## MEMO: The Master Review Form ("MRF") in USPTO's EPQI, SPL, and the IES

## Sigram Schindler, TU Berlin & TELES Patent Rights International GmbH

Starting point of this MEMO<sup>1.a)</sup> is the USPTO's Enhanced Patent Quality Initiative, EPQI. Therein, the USPTO standardizes reviews of all its finished work products by the single MRF to be used by all its reviewers. Compared to past review forms, the MRF places much more emphasis on assessing the clarity of an examiner's reasoning, while maintaining focus on addressing the correctness of her/his action. The objective is to achieve greater accuracy, consistency, and efficiency, as well as increased transparency internally and externally to the USPTO of its standards for review.<sup>[281,282,294]</sup>

An MRF reports about USPTO-internal procedural parts and Substantive Patent Law parts of such a finished work product. Presently, the assumption here made is that the USPTO would enable externally accessing at least a part of an MRF's latter parts, here named "**MRF**<sup>E</sup>" – and only MRF<sup>E</sup> is considered in the sequel, and only if the MRF of the finished work product deals with a patent.

Yet, while the MRF<sup>E</sup> focuses on an MRF's specific issues only, here also is suggested to seamlessly expand the MRF<sup>E</sup> to support<sup>1.b)</sup> also the process of building-up from scratch this eventually finished work product. The in any case indispensable MRF set-up phase for a finished work product then would (usually) be started after the currently not foreseen set-up phase for building up this product. Hence, this finished product set-up phase is called the "**MRF<sup>E</sup> prolog**" to the MRF set-up phase, here. The MRF<sup>E</sup> prolog may vastly comprise the MRF set-up. The MRF<sup>E</sup> prolog is assumed to be accessible to stake-holders in the patent (application) at issue, running an appropriate "**MRF access system**" – such as the IES (under prototype development<sup>[9,283,284,285]</sup>) – depending on access rights the USPTO would grant.

This interoperation via the Internet between a stakeholder-side whatsoever MRF access system and a central USPTO's EPQI/MRF system must use an "**MRF<sup>E</sup> communications connection protocol**"<sup>1.c</sup>, abbreviated "**MRF<sup>E</sup> protocol**". The simplest one (see below) is MRF access system independent, can interconnect any whatsoever MRF access system<sup>1.d</sup>) with the central MRF system, and enables already an end-to-end "**MRF<sup>E</sup> service**"<sup>[287]</sup> provided by the USPTO as needed here, e.g. its PE2E service.<sup>1.d</sup>)

As meanwhile the legal "**patent knowhow**"<sup>[291]</sup> has substantially been increased – induced/driven by the Supreme Court's *Mayo/Biosig/Alice* framework, abbr. *MBA*-framework – this cooperation between the USPTO and such stakeholders would enable amazing advantages to all parties involved. This will in particular dramatically boost, in breadth as in speed, •the dissemination processes of classical as well as advanced patent knowhow and hence •the resp. user qualification processes,<sup>1.d)</sup> both kinds of processes being sketched in.<sup>[9,291]</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>.a The main purpose of this MEMO is to clarify, on the one hand in what way the Innovation Expert System, IES – being totally independent of the USPTO – complements the USPTO's EPQI/INRF<sup>[281,282]</sup> project and its PE2E<sup>[294]</sup> project, and on the other hand how this is related to the FSTP project. .b , if dynamically requested by an MRF<sup>E</sup> user

b. if dynamically requested by an MRFF user
 c. By the OSI Reference Model<sup>[287]</sup>, an (L7-)"communications connection" serves for connecting a specific Application in end-systems interconnected by a network for jointly executed by end-systems being e.g. an examiner and a patent-lawyer. This (L7-)"MRFF-connection" is created/established – and from then on keeps existing/established – when the USPTO assigns a patent (application) to an examination unit. For actually using this L7-connection, first "lower layers protocols" must additionally be set-up. These details are not discussed here.
 d. This "PE2E service" has been envisioned by the USPTO already since years and the Internet interworking with it was discussed in more detail in<sup>[7]</sup>.

Seen from the "communications architecture"<sup>[287]</sup> point of view, standardized by all the giant standardization organizations, ISO/ITU-T/IEC/..., the current PE2E graphical user interface ("GUI")<sup>[284]</sup> – unknown to the author – provides no communications service elements tailored for testing an ETCI under SPL, neither in classical nor in *MBA*-framework based interpretation. Hence, the current PE2E GUI cannot support increasing any one of both patent knowhow qualifications, not to speak of supporting their broad and fast dissemination – while the IES GUI will achieve both objectives, as the author knows from his unquestionably excellent past educational career, confirmed by thousands of students (of which he evidently is very proud).

As to the IES: For enabling its end-to-end cooperation with the USPTO's MRF-system, the current IES-GUI<sup>[59,262,285]</sup> will be expanded accordingly – as indicated below – for guaranteeing that these two most urgent kind of processes would unfold smoothly and efficiently<sup>[291]</sup>. This MEMO's purpose is to outline (exceeding<sup>1.a</sup>) •how this expansion of the IES GUI is achieved and •the automatic user guidance by the very innovative style of the design of the IES UI.<sup>[262,285]</sup> optimally supports them both.

To this end is of particular importance that the MRF<sup>E</sup> protocol thus provides the currently existing missing link between the USPTO's reviewers - for the exclusive use of which the present MRF-system is designed - and the mass of the patent community, first of all the USPTO's examiners and their non-USPTO communication partners, the stakeholders in the patent(-application)s. It is evident that the seamless expansion of the MRF<sup>E</sup> communications capability to comprise the whole chain of partners that eventually will have been involved in a finished work product, i.e. enabling communications between them about a patent (application) at all its stages of development - from inventor/R&D-manager/ patent-lawyer over its USPTO's examiner(s) to its(their) USPTO's reviewer(s) - would represent to them an enormous incentive to increase all initially quoted qualities of patent work on all these patent stages.

