
TRADEMARK PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Report on Trademark Fee Proposal
August 14, 2023



UNITED STATES PATENT AND
TRADEMARK USPTO

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction.....	3
II.	Overview	3
III.	Discussion of Proposed Fee Changes	4
A.	Application Filing Fees	4
B.	Intent-to-Use (ITU) Fees.....	5
C.	Maintenance Filing Fees	5
D.	Fees for Letters of Protest and Petitions	6

TPAC Report on Fee Proposal 2023

I. Introduction

The United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”) is conducting a comprehensive review of its fees, as authorized and required by the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act.

As the first public step, on May 8, 2023, USPTO Director Kathi Vidal provided the Trademark Public Advisory Committee (“TPAC”) with the USPTO’s proposal to adjust its trademark fees. The proposal is the result of extensive internal study and analysis by the USPTO.

The USPTO has provided substantial information to TPAC and the public concerning the fee proposal, including a schedule of all proposed adjustments, a rationale for each proposed adjustment, and a detailed breakdown of current and historical processing costs for each service. Many of these materials are attached to this report for convenient reference.

TPAC conducted a public hearing on the fee proposal on June 5, 2023, and subsequently received written comments from the public as well. This report summarizes the public comments and provides TPAC’s evaluation and recommendations.

II. Overview

TPAC believes the fee proposal as a whole is appropriate and well-supported. The USPTO has explained that aggregate fee increases are needed because:

- Demand is decreasing from previously-projected levels.
- Usage patterns have shifted, resulting in lower utilization of post-registration services that were designed to recover more revenue under the current fee structure.
- Higher than expected inflation has resulted in increased operating costs.

We have no doubt that overall increases are needed to ensure that the USPTO complies with its statutory mandate to set fees at a level commensurate with anticipated aggregate costs. The majority of public commenters recognized this reality as well.

The USPTO nonetheless has flexibility in how it achieves that mandate. As a result, the levels at which individual fees are set may be adjusted based on policy considerations:

Cost recovery: The USPTO comprehensively tracks costs associated with specific services to use as a starting point, but not all fees are set at remunerative levels if there are other important policies to be served.

Access: The USPTO may lower some fees to reduce barriers to registration, especially for under-resourced filers. For example, application filing fees have historically been set below the full costs of examination, with the expectation that additional revenue will be recovered from maintenance fees.

Motivating behavior: Fees may be set at higher or lower levels to incentivize filers to engage in desirable behavior, to encourage efficiencies, or to discourage counterproductive conduct.

Subsidization: Fees for certain services may be set above estimated costs to help offset costs of other services that are not fully funded.

In this report TPAC evaluates the proposed fees in four categories. We have analyzed the extensive information provided by the USPTO, carefully considered all the public comments, and weighed the policy considerations. For some categories, we recommend that the USPTO consider

revising a proposed adjustment. In others we suggest that the USPTO consider the details of implementing a particular adjustment and provide additional explanation to the public.

III. Discussion of Proposed Fee Changes

A. Application Filing Fees

Application filing fees will be realigned as the USPTO phases out the current Trademark Electronic Application System (TEAS) Standard and Plus application filing options and replaces them with a single basic application form. Surcharge fees would only be incurred if specific actions were taken during filing.

Public comments generally supported the increase in the basic application fee and recognized that an increase is needed to maintain fiscal responsibility, though some expressed concern that the increase might discourage individuals and small entities from applying to register their marks.

Many commenters expressed questions or concerns about proposed surcharges and how they would be implemented.

TPAC Recommendations

We support the fee increases, but suggest that the USPTO further consider how the surcharges will be implemented, specifically:

- **Character limit:** We recognize the importance of discouraging unnecessarily long descriptions and recovering more of the examination costs incurred by them. We recommend additional consideration and explanation about whether a character limit is the best approach, compared to a word limit, a limit on separate goods and services, or some other similar metric.

If the USPTO retains the character limit, we suggest providing more specifics about how it will work. Will spaces and punctuation count as characters? Will the limit apply only to the free text field, or will it also apply to standard descriptions selected from the ID Manual drop-down list?

- **Custom IDs:** We encourage the USPTO to consider measures to avoid disadvantaging filers that seek protection for innovative products and services. For example, the USPTO might waive or defer the surcharge if applicants request to add the new description to the ID Manual.

Also, the drop-down lists can be cumbersome for longer descriptions. Many filers who use descriptions from the ID Manual find it more efficient to collect the descriptions and paste them as a block into the free text field, instead of individually selecting each description from the drop-down lists. Will the system be able to identify standard descriptions from the free text field and not add a custom ID charge?

- **Insufficient information:** We encourage the USPTO to provide more details about what specific deficiencies will trigger this surcharge and when it will be incurred. Will it be flagged for the filer prior to submission, or could it be assessed in a later USPTO action?

To facilitate access to the registration system for individuals and small entities, we recommend that the USPTO evaluate the feasibility of a small-entity discount or two-tiered filing fee that would permit filing at lower cost by under-resourced users. The USPTO may also consider

reducing fees for applicants who file through the USPTO clinical program, because clinics evaluate financial need before agreeing to provide clients with pro bono counsel.

B. Intent-to-Use (ITU) Fees

A number of public comments suggested that it seemed anomalous to propose a higher fee for Amendments to Allege Use (AAU) (\$200) than Statements of Use (SOU) (\$150).

There was also public concern that the proposed fee increases for the fourth and fifth extensions of time to file an SOU may unfairly disadvantage new businesses and small filers, who often need more time to begin commercial operations.

TPAC Recommendations

We recognize the need to increase these fees overall to generate adequate revenue and to help subsidize lower initial filing fees, permitting small filers to defer some fees until the viability of their enterprise is proven.

- **AAUs/SOUs:** We recommend, however, that the fee for an AAU should be less than for an SOU. That would better align incentives for efficiency, because fewer resources are required to process an AAU in the course of examination, as compared to reviewing an SOU after examination is otherwise complete. This is borne out by the reported unit costs, which are \$118 for an AAU and \$241 for an SOU.

We therefore suggest that the AAU fee be set at \$150, and the SOU fee at \$200.

- **Extensions:** We also recommend against increased fees for the fourth and fifth extensions of time to file an SOU. The stated rationale for the increase is that the pendency of these applications potentially blocks later-filed applications and makes clearance more difficult for other users. But this reasoning is just as valid for a first extension as for a fifth, and these interests were presumably balanced when it was originally decided what extensions would be allowed and for how long.

