WISCO. .IN ALUMNI RESEARCH FO(.DATION

INTER-OFFICE LETTER

TO Marv Woerpel

FROM Ward Ross **DATE** August 19, 1964

Re: HEW

Consideration should be given to discussing with Clesner and associates at your proposed meeting with Bill Young and Clesner's group in mid-September the items listed below if time permits. We recognize, of course, that the major purpose of the conference is to discuss the petition in the Lichtenstein-Casida parsnip case heretofore filed with Miss Parent.

1. University of Oregon Medical School request for determination in the Greer progoitrin case.

   See letter from Ross to Dean Zimmerman of Oregon, dated August 19, 1964.

2. The Jefferson College-Baxter-Rohm & Haas situation.

   Under date of March 13, 1964, Clesner forwarded to Bill Young a copy of a petition for a determination in this case. Since that time we have been advised by both Baxter and Rohm & Haas that the petition has never been acted upon and that Baxter has withdrawn as a prospective licensee.

3. Has an institutional agreement been recently worked out between the University of Chicago and HEW?

   Refer to your conversation in May or June of 1964 with Jack Damon of General Chemical.

4. Status of Research Corporation and American Cancer Society proposed agreements with HEW, particularly the former.

   The last word we had on the Research Corporation agreement was that it was "upstairs" awaiting action.

5. Status "Proposed Statement on Approval on University Patent Policies."

   See draft prepared by the Patent Advisory Panel of the Federal Counsel for Science and Technology (William J. Hoff)

forwarded to us by Bill Young on July 24, 1964, and suggested revisions in this draft, dated August 5, 1964, and forwarded to us with Reuben Lorenz's letter of August 12, 1964.

6. Application of Reg. 6.3 of the HEW Patent Regulations to WARF, Research Corporation, universities administering their own patents (such as California) and other groups which are permitted by the Surgeon General, under determinations made by him, to administer inventions made on federal funds.

7. Has the Surgeon General made any determinations in any cases since the Coenzyme Q determination of December 1959, in which permission has been granted for any non-government group - Research Corporation, any university, or otherwise - to take title to and administer any invention? If the answer is in the affirmative, every effort should be made to obtain information as to the conditions of and restrictions contained in the determinations.

Other points worthy of discussion may occur to us between now and the Washington conference. These should be added to the above list.

Ward Ross

WR/nmb

cc: Professor Wm. H. Young
Mr. Howard Bremer

ADDENDUM: It goes without saying that I think none of the foregoing points should be raised with the Clesner group without Bill Young's full approval. In other words, I think Bill should "call the shots" on this point.