



G A O

Accountability * Integrity * Reliability

United States General Accounting Office
Washington, DC 20548

June 4, 2001

The Honorable Christopher S. Bond
Chairman
The Honorable John F. Kerry
Ranking Member
Committee on Small Business
United States Senate

The Honorable Sherwood L. Boehlert
Chairman
The Honorable Ralph M. Hall
Ranking Minority Member
Committee on Science
House of Representatives

Subject: Federal Research and Development: Contributions to and Results of the Small Business Technology Transfer Program

Research and development (R&D) are major factors in the growth and progress of industry and the national economy. However, basic research performed by the nation's research institutions—universities and colleges, federal laboratories, and nonprofit research centers—may not be translated into marketable technologies. Small businesses have a well-earned reputation for bringing new ideas to the marketplace but often lack the resources to carry out extensive R&D. In an effort to join the ideas and resources of the research institutions with the commercialization experience of small businesses, the Congress authorized the Small Business Technology Transfer (STTR) Pilot Program in 1992 and reauthorized it in fiscal year 1997. The STTR program is scheduled to expire in September 2001.

Five agencies participate in the program, including the departments of Defense and Energy, and Health and Human Services' National Institutes of Health, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the National Science Foundation. Each agency manages its own program, while the Small Business Administration plays a central administrative role, issuing policy directives and annual reports for the program. The 1992 act authorizes each agency having an external R&D budget in

excess of \$1 billion annually to set aside not less than 0.15 percent of that budget for the Program. Since the first grants became available in 1994, the STTR program has awarded approximately \$300 million to small businesses and research institutions to foster R&D.

The 1992 act established a three-phase structure for the STTR program. The first phase, not to exceed 1 year, is designed to determine the scientific, technical, and commercial merit and feasibility of a proposed idea. Upon successful completion of phase I, the second phase, not to exceed 2 years, is designed to further develop the idea. The statute established \$100,000 and \$500,000 as the general funding limits for phases I and II, respectively. The third phase, in general, is expected to result in commercialization or further continuation of R&D. However, no STTR funding is allowed for phase III. Additional developmental funding for phase III can include private-sector funds and federal, non-STTR funds.

The STTR Program is closely modeled on the Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) Program, which was established in 1982. The two programs share the same goals and other basic features, including participation by many of the same agencies, the use of a percentage of the external budget for funding, and a three-phase approach. The key difference is that under the STTR program, a small business must partner with a nonprofit research institution. While this partnership is permitted under the SBIR program, it is not mandatory. This special STTR requirement reflects the fact that STTR was envisioned primarily as a technology transfer program, in which promising concepts originating in the nonprofit research community would move toward commercialization with the assistance of small businesses.

In preparation for the review and potential reauthorization of the STTR program, you asked us to address several issues. As agreed with your offices, we identified participating companies' views on (1) the contributions that the companies and the research institutions made to the R&D, (2) the results of the R&D, and (3) options for the future relationship between the STTR and SBIR programs.

In conducting our work, we surveyed all 166 companies that had received 201 Phase II STTR awards in fiscal years 1995 through 1997, the first 3 years when such awards were made. We chose the earliest recipients because studies by experts on technology development concluded that 5 to 9 years are needed for a company to progress from a concept to a commercial product. Our results are based on responses for 102 projects. See enclosure I for a copy of the questionnaire and the aggregate responses.

The following summarizes our findings:

- ***For the 102 partnerships that we reviewed, the companies reported that both the companies and the research institutions contributed significantly to the R&D.*** For example, the companies believed that both parties contributed significantly to the knowledge and/or expertise essential to the project. Furthermore, they generally believed that both parties contributed significantly in constructing or testing prototypes and in providing special equipment or facilities. However, the companies reported that, in aggregate, the companies played a substantially greater role in originating the key ideas for the

R&D; in their view, they originated or were primarily responsible for originating the key ideas in 72 percent of the projects.

