries. It is consistently an uphill battle for us to get recognition for these markets in some of those jurisdictions. Again a lot of these is largely due to education, people not necessarily knowing what the market is now, what OTC markets is, and maybe only having a picture of what it was 20 years ago. I put it on the slide but didn't mention it. We're the NASDAQ of the 90's with today's technology. And you see going back through a lot of the securities laws things are permitted to be done or happen on an
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	now done an offering, you have a bunch of investors, you have a market, your sole purpose is to have activity in your market, right, and you're trying to be hospitable to the brokers. So there's the SEC, FINRA and the states. So what are the sort of top five things that even understanding that there are issues to work through based on the jurisdictional issues and the mandates of those organizations on your wish list, what are five things that you would change so that a company that's just raised money can have liquidity quicker? MR. ZINN: That's a great question. This is fantastic.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	interactions with investors in these countries. It is consistently an uphill battle for us to get recognition for these markets in some of those jurisdictions. Again a lot of these is largely due to education, people not necessarily knowing what the market is now, what OTC markets is, and maybe only having a picture of what it was 20 years ago. I put it on the slide but didn't mention it. We're the NASDAQ of the 90's with today's technology. And you see going back through a lot of the securities laws things are permitted to be done or happen on an exchange or NASDAQ because those things were written at a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	now done an offering, you have a bunch of investors, you have a market, your sole purpose is to have activity in your market, right, and you're trying to be hospitable to the brokers. So there's the SEC, FINRA and the states. So what are the sort of top five things that even understanding that there are issues to work through based on the jurisdictional issues and the mandates of those organizations on your wish list, what are five things that you would change so that a company that's just raised money can have liquidity quicker? MR. ZINN: That's a great question. This is fantastic. MR. YADLEY: Isn't that what you asked me to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	interactions with investors in these countries. It is consistently an uphill battle for us to get recognition for these markets in some of those jurisdictions. Again a lot of these is largely due to education, people not necessarily knowing what the market is now, what OTC markets is, and maybe only having a picture of what it was 20 years ago. I put it on the slide but didn't mention it. We're the NASDAQ of the 90's with today's technology. And you see going back through a lot of the securities laws things are permitted to be done or happen on an exchange or NASDAQ was what we are now. So looking at that
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	now done an offering, you have a bunch of investors, you have a market, your sole purpose is to have activity in your market, right, and you're trying to be hospitable to the brokers. So there's the SEC, FINRA and the states. So what are the sort of top five things that even understanding that there are issues to work through based on the jurisdictional issues and the mandates of those organizations on your wish list, what are five things that you would change so that a company that's just raised money can have liquidity quicker? MR. ZINN: That's a great question. This is fantastic. MR. YADLEY: Isn't that what you asked me to ask earlier, right?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	interactions with investors in these countries. It is consistently an uphill battle for us to get recognition for these markets in some of those jurisdictions. Again a lot of these is largely due to education, people not necessarily knowing what the market is now, what OTC markets is, and maybe only having a picture of what it was 20 years ago. I put it on the slide but didn't mention it. We're the NASDAQ of the 90's with today's technology. And you see going back through a lot of the securities laws things are permitted to be done or happen on an exchange or NASDAQ was what we are now. So looking at that kind of treatment is really the overall answer.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	now done an offering, you have a bunch of investors, you have a market, your sole purpose is to have activity in your market, right, and you're trying to be hospitable to the brokers. So there's the SEC, FINRA and the states. So what are the sort of top five things that even understanding that there are issues to work through based on the jurisdictional issues and the mandates of those organizations on your wish list, what are five things that you would change so that a company that's just raised money can have liquidity quicker? MR. ZINN: That's a great question. This is fantastic. MR. YADLEY: Isn't that what you asked me to ask earlier, right? MR. ZINN: Yeah, exactly. The check is in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	interactions with investors in these countries. It is consistently an uphill battle for us to get recognition for these markets in some of those jurisdictions. Again a lot of these is largely due to education, people not necessarily knowing what the market is now, what OTC markets is, and maybe only having a picture of what it was 20 years ago. I put it on the slide but didn't mention it. We're the NASDAQ of the 90's with today's technology. And you see going back through a lot of the securities laws things are permitted to be done or happen on an exchange or NASDAQ because those things were written at a time when NASDAQ was what we are now. So looking at that kind of treatment is really the overall answer. MR. HAHN: You had mentioned toward the end
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	now done an offering, you have a bunch of investors, you have a market, your sole purpose is to have activity in your market, right, and you're trying to be hospitable to the brokers. So there's the SEC, FINRA and the states. So what are the sort of top five things that even understanding that there are issues to work through based on the jurisdictional issues and the mandates of those organizations on your wish list, what are five things that you would change so that a company that's just raised money can have liquidity quicker? MR. ZINN: That's a great question. This is fantastic. MR. YADLEY: Isn't that what you asked me to ask earlier, right? MR. ZINN: Yeah, exactly. The check is in the mail as they say.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	interactions with investors in these countries. It is consistently an uphill battle for us to get recognition for these markets in some of those jurisdictions. Again a lot of these is largely due to education, people not necessarily knowing what the market is now, what OTC markets is, and maybe only having a picture of what it was 20 years ago. I put it on the slide but didn't mention it. We're the NASDAQ of the 90's with today's technology. And you see going back through a lot of the securities laws things are permitted to be done or happen on an exchange or NASDAQ because those things were written at a time when NASDAQ was what we are now. So looking at that kind of treatment is really the overall answer. MR. HAHN: You had mentioned toward the end there the ATM vehicle. Was that tone of the wish list
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	now done an offering, you have a bunch of investors, you have a market, your sole purpose is to have activity in your market, right, and you're trying to be hospitable to the brokers. So there's the SEC, FINRA and the states. So what are the sort of top five things that even understanding that there are issues to work through based on the jurisdictional issues and the mandates of those organizations on your wish list, what are five things that you would change so that a company that's just raised money can have liquidity quicker? MR. ZINN: That's a great question. This is fantastic. MR. YADLEY: Isn't that what you asked me to ask earlier, right? MR. ZINN: Yeah, exactly. The check is in the mail as they say. So some of the things are what I touched on at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	interactions with investors in these countries. It is consistently an uphill battle for us to get recognition for these markets in some of those jurisdictions. Again a lot of these is largely due to education, people not necessarily knowing what the market is now, what OTC markets is, and maybe only having a picture of what it was 20 years ago. I put it on the slide but didn't mention it. We're the NASDAQ of the 90's with today's technology. And you see going back through a lot of the securities laws things are permitted to be done or happen on an exchange or NASDAQ because those things were written at a time when NASDAQ was what we are now. So looking at that kind of treatment is really the overall answer. MR. HAHN: You had mentioned toward the end there the ATM vehicle. Was that tone of the wish list items?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	now done an offering, you have a bunch of investors, you have a market, your sole purpose is to have activity in your market, right, and you're trying to be hospitable to the brokers. So there's the SEC, FINRA and the states. So what are the sort of top five things that even understanding that there are issues to work through based on the jurisdictional issues and the mandates of those organizations on your wish list, what are five things that you would change so that a company that's just raised money can have liquidity quicker? MR. ZINN: That's a great question. This is fantastic. MR. YADLEY: Isn't that what you asked me to ask earlier, right? MR. ZINN: Yeah, exactly. The check is in the mail as they say. So some of the things are what I touched on at various points in the presentation. So Blue Sky either	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	interactions with investors in these countries. It is consistently an uphill battle for us to get recognition for these markets in some of those jurisdictions. Again a lot of these is largely due to education, people not necessarily knowing what the market is now, what OTC markets is, and maybe only having a picture of what it was 20 years ago. I put it on the slide but didn't mention it. We're the NASDAQ of the 90's with today's technology. And you see going back through a lot of the securities laws things are permitted to be done or happen on an exchange or NASDAQ because those things were written at a time when NASDAQ was what we are now. So looking at that kind of treatment is really the overall answer. MR. HAHN: You had mentioned toward the end there the ATM vehicle. Was that tone of the wish list items? MR. ZINN: That's in the petition for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	now done an offering, you have a bunch of investors, you have a market, your sole purpose is to have activity in your market, right, and you're trying to be hospitable to the brokers. So there's the SEC, FINRA and the states. So what are the sort of top five things that even understanding that there are issues to work through based on the jurisdictional issues and the mandates of those organizations on your wish list, what are five things that you would change so that a company that's just raised money can have liquidity quicker? MR. ZINN: That's a great question. This is fantastic. MR. YADLEY: Isn't that what you asked me to ask earlier, right? MR. ZINN: Yeah, exactly. The check is in the mail as they say. So some of the things are what I touched on at various points in the presentation. So Blue Sky either exemption and state level qualification, that's kind of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>interactions with investors in these countries. It is consistently an uphill battle for us to get recognition for these markets in some of those jurisdictions. Again a lot of these is largely due to education, people not necessarily knowing what the market is now, what OTC markets is, and maybe only having a picture of what it was 20 years ago.</li> <li>I put it on the slide but didn't mention it.</li> <li>We're the NASDAQ of the 90's with today's technology.</li> <li>And you see going back through a lot of the securities laws things are permitted to be done or happen on an exchange or NASDAQ because those things were written at a time when NASDAQ was what we are now. So looking at that kind of treatment is really the overall answer.</li> <li>MR. HAHN: You had mentioned toward the end there the ATM vehicle. Was that tone of the wish list items?</li> <li>MR. ZINN: That's in the petition for rulemaking. Because if you're going to allow Exchange</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	now done an offering, you have a bunch of investors, you have a market, your sole purpose is to have activity in your market, right, and you're trying to be hospitable to the brokers. So there's the SEC, FINRA and the states. So what are the sort of top five things that even understanding that there are issues to work through based on the jurisdictional issues and the mandates of those organizations on your wish list, what are five things that you would change so that a company that's just raised money can have liquidity quicker? MR. ZINN: That's a great question. This is fantastic. MR. YADLEY: Isn't that what you asked me to ask earlier, right? MR. ZINN: Yeah, exactly. The check is in the mail as they say. So some of the things are what I touched on at various points in the presentation. So Blue Sky either exemption and state level qualification, that's kind of across the board, or preemption to the extent that's the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>interactions with investors in these countries. It is consistently an uphill battle for us to get recognition for these markets in some of those jurisdictions. Again a lot of these is largely due to education, people not necessarily knowing what the market is now, what OTC markets is, and maybe only having a picture of what it was 20 years ago.</li> <li>I put it on the slide but didn't mention it.</li> <li>We're the NASDAQ of the 90's with today's technology.</li> <li>And you see going back through a lot of the securities laws things are permitted to be done or happen on an exchange or NASDAQ because those things were written at a time when NASDAQ was what we are now. So looking at that kind of treatment is really the overall answer.</li> <li>MR. HAHN: You had mentioned toward the end there the ATM vehicle. Was that tone of the wish list items?</li> <li>MR. ZINN: That's in the petition for rulemaking. Because if you're going to allow Exchange Act reporting companies to participate who have this</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	now done an offering, you have a bunch of investors, you have a market, your sole purpose is to have activity in your market, right, and you're trying to be hospitable to the brokers. So there's the SEC, FINRA and the states. So what are the sort of top five things that even understanding that there are issues to work through based on the jurisdictional issues and the mandates of those organizations on your wish list, what are five things that you would change so that a company that's just raised money can have liquidity quicker? MR. ZINN: That's a great question. This is fantastic. MR. YADLEY: Isn't that what you asked me to ask earlier, right? MR. ZINN: Yeah, exactly. The check is in the mail as they say. So some of the things are what I touched on at various points in the presentation. So Blue Sky either exemption and state level qualification, that's kind of across the board, or preemption to the extent that's the ultimate solution if necessary. Margin eligibility, I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>interactions with investors in these countries. It is consistently an uphill battle for us to get recognition for these markets in some of those jurisdictions. Again a lot of these is largely due to education, people not necessarily knowing what the market is now, what OTC markets is, and maybe only having a picture of what it was 20 years ago.</li> <li>I put it on the slide but didn't mention it.</li> <li>We're the NASDAQ of the 90's with today's technology.</li> <li>And you see going back through a lot of the securities laws things are permitted to be done or happen on an exchange or NASDAQ because those things were written at a time when NASDAQ was what we are now. So looking at that kind of treatment is really the overall answer.</li> <li>MR. HAHN: You had mentioned toward the end there the ATM vehicle. Was that tone of the wish list items?</li> <li>MR. ZINN: That's in the petition for rulemaking. Because if you're going to allow Exchange Act reporting companies to participate who have this market it's kind of the next logical step.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	now done an offering, you have a bunch of investors, you have a market, your sole purpose is to have activity in your market, right, and you're trying to be hospitable to the brokers. So there's the SEC, FINRA and the states. So what are the sort of top five things that even understanding that there are issues to work through based on the jurisdictional issues and the mandates of those organizations on your wish list, what are five things that you would change so that a company that's just raised money can have liquidity quicker? MR. ZINN: That's a great question. This is fantastic. MR. YADLEY: Isn't that what you asked me to ask earlier, right? MR. ZINN: Yeah, exactly. The check is in the mail as they say. So some of the things are what I touched on at various points in the presentation. So Blue Sky either exemption and state level qualification, that's kind of across the board, or preemption to the extent that's the ultimate solution if necessary. Margin eligibility, I didn't get into it all that much other than a passing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>interactions with investors in these countries. It is consistently an uphill battle for us to get recognition for these markets in some of those jurisdictions. Again a lot of these is largely due to education, people not necessarily knowing what the market is now, what OTC markets is, and maybe only having a picture of what it was 20 years ago.</li> <li>I put it on the slide but didn't mention it.</li> <li>We're the NASDAQ of the 90's with today's technology.</li> <li>And you see going back through a lot of the securities laws things are permitted to be done or happen on an exchange or NASDAQ because those things were written at a time when NASDAQ was what we are now. So looking at that kind of treatment is really the overall answer.</li> <li>MR. HAHN: You had mentioned toward the end there the ATM vehicle. Was that tone of the wish list items?</li> <li>MR. ZINN: That's in the petition for rulemaking. Because if you're going to allow Exchange Act reporting companies to participate who have this market it's kind of the next logical step.</li> <li>MR. HAHN: That would be great.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	now done an offering, you have a bunch of investors, you have a market, your sole purpose is to have activity in your market, right, and you're trying to be hospitable to the brokers. So there's the SEC, FINRA and the states. So what are the sort of top five things that even understanding that there are issues to work through based on the jurisdictional issues and the mandates of those organizations on your wish list, what are five things that you would change so that a company that's just raised money can have liquidity quicker? MR. ZINN: That's a great question. This is fantastic. MR. YADLEY: Isn't that what you asked me to ask earlier, right? MR. ZINN: Yeah, exactly. The check is in the mail as they say. So some of the things are what I touched on at various points in the presentation. So Blue Sky either exemption and state level qualification, that's kind of across the board, or preemption to the extent that's the ultimate solution if necessary. Margin eligibility, I didn't get into it all that much other than a passing reference, but the Fed used to keep an OTC margin list	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>interactions with investors in these countries. It is consistently an uphill battle for us to get recognition for these markets in some of those jurisdictions. Again a lot of these is largely due to education, people not necessarily knowing what the market is now, what OTC markets is, and maybe only having a picture of what it was 20 years ago.</li> <li>Iput it on the slide but didn't mention it.</li> <li>We're the NASDAQ of the 90's with today's technology.</li> <li>And you see going back through a lot of the securities laws things are permitted to be done or happen on an exchange or NASDAQ because those things were written at a time when NASDAQ was what we are now. So looking at that kind of treatment is really the overall answer.</li> <li>MR. HAHN: You had mentioned toward the end there the ATM vehicle. Was that tone of the wish list items?</li> <li>MR. ZINN: That's in the petition for rulemaking. Because if you're going to allow Exchange Act reporting companies to participate who have this market it's kind of the next logical step.</li> <li>MR. HAHN: That would be great.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Anyone else? Okay. Well,</li> </ul>

	Page 150		Page 152
1	really appreciate the opportunity.	1	SB had been modeled after an old form S-18, adopted in
2	(Applause.)	2	the late 70's as an option for non-reporting companies to
3	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay, onto smaller reporting	3	conduct small offerings without incurring the full range
4	companies. For our final agenda item we will turn to	4	of reporting and disclosure obligations. Interestingly
5	this as it's the we're going to hear about the recent	5	enough while From S-18 was intended to serve small
6	proposal put out by the Commission regarding that	6	business, it's eligibility was based on the offering size
7	definition.	7	rather than the issuer size. So small issuers and SRCs
8	The SRC definition is of significant interest	8	have focused again on the size of the company that you're
9	to this committee as it determines which companies are	9	talking about.
10	eligible to use scale disclosure requirements. Last year	10	So bringing us back to the current definition,
11	the prior iteration of this advisory committee	11	as Steve mentioned SRCs are generally companies with less
12	recommended to the Commission that it revise the SRC	12	than \$75 million in public float as of the last business
13	definition to include companies with a public float of up	13	day of their most recently completed second fiscal
14	\$250 million, an increase up from the current cap of \$75	14	quarter. For companies with zero public float, either
15	million, and we were certainly pleased to see this action	15	because they have no public equity outstanding or because
16	on this front.	16	no market price exists for their equity, they would be
17	Amy Reischauer, who first and foremost is one	17	companies with annual revenues of less than \$50 million
18	of my former colleagues, and she's also special counsel	18	during the most recent fiscal year.
19	from the Office of Small Business Policy, one of the	19	As a reminder, public float is computed by
20	primary duties of well, I guess she's one of the	20	multiplying the aggregate number of shares of the
21	primary drafters of this particular rule and she's here	21	company's voting and non-voting common by the price at
22	to kind of explain it to us and just kind of bring us up	22	which it was last sold, or in the case of an IPO it would
23	to speed.	23	be the estimated offering price in contrast to market cap
24	So Amy, want to give us an overview?	24	attempts to capture the value of a company's equity held
25	MS. REISCHAUER: Thanks, Steve. As we've	25	by all holders. whether they're affiliates or not
	- 151		
	Page 151		Page 153
1	Page 151 heard on June 27th the Commission proposed amendments to	1	Page 153 affiliates.
1 2		1 2	
	heard on June 27th the Commission proposed amendments to	1	affiliates. So under the current definition a reporting company that doesn't qualify as an SRC wouldn't qualify
2 3 4	heard on June 27th the Commission proposed amendments to the Smaller Reporting Company definition using the Commission's rules and regs. For purposes of your discussion today I thought I would take a few minutes to	2 3 4	affiliates. So under the current definition a reporting company that doesn't qualify as an SRC wouldn't qualify again unless or until it had less than \$50 million on
2 3 4 5	heard on June 27th the Commission proposed amendments to the Smaller Reporting Company definition using the Commission's rules and regs. For purposes of your discussion today I thought I would take a few minutes to provide a brief background on the SRC definition and how	2 3 4 5	affiliates. So under the current definition a reporting company that doesn't qualify as an SRC wouldn't qualify again unless or until it had less than \$50 million on public float or zero public float and annual revenues of
2 3 4 5 6	heard on June 27th the Commission proposed amendments to the Smaller Reporting Company definition using the Commission's rules and regs. For purposes of your discussion today I thought I would take a few minutes to provide a brief background on the SRC definition and how we got to the current definition to identify generally	2 3 4 5 6	affiliates. So under the current definition a reporting company that doesn't qualify as an SRC wouldn't qualify again unless or until it had less than \$50 million on public float or zero public float and annual revenues of less than \$40 million. So a lower threshold would apply
2 3 4 5 6 7	heard on June 27th the Commission proposed amendments to the Smaller Reporting Company definition using the Commission's rules and regs. For purposes of your discussion today I thought I would take a few minutes to provide a brief background on the SRC definition and how we got to the current definition to identify generally the accommodations available to SRCs and to walk through	2 3 4 5 6 7	affiliates. So under the current definition a reporting company that doesn't qualify as an SRC wouldn't qualify again unless or until it had less than \$50 million on public float or zero public float and annual revenues of less than \$40 million. So a lower threshold would apply for companies transitioning from non-SRC to SRC in part
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	heard on June 27th the Commission proposed amendments to the Smaller Reporting Company definition using the Commission's rules and regs. For purposes of your discussion today I thought I would take a few minutes to provide a brief background on the SRC definition and how we got to the current definition to identify generally the accommodations available to SRCs and to walk through the proposed amendments, both what they propose to change	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	affiliates. So under the current definition a reporting company that doesn't qualify as an SRC wouldn't qualify again unless or until it had less than \$50 million on public float or zero public float and annual revenues of less than \$40 million. So a lower threshold would apply for companies transitioning from non-SRC to SRC in part to limit the fluctuations back and forth.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	heard on June 27th the Commission proposed amendments to the Smaller Reporting Company definition using the Commission's rules and regs. For purposes of your discussion today I thought I would take a few minutes to provide a brief background on the SRC definition and how we got to the current definition to identify generally the accommodations available to SRCs and to walk through the proposed amendments, both what they propose to change and what they don't propose to change.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	affiliates. So under the current definition a reporting company that doesn't qualify as an SRC wouldn't qualify again unless or until it had less than \$50 million on public float or zero public float and annual revenues of less than \$40 million. So a lower threshold would apply for companies transitioning from non-SRC to SRC in part to limit the fluctuations back and forth. SRCs are eligible to rely on a variety of scale
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	heard on June 27th the Commission proposed amendments to the Smaller Reporting Company definition using the Commission's rules and regs. For purposes of your discussion today I thought I would take a few minutes to provide a brief background on the SRC definition and how we got to the current definition to identify generally the accommodations available to SRCs and to walk through the proposed amendments, both what they propose to change and what they don't propose to change. So as background, the Smaller Reporting Company	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	affiliates. So under the current definition a reporting company that doesn't qualify as an SRC wouldn't qualify again unless or until it had less than \$50 million on public float or zero public float and annual revenues of less than \$40 million. So a lower threshold would apply for companies transitioning from non-SRC to SRC in part to limit the fluctuations back and forth. SRCs are eligible to rely on a variety of scale disclosure accommodations. These are all available a la
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	heard on June 27th the Commission proposed amendments to the Smaller Reporting Company definition using the Commission's rules and regs. For purposes of your discussion today I thought I would take a few minutes to provide a brief background on the SRC definition and how we got to the current definition to identify generally the accommodations available to SRCs and to walk through the proposed amendments, both what they propose to change and what they don't propose to change. So as background, the Smaller Reporting Company definition was established in 2007 in an effort to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	affiliates. So under the current definition a reporting company that doesn't qualify as an SRC wouldn't qualify again unless or until it had less than \$50 million on public float or zero public float and annual revenues of less than \$40 million. So a lower threshold would apply for companies transitioning from non-SRC to SRC in part to limit the fluctuations back and forth. SRCs are eligible to rely on a variety of scale disclosure accommodations. These are all available a la carte if you will. They can pick and choose which ones
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	heard on June 27th the Commission proposed amendments to the Smaller Reporting Company definition using the Commission's rules and regs. For purposes of your discussion today I thought I would take a few minutes to provide a brief background on the SRC definition and how we got to the current definition to identify generally the accommodations available to SRCs and to walk through the proposed amendments, both what they propose to change and what they don't propose to change. So as background, the Smaller Reporting Company definition was established in 2007 in an effort to provide general regulatory relief and to simplify the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	affiliates. So under the current definition a reporting company that doesn't qualify as an SRC wouldn't qualify again unless or until it had less than \$50 million on public float or zero public float and annual revenues of less than \$40 million. So a lower threshold would apply for companies transitioning from non-SRC to SRC in part to limit the fluctuations back and forth. SRCs are eligible to rely on a variety of scale disclosure accommodations. These are all available a la carte if you will. They can pick and choose which ones they wish to comply with, with the caveat that if an SRC
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	heard on June 27th the Commission proposed amendments to the Smaller Reporting Company definition using the Commission's rules and regs. For purposes of your discussion today I thought I would take a few minutes to provide a brief background on the SRC definition and how we got to the current definition to identify generally the accommodations available to SRCs and to walk through the proposed amendments, both what they propose to change and what they don't propose to change. So as background, the Smaller Reporting Company definition was established in 2007 in an effort to provide general regulatory relief and to simplify the regulatory framework for smaller companies. Previously	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	affiliates. So under the current definition a reporting company that doesn't qualify as an SRC wouldn't qualify again unless or until it had less than \$50 million on public float or zero public float and annual revenues of less than \$40 million. So a lower threshold would apply for companies transitioning from non-SRC to SRC in part to limit the fluctuations back and forth. SRCs are eligible to rely on a variety of scale disclosure accommodations. These are all available a la carte if you will. They can pick and choose which ones they wish to comply with, with the caveat that if an SRC disclosure requirement is more stringent than a non-SRC
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	heard on June 27th the Commission proposed amendments to the Smaller Reporting Company definition using the Commission's rules and regs. For purposes of your discussion today I thought I would take a few minutes to provide a brief background on the SRC definition and how we got to the current definition to identify generally the accommodations available to SRCs and to walk through the proposed amendments, both what they propose to change and what they don't propose to change. So as background, the Smaller Reporting Company definition was established in 2007 in an effort to provide general regulatory relief and to simplify the regulatory framework for smaller companies. Previously smaller companies had looked to Regulation SB, which was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	affiliates. So under the current definition a reporting company that doesn't qualify as an SRC wouldn't qualify again unless or until it had less than \$50 million on public float or zero public float and annual revenues of less than \$40 million. So a lower threshold would apply for companies transitioning from non-SRC to SRC in part to limit the fluctuations back and forth. SRCs are eligible to rely on a variety of scale disclosure accommodations. These are all available a la carte if you will. They can pick and choose which ones they wish to comply with, with the caveat that if an SRC disclosure requirement is more stringent than a non-SRC requirement the SRCs must comply with the more stringent
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	heard on June 27th the Commission proposed amendments to the Smaller Reporting Company definition using the Commission's rules and regs. For purposes of your discussion today I thought I would take a few minutes to provide a brief background on the SRC definition and how we got to the current definition to identify generally the accommodations available to SRCs and to walk through the proposed amendments, both what they propose to change and what they don't propose to change. So as background, the Smaller Reporting Company definition was established in 2007 in an effort to provide general regulatory relief and to simplify the regulatory framework for smaller companies. Previously	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	affiliates. So under the current definition a reporting company that doesn't qualify as an SRC wouldn't qualify again unless or until it had less than \$50 million on public float or zero public float and annual revenues of less than \$40 million. So a lower threshold would apply for companies transitioning from non-SRC to SRC in part to limit the fluctuations back and forth. SRCs are eligible to rely on a variety of scale disclosure accommodations. These are all available a la carte if you will. They can pick and choose which ones they wish to comply with, with the caveat that if an SRC disclosure requirement is more stringent than a non-SRC
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	heard on June 27th the Commission proposed amendments to the Smaller Reporting Company definition using the Commission's rules and regs. For purposes of your discussion today I thought I would take a few minutes to provide a brief background on the SRC definition and how we got to the current definition to identify generally the accommodations available to SRCs and to walk through the proposed amendments, both what they propose to change and what they don't propose to change. So as background, the Smaller Reporting Company definition was established in 2007 in an effort to provide general regulatory relief and to simplify the regulatory framework for smaller companies. Previously smaller companies had looked to Regulation SB, which was the prior integrated reporting and registration system	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	affiliates. So under the current definition a reporting company that doesn't qualify as an SRC wouldn't qualify again unless or until it had less than \$50 million on public float or zero public float and annual revenues of less than \$40 million. So a lower threshold would apply for companies transitioning from non-SRC to SRC in part to limit the fluctuations back and forth. SRCs are eligible to rely on a variety of scale disclosure accommodations. These are all available a la carte if you will. They can pick and choose which ones they wish to comply with, with the caveat that if an SRC disclosure requirement is more stringent than a non-SRC requirement the SRCs must comply with the more stringent standard. And the prime example of this is related party
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	heard on June 27th the Commission proposed amendments to the Smaller Reporting Company definition using the Commission's rules and regs. For purposes of your discussion today I thought I would take a few minutes to provide a brief background on the SRC definition and how we got to the current definition to identify generally the accommodations available to SRCs and to walk through the proposed amendments, both what they propose to change and what they don't propose to change. So as background, the Smaller Reporting Company definition was established in 2007 in an effort to provide general regulatory relief and to simplify the regulatory framework for smaller companies. Previously smaller companies had looked to Regulation SB, which was the prior integrated reporting and registration system for small businesses. SB had been created in 1992 as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	affiliates. So under the current definition a reporting company that doesn't qualify as an SRC wouldn't qualify again unless or until it had less than \$50 million on public float or zero public float and annual revenues of less than \$40 million. So a lower threshold would apply for companies transitioning from non-SRC to SRC in part to limit the fluctuations back and forth. SRCs are eligible to rely on a variety of scale disclosure accommodations. These are all available a la carte if you will. They can pick and choose which ones they wish to comply with, with the caveat that if an SRC disclosure requirement is more stringent than a non-SRC requirement the SRCs must comply with the more stringent standard. And the prime example of this is related party disclosure transactions where the transaction size
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	heard on June 27th the Commission proposed amendments to the Smaller Reporting Company definition using the Commission's rules and regs. For purposes of your discussion today I thought I would take a few minutes to provide a brief background on the SRC definition and how we got to the current definition to identify generally the accommodations available to SRCs and to walk through the proposed amendments, both what they propose to change and what they don't propose to change. So as background, the Smaller Reporting Company definition was established in 2007 in an effort to provide general regulatory relief and to simplify the regulatory framework for smaller companies. Previously smaller companies had looked to Regulation SB, which was the prior integrated reporting and registration system for small businesses. SB had been created in 1992 as part of a larger effort, again to facilitate capital	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	affiliates. So under the current definition a reporting company that doesn't qualify as an SRC wouldn't qualify again unless or until it had less than \$50 million on public float or zero public float and annual revenues of less than \$40 million. So a lower threshold would apply for companies transitioning from non-SRC to SRC in part to limit the fluctuations back and forth. SRCs are eligible to rely on a variety of scale disclosure accommodations. These are all available a la carte if you will. They can pick and choose which ones they wish to comply with, with the caveat that if an SRC disclosure requirement is more stringent than a non-SRC requirement the SRCs must comply with the more stringent standard. And the prime example of this is related party disclosure transactions where the transaction size threshold is lower for an SRC than it would be for other
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	heard on June 27th the Commission proposed amendments to the Smaller Reporting Company definition using the Commission's rules and regs. For purposes of your discussion today I thought I would take a few minutes to provide a brief background on the SRC definition and how we got to the current definition to identify generally the accommodations available to SRCs and to walk through the proposed amendments, both what they propose to change and what they don't propose to change. So as background, the Smaller Reporting Company definition was established in 2007 in an effort to provide general regulatory relief and to simplify the regulatory framework for smaller companies. Previously smaller companies had looked to Regulation SB, which was the prior integrated reporting and registration system for small businesses. SB had been created in 1992 as part of a larger effort, again to facilitate capital formation and to reduce compliance burdens for small	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	affiliates. So under the current definition a reporting company that doesn't qualify as an SRC wouldn't qualify again unless or until it had less than \$50 million on public float or zero public float and annual revenues of less than \$40 million. So a lower threshold would apply for companies transitioning from non-SRC to SRC in part to limit the fluctuations back and forth. SRCs are eligible to rely on a variety of scale disclosure accommodations. These are all available a la carte if you will. They can pick and choose which ones they wish to comply with, with the caveat that if an SRC disclosure requirement is more stringent than a non-SRC requirement the SRCs must comply with the more stringent standard. And the prime example of this is related party disclosure transactions where the transaction size threshold is lower for an SRC than it would be for other companies.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	heard on June 27th the Commission proposed amendments to the Smaller Reporting Company definition using the Commission's rules and regs. For purposes of your discussion today I thought I would take a few minutes to provide a brief background on the SRC definition and how we got to the current definition to identify generally the accommodations available to SRCs and to walk through the proposed amendments, both what they propose to change and what they don't propose to change. So as background, the Smaller Reporting Company definition was established in 2007 in an effort to provide general regulatory relief and to simplify the regulatory framework for smaller companies. Previously smaller companies had looked to Regulation SB, which was the prior integrated reporting and registration system for small businesses. SB had been created in 1992 as part of a larger effort, again to facilitate capital formation and to reduce compliance burdens for small businesses.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	affiliates. So under the current definition a reporting company that doesn't qualify as an SRC wouldn't qualify again unless or until it had less than \$50 million on public float or zero public float and annual revenues of less than \$40 million. So a lower threshold would apply for companies transitioning from non-SRC to SRC in part to limit the fluctuations back and forth. SRCs are eligible to rely on a variety of scale disclosure accommodations. These are all available a la carte if you will. They can pick and choose which ones they wish to comply with, with the caveat that if an SRC disclosure requirement is more stringent than a non-SRC requirement the SRCs must comply with the more stringent standard. And the prime example of this is related party disclosure transactions where the transaction size threshold is lower for an SRC than it would be for other companies.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	heard on June 27th the Commission proposed amendments to the Smaller Reporting Company definition using the Commission's rules and regs. For purposes of your discussion today I thought I would take a few minutes to provide a brief background on the SRC definition and how we got to the current definition to identify generally the accommodations available to SRCs and to walk through the proposed amendments, both what they propose to change and what they don't propose to change. So as background, the Smaller Reporting Company definition was established in 2007 in an effort to provide general regulatory relief and to simplify the regulatory framework for smaller companies. Previously smaller companies had looked to Regulation SB, which was the prior integrated reporting and registration system for small businesses. SB had been created in 1992 as part of a larger effort, again to facilitate capital formation and to reduce compliance burdens for small businesses. SB catered to what they called, what were called small business issuers, which were issuers with both annual revenues and public floats of less than \$25	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	affiliates. So under the current definition a reporting company that doesn't qualify as an SRC wouldn't qualify again unless or until it had less than \$50 million on public float or zero public float and annual revenues of less than \$40 million. So a lower threshold would apply for companies transitioning from non-SRC to SRC in part to limit the fluctuations back and forth. SRCs are eligible to rely on a variety of scale disclosure accommodations. These are all available a la carte if you will. They can pick and choose which ones they wish to comply with, with the caveat that if an SRC disclosure requirement is more stringent than a non-SRC requirement the SRCs must comply with the more stringent standard. And the prime example of this is related party disclosure transactions where the transaction size threshold is lower for an SRC than it would be for other companies.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	heard on June 27th the Commission proposed amendments to the Smaller Reporting Company definition using the Commission's rules and regs. For purposes of your discussion today I thought I would take a few minutes to provide a brief background on the SRC definition and how we got to the current definition to identify generally the accommodations available to SRCs and to walk through the proposed amendments, both what they propose to change and what they don't propose to change. So as background, the Smaller Reporting Company definition was established in 2007 in an effort to provide general regulatory relief and to simplify the regulatory framework for smaller companies. Previously smaller companies had looked to Regulation SB, which was the prior integrated reporting and registration system for small businesses. SB had been created in 1992 as part of a larger effort, again to facilitate capital formation and to reduce compliance burdens for small businesses. SB catered to what they called, what were called small business issuers, which were issuers with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	affiliates. So under the current definition a reporting company that doesn't qualify as an SRC wouldn't qualify again unless or until it had less than \$50 million on public float or zero public float and annual revenues of less than \$40 million. So a lower threshold would apply for companies transitioning from non-SRC to SRC in part to limit the fluctuations back and forth. SRCs are eligible to rely on a variety of scale disclosure accommodations. These are all available a la carte if you will. They can pick and choose which ones they wish to comply with, with the caveat that if an SRC disclosure requirement is more stringent than a non-SRC requirement the SRCs must comply with the more stringent standard. And the prime example of this is related party disclosure transactions where the transaction size threshold is lower for an SRC than it would be for other companies. Other accommodations that I'm sure you're aware of include business disclosure that would cover three years versus five. and it's slightly less detail than the enumerated requirements. Things like selected financial data, supplemental financial data aren't required.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	heard on June 27th the Commission proposed amendments to the Smaller Reporting Company definition using the Commission's rules and regs. For purposes of your discussion today I thought I would take a few minutes to provide a brief background on the SRC definition and how we got to the current definition to identify generally the accommodations available to SRCs and to walk through the proposed amendments, both what they propose to change and what they don't propose to change. So as background, the Smaller Reporting Company definition was established in 2007 in an effort to provide general regulatory relief and to simplify the regulatory framework for smaller companies. Previously smaller companies had looked to Regulation SB, which was the prior integrated reporting and registration system for small businesses. SB had been created in 1992 as part of a larger effort, again to facilitate capital formation and to reduce compliance burdens for small businesses. SB catered to what they called, what were called small business issuers, which were issuers with both annual revenues and public floats of less than \$25 million. So the SRC definition replaced that small business issuer definition.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	affiliates. So under the current definition a reporting company that doesn't qualify as an SRC wouldn't qualify again unless or until it had less than \$50 million on public float or zero public float and annual revenues of less than \$40 million. So a lower threshold would apply for companies transitioning from non-SRC to SRC in part to limit the fluctuations back and forth. SRCs are eligible to rely on a variety of scale disclosure accommodations. These are all available a la carte if you will. They can pick and choose which ones they wish to comply with, with the caveat that if an SRC disclosure requirement is more stringent than a non-SRC requirement the SRCs must comply with the more stringent standard. And the prime example of this is related party disclosure transactions where the transaction size threshold is lower for an SRC than it would be for other sompanies. Other accommodations that I'm sure you're aware of include business disclosure that would cover three years versus five. and it's slightly less detail than the enumerated requirements. Things like selected financial data, supplemental financial data aren't required. Financial statements and MD&A are required to cover two
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	heard on June 27th the Commission proposed amendments to the Smaller Reporting Company definition using the Commission's rules and regs. For purposes of your discussion today I thought I would take a few minutes to provide a brief background on the SRC definition and how we got to the current definition to identify generally the accommodations available to SRCs and to walk through the proposed amendments, both what they propose to change and what they don't propose to change. So as background, the Smaller Reporting Company definition was established in 2007 in an effort to provide general regulatory relief and to simplify the regulatory framework for smaller companies. Previously smaller companies had looked to Regulation SB, which was the prior integrated reporting and registration system for small businesses. SB had been created in 1992 as part of a larger effort, again to facilitate capital formation and to reduce compliance burdens for small businesses. SB catered to what they called, what were called small business issuers, which were issuers with both annual revenues and public floats of less than \$25 million. So the SRC definition replaced that small	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	affiliates. So under the current definition a reporting company that doesn't qualify as an SRC wouldn't qualify again unless or until it had less than \$50 million on public float or zero public float and annual revenues of less than \$40 million. So a lower threshold would apply for companies transitioning from non-SRC to SRC in part to limit the fluctuations back and forth. SRCs are eligible to rely on a variety of scale disclosure accommodations. These are all available a la carte if you will. They can pick and choose which ones they wish to comply with, with the caveat that if an SRC disclosure requirement is more stringent than a non-SRC requirement the SRCs must comply with the more stringent standard. And the prime example of this is related party disclosure transactions where the transaction size threshold is lower for an SRC than it would be for other companies. Other accommodations that I'm sure you're aware of include business disclosure that would cover three years versus five. and it's slightly less detail than the enumerated requirements. Things like selected financial data, supplemental financial data aren't required.

	Page 154		Page 156
1	disclosure. There's no MD&A, reduced tables, no pay	1 any increase in the SRC definition into t	he large
2	ratio disclosure, things like that.	2 accelerated filer definition.	0
3	I would note that the SRCs like all companies	3 So the Commission's proposal wo	uldn't change
4	are required to provide, along with the specifically	4 the thresholds in those definitions, but in	addition to
5	required information they must provide any other material	5 avoid that effectively indirect increase th	he proposed
6	information that would be necessary to make the required	6 amendment would eliminate that interlo	cking provision.
7	statements not misleading. So there's still a bit of a	7 So as proposed there could be companie	es with public
8	catchall even for those eligible for scaled disclosure.	8 floats between 75 million and 250 millio	on what would be
9	So turning to the proposed amendments, again	9 both a smaller reporting company and el	ligible for
10	these changes are intended to promote capital formation	0 disclosure, but they would also be an acc	
11	and reduce compliance costs for smaller companies by	1 with everything that comes along with th	nat, including the
12	expanding the pool of companies that qualify as SRCs and	2 SOX 404(b) obligations unless they're en	merging growth
13	that therefore are eligible to rely on the scale	3 companies who are already exempt. So	there's that
14	disclosures, while at the same time maintaining the	4 disclaimer.	
15	investor protections of the disclosure system.	5 I would reiterate, though, that whi	ile the
16	Under the definition or the proposed definition	6 Commission did not propose to extend th	he 404(b) exemption
17	SRCs would be companies with less than 250 million in	7 it did specifically request comment in th	is area, so we
18	public float as we heard, or if they have zero public	8 of course look forward to seeing those c	omments come in.
19	float it would be annual revenues of less than 100	9 I think those are the highlights from the	proposal but
20	million. And then companies that don't qualify as an SRC	0 I'm happy to take questions or stand by a	and just answer
21	would not qualify until they had less than \$200 million	1 them as they come up.	
22	in public float or zero public float and annual revenues	2 CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: You kno	ow, I think intuitively
23	of less than 80 million.	3 at least I for one thought that eliminating	g 404(b) would
24	So thresholds obviously sound a bit familiar as	4 have a greater economic impact and it w	ould appear from
25	they're fairly consistent with the recommendations of the	5 the study that it's marginal at best.	
	Dage 155		Dage 157
1	Page 155	1 MD COMEZ: So the release has	Page 157
1	committee, which the Commission considered. The	1 MR. GOMEZ: So the release has discussion with respect to 404(b). In 20	a lengthy
2	committee, which the Commission considered. The Commission could consider recommendations from the Small	2 discussion with respect to 404(b). In 20	s a lengthy 111 the staff did
2 3	committee, which the Commission considered. The Commission could consider recommendations from the Small Business Forum, which again were fairly consistent, as	<ol> <li>discussion with respect to 404(b). In 20</li> <li>a study on the impact of the 404(b) attest</li> </ol>	s a lengthy 11 the staff did station
2 3 4	committee, which the Commission considered. The Commission could consider recommendations from the Small Business Forum, which again were fairly consistent, as well as comments received in response to the disclosure	<ul> <li>discussion with respect to 404(b). In 20</li> <li>a study on the impact of the 404(b) attes</li> <li>requirement and came to certain finding</li> </ul>	s a lengthy 11 the staff did station s with respect to
2 3 4 5	committee, which the Commission considered. The Commission could consider recommendations from the Small Business Forum, which again were fairly consistent, as well as comments received in response to the disclosure effectiveness initiative.	<ul> <li>discussion with respect to 404(b). In 20</li> <li>a study on the impact of the 404(b) attes</li> <li>requirement and came to certain finding</li> <li>the question as to whether the threshold</li> </ul>	s a lengthy 11 the staff did station s with respect to should be raised
2 3 4 5 6	committee, which the Commission considered. The Commission could consider recommendations from the Small Business Forum, which again were fairly consistent, as well as comments received in response to the disclosure effectiveness initiative. I also wanted to walk through what the	<ul> <li>discussion with respect to 404(b). In 20</li> <li>a study on the impact of the 404(b) attes</li> <li>requirement and came to certain finding</li> <li>the question as to whether the threshold</li> <li>to a higher amount. And in essence the second second</li></ul>	s a lengthy 11 the staff did station s with respect to should be raised study looked at
2 3 4 5	committee, which the Commission considered. The Commission could consider recommendations from the Small Business Forum, which again were fairly consistent, as well as comments received in response to the disclosure effectiveness initiative. I also wanted to walk through what the Commission did not propose to change, but where it has	<ul> <li>discussion with respect to 404(b). In 20</li> <li>a study on the impact of the 404(b) attes</li> <li>requirement and came to certain finding</li> <li>the question as to whether the threshold</li> </ul>	s a lengthy 011 the staff did station s with respect to should be raised study looked at or protection
2 3 4 5 6 7	committee, which the Commission considered. The Commission could consider recommendations from the Small Business Forum, which again were fairly consistent, as well as comments received in response to the disclosure effectiveness initiative. I also wanted to walk through what the Commission did not propose to change, but where it has requested comment. So if you've read it you'll see that	<ul> <li>discussion with respect to 404(b). In 20</li> <li>a study on the impact of the 404(b) attes</li> <li>requirement and came to certain finding</li> <li>the question as to whether the threshold</li> <li>to a higher amount. And in essence the s</li> <li>on the one side the cost versus the invest</li> </ul>	s a lengthy D11 the staff did station s with respect to should be raised study looked at or protection concluded that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	committee, which the Commission considered. The Commission could consider recommendations from the Small Business Forum, which again were fairly consistent, as well as comments received in response to the disclosure effectiveness initiative. I also wanted to walk through what the Commission did not propose to change, but where it has	<ul> <li>discussion with respect to 404(b). In 20</li> <li>a study on the impact of the 404(b) attes</li> <li>requirement and came to certain finding</li> <li>the question as to whether the threshold</li> <li>to a higher amount. And in essence the s</li> <li>on the one side the cost versus the invest</li> <li>that comes from the 404(b) and the staff</li> </ul>	s a lengthy 11 the staff did station s with respect to should be raised study looked at or protection concluded that the threshold as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	committee, which the Commission considered. The Commission could consider recommendations from the Small Business Forum, which again were fairly consistent, as well as comments received in response to the disclosure effectiveness initiative. I also wanted to walk through what the Commission did not propose to change, but where it has requested comment. So if you've read it you'll see that the proposal would not increase the accelerated filer	<ul> <li>discussion with respect to 404(b). In 20</li> <li>a study on the impact of the 404(b) attes</li> <li>requirement and came to certain finding</li> <li>the question as to whether the threshold</li> <li>to a higher amount. And in essence the s</li> <li>on the one side the cost versus the invest</li> <li>that comes from the 404(b) and the staff</li> <li>there wasn't evidence to support raising</li> </ul>	s a lengthy 11 the staff did station s with respect to should be raised study looked at or protection concluded that the threshold as y.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	committee, which the Commission considered. The Commission could consider recommendations from the Small Business Forum, which again were fairly consistent, as well as comments received in response to the disclosure effectiveness initiative. I also wanted to walk through what the Commission did not propose to change, but where it has requested comment. So if you've read it you'll see that the proposal would not increase the accelerated filer threshold, or large accelerated filer threshold, or	<ul> <li>discussion with respect to 404(b). In 20</li> <li>a study on the impact of the 404(b) attes</li> <li>requirement and came to certain finding</li> <li>the question as to whether the threshold</li> <li>to a higher amount. And in essence the s</li> <li>on the one side the cost versus the invest</li> <li>that comes from the 404(b) and the staff</li> <li>there wasn't evidence to support raising</li> <li>to where the 404(b) would need to apply</li> </ul>	s a lengthy 011 the staff did station s with respect to should be raised study looked at or protection concluded that the threshold as y. seen looking at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	committee, which the Commission considered. The Commission could consider recommendations from the Small Business Forum, which again were fairly consistent, as well as comments received in response to the disclosure effectiveness initiative. I also wanted to walk through what the Commission did not propose to change, but where it has requested comment. So if you've read it you'll see that the proposal would not increase the accelerated filer threshold, or large accelerated filer threshold, or extend the exemption from SOX 404(b) requirement to	<ul> <li>discussion with respect to 404(b). In 20</li> <li>a study on the impact of the 404(b) attes</li> <li>requirement and came to certain finding</li> <li>the question as to whether the threshold</li> <li>to a higher amount. And in essence the s</li> <li>on the one side the cost versus the invest</li> <li>that comes from the 404(b) and the staff</li> <li>there wasn't evidence to support raising</li> <li>to where the 404(b) would need to apply</li> <li>Subsequent to 2011 DERA has be</li> </ul>	s a lengthy 011 the staff did station s with respect to should be raised study looked at or protection c concluded that the threshold as y. een looking at cademic research
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	committee, which the Commission considered. The Commission could consider recommendations from the Small Business Forum, which again were fairly consistent, as well as comments received in response to the disclosure effectiveness initiative. I also wanted to walk through what the Commission did not propose to change, but where it has requested comment. So if you've read it you'll see that the proposal would not increase the accelerated filer threshold, or large accelerated filer threshold, or extend the exemption from SOX 404(b) requirement to provide an auditor attestation.	<ul> <li>discussion with respect to 404(b). In 20</li> <li>a study on the impact of the 404(b) attes</li> <li>requirement and came to certain finding</li> <li>the question as to whether the threshold</li> <li>to a higher amount. And in essence the s</li> <li>on the one side the cost versus the invest</li> <li>that comes from the 404(b) and the staff</li> <li>there wasn't evidence to support raising</li> <li>to where the 404(b) would need to apply</li> <li>Subsequent to 2011 DERA has be</li> <li>academic research in this area and the ac</li> </ul>	s a lengthy 11 the staff did station s with respect to should be raised study looked at or protection concluded that the threshold as y. een looking at cademic research with some
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	committee, which the Commission considered. The Commission could consider recommendations from the Small Business Forum, which again were fairly consistent, as well as comments received in response to the disclosure effectiveness initiative. I also wanted to walk through what the Commission did not propose to change, but where it has requested comment. So if you've read it you'll see that the proposal would not increase the accelerated filer threshold, or large accelerated filer threshold, or extend the exemption from SOX 404(b) requirement to provide an auditor attestation. So only accelerated and large accelerated	<ul> <li>discussion with respect to 404(b). In 20</li> <li>a study on the impact of the 404(b) attes</li> <li>requirement and came to certain finding</li> <li>the question as to whether the threshold</li> <li>to a higher amount. And in essence the s</li> <li>on the one side the cost versus the invest</li> <li>that comes from the 404(b) and the staff</li> <li>there wasn't evidence to support raising</li> <li>to where the 404(b) would need to apply</li> <li>Subsequent to 2011 DERA has be</li> <li>academic research in this area and the ac</li> <li>has been mixed, some research coming v</li> </ul>	s a lengthy 11 the staff did station s with respect to should be raised study looked at or protection concluded that the threshold as y. een looking at cademic research with some g with conclusions
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	committee, which the Commission considered. The Commission could consider recommendations from the Small Business Forum, which again were fairly consistent, as well as comments received in response to the disclosure effectiveness initiative. I also wanted to walk through what the Commission did not propose to change, but where it has requested comment. So if you've read it you'll see that the proposal would not increase the accelerated filer threshold, or large accelerated filer threshold, or extend the exemption from SOX 404(b) requirement to provide an auditor attestation. So only accelerated and large accelerated filers as you know are required to comply with SOX	<ul> <li>discussion with respect to 404(b). In 20</li> <li>a study on the impact of the 404(b) attes</li> <li>requirement and came to certain finding</li> <li>the question as to whether the threshold</li> <li>to a higher amount. And in essence the s</li> <li>on the one side the cost versus the invest</li> <li>that comes from the 404(b) and the staff</li> <li>there wasn't evidence to support raising</li> <li>to where the 404(b) would need to apply</li> <li>Subsequent to 2011 DERA has be</li> <li>academic research in this area and the ac</li> <li>has been mixed, some research coming w</li> </ul>	s a lengthy D11 the staff did station s with respect to should be raised study looked at or protection concluded that the threshold as y. een looking at cademic research with some g with conclusions here. So the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	committee, which the Commission considered. The Commission could consider recommendations from the Small Business Forum, which again were fairly consistent, as well as comments received in response to the disclosure effectiveness initiative. I also wanted to walk through what the Commission did not propose to change, but where it has requested comment. So if you've read it you'll see that the proposal would not increase the accelerated filer threshold, or large accelerated filer threshold, or extend the exemption from SOX 404(b) requirement to provide an auditor attestation. So only accelerated and large accelerated filers as you know are required to comply with SOX 404(b), and those definitions like the SRC definition are based on public float, so 75 million in the case of an accelerated filer or 700 million in the case of a large	<ul> <li>discussion with respect to 404(b). In 20</li> <li>a study on the impact of the 404(b) attes</li> <li>requirement and came to certain finding</li> <li>the question as to whether the threshold</li> <li>to a higher amount. And in essence the s</li> <li>on the one side the cost versus the invest</li> <li>that comes from the 404(b) and the staff</li> <li>there wasn't evidence to support raising</li> <li>to where the 404(b) would need to apply</li> <li>Subsequent to 2011 DERA has bee</li> <li>academic research in this area and the ac</li> <li>has been mixed, some research coming</li> <li>that don't support necessarily a change the</li> <li>Commission looking at all that did not p</li> <li>the 404(b) threshold, but it did ask for q</li> </ul>	s a lengthy 011 the staff did station s with respect to should be raised study looked at or protection concluded that the threshold as y. een looking at cademic research with some g with conclusions here. So the propose changing juestions. And
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	committee, which the Commission considered. The Commission could consider recommendations from the Small Business Forum, which again were fairly consistent, as well as comments received in response to the disclosure effectiveness initiative. I also wanted to walk through what the Commission did not propose to change, but where it has requested comment. So if you've read it you'll see that the proposal would not increase the accelerated filer threshold, or large accelerated filer threshold, or extend the exemption from SOX 404(b) requirement to provide an auditor attestation. So only accelerated and large accelerated filers as you know are required to comply with SOX 404(b), and those definitions like the SRC definition are based on public float, so 75 million in the case of an accelerated filer or 700 million in the case of a large accelerated filer. But each definition also contains a	<ul> <li>discussion with respect to 404(b). In 20</li> <li>a study on the impact of the 404(b) attes</li> <li>requirement and came to certain finding</li> <li>the question as to whether the threshold</li> <li>to a higher amount. And in essence the s</li> <li>on the one side the cost versus the invest</li> <li>that comes from the 404(b) and the staff</li> <li>there wasn't evidence to support raising</li> <li>to where the 404(b) would need to apply</li> <li>Subsequent to 2011 DERA has be</li> <li>academic research in this area and the ac</li> <li>has been mixed, some research coming</li> <li>that don't support necessarily a change th</li> <li>Commission looking at all that did not p</li> <li>think there's a number of requests for c</li> </ul>	s a lengthy 11 the staff did station s with respect to should be raised study looked at or protection c concluded that the threshold as y. the nooking at cademic research with some g with conclusions here. So the propose changing questions. And comments in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	committee, which the Commission considered. The Commission could consider recommendations from the Small Business Forum, which again were fairly consistent, as well as comments received in response to the disclosure effectiveness initiative. I also wanted to walk through what the Commission did not propose to change, but where it has requested comment. So if you've read it you'll see that the proposal would not increase the accelerated filer threshold, or large accelerated filer threshold, or extend the exemption from SOX 404(b) requirement to provide an auditor attestation. So only accelerated and large accelerated filers as you know are required to comply with SOX 404(b), and those definitions like the SRC definition are based on public float, so 75 million in the case of an accelerated filer. But each definition also contains a provision that excludes SRCs however they're defined.	<ul> <li>discussion with respect to 404(b). In 20</li> <li>a study on the impact of the 404(b) attes</li> <li>requirement and came to certain finding</li> <li>the question as to whether the threshold</li> <li>to a higher amount. And in essence the s</li> <li>on the one side the cost versus the invest</li> <li>that comes from the 404(b) and the staff</li> <li>there wasn't evidence to support raising</li> <li>to where the 404(b) would need to apply</li> <li>Subsequent to 2011 DERA has be</li> <li>academic research in this area and the ac</li> <li>has been mixed, some research coming v</li> <li>conclusions while other research coming</li> <li>that don't support necessarily a change th</li> <li>Commission looking at all that did not p</li> <li>think there's a number of requests for c</li> <li>release. We encourage people to commission</li> </ul>	s a lengthy 11 the staff did station s with respect to should be raised study looked at or protection c concluded that the threshold as y. the nooking at cademic research with some g with conclusions here. So the propose changing questions. And comments in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	committee, which the Commission considered. The Commission could consider recommendations from the Small Business Forum, which again were fairly consistent, as well as comments received in response to the disclosure effectiveness initiative. I also wanted to walk through what the Commission did not propose to change, but where it has requested comment. So if you've read it you'll see that the proposal would not increase the accelerated filer threshold, or large accelerated filer threshold, or extend the exemption from SOX 404(b) requirement to provide an auditor attestation. So only accelerated and large accelerated filers as you know are required to comply with SOX 404(b), and those definitions like the SRC definition are based on public float, so 75 million in the case of an accelerated filer. But each definition also contains a provision that excludes SRCs however they're defined. So under the current definition SRCs are	<ul> <li>discussion with respect to 404(b). In 20</li> <li>a study on the impact of the 404(b) attes</li> <li>requirement and came to certain finding</li> <li>the question as to whether the threshold</li> <li>to a higher amount. And in essence the s</li> <li>on the one side the cost versus the invest</li> <li>that comes from the 404(b) and the staff</li> <li>there wasn't evidence to support raising</li> <li>to where the 404(b) would need to apply</li> <li>Subsequent to 2011 DERA has be</li> <li>academic research in this area and the ac</li> <li>has been mixed, some research coming</li> <li>that don't support necessarily a change th</li> <li>Commission looking at all that did not p</li> <li>think there's a number of requests for c</li> <li>release. We encourage people to common</li> </ul>	a a lengthy 011 the staff did datation s with respect to should be raised study looked at for protection concluded that the threshold as y. een looking at cademic research with some g with conclusions here. So the propose changing juestions. And comments in the ent on all aspects
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	committee, which the Commission considered. The Commission could consider recommendations from the Small Business Forum, which again were fairly consistent, as well as comments received in response to the disclosure effectiveness initiative. I also wanted to walk through what the Commission did not propose to change, but where it has requested comment. So if you've read it you'll see that the proposal would not increase the accelerated filer threshold, or large accelerated filer threshold, or extend the exemption from SOX 404(b) requirement to provide an auditor attestation. So only accelerated and large accelerated filers as you know are required to comply with SOX 404(b), and those definitions like the SRC definition are based on public float, so 75 million in the case of an accelerated filer. But each definition also contains a provision that excludes SRCs however they're defined. So under the current definition SRCs are generally non-accredited investors, so I don't want to	<ul> <li>discussion with respect to 404(b). In 20</li> <li>a study on the impact of the 404(b) attes</li> <li>requirement and came to certain finding</li> <li>the question as to whether the threshold</li> <li>to a higher amount. And in essence the s</li> <li>on the one side the cost versus the invest</li> <li>that comes from the 404(b) and the staff</li> <li>there wasn't evidence to support raising</li> <li>to where the 404(b) would need to apply</li> <li>Subsequent to 2011 DERA has bee</li> <li>academic research in this area and the ac</li> <li>has been mixed, some research coming</li> <li>that don't support necessarily a change the</li> <li>Commission looking at all that did not p</li> <li>the 404(b) threshold, but it did ask for q</li> <li>I think there's a number of requests for c</li> <li>release. We encourage people to common</li> <li>of the release.</li> </ul>	a lengthy 11 the staff did station s with respect to should be raised study looked at or protection <sup>1</sup> concluded that the threshold as y. the looking at cademic research with some g with conclusions here. So the propose changing juestions. And comments in the ent on all aspects
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	committee, which the Commission considered. The Commission could consider recommendations from the Small Business Forum, which again were fairly consistent, as well as comments received in response to the disclosure effectiveness initiative. I also wanted to walk through what the Commission did not propose to change, but where it has requested comment. So if you've read it you'll see that the proposal would not increase the accelerated filer threshold, or large accelerated filer threshold, or extend the exemption from SOX 404(b) requirement to provide an auditor attestation. So only accelerated and large accelerated filers as you know are required to comply with SOX 404(b), and those definitions like the SRC definition are based on public float, so 75 million in the case of an accelerated filer. But each definition also contains a provision that excludes SRCs however they're defined. So under the current definition SRCs are generally non-accredited investors, so I don't want to say that provision is moot but it's not heavily effective	<ul> <li>discussion with respect to 404(b). In 20</li> <li>a study on the impact of the 404(b) attes</li> <li>requirement and came to certain finding</li> <li>the question as to whether the threshold</li> <li>to a higher amount. And in essence the s</li> <li>on the one side the cost versus the invest</li> <li>that comes from the 404(b) and the staff</li> <li>there wasn't evidence to support raising</li> <li>to where the 404(b) would need to apply</li> <li>Subsequent to 2011 DERA has be</li> <li>academic research in this area and the ac</li> <li>has been mixed, some research coming</li> <li>that don't support necessarily a change the</li> <li>Commission looking at all that did not p</li> <li>the 404(b) threshold, but it did ask for q</li> <li>I think there's a number of requests for c</li> <li>release. We encourage people to common</li> <li>of the release.</li> <li>Quantitative data is of course extrr</li> </ul>	a lengthy 11 the staff did station s with respect to should be raised study looked at or protection concluded that the threshold as y. een looking at cademic research with some g with conclusions here. So the propose changing uestions. And comments in the ent on all aspects remely tters provide on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	committee, which the Commission considered. The Commission could consider recommendations from the Small Business Forum, which again were fairly consistent, as well as comments received in response to the disclosure effectiveness initiative. I also wanted to walk through what the Commission did not propose to change, but where it has requested comment. So if you've read it you'll see that the proposal would not increase the accelerated filer threshold, or large accelerated filer threshold, or extend the exemption from SOX 404(b) requirement to provide an auditor attestation. So only accelerated and large accelerated filers as you know are required to comply with SOX 404(b), and those definitions like the SRC definition are based on public float, so 75 million in the case of an accelerated filer or 700 million in the case of a large accelerated filer. But each definition also contains a provision that excludes SRCs however they're defined. So under the current definition SRCs are generally non-accredited investors, so I don't want to say that provision is moot but it's not heavily effective because as non-accelerated filers they would already not	<ul> <li>discussion with respect to 404(b). In 20</li> <li>a study on the impact of the 404(b) attes</li> <li>requirement and came to certain finding</li> <li>the question as to whether the threshold</li> <li>to a higher amount. And in essence the s</li> <li>on the one side the cost versus the invest</li> <li>that comes from the 404(b) and the staff</li> <li>there wasn't evidence to support raising</li> <li>to where the 404(b) would need to apply</li> <li>Subsequent to 2011 DERA has be</li> <li>academic research in this area and the ac</li> <li>has been mixed, some research coming</li> <li>that don't support necessarily a change th</li> <li>Commission looking at all that did not p</li> <li>the 404(b) threshold, but it did ask for q</li> <li>I think there's a number of requests for c</li> <li>release. We encourage people to common</li> <li>of the release.</li> <li>Quantitative data is of course extra</li> <li>helpful, so any information that commend</li> <li>that would help DERA and the Commission</li> </ul>	a lengthy 11 the staff did station s with respect to should be raised study looked at or protection concluded that the threshold as y. een looking at cademic research with some g with conclusions here. So the propose changing uestions. And comments in the ent on all aspects remely tters provide on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	committee, which the Commission considered. The Commission could consider recommendations from the Small Business Forum, which again were fairly consistent, as well as comments received in response to the disclosure effectiveness initiative. I also wanted to walk through what the Commission did not propose to change, but where it has requested comment. So if you've read it you'll see that the proposal would not increase the accelerated filer threshold, or large accelerated filer threshold, or extend the exemption from SOX 404(b) requirement to provide an auditor attestation. So only accelerated and large accelerated filers as you know are required to comply with SOX 404(b), and those definitions like the SRC definition are based on public float, so 75 million in the case of an accelerated filer. But each definition also contains a provision that excludes SRCs however they're defined. So under the current definition SRCs are generally non-accredited investors, so I don't want to say that provision is moot but it's not heavily effective	<ul> <li>discussion with respect to 404(b). In 20</li> <li>a study on the impact of the 404(b) attes</li> <li>requirement and came to certain finding</li> <li>the question as to whether the threshold</li> <li>to a higher amount. And in essence the s</li> <li>on the one side the cost versus the invest</li> <li>that comes from the 404(b) and the staff</li> <li>there wasn't evidence to support raising</li> <li>to where the 404(b) would need to apply</li> <li>Subsequent to 2011 DERA has be</li> <li>academic research in this area and the ac</li> <li>has been mixed, some research coming</li> <li>that don't support necessarily a change the</li> <li>Commission looking at all that did not p</li> <li>the 404(b) threshold, but it did ask for q</li> <li>I think there's a number of requests for c</li> <li>release. We encourage people to common</li> <li>of the release.</li> <li>Quantitative data is of course extrr</li> </ul>	s a lengthy 011 the staff did station s with respect to should be raised study looked at or protection concluded that the threshold as y. een looking at cademic research with some g with conclusions here. So the propose changing juestions. And comments in the ent on all aspects remely theres provide on sion to consider how

