

Originally Processed With FOIA(s):
2005-0336-F

FOIA Number:
2005-0336-F

FOIA MARKER

This is not a textual record. This is used as an administrative marker by the George Bush Presidential Library Staff.

Record Group/Collection: George H.W. Bush Presidential Records
Collection/Office of Origin: Science and Technology Policy, Office of (OSTP)
Series: Bromley, D. Allan, Files
Subseries: National Security Files

OA/ID Number: 62071
Folder ID Number: 62071-011

Folder Title:
Industry - DARPA [Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency] [1991]

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
	0	0	0	0

THE WHITE HOUSE

April 7, 91.

Dear John:

Here is the Critical Remedial
Panel report that we discussed. I would
welcome any suggestions you may
have regarding possible conversion
of this into an Administrative
document built upon this version that

legislation requires that we supply
to Senator Jeff Bingaman et al.
in the near future.

Sincerely
Duan

P.S. Am working on the draft article
MSFT: we have a very good story
to tell.



**REPORT OF THE
NATIONAL CRITICAL TECHNOLOGIES PANEL**

MARCH 1991

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

June 28, 1991

MEMORANDUM FOR BRENT SCOWCROFT

FROM: D. ALLAN BROMLEY *Duan*
SUBJECT: CRITICAL TECHNOLOGIES INSTITUTE

Herewith some information relevant to the Congressional action directing us to establish a Critical Technologies Institute.

I would much appreciate an opportunity to discuss this with you sometime next week if you have time on your calendar. I am providing these data to John Sununu, Roger Porter, Dick Darman and Mike Boskin, as well as to you, because I want to be sure that I have the benefit of input from all of you before proceeding.

We have \$5 million appropriated and I have established that it can be stretched over two years rather than the initially proposed one year.

I believe that this can provide an opportunity to structure something that can be useful in supporting the President's programs and the activities of the EOP but we need as much input as possible to insure the best possible result.

I shall call your office early next week to try to find some time when we can discuss this and would much appreciate your help.

Attachment

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

June 12, 1991

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

FROM: BILL WELLS

SUBJECT: CRITICAL TECHNOLOGIES INSTITUTE

A number of considerations related to the Critical Technologies Institute are reviewed in this memorandum. A question and answer format is used to convey appropriate information and pertinent appendices are enclosed.

What Are the Origins of the Institute?

It seems to have emerged as an organizational concept from an extended series of hearings beginning in about 1988 held under the jurisdiction of the Senate Armed Services Committee, specifically the Subcommittee on Defense Industry and Technology, chaired by Senator Jeff Bingaman.

When Did it Appear as a Legislative Proposal?

The legislation for the Institute was drafted, as best I can determine, in the closing weeks of the First Session of the 101st Congress -- in the September-October 1990 time period.

Was OSTP Involved With the Legislative Proposal?

The short answer is no. But there is a longer answer. During that period, I had just stepped down from acting as Dr. Bromley's Chief of Staff but was still fully engaged with a range of FY 1991 legislative and budgetary matters in a consulting role. During October I was asked by congressional staff for OSTP comment and support on the legislation during the Senate-House conference process on the Defense Authorization. However, I declined on both counts and immediately brought the request to Bob Howard's attention -- personally, in a visit to his office.

Subsequently, in response to Bob Howard's request, Dr. Bromley and Bill Phillips visited Senator Bingaman to convey the Administration's opposition to the proposed legislation. To my knowledge, no written objection on the Institute legislative proposal was ever submitted by the Administration. We dealt only with Bob Howard and did not have discussions with Defense.

I have stated elsewhere -- and will again now -- that if we had been involved in drafting the legislation, it might well have come out rather differently and perhaps a little less complex. I am the most likely one to have been involved but I was not. Bill

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

August 13, 1991

91 AUG 13 P4:11

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: D. ALLAN BROMLEY *Allan*
SUBJECT: The National Critical Materials Council

The above mentioned Council was created by Congressional action (P.L. 98-373) in July 1984 and was originally intended to provide national planning and oversight for federal programs involving strategic materials (and their stockpiling against possible emergencies); advanced materials (and the related science and technology); and, finally, superconductivity (with special reference to its application and related research).

