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(TAPES 1, 2, 3))

How should your name appear. Spelling?

GOLDMAN:


Who: 's Y9-d"e"fln. r t. ion! of the word';w:@.l-ity"1 ,

GOLDMAN:

I dtfine quality ~same ~av that mar o r ac t.ur-Lnq companies do, or anybody e Le e-, It is meeting or exceeding customer expectations.

Wfta~"m:fr. J">d-}"i"k'e,c"mE8, a1 stin9'us h for 1 a wy ers
1 s , it's not what ~ould geDou an !All :a.,t,
liar -lard Law School. It's /hot that b _eautjfl // elo1uent job, it's what will work for your cuu comers.

Wh~l are lawyers threatened by idea of quality?

GOLDMAN:"

I "think one of the reasons is that, number one, it implies that they're not doing que Li t.y. What they do at work is not a quai i t.y product. I think that's one of the threatening aspects.

I t: link another threatening aspect is that s om.ahow a lay person can have some say over the caliber of their work.
And that's -- that's not something they've learned in law school. It's not something that most lawyers may believe.

Finish: quality is.

GOLDMAN:

Quality is meeting clients' or customers' expectation. It's -- another way I'd put it is the following: quality is solving problems, not answering questions.

Don't lawyers think they're doing that?

GOLDMAN:

I think a lot of lawyers, deep inside of their head, continue to see their law school professors.

And when they write a memo, or they write a brief to the Supreme Court, or they write a letter, they're not really writing it necessarily for the person who is receiving it. They're writing it for that arbiter of good lawyer work, which is someone other than the customer.

What kinds of things does IRS measure?

GOLDMAN:

We're measuring customer satisfaction. One of the -- one -- many of the legal opinions that are produced in the Chief Counsel's office, which go to the IRS, we ask the recipients of the memos: did we answer your question; did you understand what we said; was it readable; was it brief; was it timely.
Simple questions like that. And we consider that a very important measure of the quality of what we do.

How did you decide to get involved in TQM?

GOLDMAN:

I think what prompted us to get into quality was the fact that the IRS wasn't quality. They were there before we were.

We felt that, for us to serve our clients, and to be part of the systems with our clients, we had to speak the same language. We had to understand what they were saying. In a way, we had to meet their names. So that's really how we got into quality.

How did you know you weren't meeting their needs?

GOLDMAN:

We didn't know whether we were or we weren't. But we hadn't really asked the question. I do know times have happened with me where I have produced a memo which I thought responded to exactly what my client had asked, and they said: that's not what I wanted it at all.

I've been in situations where I prepared a memo for my boss and my boss said: no, you answered issue A, but I want you to answers issues A through Z.
And I wanted with all my heart to go to the client and say: what do you want me to answer. I can answer A through Z, but do you really want a book. And I knew that sometimes we were writing books when all people wanted as short stories.

What steps did you take to close the gap?

GOLDMAN:

I think the very fact of measuring the level of satisfaction by our customers -- let me start this again. (OFF CAMERA DISCUSSION)

Th- gap between expectations and all.

GOLDMAN:

As I s- €1";,- yeah

We began to close the gap between what was expected and what we are providing, as soon as we started asking the auestioQs of our cu-tomers: are we meettD-our needs.

'Wi.&-.9, S.- ..the ~-eg'te~ did we answer the issue that you had posed, we automatically started to do a better job of it" When we started to -- when we asked qUEstions of was this a timely response, we di- a better job.

When we asked the question: is our memo un-erstandable, it started to become more understandable.
So, really, setting the criteria helped us to close the gap.

Why do lawyers find the asking to be daunting?

Let me just -- I -- there are so many different answers that are going through my head, I have to put them together.

Lawyers were graded in law school. They did very well. They consider themselves professionals. They do an excellent job.

They're now being put in a situation where a lay person and somebody who has different perspective than them may give them a "C" or a "D". And I think they find that very daunting.

