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National Academies’ Board on Science, Technology, and Economic Policy

• A Rare Combination:
  
  – STEP brings together economists, technologists, industrialists, venture capitalists, and policymakers.
  
  – STEP brings business and policymaking experience, analytical rigor, and technical knowledge to issues of public policy.

• Established to improve policymakers’ understanding of the interconnections among science, technology, and economic policies and their importance to the U.S. economy.
STEP Recognizes Challenges to the Innovation Environment

- Post Cold War imbalances in U.S. public and private R&D
- Changing relationships among industry, government, and universities
- Partnerships are increasingly important to bring new technologies to market and capture the benefits of heavy U.S. R&D investments
- Growing recognition of value of partnerships to firms participating in the global economy
U.S. Policy Context: R&D Declines and Policy Ambivalence
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U.S. Policy Context for Partnerships
Analysis: Ambivalence

• The United States is traditionally ambivalent about government support for applied R&D

• Policymakers most comfortable with “linear model” of innovation
  – many believe that government support for basic R&D will transfer seamlessly to the economy at large

• There exists genuine skepticism in Washington about government support for industrial innovation

• This view is frequently held in spite of:
  – numerous examples from U.S. history
  – current U.S. practice
  – current practice elsewhere in the world
Precedents for Public Role in Science Commercialization

- 1798 - Grant to Eli Whitney to produce muskets with interchangeable parts, founds first machine tool industry
- 1842 - Samuel Morse receives award to demonstrate feasibility of telegraph
- 1969-1990s - Government investment in forerunners of the Internet (ARPANet)
- Current investments in genomic/biomedical research
  - The issue is how to commercialize innovation
Role of Small and Medium Enterprises
The Role of SMEs
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Scale and Nature of U.S. Programs
The U.S. Innovation Ladder
Scale and Nature of U.S. Programs
Support to New Technology Development on the U.S.
Innovation Ladder

– The Basis for Growth: Sustained Support for University Research

– Private Funding
  • Friends, Family, and Fools
  • Angels
  • Foundations: Support for socially valuable innovation

– Early phase development: SBIR ($1.2 billion annually)
  • Phase I is a $100,000 grant
  • Phase II is a $750,000 grant
  • Phase III involves no direct federal award

– Mid-range development: ATP ($217 million annually)
  • Focus on technologies with broad social benefits
  • Sizeable but limited awards: 1-5 million dollars
Scale and Nature of U.S. Programs

Government Procurement of New Technologies
   Focus by agencies on mission related technologies
   Increased emphasis on commercial technologies or dual-use

CRADA (Cooperative Research and Development Agreements)
   Cooperative research carried out with national laboratories
   and individual firms or consortia (sometimes involving foreign firms, e.g., the EUV consortium)

What is not a major U.S. Program?
U.S. R&D tax credit
   • mainly benefits large business
   • is not focused on startup firms
   • most new firms are characterized by limited revenues
Early Stage Finance:
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Definition of Venture Capital Stages

- **Seed financing** - usually involves a small amount of capital provided to an inventor or entrepreneur to prove a concept.

- **Startup financing** - provides funds to companies for use in product development and initial marketing.

- **Other early-stage financing** - provides funds to companies that have exhausted their initial capital and need funds to initiate commercial manufacturing and sales.

- **Expansion financing** - includes working capital for the initial expansion of a company or for major growth expansion, and financing for a company expecting to go public within six months to a year.

- **Leveraged buyout financing** - includes funds to acquire a product line or business from either a public or private company, utilizing a significant amount of debt and little or no equity.

- **Acquisition financing** - provides financing to obtain control, possession or ownership of a private portfolio company.

