

Charles Weiss and William B. Bonvillian

Structuring
an Energy Technology
Revolution



Structuring an Energy Technology Revolution

Structuring an Energy Technology Revolution

Charles Weiss and William B. Bonvillian

The MIT Press
Cambridge, Massachusetts
London, England

© 2009 Massachusetts Institute of Technology

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form by any electronic or mechanical means (including photocopying, recording, or information storage and retrieval) without permission in writing from the publisher.

For information about special quantity discounts, please e-mail special_sales@mitpress.mit.edu

This book was set in Sabon by SNP Best-set Typesetter Ltd., Hong Kong. Printed and bound in the United States of America.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Weiss, Charles.

Structuring an energy technology revolution / Charles Weiss and William B. Bonvillian.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-262-01294-2 (hardcover : alk. paper)

1. Renewable energy sources—Research—Government policy—United States. 2. Energy policy—United States. 3. Federal aid to research—United States. I. Bonvillian, William. II. Title.

TJ807.9.U6W45 2009

333.790973—dc23

2008043059

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Contents

Preface	ix
1 Introduction	1
Demand-Side Measures by Themselves Will Be Insufficient	7
2 An Integrated Innovation Policy Model for Energy Technology	13
Three Theories of Innovation	16
Integrated Innovation in Energy Technology	28
The Four-Step Analytic Framework	34
3 Promoting Development and Adoption of New Energy Technology	37
The Multiple-Strand Problem in Technology Policy	37
The Economic Justification for Public Intervention	39
Defining Terms	42
Step 1: Different Launch Pathways for Different Technologies	44
Step 2: Matching Launch Pathways to Policy Packages	46
The Need for Policy Coherence	50

- 4 Toward a Roadmap for Launching Technological Innovation in Energy 57**
Experimental Technologies Requiring Long-Range Research 57
Disruptive Technologies: Potentially Disruptive Technological Innovations Launched in Niche Markets 64
Secondary Innovations—Uncontested Launch: Secondary (Component) Technologies That Will Face Immediate Competition on Launch but Are Acceptable to Recipient Industries 80
Secondary Innovations—Contested Launch: Secondary (Component) Technologies with an Inherent Cost Disadvantage, Facing Political and/or Nonmarket Economic Opposition 97
Incremental Innovations for Conservation and End-Use Efficiency 117
Manufacturing Production Scale-Up and Generic Process Improvements 124
- 5 Energy R&D and Implementation: What Is the Right Level of Funding and Where Will the Money Come From? 127**
What Are the Right Energy R&D and Implementation Numbers? 127
Cap and Trade as a Potential Source of Funding for R&D and Implementation? 134
- 6 Institutional Gaps in the Mechanisms of Support for Different Stages of Innovation 151**
Step 3: Identifying the Institutional Gaps 151
Step 4: Filling the Gaps 154
Summary of New Institutional Arrangements to Meet Energy Innovation Gaps 185
Will New Energy Technology Provide Economic Gains? Will It Create New Functionality? 185

7 All Pumping Together? Prospects for International Collaboration	191
The Growing Role of China and India	192
Mechanisms for International Coordination	194
Where Will Energy Innovation Leadership Come From?	195
Collaboration on Innovation	199
8 Political Prospects and Conclusions	205
The Politics of Energy Innovation	205
The Problem of Pork	208
Conclusion: Achieving a Revolution in Energy Technology	211
Glossary	219
Abbreviations	227
Notes	229
References	275
Index	301

Preface

In this book, we argue that a major supply-side program to stimulate innovation in energy technology is needed to complement a demand-side carbon tax or cap-and-trade scheme. Such a program can be launched now while further political support is developing for demand-side measures. It should go well beyond research and development to include measures to encourage prototyping, demonstration, and deployment of a wide range of technology options faster than could be accomplished by market forces alone. It should replace the varied subsidies to specific existing technologies that are anticipated to be the beneficiaries of recent and pending Congressional legislation. This “no lobbyist left behind” approach is likely to cement in currently available technology at precisely the moment when we should be launching ambitious research programs to develop and deploy imaginative new ideas, and laying the policy framework for a more level playing field on which many alternative technologies compete on their merits.

The book formulates an integrated policy framework for advancing new energy technology, building on existing innovation theory. In a new, four-step analytic approach, we first assess numerous promising groups of energy technologies, classifying them according to the likely obstacles to their

launch. Second, for each of these launch classes, we develop technology-neutral packages of policies and incentives appropriate for their launch. This analysis leads to the third step, the identification of gaps in the existing U.S. framework for stimulating innovation. In the last step, we propose three institutional innovations to fill these gaps: a new translational research projects agency for energy to identify innovation challenges and nurture the breakthroughs needed to meet them; a government corporation for the financing of demonstration projects, manufacturing scale-up, and conservation investments; and a roadmapping think tank for technology assessment and policy research. All of these fit into a new innovation strategy for energy.

This book is thus different from other approaches to the nation's energy challenges. The authors study and teach in the relatively new field of science, technology, and innovation policy, drawing on their prior career experience working in this area at the World Bank and in the U.S. Senate, respectively. This book aims to bring a new approach to innovation theory to what the authors believe is the most important and complex innovation implementation challenge the United States has ever faced, the challenge of launching new energy technology. We do not promote particular technologies, but instead propose a template for a new energy technology strategy, against which technology proposals can be judged. The 2008 presidential campaign produced proposals for substantial increases in spending on energy technology and innovation, but with limited detail on how that effort was to be carried out. Such implementation mechanisms form the heart of this book. Our aim is to set forth a new integrated framework for the encouragement of innovation in energy technology. We do not pretend to offer definitive solutions but hope to stimulate further evaluations along the lines we set forth because we believe that without a sound policy framework in this area we

will not succeed. While the current economic decline will likely stall progress on clean energy technology in the private sector, the agenda proposed here of investment in energy research, demonstration, and implementation could be a Keynesian spur to the economy.

We are indebted to a number of colleagues who have helped facilitate this project. At Georgetown, we have appreciated ongoing policy exchanges with Carl Dahlman and Nate Hultman (now at the University of Maryland). At MIT, we have appreciated policy exchanges over time with Richard Lester, Ernst Moniz, Denny Ellerman, and Henry Jacoby. We are especially indebted for perspectives on particular technologies to MIT faculty and researchers Yet-Ming Chiang, Howard Herzog, Jefferson Tester, Kristala Jones Prather, Gorbrand Cedar, Valdimir Bulovic, Daniel Cohn, and James Katzer, some of whom kindly reviewed particular technology discussions in the book, as we have acknowledged in the notes. We have also appreciated the advice on innovation policy and on energy technology that we have received from the late Vernon Ruttan and from Henry Kelly, respectively. We thank Kent Hughes for sponsoring an early presentation of the ideas in this book at a Woodrow Wilson Center forum, and Susan Cozzens and Georgia Tech for giving us the opportunity to present these ideas to the Atlanta Conference on Science, Technology and Innovation Policy. We also thank our anonymous content reviewers for the general comments they provided. In addition, we thank our research assistants Eric Mooney, Edward Parker, and Argyro Kawado. Finally, we thank Clay Morgan at the MIT Press for his confidence in the value and utility of this work, and Sandra Minkkinen and Elizabeth Judd for their help in editing and preparing the final text.

We have greatly appreciated the support, patience, and understanding of our families during our research and writing.

1

Introduction

The environmental and geopolitical costs of America's addiction to fossil fuels make a federal program to stimulate innovation in energy technology both justifiable and essential. Such a technology supply-side program should be accompanied by policies that ensure long-term, sustained high prices for emission of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere—for example, a carbon tax or a cap-and-trade system, as well as regulatory standards and other measures to foster demand for more efficient overall energy use. But market forces alone cannot provide the pace and scope of innovations required to meet the urgent national need for improved technology for energy supply and efficient end use, and to overcome the huge built-in preferences for existing energy technologies.¹

Our current technology supply-side efforts consist of underfunded research with an occasional tax incentive or regulatory mandate thrown in. There has been much talk and consensus about the need to introduce new energy technologies but few concrete proposals on how to actually get them into the marketplace at the scale required. Even climate change legislation now before the Congress calls for significant subsidies to existing alternatives to fossil fuels but only small sums for research, development, and deployment of the many new ideas now in active development in commercial and university laboratories.

This book gets inside the “black box” of energy innovation, looking at it as a system, and proposes answers to the problem of encouraging and stimulating the implementation of improved energy technology that has thus far eluded our political system. Given the central role of energy in the economy, a program to stimulate technological innovation in energy will need to approach the dimensions of a major military transformational effort. It must go beyond research and development (R&D) to include all aspects of the innovation process. No single technology or “silver bullet” will suffice; we will need an expanded set of options made possible by a broad range of new technology entrants.

As a working foundation for that program, we propose a new integrated analytic framework, drawing on current innovation theory, as a basis for developing technology policy for energy and comparable complex economic sectors. From that base, we set forth a new, four-step framework for the development of policy to encourage energy innovations. First, we assess energy technologies, not only for their present status and likely future development, but most importantly for the obstacles they are most likely to encounter when they eventually enter the highly competitive marketplace for energy technology. We use these assessments to categorize energy innovations according to the issues they will probably face as they are launched. Second, for each launch path, we define packages of relatively neutral policy measures, from R&D incentives to regulatory measures, designed both to bridge the “valley of death” between research and late-stage development that historically has been the most important barrier to the deployment of civilian technology, and more significantly in our view, to surmount the barriers to the implementation of technology. Third, based on this analysis, we identify several functional gaps in the present system of government institutional support for energy innovation that will hinder our

ability to achieve steps 1 and 2. Fourth, we propose public- and private-sector interventions to fill these gaps. This conceptual framework may be applicable to other complex innovation system areas in addition to energy.

