UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
The Assistant Secretary for Productivity, Technology and Innovation
Washington, D.C. 20230
(202) 377-1984

MAR 18 1985

Honorable Mary Ann Gilleece
Deputy Under Secretary of Defense
(Acquisition Management)
Pentagon, Room 3E144
Washington, D. C. 20301

Dear Ms. Gilleece:

I have received the joint letter of March 4, 1985, concerning the efforts of the Federal Coordinating Council on Science, Engineering and Technology (FCCSET) Committee on Intellectual Property to develop a policy framework within which more detailed Government procurement and assistance regulations dealing with technical data would be drafted and evaluated. As you recall, this effort was initiated at the request of Dr. Keyworth, the President's Science Advisor, and I am enclosing a copy of his original request.

This effort is not intended to conflict with or in any way limit the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) authorities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), the Department of Defense (DOD), and the General Services Administration (GSA). However, as I trust you agree, the FAR is written against a backdrop of statutory and administrative policies that are often set outside the FAR system as such. For example, the FAR patent provisions must conform to the President's Memorandum and applicable statutes, including Chapter 18 of Title 35 and regulations issued thereunder. Similarly, if FCCSET or another higher authority can reach agreement on basic technical data principles, there would appear to be no reason why the FAR drafters should not be expected to conform the FAR to those principles.

The concerns expressed in Dr. Keyworth's letter remain valid. For years it has proven impossible to develop Federal Procurement Regulations (FPR) or FAR coverage in the technical data area for the civilian agencies. And there have been significant differences in the approaches adopted by DOD, NASA, Department of Energy (DOE), and other agencies that have issued regulations or other policy directives. We believe a major reason for this is the failure to reach agreement on basic objectives and principles.

Analysis of DOD Concerns as Stated in Secretary Weinberger's March 19, 1985 Letter

Concern--The statement would "prohibit efforts to negotiate for the right to obtain and use for competitive procurement purposes proprietary technical data pertaining to commercial or future commercial items for which defense has requirements."

Response--Sections 4 and 5 contain such limitations. However, they are based on language in Public Law 98-525 (and similar language in PL 98-577) which states at section 1202 that the Secretary of Defense should--

"...ensure that persons that have developed products or processes offered or to be offered for sale to the public are not required, as a condition for the procurement of such products or processes by the Department of Defense, to provide to the United States technical data relating to the design, development, or manufacture of such products or processes (except for such data as may be necessary for the United States to operate and maintain the product or use the process if obtained by the United States as an element of performance under the contract)."

However, as a result of Secretary Weinberger's letter we have added references to 10 USC 2320(c) in section 5 which gives DOD greater latitude than others in this area.

Concern--The statement would "require the government to limit its use of technical data pertaining to items developed with less than total government funds to such an extent that competition would be severely inhibited if not precluded."

Response--Again, section 5 places limitations on the right of the government to use proprietary data of a contractor for reprocurement when the data relates to a commercial product developed at private expense. However, it authorizes the use of form, fit, and function data relating to such commercial products for competitive purposes. We have also added the reference to 10 USC 2320(c) to satisfy Secretary Weinberger's concern. Other than data relating to privately developed commercial products, the draft statement does not prevent DOD from obtaining any type of technical data for competitive procurement purposes that relates to noncommercial products developed with partial government and partial contractor funding. Thus, if a contractor has used internal funds to begin the development of a noncommercial, military product the Statement would in no way prevent DOD from negotiating for technical data relating to this item.

Concern--The statement will "prohibit the government's requiring contractors to deliver technical data pertaining to items developed totally at government expense unless there is a specific need for the data. This prohibition appears to extend to follow-on contracts even though data needs not initially apparent may have become known."

Response--We do not understand the basis for this statement. It appears to relate to the second paragraph of section 3 of one of our early drafts which advised agencies not to order expensive "manufacturing data" unless they foresee a need for it. This would not have affected DOD, since in most cases we assume DOD would be procuring the development of an item with an expectation of procuring it in the future if the item proves effective. Revised section 3 (now section 5) no longer contains the same language. In any case neither the earlier version or the current version should prevent DOD from obtaining technical data for procurement purposes in items wholly developed at government expense.

Concern--The statement would "preclude the acquisition of rights in software developed under a contract at government expense unless such software was a specific end product required by the contract. This, too, can serve as a bar to competitive procurement in certain situations."

Response--To fully respond it would be useful to know what type of "situations" are envisioned. However, in actual fact the statement does not precude the acquisition of rights in software unless it was a specific end product. Section 7 begins by stating the government only gets rights in software that is required to be delivered. The statement does not preclude an agency from specifying that software will be delivered.

It does state, however, that "normally" the delivery of software should not be required unless a purpose of the award is the creation of software. This is not an absolute requirement, but we believe it is a sound general rule. Scientists and engineers are constantly writing and altering computer programs to facilitate work under government R&D grants and contracts. In most cases the government is more interested in the end results than obtaining copies of software that was developed incidental to the carrying out of the work. Thus, it makes little sense in most cases for agencies to require delivery of such software. Furthermore, when a researcher sees a wider commercial market for his software, its delivery to the government will undermine his marketing efforts since it may become available to competitors through the Freedom of Information Act.

The first paragraph of section 7 may, in fact, require a change in DOD policy. The Defense Acquisition Regulation (DAR) Supplement now says that DOD will only acquire rights in computer software to meet its needs. However, it then goes on to state that DOD will take unlimited rights in computer software developed in the course of experimental, developmental, or research work specified under a contract. No explanation is given as to why DOD has such a broad need. We believe this may be the major policy issue presented by the draft Statement.

DRAFT

Government Data Policy Statement (Revised 3/27/85)

This statement provides guidance concerning the acquisition of technical data and software under government grants and contracts, except prime contracts for the operation of government-owned research or production facilities. However, it applies to subcontracts under such contracts. It is intended to (i) provide agencies with the flexibility to acquire technical data and software needed to fulfill their missions (ii) avoid unnecessary costs that result from the ordering of unneeded technical data; (iii) encourage the commercialization of new products and processes by contractors through the protection of technical data; and (iv) encourage the most qualified commercial concerns to participate in government research and development programs. It does not affect the classification of technical data and software for national security purposes.

Section 1. Definitions. As used in this Statement--

(a) "technical data" means recorded information of a scientific or technical nature. It does not include software or financial, administrative, cost and pricing, management data, and other information incidental to contract administration;

(b) "manufacturing data" means technical data and software used for the manufacture of a product or performance of a process on a commercial scale;

(c) The term "contract" includes subcontracts and the term "contractor" includes subcontractors; and

(d) "software" means computer programs, computer data bases, and documentation thereof.

Section 2. Treatment of Proposals. Proposals that have not been incoporated in an award shall be treated as confidential and not disclosed outside the government without the submitter's permission except for evaluation purposes. Parts of proposals that are incorporated in awards and which contain trade secrets or commercial or financial information shall also be treated as confidential if properly marked. Agencies shall not discriminate against marked proposals.

Section 3. Scope of Data Rights Clauses. Technical data delivery requirements should normally be fully set out at the time of contracting, but deferred ordering provisions may be used to add additional deliverables. Any rights which the government obtains to technical data will be limited to rights in data specifically required to be delivered or prepared.

Section 4. Supply Contracts. Agencies procuring standard commercial products may obtain technical data necessary for operation, maintenance or repair but not for reprocurement purposes. Notwithstanding, manufacturing data should not normally be sought.

Section 5. Engineering Development Contracts. Contracts for engineering development should be structured to prevent the disclosure of proprietary technical data related to commercial products or processes developed at private expense by contractors. For example, agencies should normally accept form, fit, and function data in lieu of manufacturing data. Or, if manufacturing data is needed, the contractor shall be allowed to mark as proprietary any data that relates to commercial products or processes developed at private expense; and the right of the government to use and disclose the data shall be specified in the contract, and shall not include the right to use the data for reprocurement purposes (except for Defense Department contracts to which 10 USC 2320(c) is applied). Use of deferred delivery provisions should also be considered. A competitive procurement of an item developed under an engineering development contract should not include in the solicitation any proprietary manufacturing data that relates to a product or process developed at private expense by a contractor which is offered or to be offered for sale commercially by the contractor (except when 10 USC 2320(c) was applied to such data).

Any technical data delivered under an engineering development contract that relates to an item develped wholly under the contract shall be taken without restrictions if competitive acquisition of the item is anticipated. When competitive acquistion is not anticipated, the contractor will be allowed to retain ownership of any such data delivered, and the agency shall reserve an unrestricted, royalty-free right to use or have its contractors use the technical data for governmental purposes (excluding publication outside the government). However, if mission needs require and this is consistent with PL 98-525 or 577, agencies may also acquire publication and other rights. Other technical data not related directly to items developed under the contract normally shall be taken without restrictions.

Section 6. Contracts for Basic and Applied Research. Agencies will normally take technical data delivered under a basic or applied research contract with the unlimited right to use and publish such data, subject to any other provisions of the contract related to inventions and patents. However, if the research involves a contractor's privately developed products or processes or if it is otherwise agreed to by the parties, proprietary data of the contractor shall be protected.

Section 7. Assistance Awards. Agencies normally should not require delivery of technical data under grants or cooperative agreements except as necessary to verify the awardee's performance. The awardee normally will be allowed to retain all

rights in technical data delivered or produced under such awards, including the right to publish and/or assert copyright, although the agency may acquire a nonexclusive, royalty-free, and worldwide license to use such technical data that is delivered or published by the awardee for internal government purposes. When considered necessary to meet program objectives or statutory requirements, agencies may also (i) reserve the right to publish technical data delivered under a grant or cooperative agreement if the awardee fails to publish the results of the research within a reasonable time and/or (ii) expand the government's license to cover State and local governments.

Section 8. Software. Unless its delivery is specifically required, agencies shall not normally acquire rights in software generated under contracts or grants. Delivery of software shall not normally be required unless a purpose of the award is the creation of software. If software has commercial potential, agencies should normally accept license rights in lieu of ownership; and consideration should be given to allowing software documentation to be maintained on the contractor's premises.

When an agency acquires existing proprietary software, it shall accept appropriate conditions limiting its right to use and disclose the software. This includes cases when proprietary software is modified to accommodate particular agency needs.

Software within the definition of "manufacturing data" at section 1(b) is subject to sections 3-7 and not this section.

There is also legitimate concern whether existing regulations give sufficient weight to the policy objectives of this Administration. In particular, this Administration is strongly committed to the principle that private investment and development of Government supported research should be encouraged--as evidenced by the issuance of the President's 1983 Memorandum on Government Patent Policy.

Because of the obvious interest your agency has in technical data issues, we hope that you will continue to provide input and comments during the development of the Statement.

Sincerely,

(signed)
Bruce Merrifield

D. Bruce Merrifield

Attachment

cc: Honorable George A. Keyworth II (White House)
Dr. Andrew Pettifor (OSTP)
Mr. Allan Beres (GSA)
Mr. Stuart J. Evans (NASA)

OPTI/FTMP/Norm Latker/Jesse Lasken/rh 3/14/85
bc: Dr. Merrifield
Egils Milbergs
Dr. Williams
Norm Latker
Chron
Read

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

March 19, 1984

Dear Bruce:

The allocation of rights to various technical data, developed in the performance of government contracts, is an issue with significant implications for future government-industry relationships. It is driven, for example, by the government's need to minimize the costs of the products and services it buys, as well as by industry's desire to maximize profits and maintain any competitive advantage. It is fundamental to the government's continued ability to obtain the services of the best of the private sector.

I believe that this is an issue of sufficient importance that any codification of the government's position on this issue, as in the technical data section of part 27 of the proposed Federal Acquisition Regulations, requires a thorough analysis and discussion by the various agencies, and by the private sector. I believe that the FCCSET Intellectual Property Committee would be an appropriate vehicle for examining the various kinds of technical data, for agreeing on the various government objectives in seeking access to, or protecting the proprietary nature of that data, and for developing the basis for an acceptable set of draft regulations for the government's rights to such data. Please keep me informed of your progress.

Yours truly,

Jay Keyworth

G. A. Keyworth
Science Advisor to the President

Dr. D. Bruce Merrifield
Assistant Secretary for Productivity,
Technology and Innovation
Department of Commerce
Washington, D.C. 20230

Analysis of DOD Concerns as Stated in Secretary Weinberger's March 19, 1985 Letter

Concern--The statement would "prohibit efforts to negotiate for the right to obtain and use for competitive procurement purposes proprietary technical data pertaining to commercial or future commercial items for which defense has requirements."

Response--Sections 4 and 5 contain such limitations. However, they are based on language in Public Law 98-525 (and similar language in PL 98-577) which states at section 1202 that the Secretary of Defense should--

"...ensure that persons that have developed products or processes offered or to be offered for sale to the public are not required, as a condition for the procurement of such products or processes by the Department of Defense, to provide to the United States technical data relating to the design, development, or manufacture of such products or processes (except for such data as may be necessary for the United States to operate and maintain the product or use the process if obtained by the United States as an element of performance under the contract)."

However, as a result of Secretary Weinberger's letter we have added references to 10 USC 2320(c) in section 5 which gives DOD greater latitude than others in this area.

Concern--The statement would "require the government to limit its use of technical data pertaining to items developed with less than total government funds to such an extent that competition would be severely inhibited if not precluded."

Response--Again, section 5 places limitations on the right of the government to use proprietary data of a contractor for reprocurement when the data relates to a commercial product developed at private expense. However, it authorizes the use of form, fit, and function data relating to such commercial products for competitive purposes. We have also added the reference to 10 USC 2320(c) to satisfy Secretary Weinberger's concern. Other than data relating to privately developed commercial products, the draft statement does not prevent DOD from obtaining any type of technical data for competitive procurement purposes that relates to noncommercial products developed with partial government and partial contractor funding. Thus, if a contractor has used internal funds to begin the development of a noncommercial, military product the Statement would in no way prevent DOD from negotiating for technical data relating to this item.

Concern--The statement will "prohibit the government's requiring contractors to deliver technical data pertaining to items developed totally at government expense unless there is a specific need for the data. This prohibition appears to extend to follow-on contracts even though data needs not initially apparent may have become known."

Response--We do not understand the basis for this statement. It appears to relate to the second paragraph of section 3 of one of our early drafts which advised agencies not to order expensive "manufacturing data" unless they foresee a need for it. This would not have affected DOD, since in most cases we assume DOD would be procuring the development of an item with an expectation of procuring it in the future if the item proves effective. Revised section 3 (now section 5) no longer contains the same language. In any case neither the earlier version or the current version should prevent DOD from obtaining technical data for procurement purposes in items wholly developed at government expense.

Concern--The statement would "preclude the acquisition of rights in software developed under a contract at government expense unless such software was a specific end product required by the contract. This, too, can serve as a bar to competitive procurement in certain situations."

Response--To fully respond it would be useful to know what type of "situations" are envisioned. However, in actual fact the statement does not precude the acquisition of rights in software unless it was a specific end product. Section 7 begins by stating the government only gets rights in software that is required to be delivered. The statement does not preclude an agency from specifying that software will be delivered.

It does state, however, that "normally" the delivery of software should not be required unless a purpose of the award is the creation of software. This is not an absolute requirement, but we believe it is a sound general rule. Scientists and engineers are constantly writing and altering computer programs to facilitate work under government R&D grants and contracts. In most cases the government is more interested in the end results than obtaining copies of software that was developed incidental to the carrying out of the work. Thus, it makes little sense in most cases for agencies to require delivery of such software. Furthermore, when a researcher sees a wider commercial market for his software, its delivery to the government will undermine his marketing efforts since it may become available to competitors through the Freedom of Information Act.

The first paragraph of section 7 may, in fact, require a change in DOD policy. The Defense Acquisition Regulation (DAR) Supplement now says that DOD will only acquire rights in computer software to meet its needs. However, it then goes on to state that DOD will take unlimited rights in computer software developed in the course of experimental, developmental, or research work specified under a contract. No explanation is given as to why DOD has such a broad need. We believe this may be the major policy issue presented by the draft Statement.

DRAFT

Government Data Policy Statement (Revised 3/27/85)

This statement provides guidance concerning the acquisition of technical data and software under government grants and contracts, except prime contracts for the operation of government-owned research or production facilities. However, it applies to subcontracts under such contracts. It is intended to (i) provide agencies with the flexibility to acquire technical data and software needed to fulfill their missions (ii) avoid unnecessary costs that result from the ordering of unneeded technical data; (iii) encourage the commercialization of new products and processes by contractors through the protection of technical data; and (iv) encourage the most qualified commercial concerns to participate in government research and development programs. It does not affect the classification of technical data and software for national security purposes.

Section 1. Definitions. As used in this Statement--

(a) "technical data" means recorded information of a scientific or technical nature. It does not include software or financial, administrative, cost and pricing, management data, and other information incidental to contract administration;

(b) "manufacturing data" means technical data and software used for the manufacture of a product or performance of a process on a commercial scale;

(c) The term "contract" includes subcontracts and the term "contractor" includes subcontractors; and

(d) "software" means computer programs, computer data bases, and documentation thereof.

Section 2. Treatment of Proposals. Proposals that have not been incoporated in an award shall be treated as confidential and not disclosed outside the government without the submitter's permission except for evaluation purposes. Parts of proposals that are incorporated in awards and which contain trade secrets or commercial or financial information shall also be treated as confidential if properly marked. Agencies shall not discriminate against marked proposals.

Section 3. Scope of Data Rights Clauses. Technical data delivery requirements should normally be fully set out at the time of contracting, but deferred ordering provisions may be used to add additional deliverables. Any rights which the government obtains to technical data will be limited to rights in data specifically required to be delivered or prepared.

