Classical "Limitations"   or   *MBA* Framework's "Inventive Concepts"?

Sigram Schindler,
TU Berlin & TELES Patent Rights International GmbH

PROPOSAL FOR STUDY[1.a]*:*   By its "*Mayo/Biosig/Alice, MBA*" framework the Supreme Court requires using inventive concepts ("inCs") instead of classical limitations for specifying ETCIs

EXPLANATION

The Supreme Court requires by its *MBA* framework – by *Mayo/Alice* explicitly, by *Biosig* implicitly – using "inventive concepts, inCs", instead of classical "limitations" for specifying ETCIs, as shown below. The USPTO's IEG still uses classical limitations to this end. [258] explains why this is an extremely error prone conception, in particular for ETCIs[1.b]. The Supreme Court's *MBA* framework therefore requires using the BRI*MBA* for an ETCI's refined claim interpretation & construction, instead of the BRI[PTO] [258].

Hence, this explanation of the above "proposal for study" focuses on showing that for ETCIs this mandatory use of the BRI*MBA* implies using also inCs (while for CTCIs both may be optional), hence first clarifies what inCs are, how they are identified and used, and finally touches that this "ETCI adequate" conception facilitates dealing with their patent-eligibility issue (as exemplified by the CAFC's *DDR* & *Myriad* decisions and the ET DC's *Motio* decision, and some more complex ETCIs, and elaborated on in [260]).

This proposal is focused on ETCIs, as having caused the Supreme Court to launch its *MBA* framework. Accordingly, it shows in Section II – after an introductory Section I – that in testing an ETCI for its satisfying SPL (including its being patent-eligible) its classical limitations are no longer tenable as too error prone, and that changing over to using inCs for all parties involved is of enormous advantages.

I.   Introductory Remarks to the Supreme Court's *MBA* Framework[1.c]

Consent exists between the Supreme Court and the USPTO that any legal decision about an ETCI requires knowing its meaning, i.e. clearly determining what exactly is the invention's claim of patent law protection, at all. This first step is called the ETCI's "claim **interpretation**".

Total disagreement exists between the Supreme Court and its *MBA* framework – based on the inCs of the tested ETCI's, being pairs or <an invention/TT0, application/A>, appreciated by the CAFC and the USPTO by lip-services, but definitely not really – and both these highly estimated authorities. They both cling to "limitations", when it comes to how to exactly proceed in an ETCI's claim interpretation, as this procedure determines this ETCI's meaning. This schism is potentially lethally threatening many patents.

For avoiding this disaster, threatening all innovative US key economies, it is necessary and sufficient to apply more notional scrutiny in testing an ETCI for its meeting SPL[1.b] requirements than hitherto practiced by courts or the USPTO – as the *MBA* framework clearly states, [258] explaining more details.

---

1 **.a** This submission by the author has the broader USPTO context of its patent quality initiative [245,244,251,258,260]. Accordingly, many of the following elaborations are highly redundant to earlier reports, even reusing earlier wordings. Such backward references are identified by [XXX**nnn**], whereby "XXX" identifies a document in the Reference List and "**nnn**" an item identifier therein, e.g. [258[2.a]]. If these elaborations and reports differ, this does not mean they contradict or devaluate each other as they often serve different purposes and/or only didactical clarifications – and/or express improved insights[2.a].

   .b CTCI/ETCI = classic/emerging technology claimed invention, SPL = Substantive Patent Law.

   .c The following mirrors advanced System Design [2] and in particular "Mathematical Artificial Intelligence, MAI" [258[5.a]].

II. Testing an ETCI for Satisfying SPL must Analyze its Total Disclosed Inventivity [2.a)]
– The Supreme Court's *MBA* Framework hence Requires Using inCs for this Purpose –

The patent community still considers the notion of 'inventive concept' as murky [247]: In *Mayo/Alice* the Supreme Court namely left its details open – as since long is known [2] that, in principle, one may precisely model all real-world issues by their issue specific concepts, e.g. ETCIs by their inCs.

For showing that this approach here is indispensable, Section II.1 starts with outlining the ●incapability of classical "limitations" to become precise and complete in describing an ETCI and the ●fundamental advantage of using this ETCI's inCs to this end[2.b)]. Section II.2 then presents 5 key inherent properties of inCs, on which the *MBA* framework requires to base an ETCI's SPL test. Section II.3 finally outlines how such inCs are mathematized for preciseness and excluding misunderstandings. This notion of inCs takes SPL precedents about ETCIs to a much higher level of development than the one it today is on.

II.1: Inventive Concepts' Fundamental Descriptive/Analytic Advantage over Classical Limitations

Any of the Supreme Court's *MBA* framework decisions and in *KSR* requires using the notion[2.a)] of "inventive concept, inC" for describing alias specifying alias modeling, for an ETCI, its meaning[2.c]. Thereby any inC precisely describes (=specifies=models) an inventive aspect of this meaning, and the **logical sum of all inCs of this ETCI describes this ETCI's total inventivity alias ETCI's meaning** – both as disclosed by ETCI's specification for the "person of pertinent ordinary skill and creativity, pposc".

As told already in [258[p.2]], verifying this fundamental statement (in bold letters) is logically impossible, if the BRI[PTO] is used in ETCI's claim interpretation, due to BRI[PTO]'s definition. It namely ●assumes the ETCI is described by its "limitations" as stated by its claim's wording – by limitations of something thus only poorly defined and often not at all precisely self-explaining, as the BRI[PTO] assumes, and then tends to ●ignore some inC/aspect of ETCI's total inventivity[2.d)], even if explicitly mentioned by this wording[2.e)].

Thus, while the *MBA* framework decisions are eligibility/definiteness decisions, they also clearly and unmistakably state the Supreme Court's claim interpretation requirements [256,258,260].

---

2 .a Describing/Analyzing an ETCI and its satisfying SPL requires using basic items of thinking for representing ETCI's total inventivity: A '**term**' is an arbitrary '**identifier**' alias '**name**' alias '**acronym**'. A pair <'term', its 'meaning'> is called '**notion**', denoted by its name. A notion's meaning, associated to its term/name, is called its '**semantics**' – if refined for an application's need its '**pragmatics**'. Making/Creating/Defining meaning/semantics/pragmatics is called '**semiotics**'[3.b)], refining or redefining of already existing notions (i.e. reusing their names) or creating new notions (i.e. using new names for them). The *MBA* framework performs 'SPL semiotics' for ETCIs, by refining existing SPL pragmatics and also creating new ones.

.b An ETCI's total inventivity disclosed by its specification notionally differs from the "problem solution" it represents, as it per se does not comprise the definition of the problem it allegedly solves. This implies that this problem does not need to be (fully) disclosed by ETCI's specification, as otherwise were indispensable. Nevertheless, by SPL the usefulness of this ETCI's total inventivity must be (fully) disclosed by its specification – and thereof the problem may be derived that the ETCI solves, but this derived problem need not to be identical to the problem that ETCI's specification discloses.

.c By contrast, any inC of any ETCI is (if necessary) precisely definable by a model, on top of which it is defined precisely [202]. Thus also this ETCI's total inventivity, i.e. the logical sum of all its inCs, is defined precisely – and defined to be this ETCI's meaning. This is the reason, why any ETCI is called "model based" [258[p.2]].