In March 1990, on my recommendation, you appointed Henson Moore, Deputy Secretary of Energy, TS Ary, Director of the Bureau of Mines, and me as the three Members of the Council. You further asked that I serve as Chairman, and I have been delighted to do so.

We have made substantial progress in all three areas mentioned above.

This year's Senate Appropriations language, however, sharply restricts the future activities of the Council to the first of the areas originally specified--namely, strategic materials and their appropriate stockpiling.

Because this is a field in which the Bureau of Mines has lead responsibility and one in which TS Ary has broad personal experience and qualifications, I would request that you now designate TS Ary as Chairman replacing me. He would be pleased to serve if asked, and Henson Moore and I will both be happy to continue as Members of the Council if that is your wish.

You have the authority under P.L. 98-373 to designate the Chairman of the Council; the pertinent sentence is "The President shall designate one of the members to serve as Chairman."

Attachment

OK with GB 8-17

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

December 12, 1991

MEMORANDUM FOR CONSTANCE HORNER

FROM: D. ALLAN BROMLEY 
SUBJECT: CRITICAL TECHNOLOGIES INSTITUTE APPOINTMENTS

In response to the request from Les Csorba of your office today for recommendations on appointments to the Operating Committee for the Critical Technologies Institute, recently established in Section 822 of the FY1992 Defense Authorization Act, the following individuals are suggested:

- Secretary of the Treasury, Nicholas Brady
- Director, Office of Management and Budget, Richard Darman
- Director, National Security Council, Brent Scowcroft
- Chairman, Council of Economic Advisors, Michael Boskin

These appointments are called for in Section 822, paragraph (c), (H), (2).

If you have any additional questions, please give me a call. If I am unavailable, please direct any questions to Dr. Eugene Wong, x3902.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

October 23, 1991

MEMORANDUM TO JOHN H. SUNUNU

FROM: D. ALLAN BROMLEY *DB*
SUBJECT: CRITICAL TECHNOLOGIES INSTITUTE (CTI)

After substantial negotiations involving OSTP, OMB and the Senate Armed Services Appropriations Subcommittee (Bingaman) concerning the CTI, the following agreement has been reached:

1. The sponsor is designated as the Director of the NSF but the National Science Board, with the exception of its chairman, is excluded from involvement.
2. There shall be an Advisory Board comprised entirely of government officials; there will be 11 members including the heads of OSTP, NSF, DOD, NASA, DOE, DOC, HHS and four additional members to be designated by the President.
3. The Chairman of the Advisory Board will be designated by the President and must be a senior EOP official.
4. The Institute will be required to perform such duties as the Chairman of the Advisory Board may specify consistent with the overall description of the duties of the Institute.

Given that all of the specified duties are related to technologies, PCAST or FCCSET and that OSTP has played the lead role in these areas throughout the Bush Administration, were I not to be appointed as Chairman of the Advisory Board it would be read throughout the scientific and technical communities as a major rejection by the President of much that I have tried to accomplish as a member of his Administration.

As the legislation is now written, the Director of OSTP is the only statutory member qualified to serve as chairman although the President could well appoint as one of his four nominees, an alternate EOP member.

The chairmanship was specifically not designated in the legislation to preserve it as a Presidential prerogative. I would however, request that the President designate me as chairman so that we can continue work in progress.

I believe that the new structure eliminates most, if not all, of the objections that have been raised to the original Congressional CTI proposal. I do feel very strongly about the matter of chairmanship in order that we be able to move forward with I consider to be an important part of the Bush Administration's record of accomplishments in the area of technology.

cc: Constance Horner

To: D. Allan Bromley
From: Eugene Wong EW

Re: The Critical Technologies Institute

- Sponsor:** Director of NSF, but the National Science Board may be involved only in having its Chair be consulted.
- Board:** The Board of Trustees is renamed the Advisory Board.
- Membership:** In the latest version, the Board consists of all government officials. There are 11 members as follows: Heads of OSTP, NSF, NASA, DOE, DOD, DOC, HHS, and four additional government members designated by the President.
- Chair:** The Chair is to be designated by the President and must be a senior official of EOP. (Note: the only statutory member who qualifies is the Director of OSTP.)
- Duties:** The Institute is required to perform such duties as the Chair may specify consistent with the overall description of duties.