Section 4. Supply Contracts. Agencies procuring standard commercial products may obtain technical data necessary for operation, maintenance or repair but not for reprocurement purposes. Notwithstanding, manufacturing data should not normally be sought.

Section 5. Engineering Development Contracts. Contracts for engineering development should be structured to prevent the disclosure of proprietary technical data related to commercial products or processes developed at private expense by contractors. For example, agencies should normally accept form, fit, and function data in lieu of manufacturing data. Or, if manufacturing data is needed, the contractor shall be allowed to mark as proprietary any data that relates to commercial products or processes developed at private expense; and the right of the government to use and disclose the data shall be specified in the contract, and shall not include the right to use the data for reprocurement purposes (except for Defense Department contracts to which 10 USC 2320(c) is applied). Use of deferred delivery provisions should also be considered. A competitive procurement of an item developed under an engineering development contract should not include in the solicitation any proprietary manufacturing data that relates to a product or process developed at private expense by a contractor which is offered or to be offered for sale commercially by the contractor (except when 10 USC 2320(c) was applied to such data).

Any technical data delivered under an engineering development contract that relates to an item develped wholly under the contract shall be taken without restrictions if competitive acquisition of the item is anticipated. When competitive acquistion is not anticipated, the contractor will be allowed to retain ownership of any such data delivered, and the agency shall reserve an unrestricted, royalty-free right to use or have its contractors use the technical data for governmental purposes (excluding publication outside the government). However, if mission needs require and this is consistent with PL 98-525 or 577, agencies may also acquire publication and other rights. Other technical data not related directly to items developed under the contract normally shall be taken without restrictions.

Section 6. Contracts for Basic and Applied Research. Agencies will normally take technical data delivered under a basic or applied research contract with the unlimited right to use and publish such data, subject to any other provisions of the contract related to inventions and patents. However, if the research involves a contractor's privately developed products or processes or if it is otherwise agreed to by the parties, proprietary data of the contractor shall be protected.

Section 7. Assistance Awards. Agencies normally should not require delivery of technical data under grants or cooperative agreements except as necessary to verify the awardee's performance. The awardee normally will be allowed to retain all

rights in technical data delivered or produced under such awards, including the right to publish and/or assert copyright, although the agency may acquire a nonexclusive, royalty-free, and worldwide license to use such technical data that is delivered or published by the awardee for internal government purposes. When considered necessary to meet program objectives or statutory requirements, agencies may also (i) reserve the right to publish technical data delivered under a grant or cooperative agreement if the awardee fails to publish the results of the research within a reasonable time and/or (ii) expand the government's license to cover State and local governments.

Section 8. Software. Unless its delivery is specifically required, agencies shall not normally acquire rights in software generated under contracts or grants. Delivery of software shall not normally be required unless a purpose of the award is the creation of software. If software has commercial potential, agencies should normally accept license rights in lieu of ownership; and consideration should be given to allowing software documentation to be maintained on the contractor's premises.

When an agency acquires existing proprietary software, it shall accept appropriate conditions limiting its right to use and disclose the software. This includes cases when proprietary software is modified to accommodate particular agency needs.

Software within the definition of "manufacturing data" at section 1(b) is subject to sections 3-7 and not this section.

Analysis of DOD Concerns as Stated in Secretary Weinberger's March 19, 1985 Letter

Concern--The statement would "prohibit efforts to negotiate for the right to obtain and use for competitive procurement purposes proprietary technical data pertaining to commercial or future commercial items for which defense has requirements."

Response--Sections 4 and 5 contain such limitations. However, they are based on language in Public Law 98-525 (and similar language in PL 98-577) which states at section 1202 that the Secretary of Defense should--

"...ensure that persons that have developed products or processes offered or to be offered for sale to the public are not required, as a condition for the procurement of such products or processes by the Department of Defense, to provide to the United States technical data relating to the design, development, or manufacture of such products or processes (except for such data as may be necessary for the United States to operate and maintain the product or use the process if obtained by the United States as an element of performance under the contract)."

However, as a result of Secretary Weinberger's letter we have added references to 10 USC 2320(c) in section 5 which gives DOD greater latitude than others in this area.

Concern--The statement would "require the government to limit its use of technical data pertaining to items developed with less than total government funds to such an extent that competition would be severely inhibited if not precluded."

Response--Again, section 5 places limitations on the right of the government to use proprietary data of a contractor for reprocurement when the data relates to a commercial product developed at private expense. However, it authorizes the use of form, fit, and function data relating to such commercial products for competitive purposes. We have also added the reference to 10 USC 2320(c) to satisfy Secretary Weinberger's concern. Other than data relating to privately developed commercial products, the draft statement does not prevent DOD from obtaining any type of technical data for competitive procurement purposes that relates to noncommercial products developed with partial government and partial contractor funding. Thus, if a contractor has used internal funds to begin the development of a noncommercial, military product the Statement would in no way prevent DOD from negotiating for technical data relating to this item.

Concern--The statement will "prohibit the government's requiring contractors to deliver technical data pertaining to items developed totally at government expense unless there is a specific need for the data. This prohibition appears to extend to follow-on contracts even though data needs not initially apparent may have become known."

Response--We do not understand the basis for this statement. It appears to relate to the second paragraph of section 3 of one of our early drafts which advised agencies not to order expensive "manufacturing data" unless they foresee a need for it. This would not have affected DOD, since in most cases we assume DOD would be procuring the development of an item with an expectation of procuring it in the future if the item proves effective. Revised section 3 (now section 5) no longer contains the same language. In any case neither the earlier version or the current version should prevent DOD from obtaining technical data for procurement purposes in items wholly developed at government expense.

Concern--The statement would "preclude the acquisition of rights in software developed under a contract at government expense unless such software was a specific end product required by the contract. This, too, can serve as a bar to competitive procurement in certain situations."

Response--To fully respond it would be useful to know what type of "situations" are envisioned. However, in actual fact the statement does not precude the acquisition of rights in software unless it was a specific end product. Section 7 begins by stating the government only gets rights in software that is required to be delivered. The statement does not preclude an agency from specifying that software will be delivered.

It does state, however, that "normally" the delivery of software should not be required unless a purpose of the award is the creation of software. This is not an absolute requirement, but we believe it is a sound general rule. Scientists and engineers are constantly writing and altering computer programs to facilitate work under government R&D grants and contracts. In most cases the government is more interested in the end results than obtaining copies of software that was developed incidental to the carrying out of the work. Thus, it makes little sense in most cases for agencies to require delivery of such software. Furthermore, when a researcher sees a wider commercial market for his software, its delivery to the government will undermine his marketing efforts since it may become available to competitors through the Freedom of Information Act.

The first paragraph of section 7 may, in fact, require a change in DOD policy. The Defense Acquisition Regulation (DAR) Supplement now says that DOD will only acquire rights in computer software to meet its needs. However, it then goes on to state that DOD will take unlimited rights in computer software developed in the course of experimental, developmental, or research work specified under a contract. No explanation is given as to why DOD has such a broad need. We believe this may be the major policy issue presented by the draft Statement.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
The Assistant Secretary for Productivity, Technology and Innovation
Washington, D.C. 20230
(202) 377-1984

MAR 18 1985

Honorable Mary Ann Gilleece
Deputy Under Secretary of Defense
(Acquisition Management)
Pentagon, Room 3E144
Washington, D. C. 20301

Dear Ms. Gilleece:

I have received the joint letter of March 4, 1985, concerning the efforts of the Federal Coordinating Council on Science, Engineering and Technology (FCCSET) Committee on Intellectual Property to develop a policy framework within which more detailed Government procurement and assistance regulations dealing with technical data would be drafted and evaluated. As you recall, this effort was initiated at the request of Dr. Keyworth, the President's Science Advisor, and I am enclosing a copy of his original request.

This effort is not intended to conflict with or in any way limit the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) authorities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), the Department of Defense (DOD), and the General Services Administration (GSA). However, as I trust you agree, the FAR is written against a backdrop of statutory and administrative policies that are often set outside the FAR system as such. For example, the FAR patent provisions must conform to the President's Memorandum and applicable statutes, including Chapter 18 of Title 35 and regulations issued thereunder. Similarly, if FCCSET or another higher authority can reach agreement on basic technical data principles, there would appear to be no reason why the FAR drafters should not be expected to conform the FAR to those principles.

The concerns expressed in Dr. Keyworth's letter remain valid. For years it has proven impossible to develop Federal Procurement Regulations (FPR) or FAR coverage in the technical data area for the civilian agencies. And there have been significant differences in the approaches adopted by DOD, NASA, Department of Energy (DOE), and other agencies that have issued regulations or other policy directives. We believe a major reason for this is the failure to reach agreement on basic objectives and principles.

There is also legitimate concern whether existing regulations give sufficient weight to the policy objectives of this Administration. In particular, this Administration is strongly committed to the principle that private investment and development of Government supported research should be encouraged--as evidenced by the issuance of the President's 1983 Memorandum on Government Patent Policy.

Because of the obvious interest your agency has in technical data issues, we hope that you will continue to provide input and comments during the development of the Statement.

Sincerely,

(signed)
Bruce Merrifield

D. Bruce Merrifield

Attachment

cc: Honorable George A. Keyworth II (White House)
Dr. Andrew Pettifor (OSTP)
Mr. Allan Beres (GSA)
Mr. Stuart J. Evans (NASA)

OPTI/FTMP/Norm Latker/Jesse Lasken/rh 3/14/85
bc: Dr. Merrifield
Egils Milbergs
Dr. Williams
Norm Latker
Chron
Read

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

March 19, 1984

Dear Bruce:

The allocation of rights to various technical data, developed in the performance of government contracts, is an issue with significant implications for future government-industry relationships. It is driven, for example, by the government's need to minimize the costs of the products and services it buys, as well as by industry's desire to maximize profits and maintain any competitive advantage. It is fundamental to the government's continued ability to obtain the services of the best of the private sector.

I believe that this is an issue of sufficient importance that any codification of the government's position on this issue, as in the technical data section of part 27 of the proposed Federal Acquisition Regulations, requires a thorough analysis and discussion by the various agencies, and by the private sector. I believe that the FCCSET Intellectual Property Committee would be an appropriate vehicle for examining the various kinds of technical data, for agreeing on the various government objectives in seeking access to, or protecting the proprietary nature of that data, and for developing the basis for an acceptable set of draft regulations for the government's rights to such data. Please keep me informed of your progress.

Yours truly,

G. A. Keyworth
Science Advisor to the President

Dr. D. Bruce Merrifield
Assistant Secretary for Productivity,
Technology and Innovation
Department of Commerce
Washington, D.C. 20230

DRAFT

Government Data Policy Statement (Revised 3/27/85)

This statement provides guidance concerning the acquisition of technical data and software under government grants and contracts, except prime contracts for the operation of government-owned research or production facilities. However, it applies to subcontracts under such contracts. It is intended to (i) provide agencies with the flexibility to acquire technical data and software needed to fulfill their missions (ii) avoid unnecessary costs that result from the ordering of unneeded technical data; (iii) encourage the commercialization of new products and processes by contractors through the protection of technical data; and (iv) encourage the most qualified commercial concerns to participate in government research and development programs. It does not affect the classification of technical data and software for national security purposes.

Section 1. Definitions. As used in this Statement--

(a) "technical data" means recorded information of a scientific or technical nature. It does not include software or financial, administrative, cost and pricing, management data, and other information incidental to contract administration;

(b) "manufacturing data" means technical data and software used for the manufacture of a product or performance of a process on a commercial scale;

(c) The term "contract" includes subcontracts and the term "contractor" includes subcontractors; and

(d) "software" means computer programs, computer data bases, and documentation thereof.

Section 2. Treatment of Proposals. Proposals that have not been incoporated in an award shall be treated as confidential and not disclosed outside the government without the submitter's permission except for evaluation purposes. Parts of proposals that are incorporated in awards and which contain trade secrets or commercial or financial information shall also be treated as confidential if properly marked. Agencies shall not discriminate against marked proposals.

Section 3. Scope of Data Rights Clauses. Technical data delivery requirements should normally be fully set out at the time of contracting, but deferred ordering provisions may be used to add additional deliverables. Any rights which the government obtains to technical data will be limited to rights in data specifically required to be delivered or prepared.

Section 4. Supply Contracts. Agencies procuring standard commercial products may obtain technical data necessary for operation, maintenance or repair but not for reprocurement purposes. Notwithstanding, manufacturing data should not normally be sought.

Section 5. Engineering Development Contracts. Contracts for engineering development should be structured to prevent the disclosure of proprietary technical data related to commercial products or processes developed at private expense by contractors. For example, agencies should normally accept form, fit, and function data in lieu of manufacturing data. Or, if manufacturing data is needed, the contractor shall be allowed to mark as proprietary any data that relates to commercial products or processes developed at private expense; and the right of the government to use and disclose the data shall be specified in the contract, and shall not include the right to use the data for reprocurement purposes (except for Defense Department contracts to which 10 USC 2320(c) is applied). Use of deferred delivery provisions should also be considered. A competitive procurement of an item developed under an engineering development contract should not include in the solicitation any proprietary manufacturing data that relates to a product or process developed at private expense by a contractor which is offered or to be offered for sale commercially by the contractor (except when 10 USC 2320(c) was applied to such data).

Any technical data delivered under an engineering development contract that relates to an item develped wholly under the contract shall be taken without restrictions if competitive acquisition of the item is anticipated. When competitive acquistion is not anticipated, the contractor will be allowed to retain ownership of any such data delivered, and the agency shall reserve an unrestricted, royalty-free right to use or have its contractors use the technical data for governmental purposes (excluding publication outside the government). However, if mission needs require and this is consistent with PL 98-525 or 577, agencies may also acquire publication and other rights. Other technical data not related directly to items developed under the contract normally shall be taken without restrictions.

Section 6. Contracts for Basic and Applied Research. Agencies will normally take technical data delivered under a basic or applied research contract with the unlimited right to use and publish such data, subject to any other provisions of the contract related to inventions and patents. However, if the research involves a contractor's privately developed products or processes or if it is otherwise agreed to by the parties, proprietary data of the contractor shall be protected.

Section 7. Assistance Awards. Agencies normally should not require delivery of technical data under grants or cooperative agreements except as necessary to verify the awardee's performance. The awardee normally will be allowed to retain all

rights in technical data delivered or produced under such awards, including the right to publish and/or assert copyright, although the agency may acquire a nonexclusive, royalty-free, and worldwide license to use such technical data that is delivered or published by the awardee for internal government purposes. When considered necessary to meet program objectives or statutory requirements, agencies may also (i) reserve the right to publish technical data delivered under a grant or cooperative agreement if the awardee fails to publish the results of the research within a reasonable time and/or (ii) expand the government's license to cover State and local governments.

Section 8. Software. Unless its delivery is specifically required, agencies shall not normally acquire rights in software generated under contracts or grants. Delivery of software shall not normally be required unless a purpose of the award is the creation of software. If software has commercial potential, agencies should normally accept license rights in lieu of ownership; and consideration should be given to allowing software documentation to be maintained on the contractor's premises.

When an agency acquires existing proprietary software, it shall accept appropriate conditions limiting its right to use and disclose the software. This includes cases when proprietary software is modified to accommodate particular agency needs.

Software within the definition of "manufacturing data" at section 1(b) is subject to sections 3-7 and not this section.

Analysis of DOD Concerns as Stated in Secretary Weinberger's March 19, 1985 Letter

Concern--The statement would "prohibit efforts to negotiate for the right to obtain and use for competitive procurement purposes proprietary technical data pertaining to commercial or future commercial items for which defense has requirements."

Response--Sections 4 and 5 contain such limitations. However, they are based on language in Public Law 98-525 (and similar language in PL 98-577) which states at section 1202 that the Secretary of Defense should--

"...ensure that persons that have developed products or processes offered or to be offered for sale to the public are not required, as a condition for the procurement of such products or processes by the Department of Defense, to provide to the United States technical data relating to the design, development, or manufacture of such products or processes (except for such data as may be necessary for the United States to operate and maintain the product or use the process if obtained by the United States as an element of performance under the contract)."

However, as a result of Secretary Weinberger's letter we have added references to 10 USC 2320(c) in section 5 which gives DOD greater latitude than others in this area.

Concern--The statement would "require the government to limit its use of technical data pertaining to items developed with less than total government funds to such an extent that competition would be severely inhibited if not precluded."

Response--Again, section 5 places limitations on the right of the government to use proprietary data of a contractor for reprocurement when the data relates to a commercial product developed at private expense. However, it authorizes the use of form, fit, and function data relating to such commercial products for competitive purposes. We have also added the reference to 10 USC 2320(c) to satisfy Secretary Weinberger's concern. Other than data relating to privately developed commercial products, the draft statement does not prevent DOD from obtaining any type of technical data for competitive procurement purposes that relates to noncommercial products developed with partial government and partial contractor funding. Thus, if a contractor has used internal funds to begin the development of a noncommercial, military product the Statement would in no way prevent DOD from negotiating for technical data relating to this item.

Concern--The statement will "prohibit the government's requiring contractors to deliver technical data pertaining to items developed totally at government expense unless there is a specific need for the data. This prohibition appears to extend to follow-on contracts even though data needs not initially apparent may have become known."

Response--We do not understand the basis for this statement. It appears to relate to the second paragraph of section 3 of one of our early drafts which advised agencies not to order expensive "manufacturing data" unless they foresee a need for it. This would not have affected DOD, since in most cases we assume DOD would be procuring the development of an item with an expectation of procuring it in the future if the item proves effective. Revised section 3 (now section 5) no longer contains the same language. In any case neither the earlier version or the current version should prevent DOD from obtaining technical data for procurement purposes in items wholly developed at government expense.

