FOIA Number: 2013-0365-F

FOIA MARKER

This is not a textual record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

Collection/Record Group: Clinton Presidential Records

Subgroup/Office of Origin: Chief of Staff

Series/Staff Member: Maria Echaveste

Subseries:

OA/ID Number: 14591

FolderID:

Folder Title:
Miscellaneous Issues

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
S	23	5	10	1

ME

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

March 29, 1999

'99 MAR 29 PM 10:08

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: ROBERT RUBIN
GENE SPERLING
JACOB J. LEW

SUBJECT: Release of Consolidated Financial Statements

I. SUMMARY

On March 31, 1999, the Secretary of the Treasury, in coordination with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, will submit to the President and the Congress the second annual financial report of the United States Government, which will be audited by GAO. These statements will show a negative $134 billion "net results of operation" and a negative $6.1 trillion "net position" for the government in FY 1998. Some people may attempt to use these results to cast doubt on our budget numbers, including our surplus number. However, the consolidated financial statements in no way challenge the $69.2 billion surplus. They are intended to be a management tool and are prepared using an entirely different accounting concept ("accrual") from the concept used in budgeting ("cash"). In fact, GAO reviewed the elements that establish our surplus number and did not challenge them.

The audit report from GAO discusses many areas in which the reliability of the current accrual-based financial statements must be improved and, as a result, states that GAO was unable to render an opinion on these statements; in addition GAO discussed incorrect Medicare payments. The development of comprehensive financial statements covering all of the myriad activities of the U. S. Government is a challenge your Administration set for itself in order to improve the accountability and functioning of the government. This is an immense task and a great deal of additional work is still required to implement an entirely new system of reporting.

The purpose of this memo is to discuss our strategy for preventing the release from damaging our budget message or impugning our stewardship of financial data and to put these financial statements in context.

II. BACKGROUND

Last year, for the first time, the U.S. government prepared comprehensive financial statements -- covering 70 agencies and over 2,000 component entities -- and subjected them to audit. The statements, to be released on Wednesday (3/31), are the second government-wide audited statement covering the Executive branch, as well as parts of the Legislative and Judicial branches.

The National Performance Review recommended that the Federal government prepare consolidated financial statements in order to improve the management and the efficiency of the government. In 1994, the Administration supported the Government Management Reform Act (GMRA), which mandated the issuance of these financial statements. The Administration supported the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board in creating the accounting standards that form the basis for the financial statements.

The principal differences between the accounting methods on which these statements are based -- accrual and cash -- pertain to the timing of the measurement and recognition of the revenues and expenses and the inclusion of a presentation of assets and liabilities. In budgeting, we measure cash in (revenues) and cash out (outlays) to determine deficit or surpluses. In contrast, accrual accounting includes such items as obligations for payments that will be made in future years (e.g. future VA benefits) and one-time only actuarial adjustments. Therefore, on an ongoing basis, the accrual method, in effect, includes a provision for future obligations as an expense, and when cash payment is made there will be an offset in liability and no net expense will be recorded. Each of the two accounting methods -- cash and accrual -- are useful tools for looking at the government's operations, but for different purposes.

III. STRATEGY

On Tuesday, March 30, 1999, it is reported that Congressman Steve Horn is planning a press conference to release a report card on the agencies' financial management in advance of Treasury's delivery to you and to the Congress on March 31, 1999 (as required by statute) of the consolidated financial statements and Horn's congressional hearing on March 31, 1999. Also on Tuesday, March 30, 1999, the Social Security and Medicare Trustees will meet and will come to the White House to brief you. In advance of Tuesday's events, Treasury and OMB officials will brief key members and their aides. We will keep our affirmative message focused on the Social Security and Medicare Trustees report (about which you will make a statement after being briefed by the Administration's four trustees -- Secretaries Shalala, Rubin, and Herman, and Commissioner Apfel). Following your statement, in a different location, Treasury and OMB officials will brief the press on the Trustees report.

