

# STIMULATING INNOVATION

DR. RONALD N. KOSTOFF  
OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH  
ARLINGTON, VA 22217

Submitted by Invitation to: INTERNATIONAL HANDBOOK OF INNOVATION

## ABSTRACT

Innovation is critical for maintaining competitive advantage in a high tech global economy, especially for organizations or nations that do not possess low cost labor forces. Many studies on innovation attempt to identify endogenous and exogenous variables that impact innovation (Kostoff, 1997a), in order to better understand the environment that promotes innovation. The author's recent efforts have focused on developing processes for enhancing innovation that exploit the transference of information and insights among seemingly disparate disciplines.

The objective of this chapter is to describe how innovation can be promoted through the enhancement of discovery by cross-discipline knowledge transfer. The approach developed entails two complementary components – one literature based, the other workshop-based. The literature-based component identifies the science and technology disciplines related to the central theme of interest, the experts in these disciplines, and promising candidate concepts for innovative solutions. These outputs define the agenda and participants for the workshop-based component. An example of this combined approach is presented for the theme of

Autonomous Flying Systems. The hybrid approach appears to be an excellent vehicle for generating discovery and enabling innovation. However, it requires substantial time and effort in both phases.

## II. INTRODUCTION

Innovation reflects the metamorphosis from present practice to some new, hopefully “better” practice. It can be based on existing non-implemented knowledge, discovery of previously unknown information, discovery and synthesis of publicly available knowledge whose independent segments have never been combined, and/ or invention. In turn, the invention could derive from logical exploitation of a knowledge base, and/ or from spontaneous creativity (e.g., Edisonian discoveries from trial and error).

The process of innovation is of immense social interest and impact. Classical studies by Mansfield (1980, 1991), Griliches (1958, 1979, 1994), and Terleckyj (1977, 1985) focused on the relationship between innovation and micro or macro economics. Studies by Wenger (1999) on combined visualization/ brainstorming techniques, Patton (2002) and Taggar (2001) on the impact of group stimulation to creativity, Chen (1998) and Siau (1996) on contributions of electronic technology to creativity, and books by Boden (1991) and DeBono (1992) on mental processes in creativity, focused on the process of creativity and its contributions to innovation. Large-scale studies by the Department of Defense (DoD, 1969), Illinois Institute of Technology Research Institute (IITRI, 1968), Battelle (Battelle, 1973), and the Institute for Defense Analysis (IDA, 1990, 1991a, 1991b) focused on identifying the environmental and management conditions most conducive to innovation. Recent symposia have focused on the relation of innovation to:

technology policy (Conceicao, 1998, 2001); technology forecasting (Grupp and Linstone, 1999; Arciszewski, 2000), competitive advantage (Hitt et al, 2000); and economic growth and impact (Van de Klundert et al, 1998; Spender and Grant, 1996; Archibugi and Michie, 1995). Yet both the process and impacts of innovation remain poorly understood.

One of the least studied components of innovation is the discovery and synthesis of publicly available knowledge whose independent segments have never been combined; i.e., the transfer of information and understanding developed in one or more disciplines to other, perhaps very disparate, disciplines. With the explosion in availability of information, the number of opportunities to synthesize knowledge and enhance discovery from disparate disciplines increases non-linearly.

Conversely, with accelerating production of information, scientists and technologists find it increasingly difficult to remain aware of advances within their own discipline(s), much less advances in other seemingly unrelated ones.

Paradoxically, the growth in science has led to the balkanization of science!

As science and technology become more specialized, the incentives for interdisciplinary research and development are reduced, and this cross-discipline transfer of information becomes more difficult. The author's observation, from examination of many science and technology sponsoring agencies and performing organizations, supplemented by a wide body of literature (Metzger, 1999; Naiman, 1999; Bauer, 1990; Bruhn, 1995; Butler, 1998), is that *strong cross-disciplinary dis-incentives exist at all phases of program/ project evolution, including selection, management and execution, review, and publication.* To overcome cross-discipline transmission barriers, and thereby enhance innovation, systematic methods are required to heighten awareness of experts in one discipline to

advances in other disciplines. Most desirable are methods that incorporate/require cross-disciplinary access as an organic component.

This chapter presents two different, yet complementary, approaches to increase cross-discipline knowledge transfer and provide the framework for enhancing innovation. One is literature-based, the other is workshop-based. Each approach individually represents a major advance in enabling discovery and subsequent innovation, and the hybrid of the two approaches provides a synergy that multiplies their combined benefits.

The literature-based approach is summarized first, followed by the workshop-based approach. The advantages of combining the two approaches are then presented. The details of each approach are presented in the appendices.

## II-A. ACCESSING LINKED LITERATURES FOR ENHANCING INNOVATION-SUMMARY

The first approach searches for relationships between linked, overlapping literatures, and discovers relationships or promising opportunities not obtainable from reading each literature separately. The general theory behind this approach, applied to two separate literatures, is based upon the following considerations (Swanson, 1986).

Assume that two literatures with disjoint components can be generated, the first literature AB having a central theme "a" and sub-themes "b," and the second literature BC having a central theme(s) "b" and sub-themes "c." From these combinations, linkages can be generated through the "b" themes that connect both

literatures (e.g., AB-->BC). Those linkages that connect the disjoint components of the two literatures (e.g., the components of AB and BC whose intersection is zero) are candidates for discovery, since the disjoint themes "c" identified in literature BC could not have been obtained from reading literature AB alone.

Some initial applications of the first approach have been published in the medical literature (Swanson, 1986). One interesting discovery was that dietary eicosapentaenoic acid (theme "a" from literature AB) can decrease blood viscosity (theme "b" from both literatures AB and literatures BC) and alleviate symptoms of Raynaud's disease (theme "c" from literature BC). There was no mention of eicosapentaenoic acid in the Raynaud's disease literature, but the acid was linked to the disease through the blood viscosity themes in both literatures. Subsequent medical experiments confirmed the validity of this literature-based discovery (Gordon and Lindsay, 1996). (A web site (Swanson and Smalheiser ,1998b) overviews the process used to generate this discovery, and contains software that allows the user to experiment with the technique. Finn (1998) outlines perceptions of different knowledgeable individuals on Swanson and Smalheiser's general technique.)

This literature-based discovery approach is in its infancy. Public and private financial support for this technology are minimal. It is a research area of unlimited potential that seems to have fallen through the cracks. There is essentially one group that is publishing results of literature-based innovation and discovery in the credible peer-reviewed literature (Swanson, 1986, 1997, 1999; Smalheiser, 1994, 1998a, 1998b), two groups that have published concept papers (Hearst, 1999; Kostoff, 1999a), and a few other groups that have replicated Swanson's initial results (Gordon and Lindsay, 1996; Weeber et al, 2001). Presently, the approach is

not automatic. It requires much thought, expertise, and effort. The author's group is examining different approaches to make the process more systematic, while reducing the manual labor intensity. Given the potential benefits of the literature-based approach for stimulating innovation, it is truly a technology whose time has come.