Concern--The statement would "preclude the acquisition of rights in software developed under a contract at government expense unless such software was a specific end product required by the contract. This, too, can serve as a bar to competitive procurement in certain situations."

Response--To fully respond it would be useful to know what type of "situations" are envisioned. However, in actual fact the statement does not precude the acquisition of rights in software unless it was a specific end product. Section 7 begins by stating the government only gets rights in software that is required to be delivered. The statement does not preclude an agency from specifying that software will be delivered.

It does state, however, that "normally" the delivery of software should not be required unless a purpose of the award is the creation of software. This is not an absolute requirement, but we believe it is a sound general rule. Scientists and engineers are constantly writing and altering computer programs to facilitate work under government R&D grants and contracts. In most cases the government is more interested in the end results than obtaining copies of software that was developed incidental to the carrying out of the work. Thus, it makes little sense in most cases for agencies to require delivery of such software. Furthermore, when a researcher sees a wider commercial market for his software, its delivery to the government will undermine his marketing efforts since it may become available to competitors through the Freedom of Information Act.

The first paragraph of section 7 may, in fact, require a change in DOD policy. The Defense Acquisition Regulation (DAR) Supplement now says that DOD will only acquire rights in computer software to meet its needs. However, it then goes on to state that DOD will take unlimited rights in computer software developed in the course of experimental, developmental, or research work specified under a contract. No explanation is given as to why DOD has such a broad need. We believe this may be the major policy issue presented by the draft Statement.

Analysis of DOD Concerns as Stated in Secretary Weinberger's March 19, 1985 Letter

Concern--The statement would "prohibit efforts to negotiate for the right to obtain and use for competitive procurement purposes proprietary technical data pertaining to commercial or future commercial items for which defense has requirements."

Response--Sections 4 and 5 contain such limitations. However, they are based on language in Public Law 98-525 (and similar language in PL 98-577) which states at section 1202 that the Secretary of Defense should--

"...ensure that persons that have developed products or processes offered or to be offered for sale to the public are not required, as a condition for the procurement of such products or processes by the Department of Defense, to provide to the United States technical data relating to the design, development, or manufacture of such products or processes (except for such data as may be necessary for the United States to operate and maintain the product or use the process if obtained by the United States as an element of performance under the contract)."

However, as a result of Secretary Weinberger's letter we have added references to 10 USC 2320(c) in section 5 which gives DOD greater latitude than others in this area.

Concern--The statement would "require the government to limit its use of technical data pertaining to items developed with less than total government funds to such an extent that competition would be severely inhibited if not precluded."

Response--Again, section 5 places limitations on the right of the government to use proprietary data of a contractor for reprocurement when the data relates to a commercial product developed at private expense. However, it authorizes the use of form, fit, and function data relating to such commercial products for competitive purposes. We have also added the reference to 10 USC 2320(c) to satisfy Secretary Weinberger's concern. Other than data relating to privately developed commercial products, the draft statement does not prevent DOD from obtaining any type of technical data for competitive procurement purposes that relates to noncommercial products developed with partial government and partial contractor funding. Thus, if a contractor has used internal funds to begin the development of a noncommercial, military product the Statement would in no way prevent DOD from negotiating for technical data relating to this item.

Concern--The statement will "prohibit the government's requiring contractors to deliver technical data pertaining to items developed totally at government expense unless there is a specific need for the data. This prohibition appears to extend to follow-on contracts even though data needs not initially apparent may have become known."

Response--We do not understand the basis for this statement. It appears to relate to the second paragraph of section 3 of one of our early drafts which advised agencies not to order expensive "manufacturing data" unless they foresee a need for it. This would not have affected DOD, since in most cases we assume DOD would be procuring the development of an item with an expectation of procuring it in the future if the item proves effective. Revised section 3 (now section 5) no longer contains the same language. In any case neither the earlier version or the current version should prevent DOD from obtaining technical data for procurement purposes in items wholly developed at government expense.

Concern--The statement would "preclude the acquisition of rights in software developed under a contract at government expense unless such software was a specific end product required by the contract. This, too, can serve as a bar to competitive procurement in certain situations."

Response--To fully respond it would be useful to know what type of "situations" are envisioned. However, in actual fact the statement does not precude the acquisition of rights in software unless it was a specific end product. Section 7 begins by stating the government only gets rights in software that is required to be delivered. The statement does not preclude an agency from specifying that software will be delivered.

It does state, however, that "normally" the delivery of software should not be required unless a purpose of the award is the creation of software. This is not an absolute requirement, but we believe it is a sound general rule. Scientists and engineers are constantly writing and altering computer programs to facilitate work under government R&D grants and contracts. In most cases the government is more interested in the end results than obtaining copies of software that was developed incidental to the carrying out of the work. Thus, it makes little sense in most cases for agencies to require delivery of such software. Furthermore, when a researcher sees a wider commercial market for his software, its delivery to the government will undermine his marketing efforts since it may become available to competitors through the Freedom of Information Act.

The first paragraph of section 7 may, in fact, require a change in DOD policy. The Defense Acquisition Regulation (DAR) Supplement now says that DOD will only acquire rights in computer software to meet its needs. However, it then goes on to state that DOD will take unlimited rights in computer software developed in the course of experimental, developmental, or research work specified under a contract. No explanation is given as to why DOD has such a broad need. We believe this may be the major policy issue presented by the draft Statement.

DRAFT

Government Data Policy Statement (Revised 3/27/85)

This statement provides guidance concerning the acquisition of technical data and software under government grants and contracts, except prime contracts for the operation of government-owned research or production facilities. However, it applies to subcontracts under such contracts. It is intended to (i) provide agencies with the flexibility to acquire technical data and software needed to fulfill their missions (ii) avoid unnecessary costs that result from the ordering of unneeded technical data; (iii) encourage the commercialization of new products and processes by contractors through the protection of technical data; and (iv) encourage the most qualified commercial concerns to participate in government research and development programs. It does not affect the classification of technical data and software for national security purposes.

Section 1. Definitions. As used in this Statement--

(a) "technical data" means recorded information of a scientific or technical nature. It does not include software or financial, administrative, cost and pricing, management data, and other information incidental to contract administration;

(b) "manufacturing data" means technical data and software used for the manufacture of a product or performance of a process on a commercial scale;

(c) The term "contract" includes subcontracts and the term "contractor" includes subcontractors; and

(d) "software" means computer programs, computer data bases, and documentation thereof.

Section 2. Treatment of Proposals. Proposals that have not been incoporated in an award shall be treated as confidential and not disclosed outside the government without the submitter's permission except for evaluation purposes. Parts of proposals that are incorporated in awards and which contain trade secrets or commercial or financial information shall also be treated as confidential if properly marked. Agencies shall not discriminate against marked proposals.

Section 3. Scope of Data Rights Clauses. Technical data delivery requirements should normally be fully set out at the time of contracting, but deferred ordering provisions may be used to add additional deliverables. Any rights which the government obtains to technical data will be limited to rights in data specifically required to be delivered or prepared.

Section 4. Supply Contracts. Agencies procuring standard commercial products may obtain technical data necessary for operation, maintenance or repair but not for reprocurement purposes. Notwithstanding, manufacturing data should not normally be sought.

Section 5. Engineering Development Contracts. Contracts for engineering development should be structured to prevent the disclosure of proprietary technical data related to commercial products or processes developed at private expense by contractors. For example, agencies should normally accept form, fit, and function data in lieu of manufacturing data. Or, if manufacturing data is needed, the contractor shall be allowed to mark as proprietary any data that relates to commercial products or processes developed at private expense; and the right of the government to use and disclose the data shall be specified in the contract, and shall not include the right to use the data for reprocurement purposes (except for Defense Department contracts to which 10 USC 2320(c) is applied). Use of deferred delivery provisions should also be considered. A competitive procurement of an item developed under an engineering development contract should not include in the solicitation any proprietary manufacturing data that relates to a product or process developed at private expense by a contractor which is offered or to be offered for sale commercially by the contractor (except when 10 USC 2320(c) was applied to such data).

Any technical data delivered under an engineering development contract that relates to an item develped wholly under the contract shall be taken without restrictions if competitive acquisition of the item is anticipated. When competitive acquistion is not anticipated, the contractor will be allowed to retain ownership of any such data delivered, and the agency shall reserve an unrestricted, royalty-free right to use or have its contractors use the technical data for governmental purposes (excluding publication outside the government). However, if mission needs require and this is consistent with PL 98-525 or 577, agencies may also acquire publication and other rights. Other technical data not related directly to items developed under the contract normally shall be taken without restrictions.

Section 6. Contracts for Basic and Applied Research. Agencies will normally take technical data delivered under a basic or applied research contract with the unlimited right to use and publish such data, subject to any other provisions of the contract related to inventions and patents. However, if the research involves a contractor's privately developed products or processes or if it is otherwise agreed to by the parties, proprietary data of the contractor shall be protected.

Section 7. Assistance Awards. Agencies normally should not require delivery of technical data under grants or cooperative agreements except as necessary to verify the awardee's performance. The awardee normally will be allowed to retain all

rights in technical data delivered or produced under such awards, including the right to publish and/or assert copyright, although the agency may acquire a nonexclusive, royalty-free, and worldwide license to use such technical data that is delivered or published by the awardee for internal government purposes. When considered necessary to meet program objectives or statutory requirements, agencies may also (i) reserve the right to publish technical data delivered under a grant or cooperative agreement if the awardee fails to publish the results of the research within a reasonable time and/or (ii) expand the government's license to cover State and local governments.

Section 8. Software. Unless its delivery is specifically required, agencies shall not normally acquire rights in software generated under contracts or grants. Delivery of software shall not normally be required unless a purpose of the award is the creation of software. If software has commercial potential, agencies should normally accept license rights in lieu of ownership; and consideration should be given to allowing software documentation to be maintained on the contractor's premises.

When an agency acquires existing proprietary software, it shall accept appropriate conditions limiting its right to use and disclose the software. This includes cases when proprietary software is modified to accommodate particular agency needs.

Software within the definition of "manufacturing data" at section 1(b) is subject to sections 3-7 and not this section.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
The Assistant Secretary for Productivity, Technology and Innovation
Washington, D.C. 20230
(202) 377-1984

MAR 18 1985

Honorable Mary Ann Gilleece
Deputy Under Secretary of Defense
(Acquisition Management)
Pentagon, Room 3E144
Washington, D. C. 20301

Dear Ms. Gilleece:

I have received the joint letter of March 4, 1985, concerning the efforts of the Federal Coordinating Council on Science, Engineering and Technology (FCCSET) Committee on Intellectual Property to develop a policy framework within which more detailed Government procurement and assistance regulations dealing with technical data would be drafted and evaluated. As you recall, this effort was initiated at the request of Dr. Keyworth, the President's Science Advisor, and I am enclosing a copy of his original request.

This effort is not intended to conflict with or in any way limit the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) authorities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), the Department of Defense (DOD), and the General Services Administration (GSA). However, as I trust you agree, the FAR is written against a backdrop of statutory and administrative policies that are often set outside the FAR system as such. For example, the FAR patent provisions must conform to the President's Memorandum and applicable statutes, including Chapter 18 of Title 35 and regulations issued thereunder. Similarly, if FCCSET or another higher authority can reach agreement on basic technical data principles, there would appear to be no reason why the FAR drafters should not be expected to conform the FAR to those principles.

The concerns expressed in Dr. Keyworth's letter remain valid. For years it has proven impossible to develop Federal Procurement Regulations (FPR) or FAR coverage in the technical data area for the civilian agencies. And there have been significant differences in the approaches adopted by DOD, NASA, Department of Energy (DOE), and other agencies that have issued regulations or other policy directives. We believe a major reason for this is the failure to reach agreement on basic objectives and principles.

There is also legitimate concern whether existing regulations give sufficient weight to the policy objectives of this Administration. In particular, this Administration is strongly committed to the principle that private investment and development of Government supported research should be encouraged--as evidenced by the issuance of the President's 1983 Memorandum on Government Patent Policy.

Because of the obvious interest your agency has in technical data issues, we hope that you will continue to provide input and comments during the development of the Statement.

Sincerely,

(signed)
Bruce Merrifield

D. Bruce Merrifield

Attachment

cc: Honorable George A. Keyworth II (White House)
Dr. Andrew Pettifor (OSTP)
Mr. Allan Beres (GSA)
Mr. Stuart J. Evans (NASA)

OPTI/FTMP/Norm Latker/Jesse Lasken/rh 3/14/85
bc: Dr. Merrifield
Egils Milbergs
Dr. Williams
Norm Latker
Chron
Read

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

March 19, 1984

Dear Bruce:

The allocation of rights to various technical data, developed in the performance of government contracts, is an issue with significant implications for future government-industry relationships. It is driven, for example, by the government's need to minimize the costs of the products and services it buys, as well as by industry's desire to maximize profits and maintain any competitive advantage. It is fundamental to the government's continued ability to obtain the services of the best of the private sector.

I believe that this is an issue of sufficient importance that any codification of the government's position on this issue, as in the technical data section of part 27 of the proposed Federal Acquisition Regulations, requires a thorough analysis and discussion by the various agencies, and by the private sector. I believe that the FCCSET Intellectual Property Committee would be an appropriate vehicle for examining the various kinds of technical data, for agreeing on the various government objectives in seeking access to, or protecting the proprietary nature of that data, and for developing the basis for an acceptable set of draft regulations for the government's rights to such data. Please keep me informed of your progress.

Yours truly,

G. A. Keyworth
Science Advisor to the President

Dr. D. Bruce Merrifield
Assistant Secretary for Productivity,
Technology and Innovation
Department of Commerce
Washington, D.C. 20230

DRAFT

Government Data Policy Statement (Revised 3/27/85)

This statement provides guidance concerning the acquisition of technical data and software under government grants and contracts, except prime contracts for the operation of government-owned research or production facilities. However, it applies to subcontracts under such contracts. It is intended to (i) provide agencies with the flexibility to acquire technical data and software needed to fulfill their missions (ii) avoid unnecessary costs that result from the ordering of unneeded technical data; (iii) encourage the commercialization of new products and processes by contractors through the protection of technical data; and (iv) encourage the most qualified commercial concerns to participate in government research and development programs. It does not affect the classification of technical data and software for national security purposes.

Section 1. Definitions. As used in this Statement--

(a) "technical data" means recorded information of a scientific or technical nature. It does not include software or financial, administrative, cost and pricing, management data, and other information incidental to contract administration;

(b) "manufacturing data" means technical data and software used for the manufacture of a product or performance of a process on a commercial scale;

(c) The term "contract" includes subcontracts and the term "contractor" includes subcontractors; and

(d) "software" means computer programs, computer data bases, and documentation thereof.

Section 2. Treatment of Proposals. Proposals that have not been incoporated in an award shall be treated as confidential and not disclosed outside the government without the submitter's permission except for evaluation purposes. Parts of proposals that are incorporated in awards and which contain trade secrets or commercial or financial information shall also be treated as confidential if properly marked. Agencies shall not discriminate against marked proposals.

Section 3. Scope of Data Rights Clauses. Technical data delivery requirements should normally be fully set out at the time of contracting, but deferred ordering provisions may be used to add additional deliverables. Any rights which the government obtains to technical data will be limited to rights in data specifically required to be delivered or prepared.

Section 4. Supply Contracts. Agencies procuring standard commercial products may obtain technical data necessary for operation, maintenance or repair but not for reprocurement purposes. Notwithstanding, manufacturing data should not normally be sought.

Section 5. Engineering Development Contracts. Contracts for engineering development should be structured to prevent the disclosure of proprietary technical data related to commercial products or processes developed at private expense by contractors. For example, agencies should normally accept form, fit, and function data in lieu of manufacturing data. Or, if manufacturing data is needed, the contractor shall be allowed to mark as proprietary any data that relates to commercial products or processes developed at private expense; and the right of the government to use and disclose the data shall be specified in the contract, and shall not include the right to use the data for reprocurement purposes (except for Defense Department contracts to which 10 USC 2320(c) is applied). Use of deferred delivery provisions should also be considered. A competitive procurement of an item developed under an engineering development contract should not include in the solicitation any proprietary manufacturing data that relates to a product or process developed at private expense by a contractor which is offered or to be offered for sale commercially by the contractor (except when 10 USC 2320(c) was applied to such data).

Any technical data delivered under an engineering development contract that relates to an item develped wholly under the contract shall be taken without restrictions if competitive acquisition of the item is anticipated. When competitive acquistion is not anticipated, the contractor will be allowed to retain ownership of any such data delivered, and the agency shall reserve an unrestricted, royalty-free right to use or have its contractors use the technical data for governmental purposes (excluding publication outside the government). However, if mission needs require and this is consistent with PL 98-525 or 577, agencies may also acquire publication and other rights. Other technical data not related directly to items developed under the contract normally shall be taken without restrictions.

Section 6. Contracts for Basic and Applied Research. Agencies will normally take technical data delivered under a basic or applied research contract with the unlimited right to use and publish such data, subject to any other provisions of the contract related to inventions and patents. However, if the research involves a contractor's privately developed products or processes or if it is otherwise agreed to by the parties, proprietary data of the contractor shall be protected.

Section 7. Assistance Awards. Agencies normally should not require delivery of technical data under grants or cooperative agreements except as necessary to verify the awardee's performance. The awardee normally will be allowed to retain all

rights in technical data delivered or produced under such awards, including the right to publish and/or assert copyright, although the agency may acquire a nonexclusive, royalty-free, and worldwide license to use such technical data that is delivered or published by the awardee for internal government purposes. When considered necessary to meet program objectives or statutory requirements, agencies may also (i) reserve the right to publish technical data delivered under a grant or cooperative agreement if the awardee fails to publish the results of the research within a reasonable time and/or (ii) expand the government's license to cover State and local governments.