We believe that additional extensions are often needed for legitimate reasons, including by filers in highly regulated industries where timelines to launch a product may be long, and by start-up entities and small users who may need more time to assemble the resources for launching a product or service. We also note that unit costs for processing these filings are very low. We recommend that this fee be maintained at current levels.

C. Maintenance Filing Fees

The proposal includes increases to fees for Renewals (§ 9), Declarations of Use (§ 8 and § 71), and Declarations of Incontestability (§ 15).

Many public comments expressed concern that the recommended increases would be punitive, and found them disproportionate to costs. Some also said that these increases may discourage maintenance filings, especially by small or under-resourced registrants.

TPAC Recommendations

- **In General:** We understand that these fees are set above unit costs to subsidize initial application fees. We nonetheless think the concerns about discouraging maintenance filings are warranted. For example, we note that the fee for filing a Section 8 Declaration has the highest percentage increase, and it was substantially increased in 2020 as well. Registrants with limited resources might decide to forego such an expense even though they would prefer to keep the registration in force.

As the USPTO has observed, recent data reflects a diminishing rate of maintenance filings in relation to applications. We are concerned that a further increase of these fees may accelerate that trend, creating challenges for all users. If more registrations are abandoned for budgetary reasons, it will be more likely that the marks will still be in use, increasing the need for common law investigations and raising clearance costs.

We recommend that the USPTO reconsider whether the proposed increases are essential to overall financial viability, or can responsibly be moderated or omitted.

- **Maintenance of §66A or §44 Registrations:** Notwithstanding our overall recommendation, above, we do believe that increasing maintenance fees is justified for registrations issued based on §66A or §44 applications. Owners of these registrations have not been required to prove use prior to registration. They are more likely to describe an excessive list of goods and services, to offer suspect specimens and declarations, and to require auditing. Consequently, they should bear a higher cost burden for post-registration filings than registrants who have already proven use to perfect their registration.

We therefore support the fee increase for Section 71 filings. We also suggest that the USPTO consider whether fee increases for other maintenance filings could be increased only for §66A and §44 registrants, though we recognize that any such increases may implicate many factors, including compliance with international treaty obligations.

D. Fees for Letters of Protest and Petitions

The proposed fee increase for filing a letter of protest received the most public comment of any of the fee proposals, with a substantial majority objecting to what is perceived as a dramatic five-fold increase (from the current \$50 fee to \$250). Many commenters urged that letters of protest, when properly prepared, add value to the examination process because they can provide information that examiners may not otherwise discover, such as information about generic or descriptive terms of art in specific industries.

The proposed increases for petitions generated few public comments, primarily expressing concern about the fairness of requiring a filer to bear the cost when the petition is needed due to inadvertence (in the case of petitions to revive) or USPTO error (in the case of petitions to the Director).

TPAC Recommendations:

- **Letters Of Protest:** We recommend the USPTO consider a more modest increase of this fee to no more than \$150. We believe that an increase is justified to recover at least a portion of processing costs, and to deter frivolous filings. But some subsidization is justified to recognize the value that meritorious letters add to the examination process, and to provide members of the public with a cost-effective means of bringing information to the attention of the USPTO.

We recognize that unit costs for processing letters of protest are substantial, but we believe they may decrease over time as users and examiners become more familiar with the framework enacted by the Trademark Modernization Act. A \$100 or \$150 fee would double or triple the current fee and would provide some amount of cost recovery.

- **Petitions To Revive:** We believe this increase is appropriate. While it is substantial as a percentage, it is justified to incentivize diligence by applicants in avoiding abandonment. We are not unsympathetic to the plight of filers who inadvertently abandon, but that is

why the USPTO relaxed the standard for filing a petition to revive some years ago. It seems fair that the filer should bear the costs so incurred.

- **Petitions To the Director:** We believe this increase is appropriate. The USPTO usually waives this fee when the petition seeks to correct an error made by the USPTO, and we encourage the continuation of that practice. Otherwise, recovery of a substantial portion of processing costs is justified.

Attachments

1. Letter from Director Vidal to TPAC May 8, 2023
2. USPTO Executive Summary of Fee Proposal
3. USPTO Table of Trademark Fees Current-Proposed-Unit Cost



United States Patent and Trademark Office

*Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and
Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office*

VIA ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION

May 8, 2023

Trademark Public Advisory Committee
ATTN: David J. Cho Esq., Chairperson
208 S. Akard St.
Dallas, TX 75202
Via email to: dc6715@att.com

Dear Members of the Trademark Public Advisory Committee (TPAC):

As a fee-funded agency, the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) must periodically assess and adjust fees to ensure our fee collections finance the aggregate costs necessary to register and maintain accurate and reliable trademarks. We recently completed a comprehensive trademark fee review, with the conclusion that we should adjust fees to increase aggregate revenue and refine certain fees to efficiently finance ongoing operations. The first steps in the fee adjustment process are to deliver our trademark fee proposal to the TPAC and engage the public. Given the statutory and regulatory timeline for setting and adjusting fees, we anticipate any fee changes will be implemented on or around November 2024.

Financial Outlook

Our trademark fee review included an evaluation of the financial outlook under the existing fee schedule, as well as significant research on and analysis of proposed revisions to certain fees. The financial outlook has two principal themes. First, forecasts for aggregate revenue using current demand estimates are lower than prior forecasts. Lower-than-expected demand is coinciding with changes to trademark filing and renewal patterns, resulting in some imbalances in the overall fee structure. Second, the broader U.S. economy has experienced higher-than-expected inflation the last two years, and this, in turn, has increased USPTO operating costs relative to baseline estimates. Consequently, aggregate operating costs will exceed aggregate fee revenue for our trademarks business line beginning this fiscal year. We will finance this operating shortfall using existing operating reserve balances until the implementation of a new fee schedule that increases fee collections.

Trademark Fee Proposal

This trademark fee proposal finances agency operating costs going forward and ensures we can accomplish our mission and deliver on the commitments contained in our forthcoming 2022-2026 Strategic Plan. It promotes efficient operations, better aligns fees with the costs of services provided, provides resources to reduce application pendency, and sufficiently finances ongoing and planned

strategic initiatives to promote access to the trademark system. The attached documents outline in detail all proposed fee changes.

