expansion of existing technologies and supporting the country’s homeland security, national defense, and other critical needs of government missions. NTIA will post a detailed agenda on its website, http://www.ntia.gov/category/csmac, prior to the meeting. To the extent that the meeting time and agenda permit, any member of the public may address the Committee regarding the agenda items. See Open Meeting and Public Participation Policy, available at http://www.ntia.gov/category/csmac.

Time and Date: The meeting will be held on April 8, 2021, from 1:30 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. EDT. The meeting time and the agenda topics are subject to change. Please refer to NTIA’s website, http://www.ntia.gov/category/csmac, for the most up-to-date meeting agenda and access information.

Place: This meeting will be conducted in an electronic format and open to the public via audio teleconference.

Individuals requiring accommodations are asked to notify Mr. Richardson at 404-707-2072 or arichardson@ntia.gov at least ten (10) business days before the meeting.

Status: Interested parties are invited to join the teleconference and to submit written comments to the Committee at any time before or after the meeting. Parties wishing to submit written comments for consideration by the Committee in advance of the meeting are strongly encouraged to submit their comments in Microsoft Word and/or PDF format via electronic mail to arichardson@ntia.gov. Comments may also be sent via postal mail to Commerce Spectrum Management Advisory Committee, National Telecommunications and Information Administration, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW, Room 4600, Washington, DC 20230. It would be helpful if paper submissions also include a compact disc (CD) that contains the comments in one of both of the file formats specified above. CDs should be labeled with the name and organizational affiliation of the filer. Comments must be received five (5) business days before the scheduled meeting date in order to provide sufficient time for review.

Comments received after this date will be distributed to the Committee, but may not be reviewed prior to the meeting. Additionally, please note that there may be a delay in the distribution of comments submitted via postal mail to Committee members.

Records: NTIA maintains records of all Committee proceedings. Committee records are available for public inspection. Washington, DC office at the address above. Documents including the Committee’s charter, member list, agendas, minutes, and reports are available on NTIA’s website at http://www.ntia.gov/category/csmac.

Dated: March 18, 2021.

Kathy Smith,
Chief Counsel, National Telecommunications and Information Administration.

[FR Doc. 2021–05976 Filed 3–22–21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–60–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Patent and Trademark Office

[Docket No. PTO–P–2021–0005]

Administrative Updates to the General Requirements Bulletin for Admission to the Examination for Registration To Practice in Patent Cases Before the United States Patent and Trademark Office

AGENCY: United States Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Request for comments.

SUMMARY: This request for comments seeks public input on proposed administrative updates to the General Requirements Bulletin for Admission to the Examination for Registration to Practice in Patent Cases Before the United States Patent and Trademark Office (GRB). There are three categories of technical and scientific qualifications that may typically make applicants eligible: Category A for specified bachelor’s degrees, Category B for other bachelor’s degrees with technical and scientific training, and Category C for practical engineering or scientific experience, which may be demonstrated by passing the Fundamentals of Engineering test. The United States Patent and Trademark Office (Office or USPTO) evaluates the criteria for applicants to sit for the registration examination on an ongoing basis. Based on this ongoing evaluation, the USPTO is looking into changing the criteria to: Add common Category B degrees to Category A, accept advanced degrees (i.e., master’s and doctoral degrees) under Category A, and accept a combination of core sciences under Category B, Options 2 and 4, so long as one of the core science courses has a lab component.

DATES: Comment Deadline Date: Written comments must be received on or before May 24, 2021.

ADDRESSES: For reasons of government efficiency, comments must be submitted through the Federal eRulemaking Portal at www.regulations.gov. To submit comments via the portal, one should enter docket number PTO–P–2021–0005 on the homepage and click “Search.” The site will provide search results listing all documents associated with this docket. Commenters can find a reference to this notice and click on the “Comment” icon, complete the required fields, and enter or attach their comments. Attachments to electronic comments will be accepted in portable document format (PDF) or DOCX format. Because comments will be made available for public inspection, information that the submitter does not desire to make public, such as an address or phone number, should not be included in the comments.

Visit the Federal eRulemaking Portal for additional instructions on providing comments via the portal. If electronic submission of and access to comments is not feasible due to a lack of access to a computer and/or the internet, please contact the USPTO using the contact information below for special instructions.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: William Covey, OED Director, by telephone at 571–272–4097 or by email at oed@uspto.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Summary

In this request for comments, the Office seeks feedback and information regarding proposed administrative updates to the GRB to the criteria of applicants who sit for the registration examination.