I don't think anybody likes to be measured, and anybody likes to be evaluated and criticized. And lawyers, perhaps, less so than others.

When you_dee~ea to be organized, whQt did ym:@l.'b first .second?

What we did first was we created quality councils. We created a National Quality council which -- from which sprang the structure for everything else.

Tfit~ext thing we did was ~#~~ councils for all the o~ ~ ecutives.
We have five associate chief counsels. We created quality councils for them. We have seven Regional Counsels. We created quality councils for them. We have seven regional Directors of Appeals. Similarly, we created oou.no i.Ls for them.

They, in turn, solicited nominations for quality improvement projects. And they got those nominations. They screened them with appropriate criteria. And then selected those problems that they thought were worth pursuing and investing in and solving via the use of a quality improvement project team.

What criteria did you establish for screening?

In fact, each counsel developed its own criteria. I can tell you that often it was a ques t.Lon of, is it within our Dower to solve this. Is this a --m.$tter 1:hi'lt i ~ i

enough for the investment. Is this ~omethjna that we can sol_ve re'ati4z:e'y glllickly so that. _wEL-a et,SPIQ~ Day-back.

I -- is it -- how useful is it. It was these kip.j of criteria that we looked at.

What kind of projects to do? Not to do?

I ~ouldn't be honest to say that we selected thE right projects in all instances. I th i nJs in man¥Lns t.ance s , we didn't sel..e..d:- th,= riq:g.t proj ects.
The ones that have worked were the ones that were closely defined, where the issue was well defined so that the team knew what it was doing. The ones that we've had difficulty with were those where it was so broad that the team spent literally months trying to figure out what it was doing.

So the thing is, we wanted, especially to find issues; that's where we wanted to have the right people on the teams.

Many of our problems involved the IRS. When the IRS is involved -- for instance, we had a project looking at we want our cases to be well developed. That's a very broad issue to start with. But the development of the case is not done by Chief Counsel's office.

So we had to make sure that we had sufficient representation from the IRS so that there would be the potential for buy-in at the conclusion as well as we got all the information we needed.

Which projects did you find most fruitful?

The ones that I think were most fruitful were those where we could get some kind of measurement. Let's say they're two parts. One is those where we could get real measurements.
And the other was when we were dealing with what I call the hand-over between different functions -- typically between the IRS and Chief Counsel's office, because, like in most organizations, you tend to have the over-the-wall syndrome: I've done my job, I'm finished with it, thank God, now it's their problem.

And, of course, it is truly the problem of the next person down the line.

GOLDMAN:

Can you be specific?

Sure. One of the problems we looked at was the handling of bankruptcy cases. Excuse me -- I'm going to try to be careful about this, but I may want to either edit this or work it again. Because it's a little sensitive --

One project that was useful was important, involved our handling of bankruptcy cases. A taxpayer goes bankrupt and we have some interest -- we have some claim for taxes. And we have to be represented in bankruptcy court, too, for our claim. To put our lien on the estate.

To do that, we have to get the proper documentation and have to get it in sufficient time. So we then turn over to the Department of Justice and make our claim in court.
In one office, we found -- and I think this is true in many offices -- that we were not getting the documents we wanted, and we were not getting them when we needed them. And this was a real problem. It's the kind of problem I described as the hand-off problem.

We worked on this project. And the good thing -- one of the good things we did was we had representatives from the service who prepare the documents, as well as the lawyers who handle the cases, as well.

And we were able to bridge that gap. Specifically what we did was we created a guide that described what should be done in each type of bankruptcy case. Each chapter. Chapter II, Chapter 13.

So that the person on the IRS who's working on it says: okay, this is X type of case. I need -- I have a check list now. If I can provide them with these things, that will be sufficient. And let's see, I need to get it to them by so-and-so date. As the check list also indicated.

