

IDENTIFICATION OF U.S. ADVANCED-TECHNOLOGY MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES FOR MONITORING AND POSSIBLE COMPREHENSIVE STUDY

Report to the Committee on
Finance, United States Senate,
on Investigation No. 332-294
Under Section 332 of the
Tariff Act of 1930

USITC PUBLICATION 2319

SEPTEMBER 1990

United States International Trade Commission
Washington, DC 20436



UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

COMMISSIONERS

Anne E. Brunsdale, Acting Chairman

Seeley G. Lodwick

David B. Rohr

Don E. Newquist

Office of Industries
Robert A. Rogowsky, Director

This report was prepared principally by
Stephen L.S. Smith and Nelson J. Hogge

with assistance from
John Cutchin and Andrew Malison
Office of Industries
and
Joseph Flynn
Office of Economics

under the direction of
Aaron H. Chesser, Chief
Machinery and Equipment Division

**Address all communications to
Kenneth R. Mason, Secretary to the Commission
United States International Trade Commission
Washington, DC 20436**

PREFACE

On July 20, 1990, at the request of the Senate Committee on Finance, and in accordance with section 332(g) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C.) (1332(g)), the U.S. International Trade Commission (Commission) instituted investigation No. 332-294, Identification of U.S. Advanced-Technology Manufacturing Industries for Monitoring and Possible Comprehensive Study. (See app. A for request letter.) The committee requested the Commission to expand its collection of, and ability to analyze, information on the competitiveness of advanced-technology manufacturing industries in the United States, pursuant to sections 332(b), 332(d), and 332(g) of the Tariff Act of 1930. Specifically, the committee requested that the Commission, under a two-stage investigation, provide the following:

- Within 3 months of the receipt of the letter, provide a list of U.S. advanced-technology industries for which the Commission will develop and maintain up-to-date information. The industries are to be identified by considering the following criteria, as well as any other criteria the Commission may choose to establish: the industries produce a product that (1) involves new or advanced technology; (2) involves high added value and research and development expenditures that are substantially above the national average; and (3) benefits in foreign markets from coordinated policies that include, among others, protection of the home market, assistance in developing technology and bringing it to market, and export promotion and regulatory policies.
- Recommend from the list three advanced-technology manufacturing industries for comprehensive study. The Commission's report on these industries should include information on existing or proposed foreign government policies that assist or encourage these industries to remain or become globally competitive, existing U.S. Government policies that assist or encourage these industries to remain or become globally competitive, and impediments in the U.S. economy that inhibit increased competitiveness of these U.S. industries.

Notice of the Commission's investigation was posted in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, Washington, DC, and published in the *Federal Register* (55 F.R. 30530) of July 26, 1990 (app. B). All persons were afforded the opportunity to submit written views concerning the industries to be included on the list and that may be the subject of a comprehensive study.

In the course of its investigation, the Commission collected information on U.S. advanced-technology manufacturing industries from various sources, including the U.S. Bureau of the Census, the U.S. Department of Defense, the U.S. Department of Commerce, the National Science Foundation, and industry and trade association officials. In addition, information was collected from scholarly research and other private sources. A public hearing was not scheduled for the investigation.

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Preface	i
Executive summary	v
Introduction	1
Identification and monitoring of advanced-technology industries	1
Methodological considerations and survey of past attempts	1
Measures of scientists, engineers, and technicians	1
Consensus-based lists	2
U.S. Bureau of the Census advanced-technology products list	2
Militarily critical technologies list	2
R&D-based measures	3
Conceptual background	3
High-technology industries identified by R&D data	4
Commission's methodology and list of high-technology products	6
Comparison of lists of high-technology products	6
Commission's list of advanced-technology products	7
Monitoring high-technology industries	7
Industries recommended by the Commission for comprehensive study	7
Objectives and methodology for future comprehensive studies by the Commission	8
Objectives	8
Methodology	9
 Appendixes	
A. Letter from the Committee on Finance, United States Senate, requesting the investigation	A-1
B. The Commission's notice of investigation	B-1
C. Comments received from interested parties	C-1
D. Data tables	D-1
E. Bibliography	E-1
 Tables	
1. High-technology industries identified by L. Davis: R&D expenditures as a percent of sales, 1977-79, and applicable SIC codes	4
2. High-technology industries with above-average R&D-to-sales ratios, by rank, 1984-87, and applicable SIC codes	5
3. High-technology industries ranked by R&D to sales for 1989, and applicable SIC codes	6
4. Advanced-technology industries identified for further monitoring and study by the Commission, and applicable SIC codes	7
D-1. Selected industries: R&D as share of net sales, 1984-87	D-2
D-2. Summary of R&D expenditures in selected industries for 1989	D-3
D-3. Comparison of coverage of high-technology industry lists	D-4

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On June 21, 1990, the Senate Committee on Finance requested the U.S. International Trade Commission to conduct a two-phase investigation covering a broad range of advanced-technology manufacturing industries. Under phase I and within 3 months of the receipt of the letter, the committee requested the Commission to provide a list of advanced-technology manufacturing industries about which the Commission will develop and maintain up to date information. The committee also requested the Commission under phase I to recommend three industries from the list for future comprehensive study. These three comprehensive studies, each taking approximately 1 year to complete, are to be conducted under phase II of the investigation.

The Identification of Advanced-Technology Manufacturing Industries

Advanced-technology manufacturing industries are difficult to identify because their basic characteristic—dependence upon new knowledge—is embodied in their output and production processes. A variety of methods exist to define advanced-technology (or, high-technology) industries. Various studies have identified groups of high-technology industries and analyzed trade in those product industries over the past 20 years.

- One prominent approach depends on the subjective but expert analysis of industry analysts. On this basis, the U.S. Department of Commerce has established a list of advanced-technology products (ATP) based on the Harmonized Tariff Schedule, which is used by the Bureau of the Census to monitor trade in these products.
- Another prominent approach, and one that has come into common usage, is to use the level of an industry's research and development (R&D), in absolute terms or as a share of sales, to measure its technological intensiveness. This report examines several of these existing R&D measures and evaluates two new R&D lists containing more recent data. The inherent strength of R&D-based measures is that R&D serves as a good index of the creation of new knowledge, allowing industries to be ranked by their degree of technological intensiveness.
- A comparison of the R&D-based lists of advanced-technology products and the Census ATP list reveals that most of the advanced-technology industries identified in the various studies are, indeed, common to all such lists. As a result, and based on these lists, the Commission identifies for the committee the advanced-technology industries shown below for which the Commission will develop and maintain up-to-date information.

Advanced-Technology Industries Identified by the Commission

1. Chemicals and plastics,
2. Drugs,
3. Machine tools, including semiconductor manufacturing equipment,
4. Computers, software, and peripherals (including displays),
5. Communications equipment,
6. Microelectronic components, including semiconductors,
7. Motor vehicles and parts,
8. Aircraft and parts,
9. Missiles, spacecraft, and parts,
10. Scientific and professional instruments, including fiber optics.

- The Commission will explore a variety of ways to develop a long-term capacity to monitor U.S. advanced-technology manufacturing industries through current and potentially new Commission work products.

Recommendation of Three Industries for Comprehensive Study

Although advanced-technology industries commonly are assumed to be important for an economy, such an assumption does not always provide sufficient guidance upon which to choose specific advanced-technology industries for comprehensive study:

- On the basis of theoretical and practical concerns, the industries chosen should meet the following criteria: (a) individually and as a group, the industries should be those the study of which will offer lessons on how market forces operate to drive competition and technological development; (b) domestic and foreign producers are affected significantly by government programs; and (c) the named industry holds the promise of having strategic importance because of its technological spillovers and externalities.
- Accordingly, the Commission recommends the following industries for indepth comprehensive study:
 - (a) Communications technology and equipment;
 - (b) Pharmaceuticals; and
 - (c) Semiconductor manufacturing and testing equipment.
- The overall objective in each of these studies will be to analyze the determinants of the economic structure and performance of the industry. Each study will take a global perspective of the marketplace, analyze the nature of competition and technological change, consider the existing and proposed U.S. and foreign government policies, and integrate these components to determine how these markets operate and how they are influenced by government policies. A second major objective of each study will be to examine the significance of the linkages and spillovers between the industry under study and the U.S. economy in general.

Introduction

On June 22, 1990, the Commission received from the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance a letter requesting that the Commission expand and enhance its capacity to develop and maintain up-to-date information on U.S. advanced-technology manufacturing industries. The Commission was requested by the committee to undertake a two-step investigation. The first step requires the Commission to submit to the committee a list of advanced-technology manufacturing industries on which to develop and maintain up-to-date information and a recommendation of three industries from the list for comprehensive study. Preparation of the three industry studies is the second step of the investigation.