Another, equally important problem is the deep politicization of energy policy in the United States. For decades, the environmental wing of American politics, now tied to the political left, has urged subsidies to renewable energy—specifically to sun and wind, with notable neglect of geothermal energy. The right has been no less enthusiastic in its support of subsidies to oil, natural gas, and nuclear energy. The coal and oil industries, moreover, are protected by the congressional delegations in key states where they provide employment. Reflecting these pressures, plus a long regulatory history, the role of the government in the energy sector has long been intense and interventionist. Despite growing geopolitical and climate realities, a balanced, technology-neutral approach to energy policy has not been attempted by either political party. Today, a coherent approach to energy technology policy is still missing from the legislative policy debate in the U.S. Congress; each technology, new and old, seeks its own separate legislative deal for federal backing.

Even in the abstract, to be sure, the idea of technology neutrality has an inescapable limitation, namely, that of the choice of objective. Politics aside, a technology strategy intended to end dependence on oil from foreign sources will differ in important ways from one intended to mitigate global warming by reducing emission of carbon dioxide. To briefly summarize this now highly visible fault line in American politics, both of these approaches will favor renewable domestic sources of energy like wind, solar, and geothermal. But a policy focused exclusively on self-sufficiency in fuels for the transport sector will emphasize domestic sources, carbon-emitting or otherwise. A policy intended to limit emission of

carbon dioxide and other forms of environmental damage must stress lowering carbon emissions by all appropriate means, predominantly through new technologies in addition to efficiency and conservation. Fortunately, there remains substantial overlap—the need for new technology—between the two positions.

Since the political system on all sides is now contemplating a major shift on energy policy, are the technologies we need already here? The dominant theme in much of the energy policy literature—especially by analysts inspired by the environmental costs of present patterns of energy use—has been the critical importance of carbon charges in directing the demand for energy and energy technology toward “carbon-free” sources. In response, some industry advocates have argued that carbon charges must be delayed because any major change in energy-use patterns will require breakthroughs in technology that will take time to achieve.

To forestall such criticism, other analysts have pointed to technologies that are at or near the point of readiness for full-scale exploitation and that, taken together, could stabilize atmospheric CO₂ concentrations, so that there is no need to wait for technological breakthroughs for this purpose. In a classic article, Socolow and Pacala have identified fifteen “wedges”—changes in energy use based on technologies said to be either at or near technoeconomic readiness, any seven of which, taken together, would suffice to stabilize CO₂ concentrations by midcentury.² Some of these changes are clearly within the range of adoption and timely scale-up. Others—reduced deforestation, a 50 percent reduction in driving by two billion vehicles, or widespread adoption of conservation tillage, for example—would, as the two authors recognize, require major changes in policy and behavior that could take extended periods. Still others, like technology for carbon capture and sequestration, are likely to take years of

development and demonstration before they are ready for widespread deployment.

Other policy analyses of climate change and energy security recommend a major effort to effect new technology, although this recommendation often comes almost as an afterthought after a long discussion of carbon charges.³ (As summarized in chapter 5, the relatively few analyses specifically concerned with energy R&D typically recommend large increases, but most of these reach more specialized audiences.) The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), for example, concurs that a portfolio of new technologies can yield CO₂ stabilization, “assuming appropriate and effective incentives are in place for their development, acquisition, deployment and diffusion and addressing related barriers.”⁴ Beyond this assertion, the processes by which the technologies might be developed, deployed, and diffused have been left largely unstudied.

In sum, technological alternatives to fossil fuels do exist or can be realized.⁵ But few are technically or economically ready for deployment on the huge scale needed to make a dent in the demand for fossil fuels. Some are operating on a limited commercial scale, while others now exist only in the laboratory. To cite a few examples of what we can see today, solar photovoltaics are still too expensive, carbon capture and sequestration require prototyping and validation at a huge scale, batteries must realize further materials and cost advances, and fuel cells for transport applications face years of experimentation. Aside from the major research needed to keep rolling out advances for these technologies to cut costs and improve efficiencies, there is a need for ongoing research to seek breakthroughs, especially if we decide we need to go beyond stabilizing the carbon dioxide concentration in the atmosphere at current levels by midcentury. For example, two recent economic evaluations have called for reductions from

1990 levels from 25 percent to 60–80 percent,⁶ and the G-8 nations agreed in principle in July 2008 to halve greenhouse gas emissions by midcentury from current levels.⁷

Taken together, these technologies will still require massive investment, involving extensive collaboration between business, government, and universities.⁸ What is more, the requirements for the development and deployment of these technologies on a scale sufficient to address the problem of global warming, not to mention the economic and geopolitical costs of dependence on foreign oil, amount to no less than a new *technological/economic/political paradigm* for energy.⁹ This new paradigm will involve new technologies backed by policies, regulations, incentives, technology institutions, and public understanding and support. This vast and varied array of new technology will take many decades and many generations of technical innovation to evolve and be adopted on the necessary scale.¹⁰ It would be a serious mistake to concentrate exclusively on short-term technological solutions to the neglect of these more far-reaching approaches.

The problem of climate change is global, so that the new paradigm will need to be global. Even so, technology advance still largely follows a nation-state model.¹¹ Although multinational corporations are moving the development stage toward international collaboration, other key features of innovation systems, such as research funding, science and technical education, and publicly funded research institutions, remain rooted in national funding and support.¹² The U.S. innovation system has led world technology waves for many decades,¹³ and despite the rapid rise of capabilities in other countries, there is no easy substitute for its technology leadership in this arena.¹⁴ There is a trade-off between the need to share technology in order to work together to meet a common danger and to benefit from the exchange of knowledge, on the one hand, and the need to provide incentives to industry to gain

competitive advantage through innovation and capacity building, on the other. The United States should keep in mind, too, that the economic advantages of leadership in technology have been the source of its wealth and well-being. Is it really in America's interest to cede leadership of a technological revolution in energy to other countries that now also understand the innovation-based growth model?

Demand-Side Measures by Themselves Will Be Insufficient

Private investment in research on alternatives to fossil fuels is discouraged by the history of wild oscillations in the price of energy. A barrel of oil may cost about \$60 as these words are written in the fall of 2008, but it cost more than \$140 in the summer of 2008 and less than \$20 in 1998.¹⁵ If energy companies were convinced that \$100-a-barrel oil were here to stay, some would see the long-term business wisdom of major investments to diversify their raw materials and their technologies, despite their current high profit levels. As things now stand, however, many of them remain opposed, skeptical, or at best ambivalent. Yet there are clear indications that, unlike the price spike induced by the oil embargo of the 1970s, increasing energy prices are predominantly due to a significant rise in world demand from developed and particularly emerging economies.¹⁶

Here we distinguish between the demand for energy itself, and the demand for improved energy technology. The two are related but are not the same. In the short term, carbon charges or high energy prices will reduce the immediate demand for fossil fuels or energy, respectively. Demand for improved or alternative energy technology, on the other hand, will be created only if these prices are seen as likely to be sustained. We may similarly distinguish between the supply of energy technology and the supply of energy itself; our focus is on the former.

The single policy that would be most effective in stimulating such research, then, would be a sustained policy that stimulates demand for both energy conservation and energy technology. This could come about by ensuring either the high energy prices¹⁷ supported by some focused on energy security, or a high cost of carbon dioxide (and other greenhouse gas) emissions supported by those focused on climate change, or both, for the next few decades¹⁸—the latter either through a direct carbon tax¹⁹ on CO₂ emissions (known in the literature as a “carbon charge”) or equivalently, through a cap-and-trade scheme. The political consensus needed to support at least cap-and-trade policies is stirring and could be reached in the next few years.²⁰ However, as we will see in later chapters, there is a real possibility of adopting a deeply flawed system because of political pressures from various interest groups.²¹

Even with such energy prices or carbon charges, private capital will not suffice to stimulate technological innovation without major public support.²² As economist Jeffrey Sachs has noted,

Technology policy lies at the core of the climate change challenge. Even with a cutback in wasteful energy spending, our current technologies cannot support both a decline in carbon dioxide emissions and an expanding global economy. If we try to restrain emissions without a fundamentally new set of technologies, we will end up stifling economic growth, including the development prospects for billions of people. Economists often talk as though putting a price on carbon emissions through tradable permits or a carbon tax will be enough to deliver the needed reductions in those emissions. This is not true. . . . We will need much more than a price on carbon. Consider three potentially transformative low-emissions technologies: carbon capture and sequestration (CCS), plug-in hybrid automobiles and concentrated solar-thermal electricity generation. Each will require a combination of factors to succeed: more applied scientific research, important regulatory changes, appropriate infrastructure, public acceptance and early high-cost investments. A failure on one or more of these points could kill the technologies.²³

An innovation system must be stimulated by market demand for improved technology, but workable policies to stimulate this demand still presuppose a strong innovation system. What is more, most new energy technologies face a dense network of political traps in the United States because of the huge scale of deployment required, because of the deeply entrenched, price-efficient competitors, and because of the economic interests, policies, and public attitudes that support the old, fossil-fuel-based paradigm.

Ideally, then, economics and technology would develop together. Major supply-side technology development programs would be coupled with policies that create a demand pull for improved energy technology through assured, sustained, high carbon energy prices, incentives for conservation and for the entry of new energy sources, and penalties for wasteful use. This mix would feature public-sector investment leveraging private capital at scale and vice versa.

Presidents since the 1970s have been calling for U.S. energy security, but the record on this issue constitutes one of the greatest public policy failures in our history. Part of this story is the level of investment. Federal support for energy R&D has fallen by more than half since a high point in 1980, and private-sector energy R&D has similarly fallen. These levels of expenditure compare poorly to other major federal R&D efforts that met challenges of similar magnitude: the Manhattan Project, the Apollo Project, the Carter-Reagan defense buildup, and the doubling of the budget of the National Institutes of Health.²⁴ Advances in energy technology will not occur on the scale required without significantly increased investment by both government and business.