It is clear that the legislative intention is to have the Director of OSTP be designated as the Chair of CTI. The evidence for this is as follows:

- a. Director of OSTP is the only statutory member who qualifies to serve as the Chair.
- b. All of the specified duties are related to technologies, PCAST, or FCCSET.
- c. Tasking of CTI is through the Chair of its Board.

The reason for not having it specified in legislation is to preserve it as a Presidential prerogative.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

June 27, 1991

MEMORANDUM FOR JOHN H. SUNUNU

FROM:

D. ALLAN BROMLEY

Alan

SUBJECT:

CRITICAL TECHNOLOGIES INSTITUTE

Here are some data and Q's and A's regarding the above mentioned Institute that we have been required to establish in OSTP by Congressional action.

I am providing similar information to Boskin, Darman and Porter and am seeking advice on how best to proceed.

I remain convinced that we can, if we use this wisely, evolve something that could be useful to the President and to the entire EOP.

Your comments, advice and suggestions would be most welcome.

Attachment

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

June 27, 1991

MEMORANDUM FOR JOHN H. SUNUNU

FROM:

D. ALLAN BROMLEY

Anan

SUBJECT:

INDIVIDUALS WITH EXPERT CREDENTIALS
RELEVANT TO THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT

Pursuant to your request I am providing you herewith a listing of individuals with expert credentials and common sense in the area of designation of endangered species.

I shall be happy to discuss this further with you. The list includes a relatively broad ideological spectrum from middle of the road to conservative. I assume that you have, as I have, already heard all you want to hear from the extreme activists.

Enclosure

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

(George Bush Library)

Document No. and Type	Subject/Title of Document	Date	Restriction	Class.
01a. Memorandum	To: Boyden Gray From: Allan Bromley Re: Position of US Attorney for Connecticut [personal information redacted] (1 pp.)	2/21/91	(b)(6)	

Collection:

Record Group: Bush Presidential Records
Office: Science and Technology Policy, Office of (OSTP)
Series: Bromley, D. Allan, Files
Subseries: National Security Files
WHORM Cat.:
File Location: Industry - DARPA [Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency] [1991]

Date Closed: 5/12/2010	OA/ID Number: 62071-011
FOIA/SYS Case #: 2005-0336-F	Appeal Case #:
Re-review Case #:	Appeal Disposition:
P-2/P-5 Review Case #:	Disposition Date:
AR Case #:	MR Case #:
AR Disposition:	MR Disposition:
AR Disposition Date:	MR Disposition Date:

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P-1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P-2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P-5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Removed as a personal record misfile.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- (b)(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- (b)(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- (b)(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- (b)(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- (b)(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- (b)(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- (b)(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- (b)(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

(George Bush Library)

Document No. and Type	Subject/Title of Document	Date	Restriction	Class.
01b. Resume	Resume [personal information redacted] (3 pp.)		(b)(6)	

Collection:

Record Group: Bush Presidential Records
Office: Science and Technology Policy, Office of (OSTP)
Series: Bromley, D. Allan, Files
Subseries: National Security Files
WHORM Cat.:
File Location: Industry - DARPA [Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency] [1991]

Date Closed: 5/12/2010	OA/ID Number: 62071-011
FOIA/SYS Case #: 2005-0336-F	Appeal Case #:
Re-review Case #:	Appeal Disposition:
P-2/P-5 Review Case #:	Disposition Date:
AR Case #:	MR Case #:
AR Disposition:	MR Disposition:
AR Disposition Date:	MR Disposition Date:

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P-1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P-2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P-5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Removed as a personal record misfile.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- (b)(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- (b)(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- (b)(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- (b)(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- (b)(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- (b)(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- (b)(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- (b)(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

May 9, 1991

MEMORANDUM FOR JOHN SUNUNU

FROM:

D. ALLAN BROMLEY 

SUBJECT:

Newspaper Article on Critical Technologies

I thought you might be interested in the latest newspaper article on the critical technologies issue.