So all of a sudden, counsel was now getting the documents they wanted and they were getting it more timely than they had been getting it. Which meant that we could prepare the case better for Justice, get it into court timely, with a proper file.
Who leads your quality management effort?

GOLDMAN:

In my estimation, the person who leads our quality effort is the Chief Counsel and Deputy Chief Counsel. "...Q~~~~~" ~ he chairman o~;Ć''eu:r"National Quality Counci~

the "~~~ty cn a e f Counsel.

I believe that the only way, you're going~, make the kind of change necessary for a quality effort is to have the top per~~n "~es~onsible for it happening.

As the National Quality Coordinator, I provide staff support and some expertise. But I could not possibly have the authority or responsibility to make this go.

GOLDMAN:

How did you determine resources? How much?

We never put a budget line in our budget for quality. We thought that it was part and parcel of what we do and what we are. Therefore, to separate it out, would be to make it into a program. And it wasn't intended to be a program.

And I -- in retrospect, I think that was a very good decision.

Something else I want to say, but let me see if I could get it.
The other reason it was important for us not to separate it out is that it -- it may become a target. Cuts come along and -- you know, there -- there are various things that tend to be fair game. Be it training or travel or something like that.

And the concern was, if you put quality up there, it can become a target. So integrating it into everything we do was important.

Lawyers are not team players.

It varies from lawyer to lawyer how they adapt to working on teams.

I've always questioned the ability of the excellent litigator, the fighter, the man who challenges -- the man or woman who challenges everything, questioned whether they can ever be an excellent manager, because it's a totally different skill.

Similarly, there are some feisty people who belong in a courtroom and may not belong on a team. But that's really the exception. I mean, this is -- we're talking about anywhere from one to ten percent of the population.

~CY2t of the other people understand that the only way to affect things is through te:nlwDrk. We're all. really dependent on one
In fact, we're finding that more in teams, even litigation. And that the importance of cooperation is becoming greater and greater.

Where does training, learning skills, ...?

GOLDMAN:

We have found that -- let me pause and think about this question ...

We have specific quality training. The teams are trained to act in -- as teams to go through an eight-step process, to brainstorm and prioritize, and flow chart, and do all the analytical things that are necessary. And they must learn to do those things.

In fact, I think we have trained in the entire quality approach. Or quality philosophy. About a year ago, I asked somebody to write an article for Quality Times. This was a lawyer --

(OFF CAMERA DISCUSSION)

Whitt training is appropriate?

GOLDMAN:

The training. We gave our people, -- in fact, the training, we had a very careful, planned training. We trained all quality council members in what they were doing as -- on the council.
Namely, screening quality improvement projects, as well as understanding a new philosophy of the quality approach.

We trained all managers in a three-day training. And this was an ov-e-e-quality approach; involving partTcipation, their participation with the quality improvement project teams.

And we did train all employees. And this's was a briefer training for a few hours, just giving them an idea of the eight-step process: brainstorming, prioritizing, work flow -- the case and effect diagrams, surveys, and so forth, statistical analysis.

Is this designed for government or corporate?

We have learned that we can do a lot of things a lot more quickly than we did.

We have learned that we can train our people more quickly and more effectively than we did finally. We can -- if you're going to put people on problem-solving teams, often that -- the training that can be done there can be just-in-time training.
That is, if you need to do cause and effect analysis, at that point an expert can come in and teach them cause and effect analysis by doing, doing what they actually have to do.

So we have found that we can actually shorten the amount of time necessary. It can be training and doing simultaneously.

Billable hours sacrificed; what's a pay back?

As I understand it, clients are looking more and more for value for the dollars they're spending. If you have a system that is very efficient, that does not require reviewing and revising of all the documents, which doesn't require retyping of things, that takes advantage of computer technology.

If lawyers get the materials that they need the first time and know the witnesses they need to identify the first time, and the evidence can be produced by the clients, then the lawyers are going to provide value to their clients. The clients are going to continue to come to them.