Application filing fees

The USPTO timed this fee proposal to coincide with the transition to our new single-application filing system, which will sunset the Trademark Electronic Application System Standard and Plus filing options and associated fees. The new filing system consists of a basic application filing option and corresponding fee with various premium surcharges for applicants selecting costly attributes, including:

- Submissions of incomplete applications (other than applications denied a filing date for failure to satisfy the requirements under 37 CFR § 2.21);
- Custom descriptions of goods and services in the free-form field instead of using the preapproved drop-down fields containing acceptable identifications of goods and services from the Trademark Next Generation ID Manual; or
- When using the free-form field, providing excessively long identifications of goods or services.

These surcharges will incentivize the submission of complete applications, thereby improving efficiency and reducing pendency times, and will also help recover higher costs incurred from excessively and unnecessarily long identifications.

Financial sustainability

The USPTO proposes to adjust fees paid throughout the trademark life cycle to collect sufficient aggregate revenue to recover recent increases in aggregate costs, due in part to higher-than-expected inflation and other requirements. Our proposal also increases aggregate revenue through fees designed to improve processing efficiencies and rebalance the fee structure to recover aggregate costs.

To facilitate low barriers to entry into the trademark system, application filing fees are lower than the USPTO's costs incurred in delivering these services. We recover aggregate shortfalls through other fees, primarily maintenance filings with fees collected later in the trademark life cycle and intent-to-use (ITU) extension fees. The percentage of registrations filing for maintenance is declining while ITU processing costs are increasing, resulting in insufficient revenue generation to offset examination costs.

This proposal recovers some additional examination costs earlier in the trademark life cycle, but not all, thus remaining consistent with a low barrier to entry policy for underresourced and underrepresented brand owners. Accordingly, we propose to increase fees for maintenance and ITU filings to increase fee collections and rebalance the fee structure. Our proposal also adjusts certain fees for resource-intensive tasks to reduce subsidization for those tasks, including for petitions and letters of protest.

Next Steps

Attached to this letter are two documents. The first provides a summary of the proposal; the second provides a detailed listing of proposed fee adjustments. In addition, [the fee setting and adjusting section of our website](#) contains further background material to assist your analysis.

As the USPTO is proposing to use our fee setting authority under section 10 of the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act (AIA), the TPAC is required to hold a public hearing within the 30-day period following receipt of this proposal. The AIA also requires the TPAC to make available to the public a written report setting forth, in detail, the committee's comments, advice, and recommendations following the hearing. We will reach out soon to answer questions and assist with logistics and required materials.

I look forward to your comments and recommendations, and I am confident our collaboration will strengthen the nation's innovation ecosystem.

Sincerely,



Kathi Vidal
Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual
Property and Director of the United States Patent
and Trademark Office

Attachments

Attachment I - Executive Summary of Trademark Fee Proposal
Attachment II - Table of Proposed Trademark Fee Adjustments

cc:

Adraea Brown, H-D USA, LLC
Tracy L. Deutmeyer, Frederikson & Byron, P.A.
Rodrick J. Enns, Enns & Archer LLP
Jomarie B. Fredericks, Rotary International
Deborah Gerhardt, University of North Carolina
Donna Griffiths, Cytiva
Amy Hsiao, Eligon IP
Dana Brown Northcott, Amazon.com, Inc.
Jay Besch, National Treasury Employees Union, Local 245
Pedro C. Fernandez, Patent Office Professional Association
Harold E. Ross, National Treasury Employees Union, Local 243
David S. Gooder, Commissioner for Trademarks

