**Wish List**

* A specific template for agencies to submit statutorily-required data to NIST. This makes it easier for agencies to provide required data.
* Lab-level data, not just aggregated agency-level
* Design a specific portal to submit data, so that it is easily captured and stored; one place that NIST can extract the data real-time. Agencies could submit their data and any data updates anytime, knowing that NIST would extract the data on a specific date to put the Federal-level report together. Instead of submitting data to a NIST contact, it would go through a portal, where NIST would have access to the data. Creating the portal/database would be funded through Lab-To-Market.
  + Creates an easy database where data could be easily released to the public.
  + Still create an annual Federal report. The publication of the Federal report would also release the then-current data within the database. Essentially make it more automated.
    - Only report that fiscal year’s data in the report, instead of the past five years. If people are interested in previous years’ data, they can go to the database, or contact a specific agency for old, or updated data. The report would just be a “moment in time” for one fiscal year.
  + The idea would be that the agencies submit the data IN ADDITION to generating their own reports.
* Through lab-to-market funding, NIST should pay to have 4 case studies completed per year, one for each agency, on a rotating basis through the agencies that are required to report T2 metrics. This will help increase the publications base on Federal technology transfer. NIST would use a contractor to produce the reports if it is unable to complete the studies in house. These reports would be success stories where additional research is completed for a specific licensed technology. This would be funded for 3 years, or until each agency has one case study, whichever comes first.
* Create official technology transfer job titles within the Office of Personnel Management, so that technology transfer professionals are not mistakenly identified as “engineers” or “physical scientists” when they are in fact CRADA officers or technology transfer program managers. Then we could get better metrics on T2 employment, instead of relying on the current STEM data available through OPM’s employment cube.

**Metrics Wish List**

1. Invention Disclosures and Patenting
   1. Invention disclosures
   2. Provisional patent applications
   3. Non-provisional patent applications
      1. Utility
      2. Plant
      3. Design
   4. PCT Patent Applications
   5. Foreign patent office applications
   6. Domestic patents issued
   7. Foreign patents issued
      1. Specify countries
   8. Days to prepare/file a non-provisional patent application, from date invention disclosure received to non-provisional filing date
   9. Number of Patent Attorneys
      1. Internal to the agency
      2. External to the agency
2. Licenses
   1. Total active licenses
   2. New licenses
   3. Total invention licenses (aka linked to a patent)
   4. New invention licenses
   5. Income bearing licenses
      1. Exclusive
      2. Non-exclusive
      3. Partially exclusive
   6. Number of licensing officers within reporting ORTA
3. Income from Licensing
   1. Total licensing income
   2. Invention licensing income
   3. Earned royalty income
   4. Percent of ERI distributed to inventors
   5. After inventor, identify remaining royalty receiver
4. Collaborative Research and Development Agreements
   1. Total active CRADAs
      1. Traditional CRADAs
      2. Non-traditional CRADAs
   2. New CRADAs
      1. Traditional
      2. Non-traditional
   3. Material Use Agreements
   4. Facility Use Agreements
   5. Other collaborative R&D relationships
      1. Must provide details as to what kind of relationships are included here
   6. Income received from CRADAs
5. Other Information
   1. Point of contact regarding metrics for each lab
   2. Federal and Non-Federal, whole and FTE counts of people within each reporting ORTA/unit
   3. Number of paralegals within each ORTA/reporting unit
   4. Number of CRADA officers/specialists within each ORTA/reporting unit
   5. Number of licensing officers/specialists within each ORTA/reporting unit
   6. Number of Start-Ups supported
   7. Number of invention licenses granted to small businesses
   8. Number of traditional CRADAs granted to small businesses
   9. Number of ORTAs within each laboratory