We are optimistic that a public consensus in favor of policies creating a demand for technological innovation will in fact take shape. In the meantime, can we begin to create a new paradigm? If such policies are to elude us for a time, can we

at least start down available pathways for R&D and put as many technology supply-oriented policies in place as possible in accordance with a coherent strategy? Regardless of when a technology demand-side program is initially imposed, developing a sound innovation system for energy technology will show industry that the transition to alternative energy technologies is feasible, not the pie in the sky they fear, and in this way will help to defuse political opposition to the sound demand-oriented policies that will also be needed to effect the needed energy transition.

A supply-side technology development strategy for energy would have to be structured quite differently from government-led technology development projects like the Manhattan Project or the Apollo Moon Mission. These projects developed and implemented single-focus technologies in comparatively short-term projects for the government, a single customer with deep pockets. They were managed and executed by unified organizations within the federal government. Energy challenges require a very different development model, in which a complex mix of energy technologies must evolve over decades in the private sector. Given the complexity and unpredictability of this evolution, the resulting innovation system should be technology-neutral to the extent possible.

This is perhaps the most complex technology evolution problem the United States has ever faced. It makes getting to the moon start to look simple by comparison. A coherent strategy will be vital; we aim in this work to begin a discussion of the elements that will be required in such a strategy. Different “front-end” research, development, and demonstration policies, and different sets of “back-end” incentives and, in some cases, regulatory mandates, for implementation and deployment will be needed at different times for different kinds of technology. These policies will depend on the present state of development of the technology, the likely path by

which it will be launched into the marketplace, the level of economic competition and political opposition it is likely to stimulate, and the availability of a sound, complementary demand-side pricing system.

Public intervention should spur and support the private sector, with the objective of speeding the development and deployment of a broad range of future energy technology options considerably faster than would be expected from market forces alone. While it is impossible to say which of the many promising energy technologies will come to full fruition, a conservative list would include: fully competitive technology for the production of electricity from wind and sun, plug-in hybrid cars with performance and range comparable to those of contemporary cars but with several times the gas mileage; a “smart grid” that is both far more efficient and can accommodate renewables; reliable and well-characterized technology for enhanced geothermal energy and for carbon capture and sequestration; lighting technologies with twice the efficiency of present-day fluorescent lights; dramatically more efficient buildings, new nuclear technologies if waste storage, safety, diversion, and proliferation issues can be satisfied; and improved manufacturing technologies for a wide variety of energy technologies to lower costs and improve quality.

There will be some who argue from a market economics perspective that a cap-and-trade policy or carbon tax will internalize carbon externalities, while high energy prices will discourage energy use, so that demand pull will be enough to foster new technologies. We believe this fails to fully take into account the realities of the government’s extensive intervention underwriting the existing system, and the need to accelerate the pace of technology introduction. An old story about the economics profession is relevant here. A bus is traveling along the California coast packed with neoclassical economists attending a convention. They are accompanied by one

reporter. Suddenly, the bus crashes through the guardrail over a 300-foot cliff toward the sea. The reporter starts screaming, but the economists are all silent. The reporter asks the economist seated next to him why he and his colleagues are not screaming since death is imminent. The economist responds, “My friend, there is so much pent-up demand that a parachute will appear.”

This book argues that someone should be working on the parachute to feed the pent-up demand. It seeks a strategy for parachute creation and implementation.

References

Abramowitz, Michael. U.S. Joins G-8 Plan to Halve Emissions. *Washington Post*, July 9, 2008. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/07/08/AR2008070800285.html>.

Acheson, Dean. *Present at the Creation*. New York: Norton, 1969.

Alexander, Lamar. A New Manhattan Project for Clean Energy Independence. *Issues in Science and Technology*, summer 2008, 39–44. <http://www.issues.org/24.4/alexander.html>.

Alic, John. *Trillions for Military Technology*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Alic, John, David Mowery, and Edward Rubin. *U.S. Technology and Innovation Policies: Lessons for Climate Change*. Washington, DC: Pew Center on Global Climate Change, November 2003. http://www.pewclimate.org/global-warming-in-depth/all_reports/technology_policy.

American Association for the Advancement of Science. *Research & Development, Fiscal Year 2008*. Report 32. Washington, DC: American Association for the Advancement of Science, 2007.

American Association for the Advancement of Science. *R&D Budget and Policy Program—FY 2009* (revised March 2008). <http://www.aaas.org/spp/rd/fy09.htm>.

Anthony, Richard. Powering Up—Roll-up Fuel Cells (research of Paula Hammond). *Spectrum* (winter 2007), 7. Cambridge, MA.: MIT.

Archibugi, Daniele, and Simona Iammarino. The Globalization of Technology and National Models. In Daniele Archibugi and

Note: URLs for cited works were checked on September 19, 2008.

Bengt-Ake Lundvall, eds., *The Globalizing Learning Economy*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Arrow, Kenneth J. Economic Welfare and the Allocation of Resources for Invention. In Richard Nelson, ed., *The Rate and Direction of Inventive Activity: Economic and Social Factors*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, for NBER, 1962.

Arrow, Kenneth J. Global Climate Change: A Challenge to Policy. *The Economists' Voice* 4, no. 3, article 2 (2007). <http://www.bepress.com/ev/vol4/iss3/art2>.

Arrow, Kenneth J. *Intergenerational Equity and the Rate of Discount in Long Term Social Investment*. Stanford University Working Papers in Economics 97-005. December 1995. <http://www-econ.stanford.edu/faculty/workp/swp97005.html>.

Arthur, Brian. *Increasing Returns and Path Dependence in the Economy*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994.

Atkinson, Robert D. *The Past and Future of America's Economy: Long Waves of Innovation That Power Cycles of Growth*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, 2004.

Auerswald, Phillip E. The Myth of Energy Insecurity. *Issues in Science and Technology*, summer 2006. <http://www.issues.org/22.4/auerswald.html>.

Baer, Walter S., Leland L. Johnson, and Edward W. Merrow. *Analysis of Federally Funded Demonstration Projects*. R-1925-DOC. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corp., April 1976. <http://www.rand.org/pubs/reports/2006/R1925.pdf>.

Banivadekar, Anup, Kristian Bodek, Lynette Cheah, Christopher Evans, Tiffany Groode, John Heywood, Emmanuel Kasseris, Mathew Kromer, and Malcolm Weiss. *On the Road in 2035, Reducing Transportation's Petroleum Consumption and GHG Emissions*. Laboratory for Energy and the Environment, Report LFEE 2008-05RP (July 2008). <http://web.mit.edu/sloan-auto-lab/research/beforeh2/otr2035/>.

Bennis, Warren, and Patricia Ward Biederman. *Organizing Genius: The Secrets of Creative Collaboration*. New York: Basic Books, 1997.

Berger, Suzanne. *How We Compete*. New York: Doubleday Business, 2005.

Berlin, Leslie. *The Man behind the Microchip: Robert Noyce and the Invention of Silicon Valley*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

- Betz, Frederick. *Strategic Technology Management*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1993.
- Bezdek, Roger H., and Robert M. Wendling. Real Numbers: The U.S. Energy Subsidy Scorecard. *Issues in Science and Technology*, spring 2006. <http://www.issues.org/22.3/realnumbers.html>.
- Bingaman, Jeff. Strategies for Today's Energy Challenge. *Issues in Science and Technology*, summer 2008, 33–38. <http://issues.org/24.4/bingaman.html>.
- BIO. Biotechnology Industry Facts. <http://bio.org/speeches/pubs/er/statistics.asp>.
- Block, Fred, and Matthew R. Keller. *Where Do Innovations Come From? Transformations in the U.S. National Innovation System 1970–2006*. Washington, DC: Information Technology and Innovation Foundation (ITIF) Report. July 2008. http://www.itif.org/files/Where_do_innovations_come_from.pdf.
- Bonds, John Bledsoe. *Bipartisan Strategy: Selling the Marshall Plan*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2002.
- Bonvillian, William B. *Comments to the House Science and Technology Committee on HR 364 (ARPA-E Legislation)*, April 2, 2007.
- Bonvillian, William B. Power Play: The DARPA Model and US Energy Policy. *The American Interest*, November-December 2006. <http://www.theamericaninterest.com/ai2/article.cfm?id=183&MI=6> [portion of article].
- Bonvillian, William B. *Testimony to the House Committee on Science and Technology, Subcommittee on Energy and Environment Hearing on Establishing ARPA-E, HR 364, 110th Cong., 1st sess. (April 26, 2007)*.
- Bonvillian, William B. Will the Search for New Energy Technologies Require a New R&D Mission Agency? *Bridges*, July 14, 2007. <http://www.ostina.org/content/view/2297/721/>.
- Bossell, Ulf, Baldour Eliasson, and Gordon Taylor. *The Future of the Hydrogen Economy, Bright or Bleak?* European Fuel Cell Forum Report. 2003, updated 2005. <http://www.efcf.com/reports/E08.pdf>.
- Branscomb, Lewis, and Philip Auerswald. *Between Invention and Innovation: An Analysis of Funding for Early-State Technology Development*. NIST GCR 02–841. Washington, DC: National Institute of Standards and Technology/ATP, November 2002.

Branscomb, Lewis M., and Philip E. Auerswald. *Taking Technical Risks: How Innovators, Executives, and Investors Manage High-Tech Risks*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2001.

Browning, Larry, and Judy Shetler. *Sematech: Saving the U.S. Semiconductor Industry*. Kenneth E. Montague Series in Oil and Business History, No. 10. College Station, TX: Texas A&M Press, 2000.

Bullis, Kevin. An Electrifying Startup. *Technology Review*, May-June 2008: 68–71. <http://www.technologyreview.com/Energy/20570/>.

Bullis, Kevin. The Incredible Shrinking Engine. *Technology Review*, March–April 2007: 88–90. <http://www.technologyreview.com/Energy/18304/>.

Bulovic, Vladimir. Identifying a New Primary Energy Source. Presentation to CSIS Energy Technology Forum, Washington, DC, September 28, 2006.

Bush, Vannevar. *Science: The Endless Frontier*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, July 1945. <http://www.nsf.gov/od/lpa/nsf50/vbush1945.htm>.