Appendix 1 generalizes and expands upon the literature-based approach, using the Database Tomography techniques and experience developed by the author since 1991 (Kostoff, 1993, 1994, 1998, 1999b, 2000a, 2000b). It outlines the theory of the expanded approach, the implementation details, and overviews the range of applications possible with this technique.

## II- B. INTERDISCIPLINARY WORKSHOPS FOR ENHANCING INNOVATION-SUMMARY

The second approach consists of convening workshop(s) of experts from different disciplines focused on specific central themes. The purpose of such a workshop is to achieve multi-discipline synergies and cross-discipline transfers to generate promising research directions for these central themes. The theory behind this approach is described in Appendix 2. To test this theory, a workshop on Autonomous Flying Systems was convened in December 1997. Its implementation mechanics and results are described in detail in Appendix 2.

The total workshop process consisted of three phases:

- (1) A two month pre-meeting e-mail phase in which each participant provided descriptions of advanced capabilities and promising research opportunities from his/her discipline to all other participants;
- (2) A two-day meeting at the Office of Naval Research during which the promising opportunities identified beforehand were discussed, crystallized, and enhanced; and
- 3) A post meeting e-mail phase in which each participant provided additional or embellished opportunities.

A number of important lessons were extracted from the conduct of this workshop, and they can be summarized as follows:

- a) The workshop approach broke new ground toward stimulating innovative thought. It was not easy, simple, or effortless, and required substantial planning and work in order to be effective. One should not throw people from fifteen different disciplines together in a room for two days and hope to get new ideas synthesized. There needs to be a common generic thread woven through the different disciplines represented to spark the innovative thought process.

Interdisciplinary workshops, when performed correctly, are the wave of the future in defining new research (and technology) areas and approaches. Because of the intensity and effort involved throughout the process, they are most appropriate for large scale "grand challenges" in full-blown workshop form, but appropriate as well for smaller scale issues.

b) Representatives from diverse technical disciplines, organizations, and development categories attended the workshop. There was substantial value in having a balance of discipline, category, and organization diversity at the same meeting. The different perspectives presented benefited all participants.

The use of modern information technology can expand the degree of diversity dramatically. Some of the concepts and group software proposed for network-centric peer review (Kostoff, 2001) can be easily adapted for use in innovation workshops. This would allow many more people, disciplines, and organizations to be represented, further enhancing the potential for cross-discipline information transfer and resultant innovation and discovery.

c) Problem selection is crucial. The problem should be sufficiently general that many diverse disciplines can link to it. Given the choice of equally relevant problems, there is more potential for impact in selecting problem areas for which a large interdisciplinary community is not yet obvious.

d) It is important to select participants by the most objective processes available. A combination of expert recommendation and strategic topical maps based on computational linguistics, publications, and citations was used for the selection process, and this approach produced highly knowledgeable individuals. Incorporation of the full literature-based approach to innovation in the discipline or participant selection process could further enhance confidence that the most appropriate mix of disciplines and experts has been chosen.

e) It is extremely important that individuals selected for participation be world-class experts in their particular areas. There are relatively very few individuals



producing the seminal works in any field (Kostoff, 1998, 1999b), and it is these people who should be central to any truly innovative workshops. However, in addition to these established experts, highly competent individuals new to the field should also be selected. One benefit of transcending selection of known experts is that fresh faces new to established communities appear. They can sometimes challenge established paradigms and offer concepts typically not advanced through panels based solely upon well-known, over-used panelists.

f) The e-mail component of the workshop is crucial. The gestation period between the input of promising ideas and their actual discussion at the workshop allows consideration of many different approaches and syntheses. It also saves substantial time at the workshop by clarifying confusing issues beforehand. However, in the first experience reported here, the stimulation of dialogue in the e-mail phase among most of the participants did not occur. The only participant to raise questions was the author, and this occurred only a few times. Nonetheless, in these instances, the dialogue was extremely valuable in clarifying issues and surfacing points of contention. In future workshops, it is strongly recommended that a few individuals representing different disciplines be asked to assume a role of facilitator, with the task of stimulating dialogue and raising questions during the workshop build-up phase.

g) All the attendees at the workshop were required to participate; there were no pure observers. This meant that they had to submit accomplishments and opportunities statements by e-mail. They also had to be prepared to lead discussions at the workshop. This participation requirement was valuable in that each attendee obtained a sense of ownership in the workshop and its outcome. His/her contribution tended to be more substantive and creative than is typically

the case at standard workshops. Those who contributed more in the e-mail phase tended to contribute more in the workshop phase. In addition, there was a sense of equality among participants when all were required to contribute, as opposed to an audience/performer environment with passive onlookers. The requirement that each attendee be an active participant translates directly into a limitation on audience size. However, it was concluded that the participation of a limited number of motivated and active individuals contributed more to the innovation process than the standard workshop of few active participants and many observers.

h) In general, there needs to be some incentive to motivate participation of world-class experts in these workshops. Unless they are able to envision some type of substantive impact resulting from their participation, either on larger science and technology issues or in their individual disciplines, they could be reluctant to invest the substantial amount of time required for serious participation. This, however, did not turn out to be a problem for the Autonomous Flying Systems workshop, apparently because of the limited size of the field and the interest of the participants in the type of workshop conducted.

In addition, during the workshop, participants did not appear to have reluctance in sharing new concepts. This is in stark contrast to some workshops the author has attended where novel ideas were held very closely. In the Autonomous Flying Systems workshop, there was a spirit of camaraderie and cooperation that pervaded the proceedings, and helped overcome the barriers to sharing. This spirit was fostered in the pre-meeting e-mail dialogue phase, and further nurtured during the meeting by having all attendees participate in the proceedings as equal partners.

Finally, interdisciplinary workshops are a powerful potential source of radically innovative ideas if conducted properly. There are three central requirements for success:

- (1) A problem of significant interest to the sponsoring organization must be selected;
- (2) An optimal mix of world-class experts appropriate to the problem must be chosen;
- (3) Conditions must be created which will motivate the participants to share their novel concepts.

The Autonomous Flying Systems workshop addressed these three requirements to a significant degree. A preliminary concept proposal emerged, and a copy of this proposal is available from the author.

### III. NEED FOR LITERATURE/WORKSHOP SYNERGY

Most organizations use some variant of a workshop/group dynamics approach for brain-storming or other proxies for stimulating innovation. The most current information is available, and real-time information exchange is unmatched. The attendees and participants in these groups tend to be focused subject experts representing a small fraction of the relevant technical community; there is rarely any complementary sophisticated literature analysis performed, and there are rarely experts present from strongly divergent disciplines. The outputs and discussion are highly subjective. The workshop techniques tend not to make full use of many of the information technology advances of recent years. Probably most importantly, there are strong disincentives for the participants to reveal the latest innovations.

