

INDEX

- Administrative cost, 36
- Advanced Technology Program (ATP), 15–17
- Agglomeration of R&D facilities and involvement, 33
- Analysts, 28–30
- Analytic hierarchy process (AHP), 20–21, 23–24, 81–83
 - evaluation, 25
 - method, 71–73
- Appropriate objectives, 61–62
- Assessment items, 59, 61–62
- Backward linkage effect, 47–48
- Balanced regional development, 24–25
- Baseline analysis, 40–41
- Behavioral approaches, 28
- Behavioral interventions, 28
- Benefit, 36
 - estimation methodology, 83–84
 - period, 41
 - of R&D projects, 37–38
- Benefit–cost (B/C)
 - analysis, 81–82
 - framework, 13–14
 - ratio, 20–21, 83
 - techniques, 7, 9, 24
- Bottom-up approach, 38–40
- Building area, 33
- Business effects, 36
- Comprehensive feasibility analysis theory, 71–72
- Contract method for risk sharing, 15–17
- Cost
 - cost-effectiveness analysis, 47–48
 - cost–benefit analysis, 24–25, 36–37, 40–41
 - cost–benefit–cost ratio, 46
 - drivers of R&D, 32–33
 - estimates, 31–32
 - estimators, 31–32
 - savings, 44
- Data mining, 66
- Decision-makers, 7, 9, 27
- Decision-making. *See also* Policy competence, 7–9
 - by decision-makers, 7, 9, 27
 - process, 25
- Department of Commerce (DOC), 15–17
- Direct benefits of R&D projects, 38–40
- Direct cost, 32–33
- Direct effects, 47–48
- Direct government funding of R&D, 5–6
- Discount rate of OECD model, 13–14
- Economic analysis, 23–24
- Economic assessment, 20–21
- Economic benefits, 36
- Economic effects of R&D activities, 41
- Economic feasibility analysis, 36–37, 49–50
- Economics analysis, 20–21

- Enterprise, 75–76
- Equipment reinvestment cost, 34–35
- EU, global sensation in, 17–19
- EUREKA program, 17–19
- European Co-operation in the Field of Science and Technical Research (COST), 17–18
- Evaluation research, 7–9
- Evaluators, 71–72
- Ex post appraisal, 23–24
- Expert judgment, 66
- Exploration Research for Advanced Technology (ERATO), 19–20
- External effect, 5–6, 47–48
- Facility costs, 33
- Feasibility analysis for R&D projects, 21–22
- Feasibility study, 23–24, 31–32
- Floor area, 33
- Forward linkage effect, 47–48
- French rate, 13–14
- Funding plan, 50–51
- Gate screening process, 18–19
- German rate, 13–14
- Global sensation, 15
 - EU, 17–19
 - Japan, 19–20
 - South Korea, 20–22
 - United States, 15–17
- Goods, 13–14
- Governance of national R&D projects, 53–54
- Government, 5–6
 - government-funded R&D funds, 87–88
 - government-sponsored frontier R&D projects, 37–38
 - policy, 15
 - R&D budget, 1–2
 - R&D project, 3–4
- High-performance computers and communication program (HPCC program), 15–17
- Horizontal governance, 53–54
- Impact analysis model, 75–76
- Income redistribution, 11–12
- Indirect benefits, 36–37
- Indirect cost, 32–33
- Infrastructure planning process, 23–24
- Innovation system, failure of, 5–6
- Intangible benefit, 38–40
- Intellectual property rights, 43–44
- Internal effect, 47–48
- Internal rate of return (IRR), 20–21, 46
- Japan, global sensation in, 19–20
- Job creation, economic effects of, 78–79
- Joint Research Center (JRC), 17–18
- Joint Research Center for Atom Technology (JRCAT), 19–20
- Knowledge ripple, 36–38
- Labor cost, 36
- Large-scale investment projects, 25
- Large-scale research facilities (LSRFs), 77–79
 - importance, 77–78
 - priorities, 79
- Logical model, 62–63
- Managers, 28–30
- Market
 - failure, 5–6
 - good effects, 47–48
 - ripple, 36–37
- Ministry of Strategy and Finance, 21–22
- Multicriteria analysis, 24–25
- Multicriteria decision analysis (MCDA), 71–72

