

(vi) Total apportioned deduction for research and experimentation:	\$100,000
(vii) Amount apportioned to the residual grouping (\$50,000+\$38,961):	\$88,961
(viii) Amount apportioned to the statutory grouping of sources within countries Y and Z:	\$11,039

(2) Tentative Apportionment on Gross Income Basis

(i) Exclusive apportionment of research and experimental expense to the residual grouping of gross income (\$100,000×25 percent):	\$25,000
(ii) Apportionment of research and experimental expense to the residual grouping of gross income (\$75,000×\$479,000/\$500,000):	\$71,850
(iii) Apportionment of research and experimental expense to the statutory grouping of gross income (\$75,000×\$9,000+\$12,000/\$500,000):	\$3,150
(iv) Amount apportioned to the residual grouping:	\$96,850
(v) Amount apportioned to the statutory grouping of general limitation income from sources without the United States:	\$3,150

(B) Since X has elected to use the optional gross income methods of apportionment and its apportionment on the basis of gross income to the statutory grouping, \$3,150, is less than 50 percent of its apportionment on the basis of sales to the statutory grouping, \$11,039, it must use Option two of paragraph (d)(3) of this section and apportion \$5,520 (50 percent of \$11,039) to the statutory grouping.

Margaret Milner Richardson,
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Approved: December 13, 1995.

Leslie Samuels,
Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

[FR Doc. 95-30901 Filed 12-21-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4830-01-U

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

48 CFR Part 970

RIN 1991-AA63

Acquisition Regulation; Technology Transfer Activities of Department of Energy (DOE) Management and Operating Contractors

AGENCY: Department of Energy.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Department of Energy (DOE) amends the Department of Energy Acquisition Regulation (DEAR) to codify DOE's implementation of its technology transfer mission for DOE laboratories (including weapon production facilities) operated by management and operating contractors.

EFFECTIVE DATE: January 22, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Howard K. Mitchell, Policy Analyst, Office of Policy (HR-51), Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Procurement and Assistance Management, Washington, D.C., 20585, (202) 586-8190.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

- I. Background
- II. Disposition of comments
- III. Procedural Requirements
 - A. Regulatory Review Under Executive Order 12866
 - B. Review Under Executive Order 12612
 - C. Review Under Executive Order 12778
 - D. Review Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act
 - E. Review Under the Paperwork Reduction Act
 - F. Review Under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)

I. Background

The proposed rule was published on May 22, 1995, at 60 FR 27069 (1995). It was intended to amend the Department of Energy Acquisition Regulation (DEAR) to codify DOE's implementation of its technology transfer mission for DOE laboratories and weapon production facilities operated by management and operating contractors. This mission was established by The National Competitiveness Technology Transfer Act of 1989, as amended by Sections 3134 and 3160 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994.

II. Disposition of Comments

DOE received formal comments from only one entity. This commenter is a current Departmental non-profit Management and Operating Laboratory contractor. The commenter noted the need for inclusion in the proposed definition of bailment the term, Laboratory Tangible Research Product. This term would encompass tangible material results of research which (i) are provided to permit replication, reproduction, evaluation or confirmation of the research effort, or to evaluate its potential commercial utility, (ii) are not materials generally commercially available, and (iii) were made under the contract by Laboratory employees or through the use of Laboratory research facilities. The definition of bailment has been modified to incorporate this new term. The commenter also expressed concern that the current definition of allowable costs only encompassed costs "through an ORTA", with the implication that the

activities and costs associated with autonomous Laboratory organizations such as finance, procurement, legal and other offices involved in technology transfer would be excluded. DOE agrees that such Laboratory organizations may be "appropriate organizational elements consistent with the requirements for an Office of Research and Technology Applications" and that the costs associated with supporting technology transfer at these Laboratory organizations would be allowable subject to other provisions of the M&O contract. One of the organizational examples cited by the commenter, however, falls under the definition of a home or corporate office general and administrative (G&A) expense. DEAR 970.3102-1 indicates that, in its fee allowance, DOE provides appropriate compensation for home office G&A expense. DOE policy also recognizes that the circumstances and the need for such home office involvement vary considerably from site to site. Therefore, home office G&A (including technology transfer related expenses) would normally be considered in the individual negotiation of the fee for the contract. When the fee amount is believed to be insufficient to cover the extent of such offsite involvement, however, DEAR 970.3102-1 also permits separate treatment of such a home office expense. Therefore, no change in the language of the rule is believed necessary.

The commenter further suggested adding language under Conflicts of Interest to reflect that other persons working at the Laboratory participating in Laboratory research or technology

transfer activities should also be considered when implementing procedures to avoid conflicts of interest. Such other persons would most likely be long term visitors, job-shop subcontractors, guest scientists, no-pay appointees, post doctoral fellows, industrial exchange participants, academic sabbaticals and other non-Laboratory personnel. DOE agrees and appropriate language to address this comment has been included under Conflicts of Interest—Technology Transfer. The commenter also recommended deleting the requirement under (d)(10) which requires contractors to notify DOE prior to evaluating a proposal by a third party or DOE when the subject matter of the proposal involves an elected or waived subject invention or one in which the Contractor intends to elect to retain title. The commenter believes that (d)(10) is burdensome for Contractors that manage and operate several private and DOE facilities because it requires Contractors to search for inventions unrelated to the contract. DOE has inserted language under (d)(10) to clarify that the notification requirement applies when the subject matter of the proposal involves an elected or waived subject invention under the contract or one in which the Contractor intends to elect to retain title under the contract.