What many workshops produce in practice are forums for "selling" completed or near-completed research efforts.

A few performers, individuals or small groups of individuals, pursue the literature-based computer-assisted approach. This literature approach tends to be more sophisticated and technologically advanced than the workshop approach, and is more objective. It is more comprehensive, since it encompasses science and technology beyond the scope of any individual, or group of individuals, and can access data from many technical disciplines and many global sources. The source data is not as current as the workshop approach, due to the documentation time lag. However, with the advent of extensive on-line documentation, this time lag has been reduced considerably. One intrinsic limitation is that only a relatively modest amount of science and technology performed globally is documented and readily accessible to the wider user community (Kostoff, 2000c); obviously, any science and technology not documented cannot be accessed. The literature-based approach has not received widespread attention and may fall short of the interpretive and analytical strengths of the workshop approach. As a result, the literature approach is not widely used (e.g., Finn, 1998).

While either the workshop approach or the literature approach can be done independently to help stimulate discovery, they should be done in tandem to maximize the benefit provided by each. There is nothing on record to indicate that this joint approach to innovation has been implemented, or even considered. The Autonomous Flying Systems workshop described in this chapter has some elements of the combined approach. Some of the Database Tomography proximity analysis tools were used to identify the scope of related literatures, and the prolific individuals in these literatures. These individuals were then invited to the

workshop. However, time constraints precluded using the full capabilities that the literature-based approach can offer.

In a joint workshop-literature effort, the literature approach would be included in the background pre-meeting phase of the workshop approach (as developed in Appendix 2). Accordingly, the literature study would provide:

- (1) Background reading for the workshop participants in related yet disparate science and technology areas;
- (2) Strategic maps of the broader science and technology literature as outlined in the DT papers referenced above;
- (3) Promising opportunities for innovation and discovery; and
- (4) The disparate science and technology disciplines from which the experts for the workshop could be drawn.

The hybrid literature-workshop approach would eliminate the limitations of each approach done separately. The right people from the right combination of disciplines could be identified by the literature-based approach, and invited to the workshop. The literature-based analysis could structure the technical relationships, and provide an objective starting point for discussion. Network-centric peer review would allow linking, and fusing information from, large numbers of reviewers to incorporate more representative opinion sampling from the larger technical community. The only limitation not overcome is the disincentive for the

participants, or document authors, to reveal their latest science and technology advancements.

There is extra time and cost involved with two approaches, and if responses were required with severe time limitations, then only one approach might prove feasible. For organizations that are serious about stimulating discovery and subsequent innovation, the additional time should not be a factor, given the potential high marginal benefits. Government could probably draw upon a more eclectic group than industry. Because of the competitive aspects, industry would probably rely more upon internal participants and contracted consultants, whereas government would draw upon individuals from many organizations.

#### IV. CONCLUSIONS

The advent of large databases, and the parallel advances in computer hardware and software, provide the opportunity to augment and amplify traditional approaches of human creativity in generating discovery and subsequent innovation. This chapter has shown that multi-discipline structured workshops can enhance the science and technology discovery and subsequent innovation processes, and has shown that multi-discipline literature-based analyses can enhance the science and technology discovery process. The document has shown conceptually that the combination of computer-enhanced literature-based analyses and multi-discipline structured workshops has the synergistic potential to dramatically improve the discovery and subsequent innovation process relative to the already strong capabilities available from each process separately. This literature-workshop synergy represents a potential major breakthrough for systematically identifying: 1) the most promising

disciplines to be used in the workshop; 2) specific experts from these different disciplines; 3) candidate promising concepts that form the basis for discussion.

(The views expressed in this chapter are those of the author and do not represent the views of the Department of the Navy.)

## V. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archibugi, D., Michie, J. (1995). (Eds.). *Technology and innovation*. Special Issue, Cambridge Journal Of Economics. 19(1) 1-4 February.

Arciszewski, T. (2000). (Ed.) *Innovation: The key to progress in technology and society*. Special issue, Technological Forecasting And Social Change. 64: (2-3). 119-120. June-July.

Battelle (1973). *Interactions of science and technology in the innovative process: some case studies*. Final Report. Prepared for the National Science Foundation. Contract NSF-C 667. Battelle Columbus Laboratories. March 19.

Bauer, H. H. (1990). Barriers against interdisciplinarity - implications for studies of science, technology, and society (sts). *Science, Technology, and Human Values*. 15(1). Winter. 105-119.

Boden, M. (1991). *The creative mind*. New York: Basic Books.

Bruhn, J. G. (1995). Beyond discipline: Creating a culture for interdisciplinary research. *Integrative Physiological and Behavioral Science*. 30(4). September-December. 331-341.

Butler, D. 1998. Interdisciplinary research 'being stifled'. *Nature*. 396. 19 November. 202.

Chen, Z. (1998). Toward a better understanding of idea processors. *Information And Software Technology*. 40(10) 541-553. October 15.

Conceicao, P., Heitor, M.V., Gibson, D.V., Shariq, S.S. (1998). (Eds.). *The emerging importance of knowledge for development: Implications for technology policy and innovation*. Special Issue, *Technological Forecasting And Social Change*. 58: (3). 181-202. July.

Conceicao, P., Gibson D.V., Heitor, M.V., Sirilli, G. (2001). (Eds.) *Beyond the digital economy: A perspective on innovation for the learning society*. Special Issue, *Technological Forecasting And Social Change*. 67(2-3). 115-142. June-July.

DeBono, E. (1992). *Serious Creativity*. New York: Harper Collins.

DOD (1969). *Project Hindsight*. Office of the Director of Defense Research and Engineering. Wash., D. C. DTIC No. AD495905. October.

Finn, R. (1998). Program uncovers hidden connections in the literature. *The Scientist*. 11 May.

Gordon, M. D., and R. K. Lindsay, (1996). Toward discovery support systems: a replication, re-examination, and extension of Swanson's work on literature-based discovery of a connection between Raynaud's disease and fish oil. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*. 47(2).

Griliches, Z. (1979). Issues in assessing the contribution of research and development to productivity growth. *The Bell Journal of Economics*. 10. Spring.

Griliches, Z. (1994). Productivity, R&D, and the data constraint. *The American Economic Review*. 84(1). March.

Griliches, Z. (1958). Research costs and social returns: hybrid corn and related innovations. *Journal of Political Economy*. 66.

Grupp, H., Linstone, H.A. (1999). (Eds.) National technology foresight activities around the globe - Resurrection and new paradigms. Special Issue, *Technological Forecasting And Social Change*. 60(1). 85-94. January.