Page	160
Paye	100

	Page 158		Page 160
1	right answer is. Again as I've said intuitively I just	1	Now again, you know, I know that I'm not alone
2	assumed that that would ease a significant burden. It	2	in this. There's a lot of biotech companies and other
3	would appear that the burden is less than I assumed it	3	small companies that are in the same boat. I just don't
4	was. But the fact does remain that it's seen as a as	4	know what those numbers are.
5	a significant enough burden to give the exemption to	5	MR. REARDON: I would observe that you probably
6	emerging growth companies for five years. Is that right?	6	could buy a lot of insurance to cover the risks that the
7	MR. GOMEZ: So keep in mind that the HEC	7	404(b) certification is intended to address. Those risks
8	exemption was statutorily mandate by Congress	8	could be covered for insurance costs a lot less than
9	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Understood, right.	9	\$100,000.
10	MR. GOMEZ: But and I'm not sure what the	10	MR. HAHN: I think I've said this at past
11	consideration there was. I think the Commission as it	11	meetings too. I know throughout the whole IPO process
12	was considering the 404(b) was considering on the one	12	and everywhere else all the investors, you know, as far
13	hand the dollar costs, which some of you I know Brian	13	as it relates to the financial statements in the biotech
14	-	14	
	you may have some ideas as to dollar costs itself on the	15	world the only question is how much cash do you have and
15	one hand versus on the other hand what's the cost from an		how long it's going to last. That's the only two
16	investor protection standpoint. So for example does the	16	questions. So
17	fact that you have a 404(b) auditor at the station does	17	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Other thoughts?
18	it result in less restatements, and if so that it's a	18	CO-CHAIR HANKS: I've got a question for
19	benefit that you counter to the cost.	19	clarification. Tell me if I've got this right or wrong.
20	So in considering this investor protection	20	The point at which a company, a Reg A issuer loses the
21	but Brian I see your light on, you	21	conditional protection form Section 12(g)(4) registration
22	MR. HAHN: So my question was we talked earlier	22	is currently set at the smaller reporting company, right.
23	is less restatements. But is that broken out by company	23	And so I think one thing that I find this very welcoming
24	size? So, you know, we've got about two more exempt	24	right now is if a Reg A issuer were to prosper, as we
25	two more years of 404(b) exemption through the JOBS Act	25	hope they all do and eventually have more than 10 million
	Page 159		Page 161
1	Page 159 when we went public and I know that in two years from now	1	Page 161 in assets, more than 2,000 or 500 shareholders plus
1 2		1 2	2
	when we went public and I know that in two years from now		in assets, more than 2,000 or 500 shareholders plus
2	when we went public and I know that in two years from now you know, we're going to we've done the research	2	in assets, more than 2,000 or 500 shareholders plus \$50 million in revenue, then they are going to have to
2 3	when we went public and I know that in two years from now you know, we're going to we've done the research with our audit firm. It's going to cost us about	2 3	in assets, more than 2,000 or 500 shareholders plus \$50 million in revenue, then they are going to have to become a fully reporting company.
2 3 4	when we went public and I know that in two years from now you know, we're going to we've done the research with our audit firm. It's going to cost us about \$100,000 more a year just to have them sign off on the	2 3 4	in assets, more than 2,000 or 500 shareholders plus \$50 million in revenue, then they are going to have to become a fully reporting company. Instead of leapfrogging from the relatively
2 3 4 5	when we went public and I know that in two years from now you know, we're going to we've done the research with our audit firm. It's going to cost us about \$100,000 more a year just to have them sign off on the 404(b). Audit fees went from \$40,000 a year as a private	2 3 4 5	in assets, more than 2,000 or 500 shareholders plus \$50 million in revenue, then they are going to have to become a fully reporting company. Instead of leapfrogging from the relatively less burdensome Reg A regime straight into the big
2 3 4 5 6	when we went public and I know that in two years from now you know, we're going to we've done the research with our audit firm. It's going to cost us about \$100,000 more a year just to have them sign off on the 404(b). Audit fees went from \$40,000 a year as a private company to \$450,000 now.	2 3 4 5 6	in assets, more than 2,000 or 500 shareholders plus \$50 million in revenue, then they are going to have to become a fully reporting company. Instead of leapfrogging from the relatively less burdensome Reg A regime straight into the big grownup company policy this would give them the ability
2 3 4 5 6 7	when we went public and I know that in two years from now you know, we're going to we've done the research with our audit firm. It's going to cost us about \$100,000 more a year just to have them sign off on the 404(b). Audit fees went from \$40,000 a year as a private company to \$450,000 now. And in two years noting is going to change in	2 3 4 5 6 7	in assets, more than 2,000 or 500 shareholders plus \$50 million in revenue, then they are going to have to become a fully reporting company. Instead of leapfrogging from the relatively less burdensome Reg A regime straight into the big grownup company policy this would give them the ability to be a smaller company with a lighter regulatory lift,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	when we went public and I know that in two years from now you know, we're going to we've done the research with our audit firm. It's going to cost us about \$100,000 more a year just to have them sign off on the 404(b). Audit fees went from \$40,000 a year as a private company to \$450,000 now. And in two years noting is going to change in our company. We still cut 125 checks a month. The CEO	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	in assets, more than 2,000 or 500 shareholders plus \$50 million in revenue, then they are going to have to become a fully reporting company. Instead of leapfrogging from the relatively less burdensome Reg A regime straight into the big grownup company policy this would give them the ability to be a smaller company with a lighter regulatory lift, right?
2 3 4 5 7 8 9	when we went public and I know that in two years from now you know, we're going to we've done the research with our audit firm. It's going to cost us about \$100,000 more a year just to have them sign off on the 404(b). Audit fees went from \$40,000 a year as a private company to \$450,000 now. And in two years noting is going to change in our company. We still cut 125 checks a month. The CEO and I are the only two check signers. So for \$100,000 a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	in assets, more than 2,000 or 500 shareholders plus \$50 million in revenue, then they are going to have to become a fully reporting company. Instead of leapfrogging from the relatively less burdensome Reg A regime straight into the big grownup company policy this would give them the ability to be a smaller company with a lighter regulatory lift, right? MR. GOMEZ: That's right. So just for everyone
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	when we went public and I know that in two years from now - you know, we're going to we've done the research with our audit firm. It's going to cost us about \$100,000 more a year just to have them sign off on the 404(b). Audit fees went from \$40,000 a year as a private company to \$450,000 now. And in two years noting is going to change in our company. We still cut 125 checks a month. The CEO and I are the only two check signers. So for \$100,000 a year and that's just to the auditors, not including	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	in assets, more than 2,000 or 500 shareholders plus \$50 million in revenue, then they are going to have to become a fully reporting company. Instead of leapfrogging from the relatively less burdensome Reg A regime straight into the big grownup company policy this would give them the ability to be a smaller company with a lighter regulatory lift, right? MR. GOMEZ: That's right. So just for everyone else's although I'm not sure I can explain it any more
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	when we went public and I know that in two years from now you know, we're going to we've done the research with our audit firm. It's going to cost us about \$100,000 more a year just to have them sign off on the 404(b). Audit fees went from \$40,000 a year as a private company to \$450,000 now. And in two years noting is going to change in our company. We still cut 125 checks a month. The CEO and I are the only two check signers. So for \$100,000 a year and that's just to the auditors, not including the time that my staff have to spend, you know, with, you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	in assets, more than 2,000 or 500 shareholders plus \$50 million in revenue, then they are going to have to become a fully reporting company. Instead of leapfrogging from the relatively less burdensome Reg A regime straight into the big grownup company policy this would give them the ability to be a smaller company with a lighter regulatory lift, right? MR. GOMEZ: That's right. So just for everyone else's although I'm not sure I can explain it any more clearly than Sara did. So currently if you are a Reg A
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	when we went public and I know that in two years from now you know, we're going to we've done the research with our audit firm. It's going to cost us about \$100,000 more a year just to have them sign off on the 404(b). Audit fees went from \$40,000 a year as a private company to \$450,000 now. And in two years noting is going to change in our company. We still cut 125 checks a month. The CEO and I are the only two check signers. So for \$100,000 a year and that's just to the auditors, not including the time that my staff have to spend, you know, with, you know, the added getting all the information to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	in assets, more than 2,000 or 500 shareholders plus \$50 million in revenue, then they are going to have to become a fully reporting company. Instead of leapfrogging from the relatively less burdensome Reg A regime straight into the big grownup company policy this would give them the ability to be a smaller company with a lighter regulatory lift, right? MR. GOMEZ: That's right. So just for everyone else's although I'm not sure I can explain it any more clearly than Sara did. So currently if you are a Reg A company that is doing a tier two offering, so you are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	when we went public and I know that in two years from now you know, we're going to we've done the research with our audit firm. It's going to cost us about \$100,000 more a year just to have them sign off on the 404(b). Audit fees went from \$40,000 a year as a private company to \$450,000 now. And in two years noting is going to change in our company. We still cut 125 checks a month. The CEO and I are the only two check signers. So for \$100,000 a year and that's just to the auditors, not including the time that my staff have to spend, you know, with, you know, the added getting all the information to the outside audit firms. So in two years nothing will	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	in assets, more than 2,000 or 500 shareholders plus \$50 million in revenue, then they are going to have to become a fully reporting company. Instead of leapfrogging from the relatively less burdensome Reg A regime straight into the big grownup company policy this would give them the ability to be a smaller company with a lighter regulatory lift, right? MR. GOMEZ: That's right. So just for everyone else's although I'm not sure I can explain it any more clearly than Sara did. So currently if you are a Reg A company that is doing a tier two offering, so you are providing the ongoing reports required by the rules,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	when we went public and I know that in two years from now - you know, we're going to we've done the research with our audit firm. It's going to cost us about \$100,000 more a year just to have them sign off on the 404(b). Audit fees went from \$40,000 a year as a private company to \$450,000 now. And in two years noting is going to change in our company. We still cut 125 checks a month. The CEO and I are the only two check signers. So for \$100,000 a year and that's just to the auditors, not including the time that my staff have to spend, you know, with, you know, the added getting all the information to the outside audit firms. So in two years nothing will change, so it's not worth \$100,000. There's no more risk	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	in assets, more than 2,000 or 500 shareholders plus \$50 million in revenue, then they are going to have to become a fully reporting company. Instead of leapfrogging from the relatively less burdensome Reg A regime straight into the big grownup company policy this would give them the ability to be a smaller company with a lighter regulatory lift, right? MR. GOMEZ: That's right. So just for everyone else's although I'm not sure I can explain it any more clearly than Sara did. So currently if you are a Reg A company that is doing a tier two offering, so you are providing the ongoing reports required by the rules, there is a there is an exemption form, the requirement
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	when we went public and I know that in two years from now - you know, we're going to we've done the research with our audit firm. It's going to cost us about \$100,000 more a year just to have them sign off on the 404(b). Audit fees went from \$40,000 a year as a private company to \$450,000 now. And in two years noting is going to change in our company. We still cut 125 checks a month. The CEO and I are the only two check signers. So for \$100,000 a year and that's just to the auditors, not including the time that my staff have to spend, you know, with, you know, the added getting all the information to the outside audit firms. So in two years nothing will change, so it's not worth \$100,000. There's no more risk to the investors as it is today.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	in assets, more than 2,000 or 500 shareholders plus \$50 million in revenue, then they are going to have to become a fully reporting company. Instead of leapfrogging from the relatively less burdensome Reg A regime straight into the big grownup company policy this would give them the ability to be a smaller company with a lighter regulatory lift, right? MR. GOMEZ: That's right. So just for everyone else's although I'm not sure I can explain it any more clearly than Sara did. So currently if you are a Reg A company that is doing a tier two offering, so you are providing the ongoing reports required by the rules, there is a there is an exemption form, the requirement that that company would have to register the class of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	when we went public and I know that in two years from now - you know, we're going to we've done the research with our audit firm. It's going to cost us about \$100,000 more a year just to have them sign off on the 404(b). Audit fees went from \$40,000 a year as a private company to \$450,000 now. And in two years noting is going to change in our company. We still cut 125 checks a month. The CEO and I are the only two check signers. So for \$100,000 a year and that's just to the auditors, not including the time that my staff have to spend, you know, with, you know, the added getting all the information to the outside audit firms. So in two years nothing will change, so it's not worth \$100,000. There's no more risk to the investors as it is today. We also talked, you know, as an internal policy	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	in assets, more than 2,000 or 500 shareholders plus \$50 million in revenue, then they are going to have to become a fully reporting company. Instead of leapfrogging from the relatively less burdensome Reg A regime straight into the big grownup company policy this would give them the ability to be a smaller company with a lighter regulatory lift, right? MR. GOMEZ: That's right. So just for everyone else's although I'm not sure I can explain it any more clearly than Sara did. So currently if you are a Reg A company that is doing a tier two offering, so you are providing the ongoing reports required by the rules, there is a there is an exemption form, the requirement that that company would have to register the class of securities under the Exchange Act, meaning an exemption
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	when we went public and I know that in two years from now - you know, we're going to we've done the research with our audit firm. It's going to cost us about \$100,000 more a year just to have them sign off on the 404(b). Audit fees went from \$40,000 a year as a private company to \$450,000 now. And in two years noting is going to change in our company. We still cut 125 checks a month. The CEO and I are the only two check signers. So for \$100,000 a year and that's just to the auditors, not including the time that my staff have to spend, you know, with, you know, the added getting all the information to the outside audit firms. So in two years nothing will change, so it's not worth \$100,000. There's no more risk to the investors as it is today. We also talked, you know, as an internal policy that because the CEO and I have to sign off on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	in assets, more than 2,000 or 500 shareholders plus \$50 million in revenue, then they are going to have to become a fully reporting company. Instead of leapfrogging from the relatively less burdensome Reg A regime straight into the big grownup company policy this would give them the ability to be a smaller company with a lighter regulatory lift, right? MR. GOMEZ: That's right. So just for everyone else's although I'm not sure I can explain it any more clearly than Sara did. So currently if you are a Reg A company that is doing a tier two offering, so you are providing the ongoing reports required by the rules, there is a there is an exemption form, the requirement that that company would have to register the class of securities under the Exchange Act, meaning an exemption from the company becoming a reporting company, it's a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	when we went public and I know that in two years from now - you know, we're going to we've done the research with our audit firm. It's going to cost us about \$100,000 more a year just to have them sign off on the 404(b). Audit fees went from \$40,000 a year as a private company to \$450,000 now. And in two years noting is going to change in our company. We still cut 125 checks a month. The CEO and I are the only two check signers. So for \$100,000 a year and that's just to the auditors, not including the time that my staff have to spend, you know, with, you know, the added getting all the information to the outside audit firms. So in two years nothing will change, so it's not worth \$100,000. There's no more risk to the investors as it is today. We also talked, you know, as an internal policy that because the CEO and I have to sign off on the filings, and we have to report to our audit committee, we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	in assets, more than 2,000 or 500 shareholders plus \$50 million in revenue, then they are going to have to become a fully reporting company. Instead of leapfrogging from the relatively less burdensome Reg A regime straight into the big grownup company policy this would give them the ability to be a smaller company with a lighter regulatory lift, right? MR. GOMEZ: That's right. So just for everyone else's although I'm not sure I can explain it any more clearly than Sara did. So currently if you are a Reg A company that is doing a tier two offering, so you are providing the ongoing reports required by the rules, there is a there is an exemption form, the requirement that that company would have to register the class of securities under the Exchange Act, meaning an exemption from the company becoming a reporting company, it's a conditional exemption and it phases out when the company
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	when we went public and I know that in two years from now - you know, we're going to we've done the research with our audit firm. It's going to cost us about \$100,000 more a year just to have them sign off on the 404(b). Audit fees went from \$40,000 a year as a private company to \$450,000 now. And in two years noting is going to change in our company. We still cut 125 checks a month. The CEO and I are the only two check signers. So for \$100,000 a year and that's just to the auditors, not including the time that my staff have to spend, you know, with, you know, the added getting all the information to the outside audit firms. So in two years nothing will change, so it's not worth \$100,000. There's no more risk to the investors as it is today. We also talked, you know, as an internal policy that because the CEO and I have to sign off on the filings, and we have to report to our audit committee, we do do some outside third party testing on our internal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	in assets, more than 2,000 or 500 shareholders plus \$50 million in revenue, then they are going to have to become a fully reporting company. Instead of leapfrogging from the relatively less burdensome Reg A regime straight into the big grownup company policy this would give them the ability to be a smaller company with a lighter regulatory lift, right? MR. GOMEZ: That's right. So just for everyone else's although I'm not sure I can explain it any more clearly than Sara did. So currently if you are a Reg A company that is doing a tier two offering, so you are providing the ongoing reports required by the rules, there is a there is an exemption form, the requirement that that company would have to register the class of securities under the Exchange Act, meaning an exemption from the company becoming a reporting company, it's a conditional exemption and it phases out when the company reaches a certain size.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	when we went public and I know that in two years from now - you know, we're going to we've done the research with our audit firm. It's going to cost us about \$100,000 more a year just to have them sign off on the 404(b). Audit fees went from \$40,000 a year as a private company to \$450,000 now. And in two years noting is going to change in our company. We still cut 125 checks a month. The CEO and I are the only two check signers. So for \$100,000 a year and that's just to the auditors, not including the time that my staff have to spend, you know, with, you know, the added getting all the information to the outside audit firms. So in two years nothing will change, so it's not worth \$100,000. There's no more risk to the investors as it is today. We also talked, you know, as an internal policy that because the CEO and I have to sign off on the filings, and we have to report to our audit committee, we do do some outside third party testing on our internal controls to kind of report internally there, and that's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	in assets, more than 2,000 or 500 shareholders plus \$50 million in revenue, then they are going to have to become a fully reporting company. Instead of leapfrogging from the relatively less burdensome Reg A regime straight into the big grownup company policy this would give them the ability to be a smaller company with a lighter regulatory lift, right? MR. GOMEZ: That's right. So just for everyone else's although I'm not sure I can explain it any more clearly than Sara did. So currently if you are a Reg A company that is doing a tier two offering, so you are providing the ongoing reports required by the rules, there is a there is an exemption form, the requirement that that company would have to register the class of securities under the Exchange Act, meaning an exemption from the company becoming a reporting company, it's a conditional exemption and it phases out when the company reaches a certain size.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	when we went public and I know that in two years from now - you know, we're going to we've done the research with our audit firm. It's going to cost us about \$100,000 more a year just to have them sign off on the 404(b). Audit fees went from \$40,000 a year as a private company to \$450,000 now. And in two years noting is going to change in our company. We still cut 125 checks a month. The CEO and I are the only two check signers. So for \$100,000 a year and that's just to the auditors, not including the time that my staff have to spend, you know, with, you know, the added getting all the information to the outside audit firms. So in two years nothing will change, so it's not worth \$100,000. There's no more risk to the investors as it is today. We also talked, you know, as an internal policy that because the CEO and I have to sign off on the filings, and we have to report to our audit committee, we do do some outside third party testing on our internal controls to kind of report internally there, and that's about 10 to \$15,000 a year. So for 10 to 15,000 it gives	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	in assets, more than 2,000 or 500 shareholders plus \$50 million in revenue, then they are going to have to become a fully reporting company. Instead of leapfrogging from the relatively less burdensome Reg A regime straight into the big grownup company policy this would give them the ability to be a smaller company with a lighter regulatory lift, right? MR. GOMEZ: That's right. So just for everyone else's although I'm not sure I can explain it any more clearly than Sara did. So currently if you are a Reg A company that is doing a tier two offering, so you are providing the ongoing reports required by the rules, there is a there is an exemption form, the requirement that that company would have to register the class of securities under the Exchange Act, meaning an exemption from the company becoming a reporting company, it's a conditional exemption and it phases out when the company reaches a certain size. Currently the way that it's set up in Reg A the threshold happens to coincide with the threshold for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	when we went public and I know that in two years from now - you know, we're going to we've done the research with our audit firm. It's going to cost us about \$100,000 more a year just to have them sign off on the 404(b). Audit fees went from \$40,000 a year as a private company to \$450,000 now. And in two years noting is going to change in our company. We still cut 125 checks a month. The CEO and I are the only two check signers. So for \$100,000 a year and that's just to the auditors, not including the time that my staff have to spend, you know, with, you know, the added getting all the information to the outside audit firms. So in two years nothing will change, so it's not worth \$100,000. There's no more risk to the investors as it is today. We also talked, you know, as an internal policy that because the CEO and I have to sign off on the filings, and we have to report to our audit committee, we do do some outside third party testing on our internal controls to kind of report internally there, and that's about 10 to \$15,000 a year. So for 10 to 15,000 it gives us comfort, it gives our audit committee comfort, and I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	in assets, more than 2,000 or 500 shareholders plus \$50 million in revenue, then they are going to have to become a fully reporting company. Instead of leapfrogging from the relatively less burdensome Reg A regime straight into the big grownup company policy this would give them the ability to be a smaller company with a lighter regulatory lift, right? MR. GOMEZ: That's right. So just for everyone else's although I'm not sure I can explain it any more clearly than Sara did. So currently if you are a Reg A company that is doing a tier two offering, so you are providing the ongoing reports required by the rules, there is a there is an exemption form, the requirement that that company would have to register the class of securities under the Exchange Act, meaning an exemption from the company becoming a reporting company, it's a conditional exemption and it phases out when the company reaches a certain size. Currently the way that it's set up in Reg A the threshold happens to coincide with the threshold for losing the SRC status. So I think what Sara is pointing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	when we went public and I know that in two years from now - you know, we're going to we've done the research with our audit firm. It's going to cost us about \$100,000 more a year just to have them sign off on the 404(b). Audit fees went from \$40,000 a year as a private company to \$450,000 now. And in two years noting is going to change in our company. We still cut 125 checks a month. The CEO and I are the only two check signers. So for \$100,000 a year and that's just to the auditors, not including the time that my staff have to spend, you know, with, you know, the added getting all the information to the outside audit firms. So in two years nothing will change, so it's not worth \$100,000. There's no more risk to the investors as it is today. We also talked, you know, as an internal policy that because the CEO and I have to sign off on the filings, and we have to report to our audit committee, we do do some outside third party testing on our internal controls to kind of report internally there, and that's about 10 to \$15,000 a year. So for 10 to 15,000 it gives us comfort, it gives our audit committee comfort, and I think, you know, that goes a long way. And I can't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	in assets, more than 2,000 or 500 shareholders plus \$50 million in revenue, then they are going to have to become a fully reporting company. Instead of leapfrogging from the relatively less burdensome Reg A regime straight into the big grownup company policy this would give them the ability to be a smaller company with a lighter regulatory lift, right? MR. GOMEZ: That's right. So just for everyone else's although I'm not sure I can explain it any more clearly than Sara did. So currently if you are a Reg A company that is doing a tier two offering, so you are providing the ongoing reports required by the rules, there is a there is an exemption form, the requirement that that company would have to register the class of securities under the Exchange Act, meaning an exemption from the company becoming a reporting company, it's a conditional exemption and it phases out when the company reaches a certain size. Currently the way that it's set up in Reg A the threshold happens to coincide with the threshold for losing the SRC status. So I think what Sara is pointing out is currently in the Reg A a company is going on on

#### Page 162 Page 164 1 reporting company they will grow into a reporting company 1 and you had the ability to voluntarily check that box and 2 that is no longer a smaller reporting company. 2 say I'm going to take advantage of the SRC scale 3 3 The Commission asks the question in the release disclosure and save the 20 to \$40,000 in disclosure, is 4 4 as to whether that threshold should change or not, but it it a penalty from the market standpoint because of the 5 did not propose a change to that threshold. So if the 5 fact that you had put yourself in the box of the smaller 6 Commission were to adopt the rules as currently proposed 6 reporting company? 7 a company that is doing a reporting under Reg A and gets 7 MR. HAHN: Again, you know, in all the meetings 8 to a certain size when it has to actually become an 8 we've had not that I'm aware of. I have never had an 9 9 Exchange Act reporting company, that company will then investor anywhere in any follow up meetings and anywhere 10 still have the bandwidth from the current SRC threshold 10 else that it's questioned how much disclosure we end up 11 until the proposed \$250 million public float is set as 11 doing. We also had a conservative law firm on our IPO and our S-1, so we kind of went a little bit beyond, you 12 the threshold to report using the scale accommodations of 12 13 the SRC definition before they grow once again out of SRC 13 know, on some of the disclosures. That was more of a, 14 14 into being a full-fledged reporting company without the you know, a choice from the company's standpoint. 15 15 ability for that scale disclosure. But at no time did we ever think, oh, you know, 16 MR. HAHN: I also think it's important to note 16 we're going to do this because we think we'll get more 17 17 -- so right now we would fall in that -- my company would credit from the investors for it. It was just kind of 18 fall in that bucket where we would be below that 200 18 our practice and our decision for that. 19 19 million for the scaled back reporting. But from our CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I think that would be 20 standpoint I know that some of the cost savings, I thank 20 consistent with my experience. I mean, it's nice to have 21 it was 20 to \$40,000 of that personally we would not 21 the option. There are some things like I think primarily 22 scale back. We would -- we would stick with the same 22 dealing with the financial statements for people who want 23 disclosure that we currently have. 23 to make sure there's more not less. But it's --24 So if you think about it it would be kind of 24 generally speaking it's not a subject that comes up. 25 moving forward with companies that go into that 25 MS. YAMANAKA: Yeah, I don't think people Page 163 Page 165 1 threshold. I don't think, personally I don't think you 1 traditionally go, oh, I'm going to increase my market 2 would see many companies scale back their disclosures 2 value of my company by having these three additional 3 because the cost -- we already have everything in place, 3 disclosures 4 so we're not going to save that money. You know, now 4 I did want to make a comment on -- about audit 5 5 it's just -- it's a quick box. You know, we've already costs and -- because I come out of that world б б got that in there. We have the auditors review it, so I historically. And, you know, there used to be a time, 7 7 and times were very different, where you could get an don't think we would, again we wouldn't realize those 8 8 audit and you were going to do an IPO and the cost savings if we were to scale back. 9 CO-CHAIR HANKS: Would that be -- just because 9 differential between a, you know, audit of a privately 10 10 of the issues of cost or non-cost, or to follow up on held entity versus a publicly traded company was 11 11 what Commissioner Stein said earlier, would you see an significant, but not like this. And now days when you 12 12 advantage to that additional disclosure which is only look at the cost, if you look at the cost of -- or the 13 costing you a little bit of extra money? 13 gap between what it is for a privately held company, just MR. HAHN: I don't see that much of an 14 for banking, you know, requirements or whatever, and what 14 15 advantage. My concern would be if I scale back now 15 you're going to have to have -- pay and actually have the

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

significant.

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

and then.

hopefully sometime in the future we'll go back up above

reinstate that than it is just to maintain it between now

point, Brian, piqued my curiosity as to something in --

and I don't know maybe from your standpoint or anyone

else on the investment banking side, is there a negative

companies? So for example if the rules were to change

perception tied to the idea of smaller reporting

the 150 threshold and it's going to cost me more money to

MR. GOMEZ: If I may ask a question. Your

42 (Pages 162 to 165)

infrastructure in place for a company to be able to

So I think that it probably does make a little

bit of sense to kind of up the ante because, you know, if

you're leaving the numbers as is, you know, 25 million is

Because in my mind and I should, you know, speaking as an

-- would cover a lot of audit costs before and it's not

going to in the future. And the gap keeps growing.

ex-auditor, it's all insurance, right. It's a different

survive an audit and get a good opinion, it's

	Page 166		Page 168
1		1 that	
1	level of insurance that's being paid as opposed to an		's a zinger that might get you.
2	insurance company and an auditor is assuring or insuring,	2	And, you know, I think we were talking about
3	I know that I know to all the auditors out there I		ier we don't you know, we're still a pre-product,
4	know it's really not that case, but in effect the market	•	revenue company. So we don't have inventory, we
5	is different. I have to say that. I'm going to get all		't have a lot of transactions going in and out. We're
6	this email from all		ducting clinical trials and so we just have cash
7	MR. YADLEY: Small A assurance.		ursements. So I think it just needs to be a balanced
8	MS. YAMANAKA: Small assurance, correct. That		roach.
9	given all these procedures that are done your risk is	9	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: You know, it's going back
10	going down theoretically, that anything you would you		he cost of 404(b) again, if I remember right the
11	would still want to make the investment based on the		posal, though, indicated that the studies were such
12	information that you have available, but it's not an		it was it was a measurable cost savings but it
13	assurance that the value of the company is there. People		n't monumental and doesn't necessarily outweigh the
14	aren't going to it's really a gatekeeper, right, it's		stor protection benefit.
15	not a value enhancer in my opinion, and the cost of that	15	I just find that hard to believe. And if that
16	is tremendous.		that if I'm looking at this way, the if you
17	So I think that when we're talking about audit		nped the number from if you bumped the threshold
18	costs, which are tremendous, but in order to we have		n 75 to 250 in terms of, you know, how that affects
19	to look at what the cost is for the company to be able to		es that are being traded it's a relatively low
20	support a clean opinion on the other side and that ends	•	eentage I think.
21	up being just as expensive if not more so having the	21	MR. GOMEZ: That's right. When you look at
22	properly trained people, the different processes and		impacts a relatively large number of companies.
23	procedures in place, the attention of the CFO to make	23	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: That was my other point.
24	sure we're in compliance. It's not just the audit fees	24	MR. GOMEZ: But as far as the total market
25	that are that expensive.	25 valu	e for the shares of those companies we're talking
	Page 167		Page 169
1	Page 167 MR. HAHN: It's also an operational issue. So,	1 abo	Page 169 ut currently less than 1 percent and it will go up to
1 2			
	MR. HAHN: It's also an operational issue. So,		ut currently less than 1 percent and it will go up to
2	MR. HAHN: It's also an operational issue. So, you know, I've spent 18 of the last 20 years at five	2 a lit 3	ut currently less than 1 percent and it will go up to the bit more than 1 percent.
2 3	MR. HAHN: It's also an operational issue. So, you know, I've spent 18 of the last 20 years at five different all startup companies, emerging growth	2 a lit 3 4 mar	ut currently less than 1 percent and it will go up to tle bit more than 1 percent. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Right. So for the overall
2 3 4	MR. HAHN: It's also an operational issue. So, you know, I've spent 18 of the last 20 years at five different all startup companies, emerging growth companies, and the way you think about it is, you know,	2 a lit 3 4 mar 5 kind	ut currently less than 1 percent and it will go up to tle bit more than 1 percent. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Right. So for the overall ket that will invest all in public if you will, that's
2 3 4 5	MR. HAHN: It's also an operational issue. So, you know, I've spent 18 of the last 20 years at five different all startup companies, emerging growth companies, and the way you think about it is, you know, what processes and procedures do we need in place to let	2 a lit 3 4 mar 5 kino 6 - in	ut currently less than 1 percent and it will go up to tle bit more than 1 percent. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Right. So for the overall ket that will invest all in public if you will, that's l of the number I think. But in terms of the number -
2 3 4 5 6	MR. HAHN: It's also an operational issue. So, you know, I've spent 18 of the last 20 years at five different all startup companies, emerging growth companies, and the way you think about it is, you know, what processes and procedures do we need in place to let the business operate. And if we put too many on right	2 a lit 3 4 mar 5 kino 6 - in	ut currently less than 1 percent and it will go up to tle bit more than 1 percent. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Right. So for the overall ket that will invest all in public if you will, that's l of the number I think. But in terms of the number - terms of the companies involved that's it's a
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. HAHN: It's also an operational issue. So, you know, I've spent 18 of the last 20 years at five different all startup companies, emerging growth companies, and the way you think about it is, you know, what processes and procedures do we need in place to let the business operate. And if we put too many on right away I don't have enough staff to have, go through all	2 a lit 3 4 mar 5 kino 6 - in 7 larg 8	ut currently less than 1 percent and it will go up to tle bit more than 1 percent. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Right. So for the overall ket that will invest all in public if you will, that's d of the number I think. But in terms of the number - terms of the companies involved that's it's a e number.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. HAHN: It's also an operational issue. So, you know, I've spent 18 of the last 20 years at five different all startup companies, emerging growth companies, and the way you think about it is, you know, what processes and procedures do we need in place to let the business operate. And if we put too many on right away I don't have enough staff to have, go through all these controls and the company is just going to slow down	2 a lit 3 4 mar 5 kind 6 - in 7 larg 8 9 We	ut currently less than 1 percent and it will go up to tle bit more than 1 percent. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Right. So for the overall ket that will invest all in public if you will, that's l of the number I think. But in terms of the number - terms of the companies involved that's it's a e number. MR. GOMEZ: It's a large number of companies.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9	MR. HAHN: It's also an operational issue. So, you know, I've spent 18 of the last 20 years at five different all startup companies, emerging growth companies, and the way you think about it is, you know, what processes and procedures do we need in place to let the business operate. And if we put too many on right away I don't have enough staff to have, go through all these controls and the company is just going to slow down and just not operate, not work.	2 a lit 3 4 mar 5 kind 6 - in 7 larg 8 9 We <sup>2</sup> 10 qua	ut currently less than 1 percent and it will go up to tle bit more than 1 percent. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Right. So for the overall ket that will invest all in public if you will, that's d of the number I think. But in terms of the number - terms of the companies involved that's it's a e number. MR. GOMEZ: It's a large number of companies. re talking about almost half of companies currently
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. HAHN: It's also an operational issue. So, you know, I've spent 18 of the last 20 years at five different all startup companies, emerging growth companies, and the way you think about it is, you know, what processes and procedures do we need in place to let the business operate. And if we put too many on right away I don't have enough staff to have, go through all these controls and the company is just going to slow down and just not operate, not work. So any time you start thinking about, okay,	2 a lit 3 4 mar 5 kind 6 - in 7 larg 8 9 We <sup>2</sup> 10 qua	ut currently less than 1 percent and it will go up to tle bit more than 1 percent. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Right. So for the overall ket that will invest all in public if you will, that's d of the number I think. But in terms of the number - terms of the companies involved that's it's a e number. MR. GOMEZ: It's a large number of companies. re talking about almost half of companies currently lifying and a little more than actually 40 percent
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. HAHN: It's also an operational issue. So, you know, I've spent 18 of the last 20 years at five different all startup companies, emerging growth companies, and the way you think about it is, you know, what processes and procedures do we need in place to let the business operate. And if we put too many on right away I don't have enough staff to have, go through all these controls and the company is just going to slow down and just not operate, not work. So any time you start thinking about, okay, what controls do we put in place, does it make sense,	2 a lit 3 4 mar 5 kind 6 - in 7 larg 8 9 We <sup>4</sup> 10 qua 11 of th 12 13 num	ut currently less than 1 percent and it will go up to tle bit more than 1 percent. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Right. So for the overall ket that will invest all in public if you will, that's d of the number I think. But in terms of the number - terms of the companies involved that's it's a e number. MR. GOMEZ: It's a large number of companies. re talking about almost half of companies currently lifying and a little more than actually 40 percent nem are qualifying. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And so if you take that aber and you multiply it, both the cost that each one
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. HAHN: It's also an operational issue. So, you know, I've spent 18 of the last 20 years at five different all startup companies, emerging growth companies, and the way you think about it is, you know, what processes and procedures do we need in place to let the business operate. And if we put too many on right away I don't have enough staff to have, go through all these controls and the company is just going to slow down and just not operate, not work. So any time you start thinking about, okay, what controls do we put in place, does it make sense, what's the cost, what's the benefit of out of it, and I think, you know, going through right now with 404(b) exemption, you know, I think we're in a good spot. We	2 a lit 3 4 mar 5 kind 6 - in 7 larg 8 9 We <sup>4</sup> 10 qua 11 of th 12 13 num	ut currently less than 1 percent and it will go up to tle bit more than 1 percent. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Right. So for the overall ket that will invest all in public if you will, that's d of the number I think. But in terms of the number - terms of the companies involved that's it's a e number. MR. GOMEZ: It's a large number of companies. re talking about almost half of companies currently lifying and a little more than actually 40 percent nem are qualifying. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And so if you take that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. HAHN: It's also an operational issue. So, you know, I've spent 18 of the last 20 years at five different all startup companies, emerging growth companies, and the way you think about it is, you know, what processes and procedures do we need in place to let the business operate. And if we put too many on right away I don't have enough staff to have, go through all these controls and the company is just going to slow down and just not operate, not work. So any time you start thinking about, okay, what controls do we put in place, does it make sense, what's the cost, what's the benefit of out of it, and I think, you know, going through right now with 404(b) exemption, you know, I think we're in a good spot. We got to the point about two years ago where we said, okay,	2 a lit 3 4 mar 5 kind 6 - in 7 larg 8 9 We 10 qua 11 of tl 12 13 nun 14 of tl 15 beca	ut currently less than 1 percent and it will go up to tle bit more than 1 percent. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Right. So for the overall ket that will invest all in public if you will, that's d of the number I think. But in terms of the number - terms of the companies involved that's it's a e number. MR. GOMEZ: It's a large number of companies. re talking about almost half of companies currently lifying and a little more than actually 40 percent nem are qualifying. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And so if you take that aber and you multiply it, both the cost that each one
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. HAHN: It's also an operational issue. So, you know, I've spent 18 of the last 20 years at five different all startup companies, emerging growth companies, and the way you think about it is, you know, what processes and procedures do we need in place to let the business operate. And if we put too many on right away I don't have enough staff to have, go through all these controls and the company is just going to slow down and just not operate, not work. So any time you start thinking about, okay, what controls do we put in place, does it make sense, what's the cost, what's the benefit of out of it, and I think, you know, going through right now with 404(b) exemption, you know, I think we're in a good spot. We	2 a lit 3 4 mar 5 kind 6 - in 7 larg 8 9 We 10 qua 11 of tl 12 13 num 14 of tl 15 bec	ut currently less than 1 percent and it will go up to tle bit more than 1 percent. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Right. So for the overall ket that will invest all in public if you will, that's d of the number I think. But in terms of the number - terms of the companies involved that's it's a e number. MR. GOMEZ: It's a large number of companies. re talking about almost half of companies currently lifying and a little more than actually 40 percent nem are qualifying. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And so if you take that aber and you multiply it, both the cost that each one nem would incur, the additional cost each would incur
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. HAHN: It's also an operational issue. So, you know, I've spent 18 of the last 20 years at five different all startup companies, emerging growth companies, and the way you think about it is, you know, what processes and procedures do we need in place to let the business operate. And if we put too many on right away I don't have enough staff to have, go through all these controls and the company is just going to slow down and just not operate, not work. So any time you start thinking about, okay, what controls do we put in place, does it make sense, what's the cost, what's the benefit of out of it, and I think, you know, going through right now with 404(b) exemption, you know, I think we're in a good spot. We got to the point about two years ago where we said, okay, we want to give comfort to management and to the audit committee, so we went outside of this.	2 a lit 3 4 mar 5 kind 6 - in 7 larg 8 9 We 10 qua 11 of tl 12 13 num 14 of tl 15 bec	ut currently less than 1 percent and it will go up to tle bit more than 1 percent. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Right. So for the overall ket that will invest all in public if you will, that's d of the number I think. But in terms of the number - terms of the companies involved that's it's a e number. MR. GOMEZ: It's a large number of companies. re talking about almost half of companies currently lifying and a little more than actually 40 percent nem are qualifying. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And so if you take that aber and you multiply it, both the cost that each one nem would incur, the additional cost each would incur ause they are complying with 404(b), I can't imagine
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. HAHN: It's also an operational issue. So, you know, I've spent 18 of the last 20 years at five different all startup companies, emerging growth companies, and the way you think about it is, you know, what processes and procedures do we need in place to let the business operate. And if we put too many on right away I don't have enough staff to have, go through all these controls and the company is just going to slow down and just not operate, not work. So any time you start thinking about, okay, what controls do we put in place, does it make sense, what's the cost, what's the benefit of out of it, and I think, you know, going through right now with 404(b) exemption, you know, I think we're in a good spot. We got to the point about two years ago where we said, okay, we want to give comfort to management and to the audit committee, so we went outside of this.	2 a lit 3	at currently less than 1 percent and it will go up to the bit more than 1 percent. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Right. So for the overall ket that will invest all in public if you will, that's d of the number I think. But in terms of the number - terms of the companies involved that's it's a e number. MR. GOMEZ: It's a large number of companies. re talking about almost half of companies currently lifying and a little more than actually 40 percent nem are qualifying. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And so if you take that aber and you multiply it, both the cost that each one nem would incur, the additional cost each would incur ause they are complying with 404(b), I can't imagine that's not a big number. MR. GOMEZ: So, Steve, I think the so the stion like I said, it's not just on the dollar
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. HAHN: It's also an operational issue. So, you know, I've spent 18 of the last 20 years at five different all startup companies, emerging growth companies, and the way you think about it is, you know, what processes and procedures do we need in place to let the business operate. And if we put too many on right away I don't have enough staff to have, go through all these controls and the company is just going to slow down and just not operate, not work. So any time you start thinking about, okay, what controls do we put in place, does it make sense, what's the cost, what's the benefit of out of it, and I think, you know, going through right now with 404(b) exemption, you know, I think we're in a good spot. We got to the point about two years ago where we said, okay, we want to give comfort to management and to the audit committee, so we went outside of this. But again I think going to, forcing us to be 404(b) with the attestation, I think that's just too much	2 a lit 3 4 mar 5 kind 6 - in 7 larg 8 9 We 10 qua 11 of tl 12 13 nun 14 of tl 15 beca 16 that 17 18 que 19 savi	<ul> <li>at currently less than 1 percent and it will go up to the bit more than 1 percent.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Right. So for the overall ket that will invest all in public if you will, that's do the number I think. But in terms of the number - terms of the companies involved that's it's a enumber.</li> <li>MR. GOMEZ: It's a large number of companies.</li> <li>re talking about almost half of companies currently lifying and a little more than actually 40 percent nem are qualifying.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And so if you take that aber and you multiply it, both the cost that each one nem would incur, the additional cost each would incur ause they are complying with 404(b), I can't imagine that's not a big number.</li> <li>MR. GOMEZ: So, Steve, I think the so the stion like I said, it's not just on the dollar ngs of the 404(b), here's a cost to the investor of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. HAHN: It's also an operational issue. So, you know, I've spent 18 of the last 20 years at five different all startup companies, emerging growth companies, and the way you think about it is, you know, what processes and procedures do we need in place to let the business operate. And if we put too many on right away I don't have enough staff to have, go through all these controls and the company is just going to slow down and just not operate, not work. So any time you start thinking about, okay, what controls do we put in place, does it make sense, what's the cost, what's the benefit of out of it, and I think, you know, going through right now with 404(b) exemption, you know, I think we're in a good spot. We got to the point about two years ago where we said, okay, we want to give comfort to management and to the audit committee, so we went outside of this. But again I think going to, forcing us to be 404(b) with the attestation, I think that's just too much cost and would kind of clog it down. I don't want to get	2 a lit 3 4 mar 5 kind 6 - in 7 larg 8 9 We 10 qua 11 of tl 12 13 nun 14 of tl 15 beca 16 that 17 18 que 19 savi 20 not	<ul> <li>att currently less than 1 percent and it will go up to the bit more than 1 percent.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Right. So for the overall ket that will invest all in public if you will, that's do f the number I think. But in terms of the number - terms of the companies involved that's it's a e number.</li> <li>MR. GOMEZ: It's a large number of companies.</li> <li>re talking about almost half of companies currently lifying and a little more than actually 40 percent nem are qualifying.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And so if you take that aber and you multiply it, both the cost that each one nem would incur, the additional cost each would incur ause they are complying with 404(b), I can't imagine that's not a big number.</li> <li>MR. GOMEZ: So, Steve, I think the so the stion like I said, it's not just on the dollar ngs of the 404(b), there's a cost to the investor of having the 404(b) attestation. What our comments in</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. HAHN: It's also an operational issue. So, you know, I've spent 18 of the last 20 years at five different all startup companies, emerging growth companies, and the way you think about it is, you know, what processes and procedures do we need in place to let the business operate. And if we put too many on right away I don't have enough staff to have, go through all these controls and the company is just going to slow down and just not operate, not work. So any time you start thinking about, okay, what controls do we put in place, does it make sense, what's the cost, what's the benefit of out of it, and I think, you know, going through right now with 404(b) exemption, you know, I think we're in a good spot. We got to the point about two years ago where we said, okay, we want to give comfort to management and to the audit committee, so we went outside of this. But again I think going to, forcing us to be 404(b) with the attestation, I think that's just too much cost and would kind of clog it down. I don't want to get too much in the weeds here but, you know, some of the	2       a lit         3	<ul> <li>att currently less than 1 percent and it will go up to the bit more than 1 percent.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Right. So for the overall ket that will invest all in public if you will, that's do the number I think. But in terms of the number - terms of the companies involved that's it's a e number.</li> <li>MR. GOMEZ: It's a large number of companies.</li> <li>re talking about almost half of companies currently lifying and a little more than actually 40 percent nem are qualifying.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And so if you take that aber and you multiply it, both the cost that each one nem would incur, the additional cost each would incur ause they are complying with 404(b), I can't imagine that's not a big number.</li> <li>MR. GOMEZ: So, Steve, I think the so the stion like I said, it's not just on the dollar ngs of the 404(b) attestation. What our comments in vious studies and some academic research have noted is</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. HAHN: It's also an operational issue. So, you know, I've spent 18 of the last 20 years at five different all startup companies, emerging growth companies, and the way you think about it is, you know, what processes and procedures do we need in place to let the business operate. And if we put too many on right away I don't have enough staff to have, go through all these controls and the company is just going to slow down and just not operate, not work. So any time you start thinking about, okay, what controls do we put in place, does it make sense, what's the cost, what's the benefit of out of it, and I think, you know, going through right now with 404(b) exemption, you know, I think we're in a good spot. We got to the point about two years ago where we said, okay, we want to give comfort to management and to the audit committee, so we went outside of this. But again I think going to, forcing us to be 404(b) with the attestation, I think that's just too much cost and would kind of clog it down. I don't want to get too much in the weeds here but, you know, sime of the things that will catch you up is, you know, if you've	2       a lit         3	<ul> <li>att currently less than 1 percent and it will go up to the bit more than 1 percent.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Right. So for the overall ket that will invest all in public if you will, that's do the number I think. But in terms of the number - terms of the companies involved that's it's a e number.</li> <li>MR. GOMEZ: It's a large number of companies.</li> <li>re talking about almost half of companies currently lifying and a little more than actually 40 percent nem are qualifying.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And so if you take that aber and you multiply it, both the cost that each one nem would incur, the additional cost each would incur ause they are complying with 404(b), I can't imagine that's not a big number.</li> <li>MR. GOMEZ: So, Steve, I think the so the stion like I said, it's not just on the dollar ngs of the 404(b), there's a cost to the investor of having the 404(b) attestation. What our comments in vious studies and some academic research have noted is fact that other costs, that is not what you're paying</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. HAHN: It's also an operational issue. So, you know, I've spent 18 of the last 20 years at five different all startup companies, emerging growth companies, and the way you think about it is, you know, what processes and procedures do we need in place to let the business operate. And if we put too many on right away I don't have enough staff to have, go through all these controls and the company is just going to slow down and just not operate, not work. So any time you start thinking about, okay, what controls do we put in place, does it make sense, what's the cost, what's the benefit of out of it, and I think, you know, going through right now with 404(b) exemption, you know, I think we're in a good spot. We got to the point about two years ago where we said, okay, we want to give comfort to management and to the audit committee, so we went outside of this. But again I think going to, forcing us to be 404(b) with the attestation, I think that's just too much cost and would kind of clog it down. I don't want to get too much in the weeds here but, you know, some of the things that will catch you up is, you know, if you've got, you know, three way matching on payables and here	2       a lit         3	at currently less than 1 percent and it will go up to the bit more than 1 percent. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Right. So for the overall ket that will invest all in public if you will, that's d of the number I think. But in terms of the number - terms of the companies involved that's it's a e number. MR. GOMEZ: It's a large number of companies. re talking about almost half of companies currently lifying and a little more than actually 40 percent nem are qualifying. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And so if you take that aber and you multiply it, both the cost that each one nem would incur, the additional cost each would incur ause they are complying with 404(b), I can't imagine that's not a big number. MR. GOMEZ: So, Steve, I think the so the stion like I said, it's not just on the dollar ngs of the 404(b), there's a cost to the investor of having the 404(b) attestation. What our comments in vious studies and some academic research have noted is fact that other costs, that is not what you're paying of pocket it's what counters the cost of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. HAHN: It's also an operational issue. So, you know, I've spent 18 of the last 20 years at five different all startup companies, emerging growth companies, and the way you think about it is, you know, what processes and procedures do we need in place to let the business operate. And if we put too many on right away I don't have enough staff to have, go through all these controls and the company is just going to slow down and just not operate, not work. So any time you start thinking about, okay, what controls do we put in place, does it make sense, what's the cost, what's the benefit of out of it, and I think, you know, going through right now with 404(b) exemption, you know, I think we're in a good spot. We got to the point about two years ago where we said, okay, we want to give comfort to management and to the audit committee, so we went outside of this. But again I think going to, forcing us to be 404(b) with the attestation, I think that's just too much cost and would kind of clog it down. I don't want to get too much in the weeds here but, you know, sime of the things that will catch you up is, you know, if you've	2       a lit         3	<ul> <li>att currently less than 1 percent and it will go up to the bit more than 1 percent.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Right. So for the overall ket that will invest all in public if you will, that's do the number I think. But in terms of the number - terms of the companies involved that's it's a e number.</li> <li>MR. GOMEZ: It's a large number of companies.</li> <li>re talking about almost half of companies currently lifying and a little more than actually 40 percent nem are qualifying.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: And so if you take that aber and you multiply it, both the cost that each one nem would incur, the additional cost each would incur ause they are complying with 404(b), I can't imagine that's not a big number.</li> <li>MR. GOMEZ: So, Steve, I think the so the stion like I said, it's not just on the dollar ngs of the 404(b), there's a cost to the investor of having the 404(b) attestation. What our comments in vious studies and some academic research have noted is fact that other costs, that is not what you're paying</li> </ul>

