

## PATENT AND TRADEMARK LAW AMENDMENTS

SEPTEMBER 23, 1980.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. BROOKS, from the Committee on Government Operations,  
submitted the following

### REPORT

together with

### ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 6933]

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

The Committee on Government Operations, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 6933) entitled "To amend the patent and trademark laws," having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendments (stated in terms of the page and line numbers of the bill as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary) are as follows:

Page 43, line 18, strike out "six months of" and insert in lieu thereof line 2 on page 46 and redesignate the succeeding section accordingly.

Page 43, line 18, strike out "six months of" and insert in lieu thereof "two years after".

Page 43, line 17, strike out "(a)" and on page 44, beginning on line 4, strike out all of subsection (b) through line 9.

Page 44, beginning on line 10, strike out all of section 11 through line 2 on page 46 and redesignate the succeeding section accordingly.

### JURISDICTION UNDER SEQUENTIAL REFERRAL

H.R. 6933 was reported to the House by the Committee on the Judiciary on September 9, 1980. It was then sequentially referred to the Committee on Government Operations for consideration of provisions of the bill and amendment which fall within the jurisdiction of the committee. These provisions deal with Federal procurement generally and matters involving reorganizations in the executive branch. The

committee's consideration was only for a period of two weeks and it was required to report no later than September 23. The time restraint under which the committee was forced to act limited the scope and depth of its study and adequate treatment could not be given to the extensive changes in patent policy proposed in this legislation. These changes and the purported justification for them deserve full consideration.

It was determined that Sections 1 through 5, dealing with certain procedures and fees, were not within the jurisdiction of the committee. The committee's jurisdiction does cover those sections dealing with Government policies for retaining or disposing of contract inventions developed during the course of or under Government contracts and related matters, and those sections dealing with the reorganization or transfer of individual units of Government.

#### EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENTS

The first amendment deletes from the bill Section 9, which requires the Comptroller General to submit to Congress and the President a report describing the functioning of the Patent and Trademark Office, the Copyright Office, and the Copyright Royalty Tribunal. The Patent and Trademark Office is located in the Department of Commerce, the Copyright Office is located in the Library of Congress, and the Copyright Royalty Tribunal is a separate unit in the legislative branch. The report would analyze the efficiency of these agencies and make recommendations on the desirability of merging the Copyright Office and the Copyright Royalty Tribunal with the Patent and Trademark Office.

The second amendment alters Section 10(a) of the bill, which requires the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks to report to Congress within six months after enactment a plan to computerize the data in the Trademark Office. The committee amendment would permit the Commissioner to have two years to make the report.

The third amendment would delete Section 10(b), which would require the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks to report to Congress every six months on the progress being made in implementing computer technology in the Patent and Trademark Office.

The fourth amendment deletes Section 11 of the bill, which removes the Patent and Trademark Office from the Department of Commerce and sets it up as an independent agency.

#### SUMMARY AND PURPOSE

H.R. 6933, as reported by the Judiciary Committee, revises the patent and trademark laws to provide for various changes in procedure in the Patent and Trademark Office in the Department of Commerce; establishes a new uniform Government-wide patent policy regarding the retention or disposal of rights to contract inventions made by private businesses and non-profit organizations developed in the course of or under Federal contracts; by Federal employees in consequence of their employment or with Federal funds; and policy dealing with the licensing of Federally-owned inventions. The bill repeals a num-

ber of congressional enactments relating to patents for individual programs or agencies. It also called for certain studies and reports and would remove the Patent and Trademark Office from the Department of Commerce and set it up as an independent agency.

The Committee on Government Operations does not agree with those provisions of the bill which would remove the Patent Office from Commerce; or require the Comptroller to make a study of the possibility of merging the Copyright Office, now in the Library of Congress with the Patent Office, and recommends that these provisions be deleted from the bill. It also disagrees with the provision to require the Commissioner of Patents to report within a period of six months on a plan to computerize data in the Patent Office. The committee recommends that a period of two years be given for such a report.

#### COMMITTEE ACTION AND VOTE

The Committee on Government Operations at a duly called meeting on September 23, ordered reported H.R. 6933 with amendments by a vote of 32 ayes and 0 noes.

#### HEARINGS

Hearings on H.R. 6933 were held by the Subcommittee on Legislation and National Security on September 16 and 17, 1980. Testimony was received from Philip M. Klutznick, the Secretary of Commerce; from Admiral H. G. Rickover, Deputy Commander for Nuclear Power, Naval Sea Systems; Daniel J. Boorstin, the Librarian of Congress; Karen H. Williams, Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy, Office of Management and Budget; and Ky P. Ewing, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice.

Differing views were presented by these witnesses, all of whom were high ranking and responsible officials of the Government. Their testimonies raised questions which merit careful study by the Congress.

#### DISCUSSION

The Committee on Government Operations recognizes the necessity of making improvements in the operation of the Patent and Trademark Office. The issuing of patents is an important part of our efforts to keep America in a position of technological leadership. Every effort should be made to encourage our inventors and creators to develop innovative products. Many complaints have been made about the Patent Office and the service it renders. Every reasonable step should be taken to speed up its work and reduce the backlog of applications not yet acted upon.

The Committee, however, does not feel that all of the proposals made in the legislation are needed in the manner presented. In fact, some may be counterproductive.

#### COPYRIGHT OFFICE STUDY

One proposal in the original bill calls for a study by the Comptroller General analyzing the efficiency of the Patent and Trademark Office, the Copyright Office, and the Copyright Royalty Tribunal. It seems to

us that such a study of the Patent Office is unnecessary. Its deficiencies are well known. The suggested study of the Copyright Office and the Copyright Royalty Tribunal seemed directed toward the possible merger of these two offices with the Patent Office. During our subcommittee hearings, we heard testimony from the Librarian of Congress, who supervises the work of the Copyright Office. It was his testimony that the Office had recently undergone an investigation by the House Committee on Appropriations and had been subject to an internal audit by the Library of Congress within the past year. A number of changes in its operations have been brought about and that Office is now operating under a new copyright law which became effective in 1978 and a new Register of Copyrights has been appointed. Furthermore, there has been an entire staff relocation during which the Office was moved, and such relocations bring about some disruption in operation. It was his opinion, and the committee agreed, that an investigation at this time would serve no useful purpose and that a possible merger of those offices should not take place in the immediate future. The committee, therefore, recommended an amendment that would delete the proposed study and report.