The commenter recommended adding language to indicate that the U.S. Industrial Competitiveness requirements apply to intellectual property where the Laboratory obtains rights during the period the Contractor is operating the Laboratory and would not apply to intellectual property owned by the parent organization/company. Language was added to reflect that the U.S. Industrial Competitiveness requirements solely apply in licensing and assignment decisions involving Laboratory intellectual property where the Laboratory obtains rights during the course of the Contractor's operation of the Laboratory under the contract. The U.S. Industrial Competitiveness requirements would not apply in licensing and assignment decisions involving the Contractor's other intellectual property.

Three comments were made objecting to three separate provisions of the Indemnity-Product Liability paragraph which might, in the commenter's view, result in the contractor being subjected to undue financial/legal risks and administrative burden. Specifically, the commenter objected to language that limited the indemnification in licensing to only personal injury or property injury and which also excluded from the indemnity protection any liability

based upon negligence of the Contractor. The Indemnity—Product Liability provisions as written are minimally acceptable to DOE and therefore, no change is being made to the language. However, the Department emphasizes that the Contractor is permitted to negotiate language that is deemed more beneficial to both the Contractor and the Department. With respect to the commenter's objection to the requirement to identify and obtain the approval of the Contracting Officer for any proposed exceptions to the Participant providing indemnification, the Department believes that overall, this requirement is beneficial to the Contractor. This requirement provides a mechanism by which the Contractor is able to obtain exceptions to the indemnification provision and, therefore, no change is believed necessary.

In the Disposition of Income provisions, the commenter made three suggestions. Under subparagraph (h)(1), the first suggestion was to modify the language to reflect that the amount of royalties or other income earned or retained by the Contractor was to be that amount remaining after payment of patenting costs, licensing costs, payments to inventors and other expenses incidental to the administration of Subject Inventions. This language parallels that which appears in 35 U.S.C. 202(c)(7)(E)(i) and has been adopted.

The second comment submitted regarding the Disposition of Income provision was to add the text of 35 U.S.C. 202 (c)(7)(E)(ii) which would allow the licensing of Subject Inventions to be administered by Contractor employees on location at the facility. This suggestion was not adopted in that 35 U.S.C. 202 (c)(7)(E)(ii) is already contained in the patent clause of the M&O contract. The third comment objected to the proposed coverage on inventor award and royalty sharing being subject to the approval of the Contracting Officer. Changing the requirement to obtain Contracting Officer approval with respect to policies for inventor award and royalty sharing, as proposed in this comment, would result in a major change to a long standing Departmental policy and has not been adopted.

Under the Transfer to Successor Contractor provision, the commenter requested that additional assurance be provided in requiring a successor contractor to accept transfer of title and accounts subject to the rights and obligations which the previous operator had to its inventors, its licensees and to its parent organization/company. No

change is believed necessary because the intent of the suggestion is implicit in the current language.

In the Technology Transfer Through Cooperative Research and Development Agreements, Withholding of Data provision, the commenter suggests that the likelihood of obtaining commercially reasonable patent protection be included as a standard in determining whether a patent application has to be filed. As provided in the M&O contract's patent clause, if the Contractor does not file a patent application on an invention disclosed to the Government as a subject invention, the Government may file. Disclosure of subject inventions and the Government's right to file is a statutory requirement.

III. Procedural Requirements

A. Regulatory Review Under Executive Order 12866

Today's regulatory action has been determined not to be a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866, "Regulatory Planning and Review," (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993). Accordingly, today's action was not subject to review under the Executive Order by the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs.

B. Review Under Executive Order 12612

Executive Order 12612 (52 FR 41285, October 30, 1987) requires that regulations, rules, legislation, and any other policy actions be reviewed for any substantial direct effects on States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or in the distribution of power and responsibilities among various levels of government. If there are sufficient substantial direct effects, then the Executive Order requires preparation of a federalism assessment to be used in all decisions involved in promulgating and implementing a policy action.

Today's final rule will revise certain policy and procedural requirements. However, DOE has determined that none of the revisions will have a substantial direct effect on the institutional interests or traditional functions of the States.

C. Review Under Executive Order 12778

Section 2 of Executive Order 12778 instructs each agency to adhere to certain requirements in promulgating new regulations and reviewing existing regulations. These requirements, set forth in sections 2(a) and (b)(2), include eliminating drafting errors and needless ambiguity, drafting the regulations to minimize litigation, providing clear and

certain legal standards for affected conduct, and promoting simplification and burden reduction. Agencies are also instructed to make every reasonable effort to ensure that the regulation: specifies clearly any preemptive effect, effect on existing Federal law or regulation, and retroactive effect; describes any administrative proceedings to be available prior to judicial review and any provisions for the exhaustion of such administrative proceedings; and defines key terms. Therefore, DOE certifies that this final rule meets the requirements of sections 2(a) and (b) of Executive Order 12778.