Campoy, Ana. Betting on a Biofuel—Butanol Has Several Advantages over Ethanol and One Big Disadvantage. Report on Energy (special supplement). *Wall Street Journal*, June 30, 2008, R14.

Carey, John. The Real Question: Should Oil be Cheap? *Business Week*, August 4, 2008, 54.

Ceder, Gerbrand. Presentation to CSIS Energy Technology Forum, Washington, DC, September 28, 2006.

Cheng, Alan Yung Chen. *Economic Modeling of Intermittency in Wind Power Generation*. Master's thesis in Technology and Policy and Civil and Environmental Engineering, MIT, 2005. http://web.mit.edu/globalchange/www/docs/Cheng_MS_05.pdf.

Chiang, Yet-Ming. *Testimony on Breakthrough Battery Technology at the Center of the Plug-in Hybrid Revolution*, Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, Subcommittee on Global Warming, Hearing on Emerging Technologies and Practices for Reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions, 110th Cong., 1st sess., May 8, 2007.

Christensen, Clayton. *The Innovator's Dilemma: When New Technologies Cause Great Firms to Fail*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 1997.

Christensen, Clayton, Scott Anthony, and Erik Roth. *Seeing What's Next*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 2004.

Clean Energy Trends 2007: Global Clean Energy Markets Projected to Exceed \$220 Billion by 2016. *Clean Edge News*, March 6, 2007. <http://www.cleanege.com/reports/reports-trends2007.php>.

Cohen, Linda R., and Roger G. Noll. *The Technology Pork Barrel*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 1991.

Council on Competitiveness. *Energy Security, Innovation and Sustainability Initiative*. Project summary. Washington, DC: Council on Competitiveness, 2008.

Council on Competitiveness. *Competitiveness Index: Where America Stands*. Report. Washington, DC: Council on Competitiveness, January 2007. http://www.compete.org/images/uploads/File/PDF%20Files/Competitiveness_Index_Where_America_Stand_March_2007.pdf.

Cowan, Ruth Swartz. *A Social History of American Technology*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Cunningham, Edward A. *Innovation Partnerships with China and India: Managing Global Climate Change and Clean Energy Systems*. Report. Boston, MA: Mass Insight Corp., February 1, 2008.

Currie, Michael J., Jonathan K. Mapel, Timothy D. Heidel, Shalom Goffri, and Marc Baldo. High-Efficiency Organic Solar Concentrators for Photovoltaics. *Science* 321, no. 5886 (July 11, 2008): 226–228. <http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/abstract/321/5886/226>.

Dahlman, Carl J., and Jean Eric Aubert. *China and the Knowledge Economy: Seizing the 21st Century*. Overview. Washington, DC: World Bank Institute, 2001. http://info.worldbank.org/etools/docs/library/17281/Chinaoverview_0917.pdf.

Davis, Graham A., and Brandon Owens. Optimizing the Level of Renewable Electric R&D Expenditures Using Real Options Analysis. *Energy Policy* 31 (2003): 1589–1608. <http://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy03osti/31221.pdf>.

Defense Science Board. *High Performance Microchip Supply*. Report. Washington, DC: DSB, February 2005. http://www.acq.osd.mil/dsb/reports/2005-02-HPMS_Report_Final.pdf.

Dennison, John, of Perkins Caulfield. *Testimony to the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Hearing to Investigate Market Constraints on Large Investments in Advanced Energy Technologies*, Senate Hearing 110–63, 100th Cong., 1st sess., March 7, 2007.

Department of Defense/Jasons (advisory group) (Paul Dimotakis, Robert Grober, and Nate Lewis, study leaders). *Reducing DOD Fossil Fuel Dependence*. JSR-06-135. McLean, VA: Mitre Corp., September 2006. <http://stinet.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA459082&Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf>.

Department of Energy. California Utility to Buy 500 Megawatts of Solar Thermal Power. *EERE Network News*, August 16, 2006. <http://apps1.eere.energy.gov/news/archive.cfm/pubDate=%7Bd%20'2006-08-16'%7D#10199>.

Department of Energy, Climate Change Technology Program. *Strategic Plan*. DOE/PI-0005. Washington, DC: Department of Energy, September 2006. <http://www.climatetechnology.gov/stratplan/final/toc.pdf>.

Department of Energy. DOE Announces Restructured FutureGen Approach to Demonstrate Carbon Capture and Storage Technology at Multiple Clean Coal Plants. DOE Fossil Energy *Technline* January 30, 2008. http://www.fossil.energy.gov/news/techlines/2008/08003-DOE_Announces_Restructured_FutureG.html.

Department of Energy, Office of Basic Energy Sciences. Workshop Reports, Abstracts of BES Workshop and Technical Reports, 2003–2007, <http://www.sc.doe.gov/bes/reports/abstracts.html>, and The Basic Research Needs Workshop Series, http://www.sc.doe.gov/bes/reports/files/BRN_workshops.pdf.

Department of Energy, Office of Basic Energy Sciences. *Basic Research Needs for the Hydrogen Economy: Report of the Workshop on Hydrogen Production, Storage and Use*, May 13–15, 2003. Washington, DC: Department of Energy, February 2004. <http://www.sc.doe.gov/bes/hydrogen.pdf>.

Department of Energy, Office of Basic Energy Sciences. *Basic Research Needs for Advanced Nuclear Systems*. August 2006. http://www.sc.doe.gov/bes/reports/files/ANES_rpt.pdf.

Department of Energy, Office of Basic Energy Sciences, *Basic Research Needs: Catalysis for Energy*, Report of Workshop, August 6–9, 2007. http://www.er.doe.gov/bes/reports/files/CAT_rpt.pdf.

Department of Energy, Office of Basic Energy Sciences. *Basic Research Needs for the Geosciences: Facilitating 21st Century Energy Systems*. February 2007. <http://www.sc.doe.gov/bes/reports/list.html>.

Department of Energy, Office of Nuclear Energy. *Generation IV Nuclear Energy Systems: Priorities and Strategic Goals*. 2008.

Department of Energy, Office of Nuclear Energy. *Generation VI Nuclear Energy Systems: What is Generation IV?*. 2008. <http://nuclear.energy.gov/genIV/neGenIV1.html>.

Department of Energy, Office of Nuclear Energy, Office of Fuel Cycle Management. *Global Nuclear Energy Partnership Strategic Plan*. GNEP-167312, Rev. 0. January 2007. <http://64.233.169.104/search?q=cache:aqcUqm5ezW8J:www.gnep.gov/pdfs/gnepStrategicPlanJanuary2007.pdf+Department+of+Energy,+Office+of+Nuclear+Energy,+Office+of+Fuel+Cycle+Management,+U.S.+Global+Nuclear+Energy+Partnership+Strategic+Plan.+GNEP-167312,+Rev.+0.+January+2007&hl=en&ct=clnk&cd=1&gl=us&client=safari>.

Deutch, John M. *What Should the Government Do to Encourage Technical Change in the Energy Sector?* Report No. 120. Cambridge, MA: MIT Joint Program on the Science and Policy of Global Change, May 2005. http://web.mit.edu/globalchange/www/MITJPSPGC_Rpt120.pdf.

Deutch, John M., and Ernest J. Moniz. The Nuclear Option. *Scientific American*, September 2006. <http://www.sciam.com/article.cfm?id=the-nuclear-option>.

Deutch, John M., and Ernest J. Moniz. *Testimony before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Hearing on the Future of Coal*, 110th Cong., 1st sess., March 22, 2007. http://64.233.169.104/search?q=cache:CepUKKbDyJAJ:energy.senate.gov/public/_files/ProfessorsDuetchandMoniztestimony.doc+Deutch,+John+and+Ernest+J.+Moniz,+Testimony+before+the+Senate+Committee+on+Energy+and+Natural+Resources,+hearing+on+the+Future+of+Coal,+March+22,+2007.&hl=en&ct=clnk&cd=3&gl=us&client=safari.

Dipippo, Ronald. Ideal Thermal Efficiency for Geothermal Binary Plants. *Geothermics* 36, no. 3 (June 2007): 276–285.

Dresselhaus, Millie. Basic Research Need for a Hydrogen Economy. Presentation at DOE BES Workshop, May 13–15, 2003. Washington, DC, June 24, 2004. https://public.ornl.gov/conf/nanosummit2004/talks/3_Dresselhaus.pdf.

Ebeling, Ashlea. Do Solar While the Credit Shines. *Forbes Magazine*, December 12, 2005. http://www.forbes.com/investmentguide/free_forbes/2005/1212/192.html.

Eckaus, Richard S., and Ian Sue Wing. Implications of the Historical Decline in U.S. Energy Intensity for Long Run CO₂ Emission Projections. *Energy Policy* 35, no. 11 (November 2007): 5267–5286.

Ellerman, A. Denny, and Barbara K. Buchner. The European Union Emissions Trading Scheme: Origins, Allocation, and Early Results. *Review of Environmental Economic Policy* 1, no. 1 (2007): 66–87.

Ellerman, A. Denny, and Paul L. Joskow. *The European Union's Emissions Trading System in Perspective*. Report of the Pew Center on Global Climate Change. Washington, DC: Pew Center on Global Climate Change, May 2008. <http://www.pewclimate.org/docUploads/EU-ETS-In-Perspective-Report.pdf>.

Ellerman, A. Denny, Paul L. Joskow, Richard Schmalensee, Juan-Pablo Montero, and Elizabeth M. Bailey. *Markets for Clean Air: The U.S. Acid Rain Program*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Energy Information Administration. *Commercial Buildings Energy Consumption Survey*. Report No. DOE/EIA-871. Washington, DC: EIA, 1995.

Energy Information Administration. *Commercial Buildings Characteristics*. Report No. DOE/EIS-E-0109. Washington, DC: EIA 1997.

