

Office of Technology Transfer

Commercialization Evaluation Report

| CER 1 – INITIAL REVIEW | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| ITEM | DESCRIPTION | | | |
| Date | | | | |
| Emory Tech ID | | | | |
| Title | | | | |
| Disclosure Date | | | | |
| Inventor(s) | | | | |
| Case Manager | | | | |
| Product/ Applications | How can this technology be applied in the marketplace (i.e., will this be a service, product or both)? Example: It is a blank for doing blank, etc. | | | |
| Technology Summary | A high-level overview of the science behind the technology. Approximately 2 paragraphs, the first paragraph summarizing the technology, the second detailing the proof of principle data supporting the technology. | | | |
| | Unmet Need | What unmet need does this technology address. | | |
| Market Summary | A brief, high-level overview of the potential market. For many healthcare opportunities, this summary often involves details around epidemiology of a disease or a patient type. Identify unmet needs. • Market Size: • Competing technologies: | | | |

| | Potential licensees: | | | |
|--------------|---|--|--|--|
| | Key Benefits | Please bullet the key benefits this technology over current standard. | | |
| Ownership | Please detail any joint ownership information and what actions will need to be completed. Emory only | | | |
| Funding | or industry fun | with PI and note whether any non-federal funding such as foundation ding was reported. (list institution) whether federal funding was reported or used (grant number) | | |
| IP Landscape | Identify search | f the potential IP landscape – both literature and patent search. n strategy and link potentially relevant references. Avoid s about obviousness. | | |

| Outstanding Questions | investigator? Suggest timeline for fo | ding questions that should be addressed or discussed with the Technical ?s IP ?s Market ?s Ilow up with inventors on these outstanding questions or as to address outstanding questions. | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Discussions | Have you reviewed technology with third parties? Yes No Party Comments Comments | | | |
| Notes from TMM Discussion | (To be completed by Lid | censing Associate after presentation.) | | |

| | | Next Step | Notes/Rationale | |
|------------------------|---|--|-----------------|--|
| Decision | | Request patent filing, complete tech brief (Active) | | |
| | | No patent needed to commercialize; complete tech brief (Active) | | |
| | | Do not pursue (Inactive; Release) | | |
| | | Hold & Revisit | | |
| | | Other | | |
| | ☐ Inventor has reviewed, no further information. | | | |
| Inventor | Inve | ntor has further releva | nt information. | |
| feedback | ■ Provide notes | | | |
| Changes made decision? | Provide notes on changes made after inventor feedback or time passage. Complete with notes if project is made inactive after initial vetting due to new data or other considerations. | | | |

| Hold & Revisit Update (if applicable) | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|-------|
| | | | | Decision | | |
| Date | Update Notes | Activate, file patent | Activate, no patent | Inactivate/ (release?) | Hold & Revisit | Other |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |



| CER 2 – PRIOR TO PROVISIONAL PATENT EXPIRATION | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| ITEM | DESCRIPTION | | | |
| Date | | | | |
| Conversion Date | | | | |
| Was CER 1 presented at TMM? | Yes No | | | |
| Inventor changes | List if applicable | | | |
| Joint Ownership | Note if different than at CER 1. | | | |
| Case Manager | Note if different than at CER 1. | | | |
| Publication | No Yes (date) | | | |
| Technology Updates | Brief overview of technology, focusing on any changes since prior CER Has the investigator performed new experiments that are relevant? Has there been a new funding agreement on this technology? Is there a prototype or have new chemical entities, antibodies, etc. been designed or made? Has there been a basic change in the underlying assumptions (MOA, etc.) that warrants revisiting CER 1? | | | |

| Market Updates | Key features of market from CER 1, plus any updates based on discussion of CER 1, updates to technology or information from marketing plan. Identify markets Competitive products (note changes from CER 1) Potential licensees Have any potential licensees been contacted or had TechBriefs sent to them? Yes \(\subseteq No \(\subseteq \) Has feedback been received/interest shown/rejections? | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--|---------------------|--|
| | Company | T.B. or other TechBrief or identify form of contact | Feedback/responses | |
| | Competitive Advantages | Ensure that any new thou | ights are captured. | |
| Recommended Next Steps | Finding that any new moughts are capilitien | | | |