.d If an ETCI's inC is, by its BRI[PTO] based claim interpretation, not recognized then it moreover is impossible to determine, whether it is causing ETCI's potential exemption from patent-eligibility – this inC then is called "patent-eligibility exempted" – or its patent-eligibility, as being part of an "**inventive *Alice* concept**, **in[A]C**", representing (part of) ETCI's application A of its TT0 [258,260]. Overcoming these deficiencies inevitably requires semiotically[2.a)] refining the classical/pre-*MBA*-framework SPL pragmatics to ETCI-needed/post-*MBA*-framework SPL pragmatics, as by the *MBA* framework achieved[4)] [171].

.e see e.g. the CAFC's recent *Myriad* decision [251] – an error very frequently committed by CAFC and USPTO.

II.2:   Inventive Concepts' Inherent Properties/Meanings/Pragmatics[2.a)]

The Subsections II.2.a-e present that due to the SPL semiotics by the *MBA* framework, any inC pragmatics – some being invisible/intangible/fictional, therefore making ETCIs representing SPL problems with CTCIs not existing[3.a)] – has some inherent SPL relevant properties. For an ETCI, their conjunction (= their logical sum) represents ETCI's meaning alias total inventivity, described by these inCs' pragmatics.

II.2.a: I.e.: By the *MBA* framework, an ETCI's 'inventive concepts' are nothing else but increments of its total inventivity, disclosed by the patent's specification and in total making-up this ETCI's subject matter, being a pair <invention/TT0, application/A>. An inC hence needs not even be quoted by the claim's wording of an ETCI, if only the latter's specification im- or explicitly discloses its meaning and this wording comprises it (see the CAFC's *DDR* case [156,160]). This evidently finishes the evergreen nonsense that "limitations must not be imported into claims' wordings" – as explained by [258[p.5]].

Yet, a patent specification may disclose, for one of its ETCIs, one or several sets of inCs, each making-up this ETCI's whole inventivity, thus disclosing for this ETCI a single or finitely many different 'interpretations' – all of these being assumed to represent the same invention [6,7,45,142].

II.2.b: Next, by a lengthy Subsection, the beginning of the use of the inC notion in an ETCI's claim interpretation[3.b)] is shown, i.e. in its claim analysis, as by the *MBA* framework required for enabling a dependable *MBA* framework based SPL test of this ETCI. Yet, the *MBA* framework's notions – especially of an ETCI's groundbreaking inC and the *Mayo* semiotics it embodies[3.c)], by *Alice* confirmed [150,151] – are too coarse [5-7] for reasoning as precisely as required by the *MBA* framework. It itself nowhere is precise, but just indicates how to refine them by the patent community, as the Supreme Court repeatedly asked for, implicitly by its above referred to metaphor and even explicitly[3.d)].

---

3 **.a** – why CTCIs' SPL tests may get along without using this more intellectual notion of its inventive concepts. Moreover, many CTCI's SPL tests are so porous – e.g. due to using the BRI[PTO] and hence only the classical claim interpretation & construction – that their use of inCs wouldn't make much sense.
.b the actual use of inCs thereby will be shown by [250]
.c The notion of semiotics[2.a)] and its derivatives, such as semiotical and semiotic, may be used as a substantive in singular or plural, or as adverb, or as adjectives, in present/past/future, …, no grammatical alias syntactical limitation exists, just as for the notion "meaning-making". Thereby "Semiotics in SPL" is not meaning "esoterics in SPL" [191], but exact and precise[6.a)] improvement – by Kant & Analytic Philosophy [237] – of scientized 'SPL Metaphysics' based on the *MBA* framework. The latter is located in fundamental Mathematics (e.g. Arithmetic, Set Theory, Logic, …) as SPL deals with Intellectual Property Rights, underlying Mathematics for supporting Natural Sciences (such as Analysis, Function Theory, Differential Equations, …). Hence, the exact and precise[6.a)] SPL Pragmatics is located below the most fundamental Natural Science, Physics.
    In the US Wikipedia, Semiotics is outlined as AIT [2] focused on linguistic **"meaning-making"** in any area of semantics/pragmatics whatever, e.g. in the area of SPL precedents about ETCIs. Semiotics may be seen as the unnoticed giant not only in the evolvement of ETCIs' SPL precedents, but in all ET areas: While R&D investments are indispensable for creating ETCIs, sufficient such investments may be raised only by anticipating them semiotically.
    This is brought to the point by Justice Breyer's "Archimedes metaphor" [244[11.a)]]. It invites to improving the *MBA* framework of SPL for ETCIs, located on top of the allegedly precise SPL Metaphysics for CTCIs – just as the metaphysical "boat building" (referred to by this metaphor) has been improved to powerful naval technologies. FSTP-Technology indeed improves the *MBA* framework's Metaphysics by scientizing the Metaphysics of SPL precedents about ETCIs and CTCIs.
    Whether there are ETCIs for which FSTP-Technology doesn't work? Based on mathematical criteria, such ETCIs would be called "pathologic", probably not existing at all, especially not with ETCIs that are of FFOL over their independent thoughts creating them [142] – whereby by logic a thus non-FFOL patented ETCI also shouldn't exist.
.d A similar notion of an invention's "inventive concept(s)" was used in CTCIs' pre-*Mayo* SPL testing [117,234,248]. Yet, it allegedly was made superfluous by the simpler – but often just absurd – vastly "claims wordings' limitations based" interpretation of CTCIs' by the BRI[PTO].

For any ETCI, FSTP-test1/2 [258**FIG1**] checks this refinement, i.e. whether its alleged E-inCs are refine-ments of its alleged O/A-inCs. Ideally, these checks are mentally performed by the user, before it starts its input to FSTP-test1(a). Practically, they iteratively overlap with this input or even correct it later[4.a)].

Before and during FSTP-test1/2, these initial steps of checking ETCI's alleged inCs, take place on all 3 levels of notional resolution: On the ETCI's notionally 'original, O'-level as the coarsest as totally infor-mal level and before; on its semi-formal 'abstract, A'-level of notional refinement; on the A-level's no-tional refinement level, the totally formal 'elementary, E'-level. Without getting aware of them, these 3 levels of notional resolution are passed everyday by everybody in any getting aware of something[4.b)].

An ETC specification's O-/A-/E-level representation of its subject matter, being a pair of <invention/TT0, application/A>, consists of mentally plain O-/A-/E-level statements. Thereby means the ●total informality of the O-level that it represents ETCI's one or several O-level statements as conjunction(s) of wordings from the ETCI's documented specification (i.e. any quotation is an original natural language wording or original graphic, hence the "O"), ●semi-formality of the A-level that it represents any O-level statement as technically and legally equivalent refinement of one or several of A-level statements (reversed by their conjunction) in a very simple natural language and therein put as formal binary predicates, ●total formality of the E-level that it represents any A-level statement as technically and legally equivalent refinement (reversed into a resp. conjunction) of one or several elementary inCs alias E-inCs, modeling (mathematizable) elementary alias E-level statements – hence the "E".