Section 8. Software. Unless its delivery is specifically required, agencies shall not normally acquire rights in software generated under contracts or grants. Delivery of software shall not normally be required unless a purpose of the award is the creation of software. If software has commercial potential, agencies should normally accept license rights in lieu of ownership; and consideration should be given to allowing software documentation to be maintained on the contractor's premises.

When an agency acquires existing proprietary software, it shall accept appropriate conditions limiting its right to use and disclose the software. This includes cases when proprietary software is modified to accommodate particular agency needs.

Software within the definition of "manufacturing data" at section 1(b) is subject to sections 3-7 and not this section.

Analysis of DOD Concerns as Stated in Secretary Weinberger's March 19, 1985 Letter

Concern--The statement would "prohibit efforts to negotiate for the right to obtain and use for competitive procurement purposes proprietary technical data pertaining to commercial or future commercial items for which defense has requirements."

Response--Sections 4 and 5 contain such limitations. However, they are based on language in Public Law 98-525 (and similar language in PL 98-577) which states at section 1202 that the Secretary of Defense should--

"...ensure that persons that have developed products or processes offered or to be offered for sale to the public are not required, as a condition for the procurement of such products or processes by the Department of Defense, to provide to the United States technical data relating to the design, development, or manufacture of such products or processes (except for such data as may be necessary for the United States to operate and maintain the product or use the process if obtained by the United States as an element of performance under the contract)."

However, as a result of Secretary Weinberger's letter we have added references to 10 USC 2320(c) in section 5 which gives DOD greater latitude than others in this area.

Concern--The statement would "require the government to limit its use of technical data pertaining to items developed with less than total government funds to such an extent that competition would be severely inhibited if not precluded."

Response--Again, section 5 places limitations on the right of the government to use proprietary data of a contractor for reprocurement when the data relates to a commercial product developed at private expense. However, it authorizes the use of form, fit, and function data relating to such commercial products for competitive purposes. We have also added the reference to 10 USC 2320(c) to satisfy Secretary Weinberger's concern. Other than data relating to privately developed commercial products, the draft statement does not prevent DOD from obtaining any type of technical data for competitive procurement purposes that relates to noncommercial products developed with partial government and partial contractor funding. Thus, if a contractor has used internal funds to begin the development of a noncommercial, military product the Statement would in no way prevent DOD from negotiating for technical data relating to this item.

Concern--The statement will "prohibit the government's requiring contractors to deliver technical data pertaining to items developed totally at government expense unless there is a specific need for the data. This prohibition appears to extend to follow-on contracts even though data needs not initially apparent may have become known."

Response--We do not understand the basis for this statement. It appears to relate to the second paragraph of section 3 of one of our early drafts which advised agencies not to order expensive "manufacturing data" unless they foresee a need for it. This would not have affected DOD, since in most cases we assume DOD would be procuring the development of an item with an expectation of procuring it in the future if the item proves effective. Revised section 3 (now section 5) no longer contains the same language. In any case neither the earlier version or the current version should prevent DOD from obtaining technical data for procurement purposes in items wholly developed at government expense.

Concern--The statement would "preclude the acquisition of rights in software developed under a contract at government expense unless such software was a specific end product required by the contract. This, too, can serve as a bar to competitive procurement in certain situations."

Response--To fully respond it would be useful to know what type of "situations" are envisioned. However, in actual fact the statement does not precude the acquisition of rights in software unless it was a specific end product. Section 7 begins by stating the government only gets rights in software that is required to be delivered. The statement does not preclude an agency from specifying that software will be delivered.

It does state, however, that "normally" the delivery of software should not be required unless a purpose of the award is the creation of software. This is not an absolute requirement, but we believe it is a sound general rule. Scientists and engineers are constantly writing and altering computer programs to facilitate work under government R&D grants and contracts. In most cases the government is more interested in the end results than obtaining copies of software that was developed incidental to the carrying out of the work. Thus, it makes little sense in most cases for agencies to require delivery of such software. Furthermore, when a researcher sees a wider commercial market for his software, its delivery to the government will undermine his marketing efforts since it may become available to competitors through the Freedom of Information Act.

The first paragraph of section 7 may, in fact, require a change in DOD policy. The Defense Acquisition Regulation (DAR) Supplement now says that DOD will only acquire rights in computer software to meet its needs. However, it then goes on to state that DOD will take unlimited rights in computer software developed in the course of experimental, developmental, or research work specified under a contract. No explanation is given as to why DOD has such a broad need. We believe this may be the major policy issue presented by the draft Statement.

Mr. Paolo Glissenti
President
Montedison U.S.A., Incorporated
1114 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036

Mr. Fred Middleton
Morgan Stanley Ventures, Inc.
101 California Street
San Francisco, CA 94111

Mr. Travis Marshall
Senior Vice President,
Director of Government Regulations
Motorola Incorporated
1303 East Algonquin Road
Schaumburg, IL 60196

Mr. Robert W. Galvia
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Motorola Incorporated
1303 East Algonquin Road
Schaumburg, IL 60196

Mr. Daniel T. Kingsley
National Venture Capital Association
1655 North Fort Myer Drive
Suite 700
Arlington, VA 22209

Mr. Stanley Ebner
Senior Vice President
Northrop Corporation
1000 Wilson Boulevard
Suite 2300
Arlington, VA 22209

Mr. Thomas V. Jones
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Northrop Corporation
1840 Century Park East
Los Angeles, CA 90067

Mr. S. J. Lukasik
Vice President and Manager
Research and Technology Center
Northrop Corporation
1840 Century Park East
Los Angeles, CA 90067

Mr. Nicholas Clements
Vice President
Paine Webber Incorporated
1285 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10019

Dr. Harry G. Pars
Chairman
H. G. Pars
763 Concord Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02138

Mr. Edmund T. Pratt, Jr.
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Pfizer, Incorporated
235 East 42nd Street
New York, NY 10017

Dr. Ronald L. Sampson
Associate Director, Product Development
Industrial Chemicals Division
The Procter and Gamble Company
Sharon Woods Technical Center
11530 Reed Hartman Highway
Cincinnati, OH 45241

Dr. Edwin Behrens
Associate Director, Technical Affairs
The Procter and Gamble Company
801 18th Street, N. W.
Suite 400
Washington, D. C. 20006

Mr. Geoffrey Place
Vice President, Research and Development
Procter and Gamble Company
301 East Sixth Street
Cincinnati, OH 45202

Mr. Hugh McClung
First Vice President
Prudential Bache Securities, Inc.
1290 Ridder Park Drive
Suite 1
San Jose, CA 95131

Mr. Thomas L. Phillips
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Raytheon Company
141 Spring Street
Lexington, MA 02173

Mr. Robert R. Frederick
President and Chief Executive Officer
RCA Corporation
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, NY 10020

Mr. Robert Anderson
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Rockwell International Corporation
600 Grant Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

Mr. A. David Silver
Santa Fe Private Equity Fund
524 Camino del Monte Sol
Santa Fe, NM 87501

Mr. Daniel Nichols
Vice President, Taxes
Schering-Plough Corporation
One Giralda Farms
Post office Box 1000
Madison, NJ 07904

Mr. Robert P. Luciano
Chairman, President and Chief Executive Officer
Schering-Plough Corporation
One Giralda Farms
Post Office Box 1000
Madison, NJ 07904

Mr. Edward E. Telling
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Sears, Roebuck and Company
Sears Tower
Chicago, IL 60684

Mr. Randolph H. Aires
Vice President
Sears, Roebuck and Company
633 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20004

Mr. Henry Wendt
President and Chief Executive Officer
SmithKline-Beckman Corporation
One Franklin Plaza
Philadelphia, PA 19101

Mr. Reznor I. Orr
Director of Corporate Marketing
Spire Corporation
Patriots Park
Bedford, MA 01730

Mr. Roger G. Little
Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer
Spire Corporation
Patriots Park
Bedford, MA 01730

Mr. Donald Nordlund
Chairman of the Board and
Chief Executaive Officer
Staley Continental, Incorporated
1 Continental Towers
1701 Golf Road
Rolling Meadows, IL 60008

Mr. Thomas V. Fischer
Executive Vice President
Industrial Products Group Operations
A. E. Staley Manufacturing Co.
2200 Eldorado Street
Decatur, IL 62525

Ms. Susan Shay
Director of Corporate Development
Teknekron
2118 Milvia Street
Berkeley, CA 94704

Mr. Fred Cohen
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Tele Sciences, Incorporated
124 Gaither Drive
Mount Laurel, NJ 08504

Mr. John K. McKinley
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Texaco, Incorported
2000 Westchester Avenue
White Plains, NY 10650

Mr. Alton W. Whitehouse, Jr.
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
The Standard Oil Company of Ohio
Midland Building
Cleveland, OH 44115

Dr. Ruben Mettler
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
TRW, Incorporated
23555 Euclid Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44117

Mr. Ralph K. Ungermann
President and Chief Executive Officer
Ungermann-Bass, Incorporated
2560 Mission College Boulevard
Santa Clara, CA 95050

Mr. Warren M. Anderson
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Union Carbide Corporation
Old Ridgebury Road
Danbury, CT 06817

Mr. James H. Evans
Chairman
Union Pacific Corporation
345 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10154

Mr. William S. Cook
Chairman, President and
Chief Executive Officer
Union Pacific Company
345 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10154

Mr. Harry J. Gray
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
United Technologies Corporation
United Technologies Building
Hartford, CT 06101

Mr. Scott R. Bayman
Director of Corporate Strategic Planning
United Technologies Corporation
United Technologies Building
Hartford, CT 06101

Mr. Latham L. Allison
Vice President, Strategic Planning
United Technologies Corporation
United Technologies Building
Hartford, CT 06101

Mr. Harold W. Paxton
Vice President, Research
U. S. Steel Corporation
600 Grant Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15230

Mr. David M. Roderick
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
U. S. Steel Corporation
600 Grant Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15230

Mr. A. J. Stein
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
VLSI Technology, Incorporated
1101 McKay Drive
San Jose, CA 95131

Mr. C. Clifford Roe
Director, Strategic Programs and
Research and Development
VLSI Technology Incorporated
1101 McKay Drive
San Jose, CA 95131

Mr. Christopher Brody
Managing Director
Warburg, Pincus Capital Corporation
277 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10172

Mr. Thomas J. Murrin
President
Energy, Advanced Technology Group
Westinghouse Electric Corporation
Westinghouse Building, Gateway Center
Stanwix and Fort Pitt. Boulevards
Pittsburgh, PA 15222

Mr. Douglas D. Danforth
Chairman of the Board and
Chief Executive Officer
Westinghouse Electric Corporation
Westinghouse Building, Gateway Center
Stanwix and Fort Pitt. Boulevards
Pittsburgh, PA 15222

Dr. George E. Pake
Group Vice President
Research Enginneering
Xerox Corporation
800 Long Ridge Road
Stamford, CT 06904

Mr. David T. Kearns
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Xerox Corporation
Post Office Box 1600
Stamford, CT 06904

Mr. Peter C. McColough
Chairman of the Board, Financial Division
Xerox Corporation
800 Long Ridge Road
Stamford, CT 06904

Mr. Lester L. Colbert, Jr.
Xidex Corporation
5201 Patrick Henry Drive
Santa Clara, CA 95050

Mr. Sidney Kulek
President and Chief Executive Officer
Xonic, Incorporated
515 East Touhy Avenue
Des Plaines, IL 60018

Dr. Stephen S. Yau
President, AFIPS
Northwestern University
Department of Electrical Engineering and
Computer Science
2145 Sheridan Road
Evanston, IL 60201

Mr. John Chester
General Counsel
National Science Foundation
Room 501
1800 G Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20550

Dr. Linda S. Wilson
Vice President, Research
University of Michigan
4080 Fleming Building
Ann Arbor, MI 48109

Dr. Donald S. Fredrickson
President and Chief Executive Officer
Howard Hughes Medical Institute
7986 Old George Town Road
Bethesda, MD 20814

Mr. David K. Kehl
Legislative Director
Office of the Republican Leader
House of Representatives
H-228 Capital Building
Washington, D.C 20515

Dean Ann Friedlander
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
School of Humanities and Social Sciences
77 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02139

Dr. Robert M. White
President
National Academy of Engineering
2101 Connecticut Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20418

Dr. Ralph Landau
Vice President
National Academy of Engineering
c/o Listowel, Inc.
2 Park Avenue
Suite 1525
New York, NY 10016

Mr. Ken McLennon
Committee for Economic Development
477 Madison Avenue
New York, NY 10022

Mr. Al Sweedler
Office of Senator Jeff Bingaman
502 Senate Hart Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20510

Mr. Keith B. Keener
Office of Senator Gary Hart
237 Senate Russell Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20510

Mr. John Holmfield
House Committee on Science and Technology
2321 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20515

Mr. Thomas Ratchford
Associate Executive Officer
American Academy for the Advancement of Science
1333 H Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Mr. Q. T. Wiles
Chairman
ADAC Laboratories
14900 Ventura Boulevard
Sherman Oaks, CA 91403

Mr. William D. Carey
Executive Officer
American Association for the
Advancement of Science
1515 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington , D.C. 20005

Mr. Robert M. Rosenzweig
President, Association of American
Universities
One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Mr. Edward Barr
President and Corporate Executive
Courtalds U.S. Developments, Inc.
222 Bridge Plaza South
Fort Lee, NJ 07024

Mr. James McGraw
Chief Executive Officer
Marion Laboratories
9221 Ward Parkway
Kansas City, MO 64114

Mr. Donald S. Beilman
President
Microelectronics Center of
North Carolina
P. O. Box 12889
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

Mr. Robert Dinnat
Associate Technical Director
U. S. Army Construction Engineering
Research Laboratory
P.O. Box 4005
Champaign, IL 61820

Dr. Harvey Drucker
Associate Laboratory Director for
Biomedical & Environmental Research
Argonne National Laboratory
9700 South Cass Avenue
Argonne, IL 60439

Mr. Robert C. Ketcham
General Counsel
Committee on Science and Technology
House of Representatives
2321 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20515

Mr. James H. Turner
Counsel
Subcommittee on Science, Research
and Technology
U.S. House of Representatives
2319 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20515

Ms. Maryanne Bach
Minority Technical Consultant
Subcommittee on Science, Research
and Technology
U.S. House of Representatives
2320 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20515

Ms. Joyce G. Freiwald
Minority Staff Director
Committee on Science and Technology
House of Representatives
2320 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20515

Mr. James M. Le Munyon
Legislative Assistant
Office of Representative Ed Zschau
429 Cannon House Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20515

Mr. Bob Barker
Administrative Assistant
Office of Congressman Judd Gregg
308 Cannon House Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20515

Ms. Cassie Phillips
Chief Counsel
Subcommittee on Science, Technology
and Space
427 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20510

Mr. Steven J. Metalitz
Staff Director
Subcommittee on Patents, Copyrights
and Trademarks
137 Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20510

Mr. Kenneth E. Mannella
Counsel
Subcommittee on Patents, Copyrights
and Trademarks
137 Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20510

Ms. Janice A. Mays
Professional Staff Member
House Committee on Ways and Means
1111 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20515

Ms. Diane Oberhalman
Legislative Assistant
Office of Representative William Frenzel
1026 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20515

Ms. Barbara Pate
Legislative Director
Office of Representative J. J. Pickle
242 Cannon House Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20515

Mr. Thomas B. Dwyer
Legislative Assistant
Office of Senator John Danforth
497 Russell Senate Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20510

Mr. Jim Gould
Legislative Assistant
Office of Senator Lloyd Bentsen
703 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20510

Eric P. Schellin, Esquire
Attorney at Law
2001 Jefferson Davis Highway
Arlington, VA 22202

Mr. Edgar C. Harrell
Special Assistant to the Administrator
Agency for International Development
Room 5942 NS
Washington, D. C. 20523

Mr. Steve Davies
Bureau of National Affairs, Inc.
1231 25th Street, N. W.
Suite 517
Washington, D. C. 20037

Mr. Jeffrey Quinn
Attorney Advisor
Office of Tax Legislative Counsel
U. S. Department of the Treasury
15th and Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20220

Mr. Michael F. Mohr
Director of Capital, Energy and
Productivity Division
Office of Strategic Resources
U. S. Department of Commerce
Room H4525
Washington, D. C. 20230

Mr. Lawrence S. Robertson
1101 14th Street, N. W.
8th Floor
Washington, D. C. 20005

Honorable George P. Debakey
Deputy Assistant Secretary
for Science and Electronics
Office of Trade Development
International Trade Administration
U. S. Department of Commerce
Room H2007
Washington, D. C. 20230

Honorable H. P. Goldfield
Assistant Secretary for Trade Development
International Trade Administration
U. S. Department of Commerce
Room H3832
Washington, D. C. 20230

Mr. Ralph Oman
Chief Counsel
Subcommittee on Patents, Copyrights,
and Trademarks
137 Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20510

Mr. Robert E. Feidler
Chief Counsel
Subcommittee on the Constitution
328 Senate Hart Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20510

Mr. John Podesta
Legal Assistant
Office of Senator Patrick J. Leahy
433 Senate Russell Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20510

Ms. Carol Pompliano
Subcommittee on Science, Research
and Technology
U.S. House of Representatives
2319 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20515

Mr. Patrick H. Windham
Minority Staff
Subcommittee on Science, Technology
and Space
566 Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20510

Mr. Mark Herbst
c/o Representative Stan Lundine
2427 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20515

Mr. W. Michael Kitzmiller
Staff Director
Committee on Energy and Commerce
House of Representatives
2125 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20515

Mr. Arnold I. Havens
Minority Counsel and Staff Director
Committee on Energy and Commerce
House of Representatives
2322 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20515

Mr. Alan F. Coffey, Jr.
Chief Minority Counsel
Committee on the Judiciary
House of Representatives
B-351C Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20515

Mr. Walter B. McCormick, Jr.
General Counsel
Committee on Commerce, Science,
and Transportation
United States Senate
256 Senate Russell Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20510

Mr. W. Allen Moore
Chief Counsel and Staff Director
Committee on Commerce, Science,
and Transportation
United States Senate
256 Senate Russell Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20510

Mr. Ralph B. Everett
Minority Chief Counsel and
Minority Staff Director
Committee on Commerce, Science,
and Transportation
United States Senate
554 Senate Dirksen Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20510

Ms. Marguerite D. Ayers
Director of Administration
Committee on Commerce, Science,
and Transportation
United States Senate
254 Senate Russell Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20510

General Thomas M. Ryan, Jr.
Chief Counsel
Committee on Energy and Commerce
House of Representatives
2125 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20515

Mr. Harold P. Hanson
Executive Director
Committee on Science and Technology
House of Representatives
2321 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20515

Mr. Robert J. Short
Chief Investigator
Committee on the Judiciary
United States Senate
2226 Senate Dirksen Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20510

Ms. Julie Scofield
Legislative Assistant
Office of Representative Stan Lundine
2427 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20515

Mr. Thomas Sheahan, Executive Director
Office of Energy Research
Energy Research Advisory Board
U. S. Department of Energy
Routing Symbol ER-6
Washington, D. C. 20585

Sent a copy of Mr. Frederick N. Khedouri ltr from Senator Dole
Plus Energy List personnel

Niels Reimers

Roger Ditzel

Gay Chin

Eugene Stark

Peg Bogosian

Philip V. Livdahl

Spencer L. Blaylock

Howard Bremer

William Ferguson

Gerald Fill

Jim Turner

Frank Lukasik

Bud Maraist

Gerald J. Mossinghoff

Andy Pettifor

Ed Springer

Len Rawicz

Catherine Miller

Barry Beringer

Anita Willis

Dave Eden

(Jay Keyworth)
(Jim Liz)

Attachment#3 — ATTENDEES AT THE 19 BABSON ENTREPRENEURSH. CONFERENCE.