If you use the quality process properly, this kind of efficiency and effectiveness will follow, and that's the pay back to the quality process.

Hourable billing versus proposals?
I don't think I can talk about that. In other words, I'm not in that context, so I don't think it.

Do you work with outside counsel at all?

Alright not at all. I mean, the only in opposition, only in opposition. I just you know, I can speculate on it, but I don't think I can bring anything more to it than, you know, anybody else outside. I mean, I can guess.

I will guess that clients are more and more going to require that lawyers provide the costs, or the estimate of the cost, up front. And they better be pretty darn close.

And I -- and that's not been the tradition for lawyers. That's a new experience that will require measurement and base-lining that they're not familiar with.

What have been most the valuable lessons?

Well, I would say that the struggle to come up with things to measure is very important. We have -- we had another project -- we've had a couple of other projects where we have tried to measure things.
a early overview of avoidings sayings.
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We have done a customer survey and we have a measure of the level of customer satisfaction. Not merely overall in terms of average satisfaction, but particular types of issues, by particular clients.

And we also have the difference in customer satisfaction when we say: yes, you can go ahead and do this and, no, you're going to go to jail if you do this. And there's a big difference in terms of customer satisfaction.

But we know that. And we're dealing with data. So we're able to make adjustments.

Slightly, we have measured the amount of time it takes for us to produce a legal opinion in a particular office. We have found it takes -- on average -- roughly 12 hours to produce this legal opinion in terms of the originator's time, the reviewer's time, and so forth.

We've also found that it takes approximately 14 days for that legal opinion to... That is very good -- very. Useful information. It means that most of the time, most of the delays are... because of the work. So, you're because of the work.

So that we're not 'going to get better terms of our timeliness, by making our lawyers work faster, by getting them to research faster that allow for faster research.
We're going to get better and make that--pipeline move along a lot -- more quickly.

So that's -- these measurements have been very, very good.

We had another measurement: we have a routine memo that is prepared at the conclusion of cases. And, in one office, they said: we take too much time to prepare this memo. It's just -- it's -- it's inordinant. We're spending 30 or 40% of our time.

Nobody knew, but they were guessing; we spend a lot of time. So we measured it. We measured how long they took. And, in measuring it, we concluded, they're right. it does take too long.

So we came up with an innovative way to prepare the memo in a particular format, using a lot of references to existing materials that people would look at anyhow. An~ we halved the time that it takes us to do that. And this is an enormous break-through in terms of rgs.c:*11G'es~.

>0...,,,going back to the point, measurement is very s i cm i r i canr __ You :)--611ly don't ~ yo~'re improving something if you don't measure it. _ And usually, you either think you're doing a pretty good job, or you' r~"'1lot d0"i~Flg~a very good job, but YOU_heFV'e"~O idea how to go about improving it.
Infusions of capital.

**GOLDMAN:**

Today, I was speaking to some people in our library. Our library has become very high tech. It's terrific. We have lasar disks which have most of the authorities we need on them so we can do research that way. And we even have our whole cata -- catalog on computes.

There was a suggestion that actually came through the catalog eletronic suggestion system, that said, you know, we love all this computer stuff, but could you just give us a list of the authorities and where they are so we can just go over and look at the books.

And I thought that was terrific. That we're li~tening to the customer, the customer is sajing: computers are nice, but what we really want is we want something we can look at we~s to the books so we can do research the. way we were trained to do research.

And so we're not forcing the high tech on people.

**HO\:Jdo you keep uninvolved up to date?**

**GOLDMAN:**

We've done two things. We've created a news Le: ter called Quality Times. And we try to us~ that to publicize the successes -- small an~ large -- that take place.
The other thing is something that we've developed in the last few months. We have a voice mail system. Every -- every region, every Associate Chief Counsel, has a quality coordinator.