Sort order	37 CFR	Fee code	Fee category	Paper or electronic submission	Description	Current fee	Proposed fee	Dollar change	Percent change	FY 2020 unit cost	FY 2021 unit cost	FY 2022 unit cost
1	2.6(a)(1)(i)	6001	Application filings	Paper	Application (paper), per class	\$750	\$850	\$100	13%	\$1,119	\$1,155	\$1,539
2	2.6(a)(19)(i)	6006	Application filings	Paper	Request to divide an application, per new application created	\$200	\$200	\$0	0%	\$131	\$205	\$182
3	2.6(a)(1)(v)	6008	Application filings	Paper	Fee for failing to meet TEAS Plus requirements, per class	\$100	discontinue	n/a	n/a	\$15	n/a	n/a
4		New fee code	Application filings	Paper	Fee for insufficient information, per class	n/a	\$100	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
5		New fee code	Application filings	Paper	Fee for using goods and services identifications not contained in Trademark Next Generation ID Manual (using the free-form text box), per class	n/a	\$200	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
6		New fee code	Application filings	Paper	For each additional 1,000 characters in excess of 1,000, per class (paper)	n/a	\$200	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
7	2.6(a)(19)(ii)	7006	Application filings	Electronic	Request to divide an application, per new application created	\$100	\$100	\$0	0%	\$142	\$153	\$264
8	2.6(a)(1)(iv)	7007	Application filings	Electronic	Application (TEAS Plus), per class	\$250	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$348	\$363	\$375
9	2.6(a)(1)(iv)	7007	Application filings	Electronic	Basic application, per class	\$250	\$350	\$100	40%	\$348	\$363	\$375
10	2.6(a)(1)(v)	7008	Application filings	Electronic	Fee for failing to meet TEAS Plus requirements, per class	\$100	discontinue	n/a	n/a	\$8	\$3	\$3
11	2.6(a)(1)(iii)	7009	Application filings	Electronic	Application (TEAS Standard), per class	\$350	discontinue	n/a	n/a	\$437	\$485	\$506
12	2.6(a)(27)	7016	Application filings	Electronic	Extension of time for filing a response to a pre-registration office action	\$125	\$125	\$0	0%	n/a	n/a	n/a
13	2.6(a)(1)(ii)	7931	Application filings	Electronic	Application fee filed at WIPO	\$500	discontinue	n/a	n/a	\$758	\$791	\$855
14	2.6(a)(1)(ii)	7933	Application filings	Electronic	Subsequent designation fee filed at WIPO	\$500	discontinue	n/a	n/a	\$725	\$770	\$821
15		New fee code	Application filings	Electronic	Basic application (\$66(a)), per class	n/a	\$350	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
16		New fee code	Application filings	Electronic	Basic application (filing a subsequent designation under §66(a)), per class	n/a	\$350	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
17		New fee code	Application filings	Electronic	Fee for insufficient information (§66(a)), per class	n/a	\$100	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
18		New fee code	Application filings	Electronic	Fee for goods and services identifications not contained in Trademark Next Generation ID Manual (using the free-form text box) (§66(a)), per class	n/a	\$200	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
19		New fee code	Application filings	Electronic	For each additional 1,000 characters in excess of 1,000 (§66(a)), per class	n/a	\$200	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
20		New fee code	Application filings	Electronic	Fee for insufficient information, per class	n/a	\$100	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
21		New fee code	Application filings	Electronic	Fee for using goods and services identifications not contained in Trademark Next Generation ID Manual (using the free-form text box), per class	n/a	\$200	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
22		New fee code	Application filings	Electronic	For each additional 1,000 characters in excess of 1,000, per class	n/a	\$200	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
23	2.6(a)(2)(i)	6002	Intent to use/Use fees	Paper	Amendment to allege use (AAU), per class	\$200	\$300	\$100	50%	\$195	\$36	n/a
24	2.6(a)(3)(i)	6003	Intent to use/Use fees	Paper	Statement of use (SOU), per class	\$200	\$250	\$50	25%	\$152	\$52	\$231
25	2.6(a)(4)(i)	6004	Intent to use/Use fees	Paper	Request for six-month extension for filing an SOU, per class	\$225	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$60	\$45	\$126
26	2.6(a)(4)(i)	6004	Intent to use/Use fees	Paper	First, second, and third request for six-month extension for filing an SOU, per class	\$225	\$225	\$0	0%	n/a	n/a	n/a
27		New fee code	Intent to use/Use fees	Paper	Fourth and subsequent request for six-month extension for filing an SOU, per class	\$225	\$350	\$125	56%	n/a	n/a	n/a
28	2.6(a)(2)(ii)	7002	Intent to use/Use fees	Electronic	Amendment to allege use (AAU), per class	\$100	\$200	\$100	100%	\$91	\$97	\$118
29	2.6(a)(3)(ii)	7003	Intent to use/Use fees	Electronic	Statement of use (SOU), per class	\$100	\$150	\$50	50%	\$145	\$163	\$241