Hearst, M. A., (1999). Untangling Text Data Mining. *Proceedings of ACL 99, the 37th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. University of Maryland. June 20-26.

Hitt, M.A., Ireland, R.D., Lee, H.U. (2000). (Eds.). *Technological learning, knowledge management, firm growth and performance*. Special issue, *Journal Of Engineering And Technology Management*. 17(3-4). 231-246. September-December.

IDA. *DARPA technical accomplishments*. Volume I. IDA Paper P-2192. February 1990; Volume II. IDA Paper P-2429. April 1991; Volume III. IDA Paper P-2538. July 1991. Institute for Defense Analysis.

IITRI (1968). *Technology in retrospect and critical events in science*, Illinois Institute of Technology Research Institute Report. December.

Kostoff, R. N. (1993). Database tomography for technical intelligence. *Competitive Intelligence Review*. 4(1).

Kostoff, R.N. (1994). Database tomography: origins and applications. *Competitive Intelligence Review*. Special Issue on Technology. 5(1).

Kostoff, R. N., (1997a). *The handbook of research impact assessment*. Seventh Edition. DTIC Report Number ADA296021. Summer. Also located at [www.dtic.mil/dtic/kostoff/index.html](http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/kostoff/index.html).

Kostoff, R. N. (1997b). Database tomography for information retrieval. *Journal of Information Science*. 23(4).

Kostoff, R. N. (1998). Database tomography for technical intelligence: a roadmap of the near-earth space science and technology literature. *Information Processing and Management*. 34(1).

Kostoff, R. N. (1999a). Science and technology innovation. *Technovation*. 19. October.

Kostoff, R. N. (1999b). Hypersonic and supersonic flow roadmaps using bibliometrics and database tomography. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*. 50(5). April.

Kostoff, R. N., Braun, T., Schubert, A., Toothman, D. R., and Humenik, J. (2000a). Fullerene roadmaps using bibliometrics and database tomography. *Journal of Chemical Information and Computer Science*. 40. January-February.

Kostoff, R. N., Green, K. A., Toothman, D. R., and Humenik, J. (2000b). Database tomography applied to an aircraft science and technology investment strategy. *Journal of Aircraft*. 37(4). July-August. Also, see Kostoff, R. N., Green, K. A., Toothman, D. R., and Humenik, J. A. *Database tomography applied to an aircraft science and technology investment strategy*. TR NAWCAD PAX/RTR-2000/84, Naval Air Warfare Center. Aircraft Division. Patuxent River, MD.

Kostoff, R. N. (2000c). The underpublishing of science and technology results. *The Scientist*. 1 May.

Kostoff, R. N. (2001). Advanced technology development peer review - A case study. *R&D Management*. July.

Mansfield, E. (1980). Basic research and productivity increase in manufacturing. *The American Economic Review*. 70(5). December.

Mansfield, E. (1991). Academic research and industrial innovation. *Research Policy*. 20.

Metzger, N., Zare, R. N. (1999). Interdisciplinary research: from belief to reality. *Science*. 283. 29 January. 642-643.

Naiman, R. J. (1999). A perspective on interdisciplinary science. *Ecosystems*. 2. 292-295.

Patton, J.D. (2002). The role of problem pioneers in creative innovation. *Creativity Research Journal*. 14(1). 111-126.

Siau, K. (1996). Electronic creativity techniques for organizational innovation. *Journal Of Creative Behavior*. 30(4). 283-293.

Smalheiser, N.R., Swanson, D.R. (1994). Assessing a gap in the biomedical literature – magnesium – deficiency and neurologic disease, *Neuroscience Research Communications*. 15(1).

Smalheiser, N.R., Swanson, D.R. (1998a). Calcium-independent phospholipase a (2) and schizophrenia. *Archives General Psychiatry*. 55(8).

Smalheiser, N.R., Swanson, D.R. (1998b). Using ARROWSMITH: a computer assisted approach to formulating and assessing scientific hypotheses. *Computational Methods and Progress in Biology*. 57(3).

Spender, J.C., Grant, R.M. (1996). (Eds.). *Knowledge and the firm*. Special Issue, *Strategic Management Journal*. 17(5-9).

Swanson, D.R. (1986). Fish oil, Raynauds syndrome, and undiscovered public knowledge. *Perspectives in Bioogy and Medicine*. 30(1).

Swanson, D.R., Smalheiser, N.R. (1997). An interactive system for finding complementary literatures: a stimulus to scientific discovery. *Artificial Intelligence*. 91(2).

Swanson, D.R. (1999). Computer – assisted search for novel implicit connections in text databases. *Abstracts of Papers of the American Chemical Society*. 217.

Taggar, S. (2001). Group composition, creative synergy, and group performance. *Journal Of Creative Behavior*. 35(4). 261-286.

Terleckyj, N. (1985) Measuring economic effects of federal R&D expenditures: recent history with special emphasis on federal R&D performed in industry. Presented at NAS Workshop on 'The Federal Role in Research and Development'. November.

Terleckyj, N. (1977). *State of science and research: some new indicators*. Westview Press. Boulder, CO.

Van de Klundert, T.C.M.J., Palm, F.C. (1998). (Eds.) *Market dynamics and innovation*. Special issue, *Economist*. 146(3). 387-390. October.

Weeber, M., Klein, H., de Jong-van den Berg, L.T.W., Vos, R. (2001). Using concepts in literature-based discovery: Simulating Swanson's Raynaud-fish oil and migraine-magnesium discoveries. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science And Technology*. May.

Wenger, W. (1999). *Discovering the obvious: techniques of original, inspired scientific discovery, technical invention, and innovation*. PsycheGenics Press. P. O. Box 332. Gaithersburg, Maryland.

## APPENDIX 1 - LITERATURE APPROACH

### A. Overview

The theoretical basis of the literature approach mirrors the scientific process in many ways. Information from diverse literatures, with relevant interfaces, is examined. All information is first analyzed and then synthesized to produce discovery and innovation. Initial work (Swanson, 1986; Gordon, 1996) examined three variable classes or themes (c, b, a) in two literature categories (C and B) using two different approaches (start with "c," determine "b," then determine "a;" start with "c" and "a," then determine "b").

The principal thematic variables determine a thematic literature. From the previous example, if Raynaud's disease is the thematic variable specified initially, then the

corresponding thematic literature might be all the papers in a given database that contain the phrase Raynaud's disease. The remaining thematic variables and literatures are determined by applying different algorithms to the initial thematic literature and subsequent derived literatures. Again, from the previous example, an algorithm would be applied to the Raynaud's disease thematic literature to determine the thematic variable blood viscosity, and a derived literature could then be determined as all the papers in a given database that contain the phrase 'blood viscosity'.