I asked those coordinators to tell me once a month, via voice mail, what of significance has happened in their area. And often I will get messages that are five to ten minutes long. And I get them from about 15 people. So they're substantial.

I, in turn, distill them down and send voice mail back to them, which are quite lengthy. I have found that those coordinators, in turn, send those out to the world.

So that many people are kept informed of all the accomplishments that are taking place. So that's been a terrific and new change.

Important things to know about communication?

I think one of the keys that has to be emphasized is that you're really trying to aooomp Li.sh a cultural change.

You are -- you're asking people to think, not exclusively on the case work they're doing, not, exclusively on billable hours, but you're asking them to think about the processes that the's use.
I believe that you have to somehow convince enough people -- at least enough to get started -- that there's something in it for them.

And I think what's in it for them is that they're -- they're working too hard. They may not be as happy with the results as they'd like to be. And this is a way to make their jobs a little more manageable to make their systems operate a little bit better.

I think that marketing has to be done.

Compensation, recognition, rewards?

We have used rewards and recognitions in a decentralized fashion. We -- different regions, different Associate Chief Counsels, reward and recognize people for nominating good projects, for solving problems. And that has helped.

But I think it's critically important to reward publicly, and recognize publicly, those people who are doing the right things. For instance, we have an office that's done a terrific job in measurement, maybe a couple.
I have strongly urged the organization to recognize these people in every possible way, so that the organization understands this is what we're looking for.

Looking back, of what are you most proud?

GOLDMAN:

I think I'm most proud of the fact that there are many -- almost any meeting that takes place, they approach them with the assumptions of the quality process.

First of all, they run meetings better than they ever did. We're used to having facilitators. We have agendas. We have action plans at the conclusion of meetings.

So that meetings are not wasted time. I'm sure there -- occasionally there are. But normally, we know why we're there, and we accomplish what we want to accomplish.

Similarly, people are all -- 'are often talking about who's the customer here. Who are -- whose needs are we trying to meet. How do we balance them. So they are thinking this way. They are looking at systems.

Pec, Ple flow chart everything today. We flow chart legal provisions. You take an obscure area of tax law, and you can do a flow chart and you get to these little decision areas, and you can portray them better with flow charts than any other way.
And, to me, that's where the satisfaction is, because I hear stories about -- for instance, a rewards and recognition system in a particular -- in two offices, which had been commented upon, at length, by all the employees.

The employees gave their feedback to the boss on how do you -- what's the best way to do rewards and recognition. In one instance, there was -- there were employees who would have gotten rewards or awards and, in fact, they didn't get them because they didn't feel the criteria were being used were fair.

. But there's a satisfaction that -- that it is a -air process by -- by this use, and by the integration of quality techniques everywhere.

The worse news facing legal profession? Best?

I'm not sure you're going to want this answer.

I think the worst news for the legal profession is that we are being judged by the value that we provide -- not by the hours that we provide. And I think that's coz-o Lja ry of the need for productivity and quality in all of our organizations.

And I think the corporations are now demanding that of us, and congress is demanding that of lawyers in the government, as we L'I.
The good news is that quality provides the technique for us to make sure that we are providing value. For example, if you simply flow_char~oces$-all.d~you~ax~step, you can s~is.~adding value?ts. this e dd i ng val uc.?Is t.h.is.. wo.-i.t.2. Is. this worth the three ~i-t.akes t~clo.-i.t..L

So the quality tools and techniques really can insure that we do provide value.

GOLDMAN:

Wh, i t if you knew then that you know now?

One thing that I learned and I think is critical, is that it's a mistake to create a parallel structure where:~ that is related to. but. separate from, normal lines of a~thQ~it~

The things that drive change in an organization, the tAing$tha...t drive az or in thE organization, are the normal lines of authority.

When we used many quality councils, what we did is we created a separate authority base f01: many people.