Background

The Director of the USPTO is given statutory authority to require a showing by patent practitioners that they possess “the necessary qualifications to render applicants or other persons valuable service, advice, and assistance in the presentation or prosecution of their applications or other business before the Office.” 35 U.S.C. 2(b)(2)(D). Thus, courts have determined that the USPTO Director bears primary responsibility for protecting the public from unqualified practitioners. Pursuant to that responsibility, USPTO regulations provide that registration to practice in patent matters before the USPTO requires a practitioner to, inter alia, demonstrate possession of scientific and technical qualifications. The role of patent

1 Legal representation before Federal agencies is generally governed by the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 500, which effectively defers to the individual States as to who may act as an attorney. That statute, however, provides a specific exception for representation in patent matters before the USPTO.
practitioners with scientific and technical backgrounds in providing full and clear patent specifications and claims has long been acknowledged. The USPTO publishes the GRB that sets forth guidance for establishing possession of scientific and technical qualifications. The GRB is available at www.uspto.gov/sites/default/files/documents/OED_GRB.pdf.

The GRB lists three categories of scientific and technical qualifications that typically make one eligible for admission to the registration examination: (1) Category A for specified bachelor’s degrees, (2) Category B for other bachelor’s degrees with technical and scientific training, and (3) Category C for individuals who rely on practical engineering or scientific experience and have passed the Fundamentals of Engineering test. If a candidate for registration does not qualify under any of the categories listed in the GRB, the USPTO will conduct an independent review for compliance with the scientific and technical qualifications.

The OED has evaluated, and continues to evaluate, the list of typically qualifying training set forth in the GRB. These evaluations seek to clarify guidance on what will satisfy the scientific and technical qualifications and to identify possible areas of improved administrative efficiency. The following proposals reflect the results of those evaluations.

Request for Public Comments

The Office seeks written comments from the public on proposed administrative updates to the GRB for those who sit for the registration examination. The goal of the proposed updates is to ensure fairness in the application process while also ensuring that patent practitioners who represent inventors are qualified, understand the technology, and are able to communicate effectively with inventors regarding the technical features of the invention.

The Office welcomes any comments from the public on the proposals covered in this notice. The Office also poses specific questions below and invites public feedback on those questions.

Proposal 1: Add Common Category B Degrees to Category A

As explained further in the GRB, bachelor’s degrees listed under Category A present prima facie evidence of the requisite technical and scientific qualifications. Currently, the bachelor’s degree may be in one of the following subjects: Biology, biochemistry, botany, computer science, electronics technology, food technology, general chemistry, marine technology, microbiology, molecular biology, organic chemistry, pharmacology, physics, textile technology, aeronautical engineering, agricultural engineering, biomedical engineering, ceramic engineering, chemical engineering, civil engineering, computer engineering, electrical engineering, electrochemical engineering, engineering physics, general engineering, geological engineering, industrial engineering, mechanical engineering, metallurgical engineering, mining engineering, nuclear engineering, and petroleum engineering.

Acceptable computer science degrees must be accredited by the Computer Science Accreditation Commission of the Computing Sciences Accreditation Board or by the Computing Accreditation Commission of the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology on or before the date the degree was awarded.

Starting in early 2020, the OED undertook a review of Category B applications to identify bachelor’s degrees that are routinely accepted as demonstrating the requisite scientific and technical qualifications. This review is ongoing. Based on the analysis to date, and understanding that Category A cannot be an exhaustive list of all degrees that would qualify and that current practice is to accept degrees wherein the transcript demonstrates equivalence to a Category A degree (for example, molecular cell biology may be equivalent to biology), the Office proposes expanding the list of Category A degrees to expressly include the following degrees that are routinely accepted: Aerospace engineering, bioengineering, biological science, biophysics, electronics engineering, genetic engineering, genetics, marine engineering, materials engineering, materials science, neuroscience, ocean engineering, and textile engineering. Listing these Category B degrees under Category A would improve operating efficiency and streamline the application process for prospective patent practitioners. The USPTO invites comments on the inclusion of any of these degrees in Category A, as well as any additional degrees that should be considered.

Proposal 2: Accept Advanced Degrees Under Category A

Category A does not currently include post-baccalaureate degrees. The USPTO proposes updating the GRB to list possession of a master’s or a doctoral degree in a Category A subject as demonstrating acceptable technical and scientific training. The USPTO invites comments on whether to include master’s or doctoral degrees in a Category A subject as qualifying technical and scientific training.

Proposal 3: Accept a Combination of Core Sciences Under Category B, Option 4

Category B, Option 4 in the GRB requires a combination of 40 credit hours in acceptable technical and scientific courses, including at least 8 hours in either chemistry with a lab or 8 hours in physics with a lab. Category B, Option 2, which focuses on training in biology and related sciences, has a similar requirement. The requirement for lab-based core science courses is meant to ensure familiarity with the processes involved in conducting valid experiments, the scientific method, and proper analysis of scientific data.

