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Communications Committee charter

Goal

Raise the visibility of DOE Tech Transfer opportunities and initiatives

Efforts

• Discover, collect and share communications best practices related to tech transfer
• Develop and implement consistent and coordinated tech transfer communication initiatives
• Evaluate, assess and recommend existing tech transfer communications efforts
Committee path forward

Communications Committee proposes to lead the following efforts:

1. Collect Tech Transfer Communication Best Practices across DOE lab complex

2. Provide analysis and recommendations for improving energy.gov tech transfer site

3. Create collection of DOE lab technology used in everyday products
1) TT Communications Best Practices

• Discover and document successful existing communications best practices at DOE labs

• Deliver document with suggestions to TTWG Committee and all labs for potential individual and collective adoption
2) Energy.gov Tech Transfer website

- Review and analyze existing energy.gov tech transfer site to discover communications gaps
- Perform discovery on tech transfer sites at other agencies and DOE national lab sites
- Deliver recommendations and proposals for improving energy.gov tech transfer site
3) Collection of DOE technology used in everyday products

• Help collect data and information for potential tech transfer communications initiatives highlighting DOE technologies used in everyday products

• Help inform potential upcoming DOE tech transfer video campaign
QUESTIONS OR SUGGESTIONS?
Education & Training Committee
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TTWG Spring Meeting
May 14-15

Help!
Where do I begin...?
Charter

• Objective – create opportunities and resources for technology transfer professionals at DOE labs to accelerate their professional development and enhance their expertise

• Focus Areas
  – Coursework
  – Networking & mentoring
  – Cross-lab projects
Plan

• Coursework
  – Survey all lab TT professionals to identify critical course content needs by Jun (Owner: Sara)
  – Leverage prior committee work and overhaul TTWG SharePoint training resources by Oct and market to DOE lab TT professionals by Nov (Owners: Diane and Eugene)
  – Harvest online or in-person course content from established programs (e.g. LES, FLC, etc.) by Nov and offer at least 3 courses by May 2019 (Owner: Sara)

• Networking & mentoring
  – Offer a mentor/mentee match-up opportunity at the Fall TTWG (Owner: Eric)
  – Coordinate at least 1 other networking/mentee opportunity (e.g. CM Swap, FLC, AUTM, etc.) by May 2019 and market to DOE lab TT professionals (Owner: Eric)

• Cross-lab projects
  – Identify cross-lab project opportunities similar to Lab-bridge pilots by Oct and commence 1-2 project(s) by Nov (Owner: Annie)
  – Hold in-person progress session by May 2019 (Owner: Annie)
Feedback and Questions

• Thoughts regarding the objective, focus areas, and plan?

• Is it possible to hold a mentoring match-up session at the upcoming Fall TTWG meeting?
  – Opportunity for staff unable to attend TTWG in the fall?

• Is there interest in the CM swap opportunity?

• Are there resources to fund 1-2 cross-lab projects?
Metrics Committee

“...coordinate the annual DOE Technology Transfer Data Call and other tasks in support of DOE reporting requirements”

Wendy Skinner
5/14/18
Task – Data Elements/Definitions

• Want: data elements that will allow DOE-OTT and the lab/sites to effectively share the success of Technology Transfer

• Right Data
• Clean Data
• Consistent Data
What have we done so far?

- Monthly conference call
- Identified problem elements
- Set up SharePoint site to assist communications
- Explored 4 elements
- Increased lab/site communications
- Set up a framework to minimize time spent
Requested Participation

You understand the element and are OK with the current definition. True or False - you don’t need to engage in the monthly call?

1. REGULAR participation from ALL labs/sites on monthly call - 1 hr/month
2. Knowledgeable person to fill out data element field – 15 minutes/element
3. Support/Lead small committee on elements your lab/site finds problematic
Governance Strategy

Goal: • Right Data
     • Clean Data
     • Consistent Data

Question: How many labs/sites need to agree to new definition before it can be proposed to TTWG?
Next Steps

• Continued monthly meetings
• Evaluate if the ‘small teams’ concept yield faster progress
• Provide TTWG board proposed changes for FY18 data call
• TTWG board formally request changes to FY-18 DOE-OTT data call
Links

• SharePoint site: https://eereprojects.ee.doe.gov/sites/ott/ttwg/SitePages/Home.aspx

• Contact Clara Asmail (Clara.Asmail@hq.doe.gov) for an account if you don’t already have one
Share Point 101

Sign In

This is a Federal computer system and is the property of the United States Government. It is for authorized use only. Users (authorized or unauthorized) have no explicit or implicit expectation of privacy.

Any or all uses of this system and all files on this system may be intercepted, monitored, recorded, copied, audited, inspected, and disclosed to authorized site, Department of Energy, and law enforcement personnel, as well as authorized officials of other agencies, both domestic and foreign, by using this system, the user consents to such interception, monitoring, recording, copying, auditing, inspection, and disclosure at the discretion of authorized site or Department of Energy personnel.

Unauthorized or improper use of this system may result in administrative, disciplinary action and civil and criminal penalties. By continuing to use this system, you indicate your awareness of and consent to these terms and conditions of use. LOG OFF IMMEDIATELY if you do not agree to the conditions stated in this warning.

User name: wendy.skinner@nl.gov
Password: *********

Contact EERE Sharepoint Support

By checking this box, the user acknowledges that he/she has read and will abide by the EERE IT Security Rules of Behavior

USE of the EERE SHAREPOINT COLLABORATION ENVIRONMENT (ESPCE) APPLICATION BY ANY USER, AUTHORIZED or UNAUTHORIZED, CONSTITUTES CONSENT to the AUDITING, INTERCEPTION, RECORDING, READING, COPYING, CAPTURING, and DISCLOSURE of APPLICATION ACTIVITY. THERE IS NO RIGHT to PRIVACY IN USING the ESPCE APPLICATION.

NOTE: The EERE IT Security Rules of Behavior (OOR) are applicable to all
Find the Subdirectory
Navigate to what interests you

- Element_EconomicContribution
- Element_PartnerName
- Element_TaxonomyParallelCategorization
- Proposed Standardization and Simplification of Economic Contribution Metric REV4

How does your lab calculate its value for Economic Contribution from Licensed Technologies?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab</td>
<td>Isolate its value for Economic Licensed Technologies?</td>
<td>Are there any differences between the group of payments you use for a key metric, and those considered for the Earned Royalty Income elements (36-40)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMES</td>
<td></td>
<td>Do you use the royalty rates for individual license agreements, when available, or do you use the imputed 2% rate for all agreements/all royalty payments?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AMES works with the Iowa State

The imputed royalty rate does not
Standardized Multi-Lab Agreement Committee

Bruce Simanton

5/14/18
Committee On Standardizing Multi-Lab Agreements

• Streamline the process to establish Multi-Lab engagements and improve lab/partner experience
  – Standardized agreements
  – Consistent review and approval process
  – Coordinate efforts more efficiently
Discussions to Date

• Challenges and best practices
• Consideration of other mechanisms to enable Multi Lab engagement
• Assemble and review current Multi-Lab CRADA templates
  – LightMAT
  – SBV
  – others
Next Steps

• Continue dialogue on best practices and process improvements

• Complete the review of current CRADA formats for standardization
  – Identify DOE Site, Program, Partner specific requirements and terms

• Obtain respective Field Office approvals of agreed upon templates