It is evident, that – for probably any known ETCI under FSTP-Test –

● while FSTP-test1(a) prompts for inputting to it the A-/E-level predicates, test1(b)-(d) prompt for the justification of this input under additional SPL O-/A-aspects, requiring these refinements;

● originally its O-level statements are pretty verbose and vague (and hence here just mentioned), the A-level statements are less verbose and less vague (due to their implicit binary predicates, called 'abstract' for distinguishing these informal A-predicates from the mathematically defined/-able E-predicates, potentially being subject to further limitations), while the E-level statements are of only 'also in Mathematics unavoidable verbosity' and therefore precise (by contemporary Mathematics);

● after having exactly and precisely[6.a)] determined ETCI's E-inCs – which normally requires several iterations over all its O-/A-/E-level statements by repeating the operational steps involved – also its A-inCs and even its O-inCs are precisely defined by them, though not necessarily unique but just isomorphic [7,64]. For an ETCI no such precise SPL knowledge exists prior to knowing its E-inCs.

After this declarative description of the structure [258**FIG1**] alias "outer shell" [258**11.a)**] of all SPL knowled-ge about an ETCI embodied by all O-/A-/E-level statements about it, the next bullet points outline how the content of this structure/shell is procedurally gained – as the Supreme Court's *MBA* framework re-quires. Thereby holds: Gaining it got eventually to be based on the mental instrument E-level "inventive concepts", as these are the only items precisely described, either in natural MAI language or formally:

---

4 **.a** As ridiculous as it may sound: Finally clarifying these steps has cost several years in the FSTP-Project – for grasping the whole problem depending on them.
  .b This is part of anybody's daily life: Mostly engaging only the O-level, seldom on the A-level, and virtually never on the E-level – which here is practiced for SPL, as ETCIs' specifications on the O/A-levels are hopelessly incomplete&imprecise, while CTCIs' specifications on the O/A-levels don't need this completeness&preciseness as with them human intuition is capable of dependably overcoming these gaps.

- Initially: Creating/Finding/Guessing an ETCI's inventive concept(s) on the O-level ought to be trivial, once its specification exists; prior to its existence this often multiply creative process is highly meta-physical but nevertheless supported by FSTP-Technology, as shown by other FSTP publications.

- Thereafter also is straightforward: Deriving/Guessing from this(these) O-inC(s) this ETCI's A-inC(s), refining or being equivalent to O-inC(s), thus getting more precisely about the ETCI, by
  - first determining, of this subject matter, its notional 'carrying pillars', called its "**ETCI-element(s)**" of its pair <invention/TT0, application/A>[5.b] – these ETCI-element(s) separate ETCI's concerns [258], are always indicated by keywords in ETCI's specification, and remain the same as for the A-level also for its E-level – and
  - then "modeling" (= precisely&exactly describing[6.a]) the properties of any ETCI-element by using a restricted natural language, **almost** exclusively based on "**atomic**" notions only [238].

- Finally: deriving/guessing from this/these A-inC/s the always several E-inCs – any one representing only a "single independent thought"[5.a] [5-9], defined in a **very restricted natural MAI language comprising only atomic notions**, thus getting absolutely exact[5.c] and precise about the ETCI[5.c] – such that any A-inC is a 'conjunction' of E-inCs and potential E-Cs (whereby the missing "in" indicates that it is an ordinary concept[6.b] – hence is superfluous, as elaborated on in [260]).

This disaggregation of the ETCI's whatever complexity is initially purely feeling controlled, by notionally 'refining' – i.e. 'separation of concerns' [122, 258[FIG1]] and 'layering' [123] – of usually compound O-/A-inCs into legally and logically equivalent conjunctions of E-inCs/E-Cs. It inevitably precedes its formal confirmation by the FSTP-Test [258[FIG2]].

'Separation of concerns' and 'layering' are fundamental in System Design Technique [2,122]. They here are used for O-/A-inC disaggregation, indispensable for most ETCIs. For such an ETCI to be tested under SPL, the complexity of the knowledge about it, modeled by only its O-/A-inCs, is opaque. I.e., for achieving the transparency of most ETCIs' A-/E-level representations necessary for their logical/ systematic test under SPL, both mental steps are imperative – but unknown to the patent community.

I.e., in determining an ETCI's 'SPL properties', applying these two powerful complexity reducing proce-dures – separation of its concerns [122] and layered refining its notions [123], including "free-hand" confirming that the logical sum of all its E-inCs describes this ETCI's total inventivity alias ETCI's meaning, thus directly leading to a COM[5.b] of this ETCI – is indispensable for dependably construing its refined claim interpretation & construction as required by the Supreme Court's *MBA* framework[5.d].

---

5 **.a** This totally fundamental Kant-like insight "1 E-crC models 1 independent thought" and vice versa – here put into FSTP language and significantly deepened – originates in the BGH's *Gegenstandstraeger* decision (1996) in a CTCI's nonob-viousness case (after several quite similarly justified nonobviousness BGH decisions), which then went completely un-noticed by the patent community. More about this rationale is provided by [6,7,9,237].

.b Had the courts started, for an ETCI, its SPL test by its refined claim interpretation&construction – and thereby deter-mined its COM(s) of inCs (by the FSTP-Test) – they would immediately have encountered the fundamental question: Does this COM at all exactly&precisely[6.a] describe this ETCI's inventivity as disclosed for the pposc by its specification? Mandatorily checking this question up-front, in construing ETCI's refined claim construction embodying COM [241], i.e. by using the BRI[MBA], would have avoided the known unfortunate dissents in and between courts dealing with this ETCI. These always are caused by the non-awareness of the exact and precise[6.a] scrutiny required for determining its COM(s).

.c If the ETCI's specification doesn't disclose enough such 'only 1 thought representing' E-inCs, it is called "**pathologic**" and here not considered [142].

.d The horribly expensive "software crisis" haunting IT during all the 60s/70s – quite similar to the current "SPL/ETCI crisis" – eventually led to accept this indispensability.

II.2.c: The Supreme Court's "inventive concept notion" – required by it to be used for modeling inventions, at least for analyzing them, explicitly required by *Mayo/Alice* and implicitly by *Biosig,* too – is a rigorous simplification of the here not used "AIT-concept notion" [2,3,4]. The latter is used, since the late 60s, for general purpose recursively exactly/precisely[6.a)] aggregating compound concepts from more elementary (= "atomic") ones.

Yet, both kinds of concepts, the AIT as well as the Supreme Court one, serve the same basic purpose – though of opposite "polarities": AIT concepts serve for exactly/precisely describing how new compound AIT concepts are to be aggregated from given elementary ones. By contrast, *MBA* framework based inC concepts – i.e. inCs, if this pleonasm is avoided – serve for exactly/precisely describing how given compound inCs are to be disaggregated into new elementary inCs. More precisely: For SPL compatibly notionally disaggregating given compound O/A-inCs into 'conjunctions' of E-inCs and E-Cs)[6.b)].

Thus, O-/A-/E-inCs facilitate modelling courts' SPL based decision making about ETCIs – by contrast to AIT-concepts, by their today being too mathematically sophisticated for providing this facilitation.

II.2.d: *Alice*'s "**Combination**" of an ETCI's E-inCs into O/A-inCs is the inverse inherent property of inCs to their in **II.2.c** discussed disaggregative inherent property, implied by *Mayo/Biosig*.

Though, *Alice* refines *Mayo/Biosig* by tying a patent-noneligible invention/TT0 to an application/A for achieving this ETCI's patent-eligibility without causing social problems for the SPL – as TT0's prevailing preemptivity now is "A-limited", which Solomonic avoids this social threat[6.c)].