Energy Information Administration. *Emissions of Greenhouse Gases in the United States*. Report No. DOE/EIA-0573(2001). Washington, DC: EIA, December 2002. <http://www.eia.doe.gov/oiarf/1605/archive/gg02rpt/index.html>.

Energy Information Administration. *International Energy Outlook 2007*. Report No. DOE/EIA-0484. Washington, DC: EIA, 2007. <http://www.eia.doe.gov/oiarf/ieo/index.html>.

Energy Information Administration. *International Energy Outlook 2008*. Report No. DOE/EIA-0484. Washington, DC: EIA, 2008. <http://www.eia.doe.gov/oiarf/ieo/>.

Energy Information Administration. *Report on Federal Financial Interventions and Subsidies in Energy Markets 1999: Primary Energy*. Table ES-1. Washington, DC: EIA, 1999. http://www.eia.doe.gov/oiarf/servicrpt/subsidy/table_es1.html.

European Union. *EU Action against Climate Change, 2005*. http://ec.europa.eu/environment/climat/pdf/emission_trading3_en.pdf.

- European Union, Directorates for Energy and Transport and for General Research. *Concentrating Solar Power: From Research to Implementation*. 2007. http://ec.europa.eu/energy/res/publications/doc/2007_concentrating_solar_power_en.pdf.
- Ezell, Stephen and Robert Atkinson. *RAND's Rose-Colored Glasses*. Report. Washington, DC: Information Technology and Innovation Foundation (ITIF) September 10, 2008. <http://www.itif.org/index.php?=174>.
- Federal Non-Nuclear Energy Research and Development Act of 1974, Public Law 93-577, 68 Stat. 1894, 42 U.S.C. 5913 (1974).
- Figueiredo, M. A. de. *The Liability of Carbon Dioxide Storage*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, 2007. http://sequestration.mit.edu/pdf/Mark_de_Figueiredo_PhD_Dissertation.pdf.
- Figueiredo, M. A. de, H. J. Herzog, P. L. Joskow, K. A. Oye, and R. M. Reiner. *Regulating Carbon Dioxide Capture and Storage*. 07-003. Cambridge, MA: CEEPR, MIT, April 2007. <http://web.mit.edu/ceepr/www/publications/workingpapers/2007-003.pdf>.
- Fong, Glenn R. ARPA Does Windows: The Defense Underpinning of the PC Revolution. *Business and Politics* 3, no. 3 (2001): 213-237.
- Fong, Glenn R. Follower at the Frontier: International Competition and Japanese Industrial Policy. *International Studies Quarterly* 42, no. 2 (1998): 339-366.
- Fong, Glenn R. Repositioning the Advanced Technology Program. *Issues in Science and Technology* (fall 2001): 65-70. <http://www.issues.org/18.1/fong.html>.
- Freeman, Christopher. The National System of Innovation in Historical Perspective. *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 19 (1995): 5-24. <http://cje.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/reprint/19/1/5>.
- Freeman, Christopher. Japan: A New National Innovation System. In G. Dosi, C. Freeman, R. R. Nelson, G. Silverberg, L. Soete, eds., *Technology and Economy Theory*. London: Pinter, 1988.
- Fri, Robert W. From Energy Wish Lists to Technological Realities. *Issues in Science and Technology*, fall 2006. <http://www.issues.org/23.1/fri.html>.
- Friedman, Thomas L. *Hot, Flat and Crowded: Why We Need a Green Revolution and How it Can Renew America*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2008.

Froomkin, A. Michael. Reinventing the Government Corporation. 1995 U. Ill. L. Rev. 543 (1995). <http://osaka.law.miami.edu/~froomkin/articles/reinvent.htm>.

Gallagher, Kelly Sims, John P. Holdren, and Ambuj D. Sagar. Energy Technology Innovation. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* 31 (November 2006): 193–327.

Ghoneim, Ahmed F. Meeting the Global Energy Challenge—Hydrogen. MIT Congressional Seminar, April 19, 2006.

Glowing After Dark. *The Economist*, August 7, 2008.

Goldemberg, José, Thomas B. Johansson, Amulya K.N. Reddy, and Rob Williams. *Energy for a Sustainable World*. Washington, DC: World Resources Institute, 1987.

Goodwyn, James C. DARPA Technology Transition. Report. Washington, DC: DOD, 1997. <http://www.darpa.mil/body/pdf/transition.pdf>.

Green, Bruce, and Gerald Nix. Geothermal—the Energy under Our Feet. NREL/TP 840–40665. Golden, CO.: National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL), November 2006. <http://www1.eere.energy.gov/geothermal/pdfs/40665.pdf>.

Green, William H. Liquid Fuels for Transportation. Presentation, MIT, April 20, 2006.

Griliches, Zvi. The Search for R&D Spillovers. *Scandinavian Journal of Economics* 94 (1992): 29–47.

Groode, Tiffany A. Review of Corn Based Ethanol Use and GHG Emissions. MIT LFEE Working Paper. Cambridge, MA: MIT LFEE June 2006.

“Grow Your Own—the Biofuels of the Future Will Be Tailor-Made,” in “The Future of Energy,” *The Economist*, June 2–27, 2008 (special report): 16–20.

Gurgel, Angelo, John M. Reilly, and Sergey Paltsev. Potential Land Use Implications of a Global Biofuels Industry. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Industrial Organization* 5, no. 2 (December 10, 2007). http://works.bepress.com/angelo_gurgel/1/.

Hawkins, D., D. Lashof, and R. Williams. What to Do about Coal. *Scientific American* 295, no. 3 (September 2006): 69–75.

Heller, Michael. *The Gridlock Economy: How Too Much Ownership Wrecks Markets, Stops Innovation, and Costs Lives*. New York: Basic Books 2008.

- Herzog, Antonia V., and Daniel Kammen. Energy R&D: Investment Challenge. *Materials Today* 5, no. 5 (May 1, 2002). http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?_ob=MImg&_imagekey=B6X1J-45NFNNM-15-9&_cdi=7244&_user=10&_orig=search&_coverDate=05%2F01%2F2002&_sk=999949994&view=c&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkzV&_valck=1&cmd5=a1f71c7a47eca507334818fab2023985&ie=/sdarticle.pdf.
- Herzog, Howard. Coal and CCS. Presentation to CSIS Energy Technology Forum, Washington, DC, September 28, 2006.
- Herzog, Howard. *Testimony before the House Committee on Natural Resources, Hearing to Explore Carbon Sequestration Technologies*, 110th Cong., 1st sess., May 1, 2007.
- Herzog, Howard J. *Regulatory Framework for Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS): The Policy Problem*. MIT project proposal, December 8, 2006.
- Hill, Christopher T. The Advanced Technology Program: Opportunities for Enhancement. In Lewis M. Branscomb and James H. Keller, eds., *Investing in Innovation: Creating a Research and Innovation Policy That Works*, 144–173. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1998.
- Holdren, John P. The Energy Innovation Imperative. *Innovations* 1, no. 2 (spring 2006): 3–23. <http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/pdf/10.1162/itgg.2006.1.2.3>.
- Hong, E., L. A. Conroy, and M. J. Scholand. *U.S. Lighting Market Characterization: Energy Efficient Lighting Technology Options*. Technical Report, vol. 2. Washington, DC: Department of Energy, EERE, 2005.
- Hosek, James, and Titus Galama. US Competitiveness in Science and Technology. Report. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corp., June 2008 House Science Committee. *Hearings on ARPA-E Concept*, 109th Cong., 2nd sess. And 110th Cong., 1st sess., March 9, 2006, and April 26, 2007.
- House Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming. *Testimony of James Hansen, NASA, at Briefing on the Climate Threat to the Planet*, 110th Cong., 2nd sess., June 23, 2008. http://www.columbia.edu/~jeh1/2008/TwentyYearsLater_20080623.pdf.
- HR 6, Public Law 110–140, *The Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007*, 110th Cong., 1st sess. (passed Congress and signed December 19, 2007); earlier Senate version, HR 6, 110th Cong., 1st sess. (passed the Senate June 2, 2007).

HR 364, *Establishing the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy (ARPA-E) Act*, 109th Cong., 2nd sess.

HR 2272, *The America COMPETES Act*, Conference Report H. Rep. 110-289, 110th Cong., 1st sess. (passed Congress August 1, 2007; signed into law August 9, 2007), particularly Sec. 5012.

HR 3221, *New Direction for Energy Independence, National Security, and Consumer Protection Act*, 110th Cong., 1st sess. (passed the House August 4, 2007).

Hudson, Andrea, Kyle Danish, and Alex Lazur. Lieberman Warner Climate Change Cap and Trade Bill Seen as Framework for Senate Climate Debate. Report. Washington, DC: Van Ness, Feldman, October 19, 2007. <http://www.vnf.com/news-alerts-217.html>.

IEA. *Energy Technology Perspectives 2008: Scenarios and Strategies to 2050*. June 6, 2008. http://www.iea.org/Textbase/techno/etp/ETP_2008.pdf.

IEA. *World Energy Outlook 2008*. November 12, 2008, <http://www.iea.org/Textbase/npsum/WEO2008SUM.pdf> (summary).

Interacademy Council. *Lighting the Way*. October 22, 2007, 42–44. <http://www.interacademycouncil.net/?id=12161>.

IPCC. *Fourth Assessment, Climate Change 2007 Synthesis Report—Summary for Policymakers*. Geneva, Switzerland: IPCC, November 17, 2007. (Citing Section 5.5 of longer report.) http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar4/syr/ar4_syr_spm.pdf.

IPCC, Working Group III, Mark Levine and Diana Urge Vorsatz, lead authors. Chap. 6 (Residential and Commercial Buildings): 389–430. *IPCC Fourth Assessment Report*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. <http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar4/wg3/ar4-wg3-chapter6.pdf>.

IPCC, Working Group III, Nebojsa Nakicenovic and Rob Swart, eds., *Special Report on Emissions Scenarios*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, March 2000. <http://www.grida.no/climate/ipcc/emission/>.

