STANFORD UNIVERSITY
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA 94305
Area Code (415) 497-0651
Telex: 348402 STANFRD STNU

OFFICE OF
TECHNOLOGY LICENSING
105 Encina Hall

April 16, 1984

Ms. Darcia Bracken
Department of Commerce
14th and Constitution NW, Room 4816
Washington, DC 20230

Dear Darcia:

Attached is the information you requested about the "informal survey" that I made of 20 universities active in technology transfer. As you can see, I got 16 responses which wasn't too bad. One attachment is a copy of the letter I sent out to the universities and a sample response. The other attachment is my handwritten notes tabulating the responses.

Let me know if you have any questions, and please give my regards to Joe and Norm.

Very truly yours,

Niels J. Reimers
Director, Technology Licensing

Enclosures
NJR:kla

STANFORD UNIVERSITY
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA 94305

Area Code (415) 497-0651
Telex: 348402 STANFRD STNU

OFFICE OF
TECHNOLOGY LICENSING
105 Encina Hall

RECEIVED
APR 11 '83
PATENTS & LICENSES

April 6, 1983

Mr. Theodore C. Wood
Manager
Patents and Licensing
Cornell University
P.O. Box Dh, Day Hall
Ithica, NY 14853

TCW
SFC
RR
FILE HFR RETURN

Subject: Experience Under PL 96-517 (as Implemented by OFPP Circular A124 "Patents-Small Firms and Non-Profit Organizations, Effective Date 3/1/82")

Dear Ted:

This is an informal survey of about 20 universities active in technology transfer to gain some insight into the effect PL 96-517 may be having on our operations.

I hope you'll be able to respond within two weeks. If any questions will take a significant effort in order to prepare a response, please just skip the question. All respondents will get a summary of the survey results.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Very truly yours,

Niels J. Reimers
Director, Technology Licensing

Enclosure
NJR:jm

PL 96-517 Survey

1. Number of disclosures

	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982
Number:	41	45	43	27	56

2. Administration

Extent PL 96-517 effected patent administration (as opposed to licensing) such as negotiation of patent clauses, petitions for release of rights, reporting, etc.

more admin | (no change) | some reduction | large reduction | (circle closest)

Estimated "full time equivalent" change 0
(Example: less 0.8 FTE)

Result of reduced (or increased) administrative FTE "person power."

Reduction in force or transfer? _____

Used to Increase licensing effort? _____

Other _____

3. Licensing

Change in licensing staff in FTE (post PL 96-157) 0
(Example: +1.5 FTE)

4. Industry Research Support

In your opinion, has the reduced prospect of "contamination" (through certainty of rights to government-supported research results) led to greater industry-university research collaborations? (Circle)

No | No opinion | (Probably) | Definitely | Other _____

Percent change in proportion of industry research support (to total research support) over last 5 years:

From 4.1 % in 1978 to 5.2 % in 1982.

perience with Government Agency Exceptions

n agency "may" (A124, Paragraph 7.a.) exempt a Go Co or specific funding agreements from the standard A124 patent rights clause, which gives a first option to contractor.

If your institution manages a Go Co, has any agency exercised the exemption; i.e., continues to require petitions for release of rights?

No Go Co	yes	no	Agency
1	X		NSF

Number (if any) of funding agreements, by agency, for which exemption exercised.

NSF-1
(Example: DOE-5)

6. Government Research Laboratories

It has been postulated government research laboratories act to:

(a) reduce level of extramural funding, becoming "competitors" with university faculty/student researchers, particularly in energy research, and

(b) make it difficult to encourage industry to invest in development of promising scientific discoveries, particularly in energy, because of "competition" by these laboratories.

Your reaction to (a): don't know
("dont know," "more perceived than real," etc.)

Your reaction to (b): don't know

Any specifics?

Yes No (Circle)

7. Post PL 96-517

Indicate if you see any intellectual property problems at the agency-university interface that could be improved.

Invention reporting obligations. We can usually determin
overnment has rights but can't identify each grant from
articularly "Cooperative Research" grants.