	Page 170		Page 172
1	blah, blah.	1	another staff or two. It's those costs and it's just the
2	MR. GOMEZ: paying for it. Restatement,	2	time for, you know, for my department to talk to clinical
3	there's some academic research that have noted that there	3	group, to talk to manufacturing group. It's just the
4	is a potential lower cost of capital for the company that	4	meetings, just to document, you know, the added burden
5	has the 404(b) attestation versus a company that doesn't.	5	there.
6	I think when you look at the costs of not doing 404(b)	6	MR. NELSON: Was going public the cap of the
7	it's harder to put them in the scale compared to just	7	last resort for you guys?
8	looking at how much you're paying the auditor because	8	MR. HAHN: Yeah, so that was the only avenue.
9	that's one bill that you could go back and say, well, it	9	So we were we had we were our lead asset was in
10	would cost me an extra \$100,00 to do it.	10	phase 2 and we were funded to complete that phase 2, and
11	The cost from on the investor side of not	11	basically there was no way to raise money until we had
12	having that comes from academic literature of looking at	12	gotten the results from that.
13	what those potential costs can be, some of it	13	So we had talked to some folks. We ended up
14	qualitative, some of it quantitative. So I think it's	14	doing a partnership with Pfizer to help fund some of that
15	hard for me but, I mean, I encourage everyone to not just	15	to extend our runway. But after we got positive results
16	look at the Commission's release but take a look at the	16	off that phase 2 there it is, what do we do. We talked
17	studies because the academic literature has been mixed	17	about a crossover round but it ended up falling right
18	since that staff study.	18	into the IPO was the only avenue we had.
19	And don't take my word for it, but hopefully	19	MS. MOTT: Brian, I bet your colleagues could
20	what the studies will do is highlight additional data	20	speak, other colleagues in the biotech industry can speak
21	that the Commission could consider in making this	21	to the difficulty of finding capital, you know, to invest
22	determination.	22	in a company, particularly biotech because it's very
23	MR. HAHN: So this cost what five years ago?	23	capital intensive and it's a long tail, so it's very
24	Because I remember the last five years auditors have been	24	challenging to find investors. So often this is the only
25	have tried to come down on increasing the fees, so I'm	25	option, right?
			D 100
1	Page 171	1	Page 173
1	just interested what the updated numbers are on that.	1	MR. HAHN: Right.
2	just interested what the updated numbers are on that. MR. NELSON: Brian, can I ask how much the	2	MR. HAHN: Right. MS. MOTT: Well, now we have Reg A. But, I
2 3	just interested what the updated numbers are on that. MR. NELSON: Brian, can I ask how much the regulatory burden actually went into your decision	2 3	MR. HAHN: Right. MS. MOTT: Well, now we have Reg A. But, I mean, how many, though, of your colleagues would you say
2 3 4	just interested what the updated numbers are on that. MR. NELSON: Brian, can I ask how much the regulatory burden actually went into your decision whether to IPO or not?	2 3 4	MR. HAHN: Right. MS. MOTT: Well, now we have Reg A. But, I mean, how many, though, of your colleagues would you say have chosen this route or
2 3 4 5	just interested what the updated numbers are on that. MR. NELSON: Brian, can I ask how much the regulatory burden actually went into your decision whether to IPO or not? MR. HAHN: So just to go public between	2 3 4 5	MR. HAHN: Right. MS. MOTT: Well, now we have Reg A. But, I mean, how many, though, of your colleagues would you say have chosen this route or MR. HAHN: So bio represents about 1,200
2 3 4 5 6	just interested what the updated numbers are on that. MR. NELSON: Brian, can I ask how much the regulatory burden actually went into your decision whether to IPO or not? MR. HAHN: So just to go public between lawyers, accountants was about \$2.4 million. And just to	2 3 4 5 6	MR. HAHN: Right. MS. MOTT: Well, now we have Reg A. But, I mean, how many, though, of your colleagues would you say have chosen this route or MR. HAHN: So bio represents about 1,200 different companies. Now I'll state that large to small,
2 3 4 5 6 7	just interested what the updated numbers are on that. MR. NELSON: Brian, can I ask how much the regulatory burden actually went into your decision whether to IPO or not? MR. HAHN: So just to go public between lawyers, accountants was about \$2.4 million. And just to kind of put it into perspective, my payroll back then was	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. HAHN: Right. MS. MOTT: Well, now we have Reg A. But, I mean, how many, though, of your colleagues would you say have chosen this route or MR. HAHN: So bio represents about 1,200 different companies. Now I'll state that large to small, but I do know, you know, there is I belong to the
2 3 4 5 6	just interested what the updated numbers are on that. MR. NELSON: Brian, can I ask how much the regulatory burden actually went into your decision whether to IPO or not? MR. HAHN: So just to go public between lawyers, accountants was about \$2.4 million. And just to kind of put it into perspective, my payroll back then was about \$3-1/2 million a year. Payroll now is about \$5	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. HAHN: Right. MS. MOTT: Well, now we have Reg A. But, I mean, how many, though, of your colleagues would you say have chosen this route or MR. HAHN: So bio represents about 1,200 different companies. Now I'll state that large to small, but I do know, you know, there is I belong to the Association of Bio Financial Officers. So we you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	just interested what the updated numbers are on that. MR. NELSON: Brian, can I ask how much the regulatory burden actually went into your decision whether to IPO or not? MR. HAHN: So just to go public between lawyers, accountants was about \$2.4 million. And just to kind of put it into perspective, my payroll back then was	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. HAHN: Right. MS. MOTT: Well, now we have Reg A. But, I mean, how many, though, of your colleagues would you say have chosen this route or MR. HAHN: So bio represents about 1,200 different companies. Now I'll state that large to small, but I do know, you know, there is I belong to the Association of Bio Financial Officers. So we you know, our annual conference we have our meetings, and it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	just interested what the updated numbers are on that. MR. NELSON: Brian, can I ask how much the regulatory burden actually went into your decision whether to IPO or not? MR. HAHN: So just to go public between lawyers, accountants was about \$2.4 million. And just to kind of put it into perspective, my payroll back then was about \$3-1/2 million a year. Payroll now is about \$5 million. So 2.4 actually just to go public and then it's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. HAHN: Right. MS. MOTT: Well, now we have Reg A. But, I mean, how many, though, of your colleagues would you say have chosen this route or MR. HAHN: So bio represents about 1,200 different companies. Now I'll state that large to small, but I do know, you know, there is I belong to the Association of Bio Financial Officers. So we you
2 3 6 7 8 9 10	just interested what the updated numbers are on that. MR. NELSON: Brian, can I ask how much the regulatory burden actually went into your decision whether to IPO or not? MR. HAHN: So just to go public between lawyers, accountants was about \$2.4 million. And just to kind of put it into perspective, my payroll back then was about \$3-1/2 million a year. Payroll now is about \$5 million. So 2.4 actually just to go public and then it's probably an added 1.5, 1.6 million a year just to operate	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. HAHN: Right. MS. MOTT: Well, now we have Reg A. But, I mean, how many, though, of your colleagues would you say have chosen this route or MR. HAHN: So bio represents about 1,200 different companies. Now I'll state that large to small, but I do know, you know, there is I belong to the Association of Bio Financial Officers. So we you know, our annual conference we have our meetings, and it is a very similar conversation. You know, our we had
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	just interested what the updated numbers are on that. MR. NELSON: Brian, can I ask how much the regulatory burden actually went into your decision whether to IPO or not? MR. HAHN: So just to go public between lawyers, accountants was about \$2.4 million. And just to kind of put it into perspective, my payroll back then was about \$3-1/2 million a year. Payroll now is about \$5 million. So 2.4 actually just to go public and then it's probably an added 1.5, 1.6 million a year just to operate as a public company. MR. REARDON: Is that with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. HAHN: Right. MS. MOTT: Well, now we have Reg A. But, I mean, how many, though, of your colleagues would you say have chosen this route or MR. HAHN: So bio represents about 1,200 different companies. Now I'll state that large to small, but I do know, you know, there is I belong to the Association of Bio Financial Officers. So we you know, our annual conference we have our meetings, and it is a very similar conversation. You know, our we had raised \$65 million as a private company in three rounds
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	just interested what the updated numbers are on that. MR. NELSON: Brian, can I ask how much the regulatory burden actually went into your decision whether to IPO or not? MR. HAHN: So just to go public between lawyers, accountants was about \$2.4 million. And just to kind of put it into perspective, my payroll back then was about \$3-1/2 million a year. Payroll now is about \$5 million. So 2.4 actually just to go public and then it's probably an added 1.5, 1.6 million a year just to operate as a public company. MR. REARDON: Is that with the underwriters discount?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. HAHN: Right. MS. MOTT: Well, now we have Reg A. But, I mean, how many, though, of your colleagues would you say have chosen this route or MR. HAHN: So bio represents about 1,200 different companies. Now I'll state that large to small, but I do know, you know, there is I belong to the Association of Bio Financial Officers. So we you know, our annual conference we have our meetings, and it is a very similar conversation. You know, our we had raised \$65 million as a private company in three rounds from VCs. Our IPO was \$65 million and we just completed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	just interested what the updated numbers are on that. MR. NELSON: Brian, can I ask how much the regulatory burden actually went into your decision whether to IPO or not? MR. HAHN: So just to go public between lawyers, accountants was about \$2.4 million. And just to kind of put it into perspective, my payroll back then was about \$3-1/2 million a year. Payroll now is about \$5 million. So 2.4 actually just to go public and then it's probably an added 1.5, 1.6 million a year just to operate as a public company. MR. REARDON: Is that with the underwriters discount? MR. HAHN: No, no, it doesn't. That's on op of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. HAHN: Right. MS. MOTT: Well, now we have Reg A. But, I mean, how many, though, of your colleagues would you say have chosen this route or MR. HAHN: So bio represents about 1,200 different companies. Now I'll state that large to small, but I do know, you know, there is I belong to the Association of Bio Financial Officers. So we you know, our annual conference we have our meetings, and it is a very similar conversation. You know, our we had raised \$65 million as a private company in three rounds from VCs. Our IPO was \$65 million and we just completed a follow on last month for, you know, \$20 million.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	just interested what the updated numbers are on that. MR. NELSON: Brian, can I ask how much the regulatory burden actually went into your decision whether to IPO or not? MR. HAHN: So just to go public between lawyers, accountants was about \$2.4 million. And just to kind of put it into perspective, my payroll back then was about \$3-1/2 million a year. Payroll now is about \$5 million. So 2.4 actually just to go public and then it's probably an added 1.5, 1.6 million a year just to operate as a public company. MR. REARDON: Is that with the underwriters discount? MR. HAHN: No, no, it doesn't. That's on op of it. And it's funny, back to our earlier discussions. You	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. HAHN: Right. MS. MOTT: Well, now we have Reg A. But, I mean, how many, though, of your colleagues would you say have chosen this route or MR. HAHN: So bio represents about 1,200 different companies. Now I'll state that large to small, but I do know, you know, there is I belong to the Association of Bio Financial Officers. So we you know, our annual conference we have our meetings, and it is a very similar conversation. You know, our we had raised \$65 million as a private company in three rounds from VCs. Our IPO was \$65 million and we just completed a follow on last month for, you know, \$20 million. So where we have some of the other
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	just interested what the updated numbers are on that. MR. NELSON: Brian, can I ask how much the regulatory burden actually went into your decision whether to IPO or not? MR. HAHN: So just to go public between lawyers, accountants was about \$2.4 million. And just to kind of put it into perspective, my payroll back then was about \$3-1/2 million a year. Payroll now is about \$5 million. So 2.4 actually just to go public and then it's probably an added 1.5, 1.6 million a year just to operate as a public company. MR. REARDON: Is that with the underwriters discount? MR. HAHN: No, no, it doesn't. That's on op of it. And it's funny, back to our earlier discussions. You know, I talked to a few people on the break here. We went public in January of 2014 but in 2012 and 2013 we were looking at all different avenues and Reg A+ would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. HAHN: Right. MS. MOTT: Well, now we have Reg A. But, I mean, how many, though, of your colleagues would you say have chosen this route or MR. HAHN: So bio represents about 1,200 different companies. Now I'll state that large to small, but I do know, you know, there is I belong to the Association of Bio Financial Officers. So we you know, our annual conference we have our meetings, and it is a very similar conversation. You know, our we had raised \$65 million as a private company in three rounds from VCs. Our IPO was \$65 million and we just completed a follow on last month for, you know, \$20 million. So where we have some of the other industries can utilize crowd funding or angel investors.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	just interested what the updated numbers are on that. MR. NELSON: Brian, can I ask how much the regulatory burden actually went into your decision whether to IPO or not? MR. HAHN: So just to go public between lawyers, accountants was about \$2.4 million. And just to kind of put it into perspective, my payroll back then was about \$3-1/2 million a year. Payroll now is about \$5 million. So 2.4 actually just to go public and then it's probably an added 1.5, 1.6 million a year just to operate as a public company. MR. REARDON: Is that with the underwriters discount? MR. HAHN: No, no, it doesn't. That's on op of it. And it's funny, back to our earlier discussions. You know, I talked to a few people on the break here. We went public in January of 2014 but in 2012 and 2013 we were looking at all different avenues and Reg A+ would have been huge for us. We definitely would have utilized	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. HAHN: Right. MS. MOTT: Well, now we have Reg A. But, I mean, how many, though, of your colleagues would you say have chosen this route or MR. HAHN: So bio represents about 1,200 different companies. Now I'll state that large to small, but I do know, you know, there is I belong to the Association of Bio Financial Officers. So we you know, our annual conference we have our meetings, and it is a very similar conversation. You know, our we had raised \$65 million as a private company in three rounds from VCs. Our IPO was \$65 million and we just completed a follow on last month for, you know, \$20 million. So where we have some of the other industries can utilize crowd funding or angel investors. It's not it doesn't work for biotech. You know, it's a billion dollars in ten years to get an asset to market. Our company was founded in 2003. Our first compound
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	just interested what the updated numbers are on that. MR. NELSON: Brian, can I ask how much the regulatory burden actually went into your decision whether to IPO or not? MR. HAHN: So just to go public between lawyers, accountants was about \$2.4 million. And just to kind of put it into perspective, my payroll back then was about \$3-1/2 million a year. Payroll now is about \$5 million. So 2.4 actually just to go public and then it's probably an added 1.5, 1.6 million a year just to operate as a public company. MR. REARDON: Is that with the underwriters discount? MR. HAHN: No, no, it doesn't. That's on op of it. And it's funny, back to our earlier discussions. You know, I talked to a few people on the break here. We went public in January of 2014 but in 2012 and 2013 we were looking at all different avenues and Reg A+ would have been huge for us. We definitely would have utilized that when we were looking at crossover rounds, a way to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. HAHN: Right. MS. MOTT: Well, now we have Reg A. But, I mean, how many, though, of your colleagues would you say have chosen this route or MR. HAHN: So bio represents about 1,200 different companies. Now I'll state that large to small, but I do know, you know, there is I belong to the Association of Bio Financial Officers. So we you know, our annual conference we have our meetings, and it is a very similar conversation. You know, our we had raised \$65 million as a private company in three rounds from VCs. Our IPO was \$65 million and we just completed a follow on last month for, you know, \$20 million. So where we have some of the other industries can utilize crowd funding or angel investors. It's not it doesn't work for biotech. You know, it's a billion dollars in ten years to get an asset to market. Our company was founded in 2003. Our first compound went in the clinic in late 2007, and where we are now
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	just interested what the updated numbers are on that. MR. NELSON: Brian, can I ask how much the regulatory burden actually went into your decision whether to IPO or not? MR. HAHN: So just to go public between lawyers, accountants was about \$2.4 million. And just to kind of put it into perspective, my payroll back then was about \$3-1/2 million a year. Payroll now is about \$5 million. So 2.4 actually just to go public and then it's probably an added 1.5, 1.6 million a year just to operate as a public company. MR. REARDON: Is that with the underwriters discount? MR. HAHN: No, no, it doesn't. That's on op of it. And it's funny, back to our earlier discussions. You know, I talked to a few people on the break here. We went public in January of 2014 but in 2012 and 2013 we were looking at all different avenues and Reg A+ would have been huge for us. We definitely would have utilized that when we were looking at crossover rounds, a way to do that stepping stone. So, I mean, that's a great	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. HAHN: Right. MS. MOTT: Well, now we have Reg A. But, I mean, how many, though, of your colleagues would you say have chosen this route or MR. HAHN: So bio represents about 1,200 different companies. Now I'll state that large to small, but I do know, you know, there is I belong to the Association of Bio Financial Officers. So we you know, our annual conference we have our meetings, and it is a very similar conversation. You know, our we had raised \$65 million as a private company in three rounds from VCs. Our IPO was \$65 million and we just completed a follow on last month for, you know, \$20 million. So where we have some of the other industries can utilize crowd funding or angel investors. It's not it doesn't work for biotech. You know, it's a billion dollars in ten years to get an asset to market. Our company was founded in 2003. Our first compound went in the clinic in late 2007, and where we are now it's midway through a phase 3. So it's not going to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	just interested what the updated numbers are on that. MR. NELSON: Brian, can I ask how much the regulatory burden actually went into your decision whether to IPO or not? MR. HAHN: So just to go public between lawyers, accountants was about \$2.4 million. And just to kind of put it into perspective, my payroll back then was about \$3-1/2 million a year. Payroll now is about \$5 million. So 2.4 actually just to go public and then it's probably an added 1.5, 1.6 million a year just to operate as a public company. MR. REARDON: Is that with the underwriters discount? MR. HAHN: No, no, it doesn't. That's on op of it. And it's funny, back to our earlier discussions. You know, I talked to a few people on the break here. We went public in January of 2014 but in 2012 and 2013 we were looking at all different avenues and Reg A+ would have been huge for us. We definitely would have utilized that when we were looking at crossover rounds, a way to do that stepping stone. So, I mean, that's a great vehicle now.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. HAHN: Right. MS. MOTT: Well, now we have Reg A. But, I mean, how many, though, of your colleagues would you say have chosen this route or MR. HAHN: So bio represents about 1,200 different companies. Now I'll state that large to small, but I do know, you know, there is I belong to the Association of Bio Financial Officers. So we you know, our annual conference we have our meetings, and it is a very similar conversation. You know, our we had raised \$65 million as a private company in three rounds from VCs. Our IPO was \$65 million and we just completed a follow on last month for, you know, \$20 million. So where we have some of the other industries can utilize crowd funding or angel investors. It's not it doesn't work for biotech. You know, it's a billion dollars in ten years to get an asset to market. Our company was founded in 2003. Our first compound went in the clinic in late 2007, and where we are now it's midway through a phase 3. So it's not going to be on the market until 2019, 2020.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	just interested what the updated numbers are on that. MR. NELSON: Brian, can I ask how much the regulatory burden actually went into your decision whether to IPO or not? MR. HAHN: So just to go public between lawyers, accountants was about \$2.4 million. And just to kind of put it into perspective, my payroll back then was about \$3-1/2 million a year. Payroll now is about \$5 million. So 2.4 actually just to go public and then it's probably an added 1.5, 1.6 million a year just to operate as a public company. MR. REARDON: Is that with the underwriters discount? MR. HAHN: No, no, it doesn't. That's on op of it. And it's funny, back to our earlier discussions. You know, I talked to a few people on the break here. We went public in January of 2014 but in 2012 and 2013 we were looking at all different avenues and Reg A+ would have been huge for us. We definitely would have utilized that when we were looking at crossover rounds, a way to do that stepping stone. So, I mean, that's a great vehicle now.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. HAHN: Right. MS. MOTT: Well, now we have Reg A. But, I mean, how many, though, of your colleagues would you say have chosen this route or MR. HAHN: So bio represents about 1,200 different companies. Now I'll state that large to small, but I do know, you know, there is I belong to the Association of Bio Financial Officers. So we you know, our annual conference we have our meetings, and it is a very similar conversation. You know, our we had raised \$65 million as a private company in three rounds from VCs. Our IPO was \$65 million and we just completed a follow on last month for, you know, \$20 million. So where we have some of the other industries can utilize crowd funding or angel investors. It's not it doesn't work for biotech. You know, it's a billion dollars in ten years to get an asset to market. Our company was founded in 2003. Our first compound went in the clinic in late 2007, and where we are now it's midway through a phase 3. So it's not going to be on the market until 2019, 2020. Our second compound now is in a phase 2 and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	just interested what the updated numbers are on that. MR. NELSON: Brian, can I ask how much the regulatory burden actually went into your decision whether to IPO or not? MR. HAHN: So just to go public between lawyers, accountants was about \$2.4 million. And just to kind of put it into perspective, my payroll back then was about \$3-1/2 million a year. Payroll now is about \$5 million. So 2.4 actually just to go public and then it's probably an added 1.5, 1.6 million a year just to operate as a public company. MR. REARDON: Is that with the underwriters discount? MR. HAHN: No, no, it doesn't. That's on op of it. And it's funny, back to our earlier discussions. You know, I talked to a few people on the break here. We went public in January of 2014 but in 2012 and 2013 we were looking at all different avenues and Reg A+ would have been huge for us. We definitely would have utilized that when we were looking at crossover rounds, a way to do that stepping stone. So, I mean, that's a great vehicle now. But, yeah, just the cost of a public company.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. HAHN: Right. MS. MOTT: Well, now we have Reg A. But, I mean, how many, though, of your colleagues would you say have chosen this route or MR. HAHN: So bio represents about 1,200 different companies. Now I'll state that large to small, but I do know, you know, there is I belong to the Association of Bio Financial Officers. So we you know, our annual conference we have our meetings, and it is a very similar conversation. You know, our we had raised \$65 million as a private company in three rounds from VCs. Our IPO was \$65 million and we just completed a follow on last month for, you know, \$20 million. So where we have some of the other industries can utilize crowd funding or angel investors. It's not it doesn't work for biotech. You know, it's a billion dollars in ten years to get an asset to market. Our company was founded in 2003. Our first compound went in the clinic in late 2007, and where we are now it's midway through a phase 3. So it's not going to be on the market until 2019, 2020. Our second compound now is in a phase 2 and it's going to be probably 2021 before it's on the market.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	just interested what the updated numbers are on that. MR. NELSON: Brian, can I ask how much the regulatory burden actually went into your decision whether to IPO or not? MR. HAHN: So just to go public between lawyers, accountants was about \$2.4 million. And just to kind of put it into perspective, my payroll back then was about \$3-1/2 million a year. Payroll now is about \$5 million. So 2.4 actually just to go public and then it's probably an added 1.5, 1.6 million a year just to operate as a public company. MR. REARDON: Is that with the underwriters discount? MR. HAHN: No, no, it doesn't. That's on op of it. And it's funny, back to our earlier discussions. You know, I talked to a few people on the break here. We went public in January of 2014 but in 2012 and 2013 we were looking at all different avenues and Reg A+ would have been huge for us. We definitely would have utilized that when we were looking at crossover rounds, a way to do that stepping stone. So, I mean, that's a great vehicle now. But, yeah, just the cost of a public company. And, you know, to your point to add 404(b) it is 100,000 at the outside potentially but, you know, we may find	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. HAHN: Right. MS. MOTT: Well, now we have Reg A. But, I mean, how many, though, of your colleagues would you say have chosen this route or MR. HAHN: So bio represents about 1,200 different companies. Now I'll state that large to small, but I do know, you know, there is I belong to the Association of Bio Financial Officers. So we you know, our annual conference we have our meetings, and it is a very similar conversation. You know, our we had raised \$65 million as a private company in three rounds from VCs. Our IPO was \$65 million and we just completed a follow on last month for, you know, \$20 million. So where we have some of the other industries can utilize crowd funding or angel investors. It's not it doesn't work for biotech. You know, it's a billion dollars in ten years to get an asset to market. Our company was founded in 2003. Our first compound went in the clinic in late 2007, and where we are now it's midway through a phase 3. So it's not going to be on the market until 2019, 2020. Dur second compound now is in a phase 2 and it's going to be probably 2021 before it's on the market. MS. MOTT: I think that it's important to take
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	just interested what the updated numbers are on that. MR. NELSON: Brian, can I ask how much the regulatory burden actually went into your decision whether to IPO or not? MR. HAHN: So just to go public between lawyers, accountants was about \$2.4 million. And just to kind of put it into perspective, my payroll back then was about \$3-1/2 million a year. Payroll now is about \$5 million. So 2.4 actually just to go public and then it's probably an added 1.5, 1.6 million a year just to operate as a public company. MR. REARDON: Is that with the underwriters discount? MR. HAHN: No, no, it doesn't. That's on op of it. And it's funny, back to our earlier discussions. You know, I talked to a few people on the break here. We went public in January of 2014 but in 2012 and 2013 we were looking at all different avenues and Reg A+ would have been huge for us. We definitely would have utilized that when we were looking at crossover rounds, a way to do that stepping stone. So, I mean, that's a great vehicle now. But, yeah, just the cost of a public company.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. HAHN: Right. MS. MOTT: Well, now we have Reg A. But, I mean, how many, though, of your colleagues would you say have chosen this route or MR. HAHN: So bio represents about 1,200 different companies. Now I'll state that large to small, but I do know, you know, there is I belong to the Association of Bio Financial Officers. So we you know, our annual conference we have our meetings, and it is a very similar conversation. You know, our we had raised \$65 million as a private company in three rounds from VCs. Our IPO was \$65 million and we just completed a follow on last month for, you know, \$20 million. So where we have some of the other industries can utilize crowd funding or angel investors. It's not it doesn't work for biotech. You know, it's a billion dollars in ten years to get an asset to market. Our company was founded in 2003. Our first compound went in the clinic in late 2007, and where we are now it's midway through a phase 3. So it's not going to be on the market until 2019, 2020. Our second compound now is in a phase 2 and it's going to be probably 2021 before it's on the market.

	Page 174		Page 176
1	this impacts your industry more so than others I guess is	1	MR. HAHN: I put down about 39 percent.
2	the point I was trying to make.	2	MR. YADLEY: Okay. But from their viewpoint
3	So and the need so Stephen, the reason I	3	maybe, and this really is a question, that's not bad as
4	wanted to bring this up was the need for that extra	4	opposed to them doing another round perhaps?
5	\$100,000 right now goes towards clinical trials or, you	5	MR. HAHN: Like any VC they never want to be
6	know, new toxicity studies or, you know, something like	6	looted. So that's always a big major discussion before
7	which is going to be more value, much more valuable to	7	you start to go out and talk about raising more funds.
8	the I guess the accretive exit value of the company than	8	MR. REARDON: Could I ask a question and then I
9	\$100,000 in a 404(b). That's just	9	want to make a comment.
10	MR. YADLEY: So Brian, I hate to pick on you,	10	If you're small reporting company you have two
11	but you're a great example of this. Companies that I've	11	year's balance sheets and one year P&L and cash flows; is
12	worked with and taken public that have been able to	12	that right?
13	access capital from the public markets later have been	13	MS. REISCHAUER: Two years. I'm sorry, two
14	happier than companies that just sort of went public and	14	years of each.
15	then, well, now we're public. You know, why did we do	15	MR. REARDON: Two years of each. And so you
16	it, we're not getting as much value.	16	have okay. So and then with the full-fledged
17	So you had a follow on round within two years	17	you've two you've got three years of P&L?
18	it sounds like, and I'm sure that was costly, but leaving	18	MS. REISCHAUER: Right.
19	aside underwriters you did have you had the baseline	19	MR. REARDON: And I would like to kind of think
20	of financial information and disclosure. Could you talk	20	about this in perspective. Last meeting we were talking
21	about that and then assuming you have to go back to the	21	about the and it was some of the it was the
22	market sometime soon how does all that play in?	22	Commissioners who really were talking about this, who
23	MR. HAHN: We actually had a couple of	23	were saying that they're concerned that we there's not
24	different things here. So we had you know, our market	24	good information or the quality of the information in
25	cap so our VCs, our main VC backer still owns about 45	25	private placements and exempt transactions is not the
	Page 175		Page 177
1	percent of the company. So last year after we filed the	1	quality that registered deals have.
2	percent of the company. So last year after we filed the K we actually fell below the we filed the S-3 and we	2	quality that registered deals have. And I think, you know, in fairness that's
2 3	percent of the company. So last year after we filed the K we actually fell below the we filed the S-3 and we fell below that.	2 3	quality that registered deals have. And I think, you know, in fairness that's probably right. I think you don't get information, you
2 3 4	percent of the company. So last year after we filed the K we actually fell below the we filed the S-3 and we fell below that. So we were baby shelf rules, so which	2 3 4	quality that registered deals have. And I think, you know, in fairness that's probably right. I think you don't get information, you may or may not get periodic reports. But and now
2 3 4 5	percent of the company. So last year after we filed the K we actually fell below the we filed the S-3 and we fell below that. So we were baby shelf rules, so which meaning, you know, we were only able to raise in a 12	2 3 4 5	quality that registered deals have. And I think, you know, in fairness that's probably right. I think you don't get information, you may or may not get periodic reports. But and now we've got Reg A+, which I'm really shocked that it's got
2 3 4 5 6	percent of the company. So last year after we filed the K we actually fell below the we filed the S-3 and we fell below that. So we were baby shelf rules, so which meaning, you know, we were only able to raise in a 12 month period 1/3 of our public float. So it limited us	2 3 4 5 6	quality that registered deals have. And I think, you know, in fairness that's probably right. I think you don't get information, you may or may not get periodic reports. But and now we've got Reg A+, which I'm really shocked that it's got the features it's got. I mean, the selling stockholders
2 3 4 5 6 7	percent of the company. So last year after we filed the K we actually fell below the we filed the S-3 and we fell below that. So we were baby shelf rules, so which meaning, you know, we were only able to raise in a 12 month period 1/3 of our public float. So it limited us to about \$20 million a while back.	2 3 4 5 6 7	quality that registered deals have. And I think, you know, in fairness that's probably right. I think you don't get information, you may or may not get periodic reports. But and now we've got Reg A+, which I'm really shocked that it's got the features it's got. I mean, the selling stockholders I think is an important feature. I think some of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	percent of the company. So last year after we filed the K we actually fell below the we filed the S-3 and we fell below that. So we were baby shelf rules, so which meaning, you know, we were only able to raise in a 12 month period 1/3 of our public float. So it limited us to about \$20 million a while back. And then, you know so we put an ATM in place	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	quality that registered deals have. And I think, you know, in fairness that's probably right. I think you don't get information, you may or may not get periodic reports. But and now we've got Reg A+, which I'm really shocked that it's got the features it's got. I mean, the selling stockholders I think is an important feature. I think some of the other things are out there make that attractive.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	percent of the company. So last year after we filed the K we actually fell below the we filed the S-3 and we fell below that. So we were baby shelf rules, so which meaning, you know, we were only able to raise in a 12 month period 1/3 of our public float. So it limited us to about \$20 million a while back. And then, you know so we put an ATM in place saying, hey, we can try to bring a little bit of money	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	quality that registered deals have. And I think, you know, in fairness that's probably right. I think you don't get information, you may or may not get periodic reports. But and now we've got Reg A+, which I'm really shocked that it's got the features it's got. I mean, the selling stockholders I think is an important feature. I think some of the other things are out there make that attractive. And I think I think the Commission has got
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	percent of the company. So last year after we filed the K we actually fell below the we filed the S-3 and we fell below that. So we were baby shelf rules, so which meaning, you know, we were only able to raise in a 12 month period 1/3 of our public float. So it limited us to about \$20 million a while back. And then, you know so we put an ATM in place saying, hey, we can try to bring a little bit of money into that. So that cost legal fees, accountant's fees.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	quality that registered deals have. And I think, you know, in fairness that's probably right. I think you don't get information, you may or may not get periodic reports. But and now we've got Reg A+, which I'm really shocked that it's got the features it's got. I mean, the selling stockholders I think is an important feature. I think some of the other things are out there make that attractive. And I think I think the Commission has got to do a little marketing to get the word out that I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	percent of the company. So last year after we filed the K we actually fell below the we filed the S-3 and we fell below that. So we were baby shelf rules, so which meaning, you know, we were only able to raise in a 12 month period 1/3 of our public float. So it limited us to about \$20 million a while back. And then, you know so we put an ATM in place saying, hey, we can try to bring a little bit of money into that. So that cost legal fees, accountant's fees. That was probably 200, \$250,000 just to put the ATM in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	quality that registered deals have. And I think, you know, in fairness that's probably right. I think you don't get information, you may or may not get periodic reports. But and now we've got Reg A+, which I'm really shocked that it's got the features it's got. I mean, the selling stockholders I think is an important feature. I think some of the other things are out there make that attractive. And I think I think the Commission has got to do a little marketing to get the word out that I know marketing is something government is not usually
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	percent of the company. So last year after we filed the K we actually fell below the we filed the S-3 and we fell below that. So we were baby shelf rules, so which meaning, you know, we were only able to raise in a 12 month period 1/3 of our public float. So it limited us to about \$20 million a while back. And then, you know so we put an ATM in place saying, hey, we can try to bring a little bit of money into that. So that cost legal fees, accountant's fees. That was probably 200, \$250,000 just to put the ATM in place. Drew down about \$3 million worth of that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	quality that registered deals have. And I think, you know, in fairness that's probably right. I think you don't get information, you may or may not get periodic reports. But and now we've got Reg A+, which I'm really shocked that it's got the features it's got. I mean, the selling stockholders I think is an important feature. I think some of the other things are out there make that attractive. And I think I think the Commission has got to do a little marketing to get the word out that I know marketing is something government is not usually used to doing, but I tell my I told my children when
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	percent of the company. So last year after we filed the K we actually fell below the we filed the S-3 and we fell below that. So we were baby shelf rules, so which meaning, you know, we were only able to raise in a 12 month period 1/3 of our public float. So it limited us to about \$20 million a while back. And then, you know so we put an ATM in place saying, hey, we can try to bring a little bit of money into that. So that cost legal fees, accountant's fees. That was probably 200, \$250,000 just to put the ATM in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	quality that registered deals have. And I think, you know, in fairness that's probably right. I think you don't get information, you may or may not get periodic reports. But and now we've got Reg A+, which I'm really shocked that it's got the features it's got. I mean, the selling stockholders I think is an important feature. I think some of the other things are out there make that attractive. And I think I think the Commission has got to do a little marketing to get the word out that I know marketing is something government is not usually used to doing, but I tell my I told my children when they were growing up, I said there are two types of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	percent of the company. So last year after we filed the K we actually fell below the we filed the S-3 and we fell below that. So we were baby shelf rules, so which meaning, you know, we were only able to raise in a 12 month period 1/3 of our public float. So it limited us to about \$20 million a while back. And then, you know so we put an ATM in place saying, hey, we can try to bring a little bit of money into that. So that cost legal fees, accountant's fees. That was probably 200, \$250,000 just to put the ATM in place. Drew down about \$3 million worth of that. Luckily markets came back up, some good news. We	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	quality that registered deals have. And I think, you know, in fairness that's probably right. I think you don't get information, you may or may not get periodic reports. But and now we've got Reg A+, which I'm really shocked that it's got the features it's got. I mean, the selling stockholders I think is an important feature. I think some of the other things are out there make that attractive. And I think I think the Commission has got to do a little marketing to get the word out that I know marketing is something government is not usually used to doing, but I tell my I told my children when they were growing up, I said there are two types of people, those who know they're in marketing and those who
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	percent of the company. So last year after we filed the K we actually fell below the we filed the S-3 and we fell below that. So we were baby shelf rules, so which meaning, you know, we were only able to raise in a 12 month period 1/3 of our public float. So it limited us to about \$20 million a while back. And then, you know so we put an ATM in place saying, hey, we can try to bring a little bit of money into that. So that cost legal fees, accountant's fees. That was probably 200, \$250,000 just to put the ATM in place. Drew down about \$3 million worth of that. Luckily markets came back up, some good news. We actually closed one day above the threshold price, so we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	quality that registered deals have. And I think, you know, in fairness that's probably right. I think you don't get information, you may or may not get periodic reports. But and now we've got Reg A+, which I'm really shocked that it's got the features it's got. I mean, the selling stockholders I think is an important feature. I think some of the other things are out there make that attractive. And I think I think the Commission has got to do a little marketing to get the word out that I know marketing is something government is not usually used to doing, but I tell my I told my children when they were growing up, I said there are two types of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	percent of the company. So last year after we filed the K we actually fell below the we filed the S-3 and we fell below that. So we were baby shelf rules, so which meaning, you know, we were only able to raise in a 12 month period 1/3 of our public float. So it limited us to about \$20 million a while back. And then, you know so we put an ATM in place saying, hey, we can try to bring a little bit of money into that. So that cost legal fees, accountant's fees. That was probably 200, \$250,000 just to put the ATM in place. Drew down about \$3 million worth of that. Luckily markets came back up, some good news. We actually closed one day above the threshold price, so we are now out from under the baby shelf rules, full S-3	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	quality that registered deals have. And I think, you know, in fairness that's probably right. I think you don't get information, you may or may not get periodic reports. But and now we've got Reg A+, which I'm really shocked that it's got the features it's got. I mean, the selling stockholders I think is an important feature. I think some of the other things are out there make that attractive. And I think I think the Commission has got to do a little marketing to get the word out that I know marketing is something government is not usually used to doing, but I tell my I told my children when they were growing up, I said there are two types of people, those who know they're in marketing and those who don't. But they are we all have to market a little
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	percent of the company. So last year after we filed the K we actually fell below the we filed the S-3 and we fell below that. So we were baby shelf rules, so which meaning, you know, we were only able to raise in a 12 month period 1/3 of our public float. So it limited us to about \$20 million a while back. And then, you know so we put an ATM in place saying, hey, we can try to bring a little bit of money into that. So that cost legal fees, accountant's fees. That was probably 200, \$250,000 just to put the ATM in place. Drew down about \$3 million worth of that. Luckily markets came back up, some good news. We actually closed one day above the threshold price, so we are now out from under the baby shelf rules, full S-3 eligible.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>quality that registered deals have.</li> <li>And I think, you know, in fairness that's probably right. I think you don't get information, you may or may not get periodic reports. But and now we've got Reg A+, which I'm really shocked that it's got the features it's got. I mean, the selling stockholders I think is an important feature. I think some of the other things are out there make that attractive.</li> <li>And I think I think the Commission has got to do a little marketing to get the word out that I know marketing is something government is not usually used to doing, but I tell my I told my children when they were growing up, I said there are two types of people, those who know they're in marketing and those who don't. But they are we all have to market a little bit. But and I can give you some ideas about some</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	percent of the company. So last year after we filed the K we actually fell below the we filed the S-3 and we fell below that. So we were baby shelf rules, so which meaning, you know, we were only able to raise in a 12 month period 1/3 of our public float. So it limited us to about \$20 million a while back. And then, you know so we put an ATM in place saying, hey, we can try to bring a little bit of money into that. So that cost legal fees, accountant's fees. That was probably 200, \$250,000 just to put the ATM in place. Drew down about \$3 million worth of that. Luckily markets came back up, some good news. We actually closed one day above the threshold price, so we are now out from under the baby shelf rules, full S-3 eligible.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>quality that registered deals have.</li> <li>And I think, you know, in fairness that's probably right. I think you don't get information, you may or may not get periodic reports. But and now we've got Reg A+, which I'm really shocked that it's got the features it's got. I mean, the selling stockholders I think is an important feature. I think some of the other things are out there make that attractive.</li> <li>And I think I think the Commission has got to do a little marketing to get the word out that I know marketing is something government is not usually used to doing, but I tell my I told my children when they were growing up, I said there are two types of people, those who know they're in marketing and those who don't. But they are we all have to market a little bit. But and I can give you some ideas about some conferences to go, and Sebastian get you some face time</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	percent of the company. So last year after we filed the K we actually fell below the we filed the S-3 and we fell below that. So we were baby shelf rules, so which meaning, you know, we were only able to raise in a 12 month period 1/3 of our public float. So it limited us to about \$20 million a while back. And then, you know so we put an ATM in place saying, hey, we can try to bring a little bit of money into that. So that cost legal fees, accountant's fees. That was probably 200, \$250,000 just to put the ATM in place. Drew down about \$3 million worth of that. Luckily markets came back up, some good news. We actually closed one day above the threshold price, so we are now out from under the baby shelf rules, full S-3 eligible. And then once again, you know, go through all the underwriter meetings, you go through two weeks of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	quality that registered deals have. And I think, you know, in fairness that's probably right. I think you don't get information, you may or may not get periodic reports. But and now we've got Reg A+, which I'm really shocked that it's got the features it's got. I mean, the selling stockholders I think is an important feature. I think some of the other things are out there make that attractive. And I think I think the Commission has got to do a little marketing to get the word out that I know marketing is something government is not usually used to doing, but I tell my I told my children when they were growing up, I said there are two types of people, those who know they're in marketing and those who don't. But they are we all have to market a little bit. But and I can give you some ideas about some conferences to go, and Sebastian get you some face time with some of my colleagues or Julie.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	percent of the company. So last year after we filed the K we actually fell below the we filed the S-3 and we fell below that. So we were baby shelf rules, so which meaning, you know, we were only able to raise in a 12 month period 1/3 of our public float. So it limited us to about \$20 million a while back. And then, you know so we put an ATM in place saying, hey, we can try to bring a little bit of money into that. So that cost legal fees, accountant's fees. That was probably 200, \$250,000 just to put the ATM in place. Drew down about \$3 million worth of that. Luckily markets came back up, some good news. We actually closed one day above the threshold price, so we are now out from under the baby shelf rules, full S-3 eligible. And then once again, you know, go through all the underwriter meetings, you go through two weeks of the diligence calls. You know, we ended up doing a CMPO, but	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>quality that registered deals have.</li> <li>And I think, you know, in fairness that's probably right. I think you don't get information, you may or may not get periodic reports. But and now we've got Reg A+, which I'm really shocked that it's got the features it's got. I mean, the selling stockholders I think is an important feature. I think some of the other things are out there make that attractive.</li> <li>And I think I think the Commission has got to do a little marketing to get the word out that I know marketing is something government is not usually used to doing, but I tell my I told my children when they were growing up, I said there are two types of people, those who know they're in marketing and those who don't. But they are we all have to market a little bit. But and I can give you some ideas about some conferences to go, and Sebastian get you some face time with some of my colleagues or Julie.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	percent of the company. So last year after we filed the K we actually fell below the we filed the S-3 and we fell below that. So we were baby shelf rules, so which meaning, you know, we were only able to raise in a 12 month period 1/3 of our public float. So it limited us to about \$20 million a while back. And then, you know so we put an ATM in place saying, hey, we can try to bring a little bit of money into that. So that cost legal fees, accountant's fees. That was probably 200, \$250,000 just to put the ATM in place. Drew down about \$3 million worth of that. Luckily markets came back up, some good news. We actually closed one day above the threshold price, so we are now out from under the baby shelf rules, full S-3 eligible. And then once again, you know, go through all the underwriter meetings, you go through two weeks of the diligence calls. You know, we ended up doing a CMPO, but again it was in legal, accounting fees, everything all in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>quality that registered deals have.</li> <li>And I think, you know, in fairness that's probably right. I think you don't get information, you may or may not get periodic reports. But and now we've got Reg A+, which I'm really shocked that it's got the features it's got. I mean, the selling stockholders I think is an important feature. I think some of the other things are out there make that attractive.</li> <li>And I think I think the Commission has got to do a little marketing to get the word out that I know marketing is something government is not usually used to doing, but I tell my I told my children when they were growing up, I said there are two types of people, those who know they're in marketing and those who don't. But they are we all have to market a little bit. But and I can give you some ideas about some conferences to go, and Sebastian get you some face time with some of my colleagues or Julie.</li> <li>But so let's look at the continuum here.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	percent of the company. So last year after we filed the K we actually fell below the we filed the S-3 and we fell below that. So we were baby shelf rules, so which meaning, you know, we were only able to raise in a 12 month period 1/3 of our public float. So it limited us to about \$20 million a while back. And then, you know so we put an ATM in place saying, hey, we can try to bring a little bit of money into that. So that cost legal fees, accountant's fees. That was probably 200, \$250,000 just to put the ATM in place. Drew down about \$3 million worth of that. Luckily markets came back up, some good news. We actually closed one day above the threshold price, so we are now out from under the baby shelf rules, full S-3 eligible. And then once again, you know, go through all the underwriter meetings, you go through two weeks of the diligence calls. You know, we ended up doing a CMPO, but again it was in legal, accounting fees, everything all in about \$300,000 for those fees before the underwriters discount. So, you know, it's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>quality that registered deals have.</li> <li>And I think, you know, in fairness that's probably right. I think you don't get information, you may or may not get periodic reports. But and now we've got Reg A+, which I'm really shocked that it's got the features it's got. I mean, the selling stockholders I think is an important feature. I think some of the other things are out there make that attractive.</li> <li>And I think I think the Commission has got to do a little marketing to get the word out that I know marketing is something government is not usually used to doing, but I tell my I told my children when they were growing up, I said there are two types of people, those who know they're in marketing and those who don't. But they are we all have to market a little bit. But and I can give you some ideas about some conferences to go, and Sebastian get you some face time with some of my colleagues or Julie.</li> <li>But so let's look at the continuum here.</li> <li>We've got private placements, we've got Reg A, which now has which has audited financial. So the quality of information there is better. So then we get to a stage at which we're talking about the small business filer and</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	percent of the company. So last year after we filed the K we actually fell below the we filed the S-3 and we fell below that. So we were baby shelf rules, so which meaning, you know, we were only able to raise in a 12 month period 1/3 of our public float. So it limited us to about \$20 million a while back. And then, you know so we put an ATM in place saying, hey, we can try to bring a little bit of money into that. So that cost legal fees, accountant's fees. That was probably 200, \$250,000 just to put the ATM in place. Drew down about \$3 million worth of that. Luckily markets came back up, some good news. We actually closed one day above the threshold price, so we are now out from under the baby shelf rules, full S-3 eligible. And then once again, you know, go through all the underwriter meetings, you go through two weeks of the diligence calls. You know, we ended up doing a CMPO, but again it was in legal, accounting fees, everything all in about \$300,000 for those fees before the underwriters discount. So, you know, it's MR. YADLEY: And you're okay, which maybe sounds, maybe it doesn't, and your primary owner is the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>quality that registered deals have.</li> <li>And I think, you know, in fairness that's probably right. I think you don't get information, you may or may not get periodic reports. But and now we've got Reg A+, which I'm really shocked that it's got the features it's got. I mean, the selling stockholders I think is an important feature. I think some of the other things are out there make that attractive.</li> <li>And I think I think the Commission has got to do a little marketing to get the word out that I know marketing is something government is not usually used to doing, but I tell my I told my children when they were growing up, I said there are two types of people, those who know they're in marketing and those who don't. But they are we all have to market a little bit. But and I can give you some ideas about some conferences to go, and Sebastian get you some face time with some of my colleagues or Julie.</li> <li>But so let's look at the continuum here.</li> <li>We've got private placements, we've got Reg A, which now has which has audited financial. So the quality of information there is better. So then we get to a stage at which we're talking about the small business filer and whether you're going to do that, and how big we're going</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	percent of the company. So last year after we filed the K we actually fell below the we filed the S-3 and we fell below that. So we were baby shelf rules, so which meaning, you know, we were only able to raise in a 12 month period 1/3 of our public float. So it limited us to about \$20 million a while back. And then, you know so we put an ATM in place saying, hey, we can try to bring a little bit of money into that. So that cost legal fees, accountant's fees. That was probably 200, \$250,000 just to put the ATM in place. Drew down about \$3 million worth of that. Luckily markets came back up, some good news. We actually closed one day above the threshold price, so we are now out from under the baby shelf rules, full S-3 eligible. And then once again, you know, go through all the underwriter meetings, you go through two weeks of the diligence calls. You know, we ended up doing a CMPO, but again it was in legal, accounting fees, everything all in about \$300,000 for those fees before the underwriters discount. So, you know, it's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>quality that registered deals have.</li> <li>And I think, you know, in fairness that's probably right. I think you don't get information, you may or may not get periodic reports. But and now we've got Reg A+, which I'm really shocked that it's got the features it's got. I mean, the selling stockholders I think is an important feature. I think some of the other things are out there make that attractive.</li> <li>And I think I think the Commission has got to do a little marketing to get the word out that I know marketing is something government is not usually used to doing, but I tell my I told my children when they were growing up, I said there are two types of people, those who know they're in marketing and those who don't. But they are we all have to market a little bit. But and I can give you some ideas about some conferences to go, and Sebastian get you some face time with some of my colleagues or Julie.</li> <li>But so let's look at the continuum here.</li> <li>We've got private placements, we've got Reg A, which now has which has audited financial. So the quality of information there is better. So then we get to a stage at which we're talking about the small business filer and</li> </ul>