II.2.e: The *MBA* framework hinted at another big chunk of metaphysics to be scientized Kant's way: Determining the precise bounds for uniformly granting patents to all ETCIs. This uniformity rationale is indispensably needed for a sustainably consistent interpretation of 35 USC § 101, in spite of the today 'unlimited preemptive' ETCIs, comprised by the inC category of natural phenomena and, broader, of abstract ideas, which 35 USC SPL must exempt from patent-eligibility as evidently violating Kant's "categorical imperative" embodied by the US Constitution. Its *Alice* decision clearly hints at the logical way out from this only seemingly existing ethical dilemma: It requires granting patents only to ETCIs of controlled preemptivity and for this uniform control to use ETCI's own "inventive concept(s)".

For mathematically modelling these fundamental inherent properties of "inC categories exempted from patent-eligibility" and of "inCs transforming a patent-noneligible invention into a patent-eligible subject matter applying this invention", three kinds of inCs must be distinguished – ordinary, 'improvement prone', and 'transformation warranting' ones – explained in detail in [237] and mathematized in [142].

---

[6] **.a** "Exact" shall reemphasize that this determination must seamlessly represent the *MBA* framework (including its social/preemptivity aspect), "precise" that this determination must not stay within the vague pre-*MBA* SPL semantics, but take an ETCI's SPL test to the here described level of development and hence scrutiny, prior to this semiotic process just unthinkable by logical reasons. Both properties are indispensable only when dealing with ETCIs.

   One could argue that none of these Supreme Court decisions explicitly requires the degree of preciseness/scrutiny as required here, for this high level SPL test of an ETCI. But this would mean forgetting about the *MBA* framework's striving for consistency in such precedents – about the social requirements the Supreme Court clearly stated in *Mayo* to be unconditionally met by its accordingly refined interpretation of 35 USC SPL. I.e.: The classic "materialistic only" SPL satisfiability tests (i.e. non-metaphysical in Kant's sense, i.e. ethics ignoring [237]) are deficient – by the *MBA* framework.

   .b E-Cs being known and belonging to posc or prior art, while E-inCs are new and do not belong to posc or prior art.

   .c The meaning of *Alice*'s "inventive concept, in^{A}C" is clarified in detail in [260].

II.3 :   Inventive Concepts' Basic Structure and their Meta-Mathematical Definition

The mathematization of SPL, outlined by   [9]   – culturally a historical step, as hitherto no comparable part of any law has ever been mathematized – starts by the following meta-mathematical MAI definition of the notion of inCs, as induced by the Supreme Court's *Markman/Teva* and *MBA* framework decisions. Its rigorous scientification provides groundbreaking advantages, first of all it enables drafting absolutely robust ETCIs patents, i.e. 'unassailable by SPL', if only exactly/precisely[6.a)] described by their inCs. [260] will focus on this fact.

This exactness[6.a)] of inCs is achieved by their following basic structure.

An inC is a pair "<'**legal concept**, **leC**', '**creative concept**, **crC**'>", or shorter <**leTS,crTS**>[7.a)], whereby:

- Any E-leC (and the E-leTS defining it) is 'ETCI independent', i.e. for any of the 9 kinds of stereotypical leCs/leTSes for all ETCIs principally the same justification of its correctness – modeled/described/defined on top of the sole "SPL-model" – as input by its user by a multiple-choice selection formally parameterized for ETCIs actual parameters.

  While any E-leC mirrors its simple E-leTS, an A-leTS/A-leC often is too complex for a clear verbal legal reasoning about an ETCI's inC – being one of the objectives of the FSTP-Technology.

- Any E-crC (and the E-crTS defining it) is ETCI dependent and to be defined, on top of its E-crC specific "E-crC-model", by the user of this ETCI's FSTP-Test by defining this E-crC's finite "truth set, E-crTS" – which must be disclosed for the pposc by the ETCI's specification[7.b)] – being the same in all 9 FSTP-testo's of this ETCI.

  crCs (and the crTSes defining them) are often precisely definable only on the E-level of notional resolution, as on the A-level they don't not meet the notional "atomicity" requirement – to be met by their mathematically precise definition – and thus are mentally uncontrollable [6,7,8,64,142].

As of today, an ETCI's A/E-leTSes are not defined at all[7.c)] and the definitions of its A/E-crTSes are left to the reader (see Subsection **II.2.b**), as for the moment these TSes need to be only meta-mathematically defined by using intuitive notions of an informal natural MAI type language[7.d)].

But, any E-crC is defined/-able also mathematically, once the model underlying it is so far clarified that its atomic E-notions are well-defined, on top of which its E-crTS then may easily be mathematically described in any formal FFOL (= finite first order logic) predicate notation, as SPL and any hitherto encountered ETCI are of FFOL. And its E-leTS is trivially mathematizable anyway. Perspectively, this eventually enables for an ETCI its A-inCs' comprehensible mathematical definitions, too.

In total: This "inC" notion that the *MBA* framework implies, today exceeds many patent experts' understanding of the SPL semiotics, as to its completeness and preciseness[3.b)], ETCIs urgently need for their SPL tests' sustainable consistency and predictability. Any average compiler/interpreter/database/… expert would rapidly understand this ETCI requirement [2] – thus also patent experts eventually will.

---

[7] **.a** The FSTP-Test [258[p.4]] shows: Also an ETCI's refined claim interpretation starts without considering, of its inCs, their legal aspects, and focuses in FSTP-test1 on only their creative concepts, crCs – their leCs are even only checked in FSTP-test2. Yet, principally, these leCs are of primary concern, as they assess the legal meaningfulness of their use.
     By contrast, for the BRI[PTO]'s "limitations" it is difficult to figure out how to provide their legal legitimation.
  .b the *MBA* framework does not require disclosing the E-leTSes's (for a priori avoiding *Markman/Teva* type problems)
  .c a problem easy to solve for SPL's E-leTS, as its basic solution comprises only 9 parameterized English sentences
  .d Semantics/Pragmatics research on this Supreme Court induced approach to SPL precedents about ETCIs will shortly deliver tools for automatically deriving purely mathematical representations from such always simple MAI type sentences.

