

**AAAS REPORT
XXVI**

**RESEARCH AND
DEVELOPMENT
FY 2002**

Intersociety
Working
Group

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE
1200 New York Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20005

The AAAS Board of Directors, in accordance with Association policy, has approved publication of this report as a contribution to the understanding of an important process. The interpretations and conclusions are those of the authors and do not purport to represent the views of the Board or the Council of the Association.

Printed in the United States of America

International Standard Serial Number 1041-8857
AAAS Publication Number 01-05S

Copyright © 2001 by the
American Association for the Advancement of Science
1200 New York Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20005

Cover design by Jennifer Anne Kolansky

Printed on recycled, acid-free paper.

Intersociety Working Group

(see the Directory at the end of this report for contact information)

American Association for the Advancement of Science
American Astronomical Society
American Chemical Society
American Educational Research Association
American Geological Institute
American Geophysical Union
American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics
American Institute of Biological Sciences
American Institute of Physics
American Meteorological Society
American Physical Society
American Psychological Association
American Society of Mechanical Engineers
Association of American Universities
Consortium for Oceanographic Research and Education
Council of Professional Associations on Federal Statistics
Ecological Society of America
Federation of Behavioral, Psychological, and Cognitive Sciences
Industrial Research Institute
Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers
National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges

Contents

| | |
|---|-----|
| List of Tables | ix |
| Preface | xi |
| Committee on Science, Engineering and Public Policy | xv |
| General Notes | xvi |

PART I: OVERVIEW

| | | |
|-----------------|--|----|
| Highlights | 3 | |
| Chapter 1 | R&D in the Federal Budget: Frequently Asked Questions <i>Albert H. Teich, AAAS</i> | 5 |
| Chapter 2 | Political and Policy Context for the FY 2002 Budget <i>Stephen D. Nelson and David G. Cooper, AAAS</i> | 13 |
| Chapter 3 | R&D Trends and Special Analyses <i>Kei Koizumi, AAAS</i> | 19 |
| Chapter 4 | R&D and Innovation in Industry <i>Charles F. Larson, IRI</i> | 29 |
| Chapter 5 | Education and Human Resources in the FY 2002 Budget <i>Jolene K. Jesse, AAAS</i> | 37 |
| Overview Tables | 47 | |

PART II: AGENCY R&D BUDGETS

| | | |
|-----------|--|----|
| Chapter 6 | R&D in the FY 2002 Department of Defense Budget <i>Kei Koizumi, AAAS</i> | 67 |
|-----------|--|----|

Contents

| | | |
|--|---|-----|
| Chapter 7 | National Science Foundation in the FY 2002 Budget <i>George L. Leventhal, AAU</i> | 71 |
| Chapter 8 | National Institutes of Health in the FY 2002 Budget <i>Kei Koizumi, AAAS</i> | 79 |
| Chapter 9 | The Department of Energy in the FY 2002 Budget <i>Michael S. Lubell, APS</i> | 87 |
| Chapter 10 | NASA R&D in the FY 2002 Budget <i>Paul Looney, AIAA</i> | 95 |
| Chapter 11 | R&D in the Department of Agriculture <i>Elizabeth Allred and Mortimer Neufville, NASULGC</i> | 105 |
| Chapter 12 | R&D in Selected Agencies <i>Kei Koizumi, AAAS</i> | 111 |
| Agency Tables | | 119 |
| PART III: DISCIPLINARY ANALYSES | | |
| Chapter 13 | Physics in the FY 2002 Budget <i>Richard M. Jones, AIP</i> | 155 |
| Chapter 14 | Astronomy in the FY 2002 Budget <i>Kevin B. Marvel, AAS</i> | 161 |
| Chapter 15 | Atmospheric and Ocean Sciences in the FY 2002 Budget <i>Eugene W. Bierly, AGU; H. Frank Eden, AMS</i> | 167 |

Contents

| | | |
|------------|---|-----|
| Chapter 16 | Ocean Sciences in the FY 2002 Budget <i>Jennie Kopelson, CORE</i> | 175 |
| Chapter 17 | Earth Sciences in the FY 2002 Budget <i>David Applegate and Margaret Baker, AGI</i> | 183 |
| Chapter 18 | Biological and Ecological Sciences in the FY 2002 Budget <i>Nadine Lymn and Alison Gillespie, ESA</i> | 189 |
| Chapter 19 | Life Sciences in the FY 2002 Budget <i>Ellen Paul, AIBS</i> | 195 |
| Chapter 20 | Chemical Sciences in the FY 2002 Budget <i>Laura M. Gerum, Annette T. Rosenblum, Heather N. Schlecht, Bradley R. Smith, and Caroline Trupp Gil, ACS</i> | 203 |
| Chapter 21 | Behavioral and Social Sciences Research in the FY 2002 Budget <i>Patricia Kobor, APA; Sandi Wurtz, AERA; and David Johnson, FBPCS</i> | 209 |
| Chapter 22 | Federal Statistics in the FY 2002 Budget <i>Edward J. Spar, COPAFS</i> | 217 |
| Chapter 23 | National Nanotechnology Investment in the FY 2002 Budget <i>M.C. Roco, ASME International</i> | 225 |
| Chapter 24 | Electrotechnology-Related Research in the FY 2002 Budget <i>Bill Williams, IEEE-USA</i> | 235 |
| Chapter 25 | Mechanical Engineering in the FY 2002 Budget <i>Michael Reischman, ASME International</i> | 241 |