D. Review Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act

This final rule was reviewed under the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980, Pub. L. 96-354, which requires preparation of a regulatory flexibility analysis for any rule which is likely to have significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. This final rule will have no impact on interest rates, tax policies or liabilities, the cost of goods or services, or other direct economic factors. It will also not have any indirect economic consequences, such as changed construction rates. DOE certifies that this final rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities and, therefore, no regulatory flexibility analysis has been prepared.

E. Review Under the Paperwork Reduction Act

No new information collection or recordkeeping requirements are imposed by this final rulemaking. Accordingly, no OMB clearance is required under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.).

F. Review Under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)

DOE has concluded that promulgation of this rule falls into a class of actions (categorical exclusion A5) that are categorically excluded from NEPA review because they would not individually or cumulatively have significant impact on the human environment, as determined by the Department's regulations (10 CFR Part 1021, Subpart D) implementing the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321, 4331-4335, 4341-4347 (1976)). Therefore, this rule does not require an environmental impact statement or an environmental assessment pursuant to NEPA.

List of Subjects in 48 CFR Part 970

Government procurement.

Issued in Washington, DC on December 15, 1995.

Richard H. Hopf,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Procurement and Assistance Management.

PART 970—DOE MANAGEMENT AND OPERATING CONTRACTS

1. The authority citation for Part 970 continues to read as follows:

Authority: Sec. 161 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2201), Sec. 644 of the Department of Energy Organization Act, Pub. L. 95-91 (42 U.S.C. 7254).

2. Section 970.5204-40, Technology Transfer Mission, is added to read as follows:

970.5204-40 Technology transfer mission.

As prescribed in 48 CFR 970.73, insert the following clause:

Technology Transfer Mission (Jan. 1996)

This clause has as its purpose implementation of the National Competitiveness Technology Transfer Act of 1989 (Sections 3131, 3132, 3133, and 3157 of Pub. L. 101-189 and as amended by Pub. L. 103-160, Sections 3134 and 3160). The Contractor shall conduct technology transfer activities with a purpose of providing benefit from Federal research to U.S. industrial competitiveness.

(a) Authority.

(1) In order to ensure the full use of the results of research and development efforts of, and the capabilities of, the Laboratory, technology transfer, including Cooperative Research and Development Agreements (CRADAs), is established as a mission of the Laboratory consistent with the policy, principles and purposes of Sections 11(a)(1) and 12(g) of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980, as amended (15 U.S.C. 3710a); Section 3132(b) of Pub. L. 101-189, Sections 3134 and 3160 of P.L. 103-160, and of Chapter 38 of the Patent Laws (35 U.S.C. 200 et seq.); Section 152 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2182); Section 9 of the Federal Nonnuclear Energy Research and Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5908); and Executive Order 12591 of April 10, 1987.

(2) In pursuing the technology transfer mission, the Contractor is authorized to conduct activities including but not limited to: identifying and protecting Intellectual Property made, created or acquired at or by the Laboratory; negotiating licensing agreements and assignments for Intellectual Property made, created or acquired at or by the Laboratory that the Contractor controls or owns; bailments; negotiating all aspects of and entering into CRADAs; providing technical consulting and personnel exchanges; conducting science education activities and reimbursable Work for Others (WFO); providing information exchanges; and making available laboratory or weapon production user facilities. It is fully expected

that the Contractor shall use all of the mechanisms available to it to accomplish this technology transfer mission, including, but not limited to, CRADAs, user facilities, WFO, science education activities, consulting, personnel, assignments, and licensing in accordance with this clause.

(b) Definitions.

(1) *Contractor's Laboratory Director* means the individual who has supervision over all or substantially all of the Contractor's operations at the Laboratory.

(2) *Intellectual Property* means patents, trademarks, copyrights, mask works, protected CRADA information, and other forms of comparable property rights protected by Federal Law and other foreign counterparts.

(3) *Cooperative Research and Development Agreement (CRADA)* means any agreement entered into between the Contractor as operator of the Laboratory, and one or more parties including at least one non-Federal party under which the Government, through its laboratory, provides personnel, services, facilities, equipment, intellectual property, or other resources with or without reimbursement (but not funds to non-Federal parties) and the non-Federal parties provide funds, personnel, services, facilities, equipment, intellectual property, or other resources toward the conduct of specified research or development efforts which are consistent with the missions of the Laboratory; except that such term does not include a procurement contract, grant, or cooperative agreement as those terms are used in sections 6303, 6304, and 6305 of Title 31 of the United States Code.

(4) *Joint Work Statement (JWS)* means a proposal for a CRADA prepared by the Contractor, signed by the Contractor's Laboratory Director or designee which describes the following:

- (i) Purpose;
- (ii) Scope of Work which delineates the rights and responsibilities of the Government, the Contractor and Third Parties, one of which must be a non-Federal party;
- (iii) Schedule for the work; and
- (iv) Cost and resource contributions of the parties associated with the work and the schedule.

(5) *Assignment* means any agreement by which the Contractor transfers ownership of Laboratory Intellectual Property, subject to the Government's retained rights.