#### PATENT OFFICE REORGANIZATION

The bill as reported by the Judiciary Committee would remove the Patent Office from the Department of Commerce, where it has been located for many years, and establish it as an independent agency. This proposal is apparently based on the assumption that the Patent Office would function more efficiently and be able to claim greater resources as an independent agency. The committee explored this matter at some length and heard testimony from the Secretary of Commerce. Secretary Klutznick, speaking for the Administration, strongly opposed the removal of the agency from the Department. He cited actions which had been taken in the recent past. A zero base analysis of Patent-Trademark Office operations produced an internal reorganization of the Office to strengthen and integrate its financial and planning activities. The financial resources of the Office have been improved. The Secretary said, "Under this Administration, the budget of the PTO has increased at a faster rate than that of the Commerce Department as a whole." He said that in the fiscal year 1981 budget, made at a time of severe budgetary constraint, a \$6,300,000 increase in the PTO appropriation was requested. He also stated that the fee provisions contained in this legislation are a major initiative to place the financing of the PTO on a more secure basis by revising its funding mechanism and by requiring that fees be set to recover a substantial portion of the PTO's operating expenses.

It is expected that if an independent Patent Office were established with its own administrative hierarchy, and which must make available the facilities and services that are now being provided by the Department of Commerce, such a reorganization would be a very costly operation. Furthermore, taking the Patent Office out of Commerce will not necessarily enhance its efficiency or improve its services to the business community and the public. What further changes in operations may be needed could just as well be done within the Department of Commerce.

As experience has shown, any reorganization requires a temporary slowdown in operations and procedures until the new organization has been put into effect. There is no way to estimate how long such a slowdown could take.

An independent PTO will not necessarily in itself bring about an increase in the number of patent examiners nor in the amount of funding available to the Office, but steady improvement in the efficiency of the agency will produce the climate to obtain greater resources. The committee, therefore, recommends that the provision in the bill making the Patent and Trademark Office an independent agency be deleted and the Office remain in the Department of Commerce.

#### DEVELOPMENT OF A COMPUTERIZED DATA AND RETRIEVAL SYSTEM

H.R. 6933, as amended, requires the Commissioner of the Patent and Trademark Office to identify and, if necessary, develop a computerized data and retrieval system. The committee believes such a system is essential if the Patent Office is to effectively fulfill its responsibilities under this legislation.

In 1978, the Committee on Government Operations conducted a review of the Patent Office's management and use of computer resources. That study revealed that the Patent Office had failed to apply modern technology to its operations and that serious technical and operating problems continued to plague the agency. Deficiencies were especially apparent in the Patent Office project to develop a computerized data and retrieval system.

In the mid-1960's, the Patent Office prepared a plan to have delivered a computerized system which would electronically prepare patents for printing and which would prepare a data base of approved patents which ultimately would be retrievable for patent searches.

In order to implement the Patent Office's plan, a contract was awarded to International Computaprint Corporation (ICC) in April of 1970 for one year, with two one-year options, at a cost of \$10,053,-766.71 per year.

Although the plan called for the Patent Office both to assume operation of the work performed by the contractor and to develop a retrieval system for patent searches, the Patent Office failed to do either. By 1978, the Patent Office had contracted with ICC for over seven years and during this period had granted the contractor nine extensions on a noncompetitive, sole-source basis. Overall, the Patent Office has paid this contractor in excess of \$32 million even though the data base, as required under the original contract, is incomplete. In addition, the Patent Office's ill-fated attempts to develop a retrieval system has cost millions.

On three separate occasions, the Patent Office ostensibly sought to compete the data base contract work. Each time the effort was aborted. These actions raised serious questions about the legality and propriety of both the Commerce Department's and the Patent Office's management of this project, particularly (a) the methods by which the Patent Office sought to implement this plan, (b) the extent to which the original objectives of the plan have been met, and (c) the extent to which the actions of the Patent Office and Commerce Department have been legal and proper.

The committee believes it is essential for the Patent Office to conduct a thorough review of its ADP management to insure that the deficiencies illustrated by its ill-fated data base and retrieval project have been corrected. Such a study should be conducted and the problems resolved before any new effort to develop a computer system is initiated.

It is the committee's view, however, that a six-month timeframe is too short for adequate and comprehensive consideration and development of such a system. In order to insure that the system which is proposed is adequate to the needs of PTO and as efficient and economical as possible, the committee has extended the time for this report to be submitted to Congress to two years.

H.R. 6933, as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, also required the Commissioner to report to the Congress every six months on the progress being made in implementing a program of computer technology. In the interest of curtailing burdensome reporting requirements that are of limited use, the Committee on Government Operations has removed this reporting requirement. The committee believes that the same purpose should be served through the oversight process of committees of Congress having jurisdiction over the Patent and Trademark Office.

## SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

### SECTIONS 1-5

Section 1 of the bill adds seven new sections to the patent laws to establish a patent reexamination system. These seven new sections would constitute Chapter 30 of Title 35 of the United States Code.

Section 2 of the bill would restructure and modernize Section 41 of Title 35 of the United States Code, the basic fee provision of the patent laws.

Section 3 of the bill would amend Section 41 of Title 35 of the United States Code to provide for the crediting of fee revenue to the Patent and Trademarks Office Appropriation Account.

Section 4 of the bill is a technical amendment to Section 154 of the patent law necessitated by creation of the maintenance fee system.

Section 5 of the bill amends Section 31 of the Trademark Act of 1946, as amended (15 U.S.C. 1113) to modernize the trademark fee system.

Inasmuch as these provisions are not within the jurisdiction of the Government Operations Committee, the reported bill makes no changes in sections 1 through 5 of H.R. 6933 as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary. (See House Report 96-1307, Part I, for explanation.)

### SECTION 6

Section 6 of the bill amends Title 35 of the United States Code by adding after chapter 37 a new Chapter 38, the Government Patent Policy Act of 1980.