As this all MRF<sup>E</sup> prolog, performed by using the MRF<sup>E</sup> protocol/service,<sup>[287]</sup> is key to the two above kinds of processes, it is worthwhile noticing its simplest implementation variant – though known by the pposc, also knowing that it is suitable for any MRF access system, not just the IES. An MRF<sup>E</sup> prolog is executed prior to having a finished work product, hence there is absolutely no interference with the USPTO's MRF system, except its usual (MRF) export/import interface.<sup>2.a)</sup> This trivial, assumedly public, interface enables already any access system (e.g. the IES) to cooperate with another one of the same brand<sup>2.b)</sup> and to eventually deliver the result of their MRF<sup>E</sup> cooperation to the USPTO's MRF system.<sup>1.b)</sup>

The MEMO's rest is IES specific again. It shows, that the current look&feel of the IES GUI need not be changed at all for the above very powerful expansion. I.e., the GUI's 9 key windows as of<sup>[262]</sup>, remain as they are – except that they get another push-button for toggling, for any ETCI at issue<sup>2.c)</sup>, its SPL test between "entry level" (= classical patent know how) and "advanced level" (= MBA-framework based patent know how). Yet, on the entry level, 6 of these 9 don't exist - which a user on entry level may invoke 1-by-1 by the toggle button to get to the advanced level.<sup>2.d)</sup> On both levels the GUI's subsidiary windows, hanging on key ones, only slightly differ in their complexities - in spite of the entry level's notions initially setting aside any scrutiny – as the entry complexity is just refined to advanced complexity, achievable by stepwise window invocations, thus iteratively increasing both level's notional scrutiny.

FIG1 shows – by double-headed arrows – the complete advanced level relation between SPL and the social concerns SPL embodies<sup>[271,291]</sup>, i.e. that the Supreme Court's MBA-framework ex- or implicitly defines 9 requirement statements to be met by an ETCI. The FSTP-Test veri-/falsifies this relation. Thus: An ETCI's passing the FSTP-Test is necessary and sufficient for this ETCI to satisfy SPL. The 3 bold solid arrows show the ETCI properties checked by the classical claim interpretation&construction. These and additional 6 bold dashed & 8 fine arrows show the ETCI's total checks by the MBA-framework-based claim interpretation&construction. The latter check hence refines the former check.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> .a

potentially limited to only importing finished work products when labeled as "complete". – via the Internet. Yet, usually the cooperation between MRF access systems of different brands would be impossible. ETCI/CTCI = emerging technology claimed invention/classical technology claimed invention The kind of scrutiny required is explained in detail and demonstrated by the CAFC's decisions in DDR/Myriad/Enfish/TLI in<sup>[297]</sup>. .b

<sup>.</sup>c .d



FIG1: The 9 Necessary Aufficient FSTP-testo's of an ETCI for its Satisfying 35 USC SPL – as Interpreted by the Supreme Court

**Legend1:** As to granting by SPL a temporary monopoly on an ETCI, the 4 Sections of 35 USC SPL (in the SPL box) are the legal implementation of social concerns, made up of 9 elementary social concerns independent of each other. Any elementary concern is an *MBA*-framework requirement statement that is to be met by an ETCI for satisfying SPL – whereby the ETCI is to be described by its inventive concept(s), "inC(s)"<sup>[291]</sup>. Thus, the SPL elementary concern boxes  $\equiv$  *MBA*-framework-based requirements box shows 9 testo's, checking any ETCI for its meeting these 9 requirements for its socially deserving legal protection as Congress determined by 35 USC SPL §§ 112/101/102/103 and as the Supreme Court interpreted it in *Mayo*. The 8 conjunctive consistency relations totally intermesh all 9 elementary social concerns of 35 USC and an ETCI's inventive properties/concepts.

1)	(a) input:	COM(ETCI#) ::=	values of I,N,K <sup>1</sup> ,, K <sup>N</sup> , and user-names for the ETCI and (optional) for $\forall \epsilon$ of the set A-crC::= {A-crC0n   1≤n≤N} U E-crC::= {E-crC0nk  1≤n≤N $\land$ 1≤k≤K <sup>n</sup> };				
	(b) justof <b>∀</b> 1≤n≤N:	A-crC0n'' =	∧¹≤k≤KnE-crC0nk, 1≤n≤N, whereby A-crC0n"···= A-crC0n mod({∀∈E-ncrC0n});				
	(c) justof <sup>v€COM(ETCI#)</sup>	:COM(ETCI#)	is (definite over	posc) ^ (E-COM( <tt0,φ>#)describes a useful</tt0,φ>			
				<ul> <li>A E-COM(ETCI<sup>#</sup>) describes a new&amp;useful invention);</li> </ul>			
	(d) justof:	<b>Biosig-test</b>	is passed: iff	this COM(ETCI#) is definite complete;			
2)	justof <sup>COM(ETCI)</sup> :	ETCI Disclosure-test	t is passed: iff	∀cCOM(ETCI#) are lawfully disclosed: COM(ETCI#)=> COM(ETCI);			
3)	justof <sup>⊎1≤n≤N</sup> :	ETCI Enabling-test	is passed: iff	∀∈A-crC0n its implementability is disclosed "for being E-crC tested ";			
4)	justof:	<u>Bilski-test</u>	is passed: iff	$E-crC\setminusE-crCmod(A^{*\#}) \neq \Phi;$			
5)	justof:	<u>Mayo-/Myriad-test</u>	is passed: iff	ULPE-crC::= $\forall \epsilon$ {E-crC unlimitedly preemptive} are identifiable;			
6)	justof:	<u>Alice-test</u>	is passed: iff	(1)-5) hold) $\land \exists \epsilon (E-crC)^{ULP}E-crC)$ that is unlimitedly preemptive;			
_							
7)	justof <sup>⊎1≤n≤N^1≤k≤Kn</sup> :	Independence-test	is passed: iff	$\forall \in \{\text{E-crC0nk} \mid 1 \le n \le \mathbb{N} \land 1 \le k \le K^n\}$ are independent of each other;			
8)	justof <sup>ע111≤ink≤INK</sup> n:	<u>KSR(RS)-test</u>	is passed: iff	$\forall$ ANM(i,n,k)::= if (E-crCink = E-crC0nk or equal within their tole-			
				rances) then "A" else "N";			
9)		<u>Graham(RS)-test</u>	is passed: iff	<∀ <sup>nk</sup> ε = A> ∉ {∀AC over ANM}.			
	FIG2. The ESTP test – Checking an ETCI for its Meeting all 9 Requirements Stated by the MBA Framework						