In response to the committee's request, this report addresses the difficulty of defining advanced-technology manufacturing industries, develops a substantive list of such industries, and discusses the Commission's plans to monitor these industries. The report subsequently takes up the issue of which industries to recommend for in-depth study. To this end, the Commission's recommendations are laid out, along with proposals for the content and coverage of the phase II comprehensive competitiveness studies.

Identification and Monitoring of Advanced-Technology Industries

In order to choose the industries to analyze in a substantive manner, a sound definition of a high-technology or, advanced-technology industry is needed. This section goes about that task in two ways. First, it outlines and evaluates the various approaches that have been used to define high-technology industries. Despite the variety of approaches that have previously been used and the intrinsic difficulties of the task, a consensus does appear to exist within the Government and the academic community that the technological intensity of an industry is best reflected in its research and development (R&D) spending (in absolute terms or as a share of sales). However, the existence of a consensus does not necessarily mean that R&D-based measures of technological intensity are exact. Several of the intrinsic shortcomings of R&D-based measures, as well as difficulties with the availability of R&D data, are therefore explored.

Second, on the basis of the best R&D data available for the 1980s, a group of industries can be identified as being the most technologically advanced in the United States. A comparison of the lists based on available R&D criteria and the previous, subjective lists of high-technology industries indicates that they are similar. In conclusion, industries can be satisfactorily classified as advanced-technology industries if they are

characterized by above-average shares of R&D expenditure relative to sales.

Methodological Considerations and Survey of Past Attempts

The hallmark of a high-technology industry is its dependence on "new knowledge" and the creation of advanced products, processes, and procedures for producing a product. However, there is no exact way to measure the creation of new knowledge, and because measures of technological intensiveness are necessarily indirect, the use of proxies is inevitable. Technological advancement is a continuous process and "new knowledge" represents a moving target as products advanced in one period often become routine or mature in the next. Hence, a list of advanced-technology industries is likely to change over time, if defined with specificity. Therefore, measures employed in discriminating between high-technology and low-technology industries should be well understood.

Measures used in the past two decades to define advanced-technology industries fall into three categories and are discussed below. Despite certain drawbacks, however, R&D-based measures offer the most sound basis for identifying high-technology industries and ranking them according to their degree of technological intensiveness.

Measures of Scientists, Engineers, and Technicians

The share of scientists, engineers, and technicians employed in an industry (often called the S/E share) is a measure that has been used to identify advanced-technology industries. The greater the number, the more advanced the technology is considered to be. The share can be calculated by using all scientists and engineers engaged in R&D (for which the U.S. average is 66.2 per 10,000 workers).¹ High-technology industries are then defined as those industries having an S/E share greater than an all-industry average, or some other appropriate measure. Obviously, choosing a dividing line is arbitrary; studies that have used the S/E ratio have usually also used other measures (see below).

The advantage of the S/E ratio is that it captures an important part of any industry's investment in new knowledge. Scientists and engineers are crucial to the invention of new goods and processes, as well as to the adoption of new technologies. However, this measure does not reveal the full extent of an industry's or firm's investment in new knowledge, which goes beyond the number of scientific personnel employed to include such things as spending on research and experimental equipment, prototypes, support staff, libraries, and travel.

¹ National Science Board, *Science & Engineering Indicators—1989*, p. 262 (data are for 1986).

Consensus-Based Lists

Consensus-based approaches have been frequently used to develop lists of high-technology industries. However, there are two fundamental drawbacks with subjective classifications because they are inherently inexact and cannot easily be used to rank industries by their degree of technological intensity. On the other hand, the approach has the merits of drawing on the insights of experienced industry observers and yields lists that can be updated quickly when any particular industry ceases to be "advanced." It is reassuring to find substantial overlap among these lists, which are surveyed below.

U.S. Bureau of the Census Advanced-Technology Products List

The U.S. Bureau of the Census (Census) developed a list of advanced-technology products to report U.S. trade performance in high-technology products as part of its general responsibility to provide U.S. trade statistics. Using what the Bureau describes as a "consensus approach," the U.S. Department of Commerce (Commerce) conducted surveys of U.S. firms and trade associations to determine industry's views on which products are considered advanced. Based on those surveys, Census selected a list of more than 500 Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) import and export items as representing "advanced-technology products." The items appearing on the list meet the following criteria: (1) they are from a "recognized high-technology field," such as biotechnology; (2) they represent leading-edge technology in that field; and (3) they constitute a significant part of all items covered in each selected classification code. After it was compiled, Census analysts reviewed the list to avoid problems inherent in canvassing firms to determine whether they classify their own products as "leading-edge" or "high-technology" products, particularly since high technology is a term often used by firms as a marketing tool to increase the sale of their products.

Based on this work, Commerce publishes in Census publication FT 920 (U.S. Merchandise Trade: Selected Highlights) statistics on U.S. imports and exports of advanced-technology products.²

Products appearing on the Census list that account for a large number of HTS import and export items include the following product categories:

² Information on the Census approach was collected from staff conversations with Census officials and at a presentation to Office of Industry staff by Dr. Robert McGuckin of the Center for Economic Studies of the Bureau of the Census (June 20, 1990). See also T. Abbott and others, *Measuring the Trade Balance in Advanced Technology Products*, U.S. Bureau of the Census, Center for Economic Studies, 1989, 89-1.

1. Semiconductors;
2. Office machines (including computers);
3. Pharmaceuticals;
4. Aircraft and spacecraft;
5. Machine tools;
6. Telephone and telegraph apparatus;
7. Communications equipment;
8. Medical equipment;
9. Scientific instruments;
10. Optical fibers and other optical goods;
11. Special machinery (e.g., machine tools, robotics, etc.);
12. Industrial inorganic chemicals; and
13. Plastics and resins.

Militarily Critical Technologies List

The U.S. Department of Defense is required under the Export Administration Act to identify strategic U.S. technologies whose export could yield a "significant contribution to the military potential of other countries." This list has included 20 technologies since 1986;³ the prominent ones are listed below:⁴

1. Computer hardware technology;
2. Computer software technology;
3. Semiconductor and electronic-component technology;
4. Instrumentation technology;
5. Telecommunications technology;
6. Chemicals and biotechnology;
7. Communications, navigation, and identification technology;
8. Vehicular technology;
9. Materials and production technology;
10. Information systems and network technology;
11. Optical technology; and
12. Energy systems technology.

Of these two lists, the Census approach is more congruent with the Commission's interests because it seeks to identify all high-technology sectors per se, whether or not they are militarily significant or are the target of foreign intervention.⁵

³ The 20 categories can be broken down further into about 120 subcategories which represent the basis for the official Coordinating Committee (COCOM) list, and which are currently being discussed for liberalization given recent developments in the Warsaw Pact nations.

⁴ These technologies are not listed in order of military priority. For information on the Defense Department's allocation of internal R&D funds across these technologies, see the U.S. Department of Defense's *Critical Technologies Plan* submitted to the Congressional Committees on Armed Services on Mar. 15, 1990.

⁵ The Office of Science and Technology Policy is also preparing a consensus-based list of "critical technologies," to be released in a public report in the fall of 1990. Finally, academic literature has also contained a number of subjective classifications of goods into the

R&D-Based Measures

Conceptual background.—These measures are based on absolute R&D, R&D as a share of industry sales, or both. High-technology industries are identified as those industries whose expenditures on R&D exceed a level specified by the researcher. This approach has two immediate and attractive features. First, and foremost, it measures the value of most of the resources committed to the creation of knowledge, and therefore can presumably be taken as a lower bound on (and index of) the value to firms of their new knowledge. Second, since these measures can allow comparisons to be made across industries of the relative importance of R&D, they offer a way of ranking industries by degree of technological intensiveness. Although there is an unavoidable subjective element in deciding which industries are high technology and which are not, the dividing line between the two can be weighed explicitly and the sensitivity of any analysis to that dividing line can be evaluated.⁶

Absolute and relative R&D are the best measures when they are used together because relative R&D is sensitive to output levels. Industries with the same absolute amount of R&D can have different technological intensiveness if their sales levels differ, leading one mistakenly to conclude that an industry is not "advanced" even when it is innovative. A measure based solely on absolute R&D could ignore industries for which R&D is at relatively small levels, and from which substantial new knowledge is being added.