5. Experience with Government Agency Exceptions

An agency "may" (A124, Paragraph 7.a.) exempt a Go Co or specific funding agreements from the standard A124 patent rights clause, which gives a first option to contractor.

If your institution manages a Go Co, has any agency exercised the exemption; i.e., continues to require petitions for release of rights?

No Go Co	(yes)	no	
1	X		Agency NSF

Number (if any) of funding agreements, by agency, for which exemption exercised.

NSF-1

(Example: DOE-5)

6. Government Research Laboratories

It has been postulated government research laboratories act to:

(a) reduce level of extramural funding, becoming "competitors" with university faculty/student researchers, particularly in energy research, and

(b) make it difficult to encourage industry to invest in development of promising scientific discoveries, particularly in energy, because of "competition" by these laboratories.

Your reaction to (a): don't know
("dont know," "more perceived than real," etc.)

Your reaction to (b): don't know

Any specifics? Yes No (Circle)

7. Post PL 96-517

Indicate if you see any intellectual property problems at the agency-university interface that could be improved.

Invention reporting obligations. We can usually determine if government has rights but can't identify each grant from each agency, particularly "Cooperative Research" grants.

PL 96-517 Survey

1. No. of Disclosures

	78	79	80	81	82	TOTAL
Boston U	13	21	11	25	32	102
U. Wash	23	22	24	28	33	130
Iowa State	32	49	47	46	51	225
Iowa	28	17	25	27	31	128
Texas A & M	15	17	18	20	39	109
Mich State	16	9	12	12	19	68
Penn	12	43*	19	28	24	126
Wash. Univ	-	-	-		-	
UC System	134	219	214	235	308	1,110
Oregon State	22	26	17	26	28	119
Northwestern	11	21	14	14	17	77
SUNY	5	23	18	33	36	115
Virginia	56*	21	12	21	16	126
Stanford	85*	67	143	190	142	577
	455	557	573	657	776	3,018

* 2 unusual blips

Duke	0	0	41	32	44
Cornell	41	45	43	27	56
MIT					
Harvard					

5/8/83

PL 96-517 Survey

2. Admin

More	No change	some reduction	large Reduction
1	~~IIII~~ III	~~IIII~~ I	1

- FTE change + reason

-X FTE	reduced admin
-0.2	"
+0.5	increase licensing
X	industry interaction
X	negligible red.
-0.1	reduced admin
0.5	" (SU)

less 0.2 FTE
[illegible]

3. Licensing

1	Independent Foundation does licensing
~~IIII~~ ~~IIII~~	None
+1.0 II	Caveat - reflects all industry interaction
+0.5 I	
+2 I	Little to do w 96-517
2 I	SU - "

4. Industry Research

	No	No Opinion	Prob.	Definitely	Others
"reduced contam., affected ind-univ.?	1	1	~~IIII~~ ~~IIII~~ I	II	

- % change industry support over last 5 years.

From	To	From	To	From	To		
1%	4%	4	5	0.58	2.55	4.1	5.2
3.01	5.12	1 weak U	8 *	>1	>2		
2.6	4.0	6 oregon state	10	"pos. trend"			

* not solely 96-517

5. Gov. Agency Exceptions

UC	6	Go Cos	DOE
SU	1		DOE
ISU	1		DOE
Cornell	1		NSF

6. Gov. Research Labs

(a) Competitor for research?

(b) " industry?

probably	don't know	More Forceful Channel	Definite	Minor
1 a+b	~~IIII~~ II a+b	1 (a)	II (a) 1 (b)	1 (a)

Specifics: Texas A+M
Iowa State

"Funds reduced as agencies transfer $ thru each other"

7. Post PL 96-517

now ok

UC DOD hasn't impl. A124, waiting for DAR Council

SUNY "Problems re ownership of TRP"

Va Agency attitude "universities getting free rise"
Go Co's which are non-weapon-related should have A124

Duke Standardize reporting - DHHS reports too much

Cornell Invention reporting - particularly multiple gov support