Contents

| | |
|---|-----|
| Appendix 1: Methodology and Data Sources | 251 |
| Appendix 2: Definitions | 253 |
| Appendix 3: Related Publications | 255 |
| Intersociety Working Group Directory | 256 |

List of Tables

Overview Tables

| | | |
|-------------|---|----|
| Table I-1. | R&D in the FY 2002 Budget by Agency | 48 |
| Table I-2. | Distribution of the FY 2002 Budget | 49 |
| Table I-3. | Historical Trends in R&D and Federal Outlays | 50 |
| Table I-4. | Major Functional Categories of R&D | 51 |
| Table I-5. | R&D by Character of Work | 52 |
| Table I-6. | Defense and Nondefense R&D by Character of Work | 53 |
| Table I-7. | “FS&T” Budget by Agency | 54 |
| Table I-8. | R&D Expenditures at Colleges and Universities | 55 |
| Table I-9. | R&D Funding by Congressional Appropriations Subcommittee | 56 |
| Table I-10. | Interagency Science and Technology Initiatives | 57 |
| Table I-11. | Total U.S. R&D, 1998-2000 | 58 |
| Table I-12. | National Patterns of R&D, 2000 | 59 |
| Table I-13. | National Funds for R&D by Source of Funds | 60 |
| Table I-14. | National Funds for R&D by Performers | 61 |
| Table I-15. | AAAS Analysis of the Outyear Projections for R&D in the FY 2002 Budget, FY 2001-2006 | 62 |
| Table I-16. | Historical Tables: Federal R&D by Agency, FY 1990-2002 | 63 |

List of Tables

Agency Tables

| | | |
|--------------|--|-----|
| Table II-1. | R&D in the FY 2002 Budget by Agency and Character of Work | 121 |
| Table II-2. | R&D in the Department of Defense | 128 |
| Table II-3. | DOD R&D by Military Departments and Agencies | 129 |
| Table II-4. | Department of Defense R&D by Character of Work | 130 |
| Table II-5. | Department of Defense Military Budget | 131 |
| Table II-6. | Trends in Department of Defense R&D, FY 1965–FY 2002 | 132 |
| Table II-7. | R&D in the National Science Foundation | 133 |
| Table II-8. | R&D in the Department of Health and Human Services | 136 |
| Table II-9. | R&D in the National Institutes of Health, by Institute | 137 |
| Table II-10. | National Institutes of Health by Funding Mechanism | 138 |
| Table II-11. | R&D in the Department of Energy | 139 |
| Table II-12. | R&D in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration | 143 |
| Table II-13. | R&D in the U.S. Department of Agriculture | 147 |
| Table II-14. | R&D in the Department of Commerce | 148 |
| Table II-15. | R&D in the Department of Transportation | 149 |
| Table II-16. | R&D in the Department of the Interior | 150 |
| Table II-17. | R&D in the Environmental Protection Agency | 151 |
| Table II-18. | R&D in the Department of Education | 152 |

Note: Tables within chapters are not included in this list.

Preface

Scientific research and development (R&D) continue to be of vital importance to the United States in the 21st century. The federal government supports a significant proportion of the nation's R&D, and its policies profoundly affect the institutions in which this work is carried out. The President's annual budget submission and the congressional debate that ensues are the mechanisms through which policies and priorities for R&D are set. Since 1976, AAAS has published an annual report analyzing R&D in the proposed federal budget in order to make available to the scientific and engineering communities and to policymakers timely and objective information about the Administration's plans for the coming fiscal year.

This year marks the 26th in the series of AAAS R&D Reports. The effort was begun in 1976 in-house at AAAS by Willis H. Shapley, under the auspices of the Committee on Science, Engineering and Public Policy. Shortly thereafter, it became a collaborative effort, and it now involves contributors from 21 scientific, engineering, higher education, and industrial associations known collectively as the Intersociety Working Group (see the Directory at the end of this report for contact information for each association). This volume is one of several publications and activities of the AAAS R&D Budget and Policy Program. In addition to functioning as a stand-alone document, the report serves as background for the 26th Annual AAAS Colloquium on Science and Technology Policy, held in Washington, DC (May 3-4, 2001).