R&D data may also understate the extent of knowledge creation if learning-by-doing is significant. R&D data by definition may exclude certain expenditures made for production engineering—toolmaking and tool tryout, creating detailed construction drawings and blueprints, and preproduction planning, all of which embody and facilitate learning. R&D data cannot include the financial losses firms may experience while moving down their learning curves, even though such losses represent investments in the learning (often of a noncodifiable variety) that take place.

⁶—Continued
"high-tech" category. One particularly prominent example is the judgmental categorization made by Hufbauer and Chilas (1974), which was then used by Stern and Maskus (1981) and Lawrence (1984). G. Hufbauer and J. Chilas, "Specialization by International Countries: Extent and Consequences," ch. in H. Giersch, ed., *The International Division of Labor: Problems and Perspectives* (New York: J.C.B. Mohr, 1974); R. Stern and K. Maskus, "Determinants of the Structure of Foreign Trade," *Journal of International Economics*, vol. 11, (1981) pp. 207-224; R. Lawrence, "Can America Compete" (Washington, DC: Brookings) 1984.

⁶ It is interesting to note that the dividing line between "capital intensive" and "labor intensive" products in traditional two-factor economic models has exactly the same ambiguity.

To solve this problem, some researchers have used patent data as an index of technology creation, but decisions by firms to obtain patents are often strategic moves whose outcome may have little to do with how much new technology is developed. For instance, some firms may choose not to obtain patents to protect the secrecy of their research, whereas others may obtain patents for each trivially different innovation they make. As long as the distribution of learning-by-doing across industries corresponds more or less to the distribution of R&D (which seems a reasonable assumption given the complementarity between R&D and learning by doing), R&D data are likely to serve as the best available general indicator of knowledge creation.⁷

Since about 1980, R&D-based measures of technological intensiveness have become the norm. Prior to that time, R&D measures were often used together with S/E measures. Since then, most of the studies attempting to identify high-technology sectors have done so on the basis of R&D alone, although R&D-based measures are not easy to construct.⁸

In fact, R&D expenditures can be measured in many ways, and fundamental problems exist in the availability of data.⁹ One problem arises because large firms often have R&D expenditures that cross several product lines. For instance, the General Electric Co. does research in such diverse areas as aircraft engines, aerospace, and consumer appliances. However, since 1983, the data collected by the National Science Foundation assigns all of the R&D conducted by a firm to a single industry category. This can obviously,

⁷ For the contrary view, and a discussion of the merits of patent data, see K. Pavitt and P. Patel, "The International Distribution and Determinants of Technological Activities," *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, vol. 4, No. 4 (1988).

⁸ For instance, Boretsky's (1971) measure defined high-technology industries as those with at least a 10-percent R&D share of gross value added, and/or at least 10 percent S/E employment. (International Trade Administration (ITA) (1983) and Hatter (1985) also provide details.) Similarly, the National Science Foundation (NSF) defined R&D-intensive goods as those with R&D of at least 3.5 percent of net sales and 2.5 percent S/E employment (Hatter (1985), citing NSF's *Science Indicators* 1982). M. Boretsky, "Concerns About the Present American Position in International Trade," ch. in National Academy of Sciences, Technology and International Trade (Washington, DC: NAS, 1971).

⁹ The National Science Foundation defines R&D expenditures as being basic research, applied research, or development. According to the National Science Foundation (NSF), basic research has as its objective "to gain fuller knowledge or understanding of the fundamental aspects of phenomena and observable fact without specific applications toward processes or products in mind", whereas applied research has as its goal "to gain knowledge or understanding necessary for determining the means by which a recognized and specific need may be met." NSF defines development as "systematic use of knowledge gained from research, directed toward the production of useful materials, devices, systems or methods, including the development of prototypes and processes."

result in some distortion in the data being generated.¹⁰

A problem also arises because of concerns about confidentiality in the NSF industry data. Total R&D spending by industry source has two major components: (1) spending out of firms' own funds and (2) spending out of Federal funds.¹¹ For some industries, in order to protect firms' identities and their proprietary information, only data for one of the groups (total, firms' own, or Federal) are reported. Through 1980, the rule at the NSF was to report the total, leaving the company and Federal shares suppressed. However, starting in 1981, the NSF has not reported the total, but instead has reported companies' own spending.¹²

Although, there are significant problems in using R&D data to identify high-technology industries, the use of available R&D data yields virtually the same set of industries identified as "technologically advanced" regardless of which R&D measure is used. Furthermore, it turns out that the list parallels the consensus-based lists discussed earlier.

¹⁰ For details, see NSF 89 323, especially the technical notes and tables B-26 and B-28. It appears from USITC staff conversations with NSF statisticians, that the major reason that R&D spending is no longer reported by product field is that responses to the product field question (in the biannual R&D survey conducted by Census under NSF supervision) were too low. However, data on R&D by product field are available from firms reporting such data.

¹¹ Several other sources of funds exist—universities, state and local governments, and non-profit private research institutions or foundations—but their funding of R&D is relatively small compared to the contributions of industry and the Federal government.

¹² Source: USITC staff telephone conversation with NSF staff on Aug. 8, 1990.

High-technology industries identified by R&D data.—The most widely cited study on identifying high-technology industries with R&D data is by Lester A. Davis (1982).¹³ Davis' list has proven popular and has been used in numerous studies, including NSB (1989), ITA (1983), Hatter (1985), and Kreinin (1987).¹⁴ Davis' list covered the period 1977–79 and used applied R&D data (Federal and firms' own) by product field. Furthermore, he included both "direct" R&D that was spent in each product field and "indirect" R&D spent in each field—that is, the R&D embodied in the inputs firms purchased from outside sources. This particular calculation was done by using input-output tables, which detailed the degree of mutual interdependence across industries that arises because of the use by each industry of other industries' outputs for its own inputs.¹⁵

Over all U.S. industries, Davis found the weighted average of total (direct plus indirect) R&D spending as a share of sales for the period 1977–79 to be 3.3 percent. He designated as "high technology" only those industries that exhibited a "significantly" higher R&D share than the average, and developed the list in table 1 below, in which the industries exhibit a total R&D intensiveness greater than 4 percent.

¹³ Commerce, ITA, *Technology Intensity of U.S. Output and Trade*, by L. Davis (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce, 1982).

¹⁴ National Science Board, *Science and Technology Indicators*, 1989, 89-1, 1989; ITA, *An Assessment of U.S. Competitiveness in High Technology Industries*; Hatter, "U.S. High Technology Trade and Competitiveness," M. Kreinin, "Comparative Advantage and Possible Trade Restrictions in High Technology Products," ch. in D. Salvatore, ed., *The New Protectionist Threat to World Welfare*, (New York: North-Holland, 1987).

¹⁵ For instance, the R&D intensiveness of the aircraft industry was ranked not only on the basis of R&D expenditures on aircraft, but also on the basis of R&D used in producing the inputs used in the aircraft industry.

Table 1
High-technology industries identified by L. Davis: R&D expenditures as a percent of sales, 1977–79, and applicable SIC codes

Industry ¹	Direct plus indirect R&D: percent of sales, 1977–79	SIC code
1. Guided missiles and spacecraft	63.86	376
2. Communications equipment and electronic components	16.04	365–67
3. Aircraft and parts	15.40	372
4. Office computing and accounting machines	13.65	357
5. Ordnance and accessories	13.64	348
6. Drugs	8.37	283
7. Industrial inorganic chemicals	8.23	281
8. Professional and scientific instruments	5.70	38, except 3825
9. Engines, turbines, and parts	5.49	351
10. Plastics materials and synthetic resins	5.42	282
11. Agricultural chemicals	4.19	287
12. Motor vehicles and equipment	4.14	371
Weighted average, all industries	3.30	

¹ The industry categories are from the NSF's 1980 classification scheme, and for the sake of later comparisons, the corresponding SIC codes are listed.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, International Trade Administration, *Technology Intensity of U.S. Output and Trade*, by L. Davis (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce, 1982).

It is no longer possible to calculate a completely accurate measure of R&D intensiveness because the NSF no longer reports R&D by product field. Total R&D spending by industry (that is, Federal plus companies' own funds) is also no longer reported. However, one can identify a group of technology-intensive industries on the basis of an industry classification of firms' own R&D expenditures. It appears that the constituent industries of such a list are relatively insensitive to changes in how the R&D is measured and to changes in the SIC-based definitions of the industries themselves. For example, although Davis includes both "direct" and "indirect" R&D in his analysis, the ranking of industries is similar if only direct R&D is used.¹⁶

The NSF collects and reports R&D data on a three-digit SIC basis. During the period 1984-87, the NSF reported R&D only as a share of net sales by industry source, and for companies' own funds, i.e., excluding Federal funds. Table 2 below ranks all the industries with above-average R&D-to-sales ratios, using the industry classifications and names by which the NSF reports the data. The corresponding SIC classes for each of these industries are also listed. Apart from slight differences due to variations in aggregating industry groups, the list is virtually the same as that compiled by Davis. (Data for all industries are reported in app. D.)