	Page 178		Page 180
1	boys. And so or big girls.	1	and all of a sudden they're going after bank money and
2	And it seems to me that and I made the point	2	they're saying we have to have a compilation. It just
3	last time that I would like to see more easier to do	3	changes their mentality. Oh, my gosh, we have to have a
4	public offerings. And if you can get your costs down,	4	review and now we have to have a journal of controls, and
5	your compliance costs down, then that is, that's a big	5	they haven't seen nothing yet, right.
6	step. I mean, it's a big step and keeping those	6	And then, oh, my gosh, you know, we're getting
7	compliance costs down is a big step toward making public	7	some outside money and they want an audited financial.
8	offerings more attractive. You know, costs, nobody I	8	Okay. And then, oh, my gosh, we all have to do filings.
9	doubt well, there's somewhere somebody hates having	9	Each one of those is a systematic increase that has
10	the 404(b) certification done, but if I'm a CEO I'm	10	value, because you can't expect somebody to go from here
11	delighted to have it done because it protects me that	11	to here overnight I don't care how much money you can
12	I've had it done. But, I mean, it becomes an item of	12	throw it at, right, because it's not just buying the new
13	cost and for a small company a cost item of \$100,000 is	13	people and the accounting company.
14	significant, just sticking with Brian's number.	14	So I think it's good that we have this staged
15	So it seems to me that if you want to pull	15	level. The questions becomes in between. You don't want
16	people out of the exempt transactions and maybe get them	16	to put the regulatory burden on them that crushes them
17	either directly through IPOs or through Reg A offerings	17	prematurely, but on the other hand they got to start
18	that you make these compliance costs as low as you can	18	doing their, you know, exercising their controls and
19	and expand the window, and then maybe even do some	19	starting to say, oh, what do you mean we have to have a
20	marketing on this. But that's my sense of it. I would	20	PO that we can't back date, right. Or, oh, I'll get you
21	say that I don't know what the incremental cost is to be	21	the documentation before year end, right, which is or
22	an accelerated filer. I don't have any idea if it's more	22	after year end but before the audit.
23	expensive or not.	23	So those kinds of things I think I know
24	But, you know, it seems counterintuitive that	24	people are going, oh, my gosh, but in reality when you're
25	you would be a small business filer yet you would be an	25	a privately held company and it's just yours it really
	Page 179		Page 181
1	accelerated filer. It seems like inconsistent thoughts,	1	doesn't matter as much as and people don't understand
2	accelerated filer. It seems like inconsistent thoughts, but I guess that's that's just me.	2	doesn't matter as much as and people don't understand that. People have been working there from the beginning
2 3	accelerated filer. It seems like inconsistent thoughts, but I guess that's that's just me. But anyway, those are my thoughts on that.	2 3	doesn't matter as much as and people don't understand that. People have been working there from the beginning maybe don't understand that.
2 3 4	accelerated filer. It seems like inconsistent thoughts, but I guess that's that's just me. But anyway, those are my thoughts on that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Patrick. Laura.	2 3 4	doesn't matter as much as and people don't understand that. People have been working there from the beginning maybe don't understand that. So I think it's good to have a staged
2 3 4 5	accelerated filer. It seems like inconsistent thoughts, but I guess that's that's just me. But anyway, those are my thoughts on that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Patrick. Laura. MS. YAMANAKA: One last comment I think, an	2 3 4 5	doesn't matter as much as – and people don't understand that. People have been working there from the beginning maybe don't understand that. So I think it's good to have a staged approached to the reporting. I think it's excellent. As
2 3 4 5 6	accelerated filer. It seems like inconsistent thoughts, but I guess that's that's just me. But anyway, those are my thoughts on that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Patrick. Laura. MS. YAMANAKA: One last comment I think, an observation. Nobody denies the value of an audit, right.	2 3 4 5 6	doesn't matter as much as – and people don't understand that. People have been working there from the beginning maybe don't understand that. So I think it's good to have a staged approached to the reporting. I think it's excellent. As far as where the cutoff comes, you know, I think it's a
2 3 4 5 6 7	accelerated filer. It seems like inconsistent thoughts, but I guess that's that's just me. But anyway, those are my thoughts on that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Patrick. Laura. MS. YAMANAKA: One last comment I think, an observation. Nobody denies the value of an audit, right. And when you look at a company that's publicly traded	2 3 4 5 6 7	doesn't matter as much as – and people don't understand that. People have been working there from the beginning maybe don't understand that. So I think it's good to have a staged approached to the reporting. I think it's excellent. As far as where the cutoff comes, you know, I think it's a little onerous. That could go either way.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	accelerated filer. It seems like inconsistent thoughts, but I guess that's that's just me. But anyway, those are my thoughts on that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Patrick. Laura. MS. YAMANAKA: One last comment I think, an observation. Nobody denies the value of an audit, right. And when you look at a company that's publicly traded and has the routine in process and procedure for an	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	doesn't matter as much as and people don't understand that. People have been working there from the beginning maybe don't understand that. So I think it's good to have a staged approached to the reporting. I think it's excellent. As far as where the cutoff comes, you know, I think it's a little onerous. That could go either way. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I think I understand what
2 3 4 5 6 7	accelerated filer. It seems like inconsistent thoughts, but I guess that's that's just me. But anyway, those are my thoughts on that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Patrick. Laura. MS. YAMANAKA: One last comment I think, an observation. Nobody denies the value of an audit, right. And when you look at a company that's publicly traded and has the routine in process and procedure for an audit, and then you look at the company first starting	2 3 4 5 6 7	doesn't matter as much as – and people don't understand that. People have been working there from the beginning maybe don't understand that. So I think it's good to have a staged approached to the reporting. I think it's excellent. As far as where the cutoff comes, you know, I think it's a little onerous. That could go either way. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I think I understand what you're saying, but bear I mind that just because you're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	accelerated filer. It seems like inconsistent thoughts, but I guess that's that's just me. But anyway, those are my thoughts on that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Patrick. Laura. MS. YAMANAKA: One last comment I think, an observation. Nobody denies the value of an audit, right. And when you look at a company that's publicly traded and has the routine in process and procedure for an audit, and then you look at the company first starting out, you know, they're a startup, they've got seven	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	doesn't matter as much as and people don't understand that. People have been working there from the beginning maybe don't understand that. So I think it's good to have a staged approached to the reporting. I think it's excellent. As far as where the cutoff comes, you know, I think it's a little onerous. That could go either way. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I think I understand what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	accelerated filer. It seems like inconsistent thoughts, but I guess that's that's just me. But anyway, those are my thoughts on that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Patrick. Laura. MS. YAMANAKA: One last comment I think, an observation. Nobody denies the value of an audit, right. And when you look at a company that's publicly traded and has the routine in process and procedure for an audit, and then you look at the company first starting out, you know, they're a startup, they've got seven people, processes and procedures between what's going to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	doesn't matter as much as – and people don't understand that. People have been working there from the beginning maybe don't understand that. So I think it's good to have a staged approached to the reporting. I think it's excellent. As far as where the cutoff comes, you know, I think it's a little onerous. That could go either way. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I think I understand what you're saying, but bear I mind that just because you're exempt from 404(b) doesn't mean that you aren't doing your audited financial statements.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	accelerated filer. It seems like inconsistent thoughts, but I guess that's that's just me. But anyway, those are my thoughts on that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Patrick. Laura. MS. YAMANAKA: One last comment I think, an observation. Nobody denies the value of an audit, right. And when you look at a company that's publicly traded and has the routine in process and procedure for an audit, and then you look at the company first starting out, you know, they're a startup, they've got seven	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	doesn't matter as much as – and people don't understand that. People have been working there from the beginning maybe don't understand that. So I think it's good to have a staged approached to the reporting. I think it's excellent. As far as where the cutoff comes, you know, I think it's a little onerous. That could go either way. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I think I understand what you're saying, but bear I mind that just because you're exempt from 404(b) doesn't mean that you aren't doing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	accelerated filer. It seems like inconsistent thoughts, but I guess that's that's just me. But anyway, those are my thoughts on that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Patrick. Laura. MS. YAMANAKA: One last comment I think, an observation. Nobody denies the value of an audit, right. And when you look at a company that's publicly traded and has the routine in process and procedure for an audit, and then you look at the company first starting out, you know, they're a startup, they've got seven people, processes and procedures between what's going to go start here and get here is huge and it doesn't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	doesn't matter as much as – and people don't understand that. People have been working there from the beginning maybe don't understand that. So I think it's good to have a staged approached to the reporting. I think it's excellent. As far as where the cutoff comes, you know, I think it's a little onerous. That could go either way. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I think I understand what you're saying, but bear I mind that just because you're exempt from 404(b) doesn't mean that you aren't doing your audited financial statements. MS. YAMANAKA: No, absolutely. Yeah,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	accelerated filer. It seems like inconsistent thoughts, but I guess that's that's just me. But anyway, those are my thoughts on that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Patrick. Laura. MS. YAMANAKA: One last comment I think, an observation. Nobody denies the value of an audit, right. And when you look at a company that's publicly traded and has the routine in process and procedure for an audit, and then you look at the company first starting out, you know, they're a startup, they've got seven people, processes and procedures between what's going to go start here and get here is huge and it doesn't happen overnight. They could triple, quadruple,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	doesn't matter as much as – and people don't understand that. People have been working there from the beginning maybe don't understand that. So I think it's good to have a staged approached to the reporting. I think it's excellent. As far as where the cutoff comes, you know, I think it's a little onerous. That could go either way. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I think I understand what you're saying, but bear I mind that just because you're exempt from 404(b) doesn't mean that you aren't doing your audited financial statements. MS. YAMANAKA: No, absolutely. Yeah, absolutely.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	accelerated filer. It seems like inconsistent thoughts, but I guess that's that's just me. But anyway, those are my thoughts on that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Patrick. Laura. MS. YAMANAKA: One last comment I think, an observation. Nobody denies the value of an audit, right. And when you look at a company that's publicly traded and has the routine in process and procedure for an audit, and then you look at the company first starting out, you know, they're a startup, they've got seven people, processes and procedures between what's going to go start here and get here is huge and it doesn't happen overnight. They could triple, quadruple, gazillion sales.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	doesn't matter as much as – and people don't understand that. People have been working there from the beginning maybe don't understand that. So I think it's good to have a staged approached to the reporting. I think it's excellent. As far as where the cutoff comes, you know, I think it's a little onerous. That could go either way. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I think I understand what you're saying, but bear I mind that just because you're exempt from 404(b) doesn't mean that you aren't doing your audited financial statements. MS. YAMANAKA: No, absolutely. Yeah, absolutely. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Any other comments?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	accelerated filer. It seems like inconsistent thoughts, but I guess that's that's just me. But anyway, those are my thoughts on that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Patrick. Laura. MS. YAMANAKA: One last comment I think, an observation. Nobody denies the value of an audit, right. And when you look at a company that's publicly traded and has the routine in process and procedure for an audit, and then you look at the company first starting out, you know, they're a startup, they've got seven people, processes and procedures between what's going to go start here and get here is huge and it doesn't happen overnight. They could triple, quadruple, gazillion sales. But that mentality of that company to get all	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	doesn't matter as much as – and people don't understand that. People have been working there from the beginning maybe don't understand that. So I think it's good to have a staged approached to the reporting. I think it's excellent. As far as where the cutoff comes, you know, I think it's a little onerous. That could go either way. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I think I understand what you're saying, but bear I mind that just because you're exempt from 404(b) doesn't mean that you aren't doing your audited financial statements. MS. YAMANAKA: No, absolutely. Yeah, absolutely. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Any other comments? CO-CHAIR HANKS: I have just a question. How
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	accelerated filer. It seems like inconsistent thoughts, but I guess that's that's just me. But anyway, those are my thoughts on that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Patrick. Laura. MS. YAMANAKA: One last comment I think, an observation. Nobody denies the value of an audit, right. And when you look at a company that's publicly traded and has the routine in process and procedure for an audit, and then you look at the company first starting out, you know, they're a startup, they've got seven people, processes and procedures between what's going to go start here and get here is huge and it doesn't happen overnight. They could triple, quadruple, gazillion sales. But that mentality of that company to get all the way through as far as the things you do when you've	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	doesn't matter as much as – and people don't understand that. People have been working there from the beginning maybe don't understand that. So I think it's good to have a staged approached to the reporting. I think it's excellent. As far as where the cutoff comes, you know, I think it's a little onerous. That could go either way. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I think I understand what you're saying, but bear I mind that just because you're exempt from 404(b) doesn't mean that you aren't doing your audited financial statements. MS. YAMANAKA: No, absolutely. Yeah, absolutely. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Any other comments? CO-CHAIR HANKS: I have just a question. How many different layers do we have now, different variations of reporting flavors? Because, you know, it's getting super confusing.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	accelerated filer. It seems like inconsistent thoughts, but I guess that's that's just me. But anyway, those are my thoughts on that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Patrick. Laura. MS. YAMANAKA: One last comment I think, an observation. Nobody denies the value of an audit, right. And when you look at a company that's publicly traded and has the routine in process and procedure for an audit, and then you look at the company first starting out, you know, they're a startup, they've got seven people, processes and procedures between what's going to go start here and get here is huge and it doesn't happen overnight. They could triple, quadruple, gazillion sales. But that mentality of that company to get all the way through as far as the things you do when you've got three people and you're signing your own checks still versus what you do when you're going to have to be an SEC, you know, publicly traded company is totally	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	doesn't matter as much as – and people don't understand that. People have been working there from the beginning maybe don't understand that. So I think it's good to have a staged approached to the reporting. I think it's excellent. As far as where the cutoff comes, you know, I think it's a little onerous. That could go either way. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I think I understand what you're saying, but bear I mind that just because you're exempt from 404(b) doesn't mean that you aren't doing your audited financial statements. MS. YAMANAKA: No, absolutely. Yeah, absolutely. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Any other comments? CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Any other comments? CO-CHAIR HANKS: I have just a question. How many different layers do we have now, different variations of reporting flavors? Because, you know, it's getting super confusing. MR. GOMEZ: So you have the large accelerated
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	accelerated filer. It seems like inconsistent thoughts, but I guess that's that's just me. But anyway, those are my thoughts on that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Patrick. Laura. MS. YAMANAKA: One last comment I think, an observation. Nobody denies the value of an audit, right. And when you look at a company that's publicly traded and has the routine in process and procedure for an audit, and then you look at the company first starting out, you know, they're a startup, they've got seven people, processes and procedures between what's going to go start here and get here is huge and it doesn't happen overnight. They could triple, quadruple, gazillion sales. But that mentality of that company to get all the way through as far as the things you do when you've got three people and you're signing your own checks still versus what you do when you're going to have to be an SEC, you know, publicly traded company is totally different.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	doesn't matter as much as – and people don't understand that. People have been working there from the beginning maybe don't understand that. So I think it's good to have a staged approached to the reporting. I think it's excellent. As far as where the cutoff comes, you know, I think it's a little onerous. That could go either way. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I think I understand what you're saying, but bear I mind that just because you're exempt from 404(b) doesn't mean that you aren't doing your audited financial statements. MS. YAMANAKA: No, absolutely. Yeah, absolutely. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Any other comments? CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Any other comments? CO-CHAIR HANKS: I have just a question. How many different layers do we have now, different variations of reporting flavors? Because, you know, it's getting super confusing. MR. GOMEZ: So you have the large accelerated filers, the accelerated filers, and in essence everyone
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	accelerated filer. It seems like inconsistent thoughts, but I guess that's that's just me. But anyway, those are my thoughts on that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Patrick. Laura. MS. YAMANAKA: One last comment I think, an observation. Nobody denies the value of an audit, right. And when you look at a company that's publicly traded and has the routine in process and procedure for an audit, and then you look at the company first starting out, you know, they're a startup, they've got seven people, processes and procedures between what's going to go start here and get here is huge and it doesn't happen overnight. They could triple, quadruple, gazillion sales. But that mentality of that company to get all the way through as far as the things you do when you've got three people and you're signing your own checks still versus what you do when you're going to have to be an SEC, you know, publicly traded company is totally different. So it's partly it's partially the cost of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	doesn't matter as much as – and people don't understand that. People have been working there from the beginning maybe don't understand that. So I think it's good to have a staged approached to the reporting. I think it's excellent. As far as where the cutoff comes, you know, I think it's a little onerous. That could go either way. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I think I understand what you're saying, but bear I mind that just because you're exempt from 404(b) doesn't mean that you aren't doing your audited financial statements. MS. YAMANAKA: No, absolutely. Yeah, absolutely. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Any other comments? CO-CHAIR HANKS: I have just a question. How many different layers do we have now, different variations of reporting flavors? Because, you know, it's getting super confusing. MR. GOMEZ: So you have the large accelerated filers, the accelerated filers, and in essence everyone below that it's not defined, but everyone who is not an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	accelerated filer. It seems like inconsistent thoughts, but I guess that's that's just me. But anyway, those are my thoughts on that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Patrick. Laura. MS. YAMANAKA: One last comment I think, an observation. Nobody denies the value of an audit, right. And when you look at a company that's publicly traded and has the routine in process and procedure for an audit, and then you look at the company first starting out, you know, they're a startup, they've got seven people, processes and procedures between what's going to go start here and get here is huge and it doesn't happen overnight. They could triple, quadruple, gazillion sales. But that mentality of that company to get all the way through as far as the things you do when you've got three people and you're signing your own checks still versus what you do when you're going to have to be an SEC, you know, publicly traded company is totally different. So it's partly it's partially the cost of the CPA, but to me it's more the cost of the company	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	doesn't matter as much as – and people don't understand that. People have been working there from the beginning maybe don't understand that. So I think it's good to have a staged approached to the reporting. I think it's excellent. As far as where the cutoff comes, you know, I think it's a little onerous. That could go either way. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I think I understand what you're saying, but bear I mind that just because you're exempt from 404(b) doesn't mean that you aren't doing your audited financial statements. MS. YAMANAKA: No, absolutely. Yeah, absolutely. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Any other comments? CO-CHAIR HANKS: I have just a question. How many different layers do we have now, different variations of reporting flavors? Because, you know, it's getting super confusing. MR. GOMEZ: So you have the large accelerated filers, the accelerated filers, and in essence everyone below that it's not defined, but everyone who is not an accelerated filer. That in many ways primarily goes to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	accelerated filer. It seems like inconsistent thoughts, but I guess that's that's just me. But anyway, those are my thoughts on that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Patrick. Laura. MS. YAMANAKA: One last comment I think, an observation. Nobody denies the value of an audit, right. And when you look at a company that's publicly traded and has the routine in process and procedure for an audit, and then you look at the company first starting out, you know, they're a startup, they've got seven people, processes and procedures between what's going to go start here and get here is huge and it doesn't happen overnight. They could triple, quadruple, gazillion sales. But that mentality of that company to get all the way through as far as the things you do when you've got three people and you're signing your own checks still versus what you do when you're going to have to be an SEC, you know, publicly traded company is totally different. So it's partly it's partially the cost of the CPA, but to me it's more the cost of the company culture in which you're building. And so whether and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	doesn't matter as much as – and people don't understand that. People have been working there from the beginning maybe don't understand that. So I think it's good to have a staged approached to the reporting. I think it's excellent. As far as where the cutoff comes, you know, I think it's a little onerous. That could go either way. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I think I understand what you're saying, but bear I mind that just because you're exempt from 404(b) doesn't mean that you aren't doing your audited financial statements. MS. YAMANAKA: No, absolutely. Yeah, absolutely. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Any other comments? CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Any other comments? CO-CHAIR HANKS: I have just a question. How many different layers do we have now, different variations of reporting flavors? Because, you know, it's getting super confusing. MR. GOMEZ: So you have the large accelerated filers, the accelerated filers, and in essence everyone below that it's not defined, but everyone who is not an accelerated filer. That in many ways primarily goes to when your reports are due and whether 404(b) auditor
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	accelerated filer. It seems like inconsistent thoughts, but I guess that's that's just me. But anyway, those are my thoughts on that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Patrick. Laura. MS. YAMANAKA: One last comment I think, an observation. Nobody denies the value of an audit, right. And when you look at a company that's publicly traded and has the routine in process and procedure for an audit, and then you look at the company first starting out, you know, they're a startup, they've got seven people, processes and procedures between what's going to go start here and get here is huge and it doesn't happen overnight. They could triple, quadruple, gazillion sales. But that mentality of that company to get all the way through as far as the things you do when you've got three people and you're signing your own checks still versus what you do when you're going to have to be an SEC, you know, publicly traded company is totally different. So it's partly it's partially the cost of the CPA, but to me it's more the cost of the company culture in which you're building. And so whether and it's painful, I know it's really painful, but we take	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	doesn't matter as much as – and people don't understand that. People have been working there from the beginning maybe don't understand that. So I think it's good to have a staged approached to the reporting. I think it's excellent. As far as where the cutoff comes, you know, I think it's a little onerous. That could go either way. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I think I understand what you're saying, but bear I mind that just because you're exempt from 404(b) doesn't mean that you aren't doing your audited financial statements. MS. YAMANAKA: No, absolutely. Yeah, absolutely. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Any other comments? CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Any other comments? CO-CHAIR HANKS: I have just a question. How many different layers do we have now, different variations of reporting flavors? Because, you know, it's getting super confusing. MR. GOMEZ: So you have the large accelerated filers, the accelerated filers, and in essence everyone below that it's not defined, but everyone who is not an accelerated filer. That in many ways primarily goes to when your reports are due and whether 404(b) auditor attestation is required or not.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	accelerated filer. It seems like inconsistent thoughts, but I guess that's that's just me. But anyway, those are my thoughts on that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Thank you, Patrick. Laura. MS. YAMANAKA: One last comment I think, an observation. Nobody denies the value of an audit, right. And when you look at a company that's publicly traded and has the routine in process and procedure for an audit, and then you look at the company first starting out, you know, they're a startup, they've got seven people, processes and procedures between what's going to go start here and get here is huge and it doesn't happen overnight. They could triple, quadruple, gazillion sales. But that mentality of that company to get all the way through as far as the things you do when you've got three people and you're signing your own checks still versus what you do when you're going to have to be an SEC, you know, publicly traded company is totally different. So it's partly it's partially the cost of the CPA, but to me it's more the cost of the company culture in which you're building. And so whether and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	doesn't matter as much as – and people don't understand that. People have been working there from the beginning maybe don't understand that. So I think it's good to have a staged approached to the reporting. I think it's excellent. As far as where the cutoff comes, you know, I think it's a little onerous. That could go either way. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I think I understand what you're saying, but bear I mind that just because you're exempt from 404(b) doesn't mean that you aren't doing your audited financial statements. MS. YAMANAKA: No, absolutely. Yeah, absolutely. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Any other comments? CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Any other comments? CO-CHAIR HANKS: I have just a question. How many different layers do we have now, different variations of reporting flavors? Because, you know, it's getting super confusing. MR. GOMEZ: So you have the large accelerated filers, the accelerated filers, and in essence everyone below that it's not defined, but everyone who is not an accelerated filer. That in many ways primarily goes to when your reports are due and whether 404(b) auditor

Page	184

	1490 102		
1	goes to what disclosure accommodations you have. And now	1	So we do have a document on the small business
2	you also have the emerging growth companies that applies	2	page. If the committee decides to take outreach we can
3	to companies from their time or their initial public	3	look at that and you guys can tell us how legalese it is,
4	offering and it has a number of requirements as to when	4	and then I encourage you to provide feedback as to how we
5	that phases out. It could be because of growth of the	5	can make it more readable.
6	company, it could be because of the amount of time the	6	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. Well, thank you all.
7	company has been public. So I don't think I missed	7	I think as far as comments to this particular proposal we
8	MS. REISCHAUER: I think that's it. Julie just	8	should kind of keep them keep thinking about this, and
9	reminded me there's, for visual, folks, there's actually	9	I think Amy will be receptive to your individual comments
10	a chart in the April 2016 concept release that maps out	10	and will consider whether it makes sense for something to
11	the various buckets, if that helps.	11	come from the committee as a whole.
12	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay.	12	The recommendation that we adopted this morning
13	MR. NELSON: I was actually going to suggest a	13	is good to go. Does so everyone take one last look at
14	blog post where it's explained like I'm nine years old.	14	the new language.
15	And this is one of the things, exercises that we actually	15	And our next meeting we're thinking of October
16	take our CEOs through is when they're actually doing	16	5. Does that work in terms of okay, right at least
17	marketing is if you as a CEO can't really explain your	17	tentatively put down October 5 for the next meeting.
18	idea and your product to a nine year old and get them	18	So the new language is paragraph 3. If you
19	excited about it chances are you're probably not going to	19	could take a quick look at that.
20	raise money. Because the people just need to understand	20	(Draft document distributed.)
21	what you're doing in plain English.	21	CO-CHAIR HANKS: Is that a could or a would?
22	I think I'm fairly intelligent. I still kind	22	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Would.
23	of struggle to keep up with some of you guys who are in	23	CO-CHAIR HANKS: That's would
24	this from day-to-day. I would love it explained like I'm	24	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Would. Okay, Sara changed
25	nine years old kind of, you know, the exemptions for Reg	25	could in the last line to would. Any other wordsmithing?
		L	
	Page 183		Page 185
1	Page 183 D, the, you know, A+ small reporting company and that	1	Page 185 MR. AGUILAR: What's the Series 82? I'm not
1 2		1 2	
	D, the, you know, A+ small reporting company and that		MR. AGUILAR: What's the Series 82? I'm not
2	D, the, you know, A+ small reporting company and that sort of stuff just so I can see the smorgasbord of	2	MR. AGUILAR: What's the Series 82? I'm not familiar with that.
2 3	D, the, you know, A+ small reporting company and that sort of stuff just so I can see the smorgasbord of options available to me as an entrepreneur of how to	2 3	MR. AGUILAR: What's the Series 82? I'm not familiar with that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Series 82 anyone? It was one
2 3 4	D, the, you know, A+ small reporting company and that sort of stuff just so I can see the smorgasbord of options available to me as an entrepreneur of how to actually raise money and what I have to do to raise that	2 3 4	MR. AGUILAR: What's the Series 82? I'm not familiar with that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Series 82 anyone? It was one of the one of the tests mentioned in the proposal.
2 3 4 5	D, the, you know, A+ small reporting company and that sort of stuff just so I can see the smorgasbord of options available to me as an entrepreneur of how to actually raise money and what I have to do to raise that money. If that exists I would please someone point me	2 3 4 5	MR. AGUILAR: What's the Series 82? I'm not familiar with that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Series 82 anyone? It was one of the one of the tests mentioned in the proposal. A PARTICIPANT: 82 is what's listed I mean,
2 3 4 5 6	D, the, you know, A+ small reporting company and that sort of stuff just so I can see the smorgasbord of options available to me as an entrepreneur of how to actually raise money and what I have to do to raise that money. If that exists I would please someone point me to it.	2 3 4 5 6	MR. AGUILAR: What's the Series 82? I'm not familiar with that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Series 82 anyone? It was one of the one of the tests mentioned in the proposal. A PARTICIPANT: 82 is what's listed I mean, what is in the steps on page 95.
2 3 4 5 6 7	D, the, you know, A+ small reporting company and that sort of stuff just so I can see the smorgasbord of options available to me as an entrepreneur of how to actually raise money and what I have to do to raise that money. If that exists I would please someone point me to it. CO-CHAIR HANKS: I'm trying to find that.	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. AGUILAR: What's the Series 82? I'm not familiar with that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Series 82 anyone? It was one of the one of the tests mentioned in the proposal. A PARTICIPANT: 82 is what's listed I mean, what is in the steps on page 95. A PARTICIPANT: Just make sure that you use
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	D, the, you know, A+ small reporting company and that sort of stuff just so I can see the smorgasbord of options available to me as an entrepreneur of how to actually raise money and what I have to do to raise that money. If that exists I would please someone point me to it. CO-CHAIR HANKS: I'm trying to find that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: If there was one I think this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. AGUILAR: What's the Series 82? I'm not familiar with that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Series 82 anyone? It was one of the one of the tests mentioned in the proposal. A PARTICIPANT: 82 is what's listed I mean, what is in the steps on page 95. A PARTICIPANT: Just make sure that you use the mike.
2 3 5 6 7 8 9	D, the, you know, A+ small reporting company and that sort of stuff just so I can see the smorgasbord of options available to me as an entrepreneur of how to actually raise money and what I have to do to raise that money. If that exists I would please someone point me to it. CO-CHAIR HANKS: I'm trying to find that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: If there was one I think this relates to our outreach. If there isn't one we can	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. AGUILAR: What's the Series 82? I'm not familiar with that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Series 82 anyone? It was one of the one of the tests mentioned in the proposal. A PARTICIPANT: 82 is what's listed I mean, what is in the steps on page 95. A PARTICIPANT: Just make sure that you use the mike. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm seeing 7, I'm seeing 7
2 3 6 7 8 9 10	D, the, you know, A+ small reporting company and that sort of stuff just so I can see the smorgasbord of options available to me as an entrepreneur of how to actually raise money and what I have to do to raise that money. If that exists I would please someone point me to it. CO-CHAIR HANKS: I'm trying to find that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: If there was one I think this relates to our outreach. If there isn't one we can certainly do one. And of course every prospectus we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. AGUILAR: What's the Series 82? I'm not familiar with that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Series 82 anyone? It was one of the one of the tests mentioned in the proposal. A PARTICIPANT: 82 is what's listed I mean, what is in the steps on page 95. A PARTICIPANT: Just make sure that you use the mike. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm seeing 7, I'm seeing 7 and 82 and 96. 95 as well. I'm not seeing where 65 is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	D, the, you know, A+ small reporting company and that sort of stuff just so I can see the smorgasbord of options available to me as an entrepreneur of how to actually raise money and what I have to do to raise that money. If that exists I would please someone point me to it. CO-CHAIR HANKS: I'm trying to find that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: If there was one I think this relates to our outreach. If there isn't one we can certainly do one. And of course every prospectus we draft we draft that with that in mind.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. AGUILAR: What's the Series 82? I'm not familiar with that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Series 82 anyone? It was one of the one of the tests mentioned in the proposal. A PARTICIPANT: 82 is what's listed I mean, what is in the steps on page 95. A PARTICIPANT: Just make sure that you use the mike. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm seeing 7, I'm seeing 7 and 82 and 96. 95 as well. I'm not seeing where 65 is mentioned.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	D, the, you know, A+ small reporting company and that sort of stuff just so I can see the smorgasbord of options available to me as an entrepreneur of how to actually raise money and what I have to do to raise that money. If that exists I would please someone point me to it. CO-CHAIR HANKS: I'm trying to find that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: If there was one I think this relates to our outreach. If there isn't one we can certainly do one. And of course every prospectus we draft we draft that with that in mind. (Laughter.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. AGUILAR: What's the Series 82? I'm not familiar with that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Series 82 anyone? It was one of the one of the tests mentioned in the proposal. A PARTICIPANT: 82 is what's listed I mean, what is in the steps on page 95. A PARTICIPANT: Just make sure that you use the mike. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm seeing 7, I'm seeing 7 and 82 and 96. 95 as well. I'm not seeing where 65 is mentioned. MS. TIERNEY: It was a combination of two other
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	D, the, you know, A+ small reporting company and that sort of stuff just so I can see the smorgasbord of options available to me as an entrepreneur of how to actually raise money and what I have to do to raise that money. If that exists I would please someone point me to it. CO-CHAIR HANKS: I'm trying to find that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: If there was one I think this relates to our outreach. If there isn't one we can certainly do one. And of course every prospectus we draft we draft that with that in mind. (Laughter.) MR. GOMEZ: There is there is a document on the small business page that describes the different capital the different exemptions that are available.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. AGUILAR: What's the Series 82? I'm not familiar with that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Series 82 anyone? It was one of the one of the tests mentioned in the proposal. A PARTICIPANT: 82 is what's listed I mean, what is in the steps on page 95. A PARTICIPANT: Just make sure that you use the mike. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm seeing 7, I'm seeing 7 and 82 and 96. 95 as well. I'm not seeing where 65 is mentioned. MS. TIERNEY: It was a combination of two other exams. Wasn't is 63 and something else, wasn't it?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	D, the, you know, A+ small reporting company and that sort of stuff just so I can see the smorgasbord of options available to me as an entrepreneur of how to actually raise money and what I have to do to raise that money. If that exists I would please someone point me to it. CO-CHAIR HANKS: I'm trying to find that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: If there was one I think this relates to our outreach. If there isn't one we can certainly do one. And of course every prospectus we draft we draft that with that in mind. (Laughter.) MR. GOMEZ: There is there is a document on the small business page that describes the different	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. AGUILAR: What's the Series 82? I'm not familiar with that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Series 82 anyone? It was one of the one of the tests mentioned in the proposal. A PARTICIPANT: 82 is what's listed I mean, what is in the steps on page 95. A PARTICIPANT: Just make sure that you use the mike. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm seeing 7, I'm seeing 7 and 82 and 96. 95 as well. I'm not seeing where 65 is mentioned. MS. TIERNEY: It was a combination of two other exams. Wasn't is 63 and something else, wasn't it? MR. AGUILAR: Yeah, the 65 is the registered
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	D, the, you know, A+ small reporting company and that sort of stuff just so I can see the smorgasbord of options available to me as an entrepreneur of how to actually raise money and what I have to do to raise that money. If that exists I would please someone point me to it. CO-CHAIR HANKS: I'm trying to find that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: If there was one I think this relates to our outreach. If there isn't one we can certainly do one. And of course every prospectus we draft we draft that with that in mind. (Laughter.) MR. GOMEZ: There is there is a document on the small business page that describes the different capital the different exemptions that are available.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. AGUILAR: What's the Series 82? I'm not familiar with that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Series 82 anyone? It was one of the one of the tests mentioned in the proposal. A PARTICIPANT: 82 is what's listed I mean, what is in the steps on page 95. A PARTICIPANT: Just make sure that you use the mike. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm seeing 7, I'm seeing 7 and 82 and 96. 95 as well. I'm not seeing where 65 is mentioned. MS. TIERNEY: It was a combination of two other exams. Wasn't is 63 and something else, wasn't it? MR. AGUILAR: Yeah, the 65 is the registered investment advisor exam.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	D, the, you know, A+ small reporting company and that sort of stuff just so I can see the smorgasbord of options available to me as an entrepreneur of how to actually raise money and what I have to do to raise that money. If that exists I would please someone point me to it. CO-CHAIR HANKS: I'm trying to find that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: If there was one I think this relates to our outreach. If there isn't one we can certainly do one. And of course every prospectus we draft we draft that with that in mind. (Laughter.) MR. GOMEZ: There is there is a document on the small business page that describes the different capital the different exemptions that are available. I wonder whether my six year old daughter that would be able to hold her interests. I think John, you make a good point. I mean,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. AGUILAR: What's the Series 82? I'm not familiar with that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Series 82 anyone? It was one of the one of the tests mentioned in the proposal. A PARTICIPANT: 82 is what's listed I mean, what is in the steps on page 95. A PARTICIPANT: Just make sure that you use the mike. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm seeing 7, I'm seeing 7 and 82 and 96. 95 as well. I'm not seeing where 65 is mentioned. MS. TIERNEY: It was a combination of two other exams. Wasn't is 63 and something else, wasn't it? MR. AGUILAR: Yeah, the 65 is the registered investment advisor exam. CO-CHAIR HANKS: It's appropriate. I have that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	D, the, you know, A+ small reporting company and that sort of stuff just so I can see the smorgasbord of options available to me as an entrepreneur of how to actually raise money and what I have to do to raise that money. If that exists I would please someone point me to it. CO-CHAIR HANKS: I'm trying to find that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: If there was one I think this relates to our outreach. If there isn't one we can certainly do one. And of course every prospectus we draft we draft that with that in mind. (Laughter.) MR. GOMEZ: There is there is a document on the small business page that describes the different capital the different exemptions that are available. I wonder whether my six year old daughter that would be able to hold her interests. I think John, you make a good point. I mean, often we live in this area and for us 506(b) versus (c)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. AGUILAR: What's the Series 82? I'm not familiar with that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Series 82 anyone? It was one of the one of the tests mentioned in the proposal. A PARTICIPANT: 82 is what's listed I mean, what is in the steps on page 95. A PARTICIPANT: Just make sure that you use the mike. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm seeing 7, I'm seeing 7 and 82 and 96. 95 as well. I'm not seeing where 65 is mentioned. MS. TIERNEY: It was a combination of two other exams. Wasn't is 63 and something else, wasn't it? MR. AGUILAR: Yeah, the 65 is the registered investment advisor exam. CO-CHAIR HANKS: It's appropriate. I have that one. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. MS. TIERNEY: If Sara has it we're good.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	D, the, you know, A+ small reporting company and that sort of stuff just so I can see the smorgasbord of options available to me as an entrepreneur of how to actually raise money and what I have to do to raise that money. If that exists I would please someone point me to it. CO-CHAIR HANKS: I'm trying to find that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: If there was one I think this relates to our outreach. If there isn't one we can certainly do one. And of course every prospectus we draft we draft that with that in mind. (Laughter.) MR. GOMEZ: There is there is a document on the small business page that describes the different capital the different exemptions that are available. I wonder whether my six year old daughter that would be able to hold her interests. I think John, you make a good point. I mean, often we live in this area and for us 506(b) versus (c) versus Reg A, it all makes sense. But when I got to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. AGUILAR: What's the Series 82? I'm not familiar with that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Series 82 anyone? It was one of the one of the tests mentioned in the proposal. A PARTICIPANT: 82 is what's listed I mean, what is in the steps on page 95. A PARTICIPANT: Just make sure that you use the mike. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm seeing 7, I'm seeing 7 and 82 and 96. 95 as well. I'm not seeing where 65 is mentioned. MS. TIERNEY: It was a combination of two other exams. Wasn't is 63 and something else, wasn't it? MR. AGUILAR: Yeah, the 65 is the registered investment advisor exam. CO-CHAIR HANKS: It's appropriate. I have that one. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. MS. TIERNEY: If Sara has it we're good. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. Well, we'll make sure
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	D, the, you know, A+ small reporting company and that sort of stuff just so I can see the smorgasbord of options available to me as an entrepreneur of how to actually raise money and what I have to do to raise that money. If that exists I would please someone point me to it. CO-CHAIR HANKS: I'm trying to find that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: If there was one I think this relates to our outreach. If there isn't one we can certainly do one. And of course every prospectus we draft we draft that with that in mind. (Laughter.) MR. GOMEZ: There is there is a document on the small business page that describes the different capital the different exemptions that are available. I wonder whether my six year old daughter that would be able to hold her interests. I think John, you make a good point. I mean, often we live in this area and for us 506(b) versus (c) versus Reg A, it all makes sense. But when I got to events to talk about the different capital raising	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>MR. AGUILAR: What's the Series 82? I'm not familiar with that.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Series 82 anyone? It was one of the one of the tests mentioned in the proposal.</li> <li>A PARTICIPANT: 82 is what's listed I mean, what is in the steps on page 95.</li> <li>A PARTICIPANT: Just make sure that you use the mike.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm seeing 7, I'm seeing 7 and 82 and 96. 95 as well. I'm not seeing where 65 is mentioned.</li> <li>MS. TIERNEY: It was a combination of two other exams. Wasn't is 63 and something else, wasn't it?</li> <li>MR. AGUILAR: Yeah, the 65 is the registered investment advisor exam.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay.</li> <li>MS. TIERNEY: If Sara has it we're good.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. Well, we'll make sure that's right.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	D, the, you know, A+ small reporting company and that sort of stuff just so I can see the smorgasbord of options available to me as an entrepreneur of how to actually raise money and what I have to do to raise that money. If that exists I would please someone point me to it. CO-CHAIR HANKS: I'm trying to find that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: If there was one I think this relates to our outreach. If there isn't one we can certainly do one. And of course every prospectus we draft we draft that with that in mind. (Laughter.) MR. GOMEZ: There is there is a document on the small business page that describes the different capital the different exemptions that are available. I wonder whether my six year old daughter that would be able to hold her interests. I think John, you make a good point. I mean, often we live in this area and for us 506(b) versus (c) versus Reg A, it all makes sense. But when I got to events to talk about the different capital raising options you do realize at that point that we may not be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. AGUILAR: What's the Series 82? I'm not familiar with that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Series 82 anyone? It was one of the one of the tests mentioned in the proposal. A PARTICIPANT: 82 is what's listed I mean, what is in the steps on page 95. A PARTICIPANT: Just make sure that you use the mike. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm seeing 7, I'm seeing 7 and 82 and 96. 95 as well. I'm not seeing where 65 is mentioned. MS. TIERNEY: It was a combination of two other exams. Wasn't is 63 and something else, wasn't it? MR. AGUILAR: Yeah, the 65 is the registered investment advisor exam. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. MS. TIERNEY: If Sara has it we're good. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. MS. TIERNEY: If Sara has it we're good. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. Well, we'll make sure that's right. MR. GOMEZ: We put it up on the screen, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	D, the, you know, A+ small reporting company and that sort of stuff just so I can see the smorgasbord of options available to me as an entrepreneur of how to actually raise money and what I have to do to raise that money. If that exists I would please someone point me to it. CO-CHAIR HANKS: I'm trying to find that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: If there was one I think this relates to our outreach. If there isn't one we can certainly do one. And of course every prospectus we draft we draft that with that in mind. (Laughter.) MR. GOMEZ: There is there is a document on the small business page that describes the different capital the different exemptions that are available. I wonder whether my six year old daughter that would be able to hold her interests. I think John, you make a good point. I mean, often we live in this area and for us 506(b) versus (c) versus Reg A, it all makes sense. But when I got to events to talk about the different capital raising options you do realize at that point that we may not be the example for what's typical out there. People who are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>MR. AGUILAR: What's the Series 82? I'm not familiar with that.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Series 82 anyone? It was one of the one of the tests mentioned in the proposal.</li> <li>A PARTICIPANT: 82 is what's listed I mean, what is in the steps on page 95.</li> <li>A PARTICIPANT: Just make sure that you use the mike.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm seeing 7, I'm seeing 7 and 82 and 96. 95 as well. I'm not seeing where 65 is mentioned.</li> <li>MS. TIERNEY: It was a combination of two other exams. Wasn't is 63 and something else, wasn't it?</li> <li>MR. AGUILAR: Yeah, the 65 is the registered investment advisor exam.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay.</li> <li>MS. TIERNEY: If Sara has it we're good.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. Well, we'll make sure that's right.</li> <li>MR. GOMEZ: We put it up on the screen, the description of the Series 82.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	D, the, you know, A+ small reporting company and that sort of stuff just so I can see the smorgasbord of options available to me as an entrepreneur of how to actually raise money and what I have to do to raise that money. If that exists I would please someone point me to it. CO-CHAIR HANKS: I'm trying to find that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: If there was one I think this relates to our outreach. If there isn't one we can certainly do one. And of course every prospectus we draft we draft that with that in mind. (Laughter.) MR. GOMEZ: There is there is a document on the small business page that describes the different capital the different exemptions that are available. I wonder whether my six year old daughter that would be able to hold her interests. I think John, you make a good point. I mean, often we live in this area and for us 506(b) versus (c) versus Reg A, it all makes sense. But when I got to events to talk about the different capital raising options you do realize at that point that we may not be the example for what's typical out there. People who are very good at making widgets, but they don't know the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>MR. AGUILAR: What's the Series 82? I'm not familiar with that.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Series 82 anyone? It was one of the one of the tests mentioned in the proposal.</li> <li>A PARTICIPANT: 82 is what's listed I mean, what is in the steps on page 95.</li> <li>A PARTICIPANT: Just make sure that you use the mike.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm seeing 7, I'm seeing 7 and 82 and 96. 95 as well. I'm not seeing where 65 is mentioned.</li> <li>MS. TIERNEY: It was a combination of two other exams. Wasn't is 63 and something else, wasn't it?</li> <li>MR. AGUILAR: Yeah, the 65 is the registered investment advisor exam.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay.</li> <li>MS. TIERNEY: If Sara has it we're good.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. Well, we'll make sure that's right.</li> <li>MR. GOMEZ: We put it up on the screen, the description of the Series 82.</li> <li>MR. AGUILAR: Yeah, it looks like it's a</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	D, the, you know, A+ small reporting company and that sort of stuff just so I can see the smorgasbord of options available to me as an entrepreneur of how to actually raise money and what I have to do to raise that money. If that exists I would please someone point me to it. CO-CHAIR HANKS: I'm trying to find that. CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: If there was one I think this relates to our outreach. If there isn't one we can certainly do one. And of course every prospectus we draft we draft that with that in mind. (Laughter.) MR. GOMEZ: There is there is a document on the small business page that describes the different capital the different exemptions that are available. I wonder whether my six year old daughter that would be able to hold her interests. I think John, you make a good point. I mean, often we live in this area and for us 506(b) versus (c) versus Reg A, it all makes sense. But when I got to events to talk about the different capital raising options you do realize at that point that we may not be the example for what's typical out there. People who are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>MR. AGUILAR: What's the Series 82? I'm not familiar with that.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Series 82 anyone? It was one of the one of the tests mentioned in the proposal.</li> <li>A PARTICIPANT: 82 is what's listed I mean, what is in the steps on page 95.</li> <li>A PARTICIPANT: Just make sure that you use the mike.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: I'm seeing 7, I'm seeing 7 and 82 and 96. 95 as well. I'm not seeing where 65 is mentioned.</li> <li>MS. TIERNEY: It was a combination of two other exams. Wasn't is 63 and something else, wasn't it?</li> <li>MR. AGUILAR: Yeah, the 65 is the registered investment advisor exam.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay.</li> <li>MS. TIERNEY: If Sara has it we're good.</li> <li>CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. Well, we'll make sure that's right.</li> <li>MR. GOMEZ: We put it up on the screen, the description of the Series 82.</li> </ul>

	Page 186		Page 188
1	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. Thanks. Is that your	1	PROOFREADER'S CERTIFICATE
2	app? You just find everything instantly on it like that?	2	
3	MR. GOMEZ: Julie does.	3	In The Matter of: ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON SMALL
4	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Oh, okay. So she's your app?	4	AND EMERGING COMPANIES MEETING
5	Okay.	5	File Number: OS-0719
6	Okay, any other changes? Okay, then I'll	6	Date: July 19, 2016
7	entertain a motion to adjourn. No one	7	Location: Washington, D.C.
8	MS. MOTT: Before we do, please.	8	
9	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Yes.	9	This is to certify that I, Nicholas Wagner,
10	MS. MOTT: One thing. I know that recently in	10	(the undersigned), do hereby swear and affirm that the
11	May the tick mark pilot started. I wondered if we could	11	attached proceedings before the U.S. Securities and
12	get an update on that study, right. Didn't that pilot	12	Exchange Commission were held according to the record and
13	study start in May? Right?	13	that this is the original, complete, true and accurate
14	MR. GOMEZ: Not my area, but I'm happy to	14	transcript that has been compared to the reporting or
15	follow up with the appropriate people.	15	recording accomplished at the hearing.
16	COMMISSIONER STEIN: Trading and markets kind	16	
17	of	17	
18	MS. MOTT: Yeah, I think we	18	(Proofreader's Name) (Date)
19	COMMISSIONER STEIN maybe have them come	19	
20	brief you.	20	
21	MR. GOMEZ: I would be happy to.	21	
22	MS. MOTT: Because that was something we took	22	
23	up, I think the first group took up the first time.	23	
24	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: It's on the list.	24	
25	MR. YADLEY: I also ask that you confirm the	25	
	Page 187		
1	October 5th date as soon it is finalized. We should at		
2	least make sure that's okay with everybody here. And I		
3	guess our next meeting would then be in January? I know		
4	advance planning is hard, but the earlier the better.		
5	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: You remind me of my wife who		
6	starts talking about dinner halfway through lunch.		
7	MR. YADLEY: And your point is?		
8	(Laughter.)		
9	CO-CHAIR GRAHAM: Okay. If nothing else,		
10	meeting adjourned.		
11	(Whereupon, at 3:16 p.m., the meeting was		
12	adjourned.)		
13	* * * *		
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

	156:2,10	17.16 18 22	116:14 171:23	130.2 10 16
A	178:22 179:1	17:16,18,22		130:2,10,16 advise 33:18
<b>A's</b> 113:16 122:7		18:1,5,9,12	171:25	
124:4,25	181:19,20,22	23:14,24 24:9	added 76:18	50:2,4 118:10
128:20	accelerator 28:5	28:4,14 31:23	159:12 171:10	advising 129:1
<b>a-n-d</b> 72:19	34:17	37:6 47:1	172:4	advisor 22:13
<b>a.m</b> 1:15 76:23	accelerators	54:19 92:13	<b>adding</b> 23:23	55:20 118:9
111:10	29:1 34:16,18	102:15,20	26:3,14	185:15
abandoning	34:22	103:3 145:16	addition 21:8	advisors 33:7
75:13	accept 105:13	accretive 21:12	37:8 61:6 63:2	50:1 91:20
aberration	accepted 39:8	99:5 144:11	90:24 156:4	126:5
51:24	accepting 126:2	174:8	additional 23:23	<b>advisory</b> 1:6 4:5
ability 9:25	127:9	accumulate	25:1 27:5,6	9:6 150:11
14:17,18 37:9	access 24:24	29:18 47:23	28:23 35:16	188:3
37:18 59:14	25:1 43:17	<b>accurate</b> 188:13	41:21 56:17	advocate 109:7
148:10 161:6	59:13 85:14	<b>achieve</b> 105:5	109:4 118:19	aerodynamics
162:15 164:1	132:25 133:2	119:11 141:6	125:5 130:21	70:8
<b>able</b> 9:15 10:12	174:13	achieved 34:6	133:1,17,22	affiliates 152:25
24:22 29:16	accessible 21:5	acquired 81:5	163:12 165:2	153:1
36:13 38:16	accessories	acquisition	169:14 170:20	<b>affinity</b> 109:13
45:25 73:24	78:14	128:6,12	<b>address</b> 65:15	109:24,25
87:12,14 90:9	accommodate	<b>acres</b> 81:6	160:7	110:4
91:7 101:2	116:12	act 5:2 111:1	addresses 24:21	<b>affirm</b> 188:10
108:7,17	accommodating	117:3 119:24	111:3	afford 71:17
121:22 122:20	106:4	128:23,25	addressing 88:8	83:17
126:18 127:18	accommodati	131:4 132:16	109:14	afield 148:22
128:3,12	10:13 151:7	132:23,23	<b>adds</b> 40:15	Africa 81:25
130:25 131:1,9	153:10,19	139:8,13	130:21	African 34:11
133:15 144:8	162:12 182:1	141:17 149:20	adjourn 186:7	afternoon 10:3
146:25 148:18	accomplish	158:25 161:16	adjourned	41:1 109:19
165:16 166:19	98:10 128:3	162:9	187:10,12	110:15 111:15
174:12 175:5	accomplished	acting 138:22	adjust 133:24	agency 139:11
183:17	81:21 188:15	142:5	adopt 40:24	agenda 4:25
absence 7:16	accord 140:11	action 150:15	162:6	5:17 6:3,7,15
31:21	<b>account</b> 43:12	actions 129:5	adopted 7:11	150:4
absent 39:21	121:23,23	active 133:7	14:20 152:1	agent 125:14,15
<b>absolute</b> 144:20	130:17 138:24	activities 131:2	184:12	agents 64:14,20
absolutely 26:15	138:25 139:1	activity 127:2	adopting 132:14	Aggarwal 135:3
45:10 68:25	accountant's	128:2 130:20	adoption 128:20	aggregate 61:20
181:12,13	175:10	147:2	<b>advance</b> 116:20	152:20
ACA 32:6 49:24	accountants	actor 45:22	187:4	<b>ago</b> 5:8 6:16
51:2	38:21 171:6	acts 123:7	advantage 6:20	24:12 26:2
academic	accounting	actual 89:5	46:17 48:8	50:25 57:24
121:12 135:2	175:20 180:13	<b>ad</b> 113:9	61:18 163:12	73:11 87:17
157:12,12	accounts 125:23	adamantly	163:15 164:2	91:16 149:7
169:21 170:3	127:13 129:14	46:21	adverse 95:15	167:15 170:23
170:12,17	accredited 5:1	add 26:3 36:22	advertisement	agree 15:19
accelerated 28:3	6:8 9:21 12:15	41:3 48:23	141:9	26:19 29:7
155:9,10,13,13	14:3,3,15,25	52:7 54:18	advice 97:2	35:17 44:13
155:17,18	15:3,13 16:21	76:9 79:4	129:6,20,22	agreements
155.17,10			····,—··, <b>—</b> -	8
	1	1	1	1

82:17 148:24	153:5 154:19	applications	<b>art</b> 20:23
American 34:11	154:22 173:9	136:7	artwork 20:22
69:21 79:22	<b>answer</b> 8:25	<b>applies</b> 61:7	aside 174:19
82:1,14 98:14	25:6 30:4	182:2	asked 26:15
Americans	41:25 42:17,20	<b>apply</b> 36:20	62:25 63:3
23:17,18 72:20	43:23 44:8	58:21 153:6	73:11 96:6
Ameritrade	45:6 49:2 59:6	157:10	103:22 138:11
121:23	59:9 77:21	applying 48:24	140:13 142:4
AMEX 135:4	80:4 87:25	141:6	147:13
amount 15:13	88:1,11,16	<b>appoint</b> 78:19	asking 59:7
17:15 18:21	89:17 90:4		102:25
22:6,10 26:11	91:24 94:24	13:22 52:25	asks 124:1 162:3
,			aspect 114:19
	, ,		122:13 129:24
			145:4
			aspects 62:18
		. –	157:19
,	0		assembled 69:22
			assembly 105:16
			assess 26:17
			asset 22:8,22
			37:16 54:7
•			58:20 172:9
· ·			173:17
			assets 46:15 50:5
•	-		161:1
			assignments
•	• •		35:19
,			assistance 12:20
•			associate 13:18
			Association
•			49:20 173:8
,	<b>▲</b>		assumably 92:20
6	1 0		assume 24:1
,			42:19 64:24
	<b>. .</b> '	-	assumed 158:2,3
			assuming 99:24
0			174:21
	**		<b>assurance</b> 166:7
			166:8,13
			<b>assure</b> 55:13
•			assuring 166:2
			ASX 144:21
			ATM 149:16
		0	175:8,11
		0	attached 11:1
67:4 116:17	Applause 150:2	Arizona 67:23	188:11
131:23 144:19 151:22 152:17	Apple 121:3 143:14	<b>arm</b> 34:8 <b>arrived</b> 34:9	attempts 152:24 attended 48:11
	69:21 79:22 82:1,14 98:14 Americans 23:17,18 72:20 Ameritrade 121:23 AMEX 135:4 amount 15:13 17:15 18:21 22:6,10 26:11 26:22 27:8 30:18 46:4 47:8,9,15 48:15 61:20 66:24 72:13,14 75:19 96:3 97:17 127:7 131:6 146:1 157:6 182:6 Amy 2:21 150:17,24 184:9 analysis 10:24 70:13 analyst 38:18 55:3,12 analyst 38:18 55:3,12 analyst's 91:14 91:17 analysts 36:23 91:19 107:10 anecdotal 35:2,3 angel 24:23 47:10 49:19,20 50:22 135:3 173:15 angels 32:2 93:5 Annemarie 2:23 23:10 25:2 46:19 anniversary 5:9 57:11 58:15 132:21 annual 7:16 10:9 61:10	69:21 79:22 82:1,14 98:14answer 8:25 25:6 30:4Americans 23:17,18 72:2043:23 44:8 45:6 49:2 59:6 121:23Ameritrade 121:2345:6 49:2 59:6 59:9 77:21AMEX 135:4 amount 15:1380:4 87:25 88:1,11,1617:15 18:21 22:6,10 26:1191:24 94:24 91:24 94:24 26:22 27:8 96:7,14,18 30:18 46:430:18 46:4 48:15 61:20106:24 137:25 140:13 149:14 48:15 61:2066:24 72:13,14 75:19 96:3 97:17 127:7 75:19 96:3 97:17 127:7 answering 77:9 77:21 answering 77:9 93:23 117:20 answering 77:9 93:23 117:20 an	69:21 79:22 82:1,14 98:14answer 8:25 25:6 30:4applies 61:7 182:2Americans41:25 42:17,20 43:23 44:8apply 36:20 58:21 153:6Ameritrade45:6 49:2 59:6 121:23157:10121:2359:9 77:21 80:4 87:25applying 48:24 141:6AMEX 135:480:4 87:25 80:4 87:25141:6amount 15:1388:1,11,16 91:24 94:24apperciate 13:22 52:25 26:22 27:8 26:22 27:896:7,14,18 96:7,14,1830:18 46:4106:24 137:25 150:1150:1 47:8,9,15140:13 149:14 48:15 61:20appreciate 12:1030:18 46:4106:24 137:25 150:1150:1 appreciatedappreciated 12:1031:6 146:127:17 35:20 157:6 182:683:2 103:19 83:2 103:19168:8 approach 15:9 49:22 58:7 157:6 182:6Amy 2:21107:1 anticipated 11:2 70:13antibiotic 50:17 181:5approached 117:15 137:2analyst 38:18 91:17anybody 54:10 117:15 137:2126:7 132:20 181:5analyst 36:2359:25 86:18 91:17 analysts 36:2359:25 86:18 124:2591:19 107:10 179:3 anectotal 35:2,3 approximate 47:10 49:19,20 101:11approximate 148:19 approximate 148:19 approximate 148:19angels 32:2 93:5 23:10 25:2 23:10 25:2 33:10 25:2 43:10 25:2 43:10 25:2appear 156:24 48:6 156:17 39:15 45:22 48:6 156:17 39:15 45:22 48:6 156:17 39:15 45:22 48:6 156:17 39:15 45:22 48:6 156:17 39:15 45:22 48:6 156:17 48:6 156:17 48:6 156:17 48:6 156:17 48:6 156:17 48:6 156:17 48:6 156:17 48:6 156:17 48:6 156:

				Page 191
attention 166:23	67:25 68:1	96:7 101:1	80:13,23 99:8	<b>Benz</b> 79:18
attest 38:5	69:9	111:17 123:15	121:9 133:19	best 9:9,23,24
attestation	availability	128:14 130:14	137:17	31:25 46:11
155:12 157:3	10:19 131:8	134:9 135:20	<b>based</b> 14:25	49:18,24 50:18
167:19 169:20	available 8:24	140:3 142:3	15:4 16:6	51:15 53:19
170:5 181:24	8:25 10:11	149:10 152:10	37:17 112:6	64:24,24 65:4
attitudes 45:8	50:13 78:15,15	153:8 162:19	114:18 117:21	65:10 67:6
attracting 68:23	80:10 90:6	162:22 163:2,8	122:6 123:2	78:17 115:11
99:11 110:7	102:24 112:7	163:15,16	124:17 135:23	116:6 121:4
attractive 18:13	115:22 123:5	168:9 170:9	141:16 142:1	134:15 135:14
177:8 178:8	123:21 124:2	171:7,14	147:6 148:10	156:25
attributable	125:13 131:19	174:21 175:7	152:6 155:16	<b>bet</b> 32:2 69:12
120:16 121:17	135:12 137:18	175:13 180:20	166:11	104:16 172:19
attribute 137:7	144:14 146:7	backer 174:25	baseline 106:22	Betsy 2:17 13:17
attributed 9:14	151:7 153:10	background	174:19	13:18,19
attributes 14:22	166:12 183:3	41:13 113:4	<b>basic</b> 60:16 61:6	better 4:24
<b>auction</b> 137:10	183:15	115:21 151:5	69:24	13:12 34:23
137:14,19	<b>avenue</b> 64:22	151:10	basically 69:2	58:9 71:17
audience 35:2,4	107:25 172:8	backward 31:1	123:3 148:2	78:19 83:3,9
108:4	172:18	backwards	172:11	86:25 88:16
<b>audio</b> 100:1	avenues 101:4	31:14	<b>basket</b> 50:15	90:8 111:3
audit 116:17	133:9 171:17	<b>bad</b> 20:18,19,22	<b>battle</b> 149:2	121:13 128:25
159:3,5,13,18	average 47:12	35:20 38:24	<b>bear</b> 181:9	136:19,20
159:22 165:4,8	47:13	45:22 52:17	beautiful 97:17	141:10 142:15
165:9,17,22	avoid 22:21	53:13 69:14	becoming	177:22 187:4
166:17,24	156:5	100:4,21 105:8	107:15 116:21	beyond 7:10
167:16 179:6,9	awake 112:22	176:3	148:1 161:17	164:12
180:22	<b>awards</b> 34:20	<b>bags</b> 100:9	<b>bed</b> 46:6	<b>bias</b> 107:14
audited 10:10	aware 9:17	<b>balance</b> 16:9,16	<b>began</b> 68:10	<b>bid</b> 118:3 120:17
61:9 131:20,23	15:19 63:23	29:21 44:7	beginning 32:12	124:17,20
177:21 179:25	64:9 66:20	48:18 58:12	112:22 122:10	127:4
180:7 181:11	83:3 153:19	139:3 176:11	127:7 181:2	<b>big</b> 21:20 23:18
auditor 155:12	164:8	balanced 168:7	<b>behalf</b> 12:5 32:6	42:24 63:21
158:17 159:25	awareness 74:20	bandwidth	<b>behavior</b> 131:10	72:20,24 73:7
166:2 170:8	<b>ayes</b> 56:19	162:10 <b>bank</b> 101:13	<b>belief</b> 99:18	78:11 79:3,8
181:23 auditors 116:18	B	180:1	<b>believe</b> 5:5 44:2 46:17 69:10	79:13 80:9
159:10 163:6	baby 175:4,15	<b>banking</b> 116:10	46:17 69:10 70:19 81:10	86:17 87:5,7 93:20 107:17
166:3 170:24	<b>bachelor</b> 42:23	128:5 163:23	82:5,6 99:13	107:19 108:22
authorized	back 5:23 13:23	128:3 103:23	99:16 168:15	107:19 108:22 108:22 114:6
79:11	13:24 22:13,17	bankruptcy	<b>bells</b> 141:18	122:3 125:21
<b>auto</b> 75:13 79:20	32:25 35:20,24	69:19 81:5	belong 173:7	126:25 123:21
80:13,15,19,22	40:7 49:2	<b>banks</b> 119:18,19	<b>belts</b> 100:9	134:17 142:6
100:8,8,11	51:22 52:11	119:22 120:2	<b>benefit</b> 7:25	142:10 161:5
<b>automatic</b> 76:4	58:1 69:25	143:4	11:11 81:21	169:16 176:6
76:15	71:24 73:4	<b>Bannister</b> 82:7	158:19 167:12	177:24,25
automatically	75:3 77:18	<b>bar</b> 18:1 49:12	168:14	178:1,5,6,7
17:25 122:17	80:7 81:4	barely 128:8	benefits 11:2	<b>bigger</b> 90:19
automotive	94:16 95:22	base 77:5 80:2	117:22	144:23
1	1	1	1	1

<b>biggest</b> 68:22	147:18	<b>broad</b> 94:11	<b>budget</b> 93:13	57:8 122:9
82:25 83:6	<b>blush</b> 77:1	117:21 122:6	107:9	151:16,19
88:12 99:11	<b>BMW</b> 79:18	broadening 29:8	<b>Bugatti</b> 79:18	<b>busy</b> 9:8 13:6
142:23	board 132:3	42:19	<b>build</b> 53:20 54:7	<b>button</b> 91:3
<b>bill</b> 72:9 170:9	147:20	broadens 42:3	59:14,16 75:14	143:6
<b>billboard</b> 81:24	<b>boat</b> 72:23 160:3	broader 37:4	75:17 76:3,19	<b>buy</b> 72:2,20,24
81:25	<b>body</b> 40:10 82:8	broadest 30:11	82:12 85:18	73:7,8,14 75:2
<b>billion</b> 61:21	book 85:23,25	broadly 113:10	94:7 99:17	75:6,18,25
66:1 98:18	120:7,24 125:5	broken 15:21	108:17 110:12	104:9 109:10
142:14,19	131:21 135:22	16:19 158:23	115:4 116:2	109:24 110:4
173:17	137:12 139:22	broker 65:11	building 12:2	121:24 127:19
<b>bio</b> 173:5,8	145:5	115:8 118:8	54:8 59:12	130:5 138:23
<b>biotech</b> 93:19	<b>bore</b> 34:24	120:19 121:1	81:6,8,13	138:25 139:2,4
160:2,13	Bosch 80:15	122:20 129:17	87:15 110:10	160:6
172:20,22	<b>bottom</b> 121:15	130:3,4,6,14	179:23	<b>buyer</b> 127:12
172:20,22	boundaries	130:17 131:10	<b>Buildings</b> 81:8	buyer's 39:6
Birmingham	126:14	139:10,11,23	<b>built</b> 38:10	<b>buying</b> 77:24
28:2	<b>bounds</b> 41:10	140:7,9 146:8	85:16 116:12	99:21 109:8
<b>bit</b> 30:3 33:25	<b>bout</b> 47:6 49:12	broker's 123:19	135:11	129:16 180:12
41:8,9 52:7	130:22	broker/dealer	<b>bumped</b> 168:17	127.10 100.12
56:23 65:23	<b>bowl</b> 137:13,23	65:15,16 111:1	168:17	C
109:4 113:10	<b>bow</b> 1137.13,23 <b>box</b> 142:13	114:11 120:24	<b>bunch</b> 28:4,7	<b>c</b> 4:1 22:18
113:21,24	163:5 164:1,5	122:24 123:3	77:23 80:17	183:19
113:21,24	<b>boys</b> 79:10	125:1 129:20	145:19 147:1	CAIA 55:25
117:12 121:8	178:1	broker/dealers	<b>burden</b> 39:5	calculation
123:12 125:7	<b>brand</b> 71:10,23	64:23 65:22	158:2,3,5	144:3
126:12,15	72:11,14 74:20	118:4 120:16	171:3 172:4	calculations
120.12,15	break 81:3	125:2	180:16	70:15
137:18 139:17	111:8 171:15	brokerage	<b>burdens</b> 151:18	<b>California</b> 99:23
140:22 142:11	breakdown	125:23 126:15	burdensome	call 4:4 10:24
140.22 142.11	63:13	125.25 120.15	58:11 161:5	20:7 57:21
144:7,23 154:7	<b>Brian</b> 2:13	brokers 65:19	<b>business</b> 4:15,23	77:25 81:1
154:24 163:13	158:13,21	90:23,23 91:1	8:12 10:8	119:2 132:5
164:12 165:20	163:21 171:2	91:4 123:8,8	13:14,24 16:18	145:23 146:8
169:2 175:9	172:19 174:10	125:18,25	28:9,10,15	called 4:15,19
177:16	Brian's 178:14	126:1,6,19	43:7 44:21	32:16 64:14
<b>blah</b> 169:25	<b>brief</b> 60:5 151:5	120:1,0,19	52:22 75:8	71:21 89:24
170:1,1	186:20	130:20 131:1	77:25 79:17	96:6 100:8
<b>blank</b> 117:3	<b>briefly</b> 15:9 60:9	138:17 139:5,8	80:7 82:19	122:19 123:3
blanket 25:7	114:3 127:22	140:17 141:24	86:20 87:3	151:20,21
<b>blind</b> 76:11,16	133:21	140.17 141.24 143:2,3 144:7	101:22 108:19	calling 33:15
<b>blocks</b> 4:19	<b>brilliant</b> 95:19	144:13 147:4	150:19 151:21	57:14 87:23
blog 182:14	bring 44:15,17	brought 4:14	151:24 152:6	102:8 155:25
Blue 65:15	49:3 60:9	87:18 98:7,11	151:24 152:0	calls 87:23 119:7
125:9 128:14	94:16 116:15	<b>bubble</b> 71:16	152:12 155:20	129:17 130:3,4
123:9 128:14	137:20 150:22	bucket 162:18	177:23 178:25	175:19
	174:4 175:9	buckets 182:11	183:14 184:1	camera 146:18
129:3,12,15 131:9 133:10	<b>bringing</b> 152:10	<b>buddies</b> 31:3	<b>businesses</b> 4:22	campaign 89:1
136:15,25	<b>brings</b> 114:10	<b>buddy</b> 51:6	9:23 36:7 57:4	96:1
130.13,23	01111go 114.10	<b>Juuuy</b> 51.0	7.25 50.7 57.4	2011
	l	l		l