Legend2: The horizontal dashed line separates the refined claim interpretation (above it) from the refined claim construction.

A) This holds also for the classical claim interpretation and classical claim construction. But, due to the by FIG1 shown classical negligence in interpreting 35 USC also for ETCIs (not only CTCIs),<sup>2.c)</sup> both notions degenerate to a degree – as FIG1 shows<sup>[274,296]</sup>: By ignoring all the by *Mayo* and *Alice* clearly required refinements of an ETCI's claim interpretation, first of all by substituting an ETCI's thus required inC(s) by per se meaningless limitations, hence barring the subtle questions caused by an ETCIs' properties (requiring a hitherto unknown high degree of scrutiny), although noticed by the Supreme Court and in the refined claim construction checked by FSTP test4-8 – resulting in an ETCI's classical claim interpretation being meaningless and moreover inseparably jammed with classical claim construction, while both notions are fundamentally separate, as logically evidently implied by §§ 112/101/102/103.<sup>3</sup>.

As a consequence, the classical claim interpretation/construction is something intellectually hopelessly premature.

**B)** The Supreme Court's *MBA*-framework fixes this intellectual deficit of the classical claim interpretation/construction by requiring to describe an ETCI by its inC(s). This enforces into an ETCI's description the O-/A-/E-levels of abstraction alias notional resolution.<sup>[272,291]</sup> Limiting Kant's thinking to the problem here at issue,<sup>[291fth2,a)]</sup> the O-level models the knowledge representation (KR) of an ETCI's description in speculative Metaphysics, the A-level models its KR pseudo-rationally, and the E-level models its KR rationally.<sup>[291,296]</sup>

I.e.: An ETCI's functionality is the same in all its 3 KRs, yet on its O-/A-/E-level described speculatively/pseudo-rationally/rationally.<sup>[274]</sup>

**C)** The *Alice* test models ETCI's KR totally on its O-level. By contrast, the FSTP test models •pseudo-rationally transforming an ETCI's A-KR into its •rational E-KR and • rationally transforming this E-KR back into its then •rational A-KR. Thereby evidently holds: If ETCI's A-level is as abstract as possible without losing the rationality of the just mentioned KR transformation then – with all (speculatively metaphysical) likelihood – the non-rationality in an ETCI's KR is minimal, as only an ETCI's KR transformation from its specification in the patent (application) is of speculative Metaphysics. I.e., an ETCI's such A-KR filters out – from the ETCI's description by its specification, which today still is of O-level quality<sup>[291ftn5.e]</sup> – "as much Mathematics as this ETCI embodies", freely after Kant.

Often, some of an ETCI's O-inCs and/or A-inCs are the same as its E-inCs – rarely even all. Nevertheless this is often assumed due to insufficient scrutiny<sup>[296]</sup>: All classical patent knowhow commits this erroneous assumption – except in the just mentioned rare case – that an ETCI's O-KR in its patent(-application)'s specification is already rational, i.e. is intellectually flawed as stated in **A**).<sup>3,b)</sup>

<sup>.</sup>a In Mathematics the necessity of this notional separation is commonly known: Between showing, for a set, that •an element with given properties does exist in this set, and that •for this element holds an additionally asserted statement, too.

<sup>.</sup>b For more information about how mentally the input in line 1)(a) is generated and why test1 has 3 subtests see [291,296,274]