¹⁶ From Davis' figures, an industry's total R&D intensiveness is highly correlated with its direct R&D intensiveness. The Pearson product-moment sample-correlation coefficient is 0.998; the Spearman rank correlation coefficient is 0.950.

Finally, consider the following data from 1989. Although the NSF's complete official survey of all 1989 company-funded R&D by industry may not be available until 1991, much of the data is already publicly available in the 10-K Reports that firms file with the Securities and Exchange Commission.¹⁷ In 1989, 894 U.S. firms reported sales of \$35 million or more and R&D expenditures in excess of either 1 percent of sales, or \$1 million. Together, these firms reported sales of \$1,897.8 billion and R&D expenditures (from their own funds, excluding R&D performed under contract for the Federal Government or others) of \$65.2 billion, with a composite average R&D share of sales of 3.4 percent. These firms accounted for the vast majority of U.S. company spending on R&D in 1989. (In fact, a subgroup of 99 firms—each with more than \$100 million in R&D expenditures—accounted for 82 percent of total reported R&D expenditures and 69 percent of the sales of the group as a whole.) Thus, an accurate picture of the nature of U.S. R&D spending in 1989 by industry can be formed by focusing on these 894 firms, placing them in their respective industries, and aggregating their R&D expenditures and sales by industry.

The ranked list in table 3 on the next page is derived from the firm-specific data for 1989 described above. Industries have been labeled by SIC code, although the groupings do not exactly

¹⁷ The data that follow in this section come from firms' 10-K Reports, as reported in "R&D Scoreboard," *Business Week*, special ed., June 1990.

Table 2

High-technology industries with above-average R&D-to-sales ratios, by rank, 1984-87, and applicable SIC codes

Industry ¹	R&D net sales ratio 1984-87 average	SIC code
	Percent	
1. Office, computing, and accounting machines	11.58	357
2. Professional, scientific measuring instruments	8.30	381, 382
3. Drugs	8.28	283
4. Electronic components	8.18	367
5. Professional, scientific instruments: other	8.15	383, 387
6. Communications equipment	5.35	366
7. Industrial chemicals	4.25	281, 282, 286
8. Aircraft, missiles, and spacecraft	3.83	372, 376
9. Radio and TV receiving equipment	3.70	365
10. Machinery: other, except electrical	3.25	351-356, 358-359
11. Motor vehicles	3.18	371
12. Other chemicals	3.15	284, 285, 287-289
Weighted average, all industries	3.03	

¹ The most recent year for which the National Science Foundation provides data is 1987.

Source: National Science Foundation, *R&D in Industry, 1987*, 1987, 89-323, tables B-21, B-22, and USITC staff calculations.

Table 3

High-technology industries ranked by R&D to sales for 1989, and applicable SIC codes

Industry	Company R&D percent of sales, 1989	SIC code
1. Semiconductors	9.3	3674
2. Computers	9.0	3571
3. Drugs	8.6	283
4. Photographic equipment and supplies	6.8	386
5. Office equipment and services except computers: software, displays, peripherals	6.1	357, except 3571
6. Instruments	5.8	381, 382, 384
7. Electronics, except semiconductors	5.0	367, except 3674
8. Communications equipment	4.7	366
9. Aerospace	4.1	372, 376
10. Chemicals	3.8	281, 286
11. Autos: cars, trucks, parts and equipment	3.4	371
Weighted average, all industries	3.4	

Source: "R&D Scoreboard", *Business Week*, special ed., June 1990, and USITC staff calculations.

match those used by the NSF. Only industries with above-average R&D shares are listed, but complete data for all industries are provided in appendix table D-2.

Commission's Methodology and List of High-Technology Products

Comparison of lists of high-technology products

The R&D-based lists are directly comparable although they report data in slightly varied SIC groups. Further, it is difficult to compare R&D-based lists with the Census Advanced-Technology Product (ATP) list because the ATP list is product based and does not contain entire SIC categories, but only narrowly defined individual products. Nevertheless, one can get a sense of the coverage of the list and compare it with the R&D lists by determining the SIC categories that are represented by products on the ATP list. Appendix table D-4 provides this comparison and displays the relative coverage of the four lists by SIC category. Without reproducing the full table here, several general points can be made.

First, although with the R&D-based lists there is always a question about what benchmark level of the R&D-to-sales ratio to use to identify high-technology industries, in practice there appears to be a natural break at or around the weighted average for all industries. For instance, for the 1984-87 NSF data, the next highest industry under the average for all industries (of 3.03 percent) has an average of 2.73 percent (SIC 361-364, 369). For the 1989 data, the R&D ratio drops from 3.4 percent (for the automotive sector) to 2.7 percent (for the manufacturing machinery sector, SIC 354-355). A similar, natural breaking point appears in Davis' data. Second, and

more importantly, the group of industries identified as "high-technology" is similar across the R&D measures and compared with the ATP list. The following industries (listed in order of their SIC codes) are found on all lists:

1. (281) Industrial inorganic chemicals;
2. (283) Drugs;
3. (357) Computers and office equipment;
4. (366) Communications equipment;
5. (367) Electronic components and accessories;
6. (372) Aircraft and parts;
7. (376) Missiles, spacecraft, and parts;
8. (381, 382) Scientific and professional instruments;
9. (384) Medical instruments and supplies; and
10. (386) Photographic equipment and supplies.

Only two major differences exist between the R&D lists and the ATP list. The R&D lists together include motor vehicles and accessories (SIC 371), but the ATP list does not, and the ATP list includes machine tools (SIC 354, 356), whereas only one of the R&D lists includes these products. The R&D-based lists include automobiles because a high level of R&D is consistently done in that sector. The ATP list, on the other hand, excludes automobiles because of the impression on the part of analysts that much of the R&D in this sector goes into substantial yearly model changes and the sector is not on the "leading edge." The ATP list includes machine tools because of the widespread perception that, through the application of robotics and numerical controls, the industry is "advanced," even though the R&D performed by the industry as a whole as a percent of sales is below the national average for all industries. The differences in coverage

among the R&D-based lists are minor and attributable to differences in reporting categories.¹⁸

One minor difference between the R&D and ATP lists is also worthy of note. The ATP list includes fiber optics and advanced optical equipment (SIC 383). Only one of the R&D measures captures that category. This difference exists because categories for fiber optics were not separately provided for in the SIC codes until 1987. Beginning in 1987, the R&D expenditures covering these products were separately reported after fiber optics were removed from the SIC category covering products of stone, clay, and glass.

Commission's List of Advanced-Technology Products

On the basis of the R&D data cited above, and the consistency of alternative measures of high-technology industries, table 4 lists industries by SIC order designated as advanced-technology industries for the purposes of further monitoring and study within the Commission. This list includes high-technology industries that are common to the R&D based lists, such as fiber optics (SIC 383), and machine tools (SIC 354, 355) from the ATP list. This list is consistent with the best available theory and evidence on identifying high-technology industries.

Monitoring High-Technology Industries

A basic function of the Commission is to maintain an ongoing expertise on industries im-

¹⁸ The 1989 list is virtually identical to the 1977-79 (Davis) list, except that it excludes SIC 348 (ordnance, because it was not broken out separately in 1989), and SIC 365, 385, and 387 (household audio/visual equipment, ophthalmic goods, and watches, respectively; again they were not broken out as separate categories in 1989). The list based on 1984-87 data also includes virtually everything on Davis' list, the major difference being that it adds SIC 384-385 and 352-355. This is probably because these industries were not specifically provided for in the 1984-87 NSF's data in the way that they were in Davis' 1977-79 data.

portant to the economy and to U.S. trade. Hence, the objective to monitor the identified high-technology industries has, in large part, been reached. Nevertheless, it is important to ensure that the substantial industry-specific expertise housed in the Commission is fully leveraged by increasing the availability of that knowledge to policymakers and other analysts throughout Government and the academic community. The knowledge generated on the designated high-technology industries takes on a special need for dissemination. A number of initiatives have already been started to accomplish this goal. The Commission, already monitoring and reporting on shifts in trade from available import and export data, will consider the creation of additional data categories to focus on high-technology products. Staff reports, working papers, and trade summaries reports have already been launched to examine competitiveness issues in selected high-technology industries and in certain leading technologies from which future industries will arise. These efforts will be continued to maintain up-to-date information and provide targeted analyses of advanced technologies.