(6) *Laboratory Biological Materials* means biological materials capable of replication or reproduction, such as plasmids, deoxyribonucleic acid molecules, ribonucleic acid molecules, living organisms of any sort and their progeny, including viruses, prokaryote and eukaryote cell lines, transgenic plants and animals, and any derivatives or modifications thereof or products produced through their use or associated biological products, made under this contract by Laboratory employees or through the use of Laboratory research facilities.

(7) *Laboratory Tangible Research Product* means tangible material results of research which

- (i) are provided to permit replication, reproduction, evaluation or confirmation of

the research effort, or to evaluate its potential commercial utility;

(ii) are not materials generally commercially available; and

(iii) were made under this contract by Laboratory employees or through the use of Laboratory research facilities.

(8) *Bailment* means any agreement in which the Contractor permits the commercial or non-commercial transfer of custody, access or use of Laboratory Biological Materials or Laboratory Tangible Research Product for a specified purpose of technology transfer or research and development, including without limitation evaluation, and without transferring ownership to the bailee.

(c) *Allowable Costs.*

(1) The Contractor shall establish and carry out its technology transfer efforts through appropriate organizational elements consistent with the requirements for an Office of Research and Technology Applications (ORTA) pursuant to paragraphs (b) and (c) of Section 11 of the Stevenson-Wylder Technology Innovation Act of 1980, as amended (15 U.S.C. 3710). The costs associated with the conduct of technology transfer through the ORTA including activities associated with obtaining, maintaining, licensing, and assigning Intellectual Property rights, and increasing the potential for the transfer of technology, and the widespread notice of technology transfer opportunities, shall be deemed allowable provided that such costs meet the other requirements of the allowable costs provisions of this Contract. In addition to any separately designated funds, these costs in any fiscal year shall not exceed an amount equal to 0.5 percent of the operating funds included in the Federal research and development budget (including Work For Others) of the Laboratory for that fiscal year without written approval of the Contracting Officer.

(2) The Contractor's participation in litigation to enforce or defend Intellectual Property claims incurred in its technology transfer efforts shall be as provided in the clause entitled "Litigation and Claims" of this Contract.

(d) *Conflicts of Interest—Technology Transfer.* The Contractor shall have implementing procedures that seek to avoid employee and organizational conflicts of interest, or the appearance of conflicts of interest, in the conduct of its technology transfer activities. These procedures shall apply to other persons participating in Laboratory research or related technology transfer activities. Such implementing procedures shall be provided to the Contracting Officer for review and approval within sixty (60) days after execution of this contract. The Contracting Officer shall have thirty (30) days thereafter to approve or require specific changes to such procedures. Such implementing procedures shall include procedures to:

(1) Inform employees of and require conformance with standards of conduct and integrity in connection with the CRADA activity in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (n)(5) of this clause;

(2) Review and approve employee activities so as to avoid conflicts of interest

arising from commercial utilization activities relating to Contractor-developed Intellectual Property;

(3) Conduct work performed using royalties so as to avoid interference with or adverse effects on ongoing DOE projects and programs;

(4) Conduct activities relating to commercial utilization of Contractor-developed Intellectual Property so as to avoid interference with or adverse effects on user facility or WFO activities of the Contractor;

(5) Conduct DOE-funded projects and programs so as to avoid the appearance of conflicts of interest or actual conflicts of interest with non-Government funded work;

(6) Notify the Contracting Officer with respect to any new work to be performed or proposed to be performed under the Contract for DOE or other Federal agencies where the new work or proposal involves Intellectual Property in which the Contractor has obtained or intends to request or elect title;

(7) Except as provided elsewhere in this Contract, obtain the approval of the Contracting Officer for any licensing of or assignment of title to Intellectual Property rights by the Contractor to any business or corporate affiliate of the Contractor;

(8) Obtain the approval of the Contracting Officer prior to any assignment, exclusive licensing, or option for exclusive licensing, of Intellectual Property to any person who has been a Laboratory employee within the previous two years or to the company in which he or she is a principal; and

(9) Notify non-Federal sponsors of WFO activities, or non-Federal users of user facilities, of any relevant Intellectual Property interest of the Contractor prior to execution of WFOs or user agreements.

(10) Notify DOE prior to evaluating a proposal by a third party or DOE, when the subject matter of the proposal involves an elected or waived subject invention under this contract or one in which the Contractor intends to elect to retain title under this contract.

(e) *Fairness of Opportunity.* In conducting its technology transfer activities, the Contractor shall prepare procedures and take all reasonable measures to ensure widespread notice of availability of technologies suited for transfer and opportunities for exclusive licensing and joint research arrangements. The requirement to widely disseminate the availability of technology transfer opportunities does not apply to a specific application originated outside of the Laboratory and by entities other than the Contractor.