## EPQI\_MBA\_293\_V.4-DOSC



## The FSTP-Project's Reference List

	FSTP = Facts <u>S</u> creening/ <u>T</u> ransforming/ <u>P</u> re Most of the ESTP-Project papers below are written in preparation of [182] – i e are n	esenting not inten	(Version_of_30.05.2016 <sup>7</sup> ) ded to be fully self-explaining independently of their predecessors
[1]	S. Schindler: "US Highest Courts' Patent Precedents in Mayo/Myriad/CLS/Ultramercial/LBC: 'Inventive Concepts' Accepted – 'Abstract Ideas' Next? Patenting Emerging Tech. Inventions Now without Intricacies'')	[160]	S. Schindler: "The USSC Mayo/Myriad/Alice Decisions, The PTO's Implementation by Its IEG, The CAFC's DDR & Myriad Recert Decisions – Clarifications&Challences"), publ. 14.01.2015(7) its short version?) and its PP presentation
[2]	AIT: "Advanced Information Tech." alias "Artificial Intelligence Technology" denotes cutting edge IT areas, e.g. Knowledge Representation/Description Logic/Natural Language (NL/Semantics/Semiotics/System Design.	[161]	at USPTO, 21.01.2015". S. Schindler: "The IES: Phil. & Func. & Ma. F. – A Proto.", 7. GIPC. Mumbai, 16.01.2015".
[3]	MAI: "Mathematical Artificial Intelligence", the resilient fundament of AIT. R. Brachmann H. Levesque: "Knowledge Represent & Reasoning". Elsevier, 2004.	162	CAFC Decision in CET, 23.12.2014 <sup>1</sup> , S. Schindler: "The USSC's Mavo/Myriad/Alice Decisions: Their Overinterpret vs. Oversimolification of FT Cls – Scientific
[4]	F. Baader, D. Calvanese, D. McGuiness, D. Nardi, P. Patel-Schneider: "The Description Logic Handbook", CUP, 2010. Schindler: "Math. Model Substantive Patent Jaw (SPI) Top-Down vs. Battam-In", Yokohama. JURISIN 20	[164]	of SPL Prec. as to ET CIs in Action: The CAFC's Myriad & CET Decisions", USPTO, 07.01.2015". J. Schulze, D. Scheenberg, J. Hunger, S. Schindler: "Intro. to the IES UI of the ESTIP-test", 7. GIPC, Mumbai
6	S. Schindler, "FSTP" pat. appl.: "THE FSTP EXPERT SYSTEM", 2012". S. Schindler, "DS" pat. appl.: "AN INNOVATION EXPERT SYSTEM IES & ITS PTR-DS", 2013".	14601	16.01.2015'.
8	S. Schindler, J. Schulze: "Technical Report#1 on '902 PTR', 2014.	[167]	<ol> <li>Schnidler. Today's CPL Precedents and its Perspectives, Driven by ET Cis, 7. GiPC, Multidal, 15.01.20157.</li> <li>R. Sachs: "A Survey of Pat. Inv. since Alice". F&amp;WLLP, Law360, New York, 13.01.20157.</li> <li>Dabled BDSOL FOR Face and the second structure and the second structure and the second structure and the second structure and structure</li></ol>
[10]	.b S. Schindler, "Patent Business – Before Shake-up", 2015'). SSRS's AB to CAEC in LBC 2013')	[171]	S. Schindler: "Semiotic Impacts of the Supreme Court's Mayo/Biosig/Alice Decisions on Legally Analyzing ETCIs"?.
[11]	S. Schindler, "inC" pat appl.: "inC ENABLED SEMI-AUTO. TESTS OF PATENTS", 2013".	[172]	USSC Decision in Teva, 20.01.2015'). USSC Dec. in Pullman-Standard, 27.04.1982').
[14] [15]	"USPTO/MPEP: "2111 Claim Interpretation; Broadest Reason. Interpretation"). S. Schindler: "KR Support for SPL Precedents", Barcelona, eKNOW-2014).	[174] [175]	USSC Decision in Markman, 23.04.1996 <sup>1</sup> . S. Schindler: "A Patent's Robustn. & 'Double Quantifying' Its InCs as of Mayo/Alice", WIPIP. USPTO&GWU, 06.02.2015 <sup>1</sup> .
[16]	J. Daily, S. Kieff: "Anything under the Sun Made by Humans SPL Doctrine as End. Instit. for Comm. Innovation", Stanford/GWU <sup>1</sup> .	[176] [177]	R. Rader: Questions as to the FSTP-Test, WIPIP, USPT0&GWU, 06.02.2015. D. Karshtedt: "The Completeness Requ. in Pat Law", WIPIP, USPT0&GWU, 06.02.2015".
[17]	CAFC En banc Heaning in LBC, 12.09.2013. USSC: SSBG's AB in CLS, 07.10.2013).	[178]	O. Livak: "The Unresol. Ambiguity of Patent Claims", WIPIP, USPTO&GWU, 06.02.2015").
[19] [20]	USSC: SSBG's AB in WildTangt, 23.09.2013". USPTO, "Intellectual Property and the US Economy: INDUSTR. IN FOCUS", 2012".	[182]	S. Schindler: "Preent/innovation Lechnology and Science", Lexibook, in prep. S. Schindler: "The Mayo/Alice SPL Ts/Ns in FSTP-T&PTO Init.", USPTO, 16.03.2015).
[21] [22]	K. O'Malley: Keynote Address, IPO, 2013'). S. Schindler, "An Inventor View at the Grace Period", Kiev, 2013').	[184]	S. Schindler: "PTOS Efficiency increase by the FSTP-1est, e.g. EPO and USPTO", LESI, Brusseis, 10.04.2015". R. Chen: Commenting politely on "tensions" about the BRI, PTO/IPO-EF Day, 10.03.2015.
[23] [24]	S. Schindler, "The IES and inC Enabled SPL Tests", Munich, 2013". S. Schindler, "Two Fund. Theorems of 'Math. Innovation Science'', Hong Kong, ECM-2013".	[186]	A. Hirshfeld: Rep. about the PTO's progress of the IEG work, PTO/IPO-EF Day, 10.03.2015. P. Michel: Moderating the SPL paradigm ref. by Mayo/Alice, PTO/IPO-EF Day, 10.03.2015.