-				Page 195
campaigns	121:2 180:11	10:13 17:22	147:9 151:8,9	<b>chief</b> 13:15
108:3	<b>careful</b> 16:19	40:4 41:12,13	155:7 156:3	<b>children</b> 109:15
<b>Canada</b> 117:10	47:18 48:18	109:18 110:25	157:15 159:7	177:12
148:24	cares 30:2,4	123:5 129:2,5	159:14 162:4,5	chills 130:20
cap 48:14 84:5	carryover 86:10	131:5,6 137:17	163:25	<b>choice</b> 20:22
98:19 117:6,10	cars 71:15,15	139:8,9 148:10	changed 15:22	73:3,7 164:14
118:13 145:4	72:8,17,17	148:25 157:4	23:14 35:10	<b>choose</b> 34:22,23
150:14 152:23	73:2	161:19 162:8	49:9,16 50:11	130:16 141:19
172:6 174:25	carte 153:11	certainly 16:15	50:22 110:25	153:11
capacities 139:9	case 25:10 82:19	19:5,7 23:22	111:2,4,6	choosing 85:11
capacity 143:5	120:7 152:22	34:3 47:1	122:11 184:24	88:4
144:7,15	155:16,17	98:19,24 99:12	changes 8:8,9	<b>Chorus</b> 56:19
<b>capital</b> 7:21 8:12	166:4	99:18 101:14	16:12 40:24	<b>chose</b> 88:23 91:9
9:17,23,25	<b>cases</b> 15:14,15	101:24 105:19	154:10 180:3	141:20,21
11:7 16:18	119:5 133:9	112:18 116:8	186:6	<b>chosen</b> 173:4
22:25 24:24	<b>cash</b> 34:20 94:14	124:7 128:21	changing 21:11	Christie's
25:1 29:3	160:14 168:6	132:4 135:12	23:20 157:16	137:15
47:22,23 48:11	176:11	137:25 138:6	channels 112:1	chronologically
49:19 54:2	cassette 78:25	145:2 150:15	characteristics	83:14
57:5 68:23	catch 167:22	183:10	135:6	Chrysler 98:15
85:14 88:6	catchall 154:8	certainty 18:15	characterize	<b>circular</b> 61:4,5
89:22 93:6	category 21:19	CERTIFICATE	34:1 95:9	circumvent
94:13,16,18	44:15 46:24	188:1	characterized	103:18
95:5,6 96:21	74:13 100:7	certification	33:20	circumvented
97:24 99:11	catered 151:20	38:17 39:19,20	characterizes	103:17
102:2 108:18	catering 4:20	55:25 160:7	33:3 86:9	Citadel 142:25
109:4 113:14	Catherine 2:16	178:10	<b>charge</b> 71:25	<b>cite</b> 119:14
133:16 151:17	18:17 19:18	certified 38:19	72:1,1,3	cited 128:4
154:10 170:4	23:9 47:10	certify 188:9	105:10	citizens 133:7
172:21,23	49:5 95:3	<b>cetera</b> 48:24	charismatic	<b>Civic</b> 71:9
174:13 183:15	Catherine's	86:25 90:22	36:12	clarification
183:21	44:18	100:10	<b>chart</b> 182:10	20:15 160:19
capitalism 30:6	caveat 67:17	<b>CF</b> 46:1	<b>charter</b> 36:23	clarified 21:5
Capitol 114:7	153:12	<b>CFA</b> 55:3,4,24	chartered 38:17	clarify 27:2
capture 108:5	<b>CD</b> 78:25	56:11	55:2,3,11	<b>class</b> 22:8,23
152:24	ceased 131:12	<b>CFO</b> 166:23	<b>cheap</b> 101:12	40:11 56:8,10
captures 67:14	celebrate 119:2	<b>CFP</b> 54:25 55:2	cheaper 86:8	58:20 64:2,6
<b>car</b> 70:22 71:6,8	celebrating	<b>Chair</b> 2:5 4:16	cheated 39:12	161:15
71:18 72:4,12	57:10	5:18,21,22	<b>check</b> 49:14	classes 54:7
73:18 78:24	<b>centers</b> 76:17,22	10:6 42:12,14	90:14 93:15	classmates 40:11
85:16 99:17	79:11,12	58:17 61:14	98:2 117:3	<b>clause</b> 19:10
105:3 109:8	<b>central</b> 14:6,7	challenges 65:6	147:15 159:9	<b>clean</b> 35:12
<b>card</b> 49:13 71:23	120:23 135:22	challenging	164:1 167:25	166:20
72:1,3	<b>CEO</b> 67:25	172:24	checking 43:12	<b>clear</b> 10:20
<b>cards</b> 88:13	88:10 137:8	<b>chance</b> 94:16	104:16,17	21:11 76:20
104:1	159:8,17	<b>chances</b> 182:19	<b>checks</b> 159:8	96:12 124:5
<b>care</b> 36:8 43:14	178:10 182:17	<b>change</b> 10:16	179:17	<b>cleared</b> 66:13
43:14,24,25	<b>CEOs</b> 182:16	15:23,25 16:6	<b>cheer</b> 98:12	clearing 118:9
109:16,16	certain 7:13	35:19 88:12	<b>chicken</b> 59:23	126:6 140:17

-l	95.10.99.2	41.10 49.10	102.15 124.10	57.7 107.10
<b>clearly</b> 107:4	85:10 88:2	41:12 48:12	123:15 134:10	57:7 107:12
136:6,7 161:11	102:12 105:22	69:21 76:18	138:15 155:4	111:20 145:15
clears 124:19	106:6,7,9,11	81:3 107:13	156:18 157:18	145:17 148:23
click 91:3	106:13 107:14	108:13 130:14	169:20 181:14	150:9,11 155:1
121:24,24	109:3,6 110:3	134:9 140:3	184:7,9	159:18,22
<b>clicking</b> 143:6	110:22 111:6,8	156:18,21	commercial 4:13	167:17 184:2
<b>client</b> 118:11	111:13,18	165:5 170:25	4:20	184:11 188:3
clients 58:12	138:1,4,11,15	184:11 186:19	Commission 1:1	committee's
<b>clinic</b> 173:19	145:11,13	<b>comes</b> 38:8 63:7	1:23 6:12,19	9:20 10:17
<b>clinical</b> 168:6	146:12,20	76:4 77:15	6:24 7:5,25	<b>common</b> 68:10
172:2 174:5	149:23 150:3	79:3 95:13	8:21 12:8,9,14	118:5 135:6
clog 167:20	156:22 157:25	156:11 157:8	13:5 14:24	152:21
close 69:22	158:9 160:17	164:24 170:12	15:6 32:4 41:6	communicate
76:18 114:3	160:18 163:9	181:6	45:18,22 54:21	120:18
137:6 140:12	164:19 168:9	<b>comfort</b> 46:24	58:5 60:19	communicating
closed 127:3	168:23 169:3	118:5 159:22	61:5,18,25	85:7
175:14	169:12,25	159:22 167:16	62:14,20,25	communication
closely 8:23	179:4 181:8,14	comfortable	63:8 132:14	120:21
<b>closes</b> 124:8,10	181:15 182:12	25:12,16 26:16	150:6,12 151:1	communities
<b>club</b> 141:11	183:7,8 184:6	93:10,15 118:7	155:1,2,7	108:13
<b>clunker</b> 71:13	184:21,22,23	119:21	156:16 157:16	community
72:15 73:20	184:24 185:3,9	coming 18:14	157:23 158:11	28:20 33:25
<b>clunkers</b> 71:14	185:16,18,20	29:8 58:9	162:3,6 170:21	83:10,11 108:6
<b>CMPO</b> 175:19	186:1,4,9,24	69:23 73:16,23	177:9 188:12	108:7,18
<b>Co-Chair</b> 2:3,4	187:5,9	96:24 118:4	Commission's	119:19 143:4
4:2,9 9:3 11:20	Coast 51:21	125:6 157:13	5:13 6:17 7:10	comp 153:25
13:25 16:8,15	Coastal 128:5	157:14	10:14,23 151:3	companies 1:7
17:11,12 20:13	coasters 59:1	commemorate	156:3 170:16	4:6 7:12,22 8:2
20:16,24,25	<b>coffee</b> 28:10	28:21	commissioned	8:16 9:6,25
21:7,10 23:9	<b>coincide</b> 161:21	<b>commence</b> 60:24	89:22 117:18	10:6,11,12,20
25:2,24 26:13	<b>cold</b> 28:10	123:23 126:18	Commissioner	11:3,5,8,11,13
26:19,21,25	collapsed 89:10	<b>commend</b> 95:4	2:6 5:20 9:3,4	12:20 13:11
27:4,6,9 29:5	colleagues 12:8	95:20	11:20,21 49:7	23:4 24:23,25
31:21 35:7	18:22 21:17	<b>comment</b> 6:10	53:5,6,8 59:6	30:12,12 33:21
37:2 38:12	150:18 172:19	13:5 22:1	134:17 163:11	34:12 47:22
39:25 40:9,19	172:20 173:3	29:10,23	186:16,19	48:7 50:7
42:11,13 43:22	177:18	106:14 107:10	Commissioners	53:16 54:1
45:3,6,11,17	collected 74:10	134:7 145:12	176:22	57:24 58:2,22
46:19 47:4	<b>college</b> 30:14,17	155:8 156:17	commitment	58:25,25 59:1
48:20 52:4,5,6	40:7 43:2	157:19 165:4	65:9 99:12	59:5,8,10
53:4,7,9 54:11	51:20	176:9 179:5	commitments	60:20 61:3
55:1,7,10,13	<b>Columbia</b> 33:16	commentary	99:19	62:8,18,19,22
55:15,19,21	<b>com</b> 49:17	17:1	committed 8:19	62:22,23,24
56:5,7,9,12,14	<b>Comau</b> 80:20	commenters	17:9 69:18	63:1,12,20
56:17,20,22	105:15	157:22	<b>committee</b> 1:6	64:7 65:19
57:1,17,19,21	combination	<b>comments</b> 6:3	4:6 5:15 7:8,9	66:7,12,14
62:6 63:10	97:4 185:12	8:1,3 12:20	9:6 10:3 12:12	67:3,12,14,18
65:6 66:19	come 9:9 22:23	14:1 18:17	13:1 16:10,17	80:5 86:12,13
67:20,21 84:25	26:1 38:20	26:25 60:25	29:21 30:1	87:2,5 91:21
	<u> </u>		l	

91:23 94:12,17	93:9 95:8	144:20	66:17	confusing
96:16 110:10	97:10 98:14,22	compelling 69:2	computational	181:18
112:7,9 113:17	99:4 102:14,25	69:6 97:10	70:13	congratulations
114:5,6,18	108:17 109:9	compensation	computed	95:21 98:21
115:25 116:1,8	109:14,17,23	140:10	152:19	102:10
116:16,21	113:15 114:4	competing	computers 86:17	Congress 34:7
117:4,4,17,22	115:2,16,18	137:19	86:17	137:2 158:8
118:15,17	116:11,14,18	competition	conceivable	conjunction
119:1,2,8,22	117:8,15 118:1	136:5 137:6	124:13	64:8
121:8 122:4,5	119:6 121:13	140:9	conceived 116:4	connected 51:21
130:25 131:4	123:5 128:4	compilation	concentration	connecting 33:9
132:16,23,23	129:2,3,12	180:2	93:18 94:15	connection
133:3 134:15	131:18 133:25	complaining	97:24	63:25
135:14 136:9	135:4,5,7	137:22	concept 8:4	connections
136:22,23,25	136:21 137:16	complement	14:15 36:11	33:6
137:11 141:19	137:16 140:1	43:17	182:10	conscious 68:5
142:19,21	146:2,3,24	complete 65:21	concern 82:25	146:5
143:16 145:19	147:9 148:3,15	172:10 188:13	163:15	consensus 16:11
147:24 148:5,8	151:2,10 152:8	completed 10:10	concerned 9:19	consequence
148:16,17	153:3 156:9	62:2 66:13,25	45:12 110:8,9	75:24
149:20 150:4,9	158:23 159:6,8	67:2,7,14,16	176:23	conservative
150:13 151:13	160:20,22	67:19 128:5	concerns 22:9	46:8 164:11
151:14 152:2	161:3,6,7,12	152:13 173:12	127:20	consider 11:16
152:11,14,17	161:15,17,17	completely	concluded 16:17	15:24 63:7
153:7,18 154:3	161:18,23	58:20 65:13	157:8	114:24 155:2
154:11,12,17	162:1,1,2,7,9,9	100:24	conclusion	157:23 170:21
154:20 156:7	162:14,17	complex 22:3	15:20	184:10
156:13 158:6	164:6 165:2,10	81:18 119:25	conclusions	considerable
160:2,3 162:25	165:13,16	complexity	157:14,14	37:23
163:2,25 167:3	166:2,13,19	22:15	<b>concur</b> 35:14	considerate
167:4 168:22	167:8 168:4	compliance 7:22	conditional	37:14
168:25 169:6,8	170:4,5 171:11	126:6 151:18	160:21 161:18	consideration
169:9 173:6	171:22 172:22	154:11 166:24	161:25	139:8 158:11
174:11,14	173:11,18	178:5,7,18	conditioning	considerations
179:25 182:2,3	174:8 175:1	compliant 129:4	76:5	122:6
188:4	176:10 178:13	complicated	<b>conduct</b> 152:3	considered 15:2
company 5:14	179:7,9,15,19	23:8	conducting	113:20 129:6
7:6 10:5,18	179:22 180:13	comply 153:12	168:6	130:10 135:24
13:4 28:13,19	180:25 182:6,7	153:14 155:14	conference	155:1
28:24 30:16	183:1	complying	48:10 173:9	considering 9:22
40:3 41:23	company's	169:15	conferences	132:22 158:12
45:2 60:15,22	113:23 152:21	component 14:6	177:17	158:12,20
62:3 63:24	152:24 164:14	56:3 119:12	configuration	consistency
64:5 66:23,25	comparable	128:16	69:25	144:15
67:1,6,7 68:8	121:21 144:22	components	configurations	consistent
68:19 74:6	145:7 148:9	116:15 122:10	75:14	154:25 155:3
75:9 86:24	<b>compared</b> 64:10	compound	confirm 92:2	164:20
87:21 88:10	170:7 188:14	173:18,22	186:25	consistently
91:8 92:17	compares	compressed	confused 19:14	74:3 149:2

[				Page 190
<b>consists</b> 60:11	contrast 152:23	167:12,20	133:8 156:18	crushes 180:16
145:18	<b>control</b> 69:19	168:10,12	157:21 183:10	culinary 4:21
constantly	76:6 136:19	169:13,14,19	cover 153:20,24	<b>culture</b> 179:23
144:10	<b>controls</b> 67:25	169:23 170:4	160:6 165:22	cumbersome
constituent	135:25 159:20	170:10,11,23	<b>coverage</b> 91:15	90:10,17
119:19	167:8,11 180:4	171:22 175:10	covered 144:9	<b>curiosity</b> 163:21
constituents 8:2	180:18	178:13,13,21	160:8	curious 63:15
constrain 75:17	controversial	179:21,22	<b>CPA</b> 21:15	current 7:10,15
90:11	133:1	costing 163:13	22:12 179:22	11:14 14:19
constrained	conversation	costly 119:25	<b>CPAs</b> 55:8	16:2,5 60:18
80:9 90:13	53:1 68:21	133:9 174:18	crawl 105:18	75:13 105:6
constraints	106:15 110:15	costs 7:22 11:12	create 38:16	115:17 116:8,9
146:24	114:7 134:18	67:5 68:5	53:15 70:21	116:9 120:5
construction	173:10	81:12 101:2,4	71:12 72:18	133:3,6,24
81:14	conversations	101:6 154:11	93:11 100:7	134:24 135:16
Consultancy	28:13 54:10	158:13,14	103:22	150:14 151:6
67:25	94:19	160:8 165:5,22	created 75:16	152:10 153:2
consulting 4:21	<b>convince</b> 93:20	166:18 169:22	77:4 127:8	155:20 162:10
consumer	cooking 28:9	170:6,13 172:1	151:16	currently 10:5
137:17	<b>cool</b> 108:20	178:4,5,7,8,18	creates 24:22	63:9 122:4
consumers	cooler 105:15	cottage 91:18	creating 68:23	160:22 161:11
75:20	cooperation	Coulson 137:8	146:5	161:20,23
consumers'	79:16	<b>counsel</b> 13:16	creation 10:22	162:6,23 169:1
72:10	cooperative	88:16 112:11	credential 37:23	169:9
consumption	95:25 106:21	117:19 130:7	credentials	<b>customer</b> 52:16
82:23	copies 138:2,9	150:18	17:22 19:3	77:2,13,21,24
<b>CONT</b> 3:1	<b>copy</b> 40:21	<b>counter</b> 96:2,9	21:25 37:17	78:3,9 79:8
contacted 126:5	core 48:22,22	114:14 158:19	38:23	121:9 129:21
<b>contains</b> 155:18	<b>corner</b> 79:20	counterintuitive	credit 71:23	133:19
contemplated	94:11	178:24	72:1,3 104:1	customer's
58:3	corporate	<b>counters</b> 169:23	128:3 132:1	77:19
<b>content</b> 69:21	112:12	countries 149:1	164:17	customers 71:4
75:19 76:7,17	correct 93:1	country 21:17	crime 83:11	75:10 78:4,10
77:3	166:8	82:13 83:6	cripple 75:15	78:18 86:14,24
<b>contest</b> 34:17	correctly 95:9	85:16 116:11	criteria 15:4	95:18 115:9,13
context 44:9	correlated 144:1	<b>couple</b> 27:10,11	104:4	139:1
66:23 114:22	correlates 83:9	32:15 37:4	critical 74:24	<b>cut</b> 111:22 159:8
Continental	correlation	46:20 59:25	87:24	<b>cutoff</b> 181:6
76:11 80:13	117:13	87:17 94:24	Cromwell 137:8	cuts 81:11
continue 12:16	correlator 83:12	97:6 109:13	crossover	cutting 107:3
22:20 30:7	<b>cost</b> 11:5,7 22:15	112:21 128:15	171:19 172:17	cycle 78:13,22
98:19 111:16	68:8 75:2	134:13 174:23	<b>crowd</b> 6:5 8:13	100:8,8,11
120:4 141:23	81:11 82:13	coupled 42:18	8:17,23 45:19	cylinder 105:13
144:16	130:21 157:7	course 12:4	48:5,8,12	• 
continues 8:22	158:15,19	13:14 41:16	50:23 74:11,23	D
continuing	159:3 162:20	43:11 80:3	83:22 85:21	<b>D</b> 4:1 14:6 19:25
145:16	163:3,10,17	97:15 107:21	108:3 109:14	47:24 59:19
continuum	165:8,12,12	110:4 114:1	136:18 173:15	145:25 183:1
177:19	166:15,19	117:16 130:15	<b>cruise</b> 46:4 76:6	<b>D.C</b> 1:25 188:7
	, -			
	1	1		I

				Page 197
daily 144:19	126:20 177:1	definitions	56:2 148:21,24	102:3 114:25
<b>Dan</b> 3:5 112:3	dear 18:19	155:15 156:4	designed 77:15	117:11 136:10
112:11,14	<b>death</b> 69:11	<b>degree</b> 21:18	81:1 105:16	142:18 144:2
149:24	debated 96:4	degrees 51:20	designing 69:8	165:7,25 166:5
dander 30:3	debating 110:5	55:9	85:15	166:22 167:3
dash 79:2	debugging 81:20	delighted 178:11	<b>desire</b> 132:24	171:17 173:6
data 9:18 26:16	<b>decade</b> 77:13	<b>deliver</b> 112:19	<b>detail</b> 153:21	174:24 179:20
31:18,18,21	deceived 39:13	<b>delta</b> 66:2,3,4,11	details 34:24	181:16,16
35:2,3,3,6	<b>decide</b> 89:21	66:16	determination	183:14,15,21
45:25 51:23	141:21	demographic	170:22	differential
61:22 63:12	decided 16:1	145:18	determine	165:9
67:11,11,16	46:5	demonstrable	103:11	differentiating
73:10 145:1,17	decides 184:2	86:15	determined	126:24
146:13,18	<b>decision</b> 164:18	demonstrated	141:12	differently 50:24
153:23,23	171:3	73:15	determines	52:22 76:2
157:21 170:20	decisions 31:19	<b>denies</b> 179:6	150:9	148:16
date 6:23 35:10	33:19 50:24	department	determining	difficult 26:1,7
60:9 64:7	decrease 23:1,2	172:2	14:21	26:11 44:3
67:17 83:20	23:19	depend 99:18	Detroit 80:2	45:3 77:6,20
142:13 180:20	decreased 23:16	depending 93:24	<b>develop</b> 124:15	85:14 90:18
187:1 188:6,18	<b>deem</b> 148:25	97:13 101:23	125:8 135:1	98:2
daughter 183:16	<b>deep</b> 120:6	deposit 125:22	136:9	difficulty 26:12
<b>Davis</b> 2:9 13:16	137:11	125:25 126:1	developed 70:25	172:21
day 5:17 10:8	deepened 99:13	depositors 120:1	79:15 119:14	<b>dilemma</b> 85:24
32:14 76:24,25	defaults 53:14	depth 125:5	121:5	94:1 97:23
79:11,12 83:18	54:8	145:5	developing	107:5
98:13 125:7	<b>deficit</b> 83:1	<b>DERA</b> 10:24	113:18 146:3	diligence 33:8
141:7 152:13	<b>define</b> 41:21,22	157:11,23	148:15	49:15 91:6,21
175:14	defined 10:5	deregister	development	97:16 175:19
day-to-day	87:1 117:3	119:24	79:18 134:25	dilution 38:7
182:24	155:19 181:21	<b>describe</b> 117:13	<b>device</b> 33:11	<b>dime</b> 87:19
days 5:24 8:14	defining 32:7	described 33:3	devil's 109:7	89:17
81:3 82:10,21	definitely 35:14	61:19 120:15	<b>diabetes</b> 109:15	<b>dinner</b> 187:6
91:6 96:5,7	98:12 108:16	140:18	<b>dialogue</b> 139:18	direct 75:9 82:5
100:18 123:11	171:18	describes 86:11	dictating 137:4	directed 129:9
125:2,4 165:11	definition 5:1,3	183:14	<b>died</b> 30:14,17	directing 136:14
<b>deal</b> 36:9 37:12	5:14 6:8,11 7:7	describing 98:6	difference 63:21	direction 128:13
38:6 46:9,17	7:7,20 9:21	133:18 145:24	143:12	130:9
49:13 71:25	10:4 12:15	description	differences	directly 7:3
90:16 108:22	14:4,19,24	80:14,16,20	120:11	146:18 178:17
111:21,24	15:21 23:14	185:23	different 30:7	<b>director</b> 13:18
<b>dealer</b> 121:9,10	24:10 31:23	<b>deserve</b> 41:20	33:25 42:23	directory 43:12
121:10 135:9	43:20 150:7,8	<b>design</b> 68:7	43:1,7 44:25	disagree 110:2
136:1	150:13 151:2,5	78:12 105:12	52:23 58:20	disappointing
<b>dealers</b> 137:19	151:6,11,23,24	designated	65:8,17 68:2,3	59:12
dealership 72:6	152:10 153:2	10:11	71:15 75:8,12	disbursements
<b>dealing</b> 164:22	154:16,16	designation	89:14 93:5,9	168:7
deals 19:25	155:15,18,20	141:6	97:6,6,14	<b>disc</b> 86:1,4,5,7
91:19 103:23	156:1,2 162:13	designations	101:22,23	86:12,16,19
				1

disclaim 128:8 $87:2,7,10$ 110:16 111:5100:5 118:6156:24disclaimer 12:5disseminated138:20 148:19driver 72:3economica 68:4lisclose 90:9distance 144:9172:14 175:19driving 72:17economics 29:19disclosed 88:11distinction176:41 77:1273:3 109:20108:23discloser 84:8143:10176:41 77:1273:3 109:20108:238:9 10:13,19distressed 57:3180:18 181:10DTC 125:12,14economics 29:19disclosure 84:8143:10180:18 181:10DTC 125:12,14educating 54:1412:21 13:7.9124:10Oldiar 25:4 27:3due 33:8 49:14118:5 126:12dif-15,15distributing159:13142:14,15,1991:62:19 7:16effect 59:61117:24 118:17129:11158:13,14127:5,5.68:13 37:23118:18 13:19distributing169:18149:4 181:23166:413:24 150:10diversification173:1728:16 97:22difective 6:2313:12 14:10diversification173:1728:16 97:22effective 0:2315:4:1,28,15diversification173:1728:16 97:22effective 0:2315:4:10diversification178:9111:1213:12effective 0:2315:4:12diversification178:912:12earlier 43:5 55:616:10discussor 5:3double 70:378:1 87:14earlier 43:5 55:616:10discussor 5:3document 29:4144:277:1415:4:12document 29:4	[				Page 190
disclaimer 12:5disseminated138:20 148:19driver 122:3economical 68:4156:14146:2316:12 162:7driver 70:14economics 29:19disclose 09:9distance 144:916:11 21 62:7driving 72:17economizs 83:7disclose 48:11distinction172:14 175:19driving 72:17economizs 83:7disclose 10:9distribute180:18 181:10drove 72:6educated 21:1811:6,6,14distributed 14:9180:18 181:10drove 72:6deucating 54:1412:11 13:7,9124:10dollar 25:4 2:3duct 71:16educating 54:1413:11 36:14distributed 14:927:7 40:14due 33:8 49:14due 75:5,611:12:14distributed 14:927:7 40:14due 33:8 49:14127:5,5,611:13:14distributing142:14,15,1991:6,21 97:16effective 6:1811:14:14129:11158:13,14127:5,5,68:13 57:2311:18:18 131:19distributin169:18149:44 181:23166:413:12:41 50:10diver 56:2432:15 34:14dumines 38:24effective 6:2315:14:12,8,15diversification173:1728:16 97:22effectively 28:715:4:15:15diving 15:23113:14121:22155:25 156:516:2:15,23diving 15:23113:1420:15 12:2416:4:10 174:20Diving 115:23113:1420:15 12:2415:14:13:6:10double 00:18178:9121:22effectively 28:715:4:10 174:20Diving 15:23113:1420:15 12:24<	disclaim 128:8	87:2.7.10	110:16 111:5	100:5 118:6	156:24
156:14146:23161:12 162:7drives 70:14economics 29:19disclose 90:9distance 144:9164:11 170:6 $86.5, 16, 25$ economists 83:7disclose 88:11distriction172:14 175:19diving 72:17economy 29:17disclose 14:11distribute182:16,21Drove 72:6educating 54:1412:21 13:7,9124:10dollar 25:4 27:3duct 71:16educating 54:1413:11 36:14distribute183:16/20 96:366:17 83:1149:4116:6,13,15distributing142:14,15,1991:6,21 97:16effect 5:9 6:18117:24 118:17129:11158:13,14127:5,5,68:13 57:23118:18 13:19distributinn169:18149:44 181:23166:4131:24 150:104:21 129:5dollars 27:24dumines 38:24effective 6:23153:43,16.0diverse 8:1674:24 75:25dynamic 7:1155:22154:1,2,8,15diversification173:1728:16 97:22effectivees3163:12 164:3,363:19door 71:24 76:5 $\mathbf{E}$ effectivees313:21division 10:23dot 9:1781:11:12,1216:7155:12division 10:23173:14 $\mathbf{E}$ 115:12 116:7164:10 174:20Diving 115:23178:8111:12,12effectiver6:8152:14 4:3363:19door 71:24 76:5 $\mathbf{E}$ effective 6:8152:14division 12:310:2000:71:27 55:5effective 70:71:70:71:72154:14 163:2division 12:3113:14 $\mathbf{E}$ effec					
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
					-
	,				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	-				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	, ,		,	,	
	-				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		0	, ,		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			,		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $				•	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					·
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	-		. –	uynamics 70.15	
182:1division 10:23dot 49:17E 4:1,1 77:25efficient 68:8disclosures 7:1313:6,18double 70:378:1 87:14115:12 116:7154:14 163:2division's 12:10doubt 51:25111:12,12effort 90:7 132:2164:13 165:3doable 90:18178:9121:22151:11,17discount 171:12101:14dovetail 53:11E1a 87:17 89:16earlier 43:5 55:6discuss 10:433:17Dow 94:2357:2 59:7,1364:24 65:5,10discussed 23:2166:8 172:4downturn 80:689:14 98:22egg 59:23discussing 37:8183:13 184:1dozen 134:7120:15 127:21eight 127:16,17discussion 5:3document 29:416:23 35:14135:21 142:22eight 127:16,17discussion 5:3documentation16:23 35:14135:21 142:22eight 127:16,17discussion 5:3dog's 137:13183:11 184:20171:14 187:451:24 60:156:7 7:2 9:2,1180:2140:21 54:16147:14 158:2218:14 25:2511:17 14:5dog's 137:13183:11 184:20171:14 187:451:24 60:156:17 85:13doing 16:20drafters 150:21early 65:40:2565:13 69:5103:1,16 104:621:23 28:8drafts 14:10125:22 127:598:17 121:9115:8 130:133:8 34:9,13dramaticallyease 158:2easier 90:2111:16 114:329:25 30:21drafts 6:18177:16181:7151:4 157:251:15,21,25dramaticallyeasier 90:2141:19 147:18151:4 157:2<				E	,
disclosures 7:1313:6,18double 70:378:1 87:14115:12 116:7154:14 163:2division's 12:10doubt 51:25111:12,12effort 90:7 132:2164:13 165:3doable 90:18178:9121:22iffort 90:7 132:2152:2doctors 33:14,1454:11Ela 87:17 89:16earlier 43:5 55:6discusse 10:433:17Dow 94:2357:2 59:7,1367:6 90:2112:13 112:4document 29:4144:266:12 83:23110:20discussing 37:8183:13 184:1downturn 80:689:14 98:22egg 59:23discussion 5:3documentation16:23 35:14135:21 142:22isther 9:166:7 7:2 9:2,11180:2140:21 54:16147:14 158:2218:14 25:2511:17 14:5dog's 137:13183:11 184:20171:14 187:451:24 60:1556:17 85:13doing 16:20drafters 150:21early 6:5 40:2565:13 69:5103:1,16 104:621:23 28:8drafts 14:1042:25 46:694:13 98:7,8111:16 114:329:25 30:21dramaticallyease 158:2126:22 141:315:14 157:251:15,21,25drawn 60:18178:3152:14 178:17176:652:2 63:15,16Drew 175:12easit 90:2141:19 147:1815:14 157:251:15,21,25drawn 60:18178:3152:14 178:17176:652:2 63:15,16Drew 175:12easit 90:2141:19 147:1815:4:15 171:1491:21 97:1672:11 78:8ebb 144:330:25electrcical 30:1630:25electrcical 30:16 <td< td=""><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td><b>E</b> 4:1.1 77:25</td><td></td></td<>		0		<b>E</b> 4:1.1 77:25	
IstaileIstailIstailIstailIstailIstailIstailIstail154:14163:2division's 12:10doubt 51:25111:12,12Iffort 90:7 132:2164:13165:3dooble 90:18178:9121:22Istail175:22doctors 33:14,14dovetail 53:11E1a 87:17 89:16effort 90:7 132:212:13112:4doctors 33:14,1454:11earlier 43:5 55:664:24 65:5,10discussed 23:2166:8 172:4downturn 80:689:14 98:22egg 59:23discussion 5:3document 29:4144:266:12 83:23110:20discussion 5:3documentation16:23 35:14131:12 132:12eight 127:16,17discussion 5:3documentation16:23 35:14135:21 142:2218:14 25:2511:17 14:5dog's 137:13183:11 184:20171:14 158:2218:14 25:2539:1 53:12doing 16:20drafters 150:21early 6:5 40:2565:13 69:5103:1,16 104:621:23 28:8drafts 14:1042:25 46:694:13 98:7,8111:16 114:329:25 30:21drag 70:14125:22 127:598:17 121:915:8 130:133:8 34:9,13dramaticallyease 158:2126:22 141:315:14 157:251:15,21,25drawn 60:18178:3152:14 178:17176:652:2 63:15,16Drew 175:12easily 77:16181:713:6:4,1480:14,16 89:23dried 111:22easily 77:16181:713:5:15 171:1491:21 97:1672:11 78:8ebb 144:330:25 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>					
164:13 165:3 discust 171:12doable 90:18 101:14178:9 dovetail 53:11121:22 Ela 87:17 89:16 earlier 43:5 55:6 64:24 65:5,10 67:6 90:21discuss 10:4 12:13 112:433:17 document 29:4Dow 94:23 144:257:2 59:7,13 66:12 83:23100:10 erlier 43:5 55:6 64:24 65:5,10 67:6 90:21discussing 37:8 134:14183:13 184:1 184:20dozen 134:7 draft 6:21 9:20121:22 Ela 87:17 89:16 earlier 43:5 55:6100:20 egg 59:23 eggs 50:15discussion 5:3 6:7 7:2 9:2,11documentation 180:2116:23 35:14 40:21 54:16135:21 142:22 131:12 132:12eight 127:16,17 either 9:16discussion 5:3 6:7 7:2 9:2,11docg 5:24 137:23 180:2160:21 183:11 40:21 54:16163:11 168:3 147:14 187:435:2 48:25 51:24 60:1511:17 14:5 56:17 85:13 103:1,16 104:6 11:16 114:3 133:8 34:9,13doard fafts 14:10 draft s14:10125:22 127:5 ease 158:2 ease 158:2 easit 90:298:17 121:9115:8 130:1 133:8 34:9,13dramatically draft 14:10178:3 easit 90:2178:3 141:19 147:18151:4 157:2 13:4:16 135:21 13:4:16 135:2134:45,15 40:25 40:15178:3 easit 90:2181:7 elect 60:15 elect 60:15discussions 145:15 171:1464:3,3 75:12 91:21 97:16draw 60:18 72:11 78:8178:3 ebb 144:3 echo 14:1 98:21181:7 elect 60:15 electrical 30:16		,			
discumt 171:12101:14dovetai 53:11E1a 87:17 89:16efforts 13:22175:22doctors 33:14,1454:11Dow 94:2357:2 59:7,1364:24 65:5,1012:13 112:4document 29:4144:266:12 83:23110:20discussed 23:2166:8 172:4downturn 80:689:14 98:22egg 59:23discussing 37:8183:13 184:1dozen 134:7120:15 127:21egg 59:23discussion 5:3documentation16:23 35:14135:21 142:22either 9:166:7 7:2 9:2,11180:2140:21 54:16147:14 158:2218:14 25:2511:17 14:5dog 5:24 137:2360:21 183:11163:11 168:335:2 48:2539:1 53:12doig 16:20drafters 150:21early 6:5 40:2565:13 69:5103:1,16 104:621:23 28:8drafts 14:1042:25 46:694:13 98:7,8111:16 114:329:25 30:21dramaticallyease 158:2126:22 141:313:4:16 135:2134:15,21 48:2149:9178:3152:14 178:1715:4 157:251:15,21,25drawn 60:18178:3152:14 178:17176:652:2 63:15,16Drew 175:12easily 77:16181:713:4:1480:14,16 89:23drive 68:6 70:9132:8elect c0:1513:4:1491:21 97:1672:11 78:8ebb 144:330:25elect c0:15elect c0:15electrical 30:1630:25electrical 30:1630:25electrical 30:1630:25					
InstructInstructInstructInstructInstructInstructInstruct175:22doctors 33:14,1454:1154:1164:24 65:5,10discuss 10:433:17Dow 94:2357:2 59:7,1367:6 90:2112:13 112:4document 29:4144:266:12 83:23110:20discussed 23:2166:8 172:4downturn 80:689:14 98:22egg 59:23discussing 37:8183:13 184:1dozen 134:7120:15 127:21egg 50:15134:14184:20draft 6:21 9:20131:12 132:12eight 127:16,17discussion 5:3documentation16:23 35:14135:21 142:22either 9:166:7 7:2 9:2,11180:2140:21 54:16147:14 158:2218:14 25:2511:17 14:5dog's 137:13183:11 184:20171:14 187:451:24 60:1556:17 85:13doing 16:20drafters 150:21early 6:5 40:2565:13 69:5103:1,16 104:621:23 28:8drafts 14:1042:25 46:694:13 98:7,8111:16 114:329:25 30:21drag 70:14125:22 127:598:17 121:9115:8 130:133:8 34:9,13dramaticallyease 158:2126:22 141:3134:16 135:2134:15,21,48:2149:9easier 90:2141:19 147:18151:4 157:251:15,21,25drawn 60:18178:3152:14 178:17176:652:2 63:15,16Drew 175:12easily 77:16181:7discussions64:3,3 75:12drive 68:6 70:9132:8electrical 30:16145:15 171:1491:21 97:1672:11 78:8<					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
15.1210:1210:1110:1110:11discuss 10:433:17Dow 94:2357:2 59:7,1367:6 90:2112:13 112:4document 29:4144:266:12 83:23110:20discussed 23:2166:8 172:4downturn 80:689:14 98:22egg 59:23discussing 37:8183:13 184:1dozen 134:7120:15 127:21egg 50:15134:14184:20draft 6:21 9:20131:12 132:12eight 127:16,17discussion 5:3documentation16:23 35:14135:21 142:22either 9:166:7 7:2 9:2,11180:2140:21 54:16147:14 158:2218:14 25:2511:17 14:5dog's 137:13183:11 184:20171:14 187:451:24 60:1556:17 85:13doing 16:20drafters 150:21early 6:5 40:2565:13 69:5103:1,16 104:621:23 28:8drafts 14:1042:25 46:694:13 98:7,8111:16 114:329:25 30:21drag 70:14125:22 127:598:17 121:9158 130:133:8 34:9,13dramaticallyease 158:2126:22 141:3151:4 157:251:15,21,25drawn 60:18178:3152:14 178:17176:652:2 63:15,16Drew 175:12easily 77:16181:7discussions64:3,3 75:12dried 111:22easily 77:16181:7136:4,1480:14,16 89:23drive 68:6 70:9132:8electrical 30:16145:15 171:1491:21 97:1672:11 78:8ebb 144:330:25electrical 30:1686:1,4,7,12,19echo 14:1 98:21electronic 76:12 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>					
12:13112:4document 29:4144:266:1283:23110:20discussed 23:21document 29:4144:2downturn 80:689:1498:22egg 59:23discussing 37:8183:13184:1dozen 134:7120:15127:21134:14184:20draft 6:219:20131:12132:12discussion 5:3documentation16:2335:14135:21142:22discussion 5:3documentation16:2335:14135:21142:22i1:1714:5dog 5:24137:2360:21183:11163:11168:339:153:12dog 5:24137:2360:21183:11163:11168:335:248:2539:153:12dog 5:24137:13183:11184:20171:14187:451:2460:1556:1785:13doing 16:20drafters 150:21early 6:540:2565:1369:5103:1,16104:621:2328:8drafts 14:1042:2546:694:1398:7,8111:16114:329:2530:21dramaticallyease 158:2126:22126:22141:19151:4157:251:15,21,25drawn 60:18178:3152:14178:17176:652:263:15,16Drew 175:12easily 77:16181:7discussions64:3,375:12dried 111:22easily 77:16181:7145:15171:1491:2197:1672:1178:8ebb144:330:25 <t< td=""><td></td><td>· · · · ·</td><td></td><td></td><td>· · · ·</td></t<>		· · · · ·			· · · ·
discussed 23:21document 25:11frit289:14 98:22egg 59:23discussing 37:8183:13 184:1dozen 134:7120:15 127:21egg 59:23134:14184:20draft 6:21 9:20131:12 132:12egg 50:15discussion 5:3documentation16:23 35:14135:21 142:22egg 59:23discussion 5:3documentation16:23 35:14135:21 142:22egg 59:236:7 7:2 9:2,11180:2140:21 54:16147:14 158:2218:14 25:2511:17 14:5dog 5:24 137:2360:21 183:11163:11 168:335:2 48:2539:1 53:12doig 16:20drafters 150:21early 6:5 40:2565:13 69:5103:1,16 104:621:23 28:8drafts 14:1042:25 46:694:13 98:7,8111:16 114:329:25 30:21drag 70:14125:22 127:598:17 121:915:8 130:133:8 34:9,13dramaticallyease 158:2126:22 141:3151:4 157:251:15,21,25drawn 60:18178:3152:14 178:17176:652:2 63:15,16Drew 175:12easigy 77:16181:7discussions64:3,3 75:12drive 68:6 70:9132:8electrical 30:16145:15 171:1491:21 97:1672:11 78:8ebb 144:330:25electrical 30:1630:25electroic 76:12				,	
discussing 37:8 134:14183:13 184:1 184:20dozen 134:7 draft 6:21 9:20120:15 127:21 131:12 132:12eggs 50:15 eight 127:16,17 either 9:16discussion 5:3 6:7 7:2 9:2,11documentation 180:2116:23 35:14 40:21 54:16120:15 127:21 131:12 132:12eggs 50:15 eight 127:16,17 either 9:1611:17 14:5 39:1 53:12dog 5:24 137:23 dog's 137:1360:21 183:11 183:11 184:20163:11 168:3 163:11 168:335:2 48:25 55:14 145:2211:17 14:5 103:1,16 104:6doing 16:20 21:23 28:8 111:16 114:3drafters 150:21 draft s14:10dearly 6:5 40:25 42:25 46:665:13 69:5 94:13 98:7,8111:16 114:3 151:4 157:229:25 30:21 51:15,21,25dramatically 49:9ease 158:2 easier 90:2126:22 141:3 141:19 147:18151:4 157:2 136:4,14 145:15 171:1451:1,21,25 91:21 97:16dramatically 72:11 78:8easily 77:16 easy 96:13 132:7leet 60:15 electrical 30:16 30:25discussions 145:15 171:1491:21 97:16 91:21 97:1672:11 78:8 72:11 78:8ebb 144:3 econ 14:1 98:2190:25 electrical 30:16					
134:14184:20draft 6:21 9:20131:12 132:12eight 127:16,17discussion 5:3documentation16:23 35:14135:21 142:22eight 127:16,17discussion 5:3documentation16:23 35:14135:21 142:22eight 127:16,17discussion 5:3dog 5:24 137:2360:21 183:1116:311 168:335:2 48:2539:1 53:12dog's 137:13183:11 184:20171:14 187:451:24 60:1556:17 85:13doing 16:20drafters 150:21early 6:5 40:2565:13 69:5103:1,16 104:621:23 28:8drafts 14:1042:25 46:694:13 98:7,8111:16 114:329:25 30:21drag 70:14125:22 127:598:17 121:915:8 130:133:8 34:9,13dramaticallyease 158:2126:22 141:3151:4 157:251:15,21,25drawn 60:18178:3152:14 178:17176:652:2 63:15,16Drew 175:12easily 77:16181:7discussions64:3,3 75:12dried 111:22easily 77:16181:7136:4,1480:14,16 89:2372:11 78:8ebb 144:330:25145:15 171:1491:21 97:1672:11 78:8ebb 144:330:25disparage 72:21103:8 105:1286:1,4,7,12,19echo 14:1 98:21electronic 76:12					
discussion 5:3 (6:7 7:2 9:2,11)documentation 180:2116:23 35:14 (40:21 54:16)135:21 142:22 (147:14 158:22)either 9:16 (147:14 158:22)11:17 14:5 (39:1 53:12)dog 5:24 137:23 (39:1 53:12)60:21 183:11 (163:11 184:20)163:11 168:3 (171:14 187:4)35:2 48:25 (163:11 168:3)39:1 53:12 (56:17 85:13)doing 16:20 (21:23 28:8)drafters 150:21 (drafters 150:21)163:11 168:3 (163:11 184:20)35:2 48:25 (171:14 187:4)103:1,16 104:6 (11:16 114:3)21:23 28:8 (29:25 30:21)drafters 150:21 (drag 70:14)early 6:5 40:25 (42:25 46:6)65:13 69:5 (94:13 98:7,8)111:16 114:3 (11:12)29:25 30:21 (33:8 34:9,13)drag 70:14 (4ramatically)125:22 127:5 (4rawn 60:18)98:17 121:9 (125:22 127:5)115:8 130:1 (135:21)34:15,21 48:21 (41:15,21,25)49:9 (4rawn 60:18)ease 158:2 (178:3)126:22 141:3 (141:19 147:18)151:4 157:2 (136:4,14) (145:15 171:14)51:2,26 3:15,16)Drew 175:12 (dried 111:22)easily 77:16 (132:8)181:7 (elect 60:15)disparage 72:21103:8 105:1286:1,4,7,12,19ebb 144:3 (30:25)30:25 (electronic 76:12)					00
discussiondocumentation10:23 35:14147:14 158:22118:14 25:2511:17 14:5dog 5:24 137:2360:21 183:11147:14 158:2218:14 25:2539:1 53:12dog's 137:13183:11 184:20171:14 187:451:24 60:1556:17 85:13doing 16:20drafters 150:21early 6:5 40:2565:13 69:5103:1,16 104:621:23 28:8drafts 14:1042:25 46:694:13 98:7,8111:16 114:329:25 30:21drag 70:14125:22 127:598:17 121:9115:8 130:133:8 34:9,13dramaticallyease 158:2126:22 141:3134:16 135:2134:15,21 48:2149:9easier 90:2141:19 147:18151:4 157:251:15,21,25drawn 60:18178:3152:14 178:17176:652:2 63:15,16Drew 175:12easily 77:16181:7discussions64:3,3 75:12dried 111:22easy 96:13 132:7elect 60:15145:15 171:1491:21 97:1672:11 78:8ebb 144:330:25disparage 72:21103:8 105:1286:1,4,7,12,19echo 14:1 98:21electronic 76:12					U I
11:17 14:5 11:17 14:5dog 5:24 137:23 dog's 137:1360:21 183:11 183:11 184:20163:11 168:3 171:14 187:435:2 48:25 55:1339:1 53:12 56:17 85:13 103:1,16 104:6doing 16:20 21:23 28:8drafters 150:21 drafters 150:21163:11 168:3 183:11 184:2035:2 48:25 65:13 69:5103:1,16 104:6 111:16 114:321:23 28:8 29:25 30:21drafters 150:21 drag 70:14125:22 127:5 42:25 46:694:13 98:7,8 98:17 121:9115:8 130:1 134:16 135:2133:8 34:9,13 34:15,21 48:21dramatically 49:9ease 158:2 easier 90:2126:22 141:3 141:19 147:18151:4 157:2 156:651:15,21,25 52:2 63:15,16drawn 60:18 Drew 175:12178:3 easily 77:16 easy 96:13 132:7 132:8152:14 178:17 elect 60:15discussions 145:15 171:1464:3,3 75:12 91:21 97:16drive 68:6 70:9 72:11 78:8132:8 ebb 144:3 echo 14:1 98:21electrical 30:16 30:25					
11.17 14.5dog 5.24 157.25105.21 105.11105.21 105.1139:1 53:12dog's 137:13183:11 184:20171:14 187:451:24 60:1556:17 85:13doing 16:20drafters 150:21early 6:5 40:2565:13 69:5103:1,16 104:621:23 28:8drag 70:14125:22 127:598:17 121:9115:8 130:133:8 34:9,13dramaticallyease 158:2126:22 141:3134:16 135:2134:15,21 48:2149:9easier 90:2141:19 147:18151:4 157:251:15,21,25drawn 60:18178:3152:14 178:17176:652:2 63:15,16Drew 175:12easily 77:16181:7discussions64:3,3 75:12dried 111:22easy 96:13 132:7elect 60:15136:4,1480:14,16 89:23drive 68:6 70:9132:8electrical 30:1630:25electrical 30:1630:2530:25disparage 72:21103:8 105:1286:1,4,7,12,19echo 14:1 98:21electronic 76:12	,				
55.1766.1785.1266.17105.112105.111101.2056:1785:1310ing16:20drafters150:21early6:540:25103:1,16104:621:2328:8drafts14:1042:2542:2542:2542:25111:16114:329:2530:21drag70:14125:22127:598:17121:9115:8130:133:834:9,13dramaticallyease158:2126:22141:3134:16135:2134:15,2148:2149:9easier90:2141:19147:18151:4157:251:15,21,25drawn60:18178:3152:14178:17176:652:263:15,16Drew175:12easily77:16181:7discussions64:3,375:12dried111:22easy96:13132:7elect60:15136:4,1480:14,1689:23drive68:670:9132:8electrical30:25145:15171:1491:2197:1672:1178:8echo14:198:21electronic76:12		0			
103:1,16 104:621:23 28:8drafts 14:1042:25 46:694:13 98:7,8111:16 114:329:25 30:21drag 70:14125:22 127:598:17 121:9115:8 130:133:8 34:9,13dramaticallyease 158:2126:22 141:3134:16 135:2134:15,21 48:2149:9easier 90:2141:19 147:18151:4 157:251:15,21,25drawn 60:18178:3152:14 178:17176:652:2 63:15,16Drew 175:12easily 77:16181:7discussions64:3,3 75:12dried 111:22easy 96:13 132:7elect 60:15136:4,1480:14,16 89:23drive 68:6 70:9132:8electrical 30:16145:15 171:1491:21 97:1672:11 78:8ebb 144:330:25disparage 72:21103:8 105:1286:1,4,7,12,19echo 14:1 98:21electronic 76:12		0			
105.1,10 104.021.25 20.0drams 14.10125.22 127:598:17 121:9111:16 114:329:25 30:21drag 70:14125:22 127:598:17 121:9115:8 130:133:8 34:9,13dramaticallyease 158:2126:22 141:3134:16 135:2134:15,21 48:2149:9easier 90:2141:19 147:18151:4 157:251:15,21,25drawn 60:18178:3152:14 178:17176:652:2 63:15,16Drew 175:12easily 77:16181:7discussions64:3,3 75:12dried 111:22easy 96:13 132:7elect 60:15136:4,1480:14,16 89:23drive 68:6 70:9132:8electrical 30:16145:15 171:1491:21 97:1672:11 78:8ebb 144:330:25disparage 72:21103:8 105:1286:1,4,7,12,19echo 14:1 98:21electronic 76:12		0		•	
111.10114.325.2530.21drag 70.14ease 158:2126:22115:8130:133:834:9,1349:9ease 158:2126:22141:19134:16135:2134:15,2148:2149:9easier 90:2141:19147:18151:4157:251:15,21,25drawn 60:18178:3152:14178:17176:652:263:15,16Drew 175:12easily 77:16181:7discussions64:3,375:12dried 111:22easy 96:13132:7136:4,1480:14,1689:23drive 68:670:9132:8elect 60:15145:15171:1491:2197:1672:1178:8a0:25disparage 72:21103:8105:1286:1,4,7,12,19echo 14:198:21electronic 76:12	,				,
110:0 150:135:0 51:0,15dramaticallyeasier 90:2141:19 147:18134:16 135:2134:15,21 48:2149:9141:19 147:18151:4 157:251:15,21,25drawn 60:18178:3152:14 178:17176:652:2 63:15,16Drew 175:12easily 77:16181:7discussions64:3,3 75:12dried 111:22easy 96:13 132:7elect 60:15136:4,1480:14,16 89:23drive 68:6 70:9132:8electrical 30:16145:15 171:1491:21 97:1672:11 78:8ebb 144:330:25disparage 72:21103:8 105:1286:1,4,7,12,19echo 14:1 98:21electronic 76:12			0		
15111015111015111017111015114157251115,21,25drawn 60:18178:3176:652:263:15,16Drew 175:12easily 77:16discussions64:3,375:12dried 111:22easy 96:13136:4,1480:14,1689:23drive 68:670:9145:15171:1491:2197:1672:1172:1178:8ebb 144:330:25electronic76:12		,	v		
131.4 137.231.13,21,23drawn 60.16132.14 176.17176:652:2 63:15,16Drew 175:12easily 77:16181:7discussions64:3,3 75:12dried 111:22easy 96:13 132:7elect 60:15136:4,1480:14,16 89:23drive 68:6 70:9132:8electrical 30:16145:15 171:1491:21 97:1672:11 78:8ebb 144:330:25disparage 72:21103:8 105:1286:1,4,7,12,19echo 14:1 98:21electronic 76:12					
discussions64:3,3 75:12dried 111:22easy 96:13 132:7elect 60:15136:4,1480:14,16 89:23drive 68:6 70:9132:8electrical 30:16145:15 171:1491:21 97:1672:11 78:8ebb 144:330:25disparage 72:21103:8 105:1286:1,4,7,12,19echo 14:1 98:21electronic 76:12					
136:4,1480:14,16 89:23drive 68:6 70:9132:8electrical 30:16145:15 171:1491:21 97:1672:11 78:8ebb 144:330:25disparage 72:21103:8 105:1286:1,4,7,12,19echo 14:1 98:21electronic 76:12		,		•	
130:1,1100:11,10 09:25anve 00:0 70:9ebb 144:330:25145:15 171:1491:21 97:1672:11 78:8echo 14:1 98:21electronic 76:12disparage 72:21103:8 105:1286:1,4,7,12,19echo 14:1 98:21electronic 76:12		,		•	
disparage 72:21 103:8 105:12 86:1,4,7,12,19 echo 14:1 98:21 electronic 76:12	,	,			
$\begin{array}{                                    $	- 0				
	uisi upuve 00.9	105.24 110.10	00.21,23 99.23	10.23	123.13 142.23
		l	l	l	l