As you will recall, last year's release of the consolidated financial statements resulted in one day of favorable stories -- concerning the first time nature of such statements -- and then following Representative Horn's hearing two days of unfavorable press coverage including discussions on the network evening news about inadequate financial control. This year we will aggressively make three crucial points to defend the Administration's efforts: (1) that nothing in the consolidated financial statements challenge the fact that we had a $69.2 billion surplus and that comparing accrual numbers to budget numbers is like comparing apples to triangles; (2) that these numbers do no in any way reflect the true net worth of the government -- at least until the systems and standards are finalized; (3) that the consolidated financial statements are an example of your commitment to improve the management and efficiency of the U.S. government and that the enormity of the task of implementing entirely new systems and standards creates a challenge for several years to come and; (4) that while the amount of incorrect Medicare payments is too large it has improved.

IV. The Challenge

Creating and implementing an entirely new system of identifying and tracking all the operations of the U. S. Government is an immense task and will require a great deal of additional effort in order to complete it. To give you some sense of this undertaking: (1) we have had to develop (and are still finalizing) new accounting standards that apply to the Federal government's unique role (e.g. as the owner of national parks and or the entity responsible for a large military infrastructure); (2) each agency must complete creation and implementation of new systems to account for their assets and liabilities and; (3) the Department of Treasury must identify, reconcile, and eliminate all the inter-agency transactions (to avoid double-counting), assure consistency, and consolidate the statements. Until the new systems are fully implemented, the results of the statements will continue to fluctuate for several years.

V. Major Concerns and Our Responses

The consolidated financial statements are expected to raise four key issues of concern:

1. **The Government Has a Negative "Net Result of Operation" in the Amount of $134 Billion for FY 1998.** As stated earlier, some people may use this result to try to cast doubt on our budget numbers, including our budget surplus number. You should know that nothing in these statements challenges the fact that we had a $69.2 billion surplus last year. We will make this point aggressively. As stated above, the two distinct bases of accounting -- cash and accrual -- are not comparable and, in fact, GAO already reviewed the components of the FY 98 $69.2 billion surplus (our revenue and debt estimates and our cash flow processes) and did not challenge them. Furthermore, there are one-time accounting differences such as a $109 billion change in veterans' benefits estimates which effect the "net result of operation."

2. **The Government Shows a Negative "Net Position" (Assets minus Liabilities) of $6.1 Trillion this Year.** This bottom line number does not in anyway reflect the true net worth of the government -- at least until the systems and standards underlying these statements are finalized. At this point, a value can not be placed on such tangible assets as national parks or military equipment or on any of the nation's intangible assets. For example, the "net position" deteriorated a full $1.1 billion from last year because of the changes in the accounting rules -- including one that removed $655 billion of military equipment from the balance sheet entirely. It is also worth noting that your current plan for the surplus would virtually wipe out the $3.7 trillion debt included in liabilities by 2020.

3. **The FY 1999 Budget Set the Goal of a Clean Audit Opinion for the FY 1999 Consolidated Financial Report.** In May of 1998 you issued a memorandum to all the agencies reiterating this goal. However, it is now unlikely that this goal will be met.

The audit report from GAO discussed many areas in which the reliability of the current financial statements must be enhanced and improved, and, as a result, GAO was unable to render an opinion on these statements. The mammoth nature of this undertaking raises questions about whether additional resources are needed throughout the government to achieve our financial management objectives. Since the time you took office, progress has been made -- process and coordination have improved and the number of major agencies with clean audits has increased from 1 to 13 (out of 24) -- but there is a great deal that remains to be done. In his letter transmitting GAO's opinion on the consolidated financial statements, Comptroller General Walker will state: "The Executive Branch recognizes the extent and severity of the financial management deficiencies and that addressing them will require concerted improvement efforts across government . . . With a concerted effort the federal government as a whole can continue to make progress toward achieving accountability and generating reliable financial and management information on a regular basis."

4. **As Previously Reported by HHS, the Consolidated Financial Statements Will Discuss $12.6 Billion in Incorrect (Both over and Under) Payments of Medicare Fee-for-Service Benefits.** You should know that these incorrect payments are not new. Our new financial statements have provided us the means to identify and track any incorrect payments -- which is how they are coming to light -- and have helped us to reduce such payments as well. Only a year ago, incorrect Medicare payments were at $20 billion.