(f) *U.S. Industrial Competitiveness.*

(1) In the interest of enhancing U.S. Industrial Competitiveness, the Contractor shall, in its licensing and assignments of Intellectual Property, give preference in such a manner as to enhance the accrual of economic and technological benefits to the U.S. domestic economy. The Contractor shall consider the following factors in all of its licensing and assignment decisions involving Laboratory intellectual property where the Laboratory obtains rights during the course of the Contractor's operation of the Laboratory under this contract:

(i) whether any resulting design and development will be performed in the United

States and whether resulting products, embodying parts, including components thereof, will be substantially manufactured in the United States; or

(ii) (A) whether the proposed licensee or assignee has a business unit located in the United States and whether significant economic and technical benefits will flow to the United States as a result of the license or assignment agreement; and

(B) in licensing any entity subject to the control of a foreign company or government, whether such foreign government permits United States agencies, organizations or other persons to enter into cooperative research and development agreements and licensing agreements, and has policies to protect United States Intellectual Property rights.

(2) If the Contractor determines that neither of the conditions in paragraphs (f)(1)(i) or (ii) of this clause are likely to be fulfilled, the Contractor, prior to entering into such an agreement, must obtain the approval of the Contracting Officer. The Contracting Officer shall act on any such requests for approval within thirty (30) days.

(3) The Contractor agrees to be bound by the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 204 (Preference for United States industry).

(g) *Indemnity—Product Liability.* In entering into written technology transfer agreements, including but not limited to, research and development agreements, licenses, assignments and CRADAs, the Contractor agrees to include in such agreements a requirement that the U.S. Government and the Contractor, except for any negligent acts or omissions of the Contractor, be indemnified for all damages, costs, and expenses, including attorneys' fees, arising from personal injury or property damage occurring as a result of the making, using or selling of a product, process or service by or on behalf of the Participant, its assignees or licensees which was derived from the work performed under the agreement. The Contractor shall identify and obtain the approval of the Contracting Officer for any proposed exceptions to this requirement such as where State or local law expressly prohibit the Participant from providing indemnification or where the research results will be placed in the public domain.

(h) *Disposition of Income.*

(1) Royalties or other income earned or retained by the Contractor as a result of performance of authorized technology transfer activities herein shall be used by the Contractor for scientific research, development, technology transfer, and education at the Laboratory, consistent with the research and development mission and objectives of the Laboratory and subject to Section 12(b)(5) of the Stevenson-Wylder Technology Innovation Act of 1980, as amended (15 U.S.C. 3710a(b)(5)) and Chapter 38 of the Patent Laws (35 U.S.C. 200 et seq.) as amended through the effective date of this contract award or modification. If the net amounts of such royalties and income received from patent licensing after payment of patenting costs, licensing costs, payments to inventors and other expenses incidental to the administration of Subject Inventions during any fiscal year exceed 5 percent of the

Laboratory's budget for that fiscal year, 75 percent of such excess amounts shall be paid to the Treasury of the United States, and the remaining amount of such excess shall be used by the Contractor for the purposes as described above in this paragraph. Any inventions arising out of such scientific research and development activities shall be deemed to be Subject Inventions under the Contract.

(2) The Contractor shall include as a part of its annual Laboratory Institutional Plan or other such annual document a plan setting out those uses to which royalties and other income received as a result of performance of authorized technology transfer activities herein will be applied at the Laboratory, and at the end of the year, provide a separate accounting for how the funds were actually used. Under no circumstances shall these royalties and income be used for an illegal augmentation of funds furnished by the U.S. Government.

(3) The Contractor shall establish subject to the approval of the Contracting Officer a policy for making awards or sharing of royalties with Contractor employees, other coinventors and coauthors, including Federal employee coinventors when deemed appropriate by the Contracting Officer.

(i) *Transfer to Successor Contractor.* In the event of termination or upon the expiration of this Contract, any unexpended balance of income received for use at the Laboratory shall be transferred, at the Contracting Officer's request, to a successor contractor, or in the absence of a successor contractor, to such other entity as designated by the Contracting Officer. The Contractor shall transfer title, as one package, to the extent the Contractor retains title, in all patents and patent applications, licenses, accounts containing royalty revenues from such license agreements, including equity positions in third party entities, and other Intellectual Property rights which arose at the Laboratory, to the successor contractor or to the Government as directed by the Contracting Officer.

(j) *Technology Transfer Affecting the National Security.*

(1) The Contractor shall notify and obtain the approval of the Contracting Officer, prior to entering into any technology transfer arrangement, when such technology or any part of such technology is classified or sensitive under Section 148 of the Atomic Energy Act (42 U.S.C. 2168). Such notification shall include sufficient information to enable DOE to determine the extent that commercialization of such technology would enhance or diminish security interests of the United States, or diminish communications within DOE's nuclear weapon production complex. DOE shall use its best efforts to complete its determination within sixty (60) days of the Contractor's notification, and provision of any supporting information, and DOE shall promptly notify the Contractor as to whether the technology is transferable.

(2) The Contractor shall include in all of its technology transfer agreements with third parties, including, but not limited to, CRADAs, licensing agreements and assignments, notice to such third parties that

the export of goods and/or Technical Data from the United States may require some form of export control license or other authority from the U.S. Government and that failure to obtain such export control license may result in criminal liability under U.S. laws.

(3) For other than fundamental research as defined in National Security Decision Directive 189, the Contractor is responsible to conduct internal export control reviews and assure that technology is transferred in accordance with applicable law.