*The first three may be referred to as "early stage financing" and the remaining three as "later stage financing."*  
*Source: NSF*
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Optimal Arrangements for Promoting Partnerships
Optimal Financial Arrangements for Promoting Partnerships:

Countries use a variety of instruments to support particular firms or an entire industry by using:

- Short Term Awards to Develop New Technologies
- Direct grants to Companies
- Preferential Loans
- Government guarantees for loans
- Equity Capital Infusions by Government or Government Controlled Banks
- Targeted Tax Concessions for specific sectors and/or regions
Optimal Financial Arrangements for Promoting Partnerships:

• Technology promotion in the U.S. relies on awards, often with the prospect of procurement
• Preferred options are awards which are:
  – Small in Size
    – allows more diversity in selection
    – encourages initial innovation
  – Limited in Duration
    – Avoid Political Capture
  – Require in-kind or direct cost sharing
Partnerships for Encouraging Technological Development and Commercialization
Encouraging Technological Development or Commercialization

The ATP Approach

- Relatively Large Awards
- Leveragability
  - Halo Effect (Awards help attract other capital)
- Explicit Cost Sharing
- Awards are limited in time
- No repeat awards—“One-Off” Approach
- Joint ventures preferred to encourage diffusion
Evaluating Partnerships
Evaluation of Partnerships

• Evaluation Must be an Integral Part of Program Design
• Risk of Political Capture
  – “Friends of the Minister” problem
  – Preferred Sectors
• Risk of Misallocation
  – sustained financing to preferred firms
  – sustained support can sap small firm vitality
• The Danger of Discrediting Technology Support
• But, the hard question is:
  – What are the Proper Metrics?
How Should a Program be Evaluated?

• **Quality of R&D? What’s the Measure of Quality?**
  - Publications
  - Patents
  - Patent Citations
  - Number of Innovations – Sometimes Unreported

• **Commercialization Rates**
  - Sales
  - Licensing
  - Sale of technologies
  - Sale of firm

• **Magnitude of Spillovers: Indirect path of acquired knowledge**
How Should the Program be Evaluated?

- **Firm Performance measured by:**
  - number and type of jobs generated
  - higher wages
  - higher sales
  - higher survival rates

- **Another Measure can be Mission Based:** Management and Integration of New Technologies into Agency Programs and Missions, from Environment to Defense
  - DoD or NASA acquisition
  - NSF and NIH are sometimes harder to measure
Measurement Issues in Evaluation

• Developmental Impacts: e.g., Are Jobs Created as a result of the Program?

• Do more productive firms win awards or do awards make firms more productive?

• What is the Return on Investment (ROI): social return?

• Can we study the “reject” firms, as well as analyze firm performance before the SBIR grant, to discern the program’s effects
  • Issue: No data currently available on firm performance before first award is granted

• Is there Crowding out of Private R&D?
  • Are firms which would have received private sector R&D, seeking “free” or supplemental funds from government?
The Efficient Management of Partnerships
Management of Partnerships

• Government plays a decisive role in the development of new programs or focus areas, e.g., to meet emerging societal needs and address “excessive” risk and uncertainty

• Industry should propose specific research areas, identify technological opportunities, and be responsible for exploiting the results, e.g., bringing products to market
  – Support by multiple private firms is a key condition for government financial participation

• Shared costs provide a constant, active, and powerful “reality check”—50/50 works well.
  – Losing only half the cost of research projects is not career enhancing for private managers
  – Private actors abandon poor investments quickly – more quickly than government actors
Concluding Remarks
Concluding Points and Broader Policy Implications

- Advances in Technology drive economic growth, and thus generate jobs, enhance welfare, and assure national security

- Government can stimulate scientific research which will not be performed by industry alone via programs such as SBIR and ATP

- Government funding for science activities serves as a catalyst among and within companies to develop new ideas

- Current NRC assessment efforts seek to provide a comprehensive analysis of ongoing contributions, accomplishments, and challenges of public-private partnerships.
Concluding Points and Broader Policy Implications

- Generating science-based growth is a major policy interest around the world.

- The role of small business and university-based growth is seen as increasingly instrumental to bringing the benefits of research to the marketplace.

- Public-Private Partnerships address key elements of the innovation system and is therefore of central policy interest.

- OECD should be commended for its research and analysis of best-practice in public-private partnerships.