UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
International Trade Administration
ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR TRADE DEVELOPMENT
Washington, D.C. 20230

Mr. John O'Neil
Senior Policy Analyst
Office of Science and
Technology Policy
Executive Office of the President
Washington, D.C. 20506

Dear Mr. O'Neil:

It is my understanding that Boris Saltykov, Russian Minister of Education, Science and Technology Policy, will be in Washington on December 14 and 15 for consultations in your office. I would like to meet with Minister Saltykov to discuss ongoing and future International Trade Administration activities with Russia. Specifically, Minister Saltykov has been invited to participate in a DOC-sponsored seminar in February in San Diego, "Health Industry Business Roundtable on Russia."

I understand that Minister Saltykov already has a very busy schedule while he is in Washington. However, Minister Saltykov's involvement with DOC is important to the continued growth of business relations between the United States and Russia. Therefore, I would appreciate your efforts to find a mutually agreeable time in which Minister Saltykov could meet me and some of my staff for a brief discussion of trade issues. If you agree, please call my secretary, Donna Williams (482-1461), to arrange this meeting.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

James D. Jameson

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

December 9, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR D. ALLAN BROMLEY

THROUGH: **J. THOMAS RATCHFORD** JTR

FROM: **JOHN F. O'NEIL** JFO

SUBJECT: **DECEMBER MEETINGS WITH MINISTER SALTYKOV**

Next week you and Minister Saltykov will meet for two sets of talks:

- **December 15 - Basic Sciences Joint Commission Meeting (JCM), and**
- **December 16 - Talks on expanding cooperation in S&T.**

The agendas for both meetings are attached. I have adjusted the agenda for December 16, 1992, to end somewhat earlier than originally planned to facilitate travel to Detroit by the Russian delegation.

The Russian side has made significant changes to its delegation. A list of the names provided to us is attached. The three deputy Ministers, Yakobashvili, Fonotov, and Kokoshin, and the President of the Russian Academy, Yuri Osipov, have been replaced. Nikolai Laverov is now expected, and Yuri Ossipyan is listed as possible but doubtful. It is likely that no one will represent the Ministry of Defense.

<u>U. S. Delegation</u>. You have sent letters of invitation. For the Basic Sciences meeting on December 15, 1992, it looks like: Walter Massey, Dallas Peck, Samuel Kramer for John Lyons (NIST), Phil Schambra, and John Boright for Frank Wisner for the Basic Sciences Delegation.

For the December 16 talks, you will be joined by: Frank Wisner, Walter Massey, John Sayre, Robert White (DoC), Bernadine Healy, Lennard Fisk for Daniel Goldin, and Wil Happer at Energy.

<u>Venue</u>. The talks will be held at State, in Room 1105 where we met 2 years ago. The Middle East peace talks are expected to be in session close by at the same time.

Dinner. Arrangements have been made for dinner on December 15, 1992, at the Smithsonian Museum of American History. We will be in the Presidential Suite, with cocktails in the Main Foyer. Dinner will be preceded by a viewing of the I MAX film on the Antarctica in the Air and Space Museum at 6:00 P.M. Dinner will start at approximately 7:00 P.M.

Delegation Meeting. A joint delegation meeting is scheduled for Friday, December 11, 1992, at 10:30 A.M. in Room 472. An agenda is attached.

Official Gifts. I recommend you consider giving President Bush cuff links or tin claps to the Russians, except for Saltykov and Laverov. Considering the number of times you have met with these two individuals, and Saltykov's position, you may want to consider a White House Pewter bowl for Laverov, and a U.S. glass paperweight and a White House ornament to Saltykov.

Schedule.

Sunday - December 13 - Russian Delegation arrives during the afternoon

Monday - December 14 - Russian Delegation makes calls in Washington

Tuesday - December 15 - Russian Delegation begins with a tour of the White House before the JCM - The JCM agenda is attached - A lunch is included

Evening will include I MAX film at the Air and Space Museum at 6:00 P.M. and U.S. hosted dinner at the Museum of American History at 7:00 P.M.

Wednesday - December 16 - Talks on expanding S&T cooperation, may include lunch. The agenda is attached.

At 4:00 P.M. the Russian Delegation leaves State for National Airport to meet Ford Motor Co. Aircraft for a 4:30 P.M. departure for Detroit,

Thursday - December 17 - Program at Ford - Travel to Motorola in Chicago

Friday - December 18 - Program at Motorola - Return to Washington in the evening

Saturday - December 19 - Depart U. S. for return to Moscow

Attachments

cc: Jeff
Erin

RUSSIAN DELEGATION

BORIS SALTYKOV
DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER, MINISTER OF SCIENCE, HIGHER EDUCATION AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

EUGENIY ROGOVSKIY
CHIEF, DEPARTMENT OF STRATEGY AND EXPORT PROMOTION, MINISTRY OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC RELATIONS

SERGEI KISLYAK
DEPUTY DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF INTERNATIONAL SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY COOPERATION, MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

VLADIMIR TYSHCHENKO
DEPUTY CHIEF OF FOREIGN RELATIONS DEPT. MINSCI

NIKOLAI LAVEROV
VICE PRESIDENT, RUSSIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

YURI OSSIPYAN
RUSSIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

NYCHKOV
DEPUTY DIRECTOR FOR DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION, MINISTRY OF SCIENCE, HIGHER EDUCATION AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

ORLOV
RUSSIAN COMMITTEE ON GEOLOGY

VLADIMIR KEYLIS-BOROK
RUSSIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

OSTROUMOV
DEPUTY GENERAL DIRECTOR, RUSSIAN SPACE AGENCY

MOSKVICHEV
DEPUTY MINISTER OF HEALTH

MINISTRY OF DEFENSE - UNKNOWN

United States-Russia Basic Sciences Agreement
Joint Commission Meeting
December 15, 1992
Washington, D.C.

AGENDA

9:15	Arrival	
9:30	Coffee	
10:00	Opening Remarks:	Dr. D. Allan Bromley Deputy Premier Boris Saltykov
10:30	Overview Presentation by Dr. Bromley on U.S. S&T Developments - Possible Topics Include: • New Approaches to Supporting S&T • U.S. R&D Priorities	
11:00	Overview Presentation by Minister Saltykov on Developments in Russian S&T Policy - Possible Topics Include: • New Organization Structures • New Approaches to Supporting S&T • R&D Priorities	
11:30	Coffee Break	

JOINT ACTIVITIES: MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU) AND OPERATIONAL ISSUES IN THEIR IMPLEMENTATION

12:00	MOU in Basic Scientific Research (NSF-Russian Academy of Sciences)
12:10	MOU in Geosciences
12:20	MOU in Physical Sciences, Chemistry and Engineering Sciences
12:30	MOU in Mapping Sciences
12:40	MOU in Biomedical Research (possible)
12:55	LUNCH
3:00	Chairman's Summary/New Areas of Cooperation/Plans for Next Meeting
3:45	Adjourn

***** REVISED DECEMBER 9, 1992 4:00 PM *******

Yeltsin-Bush Summit Follow-On
Avenues for Expanded United States-Russia S&T Cooperation
December 16, 1992
Washington, D.C.

AGENDA

INTRODUCTION

9:00	Coffee	
9:30	Opening Remarks:	Dr. D. Allan Bromley Deputy Premier Boris Saltykov

MORNING DISCUSSION

Theme: New S&T Challenges

9:45 **Cooperation with Russia: Status, Goal and Objectives**
Overview by Dr. Bromley

- **Cooperation in Science and Technology**
- **Innovative Approaches: Government and Private Sector Initiatives**

10:15 **Cooperation with the United States: Status, Goals and Objectives**
Overview by Vice Premier Saltykov

- **To be determined by Russia**

10:45 **Discussion**

Theme: Avenues for Enhanced Cooperation

11:15 **New Arrangements - S&T**

12:30 **LUNCH**

2:00 **Measures to Address Factors Affecting Cooperation**

3:15 **Chairmen's Summary/Next Steps**

3:45 **Adjourn**

NOTE: RUSSIAN DELEGATION PROCEEDS TO NATIONAL AIRPORT TO MEET FORD CORPORATE JET AT BUTLER AVIATION FOR FLIGHT TO DETROIT

DELEGATION MEETING
FRIDAY, DECEMBER 11, 1992
ROOM 472, OEOB

10:30 - 10:40	POLITICAL SITUATION
10:40 - 10:50	ECONOMIC SITUATION
10:50 - 11:00	MILITARY R&D
11:00 - 11:15	BASIC SCIENCE
11:15 - 11:30	U. S. POLICY FOR RUSSIA
11:30 - 11:50	DISCUSSION, GUIDANCE, COORDINATION

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

December 9, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR D. ALLAN BROMLEY

THROUGH: J. THOMAS RATCHFORD

FROM: JOHN F. O'NEIL JFO

SUBJECT: DECEMBER MEETINGS WITH MINISTER SALTYKOV

Next week you and Minister Saltykov will meet for two sets of talks:

- December 15 - Basic Sciences Joint Commission Meeting (JCM), and
- December 16 - Talks on expanding cooperation in S&T.

The agendas for both meetings are attached. I have adjusted the agenda for December 16, 1992, to end somewhat earlier than originally planned to facilitate travel to Detroit by the Russian delegation.

The Russian side has made significant changes to its delegation. A list of the names provided to us is attached. The three deputy Ministers, Yakobashvili, Fonotov, and Kokoshin, and the President of the Russian Academy, Yuri Osipov, have been replaced. Nikolai Laverov is now expected, and Yuri Ossipyan is listed as possible but doubtful. It is likely that no one will represent the Ministry of Defense.

U. S. Delegation. You have sent letters of invitation. For the Basic Sciences meeting on December 15, 1992, it looks like: Walter Massey, Dallas Peck, Samuel Kramer for John Lyons (NIST), Phil Schambra, and John Boright for Frank Wisner for the Basic Sciences Delegation.

For the December 16 talks, you will be joined by: Frank Wisner, Walter Massey, John Sayre, Robert White (DoC), Bernadine Healy, Lennard Fisk for Daniel Goldin, and Wil Happer at Energy.

Venue. The talks will be held at State, in Room 1105 where we met 2 years ago. The Middle East peace talks are expected to be in session close by at the same time.

Dinner. Arrangements have been made for dinner on December 15, 1992, at the Smithsonian Museum of American History. We will be in the Presidential Suite, with cocktails in the Main Foyer. Dinner will be preceded by a viewing of the I MAX film on the Antarctica in the Air and Space Museum at 6:00 P.M. Dinner will start at approximately 7:00 P.M.

Delegation Meeting. A joint delegation meeting is scheduled for Friday, December 11, 1992, at 10:30 A.M. in Room 472. An agenda is attached.

Official Gifts. I recommend you consider giving President Bush cuff links or tin claps to the Russians, except for Saltykov and Laverov. Considering the number of times you have met with these two individuals, and Saltykov's position, you may want to consider a White House Pewter bowl for Laverov, and a U.S. glass paperweight and a White House ornament to Saltykov.

Schedule.

Sunday - December 13 - Russian Delegation arrives during the afternoon

Monday - December 14 - Russian Delegation makes calls in Washington

Tuesday - December 15 - Russian Delegation begins with a tour of the White House before the JCM - The JCM agenda is attached - A lunch is included

Evening will include I MAX film at the Air and Space Museum at 6:00 P.M. and U.S. hosted dinner at the Museum of American History at 7:00 P.M.

Wednesday - December 16 - Talks on expanding S&T cooperation, may include lunch. The agenda is attached.

At 4:00 P.M. the Russian Delegation leaves State for National Airport to meet Ford Motor Co. Aircraft for a 4:30 P.M. departure for Detroit,

Thursday - December 17 - Program at Ford - Travel to Motorola in Chicago

Friday - December 18 - Program at Motorola - Return to Washington in the evening

Saturday - December 19 - Depart U. S. for return to Moscow

Attachments

cc: Jeff
Erin

RUSSIAN DELEGATION

BORIS SALTYKOV
DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER, MINISTER OF SCIENCE, HIGHER EDUCATION AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

EUGENIY ROGOVSKIY
CHIEF, DEPARTMENT OF STRATEGY AND EXPORT PROMOTION, MINISTRY OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC RELATIONS

SERGEI KISLYAK
DEPUTY DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF INTERNATIONAL SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY COOPERATION, MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

VLADIMIR TYSHCHENKO
DEPUTY CHIEF OF FOREIGN RELATIONS DEPT. MINSCI

NIKOLAI LAVEROV
VICE PRESIDENT, RUSSIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

YURI OSSIPYAN
RUSSIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

NYCHKOV
DEPUTY DIRECTOR FOR DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION, MINISTRY OF SCIENCE, HIGHER EDUCATION AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

ORLOV
RUSSIAN COMMITTEE ON GEOLOGY

VLADIMIR KEYLIS-BOROK
RUSSIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

OSTROUMOV
DEPUTY GENERAL DIRECTOR, RUSSIAN SPACE AGENCY

MOSKVICHEV
DEPUTY MINISTER OF HEALTH

MINISTRY OF DEFENSE - UNKNOWN

United States-Russia Basic Sciences Agreement
Joint Commission Meeting
December 15, 1992
Washington, D.C.

AGENDA

9:15	Arrival	
9:30	Coffee	
10:00	Opening Remarks:	Dr. D. Allan Bromley Deputy Premier Boris Saltykov
10:30	Overview Presentation by Dr. Bromley on U.S. S&T Developments - Possible Topics Include: • New Approaches to Supporting S&T • U.S. R&D Priorities	
11:00	Overview Presentation by Minister Saltykov on Developments in Russian S&T Policy - Possible Topics Include: • New Organization Structures • New Approaches to Supporting S&T • R&D Priorities	
11:30	Coffee Break	

JOINT ACTIVITIES: MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU) AND OPERATIONAL ISSUES IN THEIR IMPLEMENTATION

12:00	MOU in Basic Scientific Research (NSF-Russian Academy of Sciences)
12:10	MOU in Geosciences
12:20	MOU in Physical Sciences, Chemistry and Engineering Sciences
12:30	MOU in Mapping Sciences
12:40	MOU in Biomedical Research (possible)
12:55	LUNCH
3:00	Chairman's Summary/New Areas of Cooperation/Plans for Next Meeting
3:45	Adjourn

***** REVISED DECEMBER 9, 1992 4:00 PM *******

Yeltsin-Bush Summit Follow-On
Avenues for Expanded United States-Russia S&T Cooperation
December 16, 1992
Washington, D.C.

AGENDA

INTRODUCTION

9:00	Coffee	
9:30	Opening Remarks:	Dr. D. Allan Bromley Deputy Premier Boris Saltykov

MORNING DISCUSSION

Theme: New S&T Challenges

9:45 **Cooperation with Russia: Status, Goal and Objectives**
Overview by Dr. Bromley

- **Cooperation in Science and Technology**
- **Innovative Approaches: Government and Private Sector Initiatives**

10:15 **Cooperation with the United States: Status, Goals and Objectives**
Overview by Vice Premier Saltykov

- **To be determined by Russia**

10:45 **Discussion**

Theme: Avenues for Enhanced Cooperation

11:15 **New Arrangements - S&T**

12:30 **LUNCH**

2:00 **Measures to Address Factors Affecting Cooperation**

3:15 **Chairmen's Summary/Next Steps**

3:45 **Adjourn**

NOTE: RUSSIAN DELEGATION PROCEEDS TO NATIONAL AIRPORT TO MEET FORD CORPORATE JET AT BUTLER AVIATION FOR FLIGHT TO DETROIT

DELEGATION MEETING
FRIDAY, DECEMBER 11, 1992
ROOM 472, OEOB

10:30 - 10:40	**POLITICAL SITUATION**
10:40 - 10:50	**ECONOMIC SITUATION**
10:50 - 11:00	**MILITARY R&D**
11:00 - 11:15	**BASIC SCIENCE**
11:15 - 11:30	**U. S. POLICY FOR RUSSIA**
11:30 - 11:50	**DISCUSSION, GUIDANCE, COORDINATION**

JFO - your copy

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

December 1, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR D. ALLAN BROMLEY

THROUGH: J. THOMAS RATCHFORD

FROM: JOHN F. O'NEIL JF

SUBJECT: DECEMBER MEETINGS WITH MINISTER SALTYKOV

Two meetings are scheduled this month with Boris Saltykov:

- December 15 - Basic Sciences Joint Commission Meeting (JCM), and
- December 16 - Talks on expanding cooperation in S&T.

The Russian side has tentatively identified a nine-member delegation. The names are attached.

The agendas for both meetings are also attached.

U. S. Delegation. You have sent letters of invitation to Frank Wisner, Walter Massey, Dallas Peck, Paul Wolfowitz (DoD), John Lyons (NIST), and Phil Schambra for the Basic Sciences delegation. For the December 16 talks, you have invited Frank Wisner, Walter Massey, John Sayre, Paul Wolfowitz, Robert White (DoC), Bernadine Healy, Daniel Goldin, and Wil Happer at Energy.