- ***The companies reported a variety of results, including sales of a product, process, or service, the receipt of additional developmental funding, patents granted, and discontinuation of projects.*** As of April 2001, the companies reported about \$132 million in total sales and about \$53 million in additional developmental funding. About two-thirds of the projects with reported sales achieved their first sale in 1999 or 2000 and projected about \$900 million in additional sales by December 31, 2005. The companies also reported receiving 41 patents for the core technologies associated with their projects and the creation of 12 spin-off companies. Twenty-seven projects were discontinued. When asked to identify those factors that had a great role in the decision to discontinue the project, companies most frequently cited insufficient additional funding for further technical development.
- ***The companies reported a preference for maintaining the current separation of the STTR and SBIR programs.*** For 96 percent of the projects in our survey, the companies had also won an award under the SBIR program. In this context we asked them to choose between four options for the future of the STTR program in relation to the SBIR program: (1) preserve its current separation from the SBIR program, (2) subsume it under the SBIR program with a portion of funds reserved for STTR-type partnerships, (3) subsume it under the SBIR program with no funds reserved for STTR-type partnerships, and (4) eliminate it entirely. For approximately 50 percent of their projects, the companies preferred the current separation of the STTR program from the SBIR program. Thirty-three percent favored the second option, 19 percent the third option, and only 1 percent supported the program's elimination.

Scope and Methodology

We surveyed 166 companies that had received 201 Phase II STTR awards in fiscal years 1995 through 1997, the first 3 years when such awards were made. We did not include Phase II recipients from 1998 or later because, in most cases, they have not had sufficient time to demonstrate Phase III activity. We received questionnaire responses for 126 of the 201 projects. However, due to technical difficulties, we were not able to include the results from 24 of the questionnaires that we received. Thus, our results are based on 102 of the 201 projects. We did not survey the research partners of these companies. The questionnaire contained specific questions on the contributions to and results of the R&D for these awards. In addition, it identified companies that had received both STTR and SBIR awards. Participation in both programs enabled companies to choose among various options for the future of the STTR program in relation to the SBIR program. We conducted our review from July 2000 to June 2001 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards.

As arranged with your offices, unless you publicly announce its contents earlier, we plan no further distribution of this letter until 30 days after the date of this letter. At that time, we will send copies to the Honorable John D. Whitmore, Acting Administrator, Small Business Administration, and the heads of the other federal agencies participating in the Small Business Technology Transfer Program. We will also make copies available to others on request. The report will also be available on GAO's home page at <http://www.gao.gov>.

If you have any questions about this letter or need additional information, please call me on (202) 512-3841 or Robin Nazzaro on (202) 512-6246. Key contributors to this report were Dennis Carroll, Vondalee Hunt, and Lynn Musser.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Jim Wells". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Jim Wells
Director, Natural Resources
and Environment

Enclosure

U.S. General Accounting Office

GAO

**Survey of Companies Receiving Small Business
Technology Transfer (STTR) Phase II Awards
Fiscal Years 1995 – 1997**

October 2000

**U.S. General Accounting Office
441 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20548-0001**

Introduction

The Small Business Technology Transfer Program is scheduled to expire in 2001. The Committee on Science, House of Representatives, and the Committee on Small Business, United States Senate, have requested information on this program.

As part of a general review of the program, the U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO), an agency of the U.S. Congress, is conducting a study on the outcomes of STTR Phase II awards.

Your answers to this questionnaire will be combined with those of other companies and reported in summary form. A copy of GAO's final report will be made available to all participants in this survey.

Instructions

Upon completion of this questionnaire, please return it in the enclosed postage-paid envelope. If the envelope is misplaced, return your completed questionnaire to:

Mr. Dennis Carroll
U.S. General Accounting Office
441 G Street, N.W., Room 6K17R
Washington, D.C. 20548-0001

If you have any questions, please contact Dennis Carroll at (202) 512-6950 (email: CARROLLD.RCED@GAO.GOV) or Vondalee Hunt at (202) 512-6754 (email: HUNTV.RCED@GAO.GOV).

Please Read Before Beginning

The label on the front of this questionnaire identifies a specific STTR award and the year of the Phase II award. The questionnaire should be completed for the specific award identified in the label. If you had more than one STTR Phase II award, you may receive other questionnaires. Please complete a separate questionnaire for each award.

Note: If the information on the label is incorrect, please correct it before returning your completed questionnaire.

Section I:

Business-Research Institution Partnership

The STTR Program requires a partnership between a small business and a research institution. The questions in this section explore this partnership. The numbers may not add due to rounding.

Part A: Background Information:

Phase I Award

1. In what year was the company that received this STTR award founded?

Year company founded: Range: 1923 - 1997
Mean: 1985

2. About how many full-time equivalent employees worked for your company at the time your company received this award?

Number of employees at time of award: Range: 1 - 350
Mean: 44.1

3. About how many full-time equivalent employees currently work for your company?

Number of employees now: Range: 0 - 1000
Mean: 70.8

4. At the time you received the Phase I award, had your company previously had any formal working arrangement with the research institution partner? (Please check one.)