[25] [26]	S. Schindler, A. Paschke, S. Ramakrishna, "Form. Leg. Reas. that an Inven. Satis. SPL", Bologna, JURIX-2013". USSC: SSBG's AB in Bilski, 06.08.2009".	[188]	P. Michel: Asking this panel as to diss. of Mayo/Alice, PTO/IPO-EF Day, 10.03.2015. M. Lee: Luncheon Keynote Speech, PTO/IPO-EF Day, 10.03.2015'.
[28]	N. Fuchs, R. Schwitter, "Att. to Con. E.", 1996. K. Ashley, V. Walker, "From Info. to Arr. Ref. for Level Cases", Bologne, III. (RY, 2013)	[190] [191]	A. Hirshfeld: Remark on EPQI's ref. of pat. ap. examination, PTO/IPO-EF Day, 10.03.2015. 16≈ Int. Roundt. on Sem., Hilo, 29.04.2015 <sup>1</sup> .
31	CAFC, H. in Oracle / Google, "As to Copyrightability of the Java Platf.", 06.12.2013. Schindler: "A KB Based Inno. E. Sus, /IES) for US SPI Preceds." Phylet I (2014/2014)	[192]	M. Schecter, D. Crouch, P. Michel: Panel Disc., Patent Quality Summit, USPTO, 25.03.2015. Finnegan: 3 fund, current uncert. on SPL prec, Patent Quality Summit, USPTO, 25.03.2015.
33	S. Schindler, "Status Report about the FSTP Prototype", Hyderabad, BCP-2014.	[194]	S. Schindler, B. Wegner, J. Schulze, D. Schoenberg: "post-Mayo/Biosig/Alice – The Precise Meanings of Their New SPL Terms", publ. 08.04.15".
[35]	<ol> <li>Schindler, Values of the STL SCL, and SPL – STL Tests seen as SCL Tests seen as SPL Tests", in prep.</li> <li>Schindler, IPR-MEMO: "STL, SCL, and SPL – STL Tests seen as SCL Tests seen as SPL Tests", in prep.</li> </ol>	[195] [196]	R. Stoll: "Fed. Cir. Cases to Watch on Softw. Pat. – Planet Blue", Patently-O, 06.04.2015". See the panel at the IPBCGlobal 2015, San Francisco, 14-16.06.2015"
[37]	Precedents", Berkeley, IPSC, 08.08.20147. Precedents", Berkeley, IPSC, 08.08.20147.	[197]	S. Schindler: "Mayo/Alice – The USSC's Requirement Statement as to Semiotics in SPL & ETCIs, USPTO, 06.05.2015r <sup>3</sup> , S. Schindler: "Pats' Abs. Robust. & the FSTP-Test", LESI 2015, Brussels 18.04.2015 <sup>1</sup> , DBKDA 2015 Rome 27.05.2015.
[38]	CAFC, Transcript of the Hearing in TELES vs. CISCO/USPTO, 08.01.2014/).	[199]	B. Wegner: "The FSTP Test – Its Mathe. Assess. of an ET CI's Practical and SPL Quality", LESI 2015, Brussels, 18.04.2015 <sup>1</sup> , and DBKDA 2015, Rome, 27.05.2015.
[40]	SSBC's Brief to the CAFC in case 1453'.	[200]	D. Schoenberg: "The FSTP Test: A SW Sys. for Ass. an ET CI's Pract. and SPL Quality", LESI 2015 Brussels 18.04.2015 and DBKDA 2015 Rome 27.05.2015".
[42]	SSDG's Amicus Brief to the CAFC in case SU27. SSBG's Amicus Brief to the CAFC in case CLS, 06.12.2012").	[201] [202]	Panel: "Patent Prosecution Session", AIPLA, LA, 31.04.2015. S. Schindler:, "The Notion of "InC", Fully Scientized SPL, and "Controlled Preemptive" ETCIs", published by 11.06.2015".
[43]	<ol> <li>S. Schimkler, <u>LAC pat appr.</u> "Semi-Add. Seni-Custon: of (Air) Comminative Legal Alg. Chains (LACS) in a Cris SPL Test, Enabled by Its Inventive Concepts", 2014".</li> <li>Darker, C. Schimkler, Seni dire, "Entents and its Sences". Bedia: LECI 2012.</li> </ol>	[203] [204]	<ol> <li>Kant, http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/kant/.</li> <li>Lefstin: "The Three Faces of Prometheus: A Post-Alice Jurisprudence of Abstraction", N.C.J.L.&amp;TECH, July 2015".</li> </ol>
[44] [45]	R. Rader, S. Schinder, Parei disc. Patients on Life Sciences, Benin, LESI, 2012. USSC: SSBG's AB as to Clis, 28.01. 2014'). 9. Oktivitier Marken, Design (Alexandrian Charles	205	CAFC Decision in Biosig, 27.04.2015 <sup>n</sup> . USSC Petition for Cert in ULTRAMERCIAL vs, WILDTANGENT, May 2015.
[40]	<ol> <li>Schindler: Autom. Derv. of Leg. Arg. Chains (LACs) from Arguable Subtests (AS1s) of a Claimed Invention's Test for Satisfying. SPL", U Warsaw, 24.05.2014).</li> <li>Schindler: Automatica feature for a clause finate OPI. Test".</li> </ol>	[207] [208]	KJ. Melullis, report about a thus caused problem with a granted patent at the X. Senate of the German BGH. S. Schindler: "Reach of SPL Prot. for ETCIs of Tied Preemptivity", published by 25.06.20157.
[47] [50]	S. Schindler: "Auto, Generation of All AS Is for an Invention's SPL Test.". NAUTILUS v. BIOSIG. PFC. 2013'.	[209] [210]	CAFC Decision in Ariosa, 12.06.2015') S. Braswell: "All Rise for Chief Justice Robot", <u>Sean Braswell</u> , 07.06.2015')
[51]	BIOSIG, Respondent, 2013	[211] [212]	S. Schindler: "The Cons. of Ideas Mo. USSC's MBA-Semiotics and its Hi-Level", in prep. R. Merges: "Uncertainty, and the Standard of Patentability", 1992".