The first approach in the initial reported work (Swanson, 1986; Gordon, 1996) could be viewed as addressing the question: What variables "a" could influence variable "c" through mechanisms "b", or, in the example described above, "What treatment factors "a" could influence Raynaud's disease "c" through the different mechanisms "b." This approach started with thematic variable "c" (e.g., Raynaud's disease), and used this variable to develop thematic literature C. Algorithms were applied to this thematic literature database to identify thematic variable "b" values (b1, b2, etc., representing characteristics such as blood viscosity, blood flow, blood platelets, poor circulation, and others) closely linked to thematic variable "c." Each value or theme of variable "b" (b1, b2, etc.) was used to develop a thematic literature B1, B2, etc. Algorithms were applied to each of the thematic B literatures to identify thematic variable "a" values (a1, a2, etc. representing characteristics such as fish oil, eicosapentaenoic acid, and others) closely linked to the specific thematic variable "b" of each thematic B literature. Values of the thematic "a" variables in each of the thematic B literatures not found in thematic literature C defined a subset of the thematic B literatures that was disjoint from thematic literature C (e.g., the term "fish oil" was not found in the Raynaud's

disease literature). These disjoint thematic "a" variables and their associated thematic B literature subsets became candidates for discovery and innovation.

The other approach reported could be viewed as addressing the question: What are the mechanisms "b" through which variable "a" could impact variable "c." This approach started with variables "c" and "a", and their associated literatures C and A, and identified variables "b" that were linked to both variables "c" and "a". The same types of algorithms as in the first approach were used to identify closely linked variables, and the requirement for disjointness between literatures C and A was used as a basis for discovery.

From the experience of these two approaches, it becomes clear that the independent and dependent variables chosen, and the algorithmic approach selected, depend on the question being asked. Further examination shows that other approaches beyond these two are possible to answer other questions. The present chapter examines seven approaches to generate innovation and discovery that are structured to answer seven different questions, and shows how the algorithms and techniques developed in Database Tomography are used in these approaches.

## B. Specific Approaches

The following discussion will be limited to scenarios of three variables "a", "b", "c", and two literatures. In future studies, more complex cases could be candidates for analysis and experimentation.

For the simple two literature/ three variable case, seven separate generic cases are possible, where the variables specified can be viewed as "independent" and the variables determined can be viewed as "dependent:"

- (1) specify "a," determine "b" and "c";
- (2) specify "c," determine "a" and "b";
- (3) specify "b," determine "a" and "c";
- (4) specify "a" and "c," determine "b";
- (5) specify "a" and "b," determine "c";
- (6) specify "b" and "c," determine "a";
- (7) specify "a" and "b" and "c," validate linkage existence.

Cases (1), (2), and (3) are the most open-ended and least constrained. In each case, one variable is specified, and the other two are determined using the DT algorithms, the condition of disjointness and, most importantly, expert judgement. Cases (4), (5), and (6) are more constrained, since two variables are specified, and the third is determined using similar processes to the above. Case (7) is fully constrained, and its purpose is to ascertain literature support for validation of a hypothetical relation between specified values of the three variables. Cases (4) and (5) are subsets of case (1); cases (4) and (6) are subsets of case (2); cases (5) and (6) are subsets of case (3); Case (7) is a subset of cases (1) through (6). The solution mechanics for each of these seven cases will now be outlined.

## 1. Opportunity Driven

This first case addresses the question, "What are the potential variable 'c' impacts that could result from variable 'a,' and what are the variable 'b' mechanisms through which these impacts occur?" One specific variant of this question is of particular interest and importance to the science and technology community, "What are the

potential impacts on research, development, systems, and operations that could result from research on a given topic?"

If the generic question of this first case is applied to the above example for the case where variable "a" is "fish oil" only, it could be phrased as, "What are the potential impacts or benefits (positive or negative) resulting from fish oil that would not be obvious from examining the fish oil literature alone?" This is an open-ended question, and places no restrictions on the mechanisms "b" or the types of impact "c." The first case is represented schematically as:

a----->b----->c.

Here, "a" is the independent variable, and "b" and "c" are the dependent variables that result from the solution process. The operational sequence is to start with the variable "a" and generate a literature A. Again following the above example and using the abbreviations FO (fish oil), BV (blood viscosity), and RD (Raynaud's disease), this means that the process would start by identifying the FO literature (call this A1). Many approaches could be used to define this literature; the approach recommended here is the one used in recent Database Tomography studies (Kostoff, 2000a, 2000b) for defining literatures. As an example of one literature definition approach, the iterative Simulated Nucleation method (Kostoff, 1997b) would be used to identify all the papers in the Science Citation Index which contained FO (and other related terms in the query) in the title, keywords, and abstract fields. This collection of papers would constitute the FO literature

The next step in the process is to identify the variables "b" (b1, b2, ...) linked closely to variable "a1," and then identify the literatures B associated with variable



"b" (B1, B2, ... the BV literatures). For this step, the proximity analysis method used in the recent Database Tomography studies (or other co-occurrence techniques) would be employed. For a journal-based database, this method conceptually identifies phrases in paper titles or abstracts or main texts physically located near the term of interest. As an example, if the term of interest in a given database is Raynaud's disease, then the proximity analysis method would provide a list of all phrases in close physical proximity to the term Raynaud's disease for all occurrences of this term in the text. The proximity analysis approach of Database Tomography is based on the experimental findings that phrases within a semantic boundary (same sentence, paragraph, etc.) located physically close to the term of interest are contextually and conceptually close to the term of interest. Continuing the above example, this step uses the proximity analysis of Database Tomography to identify phrases in the FO literature physically close to the term FO, such as "b1," "b2," etc.

For each of these identified phrases "b1," "b2," etc. , a literature (B1, B2, ...) is established by querying the SCI. The next step is, for each of these B literatures, to identify the linked variables "c" (c1, c2, ... ) The process used to identify the variables "b1," "b2," etc. linked to variable "a1" is repeated to obtain the variables "c1," "c2," etc. linked to each value of variable "b." The subsets of the B literatures which are disjoint from literature A1 (e.g., the B literatures which don't contain the term FO) must then be identified, and the variables "c" (and their associated linking mechanisms "b" to variable "a1") within these disjoint B literature subsets then become the candidates for discovery and innovation.