- 69.7% No
- 28.3% Yes
- 2.0% Uncertain
- 3 Number missing

5. At the time you received this Phase I award, had any individual(s) from your company previously worked with the specific researcher(s) associated with this award? (Please check one.)

- 46.5% No
- 49.5% Yes
- 4.0% Uncertain
- 3 Number missing

6. Who made the first contact that led to the partnership for this Phase I STTR award? (Please check one.)

- 78.6% Your company contacted the research institution
- 17.4% The research institution contacted your company
- 4.1% Other *Please describe:*
- 4 Number missing

7. Where did the key idea for the R&D that led to the Phase I STTR award originate? (Please check one.)

- 52.0% Your company
- 16.3% The research institution
- 20.4% Both your company and the research institution, with your company primarily responsible
- 3.1% Both your company and the research institution, with the research institution primarily responsible
- 5.1% Both your company and the research institution, with both contributing equally
- 3.1% Other *Please describe:*
- 4 Number missing

8. With respect to intellectual property rights, how fair was the research institution in their Phase I negotiations with your company? (Please check one.)

- 49.0% Very fair
- 41.0% Generally fair
- 2.0% Generally unfair
- 0.0% Very unfair
- 8.0% No basis to judge
- 2 Number missing

9. With respect to business transactions, how fair was the research institution in their Phase I negotiations with your company? (Please check one.)

- 52.0% Very fair
- 36.0% Generally fair
- 3.0% Generally unfair
- 1.0% Very unfair
- 8.0% No basis to judge
- 2 Number missing

10. In the absence of this Phase I STTR award, do you believe your company would have undertaken this project? (Please check one.)

- 6.1% Definitely yes
- 17.4% Probably yes
- 14.3% Uncertain
- 31.6% Probably no
- 30.6% Definitely no
- 4 Number missing

Part B: Phase II Award

11. Where was the Principal Investigator for this project located at the time of the Phase II award? (Please check one.)

- 78.2% Your company
- 10.9% The research institution
- 10.9% Your company and the research institution each had a designated Principal Investigator
- 1 Number missing

12. Which of the following contributions to the project were made by your company? (Please check all that apply.)

- 91.1% Knowledge and/or expertise essential to the project
- 67.3% A key technology or method
- 58.4% Assistance in constructing or testing a prototype
- 43.6% Special equipment or facilities
- 30.7% Manufacturing capability
- 5.9% Other *Please describe:*

13. Which of the following contributions to the project were made by the research institution?
(Please check all that apply.)

- 74.0% Knowledge and/or expertise essential to the project
- 37.0% A key technology
- 42.0% Assistance in constructing or testing a prototype
- 55.0% Special equipment or facilities
- 6.0% Manufacturing capability
- 4.0% Other

14. How effective was your company's partnership with the research institution in achieving the technical objectives of the STTR project?
(Please check one.)

- 51.5% Very effective
- 40.6% Generally effective
- 5.0% Generally ineffective
- 1.0% Very ineffective
- 2.0% No basis to judge
- 1 Number missing

15. Will you continue to collaborate with your research institution partner in any prospective Phase III activity?
(Please check one.)

- 20.4% No
- 38.8% Yes
- 22.5% Uncertain
- 18.4% Not applicable – the project is unlikely to achieve Phase III activity
- 4 Number missing

16. Have other research institutions contacted your company about submitting a proposal with them to the STTR program? (Please check one.)

- 58.6% No ⇒ Skip to Question 18 (page 5).
- 41.4% Yes ⇒ Continue with Question 17.
- 3 Number missing

17. Do you expect to submit an STTR proposal as a result of contact(s) initiated by another research institution? (Please check one.)

- 7.3% No
- 56.1% Yes
- 36.6% Uncertain

Question 17 should have been answered by the 41 respondents who answered 'Yes' to Question 16.

Section II:

Additional Developmental Funding and Sales

This section asks about the overall results from your STTR Phase II award.

Note: Use the following definitions in answering Question 18.

Additional Developmental Funding: Funds from private sector sources, federal sources (including subsequent STTR or SBIR awards), or from your own company used for further development of the core technology associated with this Phase II award.

