



May 8, 2018



# The New Bayh-Dole Rules: What They Are, What They Mean



# Webinar Panel

- **Paul Zielinski**, Director of the Technology Partnership Office  
National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST)
- **Bob Hardy**, Director of Contracts and Intellectual Property  
Council on Governmental Relations (COGR)
- **Valerie McDevitt**, Associate Vice President for Technology Transfer and  
Business Partnerships, University of South Florida
- **Mike Waring**, Executive Director of Federal Relations, University of  
Michigan, and Chair of AUTM's Public Policy Advisory Committee



# Updating Bayh-Dole Regulations

Paul Zielinski

Director, Technology Partnerships Office  
National Institute of Standards and Technology



# Background



**PRESIDENT'S  
MANAGEMENT  
AGENDA**

**NIST**



# Goals

- America Invents Act timelines, definitions, and royalty payment requirements were in conflict with regulatory provisions in Bayh-Dole
- Certain scenarios were not contemplated in original Bayh-Dole Act
- Codification of EO 12591 in regulation
- Turns out we numbered sections of the original regulation wrong...

# Timeline



# Looking Ahead

**President's  
Management Agenda**  
**Cross Agency Priority Goal**  
**14 Improve Transfer of  
Federally-Funded  
Technologies from Lab-to-  
Market**  
**Performance.gov**

**NIST ROI Initiative**  
**Comment period ends July 30**  
**Public meetings:**  
**San Jose CA (May 17)**  
**Denver CO (May 21)**  
**Chicago IL (May 31),**  
**Gaithersburg MD (June 14)**  
**nist.gov/tpo/roi**



# Contact

**Paul Zielinski**

Director, Technology Partnerships Office  
National Institute of Standards and Technology  
[paul.zielinski@nist.gov](mailto:paul.zielinski@nist.gov)



# The Bottom Line

- Does not change basic Bayh-Dole regime
- Specifically incorporates large businesses
- A number of the changes are significant and will have impact on TTOs
- **Note:** Bayh-Dole regs also contain provisions on CRADAs and licensing of government-owned inventions as well as agency-specific requirements pertaining to DOE. We will not further consider as they are of limited relevance to most AUTM members.

# Assignments

- From a compliance standpoint biggest change is to extend the employee written agreement requirement to include assignments to the contractor of the entire right, title and interest in each subject invention (401.14(f)(2))
- Responds to *Stanford v. Roche* decision
- Previously no clear *regulatory* requirement for assignments

# Time Period Changes

- Changes in certain prescribed time periods of greatest operational significance
- Previously contractors had to notify agencies 30 days prior to the statutory deadline of any decision not to continue patent prosecution, pay maintenance or other fees, or defend a patent (e.g. IPRs, reexaminations, etc.).
- Now 60 days (401.14(f)(3)) (Proposal was 120)
- Note: applies only to non-provisional applications; status of abandoned provisionals unclear under the new rules

# Time Period Changes—Continued

- Another significant change is to require filing of a non-provisional application within 10 mos. of filing a provisional (401.14(c)(3))
- Automatic one-year extension upon request to funding agency unless agency notifies the contractor within 60 days of receiving request
- Not in original proposal

# More Time Period Changes (And Not)

- Also no time limit now for agency to request title when contractor fails to disclose or elect title to an invention (previously agencies had 60 days to do so—(401.14(d)(1))
- But proposal for agencies to shorten two-year time frame for contractor election of title (401.14 (c)(2)) “if necessary to protect the Government’s interest” was not adopted

# Other Changes

- Detailed new language on federal co-inventor situations (401.10)
- Small business preference concerns now to be reviewed by funding agencies rather than Commerce (401.14(k)(4))
- New provision added permitting alternatives to Bayh-Dole rights when agencies contract for services with a non-profit that does not promote commercialization (401.3(a)(6))

# What Else?

- Many changes reflect or recognize America Invents Act
- “Initial patent application” definition expanded to include first provisional or non-provisional U.S. or PCT application (401.2(n))
- Changes do not address invention reporting, but NIST notes in Preamble that it is working with NIH to update and improve iEdison
- ROI outcome may lead to further changes



# Contact

Robert Hardy

Director, Contracts and Intellectual Property Management

Council on Governmental Relations

[rhardy@cogr.edu](mailto:rhardy@cogr.edu)

**COGR**

Council On Governmental Relations



# View from a Tech Transfer Office

Valerie Landrio McDevitt  
Associate Vice President  
Technology Transfer & Business Partnerships  
University of South Florida  
[vmcdevitt@usf.edu](mailto:vmcdevitt@usf.edu)



# Q&A





**autm**

*Transforming Ideas into Opportunities*

Thank You For Joining Us!