Dr. Pier R. Abetti
School of Management
RPI
Troy, NY 12181Pier

Dr. David N. Allen
Pennsylvania State University
211 Burrowes Building
University Park, PA 16802Dr. Allen

Dr. David M. Ambrose
College of Business Administration
University of Nebraska
Omaha, NE 68182David

Professor Raphael H. Amit
J. L. Kellogg Graduate School
of Management
Northwestern University
Nathaniel Leverone Hall
2001 Sheridan Road
Evanston, IL 60201Professor Amit

Dr. John D. Aram
Associate Dean
Weatherhead School of Management
Case Western Reserve University
Cleveland, OH 44106John

Dr. Thomas M. Begley
College of Business
Northeastern University
Hayden Hall
360 Huntington Avenue
Boston, MA 02115Tom

Dr. Barbara J. Bird
Weatherhead School of Management
Case Western Reserve University
Cleveland, OH 44106Barbara

Dr. Susan Birley
Department of Management
College of Business Administration
201-D Hurley Building
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, IN 46556Sue

Professor Zenas R. Block
Graduate School of Business
New York University
100 Trinity Place
New York, NY 10006Zenas

Mr. Anthony G. Bovaird
University of Aston
Nelson Building
Gosta Green
Birmingham B4 7ET, ENGLANDTony

Professor David P. Boyd
Human Resources Group
304 Hayden Hall - College of Business
Northeastern University
360 Huntington Avenue
Boston, MA 02115Dave

Professor Robert H. Brockhaus, Sr.
School of Business
St. Louis University
3674 Lindell Boulevard
St. Louis, MO 63108Bob

Professor Albert V. Bruno
School of Business
University of Santa Clara
Santa Clara, CA 96053Al

Ms. Candida G. Brush
Department of Management
Boston College
Chestnut Hill, MA 02167Candy

DR WAYNE BROWN
UTAH INNOVATION CEN
UNIVERSITY OF UTAH
SALT LAKE CITY, UT
84112

Dr. William D. Bygrave
Post Office Box 170
130 Peter Hans Road
Carlisle, MA 01740Bill

Dr. Neil C. Churchill
Caruth Institute
Cox School of Business
Southern Methodist University
Dallas, Texas 75275Neil

Professor Dennis J. Cohen
Wharton School
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104Mr. Cohen

Mr. Patrick J. Connor
ANCO
The Industrial Training Authority
P.O. Box 456
27-33 Upper Baggot Street
Dublin 4, IRELANDPat

Dr. Arnold C. Cooper
Krannert Graduate School of Management
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN 47907Arnie

Dr. Melvyn R. Copen
Babson College
Wellesley, MA 02157Mel

Professor Stanton G. Cort
Weatherhead School of Management
Case Western Reserve University
Cleveland, OH 44106Stan

Dr. William R. Dill
Babson College
Wellesley, MA 02157Bill

Professor Jerome Doutriaux
Faculty of Administration
University of Ottawa
Ottawa, Ontario K1N 9B5
CANADAJerome

Professor William C. Dunkelberg
Krannert Graduate School of Management
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN 47907Bill

Mr. Gerald L. Feigen
Small Business Administration
Office of Advocacy
1725 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20416Jerry

Mr. Michael D. Finch
Department of Sociology
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455Mr. Finch

Professor Dennis C. Foss
c/o W. E. Wetzel
University of New Hampshire
Durham, NH 03824Dennis

Professor William B. Gartner
McIntire School of Commerce
Monroe Hall
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, VA 22903Bill

Professor Yvon Gasse
Laval University
Quebec City
Quebec G1K 7P4
CANADAYvon

Ms. Elizabeth Gatewood
c/o Dr. Frank S. Hoy
College of Business Administration
University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602Ms. Gatewood

Professor Thomas N. Gilmore
The Wharton School
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104Tom

Professor James B. Graham
Faculty of Management
University of Calgary
2500 University Drive, N.W.
Calgary, Alberta
CANADA T2N IN4Jim

Mr. Robert J. Graham
Wharton School
University of Pennsylvania
3200 Steinberg - Dietrich Hall/CC
Philadelphia, PA 19104Mr. Graham

Mr. David E. Gumpert
Harvard Business Review
Soldiers Field Road
Boston, MA 02163Mr. Gumpert

Mr. H. Graham Herford
Coordinator, Small Business Program
Director, Business Institute
School of Business Studies
Northern Rivers College of
Advanced Education
P. O. Box 157
Lismore, New South Wales 2480
AUSTRALIAMr. Herford

Dr. Gerald E. Hills
College of Business Administration
University of Illinois
2521 University Hall
Post Office Box 4348
Chicago, IL 60680Gerry

Dr. Robert D. Hisrich
Bovaird Chair of Entrepreneurial Studies
College of Business Administration
University of Tulsa
600 South College
Tulsa, OK 74104Bob

Dr. Daryl J. Hobbs
University Hall
University of Missouri - Columbia
Columbia, MO 65211Daryl

Dr. John A. Hornaday
Babson College
Wellesley, MA 02157Jack

Professor Frank S. Hoy
Department of Management
College of Business Administration
University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602Frank

Dr. Roger W. Hutt
College of Business Administration
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ 85287Roger

Mr. Auzville Jackson, Jr.
President
AJ Associates, Inc.
5505 River Point Cove
Knoxville, TN 37933Auzzie

Mr. Daniel F. Jennings
c/o Donald L. Sexton
Baylor University
Wace, TX 76706Dan

Professor Rosabeth Moss Kanter
c/o Goodmeasure, Inc.
330 Broadway
P.O. Box 3004
Cambridge, MA 02139Rosabeth

Dr. Jerome A. Katz
Wharton School
University of Pennsylvania
34th & Spruce Streets
Philadelphia, PA 19104Jerry

Dr. Robert K. Kazanjian
Graduate School of Business Administration
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, MI 48109Bob

Ms. Roubina Khoylian
Venture Economics, Inc.
16 Laurel Avenue
P.O. Box 348
Wellesley, MA 02181Roubina

Dr. Bruce A. Kirchhoff
College of Business Administration
University of Nebraska
60th and Dodge
Omaha, NE 68182Bruce

Dr. Russell M. Knight
School of Business Administration
University of Western Ontario
London, Ontario N6A 3K7
CANADARuss

Dr. O. Jay Krasner Pepperdine University
4709 Autry Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90808Jay

Mr. Jay C. Lacke
Director of New Enterprise Institute
University of Southern Maine
246 Deering Avenue
Portland, ME 04102Jay

Ms. Virginia L. Lewis
Caruth Institute
Cox School of Business
Southern Methodist University
Dallas, TX 75275Virginia

Professor Wayne A. Long
Department of Management
University of Calgary
2500 University Drive, N.W.
Calgary, Alberta T2N 1N4
CANADAWayne

Dr. Peter Lorange
Chairman, Department of Management
Wharton School
University of Pennsylvania
~~Philadelphia, PA 19104Dr. Lorange~~

Professor Ian C. MacMillan
Graduate School of Business Administration
New York University
100 Trinity Place
New York, NY 10006Ian

Professor W. Edward McMullan
Faculty of Management
University of Calgary
Calgary, Alberta T2N 1N4
CANADAEd

Mr. Douglas H. McQueen
Chalmers Innovation Center
Chalmers University of Technology
412 96 Goteborg
SWEDENDoug

Dr. Timothy S. Mescon
Department of General Business,
Management & Organization
University of Miami
P.O. Box 249145
Coral Gables, FL 33124Tim

Dr. John B. Miner
Professor of Management
Georgia State University
Atlanta, Georgia 30303John

Professor Robert E. Mittelstaedt, Jr.
Director, Wharton Innovation Center
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104Professor Mittelstaedt

Dr. Daryl G. Mitton
College of Business Administration
San Diego State University
San Diego, CA 92182Daryl

Dr. James F. Molloy, Jr.
College of Business Administration
Northeastern University
360 Huntington Avenue
Boston, MA 02115Jim

Professor Donald D. Myers
ICSB
Department of Engineering Management
301 Harris
University of Missouri-Rolla
Rolla, MO 65401-0249Don

P. N. Subba Narasimha
c/o Prof. Ian C. MacMillan
Graduate School of Business Administration
New York University
100 Trinity Place
New York, NY 10006Mr. Narasimha

Dr. D. Kirk Neiswander
Director of Entrepreneurial Programs
311 Wickenden
Weatherhead School of Management
Case Western Reserve University
Cleveland, OH 44106Kirk

Mr. Lee Ogden
Small Business Development Center
1180 East Broad Street
Chicopee Complex
University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602Mr. Ogden

Mr. Christer Olofsson
Department of Management & Economics
Linköping University
S581 83 Linköping
SWEDENChrister

Professor Rein Peterson
York University
Faculty of Administrative Studies
4700 Keele Street
Downsview, Ontario
CANADA M3J 1P3Rein

Dr. Paul D. Reynolds
Wharton School
Department of Management
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104Paul

Dr. Robert C. Ronstadt
Babson College
Wellesley, MA 02157Bob

Dr. A. William Sahlman
Harvard Business School
Soldiers Field Road
Boston, MA 02163Bill

Mr. Ravi Sarathy
c/o J. F. Molloy
College of Business Administration
Northeastern University
360 Huntington Avenue
Boston, MA 02115Mr. Sarathy

Dr. Vijay Sathe
Harvard Business School
Soldiers Field Road
Boston, MA 02163Vijay

Mr. Robert G. Schwartz
School of Business and Economics
Mercer University-Atlanta
Atlanta, GA 30303Bob

Professor Donald L. Sexton
Hankamer School of Business
Baylor University
Waco, TX 76706Don

~~Professor Albert Shapero~~
Ohio State University
~~1775 College Road~~
~~Columbus~~, OH 43210Al

William H. Davis, Chair
of America the Enterprise Spi
302D Hagerty Hall
1775 College Rd
Columbus, OH 43210-13

Timmons

Mr. John J. Shaw
39 Meadow Drive
Sudbury, MA 01776John

✓ Dr. Edward B. Shils
Wharton Entrepreneurial Center
Steinberg Hall-Dietrich Hall/CC, Suite 3200
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104Ed

Dr. Jeffrey C. Shuman
Graduate Center 325
Bentley College
Beaver & Forest Streets
Waltham, MA 02254Jeff

Ms. Robin Siegel
7901 Henry Avenue
Apartment E-212
Philadelphia, PA 19128Ms. Siegel

Professor Norman R. Smith
School of Business
University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403Norm

Dr. George T. Solomon
Small Business Administration
1441 L Street, N.W.
Room 317
Washington, DC 20416George

Professor Alvin D. Star
College of Business Administration
University of Illinois at Chicago
Box 4348
Chicago, IL 60680Al

Dr. Howard H. Stevenson
Harvard Graduate School of Business
Morgan 320
Soldiers Field
Boston, MA 02163Howard

Dr. Steven C. Stryker
9300 Brookville Road
Silver Springs, MD 20910Steve

Mr. Robert W. Stuart
School of Management
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Troy, NY 12181Bob

Professor Gerald Sussman
37 Peacock Farm Road
Lexington, MA 02173Jerry

Mr. Frank S. Swain
Small Business Administration
Office of Advocacy
1725 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20416Frank

Dr. Fred A. Tarpley, Jr.
College of Management
Georgia Institute of Technology
Atlanta, GA 30332Fred

Mr. Richard D. Teach
College of Management
Georgia Institute of Technology
Atlanta, GA 30332Dick

(John) Jack Thorn Pittsburgh Center for Entrepreneurial Development Carnegie-Mellon

Mr. Brian Thomas
c/o R. W. Hutt
College of Business Administration
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ 85287Brian

Professor Jeffry A. Timmons
Babson College
Wellesley, MA 02157Jeff

Professor Tyzoon T. Tyebjee
University of Santa Clara
Santa Clara, CA 96053Tyzoon

Professor Karl H. Vesper
School of Business
MacKenzie Hall, DJ-10
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195Karl

Dr. George S. Vozikis
Department of General Business/Management
University of Miami
P. O. Box 249145
Coral Gables, FL 33124George

Professor Clas Wahlbin
University of Linkoping
Department of Management & Economics
S-581 83 Linkoping
SWEDENClas

Herr J. Torkel Wallmark
Chalmers Tekniska Hogskola
Innovationscentrum
421 96 Goteborg
SWEDENHerr Wallmark

Dr. Robin H. Ward
Director, Ethnic Business Research Unit
Management Center
University of Aston
Nelson Building
Gosta Green
Birmingham, B4 7ET, ENGLANDRobin

Mr. Steven West
Department of Sociology
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455Mr. West

Dr. William E. Wetzel, Jr.
University of New Hampshire
Durham, NH 03824Bill

Mr. Ian G. Wilson
c/o W. E. Wetzel, Jr.
University of New Hampshire
Durham, NH 03824Ian

ALABAMA
Mr. Jaime Etheredge
Director, Alabama Development Office
135 South Union Street
Montgomery, AL 36130
205-263-0048

ALASKA
Dr. Richard A. Neve'
Senior Science Advisor
Office of the Governor
P.O. Box AM
Juneau, AK 99811
907-465-3568
c/o John Katz
Alaska Washington Office

ARKANSAS
Dr. John Ahlen
Director
Arkansas Science & Technology Authority
200 Main Street, Suite 210
Little Rock, AR 72201
501-371-3554

COLORADO
Ms. Sally Bay Cornwell
Science & Technology Advisor
to the Governor
S&T Advisory Council
Office of the Governor
124 State Capitol Building
Denver, CO 80203
303-866-2832

DELAWARE
Mr. Louis H. Papineau, Jr.
Director, Delaware Development Office
99 Kings Highway
P.O. Box 1401
Dover, DE 19903
302-736-4271

FLORIDA
Mr. Ray Iannucci
Executive Director
Florida High Technology and
Industry Council
Executive Office of the Governor
The Capitol
Tallahassee, Florida 32301-8047
904-487-3134

HAWAII
Mr. Carl E. Swanholm
Science & Technology Officer
Dept. of Planning and Economic
Development
P.O. Box 2359
Honolulu, Hawaii 96804
808-548-8741

ILLINOIS
Mr. Norm Peterson
Executive Director
Governor's Commission on Science
and Technology
100 West Randolph Streeet, Suite 3-400
Chicago, Illinois 60601
312-917-3982

INDIANA
Dr. John D. Hague, President
Indiana Corp. for Science & Technology
One North Capitol, Suite 925
Indianapolis, IN 46204
317-635-3058

IOWA
Mr. Doug Getter
Group Manager Research & Development
Iowa Development Commission
600 E. Court Ave.
Des Moines, IA 50309
515-281-3036

KANSAS
Dr. Phillips Bradford
Director of Advanced Technology
Commission
Kansas Dept. of Economic Development
503 Kansas Ave., Sixth Floor
Topeka, KS 66603
913-296-5272

MARYLAND
Dr. Herbert Rabin
Associate Dean, College of Engineering
Engineering Research Center
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland 20742
301-454-7941

MASSACHUSETTS
Tom Sommer
Federal State Relations
444 N. Capital St., NW
Suite 307
Washington, D.C. 20001
202-628-1065

MICHIGAN
Dr. James Kenworthy
Manager, Research & Technology
Programs, Michigan Strategic Fund
Research Centers, Michigan Strategic Fund
P.O. Box 30234
Lansing, MI 48909
517-373-7550