#### *Section 381. Title*

Section 381 provides for the chapter to be known as the Government Patent Policy Act of 1980.

*Section 382. Contract inventions; reporting*

Section 382 defines "contract inventions" and sets forth a contractor's responsibility with regard to a contract invention.

Subsection (a) defines "contract inventions" as "inventions made in the course of or under Federal contracts."

Subsection (b) requires that all contractors provide the responsible Federal agency with timely reports on each contract invention containing sufficient technical information to inform the Government as to the nature of the invention and a list of each country, if any, in which the contractor elects to file a patent application.

The Government is prohibited from publishing or releasing these reports until the earlier of one year from receipt of the invention disclosure or the contractor has had a reasonable time to file a patent application; the Government also must withhold such information from other records or reports.

Subsection (c) provides that the responsible agency may deprive a contractor who unreasonably fails to file the reports required by subsection (b) of any or all of the rights it otherwise would have under subchapter I pertaining to the contract invention for which such report has been unreasonably withheld.

*Section 383. Allocation of rights—small businesses and nonprofit organizations*

Subsection (a) provides for the acquisition of title to contract inventions by contractors which are either a small business or a nonprofit organization. They would acquire title in each country listed under section (b)(2) of section 382 in which they filed a patent application within a reasonable time; their title would be subject to the Government's minimum rights under section 386 and to march-in rights under section 387.

Subsection (b) provides for acquisition of title to contract inventions by the Government in each country in which a small business or nonprofit organization elects not to file a patent application or fails to file within a reasonable time.

*Section 384. Allocation of rights—other contractors*

Subsection (a) provides that a contractor that is not a small business or nonprofit organization will have four and one-half years from the filing of an invention report under section 382(b) to select one or more fields of use which it intends to commercialize or otherwise achieve public use under an exclusive license. During the four and one-half year period the contractor will have temporary title to the invention, subject to the Government's right under the Act.

Subsection (b) provides for the contractor to receive an exclusive license in each described field of use if it files a United States patent application within a reasonable time. The contractor's license is subject to the Government's minimum rights under section 386 and march-in rights under section 387.

Subsection (c) provides that the contractor will automatically acquire an exclusive license for each described field of use by operation of law ninety days after providing the responsible agency with the field of use report required by subsection (a) of section 384 unless the

agency earlier notifies the contractor of a contrary determination under subsection (d) of this section with respect to such field of use.

Subsection (d) sets forth the basis for an agency determination that a contractor will not receive an exclusive license in a selected field of use; if the responsible agency determines that the contractor's possession of such license (1) would impair national security; or (2) would create or maintain a situation inconsistent with the antitrust laws.

Subsection (e) provides that, whenever an agency determines that a contractor will not receive an exclusive license in any field of use, it must include in its determination written reasons, and that the contractor has the right of appeal de novo to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals within sixty days after the determination is issued. The Court of Customs and Patent Appeals is given exclusive jurisdiction to affirm, reverse, or modify the agency determination. Specifically included is the authority for the court to order the responsible agency to issue an exclusive license to the contractor.

Subsection (f) permits the contractor to obtain title to any contract invention in any foreign country in which the contractor agrees to file a patent application, unless the responsible agency determines that the national interest would be affected adversely, which should not occur except in extraordinary circumstances. However, title will be subject to the Government minimum rights under section 386 and march-in rights under section 387. If the contractor does not file a patent application within a reasonable time, then the Government may acquire title to patents on the contract invention.

#### *Section 385. Contractor license*

Subsection 385 automatically grants a nonexclusive, royalty free license to each contractor complying with subsection (b) of section 382 to practice the contract invention in all countries in which it neither receives title under subsection (a) of section 383 nor has an exclusive license under subsection (b) of section 384. This nonexclusive contractor license may be revoked by the Government only to the extent necessary to grant an exclusive license under subchapter III.

#### *Section 386. Minimum Government rights*

Subsection (a) sets forth the minimum rights the Government has in every contract invention, unless waived under the authority of section 388. These minimum rights are:

- (1) The right to require from the contractor written reports on the use of the invention if patented;
- (2) A royalty-free worldwide license to practice the invention or have it practiced for the Government; and
- (3) The right to license or sublicense state and local governments to practice the invention or have it practiced for them, if the agency determines at the time of contracting that acquisition of this right would serve the national interest.

Subsection (b) requires that whenever the Government has rights in a contract invention, notice to that effect shall be included in each United States patent application and patent on the invention.



### *Section 387. March-in rights*

Section 387 sets forth the basis on which the Government may terminate the contractor's title or exclusive rights with respect to one or more fields of use in any patent on a contract invention; may require the contractor to grant appropriate license or sublicense to responsible applicants; or, if necessary, may grant such licenses or sublicenses itself.

Subsection (a) sets forth the grounds for exercise of march-in rights:

- (1) If the contractor has not taken and is not expected to take timely and effective action to achieve practical application of the invention in one or more of the fields of use selected;
- (2) If necessary to protect the national security;
- (3) If necessary to meet requirements for public use specified by Federal regulation;
- (4) If continuation of the contractor's rights in the invention would create or maintain a situation inconsistent with the anti-trust laws; or
- (5) If the contractor has failed to comply with the reporting requirements of this Act with respect to such invention.

Subsection (b) permits the responsible agency to exercise its march-in rights either on its own initiative or in response to a petition from an interested person justifying such action.

Subsection (c) enables an agency to specify reasonable licensing terms whenever, in exercise of its march-in rights, it requires a contractor to grant a license or sublicense.

### *Section 388. Deviation and waiver*

Section 388 permits Federal agencies, to further an agency's mission and the public interest, to deviate from any standard patent rights clause issued under section 390 acquiring more or fewer rights to a contract invention.

Subsection (a) authorizes deviations either on a class basis in accordance with regulations to be issued under section 390, or, unless prohibited by those regulations, under regulations issued by an agency itself. Case-by-case deviations are permitted when authorized by the head of an agency or a designee, and described in the Federal Register.