143:8 144:7	131:18 132:8	131:1 141:22	127:25,25	24:19 54:25
electronics	133:18 141:12	engaged 34:7	152:15,16,24	55:17 185:15
78:22,23 80:15	Elio's 68:10	80:11,25 91:15	equivalent 56:12	examination
eligibility 60:17	85:24 127:2	97:6 99:8,9,10	64:2	18:12
63:1 125:12	else's 33:22	148:6	<b>ESG</b> 67:25	examinations
136:17 137:1	38:17 161:10	engaging 5:2	especially 7:2	17:24
147:21 152:6	email 102:5	133:18	9:12 59:12	<b>example</b> 4:23
eligible 11:2	134:6 166:6	engine 70:8	110:24	17:23 20:1
147:25 148:5	embarrassed	79:15,17,20,23	essence 36:15	33:10 38:7
150:10 153:9	101:9	105:9,16	157:6 181:20	48:23 59:1
154:8,13 156:9	embedded 75:21	120:24	essentially 16:10	95:25 98:8,9
175:16	emerging 1:7	<b>engineer</b> 67:24	16:23	98:25 107:8,16
eliminate 156:6	4:6 9:6 156:12	engineering	establish 118:1	119:20 122:22
eliminating	158:6 167:3	68:1 70:11	131:17 136:20	128:4 143:4
44:14 156:23	182:2 188:4	79:17 81:25	established	153:15 158:16
<b>Elio</b> 2:10,10	<b>Empire</b> 81:7,8	English 182:21	115:25 151:11	163:25 174:11
5:10 60:1,3	empirical 10:25	<b>enhancer</b> 166:15	estate 54:4	183:23
67:23,24 68:7	employee 148:13	enjoyed 85:13	58:19,22,22	<b>exams</b> 36:24
68:13,17,23	148:15	112:16	65:20 79:1	41:5 54:20
69:2 70:20	employees 18:8	enlighten 17:20	137:21	55:23 185:13
71:10 72:14	148:18	enormous 75:19	estimate 81:10	excellent 31:24
73:6,8,14,19	<b>employer</b> 148:14	81:9 97:17	137:14	95:4 181:5
74:8,15 76:9	employer's	entertain 186:7	estimated	exchange 1:1,23
78:2,4,15	18:10	enthusiast 68:1	152:23	114:16,16
79:20 80:1,10	employment	entire 139:7	et 48:23 86:25	119:3,22
80:24 82:5,6	108:25	entirely 113:17	90:22 100:10	120:13,25
83:2 84:3,6,8	<b>enable</b> 41:23	<b>entities</b> 14:17	Europe 148:24	121:6,22
84:15,18,22	enamored 78:12	<b>entity</b> 165:10	event 87:18,18	122:25 132:15
85:2,7,12,15	enclosed 100:8	entrepreneur	events 92:10	132:22,23
86:11 88:9,18	encompass	183:3	119:4 183:21	135:17,18,19
88:25 90:3	14:16	entrepreneurs	eventually 32:10	135:21,24,24
92:5,8,10,12	encounter	22:22 82:16	160:25	135:25 137:10
92:21 93:1,8	102:14	113:12,18	everybody 13:12	142:25 144:21
94:21 95:22	encourage 31:8	enumerated	13:20 17:3	148:2,4,9,17
96:17,17 97:4	53:20 54:6	153:22	27:17 54:4	149:12,19
97:12 98:3,11	63:4 134:8	environment	62:9 76:6	161:16 162:9
99:7,25 100:3	157:19 170:15	28:24	77:10 90:13	188:12
100:5 101:7,11	184:4	environmenta	110:24 123:21	exchanges
101:20 102:11	encouraged	68:5	187:2	120:23 134:21
102:13,18,23	96:10	<b>equal</b> 63:20	<b>evidence</b> 31:20	135:10 136:15
103:6,10,24	encouraging 53:14	equally 30:9	157:9	136:15
104:9,19,21		equation 43:8 98:14 110:14	ex-auditor 165:25	excited 97:12
105:4,10 106:3	endeavor 132:6			108:16 109:1
106:24 112:9 112:24 122:21	ended 88:24 106:19 172:13	equipment 81:9 81:13,16	exactly 27:9 30:5 76:24	125:24 182:19
112:24 122:21 122:22 124:9	172:17 175:19	equity 65:22	95:10 104:17	<b>exciting</b> 58:24 59:4,10 98:24
125:21 126:4	ends 166:20	93:14,24 94:9	141:15 147:15	<b>exclude</b> 16:6
125:21 120:4 126:13 127:7	engage 116:1	93:14,24 94:9 94:12,14,17	exam 21:2,4,5	23:15
120.13 127.7	118:10 120:4	94.12,14,17 97:7 126:21	24:11,13,14,14	excluded 62:21
127.10 127.10	110.10 120.4	71.1 120.21	27.11,13,14,14	<b>CACHUUCU</b> 02.21
L	l	l	l	l

<b>excludes</b> 155:19	132:22 178:19	156:16 172:15	144:4 154:25	175:10,10,20
<b>excuse</b> 116:20	expanded 144:7	extended 46:10	155:3 182:22	175:21
119:23	expanding 31:9	extent 107:22,24	fairness 94:22	feet 115:3
<b>execute</b> 143:9	41:3 54:18	109:18 116:11	177:2	<b>fell</b> 175:2,3
executed 58:3	110:19 154:12	138:7 139:12	fall 21:19 101:5	<b>felt</b> 106:21
77:6 121:1,25	<b>expansion</b> 63:4	145:8 147:20	124:23 162:17	fend 14:18
executing 65:15	expect 17:9	148:6	162:18	<b>Fiat</b> 74:4
69:16 88:24	66:16 180:10	extra 51:12 72:3	falling 172:17	Fiat/Chrysler
120:20 121:6	expectations	91:5 105:14	familiar 85:25	80:21
execution	101:5,17	116:14 163:13	120:12 154:24	<b>fifth</b> 80:19
115:11 135:23	expensive 22:4	170:10 174:4	185:2	<b>fight</b> 130:17
exempt 18:4	73:2 86:7	extrapolating	family 42:25	figure 24:13
129:3 131:9	101:16 166:21	103:2	fantastic 102:13	27:3 97:5
132:19 156:13	166:25 178:23	extremely 11:3	147:12	136:11 140:19
158:24 176:25	experience	157:21	far 6:5 27:24	file 59:11 61:10
178:16 181:10	15:16 18:4,6	eyes 103:12	45:12 51:11	63:14 67:1
<b>exemption</b> 8:17	19:8,12,13,14	104:11	63:6 71:4	125:3 134:8
59:8 60:10	20:3,4 21:15		74:19 79:7	139:23 188:5
62:19,21 63:2	24:2,2,8 25:14	F	104:16 116:20	<b>filed</b> 6:19 61:17
129:13 131:3	36:25 37:7	<b>F</b> 1:24 111:12	148:22 160:12	61:22 66:15
147:19 155:11	38:3,11 52:17	face 177:17	168:24 179:16	67:15 140:25
156:16 158:5,8	52:18 58:16	Facebook 74:2	181:6 184:7	175:1,2
158:25 161:14	85:2,25 87:7	93:12 103:9	fashion 148:19	<b>filer</b> 155:9,10,17
161:16,18,25	90:25 95:24	facilitate 8:12	fast 23:6 82:20	155:18 156:2
167:14	121:21 122:2	10:21 120:21	135:22	156:10 177:23
exemptions 24:3	148:9 164:20	151:17	<b>faster</b> 78:23	178:22,25
35:16 57:12	experienced	facility 84:23	86:25 144:8	179:1 181:22
110:25 130:24	144:5	120:18	<b>father</b> 30:17	<b>filers</b> 66:13
182:25 183:15	experiences 5:11	facing 113:11	<b>favor</b> 56:18	155:14,23
exercises 182:15	68:14	fact 20:3 23:21	126:23	181:20,20
exercising	expertise 24:18	28:6 31:9	<b>favorite</b> 118:23	<b>filing</b> 6:22 58:25
180:18	33:5 41:22	35:15 49:23	favorites 137:9	59:4,23 60:23
exist 23:21 70:20	44:19 51:4	57:2,3 59:21	feasible 41:2	60:24 61:2,4
122:4	explain 18:7	66:5,11,17	feature 177:7	66:7 118:19
existed 60:18	62:9 128:25	67:13 80:11	features 177:6	123:8,19
73:9	150:22 161:10	98:23 127:9	February 58:1	filings 12:19,25
existing 7:13	182:17	158:4,17 164:5	<b>Fed</b> 147:23	58:4,8,17,18
46:22 84:19	explained	169:22	148:6	61:20 65:12
135:9	182:14,24	<b>factor</b> 130:22	<b>fee</b> 121:5	159:18 180:8
exists 36:17 71:6	explores 8:4	factors 29:21	feedback 6:14	final 5:12 6:23
73:16 115:8	exploring 135:4	36:16 43:25	13:3,10 15:7	41:1 61:25
134:2,23	exponentially	127:6 136:23	91:20 96:13	150:4
152:16 183:5	107:2	<b>fail</b> 18:14 27:23	184:4	finalize 5:5 14:9
exit 20:25 174:8	exposure 15:16	failed 135:5	feel 102:4,7	14:13 17:2
expand 7:12	express 12:6,10	<b>failing</b> 144:18	feeling 16:16,16	finalized 187:1
10:19 16:22	expressed 23:12	<b>fair</b> 43:15 71:10	106:18 145:23	finally 10:3
31:11 35:1,4	expressing	128:22	feels 117:19	21:14 91:16
52:3 62:8,17	127:20	fairly 25:9	fees 159:5	96:5
63:1 94:13,18	extend 155:11	116:20 139:24	166:24 170:25	finance 24:18
L	-	-	-	-

financial 7:6,20	15:11 17:19	<b>flow</b> 136:10	102.0 0 19	fromt 60:25 70.9
	22:23 29:6	144:3	123:2,9,18 124:20,25	front 69:25 70:8
14:17,20 36:23		. –	,	70:9,10,12
38:18,19 43:1	32:5,22,22 35:24 42:24	flows 176:11	126:4 139:23	75:3 145:2
50:1 55:2,3,12	· · ·	fluctuations	139:24 145:4	150:16
55:20 56:1	44:23 46:21	153:8	152:1 160:21	<b>frothy</b> 54:4
61:9 153:22,23	49:8,10 52:20	<b>fluid</b> 70:13	161:14	<b>frowned</b> 127:24
153:24 160:13	68:19 70:22	<b>focus</b> 9:23 95:12	<b>formation</b> 7:21	<b>fuel</b> 68:5 70:2
164:22 173:8	71:13 75:1	95:13 112:1	8:12 16:18	71:25 72:8
174:20 177:21	77:1,9,11,17	113:1,13 115:7	151:18 154:10	80:16
180:7 181:11	78:2,11,16,18	119:25 120:1	former 150:18	<b>full</b> 43:16 89:15
financially 47:1	79:21 89:11,12	129:23 140:4	<b>forth</b> 15:1 73:4	120:3 152:3
financials 10:11	107:11 112:21	<b>focused</b> 6:10	118:20 123:15	175:15
131:20,23	124:4 125:4	111:23 122:9	153:8	full-fledged
financing 83:19	126:20 132:6,9	135:16 152:8	<b>Forum</b> 155:3	162:14 176:16
126:21 133:15	150:17 173:18	focuses 6:15	forward 6:13	<b>fully</b> 137:7 161:3
<b>find</b> 18:13 33:7	179:9 186:23	148:23	7:1 9:2,10,22	<b>fun</b> 68:6 72:11
35:12 94:18	186:23	folks 49:12	11:18 13:3	105:20
96:21 99:17	<b>fiscal</b> 10:10	71:20 80:25	15:6 29:17	function 120:24
103:3 135:13	152:13,18	81:2 172:13	37:25 69:1	functionality
136:3 146:17	fit 85:22 86:3	182:9	113:2,22	73:5
160:23 168:15	98:3,6 110:18	<b>follow</b> 42:14	134:11,12	<b>fund</b> 30:7 32:16
171:24 172:24	fits 85:24 110:21	82:17 88:5,5	156:18 157:24	53:24 95:7
183:7 186:2	<b>five</b> 18:11 25:14	91:19 95:11	162:25	113:15 172:14
<b>finding</b> 85:17	25:15,21 59:3	102:22 144:4	forwards 31:1	fundamental
119:21 172:21	72:25 82:21,22	146:21 163:10	31:14	36:2
findings 10:25	96:5 97:16	164:9 173:13	<b>found</b> 85:20	<b>funded</b> 172:10
157:4	100:14 104:5	174:17 186:15	95:6,7,17	funders 29:9
<b>fine</b> 12:18 53:8,9	105:11 147:5,8	following 40:24	107:24 108:5	92:3
101:19 103:6	153:21 158:6	91:24 118:20	<b>founded</b> 68:7	<b>funding</b> 6:5 8:13
121:4 138:12	167:2 170:23	122:14 146:25	173:18	8:17,20,23
<b>finish</b> 70:16	170:24	<b>folly</b> 45:15	<b>founding</b> 67:24	45:20 48:5,8
<b>FINRA</b> 8:21	<b>fix</b> 15:21	<b>Foods</b> 28:11	four 18:8 69:2	48:12 50:23
24:15,15 36:24	<b>flavors</b> 181:17	<b>Fool</b> 103:22	70:19 82:1,9	74:11,23 83:22
91:7 114:10	fleeing 5:25	104:22	82:10 91:16	85:21 101:23
120:15 122:20	<b>flies</b> 40:7	foot 47:20 81:6	96:4 132:5,9	108:3 109:14
122:23 123:2,7	<b>flip</b> 11:4 41:16	footsteps 82:17	<b>fourth</b> 77:10	173:15
123:9,21,24	109:11	forced 75:18,25	<b>framed</b> 131:4	<b>funds</b> 8:19 18:9
124:4,19 139:6	<b>float</b> 7:14,17	83:15	framework	18:10 31:8
139:7,13,19	10:7,9,15	forcing 167:18	48:22 151:13	34:11 53:18
140:16 147:4	133:12,13	<b>Ford</b> 71:3	frankly 54:1	87:7 97:7
<b>firm</b> 65:9 106:19	150:13 152:12	foreclosing	<b>fraud</b> 36:6 37:10	176:7
112:13 118:9	152:14,19	137:5	39:21 52:12,14	<b>funny</b> 51:14
159:3 164:11	153:5,5 154:18	foreign 83:1	fraudsters 41:12	94:3 171:14
<b>firms</b> 48:11	154:19,22,22	116:11	<b>free</b> 122:13	further 6:12
94:14 97:7	155:16 162:11	foremost 150:17	126:16	<b>future</b> 20:6 23:2
126:6,15 127:9	175:6	forget 111:1	freely 127:13	31:17 37:13,25
140:17 142:25	floats 151:22	form 10:15 60:4	<b>friend</b> 53:23	88:6 122:5
159:13	156:8	63:24 64:4	friends 32:3	163:16 165:23
first 5:1 12:23	<b>Florida</b> 89:20	67:1 122:20	50:14	
L				

G	180:6 181:18	130:25 135:2	89:4,16 91:5,8	185:22 186:3
$\overline{\mathbf{G}4:1}$	giant 28:5	139:22 141:21	96:20 97:1,9,9	186:14,21
gain 133:2	<b>girls</b> 178:1	143:25 162:25	99:1,3,6 101:3	good 5:25 9:4
gained 24:1,2	<b>give</b> 6:4 8:10	163:16 165:1	101:15,16	12:1 18:2
Gallagher	12:4,12 17:3	167:7 169:1	103:13,14	20:12 21:13
134:17	24:14 27:17	170:9 171:5,9	105:5 106:9,15	35:17,22 36:10
gallon 69:5 72:7	33:10 41:6	174:21 175:17	108:22,25	36:12,24 45:22
73:6 83:16	42:2 58:5 60:5	175:18 176:7	109:19 111:15	46:9 55:12
85:16	66:22 72:16	177:17 179:12	111:16,24	58:15 74:1
gambler 46:3	88:3 121:16,20	180:10 181:7	113:1,4,15,22	78:10 85:21
gap 165:13,23	127:15 131:8	184:13	115:7 118:6,9	86:19 87:6
gas 70:1,14	139:20 142:8,9	goal 119:10	124:6,18,18,20	90:25 91:22,22
71:21 72:1,2	150:24 158:5	goals 121:19	125:9,22 126:2	92:16 93:18
72:13 82:22	161:6 167:16	<b>God</b> 29:25	126:9,10,17	100:5,21 102:9
gases 82:25	177:16	goes 30:22,25	129:15,19	103:17 106:1
gatekeeper	<b>given</b> 20:5 41:13	32:14,20 40:1	130:8,14,18,19	115:12 119:5
166:14	75:15 96:12	40:7 66:8 70:2	131:15,20	129:24 133:7
gather 45:25	117:20 129:4	72:4,9 76:16	132:19 134:11	165:17 167:14
gathering 35:6	131:2 166:9	127:19 130:15	135:20 137:4	175:13 176:24
gazelles 23:5	gives 77:1 139:8	131:14 159:23	140:1,16	180:14 181:4
gazillion 179:14	159:21,22	174:5 181:22	141:11 149:10	183:18,24
gee 40:12 50:15	giving 4:13	182:1	149:19 150:5	184:13 185:19
general 89:24	30:10	going 4:13 5:9	159:2,3,7	<b>Google</b> 121:3
106:8 111:24	glad 105:25	6:2 15:25 22:2	160:15 161:2	143:14
112:11 117:19	glass 80:22	22:4,5,10,13	161:23 163:4	gosh 180:3,6,8
129:7 130:7	global 80:12,23	24:15,24,25	163:17 164:2	180:24
151:12	83:1	25:10 27:22,23	164:16 165:1,8	gotten 74:1 75:5
generally 113:11	<b>GM</b> 69:19 71:3	28:11 31:5,7	165:15,23	89:14 94:9,15
118:25 122:11	81:5,9,21	33:11 36:9,19	166:5,10,14	132:3 172:12
128:18 129:8	<b>go</b> 7:10 15:23	36:20,22 37:25	167:8,13,18	government
145:6 151:6	16:2,3,3 19:16	38:16,18,20,22	168:5,9 172:6	34:6 177:11
152:11 153:25	26:22,23 28:1	38:23,24 39:12	173:20,23	grabs 52:19
155:21 164:24	29:1 30:14,20	39:13,15,19,19	174:7 177:24	grade 83:10
generated 127:7	30:24 34:14,14	40:22 43:13,16	177:24 179:11	graduate 119:2
geographic	38:22 40:11	44:23 45:19,23	179:18 180:1	graduates
119:8	60:23 61:1	45:25 46:18	180:24 182:13	119:16
geography	62:15 67:21	47:6,19,20,21	182:19	<b>Graham</b> 2:4 4:2
28:25	68:15,18 71:3	48:7,13 49:2	<b>Gomez</b> 2:11 4:8	4:9,18 9:3
German 81:25	73:23 75:11	50:17,18 53:7	13:15 19:18,20	11:20 13:25
Germany 79:17	76:21 78:1	57:17 58:10	19:23 20:21	16:8,15 17:12
getting 4:3	80:22 82:15	59:24,25 60:2	60:7 62:12	20:13,16,24
12:24 13:3,8	84:3 85:11	60:2,5 65:9,14	63:18 64:16,25	23:9 25:24
13:10,21,24	87:12 88:4	65:25 66:4,7	66:5,21 88:15	26:13,19,21,25
26:10 60:25	92:10 93:14	66:10,17 67:7	88:19 138:9	27:4,6,9 29:5
77:6 80:25	97:7 100:7	70:11,21 71:3	157:1 158:7,10	35:7 37:2
85:8 87:19	104:1,3,11	71:20 73:12,13	161:9 163:20	38:12 39:25
111:25 113:14	110:5 119:6	73:14,21 75:9	168:21,24	40:9,19 42:11
115:3 127:25	110:5 119:6 121:22 124:1,6	76:2,3 77:17	169:8,17 170:2	42:13 43:22
	110:5 119:6	,	,	,

				Page 203
46:19 47:4	82:25	<b>gum</b> 71:16	146:20 160:18	head 25:12
48:20 52:4,6	Greg 24:2 35:7	Gutierrez 2:12	163:9 181:15	33:16 97:3
53:4,7,9 54:11	37:2,9 38:4	98:20 99:20	183:7 184:21	101:8
55:1,7,10,13	45:17 106:16	100:2,25	184:23 185:16	headlines 52:13
55:19,21 56:7	107:18 111:7	<b>guy</b> 40:7 88:14	happen 64:13	52:14
56:9,14,17,20	142:4	94:6 103:7	66:4 69:14	heads 41:24
56:22 57:19	Greg's 142:3	guys 51:6 57:14	84:24 87:5	93:13,16
66:19 67:20	Gregory 3:3	78:11 80:9	132:18 137:4	hear 5:10,12
84:25 85:10	grew 135:7	86:19,20 87:3	144:13 148:7	15:9 52:16,18
88:2 106:6,9	grief 139:20	93:14 109:8	149:11 179:13	59:25 60:4
106:13 107:14	ground 13:21	172:7 182:23	happened 32:17	68:13 83:25
109:3 110:3	group 10:20	184:3	68:24 78:18	100:1 150:5
111:6,8,13	18:22,23 21:16		85:9 86:4 87:3	heard 40:8
138:1,4,11,15	32:23 33:13	H	96:10	55:18 74:14,16
145:11 149:23	42:3,8,9 50:14	Hahn 2:13	happening	74:21 102:14
150:3 156:22	51:5,25 81:3	149:15,22	29:11 34:21	102:15,20
157:25 158:9	112:5,11	158:22 160:10	70:10 108:15	106:24 112:9
160:17 164:19	114:13 119:19	162:16 163:14	109:17 119:1	136:14 138:18
168:9,23 169:3	119:20 120:15	164:7 167:1	happens 54:5	151:1 154:18
169:12,25	138:8 172:3,3	170:23 171:5	117:17 122:17	hearing 9:12
179:4 181:8,14	186:23	171:13 172:8	125:3 142:7	11:19 29:7
182:12 183:8	Groups 3:5	173:1,5 174:23	144:12 161:21	85:13 188:15
184:6,22,24	grow 31:5 115:4	176:1,5	happier 174:14	heart 18:19
185:3,9,18,20	161:25 162:1	half 58:19 70:2,3	happy 35:1,4	heavily 74:12
186:1,4,9,24	162:13	81:12 82:23	36:21 38:14,25	155:22
187:5,9	growing 23:6	169:9	116:25 137:25	HEC 158:7
grandfathering	165:23 177:13	halfway 94:5	156:20 186:14	hedge 97:7
19:10,15 20:7	grownup 161:6	187:6	186:21	<b>heels</b> 74:5
great 6:9 13:22	growth 23:4	hand 21:4 29:16	hard 30:23 35:2	held 105:25
31:9 38:3,3	30:8 95:7	34:20 44:22	36:20 48:14	130:18 145:25
40:12 49:14	127:16 144:6,6	111:17 158:13	55:5 75:4 85:7	152:24 165:10
64:16 66:21	144:6 156:12	158:15,15	85:17,18 87:16	165:13 180:25
71:1 78:7 89:8	158:6 167:3	180:17	168:15 170:15	188:12
92:23 95:24	182:2,5	handed 71:2	187:4	helicopter 40:8
100:25 104:13	guarantee	handle 140:20	harder 170:7	helmet 100:5,12
104:15 107:6	117:20 124:5	hands 122:14	hardest 77:8	100:15,16
107:16 111:20	guaranteed	124:11	96:21 99:15	help 8:8 14:2
119:9,20	72:12	Hanks 2:3 17:11	harm 23:12	24:25 32:7
123:22 125:24	guaranteeing	20:25 21:7,10	35:15	33:11,18,21
146:12 147:11	103:13	25:2 31:21	<b>Harvard</b> 83:6	49:21 50:24
149:22 171:20	Guardian 80:21	52:5 55:15	hatched 75:1	53:15 98:17
174:11	guards 40:10	56:5,12 57:1	hate 4:22 24:16	99:3 118:6
greater 61:12	guess 5:24 19:16	57:17,21 62:6	25:18 174:10	125:15 128:8
145:6 156:24	23:3 31:19	63:10 65:6	hates 178:9	132:10 136:23
greatly 7:25	42:16 46:18	67:21 102:12	hats 71:2	140:23 148:18
green 82:18	88:4 95:4	105:22 106:7	haul 72:22	157:23 172:14
100:4,21,24	106:9 107:3	106:11 109:6 110:22 111:18	Hauptman 2:14	helped 13:20
greenfield 81:14	150:20 174:1,8		102:13,22	75:6 99:18
greenhouse	179:2 187:3	145:13 146:12	103:3	helpful 6:14
	l	l	l	

				Page 204
12:19 15:8	116:11 119:18	23:23 24:7,11	57:22 108:23	180:9
23:24 157:22	119:21	24:16,16,19	<b>importance</b> 6:9	increasing
helps 98:12,19	homework	25:7,12,13	important 4:25	170:25
120:21 182:11	35:19	27:15,18 28:8	5:3 6:14 7:23	incredible 28:3
hesitancy 9:13	honestly 71:1	29:8 35:18	12:13 13:1,2	incredibly 95:24
9:14	82:3 91:11	41:6 45:12	22:20 29:20	143:7
hey 24:2 31:4	145:9	65:2 75:1	30:9 42:1	incremental
32:20 50:2	honored 5:18	103:17 107:6	74:25,25 81:15	178:21
51:6 75:2	hook 77:12	111:23 116:21	128:15 130:2	incubator 4:20
92:11 93:19	hop 135:12	130:8 163:24	143:10 162:16	28:3,5 34:17
97:8 98:20	hope 11:16	178:22 182:18	173:24 177:7	52:23
175:9	12:19 14:9	ideal 109:23	impression	incubators
hides 70:6	45:15 160:25	ideas 29:7 31:22	113:12	22:24 29:1
Higgins 2:15	hopefully 52:21	77:6 158:14	impressive	34:16,18,22
11:25	91:23 107:13	177:16	74:17,18	incumbents
high 23:4 25:9	163:16 170:19	<b>identical</b> 122:3	improve 140:21	86:21 87:2
30:15 69:3	hoping 43:9	identified 92:16	improvement	<b>incur</b> 169:14,14
70:15 75:2	<b>horrible</b> 87:6,9	identify 9:15	79:8	incurring 152:3
82:12,13,16	89:7	15:3 36:16	improves 70:8	independent
86:15 87:1,8	hospitable 147:3	58:21 151:6	improving 86:14	117:17
higher 11:7	hotel 120:8	identifying 56:3	113:20	<b>indicate</b> 115:16
157:6	hour 70:16	87:10	inch 86:5,7,12	123:9 125:16
highest 69:9	hours 76:20,22	<b>image</b> 137:9	86:16,20,21,23	136:23 147:24
highlight 117:1	112:25,25	imagine 59:2	inclination	indicated 7:21
170:20	141:14	169:15	16:12	43:5 168:11
highlights	house 42:24	immediately	<b>include</b> 19:4	indicates 61:23
156:19	45:9	39:3 83:5	22:10 25:3	indicating
highly 70:24,25	households	immense 132:1	28:22 41:4	139:25
99:8	83:11	impact 22:22	132:15 150:13	indication 142:1
highway 70:1	huge 24:25	23:2 29:19	153:20	indications 89:2
highways 71:14	30:18 79:6	46:22 48:16,16	<b>included</b> 132:17	89:6
<b>Hill</b> 114:7	83:13 103:10	70:13 82:5,6	includes 4:25	indirect 82:6
134:19	171:18 179:12	108:25 132:19	49:25 66:14	156:5
historically 49:9	human 82:8	133:17,18	including 8:2	individual 27:19
165:6	hump 102:5,6,7	156:24 157:3	22:3 54:19	36:12 46:16
history 46:25	102:9	impacted 129:21	61:8 156:11	49:21 50:12
hit 100:23	hundred 6:18	impacting 23:7	159:10	140:6 184:9
101:18	48:1 58:18	impacts 124:3	inclusive 54:21	individual's
hits 104:15	70:25	129:9 168:22	<b>income</b> 14:20	15:16
hitting 58:11	hundreds 34:18	174:1	15:4,17 16:1,2	individuals
<b>hold</b> 109:10,10	34:18 94:22	impediments	20:1 37:6,24	14:16,25 15:3
109:24 110:4	hurdle 68:22	125:21	41:13 46:15	15:12 17:15,21
125:25 183:17	hurry 91:8	implement	61:13	18:3,11 22:6
holders 92:4	<b>hurt</b> 42:4	12:16	inconsistent	37:19 49:2
102:24 152:25		implementation	179:1	industries 51:8
holding 22:16	I	57:11	increase 7:5	86:2 173:15
127:18 139:12	IAV 79:16,16	implementing	9:24 74:20	industry 21:3
hole 105:16	<b>idea</b> 18:2,13	12:15	150:14 155:9	23:5 26:22
home 35:11	20:4 23:11,20	implications	156:1,5 165:1	28:14,20,23
1	•	•	•	•

21.1.12.02	10.21.20.9	10.19.10.04	·	29.24 42.11
31:1,13,23	10:21 30:8	10:18 12:24	invest 24:22	38:24 43:11
33:3,21 38:1,4	82:1	40:15 89:2,6	29:13 30:11	46:7 53:13,18
38:10 41:22	innovative 75:11	104:1 106:20	32:1 34:12	<b>investor</b> 5:1 6:8
49:9,16 50:11	Innovator'	112:25 115:10	41:14 46:12,13	7:23 9:22
50:22 52:24	85:24	117:1 121:10	47:16,21,25	12:15 14:4,16
86:1,5 91:18	innovator's 94:1	127:7 150:8	48:12,16,17	14:22 17:18
95:9,10 107:20	97:23	interested 5:15	50:6 53:18	18:12,23 23:14
119:8,20	<b>input</b> 8:6,6 9:2	9:12,20 13:10	54:3,7 90:20	24:9 26:18
172:20 173:25	17:5 32:2	65:23 99:21	92:11 93:19,19	28:14 36:4
174:1	ins 104:3	108:9 120:7	94:7 102:25	37:6 39:17
inevitably 119:7	inside 52:24	127:11 129:18	103:23 104:1,3	41:17 47:2
inexpensive	<b>insiders</b> 84:20	138:7 145:8	104:5 108:13	49:21 50:12
101:14	140:14	146:22 151:25	169:4 172:21	53:22 56:4
inflation 16:6	insight 88:3	171:1	investable 50:4	57:9 91:19
influencer	127:1	interesting 6:25	<b>invested</b> 19:24	102:16,20
108:14	instance 22:9	27:18,25 28:16	20:22 25:14	106:20 109:23
influencers	instant 126:20	54:6 68:13,21	31:4 86:14	115:21 122:2
108:14	instantly 186:2	71:5	96:15 102:19	124:10 129:17
inform 8:8	institution 94:3	Interestingly	<b>investing</b> 18:4	130:4,13
108:11 131:14	institutions	152:4	20:18 22:7	137:17 142:1
information	85:19 87:22	interests 48:17	24:2 25:14	146:6 154:15
50:13,21	93:9,21 95:1	110:10 111:20	28:9,15,20	157:7 158:16
104:24 106:22	instructive	183:17	32:1,18 45:1	158:20 164:9
112:7 115:17 115:18,18,21	120:10	interior 70:16	47:7,14,16	168:14 169:19
1 115118 18 /1	insurance	interlocking	91:1 103:9	170:11
		0		
120:5 121:18	116:10 160:6,8	155:24 156:6	109:15	<b>investor's</b> 61:13
120:5 121:18 123:5,10,17	116:10 160:6,8 165:25 166:1,2	155:24 156:6 internal 159:16	109:15 investment	<b>investor's</b> 61:13 <b>investors</b> 8:2,7
120:5 121:18 123:5,10,17 124:2 131:6,8	116:10 160:6,8 165:25 166:1,2 <b>insuring</b> 166:2	155:24 156:6 <b>internal</b> 159:16 159:19	109:15 <b>investment</b> 14:18 18:21	<b>investor's</b> 61:13 <b>investors</b> 8:2,7 8:20 9:24 10:1
120:5 121:18 123:5,10,17 124:2 131:6,8 131:22,25	116:10 160:6,8 165:25 166:1,2 <b>insuring</b> 166:2 <b>integrate</b> 77:11	155:24 156:6 internal 159:16 159:19 internally 96:3	109:15 <b>investment</b> 14:18 18:21 21:21 22:10	<b>investor's</b> 61:13 <b>investors</b> 8:2,7 8:20 9:24 10:1 13:10 15:4,14
120:5 121:18 123:5,10,17 124:2 131:6,8 131:22,25 133:5 139:25	116:10 160:6,8 165:25 166:1,2 insuring 166:2 integrate 77:11 integrated 79:2	155:24 156:6 <b>internal</b> 159:16 159:19 <b>internally</b> 96:3 159:20	109:15 <b>investment</b> 14:18 18:21 21:21 22:10 24:7 26:17	<b>investor's</b> 61:13 <b>investors</b> 8:2,7 8:20 9:24 10:1 13:10 15:4,14 15:14 16:7,21
120:5 121:18 123:5,10,17 124:2 131:6,8 131:22,25 133:5 139:25 141:23 146:19	116:10 160:6,8 165:25 166:1,2 insuring 166:2 integrate 77:11 integrated 79:2 151:15	155:24 156:6 internal 159:16 159:19 internally 96:3 159:20 international	109:15 <b>investment</b> 14:18 18:21 21:21 22:10 24:7 26:17 31:3 35:24	<b>investor's</b> 61:13 <b>investors</b> 8:2,7 8:20 9:24 10:1 13:10 15:4,14 15:14 16:7,21 17:16,23 18:5
120:5 121:18 123:5,10,17 124:2 131:6,8 131:22,25 133:5 139:25 141:23 146:19 154:5,6 157:22	116:10 160:6,8 165:25 166:1,2 insuring 166:2 integrate 77:11 integrated 79:2 151:15 intelligence 31:7	155:24 156:6 internal 159:16 159:19 internally 96:3 159:20 international 148:21	109:15 <b>investment</b> 14:18 18:21 21:21 22:10 24:7 26:17 31:3 35:24 36:25 37:14,20	<b>investor's</b> 61:13 <b>investors</b> 8:2,7 8:20 9:24 10:1 13:10 15:4,14 15:14 16:7,21 17:16,23 18:5 18:9 22:17
120:5 121:18 123:5,10,17 124:2 131:6,8 131:22,25 133:5 139:25 141:23 146:19 154:5,6 157:22 159:12 166:12	116:10 160:6,8 165:25 166:1,2 insuring 166:2 integrate 77:11 integrated 79:2 151:15 intelligence 31:7 intelligent	155:24 156:6 internal 159:16 159:19 internally 96:3 159:20 international 148:21 internet 27:16	109:15 <b>investment</b> 14:18 18:21 21:21 22:10 24:7 26:17 31:3 35:24 36:25 37:14,20 37:24 38:8	<b>investor's</b> 61:13 <b>investors</b> 8:2,7 8:20 9:24 10:1 13:10 15:4,14 15:14 16:7,21 17:16,23 18:5 18:9 22:17 23:16 25:17
120:5 121:18 123:5,10,17 124:2 131:6,8 131:22,25 133:5 139:25 141:23 146:19 154:5,6 157:22 159:12 166:12 174:20 176:24	116:10 160:6,8 165:25 166:1,2 insuring 166:2 integrate 77:11 integrated 79:2 151:15 intelligence 31:7 intelligent 182:22	155:24 156:6 internal 159:16 159:19 internally 96:3 159:20 international 148:21 internet 27:16 50:14 51:3	109:15 <b>investment</b> 14:18 18:21 21:21 22:10 24:7 26:17 31:3 35:24 36:25 37:14,20 37:24 38:8 39:14 42:18,24	investor's 61:13 investors 8:2,7 8:20 9:24 10:1 13:10 15:4,14 15:14 16:7,21 17:16,23 18:5 18:9 22:17 23:16 25:17 28:4,19 29:12
120:5 121:18 123:5,10,17 124:2 131:6,8 131:22,25 133:5 139:25 141:23 146:19 154:5,6 157:22 159:12 166:12 174:20 176:24 176:24 177:3	116:10 160:6,8 165:25 166:1,2 insuring 166:2 integrate 77:11 integrated 79:2 151:15 intelligence 31:7 intelligent 182:22 intended 14:16	155:24 156:6 internal 159:16 159:19 internally 96:3 159:20 international 148:21 internet 27:16 50:14 51:3 90:22 110:25	109:15 <b>investment</b> 14:18 18:21 21:21 22:10 24:7 26:17 31:3 35:24 36:25 37:14,20 37:24 38:8 39:14 42:18,24 46:25 47:3,8,9	<b>investor's</b> 61:13 <b>investors</b> 8:2,7 8:20 9:24 10:1 13:10 15:4,14 15:14 16:7,21 17:16,23 18:5 18:9 22:17 23:16 25:17 28:4,19 29:12 31:24 32:2
120:5 121:18 123:5,10,17 124:2 131:6,8 131:22,25 133:5 139:25 141:23 146:19 154:5,6 157:22 159:12 166:12 174:20 176:24 176:24 177:3 177:22	116:10 160:6,8 165:25 166:1,2 insuring 166:2 integrate 77:11 integrated 79:2 151:15 intelligence 31:7 intelligent 182:22 intended 14:16 152:5 154:10	155:24 156:6 internal 159:16 159:19 internally 96:3 159:20 international 148:21 internet 27:16 50:14 51:3 90:22 110:25 144:18	109:15 <b>investment</b> 14:18 18:21 21:21 22:10 24:7 26:17 31:3 35:24 36:25 37:14,20 37:24 38:8 39:14 42:18,24 46:25 47:3,8,9 47:10 49:10	investor's 61:13 investors 8:2,7 8:20 9:24 10:1 13:10 15:4,14 15:14 16:7,21 17:16,23 18:5 18:9 22:17 23:16 25:17 28:4,19 29:12 31:24 32:2 33:4 36:6,6,15
120:5 121:18 123:5,10,17 124:2 131:6,8 131:22,25 133:5 139:25 141:23 146:19 154:5,6 157:22 159:12 166:12 174:20 176:24 176:24 177:3 177:22 infrastructure	116:10 160:6,8 165:25 166:1,2 insuring 166:2 integrate 77:11 integrated 79:2 151:15 intelligence 31:7 intelligent 182:22 intended 14:16 152:5 154:10 160:7	155:24 156:6 internal 159:16 159:19 internally 96:3 159:20 international 148:21 internet 27:16 50:14 51:3 90:22 110:25 144:18 interplay 113:9	109:15 <b>investment</b> 14:18 18:21 21:21 22:10 24:7 26:17 31:3 35:24 36:25 37:14,20 37:24 38:8 39:14 42:18,24 46:25 47:3,8,9 47:10 49:10 50:10 55:25	investor's 61:13 investors 8:2,7 8:20 9:24 10:1 13:10 15:4,14 15:14 16:7,21 17:16,23 18:5 18:9 22:17 23:16 25:17 28:4,19 29:12 31:24 32:2 33:4 36:6,6,15 37:22 40:4
120:5 121:18 123:5,10,17 124:2 131:6,8 131:22,25 133:5 139:25 141:23 146:19 154:5,6 157:22 159:12 166:12 174:20 176:24 176:24 177:3 177:22 <b>infrastructure</b> 165:16	116:10 160:6,8 165:25 166:1,2 insuring 166:2 integrate 77:11 integrated 79:2 151:15 intelligence 31:7 intelligent 182:22 intended 14:16 152:5 154:10 160:7 intensive 108:18	155:24 156:6 internal 159:16 159:19 internally 96:3 159:20 international 148:21 internet 27:16 50:14 51:3 90:22 110:25 144:18 interplay 113:9 interrupted 94:6	109:15 investment 14:18 18:21 21:21 22:10 24:7 26:17 31:3 35:24 36:25 37:14,20 37:24 38:8 39:14 42:18,24 46:25 47:3,8,9 47:10 49:10 50:10 55:25 109:22 163:23	investor's 61:13 investors 8:2,7 8:20 9:24 10:1 13:10 15:4,14 15:14 16:7,21 17:16,23 18:5 18:9 22:17 23:16 25:17 28:4,19 29:12 31:24 32:2 33:4 36:6,6,15 37:22 40:4 43:23,24 47:24
120:5 121:18 123:5,10,17 124:2 131:6,8 131:22,25 133:5 139:25 141:23 146:19 154:5,6 157:22 159:12 166:12 174:20 176:24 176:24 177:3 177:22 <b>infrastructure</b> 165:16 <b>inherited</b> 21:20	116:10 160:6,8 165:25 166:1,2 insuring 166:2 integrate 77:11 integrated 79:2 151:15 intelligence 31:7 intelligent 182:22 intended 14:16 152:5 154:10 160:7 intensive 108:18 172:23	155:24 156:6 internal 159:16 159:19 internally 96:3 159:20 international 148:21 internet 27:16 50:14 51:3 90:22 110:25 144:18 interplay 113:9 interrupted 94:6 interstate 24:3	109:15 investment 14:18 18:21 21:21 22:10 24:7 26:17 31:3 35:24 36:25 37:14,20 37:24 38:8 39:14 42:18,24 46:25 47:3,8,9 47:10 49:10 50:10 55:25 109:22 163:23 166:11 185:15	investor's 61:13 investors 8:2,7 8:20 9:24 10:1 13:10 15:4,14 15:14 16:7,21 17:16,23 18:5 18:9 22:17 23:16 25:17 28:4,19 29:12 31:24 32:2 33:4 36:6,6,15 37:22 40:4 43:23,24 47:24 48:1,4,10
120:5 121:18 123:5,10,17 124:2 131:6,8 131:22,25 133:5 139:25 141:23 146:19 154:5,6 157:22 159:12 166:12 174:20 176:24 176:24 177:3 177:22 <b>infrastructure</b> 165:16 <b>inherited</b> 21:20 <b>initial</b> 68:4	116:10 160:6,8 165:25 166:1,2 insuring 166:2 integrate 77:11 integrated 79:2 151:15 intelligence 31:7 intelligent 182:22 intended 14:16 152:5 154:10 160:7 intensive 108:18 172:23 intent 100:23	155:24 156:6 internal 159:16 159:19 internally 96:3 159:20 international 148:21 internet 27:16 50:14 51:3 90:22 110:25 144:18 interplay 113:9 interrupted 94:6 interstate 24:3 intrigued 107:15	109:15 investment 14:18 18:21 21:21 22:10 24:7 26:17 31:3 35:24 36:25 37:14,20 37:24 38:8 39:14 42:18,24 46:25 47:3,8,9 47:10 49:10 50:10 55:25 109:22 163:23 166:11 185:15 investments	investor's 61:13 investors 8:2,7 8:20 9:24 10:1 13:10 15:4,14 15:14 16:7,21 17:16,23 18:5 18:9 22:17 23:16 25:17 28:4,19 29:12 31:24 32:2 33:4 36:6,6,15 37:22 40:4 43:23,24 47:24 48:1,4,10 53:13,17 54:3
120:5 121:18 123:5,10,17 124:2 131:6,8 131:22,25 133:5 139:25 141:23 146:19 154:5,6 157:22 159:12 166:12 174:20 176:24 176:24 177:3 177:22 <b>infrastructure</b> 165:16 <b>inherited</b> 21:20 <b>initial</b> 68:4 127:4 132:14	116:10 160:6,8 165:25 166:1,2 insuring 166:2 integrate 77:11 integrated 79:2 151:15 intelligence 31:7 intelligent 182:22 intended 14:16 152:5 154:10 160:7 intensive 108:18 172:23 intent 100:23 interact 116:7	155:24 156:6 internal 159:16 159:19 internally 96:3 159:20 international 148:21 internet 27:16 50:14 51:3 90:22 110:25 144:18 interplay 113:9 interrupted 94:6 interstate 24:3 intrigued 107:15 108:17	109:15 investment 14:18 18:21 21:21 22:10 24:7 26:17 31:3 35:24 36:25 37:14,20 37:24 38:8 39:14 42:18,24 46:25 47:3,8,9 47:10 49:10 50:10 55:25 109:22 163:23 166:11 185:15 investments 15:13,14 17:16	investor's 61:13 investors 8:2,7 8:20 9:24 10:1 13:10 15:4,14 15:14 16:7,21 17:16,23 18:5 18:9 22:17 23:16 25:17 28:4,19 29:12 31:24 32:2 33:4 36:6,6,15 37:22 40:4 43:23,24 47:24 48:1,4,10 53:13,17 54:3 54:19 59:9,14
120:5 121:18 123:5,10,17 124:2 131:6,8 131:22,25 133:5 139:25 141:23 146:19 154:5,6 157:22 159:12 166:12 174:20 176:24 176:24 177:3 177:22 <b>infrastructure</b> 165:16 <b>inherited</b> 21:20 <b>initial</b> 68:4 127:4 132:14 139:18 167:24	116:10 160:6,8 165:25 166:1,2 insuring 166:2 integrate 77:11 integrated 79:2 151:15 intelligence 31:7 intelligent 182:22 intended 14:16 152:5 154:10 160:7 intensive 108:18 172:23 intent 100:23 interact 116:7 interacting	155:24 156:6 internal 159:16 159:19 internally 96:3 159:20 international 148:21 internet 27:16 50:14 51:3 90:22 110:25 144:18 interplay 113:9 interrupted 94:6 interstate 24:3 intrigued 107:15 108:17 introducing	109:15 investment 14:18 18:21 21:21 22:10 24:7 26:17 31:3 35:24 36:25 37:14,20 37:24 38:8 39:14 42:18,24 46:25 47:3,8,9 47:10 49:10 50:10 55:25 109:22 163:23 166:11 185:15 investments 15:13,14 17:16 17:18 18:10,24	investor's 61:13 investors 8:2,7 8:20 9:24 10:1 13:10 15:4,14 15:14 16:7,21 17:16,23 18:5 18:9 22:17 23:16 25:17 28:4,19 29:12 31:24 32:2 33:4 36:6,6,15 37:22 40:4 43:23,24 47:24 48:1,4,10 53:13,17 54:3 54:19 59:9,14 59:15,20,21
120:5 121:18 123:5,10,17 124:2 131:6,8 131:22,25 133:5 139:25 141:23 146:19 154:5,6 157:22 159:12 166:12 174:20 176:24 176:24 177:3 177:22 <b>infrastructure</b> 165:16 <b>inherited</b> 21:20 <b>initial</b> 68:4 127:4 132:14 139:18 167:24 182:3	116:10 160:6,8 165:25 166:1,2 insuring 166:2 integrate 77:11 integrated 79:2 151:15 intelligence 31:7 intelligent 182:22 intended 14:16 152:5 154:10 160:7 intensive 108:18 172:23 intent 100:23 interact 116:7 interacting 113:19	155:24 156:6 internal 159:16 159:19 internally 96:3 159:20 international 148:21 internet 27:16 50:14 51:3 90:22 110:25 144:18 interplay 113:9 interrupted 94:6 interstate 24:3 intrigued 107:15 108:17 introducing 144:10	109:15 investment 14:18 18:21 21:21 22:10 24:7 26:17 31:3 35:24 36:25 37:14,20 37:24 38:8 39:14 42:18,24 46:25 47:3,8,9 47:10 49:10 50:10 55:25 109:22 163:23 166:11 185:15 investments 15:13,14 17:16 17:18 18:10,24 19:2 20:4,6,9	investor's 61:13 investors 8:2,7 8:20 9:24 10:1 13:10 15:4,14 15:14 16:7,21 17:16,23 18:5 18:9 22:17 23:16 25:17 28:4,19 29:12 31:24 32:2 33:4 36:6,6,15 37:22 40:4 43:23,24 47:24 48:1,4,10 53:13,17 54:3 54:19 59:9,14 59:15,20,21 61:11 99:3
120:5 121:18 123:5,10,17 124:2 131:6,8 131:22,25 133:5 139:25 141:23 146:19 154:5,6 157:22 159:12 166:12 174:20 176:24 176:24 177:3 177:22 <b>infrastructure</b> 165:16 <b>inherited</b> 21:20 <b>initial</b> 68:4 127:4 132:14 139:18 167:24 182:3 <b>initiative</b> 155:5	116:10 160:6,8 165:25 166:1,2 insuring 166:2 integrate 77:11 integrated 79:2 151:15 intelligence 31:7 intelligent 182:22 intended 14:16 152:5 154:10 160:7 intensive 108:18 172:23 intent 100:23 interact 116:7 interacting 113:19 interaction	155:24 156:6 internal 159:16 159:19 internally 96:3 159:20 international 148:21 internet 27:16 50:14 51:3 90:22 110:25 144:18 interplay 113:9 interrupted 94:6 interstate 24:3 intrigued 107:15 108:17 introducing 144:10 introduction	109:15 investment 14:18 18:21 21:21 22:10 24:7 26:17 31:3 35:24 36:25 37:14,20 37:24 38:8 39:14 42:18,24 46:25 47:3,8,9 47:10 49:10 50:10 55:25 109:22 163:23 166:11 185:15 investments 15:13,14 17:16 17:18 18:10,24 19:2 20:4,6,9 20:19 24:6	investor's 61:13 investors 8:2,7 8:20 9:24 10:1 13:10 15:4,14 15:14 16:7,21 17:16,23 18:5 18:9 22:17 23:16 25:17 28:4,19 29:12 31:24 32:2 33:4 36:6,6,15 37:22 40:4 43:23,24 47:24 48:1,4,10 53:13,17 54:3 54:19 59:9,14 59:15,20,21 61:11 99:3 108:5 109:10
120:5 121:18 123:5,10,17 124:2 131:6,8 131:22,25 133:5 139:25 141:23 146:19 154:5,6 157:22 159:12 166:12 174:20 176:24 176:24 177:3 177:22 <b>infrastructure</b> 165:16 <b>inherited</b> 21:20 <b>initial</b> 68:4 127:4 132:14 139:18 167:24 182:3 <b>initiative</b> 155:5 <b>initiatives</b>	116:10 160:6,8 165:25 166:1,2 insuring 166:2 integrate 77:11 integrated 79:2 151:15 intelligence 31:7 intelligent 182:22 intended 14:16 152:5 154:10 160:7 intensive 108:18 172:23 intent 100:23 interact 116:7 interacting 113:19 interaction 114:19 129:20	155:24 156:6 internal 159:16 159:19 internally 96:3 159:20 international 148:21 internet 27:16 50:14 51:3 90:22 110:25 144:18 interplay 113:9 interrupted 94:6 interstate 24:3 intrigued 107:15 108:17 introducing 144:10 introduction 13:15	109:15 investment 14:18 18:21 21:21 22:10 24:7 26:17 31:3 35:24 36:25 37:14,20 37:24 38:8 39:14 42:18,24 46:25 47:3,8,9 47:10 49:10 50:10 55:25 109:22 163:23 166:11 185:15 investments 15:13,14 17:16 17:18 18:10,24 19:2 20:4,6,9 20:19 24:6 25:3,5,8,11,17	investor's 61:13 investors 8:2,7 8:20 9:24 10:1 13:10 15:4,14 15:14 16:7,21 17:16,23 18:5 18:9 22:17 23:16 25:17 28:4,19 29:12 31:24 32:2 33:4 36:6,6,15 37:22 40:4 43:23,24 47:24 48:1,4,10 53:13,17 54:3 54:19 59:9,14 59:15,20,21 61:11 99:3 108:5 109:10 109:21 110:8
120:5 121:18 123:5,10,17 124:2 131:6,8 131:22,25 133:5 139:25 141:23 146:19 154:5,6 157:22 159:12 166:12 174:20 176:24 176:24 177:3 177:22 <b>infrastructure</b> 165:16 <b>inherited</b> 21:20 <b>initial</b> 68:4 127:4 132:14 139:18 167:24 182:3 <b>initiative</b> 155:5 <b>initiatives</b> 113:24	116:10 160:6,8 165:25 166:1,2 insuring 166:2 integrate 77:11 integrated 79:2 151:15 intelligence 31:7 intelligent 182:22 intended 14:16 152:5 154:10 160:7 intensive 108:18 172:23 intent 100:23 interact 116:7 interacting 113:19 interaction 114:19 129:20 interactions	155:24 156:6 internal 159:16 159:19 internally 96:3 159:20 international 148:21 internet 27:16 50:14 51:3 90:22 110:25 144:18 interplay 113:9 interrupted 94:6 interstate 24:3 intrigued 107:15 108:17 introducing 144:10 introduction 13:15 intuitively	109:15 investment 14:18 18:21 21:21 22:10 24:7 26:17 31:3 35:24 36:25 37:14,20 37:24 38:8 39:14 42:18,24 46:25 47:3,8,9 47:10 49:10 50:10 55:25 109:22 163:23 166:11 185:15 investments 15:13,14 17:16 17:18 18:10,24 19:2 20:4,6,9 20:19 24:6 25:3,5,8,11,17 25:20,21 26:5	investor's 61:13 investors 8:2,7 8:20 9:24 10:1 13:10 15:4,14 15:14 16:7,21 17:16,23 18:5 18:9 22:17 23:16 25:17 28:4,19 29:12 31:24 32:2 33:4 36:6,6,15 37:22 40:4 43:23,24 47:24 48:1,4,10 53:13,17 54:3 54:19 59:9,14 59:15,20,21 61:11 99:3 108:5 109:10 109:21 110:8 113:19 114:20
120:5 121:18 123:5,10,17 124:2 131:6,8 131:22,25 133:5 139:25 141:23 146:19 154:5,6 157:22 159:12 166:12 174:20 176:24 176:24 177:3 177:22 <b>infrastructure</b> 165:16 <b>inherited</b> 21:20 <b>initial</b> 68:4 127:4 132:14 139:18 167:24 182:3 <b>initiative</b> 155:5 <b>initiatives</b> 113:24 <b>injection</b> 80:17	116:10 160:6,8 165:25 166:1,2 insuring 166:2 integrate 77:11 integrated 79:2 151:15 intelligence 31:7 intelligent 182:22 intended 14:16 152:5 154:10 160:7 intensive 108:18 172:23 intent 100:23 interact 116:7 interacting 113:19 interaction 114:19 129:20 interactions 149:1	155:24 156:6 internal 159:16 159:19 internally 96:3 159:20 international 148:21 internet 27:16 50:14 51:3 90:22 110:25 144:18 interplay 113:9 interrupted 94:6 interstate 24:3 intrigued 107:15 108:17 introducing 144:10 introduction 13:15 intuitively 156:22 158:1	109:15 investment 14:18 18:21 21:21 22:10 24:7 26:17 31:3 35:24 36:25 37:14,20 37:24 38:8 39:14 42:18,24 46:25 47:3,8,9 47:10 49:10 50:10 55:25 109:22 163:23 166:11 185:15 investments 15:13,14 17:16 17:18 18:10,24 19:2 20:4,6,9 20:19 24:6 25:3,5,8,11,17 25:20,21 26:5 26:10 27:24	investor's 61:13 investors 8:2,7 8:20 9:24 10:1 13:10 15:4,14 15:14 16:7,21 17:16,23 18:5 18:9 22:17 23:16 25:17 28:4,19 29:12 31:24 32:2 33:4 36:6,6,15 37:22 40:4 43:23,24 47:24 48:1,4,10 53:13,17 54:3 54:19 59:9,14 59:15,20,21 61:11 99:3 108:5 109:10 109:21 110:8 113:19 114:20 115:22 116:1,7
120:5 121:18 123:5,10,17 124:2 131:6,8 131:22,25 133:5 139:25 141:23 146:19 154:5,6 157:22 159:12 166:12 174:20 176:24 176:24 177:3 177:22 <b>infrastructure</b> 165:16 <b>inherited</b> 21:20 <b>initial</b> 68:4 127:4 132:14 139:18 167:24 182:3 <b>initiative</b> 155:5 <b>initiatives</b> 113:24 <b>injection</b> 80:17 <b>inner</b> 105:15	116:10 160:6,8 165:25 166:1,2 insuring 166:2 integrate 77:11 integrated 79:2 151:15 intelligence 31:7 intelligent 182:22 intended 14:16 152:5 154:10 160:7 intensive 108:18 172:23 intent 100:23 interact 116:7 interacting 113:19 interaction 114:19 129:20 interactions 149:1 interacts 115:24	155:24 156:6 internal 159:16 159:19 internally 96:3 159:20 international 148:21 internet 27:16 50:14 51:3 90:22 110:25 144:18 interplay 113:9 interrupted 94:6 interstate 24:3 intrigued 107:15 108:17 introducing 144:10 introduction 13:15 intuitively 156:22 158:1 inventory 75:16	109:15 <b>investment</b> $14:18 18:21$ $21:21 22:10$ $24:7 26:17$ $31:3 35:24$ $36:25 37:14,20$ $37:24 38:8$ $39:14 42:18,24$ $46:25 47:3,8,9$ $47:10 49:10$ $50:10 55:25$ $109:22 163:23$ $166:11 185:15$ <b>investments</b> $15:13,14 17:16$ $17:18 18:10,24$ $19:2 20:4,6,9$ $20:19 24:6$ $25:3,5,8,11,17$ $25:20,21 26:5$ $26:10 27:24$ $30:18 32:23$	investor's 61:13 investors 8:2,7 8:20 9:24 10:1 13:10 15:4,14 15:14 16:7,21 17:16,23 18:5 18:9 22:17 23:16 25:17 28:4,19 29:12 31:24 32:2 33:4 36:6,6,15 37:22 40:4 43:23,24 47:24 48:1,4,10 53:13,17 54:3 54:19 59:9,14 59:15,20,21 61:11 99:3 108:5 109:10 109:21 110:8 113:19 114:20 115:22 116:1,7 117:24 120:4
120:5 121:18 123:5,10,17 124:2 131:6,8 131:22,25 133:5 139:25 141:23 146:19 154:5,6 157:22 159:12 166:12 174:20 176:24 176:24 177:3 177:22 <b>infrastructure</b> 165:16 <b>inherited</b> 21:20 <b>initial</b> 68:4 127:4 132:14 139:18 167:24 182:3 <b>initiative</b> 155:5 <b>initiatives</b> 113:24 <b>injection</b> 80:17	116:10 160:6,8 165:25 166:1,2 insuring 166:2 integrate 77:11 integrated 79:2 151:15 intelligence 31:7 intelligent 182:22 intended 14:16 152:5 154:10 160:7 intensive 108:18 172:23 intent 100:23 interact 116:7 interacting 113:19 interaction 114:19 129:20 interactions 149:1	155:24 156:6 internal 159:16 159:19 internally 96:3 159:20 international 148:21 internet 27:16 50:14 51:3 90:22 110:25 144:18 interplay 113:9 interrupted 94:6 interstate 24:3 intrigued 107:15 108:17 introducing 144:10 introduction 13:15 intuitively 156:22 158:1	109:15 investment 14:18 18:21 21:21 22:10 24:7 26:17 31:3 35:24 36:25 37:14,20 37:24 38:8 39:14 42:18,24 46:25 47:3,8,9 47:10 49:10 50:10 55:25 109:22 163:23 166:11 185:15 investments 15:13,14 17:16 17:18 18:10,24 19:2 20:4,6,9 20:19 24:6 25:3,5,8,11,17 25:20,21 26:5 26:10 27:24	investor's 61:13 investors 8:2,7 8:20 9:24 10:1 13:10 15:4,14 15:14 16:7,21 17:16,23 18:5 18:9 22:17 23:16 25:17 28:4,19 29:12 31:24 32:2 33:4 36:6,6,15 37:22 40:4 43:23,24 47:24 48:1,4,10 53:13,17 54:3 54:19 59:9,14 59:15,20,21 61:11 99:3 108:5 109:10 109:21 110:8 113:19 114:20 115:22 116:1,7

