

## REAUTHORIZING SBIR: THE CRITICAL IMPORTANCE OF SBIR AND SMALL HIGH TECH FIRMS IN STIMULATING AND STRENGTHENING THE U.S. ECONOMY

Roland Tibbetts  
SBIR Program Manager, 1976 -1996  
National Science Foundation

The proposed Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) reauthorizing legislation (H.R. 5819) is of great concern to thousands of small technology-based firms and should be of similar concern to Congress.

The bill would significantly weaken the basic elements of the SBIR program by

(1) Cutting the number of awards, probably in half. Far larger SBIR awards would be allowed. Companies could receive multiple development awards. Agencies could waive even the higher award caps. Yet the overall size of the program would not be increased. Together, these steps would eliminate funding for a large number of innovative and breakthrough ideas.

(2) Allowing firms to avoid SBIR's competitive "proof of concept" step and move directly to much larger "development" awards. This is an irresponsible policy for a program that is funding very high-risk ideas. The "proof of concept" requirement, Phase I of SBIR, is necessary to weed out ideas that are not feasible, so that large sums of taxpayer dollars aren't wasted on them.

(3) Substituting SBIR's R&D funding for private investment capital in the commercialization phase of SBIR (Phase III). Phase III is a market-based reality check. A project that can't attract private-sector funding or mainstream government procurement contracts at that point should not be pushed forward with more R&D funding from SBIR.

(4) Threatening the integrity of SBIR as a small business program by weakening the safeguards against large business access to SBIR funds.

With each of these changes, the needs of the SBIR Program, and the history of its best practices, call for doing exactly the opposite of what the bill proposes.

### **What SBIR Is Designed to Do**

SBIR was created to address a need that is still critical: to provide funding for some of the best early-stage innovation ideas – ideas that, however promising, are still too high risk for private investors, including venture capital firms. As happened with Microsoft, Apple and hundreds of other firms, technology innovations can mushroom into major products and businesses once private sector investors make a commitment. But they'll only make that commitment once the innovation is well along. In 2005 only 18 percent of all US *venture* capital invested went to seed and early stage firms while 82 percent went to later stages of development that are lower risk.

The positive role of innovative small technology firms in the economy is evident not only in the dozen or so geographic strongholds of tech entrepreneurship across the nation, but also in the increased productivity of the companies that buy and use the innovations. That is perhaps the most compelling reason to maintain a strong, effective SBIR Program.

SBIR addresses a paradox at the heart of innovation funding: capital is always short until the test results are in. At the idea stage, and even the early development stage, the risks are too great for all but a few investors. But innovations can't get beyond that stage without funding.

There is another paradox, too. The federal government has R&D needs that, for a variety of reasons, will never interest private sector investors. The business models of most investors focus on generating many sales to many customers. When the government is the only buyer, and buys on a one-time or very occasional basis, investors get skittish.

Large government contractors typically aren't interested in such R&D, either. The amounts involved are too small, and most large contractors don't have early-stage R&D capabilities anyway.

So needed innovations in fields like defense, space exploration and homeland security may not occur. The same can be true for innovations in science, especially the health sciences, when the projected patient populations are small or the innovation may only be needed once per person (such as with a vaccine).

SBIR was designed specifically to solve both of these paradoxes:

First, it provides a transparent, competitive and reliable source of early-stage funding for R&D, based entirely on scientific merit. Today, SBIR is the nation's largest source of such funding.

Second, it allows the government itself to obtain needed R&D that the private sector could not otherwise provide.

### **Why SBIR Has Been Successful**

SBIR's success, as recently documented by the major National Research Council / National Academy of Sciences study, is rooted in a number of the program's characteristics.

***Drawing on small business scientific talent.*** SBIR draws on the six million scientists and engineers that are now employed by small firms. That compares to the five million employed by medium-sized and large firms. In fact, small business employs more scientists and engineers than large business, universities, federal labs, or nonprofit organizations. A great many of these small business scientists and engineers are entrepreneurial. To see the entrepreneurial zeal of these technology-based small companies, one has only to look at the extent to which the SBIR Program and the nation's venture capital companies – the only important sources of risk capital for such companies -- are swamped with proposals. Or one can look at patents granted. The SBIR Program accounts for more than 50,000 of them. Currently, it accounts for an average of seven patents a day, which is more than all U.S. universities combined. SBIR has given us Qualcomm, Symantec and dozens of other highly successful technology companies.