MINNESOTA
Ms. Jayne B. Khalifa
Director, Governor's Office
of Science & Technology
900 American Center Building
150 E. Kellogg Blvd
St. Paul, MN 55101
612-297-4368

MISSOURI
Mr. Alan Franklin
Acting Exec. Director of Missouri Corp.
for Science & Technology/Manager of
High Technology Program
P.O. Box 118
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102
314-751-9077

MONTANA
Mr. Sam Hubbard, Administrator
Science & Technology Alliance
Montana Department of Commerce
Capitol Station
Helena, MT 59620
406-444-3707

NEBRASKA
Mr. Rod Bates
Director, Nebraska Dept. of
Economic Development
301 Centennial Mass South
P.O. Box 94666
Lincoln, NE 68509
402-471-3747

NEVADA
Mr. Andrew P. Grosie
Executive Director
Commission on Economic Development
Capitol Complex
Carson City, NV 89710
702-885-4325

NEW JERSEY
Mr. Edward Cohen
Executive Director
New Jersey Commission on Science
and Technology
122 W. State Street, CN-832
Trenton, New Jersey 08625
609-633-2740

NEW MEXICO
Mr. Bob Gold
Secretary of Economic
Development & Tourism Dept.
Bataan Memorial Building
Santa Fe, NM 87503
505-827-6204

NEW YORK
Mr. Graham Jones
New York State Science & Technology
99 Washington Ave., 17th Floor
Albany, NY 12210

NORTH DAKOTA
Mr. Dick Rayl, Director
Midwest Technical Group
Department of Management & Budget
State Capitol
Bismarck, ND 58505
701-224-4904

OHIO
Mr. Christopher M. Coburn
Science & Technology Advisor
Office of the Governor
P.O. Box 1001
Columbus, OH 43266-0101
614-466-3086

OKLAHOMA
Mr. Scott B. Ingham
Sr. Administrative Assistant
Oklahoma Council of Science & Technology
Office of the Governor
212 State Capitol
Oklahoma City, OK 73105
405-521-2342

OREGON
Dr. S. John Owens
Vice Chancellor for the Oregon
Center for Advanced Technology
Education
303 Dearborn Hall
Oregon State University Campus
Corvallis, OR 97331
503-754-3617

PENNSYLVANIA
Dr. Walter H. Plosila
Deputy Secretary for Technology
and Policy Development
Department of Commerce
433 Forum Building
Harrisburg, PA 17120
717-783-5053

RHODE ISLAND
Mr. Bruce R. Lang
Executive Director
Rhode Island Partnership for Science
& Technology
7 Jackson Walkway
Providence, RI 02903
401-277-2601

SOUTH CAROLINA
Dr. Robert E. Henderson
Director
South Carolina Research Authority
P.O. Box 12025
Columbus, SC 29211
803-799-4070

TENNESSEE
Dr. John M. Crothers
Dept. of Economic & Community
Development
6th Floor
Rachel Jackson Building
Nashville, TN 37219

UTAH
Dr. Randy G. Moon
State Science Advisor
Utah Technology Finance Corp.
Centers of Technological Excellence
116 State Capitol Building
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114
801-533-4987

VERMONT
Mr. James Guest
Secretary, Agency of Development
& Community Affairs
109 State Street
Montpelier, VT 05602
802-828-3211

VIRGINIA
Dr. John Salley
Vice President, Center for
Innovative Technology
The Hallmark Building
Suite 201
13873 Park Center Rd.
Herndon, VA 22071

WISCONSIN
Mr. Rolf Wegenke
Administrator, Division of Economic
and Community Development
Department of Development
P.O. Box 7970
Madison, WI 53707
608-266-1018

WYOMING
Dr. James G. Speight
Chief Scientific Officer
Western Research Institute
University of Wyoming Research Corp.
P.O. Box 3395
Laramie, WY 82071
307-721-2209

Others

Dr. Al Hellman
Technical Advisor for Biotechnology
International Trade Administration
Room 4045
Washington, DC 20230
202-377-3888

Curt W. Reimann
Room A365
Physics Building
National Bureau of Standards
Gaithersburg, MD 20899

Dana Peck
SURA
3401 N. Fairfax Dr., #321
Arlington, VA 22201
703-841-2694

Stephen J. Gage
President
MDTI
1300 Conwed Towers
444 Cedar Street
St. Paul, MN 55101

Additional Science and Technology Advisors and Administrators

CONNECTICUT
Mr. Jack Frazier
President, Connecticut
Product Development Corp.
93 Oak Street
Hartford, CT 06106
203-566-2920

GEORGIA
Mr. Tom Lewis
Executive Assistant to the Governor
201 State Capitol
Atlanta, GA 30334
404-656-6870

KENTUCKY
Mr. Carroll Knicely
Secretary of the Commerce Cabinet
24th Floor
Capitol Plaza Tower
Frankfort, KY 40601
502-564-7670

NORTH CAROLINA
Dr. Earl MacCormac
Science Advisor to the Governor
Executive Director of North Carolina
Board of Science and Technology
Administration Building
1616 West Jones Street
Raleigh, NC 27611
(919) 733-6500

TEXAS
Ms. Meg Wilson
Science and Technology Coordinator
Governors Office
P. O. Box 13561
Austin, TX 78711
512-463-2000

COMMERCE TASK FORCE ON PATENT POLICY

Dr. Merrifield

Dr. Williams

Lanse Felker

Mike Rubin

Fred Knickerbocker

Catherine Miller

Barry Beringer

WORKING GROUP ON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Department of Treasury (Chairman)

Stephen Entin
~~Dr. Manuel H. Johnson~~
Assistant Secretary
for Economic Policy
Department of Treasury
Room 3452
15th & Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20026
566-2551
Economic Policy
566-2551

Representatives

Mr. Maynard S. Comiez
Director
Office of Special Studies
Department of Treasury
Room 4460
15th & Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20026
566-5808

Mr. Edward E. Murphy
Economist
Office of Special Studies
Department of Treasury
Room 4460
15th & Pennsylvania, Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20026
566-5755

Department of Defense

The Honorable
Dr. James P. Wade Jr.
Assistant Secretary of Defense
3E~~1014~~ 6868
Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-8000
695-6639

Honorable
~~Mr~~. John Mittino
Deputy Assistant Secretary of
Defense for Production Support
Room 3E144
Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-8000
695-6322

Department of Commerce

Honorable
Dr. Bruce Merrifield
Assistant Secretary
Productivity, Technology & Innovation
Department of Commerce
Room 4824
14th & Constitution Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20030
377-1984

Mr. Frederick T. Knickerbocker
Executive Director
Office of Economic Affairs
Department of Commerce
Room 4838
14th & Constitution Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20030
377-2405

Dr. Jack Williams
Director of Productivity
Department of Commerce
Room ~~4816~~ 4822
14th & Constitution Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20030
377-1091

Department of Energy

Mr. Alvin W. Trivelpiece
Director
Office of Energy Research
Department of Energy
Washington, D.C. 20585
252-5430

Economic Policy Council

Mr. Eugene J. McAllister
Executive Secretary
Economic Policy Council
OEOB
Room 216
Washington, D.C. 20500

Office of Management and Budget

Mr. Randall E. Davis
Associate Director
Natural Resources, Energy & Science
Office of Management and Budget
OEOB
Room 260
Washington, D.C. 20503
395-4844

Mr. Hugh Loweth
Deputy Associate Director
of Energy & Science
Office of Management and Budget
8001 NEOB
726 Jackson Place, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20503
395-3404

Council of Economic Advisors

The Honorable
Thomas G. Moore
Member
Council of Economic Advisors
OEOB
17th & Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Room 314
Washington, D.C. 20500
395-5046

Mr. Martin Zimmerman
Senior Staff Economist
OEOB
Room 320
Washington, D.C. 20500

National Science Foundation

Dr. John Moore
Deputy Director
National Science Foundation
1800 G Street, N.W.
Room 520
Washington, D.C. 20550
357-9427

Dr. Carl Hall
Deputy Assistant Director
for Engineering
National Science Foundation
1800 G Street, N.W.
Room 1115
Washington, D.C. 20550
357-9427

Office of Science & Technology Policy

PRODUCT LIABILITY LIST (5/19/86)

Niels Reimers
Acting Director of the Licensing, Patent, and Copyright Office
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Building E19-722
77 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02139

Sheldon Steinbach
Staff Counsel
Associate Director, Office of Governmental Affairs
American Council on Education
One Dupont Circle
Washington, D. C. 20036

Howard Bremer
Patent Counsel
Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation
614 N. Walnut Street
Madison, WI 53705

Kenneth Smith
Associate Provost and Vice President for Research
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Room 3-240
77 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02139

Edward MacCordy
Associate Vice Chancellor for Research
Washington University
Lindell and Skinker Boulevards
Box 1054
St Louis, MO 63130

Bruce W. McConnell
Desk Officer
Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs
Office of Management and Budget
17th & PA Avenue, N. W.
Room 3235, New Executive Office Bldg.
Washington, D. C. 20503

Stephen H. Atkinson
Director
Office of Technology Licensing and Industry - Sponsored Programs
Harvard Medical School
221 Longwood Avenue
Boston, MA 02115

Mark Goodman
MultiNational Business Services
1333 New Hampshire Avenue, N. W.
Suite 900
Washington, D. C. 20036

Dave Eden
Director, Plant Environment
Environmental Activity Staff
General Motors Technical Center
Warren, MI 48090

TELEPHONE DIRECTORY
OFFICE OF THE
UNDER SECRETARY FOR ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

November 1986

	Telephone Number	Room Number	Mail Room/ Routing Code
Under Secretary for Economic Affairs			
Robert Ortner, Under Secretary	377-3727	4848	4848
Stefanie Salata, Private Secretary	377-3727	4848	4848
Fifi Ellis, Secretary	377-3727	4848	4848
F.T. Knickerbocker, Executive Director	377-2405	4840	4838
Gerri Tyer, Secretary	377-2405	4838	4838
Harry A. Scarr, Exec. Asst. for Statistical Affairs	377-2760	4842	4838
M. Catherine Miller, Legislative/Policy Analyst	377-3658	4843	4838
Barry C. Beringer, Director, Congressional Affairs	377-8181	4845	4838
Michael Sawyer, Congressional Liaison Specialist	377-8181	4845	4838
Ani Nazerian, Legislative Assistant	377-2843	4845	4838
Lula Thompson, Secretary	377-1194	4843	4838
Adren Cooper, Economic Information Officer	377-2235	4845	4838
Ago Ambre, Economist	377-3686	4845	4838
Ann M. Bailey, Secretary	377-3685	4845	4838
Legal Staff			
Robert Ellert, Chief Counsel for EA	377-5394	4610	4610
June Tooks, Secretary	377-5394	4610	4610
Philip Freije, Deputy Assistant General Counsel	377-5165	4610	4610
Brenda Mayo, Secretary	377-5165	4610	4610
Michael R. Rubin, Attorney Adviser	377-5394	4611	4610
Eugene J. Pawlikowski, Patent Attorney	377-5394	4613	4610
Alvin L. Englert, Patent Adviser	377-5394	4613	4610
Office of Administration			
B. Jerome Jackson, Acting Director	377-3884	4079	4079
Teresa Hampton, Secretary	377-2431	4079	4079
Clifton T. Beck, Program Analyst	377-1632	4079	4079
Management Services Division			
Doris L. Trunfio, Acting Chief	377-4165	4079	4079
Jane Parsons, Management Analyst	377-5710	4079	4079
Barbara A. Russell, Management Analyst	377-5161	4079	4079
Jackie B. Proctor, Clerk-Typist	377-2431	4079	4079

	Telephone Number	Room Number	Mail Room/ Routing Code
Management Services Division (Cont'd)			
Thomas McCormick, Management Analyst	523-0724	M-1 TOWER	BE-15
Maria A. Scott, Management Assistant	523-0898	M-1 TOWER	BE-15
Marlene Leon, Clerk Typist	523-0537	M-1 TOWER	BE-15
John C. Ross, Support Services Supervisor	523-0719	B-5 TOWER	BE-15
Charles L. West, Mail Clerk	523-0719	B-5 TOWER	BE-15
Nicholas J. Burns, Messenger	523-0719	B-5 TOWER	BE-15
Douglas K. Martin, Mail Clerk/Messenger	523-0719	B-5 TOWER	BE-15
Budget Division			
Patricia A. Davis, Budget Analyst	377-1633	4079	4079
Jane Wright, Budget Analyst	377-1633	4079	4079
Paul Rennert, Budget Analyst	377-1633	4079	4079
Office of Strategic Resources			
Robert Dale Wilson, Director	377-2388	4616	4616
Orcutt P. Drury, Deputy Director	377-2388	4616	4616
David M. Glancy, Operations Research Analyst	377-4595	4616	4616
Barbara H. Curry, Research Assistant	377-2388	4616	4616
Office of Business Analysis			
John E. Cremeans, Director	377-1405	4878	4878
Nancy C. Beltz, Secretary	377-1405	4878	4878
Robert B. Grant, Deputy Director	377-1985	4878	4878
Helen Simpson, Secretary	377-1985	4878	4878
Business Issues Analysis Division			
J. Steven Landefeld, Director	377-1224	4886	4886
E. Jean Shamberger, Secretary	377-1220	4886	4886
Donald H. Dalton, Jr., Industry Economist	377-1190	4884	4886
Virgil Ketterling, Economist	377-1225	4883	4886
Sandra Cooke, Economist	377-4940	4884	4886
Ann Lawson, Economist	377-1226	4883	4886
Armondo Lopez, Economist	377-2011	4882	4886
Pamela R. Nacci, Financial Analyst	377-4027	4884	4886
Kan Hau Young, Economist	377-1218	4885	4886

	Telephone Number	Room Number	Mail Room/ Routing Code
Capital, Energy & Productivity Studies Division			
Michael F. Mohr, Director	377-2019	4525	4525
Saundria Pitts, Statisticil Assistant	377-2013	4525	4525
Joseph G. Correia, Industry Economist	377-1223	4519-A	4525
Joseph E. Modrak, Program Anallysis Officer	377-1227	4870	4525
Lori D. Hamilton Price, Economist	377-1229	4523	4525
Robert Wendling, Economist	377-1431	4527	4525
Regulatory-Legislative Analysis Division			
Robert B. Grant, Acting Director	377-1597	4878	4877
Larry S. Campbell, Regulatory Econ. (Project Mngr.)	377-3038	4877	4877
Bernard Greifer, Chemist	377-3078	4877	4877
David K. Henry, Industry Specialist	377-2566	4874	4877
Philip F. Lewis, Industry Analyst (Regulatory)	377-4337	4875	4877
Clyde K. Rodkey, Economist	377-2326	4874	4877
Morton Schnabel, Economist	377-3753	4881	4877
Oliver Dziggle, Economist	377-2567	4875	4877
Statistical Staff			
Kenneth W. Rogers, Chief	377-4450	4887	4887
Stephen E. Mersch, Economist	377-0434	4885	4887
Dennis Pastore, Economist	377-1788	4870	4887
Charles Steigerwald, Economist	377-4947	4884	4887
Lorraine G. Pitts, Statistical Technician	377-1986	4887	4887
Chief Economist			
Lucy Falcone, Senior Advisor to the Chief Economist	377-4885	4858	4858
Robert T. Miki, Sr. Assoc. for Microeconomic Analysis	377-2482	4870	4858
Office of Economic Conditions			
Carl E. Cox, Director	377-4871	4861	4861
Jeanette T. Bennett, Secretary	377-2895	4861	4861
Theodore S. Torda, Economist	377-2894	4861	4861
Barbara A. Overton, Secretary	377-3309	4861	4861
James H. Klumpner, Economist	377-3308	4861	4861
H. Kemble Stokes, Economist	377-2205	4869	4861
Peter M. Taylor, Economist	377-3427	4861	4861
George McKittrick, Economist	377-2343	4861	4861

	Telephone Number	Room Number	Mail Room/ Routing Code
Office of Economic Policy			
Jeffrey L. Mayer, Deputy Director	377-1727	4858	4858
Marlene A. Kotkins, Secretary	377-1727	4858	4858
Gerald Moody, Economist	377-4352	4864	4858
Vickey L. Simms, Secretary	377-4945	4858	4858
Robert G. McKibben, Economist	377-4559	4858	4858
Michael E. Bell, Economist (LWOP)	377-5041	4864	4858
Edward (Ted) Barrett, Legislative Review Officer	377-2101	4857	4858
K. Peter Wagner, Industry Economist	377-5547	4868	4858
Jane W. Molloy, Legislative Review Officer	377-5926	4868-A	4858
David A. Peterson, Legislative Review Officer	377-5703	4866	4858
Rayanne P. Frazier, Secretary	377-5703	4866	4958
Benson Soffer, Labor Economist	377-5703	4868-A	4858
David C. Lund, Economist	377-5703	4855	4858
Assistant Secretary for Productivity, Technology and Innovation			
D. Bruce Merrifield, Assistant Secretary	377-1984	4824	4824
Kimberly Colclough, Secretary	377-1984	4824	4824
Lois Hall, Secretary	377-1984	4824	4824
Philip Goodman, Senior Technical Advisor	377-0825	4829	4824
Office of Productivity, Technology and Innovation			
Jack C. Williams, Director	377-1091	4820	4822
Margaret M. Brown, Secretary	377-1091	4822	4822
Industrial Technology Partnerships Division			
Lansing R. Felker, Jr., Director	377-5913	4816	4816
Elizabeth M. Robertson, Program Analyst	377-5585	4821	4816
Carl W. Shepherd, Technology Assessment Analyst	377-5922	4821	4816
Susan L. Miller, Technology Partnership Analyst	377-8014	4817	4816
Diane J. Simmons, Secretary	377-1093	4816	4816
Innovation Data Analysis Center			
John R. Heizer, Chief	377-8080	4823	4816
Carolyn P. Walker, Data Base Technician	377-8080	4823	4816

