

From: Irving Weinberg (gmail) [mailto:inweinberg@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2011 12:07 PM
To: amtech
Subject: comments on questions of AMTech

Dear Sirs or Madams:

I write as the past beneficiary of grants from the Federal government, that have been translated into products widely used in the US and abroad. I would like to address questions 7, 10, 11, 12, and 15.

--Irving Weinberg MD PhD

7. Should conditions be placed on research awards to ensure funded activities are directed toward assisting manufacturing in the U.S.?

It is clearly in the interest of US manufacturers to sell abroad (particularly to emerging markets), and in those countries there are often requirements that at least some of the manufacturing be performed in those countries. It may be reasonable to require that a significant proportion (e.g., 40%) of manufacturing for the products covered in the project be performed in the US in order to receive an award.

10. What types of intellectual property arrangements would promote active engagement of industry in consortia that include the funding of university-based research and ensure that consortia efforts are realized by U.S. manufacturers?

Currently, many granting agencies do not allow patent costs to be recovered as indirect costs under grants. This is short-sighted, as it results in less patent protection (especially overseas). I suggest that the grants allow patent costs to be recovered.

12. Should each member of an AMTech consortium be required to provide cost sharing? If so, what percentage of cost sharing should be provided?

It may make sense for large companies involved in a project to require cost-sharing, but not for small companies. In practice, such a requirement for small companies will effectively exclude them from participating.

15. Should the evaluation criteria include the assessment of leadership and managerial skills?

Any evaluations should relate to the proven ability of management to perform innovation in manufacturing. The companies with the "best" leaders (as documented in the number of books about leadership) have the worst record in innovation (for example General Electric).