Subsection (b) forbids waiver under any circumstances of the national security and antitrust march-in rights reserved by sections 387(a)(2), 387(a)(4), and 387(c).

Subsection (c) allows waiver of rights reserved by sections 384(a) and 387(a)(1) only: (1) in contracts involving cosponsored, cost-sharing or joint venture research to which the Contractor makes a substantial contribution of funds, technology, facilities, or equipment; or (2) in contracts with a contractor whose participation is necessary for the successful accomplishment of an agency mission and such contract cannot be obtained under the standard patent rights clause.

### *Section 389. Transfer of rights to contractor employees*

Section 389 authorizes a contractor's employee-inventor to receive some or all of the contractor's rights to a contract invention if the

responsible agency and the contractor approve. The corresponding obligations of the contractor under subchapter I then become the obligations of the employee.

*Section 390. Regulations and standard patent rights clause*

Subsection 390(a) requires the Office of Federal Procurement Policy to direct the issuance of regulations implementing subchapter I, including the establishment of a standard patent rights clause or clauses.

Subsections (b), (c) and (d) require a sharing of the royalties and/or revenues with the Government to pay the Government for Federal funding of research and development. Regulations to be developed may permit waiver of some or all of this payment.

**SUBCHAPTER II—INVENTIONS OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES**

*Section 391. Employees inventions*

Section 391 defines "employees inventions" as inventions made by Federal employees.

*Section 392. Reporting of inventions*

Section 392(a) requires that a Federal employee report to the employee's agency all inventions made while an employee of that agency. The Government is prohibited from publishing or releasing these reports until the earlier of one year after their receipt or the final disposition of rights under this subchapter.

*Section 393. Criteria for the allocation of rights*

Section 393 establishes the criteria for allocation of invention rights between the Government and its employee-inventor. Basically, the allocation depends upon the relationship of the invention to the employee's work and the use of Government resources.

Paragraph (1) provides for Government acquisition of all invention rights if the invention bears a direct relation to the duties of the employee-inventor or was made in consequence of the employee's employment.

Paragraph (2) provides that, where the invention neither bears a direct relation to the employee's duties nor was made in consequence of the employee's employment, but was made with a contribution of Federal resources, the employee may receive all rights in the invention subject to a nonexclusive royalty-free worldwide license to the Government to practice the invention or have it practiced for the Government as well as to sublicense State, local, or foreign governments if acquisition of this right would serve the national interest.

Paragraph (3) permits the Government to waive to the employee its rights under paragraph (1) of this section, subject to the Government license described in paragraph (2) of this section, if the agency finds insufficient interest in the invention to warrant exercising the Government's rights.

Paragraph (4) requires the Government to acquire all rights in any invention if the national security might be impaired should the employee-inventor receive rights to it, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (2) or (3) of this section.

Paragraph (5) entitles an employee-inventor to all rights in an invention made by the employee not covered by paragraphs (1), (2), or (3) of this section.

Paragraph (6) permits the Government to enter into agreements allocating rights in inventions resulting from research and development to which other parties have contributed substantially, notwithstanding paragraph (1) of this section.

*Section 394. Presumptions*

Section 394 establishes rebuttable presumptions for the application of the criteria set forth in section 393.

Subsection (a) sets out employee duties which establish a rebuttable presumption that an invention falls within the criteria of paragraph (1) of section 393.

Subsection (b) establishes a rebuttable presumption that an invention made by an employee whose duties fall outside those listed in paragraph (a) of this section falls within the criteria of paragraph (2) of section 393, reserving to the employee title to an employee-invention subject to certain license rights in the Government.

*Section 395. Review of agency determinations*

Section 395 provides for the review of Federal agency determinations regarding the respective rights of the Government and a Federal employee-inventor in situations in which the agency determines not to acquire all rights in an invention or where an aggrieved employee-inventor requests review. The review is to be conducted according to regulations issued under section 399.

*Section 396. Reassignment of rights*

Section 396 establishes a right in the Government to adjust the rights acquired from a Federal employee-inventor on the basis of evidence that the granting of greater rights to the employee-inventor is necessary to correct an inequitable allocation of rights.

*Section 397. Incentive awards program*

Subsection (a) provides Federal agencies the right to establish an incentive awards program which is intended to monetarily recognize Federal employee-inventors, stimulate innovative creativeness, and encourage disclosures of inventions which in turn will enhance the possibility of utilization through the Federal licensing program established under subchapter III.

Subsection (b) sets forth the criteria for making an award.

Subsections (c), (d), and (e) establish the procedures for making awards of different amounts.

Subsection (f) provides that acceptance of a cash reward constitutes an agreement by the employee-inventor that any use by the Government of an invention for which an award is made does not form the basis of a further claim of any nature against the Government by the receipt, his heirs, or assigns.

Subsection (g) requires that an award should be paid from the fund or appropriation of the agency primarily benefitting.

*Section 398. Income sharing from patent licenses*

Section 398 authorizes Federal agencies to share income from licensing the Government's patent rights with the employee-inventor.

*Section 399. Regulations*

Subsection (a) makes the Secretary of Commerce responsible for issuing regulations to implement subchapter II.

Subsection (b) provides that determination concerning a Federal employee's promotion of the employee's invention is subject to regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce with the concurrence of the Office of Government Ethics and the Attorney General.

#### SUBCHAPTER III—LICENSING OF FEDERALLY OWNED INVENTIONS

##### *Section 400. Covered inventions*

Section 400 provides that subchapter III applies to all federally-owned patent rights, including licenses or sublicenses granted or required to be granted by the Government under section 387, upon or after exercise of the march-in provisions. However it does not apply to licenses established by the other sections of subchapter I.

##### *Section 401. Exclusive or partially exclusive licenses*

Section 401 sets out terms and conditions under which a Federal agency may grant an exclusive or partially exclusive license.

Subsection (a) provides that an exclusive or partially exclusive domestic license not automatically granted under section 384 may be granted only after public notice and opportunity for filing written objections and only if the responsible agency determines that such licensing is necessary to achieve practical application of the invention and that the scope of proposed exclusivity is not greater than reasonably necessary.