The FSTP-Project's Reference List

FSTP = *F*acts *S*creening/*T*ransforming/*P*resenting (Version_of_07.02.2016[*])
Most of the author's below papers are written in preparation of [182] – i.e. are not intended to be 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"[*].
[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.
      MAI: "Mathematical Artificial Intelligence", the resilient fundament of AIT.
[3]   R. Brachman, H. Levesque: "Knowledge Represent. & Reasoning", Elsevier, 2004.
[4]   F. Baader, D. Calvanese, D. McGuiness, D. Nardi, P. Patel-Schneider: "The Description Logic Handbook", Camb. UP, 2010.
[5]   S. Schindler: "Math. Model. Substant. Patent Law (SPL) Top-Down vs. Bottom-Up", Yokohama, JURISIN 2013[*].
[6]   S. Schindler, **"FSTP" pat. appl.**: THE FSTP EXPERT SYSTEM", 2012[*].
[7]   S. Schindler, **"DS" pat. appl.**: "AN INNOVATION EXPERT SYSTEM, IES, & ITS PTR-DS", 2013[*].
[8]   S. Schindler, J. Schulze: "Technical Report #1 on '902 PTR", 2014.
[9]   S. Schindler: "Patent Business – Before Shake-up", 2015[*].
[10] SSBG's AB to CAFC in LBC, 2013[*].
[11] S. Schindler, **"inC" pat. appl.**: "inC ENABLED SEMI-AUTO. TESTS OF PATENTS", 2013[*].
[12] C. Correa: "Handbook on Prot. of IP under WTO Rules", EE, 2010.
[13] N. Klunker: "Harmonisierungsbest. im mat. Patentrecht", MPI, 2010.
[14] "USPTO/MPEP: "2111 Claim Interpretation: Broadest Reason. Interpretation"[*].
[15] S. Schindler: "KR Support for SPL Precedents", Barcelona, eKNOW-2014[*].
[16] J. Daily, S. Kieff: "Anything under the Sun Made by Humans SPL Doctrine as End. Instit. for Comm. Innovation", Stanford/GWU.
[17] CAFC En banc Hearing in LBC, 12.09.2013.
[18] USSC: SSBG's AB in CLS, 07.10.2013[*].
[19] USSC: SSBG's AB in WildTangt, 23.09.2013[*].
[20] USPTO, "Intellectual Property and the US Economy: INDUSTR. IN FOCUS", 2012[*].
[21] K. O'Malley: Keynote Address, IPO, 2013[*].
[22] S. Schindler, "An Inventor View at the Grace Period", Kiev, 2013[*].
[23] S. Schindler, "The IES and inC Enabled SPL Tests", Munich, 2013[*].
[24] S. Schindler, "Two Fund. Theorems of 'Math. Innovation Science'", Hong Kong, ECM-2013[*].
[25] S. Schindler, A. Paschke, S. Ramakrishna, "Form. Leg. Reas. that an Inven. Satis. SPL", Bologna, JURIX-2013[*].
[26] USSC: SSBG's AB in Bilski, 06.08.2009[*].
[27] T. Bench-Capon, F. Coenen: "Isomo. and Legal Knowledge Based Systems", AI&Law, 1992[*].
[28] N. Fuchs, R. Schwitter: "Att. to Con. E.", 1996.
[29] A. Paschke: 'Rules / Logic Programming in the Web". 7. ISS, Galway, 2011.
[30] K. Ashley, V. Walker, "From Info. to Arg. Retr. for Legal Cases", Bologna, JURIX-2013[*].
[31] CAFC, H. in Oracle / Google, "As to Copyrightability of the Java Platf.", 06.12.2013.
[32] S. Schindler, "A KR Based Inno. E. Sys. (IES) for US SPL Preceds", Phuket, ICIIM-2014[*].
[33] S. Schindler, "Status Report about the FSTP Prototype", Hyderabad, GIPC-2014.
[34] S. Schindler, "Status of the FSTP Prototype", Moscow, LESI, 2014.
[35] S. Schindler, IPR-MEMO: "STL, SCL, and SPL – STL Tests seen as SCL Tests seen as SPL Tests", in prep.
[36] S. Schindler, "Boon and Bane of Inventive Concepts and Refined Claim Construction in the Supreme Court's New Patent Precedents", Berkeley, IPSC, 08.08.2014[*].
[37] D. Bey, C. Cotropia, "The Unreasonableness of the BRI Standard", AIPLA, 2009[*].
[38] CAFC, Transcript of the Hearing in TELES vs. CISCO/USPTO, 08.01.2014[*].
[39] CAFC, Transcript of the en banc Hearing in CLS vs. ALICE, 08.02.2013[*].
[40] SSBG's Brief to the CAFC in case '453[*].
[41] SSBG's Brief to the CAFC in case '902[*].
[42] SSBG's Amicus Brief to the CAFC in case CLS, 06.12.2012[*].
[43] S. Schindler, **"LAC" pat. appl.**: "Semi-Auto. Gen./Custom. of (All) Confirmative Legal Arg. Chains (LACs) in a CI's SPL Test, Enabled by Its Inventive Concepts", 2014[*].
[44] R. Rader, S. Schindler: Panel disc. "Patents on Life Sciences", Berlin, LESI, 2012.
[45] USSC: SSBG's AB as to Clls, 28.01. 2013[*].
[46] S. Schindler: "Autom. Deriv. of Leg. Arg. Chains (LACs) from Arguable Subtests (ASTs) of a Claimed Invention's Test for Satisfying SPL", U Wasaw, 24.05.2014[*].
[47] S. Schindler: "Auto. Generation of All ASTs for an Invention's SPL Test"[*].
[48] USPTO/MPEP: "2012 Proc. for Subj. Mat. Eli. ... of Pro. Claims Inv. Laws of Nature", 2012[*].
[49] USPTO/MPEP, Supp. Ex. Guideli. for Determ. Compli. with 35 U.S.C. 112; MPEP 2171[*].
[50] NAUTILUS v. BIOSIG, PFC, 2013[*].
[51] BIOSIG, Respondent, 2013[*].
[52] Public Knowledge et al., AB, 2013[*].
[53] Amazon et al., AB, 2013[*].
[54] White House, FACT SHEET - ... the Presid.'s Call to Str. Our PS and Foster Inno., 2014[*].
[55] B. Russel: "Principia Mathematica", see wikipedia.
[56] CAFC Decision Phillips v. AWH Corp., 12.07.2005
[57] M. Adelman, R. Rader, J. Thomas: "Cases and Materials on Patent Law", West AP, 2009.
[58] SSBG's Amicus Brief to the Supreme Court as to its (In)Definiteness Quest's, 03.03, 2014[*].
[59] S. Schindler, **"UI" pat. appl.**: "An IES Cap. of S-Auto. Gen./Invoking All LACs in the SPL Test of a CI, Ean. by InCs", 2014[*].
[60] S. Schindler: "Auto. Der. of All Arg. Chains Leg. Def. Patenting/Patented Inventions", **ISPIM, Montreal,** 6.10.2014, update[*].
[61] H. Wegner: "Indf., the SI. Giant in SPL", www. Iaipla.net/hal-wegners-top-ten-patent-cases/.
[62] .a) CAFC decision on reexamination of U.S. Pat. No. 7.145,902, 21.02.2014[*].
      .b) CAFC decision on reexamination of U.S. Pat. No 6,954,453, 04.04.2014[*].
[63] B. Wegner, S. Schindler: "A Mathe. Structure Modeling Inventions", Coimbra, CICM-2014[*].
[64] SSBG's Petition to the CAFC for Rehearing En Banc in the '902 case, 2014[*].
[65] CAFC: VEDERI vs. GOOGLE, 14.03.2014
[66] CAFC: THERASENSE decision, 25.05.2011
[67] B. Fiacco: Amicus Brief to the CAFC in VERSATA v. SAP&USPTO, 24.03.14[*].