March 22, 1999

Mr. John Podesta
Chief of Staff
The White House
1st Floor, West Wing
Washington, D.C. 20502

Dear Mr. Podesta:

As supporters of family planning and equity in women's health care, the undersigned organizations are writing to ask the Administration to continue its long-standing support for both domestic and international family planning by endorsing the "Equity in Prescription Insurance and Contraceptive Coverage Act" (EPICC), a bill to remedy an existing gender inequity in private insurance coverage of contraceptives. The Administration's endorsement of EPICC would be a strong statement in opposition to this discriminatory treatment. It also would build upon the Administration's support last year for this same coverage for federal employees participating in FEBHP – support which was key to its inclusion in the FY 1999 omnibus appropriations bill.

As you are well aware, family planning is basic, preventive health care for American women, and most American women use family planning at some point in their reproductive years. However, many private insurance policies either exclude coverage for prescription contraceptives and related services *entirely* or single out these services for limited coverage. At the same time, almost all of these same policies offer coverage for prescription drugs and devices.

The exclusion of prescription contraceptive coverage makes little sense when the benefits of such services are examined. Timing and spacing births is critical in improving women's and children's health and avoiding unintended pregnancies. Pregnancies that are unintended, spaced too closely together, or occur very early or very late in a woman's reproductive years often have adverse health, social, or economic consequences for both women and children – consequences which can include lower levels of educational and job attainment as well as a greater risk for these families of living in poverty. The use of family planning also increases the likelihood that the estimated 15 million Americans who contract a sexually transmitted disease each year will be diagnosed and treated, and reduces the incidence of unintended pregnancy and abortion. The United States has an extremely high rate of unintended pregnancy compared with other developed countries – approximately half of all pregnancies in our country are unintended and half of these end in abortion. By improving and increasing access to a full range of contraceptive services, women's risk of unintended pregnancy is reduced, as is the rate of abortion.

Despite the myriad health and social benefits associated with contraception, it is the only non-experimental prescription drug benefit that is regularly excluded by insurers. Almost half of all fee-for-service plans and Preferred Provider Organizations (PPOs), 20 percent of Point-of-Service plans (POS), and seven percent of Health Maintenance Organizations (HMOs) **do not offer *any* coverage for reversible contraception**. Of those plans that do offer some coverage for contraception, many do not cover all five major methods of reversible contraception. Fewer than 20 percent of fee-for-service plans or PPOs and fewer than 40 percent of POS networks and HMOs routinely cover all five major methods – oral contraceptives (OCs), diaphragms, intrauterine devices (IUDs), Norplant, and Depo Provera.

In an important step toward remedying this inequity, family planning advocates in Congress, along with the Administration, succeeded in providing contraceptive coverage to the 1.2 million women of reproductive age participating in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program, the largest employer sponsored health insurance plan in the world. It is now time to expand this common sense provision to the rest of privately insured Americans – of whom more than eight in ten support contraceptive coverage.

Bipartisan legislation was introduced in 1997 and is about to be reintroduced in the 106th Congress to help remedy this fundamental inequity in health care coverage and to create a level playing field for American women and their families. The Senate bill will be sponsored by Senators Olympia Snowe (R-ME) and Harry Reid (D-NV), while the House bill will be sponsored by Representatives Jim Greenwood (R-PA) and Nita Lowey (D-NY). EPICC would require insurance plans that offer prescription drug coverage to cover prescription contraceptive drugs and devices. Similarly, the measure would require that health plans offering coverage for outpatient medical services also provide coverage for outpatient contraceptive services. The bill defines contraception as "consultations, examinations, procedures and medical services provided on an outpatient basis and related to the use of contraceptive methods (including natural family planning) to prevent an unintended pregnancy." Moreover, research indicates that the cost of such coverage would be minimal.

We would like to meet with you at your earliest convenience to discuss the Administration's endorsement of EPICC. Judith DeSarno, the President of NFPRHA, will be happy to serve as the contact point with the groups to set up the meeting. She can be reached at 293-3114.

Thank you for your consideration.