Industries Recommended by the Commission for Comprehensive Study¹⁹

It is recommended that the advanced-technology manufacturing industries selected for comprehensive study under phase II be broadly defined. Defining industries broadly provides the opportunity to address a wide range of leading-edge and supporting technologies and to assess how they are affected by U.S. and foreign government policies. Further, advances in technologies have often been observed to move in waves and affect broad areas of the economy. Technology waves relate to the interdependencies of innovations and the notion that certain product areas combine to form integrated systems. For instance, advances in one product area may be

¹⁹ Views received from interested parties by the Commission regarding industries recommended for comprehensive study are found in app. D.

Table 4

Advanced-technology industries identified for further monitoring and study by the Commission, and applicable SIC codes

<i>Industry</i>	<i>SIC code</i>
1. Inorganic chemicals and plastics	281, 282
2. Drugs	283
3. Machine tools, including semiconductor manufacturing equipment	354, 355
4. Computers, software, and peripherals (including displays)	357, 505, 737
5. Communications equipment	366
6. Microelectronic components, including semiconductors	367
7. Motor vehicles and parts	371
8. Aircraft and parts	372
9. Missiles, spacecraft, and parts	376
10. Scientific and professional instruments, including fiber optics	38(pt.), 322(pt.), 335(pt.)

come highly dependent on advances in another product area. The modern digital computer would not have been possible without advances in solid-state technology, and advances in integrated circuits would not have been possible without significant improvements in scientific instruments and equipment. These upstream and downstream linkages are apparent in many advanced-technology industries. Following the completion of the initial three comprehensive studies, subsequent studies could be focused on more narrowly defined advanced-technology industries. The Commission therefore recommends for the consideration of the committee the following broadly defined industries for comprehensive study: (1) communications technology and equipment; (2) pharmaceuticals; and (3) semiconductor manufacturing and testing equipment.

Communications technology and equipment would include computers, digital switches, video-imaging apparatus, digital radios, satellites, fiber optics, and the software needed to run these as integrated systems. Communications and display technologies are expected not only to revolutionize the way industries innovate and bring their products to market, but also to serve as drivers for other advanced-technology industries. Foreign governments have already recognized the importance of advanced communications systems to their economies and the impact that these systems may have on the global competitiveness of their industries. Foreign governments are known to provide significant support to their communications industries, and regulations in countries, such as France, permit telephone companies to bring video through optical fibers to its households. U.S. telephone companies are currently prohibited by Government regulations from bringing video to U.S. households.

Pharmaceuticals would include medicinal chemicals, bioengineering, botanicals and diagnostics, and other biological products such as serums and vaccines. Some drugs have significant externalities with the potential for the prevention of disease, improving the health of the general population, and increasing the yields of agricultural products. Bioengineering has already demonstrated the potential for altering the way health care is provided and making health-care delivery systems more effective. The development of advanced pharmaceutical products can be affected by factors such as lengthy governmental drug-approval processes and the acceptance of gene-altering substances.

Semiconductor manufacturing and testing equipment is needed to produce integrated circuits and other microelectronic products. These would include wafer-manufacturing equipment, mask fabrication and repair equipment, film-formation equipment, doping equipment, etching and stripping equipment, and photolithography

equipment. Also included are assembly apparatus, such as dicing equipment, die and wire-bonding equipment, packaging equipment, and testing and inspection equipment. In addition, the critical materials used by the semiconductor industry will be discussed; principal among these are silicon wafers, lead frames, ceramic packages, bonding wire, and photolithographic materials. The semiconductor manufacturing and testing equipment industry is critical to the success of the semiconductor industry, which in turn is critical to the U.S. computer and telecommunications industries. The U.S. industry's share of the world market for this equipment has declined from 80 percent in 1980 to 45 percent in 1990.

These three broadly defined industries appear high on the list of technology-intensive product industries measured in terms of absolute R&D and R&D as a percentage of sales. They are almost universally recognized for their future impact on the competitiveness of the United States both in U.S. and foreign markets. In the future, the U.S. balance of trade and U.S. technical superiority in these industries may be adversely affected by various Government policies and foreign government support.

Objectives and Methodology for Future Comprehensive Studies by the Commission

Each of the Commission's competitive studies will be unique in that it will analyze the particular circumstances of the chosen industry. Even so, the studies will share a set of overall objectives and methodologies.

Objectives

In each case, the fundamental goal of the study will be to analyze the determinants of the economic performance of U.S. firms in the world market place. The studies not only will provide information on the performance of the U.S. industry, but also an analysis of the important factors that have influenced the development and competitiveness of the industry over time. Such coverages will require for each study—

1. Global perspective. U.S. industry's performance cannot be evaluated apart from the behavior of foreign rivals and the nature and size of the international market for the industry's output.
2. Technological change. This should include an analysis of the nature and importance of technological developments in the industry, an economic analysis of the strategic choices firms face in making R&D decisions, and an analysis of the legal, commercial, and institutional factors in the United States that influence the ability to manufacture and market advanced-technology products.

3. The nature of competition. On the demand side, this analysis should address the nature, sources, and degree of demand for the industry's products. On the supply side, it should include consideration of the nature of interfirm rivalry and pricing decisions.
4. Consideration of existing or proposed U.S. and foreign government policies that influence firms' performance. This section will include sector-specific policies and general policies that affect technological changes that may have significant implications for developments in the industry.

The overall goal of the studies will be met when each of the above elements—global perspective, technological change, competition, and government policy—is integrated to provide an overall explanation of the performance of the industry. The second objective of the studies will be to analyze the nature of the interconnections between the industry in question and the rest of the domestic economy. Are there now, or are there likely to be, significant economic spillovers and externalities? To what extent are developments in upstream and downstream industries important for, or contingent upon, the industry of interest? These questions, when answered substantively, can provide much useful information to policymakers.

There are two important issues that these studies will not likely address. First, although U.S. macroeconomic policy is important in determining the performance of the economy as a whole and influences the performance of particular firms, the studies will consider macroeconomic issues only to the extent to which particular economywide events, such as changes in exchange rates, have had clearly identifiable influences on the industry in question. Second, while the general relationship between private firms and government policies presents many important and interesting issues, the studies—because they will focus on particular industries—will not attempt to survey the significance of foreign and U.S. economic policies on a macroeconomic level.

Methodology

The studies will draw heavily on the knowledge and analytic capabilities of the Commission's Office of Industries' international trade and technology analysts. Staff will conduct primary research through interviews with industry and Government officials and through extensive data and information gathering, possibly including the use of surveys. Input from academic and U.S. Government and foreign experts will also be sought.

APPENDIX A
LETTER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE,
UNITED STATES SENATE, REQUESTING THE INVESTIGATION

DAVID L. BUREN, OKLAHOMA
BILL BRADLEY, NEW JERSEY
GEORGE J. MITCHELL, MAINE
DAVID PRYOR, ARKANSAS
DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR., MICHIGAN
JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER IV, WEST VIRGINIA
TOM DASCHLE, SOUTH DAKOTA
JOHN BREAUX, LOUISIANA

WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR., DELAWARE
JOHN C. DANFORTH, MISSOURI
JOHN H. CHAFFEE, RHODE ISLAND
JOHN HEINZ, PENNSYLVANIA
DAVID DURENBERGER, MINNESOTA
WILLIAM L. ARMSTRONG, COLORADO
STEVE SYMMS, IDAHO

United States Senate

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
WASHINGTON, DC 20510-6200


VANDA B. McMURTRY, STAFF DIRECTOR AND CHIEF COUNSEL
EDMUND J. MIHALSKI, MINORITY CHIEF OF STAFF

June 21, 1990

DOCKET

The Honorable
Anne Brunsdale
Chairman
United States International
Trade Commission
500 "E" Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20436

Dear Madam Chairman:



RECEIVED
30 JUN 22 10:15
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

As part of its policymaking process, the Senate Committee on Finance anticipates a need for impartial and detailed information on the competitiveness of advanced technology manufacturing industries in the United States. As an independent Federal agency with the authority to investigate the impact of international trade upon domestic industry, it would be a logical extension of the Commission's responsibility to expand and enhance its capacity to provide information on an ongoing basis concerning the relative global competitiveness of American industry.

Accordingly, the Committee hereby requests the Commission to expand its collection of, and ability to analyze, information on the competitiveness of such industries pursuant to sections 332(b), 332(d), and 332(g) of the Tariff Act of 1930.