Venue. The Loy Henderson Conference Room at State has been reserved. The Middle East peace talks are expected to be in session at the same time, limiting the possibilities.

Dinner. Arrangements have been made for dinner on December 15, 1992, at the Smithsonian Museum of American History. We will be in the Presidential Suite, with cocktails in the main foyer. Dinner will be preceded by a viewing of the I MAX film on the Kuwaiti oil fires in the Air and Space Museum.

Delegation Meetings. I recommend both delegations meet jointly the week preceding the meetings, on Thursday or Friday. With your approval, I will coordinate with Ralph and schedule.

Official Gifts. I propose to locate appropriate gifts and, if possible, have the travel contractor procure them.

Funding. Contributions are as follows: USGS - $10,000, NIH - $3,500, State will pick up interpreter expenses and may kick in funds, DoD may contribute $1,000, and NSF will cover costs above the contributions.

Schedule.

Sunday - December 13 - Russian delegation arrives during the afternoon,

Monday - December 14 - Russian delegation makes calls in Washington,

Tuesday - December 15 - Russian delegation begins with an early tour of the White House before the start of the JCM. The JCM agenda is attached. A lunch is included.

Evening will include I MAX film at Air and Space Museum and U.S. hosted dinner at Museum of American History,

Wednesday - December 16 - Talks on expanding S&T cooperation, may include lunch. The agenda is attached.

Late afternoon/early evening - Russian delegation leaves for Ford Motor Company in Detroit,

Thursday - December 17 - Program at Ford - travel to Motorola in Chicago,

Friday - December 18 - Program at Motorola,

Saturday - December 19 - Depart U.S. for return to Moscow.

cc: Jeff
Erin

Attachments

RUSSIAN DELEGATION

BORIS SALTYKOV
DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER, MINISTER OF SCIENCE, HIGHER EDUCATION AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

ANDREI KOKOSHIN
DEPUTY MINISTER OF DEFENSE

EUGENIY ROGOVSKIY
CHIEF, DEPARTMENT OF STRATEGY AND EXPORT PROMOTION, MINISTRY OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC RELATIONS

YURI OSIPOV
PRESIDENT, RUSSIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

SERGEI KISLYAK
DEPUTY DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF INTERNATIONAL SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY COOPERATION, MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

FONOTOV
FIRST DEPUTY MINISTER OF SCIENCE, HIGHER EDUCATION AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

ZURAB YAKOBASHVILI
DEPUTY MINISTER OF SCIENCE, HIGHER EDUCATION AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

ANDREI BYKOV
CHIEF OF FOREIGN RELATIONS DEPARTMENT, MINSCI

VLADIMIR TYSHCHENKO
DEPUTY CHIEF OF FOREIGN RELATIONS DEPARTMENT, MINSCI

United States-Russia Basic Sciences Agreement
Joint Commission Meeting
December 15, 1992
Washington, D.C.

AGENDA

9:15	Arrival	
9:30	Coffee	
10:00	Opening Remarks:	Dr. D. Allan Bromley Deputy Premier Boris Saltykov
10:30	Overview Presentation by Dr. Bromley on U.S. S&T Developments - Possible Topics Include: • New Approaches to Supporting S&T • U.S. R&D Priorities	
11:00	Overview Presentation by Minister Saltykov on Developments in Russian S&T Policy - Possible Topics Include: • New Organization Structures • New Approaches to Supporting S&T • R&D Priorities	
11:30	Coffee Break	

JOINT ACTIVITIES: MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU) AND OPERATIONAL ISSUES IN THEIR IMPLEMENTATION

12:00	MOU in Basic Scientific Research (NSF-Russian Academy of Sciences)
12:10	MOU in Geosciences
12:20	MOU in Physical Sciences, Chemistry and Engineering Sciences
12:30	MOU in Mapping Sciences
12:40	MOU in Biomedical Research (possible)
12:55	LUNCH
3:00	Chairman's Summary/New Areas of Cooperation/Plans for Next Meeting
3:45	Adjourn

Yeltsin-Bush Summit Follow-On
Avenues for Expanded United States-Russia S&T Cooperation
December 16, 1992
Washington, D.C.

AGENDA

INTRODUCTION

9:00	Coffee	
9:30	Opening Remarks:	Dr. D. Allan Bromley Deputy Premier Boris Saltykov

MORNING DISCUSSION

Theme: New S&T Challenges

9:45 Cooperation with Russia: Status, Goal and Objectives
Overview by Dr. Bromley

- Cooperation in Science and Technology
- Innovative Approaches: Government and Private Sector Initiatives

10:15 Cooperation with the United States: Status, Goals and Objectives
Overview by Vice Premier Saltykov

- To be determined by Russia

10:45 Discussion

Theme: Avenues for Enhanced Cooperation

11:15 New Arrangements - S&T

12:45 LUNCH

2:15 Measures to Address Factors Affecting Cooperation

4:00 Chairmen's Summary/Next Steps

4:30 Adjourn

UNCLASSIFIED

TOR: 202311Z NOV 92 STATE 378269

BODY
TAGS: TSPL OVIP PGOV RS
SUBJECT: US ACCEPTS NEW DATES OF DECEMBER 15-16 FOR US-RUSSIA BASIC SCIENCES JOINT COMMISSION MEETING AND SUMMIT FOLLOW-ON DISCUSSIONS
REF: (A) 92 MOSCOW 34458, (B) 92 PARIS 31760

1. THIS IS AN ACTION CABLE -- SEE PARA 2.

2. EMBASSY IS REQUESTED TO DISCUSS WITH MINSCI OFFICIALS U.S PLANS FOR THE DECEMBER 15TH SESSION OF THE BASIC SCIENCES AGREEMENT JOINT COMMISSION MEETING (BSA JCM) AND THE DECEMBER 16TH SUMMIT FOLLOW-ON DISCUSSIONS ON EXPANDED S&T COOPERATION.

3. DATES: U.S. ACCEPTS [illegible] PROPOSAL TO RESCHEDULE THE MEETINGS [illegible] 15-16. DEPARTMENT AGREES WITH EMBASSY REC[illegible] REFTEL A THAT SALTZKOV SHOULD HAVE SEPARATE MEE[illegible] HINGTON WITH INDIVIDUALS SUCH AS AMBA[illegible] ROE AND OTHERS IN

[illegible]SSIFIED

DISCUSS THE FREEDOM SUPPORT ACT PROGRAMS AND SPECIFICALLY THE PROPOSED SCIENCE FOUNDATION. AT THIS TIME, HOWEVER, AMBASSADOR ARMITAGE IS SCHEDULED TO BE IN EUROPE THE WEEK OF DECEMBER 14, BUT A MEETING WITH HIS DEPUTY, FRED HOF, MAY BE POSSIBLE. SOME MEETINGS ON CAPITOL HILL ALSO MAY BE DESIRABLE BUT SCHEDULING THESE MAY PROVE DIFFICULT, WE ARE TOLD, BECAUSE MOST MEMBERS WILL HAVE LEFT TOWN BY THEN FOR THE HOLIDAYS. EMBASSY IS REQUESTED TO CONFIRM THE DATES OF MINISTER SALTYKOV'S STAY IN WASHINGTON (WILL HE REMAIN HERE DECEMBER 17-19?) AND HIS REQUESTED APPOINTMENTS. EMBASSY ALSO IS REQUESTED TO CONTINUE EFFORTS TO CONFIRM THAT MINISTER SALTYKOV DOES NOT PLAN TO ATTEND THE DECEMBER 14-16 OECD MEETING IN PARIS (REFTEL B).

4. DELEGATION: IN THE PROCEDURES FOR THE BSA JCM ADOPTED AT THE FIRST SESSION IN 1990, WE AGREED THAT EACH SIDE OF THE JOINT COMMISSION SHALL CONSIST OF NO MORE THAN 15 MEMBERS. WE ARE PREPARED TO HOST A RUSSIAN DELEGATION OF THAT SIZE. HOWEVER, WE EXPECT THAT THE U.S. DELEGATION THIS YEAR MAY BE SOMEWHAT SMALLER THAN IN PREVIOUS YEARS. IN FACT, THE EMBASSY'S INITIAL REPLY TO THE RUSSIANS OF 8-12 IS A MORE PROBABLE NUMBER. AT THIS TIME, WE ANTICIPATE THAT THE DELEGATION WILL CONSIST OF DR. BROMLEY AND DR. RATCHFORD, USGS DIRECTOR PECK, NSF DIRECTOR MASSEY, NIH/FIC DIRECTOR SCHAMBRA, DOD DDR AND E REIS, NIST ACTING DIRECTOR KRAMER, AND A REPRESENTATIVE (PROBABLY AT THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OR UNDER SECRETARY LEVEL) FROM STATE. ASIDE FROM OSTP AND STATE, THE AGENCIES REPRESENTED ARE THOSE THAT PARTICIPATE OR ARE CONSIDERING PARTICIPATING IN AN MOU UNDER THE AGREEMENT. WHILE THE COMPOSITION OF THE RUSSIAN DELEGATION OF COURSE IS FOR THE RUSSIAN SIDE TO DETERMINE, WE WOULD HOPE THAT IT INCLUDES REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE CURRENT RUSSIAN MOU COUNTERPART AGENCIES, INCLUDING THE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, THE RUSSIAN COMMITTEE ON GEOLOGY AND THE STATE GEODESY COMMITTEE.

5. THE U.S. DELEGATION FOR THE SUMMIT FOLLOW ON DISCUSSION HAS NOT YET BEEN NAMED, ALTHOUGH WE EXPECT IT TO INCLUDE REPRESENTATIVES FROM OSTP, STATE AND MANY OF THE SAME TECHNICAL AGENCIES (OR THEIR PARENT ORGANIZATIONS) REPRESENTATED IN THE BASIC SCIENCES JCM. FOR EMBASSY INFORMATION: THE DELEGATION LIKELY WILL INCLUDE A HIGH-LEVEL REPRESENTATIVE FROM NIH, DOI, DOC, AND SOME OF THE FOLLOWING AGENCIES: DOE, USDA, NASA, AND EPA. WE WILL CABLE INFORMATION ON THE COMPOSITION OF THE DELEGATION FOR THE SUMMIT FOLLOW-ON DISCUSSIONS AS SOON AS IT BECOMES AVAILABLE.

6. FUNDING: AS AGREED IN THE BSA JCM PROCEDURES, THE US IS PREPARED TO FUND THE INCOUNTRY EXPENSES OF THE RUSSIAN DELEGATION (NOT TO EXCEED 15 MEMBERS) FOR THE TWO DAYS OF MEETINGS, PLUS A DAY ON BOTH SIDES (THEREFORE, A TOTAL OF

FOUR DAYS). THE INCOUNTRY EXPENSES INCLUDE HOTEL AND PER DIEM, LOCAL TRANSPORTATION (E.G., LIMO, VAN); AND INTERPRETING COSTS. FOR EMBASSY INFORMATION: OES/SCT HAS BEEN ASKED INFORMALLY BY MINSCI STAFF IF U.S. SIDE CAN PAY FOR INTERNATIONAL TRANSPORTATION TO THE U.S. WE EXPLAINED THAT IT WOULD NOT BE POSSIBLE FOR US TO COVER THAT COST. IN THE EVENT THE ISSUE IS RAISED AGAIN, THE U.S. POSITION REMAINS THE SAME. EMBASSY ALSO SHOULD BE AWARE THAT THE U.S. SIDE HOPES TO HOST A DINNER ON THE EVENING OF THE FIRST DAY, DECEMBER 15. WE WILL RELAY ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AS PLANS DEVELOP.

7. WE HAVE BEEN ADVISED THAT TWO PRIVATE SECTOR COMPANIES, FORD AND MOTOROLA, HAVE OFFERED TO HOST ALL OR PART OF THE RUSSIAN DELEGATION FOR SITE VISITS FOLLOWING OR PRECEDING THE MEETINGS IN WASHINGTON. ALL EXPENSES WILL BE PICKED UP BY THE HOST COMPANY. IT IS POSSIBLE THAT OTHER COMPANIES WILL MAKE SIMILAR OFFERS. AT THIS TIME, WE HAVE INFORMATION THAT FORD OFFERS TO BRING ALL OF PART OF THE RUSSIAN DELEGATION TO DETROIT. THEY ARE DEVELOPING A MENU OF SITE VISITS AND PRESENTATIONS THAT WOULD BE AVAILABLE TO THE RUSSIAN VISITORS. WE EXPECT THAT THE RUSSIANS WILL HAVE TO SELECT FROM THIS MENU AS MORE WILL BE OFFERED THAN THERE WILL BE TIME. WE WILL ADVISE EMBASSY AS SOON AS WE HAVE ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FROM FORD, MOTOROLA, AND POSSIBLY OTHERS. WE BELIEVE IT BEST FOR THE COMPANIES IF THESE PROPOSED TRIPS ARE CONDUCTED SIMULTANEOUSLY TO AVOID THE LAST WEEKEND BEFORE THE HOLIDAYS. THEREFORE, ONCE WE HAVE MORE DETAILED INFORMATION FROM COMPANIES, WE WILL ASK THE RUSSIAN DELEGATES TO INDICATE THEIR PREFERENCE. DECEMBER 7TH IS THE TARGET DATE FOR PROVIDING INFORMATION ON DELEGATION SELECTIONS TO THE COMPANIES.

8. AGENDA: THE U.S. APPRECIATES THE INFORMATION PROVIDED BY THE RUSSIANS REGARDING THEIR VIEWS ON ISSUES TO BE DISCUSSED DURING THE SECOND DAY OF MEETINGS. WE ARE REVIEWING THOSE COMMENTS AND WILL PROVIDE A DETAILED RESPONSE SEPTEL.

9. MEANWHILE, ONE OF THE AGENDA ITEMS FOR THE BSA JCM IS REPORTS ON THE JOINT ACTIVITIES UNDER THE MOUS. WE AGREED AT THE OCTOBER 7TH PREPARATORY MEETINGS TO ASK PARTICIPATING AGENCIES TO PREPARE A WRITTEN REPORT THAT COULD BE DISTRIBUTED AT THE MEETING. WE ALSO AGREED TO SCHEDULE BRIEF (10 MINUTE) ORAL REPORTS FOR EACH MOU. THESE REPORTS SHOULD HIGHLIGHT SOME OF THE ACTIVITIES AND OPERATIONAL ISSUES IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MOU. WE AGREED TO FOLLOW THE PATTERN SET IN THE 1991 MEETING, I.E., FOR EACH MOU ONE SIDE GIVES AN ORAL PRESENTATION (WITH A FEW MINUTES PROVIDED FOR REMARKS BY THE MOU COUNTERPART AGENCY IF DESIRED).

10. THE U.S. AGENCIES PARTICIPATING IN MOUS UNDER THE BSA

ARE IN THE PROCESS OF CONTACTING THEIR COUNTERPARTS TO COORDINATE PREPARATIONS FOR THE REPORTS. WE SUGGEST THAT THE SIDE GIVING THE PRESENTATION AT THIS YEAR'S JCM BE THE REVERSE OF LAST YEAR'S PRESENTERS. THUS, WE ARE PROPOSING THAT THE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES GIVE THE REPORT ON ITS MOU WITH THE NSF; USGS, ON ITS MAPPING MOU WITH THE STATE GEODESY COMMITTEE; AND NIST, ON ITS MOU WITH THE ACADEMY. USGS IS PROPOSING THAT THE THE RUSSIAN COMMITTEE ON GEOLOGY GIVE A REPORT ON THE GEOSCIENCES MOU; AND NIH PROPOSES THAT THE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES PROVIDE A STATUS REPORT ON ITS REVIEW OF THE U.S. PROPOSED DRAFT TEXT OF AN MOU IN BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH. FOR EMBASSY INFORMATION, WHILE THE NIH-ACADEMY MOU MAY NOT BE READY FOR SIGNATURE AT THE DECEMBER MEETING (NIH HAS RECEIVED NO RESPONSE FROM THE ACADEMY WHO, WE UNDERSTAND, HAS BEEN REVIEWING THE TEXT SINCE JULY OF THIS YEAR), WE ARE INTERESTED IN A READOUT FROM THE ACADEMY AS TO THE STATUS OF ITS REVIEW.

