

\$244 million; computer science by 10.3%, to \$839 million; and geosciences by 10.1%, to \$1.2 billion. The White House also wants to reduce spending on the NSF Office of Integrative Activities, which supports interdisciplinary research, by 26%, to \$316 million.

## **FEWER EYES ON EARTH**

NASA would see one of the smallest overall decreases: just 2.8% below the 2017 level. That would bring the agency's budget to \$19.1 billion.

Funding for Earth science would be reduced by 8.7%, to \$1.75 billion. Five Earth-observing missions would be eliminated for reasons such as redundancy with other projects and steep technological challenges. They include the Orbiting Carbon Observatory-3 to measure carbon dioxide from space, and an ocean-colour and aerosols mission called PACE.

Congress has already rejected Trump's bid to eliminate the PACE mission, setting aside \$90 million for the programme in the recent 2017 funding deal.

The White House proposal would increase support for planetary sciences by 4.5%, to \$1.93 billion. That includes \$425 million for a mission to fly past Jupiter's moon Europa, a perennial darling of Congress. The proposed budget continues funding for missions such as the Mars 2020 rover, but does not include money to begin developing a Mars orbiter to replace those currently in orbit.

Robert Lightfoot, NASA's acting administrator, noted that the proposed science budget would support 60 operating missions and 40 that are under development.

Satellite programmes at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration would also take a hit, falling to \$1.8 billion — \$530 million below the 2017 level. The Joint Polar Sat-

"People are hanging in there, with the belief that Congress will come through."

nearly 48%, to \$99 million.

el. The Joint Polar Satellite System, which collects weather and environmental data, would see funding for its fourth and fifth satellites cut by 51%, or \$189 million. The agency's Office 2017 to about \$4.5 billion in 2018. The biggest decreases by sheer dollar amount would come from basic energy sciences and biological and environmental research, but nearly all research programmes would feel the pinch. The exception is advanced scientific computing, which would receive a 16% boost, to \$722 million.

Funding for advanced energy technologies would drop by nearly \$2.2 billion, or 53%. That includes a proposed \$1.4-billion cut to the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy. The Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy, which was designed to pursue risky projects that could lead to major breakthroughs, would see its budget drop by 93%, to just \$20 million.

Action on the 2018 budget now moves to Capitol Hill, where the House of Representatives and the Senate will begin formulating their own proposals.

## **CORRECTION**

The News Feature 'Wood grows up' (*Nature* **545**, 280–282; 2017) mistakenly implied that the Wood Innovation and Design Centre in Prince George is owned by the University of Northern British Columbia. The government of British Columbia owns the building, and the university is a tenant.

**ENERGY DRAIN** The US Department of Energy would receive \$28 billion under the president's plan, a 5.3% reduction from 2016.

of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research would

be cut by \$131 million, to \$350 million. Sup-

port for climate research would fall by 19%, to

\$128 million, and research focused on oceans,

coasts and the Great Lakes would be cut by

The department's Office of Science would have its budget cut by 16%, from \$5.3 billion in