Subsection (b) provides that an exclusive or partially exclusive foreign license may be granted only after public notice and opportunity for filing written objections and after a determination whether the interests of the Government or of United States industry in foreign commerce will be enhanced.

Subsection (c) prohibits the granting of a license under this section if the responsible agency determines that the grant would create or maintain a situation inconsistent with the antitrust laws.

Subsection (d) requires Federal agencies to maintain publicly available, periodically updated records of their determinations to grant exclusive or partially exclusive licenses.

##### *Section 402. Minimum Government rights*

Section 402 sets forth the minimum rights the Government is to have in every exclusive or partially exclusive license:

- (1) The right to require from the licensee written reports on the use of the invention;
- (2) A royalty-free, worldwide right to practice the invention or have it practiced for the Government; and
- (3) The right to license State and local, to practice the invention or have it practiced for them if the agency determines that reservation of this right would serve the national interest.

##### *Section 403. March-in rights*

Section 403 sets forth the basis on which the Government may terminate an exclusive or partially exclusive license.

Subsection (a) sets forth the grounds for such termination:

- (1) If the licensee has not taken and is not expected to take timely and effective action to achieve practical application of the invention in the fields of use affected;

- 13
- (2) If necessary to protect national security;
  - (3) If necessary to meet requirements for public use specified by Federal regulation;
  - (4) Continuation of licensee's rights in the invention would create or maintain a situation inconsistent with the antitrust laws;
  - or
  - (5) If the licensee has failed to comply with the terms of the license.

Subsection (b) permits the responsible agency to exercise its march-in rights either on its own initiative or in response to a petition from an interested person.

#### *Section 404. Regulations*

Section 404 makes the Office of Federal Procurement Policy responsible for directing the issuance of regulations specifying the terms and conditions upon which federally-owned patent rights may be licensed. Agencies are permitted to deviate from such regulations on a class basis unless prohibited by the Office of Federal Procurement Policy.

### SUBCHAPTER IV—MISCELLANEOUS

#### *Section 405. Patent enforcement suits and right of intervention*

Subsection 405(a) provides for enforcement of an exclusive license under the chapter by an exclusive licensee without the necessity of joining the United States or any other exclusive licensee as a party. However, the Attorney General and the agency that granted the license must be given prompt notice of the suit and served copies of papers as though they were parties to the suit.

Subsection (b) requires the responsible agency to notify all of its exclusive licensees of any suit by an exclusive licensee, the Government, or another person.

#### *Section 406. Background rights*

Section 406 specifies that nothing contained in this chapter will be construed to deprive the owner of any background patent or of rights under such a patent.

#### *Section 407. Notice, hearing, and judicial review*

Subsection (a) requires that agency determinations under sections 382, 387(a) and 387(c), and 403, must have written reasons and be preceded by public notice and an opportunity for a hearing in which the United States, any agency, and any interested person may participate.

Subsection (b) permits the United States or any adversely affected participant to appeal a subsection (a) determination to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals within sixty days after it is issued. The Court of Customs and Patent Appeals is given exclusive jurisdiction to determine the matter de novo, affirming, reversing, or modifying the agency determination.

#### *Section 408. Relationship to other laws*

Section 408 is intended to remove any implication that the act

Section 408 is intended to remove any implication that the act provides immunity from the antitrust laws.

### *Section 409. Authority of Federal agencies*

Subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f) set forth the authority of Federal agencies to protect patent rights at home and abroad in—"any invention in which the Government has an interest in order to promote the use of inventions having significant commercial potential or otherwise advance the national interest"—to license federally-owned patent rights; to transfer patent rights to and accept transfers of patent rights from other agencies without regard to the property transfer procedures required by the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 471); to withhold publication or release of information disclosing any invention long enough for patent applications to be filed; to promote the licensing of federally-owned patent rights; and to enter into contracts to accomplish the purpose of this section.

### *Section 410. Responsibilities of the Secretary of Commerce*

Section 410 provides authority for the Department of Commerce to assist other Federal agencies administer the licensing of federally-owned inventions.

Paragraph (a)(1) authorizes the Secretary to consult with the Federal agencies about areas of science and technology with commercial potential.

Paragraph (a)(2) authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to coordinate a program to help agencies carry out their authorities under section 409.

Paragraph (a)(3) authorizes the Secretary to evaluate inventions referred to it by Federal agencies in order to identify those inventions with the greatest commercial potential.

Paragraph (a)(4) authorizes the Secretary to assist the Federal agencies in seeking and maintaining patent protection in any country, including the payment of fees and costs.

Paragraph (a)(5) authorizes the Secretary to develop and manage a government-wide program, with private sector participation, to stimulate transfer to the private sector of potentially valuable federally-owned technology through the dissemination of information about the technology.

Paragraph (a)(6) authorizes the Secretary to publish notices of all federally-owned patent rights available for licensing.

Paragraph (a)(7) requires the Secretary, seven years after the date of enactment of the Act, to report on its operation to the Congress.

Subsection (b) authorizes the appropriation to the Secretary of Commerce of such sums as thereafter may be necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out responsibilities under this section.

### *Section 411. Definitions*

Section 411 sets out the definitions, for purposes of the Act for the terms "Agency," "Responsible agency," "antitrust laws," "contract," "contractor," "Federal employee," "invention," "made," "nonprofit organization," "patent rights," "practical application," "small business," "state," "local," and "will."

## SECTION 7

Section 7 amends or repeals parts of other acts as necessary to implement the provisions of new chapter 38 of title 35, United States Code. Acts amended or repealed in part are:

Title 7, U.S.C. 427(i).

Title 7, U.S.C. 1624(a).

The Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969.

The National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966.

The National Science Foundation Act of 1950.

The Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

The National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958.

The Coal Research and Development Act of 1960.

The Helium Act Amendments of 1960.

The Arms Control and Disarmament Act of 1961.

The Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.

The Federal Nonnuclear Energy Research and Development Act of 1974.

The Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933.

The Consumer Product Safety Act.

Title 30, U.S.C. 323.

The Resources Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976.

The Electric and Hybrid Vehicle Research, Development, and Demonstration Act of 1976.

Public Law 95-39.

The Water Research and Development Act of 1978.

