development of the technology; expected Government or commercial use of the technology; the need to provide equitable treatment among consortium or team members; and the need for the DOE to engage non-traditional Government contractors with unique capabilities.

(b) Because a TIA entails substantial cost sharing by recipients, the contracting officer must use discretion in negotiating Government rights to data and patentable inventions resulting from the RD&D under the agreements. The considerations in §§603.845 through 603.875 are intended to serve as guidelines, within which there is considerable latitude to negotiate provisions appropriate to a wide variety of circumstances that may arise.

§ 603.845 Data rights requirements.

(a) If the TIA is a cooperative agreement, the requirements at 10 CFR 600.325(d), Rights in data—general rule, apply. The “Rights in Data—General” provision in Appendix A to Subpart D of 10 CFR 600 normally applies. This provision provides the Government with unlimited rights in data first produced in the performance of the agreement, except as provided in paragraph (c) Copyright. However, in certain circumstances, the “Rights in Data—Programs Covered Under Special Protected Data Statutes” provision in Appendix A may apply.

(b) If the TIA is an assistance transaction other than a cooperative agreement, the requirements at 10 CFR 600.325(e), Rights in data—programs covered under special protected data statutes, normally apply. The “Rights in Data—Programs Covered Under Special Data Statutes” provision in Appendix A to Subpart D of 10 CFR 600 may be modified to accommodate particular circumstances (e.g., access to or expanded use rights in protected data among consortium or team members), or to list data or categories of data that the recipient must make available to the public. In unique cases, the contracting officer may negotiate special data rights requirements that vary from those in 10 CFR 600.325. Modifications to the standard data provisions must be approved by intellectual property counsel.

§ 603.850 Marking of data.

To protect the recipient’s interests in data, the TIA should require the recipient to mark any particular data that it wishes to protect from disclosure with a specific legend specified in the agreement identifying the data as data subject to use, release, or disclosure restrictions.

§ 603.855 Protected data.

In accordance with law and regulation, the contracting officer must not release or disclose data marked with a restrictive legend (as specified in 603.850) to third parties, unless they are parties authorized by the award agreement or the terms of the legend to receive the data and are subject to a written obligation to treat the data in accordance with the marking.

§ 603.860 Rights to inventions.

(a) The contracting officer should negotiate rights in inventions that represent an appropriate balance between the Government’s interests and the recipient’s interests.

1. The contracting officer has the flexibility to negotiate patent rights requirements that vary from those which the Bayh-Dole statute (Chapter 18 of Title 35, U.S.C.) and 42 U.S.C. 2182 and 5908 require. A TIA becomes an assistance transaction other than a cooperative agreement if its patent rights requirements vary from those required by these statutes.

2. If the TIA is a cooperative agreement, the patent rights provision of 10 CFR 600.325(b) or (c) or 10 CFR 600.136 applies, depending on the type of recipient. Unless a class waiver has been issued under 10 CFR 784.7, it will be necessary for a large, for-profit business to request a patent waiver to obtain title to subject inventions.

(b) The contracting officer may negotiate Government rights that vary from the statutorily-required patent rights requirements described in paragraph (a)(2) of this section when necessary to accomplish program objectives and foster the Government’s interests. Doing so would make the TIA an assistance transaction other than a cooperative agreement. The contracting officer must decide, with the
help of the program manager and assigned intellectual property counsel, what best represents a reasonable arrangement considering the circumstances, including past investments and anticipated future investments of the recipient to the development of the technology, contributions under the current TIA, and potential commercial and Government markets. Any change to the standard patent rights provisions must be approved by assigned intellectual property counsel.

(c) Taking past investments as an example, the contracting officer should consider whether the Government or the recipient has contributed more substantially to the prior RD&D that provides the foundation for the planned effort. If the predominant past contributor to the particular technology has been:

(1) The Government, then the TIA’s patent rights provision should be the standard provision as set forth in 10 CFR 600.325(b) or (c), or 10 CFR 600.136, as applicable.

(2) The recipient, then less restrictive patent requirements may be appropriate, which would make the TIA an assistance transaction other than a cooperative agreement. The contracting officer normally would, with the concurrence of intellectual property counsel, allow the recipient to retain title to subject inventions without going through the process of obtaining a patent waiver as required by 10 CFR 784. For example, with the concurrence of intellectual property counsel, the contracting officer also could eliminate or modify the nonexclusive paid-up license for practice by or on behalf of the Government to allow the recipient to benefit more directly from its investments.

(d) For subawards under a TIA that is other than a cooperative agreement, the TIA should normally specify that subrecipients’ invention rights are to be negotiated between recipient and subrecipient; that subrecipients will get title to inventions they make; or some other disposition of invention rights. Factors to be considered by the contracting officer in addressing subrecipient’s invention rights include: the extent of cost sharing by parties at all tiers; a subrecipient’s status as a small business, nonprofit, or FFRDC; and whether an appropriate field of use licensing requirement would meet the needs of the parties.

(e) Consortium members may allocate invention rights in their collaboration agreement, subject to the review of the contracting officer (See §603.515). The contracting officer, in performing such review, should consider invention rights to be retained by the Government and rights that may be obtained by small business, nonprofit or FFRDC consortium members.

§ 603.865 March-in rights.

A TIA’s patent rights provision should include the Bayh-Dole march-in rights set out in paragraph (j) of the Patent Rights (Small Business Firms and Nonprofit Organization) provision in Appendix A to subpart D of 10 CFR 600, or an equivalent clause, concerning actions that the Government may take to obtain the right to use subject inventions, if the recipient fails to take effective steps to achieve practical application of the subject inventions within a reasonable time. The march-in provision may be modified to best meet the needs of the program. However, only infrequently should the march-in provision be entirely removed (e.g., if a recipient is providing most of the funding for a RD&D project, with the Government providing a much smaller share).

§ 603.870 Marking of documents related to inventions.

To protect the recipient’s interest in inventions, the TIA should require the recipient to mark documents disclosing inventions it desires to protect by obtaining a patent. The recipient should mark the documents with a legend identifying them as intellectual property subject to public release or public disclosure restrictions, as provided in 35 U.S.C. 205.

§ 603.875 Foreign access to technology and U.S. competitiveness provisions.

(a) Consistent with the objective of enhancing national security and United States competitiveness by increasing the public’s reliance on the United States commercial technology,