***Providing the primary source of government R&D funding for small business.*** Despite their huge numbers of scientists and engineers, and despite their well-documented science and technology successes, small businesses have virtually no access to federal R&D contracts outside of the SBIR Program. According to the National Science Foundation's annual *Science Indicators* report, large firms receive 50.3 percent of federal R&D, universities receive 35.3 percent, non-profits 10 percent, and small businesses just 4.3 percent. SBIR accounts for over half of that 4.3 percent. This is an astonishingly small figure for a nation that expects technological innovation to lead it to new economic heights, but there it is. For small companies, SBIR remains the only game in town, just as it was in 1983, when it began.

### ***Adopting best practices.***

In designing the SBIR program, I drew on my own experience as a founder, director and treasurer of Allied Capital here in Washington and as operational VP for two small tech firms, one of which grew to 600 employees before being sold to TRW. I read about 50 articles on innovation and R&D management. I talked with a few dozen economists and directors of research in large firms and universities. I met with ten or so venture capitalists. I asked them, and others like the DuPont R&D advisory committee, about best practices.

***Best practices 1: managing portfolio risk.*** One thing everyone agreed on was the need to manage R&D portfolio risk through diversification. With the high risk involved in early-stage R&D, there is need to diversify the federal investment by betting on many, rather than fewer, technologies and ideas. (The R&D risk is high not only because of the technical challenges but also because cutting-edge R&D requires expensive equipment. Such R&D is the furthest away in time from the market, and the market may change during that period.)

The size of SBIR awards and thus the dollars at risk per innovation was therefore a major topic. Most of those I worked with in developing SBIR agreed that the technologies involved were such inherently high risks that smaller bets should be made on many projects before making a few larger bets.

***Best practices 2: making the largest number of awards possible.*** Making many smaller awards was not only good risk management practice. Virtually everyone I spoke with argued, and my own 20-year experience as an SBIR Program Manager subsequently confirmed, that the economic payoffs would be higher this way. Many smaller awards mean that more ideas can be evaluated for their potential. More and better choices for further development become available.

Probably a few thousand CEO's of small tech firms have talked with me about SBIR over the years. In general, they liked almost everything about SBIR, except the terrible odds against winning an award. Many no longer submit proposals because of the large investment of time and cost required to prepare a competitive proposal when only one in 15 -20 receive the larger Phase II funding. Others still compete because there are almost no alternative sources of such funding.

If there are fewer SBIR awards in the future, not only will fewer technologies get evaluated and funded. Fewer companies will compete, because the odds against winning will get even higher. I believe we have been seeing some of this occur already at the National Institutes of Health, where larger award sizes and fewer awards have been accompanied by a fall off in applicants.

***Best practices 3: creating scientific gates and milestones.*** Another best practice that we adopted for SBIR was the use of science-based gates and milestones before letting projects obtain more funding. Often an idea can be found to be infeasible through the Phase I "proof of concept" process. Other ideas show only a low probability of success. No further expenditures should be made on such technologies.

Unfortunately, some companies always came to us seeking to obtain as much SBIR funding as possible in both Phases I and II. Indeed, during my 20 years as an SBIR program manager, we frequently heard such requests from both the companies and the agency scientists and engineers. However, no proposer was ever allowed to go directly to Phase II. Even if they had done relevant work earlier, we expected Phase I to show further progress. Our strict policy on this point proved to be a good thing. The companies that argued that they had already done the early R&D, and therefore should be able to go directly into Phase II, almost always were unsuccessful when faced with competition. Their requests had been sales ploys. A company's success on earlier projects was no guarantee that its newest idea was competitive.

It is important to always remember that SBIR provides funding for *ideas*, not for *companies*. Competitive, science-based gateways are vital for identifying the best ideas.

