

NASEM Manufacturing USA report**Feedback from facilitated discussion at MFG USA network meeting****May 13, 2026**

International

- 2-4
 - Most recs for funding would be around collaborative efforts.
 - Institutes would say limited runway and need for foundational funding. “Plant needs to be watered” for stronger strategies
- 2-5 and 2-6: Standards and international opportunities – if we want to continue to be leaders we need to engage with friendly partners.
- 2-5: Implications on standards – there are orgs like IEEE that make standards. Need for microcredentials and trainings – institutes can play lead role
- 2-6: We can use the existing energy for international collaboration – can utilize data from different nations. No new structure is needed – can use structures that exist
- Existing bodies can give government insight into industry
- Would like standards related to certifications and credentials

Technology Transfer

- 3-1 and 3-2: Important
- Pilot and scaleup support are strong needs for SMMs. Those with access can leapfrog into new capabilities
- There are other barriers to tech transfer and scale, such as TRL 6 capping. What should happen next to go to TRL 7 and above? Need to go there to be effective
- 3-6: best practices
 - Good for institutes to exchange ideas and experiences, but recognize that the institutes are each different and commonalities are hard to come by
 - It’s difficult to have tech transfer that works for all of the institutes in the same way.
- Missing piece: solid tie to commercial industry: business, investor, entrepreneur communities.
 - What do they need to invest in the recommendation?
 - Speed of contracting.
 - End markets and time to order etc.
 - Networking and clear messaging

- Example: Tech transfer office sounds academic – business would not call it that
- Need to get items to market – elements that were stronger for tech transfer than others. 3-4 was strongest tech transfer recommendation: office with staff and funding.
- MEP engagement is an important part of the tech transfer strategy

Cross Institute and Agency

- 4-1 Interagency council: Trying to establish strategic vision will need some teeth and weight behind it. Strong recommendation.
- 4-1: MFG USA would provide strategic vision beyond individual departments. How do we increase effectiveness of it?
- 4-2: Needs to be fact checked for feasibility– bylaws, IP protocols, other things that implement that recommendation
- Not all MEPS are the same. It was hard to engage with them since each one is different.
 - Assess MEPs and inform institutes of their capabilities so they know which to utilize
- 4-6 – how do we help SMMs get access to institutes? MEP network? How can the council enable this?
- 4-7: working with national labs – DOE should make funding available. We want the right type of money. Not just projects – we need to billable hours to staff projects not tied to specific projects. Need access to these people broadly.
- Culture in national labs: Institutes don't always have visibility into the work that's being done
- Identify where federal structures exist to support tech transfer recommendations.
 - There is a need for additional resources by offices that have already been established.
- Federal agencies are underleveraging the institutes. Need to educate them on institutes' capabilities
 - Facilitate briefings to various agencies...
 - Facilities, knowledge ecosystems
 - At DARPA “never heard of you before”
 - How do we make institutes as well known as FFRDCs?

Workforce

- 6-1: This is an easy win
- 6-2: Good idea. Common online platform could scale well. MxD is a good example.
 - Merge 6-6 into 6-2. Allows for better scaling, but needs resources
- 6-4: A lot of wins there without too much effort.
- All EWD recs are important

General

- National strategy – when that does not exist, what can we do?
 - Efforts are modest and targeted with limited resources available
 - Could we identify 1-3 recommendations to advance over the next year to make progress on?
- Think about it pragmatically – what are we delivering for industry? Should be the strong focal point.
- Look at recommendations from the critical path of research to market – support only things on this path.
 - For example: 2-5 and 2-6 – no standard means no market.
 - If you look at all recs – ones that help a customer buy something are the strongest recs.
- Need lots of communications about the success of the institutes, like testimonials from companies large and small
- Need to craft value propositions to get different commercial communities – businesses, investors, entrepreneurs—to get involved with institutes
- Focus on 2-3 recommendations that we can meet in the next year and plan to implement