(k) *Records.* The Contractor shall maintain records of its technology transfer activities in a manner and to the extent satisfactory to the DOE and specifically including, but not limited to, the licensing agreements, assignments and the records required to implement the requirements of paragraphs (e), (f), and (h) of this clause and shall provide reports to the Contracting Officer to enable DOE to maintain the reporting requirements of Section 12(c)(6) of the Stevenson-Wylder Technology Innovation Act of 1980, as amended (15 U.S.C. 3710a(c)(6)). Such reports shall be made annually in a format to be agreed upon between the Contractor and DOE and in such a format which will serve to adequately inform DOE of the Contractor's technology transfer activities while protecting any data not subject to disclosure under the Rights in Technical Data clause and paragraph (n) of this clause. Such records shall be made available in accordance with the clauses of this Contract pertaining to inspection, audit and examination of records.

(l) *Reports to Congress.* To facilitate DOE's reporting to Congress, the Contractor is required to submit annually to DOE a technology transfer plan for conducting its technology transfer function for the upcoming year, including plans for securing Intellectual Property rights in Laboratory innovations with commercial promise and plans for managing such innovations so as to benefit the competitiveness of United States industry. This plan shall be provided to the Contracting Officer on or before October 1st of each year.

(m) *Oversight and Appraisal.* The Contractor is responsible for developing and implementing effective internal controls for all technology transfer activities consistent with the audit and record requirements of this Contract. Laboratory Contractor performance in implementing the technology transfer mission and the effectiveness of the Contractor's procedures will be evaluated by the Contracting Officer as part of the annual appraisal process, with input from the cognizant Secretarial Officer or program office.

(n) *Technology Transfer Through Cooperative Research and Development Agreements.* Upon approval of the Contracting Officer and as provided in a DOE approved Joint Work Statement (JWS), the Laboratory Director or his designee may enter into CRADAs on behalf of the DOE subject to the requirements set forth in this paragraph.

(1) *Review and Approval of CRADAs*

(i) Except as otherwise directed in writing by the Contracting Officer, each JWS shall be

submitted to the Contracting Officer for approval. The Contractor's Laboratory Director or designee shall provide a program mission impact statement and shall include an impact statement regarding related Intellectual Property rights known by the Contractor to be owned by the Government to assist the Contracting Officer in his approval determination.

(ii) The Contractor shall also include (specific to the proposed CRADA), a statement of compliance with the Fairness of Opportunity requirements of paragraph (e) of this clause.

(iii) Within ninety (90) days after submission of a JWS, the Contracting Officer shall approve, disapprove or request modification to the JWS. If a modification is required, the Contracting Officer shall approve or disapprove any resubmission of the JWS within thirty (30) days of its resubmission, or ninety (90) days from the date of the original submission, whichever is later. The Contracting Officer shall provide a written explanation to the Contractor's Laboratory Director or designee of any disapproval or requirement for modification of a JWS.

(iv) Upon approval of a JWS, the Contractor's Laboratory Director or designee may submit a CRADA, based upon the approved JWS, to the Contracting Officer. The Contracting Officer, within thirty (30) days of receipt of the CRADA, shall approve or request modification of the CRADA. If the Contracting Officer requests a modification of the CRADA, an explanation of such request shall be provided to the Laboratory Director or designee.

(v) Except as otherwise directed in writing by the Contracting Officer, the Contractor shall not enter into, or begin work under, a CRADA until approval of the CRADA has been granted by the Contracting Officer. The Contractor may submit its proposed CRADA to the Contracting Officer at the time of submitting its proposed JWS or any time thereafter. However, the Contracting Officer is not obligated to respond under paragraph (n)(1)(iv) of this clause until within thirty (30) days after approval of the JWS or thirty (30) days after submittal of the CRADA, whichever is later.

(2) *Selection of Participants* The Contractor's Laboratory Director or designee in deciding what CRADA to enter into shall:

(i) Give special consideration to small business firms, and consortia involving small business firms;

(ii) Give preference to business units located in the United States which agree that products or processes embodying Intellectual Property will be substantially manufactured or practiced in the United States and, in the case of any industrial organization or other person subject to the control of a foreign company or government, take into consideration whether or not such foreign government permits United States agencies, organizations, or other persons to enter into cooperative research and development agreements and licensing agreements;

(iii) Provide Fairness of Opportunity in accordance with the requirements of paragraph (e) of this clause; and

(iv) Give consideration to the Conflicts of Interest requirements of paragraph (d) of this clause.

(3) *Withholding of Data*

(i) Data that is first produced as a result of research and development activities conducted under a CRADA and that would be a trade secret or commercial or financial data that would be privileged or confidential, if such data had been obtained from a non-Federal third party, may be protected from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act as provided in the Stevenson-Wylder Technology Innovation Act of 1980, as amended (15 U.S.C. 3710a(c)(7)) for a period as agreed in the CRADA of up to five (5) years from the time the data is first produced. The DOE shall cooperate with the Contractor in protecting such data.

