

“If [march-in] proponents get their way, the impact on medical science could be disastrous. Private companies would no longer have a financial incentive to invest in federally-funded advances. Investment in new therapies and vaccines will collapse.” – **Jon Soderstrom, former Managing Director of the Office of Cooperative Research at Yale University. *Connecticut Post*, January 10, 2022**

“Many lawmakers want the government to use march-in rights to seize brand-name drug patents and relicense them to generic manufacturers. They have good intentions... But if companies fear that the government will intervene after years of expensive R&D, they will not invest in the first place.” – **Carol Mimura, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Intellectual Property & Industry Research Alliances at the University of California, Berkeley. *The Mercury News*, September 9, 2021.**

“Critics of Bayh-Dole have long-called for using march-in as a price control mechanism, even though this was never the intention of Bayh-Dole’s drafters.” – **Joy Goswami, Assistant Director of Technology Transfer and Corporate Partnerships at the University of Delaware’s Office of Economic Innovation & Partnerships. *The News Journal*, April 9, 2021.**

“The march-in provision allows the government limited authority to license additional developers, but only if current licensees are failing to commercialize a patent... If the government begins ignoring patents, it will end America’s long streak of hatching world-changing companies. No start-up will pay for the right to utilize a scientific, university insight, then invest in developing it further, if the government can dismiss intellectual property protections at will.” – **Niels Reimers, Founder and former Executive Director of Stanford University’s Office of Technology Licensing. *The Mercury News*, April 21, 2021.**

“Bayh-Dole’s authors made clear: March-in rights are not to be used for government price controls. March-in rights are a backstop to ensure that private sector licensees put technologies to work benefiting society.” – **Walt Copan, Vice President for Research and Technology Transfer at the Colorado School of Mines, former Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology. *Roll Call*, April 22, 2021.**

“Congress never intended the march-in provision to be used as a price-control tool. In fact, the bill’s original sponsors, Senators Birch Bayh and Bob Dole, wrote in 2002 that they ‘did not intend that government set prices on resulting products.’ Twisting the law’s intent would disrupt the tremendous flow of research it has fostered.” – **Steve Auerbach, Director of the Office of Technology Transfer at the University of Hawai’i. *Honolulu Star-Advertiser*, May 31, 2021.**

“Bayh-Dole works, as is. Don’t mess with it. Universities are licensing their most innovative discoveries to startups. If the integrity of these licenses granted to startups were breached by the government arbitrarily using march-in rights, venture investors would be reluctant to make future investments.” – **Lou Berneman, former Managing Director of the Center for Technology Transfer at the University of Pennsylvania. *The Patriot-News*, June 5, 2021.**

“Sens. Bayh and Dole clearly stated that the ‘march in’ provision was written to encourage patent holders to license their work for development and was never intended to be a price control mechanism. Distorting that original intent would inhibit university-industry transfer and the very research pipeline that produces life-saving healthcare treatments.” – **Kelly Sexton, Associate Vice President for Research, Technology Transfer, and Innovation Partnerships at the University of Michigan. *The Detroit News*, June 25, 2021.**