- Multidisciplinary analysis, 25
- Multiregional input–output model, 49–50
- National core competencies, 15–17
- National goals, 13–14
- National Institute of Standard and Technology (NIST), 15–17
- National large-scale research facilities and equipment, 77–78
- National Project Coordinator (NPC), 18–19
- National projects, 51–52
- National R&D projects, 3–4, 40–41, 52
- National Science Foundation (NSF), 79
- Net average rate of return, 46
- Net present value (NPV), 20–21, 46
 - of cash flows, 11–12
- Network ripple, 36–37
- New Action Group (NAG), 17–18
- Normative policy analysts, 28–30
- Office of Government Commerce, 18–19
- Office of Management and Budget (OMB), 15–17
- Operating costs, 34–36
- Operational maintenance cost, 34–35
- Options approach, 23–24
- Patents, 43–44
- Payback period, 20–21, 46
- Pecuniary effect, 47–48
- Planners, 28–30
- Planning, 63–65
- Policy. *See also* Technology
 - actors, 52
 - analysis, 7, 9, 23–24, 28, 30
 - analysts, 7, 9, 28
 - analytical capacity, 52
 - evaluation, 28
 - feasibility analysis, 52
 - policy-level reviews, 49–50
 - research, 7–9
- Policymakers, 27
- Postmanagement, 15–17
- Preliminary adjustment, 21–22
- Preliminary feasibility study, 5–6, 15, 20, 34–35, 37–38, 49–50, 67, 69
 - on construction projects, 38–40
 - cost of, 31–32
 - estimates, 38–40
 - method, 23–25
 - of pure R&D projects, 42
 - for R&D, 51–52
 - researchers, 72–73
- Private investment, productivity of, 11–12
- Private sector R&D budget, 1–2, 75–76
- Productivity of private investment, 11–12
- Project management
 - approach, 59–61
 - systems, 37–38
- Project objectives, 61–62
- Project plans, 50–51
- Projects, 71–72
- Promotion systems, 53–54
- Propulsion system, 53–54
- Public decision processes, 7–9
- Public investment, 11–12
 - analysis, 11–12
 - cost and benefit of, 11–14
- Public policy, 7–9
- Public R&D policy, 1–2
- Public research institutes, 84
- Public works, 11–12
- Qualitative ripple effects, 56–57
- Quantification effect, 47–48
- Quantitative risk analysis methods, 55
- R&D, 1–2
 - activities, 31–32
 - budget, 1–2

- business planning, 81
- centers, 5–6
- commercialization success rate, 42–43
- contribution, 87–88
- cost, 32–33
- expenditure, 34, 41
- impact, 3–4
- investment effect, 21–22
- personnel, 75–76
- portfolio planning, 59–61
- preliminary feasibility study, 81, 87–88
- of private sector, 75–76
 - and production interface, 75–76
- projects, 15, 17, 21–24, 31–32, 61–62, 87–88
- of public sector, 75–76
- tasks and institutions, 19–20, 63, 65
- units, 44–46
- Rational decision-making models, 7, 9, 28
- Real effect, 47–48
- Relevant plans, 51–52
- Request for proposals (RFPs), 18–19
- Research equipment construction plan, 34
- Research facility construction plan, 33
- Research tasks, 32–33
- Ripple effects, 36–37, 49–50, 56–57
 - of regional economic, 82–83
- Risk, 54–55
 - analysis, 50–51, 55
 - factors, 55
 - identification, 50–51
 - management, 3–4
- Roadmaps, 79
- Scholars, 28
- Science and technology, 77–78
- Scientific research results, 5–6
- Social discount rate, 11–14
- South Korea, global sensation in, 20–22
- Special assessment items, 59–61
- Stanford Linear Accelerator Center (SLAC), 15–17
- Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), 18–19
- Strategy, 5–6
- Sustainability, 43–44
- Tangible benefit, 38–40
- Tasks, 3–4
- Technical analysis, 23–24
- Technical Committee (TC), 17–18
- Technical feasibility analysis model, 32–33, 59, 61
- Technical levels, 66–67
- Technology
 - development roadmap, 61–62
 - fundamental corporate strategy of technology-based innovation, 33
 - gap theory, 65–66
 - innovation, 5–6
 - management, 65–66
 - trend analysis, 65–66
- Top-down approach, 38–40
- Total cost, 34–35
- United States, global sensation in, 15–17
- Unskilled labor, wage rate of, 13–14
- Value for money (VFM), 18–19
- Value-added effect, 47–48
- Value-independent analysis, 7–9
- Vertical governance, 53–54
- Wage rate, 13–14