

pursuant to which state policies, laws, or regulations?

c. Are there formal or informal state policies that require or permit states and/or particular state entities to assert sovereign immunity? Are there any policies that *prohibit* such assertions? If any such policies are set forth in official government documents, or in relevant laws, regulations, ordinances, or constitutions, please provide copies or citations.

d. Are there instances in which states or state entities have explicitly waived sovereign immunity in patent and/or trademark infringement cases, and if so, under what authority? Alternatively, are there state laws, regulations, or policies that *preclude* such waivers, and if yes, please provide copies or citations.

e. Are there instances in which a court has found that a state or state entity has waived sovereign immunity in patent and/or trademark infringement cases, and if yes, what were the bases of those findings?

f. When states or state entities assert defenses of sovereign immunity in patent and/or trademark infringement cases, do courts generally accept these defenses? If courts reject these defenses, on what basis do they do so?

g. What defenses other than sovereign immunity, if any, do states or state entities typically assert in patent and/or trademark infringement lawsuits?

4. Other impacts of availability of sovereign immunity:

a. In your view, do the outcomes of claims of patent and trademark infringement, whether asserted in litigation or otherwise, differ depending on whether the asserted infringement was carried out by a private party or a state or state entity, and, if yes, are such differences attributable to the availability of sovereign immunity? Please explain the basis for your view, and if it is based on particular instances in which there were claims of patent or trademark infringement, please describe those instances.

b. In your view, does the availability of sovereign immunity as a defense in litigation lead patent and/or trademark rights holders to enter into licensing arrangements with states or state entities on terms that are more favorable than those granted to private licensees or to otherwise change their licensing practices? Please explain the basis for your view, and if it is based on particular instances in which the availability of sovereign immunity did or did not impact the outcome of licensing negotiations, please describe those instances.

c. Are you aware of instances in which the availability of sovereign

immunity as a defense in litigation has deterred patent and/or trademark rights holders from commencing litigation against a state entity and/or from notifying it about an infringement?

5. Nature and availability of state remedies:

a. Are there causes of action under state law that may provide adequate remedies for patent and/or trademark infringement by states or state entities? For example, are any of the following causes of action available and typically asserted: State trademark infringement; takings claims, such as conversion or reverse eminent domain; tort claims; contract claims; or writs of *trover*, *replevin*, or *detinue*?

i. If yes, are the elements of these causes of action and the associated remedies comparable to those associated with infringement actions brought pursuant to the Lanham Act¹⁸ and/or the Patent Act?¹⁹

ii. Are you aware of instances in which damages were awarded in patent and/or trademark suits brought against states or state entities pursuant to such causes of action? If yes, please identify those instances and provide information about them.

iii. In which state courts can a rights holder bring a patent or trademark infringement action against a state or state entity? Which of the following doctrines, if any, are impediments to doing so: Sovereign immunity, state law, federal preemption, or others?

b. In cases of patent and/or trademark infringement by states and state entities, to what extent is injunctive relief available against state officials who act within the scope of their authority? Is such relief adequate to address the needs of patent and/or trademark rights holders whose rights are infringed?

6. Other matters:

a. Please describe any formal or informal policies that states may have for responding to claims of patent and/or trademark infringement, including policies regarding payments to or negotiations with rights holders. If these policies are written, please provide copies.

b. When rights holders notify states or state entities of patent or trademark infringements informally rather than via lawsuits, do they typically do so through the Attorney General's office or through other officials? In cases in which the interactions are with offices other than the Attorney General, is the Attorney General's office typically notified?

c. Do states or state agencies typically carry insurance policies that would cover patent or trademark infringement by state employees, and if so, under such coverage extend to intentional, reckless, or negligent infringements?

d. Please identify any other pertinent issues that the USPTO should consider in conducting its study.

Dated: October 30, 2020.

Andrei Iancu,

Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

[FR Doc. 2020-24621 Filed 11-4-20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-16-P

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FINANCE CORPORATION

Notice of Public Hearing

AGENCY: International Development Finance Corporation.

ACTION: Announcement of public hearing.

SUMMARY: The Board of Directors of the U.S. International Development Finance Corporation ("DFC") will hold a public hearing on December 9, 2020. This hearing will afford an opportunity for any person to present views in accordance with Section 1413(c) of the BUILD Act of 2018. Those wishing to present at the hearing must provide advance notice to the agency as detailed below.

DATES: Public hearing: 2:00 p.m., Wednesday, December 9, 2020.

Deadline for notifying agency of an intent to attend or present at the public hearing: 5:00 p.m., Wednesday, December 2, 2020.

Deadline for submitting a written statement: 5:00 p.m., Wednesday, December 2, 2020.

ADDRESSES: Public hearing: Virtual; Access information provided at the time of attendance registration.