It is obvious that the process can easily mushroom out of control unless stringent limiting constraints are placed on the number of B literatures and "c" variables

selected. For example, suppose that three "b" variables "b1," "b2," "b3" (and their associated three B literatures (B1, B2, B3) are identified as closely linked to FO. Suppose also that each of these three "b" variables is closely linked to five "c" variables. Then four literature searches are required (A1, B1, B2, B3), and fifteen abc linked pathways must be examined for disjointness and discovery, according to the following:

a1--->b1--->c11; a1--->b1--->c12; a1--->b1--->c13; a1--->b1--->c14; a1--->b1--->c15;

a1--->b2--->c21; a1--->b2--->c22; a1--->b2--->c23; a1--->b2--->c24; a1--->b2--->c25;

a1--->b3--->c31; a1--->b3--->c32; a1--->b3--->c33; a1--->b3--->c34; a1--->b3--->c35

In reality, there will be hundreds, if not thousands, of candidate "b" and "c" variables. However, there are different ways by which the "b" and "c" variables can be sharply limited in number. First, the analysts performing the study would eliminate all non-technical content phrases that passed through the trivial word filter in the Database Tomography algorithm. Second, the numerical indices for each phrase generated by the Database Tomography proximity algorithm would be used as one figure of merit for pre-selection of key phrases. Third, those "c" variables that reappear in different abc pathways would have a higher priority for selection. Fourth, analyst judgement would be applied to weight the potential value of the different abc pathways in computing figures of merit.

The literature searches and proximity analyses are fairly straightforward, and have been refined in the Database Tomography process. The main intellectual efforts

must be focused on prioritizing and reducing the number of linked variables or literatures to be examined, and interpreting the relationships among the final disjoint literatures to generate potential discovery relationships.

## 2. Requirements Driven

This second case addresses the question, "What are the variables 'a' that could impact variable 'c,' and what are the variable 'b' mechanisms by which these impacts are produced?" Applied to the above example for the case where "c" is Raynaud's disease only, it could be phrased as "What are the factors and their associated mechanisms that could impact the course of Raynaud's disease that would not be obvious from examining the Raynaud's disease literature alone?" This second case is represented schematically as:

a<-----b<-----c

Here, "c" is the independent variable, and "b" and "a" become the dependent variables. The operational sequence is to start with variable "c," and generate a literature C. Again following the above example, this means that the process would start by identifying the RD literature (call this C1). The same literature definition process as in the first case would be used. The next step would be to identify the linked variables "b" (b1, b2, etc.) to variable "c1," and then their associated literatures B (B1, B2, the BV literatures). For this step, the proximity analysis method used in the recent DT studies would be employed again as in the first case. Continuing the above example, this step uses the proximity analysis of DT to identify phrases in the RD literature physically close to the term RD, such as "b1," "b2," etc.

For each of these identified phrases b1, b2, etc. a literature (B1, B2, etc.) is established by querying the SCI. The next step is, for each of these B literatures, to identify the variables "a" (a1, a2, etc.) linked to variable "b." The process used to identify the variables "b1," "b2," etc. linked to variable "c1" is repeated to obtain the variables "a1," "a2," etc. linked to each value of variable "b." The subsets of the B literatures that are disjoint from literature C1 (e.g., the B literatures which don't contain the term RD) must then be identified, and the variables "a" within these disjoint B literature subsets (and their associated linking mechanisms "b" to variable "c1") then become candidates for discovery and subsequent innovation. The same stringent limits on variables and literatures used in the first case are applicable here.

### 3. Mechanism Driven

The third case addresses the question, "For a given mechanism 'b,' what are the variables 'a' that could impact the variables 'c'?" Applied to the above example for the case where "b" is blood viscosity, it could be phrased as, "What combinations of variables that could effect a change in the blood viscosity mechanism and could be impacted by a change in the blood viscosity mechanism are candidates for discovery that were not obvious from examining only the blood viscosity literature?" The third case is represented schematically as:

a<-----b----->c

Here, "b" is the independent variable, and "a" and "c" are dependent variables. The operational sequence starts with variable "b," and generates a literature B. Again

following the above example, this means that the process would start by identifying and generating the BV literature (call this B1). The same literature definition and generation process as in the first case would be used. The next step would be to identify the variables "a" (a1, a2, etc.) and "c" (c1, c2, etc.) linked to variable "b1," and then their associated literatures A (A1, A2, the FO literatures) and C (C1, C2, the RD literatures). For this step, the proximity analysis method used in the first two cases would be employed for the BV literature (B1). Continuing the above example, this step uses the proximity analysis of DT to identify phrases in the BV literature physically close to the term BV, such as "a1," "a2," etc. (FO literature) and "c1," "c2," etc. (RD literature). However, an arbitrary step is required at this point, since the proximity analysis only provides the aggregate of the linked variables "a" and "c." The analyst is required to divide the aggregate linked variables obtained from the proximity analysis into two groups, "a" variables and "c" variables. In the above example, the proximity analysis would generate the linked variables such as fish oil and Raynaud's disease. The analyst would be required to specify two categorizations for these variables, such as "dietary factors" for the "a" variables and "diseases" for the "c" variables. This step will depend heavily on the analyst's expertise in the technical area and ability to create taxonomies.

The next step is to identify/ generate A and C literatures using the approach described above. The final step is to identify the subsets of A literatures and C literatures that are disjoint. Each group of articles from the A literature and the C literature that contains a "b1" variable is considered to be a linked group. The subsets of these literatures that are linked through the common "b1" variable and that are disjoint (i.e., the C literature does not contain the "a" variable and the A literature does not contain the "c" variable) must then be identified. The variables

"a" and "c" within these disjoint A and C literature subsets linked through the "b1" variable then become the candidates for discovery and subsequent innovation. The same stringent limits on variables and literatures used in the first approach are applicable here.

#### 4. Opportunity-Requirements Driven

This fourth case addresses the question, "What are the mechanisms 'b' through which variable 'a' could impact variable 'c'?" Applied to the above example for the case where "c" is Raynaud's disease only, and "a" is fish oil only, it could be phrased as, "What are the mechanisms through which fish oil could impact Raynaud's disease that would not be obvious from examining only the Raynaud's disease literature or the fish oil literature?" The fourth case is represented schematically as:

a----->b<-----c

Here, variables "a" and "c" are independent, and variable "b" is the dependent variable. The operational sequence is to start with the variable "c," and generate a literature C, and with variable "a," and generate a literature A. Again following the above example, this means that the process would start by generating the RD literature (call this C1) and the FO literature (call this A1). The same literature definition and generation process as in the first case would be used. The next step would be to identify the linked variables "b," and then their associated literatures B for both the A1 literature and the C1 literature. For this step, the proximity analysis method used in the first two approaches would be employed, for the FO literature (A1) and the RD literature (C1). Continuing the above example, this step uses the

proximity analysis of DT to identify phrases in the RD literature physically close to the term RD, such as "b1," "b2," etc. and to identify phrases in the FO literature physically close to the term FO, such as b51, b52, etc. The next step is to identify the subsets of the A1 literature and C1 literature that are linked. Each group of articles from the A1 literature and the C1 literature that contains a "b" variable is considered to be a linked group. The subsets of these literatures linked through the common "b" variables that are disjoint (i.e., the C1 sub-literature that does not contain the "a1" variable and the A1 sub-literature that does not contain the 'c1' variable) must then be identified, and the variables "b" within these disjoint A1 and C1 literature subsets then become the candidates for discovery and subsequent innovation. The same stringent limits on variables and literatures used in the first case are applicable here.