#### ***Best practices 4: making SBIR a powerful economic development tool.***

**The past.** The roots of SBIR actually go back to Congress' concern over the "Rust-Belt Recession" of the 1970's. Unemployment in Detroit was high, due to the growing sales of new smaller automobiles and machine tools from Japan and Germany. The question was asked whether National Science Foundation research was focused on economic needs. The result was a new NSF program in applied research called "Research Applied to National Needs" or RANN. For the first time in NSF history, ten percent of a program budget – the RANN program budget -- was set aside for small business. This was the basis for the design and initiation of the Small Business Innovation Program at NSF in 1977. That program grew each year. Its successes led to legislation in 1982 that required all agencies with an extramural R&D budget over \$100 million (today 11 such agencies) to participate. There were some early successes, such as Symantec, that gave us confidence in the basic design of the program.

A little background here: Individuals and small firms are the primary source of category-creating inventions and technical breakthroughs. It is not the successful wagon company that invents the automobile. And it's not the large business that risks upending its business model and its product lines. Small company major economic breakthroughs include the digital computer, microchips, the personal computer, software, the successful cell phone, the internal combustion engine, diesel engine, steam turbines (steamships and railroads), the electric motor, typewriter, telephone, refrigerator, electric transmission, phonograph, incandescent lights, vulcanized rubber, pneumatic tire, photo plate, airplane, motion picture, anesthesia, x-ray MRI; and even earlier the cotton gin, power looms, the sewing machine, the mechanical reaper, and other agricultural machines.

Fast forward a few generations: The great technology-based economic successes of the late 1970's and 1980's – along the Route 128 corridor near Boston and in Silicon Valley – as well as the communications and information technology companies that have proliferated since the 1990's, were the result of tens of thousands of scientists and engineers annually opting to start or join small firms. Often this included many of the best and brightest, the most creative, the most entrepreneurial, and the shrewdest risk takers: exactly the qualities that private sector investors, particularly venture capital companies, were looking for.

Think about what happened as Internet-based businesses grew in the 90's. It wasn't all boom and bust. The core of the "dotcom" era was a series of rapid and related breakthroughs in new and emerging technologies. Most of the breakthroughs came from startup companies. Five "dotcom" era startups are now in the "20 Most Widely Held Stocks in the U.S": Intel (microchips), Microsoft (software), Apple (personal computers), Oracle (relational databases) and Cisco Systems (networks). In 2007 alone, their combined sales were \$166 billion and they employed 221,000. Add to this the thousands of smaller new firms with directly related new products and services, both in the U.S. and worldwide. Overall, the "dotcom" era was probably the largest economic growth breakthrough in history.

**The future.** Just as we have seen small-business-driven technological breakthroughs throughout our history, we can see them again in the future. There are a whole series of new and emerging technology areas where innovations could have powerful economic impacts. They include:

- global warming and other environmental areas, such as water purity;
- alternative energy and energy conservation;
- all kinds of security -- national, military, commercial, and economic;
- ever-changing communications;
- health care improvements and cost reduction measure;
- disease prevention;

- more effective education;
- improved transportation;
- agricultural challenges addressed;
- nano- and miniaturization technology;
- automated manufacturing; and many more.

All of these needs represent potentially large markets. Today, the technological risks are still too great for most private investors. But the technologies still need funding. SBIR is perfectly situated to explore ideas in these areas.

SBIR funding is necessary because large firms, despite their public relations, do not in fact invest extensively in these areas. Big companies do not take major risks on unproven technologies, except with massive government funding, such as in defense, NASA, and nuclear power. Large firm R&D budgets focus on improving product competitiveness and the processes for fabricating their goods, solving specific problems, and overall growth in sales and profits. Universities and non-profits also cannot raise high risk money for private sector technological innovations.

**The mechanism.** Generally only small high-tech firms can raise sufficient amounts of high risk capital to pursue commercially and economically relevant innovations. The key reason for this is that only small companies can realistically offer the promise of their stocks multiplying dozens of times. It's the prospect of that exponential growth in stock value which makes the rewards worth the risks to investors.