The Alan Guttmacher Institute
American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists
American Association of University Women
American Nurses Association
Center for Reproductive Law and Policy
National Abortion and Reproductive Rights Action League
National Family Planning and Reproductive Health Association
National Partnership for Women and Families
National Women's Law Center
Planned Parenthood Federation of America

cc:

Monica Dixon, Deputy Chief of Staff, Office of the Vice President
Maria Echaveste, Assistant to the President and Deputy Chief of Staff
Pat Ewing, Deputy Chief of Staff for Communications, Office of the Vice President
Audrey Tayse Haynes, Chief of Staff to Mrs. Gore
Christopher Jennings, Deputy Assistant to the President for Health Policy Development
Elena Kagen, Deputy Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy
Ron Klain, Assistant to the President and Chief of Staff and Counselor to the Vice President
Jenny Luray, Deputy Assistant to the President and Director of Women's Initiatives and Outreach
Bruce Reed, Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy
Melanne Verveer, Assistant to the President and Chief of Staff to the First Lady

NATIONAL
FAMILY
PLANNING &
REPRODUCTIVE
HEALTH
ASSOCIATION

WASHINGTON DC
2'99
PB METER
8466433
0.33
U.S. POSTAGE

Maria Echaveste
Assistant to the President and Deputy Chief of Staff
1st Floor, West Wing
Executive Office of the President
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20500

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 5, 1999

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: GENE SPERLING
SALLY KATZEN

SUBJECT: Summary of the Administration's Electricity Restructuring Bill

As you may recall, last year we submitted an electricity restructuring bill to Congress. Our bill would have encouraged states to open the market for electricity generation to competition; electricity transmission and distribution would remain subject to existing regulation. Efficient electricity generators would be able to attract customers based on lower rates; those that used environmentally friendly technologies (e.g., solar, wind, etc.) could sell electricity to consumers based on those features. Consumers would be able to purchase electricity from any generator that served their market, just as they are currently able to choose their long distance telephone carrier.

The bill was projected to generate $20 billion of savings. This represents a savings of about $230 per home -- the equivalent of a five percent tax cut for the average family -- of which about half would represent direct savings that would reduce consumers' electric bills and the remaining half would be achieved through lower prices for goods and services purchased by the average family. This savings would partially offset any future costs of implementing the Kyoto Accord. Congress did not act on our bill or any of the other competing bills.

This past winter, Secretary Richardson directed his staff to update the Administration's bill to address several previously unaddressed issues and several concerns that were raised about our bill last summer. The additions to the bill were reviewed by an NEC-led interagency group, which has resolved all outstanding questions. As a result, we expect to be able to send a revised Administration bill to Congress when it returns from its current recess. Principal provisions of the bill are described below, beginning with the provisions of last year's bill that remain unchanged.

I. KEY PROVISIONS OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S BILL THAT ARE UNCHANGED

There is a general recognition of the need for electricity restructuring legislation even though electricity restructuring is happening already at the state level. (At least eighteen states have already enacted some form of electricity deregulation, and the pace appears to be picking-up.) Unlike the movement of water or telephone signals, the flow of electricity cannot be directed down a specific path; it flows through any connected route that lies in front of it, following the path of least resistance. Because the electricity grid crosses state lines (and because the path of least resistance may also cross state borders), electricity restructuring will necessarily occur in an interstate environment. Moreover, the existing framework of federal electricity law, which is over 60 years old, is based on states' engaging in cost-of-service regulation, which will generally disappear for electricity generation (but not transmission and distribution) in the move to competition. For the restructured market to operate efficiently and effectively, federal law must be updated to reflect the changing structure of the industry. The key components of the previous bill were:

Flexible Federal Mandate: Among the most contentious issues is federal preemption of a traditional state role -- regulating public utilities. In order to balance the federal preference for consumer choice with the desire to avoid supplanting the states' traditional responsibilities, our bill includes a flexible mandate for state regulators. Specifically, although the bill requires that states offer consumers the opportunity to choose their electricity supplier by 2003, it allows states to opt out of this requirement if a state determines that its citizens would be served better by the state maintaining a traditional cost-of-service regulatory framework or its designing and implementing its own competitive framework.