KANTER
ADMIN
END OF MESSAGE

UNCLASSIFIED

********** CURRENT AS OF 4:00 PM DECEMBER 9, 1992 **********

December 11, 1992

U.S. DELEGATION MEETING

MEMBERS	JCM	TALKS	DIN	DEL- MTG
D. ALLAN BROMELY	YES	YES	YES	YES
J. THOMAS RATCHFORD	YES	YES	YES	YES
FRANK WISNER	?	YES		
WALTER MASSEY				
PHIL SCHAMBRA	YES		YES	YES
BERNADINE HEALY		YES?		
DALLAS PECK	YES	-		NO
JOHN SAYRE	-	YES	YES	NO
SAMUEL KRAMER (JOHN LYONS)				
ROBERT WHITE		YES		
LENNARD FISK		YES		
WIL HAPPER	-	YES	YES?	NO?
CATHY CAMPBELL	YES	YES	YES	YES
PAUL WOLFOWITZ				

DINNER INVITATION LIST FOR DECEMBER 15, 1992

RUSSIANS

BORIS SALTYKOV
EVGENIY ROGOVSKIY
SERGEI KISLYAK
VLADIMIR TYSHCHENKO
FNU NYCHKOV
NIKOLAU LAVEROV
FNU ORLOV
VLADIMIR KEYLIS-BOROK
YURI OSSIPYAN
FNU OSTROUMOV
FNU MOSKVICHEV
MINISTRY OF DEFENSE -TBD
ANATOLIY SHURIGAN - RUSSIAN EMBASSY
LEV MUKHIN - RUSSIAN EMBASSY

AMERICANS
D. ALLAN BROMLEY
J. THOMAS RATCHFORD
FRANK WISNER
WALTER MASSEY
DALLAS PECK
NIST
PAUL WOLFOWITZ - DOD
PHIL SCHAMBRA
JOHN SAYRE
ROBERT WHITE
BERNADINE HEALY
LEN FISK - NASA
WIL HAPPER
CATHLEEN CAMPBELL
JOHN O'NEIL
EUR-DOS?

DELEGATION MEETING
FRIDAY, DECEMBER 11, 1992
ROOM 472, OEOB

10:30 - 10:40	**POLITICAL SITUATION**
10:40 - 10:50	**ECONOMIC SITUATION**
10:50 - 11:00	**MILITARY R&D**
11:00 - 11:15	**BASIC SCIENCE**
11:15 - 11:30	**U. S. POLICY FOR RUSSIA**
11:30 - 11:50	**DISCUSSION, GUIDANCE, COORDINATION**

INTRODUCTION - CURRENT STATUS

At present, the governments of the United States and Russia cooperate in science and technology on a bilateral basis under the following agreements:

- **Agreement on Cooperation in the Field of Basic Scientific Research**
  - **USGS-Ministry of Geology Memorandum of Understanding on Cooperation in Geoscience**
  - **NSF-Academy of Sciences Memorandum of Understanding on Cooperation in the Field of Basic Scientific Research**
  - **USGS-Committee of Geodesy and Cartography Memorandum of Understanding on Cooperation in the Mapping Sciences**
  - **NIST-Academy of Sciences Memorandum of Understanding on Cooperation in the Physical, Chemical and Engineering Sciences**
- **Agreement on S&T Cooperation in the Field of Fuels and Energy**
- **Agreement on Cooperation in Artificial Heart Research and Development**
- **Agreement on Cooperation in Ocean Studies**
- **Agreement Concerning Cooperation in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space for Peaceful Purposes** [1]
- **Agreement on Cooperation in the Field of Environmental Protection**
- **Agreement on Cooperation in Transportation Science and Technology**
- **Agreement on Scientific and Technical Cooperation in the Field of Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy**

---

[1] **Discussion of space issues will be handled through the National Space Council**

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet
(George Bush Library)

Document No. and Type	Subject/Title of Document	Date	Restriction	Class.
01. Report	Factors Affecting Cooperation (6 pp.)		(b)(1)	

Collection:

Record Group: Bush Presidential Records
Office: Science and Technology Policy, Office of (OSTP)
Series: O'Neil, John F., Files
Subseries: Russia Subject Files
WHORM Cat.:
File Location: 3rd Joint Council Meeting, Basic Sciences Agreement [Dec 15-16, 1992] [1 of 3]

Date Closed:	5/26/2010	**OA/ID Number:**	62093-011
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

RUSSIAN DELEGATION

BORIS SALTYKOV
DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER, MINISTER OF SCIENCE, HIGHER EDUCATION AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

EUGENIY ROGOVSKIY
CHIEF, DEPARTMENT OF STRATEGY AND EXPORT PROMOTION, MINISTRY OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC RELATIONS

SERGEI KISLYAK
DEPUTY DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF INTERNATIONAL SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY COOPERATION, MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

VLADIMIR TYSHCHENKO
DEPUTY CHIEF OF FOREIGN RELATIONS DEPT. MINSCI

NIKOLAI LAVEROV
VICE PRESIDENT, RUSSIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

YURI OSSIPYAN
RUSSIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

V. NICHKOV
DEPUTY DIRECTOR FOR DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION, MINISTRY OF SCIENCE, HIGHER EDUCATION AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

VICTOR ORLOV
RUSSIAN COMMITTEE ON GEOLOGY

VLADIMIR KEYLIS-BOROK
RUSSIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

OSTROUMOV
DEPUTY GENERAL DIRECTOR, RUSSIAN SPACE AGENCY

MOSKVICHEV
DEPUTY MINISTER OF HEALTH

MINISTRY OF DEFENSE - UNKNOWN

DECEMBER 15, 1992

OPENING REMARKS

BASIC SCIENCES JOINT COMMISSION MEETING

MINISTER SALTYKOV, DR. LAVEROV, MEMBERS OF THE RUSSIAN DELEGATION - ON BEHALF OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES I WELCOME YOU TO WASHINGTON FOR OUR TWO DAYS OF TALKS ON OUR SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY RELATIONSHIP.

IT IS INDEED AN HONOR TO WELCOME YOU, MINISTER SALTYKOV, AS THE RUSSIAN CO-CHAIRMAN OF THIS OUR 3rd JOINT COMMISSION MEETING OF OUR AGREEMENT ON COOPERATION ION THE FILED OF BASIC SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH.

I SHOULD ALSO LIKE TO SAY WHAT A PLEASURE IT IS TO HAVE OUR ONLY CO-CHAINMAN EMERITUS, NIOKOLAI LAVEROV, CONTINUE HIS AFFILIATION WITH THE JOINT COMMISSION.

WE REALIZE THAT THESE ARE TIMES OF MOMENTOUS POLITICAL DEVELOPMENTS IN YOUR COUNTRY AND WE ARE PLEASED THAT YOU ARE ABLE TO BE HERE FOR THESE 2 DAYS OF IMPORTANT TALKS.

WE HOPE TO BUILD ON THE PROGRESS OF THE FIRST 2 JOINT COMMISSION MEETINGS OF ADVANCING JOINT COOPERATIVE BASIC RESEARCH, AND MORE BROADLY ADVANCING THE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY RELATIONSHIP OF OUR 2 COUNTRIES DURING TIMES OF UNPRECEDENTED CHANGE, NOT ONLY IN OUR OWN COUNTRIES, BUT THROUGHOUT THE WORLD.

TO THAT END THE AMERICAN SIDE HAS BEEN HARD AT WORK TO MAKE OUR 2 DAYS OF TALKS PRODUCTIVE AND ENJOYABLE HERE IN WASHINGTON.

I AM PLEASED THAT YOU WILL AVAIL YOURSELVES OF SOME OF THE GRACIOUS OFFERS FROM U.S. INDUSTRY TO VISIT THE FORD MOTOR COMPANY AND MOTOROLA CORPORATION FOLLOWING OUR MEETINGS AND DISCUSS WITH THEM THEIR POLICIES FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, TRAINING AND EDUCATION, AND OBSERVE PART OF THEIR PRODUCTION PROCESS.

THIS I BELIEVE IS A HARBINGER OF THE WAY OUR FUTURE S&T RELATIONSHIP WILL DEVELOP, THAT IS, WITH INCREASED INTERACTION BETWEEN THE PRIVATE SECTORS IN BOTH COUNTRIES.

AS I LOOK ACROSS THE TABLE I SEE SEVERAL FAMILIAR FACES, OLD FRIENDS REALLY, BUT I ALSO SEE SOME NEW FACES.

MR. MINISTER LET ME AT THIS TIME SUGGEST THAT WE INTRODUCE OUR DELEGATIONS - AS HOST I WOULD BE PLEASED TO INTRODUCE THE AMERICAN DELEGATION FIRST.

.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.

MINISTER SALTYKOV, WOULD YOU CARE TO MAKE A FEW REMARKS AT THIS TIME?

****** MINISTER SALTYKOV'S REMARKS AND INTRODUCTIONS ******

LET ME ASK OUR EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, CATHLEEN CAMPBELL TO COVER ANY LOGISTICAL INFORMATION THAT YOU WILL NEED DURING OUR MEETING TODAY.

NOW I WOULD LIKE TO BRIEFLY GO OVER OUR AGENDA FOR TODAY. THIS MORNING MINISTER SALTYKOV AND I WILL REPORT ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY AND SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY DEVELOPMENTS IN OUR COUNTRIES.

AFTER A COFFEE BREAK, WE WILL RECEIVE REPORTS ON THE COOPERATIVE RESEARCH UNDER WAY UNDER EACH OF THE MEMORANDA OF COOPERATION.

THIS AFTERNOON, WE WILL CLOSE WITH DISCUSSION OF FUTURE COOPERATION, THE FUTURE OF THE AGREEMENT, AND PLANS FOR THE NEXT JOINT COMMISSION MEETING.

THIS EVENING, AFTER VIEWING A VERY INTERESTING N IMAX FILM ON ANTARCTICA, WE WILL BE ABLE TO CONTINUE CONVERSATIONS OVER DINNER.

Schedule of Visits for Russian Delegation

Sunday, 12/13	Arrive Dulles on SU 317 at 3:35 PM
	Proceed to Hotel Free Time
Monday, 12/14	Meetings/Appointments in Washington Area
	Possible appointments for Saltykov: -- Frank Press, NAS, 10:30 AM -- Fred Hof, deputy to Ambassador Armitage -- John Knauss, NOAA -- DOD? -- Meeting with Grumman Aircraft, followed by dinner for the delegation
Tuesday, 12/15	
8:15	White House Tour
9:15 - 3:45 PM	BSA JCM (State Department)
6:00 PM	IMAX film (Smithsonian)
7:00 PM	US-hosted dinner (Smithsonian)
Wednesday, 12/16	
9:00 - 3:45	Summit Follow-On Discussions
4:00	Depart for National Airport
4:30	Depart for Detroit via Ford Corporate Jet
Thursday, 12/17	
evening	Depart for Chicago via Motorola Corporate Jet
Friday, 12/18	Chicago (hosted by Motorola)
evening	Return to Washington
Saturday, 12/19	
morning	Free time
12:45 P.M.	Depart hotel for Dulles Airport
3:15 P.M.	Depart Dulles for Moscow via SU 318

U.S.-Russia Basic Sciences Agreement
Joint Commission Meeting
December 15, 1992
Washington, D.C.

U.S.-Russia Basic Sciences Agreement
Joint Commission Meeting
December 15, 1992
Washington, D.C.

PROCEDURES
OF THE US-USSR JOINT COMMISSION
ON COOPERATION IN BASIC SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

In accordance with Article X of the Agreement Between the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Government of the United States of America on Cooperation in the Field of Basic Scientific Research on the establishment of a Joint US-USSR Commission on Cooperation in Basic Scientific Research of January 8, 1989, the Joint Commission has established the following procedures:

Article 1

The US-USSR Joint Commission on Cooperation in the Field of Basic Scientific Research, hereafter referred to as the Joint Commission, was established to review, coordinate and facilitate cooperation in the field of basic scientific research.

The Joint Commission shall consider only basic scientific research as defined in Article II of the Agreement.

Article 2

The Joint Commission shall consider issues related to cooperation in the field of basic scientific research and act by mutual consent. Each country shall decide its own internal procedures for deciding when its consent should be given.

The functions of the Commission are:

-to consider and recommend ways to create favorable conditions of cooperation;

-to review the results of cooperation undertaken under the subordinate MOUs;

-to consider proposals for additions, deletions or modifications to the list of areas of cooperation in Annex III of the Agreement, which it shall forward to the parties for their approval;

-to consider modes of support for bilateral scientific cooperation.

The Joint Commission shall review changes to Annex III which previously have been approved by the Parties.

The Joint Commission shall only designate broad areas of cooperation. Specific areas and topics will be designated under Memoranda of Understanding. The Joint Commission can recommend measures and programs for consideration and subsequent approval by both Parties.

Article 3

The Executive Agent of each side shall designate a Co-Chairman of the Joint Commission.

The composition of the Joint Commission shall be designated by the respective Co-Chairmen and the Co-Chairmen shall exchange lists of Commission members.

The Joint Commission shall be composed of members from both countries and shall include, at a minimum, representatives of the Executive Agents, Memoranda of Understanding signatories, and the Executive Secretaries. Each side of the Joint Commission shall consist of no more than 15 members, which figure shall include the prescribed members, and is taken to mean all Principals and all their assistants, the Executive Secretary, and all others. Members of the Joint Commission shall serve without compensation.

Article 4

The Joint Commission shall ordinarily meet once a year, alternately in the United States and in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The Co-Chairman of the hosting side shall be designated at least 90 days before the meeting and act as Chairman of the Joint Commission for the duration of the meeting.

The Co-Chairmen of the Joint Commission shall propose a date, agenda, and delegation list for the meeting not less than 30 days prior to the meeting.

Article 5

The Joint Commission shall issue a Record of the Meeting at the conclusion of each annual meeting.

A Record of the Meeting shall be made in English and Russian not later than 30 days after the conclusion of the meeting, both texts being equally valid.

Article 6

To fulfill its tasks, the Joint Commission may establish temporary working groups.

The Joint Commission determines the role and membership of such temporary bodies.

Article 7

Expenses for the Joint Commission annual meetings shall be handled on a receiving side pays basis. Such expenses shall not exceed the 15 members of the Joint Commission and shall apply only to the time required for the Joint Commission meeting plus surrounding days, not to exceed 7, for local site visits and counterpart meetings. Participation by either country of more than 15 persons shall be at that Party's expense. This policy shall be reviewed on a biannual basis.

Article 8

Any additional needed details on these Procedures should be worked out by the Executive Secretaries and implemented by mutual consent.

US-USSR BASIC SCIENCES AGREEMENT OF 1989

History and Background

-- In discussions leading to formal negotiations, the Soviets wanted the 1989 Agreement to be a direct successor to the 1972 US-USSR Science and Technology Agreement which was allowed to expire after the imposition of martial law in Poland in 1981.

-- However, the 1972 Agreement was widely believed to have produced one-sided S&T benefits (in Soviet favor) and allowed the Soviet side to gain unintended access to sensitive and/or advanced U.S. technology; consequently the U.S. clearly established, in negotiating the new agreement in 1987-1988, that such an agreement was to provide for demonstrable mutual benefit and to focus on basic research cooperation; by eliminating applied research, the current agreement is designed to avoid undesired and unwanted technology transfer.

-- To this end, the NSC mandated in March 1988 that all US-USSR S&T cooperative activities are to be subject to USG interagency review.

-- To implement this goal, the NSC approved in September 1988, the current interagency review procedures; developed by an interagency task force, these govern all bilateral S&T activities with the USSR and East Europe, including the US-USSR Basic Sciences Agreement.

-- The latter was negotiated by a USG interagency delegation in 1988 and signed in January 1989 by Secretary of State Schultz and Foreign Affairs Minister Shevardnadze.

Current Policies, Procedures and Implementation

-- To differentiate the 1989 Basic Sciences Agreement from the expired 1972 S&T Agreement, the current agreement not only excludes applied research activities, but calls for a "bottom-up" approach, i.e., proposals are to be initiated by U.S. and Soviet working scientists, as opposed to those negotiated and "imposed" from the top under the 1972 Agreement (by the 11 working groups under the then Joint Commission).

-- To implement the current decentralized approach, USG technical agencies are authorized to work out MOU's with their USSR counterparts and, under these "sub-agreements," to encourage their scientists to develop joint basic research projects, subject to the interagency review process noted earlier.

-- By early 1990, NSF and USGS developed such MOU's with the USSR Academy of Sciences and the USSR Ministry of Geology.

-- These USG technical agencies reported on their experience to the first meeting of the new Joint Commission under the Basic Sciences Agreement, held in Washington, April 19-20, 1990.

-- Since then, the NIST-Academy of Sciences MOU and a new MOU in Mapping Sciences between USGS and the USSR Committee on Geodesy and Cartography have been proposed to be brought under the Basic Sciences Agreement.

-- The U.S. expects to sign the NIST-Academy MOU at the second meeting of the Joint Commission in Moscow, May 13-14, 1991. The U.S. also expects to sign or at least initial the USGS-CGK MOU, assuming negotiations are completed by that time.

-- At the 2nd Joint Commission Meeting, the U.S. and USSR also will agree to discuss cooperation in the Ocean Drilling Program at this -- and subsequent -- JCM's (the ODP MOU was signed in February 1991).

-- Then, too, to broaden cooperation, the U.S. side proposes at the upcoming Joint Commission Meeting to add experimental physics and social sciences as new areas for joint research.

SESCTA 5381
Drafted:DOD/JThomas

United States-Russia Basic Sciences Agreement
Joint Commission Meeting
December 15, 1992
Washington, D.C.