(ii) Unless otherwise expressly approved by the Contracting Officer in advance for a specific CRADA, the Contractor agrees, at the request of the Contracting Officer, to transmit such data to other DOE facilities for use by DOE or its Contractors by or on behalf of the Government. When data protected pursuant to paragraph (n)(3)(i) of this clause is so transferred, the Contractor shall clearly mark the data with a legend setting out the restrictions against private use and further dissemination, along with the expiration date of such restrictions.

(iii) In addition to its authority to license Intellectual Property, the Contractor may enter into licensing agreements with third parties for data developed by the Contractor under a CRADA subject to other provisions of this Contract. However, the Contractor shall neither use the protection against dissemination nor the licensing of data as an alternative to the submittal of invention disclosures which include data protected pursuant to paragraph (n)(3)(i) of this clause.

(4) *Work For Others and User Facility Programs*

(i) WFO and User Facility Agreements (UFAs) are not CRADAs and will be available for use by the Contractor in addition to CRADAs for achieving utilization of employee expertise and unique facilities for maximizing technology transfer. The Contractor agrees to inform prospective CRADA participants, which are intending to substantially pay full cost recovery for the effort under a proposed CRADA, of the availability of alternative forms of agreements, i.e., WFO and UFA, and of the Class Patent Waiver provisions associated therewith.

(ii) Where the Contractor believes that the transfer of technology to the U. S. domestic economy will benefit from, or other equity considerations dictate, an arrangement other than the Class Waiver of patent rights to the sponsor in WFO and UFAs, a request may be made to the Contracting Officer for an exception to the Class Waivers.

(iii) Rights to inventions made under agreements other than funding agreements with third parties shall be governed by the appropriate provisions incorporated, with DOE approval, in such agreements, and the provisions in such agreements take precedence over any disposition of rights contained in this Contract. Disposition of rights under any such agreement shall be in

accordance with any DOE class waiver (including Work for Others and User Class Waivers) or individually negotiated waiver which applies to the agreement.

(5) *Conflicts of Interest*

(i) Except as provided in paragraph (n)(5)(iii) of this clause, the Contractor shall assure that no employee of the Contractor shall have a substantial role (including an advisory role) in the preparation, negotiation, or approval of a CRADA, if, to such employee's knowledge:

(A) Such employee, or the spouse, child, parent, sibling, or partner of such employee, or an organization (other than the Contractor) in which such employee serves as an officer, director, trustee, partner, or employee—

(1) holds financial interest in any entity, other than the Contractor, that has a substantial interest in the preparation, negotiation, or approval of the CRADA;

(2) receives a gift or gratuity from any entity, other than the Contractor, that has a substantial interest in the preparation, negotiation, or approval of the CRADA; or

(B) A financial interest in any entity, other than the Contractor, that has a substantial interest in the preparation, negotiation, or approval of the CRADA, is held by any person or organization with whom such employee is negotiating or has any arrangement concerning prospective employment.

(ii) The Contractor shall require that each employee of the Contractor who has a substantial role (including an advisory role) in the preparation, negotiation, or approval of a CRADA certify through the Contractor to the Contracting Officer that the circumstances described in paragraph (n)(5)(i) of this clause do not apply to that employee.

(iii) The requirements of paragraphs (n)(5)(i) and (n)(5)(ii) of this clause shall not apply in a case where the Contracting Officer is advised by the Contractor in advance of the participation of an employee described in those paragraphs in the preparation, negotiation or approval of a CRADA of the nature of and extent of any financial interest described in paragraph (n)(5)(i) of this clause, and the Contracting Officer determines that such financial interest is not so substantial as to be considered likely to affect the integrity of the Contractor employee's participation in the process of preparing, negotiating, or approving the CRADA.

(o) *Technology Transfer in Other Cost-Sharing Agreements.* In conducting research and development activities in cost-shared agreements not covered by paragraph (n) of this clause, the Contractor, with prior written permission of the Contracting Officer, may provide for the withholding of data produced thereunder in accordance with the applicable provisions of paragraph (n)(3) of this clause.

(End of clause)

Alternate I (Jan 1996). As prescribed in 970.7330(b), add the following definition under paragraph (b) and new paragraph (p):

(b)(8) *Privately funded technology transfer* means the prosecuting, maintaining, licensing, and marketing of inventions which are not owned by the Government (and not related to CRADAs) when such activities are

conducted entirely without the use of Government funds.

(p) Nothing in paragraphs (c) Allowable Costs, (e) Fairness of Opportunity, (f) U.S. Industrial Competitiveness, (g) Indemnity - Product Liability, (h) Disposition of Income, and (i) Transfer to Successor Contractor of this clause are intended to apply to the contractor's privately funded technology transfer activities if such privately funded activities are addressed elsewhere in the contract.

Alternate II (Jan 1996). As prescribed in 970.7330(c), the phrase "weapon production facility" may be substituted wherever the word "laboratory" appears in the clause.

3. A new subpart 970.73, Technology Transfer, consisting of sections 970.7310, 970.7320, and 970.7330, is added to read as follows:

Subpart 970.73 Technology Transfer

Secs.