Jaffe, Judson, and Robert Stavins, *Linking Tradable Permit Systems for Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Opportunities, Implications and Challenges*, Report for the International Emissions Trading Association (Geneva Switzerland and Washington, DC: International Emissions Trading Association, November 2007). <http://www.ieta.org/ieta/www/pages/getfile.php?docID=2733>.

- Jochem, Eberhard A. An Efficient Solution. *Scientific American*, September 2006, 64–67.
- Johnson, Robbin S., and C. Ford Runge. Ethanol: The Train Wreck Ahead. *Issues in Science and Technology* (Fall 2007): 25–30. http://www.issues.org/24.1/p_johnson.html.
- Joint Committee on Taxation. *Estimated Budget Effects of the Conference Agreement for Title XIII of HR 6, the Energy Tax Incentives Act of 2005* JCX 59–05. July 27, 2005. <http://www.house.gov/jct/x-59-05.pdf>.
- Jones, Charles I., and John C. Williams. Measuring the Social Return to R&D. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 13, no. 114 (1998): 1119–1135.
- Jorgenson, Dale. U.S. Economic Growth in the Information Age. *Issues in Science and Technology*, fall 2001. <http://www.issues.org/18.1/jorgenson.html>.
- Kalicki, Jan, and David Goldwyn, eds. *Energy Security*. Baltimore: Woodrow Wilson Center/Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005.
- Kammen, Daniel M. The Rise of Renewal Energy. *Scientific American* 295, no. 3 (September 2006): 86–89.
- Kammen, Daniel M., and Gregory Nemet. Real Numbers: Reversing the Incredible Shrinking Energy R&D Budget. *Issues in Science and Technology*, fall 2005. <http://rael.berkeley.edu/files/2005/Kammen-Nemet-ShrinkingRD-2005.pdf>.
- Kanan, Matthew W., and Daniel G. Nocera. In Situ Formation of an Oxygen-Evolving Catalyst in Neutral Water Containing Phosphate and Co^{2+} , *Science Online* DOI: 10.1126/science.1162018, July 31, 2008. <http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/abstract/1162018>.
- Karsner, Alexander. *Testimony of the Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, before the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate*, April 11, 2007. http://www.congressional.energy.gov/documents/April_12_-_EE_-_Karsner.pdf.
- Katzer, James. *Testimony on Coal-Based Power Generation with CO₂ Capture and Sequestration, Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, Science, Energy, and Innovation Subcommittee*, 110th Cong., 1st sess., March 20, 2007.

Keasling, Jay D., and Howard Chou. Metabolic Engineering Delivers Next-Generation Biofuels. *Nature Biotechnology* 263 (March 26, 2008): 298–299.

Kenderdine, Melanie A., and Ernest J. Moniz. Technology Development and Energy Security. In David Goldwyn and Jan Kalicki, eds., *Energy Security in the 21st Century*. Baltimore: Woodrow Wilson Center, 2004: 429–459.

Kennedy, Donald. The Biofuels Conundrum. *Science* 316 (April 27, 2007): 515. <http://physics.indiana.edu/~brabson/p310/kennedy.pdf>.

Krauss, Clifford. Ethanol's Boom Stalling as Glut Depresses Prices. *New York Times*, September 30, 2007, Business section. http://www.nytimes.com/2007/09/30/business/30ethanol.html?_r=1&ref=business&oref=slogin.

Kreith, Frank, and Ron West. The Fallacies of a Hydrogen Economy. *Journal of Energy Resources Technology* 126, no. 4 (December 2004): 249–257.

Lazowska, Edward D., and David Paterson. An Endless Frontier Postponed. *Science* 308 (May 6, 2005): 757. <http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/summary/308/5723/757>.

Lerner, Josh. The Design of Effective Public Venture Capital Programs. Paper in NIST, *Managing Technical Risk*, NIST GCR 00–787 (April 2000): 80–93.

Lester, Richard K. *Universities, Innovation and the Competitiveness of Local Economies*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Industrial Performance Center Working Paper 05-010 (Dec. 2005).

Lieberman, Joseph I. Global Warming Goes to Market. *The American Interest* 1, no. 1 (autumn 2005). <http://www.the-american-interest.com/ai2/article.cfm?Id=63&Mid=1> [portion of article].

Lipsey, Richard G. *Economic Transformations: General Purpose Technologies and Long-Term Economic Growth*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Lundvall, Bengt-Ake. *Innovation, Growth and Social Cohesion*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, 2002.

Lundvall, Bengt-Ake. National Innovation Systems—Analytical Concept and Development Tool. 14 *Industry and Innovation* 1, (February 2007): 95–119.

Machiavelli, Niccolò. *The Prince and the Discourses*. New York: Modern Library, [1513] 1950. 21.

Markoff, John. Clouds over “Blue Sky” Research Agency. *New York Times*, May 4, 2005, 12.

Matthews, H. Damon, and Ken Caldeira. Stabilizing Climate Requires Near-Zero Emissions. *Geophysical Research Letters* 35, February 27, 2008. <http://www.agu.org/pubs/crossref/2008/2007GL032388.shtml>.

McCormick, David. *Undersecretary of the Treasury for International Affairs, Testimony before the Subcommittee on Monetary Policy of the House Financial Services Committee on \$2b Proposed U.S. Contributions to the \$10b Clean Technology Fund*, 110th Cong., 2nd sess., June 6, 2008.

McGee, Tim. Cut Solar Subsidies? Update with Vinod Khosla. *Los Angeles Times*, October 24, 2006. http://www.treehugger.com/files/2006/10/cut_solar_subsi_1.php.

McGuinness, Meghan, and A. Denny Ellerman. *The Effects of Interactions between Federal and State Climate Policies*. Report 08–004. Cambridge, MA: MIT Center for Energy and Environmental Policy Analysis, May 2008. <http://web.mit.edu/ceepr/www/publications/workingpapers/2008–004.pdf>.

MIT. *The Future of Coal*. Cambridge, MA: MIT, March 14, 2007. http://web.mit.edu/coal/The_Future_of_Coal.pdf.

MIT. *The Future of Geothermal Energy—Impact of Enhanced Geothermal Systems (EGS) on the U.S. in the 21st Century*. Cambridge, MA: MIT, February 2007. http://geothermal.inel.gov/publications/future_of_geothermal_energy.pdf.

MIT. *The Future of Nuclear Power*. Cambridge, MA: MIT, 2003. <http://web.mit.edu/nuclearpower/>.

MIT Energy Research Council. *Report of the Energy Research Council*. Cambridge, MA: MIT, May 3, 2006. <http://web.mit.edu/mitei/about/erc-report-final.pdf>.

MIT Joint Program on the Science and Policy of Global Climate Change. *The Environmental and Policy Issues Posed by New Concept Energy Technologies Operating at the Scale Required to Impact the Climate Problem*. Unpublished study proposal. February 21, 2007.

Mitchell, Donald. A Note on Rising Food Prices. World Bank Policy Working Paper 4682. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank

Development Prospects Group, July 2008. http://www.wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/IW3P/1B/2008/07/28/000020439_20080728103002/Rendered/PDF/WP4682.pdf

Nadiri, M. Ishaq. *Innovations and Technological Spillovers*. NBER Working Paper No. 4423. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research, 1993.

National Academy of Sciences. *Rising above the Gathering Storm*. Washington, DC: National Academy of Sciences, 2007. http://www.nap.edu/openbook.php?record_id=11463&page=R1.

National Academy of Sciences. Board on Science, Technology, and Economic Policy. *Partnerships for Solid State Lighting*. Washington, DC: National Academy of Sciences, 2002.

National Academy of Sciences, Board on Energy and Environmental Systems, *Energy: What You Need to Know*. Washington, DC: National Academy of Sciences, 2008.

National Commission on Energy Policy, *Ending the Energy Stalemate: A Bipartisan Strategy to Meet America's Energy Challenges*. December 1, 2004. <http://www.energycommission.org/ht/a/GetDocumentAction/i/1088>.

National Research Council, Board on Energy and Environmental Systems. *Energy: What You Need to Know*. Washington, DC: National Academy of Sciences, 2008. http://www7.nationalacademies.org/energy/energy_booklet_pdf.pdf.

National Research Council. *Energy Research at DOE: Was It Worth It?* Washington, DC: National Academies of Science, 2001.

National Research Council, Board on Science, Technology and Economic Policy. *21st Century Innovation Systems for Japan and the United States: Lessons from a Decade of Change*. 2008. (in publication).

National Research Council, Board on Science, Technology, and Economic Policy *SBIR: Challenges and Opportunities*. Report. Washington, DC: National Academy Press, 1999.

National Research Council, Board on Science, Technology, and Economic Policy, *The Advanced Technology Program: Challenges and Opportunities*. Report. Washington, DC: National Academies Press, 1999.

National Research Council, Science and Telecommunications Board, *Funding a Revolution: Government Support for Computing Research*. Report. Washington, DC: National Academy Press, 1999.