125.19.120.2	162.10	100.12 127.17	114.5 115.20	07.10.10.00.0
125:18 129:2	163:10	100:13 127:17	114:5 115:20	27:18,18 28:8
129:16 131:8	itching 106:16	151:1	117:11,15,24	28:17,18,19
141:22 145:16	item 137:15	jurisdictional	118:10 120:9	29:24 30:3,4
147:1 149:1	150:4 178:12	147:7	121:11 124:2	30:22 31:13
155:21 159:15	178:13	jurisdictions	125:14 126:14	32:1,12,13,15
160:12 164:17	items 6:3 149:17	149:3	128:12 132:13	32:25 33:6,14
172:24 173:15	iteration 107:11	justify 159:24	133:6,14,16	33:15,15,23,24
involved 7:3	132:17 150:11	K	134:18 135:22	33:24 34:2,2,3
45:14 145:5	J	$\frac{\mathbf{K}}{\mathbf{K}$ 175:2	136:8 137:9,16	34:8 36:15
169:6	<b>January</b> 89:10	<b>Kara</b> 2:6	137:17 139:19	37:11,16,21,25
<b>Iowa</b> 132:7	89:10 171:16	<b>KCG</b> 142:25	139:22 140:12	39:9,11,11,21
<b>IPO</b> 57:13,14,22	187:3	<b>keen</b> 7:8 12:24	141:9 142:8	39:23 40:1,23
62:23 64:3	<b>JD</b> 75:19	keep 10:2 22:20	143:17 144:22	41:5,17,19
89:11 101:13	<b>JD</b> 75.19 <b>JDs</b> 56:6	23:7 26:1	145:14 146:8	42:7,17,17
110:6 127:23		45:21 67:17	147:19 149:14	43:6,23,25
152:22 160:11	<b>Jersey</b> 83:13 <b>jigsaw</b> 146:14	45:21 67:17 71:16 72:16	149:21 150:22	44:7,8,8,10,21
164:11 165:8	146:15	73:7 77:13	150:22 159:20	45:6,11 47:25
171:4 172:18	<b>Jo</b> 2:5	91:8 94:20,21	162:24 164:12	48:6 49:7,8,15
173:12	<b>Joan</b> 137:13	91:8 94:20,21 99:9,10 145:20	164:17 165:20	49:15,17 50:2
<b>IPOs</b> 107:6,12	<b>job</b> 10:22 13:22	147:23 158:7	167:20 169:5	50:10,19 51:2
178:17	20:18 45:22	182:23 184:8,8	171:7 176:19	51:3,11,22
<b>IRRs</b> 53:21	83:16,17 95:4	keeping 43:20	182:22,25	52:1,9 53:20
<b>IRS</b> 148:12	132:13	178:6	184:8 186:16	54:11 55:5,15
<b>issue</b> 6:9 41:19	jobs 83:15	keeps 165:23	<b>kinds</b> 34:12	56:2,5 57:5
62:10 77:14	119:23 158:25	<b>Keith</b> 2:15 11:24	36:17 40:5	59:9 60:8
83:6 84:7 94:1	<b>Joe</b> 40:12	13:25 14:1	120:3 124:16	64:13 65:9
99:11 109:6	<b>John</b> 38:4	kept 24:15 97:5	126:19,24	76:11 85:5,7
110:1 111:19	183:18	112:21	140:3 143:15 144:11 180:23	85:10,12 86:22
111:21 167:1	<b>Johnson</b> 67:24	key 68:25 70:1	<b>kit</b> 102:2	88:10 89:16
<b>issuer</b> 26:22	<b>join</b> 67:23	87:12,19 95:16		90:20 91:8,16 92:22 93:8
39:7,17,18	joined 13:13	104:12 113:1	kitchen 4:19,20 knew 30:25,25	92:22 95:8 94:8,9 95:1,10
63:1 125:17	60:3 112:11	116:24 119:12	,	, , ,
126:23 133:1 140:8,13 141:6	127:2	122:12 137:6	31:1,1,13	95:12,12,14,15 95:18 96:2
146:4 151:24	<b>joining</b> 12:2	<b>kick</b> 87:16	32:20 33:17 86:17	97:1,5,24
152:7 160:20	68:15 112:13	kids 43:2	<b>knocks</b> 30:23	98:12,16 99:16
160:24	joke 40:6,8	kind 6:4 27:12	<b>know</b> 4:5,14 6:4	101:7,7,12,13
issuers 6:20 8:7	Jonathan 2:18	27:20 28:1,10	7:7 10:2 11:12	101:20,21
9:13,16 27:17	52:5 53:6,7,10	31:7 34:10	11:14 12:23,25	101:20,21
59:22 61:17	journal 180:4	41:24 43:3	13:17 14:1,6	102.3,10 103.0
113:11 116:5	<b>Julie</b> 2:9 13:16	46:21 48:6	14:15 16:8,9	103:19 104:4,8
116:13 131:14	13:20 14:2	51:7,14 53:11	16:11,15 17:2	103.19 104.4,8
133:14 145:21	38:25 177:18	56:24 68:18	17:4 19:6,11	104.9 105.5
151:21,21	182:8 186:3	81:23 85:10	19:11 21:10,22	107:22,24
151.21,21	<b>July</b> 1:14 8:17	87:25 88:3,14	22:7,12,16,17	107.22,24
<b>issuers'</b> 48:17	61:16 188:6	94:3,15 97:2	23:4,12 24:14	108:20,20,21
issues 11:16 65:7	jump 16:5 19:16	99:7 101:8	25:6,11,13,19	108:20,20,21
65:16 112:4	19:19,21 50:22	104:18 106:14	25:22,22,23,24	110:9,9,13
113:11 147:6,7	<b>June</b> 6:16 60:8	109:24 110:7	25:24 26:4	111:15 113:6
113.11 147.0,7			23.27 20. <del>4</del>	111.15 115.0
			I	

115.10 100.0 0	09.12 12 02 04	120.15 140.11	66.10.112.16	114.10 101.00
115:12 120:2,9	28:13,13,23,24	129:15 149:11	66:10 113:16	114:10 121:20
121:1 122:11	33:5 36:9 37:7	183:25	118:5 121:16	138:21
123:25 124:12	38:1,3,10	lawyer 89:20	126:19 147:19	<b>linked</b> 123:19
124:17,20	41:22 44:19	lawyers 17:25	166:1 180:15	liquidation
126:8,9,10,13	45:1 129:16	21:15 38:5,21	levels 16:2 30:8	51:10
126:19 127:12	knowledgeable	39:10,10 55:15	65:17 101:23	liquidity 11:7
128:2 129:25	18:8	89:24 111:5	114:21	109:4,6,16,19
131:14 133:6	<b>known</b> 114:10	171:6	<b>leverage</b> 116:5	109:20,21
140:7,14 141:5	knows 28:15	lay 88:13	<b>liberal</b> 77:18	110:1,8,13
141:23 142:8	<b>Kyle</b> 2:14	layer 27:8	<b>library</b> 34:7	111:20,21,23
142:20 143:3	L	181:25	131:21	112:2 120:22
143:16,21,24	la 79:20 153:10	layers 181:16	license 99:22	120:22 127:20
144:1,2,6,14	lack 134:22	lazy 72:22	100:11	146:21 147:10
144:24 145:3	141:9 145:17	lead 11:6 113:21	licensing 100:20	Lisa 2:22 52:6
146:13 148:17	land 81:7 110:25	172:9	<b>life</b> 4:23 29:10	list 49:20 50:22
148:22 155:14	language 184:14	leads 119:7	43:11 78:23	147:8,23 148:3
156:22 157:25	184:18	leap 83:5	<b>lift</b> 161:7	148:4 149:16
158:13,24	laptop 87:4	leapfrogging	light 29:10	186:24
159:1,2,11,12	large 35:2,25	161:4	158:21	<b>listed</b> 27:3 54:1
159:16,23	155:10,13,17	learned 86:2	<b>lighter</b> 161:7	54:9 114:15
160:1,1,4,11	156:1 168:22	learning 88:9	<b>likes</b> 74:2	115:18 119:22
160:12 162:20	169:7,8 173:6	140:18	<b>liking</b> 51:23	121:22 122:25
163:4,5,22	181:19	leather 76:10,15	limit 25:18	144:3,17
164:7,13,14,15		leaving 119:6	47:14 50:4	148:17 185:5
165:6,9,14,20	largely 61:23	165:21 174:18	71:24 120:23	<b>listen</b> 68:21
165:21,24	63:20 114:18 141:17 149:4	<b>led</b> 104:14,14	129:25 135:22	listened 86:13
166:3,3,4		<b>left</b> 4:12 49:3	153:8	86:24 112:19
167:2,4,13,14	larger 10:20 35:4 71:7	81:9 100:14	limitation 44:11	listening 98:9
167:21,22,23	116:2 145:1	105:16 133:14	46:23 48:15	literally 72:16
167:25 168:2,3	151:17	legal 37:11 96:4	51:4 61:10	literature
168:9,18		175:10,20	limitations	170:12,17
171:15,23,24	largest 53:23 76:12 80:13,15	legalese 184:3	47:19	little 19:14 24:18
171:25 172:2,4	80:18,19,22	legislative	<b>limited</b> 47:2,7	30:3 31:4
172:21 173:7,7	late 35:10 152:2	134:19 136:18	47:24 48:2	32:13,14 33:25
173:9,10,13,16	173:19	legislature	131:10 175:6	41:8,9 51:20
174:6,6,15,24	Latino 34:11	100:17	<b>limits</b> 42:18,21	52:7 56:23
175:5,8,17,19		<b>lengthy</b> 157:1	43:19 44:10	68:19 89:13,14
175:22 177:2	Laughter 40:17 57:16 183:12	let's 14:3 42:22	45:19,20 46:3	103:7 105:8
177:11,14	187:8	44:12 48:21	46:14,22 47:6	108:21 109:3
178:8,21,24	Laura 3:4 29:5	56:23 96:5	48:24 52:8	113:10,21,24
179:10,19,24	59:13 145:11	108:2 109:18	line 45:5 82:20	114:1 115:23
180:6,18,23		109:20 111:1,8	101:4 103:7	117:12 121:5,8
181:6,17	179:4 <b>Laurie</b> 96:19	177:19	105:16 115:1	123:12 125:7
182:25 183:1	law 35:18 55:8	<b>letters</b> 6:10	118:14 124:7	126:12,14
183:24 186:10	112:13 130:11	134:7	124:24 126:21	127:1 136:18
187:3	164:11	letting 104:10	184:25	137:18,20
knowing 15:21	laws 125:9	level 7:15 38:9	<b>lines</b> 54:10 79:7	139:17 140:22
149:5	128:24 129:7	41:13 44:25	81:19	142:11,12
knowledge	120.24 129.7	45:2 65:13	<b>Link</b> 112:8	143:12,23
			l	

				Page 200
144:7,23	166:19 168:21	70:18 77:2,2,2	maintaining	<b>maps</b> 100:24
146:14 148:22	170:6,16,16	78:19 81:19	7:23 154:14	182:10
163:13 164:12	173:25 177:19	85:6 91:2 93:9	<b>major</b> 35:19	margin 86:15
165:19 169:2	179:7,9 184:3	94:25 96:11,23	101:13 176:6	87:1,9 136:17
169:10 175:9	184:13,19	102:1 106:20	majority 52:21	136:25 147:21
177:10,15	looked 18:19	107:1,3 109:1	64:18 92:20	147:23,24
181:7	21:16,16,17	109:7,12,12	102:19	148:3,4,5
live 29:20 60:23	33:11 91:4	113:17,19	maker 142:5	<b>marginal</b> 156:25
91:12 94:4	100:4 151:14	115:15 119:21	makers 121:18	mark 2:24 27:1
95:25 99:23	157:6	122:9 124:23	125:5 127:17	33:2 35:17
183:19	<b>looking</b> 9:10	126:4 129:23	127:18 138:18	186:11
lived 32:19	13:3 33:9 35:1	134:16,16	138:22 139:9	Mark's 42:7
lively 14:5	47:25 48:1,2	136:7 137:5	139:13,14	44:18
<b>LLC</b> 112:14	69:1 87:8	149:4,10 160:2	142:6,24 145:5	market 3:5 7:3
<b>loan</b> 72:4	91:20,23	160:6,8 165:22	<b>making</b> 12:24	8:7 22:5,19
local 4:15	109:11 113:2	168:5	21:24 28:10	23:25 24:12
location 119:9	128:9 134:10	lots 36:19	33:18 37:20	36:13 57:6
188:7	149:13 157:11	<b>Louisiana</b> 69:20	39:14 44:16	68:12 70:22
locks 76:5	157:16 168:16	love 92:11 109:9	69:18 79:9	71:2,6,7,8,13
logical 149:21	170:8,12	148:7 182:24	86:25 131:18	73:18,20 75:1
<b>London</b> 144:21	171:17,19	loves 132:4	138:20 170:21	75:4 78:14,17
long 11:12 20:19	looks 58:18 85:5	low 68:8 69:3	178:7 183:24	84:4 86:10,23
23:7 27:7 31:2	185:24	75:2 82:13	<b>man</b> 51:24	87:9 94:12
32:19 38:25	loop 96:13	86:9,23 137:14	manage 33:12	98:18 99:13
67:6 72:6 79:9	<b>looted</b> 176:6	168:19 178:18	48:14 108:3	107:2 113:18
118:20 131:5	lop 75:23	lower 11:6	managed 21:5	114:4,17,24,25
139:25 159:23	Lord 4:15	119:16 153:6	34:11 86:13,23	115:4,5,8,15
160:15 172:23	<b>lose</b> 39:12 44:1,3	153:17 170:4	129:14	116:2,22 117:6
longer 20:1,10	44:6 45:9 46:5	lowest 78:16	management	117:10,23,25
20:19 69:13	103:14	LSE's 119:15	36:10 90:15	118:2,4,13,25
78:22 79:5	loses 160:20	luck 85:21 106:2	167:16	118:25 119:15
162:2	losing 161:22	Luckily 175:13	managing 95:15	120:9,11,14
<b>look</b> 6:13 7:1 9:2	loss 14:18 36:7	<b>lucky</b> 21:20 60:1	107:23	121:10,18
11:18 20:6	37:9,10,19	lucrative 41:15	mandate 137:2	122:1,4,13,23
22:2 26:18	43:5,7,19	lunch 106:10,12	158:8	124:22 125:5,7
29:17 41:1	44:21 45:12,14	106:15 111:8	mandates 147:7	127:17,18
42:8 43:13	45:15 130:20	187:6	manner 116:7	128:1,17,18
45:19 47:23	lost 20:17 35:23	luncheon 111:10	119:25	131:15,25
48:5 54:21	49:15 52:15	<b>LX</b> 75:16	<b>manual</b> 131:3,7	132:10 133:23
62:13,16 63:5	87:25 94:9,15		131:11	134:1,2,3,14
63:7,9 80:2	100:1	<u> </u>	manuals 131:17	135:5,13,13,20
103:25 116:23	lot 29:7 39:10	<b>M</b> 2:6	manufacturer	136:2,8,11
117:7 121:16	40:18 43:18	<b>M&amp;A</b> 128:2	76:9	137:20 138:18
126:19 131:15	47:7 48:3,7,9	mail 147:16	manufacturers	138:20,22
134:9 142:15	51:3,17 52:2	<b>main</b> 174:25	75:14	139:8,11,12,14
143:21 145:3	54:14 56:5	mainframes	manufacturing	141:24 142:5,6
146:17,18	57:4 58:24	86:6	68:8 80:20	142:13,21,23
148:21 156:18	64:18 65:19,20	<b>maintain</b> 16:24	81:17 172:3	142:24 143:17
165:12,12	65:22 67:5	163:18	<b>map</b> 100:4,13	143:19 145:4,5
L				

145:18 146:3,6	76:17	175:5	34:4	10:7,9,15,15
147:2,3 148:11	Mary 2:5	meaningful	<b>memo</b> 82:8,12	10:17,17 16:3
149:5,21	mass 70:9	15:15 82:24	102:5	19:1 21:24
152:16,23	match 143:11	means 36:5 38:7	memorize	57:25 60:12,13
164:4 165:1	matching	60:22 62:1	103:19	60:14 62:4
166:4 168:24	120:24 138:19	80:11 126:10	memory 17:10	66:2 67:17
169:4 173:17	143:8 167:23	133:23	mentality	68:11 70:23
173:21,23	material 131:24	measurable	179:15 180:3	71:14 72:8,17
174:22,24	154:5	168:12	mention 110:23	74:11,11 81:6
177:15	math 65:25	<b>measure</b> 15:11	149:8	81:11,12,13
marketed 90:12	88:21	26:7,8	mentioned 7:4	83:19,20,21
92:19,24	matter 5:12 28:6	<b>measures</b> 14:20	10:6 27:11	84:6,9,10
marketing 36:12	49:23 55:9	15:1,7 17:2	29:3 55:6	88:21,22,22,25
90:21 99:2	76:25 94:23	measuring 15:16	61:15 83:23	89:1,2,5 90:7
104:18 133:17	95:1 181:1	mechanism	106:18 114:8	93:11,12
177:10,11,14	188:3	141:8	114:17 145:4	101:18 117:6
178:20 182:17	matters 5:1	med 33:17	149:15 152:11	117:10 118:13
marketplace	60:18 83:18	media 52:19	185:4,11	133:13 143:17
22:21 23:7	<b>MBA</b> 21:15 56:3	74:2 90:21	<b>menu</b> 28:1	150:14,15
118:8 135:5	MBAs 56:6	108:12	Mercedes 79:18	151:23 152:12
marketplaces	MD&A 153:24	median 117:6,10	merit 123:13	152:17 153:4,6
112:5	154:1	118:13	message 114:12	154:17,20,21
markets 5:10	mean 19:5,6,9	meet 24:9 90:15	met 28:3 104:5	154:23 155:16
8:24 14:7 54:2	19:16 22:12	116:7 131:5	141:10	155:17 156:8,8
54:3 57:22	23:6 26:21	136:24 141:12	<b>metal</b> 73:3	160:25 161:2
68:14 70:19	27:18 30:24	148:10	method 127:25	162:11,19
71:12 86:15	31:21,25 32:19	meeting 1:7 4:4	methods 93:6	165:21 171:6,8
87:1 89:10	34:3 36:4,5,9	4:5 5:4 6:1	metric 142:16	171:9,10
94:9 97:8	38:5,25 39:22	8:15 9:5 14:4,9	Metrica 117:18	173:11,12,13
112:4,5,11,13	42:15,15 43:6	16:9 35:10	Michael 2:19	175:7,12
113:5 114:8,18	44:5 50:8,9,11	39:2 58:2	37:2 38:12	<b>millions</b> 75:14
117:7,8 118:14	50:19 55:4	176:20 184:15	Microsoft 121:3	mind 26:1 39:2
119:3,6,11,17	59:15 64:23	184:17 187:3	midnight 76:19	45:21 67:17
119:24 120:4	101:24 107:1	187:10,11	76:21	72:24 140:7
124:14,15	108:12,21,23	188:4	<b>midway</b> 173:20	158:7 165:24
126:5 129:19	108:24,25	meetings 13:21	<b>mike</b> 128:24	181:9 183:11
130:5 132:4	109:6,9,19	51:13 54:13	131:16 185:8	<b>minds</b> 73:1
134:20,24,25	121:17 122:17	90:15 94:25	<b>Mike's</b> 132:6	124:1
135:7,8,9,11	138:21 141:1	97:9,19,21	mile 71:9 82:8	mine 53:23
136:2,10	146:23,25	160:11 164:7,9	<b>mileage</b> 69:3,4	<b>mini</b> 57:13,14,22
141:20 143:1	164:20 170:15	172:4 173:9	70:1,4,14 75:2	74:5 86:16,17
143:24 144:4	171:20 173:3	175:18	82:13	127:23
144:17,22,24	173:25 177:6	megabyte 86:8	miles 69:5 70:15	minimum 15:12
145:6,7 148:25	178:6,12	member 18:1	72:7 73:6	15:13 17:15
149:3,6 174:13	180:19 181:10	114:11 120:15	83:16 85:16	18:21,25 22:10
175:13 186:16	183:18 185:5	members 8:21	milestone 79:21	25:3 35:22
marshaling	meaning 67:15	13:13 123:7	79:25	46:25 47:8,9
76:22	120:16 131:3	139:6	<b>million</b> 7:15,16	101:21
marshalling	135:18 161:16	membership	7:17,18 8:19	minutes 54:23

82:9 128:15	163:13,17	186:10,18,22	<b>nature</b> 37:18	182:13
151:4	172:11 175:9	mouthful 9:7	46:8 140:4	net 14:21 15:4
mirroring 104:5	180:1,7,11	move 5:17 9:22	navigating	15:17,25 16:3
<b>mirrors</b> 76:11	182:20 183:4,5	15:6 37:16,18	12:21	18:25 21:23
76:16	monitor 8:23	40:23 70:3	nay 130:10	23:15 32:8
misleading	month 5:8 7:4	119:3 128:12	near 18:18	37:23 46:15
154:7	57:10,25 72:13	144:16 157:24	nearly 6:24	61:13
mismatched	72:15 74:4	moved 70:8	68:11 81:16	<b>network</b> 47:16
146:14	159:8 173:13	134:18	82:23	48:2 120:14
missed 100:18	175:6	mover 132:9	necessarily 38:5	networks 24:23
182:7	monthly 72:8	movers 132:6	41:20 54:9	neurosurgeons
<b>mission</b> 74:20	months 69:13	moving 29:17	111:22 124:21	33:13,14
<b>mistake</b> 91:13	97:16,20 104:2	70:2 101:25	126:22 140:8	neurosurgery
mitigate 69:17	146:2	162:25	144:1 148:11	33:16
mixed 157:13	monumental	<b>muffin</b> 4:11,13	149:5 157:15	<b>never</b> 30:19 44:2
170:17	168:13	<b>multiple</b> 125:2	168:13	48:12 78:18
<b>mobility</b> 83:6,9	moons 24:12	multiply 90:20	necessary 142:1	102:15,20
83:12	moot 155:22	169:13	147:21 154:6	129:15 132:7,8
model 75:8,15	morning 9:4	multiplying	need 11:10 12:4	148:4 164:8
77:25 78:14	12:1 40:25	152:20	13:14 15:20	176:5 179:25
120:14 121:4	61:15 112:9,16	<b>Murphy</b> 2:17	20:5 31:18,18	new 5:9,11,13
121:13 135:17	184:12	13:18	35:6 36:15	66:6,12,18
135:23 136:2	morning's		46:23 47:5	69:10 70:22
136:19,20	111:19	N	52:8 68:2 73:5	71:8,10,23
137:10,10,18	<b>motion</b> 56:15,16	<b>N</b> 4:1 111:12,12	73:18 76:1	72:11,14 73:18
modeled 152:1	186:7	111:12	99:22 100:11	74:5 77:6 78:7
modest 11:4	motivated	<b>N.E</b> 1:24	100:15,16	78:11 79:4,22
moment 26:2	127:11	name 10:25	104:18 112:1	83:13 87:21
46:16 59:4	Motley 103:22	71:22 104:23	113:20 121:8,9	93:22 100:7
96:18 109:7	104:22	188:18	128:16 135:17	113:17 114:16
117:13 125:10	<b>Motor</b> 85:8	napkin 70:17	136:24 157:10	119:3 127:25
money 20:17	motorcycle 70:6	narrower 118:3	167:5 174:3,4	128:1 132:19
21:20,24 24:23	99:22 100:6,11	NASAA 131:3	182:20	141:8,16
32:11,14 33:1	Motors 2:10	131:16 132:1	needed 47:2	142:24 174:6
33:5,22,23	5:10 67:24	141:17	91:8 93:20	180:12 184:14
39:12 40:13	68:7,23 80:1	nascent 9:18	needs 39:4 41:18	184:18
46:5 51:8,9,12	80:24 96:18	NASDAQ	54:14 88:7	newly 11:2
69:14 73:20	98:3 129:18	114:16 119:4	91:18,20 136:8	newness 9:15
74:9 77:19	Mott 2:16 18:18	141:7,16	168:7	news 52:19
81:19 85:18	19:19,22 20:11	142:25 144:25	negative 65:21	131:24 175:13
86:24 89:9	20:15 21:2,9	148:1,2,3	98:8 163:23	nice 46:2 57:18
90:10 91:1	21:13 32:5	149:9,12,13	negotiate 120:19	90:18 117:22
95:16,17 99:17	33:2 47:12	Nash 79:23	neighbor 33:23	127:16 128:10
103:14 104:3	49:6 53:12	nation 29:2	neither 75:25	132:13 164:20
106:20,22	95:3,3 107:17	national 129:11	Nelson 2:18	nicely 113:5
107:23 111:24	140:23 141:4	135:18	53:11 92:7	Nicholas 188:9
133:16 140:14	142:3 143:18	nationally 131:7	93:4 94:19	night 35:11
141:9 145:19	172:19 173:2	natural 85:22	112:13 144:18	nine 69:12 76:22
147:10 163:4	173:24 186:8	128:13	171:2 172:6	97:20 104:2
L	-	-	-	-

182:14,18,25	112:12	observable 11:5	60:14 61:7,17	184:16,24
Ninety 73:12	number 7:12	observation	61:24 62:4	185:18,20
nodding 39:22	17:14,21 18:3	179:6	64:15,20 88:5	186:1,4,5,6,6
nominal 82:19	18:8,11 23:1	<b>observe</b> 160:5	113:22 126:24	187:2,9
<b>non-</b> 61:18	25:3,4,4,4,9,10	observed 108:1	133:23 152:3	<b>old</b> 28:6 40:8
146:2	25:18 26:4,10	obsolete 79:1	178:4,8,17	70:25 72:8,17
non-accelerated	26:22 27:24	obvious 70:22	offers 4:20	152:1 182:14
155:23	34:1 35:25	71:4	133:11	182:18,25
non-accredited	47:24 48:2	obviously 6:5,8	offhand 145:22	183:16
24:4 25:17	57:3 58:17	6:14,25 18:18	office 13:13,16	once 15:22
26:17,18 61:11	59:10 61:11,18	23:24 74:21,24	13:17,19	38:18 63:6
92:20 155:21	64:10 65:1	82:21 101:16	150:19	66:24 122:13
non-affiliates	66:12,22,23	115:22 130:21	<b>Officers</b> 173:8	124:25 162:13
122:14	71:11 74:17	133:11 134:9	official 27:20	175:17
non-cost 163:10	81:7 82:24	154:24	officially 102:6	one-on-ones
non-financial	83:8,10,12	occupant 100:10	offt 34:6	107:4
15:11 17:2	92:5 101:8	<b>October</b> 184:15	oh 26:13 29:25	one-to-one
<b>non-public</b> 6:21	112:20 122:18	184:17 187:1	50:15 84:3	117:12
60:21	124:1 125:24	<b>OEMs</b> 77:5	95:22 99:25	onerous 181:7
non-refundable	125:25 126:5,6	offer 34:17	138:21 164:15	ones 27:21 34:23
74:10,12,12	127:6 130:24	115:20 120:18	165:1 180:3,6	46:11 66:9
non-reporting	136:10 142:14	offering 6:18,22	180:8,19,20,24	77:5 97:14
152:2	144:20 145:1,5	6:24 58:3	186:4	136:11 153:11
non-sexy 101:1	146:14 148:23	60:21 61:4,5	oil 83:1,2	ongoing 67:10
non-SRC 153:7	152:20 157:18	61:22,24 62:1	okay 4:9 13:25	68:4 116:13,19
153:13	168:17,22	63:25 64:1,5,8	19:22 20:24	118:17 161:13
non-traditional	169:5,5,7,8,13	65:4 66:8,25	30:16 32:18	op 171:13
42:6	169:16 178:14	67:2,7,9,15,16	33:2 35:24	open 33:6
non-voting	182:4 188:5	67:19 68:10,11	40:19 42:20	103:12 104:11
152:21	numbers 16:25	84:17,21 87:13	46:18 52:4,6	140:20
normal 43:11	18:20 26:15	87:14 102:20	53:4,9 54:16	opened 87:17
47:10 126:19	55:17 61:14	113:14 118:10	55:7,22 56:14	opening 5:18
127:14	63:19 64:17	122:8,15	56:22 57:14,19	operate 120:23
normally 88:13	119:16 143:23	122:0,15	60:2 65:24	121:20 123:7
<b>North</b> 69:21	144:11,20	124:8,9 127:3	77:16 88:18	131:25 135:21
82:14	145:9 160:4	127:13 128:5	89:9 96:8	167:6,9 171:10
note 11:21 113:2	165:21 171:1	128:21 132:19	100:3 101:10	operated 131:11
117:5 118:12	<b>numeric</b> 23:20	133:8,10,24	102:22 106:6	135:8
120:10 127:22		134:3,3 145:25	111:8,13	<b>operates</b> 114:9
130:12 154:3	0	147:1 148:20	122:24 123:22	120:11
162:16	<b>o</b> 4:1 23:17	152:6,23	124:6 126:15	operating 58:25
noted 127:3	111:12,12,12	161:12 182:4	129:20 138:5	65:20 117:4
132:12,14	objective 7:19	185:25	138:15 139:15	143:1
134:5 169:21	obligated 117:19	offering's 67:5	141:4 142:3	operational
170:3	124:4,7	offerings 8:19	143:18 149:23	167:1
<b>notice</b> 123:8	obligations	18:4 24:3	150:3 167:10	operator 122:13
noting 159:7	42:25 115:11	25:15 47:25	167:15 175:23	opinion 37:11
notoriety 99:2	148:14 152:4	48:8 57:24	176:2,16 180:8	38:11 165:17
November 68:9	156:12 161:24	59:19 60:12,13	182:12 184:6	166:15,20
		00.12,13	102.12 101.0	100.12,20
L	l	1	1	1

opportunities	<b>OT</b> 116:20	outstanding	<b>painful</b> 179:24	36:17
47:7	<b>OTC</b> 3:5 5:10	84:9 152:15	179:24	particularly
opportunity	62:8 68:14	outweigh 168:13	<b>paper</b> 70:17	22:7,22 75:10
4:11 9:7 14:10	112:4,5,6,8,11	over-the- 114:13	103:23	78:22 80:6
14:12 17:4	112:13 113:4	over-the-coun	paragraph	124:3 136:5
23:3 29:13	114:8,10	115:25 135:8	184:18	172:22
30:10 41:14	121:19 126:5	overall 86:8	<b>parameter</b> 25:23	partly 179:21
42:2,5,16,18	129:12,18	149:14 169:3	25:25	<b>partner</b> 80:20
42:19 47:17,21	130:5 132:4	overcome 93:25	parent 83:11	112:13 127:15
51:19 129:25	134:23,25	overlapping	parents 30:16	partnered 79:10
131:13,16	135:11 136:2	13:8	43:1	partners 99:4
150:1	138:21 142:7	overnight 85:6	part 8:22 11:9	partnership
opposed 21:12	145:21 147:23	179:13 180:11	16:17 21:22	172:14
27:19 28:14,20	147:24 148:3,4	overpromise	34:13 40:14	parts 69:23 80:3
41:11 46:21	148:5,13,16	112:18	42:3 43:7 46:2	80:4,15,19
56:20 65:20	149:5	overrun 82:21	59:8 65:18	82:14 90:3
81:14 166:1	<b>OTCB</b> 112:5	oversees 13:19	66:5,11 80:13	party 153:15
176:4	<b>OTCQB</b> 114:23	overstepping	85:14,17,18	159:19
<b>option</b> 11:14	115:5 117:13	52:11	92:17,21 99:15	pass 17:23 18:12
24:9 152:2	118:12,16,18	overview 68:19	110:13,14,19	18:14 19:5
164:21 172:25	118:22 119:18	150:24	110:19,20,20	24:19
optionality	124:14 131:17	overwhelming	114:14 121:2	passed 41:4
121:11	142:17	69:7	126:25 127:6	54:19 55:5
options 23:23	<b>OTCQX</b> 68:12	owned 75:9	128:6 133:22	132:20
24:5,21 25:16	83:22 112:5,10	80:21	142:22 143:14	passing 48:23
57:5 78:19	114:22 115:24	owner 175:24	144:24 148:8	147:22
101:12 137:5	115:24 116:4,8	owners 125:16	151:17 153:7	passionate 108:4
183:3,22	116:16,19	ownership	part-time 35:18	pastries 4:14
<b>order</b> 4:4 5:6	117:4,6,15,17	148:13,15	partially 124:16	paternalistic
22:21 50:9	117:21 119:18	owns 174:25	179:21	45:8
76:16 80:10	119:19,21	<b>Oxford</b> 117:18	PARTICIPANT	path 95:5
90:16 91:7	124:14 127:2,4		57:18,20 138:3	135:12
99:22 102:2	128:4 131:17	P P	185:5,7	patient 112:19
119:11 120:23	131:19 141:13	<b>P</b> 4:1	participants 2:1	Patrick 2:20
120:25,25	141:15 142:13	<b>P&amp;L</b> 176:11,17	3:1 7:3 8:7	15:18 38:13
122:20 124:24	142:17	<b>p.m</b> 76:19	117:25 142:23	64:16 84:13
135:22 137:12	ought 36:5	187:11	143:8	138:16 142:4
166:18	outdated 13:9	<b>package</b> 75:13	participate	179:4
orders 76:18	outline 5:4	75:23,24 77:24	13:21 22:7	Patriotic 82:18
138:19	outreach 54:13	97:17	32:7 42:5,10	pattern 128:10
organism 81:18	57:8 108:10	packaged 77:22	42:16,19	144:4
organizations	110:20 140:21	packages 75:16	139:11 149:20	<b>Paul</b> 2:10 60:1,3
147:8	183:9 184:2	packaging	participating	60:4 65:2
orientation	outside 57:6	105:15	62:21	67:22,23,24
49:24,25	79:7 80:2	<b>page</b> 83:5 183:14 184:2	particular 23:3	68:15 88:15,17
oriented 107:21	124:1 130:10	185:14 184:2	38:3,10 41:23	89:20 95:3
original 62:20	159:13,19		124:21 132:24	96:19 98:20
188:13	167:17 171:24	<b>pages</b> 139:24 <b>paid</b> 42:24 166:1	150:21 184:7	101:1 105:24
<b>OS-0719</b> 188:5	180:7	<b>Patu</b> 42.24 100.1	particularity	112:24 113:12
L				

			1	
126:13 127:3	149:4 157:19	125:6 130:6	115:6,15,16	186:8
132:8 133:18	164:22,25	133:7 140:8	141:24	pleased 32:7
<b>pay</b> 78:5,6 104:1	166:13,22	149:11	<b>pipe</b> 126:21	67:22 112:3
121:5 127:12	171:15 177:14	person 12:5	piqued 163:21	150:15
154:1 165:15	178:16 179:11	36:12 65:10	<b>piss</b> 82:2	plenty 39:10,22
<b>payables</b> 167:23	179:17 180:13	98:8 105:3	<b>pitch</b> 93:4	<b>plowed</b> 86:24
paycheck 44:24	180:24 181:1,2	143:6	pitched 94:4	<b>plus</b> 78:1,1
paying 72:4	182:20 183:23	personally 27:22	pitching 94:23	159:24 161:1
169:22 170:2,8	186:15	46:2 57:21	95:2	<b>plywood</b> 72:22
payment 72:5	<b>people's</b> 69:14	96:15 162:21	Pittsburgh	<b>PO</b> 145:24
72:12	95:16 107:23	163:1	18:23	180:20
payments 71:21	<b>Pep</b> 79:10	perspective 37:5	<b>Piwowar</b> 11:21	pocket 169:23
payroll 171:7,8	perceive 122:5	38:1 72:10	place 4:19 17:19	<b>point</b> 21:13
<b>PC</b> 86:22	percent 16:2	81:7 171:7	22:23 51:5	31:25 33:20
<b>PCAOB</b> 116:18	23:17,17 40:15	176:20	59:15 81:17	36:18 37:20
penalty 164:4	50:4,10 52:17	<b>petition</b> 62:7,11	94:12,13,17	38:2 42:7
penetrate 36:13	52:18 61:12	62:14,16,17,25	122:19 125:20	44:18,18 51:1
<b>penny</b> 117:2,2	65:12 69:21	63:2,6,9	126:17 143:7	51:17 64:16
124:18	70:9 72:25	113:25 132:11	163:3 165:16	65:18 86:10,23
<b>people</b> 4:3 5:24	73:12 74:15,19	133:22 149:18	166:23 167:5	92:9 94:8
18:22 21:22	75:21,22 78:4	<b>Pfizer</b> 172:14	167:11 175:8	120:20 136:4
23:24 24:1,5	79:16 82:23	<b>phase</b> 172:10,10	175:12	143:11 144:12
25:8 29:12,18	85:3,3 90:11	172:16 173:20	<b>placement</b> 64:13	148:1 160:20
30:10 31:11,13	90:12,13 92:3	173:22	64:20 89:24	163:21 167:15
38:2,22 39:22	92:5,5 169:1,2	phases 161:18	placements 36:1	168:23 171:23
40:18 41:10,11	169:10 175:1	182:5	176:25 177:20	174:2 178:2
42:2,5 43:8,10	176:1	phenomenal	places 29:2	183:5,18,22
44:15,23 45:13	percentage	98:22 <b>Dh</b> aan <b>i</b> n (7:22	plain 182:21	187:7
46:9 47:7,14	23:18 46:14	<b>Phoenix</b> 67:23	plan 34:19 88:7	<b>pointed</b> 38:25
47:20 48:13	64:18,21 83:14	phone 87:23	105:12 107:6,7 148:16	<b>pointing</b> 161:22
51:17 52:2	98:7 168:20	119:7	- · -	<b>points</b> 37:4,9
53:2 69:24 71:15 74:8	175:25	phrase 28:18	<b>planned</b> 36:8	97:6 113:1 132:13 147:18
	perception 163:24	<b>pick</b> 39:9 87:14 106:10,15	83:24 90:1 planners 38:20	<b>police</b> 24:13
75:2,5 80:2 82:10,11 83:16	perfectly 121:4	153:11 174:10	planning 187:4	<b>policy</b> 13:14
85:4 89:3	performing	<b>picked</b> 148:4	<b>plans</b> 101:22	37:4 77:18
90:19 91:2,12	140:10	<b>picture</b> 107:18	148:13	150:19 159:16
90:19 91:2,12 92:11,16,19	period 26:5	107:19 117:15	<b>plant</b> 81:17	161:6
94:10,10 95:17	36:22 57:25	142:6,10,17	<b>plates</b> 120:3	<b>pool</b> 16:20,22
96:2,23,25	66:6 125:7	142:0,10,17	play 32:16 42:2	23:16 24:22
102:14,19	175:6	<b>piece</b> 83:4 90:4	46:5 71:8	29:9 31:3 41:4
102:14,19	<b>periodic</b> 177:4	<b>pieces</b> 81:19	109:13,24	42:3 43:20
104.8,11,10	permit 15:12	146:14,15	110:4 174:22	42.3 45.20 54:18 64:10,21
113:14 118:7	17:15,21 18:3	<b>Pieciak</b> 2:19	<b>players</b> 71:1	90:19 132:22
120:7,12,17,17	18:8,11 60:20	37:3 128:24	78:25,25	154:12
126:13 128:10	62:18	131:16	<b>playing</b> 109:7	<b>Poor's</b> 131:12
128:16,19	permits 122:17	<b>Pies</b> 4:15	plays 118:25	<b>pop</b> 93:13,16
129:10,23	permitted	<b>pilot</b> 186:11,12	please 40:9	population
138:7 145:20	118:21 124:12	<b>pink</b> 112:6	42:13 183:5	44:25 90:12,14
130.7 173.20	110.21 127.12	<b>F</b> <sup>112.0</sup>	12.13 103.3	11.23 70.12,14
L			1	l

				Page 214
portal 50:23	pre-reservation	preventing	93:2 110:14	179:11
104:7	92:4	45:12	111:18 121:4	product 83:17
portals 8:20	pre-revenue	previous 20:4	126:7 128:7,24	86:14 105:20
49:20 90:24	69:11 93:10	36:24 143:20	139:20 140:24	108:4 182:18
portfolio 26:18	168:4	169:21	140:24 143:14	production
49:22 51:4	preaching 73:9	previously 19:24	144:16 160:5	73:24 100:22
53:19 59:14,16	precise 36:18	20:9 87:2	165:19 171:10	100:23 104:10
<b>portfolios</b> 53:15	preclude 47:6	151:13	173:23 175:11	profession 39:9
54:8	103:9	<b>price</b> 68:4 69:3,4	177:3 182:19	professional
<b>portion</b> 130:2	precluded 92:18	86:9,23 124:17	problem 38:15	17:22 19:3
posit 28:2	precludes 47:14	124:20 127:4	46:14 65:18	91:20 96:23
<b>position</b> 100:10	precondition	133:24 152:16	75:18,22 90:8	professionals
110:12	109:21	152:21,23	100:17	98:1
positive 98:8	predicting 70:14	175:14	<b>problems</b> 36:2	professor 35:18
106:18 130:23	predictor 83:8	priced 78:16	58:8	Professors 135:3
172:15	preemption	134:4	procedure 22:11	<b>profile</b> 82:16
<b>possesses</b> 14:22	128:20 133:10	prices 142:21	179:8	118:16
possession 123:4	136:16,25	primarily	procedures	profit 34:8
possibility 45:14	147:20	164:21 181:22	166:9,23 167:5	program 9:15
84:23 130:12	preexisting	primary 23:15	179:11	49:25 71:20
130:18	135:8	150:20,21	proceed 60:15	programs 74:9
<b>possible</b> 30:11	prematurely	175:24	proceedings	progresses 66:16
135:15	180:17	prime 122:21	188:11	prohibited
<b>post</b> 76:9 84:11	premise 72:19	153:15	proceeds 146:8	129:4,9
120:16 182:14	prep 101:9	priming 35:23	process 44:16	prohibitive
<b>posted</b> 62:14	prepare 12:14	<b>prior</b> 7:9 67:23	58:7,10 59:17	91:10
posted 02.14 potential 15:9	prescribing	112:12 132:17	60:22 61:19	<b>project</b> 70:18
16:7 23:16	136:8	148:1 150:11	62:2,10 63:6	81:24 82:16
29:9 95:18	presentation 7:2	151:15	66:7,9,10,13	83:3 85:15,17
116:2 133:19	81:23 83:24	<b>Prius</b> 72:23	66:15 76:14	<b>projecting</b> 88:7
145:21 170:4	85:13 94:5	<b>private</b> 18:9	87:15,20 90:10	prominent
170:13	137:24 147:18	24:6,8,25 28:4	90:17 93:5	122:19 131:2
potentially 22:6	presentations	33:4 36:1 54:2	95:23 96:9,14	131:11
48:8 115:9	60:1 112:20	89:23 93:14,24	96:22,23 98:23	<b>promise</b> 134:13
124:15 125:18	presenting	94:14 97:7	98:25 99:2,6	promised 8:10
133:2 136:2	106:1	145:25 159:5	101:3,15,17	135:2
137:4 171:24	presiding 5:23	173:11 176:25	113:17,20	<b>promote</b> 7:21
poverty 83:8	press 128:22	177:20 185:25	113:17,20	154:10
<b>power</b> 76:5,5,10	pressure 15:23	<b>privately</b> 106:22	123:14 124:24	<b>prone</b> 44:5
<b>Powers</b> 75:19	presuming 97:2	145:20 165:9	125:16 126:12	Proofreader's
<b>practice</b> 48:7	presumption	165:13 180:25	127:8 133:12	188:1,18
123:12 164:18	39:4	<b>privilege</b> 121:6	134:10 139:21	<b>properly</b> 166:22
practices 49:18	pretty 23:18	probably 5:6	139:23 140:15	proponent
49:24 51:15	27:14 55:12	23:22 24:15	140:17,21	134:18
<b>pre-</b> 93:15	74:6 76:6	27:13 32:5	140:17,21	proposal 5:13
pre-money	91:13 96:17	42:17 47:23	146:4,8 160:11	7:11,11,19 8:1
84:10	145:10	48:12 51:22	179:8	13:4,8 15:11
pre-product	prevent 44:20	54:12 56:1	processes 126:17	150:6 155:9
168:3	45:15 46:16	65:12 70:24	166:22 167:5	156:3,19
100.5	TJ.1J TU.10	03.12 /0.24	100.22 107.3	150.5,17
			I	l

				Page 215
168:11 184:7	29:15 33:4,5	53:25 61:17,22	108:2 111:24	qualitative
185:4	61:9 63:8	87:21 88:11	125:10 126:17	114:21 170:14
proposals	115:12 116:14	90:2,9 102:1	149:8 150:6	quality 82:13
134:19 135:16	119:20 130:16	114:12 123:4,6	164:5 167:6,11	112:6 176:24
propose 151:8,9	140:8 141:23	123:11,20	170:7 171:7	177:1,21
155:7 156:16	151:5,12 154:4	124:2 146:7	175:8,11 176:1	quantitative
157:16 162:5	154:5 155:12	165:10 179:7	180:16 184:17	114:21 115:1
proposed 7:5	157:22 184:4	179:19	185:22	157:21 170:14
10:4,14 11:1,3	provided 7:13	<b>published</b> 131:6	puts 74:4	quantity 112:6
11:17 151:1,8	7:24	131:21	putting 13:7	quarter 10:8
154:9,16 156:5	providers	publishing	73:19 78:4	152:14
156:7 162:6,11	120:22	115:17	97:16 142:2	quarterly
<b>proposition</b> 69:3	<b>providing</b> 12:19	<b>pull</b> 79:3 99:16	<i>J</i> 7.10 1 <del>4</del> 2.2	116:17 118:19
69:7	74:25 120:5	146:13 155:25	Q	131:23
proprietary	133:4 161:13	178:15	<b>OB</b> 141:1,5	<b>question</b> 16:13
115:10 121:10	<b>proving</b> 39:6	<b>pulled</b> 73:10	quadruple	19:9,15 42:15
props 58:5	proving 57.0	pump 35:23	179:13	44:13 45:4
prospectus	155:19,22,25	<b>purchase</b> 61:12	qualification	49:7 59:6 62:6
183:10	156:6	68:4 140:15	12:22 62:1	63:11 66:21
<b>prosper</b> 160:24	<b>provisions</b> 6:20	<b>purchased</b> 81:13	63:20 123:14	77:20,21 85:1
protect 9:24	119:23	89:4	124:14 129:12	87:25 88:1,3,5
29:14,15,16	proxy 14:21	<b>purchaser</b> 140:5	147:19	89:17,21 91:25
41:10,11 43:19	37:7	140:6	qualifications	95:20 96:6,14
53:2 103:7	<b>public</b> 7:14,17	purchasing	37:17 114:22	96:20 98:5,13
protected	8:1 10:7,8,15	129:18	116:25 130:24	98:21 99:1,20
105:15,19	13:5 54:3 57:6	purge 27:14	131:5	101:2 102:12
protecting 10:1	57:22 60:23	<b>purpose</b> 72:25	qualified 6:24	105:2 106:25
36:6,6 37:22	61:1,19,20	147:2	20:9,17 21:23	108:8 142:3,22
37:24,24 39:16	87:10,13 88:10	<b>purposes</b> 114:12	22:6 30:19	145:13 147:11
39:17 53:13	92:10 107:4	115:7 151:3	32:18 62:1,4	157:5 158:22
76:11,16	108:11 115:3,4	pursuant 64:1	63:13 66:2	160:14,18
protection 36:4	118:2 133:12	161:24	67:15 89:7	162:3 163:20
41:17 43:5	133:13 134:5	<b>push</b> 126:14	106:19 148:25	169:18 176:3,8
52:11,12 53:22	146:3,5 150:13	push 120:11 pushback 21:3	qualifies 123:16	181:15
157:7 158:16	151:22 152:12	pushing 52:24	qualify 7:12	questioned
158:20 160:21	151:22 152:12	put 13:5 25:18	11:15 14:25	164:10
168:14	153:5,5 154:18	28:17 30:16	15:3,13 17:16	questions 8:25
protections 7:23	154:18,22,22	31:17 32:3,4	17:17,22 18:4	77:8 96:11
154:15	155:16 156:7	36:18 37:13	18:9,12,24	105:22 106:7,8
protects 178:11	159:1 162:11	41:24 43:2	19:12,13 20:2	113:3 114:2
prototypes	169:4 171:5,9	44:24 50:3,15	20:10,19 26:4	124:1 134:9
87:15	171:11,16,22	50:18 51:8,9	41:24 116:19	137:25 138:1
proud 74:6	172:6 174:12	52:8 66:22	124:21 136:24	138:15 139:19
79:24 119:13	174:13,14,15	69:6 73:21	141:10,19	140:3,13
prove 78:8	175:6 178:4,7	74:9 77:15	153:3,3 154:12	156:20 157:17
proven 121:11	182:3,7	81:7 86:19	154:20,21	160:16 180:15
121:13	publication	87:2 96:1,9	qualifying	quick 8:11 27:10
proves 86:2	131:12	102:4 103:24	118:18 169:10	96:13 98:20
provide 17:1	publicly 6:22	104:7 105:17	169:11	99:20 163:5
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
	1	1	1	I

				Page 210
184:19	47:22 57:5	48:9,18 49:21	reasons 9:16	referred 57:12
<b>quicker</b> 107:9	95:5 132:13	51:23 55:4,9	40:5 53:25	refers 125:12
147:10	141:8 157:9	57:4 58:5,10	59:22 73:8	<b>refine</b> 14:13
quickly 143:7	176:7 183:21	58:24 59:10,11	<b>recall</b> 56:9	reflects 14:11
145:10	range 8:16 152:3	63:21 68:3	<b>receive</b> 8:1,3	16:24
quite 31:5 37:12	rapidly 27:14	74:1 75:6,12	140:10	refundable 74:9
71:1 79:9 82:3	rarely 34:6	80:1,11,24	received 6:10	<b>Reg</b> 5:9 9:17
<b>quo</b> 16:24	125:3	83:17 85:12,24	155:4	19:25 47:24
<b>quorum</b> 4:7	rates 83:11	87:6 93:18	receptive 184:9	58:1,3,4 59:19
quotation	ratio 154:2	99:7 103:11	recess 111:10	60:4,9,10,19
139:18	rationale 49:4	104:11 105:20	recognition	62:17,20 64:5
quote 114:12	reach 7:10 31:11	107:1,11	149:2	68:14,20,24
118:21 122:21	64:23 108:3	109:16 110:4	recognized	83:21 84:8,17
123:6 124:6,12	reached 103:21	112:16 114:24	131:7	84:20 85:2,3,8
125:1 140:1	reaches 161:19	116:1 117:4	recognizes 10:17	85:11,19,22
144:8	reactions 18:20	118:16 119:20	recommendati	87:13,18 88:4
quoted 115:8,15	reacts 22:19	120:21 125:12	5:5 6:13 14:8	88:23 89:23
122:23	read 40:22 43:25	126:8 128:17	14:13 15:24	90:6,19 91:19
quotes 120:16	85:23 102:21	130:5 132:17	16:4,23,24	91:24 92:10,20
121:16,19	155:8	132:22 134:20	17:3 37:21	93:7 94:4.16
quoting 115:10	readable 184:5	135:4,11	40:22,24 54:17	95:23 96:16
121:17 123:11	reading 19:8	138:19 140:7	184:12	98:23 99:8,18
123:17,23	51:15	140:12,18	recommendati	101:3 102:4,19
144:13	ready 67:21	149:14 150:1	6:12 7:9 9:21	103:23 104:2,4
<b>QX</b> 91:15 141:1	116:1 125:25	159:24 166:4	12:14 35:14	106:11,15,18
141:5,7	139:1	166:14 176:3	63:8 154:25	106:25 107:7
	real 33:1 41:19	176:22 177:5	155:2	109:22 111:16
R	43:7 54:4	179:24 180:25	recommended	112:20 113:7,9
<b>R</b> 4:1 111:12	58:19,21,22	182:17	14:24 150:12	113:11,16,22
radically 68:2,3	59:20 65:6,20	<b>rear</b> 70:12	reconvene 111:9	113:25 114:4
rainy 32:14	79:1 81:25	Reardon 2:20	record 80:7	115:24 116:12
raise 7:20 9:23	98:24 177:25	15:19 16:14	144:2 188:12	116:20 118:6
9:25 10:14	realistic 109:4	38:14 40:6,10	recording	118:21 122:5,7
62:4 89:6,9,21	reality 59:1	40:18 54:25	188:15	122:11 123:17
90:9 93:6	72:22 180:24	55:2 64:12,22	records 145:20	123:18 124:4
94:12 102:2	realize 4:12	65:24 84:13,13	red 76:15 79:19	124:25 126:2,8
133:16,17	51:18 74:18	84:16,19 105:2	100:4	126:24 127:23
172:11 175:5	84:23 117:23	105:8,21	reduce 7:22	127:24 128:3,5
182:20 183:4,4	163:7 183:22	138:17,23	16:20 22:5	128:17,20
raised 16:13	realized 57:13	139:3,15 160:5	82:22 151:18	130:24 132:10
59:7 66:20,24	really 7:8 8:10	171:11 176:8	154:11	132:14,17,25
67:2 68:11	12:23 14:4	176:15,19	reduced 153:25	133:2,5,11,19
83:19 88:20,21	19:3 22:16	<b>reason</b> 39:5,7,23	154:1	134:3,15 136:6
88:22 89:15	24:24 26:5	69:25 72:20	reduces 81:10	137:16 140:4
90:6 106:22	29:7,8,20 30:1	102:23 107:12	redundant 13:8	140:19,25
145:19 147:10	30:5 31:18,18	110:16 132:15	reference 138:14	145:24 151:25
157:5 173:11	31:18,24 32:23	174:3	147:23	160:20,24
raises 109:5	36:11,12 40:15	reasoning	referenced	161:5,11,20,23
raising 7:14 9:17	45:13 47:18	136:13	138:17	161:24 162:7
	1	1	1	

171,17,172,0		11.11.12.12.4	141.12 140.11	1(0.24.25
171:17 173:2	related 121:19	11:11,13 13:4	141:13 148:11	169:24,25
177:5,20	153:15	62:19,22,24	150:10 153:22	170:2
178:17 182:25	<b>relates</b> 113:7,25	75:20 116:9,9	165:14 182:4	restatements
183:20	115:17 122:7	116:17 132:16	<b>requires</b> 117:24	158:18,23
regarding 9:21	160:13 183:9	132:23 133:4	123:3	result 118:4
21:2 44:18	relating 17:1	146:2,3,19	requiring 100:5	119:11 124:13
150:6	129:23	149:20 150:3	<b>resale</b> 63:3	158:18
<b>regime</b> 12:21	relation 118:21	151:2,10,15	rescind 130:19	results 53:21
161:5	relationship	152:4 153:2	Rescission	144:2 172:12
<b>register</b> 64:2,6	140:12	156:9 160:22	130:12	172:15
161:15	relatively 5:11	161:3,17,24	research 34:8,21	retire 20:1
registered 8:20	66:6 101:12	162:1,1,2,7,9	50:8 129:6,8,9	retired 32:24,24
114:9 116:18	161:4 168:19	162:14,19	129:11 146:23	retirement
134:1 135:18	168:22	163:24 164:6	157:12,12,13	29:19 43:13
177:1 185:14	release 8:4	176:10 181:5	157:14 159:2	<b>return</b> 50:10
registrants 10:6	132:14 157:1	181:17,25	169:21 170:3	77:18,19 87:23
66:1	157:19,20	183:1 188:14	reservation	returns 54:1
registration	162:3 170:16	<b>reports</b> 61:10	73:19 74:22	<b>reunion</b> 40:7
12:22 60:10	182:10	67:1 131:23	85:5 102:24	revenue 10:16
64:4 111:2	relevant 78:21	161:13 177:4	reservations	19:1 93:16
151:15 160:21	79:4	181:23	73:10,16,22	161:2
<b>regs</b> 28:17 151:3	<b>relief</b> 151:12	represent 12:7	74:7,16 92:19	revenues 7:16
regulation 5:7	<b>rely</b> 38:17 153:9	representing	92:25	10:9 65:22
6:15,17 8:3,13	154:13	40:3	reserved 89:3	151:22 152:17
8:23,24 9:13	<b>remain</b> 158:4	represents 173:5	96:2	153:5 154:19
12:16,17,18	remaining 115:6	reputations 71:1	residence 23:15	154:22
14:6 36:3 46:1	116:16	request 156:17	<b>resist</b> 16:11	<b>review</b> 6:21
56:24 57:12,13	remarks 5:18	requested 155:8	resistance 22:5	12:18,25 13:7
62:8 68:10	remember 22:17	requests 157:18	22:15,21 95:6	14:11 58:7,9
110:25 111:21	51:7 52:13,20	<b>require</b> 66:23	<b>resort</b> 172:7	59:17 60:21,24
151:14	168:10 170:24	required 67:8	resource 80:8	61:5,19 62:2
regulations 7:14	remind 110:24	110:21 116:14	resources 31:8	66:8,10 115:22
36:19 134:24	187:5	123:10 133:5	52:24 80:10	123:13 163:6
regulator 37:5	reminded 182:9	139:6,10	136:10	180:4
116:10,10	reminder 152:19	153:23,24	respect 16:4	reviewed 17:8
137:1	<b>remorse</b> 39:6,13	154:4,5,6	17:4 41:23	167:25
regulators	repairing 77:12	155:14 161:13	57:7 62:18	<b>revise</b> 14:24
117:25	replaced 151:23	181:24	63:3,22 129:1	150:12
regulatory 120:1	replacement	requirement	145:15 157:2,4	revising 10:18
122:18 136:18	27:3	61:8,9 118:19	respects 7:11	revisions 11:3
151:12,13	report 8:16	153:13,14	respond 49:6	rewards 74:11
161:7 171:3	22:11 66:23	155:11 157:4	response 56:21	74:23 83:22
180:16	67:3,4,9 91:17	161:14	155:4	85:21
reinstate 163:18	159:18,20	requirements	responsibility	<b>rid</b> 13:8
Reischauer 2:21	162:12	8:5,9,22 13:9	43:16 44:20	<b>right</b> 12:24
150:17,25	<b>reported</b> 67:8,16	60:17 61:6,8	responsible	16:14 21:9
176:13,18	reporting 5:14	115:1 116:6,8	130:18	22:18 23:12
182:8	7:6 10:5,6,12	116:19 120:2	<b>rest</b> 76:7	25:22,23,25
reiterate 156:15	10:18 11:2,5	133:4,12	restatement	26:7,24 27:25