While the Committee wants the Commission to develop a long-term capacity on a broad range of industries, it recognizes that this expertise must evolve in stages. Thus, the Committee requests initially a two-step investigation. Within three months of the receipt of this letter, the Commission is requested to provide to the Committee a list of industries about which the Commission will develop and maintain up-to-date information. In identifying these industries, the Commission should consider the following criteria, as well as any other criteria it may choose to establish.

RECEIVED
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
U.S. INT'L TRADE COMMISSION
JUN 22 1990

The Honorable
Anne Brunsdale
June 21, 1990
Page Two

-- Those industries producing a product that:

- (1) involves use or development of new or advanced technology, involves high value-added, involves research and development expenditures that, as a percentage of sales, are substantially above the national average, and is expected to experience above-average growth of demand in both domestic and international markets; and
- (2) benefits in foreign markets from coordinated -- though not necessarily sector-specific -- policies that include, but are not limited to, protection of the home market, tax policies, export promotion policies, antitrust exemptions, regulatory policies, patent and other intellectual property policies, assistance in developing technology and bringing it to market, technical or extension services, performance requirements that mandate either certain levels of investment or exports or transfers of technology in order to gain access to that country's market, and other forms of Government assistance.

At the time the Commission provides this list of industries, the Commission is requested to recommend to the Committee three industries for comprehensive study. In selecting these industries, the Commission should consider, among any other factors it considers relevant, the importance of the industries producing these products to future U.S. global competitiveness; and the extent of foreign government benefits to industries producing competing products.

The Commission's report on these three industries should include, but is not limited to, the following information:


- Existing or proposed foreign government policies that assist or encourage these industries to remain or to become globally competitive, existing or proposed U.S. Government policies that assist or encourage these industries to remain or become globally competitive, and impediments in the U.S. economy that inhibit increased competitiveness of these U.S. industries.

The Honorable
Anne Brunsdale
June 21, 1990
Page Three

The Commission should complete the study of these three industries within 12 months of the Committee's approval of the list of recommended industries.

It would be the Committee's intention to review the report carefully in order to determine how to expand, extend, or otherwise modify this request, if necessary, to ensure that future reports continue to yield worthwhile results.

Sincerely,


Lloyd Bentsen
Chairman

APPENDIX B
THE COMMISSION'S NOTICE OF INVESTIGATION

This Notice constitutes the public Notice of Availability of environmental documents required under the NEPA regulations.

Dated: July 17, 1990.

P. Tweedt,

Acting Regional Director.

[FR Doc. 90-17426 Filed 7-25-90; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-MR-M

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-399]

Athletic Shoes With Viewing Windows; Initial Determination Terminating Respondents on the Basis of Settlement Agreement

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice is hereby given that the Commission has received an initial determination from the presiding officer in the above-captioned investigation terminating the following respondents on the basis of a settlement agreement: Reebok International Ltd. and H.S. Corporation.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This investigation is being conducted pursuant to section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. §1337). Under the Commission's rules, the presiding officers' initial determination will become the determination of the Commission thirty (30) days after the date of its service upon the parties, unless the Commission orders review of the initial determination. The initial determination in this matter was served upon the parties on July 6, 1990.

Copies of the initial determination, the settlement agreement, and all other nonconfidential documents filed in connection with this investigation are available for inspection during official business hours (8:45 a.m. to 4:15 p.m.) in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW Washington, DC 20436, telephone 202-252-1000. Hearing impaired individuals are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202-252-1810.

WRITTEN COMMENTS: Interested persons may file written comments with the Commission concerning termination of the aforementioned respondents. The original and 14 copies of all such comments must be filed with the Secretary to the Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436, no later than 10 days after publication of

this notice in the Federal Register. Any person desiring to submit a document (or portion thereof) to the Commission in confidence must request confidential treatment. Such requests should be directed to the Secretary to the Commission and must include a full statement of the reasons why confidential treatment should be granted. The Commission will either accept the submission in confidence or return it.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ruby J. Dionne, Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, telephone 202-252-1805.

Issued: July 19, 1990.

By order of the Commission.

Kenneth R. Mason,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 90-17461 Filed 7-25-90; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-M

[Investigation No. 332-294]

Identification of U.S. Advanced-Technology Manufacturing Industries for Monitoring and Possible Comprehensive Study

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Institution of investigation; opportunity for public comment.

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 20, 1990.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Nelson J. Hogge (202-252-1395), or Aaron H. Chessner (202-252-1380) Machinery and Equipment Division, Office of Industries, U.S. International Trade Commission, Washington, DC 20436. Hearing-impaired persons can obtain information on this study by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on (202) 252-1810.

BACKGROUND: On June 22, 1990, the Commission received a request from the Senate Committee on Finance to expand its collection of, and ability to analyze, information on the competitiveness of advanced-technology manufacturing industries in the United States, pursuant to sections 332(b), 332(d), and 332(g) of the Tariff Act of 1930. In response to that request, the Commission instituted investigation No. 332-294 under section 332(g) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. §1332(g)). In order that it may (1) identify for the purpose of monitoring, using criteria provided by the Committee, U.S. advanced-technology manufacturing industries, and (2) recommend to the Committee three of those industries as subjects for comprehensive Commission studies. The Committee asked that the Commission provide its list of industries

and recommendation of three for special study within 3 months of receipt of the letter (by September 21, 1990), and that it submit its report on the three industries the subject of comprehensive studies within 12 months or receipt of the Committee's approval (or modification) of the Commission's recommendations.

In its letter the Committee stated that it anticipates a need for impartial and detailed information on the competitiveness of advanced technology manufacturing industries in the United States. It stated that it would be a logical extension of the Commission's responsibility under section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930 to expand and enhance its capacity to provide information on an ongoing basis concerning the relative global competitiveness of American industry.

In identifying the industries to be monitored, the Committee requested that the Commission consider the following criteria as well as any other criteria it may choose—

(1) Industries producing a product that involves use or development of new or advanced technology, involves high value-added, involves research and development expenditures that, as a percentage of sales, are substantially above the national average, and is expected to experience above-average growth of demand in both domestic and international markets; and

(2) Benefits in foreign markets from coordinated—though not necessarily sector specific—policies that include, but are not limited to, protection of the home market, tax policies, export promotion policies, antitrust exemptions, regulatory policies, patent and other intellectual property policies, assistance in developing technology and bringing it to market, technical or extension services, performance requirements that mandate either certain levels of investment or exports or transfers of technology in order to gain access to that country's market, and other forms of Government assistance.

The Committee requested that the report on the three industries to be selected include at least the following information—

Existing or proposed foreign government policies that assist or encourage these industries to remain or to become globally competitive, existing or proposed U.S. Government policies that assist or encourage these industries to remain or become globally competitive, and impediments in the U.S. economy that inhibit increased competitiveness of these U.S. industries.

Written Submissions. No public hearing has been scheduled. However, interested persons may submit written views concerning the industries to be included in the list and which may be the subject of a comprehensive study. To be assured of consideration, all such statements should be received by the Commission at the earliest practical time but not later than August 15, 1990. Commercial or financial information that the submitter desires the Commission to treat as confidential must be submitted on separate sheets of paper, each clearly marked "Confidential Business Information" at the top. All submission requesting confidential treatment must conform with the requirements of § 201.6 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 201.6). All written submissions, except for confidential business information, will be made available for public inspection in the Office of the Secretary to the Commission. All submissions should be addressed to the Secretary at the Commission's office in Washington, DC.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: July 23, 1990.

Kenneth R. Mason,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 90-17460 Filed 7-25-90; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-M

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

(Docket No. AB-55 (Sub-No. 338X))

CSX Transportation, Inc.— Abandonment Exemption—In Hopkins County, Ky

Applicant has filed a notice of exemption under 49 CFR part 1152, Subpart F—*Exempt Abandonments* to abandon its 8.6-mile line of railroad between Colonial Junction and Drake #4 (known as the Magnolia Branch) and also the adjacent joint track, in Hopkins County, KY.

Applicant has certified that: (1) No local traffic has moved over the line for at least 2 years; (2) any overhead traffic on the line can be rerouted over other lines; and (3) no formal complaint filed by a user of rail service on the line (or a State or local government entity acting on behalf of such user) regarding cessation of service over the line either is pending with the Commission or with any U.S. District Court or has been decided in favor of the complainant within the 2-year period. The appropriate State agency has been notified in writing at least 10 days prior to the filing of this notice.