Sales: Sales of a product, process, or service, to federal or private sector customers resulting from the core technology associated with this Phase II award. A sale also includes the sale of technology or rights, etc.

The numbers in () represent the number of projects that responded to the questions.

18. Has the core technology associated with this Phase II award led to additional developmental funding and/or sales and is further work on this technology underway? (Please check the statement that best describes the status of your project.)

25.3% (25)	<input type="checkbox"/> A. Funding and/or sales have not occurred, are not expected, and this project has been dropped. ⇒ Answer Question 19, then skip to Question 30 (page 11).
2.0% (2)	<input type="checkbox"/> B. Funding and/or sales have occurred, but this project has been dropped. ⇒ Complete all questions in this section.
51.5% (51)	<input type="checkbox"/> C. Funding and/or sales have occurred, and further work is underway. ⇒ Skip to Question 20 (page 7).
18.2% (18)	<input type="checkbox"/> D. Funding and/or sales have not yet occurred but are expected, and further work is underway. ⇒ Skip to Question 22 (page 8).
3.0% (3)	<input type="checkbox"/> E. Phase II is still in progress and no funding or sales have yet occurred. ⇒ Skip to Question 22 (page 8).
3	<input type="checkbox"/> Number Missing

Reminder: Question 19 should be answered only by those individuals who checked the first box (A) or second box (B) for Question 18 on the previous page, indicating that the Phase II award project has been dropped.

19. How much of a role did the following factors play in your company's decision to drop this Phase II award project? (For each factor, please check one box.)

Factors Influencing Decision to Drop Phase II Award Project	No Role	Little Role	Some Role	Moderate Role	Great Role	Number Missing
Project goal was achieved (e.g., a prototype was delivered for federal agency usage)	40.7% (11)	7.4% (2)	14.8% (4)	7.4% (2)	3.7% (1)	7
Market demand was small and company met existing need	18.5% (5)	11.1% (3)	3.7% (1)	11.1% (3)	29.6% (8)	7
Higher level of risk than anticipated reduced the sales potential	14.8% (4)	18.5% (5)	11.1% (3)	18.5% (5)	11.1% (3)	7
Additional funding for further technical development was insufficient	11.1% (3)	0.0% (0)	3.7% (1)	14.8% (4)	40.7% (11)	8
Company shifted priorities to other projects	22.2% (6)	18.5% (5)	7.4% (2)	14.8% (4)	18.5% (5)	5
Principal Investigator left the research institution	59.3% (16)	7.4% (2)	3.7% (1)	3.7% (1)	3.7% (1)	6
Main collaborator left the research institution	66.7% (18)	3.7% (1)	0.0% (0)	3.7% (1)	3.7% (1)	6
Difficulties with the research institution	51.9% (14)	7.4% (2)	3.7% (1)	11.1% (3)	0.0% (0)	7
Other: Please specify:	7.4% (2)	0.0% (0)	3.7% (1)	0.0% (0)	11.1% (3)	21

Reminder: If you checked the first box (A) for Question 18 on the previous page, indicating that no sales have occurred, then you should skip to Question 30 (page 11). If you checked the second box (B) for Question 18, then you should continue with the rest of the questions in this section.

Question 19 should have been answered by the 27 respondents who checked box (A) or box (B) in Question 18.

Questions 20 – 21 should have been answered by the 53 respondents who checked box (B) or box (C) in question 18.

20. How much of a role (if any) has this Phase II award played in achieving the following results? (Check one box for each of the listed results. If one of the results has not yet been achieved, then select “none” for it.)

Results	Role of Project				
	None	Minor	Moderate	Major	Number Missing
Obtaining additional developmental funding	13.2% (7)	9.4% (5)	24.5% (13)	50.9% (27)	1
Achieving sales of a product, process, service, or other sale (e.g., rights to technology)	11.3% (6)	18.9% (10)	20.8% (11)	43.4 (23)	3

21. To date, what additional developmental funding has your company received for the core technology associated with this award? (Enter dollars provided by each of the following sources. If none, enter 0 (zero)).