Please call if you have any questions.

INNOVATION / MICHAEL SCHRAGE

Meaningless Lists of 'Critical' Technologies

Drawing inspiration from both Santa Claus and People magazine, the champions of competitiveness are making up lists and checking them twice.

These lists—generated with much fanfare by the good folks at the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, the Commerce Department and the industry-based Council on Competitiveness, among others—are intended to show which technologies are naughty and nice. In other words, what are the 25 Most Intriguing Technologies? Where is the United States ahead and Japan behind? What is the Sexiest Technology Alive? Inquiring minds want to know.

They'll find no titillating technologies here. The National Critical Technologies Panel (mandated by Congress and appointed by White House Science Adviser D. Alan Bromley), for example, selected no fewer than 22 technologies "deemed critical to the national needs that have been identified." These included software, biotechnology, pollution minimization and remediation, high-definition imaging and displays, ceramics, composites and several other obvious candidates.

Come on! This is techno-pablum being served up as meaningful analysis. Saying that "software" is a critical technology is precisely like saying that physics is a critical science. It's true, but so what? Does listing software—or biotechnology or composites—as a critical technology give one any sense of how to prioritize research in the area? Does it offer any insights into the commercialization process? Does it send any kind of meaningful message to the investment community about how resources should be best allocated?

Of course not. What we have here is "information" that adds virtually nothing to the debate over the critical issues surrounding America's massive public and private investments in technology. Your tax dollars at work. (Calls to the chairman of the White House panel were not returned.)

By the way, don't think that it's simply a happy coincidence that federal funding for most of these "critical technologies" just happens to have been increased. These lists aren't just obvious; they're also politically correct. There's nothing challenging, counter-intuitive or provocative about them.

"I don't think these lists have any intrinsic merit at all," asserts Michael Odza, a technology transfer consultant and publisher of the Berkeley-based Technology Access Report. "They don't seem to change people's thinking in any way."

"In general, lists force people to give at least some level of priority," says Robert

Costello, an undersecretary of defense in the Reagan Administration who championed using Pentagon procurement polices as a prod to industrial competitiveness. "But, if you don't explicitly link them to an action agenda, they're pretty marginal."

These lists are as marginal as they come. If you wanted to write something important, you wouldn't make a list of the nouns, verbs and adjectives you planned to use; you'd figure out what you really wanted to say. The problem here is that people are focusing on the technologies rather than on the economic, industrial, governmental and scientific processes that create them.

America isn't the undisputed global leader in software because the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, IBM and Microsoft sat around in their respective offices coming up with lists of critical systems software and applications to develop. This country dominates the field because it evolved the appropriate infrastructures of hardware, capital, academic research and entrepreneurs that stimulate state-of-the-art innovations.

Technology isn't a product. It's a process—but you'd never know it from scanning these lists.

"We never make up lists," says Michael C. Sekora, who once ran the Pentagon's Project Socrates technology planning support software and is now providing support to American technology firms as president of Florida-based Technology Strategic Planning. "Coming up with a list has no value. Instead of coming up with a list, you need a strategic plan."

Plans don't begin with lists of "critical" technologies, says Sekora; they begin with an objective—"and then you figure out how you're going to effectively utilize worldwide technology to achieve that objective."

It's at that point that you begin to make the hard decisions about what technologies should be internally developed, externally acquired or jointly created with partners. Competitiveness comes from the ability to cost-effectively balance these different technology paths.

Needless to say, the various critical technologies lists barely touch the issue of cost-effectiveness. What price is America prepared to pay to be "competitive" in new materials and biotechnology? Will this price be borne by taxpayers? Or will innovative government policies put industry in a position to cost-effectively compete in global high-tech markets by better leveraging existing resources?