However, it is not clear whether multiple courses in either chemistry or physics alone, with a lab, provide an appreciable benefit over general core science training. Accordingly, the USPTO proposes revising Category B, Option 4 by changing “8 semester hours in chemistry or 8 semester hours of physics . . . obtained in two sequential courses, each containing a lab” to “eight semester hours in a combination of chemistry, physics, and/or biology, with at least one course including a lab.” Category B, Option 2, which already requires training in biology, would be revised to require at least “eight semester hours in a combination of chemistry and physics, with at least one course including a lab.” The USPTO invites comments on whether to change the requirement under Category B. Option 4 from two sequential courses in chemistry or physics, each containing a lab, to that of eight semester hours in a combination of chemistry, physics, and/or biology, with at least one course including a lab.

Questions Regarding Administrative Updates to the General Requirements Bulletin for Admission to the Examination for Registration To Practice in Patent Cases Before the United States Patent and Trademark Office

As noted above, the Office welcomes comments from the public on any portion of the proposed updates to the

---

General Requirements Bulletin for registration to practice in patent matters. The Office is particularly interested in the public’s input on the following questions:

1. What additional degrees should qualify under Category A?
2. Should the USPTO include master’s or doctoral degrees in a Category A subject as qualifying technical and scientific training?
3. Should the USPTO change the Category B requirement of two sequential courses in chemistry or physics, each containing a lab to that of at least one course including a lab for Option 4; and to eight semester hours in a combination of chemistry, physics, and/or biology, with at least one course including a lab for Option 2?

Andrew Hirshfeld,
Commissioner for Patents, Performing the Functions and Duties of the Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION:
Dated: March 18, 2021.
Alberta E. Mills,
Commission Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Defense Acquisition Regulations System

[Docket Number DARS–2020–0047; OMB Control Number 0750–0003]

Information Collection Requirement; Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Requests for Reimbursement Under Section 3610 of the CARES Act

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

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Defense Acquisition Regulations System has submitted to OMB for clearance, the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act.

DATES: Consideration will be given to all comments received by April 22, 2021.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title and OMB Number: Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS), Requests for Reimbursement under Section 3610 of the CARES Act: OMB Control Number 0750–0003.

Type of Request: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Obligation to Respond: Required to obtain or retain benefits.

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

Number of Respondents: 16,224.

Responses per Respondent: 1.5 approximately.

Annual Responses: 24,337.
Average Burden per Response: 63 hours approximately.

Annual Burden Hours: 1,523,053.

Reporting Frequency: On occasion.

Needs and Uses: Section 3610 of the Coronavirus Aid, Relief and Economic Security (CARES) Act (Pub. L. 116–136), enacted on March 27, 2020, authorizes, but does not require, contracting officers to modify contracts and other agreements, without consideration, to reimburse contractors for paid leave a contractor provides to its employees or subcontractors in a ready state, including to protect the life and safety of Government and contractor personnel, during the public health emergency declared for Coronavirus Disease (COVID–19).

A contractor request for reimbursement under section 3610 must include sufficient documentation to support the request and enable the contracting officer to determine whether a contractor is eligible for reimbursement under section 3610 and, if so, the amount of reimbursement to provide to a contractor. Contractors’ requests for reimbursement under section 3610 will vary in dollar amount and complexity; as such, will the amount and type of information needed from a contractor to support their reimbursement request. Based on this variation, contracting officers will use one of three DoD reimbursement checklists to advise contractors of the information needed to support their request. The information described in the checklists is necessary to collect from contractors in order to ensure that contracting officers are able to determine whether to approve the request for reimbursement and expediently modify the affected contract(s) for the authorized reimbursement amount.

Section 3610 also requires that any reimbursements made under its authority are reduced by the amount of credit a contractor is allowed under other provisions of the CARES Act and division G of the Families First Coronavirus Response Act (FFCRA) (Pub. L. 116–127). As the status of such credits may not be known at the time of reimbursement, DFARS clause 252.243–7999, Section 3610 Reimbursement (Deviation 2020–O0021), requires contractors to notify the contracting officer of any credits received after receiving reimbursement under section 3610 and make any repayment, as necessary, to comply with the requirements of section 3610. This information is necessary so that contracting officers may comply with the provisions of section 3610.

Comments and recommendations on the proposed information collection should be sent to Ms. Susan Minson, DoD Desk Officer, at Oira_submission@omb.eop.gov. Please identify the proposed information collection by DoD Desk Officer and the Docket ID number and title of the information collection.

You may also submit comments, identified by docket number and title, by the following method: Federal eRulemaking Portal: https://