30	2.6(a)(4)(ii)	7004	Intent to use/Use fees	Electronic	Request for six-month extension for filing an SOU, per class	\$125	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$25	\$18	\$17
31	2.6(a)(4)(ii)	7004	Intent to use/Use fees	Electronic	First, second, and third request for six-month extension for filing an SOU, per class	\$125	\$125	\$0	0%	n/a	n/a	n/a
32		New fee code	Intent to use/Use fees	Electronic	Fourth and subsequent request for six-month extension for filing an SOU, per class	\$125	\$250	\$125	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a
33	2.6(a)(15)(i)	6005	Trademark processing fees	Paper	Petition to the Director	\$350	\$500	\$150	43%	\$4,777	\$148	\$189
34	2.6(a)(15)(iii)	6010	Trademark processing fees	Paper	Petition to revive an application	\$250	\$350	\$100	40%	n/a	n/a	n/a
35	2.6(a)(15)(ii)	7005	Trademark processing fees	Electronic	Petition to the Director	\$250	\$400	\$150	60%	\$182	\$200	\$886
36	2.6(a)(15)(iv)	7010	Trademark processing fees	Electronic	Petition to revive an application	\$150	\$250	\$100	67%	n/a	\$167	\$94
37	2.6(a)(25)	7011	Trademark processing fees	Electronic	Letter of protest	\$50	\$250	\$200	400%	n/a	\$7	\$312
38	2.6(a)(26)	7014	Trademark processing fees	Electronic	Petition for expungement and reexamination, per class	\$400	\$400	\$0	0%	n/a	n/a	\$9
39	2.6(a)(27)	7015	Trademark processing fees	Electronic	Extension of time for filing a response to an office action in an expungement or reexamination proceeding	\$125	\$125	\$0	0%	n/a	n/a	\$138
40	2.6(a)(12)(iii)	6012	Maintaining exclusive rights	Paper	Deleting goods/services/classes from registration, after filing §8 declaration and before acceptance, per class	\$350	\$350	\$0	0%	n/a	n/a	n/a
41	2.6(a)(5)(i)	6201	Maintaining exclusive rights	Paper	§9 registration renewal application, per class	\$500	\$550	\$50	10%	\$82	\$78	\$106
42	2.6(a)(6)(i)	6203	Maintaining exclusive rights	Paper	§9 registration renewal application grace period fee, per class	\$200	\$200	\$0	0%	\$31	\$38	n/a
43	2.6(a)(21)(i)	6204	Maintaining exclusive rights	Paper	§9 registration renewal application deficiency fee	\$200	\$200	\$0	0%	n/a	n/a	n/a
44	2.6(a)(12)(i)	6205	Maintaining exclusive rights	Paper	§8 declaration, per class	\$325	\$400	\$75	23%	\$83	\$81	\$152
45	2.6(a)(14)(i)	6206	Maintaining exclusive rights	Paper	§8 declaration grace period fee, per class	\$200	\$200	\$0	0%	\$31	\$38	n/a
46	2.6(a)(20)(i)	6207	Maintaining exclusive rights	Paper	§8 declaration deficiency fee	\$200	\$200	\$0	0%	\$96	n/a	n/a
47	2.6(a)(13)(i)	6208	Maintaining exclusive rights	Paper	§15 declaration, per class	\$300	\$350	\$50	17%	\$83	n/a	\$152
48	2.6(a)(7)(i)	6210	Maintaining exclusive rights	Paper	§12(c) affidavit, per class	\$200	\$200	\$0	0%	n/a	n/a	n/a
49	2.6(a)(8)(i)	6211	Maintaining exclusive rights	Paper	New registration certificate	\$200	\$200	\$0	0%	n/a	n/a	n/a
50	2.6(a)(9)(i)	6212	Maintaining exclusive rights	Paper	Corrected registration certificate, registrant's error	\$200	\$200	\$0	0%	n/a	n/a	n/a
51	2.6(a)(10)(i)	6213	Maintaining exclusive rights	Paper	Adding a disclaimer to a registration	\$200	\$200	\$0	0%	n/a	n/a	n/a
52	2.6(a)(11)(i)	6214	Maintaining exclusive rights	Paper	Amending registration for other than adding a disclaimer	\$200	\$200	\$0	0%	\$753	n/a	n/a
53	2.6(a)(12)(iv)	7012	Maintaining exclusive rights	Electronic	Deleting goods/services/classes from registration, after filing §8 declaration and before acceptance, per class	\$250	\$250	\$0	0%	n/a	\$13	\$16
54	2.6(a)(5)(ii)	7201	Maintaining exclusive rights	Electronic	§9 registration renewal application, per class	\$300	\$350	\$50	17%	\$34	\$19	\$24
55	2.6(a)(6)(ii)	7203	Maintaining exclusive rights	Electronic	§9 registration renewal application grace period fee, per class	\$100	\$100	\$0	0%	\$12	\$5	\$7
56	2.6(a)(21)(ii)	7204	Maintaining exclusive rights	Electronic	§9 registration renewal application deficiency fee	\$100	\$100	\$0	0%	\$32	\$18	\$23
57	2.6(a)(12)(ii)	7205	Maintaining exclusive rights	Electronic	§8 declaration, per class	\$225	\$300	\$75	33%	\$35	\$21	\$26
58	2.6(a)(14)(ii)	7206	Maintaining exclusive rights	Electronic	§8 declaration grace period fee, per class	\$100	\$100	\$0	0%	\$12	\$5	\$7
59	2.6(a)(20)(ii)	7207	Maintaining exclusive rights	Electronic	§8 declaration deficiency fee	\$100	\$100	\$0	0%	\$34	\$21	\$25
60	2.6(a)(13)(ii)	7208	Maintaining exclusive rights	Electronic	§15 declaration, per class	\$200	\$250	\$50	25%	\$35	\$21	\$26
61	2.6(a)(7)(ii)	7210	Maintaining exclusive rights	Electronic	§12(c) affidavit, per class	\$100	\$100	\$0	0%	\$29	\$15	\$19
62	2.6(a)(8)(ii)	7211	Maintaining exclusive rights	Electronic	New registration certificate	\$100	\$100	\$0	0%	\$439	\$477	\$375
63	2.6(a)(9)(ii)	7212	Maintaining exclusive rights	Electronic	Corrected registration certificate, registrant's error	\$100	\$100	\$0	0%	\$440	\$478	\$376