When SBIR is guided well, it fosters breakthroughs by such small companies. These breakthroughs get the technologies to the point where they can deliver great economic benefits.

At that point, when the scientific evidence is starting to come in, innovations attract not only additional VC investments, but also investments by individual "angels," mutual funds, insurance companies, endowment funds, and others. Longer-term bank lending becomes possible. All of that financing lays the foundation for stock offerings. Then these stock offerings attract more capital. This business growth, plus the revenues from subsequent product sales and spin-offs, is the money that stimulates the economy.

Successful SBIR-funded technologies can thus generate many multiples of their federal investments, often in a much shorter time frame than traditional investments.

Again, the key steps are: casting the net as widely as possible, attracting entrepreneurial individuals and small companies, insisting on technical feasibility in a competitive and transparent environment, and then moving to a commercialization phase that requires private sector investment equaling or exceeding the federal investment.

## **What To Avoid in the Future**

### ***Avoid needless disruptions to the SBIR Program.***

SBIR has proven itself over 25 years. It is known and understood by hundreds of thousands of scientists and engineers, most of them in small firms, but many of them also in the 11 participating federal R&D agencies, in universities, in venture capital companies, in larger firms, in Congress and in other parts of government, including the 50 state governments and a number of foreign countries. SBIR is successful. The National Research Council / National Academy of Sciences comprehensive assessment of the SBIR program last year confirmed the effectiveness of SBIR along the broad general lines that it exists today. Other studies, too, such as those by GAO and by Professor Josh Lerner of Harvard Business School have been highly favorable. No reputable independent study in the past 25 years has called for major changes in SBIR.

Rather than implementing the constructive recommendations offered by the NRC/NAS study, the House-passed bill (H.R. 5819) mandates a vast upheaval in SBIR. Such a re-write of the program would make the NRC/NAS changes far more difficult to execute. How, for example, can the agency Advisory Committees that the study recommends do their work when agencies in the program would be spending the next few years redrafting all their SBIR program rules and retraining all their personnel?

Worse, the extensive reworking of the program would confuse everyone who uses the program – all those people in the small firms, universities, VC firms, large companies, state programs, and Congress that tap into the program. It would lead to lengthy award delays as the program is re-tooled in one agency after another.

Small technology-based companies will suspect, probably correctly, that all these changes will self-destruct and that SBIR will have to be re-tooled again in a few more years. So they'll hold back and shift to other activities. This will intensify the upheaval.

And for what? H.R. 5819 is designed to sharply increase the amount of SBIR funding that goes to maybe half the current number of companies, and to explore perhaps half as many promising ideas. This bill is more like special interest legislation than national interest legislation.

All available evidence suggests the major changes proposed by H.R. 5819 would be highly detrimental to SBIR's mission and effectiveness. Congress has never examined the full implications of these changes and should not embark on them without doing so. Unraveling SBIR now, at a time when the nation urgently needs the economic boost that the program can provide, would be a national tragedy.

#### ***Avoid excessive increases in award sizes.***

SBIR is not intended to pay for the entire R&D costs required for every project. Some ideas could require tens of millions and even hundreds of millions of dollars ultimately. The purpose of SBIR, as stated earlier, is to lower the R&D risk to the levels that can attract private investment.

H.R. 5819 triples the Phase II award cap, making it \$2.2 million. The bill would also allow agencies to make multiple Phase II awards, and even to waive the \$2.2 million cap. One effect of doing all this will be to divert tremendous amounts of energy to negotiations about how much of an award each project will get. It is difficult, unwise and unfair to most small firms and program officers to have to judge how much to request or award over such a vast range of dollars. Determining the award size will become a time consuming negotiation, complicated by questions of fairness to other participants. Those other applicants often will be equally qualified, and their projects will always be in need of more money. Ultimately, the size of many awards will end up being decided by salesmanship and personal connections, not by science. This will be a very corrosive influence on SBIR.