## SECTION 8

Section 8 provides for effective date of the bill's provisions.

Subsection 8(a) specifies sections 2, 4, and 5 will take effect on enactment.

Subsection 8(b) provides that section 1 will take effect on the first day of the seventh day after enactment and will apply to patents then in force or issued thereafter.

Subsection 8(c) provides that section 3 will take effect on the first day of the first fiscal year beginning one calendar year after enactment. However, until that section takes effect, the Secretary, in order to pay the cost of reexamination proceedings, may credit the Patent and Trademark Office Appropriation Account with the revenues from collected reexamination fees.

Subsection 8(d) continues existing fees until new fees are established.

Subsection 8(e) provides that maintenance fees shall not be applicable to patents applied for prior to the date of enactment of the Act.

Subsection 8(f) provides that sections 6 and 7 of the bill will take effect on the first day of the seventh month after its enactment, although implementing regulations may be issued earlier.

## SECTION 9

Section 9 requires the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks to report to Congress, within two years after the effective date of the Act, on a plan for computerized data and retrieval systems for the operation of the Patent and Trademark Office.

## SECTION 10

Subsection 10(a) adds a definition of "computer program" to section 101 of Title 17, United States Code.

Subsection 10(b) amends section 117 of Title 17, United States Code in regard to copyrights on computer programs.

## COST ESTIMATE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE

The cost estimate prepared by the Congressional Budget Office is contained in the following letter from its Director:

U.S. CONGRESS,  
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,  
Washington, D.C., September 23, 1980.

Hon. JACK BROOKS,  
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations, U.S. House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to Section 403 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Congressional Budget Office has prepared the attached cost estimate for H.R. 6933, a bill to amend the patent and trademark laws.

Should the committee so desire, we would be pleased to provide further details on this estimate.

Sincerely,

ALICE M. RIVLIN, Director.

## CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

SEPTEMBER 23, 1980.

1. Bill number: H.R. 6933.
2. Bill title: A bill to amend the patent and trademark laws.
3. Bill status: As ordered reported by the House Committee on Government Operations on September 23, 1980.
4. Bill purpose: This bill would establish a new fee structure within the Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), provide for a system of administrative reexaminations, and create a uniform government policy regarding patent rights. The PTO would also be required to implement a computerized data and retrieval system. In addition, H.R. 6933 would repeal section 117 of the 1976 Copyright Act to clarify copyright laws regarding computer programs.
5. Cost estimate: The table below reflects the budget impact resulting from a change proposed by H.R. 6933 in the classification of the fees received by the PTO.



	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985
Revenue reduction.....	1.8	23.2	23.8	24.3	24.8
Net spending reduction:					
Estimated authorization level.....	1.9	23.8	24.8	25.8	31.8
Estimated outlays.....	2.4	24.7	24.8	25.8	31.8
Net budget impact <sup>1</sup> .....	-6	-1.5	-1.0	-1.5	-7.0

<sup>1</sup> Negative sign indicates increased surplus or decreased deficit.

The costs of this bill fall primarily within budget subfunction 376. 6. Basic of estimate: For purposes of this estimate, it is assumed that this bill will be enacted around October 1, 1980.

#### REEXAMINATION OF PATENTS

H.R. 6933 would allow any party to petition the PTO to reexamine a patent for validity. The cost of reexamination would be paid by the party based on a fee structure established by the Commissioner of Patents. It is anticipated that the number of patent applications for reexaminations will be limited by the cost involved and the potential for commercial development. Based on rates currently available in foreign countries for similar procedures, as well as estimates provided by the PTO, it is estimated that the number of appeals will be approximately 500 in fiscal year 1981, increasing to 2,000 by 1982, and remain relatively stable thereafter.

Although the bill does not specifically authorize funding for this purpose, it is assumed that additional staff will be required to handle the reexamination procedures. Based on PTO data, it is estimated that the average cost per employee, including overhead and benefits, would be approximately \$40,000 in fiscal year 1981. Assuming approximately 30 hours per reexamination, plus clerical support, it is estimated that approximately 55 appeals could be reviewed annually by a professional staff member. It is estimated that the cost of this procedure would be approximately \$0.4 million in fiscal year 1981, which reflects six months' activity. Costs are estimated to be \$1.4 million in fiscal year 1982, increasing to \$2.5 million by fiscal year 1985. It is assumed, however, that the full amount required by the PTO for salaries and expenses would be recovered by fees set at the beginning of the fiscal year and adjusted annually for inflation and anticipated workload. It is assumed that fees would be included with the request for reexamination and reflected as a reimbursable to the agency, resulting in a net outlay of around zero in each fiscal year.

#### REVISION OF FEE STRUCTURE

H.R. 6933 would restructure the current fee structure for patents and trademarks. Currently, the PTO recovers approximately 20 percent of the cost of processing patents and approximately 30 percent of the cost of issuing trademarks. These fees are deposited in the general fund of the Treasury.

The bill would allow the PTO to recover up to 25 percent of the average processing costs and 25 percent of the maintenance costs for patents, the latter fee collected in four installments over the life of the patent. In addition, the PTO would be allowed to recover a maximum of 50 percent of the cost of issuing trademarks. All fees for patents and trademarks could be adjusted no more than once every three years and would be credited to the PTO as a reimbursable to the agency, rather than as a revenue to the Treasury.

It is assumed that the revised fee structure for trademarks would be implemented early in the second quarter of fiscal year 1981, and for patents beginning in fiscal year 1982. It is assumed that the agency costs for processing patents and trademarks from which recovery could be made would be approximately \$84 million in fiscal year 1982, increasing to approximately \$109 million by fiscal year 1985. It is assumed that an average recovery rate of 25 and 50 percent, adjusted every third year, would be established for processing fees for patents and for trademarks, respectively. Patent maintenance fees would be collected three times in a patent's life—around the fourth, eighth, and twelfth year. Since the first payment would not be made until fiscal year 1986, it is not reflected in the table below.