AGENDA

9:15	**Arrival**	
9:30	**Coffee**	
10:00	**Opening Remarks:**	**Dr. D. Allan Bromley** **Deputy Premier Boris Saltykov**
10:30	**Overview Presentation by Dr. Bromley on U.S. S&T Developments - Possible Topics Include:** • **New Approaches to Supporting S&T** • **U.S. R&D Priorities**	
11:00	**Overview Presentation by Minister Saltykov on Developments in Russian S&T Policy - Possible Topics Include:** • **New Organization Structures** • **New Approaches to Supporting S&T** • **R&D Priorities**	
11:30	**Coffee Break**	

JOINT ACTIVITIES: MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU) AND OPERATIONAL ISSUES IN THEIR IMPLEMENTATION

12:00	**MOU in Basic Scientific Research (NSF-Russian Academy of Sciences)**
12:10	**MOU in Geosciences**
12:20	**MOU in Physical Sciences, Chemistry and Engineering Sciences**
12:30	**MOU in Mapping Sciences**
12:40	**MOU in Biomedical Research (possible)**
12:55	**LUNCH**
3:00	**Chairman's Summary/New Areas of Cooperation/Plans for Next Meeting**
3:45	**Adjourn**

********** CURRENT AS OF 11:00 AM DECEMBER 10, 1992 **********

December 15, 1992

U.S. DELEGATION

D. ALLAN BROMLEY

J. THOMAS RATCHFORD

WALTER MASSEY

DALLAS PECK

SAMUEL KRAMER

JOHN BORIGHT

PHIL SCHAMBRA

CATHY CAMPBELL

***** REVISED DECEMBER 9, 1992 4:00 PM *******

Yeltsin-Bush Summit Follow-On
Avenues for Expanded United States-Russia S&T Cooperation
December 16, 1992
Washington, D.C.

AGENDA

INTRODUCTION

9:00	Coffee	
9:30	Opening Remarks:	Dr. D. Allan Bromley Deputy Premier Boris Saltykov

MORNING DISCUSSION

Theme: New S&T Challenges

9:45 **Cooperation with Russia: Status, Goal and Objectives**
Overview by Dr. Bromley

- **Cooperation in Science and Technology**
- **Innovative Approaches: Government and Private Sector Initiatives**

10:15 **Cooperation with the United States: Status, Goals and Objectives**
Overview by Vice Premier Saltykov

- **To be determined by Russia**

10:45 **Discussion**

Theme: Avenues for Enhanced Cooperation

11:15 **New Arrangements - S&T**

12:30 **LUNCH**

2:00 **Measures to Address Factors Affecting Cooperation**

3:15 **Chairmen's Summary/Next Steps**

3:45 **Adjourn**

NOTE: RUSSIAN DELEGATION PROCEEDS TO NATIONAL AIRPORT TO MEET FORD CORPORATE JET AT BUTLER AVIATION FOR FLIGHT TO DETROIT

US-Russia Summit Follow-On Discussions
December 16, 1992
Washington, D.C.

BRIEFING BOOK
TABLE OF CONTENTS

add items to this table of contents indicated on attached Table for Basic Sciences meeting

+

Summit Statement

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet
(George Bush Library)

Document No. and Type	Subject/Title of Document	Date	Restriction	Class.
02. Report	Factors Affecting Cooperation (7 pp.)		(b)(1)	

Collection:

Record Group: Bush Presidential Records
Office: Science and Technology Policy, Office of (OSTP)
Series: O'Neil, John F., Files
Subseries: Russia Subject Files
WHORM Cat.:
File Location: 3rd Joint Council Meeting, Basic Sciences Agreement [Dec 15-16, 1992] [1 of 3]

Date Closed:	5/26/2010	**OA/ID Number:**	62093-011
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

FACT SHEET
ON THE PROPOSED U.S.-RUSSIAN
S&T AGREEMENT

1. IMPACT OF THE UMBRELLA AGREEMENT ON EXISTING AGREEMENTS AND MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING

Existing agreements and MOUs which are in force at the time of the signing of the umbrella agreement will not terminate but will be subject to the provisions of the umbrella agreement. This means that existing agreements and MOUs will be within the general policy framework of the umbrella agreement and that matters of importance arising from cooperation under those agreements and MOUs may be considered by the Joint Commission. The practical effect of this on agencies is two-fold:

- o A senior official of each agency responsible for agreements, MOUs, or cooperative activities in force, will be expected to participate in the annual meeting of the Joint Commission, and important existing activities will be considered by the Joint Commission, for the purpose of facilitating cooperation. Policy considerations, such as resolution of crosscutting problems, emanating from the Joint Commission may provide policy guidance relevant to agency agreements, MOUs and activities.

- o Both governments, based on information provided by agencies, will be required to make annual reports to the Joint Commission. Such reports, as outlined in paragraph 5 of Annex 1 will be fairly broad and the level of detail to be included in the USG report will be left to the discretion of the implementing agencies. The desired outcome is more transparency in the S&T activities between the United States and Russia.

Intellectual property rights provisions of the existing agreements and MOUs will remain unchanged and unaffected by the umbrella S&T agreement. If an agreement or MOU does not provide for IPR, the umbrella IPR provisions will apply.

2. IMPACT OF UMBRELLA AGREEMENT ON NEW AND RENEWAL AGREEMENTS, MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING AND ACTIVITIES

New and renewal agreements, MOUs and activities concluded by departments and agencies also will be subject to the provisions of the umbrella agreement as descrived above. Negotiation and conclusion of binding agreements and MOUs will require interagency coordination, as is now the case without the umbrella. The practical effect on operating agencies is four fold:

- o Participation in annual Joint Commission meetings

- o Providing information for annual reports to the Joint Commission

- o The umbrella agreement provides additional flexibility for operating agencies to determine the most appropriate mechanism for cooperation. In addition to formal agency-to-agency agreements or MOUs, specific projects may be implemented subject to the provisions of the umbrella agreement, without negotiating specialized agency agreements.

- o Intellectual property rights provisions of the umbrella agreement will apply, unless agencies determine that other provisions would be more suitable. Both Article VI and Annex II clearly allow other IPR arrangements. Where other IPR provisions are more desirable, interagency clearance will be required, as is the case now without the umbrella agreement.

3. EFFECT OF UMBRELLA AGREEMENT ON RELATIONS WITH OTHER REPUBLICS

Each state that was a republic of the former Soviet Union continues to be bound by US-USSR agreements, subject to certain exceptions (e.g., the object and purpose of the agreement are inconsistent with respect to a particular republic). The conclusion of an umbrella agreement with Russia will have no legal impact on the continuation of existing agreements with the other republics that are based on prior agreements with the USSR. While Circular 175 clearance has been requested only for the conclusion of an umbrella agreement with Russia, this agreement may set a precedence for similar cooperation with certain other republics.

4. EFFECT OF UMBRELLA AGREEMENT ON TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS WITHIN S&T AGREEMENTS AND MOUS

All science and technology components of S&T agreements and MOUs will be subject to the provisions of the umbrella agreement, including those S&T activities which are supported by technical assistance funds. Technical assistance funds used for other, non-S&T activities are not subject to the provisions of the S&T agreement. In practical terms, this means that the policy forum of the Joint Commission will impact only that assistance utilized in S&T cooperative activities. The Joint Commission's competence does not extend to technical assistance for non-S&T activities. Operating agencies will be responsible for identifying S&T activities funded by technical assistance.

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet
(George Bush Library)

Document No. and Type	Subject/Title of Document	Date	Restriction	Class.
03. Report	Items to be included in December discussions (3 pp.)		(b)(1)	

Collection:

Record Group: Bush Presidential Records
Office: Science and Technology Policy, Office of (OSTP)
Series: O'Neil, John F., Files
Subseries: Russia Subject Files
WHORM Cat.:
File Location: 3rd Joint Council Meeting, Basic Sciences Agreement [Dec 15-16, 1992] [1 of 3]

Date Closed:	5/26/2010	**OA/ID Number:**	62093-011
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

Yeltsin-Bush Summit Follow-On
Avenues for Expanded United States-Russia S&T Cooperation
December 9, 1992
Washington, D.C.

AGENDA

INTRODUCTION

9:00	**Coffee**	
9:30	**Opening Remarks:**	**Dr. D. Allan Bromley** **Deputy Premier Boris Saltykov**

MORNING DISCUSSION

Theme: New S&T Challenges

9:45 **Cooperation with Russia: Status, Goal and Objectives**
Overview by Dr. Bromley

- **Cooperation in Science and Technology**
- **Innovative Approaches: Government and Private Sector Initiatives**

10:15 **Cooperation with the United States: Status, Goals and Objectives**
Overview by Vice Premier Saltykov

- **To be determined by Russia**

10:45 **Discussion**

Theme: Avenues for Enhanced Cooperation

11:15 **New Arrangements - S&T**

12:45 **LUNCH**

2:15 **Measures to Address Factors Affecting Cooperation**

4:00 **Chairmen's Summary/Next Steps**

4:30 **Adjourn**

RUSSIAN DELEGATION

BORIS SALTYKOV
DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER, MINISTER OF SCIENCE, HIGHER EDUCATION AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

ANDREI KOKOSHIN
DEPUTY MINISTER OF DEFENSE

EUGENIY ROGOVSKIY
CHIEF, DEPARTMENT OF STRATEGY AND EXPORT PROMOTION, MINISTRY OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC RELATIONS

YURI OSIPOV
PRESIDENT, RUSSIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

SERGEI KISYAK
DEPUTY DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF INTERNATIONAL SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY COOPERATION, MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

FONOTOV
FIRST DEPUTY MINISTER OF SCIENCE, HIGHER EDUCATION AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

ZURAB YAKOBSHVILI
DEPUTY MINISTER OF SCIENCE, HIGHER EDUCATION AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

ANDREI BYKOV
CHIEF OF FOREIGN RELATIONS DEPARTMENT, MINSCI

VLADIMIR TYSHCHENKO
DEPUTY CHIEF OF FOREIGN RELATIONS DEPT. MINSCI

RUSSIAN DELEGATION

BORIS SALTYKOV
DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER, MINISTER OF SCIENCE, HIGHER EDUCATION AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

ANDREI KOKOSHIN
DEPUTY MINISTER OF DEFENSE

EUGENIY ROGOVSKIY
CHIEF, DEPARTMENT OF STRATEGY AND EXPORT PROMOTION, MINISTRY OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC RELATIONS

YURI OSIPOV
PRESIDENT, RUSSIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

SERGEI KISYAK
DEPUTY DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF INTERNATIONAL SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY COOPERATION, MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

FONOTOV
FIRST DEPUTY MINISTER OF SCIENCE, HIGHER EDUCATION AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

ZURAB YAKOBSHVILI
DEPUTY MINISTER OF SCIENCE, HIGHER EDUCATION AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

ANDREI BYKOV
CHIEF OF FOREIGN RELATIONS DEPARTMENT, MINSCI

VLADIMIR TYSHCHENKO
DEPUTY CHIEF OF FOREIGN RELATIONS DEPT. MINSCI

RUSSIAN DELEGATION

BORIS SALTYKOV
DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER, MINISTER OF SCIENCE, HIGHER EDUCATION AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

ANDREI KOKOSHIN
DEPUTY MINISTER OF DEFENSE

EUGENIY ROGOVSKIY
CHIEF, DEPARTMENT OF STRATEGY AND EXPORT PROMOTION, MINISTRY OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC RELATIONS

YURI OSIPOV
PRESIDENT, RUSSIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

SERGEI KISYAK
DEPUTY DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF INTERNATIONAL SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY COOPERATION, MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

FONOTOV
FIRST DEPUTY MINISTER OF SCIENCE, HIGHER EDUCATION AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

ZURAB YAKOBSHVILI
DEPUTY MINISTER OF SCIENCE, HIGHER EDUCATION AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

ANDREI BYKOV
CHIEF OF FOREIGN RELATIONS DEPARTMENT, MINSCI

VLADIMIR TYSHCHENKO
DEPUTY CHIEF OF FOREIGN RELATIONS DEPT. MINSCI

December 1, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR D. ALLAN BROMLEY

THROUGH: J. THOMAS RATCHFORD

FROM: JOHN F. O'NEIL

SUBJECT: DECEMBER MEETINGS WITH MINISTER SALTYKOV

Two meetings are scheduled this month with Boris Saltykov:

- December 15 - Basic Sciences Joint Commission Meeting, and
- December 16 - Talks on expanding cooperation in S&T.

The Russian side has tentatively identified their delegation. The names are attached.

The agendas for both meetings are also attached.

U. S. Delegation. You have sent letters of invitation to Frank Wisner, Walter Massey, Dallas Peck, Paul Wolfowitz (DoD), John Lyons (NIST), and Phil Schambra for the Basic Sciences delegation. For the December 16 talks, you have invited Frank Wisner, Walter Massey, John Sayre, Paul Wolfowitz, Robert White (DoC), Bernadine Healy., Daniel Golden, and Wil Happer at Energy.

Venue. The Loy Henderson Conference Room At State has been reserved. The Middle East Peace Talks are expected to be in session at the same time as your meetings.

Dinner. Arrangements have been made for dinner on December 15, 1992 at the Smithsonian Museum of American History. We will be in the Presidential Suite, with cocktails in the main foyer. Dinner will be preceded by a viewing of the IMAX film on the Kuwaiti oil fires.

Delegation Meetings. I recommend both delefgations meet jointly the week preceding the meetings, on Thursday or Friday. With your approval, I will coordiante with Ralph and schedule.

Official Gifts. I propose to locate appropriate gifts and have the travel contractor procure them.

Funding. Contributions are as follows: USGS - $10,000, NIH - $3,500, State will pick up interpreter expenses and may kick in funds, DoD may contribute $1,000, and NSF will cover costs above the contributions.

Schedule.

Sunday - December 13 - Russian delegation arrives during the afternoon,

Monday - December 14 - Russian delegation makes calls in Washington,

Tuesday - December 15 - Russian delegation begins with an early tour of the White House tour before the start of the Joint Commission meeting. The agenda for the Joint Commission Meeting is attached. A lunch is included.

Evening will include I MAX film at Air and Space Museum and U. S. hosted dinner at Museum of American History,

Wednesday - December 16 - Talks on expanding S&T cooperation,

Late afternoon/early evening - Russian delegation leaves for Ford Company in Detroit,

Thursday - December 17 - Program at Ford - travel to Motorola in Chicago,

Friday - December 18 - Program at Motorola,

Saturday - December 19 - Depart U. S. for return to Moscow.

RUSSIAN DELEGATION

BORIS SALTYKOV
DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER, MINISTER OF SCIENCE, HIGHER EDUCATION AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

ANDREI KOKOSHIN
DEPUTY MINISTER OF DEFENSE

EUGENIY ROGOVSKIY
CHIEF, DEPARTMENT OF STRATEGY AND EXPORT PROMOTION, MINISTRY OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC RELATIONS

YURI OSIPOV
PRESIDENT, RUSSIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

SERGEI KISYAK
DEPUTY DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF INTERNATIONAL SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY COOPERATION, MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

FONOTOV
FIRST DEPUTY MINISTER OF SCIENCE, HIGHER EDUCATION AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

ZURAB YAKOBSHVILI
DEPUTY MINISTER OF SCIENCE, HIGHER EDUCATION AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

ANDREI BYKOV
CHIEF OF FOREIGN RELATIONS DEPARTMENT, MINSCI

VLADIMIR TYSHCHENKO
DEPUTY CHIEF OF FOREIGN RELATIONS DEPT. MINSCI

United States-Russia Basic Sciences Agreement
Joint Commission Meeting
December 15, 1992
Washington, D.C.

AGENDA

9:15 Arrival

9:30 Coffee

10;00 Opening Remarks: Dr. D. Allan Bromley
Deputy Premier Boris Saltykov

10:30 Overview Presentation by Dr. Bromley on U.S. S&T Developments - Possible Topics Include:

- New Approaches to Supporting S&T
- U.S. R&D Priorities

11:00 Overview Presentation by Minister Saltykov on Developments in Russian S&T Policy - Possible Topics Include:

- New Organization Structures
- New Approaches to Supporting S&T
- R&D Priorities

11:30 Coffee Break

JOINT ACTIVITIES: MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU) AND OPERATIONAL ISSUES IN THEIR IMPLEMENTATION

12:00 MOU in Basic Scientific Research (NSF-Russian Academy of Sciences)

12:10 MOU in Geosciences

12:20 MOU in Physical Sciences, Chemistry and Engineering Sciences

12:30 MOU in Mapping Sciences

12:40 MOU in Biomedical Research (possible)

12:55 LUNCH

3:00 Chairman's Summary/New Areas of Cooperation/Plans for Next Meeting

3:45 Adjourn

Yeltsin-Bush Summit Follow-On
Avenues for Expanded United States-Russia S&T Cooperation
December 16, 1992
Washington, D.C.