[68] USSC, Transcript of the oral argument in Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank, 31.03.2014[*].
[69] R. Rader, Keyn. Sp.: "Pat. Law and Lit. Ab.", ED Tex Bench and Bar Conf., 01.11.2013[*].
[70] S. Schindler, Keynote Speech: "eKnowledge of SPL – Trail Blazer into the Innovation Age", Barcelona, eKNOW-2014[*].
[71] .a) S. Schindler: "The Sup. Court's 'SPL Init.': Sci. Its SPL Interpreta. Removes 3 Everg. SPL Obscurities", PR, 08.04.2014[*].
[72] .b) S. Schindler: "The Supreme Court's 'SPL Initiative': Sci. Its SPL Int. Rem. 3 Everg. SPL Obsc. and En. Auto. in a CI's SPL Tests and Arg. Chains", Honolulu, IAM2014S, 18.07.14[*].
[73] .a) USPTO/MPEP: "2014 Procedure For Subject Matter Eligibility Analysis Of Claims Reciting Or Involving Laws Of Nature/Natural Principles, Natural Phenomena, And/Or Natural Products", [48,49], 2014[*].
      .b) MEMORANDUM: "Prelim. Examin. Instructions in view of Alice v. CLS"[*].
[74] B. Wegner: "The Mathematical Background of Proving an InCs Based Claimed Inv. Satisfies SPL", 7. GIPC, Mumbai, 16.01.2015[*].
[75] CAFC Order as to denial [65], 27.05.2014
[76] D. Crouch: "En Banc Fed. Cir. Panel Changes the Law of Claim Construction", 13.07.2005[*].
[77] Video of the USPTO Hearing, 09.05.2014[*].
[78] R. Rader, Keynote Speech at GTIF, Geneva 2014 and LESI, Moscow, 2014
[79] S. Schindler: "On the BRI-Schism in the US NPS ...", publ. 22.05.2014.[*]
[80] USSC: SSBG's PfC in the '902 case, Draft_V.133_of_[121], publ. 14.07.2014[*].
[81] S. Schindler: "To Whom is Interested in the Supreme Court's Biosig Decision"[*]
[82] R. Deberardine: "Inno.Corp.Per.", FCBA[*].
[83] SSBG's Petition to the CAFC for Rehearing En Banc in the '453 case, 09.06.2014[*].
[84] CAFC's Order as to denial [83], 14.07.2014[*].
[85] CAFC: "At Three Decades", DC, 2012.
[86] S. Schindler Foundation: "Transatlantic Coop. for Growth and Security", DC, 2011.
[87] DPMA: "Recent Developments and Trends in US Patent Law", Munich, 2012.
[88] FCBA: "Inno., Trade, Fis. Real.", Col. S., 2013.
[89] LESI: GTIF, Geneva, 2014.
[90] FCBA: "Sharp. C. Man.", Asheville, N.C., 2014
[91] B. Wegner, S. Schindler: "A Math. KR Model for Ref. CI. Cons. II", subm. for publication.
[92] SSBG's Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court in the '453 case, 06.10.2014[*].
[93] E. Morris: "What is 'Technology'?", IU I.N.[*]
[94] E. Morris: "Alice, Artifice, and Action – and Ultramercial", IU I.N., 08.07.2014[*].
[95] S. Schindler, ArAcPEP-MEMO: "Artifice, Action, and the Pat.-Eli. Prob.", in prep., 2014.
[96] A. Chopra: "Deer in the Headlights, Response of Incumbent Firms to ... ", School of Management, Fribourg, 2014[*].
[97] S. Schindler, DisInTech-MEMO: "R&D on Pat. Tech.: Eff. and Safety Boost.", in prep., 2014.
[98] G. Boolos, J. Burgess, R. Jeffrey: "Computability and Logic", Cambridge UP, 2007.
[99] A. Hirshfeld, Alexandria, PTO, 22.07.2014[*].
[100] C. Chun: "PTO's Scrutiny on Software Patents Paying Off", Law360, N.Y.[*].
[101] P. Michel, Keynote, PTO, 22.07.2014.
[102] D. Jones, Alexandria, PTO, 22.07.2014.
[103] R. Gomulkiewicz, Seattle, CASRIP, 25.07.14.
[104] M. Lemley, Seattle, CASRIP, 25.07.2014.
[105] D. Jones, Seattle, CASRIP, 25.07.2014.
[106] B. LaMarca, Seattle, CASRIP, 25.07.2014.
[107] J. Duffy, Seattle, CASRIP, 25.07.2014.
[108] J. Pagenberg, Seattle, CASRIP, 25.07.2014.
[109] M. Adelman, Seattle, CASRIP, 25.07.2014.
[110] B. Stoll, Seattle, CASRIP, 25.07.2014.
[111] R. Rader, Seattle, CASRIP, 25.07.2014.
[112] E. Bowen, C. Yates: "Justices Should Back Off Patent Eligibility, ...", L360[*].
[113] S. Schindler: "The CAFC's Rebellion is Over – The Supreme Court, by Mayo/Biosig/Alice, Provides Clear Guidance as to Pat. ETCIs", published 07.08.2014[*].
[114] S. Elliott: "The USPTO Patent Subj. Matter Eligi. Guidance TRIPs", 30.07.2014[*].
[115] W. Zheng: "Exhausting Patents", Berkeley, IPSC, 08.08.2014[*].
[116] R. Merges: "Independent Invention: A Limited Defense of Absolute Infringement Liability in Patent Law", Berkeley, IPSC, 08.08.2014[*].
[117] J. Sarnoff, Berkeley, IPSC, 08.08.2014.
[118] H. Surden: "Principles of Problematic Pats", Berkeley, IPSC, 08.08.2014[*].
[119] www.zeit.de/2013/33/multiple-sklerose-medikament-tecfidera/seite-2[*].
[120] J. Merkley, M. Warner, M. Begich, M. Heinrich, T. Udal: "Letter to Hön. Penny Pritzker", DC, 06.08.2014[*].
[121] USSC: SSBG's PfC in the '902 case, 25.08.2014[*].
[122] D. Parnas, see Wikipedia.
[123] E. Dijkstra, see Wikipedia.
[124] S. Schindler: "Computer Organization III", 3. Semester Class in Comp. Sc., TUB, 1974-1984.
[125] S. Schindler: "Nonsequential Algorithms", 4. Semester Class in Comp. Sc., TUB, 1978-1984.
[126] S. Schindler: "Optimal Satellite Orbit Transfers", PhD Thesis, TUB, 1971.
[127] USSC Decision in KSR......
      USSC Decision in Bilski......
      USSC Decision in Mayo .....
      USSC Decision in Myriad .....
      USSC Decision in Biosig .....
      USSC Decision in Alice .....
[128] R. Feldman: "Coming of Age for the Federal Circuit", The Green Bag 2014, UC Hastings.
[129] D. Quinn: "Judge Michel says Alice Decision 'will create total chaos'", IPWatch,[*].
[130] G. Frege: "Function und Begriff", 1891.
[131] L. Wittgenstein: "Tract. logico-philoso.", 1918.
[132] B. Wegner, MEMO: "About relations (V.7-final)", 25.04.2013[*].
[133] B. Wegner, MEMO: "About con. of pre. /con., scope and solution of problems", 20.08.2013.
[134] B. Wegner, MEMO: "A refined relat. between domains in BADset and BEDset", 18.09.2014.
[135] H. Goddard, S. Schindler, S. Steinbrener, J. Strauss: FSTP Meeting, Berlin, 29.09.2014.
[136] S. Schindler: "Tutorial on Commonalities Between System Design and SPL Testing".[*].
[137] S. Schindler: "The Rationality of a Claimed Invention's (CI's) post-Mayo SPL Test – It Increases CI's Legal Quality and Professional Efficiency in CI's Use", in prep.