## 5. Opportunity-Mechanism Driven

The fifth case addresses the question, "What are the variables 'c' which could be impacted by variable 'a' through mechanism(s) 'b'?" While the schematic shown for this case is identical to that of case 1, the two schematics should be interpreted differently. In case 1, the intermediate mechanism(s) "b" are not specified beforehand, but are a result of the solution process. In the present case, these "b" mechanism(s) are specified beforehand. Applied to the above example for the case where "b" is blood viscosity only, and "a" is fish oil only, the question in this case could be phrased as, "What abnormalities could be influenced from the impact of fish oil on blood viscosity that would not be obvious from examining only the abnormality's literature or the fish oil literature?" The fifth case is represented schematically as:

a----->b----->c

Here, "a" and "b" are the independent variables, and "c" is the dependent variable. The operational sequence is to start with the variable "a," and generate a literature A, and with variable "b," generate a literature B. Again following the above example, this means that the process would start by generating the FO literature (A1) and the BV literature (B1). The same literature definition and generation process as in the first case would be used. The next step would be to identify the linked variables "c," and then their associated literatures C (the collection of RD literatures) for the B1 literature. For this step, the proximity analysis method used in the previous cases would be employed for the B1 literature only. Continuing as before, this step uses the proximity analysis of DT to identify phrases in the BV literature physically close to the term BV, such as "c1," "c2," etc. The resulting C literatures are automatically linked to the A1 literature through the linking variable "b1." The "c" variables which are disjoint to the A1 literature (i.e., the C sub-literature that does not contain the "a1" variable and the A1 literature does not contain the "c" variables) must be identified, and become the candidates for discovery and subsequent innovation. The same stringent limits on variables and literatures used in the first case are applicable here.

## 6. Requirements-Mechanism Driven

The sixth case addresses the question, "What are the variables 'a' that could impact variable 'c' through mechanism 'b'?" Applied to the above example for the case where "b" is blood viscosity only, and "a" is fish oil only, it could be phrased as, "What factors could impact Raynaud's disease by impacting blood viscosity that



would not be obvious from examining only the factors' literature or the Raynaud's disease literature?" The sixth approach is represented schematically as:

a<-----b<-----c

Here, "b" and "c" are the independent variables, and "a" is the dependent variable. The operational sequence is to start with the variable "c," and generate a literature C, and with variable "b," and generate a literature B. Again, this means that the process would start by identifying and generating the RD literature (C1) and the BV literature (B1). The same literature definition and generation process as in the first case would be used. The next step would be to identify the linked row of variables "a" (a1, a2, etc.), and then their associated literatures A (the FO literatures) for the B1 literature. For this step, the proximity analysis method used in the previous cases would be employed, for the B1 literature only. Continuing as before, this step uses the proximity analysis of DT to identify phrases in the BV literature physically close to the term BV, such as "a1," "a2," etc. The resulting A literatures are automatically linked to the C1 literature through the linking variable "b1." The "a" variables which are disjoint to the C1 literature (i.e., the A sub-literature does not contain the "c1" variable and the C1 literature does not contain the "a" variables) must be identified, and become the candidates for discovery and subsequent innovation. The same stringent limits on variables and literatures used in the first case are applicable here.

## 7. Opportunity-Mechanism-Requirements Validation

The seventh case addresses the question, "Does the literature support the possibility that variable 'a' could impact variable 'c' through mechanism 'b'?"

Applied to the above example for the case where "a" is fish oil only, "b" is blood viscosity only, and "c" is Raynaud's disease only, it could be phrased as, "Does the literature support the possibility that fish oil could impact Raynaud's Disease by altering blood viscosity in a way that would not be obvious from examining only the fish oil literature or the Raynaud's disease literature?" The seventh approach is represented schematically as:

a<----->b<----->c

Here, "a" and "b" and "c" are independent variables. The operational sequence could start with either "a" or "b" or "c." For the present discussion, the operational sequence starts with the variable "b," and generates literature B. Again following the above example, this means that the process would start by identifying and generating the BV literature (B1). The same literature generation process as in the first approach would be used. The next step would be to extract the B1 sub-literatures which contain the variables "a1" (literature A1) and "c1" (literature C1).

The final step is to validate the existence of disjoint A1 and C1 sub-literatures (i.e., A1 sub-literature that does not contain the "c1" variable and a C1 literature that does not contain the "a1" variable). The "a1"- "b1"- "c1" sequence then becomes a candidate for discovery and subsequent innovation. The same stringent limits on variables and literatures used in the first approach are applicable here.

APPENDIX 2: Crossing the Bridge: Interdisciplinary Workshops for Innovation.

BACKGROUND

The Office of Naval Research established a series of workshops in 1997 aimed at promoting innovation while also enhancing organization, category, and discipline diversity components. The focus of the first novel workshop founded on this plan was "Autonomous Flying Systems," an area of perceived long-term interest to not only the Navy and Department of Defense, but also to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and other governmental and industrial organizations. The process employed was designed starting with a clean slate and was intended for application to very significant technical challenges. The present appendix further describes the process that was used to identify the technical theme of the workshop, select the participants, and conduct all three phases of the total workshop.

## WORKSHOP THEME IDENTIFICATION

It was decided that the initial workshop theme should 1) focus on problems related to the main science and technology emphasis area of the author's home organization, Strike Technology, and 2) help establish the most supportive environment for innovation. The problem selected should be focused and understandable, and it should have a generic technical base amenable to soliciting people from many different disciplines. The topic finally selected was autonomous control of unmanned air vehicles, including takeoff and landing from limited areas on smaller Navy ships. It was apparent that the underlying science and technology permeated many different disciplines, including aerodynamics, controls, structures, communications, guidance, navigation, propulsion, sensing, and systems integration. Also, the naval applications for some aspects of this problem were

sufficiently unique that probably not a great deal of work had been done in this area. Subsequent literature analyses validated this assumption.

Present naval air systems are either manned (most aircraft) or tele-operated, semi-autonomous (weapons and some aircraft). The weapons are a mix ranging from "dumb" bombs and shells to "smart" missiles. The future trend is toward "smart" autonomous or semiautonomous aircraft and weapons. Since a major role of the Office of Naval Research is to proactively address the technology that will influence future naval forces, it seemed natural to examine science and technology roadblocks on the path to unmanned autonomous "smart" flight systems.