AGENDA

INTRODUCTION

9:00	**Coffee**	
9:30	**Opening Remarks:**	**Dr. D. Allan Bromley** **Deputy Premier Boris Saltykov**

MORNING DISCUSSION

Theme: New S&T Challenges

9:45 **Cooperation with Russia: Status, Goal and Objectives**
Overview by Dr. Bromley

- **Cooperation in Science and Technology**
- **Innovative Approaches: Government and Private Sector Initiatives**

10:15 **Cooperation with the United States: Status, Goals and Objectives**
Overview by Vice Premier Saltykov

- **To be determined by Russia**

10:45 **Discussion**

Theme: Avenues for Enhanced Cooperation

11:15 **New Arrangements - S&T**

12:45 **LUNCH**

2:15 **Measures to Address Factors Affecting Cooperation**

4:00 **Chairmen's Summary/Next Steps**

4:30 **Adjourn**

BILATERAL COOPERATIVE S&T AGREEMENTS WITH THE FORMER USSR

1. **AGRICULTURE**
2. **ARTIFICIAL HEART**
3. **BASIC SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH**
4. **ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION**
5. **MEDICAL SCIENCE AND PUBLIC HEALTH**
6. **OCEANS STUDIES**
7. **PEACEFUL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY**
8. **SPACE**
9. **TRANSPORTATION**

BILATERAL COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS WITH THE FORMER USSR

1. AGRICULTURE **TERM: 6/19/93**

EXECUTIVE AGENTS: **USDA**
USSR COMMISSION ON FOOD AND FOOD PROCUREMENT

2. ARTIFICIAL HEART **TERM: 6/28/92**

EXECUTIVE AGENTS: **HHS**
USSR MINISTRY OF HEALTH, ALL UNION CENTER FOR CARDIOLOGY RESEARCH

3. BASIC SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH **TERM: 1/08/93**

EXECUTIVE AGENTS: **OSTP**
GKNT

SUBSIDIARY MOU PARTNERS: NSF-USSR ACADEMY OF SCIENCES
NIST-USSR ACADEMY OF SCIENCES
USGS-USSR MINISTRY OF GEOLOGY
USGS-USSR COMMITTEE OF GEODESY & CARTOGRAPHY

4. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION **TERM: 5/23/92**

EXECUTIVE AGENTS: **EPA**
USSR STATE COMMITTEE FOR NATURE USE AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

5. MEDICAL SCIENCE AND PUBLIC HEALTH: **TERM: 5/01/92**

EXECUTIVE AGENTS: **HHS**

USSR MINISTRY OF HEALTH

6. OCEAN STUDIES: **TERM: 5/31/95**

EXECUTIVE AGENTS: **NOAA**
GKNT

7. PEACEFUL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY: **TERM:6/01/95**

EXECUTIVE AGENTS: **DOE**
MINISTRY OF ATOMIC POWER AND INDUSTRY

8. SPACE: **TERM: 4/14/92**

EXECUTIVE AGENTS: **NASA**
USSR ACADEMY OF SCIENCES
GLAVKOSMOS

9. TRANSPORTATION: **TERM: 5/31/93**

EXECUTIVE AGENTS: **DOT**
GKNT

AGREEMENTS BY ORGANIZATION

GKNT:

BASIC SCIENCES
OCEAN STUDIES
TRANSPORTATION

ACADEMY OF SCIENCES:

BASIC SCIENCES
SPACE

USSR MINISTRY OF HEALTH:

ARTIFICIAL HEART
MEDICAL SCIENCES AND PUBLIC HEALTH

USSR MINISTRY OF GEOLOGY:

BASIC SCIENCES

USSR COMMISSION ON FOOD AND FOOD PROCUREMENT:

AGRICULTURE

USSR STATE COMMITTEE OF GEODESY AND CARTOGRAPHY:

BASIC SCIENCES

USSR STATE COMMITTEE FOR NATURE USE AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION:

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

USSR MINISTRY OF ATOMIC POWER AND INDUSTRY:

PEACEFUL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

GLAVKOSMOS:

SPACE

Saltykov's speeches & Articles & interviews

/********** THIS IS A COMBINED MESSAGE **********/
BODY
PASS: ATTN BBC PRESS
COPY TO CD
COUNTRY: RUSSIA
SUBJ: TAKE 1 OF 3--VICE PREMIER ON RUSSIAN SCIENCE RECOVERY
SOURCE: MOSCOW IZVESTIYA IN RUSSIAN 26 NOV 92 MORNING EDITION P 3
TEXT:

//((INTERVIEW WITH B.G. SALTYKOV, DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION GOVERNMENT AND MINISTER OF SCIENCE, HIGHER EDUCATION, AND TECHNICAL POLICY, BY IZVESTIYA SCIENCE COMMENTATOR BORIS KONOVALOV; PLACE AND DATE NOT GIVEN: "THE RUMORS ABOUT THE DEATH OF RUSSIAN SCIENCE ARE EXAGGERATED"))

((TEXT)) ((KONOVALOV)) BORIS GEORGIYEVICH, OUR ARMY OF SCIENTISTS, STILL QUITE LARGE, IS QUICKLY BECOMING IMPOVERISHED. EVEN SENIOR RESEARCH ASSOCIATES SOMETIMES MAKE 2,500 TO 3,000 RUBLES ((R)) AT PRESENT. IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO GET BY ON THIS KIND OF MONEY. DESPITE THE FACT THAT OUR GOVERNMENT IS HEADED BY A SCIENTIST, IT TURNS OUT THAT IT RATHER ACTS IN THE INTERESTS OF BANKERS, WHO ARE RAPIDLY GROWING RICH THROUGH INSANELY EXPENSIVE LOANS, AND OF SPECULATORS, WHO HAVE FILLED THE STREETS AND DO NOT PAY ANY TAXES TO THE STATE...

((SALTYKOV)) INDEED, THE SCIENTISTS' SITUATION IS CALAMITOUS. I BELIEVE THAT IT IS NECESSARY TO SUBSTANTIALLY ADJUST THE GOVERNMENT'S POLICY FOR MANY REASONS, OF WHICH THE CALAMITOUS SITUATION OF SCIENCE, EDUCATION, CULTURE, AND HEALTH CARE IS NOT THE LEAST. HOWEVER, THE GOVERNMENT CERTAINLY DID NOT SET THE GOAL OF SUPPORTING BANKERS OR SPECULATORS TO THE DETRIMENT OF THE INTERESTS OF EMPLOYEES IN BUDGET-FINANCED SECTORS.

LET US TRY TO ANALYZE CALMLY THE REAL SITUATION IN WHICH WE CURRENTLY OPERATE. IN DECEMBER OF LAST YEAR WE COUNTED ON RECEIVING

20-30 PERCENT LESS FUNDING FROM THE STATE BUDGET IN 1992 THAN WE DID IN 1991. HOWEVER, IT IS NOW CLEAR THAT ACTUALLY, IN COMPARABLE PRICES, OUTLAYS ON CIVILIAN SCIENCE WILL BE SMALLER THAN LAST YEAR BY APPROXIMATELY A FACTOR OF THREE (|). THIS IS HAPPENING WHILE ORDERS FOR RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN WORK FROM INDUSTRY HAVE ALSO DECLINED SIMULTANEOUSLY BY APPROXIMATELY A FACTOR OF 10. I CAN ONLY WONDER AND ADMIRE OUR SCIENTISTS AND DESIGNERS FOR BEING ABLE TO SURVIVE AND CONTINUING TO WORK UNDER SUCH CIRCUMSTANCES, AS THEY DISPLAY MIRACULOUS FEATS OF PERSEVERANCE AND INGENUITY. TO MY MIND, ONLY RUSSIAN SCIENCE COULD WITHSTAND THIS SHOCK. OF COURSE, AS A MINISTER I AM ASHAMED OF THE MEAGER SALARIES WHICH MANY SKILLED SCIENTISTS DRAW.

THEY BEGAN TO OBJECT TO ME WHEN, EARLY IN THE YEAR, I BEGAN TO CALL ON RESEARCH COLLECTIVES TO LOOK FOR NEW SOURCES OF FINANCING, INCLUDING SOURCES FROM ABROAD. ONLY THE STATE MAY AND SHOULD PRESERVE DOMESTIC SCIENCE AT PRESENT, THEY SAID. NOBODY IS DISPUTING THIS| THE STATE NOW REMAINS VIRTUALLY THE ONLY "GUARDIAN" OF SCIENCE: THE PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL OUTLAYS ON RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN WORK ACCOUNTED FOR BY THE FEDERAL BUDGET HAS INCREASED FROM 55 TO MORE THAN 80 PERCENT DURING THIS PERIOD OF TIME. THIS IS THE LIMIT OF THE CAPABILITIES OF THE STATE. HOWEVER, EVEN THESE FUNDS ARE EXTREMELY SCARCE.

((KONOVALOV)) DOES THE GOVERNMENT FAIL TO UNDERSTAND THAT RUSSIA HAS NO FUTURE WITHOUT SCIENCE?

((SALTYKOV)) OF COURSE THE GOVERNMENT UNDERSTANDS. THE PRESERVATION OF SCIENCE AND THE COMPREHENSIVE USE OF ITS ACCOMPLISHMENTS ARE CERTAINLY IN THE STRATEGIC INTERESTS OF RUSSIA. THE GOVERNMENT IS AWARE OF THE TREMENDOUS NATIONAL VALUE OF SCIENCE AND UNDERSTANDS THAT IT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR ITS FUTURE. HOWEVER, SCIENCE CANNOT REMAIN A DETACHED "IVORY TOWER" AT A TIME OF GIGANTIC SOCIAL SHOCKS. THERE IS EVERY REASON TO REFER TO THE MISTAKES AND LACK OF DISPATCH ON THE PART OF THE GOVERNMENT AND WASTED OPPORTUNITIES. SUCH TALK UNAVOIDABLY ACCOMPANIES ALL CRISES WHEN DECISIONS ARE MADE AND CARRIED OUT IN THE ENVIRONMENT OF VERY GREAT UNCERTAINTY, THE SEVERANCE OF EXISTING RELATIONS, AND THE EROSION OF EXECUTIVE POWER. SUCH TALK IS A NECESSARY OUTLET, A NECESSARY MEANS OF MENTAL THERAPY, ESPECIALLY FOR PEOPLE WHO ARE WISE AFTER THE FACT. HOWEVER, ULTIMATELY THE CONTENT OF ANY PROGRAM HINGES PRIMARILY ON THE ESSENCE OF THE FUNDAMENTAL CHOICE MADE, AND ONLY AFTER THAT, ON THE SKILLS OF THE WORKER AND THE EFFECTIVENESS OF EXECUTION.

THE ONLY THING WHICH MAY STRIKE US TODAY IS THE INERTIA OF THINKING OF A CONSIDERABLE SEGMENT OF THE RUSSIAN INTELLIGENTSIA, WHO STILL FAIL TO APPRECIATE THE PROFUNDITY OF THE SHOCK WHICH RUSSIA IS EXPERIENCING.

HOWEVER, SHOCKS OF THIS KIND IN A HUGE COUNTRY CANNOT BE THE RESULT OF CONSPIRACIES BY KIKE-FREEMASONS, THE CIA, GORBACHEV, OR YELTSIN. THEY ARE THE RESULT OF AN IRREVOCABLE CHOICE MADE BY THE MOST INFLUENTIAL AND ACTIVE SOCIAL FORCES OF SOCIETY. IN RUSSIA THIS CHOICE WAS MADE PRIMARILY BY THE INTELLIGENTSIA, DESPITE THE FACT THAT STUDENTS, YOUNG EMPLOYEES OF THE STATE APPARATUS, SKILLED WORKERS, AND SOME PEASANTS WERE LIKEWISE THE BEARERS OF IDEAS WHICH LEAD TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF DEMOCRACY AND MARKET RELATIONS.

I BELIEVE THAT A MAJORITY OF REASONABLE PEOPLE STAND BY THIS CHOICE AT PRESENT AS WELL, DESPITE ALL THE DIFFICULTIES OF THE CRISIS WE ARE EXPERIENCING. WE HAD TO GET ACROSS THE PRECIPICE; VIRTUALLY EVERYONE AGREES WITH THIS. WHATEVER ONE THINKS ABOUT THE CONSTRUCTION OF SOCIALISM, THE POTENTIAL OF THIS CONCEPT WAS ENTIRELY DEPLETED ONCE ENTHUSIASM HAD BEEN SNUFFED OUT AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE EXTENSIVE USE OF RESOURCES HAD BEEN EXHAUSTED. IT BECAME NECESSARY TO MODERNIZE THE ECONOMY AND SOCIETY AND TO BRIDGE THE GAP SEPARATING US FROM DEVELOPED COUNTRIES. HOWEVER, IT IS ABSOLUTELY OBVIOUS TO ME THAT WE WILL BE ABLE TO ARRIVE AT DEMOCRACY AND MARKET RELATIONS ONLY BY WAY OF RUSSIAN TRADITIONS.

((KONOVALOV)) I WOULD LIKE TO RECALL THAT, DURING THE POST-OCTOBER REVOLUTION PERIOD, WHICH WAS NO LESS DIFFICULT FOR THE COUNTRY, THE BOLSHEVIK GOVERNMENT CAME UP WITH THE MONEY AND RESOURCES TO SET UP QUITE A NUMBER OF INSTITUTES WHICH BECAME THE PRIDE OF OUR NATIONAL SCIENCE. AT THE TIME THE IMPOVERISHED AND DEVASTATED RUSSIA THOUGHT ABOUT ITS FUTURE, WHEREAS WE DO NOT WANT TO DO THIS AT PRESENT. AFTER ALL, NO MATTER HOW WE CONDEMN THE FLAWS OF OUR SCIENCE, IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO OVERLOOK THE FACT THAT THE POWERFUL SCIENTIFIC POTENTIAL WHICH HAS BEEN CREATED IS ONE OF THE MAIN RICHES OF RUSSIA. IT IS PAINFUL TO WATCH AT PRESENT HOW THIS POTENTIAL IS BEING DESTROYED--SOME ARE GOING ABROAD, OTHERS ARE TAKING UP COMMERCE...

/****** BEGINNING OF TAKE 002 ******/
REF: 934C0410A MOSCOW IZVESTIYA IN RUSSIAN 26 NOV 92 MORNING EDITION P 3 ///TAKING UP COMMERCE...
SOURCE: MOSCOW IZVESTIYA IN RUSSIAN 26 NOV 92 MORNING EDITION P 3
TEXT:

((SALTYKOV)) I AGREE THAT IT IS PAINFUL. OUR MAIN TASK IS TO PRESERVE THE PEOPLE, RATHER THAN THE SUPERFICIAL FORMS, OF SCIENCE. IN THE USSR SCIENCE WAS, IN TERMS OF ITS STRUCTURE AND GENETIC CODE, AN INTEGRAL PART OF THE STATE MONSTER WHICH WE ARE NOW RESTRUCTURING WITH SUCH PAIN.

THE DISMANTLING OF THE OLD MONOPOLISTIC SYSTEM UNAVOIDABLY CALLS FOR A PROFOUND TRANSFORMATION OF THE SCIENTIFIC STRUCTURE WHICH IS BUILT INTO IT. ARE PREDICTIONS OF A CATASTROPHE LEGITIMATE AT THIS TIME? AS I SEE IT, THEY ARE NOT. CERTAINLY, ORGANIZATIONAL FORMS INFLUENCE THE ACTIVITIES OF A SCIENTIST. STILL, THEY ARE MERELY AN OUTER SHELL WITH REGARD TO SUCH ACTIVITIES. THE BREAKUP OF SUCH FORMS IS PAINFUL BUT IS NOT LETHAL TO SCIENCE. FOR EXAMPLE, THE MINISTRY AS THE MONOPOLIZING STRUCTURE DISAPPEARS, AND SCIENTISTS WELCOME THIS. HOWEVER, IN THE PROCESS THEY LOSE THEIR BASE; IT TURNS OUT THAT SECTORAL SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH INSTITUTES, WHICH WERE PART OF THIS STRUCTURE, MUST BE RADICALLY RESTRUCTURED. ATTEMPTS TO CURTAIL THIS PROCESS AND TO "CONTINUE CENTRALIZED FUNDING" ARE WORSE THAN JUST UNSOUND; THEY DISTRACT PEOPLE FROM ACTIVE AND URGENT EFFORTS TO FIND A NEW ORGANIZATION, A NEW RELATIONSHIP WITH SOCIETY.

ON THE OTHER HAND, I SEE CLEARLY THAT THERE IS A LIMIT TO THE ABILITY OF THE SYSTEM TO ADAPT, AND AS I SEE IT, WE HAVE COME VERY CLOSE TO IT.