[138] USSC: "The USSC Guid. to Robust ET CI Patents", ICLPT, Bangkok, 22.01.2015[*].
[139] USSC: Order as to denial [121], 14.10.2014[*].
[140] S. Schindler: "§ 101 Bashing of § 101 Clarification", published 27.10.2014[*].
[141] BGH, "Demonstrationsschrank" decision[*].
[142] B. Wegner, S. Schindler: "A Mathematical KR Model for Ref. CI. Inst. & Constr. II", in prep...
[143] ... Press, ... to go into [137] ....
[144] "Turmoil ......", see program of AIPLA meeting, DC, 23.10.2014
[145] "Dark side of Innovation", ... see [137]
[146] D. Kappos: About his recent west coast meetings, AIPLA, DC, 23.10.2014.
[147] CAFC, Transcript of the Hearing in Biosig case, 29.10.2014[*].
[148] R. Rader: Confirming that socially inacceptable CIs are extremely preemptive, such as for example [119]2), should be patent-eligible, AIPLA meeting, DC, 24.10.2014.
[149] A. Hirshfeld: Announcing the PTO's readiness to consider also hypothetical CIs into its resp. guideline, AIPLA meeting, DC, 24.10.2014.
[150] S. Schindler: "Alice-Tests Enable 'Quantifying' Their Inventive Concepts ... – A Tut. about this Key to Increasing a Patent's Robustness", USPTO&GWU, 06.02.2015[*], see also [175][*].
[151] S. Schindler: "Biosig, Refined by Alice, Vastly Increases the Robustness of Patents – A Tutorial about this Key to Increasing a Patent's Robustness", in prep."[*].
[152] S. Schindler: "Auto. Deriv./Reprod. of Legal Argument Chains, Protecting Patens Against SPL Attacks", Singapore, ISPIM, 09.12.2014[*].
[153] S. Schindler: "Practical Impacts of the Mayo/Alice/Biosig-Test – A Tutorial about ... Patent's Robustness", 2015 IP Scholars Roundt., Berale Uni. Law School, 27.03.2015[*].
[154] CAFC Decision in DDR, 05.12. 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] CAFC Decision in DDR, 05.12. 2014[*].
[157] USPTO: "2014 Int. Guidance on Pat. Subj. M. Eli. & Examples: Abs. Ideas", 16.12.2014[*].
[158] USSC's Order as to denial [92], 08.12.2014[*].
[159] CAFC Decision in Myriad, 17.12.2014[*].
[160] S. Schindler: "The USSC Mayo/Myriad/Alice Decisions, The PTO's Implementation by Its IEG, The CAFC's DDR & Myriad Recent Decisions – Clarifications&Challenges"[*], publ. 14.01.2015[*], its short version[*], and its PP presentation at USPTO, 21.01.2015[*].
[161] S. Schindler: "The IES: Phil. & Func. & Ma. F. – A Proto.", 7. GIPC, Mumbai, 16.01.2015[*].
[162] CAFC Decision in CET, 23.12.2014[*].
[163] S. Schindler: "The USSC's Mayo/Myriad/Alice Decisions: Their Overinterpret. vs. Oversimplification of ET CIs – Scientific. of SPL Prec. as to ET CIs in Action: The CAFC's Myriad & CET Decisions", USPTO, 07.01.2015[*].
[164] J. Schulze, D. Schoenberg, L. Hunger, S. Schindler: "Intro. to the IES UI of the FSTP-Test", 7. GIPC, Mumbai, 16.01.2015[*].
[165] "ALICE AND PATENT DOOMSDAY IN THE NEW YEAR", IPO, 06.01.2015[*].
[166] S. Schindler: "Today's SPL Precedents and Its Perspectives, Driven by ET CIs", 7. GIPC, Mumbai, 15.01.2015[*].
[167] N. Sachs: "A Survey of Pat. Inv. since Alice". F&W LLP, Law360, New York, 13.01.2015[*].
[168] S. Schindler: "PTO's IEG Forum – Some Aftermath", publ. 10.02.2015[*].
[169] Agenda of this Forum on [157], Alexandria, USPTO, 21.01.2015[*].
[170] G. Quinn: "Patent Eli. For. Discuss. Ex. Appl. of Mayo/Myriad/Alice", IPWatched, 21.01.2015[*].
[171] S. Schindler: "Semiotic Impacts of the Supreme Court's Mayo/Biosig/Alice Decisions on Legally Analyzing ETCIs"[*].
[172] USSC Decision in Teva, 20.01.2015[*].
[173] USSC Decision in Pullman-Standard, 27.04.1982[*].
[174] USSC Decision in Markman, 23.04.1996[*].
[175] S. Schindler: "A Patent's Robustn. & 'Double Quantifying' Its InCs as of Mayo/Alice", WIPIP. USPTO&GWU, 06.02.2015[*].
[176] R. Rader: Questions as to the FSTP-Test, WIPIP, USPTO&GWU, 06.02.2015[*].
[177] D. Karshtedt: "The Completeness Regu. in Pat Law", WIPIP, USPTO&GWU, 06.02.2015[*].
[178] O. Livak: "True Unresol. Ambiguity of Patent Claims", WIPIP, USPTO&GWU, 06.02.2015[*].
[179] J. Miller: "Reasonable Certain Notice", WIPIP, USPTO&GWU, 06.02.2015[*].
[180] S. Ghosh: "Demarcating Nature After Myriad", WIPIP, USPTO&GWU, 06.02.2015[*].
[181] CAFC Decision in Cuozzo, 04.02.2015[*].
[182] S. Schindler: "Patent/Innovation Technology and Science", Textbook, in prep.
[183] S. Schindler: "The Mayo/Alice SPL Ts/Ns in FSTP-T&PTO Init.", USPTO, 16.03.2015[*].
[184] S. Schindler: "PTOs Efficiency Increase by the FSTP-Test, e.g. EPO and USPTO", LESI, Brussels, 10.04.2015[*].
[185] R. Chen: Commenting politely on "tensions" about the BRI, PTO/IPO-EF Day, 10.03.2015.
[186] A. Hirshfeld: Rep. about the PTO's progress of the IEG work, PTO/IPO-EF Day, 10.03.2015.
[187] P. Michel: Moderating the SPL paradigm ref. by Mayo/Alice, PTO/IPO-EF Day, 10.03.2015.
[188] P. Michel: Asking this panel as to diss. of Mayo/Alice, PTO/IPO-EF Day, 10.03.2015.
[189] M. Lee: Luncheon Keynote Speech, PTO/IPO-EF Day, 10.03.2015[*].
[190] A. Hirshfeld: Remark on EPOI's ref. of pat. ap. examination, PTO/IPO-EF Day, 10.03.2015.
[191] 16th Int. Roundt. on Sem., Hilo, 29.04.2015[*].
[192] M. Schecter, D. Crouch, P. Michel: Panel Disc., Patent Quality Summit, USPTO, 25.03.2015.
[193] Finnegan: 3 fund. current uncert. on SPL prec, Patent Quality Summit, USPTO, 25.03.2015.
[194] S. Schindler, J. Schulze, D. Schoenberg: "post-Mayo/Biosig/Alice – The Precise Meanings of Their New SPL Terms", publ. 08.04.15[*].
[195] R. Stoll: "Fed. Cir. Cases to Watch on Softw. Pat. – Planet Blue", Patently-O, 06.04.2015[*].
[196] See the panel at the IPBCGlobal'2015, San Francisco, 14-16.06.2015[*].
[197] S. Schindler: "Mayo/Alice – The USSC's Requirement Statement as Semiotics in SPL & ETCIs, USPTO, 06.05.2015[*].
[198] S. Schindler: "Pats' Abs. Robust. & the FSTP-Test", LESI 2015, Brussels 18.04.2015[*], DBKDA 2015 Rome 27.05.2015.