- Nelson, Richard R. *National Systems of Innovation*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Nelson, Richard R., and Sidney G. Winter. *An Evolutionary Theory of Economic Change*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982.
- Nemet, Gregory. *Policy and Innovation in Low Carbon Energy Technologies*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, UC Berkeley, 2007.
- Nemet, Gregory, and Daniel Kammen. U.S. Energy R&D: Declining Investment, Increasing Need, and the Feasibility of Expansion. *Energy Policy* 35 (2007): 747.
- Newell, Richard G., and Nathan E. Wilson. *Technology Prizes for Climate Change Mitigation*. RFF Discussion Paper 05–33. Washington, DC: Resources for the Future, June 2005. <http://www.rff.org/RFF/Documents/RFF-DP-05–33.pdf>.
- Nordhaus, Robert, and Kyle Danish. *Designing a Mandatory Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program for the U.S.* Executive Summary. Washington, DC: Pew Center for Global Climate Change, May 2003. <http://www.pewclimate.org/docUploads/USGas.pdf>.
- William Nordhaus, *A Question of Balance: Weighing the Options for Global Warming Policies*. New Haven, CT: Yale Univ. Press, 2008.
- Ogden, Joan. High Hopes for Hydrogen. *Scientific American* 295, no. 3 (September 2006): 94–101.
- Ohmae, Kenichi. *The End of the Nation State*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1995.
- Ohmae, Kenichi. *The Next Global State—Challenges and Opportunities in Our Borderless World*. Philadelphia: Wharton 2005.
- Pacala, Stephen W., and Robert H. Socolow. Stabilization Wedges: Solving the Climate Problem for the Next 50 Years with Current Technologies. *Science* 305 (August 13, 2004): 968. <http://carbonsequestration.us/Papers-presentations/htm/Pacala-Socolow-ScienceMag-Aug2004.pdf>.
- Paltsev, S. J., J. Reilly, H. Jacoby, A. Gurgel, G. Metcalf, A. Sokolov, and J. Holak. *Assessment of U.S. Cap-and-Trade Proposals*. Report No. 146. Cambridge, MA: MIT Joint Program on the Science and Policy of Global Change, April 2007. http://web.mit.edu/globalchange/www/MITJPSPGC_Rpt146.pdf.
- Perez, Carlota. *Technological Revolutions and Financial Capital*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, 2002.

Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America (PhRMA). R&D Spending by Biopharmaceutical Reaches \$58.8 Billion in 2007. March 24, 2008. http://www.phrma.org/news_room/press_releases/us_biopharmaceutical_companies_r%26d_spending_reaches_record_%2458.8_billion_in_2007/.

Pizer, William A. *A U.S. Perspective on Future Climate Regimes*. RFF Discussion Paper 07–04. Washington, DC: Resources for the Future, February 2007.

Podesta, John, Todd Stern, and Kit Batten. *Capturing the Energy Opportunity: Creating a Low-Carbon Economy*. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress, November 27, 2007.

Pogue, Forest C. *George C. Marshall—Statesman 1945–1959*. New York: Viking Penguin, 1987.

Pontin, Jason. Vinod Khosla, Veteran VC's New Energy: Q and A. *Technology Review*, March/April 2007, 32. www.technologyreview.com/energy/18299/.

Popp, David. The Effect of New Technology on Energy Consumption. *Resource and Energy Economics* 23 (2001): 215–239.

Prather, Kristala Jones. *Testimony to the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Conference on Accelerated Biofuels Diversity*, February 1, 2007, and accompanying *Comments Submitted to the Committee on Question 5 on Required R&D*, 110th Cong., 1st sess., January 26, 2007.

President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCAST). *Report to the President on Federal Energy R&D for the Challenges of the 21st Century*. Washington, DC: Executive Office of the President 7, November 1997. http://www.ostp.gov/cs/report_to_the_president_on_federal_energy_research_and_development_for_the_challenges_of_the_twentyfirst_century_table_of_contents.

President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCAST). *The Energy Imperative: Technology and the Role of Emerging Companies*. Washington, DC: OSTP, Executive Office of the President of the United States, November 2006. http://www.ostp.gov/pcast/PCAST-EnergyImperative_FINAL.pdf.

President's Information Technology Advisory Committee (PITAC). *Cybersecurity: A Crisis of Prioritization*. Report to the President. February 2005. http://www.nitrd.gov/pitac/reports/20050301_cybersecurity/cybersecurity.pdf.

- Price, Harry B. *Marshall Plan and Its Meaning*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1955.
- Public Law 96–480, *Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980* (1980), as amended by the *Federal Technology Transfer Act of 1986*, Public Law 99–502, (1986).
- Public Law 99–272, *Termination of US SFC Act*, Title VII, Subtitle E, 100 stat. 143 (April 7, 1986).
- Public Law 101–548, *Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990* (November 15, 1991).
- Public Law 109–058, *Energy Policy Act of 2005* (July 29, 2005).
- Rauch, Jonathan. Electro-Shock Therapy. *Atlantic*, July/August 2008, <http://www.theatlantic.com/doc/200807/general-motors>.
- Reilly, John, and Sergey Palsev. *Biomass Energy and Competition for Land*. Report No. 145. Cambridge, MA: MIT Joint Program on the Science and Policy of Global Change, April 2007. http://web.mit.edu/globalchange/www/MITJPSPGC_Rpt145.pdf.
- Reis, Victor. Nuclear Energy, Nuclear Weapons and Climate Change. Unpublished presentation, Washington, DC: Department of Energy, June 2008.
- Romer, Paul M. Endogenous Technological Change. *Journal of Political Economy* 98, no. 5 (1990). <http://www.nber.org/papers/w3210.pdf>.
- Romer, Paul M. Implementing a National Technology Strategy with Self-Organizing Investment Boards. In Martin N. Baily and Peter C. Reiss, eds., *Macromomics 1993*. Brookings Papers on Economic Activity. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 1993.
- Romm, Joseph J. *Hell and High Water: Global Warming—the Solution and the Politics—and What We Should Do*. New York: Morrow, 2007.
- Rosenthal, Elisabeth. China Leads the World in Emissions of Carbon Dioxide. *New York Times*, June 14, 2008. <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/06/14/world/asia/14china.html>.
- Rotman, David. The Price of Biofuels. *Technology Review* 111, no. 1 (January–February 2008): 42. <http://www.technologyreview.com/Energy/19842/>.
- Runge, C. Ford, and Benjamin Senauer. How Biofuels Could Starve the Poor. *Foreign Affairs* 86, no. 3 (May–June 2007): 41–53.

<http://www.foreignaffairs.org/20070501faessay86305/c-ford-runge-benjamin-senauer/how-biofuels-could-starve-the-poor.html>.

Ruttan, Vernon W. *Is War Necessary for Economic Growth? Military Procurement and Technology Development*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Ruttan, Vernon W. *Technology Growth and Development: An Induced Innovation Perspective* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001).

Ruttan, Vernon W. Will Government Programs Spur the Next Breakthrough? *Issues in Science and Technology*, winter 2006. <http://www.issues.org/22.2/ruttan.html>.

Ruttan, Vernon W., and Yujiro Hayami. *Agricultural Development: An International Perspective*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985 ed.).

Ruttan, Vernon W., and Yujiro Hayami, "Induced Innovation Model of Agricultural Development," in Carl K. Eicher and John M. Staatz, eds., *International Agricultural Development*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press 1998, 3rd ed., 163–178.

S. 761, *America COMPETES Act*, 110th Cong., 1st sess. (passed Senate April 25, 2007 as amended).

S. 932, *Energy Security Act, Public Law 96–294* (June 23, 1980).

S. 1151, *The McCain-Lieberman Climate Stewardship and Innovation Act of 2005*, 109th Cong., 1st sess. <http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/z?d109:s.01151>.

S. 2191, *The Climate Security Act*, introduced October 18, 2007, 110th Cong., 1st sess. (debated on the Senate floor, as amended, as S. 3036), 110th Cong., 2nd sess. (June 6, 2008).

S. 2730, *Clean Energy Investment Bank Act*, 110th Cong., 2nd Sess. (introduced by Sen. Domenici, March 6, 2008).

S. 3036, *Boxer-Lieberman-Warner Substitute Amendment to S. 2191*, 110th Cong., 2nd sess. (introduced May 21, 2008), Title III, Subtitle B, Sec. 321–322.

S. 3233, *21st Century Energy Technology Deployment Act*, 110th Cong., 2nd Sess. (introduced by Sen. Bingaman, July 11, 2008).

Sachs, Jeffrey. Technological Keys to Climate Protection. *Scientific American* 297, March 2008. <http://www.sciam.com/article.cfm?id=keys-to-climate-protection>.

Sachs, Jeffrey. The Road to Clean Energy Starts Here. *Scientific American* 296, April 2007. <http://www.sciam.com/article.cfm?id=the-road-to-clean-energy&SID=mail&sc=emailfriend>.

Sanderson, Susan W., Kenneth L. Simons, Judith L. Walls, and Yin-Yi Lai. Lighting. In National Research Council, Board on Science, Technology, and Economic Policy, *Innovation in Global Industries*. Washington, DC: National Research Council, 2008.

Schelling, Thomas C. Climate Change: The Uncertainties, the Certainties and What They Imply about Action. *The Economists' Voice* 4, no. 3, article 3 (2007). <http://www.bepress.com/ev/vol4/iss3/art3>.

Schilling, Melissa. *Strategic Management of Technological Innovation*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2005.

Schock, Robert N., William Fulkerson, Merwin Brown, Robert San Martin, David Greene, and Jae Edmonds. How Much Is Energy R&D Worth as Insurance? *Annual Review of Energy and the Environment* 24 (1999): 487–512.

Semiconductor Industry Association (SIA). Industry Facts and Figures. 2007. http://www.sia-online.org/ind_facts.cfm.

Senate Budget Committee. Hearing on the Long-Term Budget Outlook. *Testimony of GAO Comptroller General David Walker*. 110th Cong., 1st sess., January 11, 2007. <http://www.senate.gov/~budget/democratic/testimony/2007/Walkers%20Long-term%20Testimony.pdf>. http://www.senate.gov/~budget/democratic/charts/2007/Hearings/packet_LTBixby013107.pdf.

Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. Hearing to Investigate Market Constraints on Large Investments in Advanced Energy Technologies. Senate Hearing 110–63, 110th Cong., 1st sess., March 7, 2007.

Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. Hearings on the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership as It Relates to U.S. Policy on Nuclear Fuel Management. 110th Cong., 1st sess. (November 14, 2007). http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=110_senate_hearings&docid=f:41099.wais.

Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. Hearings on Legislation to Improve the Availability of Financing for Deployment of Clean Energy and Energy Efficiency Technologies and to Enhance

United States' Competitiveness in this Market, S. 3233 and S. 2730, 110th Cong., 2nd sess. (July 15, 2008).