AS FAR AS THE EMIGRATION OF OUR SCIENTISTS ABROAD IS CONCERNED, IT IS NOT ALL THAT UNAMBIGUOUS. INDEED, AT PRESENT THE "BRAIN DRAIN"

TROUBLES AND PAINS US BECAUSE, IN SCIENCE, EVERY PERSON IS AN INDIVIDUAL, A TALENT WHOSE LOSS FREQUENTLY BECOMES IRREPARABLE. HOWEVER, LET US TAKE A DIFFERENT VIEW OF THIS. MANY SCIENTISTS WHO HAVE GONE ABROAD ARE WORKING THERE UNDER TEMPORARY CONTRACTS. I AM CONFIDENT THAT MOST OF THEM WILL RETURN TO RUSSIA ENRICHED WITH THE EXPERIENCE AND SKILLS OF THE BEST LABORATORIES OF THE WORLD. YOU HAVE MENTIONED THE TIME FOLLOWING THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION; IF SO, WE SHOULD RECALL HOW SOME OF OUR INSTITUTES AND SCHOOLS WERE CREATED. AFTER WORKING IN E. RUTHERFORD'S LABORATORY, ACADEMICIAN P. KAPITSA FOUNDED THE FAMOUS INSTITUTE FOR PROBLEMS OF PHYSICS IN MOSCOW AND CREATED A MARVELOUS DOMESTIC SCIENTIFIC SCHOOL. INCIDENTALLY, EQUIPMENT FOR THE INSTITUTE WAS A GIFT FROM RUTHERFORD. ACADEMICIAN YU. KHARITON, THE SCIENCE DIRECTOR OF THE NOW WIDELY KNOWN ARZAMAS-16, IN WHICH OUR NUCLEAR WEAPONS WERE DEVELOPED, WAS ALSO TRAINED AT E. RUTHERFORD'S LABORATORY. N. SEMENOV, A. IOFFE, AND MANY OTHER LUMINARIES OF OUR SCIENCE ALSO TRAVELED THIS PATH OF TRAINING ABROAD.

THE EXCESSIVELY SLOW DEVELOPMENT OF OUR SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL RELATIONS WITH FOREIGN PARTNERS IS WHAT WE SHOULD BE TALKING ABOUT AT PRESENT. AFTER ALL, FROM AN OBJECTIVE POINT OF VIEW IT IS PRECISELY OWING TO SCIENCE THAT WE WILL BE ABLE TO INTEGRATE WITH THE WORLD COMMUNITY WITH GREATER EASE AND SPEED. OUR INDUSTRIALISTS AND ENTREPRENEURS ARE YET TO MASTER A COMMON (MARKET-BASED) LANGUAGE OF THE WEST, WHEREAS THERE IS NO NEED FOR SCIENTISTS TO DO SO: THEY HAVE LONG BEEN SPEAKING THE SAME LANGUAGE. SCIENCE IS INTERNATIONAL. AT PRESENT, THIS IS ONE OF THE FEW AREAS IN WHICH WE ARE PARTNERS ON AN EQUAL FOOTING AND ARE OF INTEREST TO THE ENTIRE WORLD. WE SHOULD URGENTLY STUDY TRENDS IN THE NEW MARKET FOR SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL PRODUCTS, AND REFRAIN FROM SELLING FOR $1,000 SOMETHING THAT COSTS $1 MILLION. IT IS IN THIS THAT THE STATE SHOULD HELP OUR SCIENTISTS.

((KONOVALOV)) WE HEAR FREQUENTLY THAT THE WEST WILL HELP US, WHEREAS AN OLD RUSSIAN MAXIM SAYS: "GOD HELPS THOSE WHO HELP THEMSELVES." COULD YOU REFER TO SPECIFIC MEASURES WHICH HAVE BEEN TAKEN OR ARE BEING TAKEN WITH A VIEW TO PRESERVING THE SCIENTIFIC POTENTIAL OF RUSSIA?

((SALTYKOV)) FIRST OF ALL, A NORMATIVE FOUNDATION HAS BEEN LAID FOR REGULATING RELATIONS IN THE SPHERE OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY--FOUR LAWS (INCLUDING A PATENT LAW). THIS IS VERY IMPORTANT FOR PROTECTING INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY. THE PROGRAM SEGMENT OF THE BUDGET WILL BE INCREASED, AND PROGRAMS THEMSELVES WILL BE RENEWED. A SYSTEM OF INDEPENDENT FOUNDATIONS IS BEING FORMED WHICH WILL FINANCE SCIENTIFIC COLLECTIVES BY PROVIDING GRANTS. THE MAIN ONE AMONG THEM, THE RUSSIAN FOUNDATION FOR BASIC RESEARCH, IS BEGINNING TO OPERATE IN MOSCOW. THE FOUNDATION FOR SUPPORTING YOUNG SCIENTISTS IS BEING SET UP IN NOVOSIBIRSK AT THE FACILITIES OF THE ACADEMIC CITY AND THE UNIVERSITY. IN ST. PETERSBURG, A REGIONAL FOUNDATION FOR SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL DEVELOPMENT IS BEING SET UP.

FOREIGN FOUNDATIONS ARE EMBARKING ON ACTUAL OPERATIONS TO SUPPORT RUSSIAN SCIENTISTS: THE EUROPEAN FOUNDATION (4 MILLION ECU ((EUROPEAN CURRENCY UNITS))) AND THE MCARTHUR FOUNDATION IN MOSCOW ($3 MILLION). THE U.S. NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION IS INCREASING ASSISTANCE CONSIDERABLY. THE U.S. ADMINISTRATION IS CONSIDERING THE POSSIBILITY OF ALLOCATING $25 MILLION. CONSIDERABLE AMOUNTS HAVE

BEEN ALLOCATED TO THIS END IN ITALY, ENGLAND, AND OTHER COUNTRIES.

FINALLY, THE DECISION HAS BEEN MADE TO EXEMPT FOREIGN GRANTS FROM TAXES, AND EQUIPMENT AND SCIENTIFIC INSTRUMENTS DELIVERED THROUGH THIS ARRANGEMENT, FROM CUSTOMS DUTIES.

WORK IS UNDERWAY ON CREATING FEDERAL SCIENTIFIC CENTERS WHICH ARE CALLED UPON TO PRESERVE COMPREHENSIVE SCIENTIFIC SCHOOLS AND ENSURE THE REPRODUCTION OF SCIENTIFIC-TECHNICAL POTENTIAL IN KEY SECTORS.

WE PROPOSE TO STIMULATE INNOVATION-ORIENTED ACTIVITIES OF ENTERPRISES THROUGH CREDIT AND TAX POLICY PROVISIONS AND SPECIAL-PURPOSE SUBSIDIES. WE WILL SUPPORT THE CREATION OF SMALL ENTERPRISES AT THE FACILITIES OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH INSTITUTES AND DESIGN BUREAUS, AS WELL AS THE RETRAINING AND JOB PLACEMENT OF SCIENTISTS AND SPECIALISTS RIGHT THERE.

/****** BEGINNING OF TAKE 003 ******/
REF: 934C0410A MOSCOW IZVESTIYA IN RUSSIAN 26 NOV 92 MORNING EDITION P 3 ///SPECIALISTS RIGHT THERE.
SOURCE: MOSCOW IZVESTIYA IN RUSSIAN 26 NOV 92 MORNING EDITION P 3
TEXT:

WE VIGOROUSLY SUPPORT THE INTEGRATION OF INSTITUTES OF HIGHER LEARNING AND RESEARCH ORGANIZATIONS THROUGH USING THEIR ASSOCIATES AS INSTRUCTORS, FINANCING EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AT BOTH THE SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH INSTITUTES OF THE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES AND SECTORAL INSTITUTES, AND CREATING JOINT INSTRUCTION AND RESEARCH CENTERS AND SPECIALIZED INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING OF THE "ADVANCED TYPE." THE STATE PROVIDES INCENTIVES FOR THE CREATION OF COMMERCIAL AND NONPROFIT TECHNOLOGY PARKS, INSTRUMENT CENTERS, AND RESEARCH-INTENSIVE PRODUCTION AT THE FACILITIES OF LIQUIDATED SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH INSTITUTES, INCLUDING THOSE WHICH USE, IN PART, THEIR STAFF AND THEIR WAGE FUNDS.

THE FUTURE OF OUR RESEARCH SETTLEMENTS IS YET ANOTHER PROBLEM. MANY OF THEM (OBNINSK, PUSHCHINO, DUBNA, CHERNOGOLOVKA, AND OTHERS) CAME UP WITH THE INITIATIVE TO OPEN RESEARCH-TYPE UNIVERSITIES THERE. WE ARE FINALIZING SUCH INITIATIVES THROUGH LEGISLATION WHICH WILL MAKE IT POSSIBLE TO USE THE FREED-UP POTENTIAL OF RESEARCH FACILITIES MOST EFFICIENTLY, WHILE AT THE SAME TIME CREATING NEW CENTERS FOR THE TRAINING OF HIGHLY SKILLED CADRES. WE WILL ALSO HAVE "RUSSIAN PRINCETONS|" A GOVERNMENT DECISION ON ESTABLISHING A UNIVERSITY AT PUSHCHINO HAS ALREADY BEEN ADOPTED.

((KONOVALOV)) WILL WE FINALLY ABANDON THE PRINCIPLE "A LITTLE BIT TO EACH" AND PROVIDE SPECIAL SUPPORT FOR THOSE WHO ARE TALENTED?

((SALTYKOV)) AS EARLY AS THE BEGINNING OF THIS YEAR WE ANNOUNCED A POLICY OF PRIORITY FUNDING FOR STRONG COMPETITIVE SECTORS. FIGURATIVELY SPEAKING, AT PRESENT WE CAN ONLY AFFORD TO WORK RICH GOLD VEINS WHILE KEEPING POOR "DEPOSITS" IN RESERVE UNTIL BETTER TIMES.

WE SHOULD ADMIT FRANKLY THAT SO FAR WE HAVE NOT BEEN ABLE TO ABANDON THE "POURING" OF STATE FUNDS EVENLY INTO SCIENTIFIC STRUCTURES WHICH HAVE EMERGED OVER DECADES. THE REASONS ARE FOUND NOT ONLY IN THE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM BEING AWKWARD, AND THE MONTHLY FINANCING ARRANGEMENT BEING UNACCEPTABLE FOR SCIENCE, BUT ALSO IN THE POWERFUL OPPOSITION OF A CERTAIN SEGMENT OF THE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY TO CUTBACKS IN RESEARCH PROJECTS WHICH ARE NOT PROMISING

BUT CUSTOMARY. UNLESS WE OVERCOME THIS WE WILL NOT PROVIDE THE CONDITIONS FOR FULL-FLEDGED OPERATIONS IN AREAS OF HIGH PRIORITY.

WHILE ACKNOWLEDGING THE EXCESSIVE PROCRASTINATION OF THE AUTHORITIES IN MAKING URGENT DECISIONS, WE SHOULD NOTE THAT A NUMBER OF IMPORTANT STEPS HAVE BEEN TAKEN, AFTER ALL. LET US NOTE IN ALL THIS THAT DESPITE THE PRINCIPLE OF SELECTIVITY WE ARE BUILDING OUR SCIENCE POLICY ON THE BASIS OF STATE SUPPORT FOR SCIENCE AS AN ORGANIC ENTITY WITH ITS CHARACTERISTIC SECTORAL AND REGIONAL STRUCTURES.

IN SUMMATION I WOULD LIKE TO STRESS THE FOLLOWING. THE SITUATION OF OUR SCIENCE DOES NOT APPEAR HOPELESS TO ME. INDEED, THE COMING TWO OR THREE YEARS WILL BE DIFFICULT, PERHAPS VERY DIFFICULT. HOWEVER, THE INTELLECTUAL POTENTIAL OF RUSSIA IS QUITE GREAT; THE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY AND THE INTELLIGENTSIA STILL ENJOY GREAT AUTHORITY IN OUR SOCIETY. AT PRESENT THE GOVERNMENT CANNOT CONCEIVE OF CHOOSING A PATH FOR ADJUSTING THE REFORM WITHOUT GETTING ADVICE FROM SCIENTISTS, INSTRUCTORS, AND DEANS OF INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING, THE ENTIRE INTELLIGENTSIA OF RUSSIA, AND WITHOUT PROCEEDING FROM THEIR VIEWS. WE WILL ONLY BE ABLE TO FIND WISE SOLUTIONS TOGETHER.

ADMIN

(ENDALL) VM/COLLIER 01/1415Z DEC

BT

#7526

RTTUZYUW RUCWAAA7526 3362045 0081-UUUU NNNN

Saltykov Interviewed on Science Funding Efforts

927A0192A Moscow IZVESTIYA (Morning edition) in Russian 1 Jun 92 p 2

[Interview with Minister of Science, the Higher School, and Technical Policy of Russia Boris Georgiyevich Saltykov by IZVESTIYA science commentator Boris Konovalov; date and place not given: "There Will Be Money for Science, But There Will Not Be Enough for Everyone"—first paragraph is IZVESTIYA introduction]

[Text] The deplorable state of the financing of our science, the possible loss of the still potent scientific potential of Russia, and the increase of the "brain drain" abroad are causing anxiety. IZVESTIYA's science commentator asked Minister of Science, the Higher School, and Technical Policy of Russia Boris Georgiyevich Saltykov to tell what way our of the forming situation the government sees.

[Saltykov] Most likely not everyone knows that in practice two-thirds of the state allocations until 1985 were spent on military scientific and experimental design work. Now we have begun the demilitarization of the country, but the structure of science by its nature is conservative and inert, it is changed with enormous difficulty. And the main thing is that the consciousness of scientists, whom for decades they accustomed to the fact that the state provides the money for everything, is being reformed very slowly. Now titled petitioners are coming to me in masses: There is an excellent development—give the money for implementation. When you begin to ascertain what kind of development it is, it turns out that it is a new model of a tractor or, for example, a machine tool. But pardon me—what does the state have to do with it? Why should the state support at the expense of taxpayers one of the competing designs? If you have struck a technical "vein of gold," go to a bank, get together a financial group for its development, develop your own advanced, competitive product, and derive a profit.

By large account the state should finance mainly basic science, which everyone needs and on the basis of which technical applications grow.

[Konovalov] But, unfortunately, today basic science is also destitute, many institutes are now on the verge of bankruptcy. Scientists are not miners, not medical personnel, and not teachers, their strikes will not affect the everyday interests of the population. Therefore, they actually can count only on the intellect and common sense of the government....

[Saltykov] We understand this, and the government is taking steps on the strength of its possibilities. During just the first quarter of this year, while not yet having long-term allocations, we financed about 400 projects of basic and VUZ science.

Now in conformity with the ukase of the president the Russian Basic Research Fund has been formed. Vice President of the RAS [the Russian Academy of Sciences] A.A. Gonchar became its organizing director. But we do not regard this fund as an academic fund. Its goal is not to finance the "signboards" of institutes, but to distribute on the basis of independent expert evaluations grants to scientists of any departmental affiliation. This will be a state, but self-administered organization that carries out the selection of programs and projects on a competitive basis.

The reorganization of state scientific and technical programs of the former USSR and Russia is now under way. We should specify the priorities more clearly and update them in conformity with the requirements of today and, what is the main thing, the future. We should reject the former doctrine of competition with the entire world along the entire front of scientific research. We need more thorough integration with the world community. It is pointless to invest money in the directions, in which we have fallen hopelessly behind.

Abroad immediately after appointment I have actively sought sources of the financing of our basic science. This is first of all "explanatory work" among my colleagues—executives of science in the wealthy countries of the West. I have been showing that now it is wise to help Russian science, if they think not about their own petty advantage, by reinforcing several of their universities by enticing our specialists, but as a whole about world science. Our scientific schools belong not only to Russia, but also to the entire world, as does, for example, Tolstoy or Dostoyevskiy—this is not only Russian property, but also the property of all mankind.

In the West, it seems, they are beginning to understand the importance of preserving the intellectual potential of Russia for the progress of civilization on the entire planet. Recently French President Mitterrand came forth with the initiative to establish a fund of the developed countries for the support of basic research in Russia during this difficult time for us. Many small funds of the West, including private ones, are also prepared to help us.

There will not be enough assets, of course, for everyone. It is necessary first of all to help the most intelligent, talented people, and not to hand out "to all the sisters a pair of earrings each." This, incidentally, will also be more fair. Let us face it, in our science there are not only many talented people, but also much ignorance and mediocrity. Why support the existence of this part of science?

[Konovalov] And what strategy has been selected for the financing of sectorial, applied science? Here, after all, the situation is also being aggravated by the fact that the process of the "sovereignization" of experimental and pilot works, which under the conditions of a "barren" market can live better alone than in a complex with scientific institutions, has begun.

[Saltykov] Technological research funds of ministries, departments, state concerns, and corporations are now being set up for the support of sectorial science, without which, of course, scientific and technical progress is impossible. There should be deducted for these funds 1.5 percent of the product cost of all state enterprises. From each holder of these funds our ministry will take 25 percent for the financing of intersectorial development. If this is not done, it may "hang in the air," in spite of its particular importance for the state.

As for experimental and pilot works, now by the Ukase of the president of Russia the possibility of their separation from scientific institutes and associations has been checked.