[55] [56]	B. Russel: "Principia Mathematica", see wikipedia. CAFC Decision Phillips v. AWH Corp., 12.07.2005	[213] [214]	CAFC Decision in Teva, 18.06.2015' K. O'Malley, B. Lynn, A. Weiss, M. Cooper: "Pat. Lit. Case Man.: Reforming the Pat. Lit. Proc", FCBA, 25.06.2015.
[57] [58]	M. Adelman, R. Rader, J. Thomas: "Cases and Materials on Patent Law", West AP, 2009. SSBG's Amicus Brief to the Supreme Court as to its (In)Definiteness Quest's, 03.03, 2014".	[215]	R. Chen, A. Bencivengo, N. Kelley, J. Reisman: "Claim Construct.", FCBA, 26.06.2015. S. Schindler: "The US NPS: The MB4 Framework a Rough Diamond – but Rough for Ever? Teva will Cut this Diamond
[59] [60]	S. Schindler, " <u>UI" pat. appl.</u> : "An IES Cap. of S-Auto. Gen./Invoking All LACs in the SPL-T, Ean. by InCs", 2014". S. Schindler: "Auto. Der. of All Arg. Chains Leg. Def. Patenting/Patented Inventions", ISPIM, Montreal, 6.10.2014, ".	[217]	and thus Create a Mega-Trend in SPL, Internat.", publ. 21.07.2015'. B Puesa' "brinciples of Mathematics" say Wikingdia
[62] [63]	<ul> <li>a) CAFC decision on reexamination of U.S. Pat. No. 7,145,902, 21.02.2014<sup>1</sup>.</li> <li>b) CAFC decision on reexamination of U.S. Pat. No. 6 954 453, 04 04 2014<sup>1</sup>.</li> </ul>	219	CAFC Decision in LBC, 23.06.2015').
64	B. Wegner, S. Schindler, "A Mathe. Structure Modeling Inventions", Combra, CICM-2014". SSRC's Petition to the CAEC for Rehearing En Banc in the '902 case. 18 (M 2014').	[221]	CAFC Decision in Versata, 09.07.2015' CAFC Decision in Versata, 09.07.2015'
[67]	CAFC: THERASENSE decision, 25.05.2011	223	J. Duffy J. Dabney: PfC, 13.08.2009'. S. Scheider * A PC to an Approximate to the LISSC's Tayle Decision: CAEC Teaming up with PTO for Parties Tayle and
[69]	B. Fracto. Annous brie to the OAP's in VERSATA V. SAPAGSP10, 24:03:14). USSC, Transcript of the oral argument in Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank, 31.03.2014'). D. Date: Kanada Sapada Marking Tel Lew and Life Ab's TE Tay Dente and Par Coef. 04.11.2012's	[224]	<ol> <li>Schilder, A PS to an Applatish to the USSC's revealed becasion. CAPC reaning-up with PTO for Baning reval – and this entire 'ET Spirit' Framework?", pub 27.07.2015.</li> <li>Schild LeMarse, D. Cap, M. Caddard, M. Hander, "Challenging Caffurer During and Mathed Pat. Ell. in Child Adjance.</li> </ol>
[71]	R. Kader, Keynote Speech: Pat. Law and Ltt. Adv., ED Tex Bench and Bar Cont., 0111.2013. S. Schindler, Keynote Speech: "eKnowledge of SPL – Trail Blazer into the Innovation Age", Barcelona, eKNOW-2014".	[225]	R. Stoll, B. Lawarca, S. Ono, H. Goodaro, N. Hoeloer: Unailenging Software-Business Method Pat. Eli. In CWI Actions and Post Grant Review, CASRIP, Seattle, 24.07.2015.
[/2]	.a) S. Schindler: "The USSC's SPL Init: Sch. Instruction and the second	220	A. Seranni, D. Reteinberger, J. Haley, J. Krauss: "Biotech and Pharma Patents Eligi.", CASRIP, Seattle, 24.07.2015. D. Kettelberger, see [227]
[73]	SPL tests and Arg. Chains, Honolulu, NAW20145, 18.07.141. a) USPTO/MPEP: "2014 Procedure For Subject Matter Eligibility Analysis Of Claims Reciting Or Involving Laws Of	228	Justice Breyer: Archimedes Metaphor, [69]. I. Kant: "The Metaphysical Foundations of Natural Science ", Wikipedia.
[7.4]	Nature/Natural Principles, Natural Phenomena, And/Ur Natural Products, (46,49), 20141. .b) MEMORANDUM: "Prelim. Examin. Instructions in view of Alice v. CLS"". .B. Woener: "The Math. Destructure of the Standard Register of the Cast of the Standard Register of the Stand	[230]	I. Kant. https://en.wikipedia.com/wiki/immanuei_Kant. & I. Kant. *Critique of Pure Reason", https://en.wikipedia.com/wiki/L_Kant.
[74] [75]	B. Wegner: The Math. background of Proving InCs Based Claimed InV. Satisfies SPL, 7. GIPC, Mumdal, 16.01.2015.) CAFC Order as to denial [65], 27.05.2014	[232]	I. Kant. "Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals , <u>https://en.wkipedia.org/wki/</u> I. Kant. "Categorical Imperative", <u>https:/en.wkipedia.org/wki/Categorical</u> Imperative
[78] [79]	R. Rader, Keynote Speech at GTIF, Geneva, 2014 and LESI, Moscow, 2014 S. Schindler: "On the BRI-Schism in the US NPS", publ. 22.05.2014."	[234]	I. Kant. "Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics", <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/</u>
[80] [81]	USSC: SSBG's PfC in the '902 case, Draft_V.133_of_[121], publ. 14.07.2014". S. Schindler: "To Whom is Interested in the Supreme Court's Biosia Decision""	[236]	.a USPTO: "July 2015 Update on Subj. Matter Eligibility", 30.07.2015" .b USPTO: "May 2016 Update: Memorandum - Recent Subj.Matter Eligibility Decisions", 19.05.2016*)