[199] B. Wegner: "The FSTP Test – Its Mathe. Assess. of an ET CI's Practical and SPL Quality", LESI 2015, Brussels, 18.04.2015[*] and DBKDA 2015, Rome, 27.05.2015.
[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[*].
[201] Panel: "Patent Prosecution Session", AIPLA, LA, 31.04.2015.
[202] S. Schindler: "The Notion of "InC", Fully Scientized SPL, and 'Controlled Preemptive' ETCIs", published by 2015[*].
[203] I. Kant, http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/kant/.
[204] J. Lefstin: "The Three Faces of Prometheus: A Post-Alice Jurisprudence of Abstraction", N.C.J.L.&TECH, July 2015[*].
[205] CAFC Decision in Biosig, 27.04.2015[*].
[206] USSC Petition for Cert in ULTRAMERCIAL vs. WILDTANGENT, May 2015. .
[207] K.-J. Melullis, report about a thus caused problem with a granted patent at the X. Senate of the German BGH.
[208] S. Schindler: "Reach of SPL Prot. for ETCIs of Tied Preemptivity", published by 25.06.2015[*].
[209] CAFC Decision in Ariosa, 12.06.2015[*].
[210] S. Braswell: "All Rise for Chief Justice Robot", 07.06.2015[*].
[211] S. Schindler: "The Cons. of Ideas Mo. USSC's MBA-Semiotics and its Hi-Level", in prep.
[212] R. Merges: "Uncertainty, and the Standard of Patentability", 1992[*].
[213] CAFC Decision in Teva, 18.06.2015[*].
[214] K. O'Malley, B. Lynn, A. Weiss, M. Cooper: "Pat. Lit. Case Man.: Reforming the Pat. Lit. Proc. ...", FCBA, 25.06.2015.
[215] P. Clare, A. Bencivengo, N. Kelley, J. Reisman: "Claim Construct.", FCBA, 26.06.2015.
[216] P. Naik, C. Laporte, C. Kinzig, T. Chappel, K. Gupta: "Chan. IP Norms and their Effect on Inno. in Bio-/Pharmaceut.-/High-Tech Sectors of the Corporate World", FCBA, 27.06.2015.
[217] S. Schindler: "The US MPS: The MBA Framework a Rough Diamond – but Rough for Ever? Teva will Cut this Diamond and thus Create a Mega-Trend in SPL, Internat.", publ. 21.07.2015[*].
[218] B. Russel: "Principles of Mathematics", see Wikipedia.
[219] I. Kant: The Metaphysical Foundations of Natural Science ", Wikipedia.
[220] CAFC Decision in LBS, 23.06.2015[*].
[221] CAFC Decision in Cuozzo, 08.07.2015[*]..
[222] CAFC Decision in Versata, 09.07.2015[*].
[223] CAFC Decision in Internet Patents Corporation, 23.06.2015[*]..
[224] J. Duffy, J. Dabney: PfC, 13.08.2009[*].
[225] S. Schindler: "A PS to an Appraisal to the USSC's Teva Decision: CAFC Teaming-up with PTO for Barring Teva – and this entire 'ET Spirit' Framework?", pub 27.07.2015[*].
[226] R. Stoll, B. LaMarca, S. Ono, H. Goddard, N. Hoelder: "Challenging Software-Business Method Pat. Eli. in Civil Actions and Post Grant Review", CASRIP, Seattle, 24.07.2015.
[227] A. Serafini, D. Kettelberger, J. Haley, J. Krauss: "Biotech and Pharma Patents Eligi.:", CASRIP, Seattle, 24.07.2015.
[228] D. Kettelberger, see [227]
[229] Justice Breyer: "Archimedes Metaphor", [69][*].
[230] I. Kant: https://en.wikipedia. com/wiki/Immanuel_Kant & I. Kant: "Critique of Pure Reason", https://en.wikipedia.com/w-iki/I_Kant.
[231] I. Kant: "Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals", https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Groundwork of _the Metaphysics of Morals.
[232] I. Kant: "Categorical Imperative", https://en. wikipedia.org/wiki/Categorical_Imperative
[233] I. Kant: "Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics", https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ Prole-gomena_to_Any_Future_Metaphysics.
[234] J. Dabney: "The Return of the Inventive Concept?", 06.12.2012[*].
[235] USPTO: "July 2015 Update on Subj. Matter Eligibility", 30.07.2015[*]
[236] Concepts, http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/concepts/.
[237] S. Schindler: "The Sol. of the Patent-Eligibility/Preemptivity Prob. – Rooted in Kant", in prep.
[238] R. Hanna: "Kant and the Foundations of Analytic Philosophy", OUP, 2001.
[239] S. Koerner: "The Philosophy of Mathematics", DOVER, 2009
[240] USSC: PfC by Cuozzo[*].
[241] S. Schindler: "Draft of an Amicus Brief to the USSC in Cuozzo supporting", publ. 05.11.2015[*].
[242] "The Evolving Landscape at PTAB Proceedings", AIPLA, DC, 22.10.2015[*].
[243] M. Lee: Publ. Interview at Opening Plenary Session, AIPLA, DC, 21.10.2015.
[244] S. Schindler: "The ITC's July 2015 Update & the 'Patent-Eligibility Granted'-ing, PEG' Test", publ. 18.12.2015[*]
[245] M. Lee: USPTO Director's Forum, Enhanced Patent Quality Initiative: Moving Forward", 06.11.2015[*].
[246] ISO/OSI Reference Model of Open Systems Interconnection, see Wikipedia.
[247] S. Graham (LAW.COM): Q&A With AIPLA President Denise DeFranco, 13.11.2015[*].
[248] S. Schindler: Question on Parker vs. Flook, 22.06.1978[*].
[249] CAFC Denial of En Banc Petition in Ariosa v. Sequenom, 02.12.2015[*].
[250] D. Crouch (Patently-O): Federal Circuit Reluctantly Affirms Ariosa v. Sequenom and Denies En Banc Rehearing, 03.12.2015[*]
[251] S. Schindler: "Patent-Eligibility and the 'Patent-Eligibility Granted'-ing, PEG' Test, resp. the CAFC Objectively Counters the Supreme Court's MBA Framework, by its DDR vs. Myriad/ Cuozzo Decisions]", publ. 05.01.2016[*].
[252] E. Coe: "Michelle Lee Steers USPTO Through Choppy Waters", Law360, 09.12.2015[*].)*) available at
[253] USSC Cert Petitions in Halo v. Pulse and Stryker v. Zimmer, 22.06.2015
[254] CAFC Oral Argument in McRo v. Bandai, 11.12.2015
[255] CAFC Oral Argument in Lexmark v. Impression, 02.10.2015
[256] CAFC Decision in Carnegie v. Marvell, 04.08.2015
[257] S. Schindler: "A PS as to the Motio Decision ....",publ. 11..01.2016[*].
[258] S. Schindler: "BRI[PTO] by the USPTO or BRI[MBA] by the Supreme Court?", this paper[*]
[259] S. Schindler: "Classical Limitations or MBA Framework's Inventive Concepts?",08.02.2016[*],
[260] S. Schindler: "Patent-Eligibility: Vague Feeling or MBA Facts?", 12.02.2016[*]

*) available at www.fstp-expert-system.com