	Telephone Number	Room Number	Mail Room/ Routing Code
Policy Development and Coordination Division			
J. William Nelson, Director	377-2058/59	4814B	4814B
Sara Thompson, Secretary	377-2058/59	4814B	4814B
Paul V. Braden, Economist	377-5572	4814B	4814B
Richard A. Johnson, Senior Policy Analyst	377-2922	4814B	4814B
Commerce Productivity Center			
Carol Ann Meares, Acting Director	377-0940	7413	7413
Doris A. Gallahan, Program Assistant	377-0940	7413	7413
Metric Programs Division			
Gerald T. Underwood, Director	377-3036	4082	48164
Eldon Nowstrup, Special Projects Officer	377-3036	4982	4082
Alan S. Whelihan, State/Local Metric Conversion Coord.	377-3036	4082	4082
Howard B. Ellsworth, Metric Conversion Coord.	377-3036	4082	4082
Norma Kent, Secretary	377-3036	4817	4816
International Joint Venture Program			
Gerald T. Underwood, Project Leader	377-0944	4818	4816
Margaret Sexton, Secretary	377-3036	4817	4816
Gerard Helfrich, Special Projects Officer	377-0944	4833	4816
Robert P. O'Malley, Special Projects Officer	377-0639	4817	4816
Federal Technology Management Policy Division			
Norman J. Latker, Director	377-0659/60	4839	4837
Thornton (Tip) J. Parker, III, Program Analyst	377-8100	4835	4837
Joseph P. Allen, Policy Liaison Specialist	377-8102	4835	4837
Richard H. Mullins, Economist	377-8100	4837	4837
Regina Horton, Secretary	377-8100	4837	4837
Small Business Technology Liaison Division			
Theodore J. Lettes, Director	377-8111	4827	4816
Christopher B. Cannon, Attorney Advisor	377-8111	4827	4816
Claudeen Julia, Secretary	377-0826	4829	4816
National Technical Information Service			
Joseph F. Caponio, Director	487-4636	200 FORBES	
Jill Shockley, Secretary	487-4636	200 FORBES	
Joseph E. Clark, Deputy Director	487-4612	200 FORBES	
Thomas J. Cox, Jr., Associate Director for Admin.	487-4736	207 FORBES	
Thomas P. Bold, Jr., Director, O/Administrative Mgmt.	487-4608	209 FORBES	
Wayne J. Gallant, Budget Officer	487-4862	204 FORBES	

	Telephone Number	Room Number	Mail Room/ Routing Code
Bureau of the Census			
John G. Keane, Director	763-5190/91	2049	FB3
Helen Fedele, Administrative Asst/Secretary	763-5190	2049	FB3
C. Louis Kincannon, Deputy Director	763-5192/93	2049	FB3
Shelby Weekly, Secretary	763-5192	2049	FB3
Clifford Parker, Asst. Director for Administration	763-2350	3045	FB3
Bureau of Economic Analysis			
Allan H. Young, Director	523-0693	704	TOWER BE-1
Teresa A. Williams, Secretary	523-0694	704	TOWER BE-1
Carol S. Carson, Deputy Director	523-0709	705	TOWER BE-2
Teresa A. Williams, Secretary	523-0710	705	TOWER BE-2
James J. Hartman, Administrative Officer	523-0508	1019	TOWER BE-11

MISCELLANEOUS:

EA Telecopier	377-0432	4853
EA Xerox Room		4853
EA Wang Room		4431
Imprest Fund	377-3291	6880
Motor Pool/Messenger Service	377-4621	B-819
Scheduled Airline Ticket Office (SATO)	377-1543	6880

BUILDING ABBREVIATIONS*:

TOWER - Tower Building, 1401 K St., NW, Washington, DC,
FORBES - Forbes Office Building, 8001 Forbes Place, Springfield, VA
FB3 - Federal Building No. 3, Suitland & Silver Hill Roads, Suitland, MD

* Rooms listed without an abbreviation are located in the Herbert C. Hoover Building (HCHB).

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
The Assistant Secretary for Productivity, Technology and Innovation
Washington, D.C. 20230
(202) 377-1984

MAR 18 1985

Honorable Mary Ann Gilleece
Deputy Under Secretary of Defense
(Acquisition Management)
Pentagon, Room 3E144
Washington, D. C. 20301

Dear Ms. Gilleece:

I have received the joint letter of March 4, 1985, concerning the efforts of the Federal Coordinating Council on Science, Engineering and Technology (FCCSET) Committee on Intellectual Property to develop a policy framework within which more detailed Government procurement and assistance regulations dealing with technical data would be drafted and evaluated. As you recall, this effort was initiated at the request of Dr. Keyworth, the President's Science Advisor, and I am enclosing a copy of his original request.

This effort is not intended to conflict with or in any way limit the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) authorities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), the Department of Defense (DOD), and the General Services Administration (GSA). However, as I trust you agree, the FAR is written against a backdrop of statutory and administrative policies that are often set outside the FAR system as such. For example, the FAR patent provisions must conform to the President's Memorandum and applicable statutes, including Chapter 18 of Title 35 and regulations issued thereunder. Similarly, if FCCSET or another higher authority can reach agreement on basic technical data principles, there would appear to be no reason why the FAR drafters should not be expected to conform the FAR to those principles.

The concerns expressed in Dr. Keyworth's letter remain valid. For years it has proven impossible to develop Federal Procurement Regulations (FPR) or FAR coverage in the technical data area for the civilian agencies. And there have been significant differences in the approaches adopted by DOD, NASA, Department of Energy (DOE), and other agencies that have issued regulations or other policy directives. We believe a major reason for this is the failure to reach agreement on basic objectives and principles.

There is also legitimate concern whether existing regulations give sufficient weight to the policy objectives of this Administration. In particular, this Administration is strongly committed to the principle that private investment and development of Government supported research should be encouraged--as evidenced by the issuance of the President's 1983 Memorandum on Government Patent Policy.

Because of the obvious interest your agency has in technical data issues, we hope that you will continue to provide input and comments during the development of the Statement.

Sincerely,

(signed)
Bruce Merrifield

D. Bruce Merrifield

Attachment

cc: Honorable George A. Keyworth II (White House)
Dr. Andrew Pettifor (OSTP)
Mr. Allan Beres (GSA)
Mr. Stuart J. Evans (NASA)

OPTI/FTMP/Norm Latker/Jesse Lasken/rh 3/14/85
bc: Dr. Merrifield
Egils Milbergs
Dr. Williams
Norm Latker
Chron
Read

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

March 19, 1984

Dear Bruce:

The allocation of rights to various technical data, developed in the performance of government contracts, is an issue with significant implications for future government-industry relationships. It is driven, for example, by the government's need to minimize the costs of the products and services it buys, as well as by industry's desire to maximize profits and maintain any competitive advantage. It is fundamental to the government's continued ability to obtain the services of the best of the private sector.

I believe that this is an issue of sufficient importance that any codification of the government's position on this issue, as in the technical data section of part 27 of the proposed Federal Acquisition Regulations, requires a thorough analysis and discussion by the various agencies, and by the private sector. I believe that the FCCSET Intellectual Property Committee would be an appropriate vehicle for examining the various kinds of technical data, for agreeing on the various government objectives in seeking access to, or protecting the proprietary nature of that data, and for developing the basis for an acceptable set of draft regulations for the government's rights to such data. Please keep me informed of your progress.

Yours truly,

Jay Keyworth

G. A. Keyworth
Science Advisor to the President

Dr. D. Bruce Merrifield
Assistant Secretary for Productivity,
Technology and Innovation
Department of Commerce
Washington, D.C. 20230

Analysis of DOD Concerns as Stated in Secretary Weinberger's March 19, 1985 Letter

Concern--The statement would "prohibit efforts to negotiate for the right to obtain and use for competitive procurement purposes proprietary technical data pertaining to commercial or future commercial items for which defense has requirements."

Response--Sections 4 and 5 contain such limitations. However, they are based on language in Public Law 98-525 (and similar language in PL 98-577) which states at section 1202 that the Secretary of Defense should--

"...ensure that persons that have developed products or processes offered or to be offered for sale to the public are not required, as a condition for the procurement of such products or processes by the Department of Defense, to provide to the United States technical data relating to the design, development, or manufacture of such products or processes (except for such data as may be necessary for the United States to operate and maintain the product or use the process if obtained by the United States as an element of performance under the contract)."

However, as a result of Secretary Weinberger's letter we have added references to 10 USC 2320(c) in section 5 which gives DOD greater latitude than others in this area.

Concern--The statement would "require the government to limit its use of technical data pertaining to items developed with less than total government funds to such an extent that competition would be severely inhibited if not precluded."

Response--Again, section 5 places limitations on the right of the government to use proprietary data of a contractor for reprocurement when the data relates to a commercial product developed at private expense. However, it authorizes the use of form, fit, and function data relating to such commercial products for competitive purposes. We have also added the reference to 10 USC 2320(c) to satisfy Secretary Weinberger's concern. Other than data relating to privately developed commercial products, the draft statement does not prevent DOD from obtaining any type of technical data for competitive procurement purposes that relates to noncommercial products developed with partial government and partial contractor funding. Thus, if a contractor has used internal funds to begin the development of a noncommercial, military product the Statement would in no way prevent DOD from negotiating for technical data relating to this item.

Concern--The statement will "prohibit the government's requiring contractors to deliver technical data pertaining to items developed totally at government expense unless there is a specific need for the data. This prohibition appears to extend to follow-on contracts even though data needs not initially apparent may have become known."

Response--We do not understand the basis for this statement. It appears to relate to the second paragraph of section 3 of one of our early drafts which advised agencies not to order expensive "manufacturing data" unless they foresee a need for it. This would not have affected DOD, since in most cases we assume DOD would be procuring the development of an item with an expectation of procuring it in the future if the item proves effective. Revised section 3 (now section 5) no longer contains the same language. In any case neither the earlier version or the current version should prevent DOD from obtaining technical data for procurement purposes in items wholly developed at government expense.

Concern--The statement would "preclude the acquisition of rights in software developed under a contract at government expense unless such software was a specific end product required by the contract. This, too, can serve as a bar to competitive procurement in certain situations."

Response--To fully respond it would be useful to know what type of "situations" are envisioned. However, in actual fact the statement does not precude the acquisition of rights in software unless it was a specific end product. Section 7 begins by stating the government only gets rights in software that is required to be delivered. The statement does not preclude an agency from specifying that software will be delivered.

It does state, however, that "normally" the delivery of software should not be required unless a purpose of the award is the creation of software. This is not an absolute requirement, but we believe it is a sound general rule. Scientists and engineers are constantly writing and altering computer programs to facilitate work under government R&D grants and contracts. In most cases the government is more interested in the end results than obtaining copies of software that was developed incidental to the carrying out of the work. Thus, it makes little sense in most cases for agencies to require delivery of such software. Furthermore, when a researcher sees a wider commercial market for his software, its delivery to the government will undermine his marketing efforts since it may become available to competitors through the Freedom of Information Act.

The first paragraph of section 7 may, in fact, require a change in DOD policy. The Defense Acquisition Regulation (DAR) Supplement now says that DOD will only acquire rights in computer software to meet its needs. However, it then goes on to state that DOD will take unlimited rights in computer software developed in the course of experimental, developmental, or research work specified under a contract. No explanation is given as to why DOD has such a broad need. We believe this may be the major policy issue presented by the draft Statement.

DRAFT

Government Data Policy Statement (Revised 3/27/85)

This statement provides guidance concerning the acquisition of technical data and software under government grants and contracts, except prime contracts for the operation of government-owned research or production facilities. However, it applies to subcontracts under such contracts. It is intended to (i) provide agencies with the flexibility to acquire technical data and software needed to fulfill their missions (ii) avoid unnecessary costs that result from the ordering of unneeded technical data; (iii) encourage the commercialization of new products and processes by contractors through the protection of technical data; and (iv) encourage the most qualified commercial concerns to participate in government research and development programs. It does not affect the classification of technical data and software for national security purposes.

Section 1. Definitions. As used in this Statement--

(a) "technical data" means recorded information of a scientific or technical nature. It does not include software or financial, administrative, cost and pricing, management data, and other information incidental to contract administration;

(b) "manufacturing data" means technical data and software used for the manufacture of a product or performance of a process on a commercial scale;

(c) The term "contract" includes subcontracts and the term "contractor" includes subcontractors; and

(d) "software" means computer programs, computer data bases, and documentation thereof.

Section 2. Treatment of Proposals. Proposals that have not been incoporated in an award shall be treated as confidential and not disclosed outside the government without the submitter's permission except for evaluation purposes. Parts of proposals that are incorporated in awards and which contain trade secrets or commercial or financial information shall also be treated as confidential if properly marked. Agencies shall not discriminate against marked proposals.

Section 3. Scope of Data Rights Clauses. Technical data delivery requirements should normally be fully set out at the time of contracting, but deferred ordering provisions may be used to add additional deliverables. Any rights which the government obtains to technical data will be limited to rights in data specifically required to be delivered or prepared.

Section 4. Supply Contracts. Agencies procuring standard commercial products may obtain technical data necessary for operation, maintenance or repair but not for reprocurement purposes. Notwithstanding, manufacturing data should not normally be sought.

Section 5. Engineering Development Contracts. Contracts for engineering development should be structured to prevent the disclosure of proprietary technical data related to commercial products or processes developed at private expense by contractors. For example, agencies should normally accept form, fit, and function data in lieu of manufacturing data. Or, if manufacturing data is needed, the contractor shall be allowed to mark as proprietary any data that relates to commercial products or processes developed at private expense; and the right of the government to use and disclose the data shall be specified in the contract, and shall not include the right to use the data for reprocurement purposes (except for Defense Department contracts to which 10 USC 2320(c) is applied). Use of deferred delivery provisions should also be considered. A competitive procurement of an item developed under an engineering development contract should not include in the solicitation any proprietary manufacturing data that relates to a product or process developed at private expense by a contractor which is offered or to be offered for sale commercially by the contractor (except when 10 USC 2320(c) was applied to such data).

Any technical data delivered under an engineering development contract that relates to an item develped wholly under the contract shall be taken without restrictions if competitive acquisition of the item is anticipated. When competitive acquistion is not anticipated, the contractor will be allowed to retain ownership of any such data delivered, and the agency shall reserve an unrestricted, royalty-free right to use or have its contractors use the technical data for governmental purposes (excluding publication outside the government). However, if mission needs require and this is consistent with PL 98-525 or 577, agencies may also acquire publication and other rights. Other technical data not related directly to items developed under the contract normally shall be taken without restrictions.

Section 6. Contracts for Basic and Applied Research. Agencies will normally take technical data delivered under a basic or applied research contract with the unlimited right to use and publish such data, subject to any other provisions of the contract related to inventions and patents. However, if the research involves a contractor's privately developed products or processes or if it is otherwise agreed to by the parties, proprietary data of the contractor shall be protected.

Section 7. Assistance Awards. Agencies normally should not require delivery of technical data under grants or cooperative agreements except as necessary to verify the awardee's performance. The awardee normally will be allowed to retain all

rights in technical data delivered or produced under such awards, including the right to publish and/or assert copyright, although the agency may acquire a nonexclusive, royalty-free, and worldwide license to use such technical data that is delivered or published by the awardee for internal government purposes. When considered necessary to meet program objectives or statutory requirements, agencies may also (i) reserve the right to publish technical data delivered under a grant or cooperative agreement if the awardee fails to publish the results of the research within a reasonable time and/or (ii) expand the government's license to cover State and local governments.

Section 8. Software. Unless its delivery is specifically required, agencies shall not normally acquire rights in software generated under contracts or grants. Delivery of software shall not normally be required unless a purpose of the award is the creation of software. If software has commercial potential, agencies should normally accept license rights in lieu of ownership; and consideration should be given to allowing software documentation to be maintained on the contractor's premises.

When an agency acquires existing proprietary software, it shall accept appropriate conditions limiting its right to use and disclose the software. This includes cases when proprietary software is modified to accommodate particular agency needs.

Software within the definition of "manufacturing data" at section 1(b) is subject to sections 3-7 and not this section.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
The Assistant Secretary for Productivity, Technology and Innovation
Washington, D.C. 20230
(202) 377-1984

MAR 18 1985

Honorable Mary Ann Gilleece
Deputy Under Secretary of Defense
(Acquisition Management)
Pentagon, Room 3E144
Washington, D. C. 20301

Dear Ms. Gilleece:

I have received the joint letter of March 4, 1985, concerning the efforts of the Federal Coordinating Council on Science, Engineering and Technology (FCCSET) Committee on Intellectual Property to develop a policy framework within which more detailed Government procurement and assistance regulations dealing with technical data would be drafted and evaluated. As you recall, this effort was initiated at the request of Dr. Keyworth, the President's Science Advisor, and I am enclosing a copy of his original request.

This effort is not intended to conflict with or in any way limit the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) authorities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), the Department of Defense (DOD), and the General Services Administration (GSA). However, as I trust you agree, the FAR is written against a backdrop of statutory and administrative policies that are often set outside the FAR system as such. For example, the FAR patent provisions must conform to the President's Memorandum and applicable statutes, including Chapter 18 of Title 35 and regulations issued thereunder. Similarly, if FCCSET or another higher authority can reach agreement on basic technical data principles, there would appear to be no reason why the FAR drafters should not be expected to conform the FAR to those principles.