If you were -- if you were on a quality improvement project team, you, on the one han:l, had a pull to that team and, on the other hand, your boss still had work for you to 10. So your boss was not pleased by your being on the quality improvement project team.
Moreover, your boss may seem threatened by it. Because here's this other authority, which happens to be manned by many of his bosses, looking into his organization -- how are you doing certain things.

So. The thing I have learned is that you want, to the extent possible, to have the quality process driven by -- not only driven by top management, but don't create something that's separate that looks a little bit different and can pull the organization apart.

Because the fact is, the line authority always wins. That's the way an organization should work. And, therefore, you -- you hurt your buy into quality by setting it apart.

There's one other thing I'd like to emphasize. Learned -- the importance of measurement. I think you really need to start with measurement.

You measure how -- what your customers think of your product, what you -- they think is important. And, on that, you can then pick out those areas that you need to improve. But I think you really need the measurement --

Cross-functional and seems between functions.
GOLDMAN:

In the areas where teams have been active, they have been able to avoid things falling in the cracks, between the organization. They -- for example, we have bankruptcy cases that are handled by the service and then counsel handles them and that goes to the Department of Justice.

We got counsel together with the IRS people and now it works much more smoothly, that particular area. That doesn't -- all if does is build a bridge at that particular point. It doesn't -- remove the divide altogether or knock down the wall altogether.

So it's -- it's very useful on those particular projects, but it doesn't promote the cooperation across the board that you'd like to see.

What have I not asked you?

GOLDMAN:

I think lawyers are somewhat opposed to the idea of measurement. But I think that it's inevitable. For instance, we have to go before congress and get an appropriation and explain how we're using this money. And, you knew, we say we're doing X, Y, and Z to congress.

And their response is: how do you know? Or, you're doing well, you know, show it to me. Everybody's doing well, but show it to me.
I think everybody's starting to ask that question today. Somebody -- you know, it may be very difficult to measure what lawyers do, but the fact is that it happens all the time.

We're measured, not only by congress, but by our bosses who evaluate us. And, similarly, lawyers in private practice are measured by their clients. Their client may measure them and decide, I'm going somewhere else. This costs too much, I'm not getting what it is worth.

So it's very important to develop measures, critical measures, that tell you how you're doing. I think survival is at stake.

(OFF CAMERA DISCUSSION)

GOLDMAN:

Measurement -- say it all together.

S'!! Yce. We have measured a number of things. On of the things we've measured is customer satisfaction. 00 the legal opinions answer their questions. Do they answer the question?

We have also measured the amount of time it takes from the time somebody asks a question until they get the answer. And how long it takes.

c sat ea ch s e illinng. ~....ha Via-t and hOyt muc i L'wai ting time is involved in betwP'en.

Anc we found that it' F<ome t b ingLik e so... of th~ time is wa~time~
That gives you a lot of room for---:
@IJ-,ortunity ~ improvement.
One more time without examples.

GOLDMAN: Okay, I'm just trying to think. There was one other that was preying on my mind.

Do you measure cost reductions?

GOLDMAN:
I don't think they understand that -- and I guess I'm thinking particularly in my own organization -- that life is difficult as a lawyer, very difficult. And one of the reasons it's difficult is you do all these inefficient things.

You know, you have to call people several times. Y'all, okay. We measure a few things, I think that are critical. We measure customer satisfaction. We measure the amount of time it -- it takes from the time somebody asks a question until the answer is provided. And we also measure the amount of time it takes to actually produce a result. I think your message is going to be --

But it is -- it's a radical change. And to me -- and I'm sure you understand this much better than I. But, to me, I see it as a marketing issue. I mean, not -- not just marketing for your business, but marketing in the sense that lawyers don't really understand how desperate the need is.

Quality in this whole industry.

It is an industry that's crying out for it.

And Corporate Concepts in many instances, they're not. And they
just waste a lot of time.

... how about just telephone tact. In telephone tact. I'm sure lawyers spend days getting things accomplished because they can't reach a person. And there -- there're solutions to these things. There really are solutions.