There's no way to know the answers to those questions because they aren't being asked. Instead of thought-provoking ideas, we're getting laundry lists of technological cliches. That's hardly shocking. But cliches do nothing to boost either our awareness or competitiveness. The real debate isn't about which technologies are economically important; it's about how best to manage those technologies to boost the quality of national life.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

January 9, 1991

MEMORANDUM FOR GOVERNOR SUNUNU

FROM: D. ALLAN BROMLEY 

SUBJECT: Critical Technologies Institute

Here is some additional information on the Critical Technologies Institute that we talked about briefly the other day.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991, Sec. 822, Part C, TITLE VIII, called for the establishment of a Critical Technologies Institute under the sponsorship of OSTP. The format chosen by the Congress was as a Federally Funded Research and Development Center (FFRDC).

In recent weeks we have been struggling with how best to respond to the legislative mandate that also appropriated five million dollars for FY 1991. We have held dozens of discussions with groups inside and outside of government, including OMB, the Defense Department, and a representative sampling of existing FFRDCs.

We are exploring various alternatives for complying with the legislation as well as taking into account a less than certain funding support outlook beyond FY 1991. In the final analysis, we are seeking to devise an arrangement that will provide the most utility in the form of solid analysis to the President, OSTP and the rest of the Executive Office of the President.

I would be interested in any further thoughts you might have and I will keep you posted on our progress.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

January 29, 1991

Dear Jim:

Thank you for your letter of January 23 regarding the National Critical Technologies report. For a variety of reasons, the government/private sector panel enlisted to identify "national critical technologies" got off to a slower start than I had hoped. The study now appears to be on track and I expect to have the report in the hands of the President in February and to the Congress in March. We have had excellent cooperation from a number of agency personnel during the course of this study including, prominently, Everet Beckner and others from the Department of Energy. As a result of this input, we expect the report to have major impact.

Sincerely,



D. Allan Bromley
Assistant to the President
for Science and Technology

Admiral James D. Watkins, U.S. Navy (Retired)
The Secretary of Energy
Department of Energy
Washington, DC 20585

"CORRESPONDENCE TRACKING"

9160020



TYPE: ACTION

DOCUMENT NUMBER: 9120120

FROM: WATKINS, JAMES D.

TO: DR. BROMLEY

DATE OF
CORRESPONDENCE:

SUBJECT: THE NAT'L CRITICAL TECHNOLOGIES REPORT FOR THE
PRESIDENT TO SEND TO CONGRESS

ASSIGNED TO: D. Allan Bromley

*Bill
Hawcroft
quite happy!
DAB*

ACTION REQUIRED: AS NECESSARY

SENDER'S DUE DATE:

OSTP DUE DATE:

DATE COMPLETED: _____

COPIES TO:

WHITE HOUSE TRACKING #:

CONTACT PERSON:

REMARKS:

DATE RECEIVED: 01/23/91

FILE: ENERGY-NCT REPORT



The Secretary of Energy

Washington, DC 20585

January 23, 1991

ST JAN 24 A 9:49

DIRECTOR


The Honorable D. Allan Bromley
Assistant to the President
for Science and Technology
Director, Office of Science
and Technology Policy
The White House
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Dr. Bromley: *Allan:*

This Department is working with the Office of Science and Technology Policy to produce the National Critical Technologies (NCT) Report for the President to send to Congress, as mandated. At your request, I assigned Under Secretary John Tuck to serve on the NCT Advisory Panel.

I have been following the activities of the Panel and, quite frankly, I am disappointed to find that not only is the Report running very late in its preparation, but it is also suffering from serious technical weakness in many areas of interest to DOE. Mr. Tuck has found it necessary to assign many sections of the Report for rework by experts from the DOE staff and from the Laboratories. Due to the importance of this work, I hope that the other panel members are responding similarly.

Sincerely,


James D. Watkins
Admiral, U.S. Navy (Retired)