The concerns expressed in Dr. Keyworth's letter remain valid. For years it has proven impossible to develop Federal Procurement Regulations (FPR) or FAR coverage in the technical data area for the civilian agencies. And there have been significant differences in the approaches adopted by DOD, NASA, Department of Energy (DOE), and other agencies that have issued regulations or other policy directives. We believe a major reason for this is the failure to reach agreement on basic objectives and principles.

There is also legitimate concern whether existing regulations give sufficient weight to the policy objectives of this Administration. In particular, this Administration is strongly committed to the principle that private investment and development of Government supported research should be encouraged--as evidenced by the issuance of the President's 1983 Memorandum on Government Patent Policy.

Because of the obvious interest your agency has in technical data issues, we hope that you will continue to provide input and comments during the development of the Statement.

Sincerely,

(signed)
Bruce Merrifield

D. Bruce Merrifield

Attachment

cc: Honorable George A. Keyworth II (White House)
Dr. Andrew Pettifor (OSTP)
Mr. Allan Beres (GSA)
Mr. Stuart J. Evans (NASA)

OPTI/FTMP/Norm Latker/Jesse Lasken/rh 3/14/85
bc: Dr. Merrifield
Egils Milbergs
Dr. Williams
Norm Latker
Chron
Read

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

March 19, 1984

Dear Bruce:

The allocation of rights to various technical data, developed in the performance of government contracts, is an issue with significant implications for future government-industry relationships. It is driven, for example, by the government's need to minimize the costs of the products and services it buys, as well as by industry's desire to maximize profits and maintain any competitive advantage. It is fundamental to the government's continued ability to obtain the services of the best of the private sector.

I believe that this is an issue of sufficient importance that any codification of the government's position on this issue, as in the technical data section of part 27 of the proposed Federal Acquisition Regulations, requires a thorough analysis and discussion by the various agencies, and by the private sector. I believe that the FCCSET Intellectual Property Committee would be an appropriate vehicle for examining the various kinds of technical data, for agreeing on the various government objectives in seeking access to, or protecting the proprietary nature of that data, and for developing the basis for an acceptable set of draft regulations for the government's rights to such data. Please keep me informed of your progress.

Yours truly,

G. A. Keyworth
Science Advisor to the President

Dr. D. Bruce Merrifield
Assistant Secretary for Productivity,
Technology and Innovation
Department of Commerce
Washington, D.C. 20230

EJB
NJL

DULIN, THIENPONT, POTTHAST & SNYDER, LTD.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
SUITE 606,
135 SOUTH LASALLE STREET
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60603

JACQUES M. DULIN
JAMES W. POTTHAST
RAY E. SNYDER
FRANK R. THIENPONT

(312) 263-3288
CABLE
LAWBYRINTH

PATENT BRANCH, OGC
DHEW

AUG 25 1978

August 22, 1978

Senator Robert Dole
Russell Senate Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20510

Dear Senator Dole:

Thank you for your letter of August 14, 1978 and the page from the Congressional Record dated Wednesday, August 9, 1978. I had already sent you a communication dated August 14, 1978 commending and supporting your position based on your news release. I am still amazed at the clarity with which you have analyzed the problem, and the logic of your proposed solution.

Patents generally are not of universal interest, and some of your colleagues, namely Nelson and Long, no doubt have made hay back home in haranguing on the governments' treatment of them. In fact, dealing with inventions is fairly intricate, and patents are a vital link for effecting the transfer of technology you refer to.

I believe that much of the furor and confusion expressed by some of your colleagues and members of the administration stem from a lack of understanding of just what a patent is and how it functions. There seems to be a real hang-up over the concept of granting anyone a monopoly, albeit a very restricted one. In truth it is not very much of a monopoly. The worst that can happen is that a competitor affected by another's patent may have to get off his duff and develop something as good or better in order to compete. In this sense, patents can be a strong force for stimulating competition. There may be a temporary howl, but any company still in the business of making buggy whips should upgrade its product line.

As a final comment, I was particularly pleased with your reference to the position of the patent counsel for the DHEW. I have known Mr. Norm Latker for many years and am intimately aware of his stand on the handling of these matters--even to the point of jeopardizing his job. In my opinion, Mr. Latker has done more toward placing DHEW sponsored inventions into the hands of the public than any other individual and perhaps more than all of the rest of DHEW combined.

If I can be of further assistance in this matter, I am at your service.

Very truly yours,

Ray E. Snyder

Ray E. Snyder

RES:cs

bcc:Donald W. Banner, Esq.
Howard Bremmer, Esq.
Mr. Paul R. Keenan
Dr. Martin Rachmeler
Norman J. Latker, Esq.

CONFERENCE AUDIENCE INVITATION LIST

Mr. Robert A. Schoellhorn
Chief Executive Officer
Abbott Laboratories- Abbott Park
North Chicago, IL 60064

Mr. Robert S. Janicki
Vice President, Pharmeceutical
Products Research & Development
Abbott Laboratories, Abbott Park
North Chicago, IL 60064

Mr. W. J. Sanders, III
Chairman, President and
Chief Executive Officer
Advanced Micro Devices, Incorporated
901 Thompson Place
Sunnyvale, CA 94086

Mr. Edward L. Hennessy, Jr.
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Allied-Signal Companies
Columbia Road and Park Avenue
Morristown, NJ 07960

Mr. Albert E. Germain
Tax Counsel
Aluminum Company of America
1501 Alcoa Building
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

Mr. Charles W. Parry
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Aluminum Company of America
1501 Alcoa Building
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

Mr. Eugene R. White
Chairman
Amdahl Corporation
1250 E. Arques Avenue
Sunnyvale, CA 94086

Mr. George Sella, Jr.
Chairman, President and
Chief Executive Officer
American Cyanamid Company
One Cyanamid Plaza
Wayne, NJ 07470

Mr. Claude Barfield
Resident, Fellow Science and Technology Policy
American Enterprise Institute
1150 17th Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Mr. Edward A. Mason
Vice President, Research
Amoco
200 East Randolph Drive
Chicago, IL 60601

Mr. Walter F. Raab
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
AMP, Incorporated
Post Office Box 3608
Harrisburg, PA 17105

Mr. John Sculley
President and Chief Executive Officer
Apple Computer, Incorporated
20525 Mariana Avenue
Cupertino, CA 95014

Mr. James C. Morgan
President and Chief Executive Officer
Applied Materials, Incorporated
3050 Bowers Avenue
Santa Clara, CA 95051

Mr. Emmett W. Hines
Director, Government Relations
Armstrong World Industries
1025 Connecticut Avenue, N. W.
Suite 1007
Washington, D. C. 20036

Mr. Joseph L. Jones
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Armstrong World Industries, Incorporated
Liberty and Charlotte Streets
Lancaster, PA 17604

Mr. Irving Levin
Senior Consultant
Arthur D. Little, Incorporated
4 Embarcadero Center
San Francisco, CA 94111

Mr. Peter E. Glaser
Vice President for Advances
in Technology
Arthur D. Little, Incorporated
25 Acorn Park
Cambridge, MA 02140

Mr. James E. Olson
Vice Chairman
AT & T
550 Madison Avenue
New York, NY 10022

Mr. Charles L. Brown
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
AT & T
550 Madison Avenue
New York, NY 10022

Mr. Vernon R. Loucks, Jr.
President and Chief Executive Officer
Baxter Travenol Laboratories
1 Baxter Parkway
Deerfield, IL 60015

Dr. Robert A. Patterson, M. D.
Senior Vice President of Scientific Affairs
Baxter Travenol Laboratories
1 Baxter Parkway
Deerfield, IL 60015

Mr. G. S. C. Wang Mr.
Manager, Research and Engineering
Bechtel Group Incorporated
50 Beale Street
San Francisco, CA 94150

Mr. James H. Leonard
Vice President, Technology
Bethlehem Steel Corporation
Bethlehem, PA 18016
Mr. Donald H. Trautlein
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Bethlehem Steel Corporation
2118 Martin Tower
Bethlehem, PA 18016

Ms. Jane Cicala
Senior Administrator
Governmental & International Affairs
Boeing Company
Post Office Box 3707
Seattle, WA 98124

Mr. Thornton A. Wilson
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Boeing Company
Post Office Box 3707
Seattle, WA 98124

Mr. James F. Bere
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Borg-Warner Corporation
200 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, IL 60604

Mr. Richard L. Gelb
Chairman of the Board and
Chief Executive Officer
Bristol-Myers Company
345 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10154

Mr. Charles A. Heimbold, Jr.
Sr. Vice President for
Planning and Development
Bristol-Myers Co.,Inc.
345 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10154

Mr. George T. Maloney
President
C. R. Bard
371 Central Avenue
Murray Hill, NJ 07974

Mr. Robert H. McCaffrey
Chairman of the Board and
Chief Executive Officer
C. R. Bard
731 Central Avenue
Murray Hill, NJ 07974

Mr. Robert A. Charpie
President
Cabot Corporation
125 High Street
Boston, MA 02110

Mr. George A. Schaefer
Chairman of the Board
Caterpillar Tractor Company
100 North East Adams Street
Peoria, IL 61629

Mr. John D. Macomber
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Celanese Corporation
1211 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036

Mr. Peter Crawford
Vice President, Information Services
Citibank, N. A.
399 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10043

Mr. William C. Norris
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Control Data Corporation
8100 34th Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55420

Mr. John W. Lacey
Executive Vice President for
Technology and Planning
Control Data Corporation
8100 34th Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55420

Mr. Amory Houghton
Chairman, Executive Committee
Corning Glass Works
Houghton Park
Corning, NY 14831

Mr. John A. Rollwagon
Chairman, President and
Chief Executive Officer
Cray Research, Incorporated
608 Second Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55402

Mr. John Mumford
Crosspoint Venture Associates
Post Office Box 10101
Palo Alto, CA 94303

Mr. Michael Dale
DALECO Research and Development, Inc.
3388 Via Lido
Fourth Floor
Newport Beach, CA 92663

Mr. Gerald B. Mitchell
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Dana Corporation
Post Office Box 1100
Toledo, OH 43697

Mr. Robert A. Hanson
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Deere and Company
John Deere Road
Moline, IL 61265

Mr. Paul F. Oreffice
President and Chief Executive Officer
Dow Chemical Company
2030 Willard N. Dow Center
Midland, MI 48640

Mr. Howard E. Simmons
Director, Central Research and Development
E. I. Dupont De Nemours & Company
1007 North Market Street
Wilmington, DE 19898

Mr. Edward G. Jefferson
Chief Executive Officer
E.I. duPont de Nemours and Co., Inc.
1007 Market Street
Wilmington, DE 19898

Mr. Leo J. Thomas, Jr.
Senior Vice President (Research)
Eastman Kodak Company
343 State Street
Rochester, NY 14650

Mr. Colby H. Chandler
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Eastman Kodak Company
343 State Street
Rochester, NY 14650

Mr. DeSoto Jordan
Vice President, Government Affairs
EDS Corporation
229 Pennsylvania Avenue, S. E.
Washington, D. C. 20003

Mr. H. Ross Perot
Chairman
EDS Corporation
721721 Forrest Lane
Dallas, TX 75230

Mr. R. William Gorin
E. F. Hutton & Company, Inc.
One Battery Park Plaza
New York, NY 10004

Mr. Gene Mannella
Deputy Director
Electric Power Research Institute
1800 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, D. C. 20036

Mr. Edward E. David, Jr.
President
Exxon Research and Engineering Company
Post Office Box 101
Florham Park, NJ 07932

Mr. C. C. Garvin
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Exxon Corporation
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10020

Mr. David S. Tappan, Jr.
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Fluor Corporation
3333 Michelson Drive
Irvine, CA 92730

Mr. Robert H. Malott
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
FMC Corporation
200 East Randolph Drive
Chicago, IL 60601

Mr. Donald E. Petersen
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Ford Motor Company
The American Road
Dearborn, MI 48121

Mr. Howard G. Schaeffer
Freshman, Marantz, Orlanski,
Comsky and Deutsch
9100 Wilshire Boulevard
8th Floor, East Tower
Beverly Hills, CA 90212

Mr. Robert Swanson
President
Genentech
460 Point San Bruno Boulevard
San Francisco, CA 94080

Mr. Roland W. Schmitt
Senior Vice President for
Corporate Research and Development
General Electric Company
3135 Easton Turnpike
Fairfield, CT 06430

Mr. John F. Welch
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
General Electric Co.
3135 Easton Turnpike
Fairfield, CT 06431

Mr. Phillips S. Peter
Vice President
Corporate Government Relations
General Electric Company
1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W.
Suite 800
Washington, D. C. 20004

Dr. Paul F. Chenea
Vice President for Research
General Motors Corporation
3044 West Grand Boulevard
Detroit, MI 48202

Mr. Robert A. Frosch
Vice President, Research Laboratories
General Motors Corporation, U. S. A.
767 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10153

Mr. Roger B. Smith
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
General Motors Corporation
3044 West Grand Boulevard
Detroit, MI 48202

Mr. William R. Thurston
President and Chief Executive Officer
Genrad, Incorporated
300 Baker Avenue
Concord, MA 01742

Mr. David A. Kelso
Special Investments
Goldman, Sachs & Company
85 Broad Street
New York, NY 10004

Mr. William R. Ylvisaker
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Gould Incorporated
10 Gould Center
Rolling Meadows, IL 60008

Mr. John F. Carr
Vice Chairman of the Board
Grumman Corporation
1000 Wilson Boulevard
Suite 2100
Arlington, VA 22209

Mr. Theodore F. Brophy
Chairman
GTE Corporation
One Stamford Forum
Stamford, CT 06904

Mr. Thomas H. Cruikshank
President and Chief Executive Officer
Halliburton Company
400 North Olive LB 263
Dallas, TX 75201

Mr. William Perry
Hambrecht and Quist
235 Montgomery Street
Suite 530
San Francisco, CA 94101

Mr. Joseph A. Boyd
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Harris Corporation
Melbourne, FL 32919

Mr. Robert H. Kessel
Herrick and Smith
100 Federal Street
Boston, MA 02110

Mr. David Packard
Chairman of the Board
Hewlett-Packard
3000 Hanover Street
Palo Alto, CA 94304

Mr. John A. Young
President and Chief Executive Officer
Hewlett-Packard
3000 Hanover Street
Palo Alto, CA 94304

Mr. John L. Doyle
Vice President for Research and Development
Hewlett-Packard
3000 Hanover Street
Palo Alto, CA 94304

Mr. Gerald Lore
Director of Federal Government Affairs
Hoffmann-LaRoche, Incorporated
30040 Kingsland Street
Nutley, NJ 07110-1199

Mr. Irwin Lerner
Chief Executive Officer
Hoffmann-LaRoche, Incorporated
30040 Kingsland Street
Nutley, NJ 07110-1199

Mr. Edson W. Spencer
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Honeywell Incorporated
Honeywell Plaza
Minneapolis, MN 55408

Mr. William B. Johnson
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
I. C. Industries, Incorporated
One Illinois Center
Chicago, IL 60601

Mr. Ralph E. Gomory
Vice President for Research
IBM Corporate Headquarters
Old Orchard Road
Armonk, NY 10504

Mr. John F. Akers
President and Chief Executive Officer
IBM Corporation
Old Orchard Road
Armonk, NY 10504

Mr. John R. Opel
Chairman of the Board
IBM Corporate Headquarters
Old Orchard Road
Armonk, NY 10504

Mr. Gordon E. Moore
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
INTEL Corporation
3065 Bowers Avenue
Santa Clara, CA 95051

Mr. Rand V. Araskog
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
ITT Corporation
320 Park Avenue
New York, NY

Mr. Roy A. Anderson
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Lockheed Corporation
2555 Hollywood Way
Building 61
Burbank, CA 91503

Mr. Mitchell D. Kapor
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Lotus Development Corporation
161 First Street
Cambridge, MA 02142

Mr. Raymond A. Hay
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
LTV Corporation
Post Office Box 5003
Dallas, TX 75222

Mr. Thomas J. Pownall
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Martin Marietta Corporation
6801 Rockledge Drive
Bethesda, MD 20817

Mr. James E. Cunningham
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
McDermott International, Incorporated
1010 Common Street
New Orleans, LA 70160

Mr. Thomas M. Gunn
Staff Vice President-Washington
McDonnell Douglas Corporation
1225 Jefferson Davis Highway
Suite 800
Arlington, VA 22202

Mr. John Huck
Chairman of the Board
Merck, Sharp and Dohme Research Laboratories
Post Office Box 2000
Rahway, NJ 07065

Mr. P. Roy Vagelos
President and Chief Executive Officer
Merck, Sharp and Dohme Research Laboratories
Post Office Box 2000
Rahway, NJ 07065

Mr. Hirman W. Emery, Jr.
Managing Director
Merrill Lynch Capital Markets
165 Broadway
1 Liberty Plaza - 44th Floor
New York, NY 10023

Mr. Glen Haney
President and Chief Executive Officer
Micropro International Corporation
33 San Pablo Avenue
San Rafael, CA 94903

Mr. Lewis W. Lehr
Chief Executive Officer
Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Co.
General Offices/3M
3M Center
Saint Paul, MN 55144

Mr. Lester C. Krogh
Vice President, Research and Development
Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Company
3M Center
Saint Paul, MN 55144

Mr. A. E. Klauser
Senior Vice President
Mitsui and Company (U.S.A.), Inc.
1701 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W.
Suite 400
Washington, D. C. 20006

Mr. Rawleigh Warner, Jr.
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Mobil Corporation
150 East 42nd Street
New York, NY 10017

Dr. Howard A. Schneiderman
Senior Vice President for
Research and Development
Monsanto Company
800 North Lindbergh Boulevard
Saint Louis, MO 63167

Mr. Richard Mahoney
President and Chief Executive Officer
Monsanto Company
800 North Lindbergh Boulevard
Saint Louis, MO 63167