

DOWNLOAD PDF SMALL BUSINESS TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION

Chapter 1 : About STTR | calendrierdelascience.com

The Small Business Technology Transfer (STTR) is another program that expands funding opportunities in the federal innovation research and development (R&D) arena. Central to the program is expansion of the public/private sector partnership to include the joint venture opportunities for small businesses and nonprofit research institutions.

Laws acquire popular names as they make their way through Congress. History books, newspapers, and other sources use the popular name to refer to these laws. How the US Code is built. The United States Code is meant to be an organized, logical compilation of the laws passed by Congress. At its top level, it divides the world of legislation into fifty topically-organized Titles, and each Title is further subdivided into any number of logical subtopics. In theory, any law -- or individual provisions within any law -- passed by Congress should be classifiable into one or more slots in the framework of the Code. On the other hand, legislation often contains bundles of topically unrelated provisions that collectively respond to a particular public need or problem. A farm bill, for instance, might contain provisions that affect the tax status of farmers, their management of land or treatment of the environment, a system of price limits or supports, and so on. Each of these individual provisions would, logically, belong in a different place in the Code. The process of incorporating a newly-passed piece of legislation into the Code is known as "classification" -- essentially a process of deciding where in the logical organization of the Code the various parts of the particular law belong. Sometimes classification is easy; the law could be written with the Code in mind, and might specifically amend, extend, or repeal particular chunks of the existing Code, making it no great challenge to figure out how to classify its various parts. And as we said before, a particular law might be narrow in focus, making it both simple and sensible to move it wholesale into a particular slot in the Code. But this is not normally the case, and often different provisions of the law will logically belong in different, scattered locations in the Code. As a result, often the law will not be found in one place neatly identified by its popular name. Nor will a full-text search of the Code necessarily reveal where all the pieces have been scattered. Instead, those who classify laws into the Code typically leave a note explaining how a particular law has been classified into the Code. It is usually found in the Note section attached to a relevant section of the Code, usually under a paragraph identified as the "Short Title". Our Table of Popular Names is organized alphabetically by popular name. So-called "Short Title" links, and links to particular sections of the Code, will lead you to a textual roadmap the section notes describing how the particular law was incorporated into the Code. Finally, acts may be referred to by a different name, or may have been renamed, the links will take you to the appropriate listing in the table.

DOWNLOAD PDF SMALL BUSINESS TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION

Chapter 2 : SBIR/STTR Program Reauthorized for 5 Years | calendrierdelascience.com

Today the Subcommittee on Technology is meeting to consider the reauthorization of the Small Business Technology Transfer Program (STTR). STTR is an off-shoot of the Small Business Innovation Research program, or SBIR.

Committee on Science, Washington, DC. The Subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10 a. Morella, Chairwoman of the Subcommittee, presiding. Today, that percentage has reached 2. This set-aside provides funding for ideas that are cooperatively researched and developed by a small business firm and research institution. The programs are divided into three phases. Phase I is the development stage of the idea. Phase II allows for further development of the most promising ideas from Phase I. The final phase, Phase III, is the commercialization of the product or service, or, the use of that product or service by the Federal Government. So, the main difference between the two programs, is that STTR requires a research institution to be involved. STTR was designed to take ideas that originated in universities and laboratories, and develop them through a cooperative agreement with a small business entity. The SBIR program allows for such a collaboration on a smaller scale, but does not require it. Since STTR is a relatively new program, limited data on its success is available. Thank you, Madam Chair, and welcome back and welcome to everyone who is here today. I am pleased that the Subcommittee is playing a strong role in the authorization of this program. The STTR Program is generating strong support in Tennessee and other places where top-notch small businessmen are working to create new relationships with universities and national labs. Too many of these grantees are still in the beginning stages of their STTR efforts. It takes a number of years for a truly innovative concept to move from an idea to commercial product. We must wait until a significant number of STTR grantees that participate in all programs phases to do a full fledged evaluation of this program. Today, many of the same companies participate in both programs. Therefore, I look forward to hearing our witnesses views on some of the major issues which have faced the SBIR programs so that we can avoid repeating the mistakes of the past as we review and reauthorize the STTR program. I want to acknowledge that Mr. Cannon is here from Utah. He said he does not have an opening statement and Mr. Bartlett, from Maryland, would you like to proceed with any opening statement? Thank you, very much. I have a prepared statement for the record. I would have welcomed such a program as this because I did not want to leave the academic research world. But, I did have an interest in seeing that my ideas made the trip over into the commercial world. And, I now am delighted to recognize Ms. Rivers, the distinguished woman from Michigan. Stabenow, who is also from Michigan, do you have an opening statement? To our panelists, it is the policy of the Science Committee to swear in all its witnesses and so I will ask you if you would stand, raise your right hand. The record will indicate affirmative responses. And, I ask you if you would kindly confine your comments to not more than about 5 minutes and please note that the totality of your testimony will be included fully in the record. So, at this time to begin with Mr. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman. Good morning, Madam Chairwoman and distinguished members. Can you hear me out there? Studies show that small businesses are the leading source of innovations and that small firms produce twice as many innovations per employee as large firms. The Congress created this program and a small business innovation research program known as SBIR to ensure that the best and brightest entrepreneurial researchers in America would be part of vital federal research and development efforts that benefit our national defense, build safer highways and airports and contribute to our public health and safety. At the same time, it has enabled small businesses to grow, mature and create jobs for Americans by moving ideas from the drawing board to the marketplace. The innovations from these programs cover the scientific and technical spectrum from sophisticated concepts to practical consumer products and services. The General Accounting Office and others have studied these programs and generally awarded them high marks for quality and for commercialization success. For example, and among many others, a National Academy of Sciences report found that SBIR has proved important in providing a bridge across which companies can move from start-up to commercialization. They believe this program has significant merit and the program should be