970.7310 General.

970.7320 Policy.

970.7330 Contract Clause.

Subpart 970.73—Technology Transfer

970.7310 General.

This subpart prescribes policies and procedures for implementing the National Competitiveness Technology Transfer Act of 1989. The Act required that technology transfer be established as a mission of each Government-owned laboratory operated under contract by a non-Federal entity. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 expanded the definition of laboratory to include weapon production facilities that are operated for national security purposes and are engaged in the production, maintenance, testing, or dismantlement of a nuclear weapon or its components.

970.7320 Policy.

All new awards for or extensions of existing DOE laboratory or weapon production facility management and operating contracts shall have technology transfer, including authorization to award Cooperative Research and Development Agreements (CRADAs), as a laboratory or facility mission under Section 11(a)(1) of the Stevenson-Wylder Technology Innovation Act of 1980, as amended. A management and operating contractor for a facility not deemed to be a laboratory or weapon production facility may be authorized on a case-by-case basis to support the DOE technology transfer mission including, but not limited to, participating in CRADAs awarded by DOE laboratories and weapon production facilities.

970.7330 Contract clause.

(a) The contracting officer shall insert the clause at 970.5204-40, Technology

transfer mission, in each solicitation for a new or an extension of an existing laboratory or weapon production facility management and operating contract.

(b) If the contractor is a nonprofit organization or small business eligible under 35 U.S.C. 200 et seq., to receive title to any inventions under the contract and proposes to fund at private expense the maintaining, licensing, and marketing of the inventions, the contracting officer shall use the basic clause with its Alternate I.

(c) The contracting officer may substitute the Alternate II phrase "weapon production facility" wherever the word "laboratory" appears in the clause where the facility is operated for national security purposes and engaged in the production, maintenance, testing, or dismantlement of a nuclear weapon or its components.

[FR Doc. 95-31187 Filed 12-21-95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6450-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

50 CFR Part 675

[I.D. 121295B]

Groundfish of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Area; Approval of Community Development Plans

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Allocation of Community Development Quota of pollock for 1996-98.

SUMMARY: NMFS announces the approval of recommendations made by the Governor of the State of Alaska (Governor) for Community Development Plans (CDPs) during the calendar years 1996-98 under authority of the Community Development Quota (CDQ) program. This action announces the decision of NMFS to approve the Governor's recommended CDPs, including the pollock CDQs for each

subarea or district, and the availability of findings underlying the decision.

EFFECTIVE DATE: Effective January 1, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the findings made by NMFS in approving the Governor's recommendations may be obtained from the Alaska Region, National Marine Fisheries Service, P.O. Box 21668, Juneau, AK 99802, Attn: Lori Gravel.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David C. Ham, 907-586-7228.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The pollock CDQ program originally was developed by the North Pacific Fishery Management Council (Council) and submitted as part of Amendment 18 to the Fishery Management Plan (FMP) for the Groundfish Fishery of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Area, which was approved in part by the Secretary of Commerce (57 FR 23321, June 3, 1992). Initial Federal regulations implementing the CDQ program became effective on November 18, 1992 (57 FR 54936, November 23, 1992) and expire on December 31, 1995. The Council proposed re-authorizing the CDQ program for an additional 3 years as part of Amendment 38 to the FMP. NMFS approved this amendment on November 28, 1995. Regulations implementing the pollock CDQ program for 1996, 1997, and 1998, were published on December 12, 1995 (60 FR 63654), and will be effective on January 1, 1996.

Eligible western Alaska communities submitted six proposed CDPs requesting CDQs to the Governor under § 675.27. The State of Alaska conducted a public hearing on September 23, 1995, in Seattle, WA, during which all interested persons had an opportunity to be heard. The hearing covered the substance and content of the proposed CDPs in such a manner that the general public, and particularly the affected parties, had a reasonable opportunity to understand the impact of each proposed CDP. The Governor made available for public review all State of Alaska materials pertinent to the hearing at the time the hearing was announced. The public hearing held by the State of Alaska satisfied the requirements of § 675.27(a).

The Governor consulted the Council concerning the proposed CDPs during the Council's September 1995 meeting. The Council reviewed copies of the CDP executive summaries, summary sheets, and the Governor's recommended allocations and unanimously concurred in the Governor's recommendations.

Upon receiving the Governor's recommendations on November 1, 1995, NMFS commenced a review of the record to determine whether the community eligibility criteria and the evaluation criteria set forth in regulations implementing the CDQ program have been met. NMFS has found that the Governor's recommendations for approval of proposed CDPs are consistent with the community eligibility conditions and evaluation criteria and other applicable provisions of the regulations.

As required by § 675.27(c)(1), NMFS publishes this announcement of approval of the Governor's recommendations, including the CDQ allocated to each CDP (see table below) and the availability of the findings regarding this decision (see **ADDRESSES**).

CDQ recipient	CDQ for 1996, 1997, and 1998 (percent)
Aleutian Pribilof Island Community Development Association	16
Bristol Bay Economic Development Corporation	20
Central Bering Sea Fishermen's Association	04
Coastal Villages Fishing Cooperative	25
Norton Sound Economic Development Corporation	22
Yukon Delta Fisheries Development Corporation	13

Authority: This action is taken under 50 CFR 675.27.

Dated: December 14, 1995.

Gary Matlock,
Program Management Officer, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 95-31182 Filed 12-21-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-22-W