				_
30:15 32:9,16	103:12,15,20	<b>rules</b> 5:9 6:21,23	Sarah 2:3 5:23	school 30:15,23
34:21 39:25	104:9 130:12	8:12 30:19	56:25	33:17
42:11,21 44:14	159:14 166:9	31:15 60:8	Sarbanes-Oxley	schools 83:10
45:3,16 47:10	<b>risks</b> 160:6,7	61:16,25 66:23	7:24	Schwab 121:23
47:24 48:22	risky 59:18,18	111:2 116:12	<b>sat</b> 134:6	scope 130:11
50:7 51:13	<b>Rivers</b> 137:13	118:20 123:7	Sates 51:25	scores 83:9
57:1 58:6,11	<b>Rivers'</b> 137:21	128:23 131:10	satisfaction 79:8	screen 185:22
64:25 67:21	road 71:16	132:19 139:13	save 29:18 32:14	screened 18:6
69:11 72:4,9	72:16 78:24	141:15 151:3	32:15 104:3	search 50:14
72:20,23 73:1	97:10	161:13 162:6	163:4 164:3	Sears 28:6
73:17 75:11	Robert 2:8	163:25 175:4	saved 32:11	seat 76:15 100:9
78:11 80:6	<b>Roger</b> 82:7	175:15	savings 71:21	seating 69:25
81:24 85:18	role 118:24,25	<b>run</b> 11:12 15:8	104:3,3 162:20	75:3
88:21 89:8,12	125:14	31:2,2 71:20	163:8 168:12	seats 4:3 69:24
90:10,15 91:3	roller 58:25	82:8 101:22	169:19	76:10 111:14
94:24 97:4,12	rolodex 33:9	148:19	saw 68:1 88:20	Sebastian 2:11
99:9,14 100:5	rolodexes 33:7	runs 53:23 112:5	94:6 99:6,12	4:7 13:15,19
101:20,20	room 44:10	runway 172:15	111:19	19:20 20:14
102:9 103:2,12	51:19 105:23		saying 20:16	60:4,6 62:7
104:10,16,25	120:8	S	24:15 26:12	63:10,12 64:12
106:10 123:25	roots 94:17	<b>S</b> 4:1 111:12,12	28:7 34:3	65:8 113:24
131:18 136:24	roughly 58:18	111:12	43:17 53:12,24	122:9 132:12
137:11 139:5	58:19 94:20	<b>S-</b> 133:8	65:10 91:21	133:21 134:8
139:21 142:13	round 38:8	<b>S-1</b> 64:4 123:14	96:24 119:9	177:17
147:3,14 148:2	48:13 83:20	133:8 164:12	126:1 175:9	Sebastian's 14:2
149:25 158:1,6	88:21,23	<b>S-18</b> 152:1,5	176:23 180:2	<b>SEC</b> 2:5 5:13
158:9 160:19	118:14 172:17	<b>S-3</b> 133:11 175:2	181:9	8:22 12:21
160:22,24	174:17 176:4	175:15	says 17:12 39:4	14:23 29:25
161:8,9 162:17	roundabout	sad 104:23	39:18 46:2	58:9 59:17
165:25 166:14	137:3	safe 59:15 68:5	65:8 129:18	62:15,15 66:24
167:6,13	<b>rounds</b> 23:2	69:8	130:4 146:6	89:8 95:24
168:10,21	37:13 171:19	safety 69:9	<b>SB</b> 151:14,16,20	96:6,6,10
169:3 172:17	173:11	80:17	152:1	106:21 114:7,9
172:25 173:1	route 85:11 88:4	salary 104:3	<b>SBA</b> 34:7	116:9 118:21
174:5 176:12	110:6,6 173:4	sale 63:25	<b>SBIC</b> 34:10,11	122:11,16
176:18 177:3	routine 179:8	sales 75:9 82:22	<b>scale</b> 7:13	123:2,14,15
179:6 180:5,12	<b>rule</b> 10:4,14	179:14	150:10 153:9	133:4,25 134:8
180:20,21	11:1 20:8 32:4	salespeople	154:13 162:12	134:11,17
184:16 185:21	39:18 102:16	89:22	162:15,22	147:4 179:19
186:12,13	102:20 103:3	sample 35:3	163:2,8,15	SEC's 4:5 7:13
rigmarole 107:3	122:12,16,25	Sara 12:1 17:13	164:2 170:7	12:6
rigorous 27:21	123:2,16 139:7	25:7 26:2,15	scaled 8:4,8	second 10:8
<b>ripples</b> 108:24	141:16 146:1	34:1 60:7 62:5	10:13,19 11:6	24:12 35:23
<b>risk</b> 10:23 14:18	150:21	64:25 111:17	11:14 58:6	57:9 77:10
36:15,16,17	ruled 74:19	113:5,24 114:8 114:17 132:12	154:8 162:19	80:15 142:14
37:10,10,11,13	rulemaking 62:7	146:22 161:11	scenes 60:25	152:13 173:22
38:7 43:25	62:10,13	146:22 161:11 161:22 184:24	70:12 120:9	secondary 53:24
45:13 69:10,17	113:25 132:11	185:19	122:1	113:8,18 122:7
79:6 95:14,17	149:19	105.17	schedules 9:9	124:3 128:17
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				Page 219
128:17,22,23	117:22 120:17	sell 40:15 70:20	47:14 113:5	<b>shirt</b> 35:12
136:16	121:15,18	73:25 80:3	114:25 115:18	shocked 97:22
seconded 56:16	123:13 125:4,5	84:20 121:24	118:20 128:24	98:1 177:5
Secondly 5:7	125:7 127:1,5	127:19 139:2	131:5,19	<b>shoot</b> 47:19
seconds 105:5,7	127:14 128:10	<b>selling</b> 62:3	141:14,16	short 5:6 6:2
secretary 112:12	132:18 140:5	65:11 67:19	160:22 161:20	31:2 67:1
section 7:24	141:16 143:12	80:3 84:14,16	162:11	shortage 127:8
30:11 81:23	144:25 145:6	84:18 109:8	setting 31:15,16	shorthand 54:22
111:2 160:21	146:10,15	129:17,19	settling 93:7	<b>shout</b> 31:17
sector 93:18,22	148:7,9 149:10	177:6	seven 76:17,22	show 79:20
securities 1:1,23	150:15 155:8	semi-annual	179:10	93:12 97:10
5:2 59:16	158:21 163:2	61:10	Seventy 78:4	120:5
61:11 62:3	163:11,14	send 97:17,18	sexy 82:16	showed 79:19,22
63:3 64:1,2,6	178:3 183:2	138:6 146:19	shame 59:20	showed 77:13,22
94:11 113:9	seeds 31:16	senior 13:16	share 9:9 84:9	70:16
114:14,15,23	seeing 6:4 76:8	sense 19:4,7	89:4 104:22	<b>shown</b> 50:9
115:5,6,11,14	156:18 185:9,9	21:6 25:8 41:5	124:11 126:3	shown 50.5 showroom 71:22
116:3 117:3,7	185:10	42:5 73:17,22	126:16 127:16	76:14
118:6 124:16	seekers 120:22	102:6 107:1	128:22	showrooms
125:17 130:21	seeking 61:20	108:1 114:4	shared 27:16	76:23
131:4,7 132:10	62:4,17	121:17 132:21	35:21	shows 72:2
133:25 135:18	seen 13:6 28:19	137:20 165:20	shareholder	78:13
138:20 140:6	40:2,2 54:5	167:11 178:20	126:23	Shreveport
141:17 144:8	58:16 59:10	183:20 184:10	shareholder's	69:20
144:14,25	68:2 108:13	sensors 80:17	65:21	side 11:4 32:11
148:14 149:10	109:13 144:5	separate 27:8	shareholders	41:16 57:9
161:16 183:25	158:4 180:5	130:1 135:9	85:3 125:22,24	70:12 120:17
185:25 188:11	segment 44:25	separated	128:1 161:1	120:18 121:2
security 115:16	71:18 72:18	114:18	shares 68:12	130:23 157:7
117:11 121:22	73:9,16,17,23	sequences 75:17	84:9,20 89:3	163:23 166:20
122:21 123:1	segmented	series 17:23,23	104:9 109:9	170:11
124:18,19	70:25	17:24 19:4,4	122:13 124:10	sidelines 139:22
125:2 126:10	segments 73:25	24:17 27:20	125:13,19,23	sides 40:1 54:14
129:17,23	selected 153:22	36:23 41:4	127:10,13,19	<b>sign</b> 71:22
131:9 140:19	selectively 10:12	48:23 54:20	127:25,25	115:19 141:25
146:7	self- 67:5 91:11	55:24 81:1	129:19 130:5	141:25 159:4
<b>see</b> 5:19,24,25	self-certification	87:14 89:16	140:15 142:16	159:17,25
17:5,5 19:11	22:14 39:8	185:1,3,23	152:20 168:19	signed 167:25
20:8 27:19	self-directed	serous 89:5	168:25	signers 159:9
28:25 29:21	129:16 130:3,4	serve 14:21	<b>sharing</b> 104:23	significant 82:6
31:5 34:10,12	130:14	152:5	shave 35:12	82:7 150:8
35:5 39:23	self-referential	service 12:11	sheets 176:11	158:2,5 165:11
41:25 42:8	27:13	52:16 79:10,11	shelf 175:4,15	165:18 178:14
44:9,10,11	self-selecting	79:12 108:5	<b>shell</b> 117:3	significantly
45:9 54:9	9:16	115:13 140:11	<b>shifts</b> 82:21	142:18
73:21 77:4	self-underwrit	services 79:17	Shimkat 2:22	signing 179:17
78:10 104:25	64:19 65:4,13	session 111:19	52:7	<b>Silicon</b> 53:24
108:23 111:25	self-underwrote	112:17	<b>shining</b> 98:24	<b>similar</b> 18:20
116:24 117:12	91:11	set 15:1 39:18	<b>ship</b> 46:4	19:25 51:7
L				

56 11 10 04 5	106 15 05	1 6 4 5 101 05	401 10 06 17	1065
56:11,12 94:5	136:15,25	164:5 181:25	sort 21:18 26:17	<b>spend</b> 26:5
107:14 119:8,8	147:18	smart 32:17	27:12 40:25	72:13 93:11
119:14 122:2	slide 79:14 99:25	49:13,13 52:1	44:7,11 45:1	97:13,15
141:15 144:4	116:24 117:6	53:14 54:8	59:2 99:5	128:14 159:11
173:10	121:15 137:7	82:1 88:16	107:5,8 111:22	<b>spending</b> 159:24
<b>similarly</b> 114:5	142:12 143:22	smartest 28:18	112:24 135:13	spent 106:20
134:15	149:8	smooth 124:24	142:5 147:5	167:2
<b>simple</b> 22:21	slides 118:23	smoothed	174:14 183:2	<b>Sphero</b> 108:20
23:8	125:11 128:8	127:14	sound 154:24	<b>spirit</b> 137:7
simplicity 18:15	134:14 138:2	smorgasbord	sounded 49:14	<b>spoke</b> 30:20 94:1
45:21	140:24 142:9	183:2	sounds 35:17	127:4
<b>simplify</b> 151:12	slightest 65:23	snapshot 46:15	88:15 123:22	<b>spoken</b> 113:13
simply 21:19	slightly 83:20	sneak 5:19	174:18 175:24	<b>spot</b> 76:11,16
36:19 139:24	114:25 153:21	social 74:1 90:21	sour 130:15	107:19 132:1
single 68:22	sliver 67:12	108:12,14	South 81:25	167:14
72:14 80:8	<b>slow</b> 90:17	<b>sold</b> 67:9,13	148:24	spreads 118:3
85:14 98:13	145:24 167:8	137:14 152:22	SOX 155:11,14	springboard
125:1	<b>slower</b> 143:24	sole 147:2	156:12	115:4
<b>Sion</b> 74:5	small 1:6 4:6,15	solicit 130:1	space 4:20 5:11	SPV 48:2
sit 35:4 51:19	4:23 8:12 9:6	solicitation	6:6 7:1 24:6,8	square 81:6
131:20 139:22	9:22 13:4,14	89:24 129:22	<b>speak</b> 32:6 108:6	SRC 7:7 8:1
site 69:19 81:5,9	16:18 30:12	129:24	172:20,20	150:8,12 151:5
sitting 49:11,12	32:2 43:21,24	<b>solid</b> 31:19	speaking 83:25	151:23 153:3,7
situated 114:5	48:3,9,15 57:4	<b>solution</b> 147:21	164:24 165:24	153:12,17
134:16	57:8 59:14	somebody 18:7	speaks 12:6	154:20 155:15
situation 19:24	64:9,17,21,23	25:19,20 29:23	142:20	156:1 161:22
42:23 43:1	67:12 73:2	33:24 36:9	<b>special</b> 13:16	162:10,13,13
44:4 51:12	80:5 108:19	38:17 39:4	28:10 150:18	164:2
96:13 97:13	135:4,5,7	45:9 46:25	specialize 93:17	SRCs 8:5 151:7
98:6	150:19 151:16	52:14 79:24	93:23 143:3	152:7,11 153:9
situations 95:6	151:18,21,23	86:6,21 91:2	specialized 36:8	153:14 154:3
six 25:21 69:12	152:3,5,7	98:2,16 107:8	97:25	154:12,17
89:11,12 97:20	155:2 160:3	141:12 145:18	specialty 137:15	155:19,20
146:1 183:16	166:7,8 173:6	167:24 178:9	specific 15:7	staff 5:13 6:11
<b>size</b> 88:23	176:10 177:23	180:10	28:24 31:23	6:21 8:22,24
110:18 152:6,7	178:13,25	<b>someone's</b> 38:10	36:23 62:16	12:6,8,17,23
152:8 153:16	183:1,14 184:1	<b>son</b> 55:5	63:18 64:17	13:20 14:23
158:24 161:19	188:3	<b>soon</b> 78:15	72:24 99:24	15:6 19:23
162:8	smaller 5:14 7:6	85:20 174:22	103:23 129:10	20:7 58:6
sizeable 25:19	7:22 10:5,5,12	187:1	145:1	60:25 61:1,6
<b>sized</b> 58:6	10:18 11:2,5,7	sophisticated	specifically	61:19 62:2
<b>sizes</b> 90:14	11:11,13 12:20	19:2 39:5,7	61:15 113:6	63:7,8 66:9
<b>SK</b> 8:4	117:8 121:13	49:18 56:4	135:16 136:15	157:2,8 159:11
<b>sketch</b> 70:17	143:2 144:22	sophistication	154:4 156:17	167:7 170:18
<b>skews</b> 74:12	150:3 151:2,10	14:17 15:1	speechless 84:1	172:1
<b>sky</b> 65:15 125:9	151:13,14	37:7 38:9,15	<b>speed</b> 70:15	<b>staff's</b> 6:11
128:14,20,23	154:11 156:9	40:1	135:22 143:13	stage 113:5
129:3,12,15	160:22 161:7	sorry 55:1,18	144:13 150:23	114:6 128:21
131:9 133:10	162:2 163:24	84:15 176:13	<b>speeds</b> 70:1	133:10 177:22
L				

				Page 221
staged 180:14	startups 29:2	174:3	stress 105:14,14	114:11 115:9
181:4	65:21 69:11	<b>stepping</b> 171:20	stringent 103:4	subscription
stakeholders	80:5 93:11,23	steps 113:19	103:4 153:13	140:5
99:10	stat 92:2	118:1 122:18	153:14	Subsequent
stand 139:1	state 37:5 65:15	185:6	strokes 33:12	157:11
156:20	66:10 81:8,8	<b>stereo</b> 76:5	strong 14:8	subsequently
standard 12:5	99:24 100:7,7	<b>Steve</b> 5:22,23	119:6	19:25
30:4 45:23	100:15 128:24	7:4 12:1 13:23	structure 43:18	substantially
76:3 116:15	129:2,4,7,8,8	66:21 88:15	46:22 114:17	69:17 82:14
131:12 141:10	129:10,13	138:9 150:25	120:9 135:14	substituting
153:12	131:2,10 132:7	152:11 169:17	135:20	21:12
standards 15:25	147:19 173:6	stick 57:20	struggle 42:21	succeed 82:15
16:1 18:25	<b>statement</b> 64:4	162:22	182:23	succeeding
69:9 117:23	72:3 123:18,19	sticker 69:4	struggling 10:2	109:17
standing 98:15	statements 6:19	sticking 36:21	11:18 72:16	success 60:3
standpoint	6:22,25 31:25	178:14	83:5	68:25 74:24
158:16 162:20	60:21 61:9,22	sticky 140:15	stuck 85:19	85:6 113:22
163:22 164:4	62:1 69:1	<b>stipulate</b> 48:21	studies 86:1	successful 32:21
164:14	153:24 154:7	stock 22:12 45:2	117:16 121:12	33:22 46:7
stands 44:14	160:13 164:22	68:10 110:11	135:2 168:11	58:23 95:7
start 5:18 41:10	181:11	111:3 114:16	169:21 170:17	98:25 99:12
43:10 44:22	states 30:9,11	115:19 119:3	170:20 174:6	108:2 135:7
45:19,24,25	44:16 68:9	121:24 142:24	study 6:11 14:23	successfully
52:11 53:1	100:14 106:21	144:21 148:13	15:1 17:8,9,9	98:17
58:15 60:22,25	132:2,5 147:4	148:15	24:18 83:7,13	sudden 180:1
73:24 91:23	station 158:17	stockholders	117:18,21	sue 44:5
94:13,18 113:4	statistic 117:5	84:14,17,18,20	135:3 156:25	sufficiency
116:22 132:21	statistics 23:13	177:6	157:3,6 170:18	114:20
136:8 167:10	119:14 128:7	stocks 117:2,2	186:12,13	suggest 11:1
176:7 179:12	stats 60:5 99:16	store 171:20	stuff 27:25 32:25	27:15 54:18
180:17 186:13	105:6	stop 88:17	35:5 75:25	182:13
started 4:3	<b>status</b> 16:24	115:19 129:15	77:23 80:18	suggesting 54:17
30:15 32:11	161:22	129:16 141:25	102:21 111:5	55:18
51:14 67:18	statutorily 158:8	store 28:6	183:2	suggestion 17:25
98:15 100:3	statutoring 150.0	stores 75:9	stupid 36:11	24:20 34:5
111:14 134:17	stays 78:21 79:4	76:18	56:6	41:3
186:11	steel 39:2	<b>stories</b> 60:3	<b>subject</b> 7:9 14:5	suggestions 17:5
startengine	<b>Stein</b> 2:6 5:20	story 34:25 80:1	60:16 61:7	suggestions 17.5
104:7	9:3,4 11:21	80:24 85:8	139:7 155:24	summits 81:2
startengine.com	53:5,6,8 59:7	92:23 98:17	164:24	super 181:18
90:24 96:1	163:11 186:16	100:20 119:9	subjectivity	superseded 13:9
102:21 103:24	186:19	straight 63:16	39:16	supplement
starting 66:15	step 87:24 122:8	161:5	submit 34:19	14:12
96:22 115:2	149:21 178:6,6	<b>strategy</b> 34:19	60:20 62:13	supplemental
179:9 180:19	178:7	<b>stream</b> 70:7	123:9 134:10	153:23
starts 6:7 187:6	Stephen 2:4	streamlined	136:20	<b>supplier</b> 76:12
startup 79:13,22	18:19 37:3	133:12	submits 120:25	80:8,14,16,19
81:11,12 167:3	38:4 42:1,12	Street 1:24	subscribe 139:6	80:19,22 81:1
179:10	88:15 127:20	strength 87:13	subscribers	suppliers 33:7
177110	00.10 127.20			
		1		I

<b></b>				Page 222
80:7 99:4	121:24	131:15 174:12	targeted 88:25	16:21,25,25
108:24	syndrome 38:19	takes 69:12	targeting 105:4	37:12,19 38:6
supply 77:4 80:2	synergy 34:6	78:13 81:18	tautological	53:13,22 68:4
80:13,23 99:8	system 8:9 12:22	talk 22:2 47:6	27:12	89:21 113:22
supply/demand	12:22 13:12	49:8 68:19	tax 51:12	115:13 118:24
127:8	16:18 75:13,24	87:22 88:12	<b>TD</b> 121:23	126:22 128:16
support 23:22	76:20 77:1	90:5 91:2,12	<b>team</b> 96:4	134:23 140:21
23:23 24:16,20	78:1,1 112:8	92:7 93:4	146:19	148:22 168:18
29:8 37:1	114:9,11 123:6	109:19 111:4	teammates 35:5	169:5,6 184:16
108:11 121:8,9	139:6,14 140:1	112:24 113:6	teams 126:7	terrible 24:17
134:5,7 157:9	140:2 151:15	113:10 116:25	tech 49:13	130:8
157:15 166:20	154:15	125:9,10	technically 70:5	Tesla 75:10 98:7
supporting 28:5	systematic 180:9	129:22 139:17	100:6	98:12,13,18
supportive	• 	142:6 143:20	technologies	test 15:17,17
132:2	T	172:2,3 174:20	31:4 87:10	16:5 17:11,12
suppose 137:13	<b>T</b> 86:11 111:12	176:7 183:21	technology	18:14 19:5,6
sure 12:24 17:8	table 4:10,12	talked 23:13	49:13 69:10,10	23:15 25:3
18:1 20:13	17:7 40:1	30:13 39:16	69:12,15 75:21	27:15,16,19
27:21 28:21	44:12,17 48:14	48:6,10 54:12	78:7,11,12,17	35:17,22 37:17
30:7 32:6	52:10 54:15	58:1 59:19	79:3 81:20	38:16,18,21,21
34:13,22 35:13	88:13	79:14 93:8	86:9,10 87:6,7	61:3 78:7 83:9
53:1 55:8	tables 154:1	97:23 107:11	93:19 149:9	89:1 95:25
62:12 104:21	tail 172:23	108:9 113:24	teeny 25:21	103:17
104:22 105:1	take 4:3 9:7	122:10 128:19	tell 27:22 39:11	testing 59:3
108:12 111:4	24:21 38:21,21	135:6 148:12	40:9 47:1 50:1	159:19
117:14 125:12	39:19,20 42:22	158:22 159:16	50:5 51:24	tests 38:14 185:4
132:8 138:7,14	43:14 44:23	171:15 172:13	64:12 122:24	text 142:12
139:16 142:11	48:8 49:25	172:16	132:8 143:18	thank 5:22,23
143:22,25	57:17 62:13	talking 21:11	160:19 177:12	9:1,4,8 11:19
144:17 153:19	63:4 71:3	22:15,18 26:3	184:3	11:20 13:19,25
158:10 161:10	77:18 91:5	35:16 36:1,3	telling 50:2 80:9	20:11,15 21:14
164:23 166:24	98:13 109:25	41:7 44:23,24	temptation	23:9 29:5
174:18 185:7	111:14 113:16	48:24 49:12,12	50:16,19	31:20 35:7,9
185:20 187:2	114:1 116:13	53:23 54:22	<b>ten</b> 20:19 25:15	37:1,2,3 38:12
<b>survey</b> 34:3,15	118:17 122:18	57:2,7 59:13	49:10 50:7,7	42:10 48:20
35:3 74:14	125:19 126:2	65:19 91:5	104:5 105:4	56:22 63:10
75:20	127:15 130:9	95:11 101:5	173:17	64:11 65:24
surveying 34:10	130:19 134:8	113:8 134:20	tend 19:1 21:18	68:15,25 84:1
survive 165:17	137:9 143:7 151:4 156:20	136:17 152:9	21:18	84:12 88:18
suspect 100:22	164:2 169:12	166:17 168:2	tendency 95:11	89:18,19 92:1
102:18	164:2 169:12	168:25 169:9	107:20	93:3 95:22
sustain 14:18	170:16,19	176:20,22	tending 47:23	98:4 100:25
sustaining 87:6	173:24 179:24	177:23 187:6	tension 10:1	102:11 104:20
swear 188:10	182.10 184.2	tap 108:7	tentatively	105:24 106:1,3
swerve 70:15	taken 12:23 19:6	tape 71:16	184:17	112:14,15
swings 103:10	24:17 43:14	<b>tapping</b> 108:18	tenth 124:18	139:15 149:24
Swiss 82:1	46:4 61:18	target 69:3,4,20	term 127:23	149:25 162:20
<b>SX</b> 75:16	111:11 131:13	101:18,21	termed 23:5	179:4 184:6
<b>symbol</b> 115:20	111.11 151.15	105:6	<b>terms</b> 15:15	thankfully
			l	l

10 < 10	100 10 104 05	00.10.00.0	106 10 00	155 10 10
126:13	133:19 134:25	89:13 90:8	186:18,23	155:10,10
thanks 11:25,25	135:15 136:16	91:13,18,19,21	thinking 19:23	157:5,9,17
60:7 67:20,22	136:19 140:7	91:22 94:16	24:11 26:6	161:21,21
68:17 106:4	144:10 145:10	95:19 97:13,22	31:10 43:10,12	162:4,5,10,12
111:18 146:20	145:14 147:5,8	98:1,22 103:16	48:25 49:1	163:1,17
150:25 186:1	147:17 149:11	104:11 105:11	58:15 65:2,3	168:17 175:14
Thanksgiving	149:12 153:22	105:19,23	85:11 88:4,6	thresholds 7:6
89:8	154:2 164:21	106:24 107:6	110:17,17	7:20 16:25
theme 118:5	167:22 174:24	107:15,16,17	124:9 129:10	23:20 154:24
145:16	177:8 179:16	107:19 108:8,9	167:10 184:8	156:4
theoretically	180:23 182:15	108:22 109:12	184:15	<b>throw</b> 17:7,14
76:23 106:17	<b>think</b> 4:2,17	109:18,22	thinks 82:2	56:2 180:12
123:22 134:1	8:14,18 11:9	110:3,6,7,21	137:2	<b>thrown 52:10</b>
166:10	11:10 14:10,11	112:22 113:1,5	third 34:20 70:7	<b>tick</b> 186:11
theory 123:18	15:7 16:9,16	113:21 115:2	72:18 159:19	tied 97:20
125:2 131:7	16:21 17:24	118:6,24	thirdly 93:25	125:14 163:24
thicknesses	18:13 21:2,4,5	119:18 120:10	thought 17:17	tier 60:11,12,15
105:13	21:10,13 22:19	122:8,21	18:21 30:5	60:16 61:7,23
thing 33:15 47:5	22:20 23:4,11	123:25 126:20	34:4 41:6,18	61:24 63:14,16
50:18 51:10,23	23:13,16,21,24	127:6,20,24	41:21 68:13	63:16,19,19,25
58:13 59:12,23	24:25 26:9,11	129:23,24	69:13 85:21	64:1,8 66:9
78:21 79:4	26:23 27:11,13	130:7,22	89:23,25 94:8	67:1,3 77:4,5
82:11 86:22	27:22,25 28:15	132:12,18	111:6 132:21	116:13 118:17
90:18 92:8,9	28:16 29:20	134:22 136:17	151:4 156:23	161:12
95:16 96:21	31:10,24 32:24	136:21 137:15	thoughtful 5:3	Tierney 2:23
109:17 110:22	33:8 34:2	138:18 142:4,9	thoughts 6:13	23:11 25:6
112:25 118:12	35:22 36:2,5	144:11 145:11	7:25 9:10	26:9,14,20,24
123:25 141:7	36:14,18,22	146:13 156:19	15:18 21:14	46:20 47:5,13
142:8 160:23	37:5,6,8 38:4	156:22 157:18	27:10 46:20	55:17,20,22
186:10	38:15 41:17,18	158:11 159:23	65:3 160:17	63:11 64:11
things 4:16 26:3	41:20,24 42:4	160:10,23	179:1,3	185:12,19
27:2 28:23	42:8,17,22	161:22 162:16	thousand 93:2	tiers 60:11,16,20
36:22,25 37:17	43:4,9,15	162:24 163:1,1	thousands 75:25	61:7
39:23 41:14	44:14,20,22,25	163:7 164:15	<b>three</b> 4:25 18:3	<b>ties</b> 57:6
43:3,14,18	45:21 46:9,13	164:16,19,21	51:9 59:2 68:8	tightening 82:20
45:20 49:8,11	46:23 47:3,5	164:25 165:19	70:5 72:9 75:3	time 5:16 7:8 9:8
49:21 51:14	47:18,22 48:5	166:17 167:4	76:20 78:13	10:1 12:23
52:2 57:2 69:2	48:18 51:2,17	167:13,14,18	81:2 82:10	14:12 15:9
69:14 76:1	52:1,8,10,19	167:19 168:2,7	91:16 97:14,22	26:6 30:20
77:22 82:17	54:6,13 55:11	168:20 169:5	100:8,9 104:2	32:17,20 35:12
93:21 96:11	55:24 56:1,5	169:17 170:6	112:5 114:18	39:24 41:8
97:23 103:10	58:21 59:3,8	170:14 173:24	119:7 123:10	46:12,16 49:17
103:21 108:15	59:20,21 66:15	173:25 176:19	143:20 153:20	53:4 54:17
110:7,17 111:4	68:24 69:21	177:2,3,7,7,9,9	153:25 165:2	58:15 66:1,16
116:16 117:1	71:8,10,18	179:5 180:14	167:23 173:11	70:22 72:1
118:3,24 120:3	75:11 78:24	180:23 181:4,5	176:17 179:17	76:25 77:6,8
122:12,22	79:6,14 82:3	181:6,8 182:7	threshold 7:14	78:16,22 79:9
123:16 128:12	82:10 85:15,24	182:8,22 183:8	7:16 10:15,16	79:22 81:19
128:19 129:5,7	88:1,2,16	183:18 184:7,9	10:19 153:6,17	85:22 89:9,11

89:12 91:10	toolbox 110:19	tradeable	178:16	41:10,11 45:23
93:1 98:7	tools 20:5 87:16	126:16 127:13	transcript	53:2 77:13
100:23 102:12	102:1	traded 68:12	188:14	89:21 90:1,9
105:3 106:19	top 27:8 101:8	87:21 90:2	transfer 125:13	93:6 97:5 98:9
107:2 110:9	114:20 147:5	102:1 114:15	125:14,15,19	123:25 136:22
112:25 119:14	topic 5:15 12:17	122:23 137:17	transitioning	140:19,21
127:14 135:1	14:23 18:18	142:8,15,15	153:7	146:13 147:3
143:12 146:1	114:6 128:14	144:19 165:10	translate 24:8	174:2 183:7
149:13 154:14	145:14	168:19 179:7	transmission	<b>TSX</b> 117:9
159:11 164:15	topics 12:12,25	179:19	80:18	119:15
165:6 167:10	toss 106:14	trades 112:10	transparency	Tuesday 1:14
172:2 177:17	total 8:19 64:10	120:19	11:8,10 29:15	tuning 12:18
178:3 182:3,6	66:1,24 81:11	trading 83:22	137:8	turbo 105:10,12
186:23	82:22 88:22	94:10 101:25	trap 39:2	105:14,17,18
<b>timelines</b> 114:20	101:2 168:24	112:8 113:8	traveling 11:23	turn 5:7,21
timely 5:8 12:19	totally 42:23	114:9,13 115:3	<b>Treasury</b> 148:12	13:23 14:3,7
131:23	101:19 110:2	115:10,13	treat 112:23	83:15 145:10
times 40:2,3	179:19	116:22 117:23	treatment 137:1	150:4
43:24 44:1	touch 113:23	120:8 121:3,14	139:13 149:14	<b>turned</b> 31:6,6
46:15 71:7	114:1 117:8	121:21,21	<b>tree</b> 94:11	turning 59:21
72:9 102:4	118:12 132:11	122:5,7,13	tremendous	59:22 154:9
137:14 143:17	132:24	124:3 125:19	166:16,18	turns 74:15
165:7	touched 28:16	126:18 127:2	trend 63:17	85:17
timing 89:7,13	41:7 133:21	127:15 128:7	107:21 143:24	<b>twelve</b> 8:20
<b>tiny</b> 146:14	147:17	128:10,22,23	143:24	57:25
today 4:25 5:8	touching 61:14	131:15,24	<b>trending</b> 143:20	<b>two</b> 8:14 17:21
5:12 6:7,15	tough 44:13,13	133:24 134:1	trends 9:18	25:19,20 60:11
11:19,22 12:6	tougher 55:24	135:23 136:8	95:13	60:12,16 61:7
12:13 13:13	<b>touts</b> 111:3	136:16 139:3	trendy 95:14	61:24 62:18
14:9 22:2	<b>tow</b> 72:23	142:21 143:5,6	<b>trials</b> 168:6	63:14,16,16,19
31:16 37:8	toxicity 174:6	143:13,19	174:5	63:25 64:1,8
41:1 49:17	<b>toy</b> 108:21	144:12 186:16	tried 170:25	67:3 69:24
59:25 73:19	<b>Toyota</b> 71:3	traditional 64:4	trip 29:24 72:2	70:10,20,20
77:4 78:25	track 88:1 94:20	78:9 101:13	<b>triple</b> 72:13	71:12 74:9
94:22 143:21	94:21 101:2	110:6 120:12	179:13	76:3 77:8
151:4 159:15	traction 70:10	127:24 133:8	trite 4:22	82:11,20 83:11
today's 7:1 9:5	74:1 75:4	133:16 145:25	trivial 79:21	90:3,14 93:21
9:10 149:9	trade 71:17	traditionally	<b>trucks</b> 76:21	94:4 97:15,18
token 103:8	73:12,13 83:1	70:23 71:7	true 188:13	97:21 106:14
told 29:24 32:13	115:6 117:20	165:1	<b>truly</b> 45:13	116:13 118:17
44:1 96:8	119:1,24 121:4	<b>trained</b> 166:22	80:12,23	119:7 121:16
177:12	121:23 124:12	training 36:23	<b>trust</b> 46:9	143:7 153:24
tomorrow 31:16	127:15 130:15	transaction	<b>try</b> 64:5 96:24	158:24,25
ton 80:6 97:9	130:19,25	120:21 121:6	96:24,24 97:1	159:1,7,9,13
tone 149:16	131:9 136:9	121:25 125:16	104:8 106:23	160:15 161:12
tonight 120:8 tool 102:2	137:3 141:11 141:24 143:9	130:13 153:16 transactions	140:22 141:12 175:9	167:15 172:1 174:17 175:18
128:11 133:15	143:16 146:7	129:14 153:16	trying 24:12	176:10,13,13
128.11 155.15	143.10 140.7	168:5 176:25	33:8 36:18	176:15,17
150.0	140.12	100.3 170.23	55.0 50.10	1/0.13,1/
	1	1	1	1

177:13 185:12	113:15 116:22	171:1	VCs 87:8 93:5	<b>viable</b> 32:23
type 19:25 35:3	118:1,8 126:16	<b>uphill</b> 149:2	93:10 94:13	78:8 79:9
35:3 89:20	127:24 128:16	upscale 76:7	107:20 173:12	<b>video</b> 103:22
109:14 112:20	140:23 181:1,3	use 9:13 10:13	174:25	104:17 105:25
114:4 121:24	181:8 182:20	31:19 62:8,19	<b>Vegas</b> 51:13	<b>videos</b> 34:19
132:19 134:14	understanding	63:2 72:24,24	vehicle 59:2 68:2	view 65:18
types 53:17	68:18 134:23	75:21 83:2	69:17 71:23	103:5 119:12
94:25 118:15	147:6	89:22 90:23	72:11,15,19,19	121:16 139:20
133:1,8 136:14	understood	99:23 114:11	72:25 73:7,12	viewed 148:14
142:20 177:13	37:12 128:11	116:6 117:2	73:13,15,18,21	viewpoint 176:2
typical 26:17	158:9	118:18 120:3	75:3,22 76:8	views 12:6,7
183:23	undertaking	120:18 128:11	76:24 77:7,15	42:18
typically 29:2	103:15	133:15 143:4	78:5,17,20,21	<b>Virginia</b> 100:17
33:23	underwriter	150:10 185:7	79:4,9,19,22	<b>virtual</b> 59:1
	175:18	useful 78:23	80:25 81:3	106:4
U	underwriters	136:3,6 137:5	82:13 85:5	virtually 60:3
<b>U.S</b> 1:1,23 71:14	64:14,20	<b>uses</b> 14:20 86:1	93:22 94:7	visitors 74:3
82:22 188:11	171:12 174:19	127:22	98:14 100:9	visual 182:9
<b>Uber</b> 103:9	175:21	usually 10:24	149:16 171:21	Volkswagen
<b>ultimate</b> 147:21	underwriting	177:11	vehicles 68:9	79:12
ultimately	65:9,11 90:4	utilize 173:15	69:16 72:20,24	<b>volume</b> 82:19
114:13 120:19	91:12	utilized 175.15	73:24 76:19,21	135:23 142:14
125:19 143:9	underwritten	<b>utilizeu</b> 171.10	77:4 78:24	142:15,19
unaccredited	67:6	V	87:15 93:5	143:19 144:19
53:17 54:2	unemployed	vacation 35:11	velocity 142:7	volumes 80:8
<b>unaware</b> 103:1	83:14	validate 34:13	vendors 33:7	143:25,25
<b>uncle</b> 30:14,20	unfolds 139:23	validation 87:16	venture 22:25	144:3
31:12,19,23	<b>uniform</b> 131:4	Valley 53:24	29:3 48:11	voluntarily
32:8 42:22	141:17	valuable 81:17	114:5,25 115:2	164:1
50:12 51:2,24	<b>union</b> 4:19	174:7	117:7,9 118:14	<b>Volvo</b> 74:5
<b>uncles</b> 31:12	32:25	valuation 84:10	118:25 119:15	voting 152:21
uncomfortable	<b>unique</b> 74:3	value 35:6 69:2	134:20,21	<b>VX</b> 75:17
93:21	129:7	69:7 85:4 92:6	135:17 136:21	• 21 / 3.17
<b>undefined</b> 86:10	<b>United</b> 30:8,11	99:5 152:24	verification	W
86:22	44:16 51:25	165:2 166:13	22:14	Wagner 188:9
underestimates	68:9	166:15 168:25	verify 22:12,13	wait 100:19
67:12,18	<b>units</b> 70:23	174:7,8,16	123:4	123:10
underneath	82:19,20	179:6 180:10	<b>Vermont</b> 132:6	walk 71:22,24
94:11	University 33:16	variations	<b>Versa</b> 72:23	76:14 103:7
underscore	unproven 75:4	181:17	version 122:12	105:18 151:7
35:15	unregistered	variety 153:9	123:15	155:6
undersigned	14:7	various 65:17	versus 22:14	walked 76:25
188:10	unsolicited	108:24 147:18	43:1 65:4	wall 94:12
understand 20:5	130:13	182:11	101:3 120:11	105:13
20:11,13 33:12	<b>unveiled</b> 87:17	vary 129:8	153:21,25	Walsh 2:24 27:2
38:6,7 43:8,10	update 5:14	<b>vast</b> 64:18	157:7 158:15	27:5,7,10 34:5
45:13,13 53:16	8:11 60:5	VC 93:24 95:9	165:10 170:5	56:8 65:25
62:7 85:23	186:12	97:7 174:25	179:18 183:19	84:4,7,12
95:12 103:14	updated 60:19	175:25 176:5	183:20	88:20 89:18
	-ranted out?		100.20	
		I	I	I

06 15 00 5	4 51 6	c0 01 70 04	104.15.105.10	102 25 150 1 5
96:15 98:5	wants 51:6	69:21 73:24	184:15 185:19	103:25 159:1,5
Walter 98:15	60:22 76:6	77:18 104:25	we've 6:10 23:21	164:12 167:17
want 4:13 9:7	77:9,10,10,11	132:5 163:16	48:5,10 50:8,8	171:3,16
12:10 25:9	106:13	164:16 185:20	54:5,12,22	173:19 174:14
29:6,10,14,14	warming 83:1	we're 6:4 12:19	57:6 58:14	weren't 39:6
31:8 33:21	warranty 72:11	12:24 13:3,10	59:9,19 73:15	79:2 96:25
38:20 42:2	Washington	22:2,13,15	74:1,10,18,18	West 100:16
45:7,9,20	1:25 5:25 6:1	26:2 30:6,10	75:5 79:10	wet 115:3
46:10 47:1	9:9 132:7	31:9,15,16	83:19 100:7,18	whack 137:18
48:3,7 51:1,11	188:7	33:15 34:9,13	105:4 106:11	wheel 70:7,9
52:25 58:5	wasn't 16:18	34:15,21,25	108:13 110:18	100:9
62:13 66:22	63:21 96:12	35:5,15 36:1,3	111:23 114:17	wheeled 59:2
74:8 75:19	157:9 168:13	36:18,22 37:8	116:4,12	68:9
76:1,1,10,15	185:13,13	38:15 41:7	118:16 119:4	wheels 70:5,10
77:22 78:3,5	wasteful 72:21	44:21,22,24	131:13,15	75:3
87:22 88:17	watch 139:22	45:23,25 46:18	136:13 144:5	whistles 141:18
91:2,3 92:17	watched 130:6	48:21,24 50:2	146:10 150:25	white 2:5 4:16
93:11 95:4,19	watching 110:24	52:24 53:2	158:24 159:2	5:19,21,22
98:21 103:7	water 96:1	56:23 57:10	163:5 164:8	35:12 42:12,14
104:21 107:18	waters 59:3 61:3	59:25 60:2	177:5,20,20	White's 49:7
109:9 110:11	89:1	65:19 66:20	wealth 29:18	wholly 80:21
111:3 112:18	<b>way</b> 29:23 30:23	69:8,18 71:2	37:6 44:16	wide 70:3
113:6,10,14	36:7 37:22	71:20 74:6,7	93:18	103:12 104:11
117:14 127:22	42:4,6 49:4	74:19 75:9,12	webcast 12:3	widget 77:13,24
129:25 132:11	51:20 56:8	76:2,2,22	130:7	widgets 183:24
132:15 136:5,7	71:22 74:23	77:16,17 79:7	website 62:15,15	wife 112:19
138:13 140:5,7	75:11 76:24	79:24 80:7	74:4 103:25	187:5
141:22,23	78:7 83:15	82:14,19 83:22	104:8 115:20	willing 74:8 78:5
143:15 144:13	91:9 108:2,11	84:1 87:15,20	138:3,4	78:6 95:17
144:14 148:8	111:25 113:21	93:9 97:9,9	weeds 120:6	126:13
148:18,18	116:4 117:20	100:21,22	167:21	win 71:10 79:13
150:24 155:21	119:13 120:4	102:7 104:10	week 13:6	103:13
164:22 165:4	120:11 121:4,7	104:10 105:5 106:9,14	weeks 87:17	wind 110:23
166:11 167:16 167:20 176:5,9	121:20 122:2	106:9,14	91:16 94:4	window 177:25
,	123:6 124:3	110:16,17	175:18	178:19 windows 76:5
178:15 180:7	131:3 136:1 137:3 142:20	111:15 112:3	weigh 17:4 welcome 4:5,9	
180:15	148:13 159:23		,	winking 39:21 winnings 94:14
<b>wanted</b> 11:22 17:3 37:4 38:2	148:13 159:23	119:13 126:1,2 134:10 144:10	5:19,23 9:5 35:8	winnings 94:14 wise 144:20
49:6 52:7	167:23 168:16	134:10 144:10	welcoming	wish 147:8
68:18 73:8	171:19 172:11	144.12,23	160:23	149:16 153:12
76:9,24 90:23	179:16 181:7	140.15,22	well-defined	withdraw 59:11
90:25 91:9	ways 31:10	159:2 163:4	87:9	withdrawn 66:3
92:21 95:21	35:19 42:9	164:16 166:17	went 6:18 8:13	withstand 37:9
96:1 102:15	53:20 54:21	166:24 167:14	28:12 33:17	37:19
107:4 110:23	58:20 59:18	168:3,5,25	57:23 80:7	women 34:11
110:23 116:21	65:8 76:3 95:7	169:9 174:15	82:9 86:25	wonder 183:16
132:18 155:6	181:22	174:16 177:23	93:6 94:4 95:5	wondered 62:9
174:4	we'll 54:12	177:24 180:6	95:18,25 98:23	186:11
1/7.7	WC II J7.12	177.27 100.0	75.10,25 70.25	100.11
		1		l

wonderful 31:10	worried 23:6	51:1 92:2,24	50:25 78:13	<b>1:30</b> 111:9
34:24 52:18	105:25	93:3 96:19,19	79:24 82:11,22	<b>10</b> 50:4 61:12
wondering 54:9	worry 39:17	97:11 98:4	85:7 89:11,12	65:12 72:2
144:19	86:15 109:3	101:1,10,15	94:24 97:15	105:6 117:10
word 6:4 8:10	worth 14:21	102:8 104:13	98:16 112:21	159:21,21
8:11 111:3	15:5,17,25	104:20,25	119:5 143:20	160:25
141:10 170:19	16:3 18:25	164:25 166:8	144:5 149:7	<b>10,000</b> 114:13
177:10	21:24 23:15	179:5 181:12	153:21,25	114:23 144:24
words 32:3	32:8 34:2	<b>yay</b> 130:10	158:6,25 159:1	<b>10:00</b> 76:23
wordsmithing	37:23 61:13	yeah 11:25	159:7,13 167:2	<b>100</b> 1:24 7:18
184:25	72:2 159:14	17:12 21:14	167:15 170:23	10:17 71:13
wordy 36:19	175:12	26:13 32:2	170:24 173:17	72:8,17 81:13
work 12:11,13	wouldn't 23:22	39:25 40:19	174:17 176:13	83:19 88:22
16:19 27:21	47:1 81:16	43:22 46:2	176:14,15,17	154:19
31:2 36:7,10	87:22 104:22	55:4,23 56:12	182:14,25	<b>100,00</b> 170:10
46:13 69:13	153:3 156:3	56:13 75:5	Yellow 100:4,21	<b>100,000</b> 71:3
70:18 73:4	163:7	88:19 93:8	yesterday 8:18	159:4,9,14,24
77:12,17 80:10	wound 137:21	97:11 102:13	yield 141:25	160:9 171:23
81:3,20 85:7	137:22	103:6 104:19	York 114:16	174:5,9 178:13
97:18 105:17	wrap 53:5,10	104:21 106:11	119:3 141:8,16	<b>108</b> 61:17,20
119:10 125:17	write 24:13 89:4	147:15 164:25	142:24	64:13,21 66:1
125:17,18	98:2	171:22 172:8	<b>young</b> 37:22	66:14
126:4,17 130:8	writing 65:4	181:12 185:14		<b>11</b> 58:4
131:16 134:14	written 123:8	185:24 186:18	$\frac{\mathbf{Z}}{\mathbf{Z}$	<b>11:52</b> 111:10
136:11,19	149:12	<b>year 5</b> :8 6:16	<b>Z</b> 2:9	<b>110</b> 114:10
140:22 142:24	wrong 43:9	10:10 34:17	Zacks 91:16	<b>12</b> 50:25 84:8
147:6 167:9	160:19	35:19 47:17	<b>zero</b> 10:8 152:14	89:2 118:13
173:16 184:16	wrote 19:9,15	57:24 58:14	153:5 154:18	124:19 127:3
worked 30:15	49:14	60:8,12,13,14	154:22	175:5
58:2,4,9 65:1	<b>Wyoming</b> 132:7	66:6 70:23,24	<b>zinger</b> 168:1 <b>Zinn</b> 3:5 112:3	<b>12(g)(4)</b> 160:21
91:13 174:12	X	70:24,25 73:11		<b>12.6</b> 101:21
working 6:12		73:21 78:14	112:15 138:6	<b>120</b> 91:6
12:18 69:13	X 26:4,5 Xavier 2:12	93:16 100:18	138:13,21,25 139:5,16,21	<b>120,000</b> 71:9
96:25 111:7	Aavier 2:12	100:19,22	141:3,5 142:11	<b>125</b> 159:8
134:11 143:9	Y	106:23 131:13	143:22 144:23	<b>13</b> 57:10
181:2	<b>Yadley</b> 3:3 35:9	132:21 142:13	145:22 144:23	<b>14</b> 86:5,12,20
works 71:22	45:18 55:4,8	143:17 146:2	147:11,15	127:4
100:18 110:5	55:11 84:1	150:10 152:18	149:18,25	<b>14,000</b> 137:23
113:21 118:7	89:19 92:1	159:4,5,10,21	177.10,23	<b>144</b> 146:1
120:8 123:24	106:17 111:7	159:24 171:8	0	<b>15</b> 50:9
135:14 146:15	139:17 146:21	171:10 175:1	0 105:3	<b>15,000</b> 159:21
148:16	147:13 166:7	176:11 180:21		159:21 <b>150</b> 78:5 162:17
world 29:11 82:2 87:21	174:10 175:23	180:22 182:18 183:16	1	<b>150</b> 78:5 163:17 <b>15c211</b> 123:3
	176:2 186:25		<b>1</b> 169:1,2	
102:3 117:8 118:15 142:2	187:7	year's 176:11	<b>1-1/2</b> 81:8	<b>16</b> 70:23 88:21 <b>16th</b> 8:14
160:14 165:5	Yamanaka 3:4	<b>year-and-a-half</b> 73:11	<b>1,200</b> 173:5	<b>16th</b> 8:14 <b>17</b> 68:11 83:20
world's 76:12	29:6 32:10	years 13:1 25:15	<b>1.5</b> 16:3 171:10	101:18,24
80:18,22	42:1,21 44:12	32:19,22 49:10	<b>1.6</b> 171:10	<b>17(b)</b> 111:2
00.10,22	45:5,10,16	52.17,22 47.10	<b>1/3</b> 175:6	<b>1</b> /( <b>U</b> ) 111.2
		1		1

17 5 1 40.14	2020 172.21	4 2 1 4 2 . 1 0	25-20 192-10	9(-) (2,14,17,22
<b>17.5</b> 142:14	<b>2020</b> 173:21	<b>4.3</b> 142:19	25:20 183:19	<b>8(a)</b> 63:14,17,23
<b>17.6</b> 101:23	<b>2021</b> 173:23	<b>4.4</b> 8:19	<b>506(c)</b> 89:25	64:9
<b>1700's</b> 94:10	<b>21</b> 100:14,16	<b>40</b> 6:10 75:21,22	90:5,6,8 92:18	<b>8/4/2016</b> 1:16
<b>18</b> 5:4 50:9	<b>211</b> 122:20	89:5 93:2	106:25	<b>80</b> 154:23
100:14 167:2	123:2,12 124:5	153:6 169:10	<b>54,000</b> 92:25	<b>800</b> 66:2 79:11
<b>18th</b> 8:18	124:20 125:3	<b>40,000</b> 159:5	<b>55</b> 32:24	<b>81</b> 72:9
<b>19</b> 1:14 188:6	139:24 146:4	162:21 164:3	<b>55,000</b> 74:7,8	<b>82</b> 17:24 41:5
<b>1928</b> 98:15	<b>211's</b> 124:25	<b>400</b> 81:11 93:12	<b>58</b> 117:6	54:20 55:21
<b>1951</b> 79:23	<b>23</b> 74:11 87:15	<b>401K</b> 45:2	<b>5th</b> 61:16 187:1	56:11 185:1,3
<b>1982</b> 14:20	<b>24</b> 74:10 83:21	<b>404(b)</b> 7:24	6	185:5,10,23
<b>1992</b> 151:16	<b>25</b> 53:15 84:9	155:11,15,24	<b>6</b> 89:2	<b>84</b> 69:4 72:10
<b>1999</b> 49:10	88:25 89:6,15	156:12,16,23	<b>6-1/2</b> 74:15	73:6 83:16
<b>19th</b> 60:8	101:18,21	157:2,3,8,10		85:16
<b>1A</b> 123:18	151:22 165:21	157:17 158:12	<b>6,400</b> 92:19,25	<b>841</b> 62:4
2	<b>25,000</b> 47:9	158:17,25	<b>6,800</b> 69:4 73:6	9
$\frac{2}{252:17\ 61:21}$	<b>250</b> 7:15 10:15	159:5,25 160:7	83:16 85:15 60 8:18 105:3	<b>9</b> 23:17
66:1 124:19	150:14 154:17	167:13,19	<b>60</b> 8:18 105:3 <b>60's</b> 86:5	<b>9:00</b> 76:19
	156:8 162:11	168:10 169:15	<b>600,000</b> 74:3	<b>9:00</b> 76:19 <b>9:31</b> 1:15
172:10,10,16 173:22	168:18	169:19,20	<b>600,000</b> 74:3 <b>63</b> 19:5 185:13	<b>9:31</b> 1:15 <b>90</b> 69:20 82:10
<b>2-1/2</b> 71:7	<b>250,000</b> 82:19	170:5,6 171:23	<b>64</b> 85:2 92:5,24	91:5 98:16
	82:20 175:11	174:9 178:10	<b>65</b> 17:23 41:5	<b>91</b> :5 98:10 <b>90's</b> 135:5 149:9
<b>2,000</b> 161:1 <b>2.2</b> 87:4	<b>27</b> 50:9 72:7,9	181:10,23	54:20 55:19	<b>90 8</b> 135:5 149:9 <b>900</b> 115:5
	<b>27th</b> 100:13	<b>45</b> 100:18		<b>900</b> 113:5 <b>93</b> 74:19
<b>2.4</b> 171:6,9	151:1	174:25	56:11 79:16,23	
<b>20</b> 47:12,13	3	<b>450</b> 16:3 114:23	173:11,12	<b>95</b> 185:6,10
53:15 60:12,14 72:3 82:11	<b>3</b> 71:7 75:17	<b>450,000</b> 159:6	185:10,14 <b>68</b> 85:3 92:3,5	<b>96</b> 185:10 <b>98</b> 52:18
		<b>46</b> 89:1	08 85:5 92:5,5	<b>98</b> 52:18 <b>99</b> 67:17 88:22
127:15 149:7	93:11,12 133:9	<b>48</b> 62:1 63:12	7	9907:17 88:22
162:21 164:3	173:20 175:12	66:2	<b>7</b> 17:23 19:4	
167:2 173:13	184:18 <b>3-1/2</b> 171:8	5	23:17 24:17	
175:7 <b>200</b> 119:4			27:20 36:24	
154:21 162:18	<b>3-1/4</b> 87:4 <b>3:16</b> 187:11	<b>5</b> 90:7 117:10 171:8 184:16	41:4 48:23	
			54:20 55:18,24	
175:11	<b>30</b> 32:22 54:23	184:17	56:11 90:11,12	
<b>200,000</b> 19:1	72:2 98:18	<b>5-1/4</b> 86:21 87:3	90:13 185:9,9	
<b>2003</b> 173:18	125:2,4,7	<b>50</b> 6:24 7:17	<b>7,000</b> 71:9,10	
<b>2007</b> 151:11	137:14 <b>300</b> 16:3 71:23	10:9,16 16:2	94:23	
173:19 <b>2009</b> 68:7 94:21	<b>300</b> 16:3 71:23	57:24 60:13	<b>70</b> 70:9	
<b>2009</b> 68:7 94:21 <b>2010</b> 112:12	81:12 84:8,10 300 000 50:18	70:15 152:17 153:4 161:2	<b>70</b> 70:5 <b>70</b> 's 152:2	
<b>2010</b> 112:12 <b>2011</b> 157:2,11	<b>300,000</b> 50:18 175:21		<b>700</b> 155:17	
		<b>50,000</b> 34:20	<b>701</b> 148:20	
<b>2012</b> 171:16	<b>30th</b> 127:17 <b>317</b> 84:10	47:10 <b>500</b> 74:3 75:17	<b>75</b> 7:15 10:7,15	
<b>2013</b> 171:16 <b>2014</b> 171:16	<b>31</b> / 84:10 <b>320,000</b> 74:2	81:6 84:6	119:19 133:13	
<b>2014</b> 171:16 <b>2015</b> 6:17 68:9	<b>320,000</b> 74:2 <b>33</b> 111:1	81:0 84:0 161:1	150:14 152:12	
143:23	<b>35</b> 24:4	<b>500,000</b> 89:3	155:16 156:8	
<b>2016</b> 1:14	<b>39</b> 176:1	<b>500,000</b> 89:5 <b>504</b> 24:5	168:18	
182:10 188:6	371/0.1	<b>504</b> 24:5 <b>506</b> 24:3 47:25		
<b>2019</b> 173:21	4	<b>506</b> ( <b>b</b> ) 22:18	8	
2017 1/3.21	<b>4</b> 40:15,15 81:6	<b>JUU(U)</b> 22.10	<b>8</b> 86:7,16,23	
		l		I