Just as important, larger awards reduce the number of ideas that can be funded. An \$8 million Phase II award, if cut back to \$1 million, could free up funding for seven other \$1 million Phase II awards. Or, that \$7 million difference could fund **35** "proofs of concept" ideas at \$200,000 each. Similarly, a \$1 million Phase I "proof of concept" award eliminates the possibility of four others at \$200,000 each. We need to remember that research on innovative ideas at the idea stage is often primarily a one person job.

### ***Avoid bypassing Phase I.***

The foundation of the SBIR program is competition and openness. Take away the need to prove an innovation against other worthy innovations, in an above-board competition, and SBIR will degenerate into salesmanship and influence-peddling. Its genuine scientific accomplishments will diminish, year by year. If companies are allowed to apply directly for Phase II funding, SBIR will become little more than a traditional procurement program, not an innovation program. Phase I must not be by-passed; it is the seed bed of the entire SBIR Program.

### ***Avoid using SBIR funds for commercialization.***

If an SBIR firm cannot obtain a commercialization commitment from private sources, or from federal agencies (using non-SBIR funds), that at least equals the SBIR investment in an innovation, then SBIR's involvement in that innovation should end. The far more pressing public need is to fund additional recommended early-stage innovations, not to keep projects afloat that cannot attract financial support from the government or the private sector.

If SBIR award levels rise moderately to keep pace with inflation, an approach that the NAS/NAS study recommended, and that I agree with, then the SBIR investment in an early-stage technology idea should not exceed \$1.2 million (\$200,000 for Phase I and \$1 million for Phase II). An innovation that cannot match or exceed that \$1.2 million in the commercialization phase (Phase III) of SBIR, using non-SBIR funding, should not be rewarded with more SBIR funding.

In other words, no SBIR funds should be spent for Phase III. SBIR dollars are urgently needed to support additional promising ideas and to keep the high-risk SBIR portfolio diversified. If an agency feels that an innovation deserves financial support beyond a single Phase II award, then it can provide this further investment with non-SBIR funding. An agency that lacks that much faith in an innovation developed under its own guidance should not expect the taxpayers, via the SBIR program, to supply that faith.

### ***Avoid steps that would diminish the small business character of the program.***

Large companies view innovation much differently than small companies. A large company wants to protect its product lines and its customer bases. It looks for incremental innovations that make those existing products a little better and a little cheaper to produce. It looks for new products that are familiar and comfortable. For large companies, "re-defining" types of innovations are frightening. They upset settled ways of doing business. The nation needs both incremental innovations and quantum-leap innovations, but right now and for the foreseeable economic future, it needs those out-sized innovations the most. SBIR can deliver sweeping innovations, but to do so it must avoid taking on the coloration and biases of large companies.

Even if there were only a modest national need for "out-of-the-box" innovations, there would still be a powerful need for SBIR, because nothing else in the country, and certainly nothing else in the federal government, supports early-stage innovation by small companies. Despite having more scientists and engineers than large business, universities, nonprofit organizations, or the federal government itself, small business gets only 4.3 percent of federal R&D dollars. And SBIR accounts for over half of that. Those other institutions draw more than 90% of federal R&D dollars. And here's the rub: there aren't any other sources of that early-stage innovation funding for small business. Capital for small business innovation research is so short in the United States that SBIR rapidly became, and remains, the largest source of it.

I come from a long and deep background in venture capital and I am a great believer in it. SBIR won't be nearly as successful unless VC's can participate in it. But VC's that directly or indirectly report back to large companies shouldn't be in Phase I or Phase II of the SBIR program. Nor should VC's that are big companies themselves.

VC's that are large firms in fact or spirit will inevitably focus on companies more than innovations. That's fine in Phase III, but not earlier. If big VC's get into Phase I and Phase II, they will push for bigger bets on fewer companies. They will want to shift SBIR funding away from high-risk Phase I ideas and toward Phase II development, which is closer to market and therefore less risky for them. Sooner or later, they will back SBIR funding for Phase III, which will also offset some of their risk. And the kind of innovations they ultimately favor will be those that big companies favor – safer and more familiar ones, incremental rather than quantum leap. SBIR can do much more than this. SBIR's current restrictions on big VC's are therefore wise. By contrast, H.R 5819's approach to this issue is dangerously unwise.