64	2.6(a)(10)(ii)	7213	Maintaining exclusive rights	Electronic	Adding a disclaimer to a registration	\$100	\$100	\$0	0%	n/a	n/a	n/a
65	2.6(a)(11)(ii)	7214	Maintaining exclusive rights	Electronic	Amending registration for other than adding a disclaimer	\$100	\$100	\$0	0%	\$70	\$90	\$117
66	2.6(a)(16)(i)	6401	Trademark Trial and Appeal Board	Paper	TTAB petition for cancellation, per class	\$700	\$700	\$0	0%	\$726	\$42	n/a
67	2.6(a)(17)(i)	6402	Trademark Trial and Appeal Board	Paper	TTAB notice of opposition, per class	\$700	\$700	\$0	0%	\$673	\$42	\$1,027
68	2.6(a)(18)(i)	6403	Trademark Trial and Appeal Board	Paper	TTAB ex parte appeal, per class	\$325	\$325	\$0	0%	\$2,054	\$2,040	\$595
69	2.6(a)(22)(i)	6404	Trademark Trial and Appeal Board	Paper	TTAB first 90-day or second 60-day request for extension of time to file a notice of opposition	\$400	\$400	\$0	0%	n/a	n/a	n/a
70	2.6(a)(23)(i)	6405	Trademark Trial and Appeal Board	Paper	TTAB final 60-day request for extension of time to file a notice of opposition	\$500	\$500	\$0	0%	n/a	n/a	n/a
71	2.6(a)(18)(vi)	6406	Trademark Trial and Appeal Board	Paper	TTAB ex parte appeal brief, per class	\$300	\$300	\$0	0%	n/a	\$1	\$20
72	2.6(a)(18)(v)	6407	Trademark Trial and Appeal Board	Paper	TTAB ex parte appeal brief extension, second or subsequent	\$200	\$200	\$0	0%	n/a	\$2	\$33
73	2.6(a)(16)(ii)	7401	Trademark Trial and Appeal Board	Electronic	TTAB petition for cancellation, per class	\$600	\$600	\$0	0%	\$3,128	\$1,745	\$1,733
74	2.6(a)(17)(ii)	7402	Trademark Trial and Appeal Board	Electronic	TTAB notice of opposition, per class	\$600	\$600	\$0	0%	\$2,925	\$1,754	\$5,932
75	2.6(a)(18)(ii)	7403	Trademark Trial and Appeal Board	Electronic	TTAB ex parte appeal, per class	\$225	\$225	\$0	0%	\$2,274	\$2,093	\$2,118
76	2.6(a)(22)(ii)	7404	Trademark Trial and Appeal Board	Electronic	TTAB first 90-day or second 60-day request for extension of time to file a notice of opposition	\$200	\$200	\$0	0%	\$63	\$10	\$9
77	2.6(a)(23)(ii)	7405	Trademark Trial and Appeal Board	Electronic	TTAB final 60-day request for extension of time to file a notice of opposition	\$400	\$400	\$0	0%	\$63	\$10	\$9
78	2.6(a)(18)(vii)	7406	Trademark Trial and Appeal Board	Electronic	TTAB ex parte appeal brief, per class	\$200	\$200	\$0	0%	n/a	\$1	\$20
79	2.6(a)(18)(v)	7407	Trademark Trial and Appeal Board	Electronic	TTAB ex parte appeal brief extension, second or subsequent	\$100	\$100	\$0	0%	n/a	\$2	\$33
80	2.6(a)(24)	7408	Trademark Trial and Appeal Board	Electronic	TTAB request for an oral hearing	\$500	\$500	\$0	0%	n/a	n/a	n/a
81	7.6(a)(6)(iii)	6013	Madrid Protocol fees	Paper	Deleting goods/services/classes from registration, after filing \$71 declaration and before acceptance, per class	\$350	\$350	\$0	0%	n/a	n/a	n/a
82	7.6(a)(1)(i)	6901	Madrid Protocol fees	Paper	Certifying an international application based on a single basic application or registration, per class	\$200	\$200	\$0	0%	\$67	n/a	n/a
83	7.6(a)(2)(i)	6902	Madrid Protocol fees	Paper	Certifying an international application based on more than one basic application or registration, per class	\$250	\$250	\$0	0%	n/a	n/a	n/a
84	7.6(a)(4)(i)	6903	Madrid Protocol fees	Paper	Transmittal fee for request to record an assignment or restriction to the international registration	\$200	\$200	\$0	0%	\$31	n/a	n/a
85	7.6(a)(5)(i)	6904	Madrid Protocol fees	Paper	Notice of replacement, per class	\$200	\$200	\$0	0%	\$6	n/a	n/a
86	7.6(a)(6)(i)	6905	Madrid Protocol fees	Paper	\$71 declaration, per class	\$325	\$400	\$75	23%	\$30	n/a	n/a
87	7.6(a)(7)(i)	6906	Madrid Protocol fees	Paper	\$71 declaration grace period fee, per class	\$200	\$200	\$0	0%	n/a	n/a	n/a
88	7.6(a)(3)(i)	6907	Madrid Protocol fees	Paper	Transmittal fee for subsequent designation	\$200	\$200	\$0	0%	n/a	n/a	n/a
89	7.6(a)(8)(i)	6908	Madrid Protocol fees	Paper	\$71 declaration deficiency fee	\$200	\$200	\$0	0%	n/a	n/a	n/a
90	7.6(a)(6)(iv)	7013	Madrid Protocol fees	Electronic	Deleting goods/services/classes from registration, after filing \$71 declaration and before acceptance, per class	\$250	\$250	\$0	0%	n/a	\$3	\$2
91	7.6(a)(1)(ii)	7901	Madrid Protocol fees	Electronic	Certifying an international application based on a single basic application or registration, per class	\$100	\$100	\$0	0%	\$59	\$22	\$36
92	7.6(a)(2)(ii)	7902	Madrid Protocol fees	Electronic	Certifying an international application based on more than one basic application or registration, per class	\$150	\$150	\$0	0%	\$59	\$22	\$36
93	7.6(a)(4)(ii)	7903	Madrid Protocol fees	Electronic	Transmittal fee for request to record an assignment or restriction to the international registration	\$100	\$100	\$0	0%	\$8	\$3	\$3
94	7.6(a)(5)(ii)	7904	Madrid Protocol fees	Electronic	Notice of replacement, per class	\$100	\$100	\$0	0%	n/a	n/a	n/a
95	7.6(a)(6)(ii)	7905	Madrid Protocol fees	Electronic	\$71 declaration, per class	\$225	\$300	\$75	33%	\$10	\$7	\$6
96	7.6(a)(7)(ii)	7906	Madrid Protocol fees	Electronic	\$71 declaration grace period fee, per class	\$100	\$100	\$0	0%	\$10	\$7	\$6
97	7.6(a)(3)(ii)	7907	Madrid Protocol fees	Electronic	Transmittal fee for subsequent designation	\$100	\$100	\$0	0%	\$44	\$13	\$26
98	7.6(a)(8)(ii)	7908	Madrid Protocol fees	Electronic	\$71 declaration deficiency fee	\$100	\$100	\$0	0%	\$1	\$3	\$2
99	2.7(a)	6991	Other trademark fees	Paper	Recordal application	\$20	\$20	\$0	0%	\$2,228	\$494	\$579
100	2.7(b)	6992	Other trademark fees	Paper	Renewal application	\$20	\$20	\$0	0%	\$2,228	\$494	\$579
101	2.7(c)	6993	Other trademark fees	Paper	Late fee for renewal application	\$20	\$20	\$0	0%	n/a	\$494	\$579
102	2.7(a)	6994	Other trademark fees	Paper	Application fee for reactivation of insignia, per request	\$20	\$20	\$0	0%	n/a	\$494	\$579
103	n/a	7932	Other trademark fees	Electronic	Renewal fee filed at WIPO	\$300	\$350	\$50	17%	n/a	n/a	n/a
104	2.6(b)(1)	8501	Other trademark fees	Electronic	Printed copy of registration, delivery by USPS, USPTO box, or electronic means	\$3	\$3	\$0	0%	n/a	n/a	n/a
105	2.6(b)(4)(i)	8503	Other trademark fees	Electronic	Certified copy of registration, with title and/or status, regular service	\$15	\$15	\$0	0%	n/a	n/a	n/a
106	2.6(b)(4)(ii)	8504	Other trademark fees	Electronic	Certified copy of registration, with title and/or status, expedited local service	\$30	\$30	\$0	0%	n/a	n/a	n/a
107	2.6(b)(2)	8507	Other trademark fees	Electronic	Certified copy of domestic application as filed	\$15	\$15	\$0	0%	n/a	n/a	n/a
108	2.6(b)(3)	8508	Other trademark fees	Electronic	Certified or uncertified copy of application/registration file	\$50	\$50	\$0	0%	n/a	n/a	n/a
109	2.6(b)(5)	8513	Other trademark fees	Electronic	Certified or uncertified copy of trademark document, unless otherwise provided	\$25	\$25	\$0	0%	n/a	n/a	n/a
110	2.6(b)(7)	8514	Other trademark fees	Electronic	For assignment records, abstracts of title and certification per registration	\$25	\$25	\$0	0%	n/a	n/a	n/a
111	2.6(b)(6)(i)	8521	Other trademark fees	Electronic	Recording trademark assignment, agreement or other ownership document, first mark per document	\$40	\$40	\$0	0%	n/a	n/a	n/a
112	2.6(b)(6)(ii)	8522	Other trademark fees	Electronic	Recording trademark assignment, agreement or other ownership document, second and subsequent marks in the same document	\$25	\$25	\$0	0%	n/a	n/a	n/a
113	2.6(b)(8)	8533	Other trademark fees	Electronic	Additional fee for overnight delivery	\$40	\$40	\$0	0%	n/a	n/a	n/a
114	2.6(b)(9)	8534	Other trademark fees	Electronic	Additional fee for expedited service	\$160	\$160	\$0	0%	n/a	n/a	n/a
115	1.21(b)(2), (b)	9202	General service fees	Electronic	Service charge for below minimum balance	\$25	\$25	\$0	0%	n/a	n/a	n/a
116	1.21(m) or 2.	9101	General service fees	Electronic	Processing each payment refused or charged back	\$50	\$50	\$0	0%	n/a	n/a	n/a