[83]	SSBG's Petition to the CAFC for Rehearing En Banc in the '453 case, 09.06.2014').	[237]	Concepts, http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/concepts/. S. Schindler: "The Supreme Court's Substantive Law (SPL) Interpretation – and Kant", publ.13.04.2016').
85	CAFC: "At Three Decades", DC 2012. Schiedre Foundation: "Transationic Capp. for Growth and Society", DC 2011	[239] [240]	R. Hanna: "Kant and the Foundations of Analytic Philosophy", OUP, 2001. S. Koerner: "The Philosophy of Mathematics", DOVER, 2009
[91]	B Wegner S. Schindler "A Math. KR Model for Ref. Cl. Cons. II", subm. for publication	[241]	USSC: PIC by Cuozzo'). S. Schindler: "Draft of an Amicus Brief to the USSC in Cuozzo supporting", publ. 05.11.2015').
[92]	SSBG's Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court in the '453 case, 06.10.2014'1.	[244] [245]	M. Lee: Publ. Interview at Opening Plenary Session, AIPLA, DC, 21.10.2015. S. Schindler: "The IEG's July 2015 Update & the 'Patent-Eligibility Granted/-ing, PEG' Test", publ. 18.12.2015"
[95] [97]	S. Schindler, ArAchen-MEMO: "Arance, Action, and the PatEll. Prob., in prep., 2014. S. Schindler, DisInTech-MEMO: "R&D on Pat. Tech.: Eff. and Safety Boost.", in prep., 2014.	[246] [247]	M. Lee: USPTO Director's Forum, "Enhanced Patent Quality Initiative: Moving Forward", 06.11.2015". ISO/OSI Reference Model of Open Systems Interconnection, see Wikipedia.
[98] [99]	G. Boolos, J. Burgess, R. Jeffrey: "Computability and Logic", Cambridge UP, 2007. A. Hirshfeld, Alexandria, PTO, 22.07.2014 <sup>1</sup> .	249	USSC Decision in Parker vs. Flook, 22.06.1978'). CAEC Denial of En Banc Patition in Aricea v. Seguenom, 02.12.2015')
[101]	P. Michel, Keynote, PTO, 22.07.2014.	[252]	S. Schindler: "Patent-Eligibility and the "Patent-Eligibility Granted-Ing, PEG" Test, resp. the CAFC Objectively Counters
[109]	M. Adelman, Seattle, CASRIP, 25.07.2014.	[254]	USSC Cert Petitions in Halo v. Pulse and Stryker v. Zimmer, 22.06.2015
[110] [111]	B. Stoll, Seattle, CASRIP, 25.07.2014. R. Rader, Seattle, CASRIP, 25.07.2014.	[255] [256]	CAFC Oral Argument in McRo v. Bandai, 11.12.2015 CAFC Oral Argument in Lexmark v. Impression, 02.10.2015
[113]	S. Schindler: "The CAFC's Rebellion is Over – The USSC, by Mayo/Biosig/Alice,", published 07.08.2014".	[257] [258]	CAFC Decision in Carnegie v. Marvell, 04.08.2015 S. Schindler: "A PS as to the Motio Decision",publ. 11.01.2016").
[116]	R. Merges: Ind. IN: A Limited Defense of Absolute Immgement Liability in Patent Law , Berkeley, IPSC, 08.08.20141.	[259] [260]	S. Schindler: "BRIP™ by the USPTO or BRIMBA by the Supreme Court?, publ 03.02.2016, <sup>1</sup> . S. Schindler: "Classical Limitations or MBA Framework's Inventive Concepts?", publ. 08.02.2016 <sup>1</sup>
[121] [122]	USSC: SSBG's PfC in '902 case, 25.08.2014'). D Parmas see Wikinedia	[261] [262]	S. Schindler: "Patent-Eligibility: Vague Feelings or an MBA Fact?", publ. 12.02.2016 S. Schindler, U. Diaz, T. Hofmann, L. Hunger, C. Negrutiu, D. Schoenberg, J. Schulze, J. Wang, B. Wegner, R. Wetzler:
123	E. Dijkstra, see Wikipedia. S. Schindler, "Computer Organization III", 3. Semester Class in Comp. Sc. TUB, 1974-1984		"The User Interface Design of an Innovation Expert System (= IES) for Testing an Emerging Technology Claimed Invention (= ETCI) for its Satisfying Substantive Patent Law (= SPL)", publ. 07.03.201*)
125	S. Schindler: "Nonsequential Algorithms", 4. Semester Class in Comp. Sc., TUB, 1976-1984. S. Schindler: "Ontimal Satellite Orbit Transfers", PhD Thesis, TUB, 1971	[263] [264]	M. McCormick: "Immanuel Kant: Metaphysics", <u>www.iep.utm.edu/kantmeta/</u> . M. Fuller, D. Hirshfeld, M. Schecter, L. Sheridan, C Brinckerhoff (Moderator), Panel Disc., IPO, DC, 15.03.2016.
[127]	USSC Decision in KSR	[265] [266]	W. Quine, see Wikipedia. USSC PfC by Samsung v. Apple, 21.03.2016
	USSC Decision in Mayo	[268]	S. Schindler: "MII" pat. appl.: "THE 'MATHEMATICAL INVENTIVE INTELLIGENCE, MII' TOOLBOX", 2016, in prep S. Schindler: "IES-UIE" appl.: "THE IES, USER INTERFACE DESIGN", 2016, in prep
	USSC Decision in Biosig	270	S. Schindler: "FSTP II" pat. appl.: "THE FSTP-II", 2016', in prep S. Schindler: "PEGG-Test" pat. appl.: "THE FPATENT FLIGIBILITY GRANTING/GRANTED TEST". 2016. in prep.
[130]	G. Frege: "Function und Begriff", 1891.	272	S. Schindler: "The Supreme Court's MBA Framework" Implies "Levels Of Abstraction", pub.12.05.2016 S. Schindler: "CSIP" pat. appl: "CONTEXT SENSITIVE ITEMS PROMPTING" 2016. in prep.