### **What to Do in the Future**

#### ***We must meet the competitive challenge.***

We are currently the world leader in small high tech firms, in venture capital, and in basic research. These strengths are critical to our future economic growth. But others are catching up.

China, Japan, and Western Europe are rapidly increasing their investment in all three areas.

In a recent Harvard Business School Bulletin article, Jim Breyer, founder of Accel Partners and past chairman of NVCA, stated that there are now 6,000 venture-backed companies in Beijing alone! Accel has recently closed its second Chinese venture fund for \$510 million. "Many of the very best [VC] firms in Europe and in Asia are affiliated with firms here in the United States," he notes.

The UK has just announced a new innovation program. Dozens of countries, notably including those that came here to study the SBIR program, are now increasing their investment in innovations by small technology firms, venture capital development, business schools, and basic research.

Seeking out technology breakthroughs should be a far more important objective of government R&D than ever before. The single most important initiative we could mount would be to increase the SBIR to 5 percent of extramural federal R&D in a series of steps.

Such an initiative would be opposed by the current recipients of over 90% of federal R&D, like large companies, universities, nonprofits, and the organizations representing them, but these were the same groups that opposed the creation of SBIR in the first place and have opposed every modest increase in the program ever since. The NAS/NAS report clearly shows that SBIR can successfully deploy additional funding.

Think what the Internet and the telecommunications revolution have done for our economy. This was accomplished primarily by small, high-tech firms with major VC support. Now the investment risk is even higher for initial funding. Seed-stage and early-stage VC support has plummeted. If there are only rare investments at the idea stage, there will be no storehouse of proven ideas ready for later development funding. As bad as our economic problems are today, with budget deficits, trade deficits, a shaky dollar, and so on, where would our tax revenues, our productivity, and our technology leadership be today if we had not had that technological revolution?

***The SBIR program should be carefully strengthened.***

The following are my recommendations to Congress about some specific issues in the SBIR reauthorization:

1. Small firms with 500 or fewer employees should remain eligible for SBIR awards as long as one or more large firms, including large venture capital firms, do not acquire a majority of ownership. Broad eligibility is necessary to identify and accelerate those innovations that can lead to technical and market success and superior economic growth. The nation needs these potentially fast-growing firms far more than those that do not grow. Outside investors can, and often must, obtain more than 50 percent of the stock to protect their investment. That should be acceptable in SBIR as long as these investors are individuals and as long as the companies that they represent are small, as is required today. However, these investors must not be controlled, directly or indirectly, by large businesses. SBIR was created to provide small companies with innovation funding. The program remains too small to allow funds to be siphoned off by large companies, which already receive over half of federal R&D.

2. There should be a set review period for Phase I results, as well as a set period for Phase II proposals, based upon Phase I results. Some firms are obtaining early reviews, before other firms. That is not fair to others and should not be allowed.

3. Agencies should not allow companies to extend the break between Phase I and II except for illness or similar reasons. On the other hand, agencies themselves sometimes need to extend the breaks between Phase I and Phase II due to budgetary issues. This should be allowed when truly necessary, despite justifiable company concerns about cash flow. In the end, SBIR's purpose is to fund ideas, not to support a company's financial picture.

4. SBA is still the proper organization to manage SBIR, not the Department of Commerce. Criticism of SBA over the years has been due in great part to significant understaffing by SBA management that should not have been allowed. SBA's SBIR staff is less than half the level any evaluator would recommend. When SBIR was a much smaller program, SBA had eleven staff members assigned to it. Today, there are only four. This headquarters staffing crisis is responsible for many complaints. But some agencies, such as DOE, also grossly under-staff SBIR. This leads to reductions in the number of award topics, in order to reduce agency workloads, and to the temptation to use jumbo awards, far in excess of the program's legal guidelines. I suggest some kind of a brake on agency proposal cutbacks and stricter enforcement of the caps.