DOWNLOAD PDF SMALL BUSINESS TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION

expanded so that more companies could participate in it. Despite the successes of the SBIR program, the Congress felt that more could be done to link small businesses with creative ideas generated at universities, nonprofit scientific and educational institutions and federal laboratories. This collaboration, Congress hoped, would result in a better commercialization rate for federally sponsored research conducted at nonprofit organizations. This would mean that more goods and services would be introduced into the marketplace as a direct return on the research and development invested by the Federal Government. In its fourth year of operation, the STTR program is meeting those objectives. An outstanding example demonstrating the effectiveness of such collaboration can be seen in an STTR project at Altus Biologics. These materials can be used to detoxify chemical weapons stockpiles as well as equipment, clothing and people that have been exposed to chemical weapons. This technology also has broad agricultural applications in the detoxification of pesticides and insecticides. In Phase II of this project, which started earlier this year, the company is testing the materials on live agents. The STTR project gave the company an efficient way to tap both the expertise and the technology at these universities without which this project could not have moved forward. Without these valuable programs it is unlikely that this level of participation and opportunity would exist for these firms and I believe that our national research programs would not receive the benefit of these highly innovative companies. These programs are not giveaways, but rather highly competitive awards that assist the Federal Government in meeting its specific mission needs. Further, as a result of these programs, there is a flow of innovative new products and services to the American marketplace. For these reasons, the Administration strongly urges the Congress to extend the STTR program through the Year at its current level. Thank you for inviting me to testify this morning and I will be happy to answer any questions you may have. Hill, for your testimony. Please now recognize Dr. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman and members of the Committee. Due to the size of our Extramural program, we are the only component within the department participating in STTR. NIH, as we looked at external reviews of our SBIR program, had experienced the highest success rate in commercialization of the results of the research that were conducted under that program. We expect the STTR program to achieve similar results as it matures. We view this program as a bridge or a tool to move between the basic research investment that we make and the application of that research. We have many examples of where we have seen that translation take place and I want to just tell you about just a couple of those. Another of our programs, which in fact, is a small component within the NIH, has found that investment in the SBIR program has generated tools that would make other research projects more efficient and less expensive. So, we found that we have to look at multiple outcomes for those programs. A great deal of that work has been conducted under Phase I. In the NIH we have tried to both be flexible in our use of these programs and also to mainstream these programs. However, we do ensure that for those committees that are going to review small business applications, that we also have brought to those committees scientific experience and technical experience from members of the small business community. Thank you, very much, Dr. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman and members of the Subcommittee. The two programs share similar goals which emphasize the benefits of technological innovation and the ability of small businesses to transform the results of research and development into new products. However, the programs differ primarily in that STTR requires a company to form a partnership with a nonprofit research institution such as a university. Furthermore, some officials noted potentially beneficial effects, such as greater collaboration between small businesses and research institutions in the SBIR program. STTR uses small businesses as a vehicle to foster this commercialization. First, is the technology originating in the research institution or in the small business? Under STTR, the assumption is that the research institution will be the primary originator of the new concept. However, neither SBA nor the agencies have collected data to determine the extent to which the research institutions are providing the technologies. This information bears directly on the need for the STTR program. Second, if the program is effective in moving ideas from research institutions to small businesses, then the next logical question is whether their collaboration is effective in moving the ideas to the marketplace. Information on how well the collaborations are working was not

DOWNLOAD PDF SMALL BUSINESS TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION

available at the time of our report. And, information on actual commercial outcomes will require a greater amount of time to develop. Generally, 5 to 9 years are needed to turn an initial concept into a marketable product. And finally, could the STTR program do what is needed? On the other side, the Army SBIR program, which has had a lesser degree of involvement with universities and other research institutions in the past, said that STTR has been a stimulus in terms of getting these collaborations in place. Given the apparent variation from one agency to another and the lack of current data, no definite conclusion can be drawn at present about the need for STTR in forging new collaborations. Of these companies, , or about 6 percent, have received 10 or more awards. Two companies have received over awards each, and another eight companies have received over awards each from the programs. Generally, the agencies have not collected information on the number of employees and the annual revenue of the companies that receive awards and have limited information on the commercialization resulting from these programs. As I noted earlier, it may be too soon to have achieved success in commercializing the results of STTR awards, but our work on the SBIR program in suggests a basis for some concern about multiple awardees, for the ability to produce commercial success. Madam Chairwoman, this concludes my statement. I would be happy to respond to any questions you or members of the Subcommittee may have. Recently I was commissioned by the Competitiveness Policy Council, a bipartisan federal advisory commission, to write a chapter about SBIR in a soon to be published book that endeavors to evaluate federal technology policies and initiatives. My testimony today draws heavily from that chapter and from my other SBIR related research. It is widely recognized that the returns to investments in research and development tend to be far higher to society than to those who actually make the investments.

Chapter 3 : Reauthorization of the Small Business Technology Transfer Program (STTR)

To reauthorize the Small Business Technology Transfer Program, and for other purposes. Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, Contents.

Chapter 4 : DoD SBIR/STTR Program

The Technology Program Office administers the Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) Program and the Small Business Technology Transfer (STTR) Program. Through these two competitive programs, SBA ensures that the nation's small, high-tech, innovative businesses are a significant part of the federal government's research and development efforts.

Chapter 5 : Small Business Innovation Research - Wikipedia

Summary. H.R. makes improvements to the Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) and Small Business Technology Transfer (STTR) programs, including extending several pilot programs instituted in the reauthorization of both programs through , when both programs will need a full reauthorization.