Consequently, the focus of the initial workshop was defined as identification of the fundamental operational principles of autonomous flying systems over a fairly wide range of flight environments. In particular, the workshop was aimed at examining what had been learned about autonomous or semiautonomous operation from the animal (mainly flying) kingdom and from other unmanned autonomous/semiautonomous tele-operated systems such as autonomous underwater vehicles and locomoted robots. Animals are now being studied as integrated systems by scientists on the forefront of biological research. The issues of aerodynamics, flight mechanics, dynamic reconfiguration, materials, control, neuro-sciences, and locomotion are not being studied as separate disciplines by these scientists, but rather are being studied in parallel in the same animal system and in their relation to the function and mission of the animal system. While this integrative biological research is in its infancy, and results are only starting to emerge, the time seemed appropriate for assembling these diverse groups and exploiting their synergy. Not only could there be benefit to the Navy from such cross-discipline interaction, but benefit could be possible for each of the contributing disciplines as well.

A major thrust of the workshop was projected to be identification of the autonomous operational principles for each unique system and the relation of these principles to mission and function, then extraction of the generic operational principles that underlay all the systems, both biological and man-made. It was hoped that the cross fertilization of disciplines would be able to further elucidate and clarify the more important generic concepts, and then provide insight that could be utilized to enhance the autonomous operation of naval flying systems.

## PARTICIPANT SELECTION

Once the theme of the workshop was established, a sub-theme taxonomy was developed to focus the agenda and to identify workshop participants. A dual approach was followed to generate the taxonomy.

Discussions were held with agency experts on the generic theme concerning the taxonomy structure. In parallel, the Science Citation Index was queried for papers related to the generic theme. Both bibliometric and computational linguistics analyses of these papers were performed to provide strategic maps of the topical area, identifying key performers, journals, institutions, and their relations to the technical themes and sub-themes of the workshop. A taxonomy was constructed based on these strategic maps. (For a description of how the bibliometric and computational analyses are combined to generate strategic maps, see Kostoff (1998, 1999)).

Both of these taxonomy sources, in-house experts and the Science Citation Index, then provided initial candidates for participation in the workshop. These candidates were contacted, and asked to suggest additional candidates. This procedure

continued until a large pool of potential candidates was established. Three main selection criteria for workshop participants were established;

- (1) Multiple recommendations,
- (2) Significant publications in the field, and
- (3) Literature citations.

These three criteria were tempered with judgement to insure that bright young individuals, who had not yet established a track record, were not excluded from the pool, and that the panel as a whole had the correct level of discipline, category, and organization balance. In addition, a guideline was established that all workshop attendees would be active participants, so the number of attendees was limited to facilitate discussion and interactions.

All these constraints, guidelines, and selection criteria were used to arrive at the final panel size and structure. The result was a panel of slightly more than twenty people representing a mix of disciplines that included biologists (experts in bird, bat, frog, fish, or insect studies), robotics, artificial intelligence, controls, autonomous aircraft, fluid dynamics, sensors, neuroscience, cognitive science, autonomous underwater vehicles, aerodynamics, propulsion, and avionics.

## OVERVIEW OF WORKSHOP PROCESS STEPS

### (1) Workshop Buildup

The buildup period for the workshop in question started about two months before the meeting. Specific guidance for the conduct of the workshop was sent to the

participants by e-mail, including a statement of the naval technical problems to be addressed. The technical component of the buildup phase was then conducted by e-mail.

The main purpose of this buildup phase technical component was to have each participant generate new ideas from his/ her discipline for all other participants to consider. The other participants could then dialogue by e-mail to clarify/ modify/ embellish these ideas. At a minimum, even if no dialogue resulted, there would be a gestation period of about two months for each participant to absorb these concepts from other disciplines. Specifically, each participant was requested to:

- Submit a half dozen leading edge capabilities or accomplishments in his/her discipline(s) that could potentially impact the naval technical problems; and
- Identify several leading edge capabilities or accomplishments projected in his/her discipline(s) over the next decade that could potentially influence the naval technical problems; and

Submit a few leading edge capabilities or accomplishments in his/ her discipline(s) whose impact on the naval technical problems was not obvious to him/ her, but might be obvious to someone else.

The participants were free to comment on potential relations among any of the capabilities, accomplishments, or combinations of capabilities and accomplishments, and any of the naval technical problems, or combinations of problems. All of the comments received were then sent to all the participants. This exercise helped stimulate the thinking of the participants, and provided a

documented record of the process. One of the functions of the participants from the author's organization was to facilitate and stimulate dialogue by raising questions and issues on the submitted information.

If any of the participants saw a capability or accomplishment from another participant that could impact a problem in his/her discipline, but not impact a naval technical problem, then the two participants were free to dialogue together without informing all the participants. However, these two participants engaged in independent dialogue were requested to keep a record of their exchange that might be included with the final workshop report as potential discovery. This would cover the real possibility of discovery occurring in topics other than the one targeted.

## (2) Workshop Meeting

As a result of the ideas presented during the buildup phase, it appeared that the seeds existed for a new science and technology program on Autonomous Flying Systems. Therefore, an agenda was sent to the participants with further guidance to address promising science and technology opportunities at the workshop, that would serve as the foundation of such a program. Specifically, the participants were asked to address the following issues at the workshop:

- What are the present leading-edge capabilities in your discipline?
- What are the desired future capabilities in your discipline?



- What are the leading research opportunities in your discipline and what additional capabilities could they provide if successful?
- What is the level of risk of these opportunities successfully achieving their targets?
- How would these potentially enhanced capabilities contribute to, or translate into, improved understanding and/or operation of autonomous flying systems?

The meeting occurred on 10-11 December 1997 at ONR. Since some of the leading edge capabilities and potential accomplishments appeared to have applicability to naval technical problems (identified during the e-mail buildup period), the proponent for the capability or accomplishment item took the lead in fleshing out his/her ideas and leading the discussion at the meeting. As a result, the workshop meeting tended to evolve into full panel discussions on each of these potential capabilities.

There were two rounds of discussion at the workshop. The first round consisted of presentations and discussions by each proponent. The second round of the workshop consisted of each participant identifying his/her leading promising research opportunities.

### (3) Workshop Cleanup

The participants were requested to provide any additional narrative information that added to or modified their ideas as a result of the workshop experience. The outcomes of the workshop included both the tangible and intangible.

Three immediate tangible outcomes were projected:

- (1) A concept proposal for a science and technology program focused on Autonomous Flying Systems would be generated;
- (2) Technical papers may be submitted to leading science journals based on innovations identified; and
- (3) One or more papers on the complete workshop experience might be submitted to leading science journals.

In addition to developing specific topics, it was anticipated that new, un-exploited ideas in interdisciplinary research and development might surface during contact between panelists. These novel subjects might form the basis of additional workshops. In addition, extensive lessons were learned as a result of the workshop process. These lessons were summarized in section II-B.