Shao-Horn, Yang. An Alternative Technology for Transportation: Fuel Cell Hybrid Vehicles. Presentation to CSIS Energy Technology Forum, Washington, DC, September 28, 2006.

Shapiro, Robert, Nan Phan, and Arun Malik. *Addressing Climate Change without Impairing the U.S. Economy—the Economics and Environmental Science of Combining a Carbon-Based Tax and Tax Relief*. Washington, DC: U.S. Climate Task Force, June 2008. http://www.climate-taskforce.org/pdf/CTF_CarbonTax_Earth_Spgs.pdf.

Shinnar, Reuel. The Hydrogen Economy. *Technology in Society* 25, no. 4 (2003): 455–476.

Sklar, Scott. The Solar Subsidy Crutch or an Uneven Playing Field? *Renewable Energy Access*, April 25, 2006. <http://www.renewableenergyaccess.com/rea/news/story?id=44723>.

Smil, Vaclav. *Energy in Nature and Society: General Energetics of Complex Systems*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2008.

Sobel, Dava. *Longitude*. New York: Walker and Co., [1995] 2005.

Socolow, Robert H., and Stephen W. Pacala. A Plan to Keep Carbon in Check. *Scientific American* 295, no. 3 (September 2006): 50–57. <http://www.princeton.edu/mae/people/faculty/socolow/socdoc/carbonincheck.pdf>.

Solar PV Set to Grow. *Oxford Analytica*, May 9, 2008.

Solow, Robert M. *Growth Theory: An Exposition*. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000. (Nobel Prize Lecture, December 8, 1987.)

Stauffer, Nancy. *Ethanol Study Show Biofuels Benefits*. *MIT Tech Talk* 51, no. 15 (January 24, 2007). <http://mit.edu/newsoffice/2007/techtalk/51-15.pdf>.

Stauffer, Nancy. *Research Spotlight: Algae System Transforms Greenhouse Emissions into Fuel*. Research of Isaac Berzin. Cambridge, MA: MIT ERC, 2006. <http://web.mit.edu/erc/spotlights/alg.html>.

Stauffer, Nancy. *Research Spotlight: Engineering Viruses: Using Biology to Assemble Materials, Devices*. Research of Angela Belcher.

Cambridge, MA: MIT ERC, 2006. <http://web.mit.edu/erc/spotlights/vir.html>.

Stauffer, Nancy. *Research Spotlight: Giant Wind Turbines Floating Out of Sight*. Research of Paul D. Sclavounos. Cambridge, MA: MIT ERC, 2008. <http://web.mit.edu/erc/spotlights/wind.html>.

Stauffer, Nancy. *Research Spotlight: Making Solar Cells from Ribbons*. Research of Emanuel Sachs. Cambridge, MA: MIT ERC, 2006. http://web.mit.edu/erc/spotlights/solar_cells.html.

Steinfeld, Edward S. *Testimony to the House Committee on Energy and Commerce, Hearing on Climate Change—International Issues, Engaging Developing Countries*. 110th Cong., 1st sess., March 27, 2007. http://energycommerce.house.gov/cmte_mtgs/110-eaq-hrg.032707.Steinfeld-testimony.pdf.

Stephanopoulos, Gregory. Challenges in Engineering Microbes for Biofuels Production. *Science* 315 (February 9, 2007): 801–804.

Stern, Nicholas. *Stern Review on the Economics of Climate Change*. London: H. M. Treasury, 2006. http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/media/4/3/Executive_Summary.pdf.

Stokes, Donald E. *Pasteur's Quadrant: Basic Science and Technological Innovation*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 1997.

Stolberg, Sheryl Gay. Richest Nations Pledge to Halve Greenhouse Gas—G8 Call for GHG Reductions beyond Stabilization. *New York Times*, July 9, 2008, Science/Environment section. <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/07/09/science/earth/09climate.html>.

Talbot, David. Emerging Technologies 2007—Nanocharging Solar. *Technology Review*, March/April 2007. <http://www.technologyreview.com/Energy/18285>.

Tester, Jefferson W., Elisabeth M. Drake, Michael J. Driscoll, Michael W. Golay, and William A. Peters. *Sustainable Energy: Choosing among Options*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2005.

Thompson, Elizabeth A. MIT Opens New “Window on Solar Energy. MIT News Office, July 10, 2008. <http://web.mit.edu/newsoffice/2008/solarcells-0710.html>.

Thorsteinsson, Hildigunnur, Chad Augustine, Brian Anderson, Michal Moore, P. von Rohr, T. Rothenfluh, and Jefferson Tester. Sustainable Energy Opportunities with the Geothermal Continuum. Paper, NSTI Nanotech 2008, June 1–5, 2008.

Thorsteinsson, Hildigunnur, Chad Augustine, Brian Anderson, Michal Moore, and Jefferson Tester. The Impacts of Drilling and Reservoir Technology Advances on EGS Exploitation. Paper, *Proceedings of the Thirty-Third Workshop on Geothermal Reservoir Engineering*, January 28–30, 2008.

Trafton, Anne. Major Discovery from MIT Primed to Unleash Solar Revolution. MIT News Office, July 31, 2008. <http://web.mit.edu/newsoffice/2008/oxygen-0731.html>.

UD Team Sets Solar Record. *Science Daily*, July 30, 2007. <http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2007/07/070726210931.htm>.

UD-Led Team Sets Solar Cell Record. *University of Delaware Daily*, July 23, 2007. <http://www.udel.edu/PR/UDaily/2008/jul/solar072307.html>.

Uranium Information Centre. *Nuclear Power in France*. Briefing Paper No. 28. April 2007. <http://www.uic.com.au/nip28.htm>.

Urge-Vorsatz, Diana, L. D. Harvey, Sevastianos Mirasgedis, and Mark D. Levine. Mitigating CO₂ Emissions from Energy Use in the World's Buildings. *Building and Research Information*, 2007. <http://web.ceu.hu/envsci/publication/duv/BRImitiginbldgsppr2007.pdf>.

Utterback, James M. *Mastering the Dynamics of Innovation*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 1996.

Van Atta, Richard H., Sidney G. Reed, and Seymour J. Deitchman. *DARPA Technical Accomplishments: An Historical Review of Selected DARPA Projects*. Vols. 1–5. Alexandria, VA: IDA, 1991.

Venture Capital Investment in Renewable Energy Soars to \$3.4 Billion in 2007. Reuters, *Business Wire*, January 16, 2007. <http://www.reuters.com/article/pressRelease/idUS153866+16-Jan-2008+BW20080116>.

Vermerris, Wilfred, ed. *Genetic Improvement of Bioenergy Crops*. New York: Springer, 2008.

Waldrop, M. Mitchell. *Complexity*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1992.

Waldrop, M. Mitchell. *The Dream Machine—JCR Licklider and the Revolution That Made Computing Personal*. New York: Viking, 2001.

Walker, David M. A Call for Stewardship. National Press Club speech by U.S. Comptroller General, December 17, 2007. <http://www.gao.gov/cghome/d08371cg.pdf>.

Weiss, Charles. *The Marshall Plan: Lessons for U.S. Assistance to Central and Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union*. Atlantic Council Occasional Paper. Washington, DC: Atlantic Council, 1995.

Wexler, Imanuel. *Marshall Plan Revisited*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1983.

Williams, Eric, Nora Greenglass, and Rebecca Ryals. *Carbon Capture, Pipeline, and Storage: A Viable Option for N.C. Utilities?* Report No. CC PP WP 07–01. Durham, NC: Nicholas Institute for Environmental Policy, Duke University, March 8, 2007. <http://www.nicholas.duke.edu/institute/carboncapture.pdf>.

Wilson, Theodore A. *The Marshall Plan: An Atlantic Venture of 1947–51 and How It Shaped the World*. New York: Foreign Policy Association, June 1977.

Wind Power Expands in Renewables Search. *Oxford Analytica*, November 15, 2007.

Wiser, Ryan H., and Galen Barbose. *Renewable Portfolio Standards in the U.S.: A Status Report with Data through 2007*. Berkeley, CA: Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, April 10, 2008. <http://eetd.lbl.gov/ea/ems/reports/ibnl-154e-revised.pdf>—or— <http://eetd.lbl.gov/ea/ems/emp-ppt.html>.

World Bank. *Proposal for a Clean Technology Fund*. Report on Design Meeting on Climate Investment Funds, Washington, DC: World Bank April 3, 2008. http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTCC/Resources/Proposal_For_A_Clean_Technology_Fund_April_3_2008.pdf.

World Economic Forum. *Global Competitiveness Report 2007–08—National Competitiveness Rankings*. October 31, 2007. <http://www.gcr.weforum.org/>.

Wright, Tom. Indian Wind Turbine Firm Hits Turbulence, *Wall Street Journal*, June 30, 2008, 31.

WTRG Economics. *Oil Price History and Economics*. 2007. wtrg.com/prices.html.

Wulf, William A., and Thomas Leighton. Testimony to the House Science Committee Hearing on the Future of Computer Science Research in the U.S., 109th Cong., 1st sess., May 12, 2005; Joint Statement of the Computing Research Community; Letters in

Response to Committee Questions from W. Wulf and T. Leighton, July 2005; and DARPA responses to Committee Questions, House Science Committee Hearing, May 12, 2005 (DARPA Testimony, including Appendices A–D).

Yanuzzi, Rick E. In-Q-Tel: A New Partnership between the CIA and the Private Sector. *Defense Intelligence Journal* 9, no. 1 (2000). <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/additional-publications/in-q-tel/index.html#author>.

Yokell, Michael D. The Role of the Government in Subsidizing Solar Energy. *American Economic Review* 69, no. 2, containing *Papers and Proceedings of the Ninety-First Annual Meeting of the American Economic Association*, May 1979.

Zittrain, Jonathan. *The Future of the Internet—And How to Stop It*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008.

Zubrin, Robert. In Defense of Biofuels. *New Atlantis: A Journal of Technology and Society*, spring 2008. <http://www.thenewatlantis.com/publications/in-defense-of-biofuels>.