5. Breakthroughs occur in new and emerging areas that cannot be predicted. I suggest that all agencies should allow innovation proposals in all areas that are relevant to their R&D programs. This openness to innovation proposals should be outlined in agency solicitations. Many agencies think in terms of relatively few topic areas. The original interagency innovation program essentially opened entire agency R&D programs for proposals. Solicitations now have become far more restrictive, which cuts against the national economic interest. Breakthrough ideas that are relevant to an aspect of an agency's R&D should be invited.

6. The commercial results of SBIR need to be strengthened. Awards should not be made by agencies solely on the basis of technical merit and without any consideration being given to downstream commercial potential. Unfortunately, some SBIR firms favor agency approaches that minimize commercial potential, because the firms are really only interested in having their R&D ideas funded, not in commercializing the results. I suggest that proposers and agencies require a commercialization plan in both phases with a more detailed and specific plan in Phase II. Reviewers should consider both technical and commercial merit in their recommendations. This would include the proposer's plan for obtaining non-SBIR funding for Phase III. I would also support an SBIR funding cutoff for firms that win many Phase I awards without advancing any of

them to Phase II, along the lines of what H.R. 5819 proposes. SBIR was specifically designed to force the small firm to focus on innovation, technology breakthroughs, and commercialization for their economic benefits to the nation. Defense and NASA should also seek SBIR projects that have potential Phase III follow-on funding from non-SBIR sources. SBIR funds should not be used for mainstream procurement.

7. Award sizes should be increased in size in this reauthorization, to keep pace with inflation since the last adjustment in 1992. I recommend increasing Phase I awards to a \$200,000 cap and Phase II awards to a \$1 million cap. These are both substantial amounts of risk capital to explore technical feasibility. SBIR is not intended to build up the capabilities of a company, based on considerations like its other projects, but to explore the promise of the specific idea proposed. And SBIR's budget must fund as many ideas as possible.

8. The SBIR set-aside should be doubled as soon as possible. SBIR is a major national asset. It accelerates technological innovation and technology breakthroughs. It helps attract private sector investment to the most promising innovations. It increases economic growth. We need to reinvigorate the economy, and we need more technological innovation. Yet despite the history of small company innovations, notably relating to the Internet and to telecom, and despite the fact that there are six million scientists and engineers employed by small firms, over half of the government's external R&D, (50.3 percent) goes to large firms, 35.3 percent to universities, and 10 percent goes to non-profit institutions. Small business firms received only that 4.3 percent. (2005 figures from NSF.) Even a modest increase in the award caps, such as I recommend, will diminish the number of SBIR awards and companies unless Congress takes the sensible step that it took last time award steps were increased – increasing the program size by a large enough amount to offset the larger awards. Shrinking SBIR would be exactly the wrong thing for Congress to do at this point in our economic history.

Finally, I must say that as I review the SBIR recommendations made to Congress by the Biotechnology Industry Organization (BIO) and by my former VC colleagues in the National Venture Capital Association (NVCA), I am deeply troubled. It is mainly these two organizations that are calling for the far-reaching changes in the program. Many of the changes they are proposing would, in my judgment, significantly and perhaps irreparably harm the program. I can understand the desire of any organization to represent its members and prospective members, but this is a case when we must think of the broader national interest.

Without open and competitive early R&D efforts, spread as widely as possible, innovations will never reach the level of maturity that can draw in venture capital or other follow-on funding. BIO and especially NVCA should understand this. The need is to explore as many ideas as possible and lower the risk as much as possible to attract follow-on Phase III investment. There will be no shortage of great new innovations to invest in if we allow SBIR to do its work in supporting truly innovative small companies by objectively assessing which ideas are wheat and which ones chaff.

Congress supported the current SBIR objectives with the first SBIR legislation in 1982. The program is working well, but can be improved, as stated in the comprehensive NRC/NAS report. SBIR can stimulate thousands of high-risk, economically promising ideas like no other program. Given the opportunity to work as designed, and as proven, SBIR can make a major contribution to the national economic welfare.

May 28, 2008