Lawyers are threatened by quality.

I think it's very important for lawyers to understand that when we speak of quality we're not talking about the quality of their legal product or their legal service. That's very threatening, to hear that we are here to help you improve the quality of your work.

The fact is, law schools, senior partners, supervisors, reviewers, et cetera, have been working on this for years. And, as a lawyer, I think the quality of our work is quite good. And often excellent.
But the word, quality, as used by the Jura Institute and the Chief Counsel Office of IRS, means an interest in the way we accomplish our work.

It -- my -- if I write a brief, I believe that my brief is going to be excellent, no matter what. But the different is, I may have all the facts and all the witnesses and all the files at my fingertips, in which case, I can knock out that brief in eight, 12 hours, or less.

Or, I may have none of the needed information, in which case, it may take me a week or two to get it out. And it won't be as good because of all

Contract system -- do you know the story?

GOLDMAN:

I know the story. I know exactly. And I knew that we have a -- we're trying to do the same thing. We've been trying to do it for over a year.

Somebody asks for a contract and it's done.

GOLDMAN:

Right.

Gn, at, isn't it?

GOLDMAN:

Yeah, absolutely.
Well, we have something like that. We have devised a system whereby we put all of our memos on one data base. And we can now do text-base research of this data base.

So if I get -- in 1989, I did research on a particular issue, in 1992, I'm no longer there, somebody else is there. They don't remember the case, they don't remember me. But they know the issue, they type it in, they have that memo. They can then just modify the memo to update it.

You said that you started with the believers.

GOLDMAN: Right.

Success with little projects makes believers.

GOLDMAN: If you start with people -- if you start projects with people who really don't believe it, they can undercut the projects in hundreds of different ways. They don't pre vide the time to do it. They don't get the data to do it, et cetera.

La-yers love to argue, and can argue any side of an issue. And if a lawyer decides that he wants to argue against the use of quality, there'll be ample ammunition.

Hcwev e r , you will find some people who believe in using quality, and that's your opportunity.
If you not only go with them, have successes through the use of their teams and their organizations, but also reward and recognize them for that, that turns an organization around, I think very quickly.

It isn't enough that they have a success and that it's a documented success. If the organization itself says, this is important, in terms of whatever recognition mechanism they have, that I think is recognized by all.

Give it to me in terms of advice.

Okay. My suggestion --

I have seen that time and time again. If they're recognized, then everybody will realize this is where the organization is going.

steve Brill, do you know him?
It is Total Quality Management. It may go by another name. But the fact is, our systems have to align themselves to make sure that we are giving our clients what they need and want.

I just heard that line. I love that.

You talked about is it worth the money?

GOLDMAN: Yeah, yeah. I think it's worth the money. I do.

"y answer was; I can't tell you the amount that it's the only way to go.

And that's basically what I said.

Do you have any sense of the return?

GOLDMAN: Va On the IRS side, they have some figures and they've -- it's in the order of hundreds of millions of dollars that have been saved via the quality process. In particular quality improvement project--

We don't have figures on overall how much we've saved. But, as I've -- I've indicated before, the former commissioner said' quality is the only way to go .•
It's something that we have to do. We have to measure what we're doing, we have to improve it, we have to provide value to the American people. This is vital.

He meant to: "..."

You have no idea how powerful that will be.

Well, I think it's -- I think it's true.

No, Cody's said it quite that way.

But I think it's true. I mean, I think -- I think if you look, after one year, you're going to -- you're going to say: geez, I've invested all this money, and people are trained, and we have these teams out here, and what do we really have, a couple of projects may not have been the best people hav~ come up with.

You could say the same thing after one year of law school. What have you learned after one year of law school. What's the pay back.
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I don't think so.
I think I'm ...

exhausted. I think

GO I've exhausted it
LD all.

MA N:

That's
great.

Okay.
Thank
you for
inviting
me.
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