Of course, all these steps are of an administrative nature, these are "crutches" for the sick organism of the old system. It is necessary to use economic methods which have a

self-adjusting capability. Of course, the future of the sectorial scientific institutions, which will be unable to survive under the new conditions, is ruin or merging into industrial and commercial structures, in which they should exist as intrafirm science. But today enterprises do not have the money for this, they have been forced in general to abandon scientific and technical progress. Thus, in order not to destroy science, it is necessary today to preserve it for tomorrow, even if by administrative measures.

Although timidly, the use of economic levers of management is also beginning. Thus, all scientific research and experimental design operations, of which the state budget serves as the primary source of financing, regardless of through what "chain" they pass, are already exempt from the value-added tax. We are preparing a decree so that experimental and pilot works, if they separate from institutes, would be assessed taxes as purely industrial enterprises, while if they stay, they would receive privileges. We are striving to see to it that all institutes, which change over to the self-financing of research, as well as commercial structures, which invest assets in scientific and technical progress, would enjoy preferential taxation.

[Konovalov] What is to be done with the giants of sectorial science, like the Central Aerohydrodynamics Institute? After all, their research, although it is applied research, in essence is of a basic nature. Commercial structures will hardly help such giants....

[Saltykov] Of course. It is planned to turn them into National Scientific and Science and Technology Centers. There will be a few of them—approximately 20-25. They will be financed by a separate line in the state budget. The first such center has already been established—the Institute of Atomic Energy imeni I.V. Kurchatov, others are next.

But in sectorial science, in addition to them, there are a large number of institutes with 500-600 associates—large ones by western standards, which often openly engaged in the borrowing and adaptation to our conditions of foreign technologies. The state is no longer capable of maintaining such institutes.

It is necessary today to tell the truth, that for our generally poor country we had science, which was too large and very heterogeneous in efficiency. Yes, owing to the heroic efforts of our scientists, engineers, and workers, who worked for a starvation, by western standards, wage, we obtained a large number of outstanding achievements and a good level in many directions. But in far from all directions. And today we can no longer invest assets in the "black hole" of weak directions only on the grounds that abroad they are also working here and we should not fall behind. Today there will not be enough money for everyone. Therefore, it is necessary to support the most intelligent and best people in their field. Earlier they appealed endlessly for the combating of mediocrity in science, now it is necessary to begin it. We can no longer allow ourselves the luxury of supporting science, as Mikhail Bulgakov said, of "second freshness."

Saltykov Interviewed on Science Funding Problems

927A0094A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
9 Jan 92 p 2

[Interview with Russian Minister Boris Georgiyevich Saltykov by IZVESTIYA correspondent Yevgeniya Manucharova; date and place not given: "Boris Saltykov: It Is Advantageous To Be Free. The Russian Minister Answers Questions on Business in Science"—first two paragraphs are IZVESTIYA introduction

[Text] "If you cannot give money, give us freedom. And do not interfere." This is the usual demand of energetic people to governments. We will also act precisely this way: There is no money in the budget, but the intention of the government to give scientists freedom is firm. In many respect the "concept of the rescue of science," about which you are asking, is based on this, Russian Minister Boris Georgiyevich Saltykov said.

Freedom in the understanding of Saltykov, a convinced "market advocate" (not without reason after the Moscow Physical Technical Institute did he go through the school of our most prominent economists at the Central Institute of Economics and Mathematics), presumes the freedom of actions of not only those who need money, but also those who can finance science.

[Saltykov] I will make every effort so that the enterprises and funds, which will finance science, would have preferential taxation. Domestic commercial structures (a large amount of paper money has been amassed there) and foreign sponsors can be among them. I am trying to conduct the most vigorous propaganda among all potential investors, but, I must admit, for the present there are few who want to: Scientific development (especially basic research) does not promise a rapid return on money. And still both Europe and the United States are proposing to give our scientists aid.

Perhaps, the Debt Forgiveness Project is most practicable and interesting. It is proposed that we repay the United States not the entire amount of credit that is granted to us. They will knock off from it for us such a sum as we spend in ruble equivalent on the development of basic science. As if we would be spending the money in the interests of the Americans themselves. And in essence this is also true: All mankind needs the results of such research.

But this is in the future. While now common grants with Americans—sums for specific special-purpose research—are saving us. They have been allocated by the U.S. National Science Foundation.

[Manucharova] Is Russia not forming its own basic science fund?

[Saltykov] It will exist. But a small one. Initially it will be difficult to organize the distribution of these assets—for an adjusted system of examination, a skilled staff, and experience do not yet exist. Now only a data bank on specialists, who can become independent experts, is being developed.

[Manucharova] Grants, just as other foreign benefits, rarely fall to the lot of young scientists. How is one to rejuvenate our science and to slow the process of the brain drain?

[Saltykov] The aging of science is an objective process. Scientists do not share their laboratories with their students and remain (willing or not!) monopolists in their themes. The hidden economic motive of academic monopolism lies in this.

But with the introduction of normal market relations in scientific structures much will change. People, who are capable of setting up innovation firms, are now also engaged in this. And this will not be any tragedy for science. Some commercial firms are operating very successfully. (They are developing new tools, including medical instruments, and equipment.) People with organizing skill are going there.

But at scientific research institutes there are also people of another type. Science itself is their goal and joy. Even with today's impoverishment they are not seeking commercial success. Although the influx to scientific research institutes of young people of this type is now small. And the objective demand for them has now decreased.

[Manucharova] Thus, are we easily letting talented people go beyond the cordon?

[Saltykov] We are. And it cannot be otherwise. The "drain" is not yet the greatest misfortune. In the present urgent situation it (at least somehow!) is still making it possible to preserve the intellectual potential of the nation. Better for them to be there than nowhere. But we are trying to find various (including commercial) means of interesting people in work in the homeland. If you know of any other opportunities, let me know. We are open to new ideas. And we know: They originate not in ministerial corridors.

[Manucharova] Can the powerful scientific complex, which is busy with truly new scientific ideas, operate without budget supply?

[Saltykov] They are actually operating in all countries.... And they will in ours. The Central Aerohydrodynamics Institute imeni N.Ye. Zhukovskiy intends to be an independent structure. Of course, a certain courage is needed to make up one's mind. After all, only once in five to seven years does there appear in research complexes such an intellectual product, in which it is profitable to deal. That is why large research centers, if the state does not maintain them, exist not due to their main product, but due to the fact that they produce at the same time mass-produced items. The Central Aerohydrodynamics Institute imeni N.Ye. Zhukovskiy, for example, has the opportunity to use its unique experimental equipment for commercial services.

[Manucharova] Small science business has now blossomed in our country. What incidental jobs do they have? For they simply deal in new technologies and ideas. Are they their own?

[Saltykov] No, for the present it is beyond their power to develop a new intellectual product. Small innovation firms for the present are intermediaries. They are also becoming rich on that. But they are useful. After all, usually (during the distant times of stagnation) the periods of the introduction of scientific developments were dragged out for 10-12 years. While a year, half a year, or else five months are sufficient for the new firms. They act promptly on the buying up of components and on the enlistment of the needed specific people and conclude profitable contracts namely with them. The next stage is the switch to the open buying up of advanced technologies. And it has already begun. Now it is possible to shut one's eyes to the stealing of state intellectual property. For it will remain on our territory.

[Manucharova] Again the state is out a pretty penny. And it still does not have laws on the protection of intellectual property....

[Saltykov] The laws will begin to work. But still it is not a matter of protective measures. A different system of the organization of large communities of scientists is needed—only they can both generate new ideas and develop such an intellectual product, which will sell on the world market. But they should not count forever on intermediary firms. Such a thing does not exist in the world. And they should not count on sponsors—large industrialists. Wealthy firms rarely conclude contracts with any research collective, thereby giving it means of subsistence. They have their own in-house laboratories for this.

[Manucharova] Did you come to give science free rein? And higher education as well? Can the educational institution itself formulate programs of instruction?

[Saltykov] It can. But some standard of the demands on specialists is needed. Given the opportunity to carry out freely teaching in accordance with various (at times very dissimilar) programs and courses it is important to maintain a high level. For the present it is too early to abolish state certification of courses and instructors (I did not use a very apt verb, but the idea, I think, is clear). And it is too early for the present to abolish the idea of the Higher Certification Commission. We pay for the labor of professors from the state budget and should be certain that they deserve that. Therefore, a certificate, which testifies to one's skill, is also necessary. But it is necessary, of course, to improve the Higher Certification Commission.

[Manucharova] Once again control over the controller! But will there really not be independent scientific institutions?

[Saltykov] The more of them there will be, the better. Soon Moscow State University will become an independent university. Although not fully.... It is autonomous. But still a state university. The approval of the person of the rector will go through several stages. The scientific council will elect him, the board of trustees will consider the candidate, while the government will finally approve him. This is normal. The state pays the money and should be certain that a worthy scientist directs the university. The level of the rector and the level of the charter—this is what determines the life of the modern university.

[Manucharova] Thus, Moscow State University will live like the Academy of Sciences. They have given it, it would seem, independence. However, they did not keep it on a money leash—on financing. A final question: Will Russia shut itself up in its own scientific programs or will it do business with the sovereign neighbors?

[Saltykov] Academician Paton, president of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukraine, was the first, perhaps, to understand the necessity of our cooperation and took steps against the narrowing of the front of scientific work. He turned to us with the idea of continuing the joint program on the development of new materials (he is the leader in this area). Russia, like any civilized state, is not setting limits for its science.

Saltykov on Science, Market Economy

917A0020A Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 90 pp 25-33—FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

[Article by Candidate of Economic Sciences Boris Saltykov, head of a department of the Institute of Economics and Forecasting of Scientific and Technical Progress of the USSR Academy of Sciences, under the rubric "Scientific and Technical Progress": "Science and the Market. A Compatibility Check"]

[Text] The crisis of society, to which the many years of domination of the administrative command system led, turned out to be total—all its social institutions, including science, education, and culture, stopped developing and in some way also became degraded.

The labor-intensive, inefficient type of "production," which is based on the use of relatively cheap, often unskilled personnel, was always characteristic of our science. The shortage of means of the automation of research was traditionally compensated for by the attraction of additional personnel, including creative personnel. Here, in spite of the wavelike type of development, which is natural for science, and the "fading away" of individual directions, we were devoted to the social dogma of the need to maintain the entire manpower potential that had been accumulated in research structures.

Domestic science was developed in conformity with a reproduction model of the extensive type, when the dynamics of the development of new directions could be maintained only by large (six-eight percent and more a year) increases of the number of scientific personnel. Motivations and stimuli for an appreciable outflow from science of middle-aged personnel (30-45), who had not found themselves in creative activity, were lacking. In the United States, for example, a considerable share of such people leave for business, freeing up room for young scientists. In our country the rate of the natural replacement (rotation) of personnel depended almost entirely on the rate of retirement. This peculiarity of the reproduction mechanism played a fatal role in the last 10-15 years, when the growth rate of personnel decreased to one and a half-two percent percent a year. As a result, the development of many new directions became impossible—there were not enough young talented scientists. Such a situation in science also signified stagnation in the literal sense of the word.

Glasnost spilled onto the pages of newspapers and journals with thousands of opinions, appraisals, and suggestions on the reorganization of science, which were not screened by bureaucrats. The introduction of the statute on the electivity of directors of scientific research institutes was its first conquest, but today this principle no longer seems to be an unequivocal attribute of democracy. The guarantee of the real freedom of choice by the scientist of the direction of his research, that is, the choice of an organization or fund (including foreign ones), which could finance his theme, is more important. Moreover, it is necessary to provide a portion of the scientists with economic conditions of work also "without a director."

The concept of the radical reorganization of science seemed most simple—freedom, democracy, a market. Some people, it is true, called simply for "order," but among scientists such people were an obvious minority.

Glasnost, while undoubtedly having broadened the framework of political and intellectual freedoms, in itself was unable to ensure economic democracy in science. Decisions are needed here. Three documents: "The Law on the State Enterprise," the decree of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers "On the Changeover of Science to Cost Accounting and Self-Financing," and "The Law on Cooperation in the USSR," became the starting points on the road to the formation of a new character of our science. Without discussing the details of these acts, let us point out the fundamentally new things that were introduced by them in the mechanism of the functioning of science.

First, the principle of self-organization was implemented to a certain degree—scientists and engineers now have the opportunity to set up on their own initiative scientific and technical cooperatives, temporary creative collectives, associations, unions, and so forth.

Second, there was removed from state control the mechanism of the formation of the price for the scientific and technical product. The latter became a subject of the contract between the client and the performer.

Third, the overall control on the part of departments over the network of existing scientific organizations was reduced (but thus far has not been completely lifted). A portion of the powers of administrative organs were passed "down"—to head scientific research institutes or councils, which are responsible for the formulation of programs.

Finally, practically all the restrictions on the amount of the individual wage (more precisely, income) in the sphere of research and design activity were removed, including by the repeal of the majority of bans on the holding of more than one job.

The consequences of these decisions were significant and ambiguous.

The new extradepartmental sector of science appeared and is continuing to grow rapidly. By early 1990 more than 320,000 people, who performed in 1989 work and services worth more than 3 billion rubles, worked in scientific and technical cooperatives. Temporary creative collectives, which worked under the aegis of centers of the scientific and technical creativity of youth, during the same period completed work worth approximately 1 billion rubles. The total amount of work, which was paid for by clients, of the new sector (with allowance made for scientific and technical societies and cost accounting centers) came to approximately 5 billion rubles.

Of course, the payment for intermediary services, which are usually regarded as speculation, made up a significant part of this amount. However, it is impossible not to admit that in many respects owing to the "resale" of computers by cooperatives and joint ventures a real market of these machines and, in part, software appeared in the USSR for the first time. In some one and one half-two years hundreds of thousands of personal computers were brought into the country. As a result, we succeeded in catching hold of the step of the train rushing by us into the information society. If today many young scientists, designers, managers, and even undergraduates cannot imagine work without a "PC," this, alas, is not owing to the state computerization program.

Small mobile structures of the extradepartmental sector quickly filled those "niches" of scientific and technical, engineering, and intermediary activity, for which the state had not time. In the sphere of research and development (NIOKR) features of competition appeared, the prices for many types of jobs and services, which are offered by collectives of the extradepartmental sector, are less than those of state organizations, while the time of their completion is several fold less. There has decreased appreciably in the last year the amount of the "commission" (from 40 to 15 percent), which cost accounting collectives charge for the rendering of services—this market is getting tight.

Dramatic changes occurred in the dynamics of the remuneration of the labor of personnel of the sphere of research and development, moreover, not only in its cooperative sector. For the first time in many decades the growth rate of the wage in science and scientific service was the highest among the sectors of the national economy and industry, having come in 1989 to about 40 percent! Whereas prior to 1986 jokes about the level of income of scientific personnel and engineers were a commonplace of variety reprises, today another question has begun to worry many people: For what are they receiving such money?

Of course, it is possible to understand why people with a higher education, who knew how to do nearly the same thing that their foreign colleagues do, but in contrast to the latter for long years were in a humiliating material position, suddenly rushed to earn money (a year ago the wage of a doctor of sciences in our country came to 400-500 rubles, while in the United States similar specialists earn in a month $4,000-5,000, while at prestigious universities they earn one and one half-to-two fold more). It is possible to understand, but it is impossible to recognize the present situation in science as normal, for the laws of the wild steppe frontier—everyone takes as much as he can "make off with"—prevail in it.

The reason, in our opinion, is that, having begun to move toward a market, without having prepared the conditions for the emergence of a demand for efficient innovations, without having passed a whole set of laws, which regulate the interrelations of the subjects of scientific and technical activity, and without having demolished the monopoly structures in science and the economy, we allowed to be done what was not prohibited. But it turned out that today in our country nothing is prohibited!

It is appropriate to recall an incident which, they say, happened to P. Kapitsa during his stay in England. One of the firms brought him in as a consultant to help start up a steam turbine. P. Kapitsa after careful examination of the machine asked for a sledge hammer and hit a spot known only to him. The rotor began to turn. He specified his fee as 1,000 pounds. The clients were astounded: "A thousand pounds for one blow with a sledge hammer?" "For the blow—one pound, and 999 to find out where to hit," the future academician replied.

Unfortunately, today we often pay not to find out something new, but for blows with a sledge hammer. By the piece it is 1,000 for each blow. Indeed, many scientific research institutes and design organizations are selling standardized methods and other stand materials at a price of tens of thousands of rubles, while just yesterday they went for a ruble each.

When introducing elements of a market economy, we often did not take into account the specific nature of scientific and technical activity. First, the information nature of its results makes it possible to duplicate them practically without additional expenditures—a situation that is absolutely impossible in physical production. Thus, with the introduction of commodity-money relations in the scientific and technical sphere chances for deriving superprofits are appearing. Second, due to the unique nature of the jobs and the high degree of uncertainty and risk in science it is possible to "calculate" formally any production cost. Indeed, in the last two years ministries and departments have changed on four occasions the methods of monitoring the wage fund at scientific research institutes, tying it now to the profitability, now to the growth rates of the amount of work, now to more ingenious indicators. Everything is futile, for if a free contractual price is introduced, only the lack of assets of the clients of scientific research institutes and design bureaus—enterprises and the state—could stop the increase of their revenues. But precisely this time an enormous amount of money not backed by goods had accumulated in the development funds of enterprises, therefore, they were willing to pay any price for jobs that if only in some way were useful to them. The sharp increase of the amounts of research and developed during 1988-1989 in many respects is explained precisely by the increase of prices. At the same time the state budget during 1988-1989 also "threw" hundreds of millions of rubles into the academic and higher educational institution [VUZ] sectors.