Source of Funding	Dollars (in millions)
Your own company	\$ 10.0 m
Other private companies	\$ 11.5 m
Your research institution partner(s) for this project	\$.4 m
Other research institution(s)	\$ 2.2 m
Other federal awards (including subsequent STTR or SBIR awards)	\$ 21.9 m
Venture capital institution(s)	\$ 1.5 m
Private investor(s)	\$ 3.9 m
State insitution(s)	\$ 1.6 m
Other <i>Please describe:</i>	\$.1 m
Total amount	\$53.1 m

Questions 22 – 29 should have been answered by the 74 respondents who checked box (B), box (C), box (D), or box (E) in Question 18.

22. What is your estimate of the additional developmental funding required to realize the full sales potential of the core technology associated with this Phase II award?
(Enter dollars. If none, enter 0.)

Additional developmental funding required: Range: \$0 – \$60.0 million
Mean: \$ 2.9 million

23. As a result of the core technology associated with this Phase II award, which of the following describes your company's ongoing discussions with other companies and investors in the United States and foreign countries? (Check all that apply.)

- 46.0% Licensing agreement(s)
- 36.5% Joint venture agreement(s)
- 33.8% Marketing/distribution agreement(s)
- 20.3% Manufacturing agreement(s)
- 13.5% Sale of technology or rights
- 10.8% Sale of partial ownership
- 6.8% Sale of complete ownership
- 25.7% None of the above
- 8.1% Other Please describe:

24. As a result of the core technology associated with this Phase II award, which of the following describes your company's finalized agreements with other companies and investors in the United States and foreign countries? (Check all that apply.)

- 18.9% Licensing agreement(s)
- 5.4% Joint venture agreement(s)
- 17.6% Marketing/distribution agreement(s)
- 5.4% Manufacturing agreement(s)
- 5.4% Sale of technology or rights
- 2.7% Sale of partial ownership
- 5.4% Sale of complete ownership
- 54.1% None of the above
- 6.8% Other Please describe:

25. Has your company and/or licensee had any actual sales of products, processes, services, or other sales from the core technology associated with this Phase II award? (Check all that apply.)

- 55.4% No sales to date⇒Skip to Question 29
- 33.8% Sales of product(s)
- 4.1% Sales of process(es)
- 23.0% Sales of service(s)
- 1.4% Other sales Please describe:

26. For your company and/or your licensee, when did the first sale resulting from the core technology associated with this Phase II award occur?

Year when first sale occurred:

(Question 26 was answered by 29 projects)

Percent/ (frequency)	Year
3.5% (1)	1996
20.7% (6)	1997
10.3% (3)	1998
34.5% (10)	1999
31.0% (9)	2000

27. What are the approximate total sales, for your company and/or your licensee, resulting from the core technology associated with this Phase II award? (Enter dollars. If none, enter 0.)

Sales of product(s), process(es), and/or service(s):	Total dollars from sales:
To Date:	\$ 132.1 million
Expected by December 31, 2001:	\$ 131.6 million
Expected by December 31, 2005:	\$ 900.4 million
Please use this space to provide optional explanation for any of the above numbers.	

28. To date, about what percent of total sales from the core technology associated with this Phase II award has gone to the following customers? (If none, enter 0. Round to whole percents. Percentages should total 100%.)

Number of projects reporting 50% or more of total sales to the following customers:

Customers	Number of Projects
Private sector	13
Department of Defense (DOD)	4
Prime contractors for DOD	5
NASA	1
Other federal agencies	0
State or local government(s)	0
University and/or other non-profit research institution(s)	3
Export markets	3
Other <i>Please specify:</i>	0

Note: Question 28 was answered by 29 projects. One project did not have any total sales of 50% or more to one customer. One project had total sales of 50% to each of two customers (private sector and NASA).

29. Please indicate the status of marketing activities by your company and/or your licensee for the core technology associated with this Phase II award. (For each activity, check one box under status.)

Marketing Activity	Status of Marketing Activity				Number Missing
	Plan to implement this but have not yet started	Currently being implemented	Completed	Have no plans to implement this activity	
Marketing Plan	27.0% (20)	41.9% (31)	16.2% (12)	6.8% (5)	6
Hiring Marketing Staff	28.4% (21)	16.2% (12)	16.2% (12)	23.0% (17)	12
Test Marketing	27.0% (20)	27.0% (20)	12.2% (9)	16.2% (12)	13
Advertising/Marketing	27.0% (20)	31.1% (23)	9.5% (7)	14.5% (11)	13

**Section III:
Benefits to Your Company**

This section asks about benefits to your company as a result of this STTR award.