UNITED STATES
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



Trademark fee proposal Executive summary

June 2023



UNITED STATES
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE®

Introduction

- This document explains proposed trademark fee adjustments.
- The following additional documents comprise the fee proposal package delineating changes to the fee schedule:
 - Letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the USPTO to the Trademark Public Advisory Committee (TPAC)
 - Table of proposed fee adjustments
 - Trademark fee proposal background information
 - Table of trademark fees: current, proposed, and unit cost

Documents are available at the [fee setting and adjusting section of the USPTO website](#).



Objectives of fee setting proposal

- Recover aggregate costs to finance the mission, strategic goals, and priorities
- Enable financial sustainability
- Better align fees with costs of provided services
- Improve processing efficiencies
- Enhance the quality of incoming applications
- Offer affordable processing options to stakeholders

Resourcing mission benefits for intellectual property (IP) stakeholders

- Enhance the United States' role as a global innovation leader
- Promote inclusive innovation through active engagement and widespread access to IP resources and tools
- Foster an innovation mindset in more Americans
- Issue and maintain accurate and reliable trademark registrations that protect brands and investments
- Improve trademark application pendency
- Optimize trademark application processes to enable efficiencies for applicants and other stakeholders
- Protect the integrity of the trademark register
- Support the development and enforcement of clear IP laws
- Help those pursuing IP protection identify available funding sources
- Continue to equitably deliver exceptional customer experiences
- Develop modern information technology infrastructure and applications

Financial outlook

- **General financing premise:**
 - The trademark fee schedule generates aggregate revenue to recover aggregate costs.
 - The fee structure promotes broad participation in the trademark system with below-cost application filing fees subsidized by maintenance and intent-to-use extension fees.
- **Aggregate revenue is not recovering aggregate costs under the existing fee schedule for two principal reasons:**
 - Trademark demand and applicant filing behaviors have changed.
 - Trademark demand surged without a commensurate surge in maintenance and intent-to-use filings, then softened relative to prior forecasts.
 - Behavioral filing patterns are generating imbalances in the fee structure.
 - The broader economy has experienced higher-than-expected inflation, which has, in turn, increased aggregate costs relative to baseline estimates.

Fee proposal

Proposed fee schedule changes

Based on our review, we propose to set or adjust the following fees:

- Applications
- Intent-to-use filings:
 - Amendments to allege use
 - Statements of use
 - Extensions for filing a statement of use
- Letters of protest
- Maintenance filings:
 - Renewals (§ 9)
 - Declarations of use (§ 8 and § 71)
 - Declarations of incontestability (§ 15)
- Petitions to the Director
- Petitions to revive an application



Applications

- Propose implementing a single basic application filing option with a corresponding fee and discontinuing the current Trademark Electronic Application System (TEAS) Standard and Plus application filing options and fees.
- Applications currently filed using the TEAS Plus filing method are more efficient and aid in pendency reduction because they are complete and make use of the preapproved drop-down selections of goods or services.
 - Only approximately one half of trademark applications are filed using TEAS Plus.
 - When applicants do not provide all the necessary information upon filing, examiners are required to perform additional work that increases application processing time.
 - Applications with descriptions of goods or services that are excessively long, with thousands of characters, require additional work during examination, causing increases in costs that are borne by all trademark owners.



Applications (cont.)

- We propose a new single **basic application** filing fee with additional **premium application** surcharge fees based on the following actions an applicant can take during filing:
 - Submissions of incomplete applications (other than applications denied a filing date for failure to satisfy the requirements under 37 CFR § 2.21).
 - Custom descriptions of goods and services in the free-form field instead of using the preapproved drop-down fields containing acceptable identifications of goods and services from the Trademark Next Generation ID Manual.
 - When using the free-form field, providing excessively long identifications of goods or services, which often overclaim use of the mark with listed goods and services.
- These surcharges encourage efficient application filing behaviors, enhance the quality of incoming applications, and improve processing efficiencies.
(see details on the following pages)

Basic applications

Propose setting the fee for a **basic application** at a rate greater than the TEAS Plus fee to recover some additional examination costs earlier in the trademark life cycle.

- Maintain a subsidized, low-cost filing option for under-resourced and under-represented brand owners. Not all costs are recovered.

Fee code	Description	Historical cost (FY 2022)	Current fee	Proposed fee	Dollar change	Percent change
6001	Application, per class (paper)	\$1,526	\$750	\$850	\$100	12%
7007	Basic application (formerly TEAS Plus), per class	\$373	\$250	\$350	\$100	40%

Premium applications

- Propose **discontinuing** the TEAS Standard application filing fee and fees for failing to meet TEAS Plus requirements, per class.
- Propose **establishing new fees** for filing a premium application when complete information is not provided or when custom identifications of goods or services are used.

Fee code	Description	Historical cost (FY 2022)	Current fee	Proposed fee	Dollar change	Percent change
6008	Fee for failing to meet TEAS Plus requirements, per class	n/a	\$100	discontinue	n/a	n/a
7008	Fee for failing to meet TEAS Plus requirements, per class (paper)	\$3	\$100	discontinue	n/a	n/a
7009	Application (TEAS Standard), per class	\$504	\$350	discontinue	n/a	n/a
New fee code	Fee for insufficient information, per class	n/a	n/a	\$100	n/a	n/a
New fee code	Fee for using goods and services identifications not contained in Trademark Next Generation ID Manual (using the free-form text box), per class	n/a	n/a	\$200	n/a	n/a

Premium applications (cont.)

Character limits for free-form IDs

- Propose setting a 1,000-character per class limit for free-form descriptions of goods and services.
- Propose setting a fee for each additional block of 1,000 characters used, in whole or in part, if the ID contains characters in excess of that limit.
 - Establishing this premium application surcharge will align fees with the additional costs of examining lengthy identifications.
 - About 9% of all trademark applications currently exceed 1,000 characters per class.

Fee code	Description	Historical cost (FY 2022)	Current fee	Proposed fee	Dollar change	Percent change
New fee code	For each additional 1,000 characters in excess of 1,000, per class (paper)	n/a	n/a	\$200	n/a	n/a
New fee code	For each additional 1,000 characters in excess of 1,000, per class	n/a	n/a	\$200	n/a	n/a

Madrid applications

Propose adjusting the fees paid for Madrid applications under section 66(a) of the Trademark Act to align with proposed fees for domestic applications.

Fee code	Description	Historical cost (FY 2022)	Current fee	Proposed fee	Dollar change	Percent change
7931	Application (§ 66(a)), per class	\$852	\$500	discontinue	n/a	n/a
7933	Filing a subsequent designation under § 66(a) of the Act, per class	\$819	\$500	discontinue	n/a	n/a
New fee code	Basic application (§ 66(a)), per class	n/a	n/a	\$350	n/a	n/a
New fee code	Basic application (filing a subsequent designation under § 66(a)), per class	n/a	n/a	\$350	n/a	n/a
New fee code	Fee for insufficient information (§ 66(a)), per class	n/a	n/a	\$100	n/a	n/a
New fee code	Fee for using goods and services identifications not contained in Trademark Next Generation ID Manual (using the free-form text box) (§ 66(a)), per class	n/a	n/a	\$200	n/a	n/a
New fee code	For each additional 1,000 characters in excess of 1,000 (§ 66(a)), per class	n/a	n/a	\$200	n/a	n/a

Intent-to-use (ITU) filings

- Propose increasing fees for amendments to allege use (AAUs) and statements of use (SOUs), and creating a new tiered fee structure for extensions of time to file an SOU.
 - The fees for processing AAUs and SOUs have not been adjusted since they were implemented in 2002.
 - The costs of processing these filings have increased due to inflation and application complexity.
 - The proposal improves cost recovery for processing ITUs and balances the fee structure.
- **The tiered fee structure for extensions of time to file an SOU encourages timely ITU decisions.**
 - Applicants who extend their decisions to file an SOU into their third year (after the notice of allowance is issued) impact prior pending applications and those trying to clear new marks.