Recovery of Stranded Costs: If a previously regulated utility loses market share in a competitive market, it may no longer be able to recover previously incurred costs of underutilized investments, resulting in stranded costs (*i.e.*, costs that are not recoverable in a competitive marketplace). Reflecting our sensitivity to federalism issues, the bill requires states to examine the issue of recovery of stranded costs as part of their restructuring process, but to take whatever action they deem appropriate.

Consumer Information: In a competitive electricity market, consumers will need information to enable them to compare the costs and sources of electricity from different suppliers. Therefore, the bill directs the Department of Energy ("DOE") to establish uniform "labeling" requirements for electricity so that consumers can compare easily the cost electricity available from different generators. In addition, it is expected to assist consumers who want to purchase electricity generated from environmentally friendly sources ("green labeling").

System Reliability: In a competitive generation market, utilities must provide fair access to their transmission and distribution lines so that their competitors may reach new customers. To that end, the bill directs utilities to join an organization that would establish standards for access to the power grid that protects reliability, subject to Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC") oversight.

Environmental Protection: Power plants are significant emitters of pollution, and restructuring offers them the potential to increase pollution either through increased demand in response to lower costs or as a result of incentives for generators to use cheaper (dirtier) fuel (*i.e.*, coal). To counteract these incentives, the bill contains several features to enhance environmental protection, including a $3 billion public benefits fund (funded from a federal fee collected on the sale of electricity) to support conservation programs and the deployment of renewable energy technologies. (The public benefits fund will also support programs to assist low-income consumers of electricity.) The bill also includes a requirement that a specified percentage of electricity generated by each generator come from non-hydro renewable resources.

Repeal of PUHCA: The Public Utilities Holding Companies Act of 1935 (PUHCA) was passed to curb the abuses of the giant utility holding companies in the early part of the century. Today, the law limits the ability of utility holding companies to operate generation facilities in non-contiguous geographic territories and is a significant barrier to genuine competition in a restructured industry. In order to enable generators to compete on a nationwide basis, and in order to ensure that consumers have a wide range of choice of their electricity providers, the bill repeals most of the restrictive language in PUHCA, but enhances the ability of states and the federal government to oversee holding company activities.

II. NEW PROVISIONS INCORPORATED INTO THE ADMINISTRATION'S BILL

Environmental Protection/Renewable Portfolio Standard: As noted above, the Administration's previous bill included a requirement that a specified percentage of electricity be generated from renewable resources. Last year's bill set the standard at 5.5 percent of electricity generated. In response to concerns that our bill was not sufficiently environmentally friendly, we have raised the standard to 7.5 percent. Generators may meet the standard by generating 7.5 percent of their power from renewable non-hydropower sources, by purchasing credits from another generator that has exceeded the 7.5 percent standard, or by purchasing credits from DOE for 1.5 cents per kilowatt hour, the proceeds of which will be deposited in the public benefits fund. (To the extent that the sale of such credits raise money for the public benefits fund, the federal fee on the sale of electricity will be reduced.)

Efficient Generation Technologies: There is increasing interest in the use of small distributed power generation equipment and the use of combined heat and power generating equipment (similar to the move to PCs from mainframes). These smaller power systems, which are located near the site where the electricity is used, have both environmental and economic benefits. The bill seeks to promote their use through tax credits (included in the FY 2000 budget) and shortened depreciation periods, and facilitates their interconnection to the power grid.

Tennessee Valley Authority: The Tennessee Valley Authority ("TVA") is among the largest utilities in the United States. The current bill removes the "TVA Fence," which currently prohibits TVA from competing outside its service territory and prevents competitors from competing within TVA's service territory. This will ensure that the Tennessee Valley obtains the benefits of a competitive electricity market. The bill will not, however, subject TVA to FERC jurisdiction, either for review of its wholesale power rates or its accumulation of market power, notwithstanding the fact that virtually all other generators are subject to FERC oversight and calls for such oversight of TVA are widespread.

Power Marketing Administrations: The Bonneville Power Administration and the Western and Southwestern Power Marketing Administrations ("PMAs") sell federally generated power, generally in the Western states. This bill subjects the PMAs transmission rates to FERC jurisdiction under the Federal Power Act, which requires FERC to review proposed transmission rates to ensure that they are just and reasonable and not unduly discriminatory. The bill also requires FERC to consider that, in addition to generation costs, the PMAs have additional costs for environmental and other public responsibilities that may legitimately be recouped.