30. About what percentage of your company's growth would you attribute to the STTR program? (Please check one.)

- 50.0% (49) Less than 5%
- 29.6% (29) 5% to 25%
- 13.3% (13) 26% to 50%
- 3.1% (3) 51% to 75%
- 4.1% (4) More than 75%
- 4 Number missing

31. For each of the following factors, please indicate the degree to which your company has benefited from this Phase II award. (For each factor, check one box under degree of benefit.)

Factors	Degree of Benefit						Number Missing
	No Benefit	Little Benefit	Some Benefit	Moderate Benefit	Great Benefit	Not Applicable	
Increased credibility and financial stability of your company	6.0% (6)	13.0% (13)	31.0% (31)	15.0% (15)	33.0% (33)	2.0% (2)	2
Increased retention and/or aided in hiring of personnel	14.1% (14)	14.1% (14)	23.2% (23)	19.2% (19)	25.3% (25)	4.0% (4)	3
Increased staffs' skills	1.0% (1)	7.0% (7)	21.0% (21)	30.0% (30)	41.0% (41)	0.0% (0)	2
Increased your company's development of other products, processes, or services	3.0% (3)	9.9% (10)	19.8% (20)	32.7% (33)	33.7% (34)	1.0% (1)	1
Enabled your company to acquire valuable equipment	31.6% (31)	19.4% (19)	19.4% (19)	12.2% (12)	14.3% (14)	3.1% (3)	4
Led to additional STTR and/or SBIR awards	21.4% (21)	9.2% (9)	23.5% (23)	13.3% (13)	26.5% (26)	6.1% (6.1)	4
Increased or established your company's production capability	31.3% (31)	9.1% (9)	16.2% (16)	13.1% (13)	16.2% (16)	14.1% (14)	3

32. Please give the number of patents, copyrights, and/or invention disclosures for the core technology associated with this Phase II award. Include all patents, copyrights, and invention disclosures generated by your company and by the research institution. (Enter number(s). If none, enter 0.)

TOTAL NUMBER

Invention disclosures:	98
Number patents applied for:	73
Number patents received:	41
Number copyrights applied for:	10
Number copyrights received:	8

33. Which of the following has occurred as a result of the core technology associated with this Phase II award? (Please check one.)

- 0.0% (0) Made an initial public stock offering
- 12.0% (12) Established a spin-off company
- 0.0% (0) Both of the above
- 88.0% (88) Neither of the above
- 2 Number missing

**Section IV:
Comparison of the STTR and SBIR Programs**

This section asks for your views about the STTR and SBIR Programs.

34. Has your company ever submitted an SBIR proposal? (Please check one.)

- 4.0% (4) No ⇒ Skip to Section V, Page 14
- 96.0% (97) Yes
- 1 Number missing

35. Has your company won an SBIR award or awards? (Please check one.)

- 4.1% (4) No
- 93.8% (91) Yes
- 2 Missing

36. Which statement best describes your view of STTR's mandatory partnership between a company and a research institution? (Please check one.)

- 55.7% (54) The requirement is important because it leads to collaborations that would not occur otherwise.
- 41.2% (40) The requirement is not necessary because collaborations would occur anyway.
- 3 Missing

37. As a result of your experience with the STTR and SBIR programs, which one of the following statements best describes your view of the STTR program in relation to the SBIR program? (Please check one.)

- 46.4% (45) The STTR program should be continued as a separate program.
- 1.0% (1) The STTR program should be eliminated.
- 32.0% (31) The STTR program should be subsumed under the SBIR program with a portion of funds reserved for STTR-type partnerships.
- 18.6% (18) The STTR program should be subsumed under the SBIR program, but no funds should be reserved for STTR-type partnerships.
- 2 Missing

Questions 35 – 37 should have been answered by respondents who answered yes to Question 34.

**Section V:
Information about Individual(s) Completing Questionnaire and Research
Institution Contacts**

Please provide the following information on all individuals who completed or helped to complete this questionnaire. (Attach additional sheets if necessary.)

Name: _____

Title: _____

Phone: _____

Email: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

Phone: _____

Email: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

Phone: _____

Email: _____

Please provide the following information on the person who was your company's main point of contact at the Research Institution that was your partner.

Name: _____

Title: _____

Research Institution: _____

Address: _____

Phone: _____

Email: _____

Thank you very much for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. If you would like to make additional comments concerning the STTR program, please feel free to use this page or to attach additional pages.