(see details on the following pages)



Intent-to-use (ITU) filings (cont.)

Proposed increases to AAU and SOU fees are outlined below.

Fee code	Description	Historical cost (FY 2022)	Current fee	Proposed fee	Dollar change	Percent change
6002	AAU, per class (paper)	n/a	\$200	\$300	\$100	50%
7002	AAU, per class	\$117	\$100	\$200	\$100	100%
6003	SOU, per class (paper)	\$231	\$200	\$250	\$50	25%
7003	SOU, per class	\$240	\$100	\$150	\$50	50%

Intent-to-use (ITU) filings (cont.)

Propose splitting the current structure for six-month extensions for filing an SOU into two tiers:

1. A fee for the first through third extension, and
2. An increased fee for the fourth and fifth (final) extensions.

	Description	Historical cost (FY 2022)*	Current fee	Proposed fee	Dollar change	Percent change
6004	First, second, and third request for six-month extension for filing an SOU, per class (paper)	\$126	\$225	\$225	-	-
7004	First, second, and third request for six-month extension for filing an SOU, per class	\$17	\$125	\$125	-	-
New	Fourth and subsequent request for six-month extension for filing an SOU, per class (paper)	\$126	\$225	\$350	\$125	56%
New	Fourth and subsequent request for six-month extension for filing an SOU, per class	\$17	\$125	\$250	\$125	100%

Maintenance filings

- Propose increasing fees for maintenance filings to offset increased costs and rebalance the fee structure.
- Costs to process maintenance filings have increased due to higher inflationary costs, post registration audits, and elevated legal review to address potential fraud or improper filing behaviors.
- The percentage of registrants that choose to maintain their trademark and file for maintenance is declining.
 - The number of pro se filers are increasing, and the percentage of pro se filers who maintain their trademark registration is only half the percentage of non-pro se filers who maintain their registration.
 - International filers represent a larger share of applications and are exhibiting different maintenance behavior than domestic filers.
- Given these changes in demand and filing behaviors, aggregate revenue derived from maintenance filings requires a rebalancing to keep barriers to filing new applications low.

(see details on the following pages)

Maintenance filings (cont.)

Renewals

Propose increasing fees for renewals under section 9.

Fee code	Description	Historical cost (FY 2022)	Current fee	Proposed fee	Dollar change	Percent change
6201	§ 9 registration renewal application, per class (paper)	\$106	\$500	\$550	\$50	10%
7201	§ 9 registration renewal application, per class	\$24	\$300	\$350	\$50	17%
7932	Renewal fee filed at World Intellectual Property Organization	n/a	\$300	\$350	\$50	17%

Maintenance filings (cont.)

Declarations of use

Propose increasing fees for declarations of use under sections 8 and 71.

Fee code	Description	Historical cost (FY 2022)	Current fee	Proposed fee	Dollar change	Percent change
6205	§ 8 declaration, per class (paper)	\$152	\$325	\$400	\$75	23%
7205	§ 8 declaration, per class	\$25	\$225	\$300	\$75	33%
6905	§ 71 declaration, per class (paper)	n/a	\$325	\$400	\$75	23%
7905	§ 71 declaration, per class	\$6	\$225	\$300	\$75	33%

Maintenance filings (cont.)

Declarations of incontestability

Propose increasing fees for declarations of incontestability under section 15.

Fee code	Description	Historical cost (FY 2022)	Current fee	Proposed fee	Dollar change	Percent change
6208	§ 15 declaration, per class (paper)	\$152	\$300	\$350	\$50	17%
7208	§ 15 declaration, per class	\$25	\$200	\$250	\$50	25%

Letters of protest (LOPs) and petitions

- Propose increasing fees for LOPs and petitions to the Director to recover more of the costs associated with extensive and lengthy reviews.
 - Optional LOPs and petitions are a valuable, though costly, part of the trademark registration process, and processing costs are subsidized by other fees.
 - The proposal maintains the fees below the costs of services performed and encourages more timely and efficient filing behaviors by applicants and registrants.

(see details on the following pages)



Letters of protest (LOPs) and petitions

(cont.)

Propose increasing LOP fees.

Fee code	Description	Historical cost (FY 2022)	Current fee	Proposed fee	Dollar change	Percent change
7011	LOP	\$312	\$50	\$250	\$200	400%

Propose increasing fees for petitions to the Director.

Fee code	Description	Historical cost (FY 2022)	Current fee	Proposed fee	Dollar change	Percent change
6005	Petition to the Director (paper)	n/a	\$350	\$500	\$150	43%
7005	Petition to the Director	\$886	\$250	\$400	\$150	60%



Letters of protest (LOPs) and petitions

(cont.)

Propose increasing fees for petitions to revive an application.

- Encourages efficient prosecution of applications and post-registration maintenance filings.
- Encourages processing efficiencies in the event of multiple abandonments.

Fee code	Description	Historical cost (FY 2022)	Current fee	Proposed fee	Dollar change	Percent change
6010	Petition to revive an application (paper)	n/a	\$250	\$350	\$100	40%
7010	Petition to revive an application	\$94	\$150	\$250	\$100	67%

Path forward

Path forward

- This proposal is not final; it is a starting point. We look forward to your comments and suggestions.
 - Please directly associate comments, favorable or critical, with the specific proposals under consideration so we can appropriately consider them.
- We will consider and analyze all input before preparing a notice of proposed rulemaking.
- We look forward to a productive dialogue over the next few months.
Thank you!

Milestones

- June 2023: TPAC hearing
- January–March 2024: Publish notice of proposed rulemaking
- March–June 2024: Public comment period
- NLT October 2024: Publish final rule
- November 2024: Anticipated effective date of fee changes