You may send notices of intent to attend, present, or submit a written statement to Catherine F. I. Andrade, DFC Corporate Secretary, via email at candrade@dfc.gov.

Instructions: A notice of intent to attend the public hearing or to present at the public hearing must include the individual's name, title, organization, address, email, telephone number, and a concise summary of the subject matter to be presented. Oral presentations may not exceed five (5) minutes. The time for individual presentations may be reduced proportionately, if necessary, to afford all participants who have submitted a timely request an

¹⁸ 15 U.S.C. 1051 *et seq.*

¹⁹ 35 U.S.C. 1 *et seq.*

opportunity to be heard. Submission of written statements must include the individual's name, title, organization, address, email, and telephone number. The statement must be typewritten, double-spaced, and may not exceed ten (10) pages.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Catherine F. I. Andrade, DFC Corporate Secretary, (202) 336-8768, or candrade@dfc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The public hearing will take place via video and teleconference. Upon registering, participants and observers will be provided instructions on accessing the hearing. DFC will prepare an agenda for the hearing identifying speakers, setting forth the subject on which each participant will speak, and the time allotted for each presentation. The agenda will be available at the time of the hearing.

Authority: 22 U.S.C. 9613(c).

Catherine F. I. Andrade,
DFC Corporate Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2020-24599 Filed 11-4-20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3210-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Defense Acquisition Regulations System

[Docket Number DARS-2020-0042; OMB Control Number 0704-0341]

Information Collection Requirement; Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Part 239, Acquisition of Information Technology

AGENCY: Defense Acquisition Regulations System, Department of Defense (DoD).

ACTION: Notice and request for comments regarding a proposed revision and extension of an approved information collection requirement.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, DoD announces the proposed revision and extension of a public information collection requirement and seeks public comment on the provisions thereof. DoD invites comments on: whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of DoD, including whether the information will have practical utility; the accuracy of the estimate of the burden of the proposed information collection; ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and ways to minimize the burden of the information collection on

respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has approved this information collection requirement for use through January 31, 2021. DoD proposes that OMB extend its approval for use for three additional years beyond the current expiration date.

DATES: DoD will consider all comments received by January 4, 2021.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by OMB Control Number 0704-0341, using any of the following methods:

Federal eRulemaking Portal: <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

Email: osd.dfars@mail.mil. Include OMB Control Number 0704-0341 in the subject line of the message.

Mail: Defense Acquisition Regulations System, Attn: Ms. Heather Kitchens, OUSD(AT&L)DPAP(DARS), 3060 Defense Pentagon, Room 3B938, Washington, DC 20301-3060.

Comments received generally will be posted without change to <http://www.regulations.gov>, including any personal information provided.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Heather Kitchens, 571-372-6104.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title and OMB Number: Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS) Part 239, Acquisition of Information Technology, and the associated clause at DFARS 252.239-7000; OMB Control Number 0704-0341.

Affected Public: Businesses or other for-profit and not-for-profit institutions.

Respondent's Obligation: Required to obtain or retain benefits.

Type of Request: Revision and extension of a currently approved collection.

Reporting Frequency: On occasion.

Number of Respondents: 820.

Responses per Respondent: Approximately 7.

Annual Responses: 5,932.

Average Burden per Response: Approximately 0.5 hour.

Annual Burden Hours: 3,025.

Needs and Uses: This requirement provides for the collection of information from contractors regarding security of information technology and proposals from common carriers to perform special construction under contracts for telecommunications services. Contracting officers and other DoD personnel use the information to ensure that information technology is protected and to establish reasonable prices for special construction by common carriers.

The clause at DFARS 252.239-7000, Protection Against Compromising Emanations, requires that the contractor provide, upon request of the contracting officer, documentation that information technology used or provided under the contract meets appropriate information assurance requirements. DFARS 239.7408 requires the contracting officer to obtain a detailed special construction proposal from a common carrier that submits a proposal or quotation that has special construction requirements related to the performance of basic telecommunications services.

Jennifer D. Johnson,

Regulatory Control Officer, Defense Acquisition Regulations System.

[FR Doc. 2020-24561 Filed 11-4-20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001-06-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Defense Acquisition Regulations System

[Docket DARS-2020-0038; OMB Control No. 0750-0004]

Information Collection Requirement; Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS); Assessing Contractor Implementation of Cybersecurity Requirements

AGENCY: Defense Acquisition Regulations System, Department of Defense (DoD).

ACTION: Notice and request for comments regarding a proposed extension of an approved information collection requirement.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, DoD announces the proposed extension of a public information collection requirement and seeks public comment on the provisions thereof. DoD invites comments on: whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of DoD, including whether the information will have practical utility; the accuracy of the estimate of the burden of the proposed information collection; ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and ways to minimize the burden of the information collection on respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has approved this information collection for use through April 30, 2021. DoD proposes that OMB extend its approval for use for three additional