The second item in the R&D Program's annual series of three publications is the *AAAS Science and Technology Policy Yearbook*. This book contains most of the major Colloquium addresses, as well as

both original and previously published articles by leading figures in science and technology policy.

The third publication appears after Congress has completed its appropriations process. At that time, AAAS, in collaboration with the Intersociety Working Group, publishes its annual review of the impact of congressional decisions on R&D, *Congressional Action on Research and Development in the FY 2002 Budget*. These publications are supplemented by R&D Funding Updates on the AAAS R&D Web site (www.aaas.org/spp/R&D), which provide regularly updated information on R&D in the budget between the publication of this report and the *Congressional Action* report.

The overall structure of this report parallels that of recent editions. Part I, the overview, includes discussions of R&D's place in the federal budget, the political context of FY 2002 R&D proposals, analysis of major funding trends for FY 2002 including outyear projections for R&D, and analyses of funding for basic research and R&D in colleges and universities. Chapters on R&D in industry and funding for science, engineering, and mathematics education are also included in Part I. Although neither of these latter topics is concerned strictly with R&D in the federal budget, each deals with closely related funding and policy matters that help define the context within which federal R&D is discussed and debated. A set of overview tables appears at the end of this section.

The chapters in Part II examine the proposed R&D budgets of major federal agencies and departments. Tables detailing those budgets and the budgets of several smaller agencies and departments not featured in the chapters are included at the end of Part II. Finally, Part III consists of a set of cross-cutting analyses that look at the budget in terms of disciplines and areas of research.

Readers should be aware that the chapters in this report have been prepared largely independently of one another and under extremely tight deadline pressure. Although every effort has been made to assure a high quality product, some overlap and inconsistencies among the chapters are, unfortunately, inevitable.

On behalf of the members of the Intersociety Working Group, we would like to express our appreciation to the officers, members, and staffs of the participating organizations for their support and assistance in preparing this report—particularly those who facilitated our efforts to put this unruly, multiple-authored volume into a common format and single typeface. Our thanks also to the AAAS Committee on Science, Engineering and Public Policy, which initiated the R&D Program and periodically reviews it and provides guidance to it. We are very grateful to individuals in the Office of Management and Budget, other federal agencies, on congressional staffs, and elsewhere who aided us in collecting the information and advised us on its interpretation.

Albert H. Teich
Kei Koizumi

Stephen D. Nelson
Joanne P. Carney

May, 2001

Committee on Science, Engineering and Public Policy

Willie Pearson, Jr. (2002)

Chair

Wake Forest University

Reid G. Adler (2004)

Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP

Jane Alexander (2004)

Defense Advanced Research
Projects Agency

Richard N. L. Andrews (2003)

University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill

Robert E. Barnhill (2002)

University of Kansas

Radford Byerly, Jr. (2004)

Boulder, Colorado

Susan E. Cozzens (2004)

Georgia Institute of Technology

Richard Florida (2003)

Carnegie Mellon University

Kerri-Ann Jones (2003)

Castine, Maine

Kai N. Lee (2004)

Williams College

David C. Mowery (2003)

University of California-Berkeley

Robert J. Spinrad (2002)

Palo Alto, CA

Skip Stiles (2004)

Genetic Resources
Communications Systems, Inc.

Lewis M. Branscomb

(Board Representative)

Harvard University

Richard S. Nicholson

(Ex Officio) AAAS

Stephen D. Nelson

(Staff Officer) AAAS

*Terms expire on last day of Annual Meeting in year shown.

General Notes

BASIS OF BUDGET STATISTICS

Budget statistics are presented on three bases: (1) **budget authority**, corresponding to the funds appropriated each year; (2) **obligations**, indicating the amounts of contracts and grants entered into; and (3) **outlays**, representing the amounts actually expended (see Appendix 2: Definitions). Because budget decisions in the Executive Branch and in Congress are almost always made in budget authority, this metric most accurately reflects current changes in budget policies. Outlay trends lag a year or more behind decisions in budget authority, and obligations estimates are often adjusted to meet fiscal or budget strategy demands. We have, therefore, selected budget authority as the most meaningful measure of budget decisions and trends and used it in nearly all cases throughout the report.

BASIC RESEARCH, APPLIED RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT

The allocation of agency budgets among basic research, applied research, and development is not an exact procedure; a certain arbitrariness is inevitably involved (see Appendix 2: Definitions). The severe time pressures under which these figures are compiled for OMB are also a problem. Nevertheless, there is presumably some consistency within each agency's estimates so that the trends are meaningful.

ROUNDING NUMBERS

Due to rounding in the tables, the detail may not add to the totals, and the percentage changes may not correspond exactly to the difference shown. Most figures are rounded to the nearest million; totals and percentage changes are calculated from unrounded figures. In the Overview and Agency Tables, subtotals are occasionally provided for additional detail. These subtotals are shown in italics to indicate that they do not add into the totals.

Please see Appendix 1: Methodology and Data Sources for more information.