In itself this step was correct, but the second step was not taken—the inefficient mechanism of distributing these assets was not changed. The existence in the structure of science of a large number of monopolies, or, in other

words, the obvious inadequacy of the number of competing producers of scientific and technical products, is, undoubtedly, the basis of the latter.

The administrative system, which was based on the leitmotif of power relations between the subjects of the national economy and the centralized distribution of resources, created ideal conditions for the origination and long-term preservation of monopolies.

Departmentalism, in case of which the sphere of research and development was divided among a small number of supermonopolies with a closed reproduction cycle (that is, with their own systems of the training of scientific and engineering personnel, material and technical supply, capital construction, and so on), was the main structure-forming factor of our science (as, incidentally, of the economy as well). Here the large monopolist scientific research institute, which was closely connected with its ministry (department) and in practice did not depend either on consumers or on the remaining scientific community, was the most typical subject of scientific and technical activity.

Monopolism in science is holding its ground owing to the officially secured right of any scientific school to engage in the development of a specific scientific direction (method of research). Such a monopoly, being, as a rule, based from the start on the actual authority of the leader of the school, was legitimized by means of the institution of "head" scientific institutions, which were given the right to coordinate the activity of the collectives working in this field.

In practice such a scientific research institute has a large number of rights: the selection of themes for inclusion in the plan and their priority financing; the purposive formation of scientific successors through graduate studies, the establishment of base chairs, the development of textbooks; the subjective evaluation of the results of its own and others' works through academic, scientific, and expert councils that are controlled by it. Through the press organ of the head institute, of which, as a rule, its director is the editor in chief, the purposive regulation of the flow of publications takes place. Moreover, the scientific monopoly often has priority access to not only departmental, but also statewide scientific publishing houses. Finally, the last, but by no means unimportant factor of the maintenance of the monopoly is control over international relations in the sphere of its interests.

Thus, the monopoly of the scientific (or design) school, while emerging as a purely "technological" monopoly, on the basis of the possession of new knowledge, in the administrative system degenerates into a legal monopoly. Under the conditions of democracy and a market economy technological monopolies collapse relatively quickly in connection with the development of new directions. In a command economy the time of existence of monopolies owing to vigorous legal support on the part of the system is often determined by the maximum age of its leader.

By checking the timely development of alternative means of scientific and technical research, monopolism gives rise to colossal losses, which are connected with "insufficiently obtained" new knowledge in science and a enormous missed profit in the economy. Economic subjects in such a system are deprived of the right to choose the most effective economic solutions and are forced to use only the technologies and products, which monopoly producers make available to it.

Of course, it is impossible not to acknowledge that owing to the reform in the last two years in many fields of research and development the intensity of the labor of scientists and engineers increased, the density of the utilization of working time rose, and the possibilities of the choice of directions and types of activity and, as a result, the possibilities of self-realization broadened. Owing to the sharp increase of the wage in science the appeal of a purely administrative career decreased, although at the same time the formal status characteristics of personnel were devalued. For example, today an associate of a sectorial scientific research institute, who, by taking advantage of market conditions, duplicates simple articles, can easily exceed the wage of a director of an academic institute (600 rubles a month).

However, unfortunately, the real changes in the structure of scientific and technical activity do not corresponding to the scale of the "financial revolution" that is taking place in science. The main reason is that, in spite of the liberalization of the command system, thus far it has not been possible to change radically the reproduction mechanisms of our science. The distribution of assets of the state budget for research and development for the most part, as before, takes place through the old hierarchical structures, the introduction of basic research programs at the USSR Academy of Sciences merely strengthened the monopoly position of the corresponding head institutes. The "easy" money of clients prevented the selection of the most efficient research groups and enabled scientific research institutes to keep all the associates, including the "ballast." The "ritual" financing of obsolete and dead-end directions together with their honored leaders continued.

The fact that the system of labor relations and hiring has not been changed, is also contributing to the retention of "ballast." We continue to talk about the necessity of the sharp intensification of labor, by counting on material stimuli, but forget here that the existence of a labor market is the main characteristic of an efficient economy.

It is possible to define the formula of labor activity in the administrative command system with one phrase: It is disadvantageous to work well here, but it is possible to work poorly with impunity. Whereas we have begun little by little to reverse its first part, we have not even

gotten started on the reconstruction of the second part. Meanwhile it is impossible to carry out perestroyka in our science in such a way that no one would suffer. The radical modernization of the structure of the front of scientific research, the cutting back of old directions, and the initiation of work in the most advanced directions are of prime importance for the increase of its efficiency. But this maneuver should inevitably lead to unemployment, if only structural unemployment. Even in the very mobile U.S. economy in 1986 of the 2.32 million scientists, who made up the overall market of scientific labor, 44,100 (1.9 percent) were counted as unemployed, while about 100,000 (4.3 percent) were forced to work an incomplete workday or where their knowledge and skill were not needed. Thus, the total forced "underutilization" of scientists came to 6.2 percent. In our country the painful processes of the formation of a labor market in the sphere of research and development can be moderated by the transfer of a portion of the scientists and engineers to the sector of consulting, engineering, and intermediary services, which just yesterday was lacking, but is now growing rapidly.

The paradox of the present situation consists in the fact that in large cities regional markets of scientific labor have already appeared, but these are markets of "second employment." We mean the hundreds of thousands of scientists and engineers, who work under contracts and labor agreements with organizations of the extradepartmental sector. Here the labor formula of the command economy has been completely abolished: The client carries out control by the ruble, while the performer answers for a job with his reputation. It is possible to order the work you need from one or several specialists, and not to hire as a "trailer" an entire institute. At the same time a large portion of the performers in this sector are not taking a risk, inasmuch as they have an "armored back"—their basic place of work.

Using the now popular terminology, it is possible to speak about the actual emergence of a "second," or "shadow," science, more precisely, an entire innovation sector. Here what is meant is not the crime-producing nature of the activity of its subjects (here there are by no means more crimes than in any other part of the economy), but its practically complete removal from the sphere of accounting and control of state organs. Owing to the gaping breaches in our legislation today it is possible here to engage legally in the embezzlement of working time, materials, equipment, and, of course, a finished product.

In the USSR national economy a "social contract" between employees and employers with respect to the permitted amounts of stealing of working time always existed. In science this was a means of supplementing by payment in kind the wretched rates, which it was impossible to increase without violating the pale of bans. Everyone was perfectly aware that, by permitting an associate to hold another job during "nonworking" time, the normal director was giving him carte blanche in the planning of the routine of the work week. The system of office and library days was one of the articles of this contract in science.

Today not so much the exceeding of the reasonable amounts of the stealing of working time as double payment for it—by both the state and the free client—has become the most typical violation. The latter is connected with the problem of the ownership of the scientific and technical product.

In so-called pure or basic science the problem of ownership was solved long ago by the scientific community at the ethical (and in part the commercial) level by means of the institution of the copyright. Owing to the "noncommodity nature" of its results anyone can use them freely as general property—it is necessary merely to cite the author.

It is a different matter in the commercial sector of science, where a new result promises its possessor an enormous profit. And when the initiative of a novice entrepreneur bursts into our economy with state (and, hence, nobody's) ownership, only strict regulations of the possession, disposal, and use of intellectual products (including know-how), which are developed with the assets of various subjects of scientific and technical activity, can save us from chaos and robbery.

Today much is being written about the "commercialization" of science, incorporating in this term only a negative meaning. Indeed, the process of the active search by science for additional orders, which is new for us, but is natural, has appeared. Unfortunately, for the present this is connected only with the aspiration to increase the personal wage.

In a free enterprise economy every subject strives to consolidate his position on the market and to find unoccupied "niches." Such a motivation induces him to invest considerable resources in the development of scientific reserves. In our country, on the contrary, when making economic decisions short-range criteria and first of all the maximization of current consumption prevailed; here a larger and larger portion of the resources of our science is being diverted from exploratory work.

In many respects this is explained by the overall political and economic instability, by the inconsistency of the decisions being made by the government, and, in part, by the aspiration of a number of subjects (particularly in the extradepartmental sector) to accumulate primary capital and to acquire economic independence.

Here we are approaching, in my opinion, the key factor that explains the failures of a number of sensible changes in our science. The point is that we attempted to develop a new economic mechanism by means of a single standardized tool that is equally suited for the entire sphere of research and development. However, when Pascal asserted that there is no applied and basic science, but there is only one Science, he had in mind the value of its results. From an economic standpoint there are two

essentially different sectors in it—the nonprofit (conditionally the basic) sector, which works for the good of all of society, and the commercial sector, the subjects of which in one way or another are oriented toward the development of a commodity for the market.

These blocks of science have not been assembled into some specialized organizational structures. For example, a purely commercial enterprise can belong to the Academy of Sciences, while a ministry can establish a nonprofit university. With the development of joint-stock forms of ownership the feature of departmental subordination will lose meaning all together.

The boundary between the blocks is determined according to other attributes. In them the criteria of the functioning of the subjects of activity, the labor motivations of personnel, the systems of values, and even the norms of economic behavior are substantially different. Therefore, in spite of the fact that the general concept of perestroyka—freedom, democracy, and a market of competing producers and consumers—remains acceptable for the entire sphere of research and development, the specific methods of the organization, management, and financing of operations for each sector should be different.

Institutes of the nonprofit sector are intended for the generation and dissemination of knowledge in the interests of all of society and, therefore, should mainly be financed at the expense of the state or charitable foundations. This does not mean that they cannot have a profit from the jobs performed under contracts with clients, but they should use it only for the purposes of developing the organization, and not in the name of dividends of the owners or the increase of the incomes of managers.

An "idealistic" type of motivation (the aspiration for the truth) is characteristic of the personnel of this sector—scientists, therefore, here it does not make sense to devise refined systems of stimulation "for the result." In order not to incite them to additional extra earnings and to ensure the sound reproduction of manpower, the wage should be increased by at least twofold and its indexing should be introduced. In relative indicators this would correspond approximately to the status of science in the system of sectors of the national economy in the early 1960's. Here with the appearance of competition and new methods of the financing and development of enterprise the number of scientific personnel in the sector in the next few years could be reduced by 10-15 percent.

Inasmuch as the scientist or the small group is the main character in basic science, the effectiveness of the use of resources depends to an enormous degree on the methods of financing.

The system of the distribution of resources cannot be effective (and fair), if the people making the decisions are directly interested in obtaining them. But the present arrangement of financing—"state—department—institute—scientist"—at nearly every stage errs precisely in the direction of this shortcoming, while the role of the "invisible college" in it has practically been reduced to naught. World experience has shown that the allocation of resources "against a name" is the best method here, therefore, only a community of specialists, who know each other, in a given direction of research regardless of their place of work can make the decision on the financing of a project.

The systems of the financing of science, which are based precisely on the appraisals of colleagues, are well known (for example, the one used by the U.S. National Science Foundation). Several years ago we together with a number of scientists proposed to establish the USSR State Basic Research Fund for the financing of exploratory operations in the form of grants. Today this idea is close to practical implementation. The Ukase of USSR President M.S. Gorbachev of 23 August 1990, "On the Status of the USSR Academy of Sciences," among the other assignments to the USSR Council of Ministers envisages within a month to specify "the procedure and time of the formation of the all-union state-budget basic research fund" and to draft the statute on it. In light of what was said earlier one should ensure the independence and extradepartmental nature of such a fund. Its director should be appointed by the President of the USSR Supreme Soviet, while scientific policy should be formulated by the Council of the fund, which consists of scientists who are recognized in the country and in the world.

The financing of projects by the fund in accordance with the criteria of maximum scientific effectiveness would make it possible to support our highest quality, elite science, which is the basic locomotive of scientific progress.

An active policy, which is aimed at the demonopolization of science, the support of competitive projects, and the encouragement of joint work of VUZ and academic scientists, should also become an important task of the fund.

The development also of other—public and private—charitable foundations, the facilitation of the procedures of the conclusion by our scientists of contracts with foreign centers, as well as the obtaining of subsidies and grants from them—all this will help to create in our basic science self-reproducing antimonopoly mechanisms.

In the commercial sector of science its excessive monopolization is also the basic obstacle for the increase of quality, the decrease of prices, and the shortening of the time of development. It is necessary for the state not to fight, but to stimulate the formation of information, consulting, and other intermediary structures, which create a culture medium for the development of competition.

In contrast to "pure" science the entrepreneurial motivation of the personnel of this sector and the aspiration to establish their own business are the main catalyst of innovation activity. It is naive to expect the acceleration

of scientific and technical progress, if we, as before, encourage our enthusiast-innovator with a coupon-certificate concerning the fact that he invented something valuable and this valuable thing now belongs to the state. Individual obstinate people (like S. Fedorov), who, after all, are succeeding in becoming genuine Soviet entrepreneurs, for the present, unfortunately, do not affect the matter.

In favor of the fact that it is possible to treat inventors differently, let us cite just one textbook example. In the 1970's two Americans S. Jobs and S. Woznial developed in a home garage the first personal computer and in 1977 founded Apple Computer, the revenue of which in 1982 already came to $600 million. In the United States, according to some estimates, in the middle of the 1980's more than 70,000 scientific and technical firms, of which several tens of thousands were small venture firms, appeared annually. These venture firms, a large portion of which will be ruined in the first five years, nevertheless play the indispensable role of scouts and testers of new commodities and technologies. For their support vast venture capital, the annual increases of which now exceed $4 billion, has been accumulated in the United States. The small-scale innovation business is a fundamental supplement to the network of major corporations and together with them ensures a high rate of replacement of equipment and technology.

If we have decided to convert to an economy of equal and free entrepreneurs, we will have to give up many ideological dogmas and stereotypes. One must not frighten the people with Soviet millionaires—not the fact that they have appeared, but the fact that they, as before, have nothing to use their money for, is frightening. Many scientific and technical cooperatives and cost accounting centers could already tomorrow invest assets in the development and output of science-intensive products. This is one of the most mobile, skilled sectors of our economy, which are ready to enter the market. However, legal guarantees of innovative, including private, enterprise and, of course, large-scale financial assistance are needed to put it into operation.

It is well known that an overwhelming portion of our innovation potential is concentrated in the sectorial and first of all the defense sector of science. The methods of its perestroyka are the theme of a special discussion, but it seems important to us to stress the following. One must not limit its perestroyka to the transition to the tax regulation of existing ministerial scientific complexes. New sectorial structures, yet not power structures, but financial and economic structures: innovation funds and banks, analytical forecasting and information centers, and so forth, should emerge in place of ministries. The scientific and technical organizations of today's ministries are called upon to become independent subjects of our national economy—state, joint-stock, and leasing subjects, while a portion of them are also called upon to become joint subjects with foreign firms. There cannot be a general formula here.

Today everything has intermingled in the crowded temple of our science—both the true priests and the artisan merchants. Let us take them to their homes and return science to the scientist and business to the entrepreneur. Both are important for our well-being, if only each would do his own work professionally.

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet
(George Bush Library)

Document No. and Type	Subject/Title of Document	Date	Restriction	Class.
04. Report	Russia's Political Situation (1 pp.)		(b)(1)	

Collection:

Record Group: Bush Presidential Records
Office: Science and Technology Policy, Office of (OSTP)
Series: O'Neil, John F., Files
Subseries: Russia Subject Files
WHORM Cat.:
File Location: 3rd Joint Council Meeting, Basic Sciences Agreement [Dec 15-16, 1992] [1 of 3]

Date Closed:	5/26/2010	**OA/ID Number:**	62093-011
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.
05. Report	Economic Trends in Russia (3 pp.)		(b)(1)	

Collection:

Record Group: Bush Presidential Records
Office: Science and Technology Policy, Office of (OSTP)
Series: O'Neil, John F., Files
Subseries: Russia Subject Files
WHORM Cat.:
File Location: 3rd Joint Council Meeting, Basic Sciences Agreement [Dec 15-16, 1992] [1 of 3]

Date Closed:	5/26/2010	**OA/ID Number:**	62093-011
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.
06. Report	Russian S&T Developments (2 pp.)		(b)(1)	

Collection:

Record Group: Bush Presidential Records
Office: Science and Technology Policy, Office of (OSTP)
Series: O'Neil, John F., Files
Subseries: Russia Subject Files
WHORM Cat.:
File Location: 3rd Joint Council Meeting, Basic Sciences Agreement [Dec 15-16, 1992] [1 of 3]

Date Closed:	5/26/2010	**OA/ID Number:**	62093-011
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