Assistance for Remote Communities and Indian Tribes: In order to ensure that remote communities and Indian tribes benefit from a restructured electricity industry, the bill establishes grant programs to assist remote communities and tribes in connecting to the grid and participating in a competitive market. In addition, to promote economic development on Indian reservations, the bill provides extra credit towards meeting the renewable portfolio standard (of 7.5 percent) for renewable power that is generated on tribal lands.

Consumer Protection: The bill enhances consumer protection by requiring states to hold proceedings to examine how to maintain service to low income individuals, providing protection against "slamming" (switching providers without the consumer's permission) and "cramming" (billing consumers for fictitious service), requiring generators to provide clear information about the source and price of their electricity, and requiring FERC to consider the effects of utility mergers on consumers.

Promotes Reliability: The bill enhances reliability in a competitive market by directing the Secretary of Energy to convene a board to investigate major electricity outages and also directing the Secretary to convene a panel to examine the need for additional transmission capacity to ensure that consumers in all parts of the country have access to a wide range of generators.

Worker Displacement: Labor unions have expressed concern about the loss of jobs among utility workers in a restructured industry. In response to their concerns, the bill directs states to consider the treatment of displaced workers when they consider stranded costs and directs DOE to establish a model reliability code sought by the utility industry. Moreover, all displaced workers will be eligible for training and benefits under the Federal displaced worker training programs at the Department of Labor.

III. NEXT STEPS

As noted above, we expect to clear the legislative language through an interagency process and send the Administration's bill to Congress as soon as it returns from its current recess. We understand that Congress will appreciate that we are sending a bill up earlier this year than we did last year, and expect it to stimulate active consideration of the issues addressed in the bill. We will include a number of Departments other than DOE (e.g., EPA (and/or CEQ), USDA and DOI) in the roll-out to make it clear that the Administration speaks with a single voice on this matter.

We believe that the Administration's bill presents a reasonable proposal, although by occupying the center it is likely to draw some fire from both the left and the right. For example, some environmentalists remain deeply concerned that power plants contribute to pollution; notwithstanding the changes we are making, they would like to see a much greener bill. Similarly, some in the labor movement remain concerned about the potential job losses from restructuring, and while they will welcome the changes in our bill, they are unlikely to actively support it. At the same time, industry will notice that we have moved to the left, but should also give us credit for maintaining our focus on economic considerations. In short, we believe that the bill represents a credible plan, and is a good starting point that will enable us to engage fully in the legislative debate over the matter.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

April 29, 1999

MEMORANDUM TO: Maria Echaveste
Bruce Reed
Mickey Ibarra
Kevin Thurm

FROM: Fred DuVal

This is rather unprecedented! For NGA to compliment us is a rare and wonderful feat. Thanks to HHS and DPC for their good work.

NATIONAL GOVERNORS' ASSOCIATION

Thomas R. Carper
Governor of Delaware
Chairman

Michael O. Leavitt
Governor of Utah
Vice Chairman

Raymond C. Scheppach
Executive Director

Hall of the States
444 North Capitol Street
Washington, D.C. 20001-1512
Telephone (202) 624-5300
http://www.nga.org

April 28, 1999

The President
The White House
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. President:

We appreciate that many of the changes in final regulations for the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) block grant reflect comments submitted by the nation's Governors. Specifically, we are pleased that significant changes were made related to the definition of assistance, the creation of separate state programs, and the continuation of waivers.

We believe that the final regulations recognize the positive initiatives already taking place at the state level and support the flexibility inherent in the statute. We look forward to continuing to work with the administration as we move toward new challenges in welfare reform.

Clearly it will take some time to fully analyze the impact of these regulations on states' efforts to reform the welfare system. As states begin to understand how they will effect innovation at the state level, it is our hope that we can work with you and Congress to resolve any outstanding issues affecting the continued success of welfare reform.

We look forward to continuing our federal-state partnership in serving the nation's neediest families.

Sincerely,

Tom Carper
Governor Thomas R. Carper
Chairman

Michael O. Leavitt
Governor Michael O. Leavitt
Vice Chairman