| | Answers to issues raised in CER 1 (if applicable) | | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| | Note whether there were questions/what they were? | | | |
| | Other | | | |
| IP Landscape | Brief overview of CER 1 (i.e., "crowded," "clear") and breadth of likely claim scope (i.e., "broad," "medium," "narrow," "pinpoint at best"). Point out if any particularly relevant art identified, especially if new. Specifically identify any changes in assumptions made at CER 1. | | | |
| New Questions | Are there any outstanding questions that should be addressed or discussed with the investigator (also any CER 1 questions still outstanding)? • Technical ?s • IP ?s • Market ?s | | | |
| NEEDED FROM INVESTIGATOR | IS THERE ANY ITEM NEEDED FROM INVESTIGATOR PRIOR TO PATENT CONVERSION? Check with EPG, were assignments completed and returned for provisional filing? If not, request assignments. | | | |
| | Have you reviewed technology with third parties? Yes No If applicable, list parties and provide comments | | | |
| Discussions | Party Comments | | | |
| Notes from TMM Discussion | (To be completed by Licensing Associate after presentation.) | | | |

| | | Next Step File as PCT File as US normal only | Notes/Rationale |
|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|
| Decision | | Refile Provisional Do not convert | **only available if not published** |
| | | Other | |
| Other Party Notification | Is technology jointly owned with another institution (GTRC, etc., see CER 1)? | | |
| Inventor feedback (after presentation) | □ Inventor has reviewed, no further information. □ Inventor has further relevant information. ■ Provide notes | | |
| Changes made to decision | Provide notes on changes made after inventor feedback or additional data. | | |



| CER 3 – PRIOR TO PCT EXPIRATION | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| ITEM | DESCRIPTION | | | |
| Date | | | | |
| National Phase Date | | | | |
| Case Manager change | Note if different than at CER 1 or CER 2. | | | |
| Technology Updates | Is there a prototype or have new chemical entities, antibodies, etc. been designed or made? Has there been a basic change in the underlying assumptions (MOA, etc.), i.e., were the assumptions proven correct/wrong? Other key technology updates. Updates on funding. | | | |
| Project Development Plan Updates | Briefly identify steps for technology, marketing, and licensing taken since CER 2. Investigator-related updates Were 'upcoming' experiments completed? Is there a prototype/pre-clinical lead, etc.? Marketing plan Updates on direct marketing – who was contacted, feedback. Are key "selling features" consistent with existing TechBrief? Note details Is there a new marketing strategy? Note details Has there been feedback? | | | |

| | Contact | Type of contact | Feedback/responses | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|--------------------|--|--|
| | Company | Tech brief or identify form of contact | | | |
| | Have there been RDAs signed? Other Specific obstacles for licensing | | | | |
| IP Landscape | Has there been a search report or other substantive office action/IP review? Yes No If yes, how did it look? | | | | |
| New Questions | Are there any outstanding questions that should be addressed or discussed with the investigator? • Technical ?s • IP ?s • Market ?s | | | | |
| Discussions | Party Comments Comments | | | | |
| Third Party CER Received? | Yes No No If Yes, provid | | | | |

| Notes from TMM Discussion | (To be completed by Licensing Associate after presentation.) | | | |
|------------------------------|---|---|----------------------------------|--|
| | | Next Step | Notes/Rationale | |
| | | National Phase ex-US | Countries: | |
| Decision | | | Rationale: | |
| | | File US only | | |
| | | Do not file | Assess if release is appropriate | |
| | | | | |
| Other Party Notification | Is techn | Is technology jointly owned with another institution (GTRC, etc., see CER 1)? | | |
| Inventor feedback | □ Inventor has reviewed, no further information. □ Inventor has further relevant information. ■ Provide notes | | | |
| Changes made to decision | Provide notes on changes made after inventor feedback or additional data. | | | |