As a condition to use of this exemption, any employee affected by the abandonment shall be protected under *Oregon Short Line R. Co.—Abandonment—Goshen*, 360 I.C.C. 91 (1979). To address whether this condition adequately protects affected employees, a petition for partial revocation under 49 U.S.C. 10505(d) must be filed.

Provided no formal expression of intent to file an offer of financial assistance has been received, this exemption will be effective on August 25, 1990 (unless stayed pending reconsideration). Petitions to stay that do not involve environmental issues,¹ formal expressions of intent to file an offer of financial assistance under 49 CFR 1152.27(c)(2),² and trail use/rail banking statements under 49 CFR 1152.29 must be filed by August 6, 1990.³ Petitions for reconsideration or requests for public use conditions under 49 CFR 1152.28 must be filed by August 15, 1990, with:

Office of the Secretary, Case Control
Branch, Interstate Commerce
Commission, Washington, DC 20423.
A copy of any petition filed with the Commission should be sent to applicant's representative:
Charles M. Rosenberger, CSX
Transportation, Inc., 500 Water Street,
Jacksonville, FL 32202.

If the notice of exemption contains false or misleading information, use of the exemption is void *ab initio*.

Applicant has filed an environmental report which addresses environmental or energy impacts, if any, from this abandonment.

The Section of Energy and Environment (SEE) will prepare an environmental assessment (EA). SEE will issue the EA by July 31, 1990. Interested persons may obtain a copy of the EA from SEE by writing to it (room 3219, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, DC 20423) or by calling Elaine Kaiser, Chief, SEE at (202) 275-7684. Comments on environmental and energy concerns

¹ A stay will be routinely issued by the Commission in those proceedings where an informed decision on environmental issues (whether raised by a party or by the Section of Energy and Environment in its independent investigation) cannot be made prior to the effective date of the notice of exemption. See *Exemption of Out-of-Service Rail Lines*, 5 I.C.C.2d 377 (1989). Any entity seeking a stay involving environmental concerns is encouraged to file its request as soon as possible in order to permit this Commission to review and act on the request before the effective date of the exemption.

² See *Exempt. of Rail Abandonment—Offers of Finan. Assist.*, 4 I.C.C.2d 164 (1967).

³ The Commission will accept a late-filed trail use statement so long as it retains jurisdiction to do so.

must be filed within 15 days after the EA becomes available to the public.

Environmental, public use, or trail use/rail banking conditions will be imposed, where appropriate, in a subsequent decision.

Decided: July 20, 1990.

By the Commission, David M. Konschnik,
Director, Office or Proceedings.

Sidney L. Strickland, Jr.,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 90-17485 Filed 7-25-90; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7035-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of Consent Decree Pursuant to Clean Air Act

In accordance with Departmental policy, 28 CFR 50.7, notice is hereby given that on July 12, 1990 a proposed consent decree in *United States v. Sid Richardson Carbon & Gasoline Co.*, Civil Action No. 90-646-B, was lodged with the United States District Court for the Middle District of Louisiana. The proposed consent decree concerns a complaint filed by the United States that alleged violations of section 113 of the Clean air Act, 42 U.S.C. 7413, and the Louisiana State Implementation Plan ("SIP") at defendant's Addis, Louisiana carbon black plant. The complaint alleged that defendant violated Louisiana Air Quality Regulation section 22.8(a) of the Louisiana SIP by allowing uncontrolled emissions of waste acetylene gas. The complaint sought injunctive relief to require compliance with the Louisiana SIP and civil penalties for past violations.

The consent decree requires defendant to come into compliance with section 22.8(a) by installing a flare system capable of destroying at least 90 percent of the acetylene contained in the waste gas stream. In addition, defendant is required to pay a civil penalty of \$77,000 in settlement of claims for past violations, and to dismiss a petition for review now pending in the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit of EPA's denial of a SIP revision which would have exempted the Addis plant from section 22.8(a).

The Department of Justice will receive for a period of thirty (30) days from the date of the publication comments relating to the proposed consent decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General of the Environment and Natural Resources Division, United States Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20530, and should refer to *United States v. Sid*

APPENDIX C
COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM INTERESTED PARTIES

Comments Received From Interested Parties

In the course of conducting this phase I investigation, the Commission received written comments from four interested parties suggesting that the Commission recommend to the committee three U.S. advanced-technology manufacturing industries for comprehensive study. The interested parties included Planar Systems Inc., a major U.S. producer of high-definition displays, the Zenith Electronics Corp., which is the only remaining U.S.-based producer of color television receivers, the Semiconductor Equipment Materials International (SEMI), which represent, about 850 U.S. producers and 150 foreign producers of semiconductor equipment and materials, and the National Tooling & Machining Association (NTMA), which represents about 12,000 small and medium-size U.S. users of machine tools.

Planar Systems suggests that the Commission select high-definition displays as one of the advanced manufacturing industries that it will recommend to the Senate Committee on Finance as a subject for comprehensive study. Planar indicates that recent reports by the American Electronics Association and various U.S. Government agencies have all identified high-definition displays as a critical component in future electronic systems; Planar identifies high-definition displays as including both cathode-ray tubes and high-information flat-panel displays. According to Planar, the United States lags behind Japan and Western Europe in understanding the critical role of high-definition displays in the future competitiveness of the domestic electronics market.

Zenith Electronics recommends to the Commission that high-definition displays be selected for comprehensive study. Zenith indicates that its "flat tension mask" cathode-ray tubes (CRTs) are the key high-definition display technologies for the foreseeable future. The firm suggests that, while other U.S. and foreign firms are actively working on alternate display devices such as liquid crystal, electroluminescent, and gas plasma panels, these segments of the industry are of longer range and are not likely to have major impact on the display-device market until the cost of these devices can be reduced. Zenith reports that Stanford Resources, Inc. estimates that the electronic-display market is expected to grow from \$12 billion today to \$30 billion by 1996.

SEMI recommends that semiconductor equipment and materials (SEM) be selected as an industry candidate for comprehensive study and monitoring. SEMI indicates that the SEM industry is the heart of the microelectronics industry and that the equipment this industry produces is critical to the ability of the semiconductor industry to produce solid-state devices at sufficiently low cost to enable U.S. industries, such as those producing computers and telecommunications equipment, to offer their products on world markets at competitive prices. SEMI indicates that because of the diffusion of SEM technology world-class industries have emerged in foreign countries and many of these industries are better financed than those in the United States. The association reports that the U.S. share of the global markets for these equipment and materials declined from 80 percent in 1980 to 45 percent in 1990.

The NTMA is a member of the National Coalition for Flexible Automated Manufacturing whose goals are to promote the interests of small and medium-size firms that use machine tools. The NTMA recommends that the Commission consider this industry for comprehensive study because its members are being challenged to change their process technologies. These process technologies are changing rapidly, and at the same time, new processes, new materials, finer tolerances, and specifications are also affecting the way the firms do business.

APPENDIX D

DATA TABLES

Table D-1

Selected Industries: R&D as share of net sales, 1984-87

Industry	SIC code	Companies' own and Federal R&D				Companies' own R&D			
		1984	1985	1986	1987	1984	1985	1986	1987
Food, kindred, & tobacco	20, 21	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	0.7	0.5	0.7	0.7	0.7
Textiles and apparel	22, 23	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.4
Lumber, wood prods, furn . . .	24, 25	0.9	1.0	0.8	0.6	0.9	1.0	0.8	0.6
Paper & allied prods	26	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.7
Chemicals & allied prods	28	4.7	5.0	5.2	5.3	4.6	4.9	5.1	5.2
Industrial chems	281-282, 286	4.0	4.4	4.6	4.8	3.8	4.2	4.4	4.6
Drugs & medicines	283	(¹)	(¹)	8.5	(¹)	8.2	8.0	8.4	8.5
Other chemicals	284-285, 287-289	(¹)	(¹)	3.3	(¹)	2.9	3.1	3.3	3.3
Petroleum	13, 29	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	1.0	0.7	0.9	1.1	1.0
Rubber prods	30	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	2.4	2.3	2.2	1.8
Stone, clay, glass prods	32	(¹)	(¹)	2.5	2.6	1.9	2.3	2.4	2.6
Primary metals	33	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	0.9	0.9	1.0	0.8
Ferrous metals	331-332, 398-399	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	0.7	0.6	0.8	0.6
Nonferrous metals	333-336	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.2	1.1	1.3	1.4	1.2
Fabricated metal prods	34	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.7	1.7	1.8	1.8	1.6
Machinery	35	6.4	7.6	(¹)	(¹)	5.8	6.7	7.4	7.6
Office, computing, & accounting mach	357	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	10.3	11.7	11.7	12.6
Other, except elect	351-356, 358-359	(¹)	(¹)	3.9	3.6	2.7	3.0	3.8	3.5
Electrical equipment	36	7.2	8.0	8.3	8.2	4.8	5.1	5.4	5.4
Radio, TV receiving	365	(¹)	(¹)	3.6	3.2	3.7	4.3	3.6	3.2
Communication equip	366	8.3	9.3	9.2	9.3	5.2	5.5	5.3	5.4
Electronic compon	367	7.8	9.6	(¹)	(¹)	6.6	8.2	9.2	8.7
Other electric equip	361-364, 369	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	2.7	2.5	2.7	3.0
Transportation equipment	37	(¹)	(¹)	8.1	8.5	3.3	3.4	3.6	3.4
Motor vehicles	371	3.4	3.8	(¹)	(¹)	3.0	3.1	3.3	3.3
Other trans equip	373-375, 379	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	2.0	2.3	2.7	2.4
Aircraft, missiles	372, 376	15.4	14.9	13.4	15.0	3.9	3.8	3.9	3.7
Profess., scientif. inst	38	8.5	9.1	9.0	8.8	7.7	8.4	8.3	8.4
Measuring inst	381-382	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	8.3	8.4	8.4	8.1
Other	383-387	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	7.4	8.4	8.3	8.5
Other manufacturing	27, 31, 39	(¹)	(¹)	1.2	(¹)	1.1	1.0	1.2	1.1
Total		3.9	4.4	4.7	4.8	2.6	3.0	3.3	3.2