(By fiscal years, in millions of dollars):

	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985
<b>Estimated revenues: Existing fee structure:</b>					
Patents	20.3	20.8	21.3	21.8	22.2
Trademarks	2.4	2.4	2.5	2.5	2.6
Total	22.7	23.2	23.8	24.3	24.8
<b>Proposed fee structure in H.R. 6933:</b>					
<b>Estimated collections:</b>					
Patents <sup>1</sup>	20.3	21.2	21.2	21.2	27.2
Trademarks <sup>2</sup>	3.6	3.6	3.6	4.6	4.6
Total	23.6	24.8	24.8	25.8	31.8
Net budget impact	-.9	-1.6	-1.0	-1.5	-7.0

<sup>1</sup> Maintenance fees would be collected beginning in fiscal year 1986, and by fiscal year 1994 would result in revenues approximately twice those estimated for processing.

<sup>2</sup> The current fee structure for patents remains in effect through fiscal year 1981.

#### GOVERNMENT PATENT POLICY

H.R. 6933 would establish a uniform federal system for the commercialization and allocation of rights in inventions resulting from federally sponsored or supported research and development. The bill would allow contractors from small businesses and non-profit institutions to acquire title to inventions resulting from government-funded research. Other contractors could receive exclusive licenses for specific uses. The bill directs the Office of Federal Procurement Policy (OFPP) to issue regulations to implement these policy changes. According to the OFPP, the cost of revising existing regulations would be minimal. It is estimated implementation of these changes in the various federal agencies, including training, would cost approximately \$650,000 in fiscal year 1981. Outlays are estimated to be 90 percent the first year and 10 percent the second year.

H.R. 6933 would revise the criteria for allocation of invention rights between the federal government and employees who produce inventions. To stimulate innovation, the bill would establish an incentive cash awards program to federal employee-inventors. The awards are to be paid from funds from royalties or agency appropriations; consequently, it is estimated that this provision would result in no additional cost to the government.

The bill also authorizes federal agencies to share income from licensing the government's patent rights with the employee-inventor. It is not possible at this time to estimate the extent which royalties will be generated or shared with employee-inventors.

#### OTHER

The bill would repeal section 117 of the 1976 Copyright Act, which disclaims any intent to modify the pre-existing copyright law for computer programs. This has the effect of clearly applying the 1976 law to computer programs, which is not expected to have a cost impact upon the federal government.

In addition, H.R. 6933 outlines the responsibilities of the Secretary of Commerce to assist agencies and others in promoting access to patent information. Currently these activities are being performed by the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), created in 1970. The President is requesting approximately \$740,000 for these activities in fiscal year 1981, which is about the same level of funding in the current fiscal year. The bill would authorize the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary for these activities. Since current law authorizes these activities it is estimated that no additional costs would be incurred as a result of enactment of this legislation.

Finally, the PTO would be required to report within two years of date of enactment on the status of a computerized data retrieval system. Since the PTO is already planning to study and evaluate the feasibility of such a system, it is assumed that any significant costs incurred as a result of analyzing or implementing such a system would not be a direct result of the legislation. Consequently, no cost has been estimated for this provision.

7. Estimate comparison: The Commissioner of Patents has estimated that approximately 1,000 to 3,000 requests for reexaminations would be made annually, requiring from 25 to 100 additional staff members, at a cost of between \$1 million and \$4.5 million annually. CBO estimates approximately 500 applications will be processed beginning in fiscal year 1981 because a later date of enactment is assumed.

8. Previous CBO estimate: On August 28, 1980, the CBO prepared a cost estimate on H.R. 6933, as ordered reported by the House Committee on the Judiciary on August 20, 1980. This version of H.R. 6933 would have required the General Accounting Office to report on the desirability of merging the Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) with the Copyright Office and the Copyright Royalty Tribunal. It would also have established the PTO as an independent agency, removing it from the Department of Commerce. The difference in costs between the two versions of H.R. 6933 reflect these differing provisions.

On February 27, 1980, the CBO prepared a cost estimate for S. 1679, the Patent Law Amendments of 1979, as ordered reported by the Sen-

ate Committee on the Judiciary on February 19, 1980. The costs of S. 1679 and the costs attributed to reexamination in this bill are the same, with adjustments assumed for date of enactment.

On December 4, 1979, CBO prepared a cost estimate on S. 414, the University and Small Business Patent Procedures Act, as ordered reported by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on November 20, 1979. The CBO estimated that no significant cost would be incurred by the government if a uniform patent procedure for small businesses and nonprofit organizations performing government-supported research and development were established.

9. Estimate prepared by : Mary Maginniss.

10. Estimate approved by :

C. G. NUCKOLS  
(For James L. Blum,  
Assistant Director for Budget Analysis).

#### COMMITTEE ESTIMATE OF COST

A number of provisions in the bill do not come within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Operations. These have not been considered in depth by the committee and, therefore, the committee has no basis upon which to make an estimate of cost for the entire bill.

#### INFLATIONARY IMPACT

The committee has insufficient evidence available on which to determine whether this legislation will have a significant inflationary impact on prices and costs in the operation of the economy.

#### NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY AND TAX EXPENDITURES

The bill, as reported by the Committee on Government Operations, provides no new budget authority and tax expenditures.

#### REVIEW OF EXISTING LAW

In compliance with Subdivision (A) of Clause 2(1)(3) of House Rule XI, the Subcommittee on Legislation and National Security reviewed the application and administration of the laws relating to patent policy and organization.

#### OVERSIGHT FINDINGS

No oversight findings or recommendations were made, other than the legislation recommended in this report.

#### CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

The bill was referred to the Committee on Government Operations for a period ending not later than September 23, 1980, for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of that Committee under clause 1(i)(2), rule X. The changes made to existing law by the bill as reported by the Committee

on the Judiciary are shown on pages 33 through 81 of House Report 96-1307, Part 1.

For the information of the Members of the House of Representatives, the changes made by the Committee on Government Operations strike out the amendments made to title 35 of the United States Code in sections 1, 3(a), 3(b), 3(c), 6, 7, 31, 181, and 188; and section 12(c) of the Act of February 14, 1903 by the bill as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary. Consequently, these existing provisions of law are not changed in the bill as reported by the Committee on Government Operations.

## ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF HON. JACK BROOKS

The major problem I have with H.R. 6933 is that it violates a basic provision of the unwritten contract between the citizens of this country and their government; namely, that what the government acquires through the expenditure of its citizens' taxes, the government owns. Assigning automatic patent rights and exclusive licenses to companies or organizations for inventions developed at government expense is a pure giveaway of rights that properly belong to the people.

The argument is made by proponents of the bill that it will spur productivity, a goal that is both necessary and desirable if the United States is to regain its position in the world economy. But that argument ignores the fact that the Federal Government is already paying half the costs of research and development in the United States at an annual cost of \$30 billion. No companies or nonprofit organizations that I know of have been turning down that money because they are not now receiving automatic patent and exclusive licensing rights. So unless it is the intent of the supporters of H.R. 6933 that the government greatly increase this already enormous public investment in research and development, I fail to see how enactment of the bill will lead to increased production.

It is also argued that this legislation will increase competition in industry and thereby spur production. But again the connection is hard to establish. Under current practice, inventions, new products and technological advances developed under government contracts—unless awarded to a specific contractor under existing permissible arrangements—are available to all. That approach would seem to offer far greater potential for increased competition and productivity than handing over exclusive rights to one company. In the latter case the company might even choose to reduce production with the aim of increasing its profits.

Admiral Hyman G. Rickover testified at the hearings by the Legislation and National Security Subcommittee that:

Based on 40 years experience in technology and in dealing with various segments of American industry, I believe the bill would achieve exactly the opposite of what it purports. It would impede, not enhance, the development and dissemination of technology. It would hurt small business. It would inhibit competition. It would promote greater concentration of economic power in the hands of large corporations. It would be costly to the taxpayer.

I do not overlook or underestimate the importance of patents in developing and maintaining a thriving economy. My concern is simply the role of the government and the rights of the people in the patent process. When a private company risks its own money to develop new products and procedures it deserves and receives

the profits that may result. There should not be a different standard applied when it is the government that risks the taxpayers' money. The rewards of successful research and development conducted at government expense should go to all the people.

I agree wholeheartedly with the establishment of a U.S. patent policy that encourages the development and production of new products, that will reward those who take risks, and that will inspire increased confidence in our economy. My comments above deal only with the very special issue of government-funded research and development activities. (A fuller explanation of my views can be found in the report of H.R. 6933, as reported by the House Judiciary Committee, H. Rept. 96-1307, Part I, pp. 29-32.)

The Federal Government has the equivalent of a fiduciary responsibility to the taxpayers of this country. Property acquired with public funds should belong to the public. Deviations from that fundamental principle should be allowed only where a compelling justification can be shown and where the voice of the public can be heard in protest. This legislation stands that principle on its head by automatically conveying title or the exclusive right to use public property to private entities and placing the burden on the Federal government to demonstrate that a retrieval of those rights is in the public interest.

JACK BROOKS

### ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF HON. TOBY MOFFETT

Encouraging industrial innovation and increased productivity by U.S. businesses is central to retaining our commercial primacy in the world marketplace. For that reason, the goals of H.R. 6933 and its sponsors are easily shared and properly applauded by all of us.

Unfortunately, the approach taken by H.R. 6933 appears to be seriously flawed. I share the general view expressed by Chairman Jack Brooks in fearing that the bill constitutes a "giveaway of rights that properly belong to the people." Sections 6 and 7 of the bill go too far in favoring the commercial rights of contractors doing research with government—that is, taxpayers'—funds. And it does so without adequate demonstration that the stated lofty goals of increased innovation and productivity will in fact result from shifting the law for the benefit of these contractors.

To pursue that point, let me turn one of the proponents' arguments on its head. It is said that we need "uniformity" in this area, and it is pointed out that there are now "26" different statutory schemes affecting this question of the commercial rights to inventions and discoveries generated under government research grants and contracts. The fallacy of that argument can be seen by looking more carefully at some of those 26 specific arrangements established by statute. The fact is that each statutory enactment was rooted in specific events, specific cases or situations examined by the appropriate Congressional Committees. In each instance, the considered opinion of the Congress was that the results of the research being promoted in that case could best be preserved for the benefit of the public by the commercial licensing arrangement sanctioned at that time. Some of those Congressional determinations, moreover, are quite recent, such as the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 and the Water Research and Development Act of 1978.

In my judgment, those statutes demonstrate that the case can be made for diversity rather than uniformity. It would appear more appropriate for the Judiciary Committee to have produced a bill which precisely assessed the arrangements in each of the 26 cases, in consultation with the Committees having jurisdiction in each of those areas, and to have produced a bill creating the best arrangement for each of those areas. Such a bill would not seek uniformity for its own sake, but would analytically design the best arrangement with regard to commercial use for each of the many areas in which the Federal government sponsors research. Such a bill might produce uniformity, but it might also reflect the fact that different cases sometimes deserve different treatments.

That observation leads to an additional compelling reason why this legislation should not be passed by this Congress at this time. I fully respect the extensive efforts of the Judiciary Committee. I am well aware of the hard work involved in holding numerous days of hearings



and in drafting a large piece of legislation. Nevertheless, I believe it can fairly be said that not all of the Committees whose jurisdictions would be significantly affected by this legislation have been adequately consulted. Their judgment and experience is vitally needed to assure that this bill's approach is indeed a sound one for all the diverse areas which it will affect, as its sponsors take great pride in pointing out.

For that reason, I urge my colleagues to opt for further consideration of this measure. I specifically urge that all Committee Chairmen whose substantive jurisdictions will be affected by the impact of this bill on government-sponsored research in their areas be given adequate time to assess this bill and to consult with one another before the House takes action. I am aware that genuine consultation of this sort probably cannot be achieved in the waning hours of this Congress. If not, I believe the long-term implications of this measure are far too important to go forward at this time.

As with so many of our problems as a Nation, we did not get into this problem of lowering productivity and declining ingenuity overnight. It is a complex problem reflecting many developments over many years. There is thus no need to rush out a bill now without being certain that we are doing the right thing, based on the full and deliberate consultation among our colleagues with the greatest knowledge of the potential effects of this legislation.

TOBY MORFETT.



[illegible][illegible]