[131]	L. Wittgenstein: "Tract. logico-philoso.", 1918. B. Wegner, MEMO: "About relations (V.7-final)", 25.04.2013").	274	S. Schindler: "MII, the " Mathematical Inventive Intelligence' Natural Language", 2016, to be published on 22.06.2016 M. Flanacan, R. Merces, S. Michel, A. Rai, W. Taub: "After Alice. Are SW Innovations Ever Patentable Subi, Matter?"
133	B. Wegner, MEMO: "About con. of pre. /con., scope and solution of problems", 20.08.2013. B. Wegner, MEMO: "A refined relat. between domains in BADset and BEDset", 18.09.2014.	276	V. Winters, K. Collins, S. Mehta, van Pelt: "After Williamson, Are Functional Claims for SW Viable?" K. Collins: "The Williamson Revolution in SW Structure", Washington University. Draft 04/01/16
[135] [136]	H. Goddard, S. Schindler, S. Steinbrener, J. Strauss: FSTP Meeting, Berlin, 29.09.2014. S. Schindler: "Tutorial on Commonalities Between System Design and SPL Testing".	278	CAFC Decision in Williamson v. Citrix Online, 2015-2 D. Pamas: "Software Fundamentals", ADDISON-WESI FY, 2001
[137]	S. Schindler: "The Rationality of a Claimed Invention's (Cl's) post-Mayo SPL Test – It Increases Cl's Legal Quality and Professional Efficiency in Cl's Use", in prep.	280	USSC: Transcript of its Hearing in Cuozzo on 25.04.2016' M Lee: Opening Statement at the Patent Quality Community Symposium LISPTO' Alexandria 27.04.2016
[138] [139]	S. Schindler: "The USSC Guid. to Robust ET CI Patents", ICLPT, Bangkok, 22.01.2015". USSC: Order as to denial [121], 14.10.2014".	282	USPT0: EPQI, http://www.uspto.gov/patent/initiatives/enhanced-patent-quality-initiative-0 S. Schindler: "Prototyne Demonstration of the Inovation Excert System"   ESI 2016 Peking 16.05 2016
[140] [141]	s. scnindler: "§ 101 Bashing or § 101 Clarification", published 27.10.2014". BGH, "Demonstrationsschrank" decision".	284	B. Wegner: "The FSTP – Its Math. Assessment of an ETCI's Practical and SPL Quality", LESI 2016, Peking, 16.05.2016. D. Schoenberg: "Presentation of the IES Prototyne", I ESI 2016 Peking, 16.05.2016.
[142]	B. Wegner, S. Schindler: "A Mathematical KR Model for Ref. Cl. Int. & Constr. II", in prep	286	W. Rautenberg: "Einführung in die Mathematische Logik", VIEWEG"tEUBNER, 2008 ISO/IEC 7498-11994: Information technology – Onen Systems Interconnection – Beeic Beference Model: www.icc.com
[147] [148]	CAFC, Transcript of the Hearing in Biosig case, 29.10.2014". R. Rader: Confirming that socially inacceptable CIs as extremely preemptive, such as for example [119]2), should be	288	N. Fuchs, K. Kaljurand, T. Kuhn: "Attempto Controlled English for Knowledge Representation", University of Bonn, 2008 CAEC, Decksion in 77/1 / 17.05.2016)
[149]	patent-eligible, AIPLA meeting, DC, 24.10.2014. A. Hirshfeld: Announcing the PTO's readiness to consider also hypothetical CIs into its resp. guideline, AIPLA meeting,	209	CAFC, Decision in <i>Enfish</i> , 12.05.20167. S. Schindler, "Enfish, 12.11 The CAFC in Line with the Supreme Courter MDA Economics" with 26.06.2016*
[150]	DC, 24.10.2014. S. Schindler: "Alice-Tests Enable 'Quantifying' Their Inventive Concepts – A Tut. about this Key to Increasing a	292	USPTO: MEMORANDUM as to "Recent Subject Matter Eligibility Decisions", 19.05.20167
[151]	Patent's Robustness", USPTO&GWU, 06.02.2015", see also [175]". S. Schindler: "Biosig, Refined by Alice, Vastly Increases the Robustness of Patents – A Tutorial about this Kev to	293	USPTO: Strategic IT Plan for FY 2015-2018, USPTO's home page
[152]	Increasing a Patent's Robustness", in prep. <sup>4</sup> "). S. Schindler: "Auto. Deriv /Reprod. of Legal Argument Chains, Protecting Patens Against SPL Attacks", Sinoapore.	[295]	S. Schindler: "A Comment on the Recent IEG Update – Suggesting More Scrutiny ", to be publ. by 06.06.2016 ").
[153]	ISPIM, 09.12.2014 <sup>1</sup> ). S. Schindler: "Practical Impacts of the Mayo/Alice/Biosig-Test – A Tutorial about Patent's Robustness", 2015 IP	*) ava	ilable at <u>www.fstp-expert-system.com</u>
[154]	Scholars Roundt., Drake Uni. Law School, 27.03.2015*) CAFC Decision in Interval, 10.09. 2014".		
[155]	S. Schindler: "A Tutorial into (Operating) Sys. Design and AIT Terms/Notions on Rigorous ETCIs' Analysis by the Patent Com.", in prep.		
[156] [157]	CAFC Decision in DDR, 05.12. 2014). USPTO: "2014 Int. Guidance on Pat. Subj. M. Eli. & Examples: Abs. Ideas". 16.12.2014)		
[158] [159]	USSC's Order as to denial [92], 08.12.2014/. CAFC Decision in <i>Myriad</i> , 17.12.2014/.		