¹ Data withheld to avoid revealing operations of individual companies.Source: National Science Foundation, *R&D in Industry: 1987* (NSF 89-323), tables B-21 and B-22.

Table D-2
Summary of R&D expenditures in selected industries for 1989

<i>Industry</i>	<i>In millions of dollars</i>	<i>As a percent of sales</i>
Aerospace	3,937	4.1
Automotive	10,284	3.4
Cars and trucks	9,512	3.6
Parts & Equipment	417	2.1
Tire & Rubber	355	2.4
Chemicals	4,753	3.8
Conglomerates	3,448	2.3
Consumer Products	1,678	1.4
Appliances & Home Furnl	214	1.6
Other Consumer Goods	461	0.7
Personal Care	1,003	2.5
Containers & Packaging	91	0.9
Electrical & Electronics	6,493	5.4
Electrical Products	689	2.3
Electronics	2,217	5.0
Instruments	1,432	5.8
Semiconductors	2,155	9.3
Food	460	0.7
Fuel	2,480	0.8
Oil, Gas & Coal	1,949	0.7
Petroleum Services	531	2.7
Health Care	7,126	8.6
Drugs & Research	5,144	10.1
Medical Products & Serv	1,982	6.2
Housing	464	1.9
Leisure Time Products	1,714	4.9
Manufacturing	2,796	2.7
General Manufacturing	1,326	3.2
Machine & Hand Tools	229	2.0
Special Machinery	1,191	2.6
Textiles	50	0.8
Metals & Mining	293	1.1
Nonbank Financial	85	0.7
Office Equipment & Servic	15,248	8.1
Business Machines & Ser	268	2.2
Computer Communications	305	9.8
Computers	11,737	9.0
Data Processing	177	5.4
Disk & Tape Drives	365	6.4
Peripherals & Other	974	4.8
Software & Services	820	13.2
System Design	604	10.1
Paper & Forest Products	432	1.0
Service Industries	142	1.1
Publishing & Broadcasting	3	1.0
Telecommunications	3,304	4.7
Total	65,231	3.4

Source: "R&D Scoreboard," *Business Week*, June 1990.

Table D-3

Comparison of coverage of high-technology industry lists

("X" Indicates that an industry is included on the list)

SIC Code	Description	R&D-based lists			Census ATP list ¹
		1977-79	1984-87	1989	
281	Industrial inorganic chemicals	X	X	X	X
282	Plastics materials and synthetics	X	X		
283	Drugs	X	X	X	X
284	Soap, cleaners, and toilet goods		X		
285	Paints and allied products		X		
286	Industrial organic chemicals		X	X	
287	Agricultural chemicals		X	X	
289	Miscellaneous chemical products		X		
344	Fabricated structural metal products				X
348	Ordnance	X			X
349	Misc. fabricated metal products				X
351	Engines and turbines	X	X		X
352	Farm and garden machinery		X		
353	Construction and related machinery		X		X
354	Metalworking machinery		X		X
355	Special industry machinery		X		
356	General industrial machinery		X		X
357	Computer and office equipment	X	X	X	X
358	Refrigeration and service equipment		X		
359	Industrial machinery, n.e.c.		X		
362	Electrical industrial apparatus				X
365	Household audio and video equipment	X	X		X
366	Communications equipment	X	X	X	X
367	Electronic components and accessories	X	X	X	X
369	Misc. electrical equipment, supplies				X
371	Motor vehicles and equipment	X	X	X	
372	Aircraft and parts	X	X	X	X
376	Guided missiles, spacecraft, and parts	X	X	X	X
381	Search and navigation equipment	X	X	X	X
382	Measuring and controlling devices	X	X	X	X
383	Optical fiber, other optical goods		X		X
384	Medical instruments and supplies	X	X	X	X
385	Ophthalmic goods	X	X		
386	Photographic equipment and supplies	X	X	X	X
387	Watches, clocks, watchcases and parts	X	X		

¹ Note that the Census Advanced Technology Products list is a product-based list; the SIC codes listed are those to which the products on the ATP list belong.

Source: For R&D-based lists, see text; Census ATP list is derived from app. B in Abbott (1989). The industry titles are the official short titles taken from, Executive Office of the President, Office of Management and Budget, *Standard Industrial Classification Manual*, 1987.

APPENDIX E

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bibliography

- Abbott, T., R. McGuckin, and others. Herrick, P. and L. Norfolk, "Measuring the Trade Balance in Advanced Technology Products." Washington, DC: Bureau of the Census, Center for Economic Studies, 1989.
- Bartel, A. and F. Lichtenberg. "The Comparative Advantage of Educated Workers in Implementing New Technology" *Review of Economics and Statistics*, vol. 69 (1987), pp. 1-11.
- Boretsky, M. "Concerns About the Present American Position in International Trade." ch. in National Academy of Sciences, *Technology and International Trade*: Washington, DC: National Academy of Sciences, 1971.
- Davis, L., "Technology Intensity of U.S. Output and Trade." International Trade Administration, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce, 1982.
- Grossman, G. "Strategic Export Promotion: A Critique." ch. in P. Krugman, ed. *Strategic Trade Policy and the New International Economics.*, MIT Press, 1986.
- Hatter, V., "U.S. High Technology Trade and Competitiveness", Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce, International Trade Administration.
- Hufbauer, G. and J. Chilas. 1974, "Specialization by Industrial Countries: Extent and Consequences" ch. in H. Giersch, ed. *The International Division of Labour: Problems and Perspectives*, New York, NY: J.C.B. Mohr, 1974.
- International Trade Administration; "An Assessment of U.S. Competitiveness in High Technology Industries." Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce.
- "Innovation: The Global Race" (Special Edition), *Business Week*, McGraw Hill Inc., New York, NY: June 15, 1990, pp. 33-224.
- Kreinin, M. "Comparative Advantage and Possible Trade Restrictions in High-Technology Products." in D. Salvatore, ed. *The New Protectionist Threat to World Welfare*. North-Holland, 1987.
- Lawrence, R., *Can America Compete?*, Washington, DC: Brookings, 1984.
- Mowery, D. and N. Rosenberg, *Technology and the Pursuit of Economic Growth*, Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- National Science Board: *Science and Technology Indicators -1989*. Washington, DC: 1989.
- National Science Foundation; "Research and Development in Industry: 1987" (NSF 89-323). Washington, DC: January 1988.
- Office of Secretary of Defense; "Critical Technologies Plan." Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Defense, March 15, 1990.
- Pavitt, K. and P. Patel, 1988, "The International Distribution and Determinants of Technological Activities" *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, vol. 4, (1988) no. 4.
- Reich, R., "Beyond Free Trade" *Foreign Affairs*. Cambridge, U.K., 1983.

**UNITED STATES
INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20436**

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

ADDRESS CORRECTION REQUESTED

**Postage And Fees Paid
U.S. International Trade Commission**



ITC-653

ADDRESS CHANGE

- ☐ Remove from List
 - ☐ Change as Shown
- Please detach address
label and mail to address
shown above